

# OFFICE OF INFORMATION PRACTICES

STATE OF HAWAII  
NO. 1 CAPITOL DISTRICT BUILDING  
250 SOUTH HOTEL STREET, SUITE 107  
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813  
TELEPHONE: 808-586-1400 FAX: 808-586-1412  
EMAIL: oip@hawaii.gov

To: House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs

From: Cheryl Kakazu Park, Director

Date: February 23, 2024, 2:00 p.m.  
State Capitol, Conference Room 325

Re: Testimony on S.B. No. 1600  
Relating to Open Meetings

---

---

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony on this bill, which would require at least six days between the board meeting at which a permitted interaction group set up by a Sunshine Law board makes its report, and the subsequent meeting at which the full board discusses and potentially takes action on the report. The Office of Information Practices (OIP) **supports** this bill to the extent it sets a clear standard consistent with OIP's interpretation of the Sunshine Law.

Subsection 92-2.5(b)(1) of the Sunshine Law allows a government board to set up what is commonly called a permitted interaction group, or PIG, of less than a quorum of members to work together outside the context of a board meeting to investigate an issue. The investigatory PIG in this particular subsection requires three separate board meetings: the first to assign the PIG members and set the scope of their investigation and authority, the second to hear their report without discussion (at which point the PIG is effectively dissolved), and the third for the full board to discuss and perhaps take action on the issue the PIG investigated. (Note that the investigatory PIG should not be confused with a negotiating PIG

established under subsection 92-2.5(b)(2), which does not have the same requirement for three meetings and is a preferred method of providing legislative testimony in a timely manner.)

Since an investigatory PIG can conduct its work without public meetings or testimony, OIP has long interpreted this provision to require a board to provide sufficient time between the second and third meetings for the public to digest the PIG's report and then testify on it before the full board's discussion and possible action on the issue at the next meeting. Otherwise, the statutory requirement for a third meeting would be pointless and the public could be fully shut out of the process. **While a full six days as proposed by this bill may not always be necessary to allow the public to respond to a PIG's report, a meeting on the same day or the day after the report is made (as boards have occasionally proposed) is clearly insufficient time to allow the public to respond. This proposal would set a clear standard for how much time must elapse** between the meeting where a PIG reports and the one at which the board discusses and acts on the report, so as to prevent efforts to circumvent the current law's requirement. OIP therefore recommends this Committee pass out the bill.

Thank you for considering OIP's testimony.



House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs  
Honorable David A. Tarnas, Chair  
Honorable Gregg Takayama, Vice Chair

**RE: Testimony in Support of H.B. 1600, Relating to Open Meetings**  
Hearing: February 23, 2024 at 2:00 p.m.

Dear Chair and Members of the Committee:

My name is Ben Creps. I am a staff attorney at the Public First Law Center, a nonprofit organization that promotes government transparency.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony **in strong support** of H.B. 1600. This measure amends HRS § 92-2.5 to clarify that six calendar days is the minimum time required between the public disclosure of the PIG's report and any subsequent board action on the report.

The Sunshine Law has an exception to the open meetings requirement to permit a limited number of board members (permitted interaction group or "PIG") to investigate an issue, without complying with the Sunshine Law, and report back to the board before a discussion occurs. The statute requires *three* different meetings: (1) to identify the members and scope of the investigative group; (2) for the group to report its findings; and (3) to discuss and act on the report. HRS § 92-2.5.

On multiple occasions over the years, boards have tried to circumvent the legislative intent that the public (and the board) have an opportunity to digest the report before any substantive discussion by scheduling back-to-back second and third meetings. Last year, for example, the City Council attempted to schedule a meeting for a group to report back on its investigation into real property tax bills with a "separate" meeting scheduled 30 minutes later to discuss and act on the report. H.B. 1600 would clarify that the third meeting must occur at least 6 days after meeting second meeting.

This measure will promote public access and informed decision-making, while preserving boards' ability to conduct board business through PIGs. Simply clarifying the original legislative intent, this measure ensures the public's right to understand what happened during these closed-door investigations *before* a board discusses and acts on the information.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify in support of H.B. 1600.





House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs  
Chair David A. Tarnas, Vice Chair Gregg Takayama  
Friday, February 23, 2024, 2 PM Public Hearing in Conference Room 325 on  
HB 1600, RELATING TO OPEN MEETINGS

TESTIMONY

Douglas Meller, Legislative Committee, League of Women Voters of Hawaii

Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Takayama, and Committee Members:

**The League of Women Voters of Hawaii supports HB 1600.**