•	CONFIDENTIAL —
	1
1	The Senate
2	State of Hawai'i
3	State Capitol
4	Honolulu, Hawai'i
5	96813
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	TESTIMONY OF KA'IULANI LAMBERT
14	
15	Executive Session of the Senate Committee on Water,
16	Land, Agriculture and Hawaiian Affairs' transcript of tape
17	recorded testimony Re. Confirmation Hearing of Peter Young,
18	commencing at 2:40 p.m. on Friday, April 13th, 2007.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Transcribed April 19th, 2007 in Honolulu, Hawai'i
25	by B. KANOELANI COCKETT, HI CSR 379, CA CSR 7995

SENATOR KOKUBUN: We remain in Executive Session to hear the presentation by subpoenaed witness Ka'iulani Lambert. It is approximately 2:40, Friday afternoon, April the 13th.

Present is Sarah Akinaka, Richard Wada, Jason

Watts, Attorney General Mark Bennett. Members of the

Committee are Chair Kokubun, Vice Chair Tokuda, Senator Slom,

Senator Fukunaka, Senator Hee.

Ka'iulani, will you please stand. I need to swear you in as part of our official proceeding.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

SENATOR KOKUBUN: Will you please raise your right hand.

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony that you will be giving at this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY SENATOR KOKUBUN:

- Q. Thank you very much. Please be seated.
- A. Um-hum.
- Q. Ka'iulani, I'm going to run through a few perfunctory kind of questions.

You have been subpoenaed to testify on the background, character and qualifications of Peter Young, who was nominated by the governor to be the chairman of the Board of Land and Natural Resources.

After undergoing the oath I'm sure you understand that the testimony you give today will have to be truthful.

Can you please verbally --

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. You know, you also understand that we are taping this proceeding so that we can establish a record of what is going on, so we would need for you to verbally --
 - A. Yes, I understand.
- Q. Okay. Thank you very much, Ka'iulani. And thank you for your patience. I know you've been waiting for a number of days, and thank you.

You know, we have heard from already two staff people from the Bureau of Conveyances, essentially Harriet Enriques and Scott Chang. I want to just begin, then, by asking you to state your name for the record, your position at the -- and your place of employment and your address. I'm sorry, your name, address, place of employment and title.

A. Okay. My name is Ka'iulani J. Lambert. I am a land document receiving clerk at the Bureau of Conveyances. I'm also an HGEA steward for Unit 3. My place of employment is at 1151 Punchbowl Street, and I have ten years with the department.

Q. Thank you very much. (Inaudible.)

You have -- are those documents that you have brought with you?

A. Pretty much. It's just a solidarity list of the people that supported us in our correspondence with Peter Young, and eventually which led to our letters to Bob Awana before we could even meet with Peter, because we had made several attempts to meet with him at various levels. Before we got to him we went to Dennis, we went through a chain of command and we brought our concerns to Peter, where it was rightfully supposed to be.

It wasn't until we told him that we would go, you know, further. You know, we wanted to go to Bob Awana, and basically it was to voice the concerns of our members and our employees at work. So this is pretty much it.

I don't know, am I supposed to be distributing this to you folks?

- O. We will take care of that.
- A. Yeah, okay. Um. . .
- Q. If you know, as you're making your presentation, Ka'iulani, if I tell you that we've already --
 - A. You've already got this stuff?
- Q. No, no, not necessarily. As you're providing the information, as I say, I'm not being rude. I'm just informing you that we have heard one perspective, and so if

there are any questions, we can ask you --

A. Well, basically we all pretty much had this. And I'm not sure what Scott them provided for you, but what I did was we kept a record of all the things that we organized in order to present it to you folks.

For us this is all relatively new, and we went based off of our audit by Marion Higa, which is part of our Table of Contents. But firstly, like I said, this is just our correspondence with Peter Young, himself, and addressing some other issues and concerns.

On the second packet we have a whole bunch of stuff, too, that we actually tried to address with you folks. One is the audit. The second was, again, our solidarity list. C was our Pacific Business News articles because, you know, this is where the controversy started, and it was made public about our backlog and problems that we were having, issues like workplace violence. Our grievances were part of this, the prohibitive practice, and the reorg. chart.

Finally -- well, not "finally". We have the House bills that were eventually killed. I'm hoping that it didn't go through on the House. I'm not sure. There is still that -- you know, that timetable where that House rule was going to come back in. So we put that in here, and also the unresolved grievances that we had, which I had, and I just collected for the records.

- Q. Thank you.
- A. Um-hum.
- Q. And, you know, in your ten years you said that you've worked for the Bureau of Conveyances?
 - A. Um-hum.
 - Q. It was always at the Bureau of Conveyances?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. Did you work at DLNR in any other capacity?
- A. No. I worked in the title business as well. I was at Island Title first where I started, and I stayed there for about ten months, and I joined with Long & Malone, which is no longer Long & Malone, and I was there for six years before I came over to the department.
 - Q. I appreciate you sharing this information.

One of the issues, you know, of course, that we've been made aware of through a number of people, including the investigator from the Attorney General's Office, Dennis Naganuma, is that there is an investigation going on now.

Can you shed any information on those issues from your perspective?

much it.

* * *

with issues like this on a daily basis, believe it or not.

reality show here at the Bureau of Conveyances of all the

activities that happen on a daily basis, but that's pretty

And you probably heard the dramas already. It's just like a

It's frustrating because we do -- we're dealing

1 Q. Yeah.

- A. I mean, why would you even have us? Why don't you just take the whole Bureau of Conveyances and do it yourself and do the entire process?
- Q. Right, and then the only issue being paying the dollar in conveyance tax?
- A. Correct. I mean, that's normally how they would expedite the document. They wouldn't need to go through the formal procedures of actually getting a waiver. That's what the title companies do to escape from doing that.
 - Q. Oh.
- A. Whether that's something legal, I cannot challenge. It provides me with certain things to record and I take it for what its worth.
- Q. Do you know if these kinds of amendments cost the title company any additional monies, other than just the one dollar conveyance tax, I mean? You essentially are saying that the document had a flaw and so they want to amend it; is that correct? Do I have the right assumption?
- A. Well, in this instance it's to do a correction they are going through the proper way. They are amending it to do like some kind of typos in the mean. So, actually, if they came to us at the receiving level where you come in to record, I would have accepted the document for what it was worth with a conveyance tax form. The document, itself, was recordable,

but it didn't have one of these exemption sheets to notify the tax office.

So what this is is actually, in essence, this is where you would actually fill out your return address, you know, for assessment purposes. So why wouldn't you want to notify the state tax office of any corrections to your document, especially if it has to do with your name because, you know, they are going to be coming back a few years later when they get the tax assessment bill and say, "That's not my name"? I mean, you know, "They misspelled my name."

I think I was supposed to be giving you one of our HLPA agreements, or you guys were asking Harriet for.

Business -- the agreement between the title company. Okay.

So I have a copy of this for you folks as well. This is the

agreement that we have with all the --

- Q. How current is that agreement?
- A. It was never re -- I don't know if it was revised. Some of these title companies don't even exist. Long & Malone is no longer there.

SENATOR TOKUDA: What is the date on that one?

THE WITNESS: This one is in '94.

SENATOR KOKUBUN: Oh, pretty old, then.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. And I do believe this is done with Sandy Furukawa during her tenure there.

SENATOR KOKUBUN: You think that's the most current?

THE WITNESS: As far as I know, this is the only one we have. If there was any amendments, they are not going to provide us a copy, and I know that there were some title companies that came forward to try and get in. They were not included in the process, and if they did amend it, then Carl would have records of any amendments, but to date, this is what the receiving section has.

SENATOR KOKUBUN: Okay. Members, any questions for Ka'iulani?

BY SENATOR TOKUDA:

Q. I'm just curious, Ka'iulani.

In terms of Carl Watanabe's assignments, yeah, or what he's tasked to do, who gives him these assignments?

I mean, he's been assigned special projects, right? That's

his job description, but who would be the one to give him these special projects?

- A. To assign the certain functions, I mean who actually put them there, I don't know, but what he's supposed to be doing, he has his clerks come down to take in -- they pick and choose what things they are going to check and what they are going to do, you know, on a daily basis. So I'm in the regular receiving section, so I'm not certain as to what they are actually taking upstairs. There's no gauging on my part because I'm on the other side, but from my understanding the clerks, at the time that they were addressing the backlog, took portions of dates, you know, that they were working supposedly in date order.
- Q. At one point Carl was opening mail or going through the mail backlog?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And in opening mail you're opening checks, potentially, or receiving checks?
- A. Actually, we have -- they have the clerks in the mail section or the will call section open all the documents. So they sorted through what they thought was important, which would have been the mortgages and deeds.
 - Q. Um-hum.
- A. The ones -- the documents (inaudible) were mail dated they didn't work on right away. Like releases of

mortgages, they didn't feel it was critical, so they threw it on the side and they tried to address, I believe, the deeds and mortgages because those pretty much affect title because people are paying mortgages and the documents really aren't on record, and you night be paying a mortgage and you're not even holding title.

- Q. I'm just trying to get at what happens if Carl, in his special assignment, was to deal with the mail backlog, he, himself, would be coming into contact with any potential checks that's in the mail. I know we've been told that in the mail you've got checks. Sometimes you even have cash, so whether Carl, himself, in doing the special projects would be coming into any contact with these checks.
 - A. I'm sure, yes.
- ${\tt Q.}$ And who is Carl -- I know we probably asked this a few witnesses ago.

Who is Carl's supervisor? Who does he report to?

- A. I believe it's supposed to be Bob and Peter in the chain of command.
- Q. So there's no one between the director's office, essentially? It's just Peter, Bob, Carl?
 - A. Carl, yes.
 - Q. And are you aware as to whether or not, you

know, the director was involved in his reassignment or --

- A. I'm not sure.
- Q. Or you just know he was reassigned?
- A. All we know is that he went on leave indefinitely, and of course we found that out first in the PBN, and so when we questioned Bob about it, you know, where we were asking, in essential, was is he on sick leave? Is he on family leave? You know, what kind of leave? What's going on? You know, we had no answers with us.

He goes, "Well, you know, that's with us right now and we respect that you guys honored, you know, that he's going to be out on leave indefinitely," with no explanation.

You know, just kind of cut us off right there.

- Q. And when was that, again?
- A. I believe it must have been about January.
- Q. January?
- A. Of last year.
- Q. 2006?
 - A. Yeah, between January and February.
- Q. So since January 2006 he's been on special projects on the second floor?
 - A. I think that took in effect sometime in July, June or July.
 - Q. The special projects?
- A. Yes.

1 SENATOR TOKUDA: Thank you.

SENATOR KOKUBUN: Okay. Members, any questions?

Yes, Senator Fukunaka.

BY SENATOR FUKUNAGA:

- Q. You know, in, I guess, the correspondence that you provided us copies of --
 - A. Um-hum.
- Q. -- you said that you had tried -- or I guess various groups of employees have tried to schedule and follow up in relaying some of the problems to the director, and you went through your chain of command and you subsequently had a meeting with Director Young, and with, I guess, Director Young and/or Bob Awana.

As a result of the meeting with Director Young, was there any followup, you know, as to the specifics you've provided, or was it pretty much just nothing happened after that and then you went to the governor's office, you know, to Bob Awana to try and seek some, I guess, implementation or addressing of, you know, the specific concerns that you brought to their attention?

A. Well, what had transpired is that if you read -what in essence happened was that we -- in the first attempt
we sent that off to talk to Peter. We rallied our people to
go to sign this solidarity letter to try and make appointments
with him. He kept deferring us, you know, like, "You know

what, I can't make it here. I can't do it there. I'm going to defer you to Bob," you know, on our problems. So we already went to Bob to discuss issues.

And in our dialogue with Bob, we weren't getting — we knew we weren't going to get anywhere because we knew that Bob is trying his best to address the issues, but it was not moving anywhere. So we decided, you know what, we have to go to Peter, in essence, because the responses we got from Bob pretty much was going nowhere. So we just kept going up the line to address him, and he kept telling us, "No, come back to Bob." So it was just an endless circle we were going back in.

So we decided that the next on the chain would have been to try and correspond with Bob Awana. We sent e-mails to him. We sent our proposals of the things that we wanted to discuss, our e-mails -- pretty much our dialogue that we had with Peter.

When he found out that we went to Bob, he sent his secretary. His secretary e-mailed Scott Chang to schedule a meeting. So, in essence, we finally got our wish, and that was from December it took, I think, January when we finally got to meet with him.

And in the dialogue we had with him, with Peter, he assured us that he would take a full active role in the bureau affairs, and that he would come to, you know -- he was at the time having manager meetings when you were supposed to come up

with ideas on how to work on the backlog. He wanted us to actually get involved with the process of bringing ideas forward, and we did. We shot him ideas about -- like for me, it was flex time because that was an issue. And we actually had solutions, you know, to address the backlog.

If we had staggered some of the work hours, you would still have coverage in our sections. And technically, they wouldn't -- you wouldn't need a crew, in essence, to work, you know, in long hours. So we would stagger it and then you wouldn't have to work with a budget, you know, for overtime.

So that went back and forth, and right now we have got nothing. I've been e-mailing periodically, you know, to send stuff, and I found that the only way I would be able to address Peter is by shooting him e-mails.

We would try to make attempts to meet with him at his brown bags. He told us to come and -- you know. And I said, "Okay. You know, that's fine," but every time he posts them, it's like at quarter to 11, you know, for the first shift of lunch, and we don't know about it until after we find out. Okay. Well, oh, it's going on. Oh, okay. Or sometimes he posts it and then the next thing you know, it's cancelled.

So I shot an e-mail to him and said, "Well, you know, you told us that you want to have these interactions, but yet you cancel 'em," or, you know, "You know, what's the

purpose of having it?" At one time it just disappeared, so I said, "You know, you told us that you want us to correspond with you. You entertained the idea of coming back to -- you know, to go back to the brown bag, but where is it? What's become of it? I shot you that before. I told you about the problems we were having. I came to you. I went to lunch."

And let me tell you, at the beginning I went to the first one and he just had loads of people in there to talk to. And we had grievances about our one-hour lunch. So entertain -- not only do I try to come up -- I try to come up with solutions to help him, and he said, "Well, I'll look into it," but he never follows through. So that's pretty much what the discussions became with him.

It was apparent that, "You know what, I'm just going to -- I'm just going to entertain these ideas and then I'll get back to you," but he never follows through. So I'm still waiting on my flex time suggestion.

So in essence, yeah, got nowhere with him. I went to -- I think -- did anybody tell you that we went -- Bob

Awana had told us to go to Laderta, so we went there, too, and I'm still waiting for them to correspond about our pretty much our daily activities at the bureau. So now within our e-mails we just fire away to everybody.

And we just got e-mailed, by the way. That was just in January, thanks to, you know, Dennis. It was pretty

much just one-sided stuff, because, you know, that Nicole was firing stuff to Lingle on a daily basis about the gripings about just what regular system is doing or what we're not doing. So this way we got the fair advantage. You know, we're on an equal playing field now. So at least they are going to hear and see the things that we were doing. And we're forwarding all the transmittals now and keeping track of those activities, but we never got any response from Bob Awana's office or Laderta.

SENATOR KOKUBUN: Senators, is that it?

SENATOR TOKUDA: Yup.

SENATOR FUKUNAGA: Yup.

SENATOR KOKUBUN: Okay. Senator Hee, you have questions?

SENATOR HEE: Yes.

- Q. Ka'iu, thank you.
- A. Um-hum.
- Q. You provided us this?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. You know, I went through this thing and it seems to me a lot of it, a lot of the letters have to do with the actions of Nicole Gagachang (phonetic), yeah?
 - A. Yes.
 - O. On December 28th, you wrote to Peter Young.
 - A. Which one is that one?

- Q. Attachment one of four. The receive date, 28

 December --
 - A. Yes.
 - O. -- 1:38. Now, on page --
 - A. Yeah, I got it right here, a letter to Peter.
 - 0. -- 27.

And then in the third paragraph you say on line two, we see -- "We continue to see setbacks caused by the same incompetent land court branch chief."

- A. Um-hum.
- O. Is that Carl Watanabe?
- A. That is Nicole Gagachang.
- Q. That's Nicole Gagachang.

Then you say that on line one, two, three, four, "Among these rants is overtime permitted for Sundays. The land court branch strongly believes that because she is unable to come in on Sundays, therefore, Sundays should not be permitted."

Why is that?

- A. Because she goes to church on Sundays.
- Q. No, no. Why is the land court branch chief necessary to be present?
- A. That's policies that she set forth. She wants everything to be controlled by her and her alone. So if you're going to do any overtime, she has to be present,

although you have assistant registrars under her that supervise girls in their section. So, in essence, on certain occasions they do -- they do set -- they have ARs present to work on overtime, but she's trying to control just the weekend overtime.

Q. What is her job description? What -- or let me ask it this way.

What in her job description requires her to be present for people to work overtime on Sundays?

- A. I don't know.
- Q. I see. Has she -- have you folks asked her why she needs to be present, or have you asked Ihara or Masuda or have you folks made inquiries?
 - A. No, I haven't, I haven't.
 - O. Okay.
- A. Like I said, it's hard for me to pretty much get involved in their section because I'm on the other side.
 - Q. Um-hum. But I see one, two, three, four --
- A. We all signed it because we're the stewards on this front page, yeah.
- Q. But then also there is a petition in the back that's contained there.
 - A. Yeah.
 - Q. Okay. Who is Susan Cummings?
 - A. She is the land court receiving section supervisor.

	CONTIDENTIAL	26
		2.0
1	Q. So are you familiar I don't know if you	
2	provided us this.	
3	Are you familiar with this letter? You see	
4	where I underlined? That's why I'm wondering.	
5	A. No, I'm not, I'm sorry.	
6	Q. Let me see.	
7	Did we have another handout so she can use that	
8	handout?	
9	(Off-the-record discussion was held.)	
10	BY SENATOR HEE:	
11	Q. Thank you. If you use this one and I use that	
12	one, because I wrote stuff on it.	
13		
14	* * *	
15		
16		
17		

•

* * *

- Q. Does Bob Masuda know that this kind of e-mail goes --
- A. Oh, yes. So Masuda, he knows, too, because we go through the chain of command. We just fire off stuff. We as stewards take it, you know, personally, "What are these guys doing in here? Bob? Dennis? Peter?"
 - o. It's all on the same e-mail?
- A. Sometimes we address it, but then we cc it to them, you know, depending on circumstances. If we're dealing with Bob, we deal with Bob, but we cc, so, yes, Peter is well aware of all of this stuff.
- Q. Has anyone taken corrective action or responded to the e-mail?
- A. No, but I have one (inaudible) here on mine because, I mean, something really serious about this, if you need it, I sent it to Bob and Dennis. They are my immediate chain, and I cc'd it to Peter about his activities.
 - Q. Yeah, I --
 - A. In this instance I sent this. It was just recent.

- Q. Yeah, yeah. Okay. Thank you.
- A. Um-hum.

SENATOR HEE: That can be returned.

SENATOR KOKUBUN: Oh, she has a question.

SENATOR TOKUDA: Followup.

Q. You know, I notice you have a lot of the grievances in your packet.

What is the altercation that took place between Sandy Furukawa and Harriet, I believe, in terms of a workplace violence.

- A. Workplace violence, that one led to us going to arbitration.
 - Q. This is not when Sandy worked for --
 - A. No.
 - Q. Was she working at Title Guaranty?
- A. She worked for -- now, on that day I was not there to see it firsthand, but apparently what had happened was we were doing a recording for Title Guaranty, and Sandy just so happened to be recording on a personal, on personal stuff that -- she comes in frequently. At least once a week she records documents, but apparently she was there, but she said she was not there in the capacity of a TG employee but was recording personal stuff.

She had interfered with a recording process with one of our -- the TG clerks. The documents -- this instance a

document was recorded double system, and we were shorthanded. I was out sick, so Harriet came forward as a branch chief to the receiving section to help us, and she went on the front counter to receive documents while we checked -- while the other girls were taking prechecks.

Apparently there was some kind of altercation with -- or there was communication between another receiving clerk, Carla Martin. She did not -- she was supposed to recheck the document for a TCT number or a blank space.

For instance, you have a deed, and the following document is the mortgage. The mortgage needs the blank space to provide for the new certificate of title that was issued on the first document, which is the deed. There was nothing on the second page, so Harriet had to tell the girl, "You know what, you forgot the blank space for me to fill the TCT in on your mortgage." So it created some problems, and she already had recorded the document. Sandy got involved and there were words that were between her --

- Q. Words between Harriet and Sandy Furukawa?
- A. Harriet and Sandy. And Sandy was saying, "You don't need a TCT." Statute provides that if you're going to do any land court recordings, you need a TCT, a transfer certificate of title. So there were -- there were discussions, and Sandy Furukawa took it upon herself to say that Harriet was yelling at her, so it --

1 | End of Tape 1, Side A

Tape 2, Side A.

THE WITNESS: Statute provides that if you're going to do any land court recordings, you need a TCT, a transfer certificate of title. So there were -- there were discussions, and Sandy Furukawa took it upon herself to say that Harriet was yelling at her. So it led to a workplace violence situation, which she went to Carl to discuss about what was going on.

There was an investigation by Carl stating, you know, his own investigation. He didn't take proper policies and procedures that was done. We have -- I think I have a policy here for zero tolerance workplace violence, but prior to this, Carl and Nicole were charged with workplace violence, and pretty much --

BY SENATOR TOKUDA:

- Q. (Inaudible.)
- A. Yeah. So in that instance, that pretty much got swept under the rug.
- Q. But that was where Sandy, who no longer works for the bureau --
 - A. Um-hum.
 - Q. -- complained to Carl --
- A. Um-hum.
 - Q. -- that his employee was --

- 1 A. Yelling.
- Q. -- at her, and that was a situation of workplace violence?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. But she's not an employee at the bureau?
- A. Yes.

5

9

10

14

18

19

- 7 Q. She's a private citizen and --
- 8 A. Yes.
 - Q. -- and made (inaudible) allegations as a private citizen?
- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. Did this take place with Sandy in front or behind of the counters?
 - A. In front of the counters.
- 15 Q. So she was there as?
- A. She said personally, but then she got involved with TG business on the TG recording.
 - Q. And then you also had something about an illegal reorganization?
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. What was -- I'm not sure where in your packet that was.
- And was that, I guess, resolved?
- A. Yeah. Carl was ultimately ordered to put the sections in the perspectives, org. On the org what he did was

we were reorg'd illegally to merge the receiving regular system and land court to receive both documents where statute allows you can't do that.

We come under two laws, 501 and 502. The recording procedures are different, but what they did was because they felt that that was in our capacity, we're doing pretty much the same thing, they merged us. When he merged this, it created more problems internally because we weren't cross trained to do the work in land court. You know, you're just assuming the duties, but there were problems with the recording process and eventually led to people not showing up to work.

- Q. Okay. So Carl conducted this reorganization?
- A. Yes. It started with Mason as a pilot program, and what it was supposed to do was we were going to do it on a short-time basis to see if it would actually work, but he was going through the process, process, you know, with the union for consultation to see if they could do it.

They were actually pilot programs to see if this stuff would work, but the bottom line was it created more problems internally as far as checking the documents and errors because there were no -- there was no training, cross training for both sections, because then we had to learn different reviewing procedures in that. So I was one of them that filed it. I was the original that filed the grievance.

BY SENATOR KOKUBUN:

Q. You know, Ka'iulani, one of the issues that have come up are the gifts that come from title companies.

Can you -- are you aware of that?

- A. Oh, yeah.
- O. So that occurs at like, what, holiday time?
- A. Holiday time.
- Q. Is it a practice that's been going on for many years?
 - A. When I started it was already happening.
- Q. Can you give us any idea about the different kinds of gifts that were brought?
- A. During the year sometimes we would get malasadas or we would get manapua. I know there were situations when we were working on the weekends they would provide us lunch, provide us breakfast, you know, doughnuts, anything to -- like for Christmas times there would be gift packages or baskets and then.
 - Q. For every employee?
- A. It was actually addressed to the bureau, and what they did was during Christmastime they placed it around the tree. Everybody would do a lottery thing where you pick numbers and they assign numbers to these things.
 - O. Yeah.
 - A. And everybody would essentially get something out

of it, and if they didn't have, then they kind of made it that every employee had something, but this was going on for years.

- Q. Oh. What about were there other kinds of gifts? Were there cash gifts?
 - A. I'm not aware of that. I'm not aware of that.
 - O. Were there clothes?
 - A. No, not that I know of.
 - Q. Okay. What about trips?
 - A. Don't know about that.

SENATOR KOKUBUN: Okay. Okey-doke.

BY SENATOR HEE:

- Q. Let me ask you something to follow up with that previous questions.
 - A. Um-hum.
- Q. Are you aware of gifts to Nicole Gagachang or Carl Watanabe specifically?
- Vegas or probably we know that he went on conventions. And I heard that he also bragged about the fact that he may have had, you know, special interest groups like Marriott that he can stay anyplace in the states. He can go like, you know, he can get a hotel, and even his son could have a job working for them.
 - Q. But you don't know --
 - A. I don't know that, but that's like secondhand

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think those were our documents in the file. THE WITNESS: Which one? SENATOR TOKUDA: Oh, yeah, the packet from Mason is ours, this one right there. THE WITNESS: Oh, yeah, sorry about that. (Off-the-record discussion was held.) SENATOR KOKUBUN: Thank you. Okay. It is now 3:35 and we will close this Executive Session with subpoenaed witness Ka'iulani Lambert. Thank you. We are in recess. End of Tape 2, Side A End of testimony of Ka'iulani Lambert.