

**HAWAII BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICINE**  
Professional and Vocational Licensing Division  
Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs  
State of Hawaii

MINUTES

Date: November 12, 2021

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Place: Virtual Videoconference Meeting – Zoom Webinar  
(use link below)  
<https://dcca-hawaii-gov.zoom.us/j/92887005793>

Present: Leianne K. Lee Loy, D.V.M., Chairperson  
Craig Nishimoto, D.V.M., Vice-Chairperson  
Nathaniel Lam, D.V.M., Member  
Aileen Wada, Public Member  
Marcella Chock, Public Member  
Shari J. Wong, Esq., Deputy Attorney General (“DAG”)  
Kelly Suzuka, Esq., DAG  
Candace Ito, Acting Supervising Executive Officer,  
PVL, DCCA  
Kerrie Shahan, Executive Officer  
Chelsea Fukunaga, Executive Officer  
Leanne Abe, Secretary  
Marc Yoshimura, Technical Support

Excused: None.

Guests: Jenee Odani, D.V.M., Hawaii Veterinary Medical Association  
Stephanie Kendrick, Hawaii Humane Society

Agenda: The agenda for this meeting was filed with the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, as required by Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”) section 92-7(b).

A brief video was played to explain procedures for this virtual meeting and how members of the public can participate and interact with the Board during the meeting.

Call to Order: Chairperson Lee Loy proceeded with roll call. All Board members confirmed they were present. There being a quorum present, the meeting was called to order at 10:06 a.m. by Chairperson Lee Loy.

Approval of the  
Minutes of the  
October 13, 2021  
Board Meeting:

Chairperson Lee Loy asked if any members of the public would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item. There were none.

After discussion, it was moved by Ms. Chock, seconded by Ms. Wada, and unanimously carried to approve the October 13, 2021 open session meeting minutes as circulated.

Chapter 91, HRS  
Adjudicatory  
Matter:

Chairperson Lee Loy called for a recess from the meeting at 10:09 a.m. to discuss and deliberate on the following adjudicatory matter pursuant to Chapter 91, HRS (Board members and staff entered into Microsoft Teams):

- A. In the Matter of the Veterinary Medicine License of Emma M.B. Kaiser, D.V.M.; VET 2021-15-L Settlement Agreement Prior to Filing of Petition for Disciplinary Action and Board's Final Order

After discussion, it was moved by Vice-Chairperson Nishimoto, seconded by Dr. Lam, and unanimously carried to approve the Settlement Agreement Prior to Filing of Petition for Disciplinary Action and Board's Final Order relating to the Matter of the License to Practice Veterinary Medicine of Emma M.B. Kaiser, D.V.M.; VET 2021-15-L.

Following the Board's review, deliberation, and decision on these matters pursuant to Chapter 91, HRS Chairperson Lee Loy announced that the Board reconvene to its regular Chapter 92, HRS meeting at 10:25 a.m. Board members and staff returned to the Zoom meeting.

The Board briefly discussed continuing education requirements in light of the Covid-19 pandemic. Executive Officer Shahan advised the Board that this matter should be placed on a future meeting.

Applications:

Chairperson Lee Loy asked if any members of the public would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item. There were none.

At 10:27 a.m., it was moved by Ms. Chock, seconded by Dr. Lam, and unanimously carried via a roll call vote by Chairperson Lee Loy for the Board to enter into Executive

Session to consider sensitive matters related to public safety or security, to deliberate or make a decision upon a matter that requires the consideration of information that must be kept confidential pursuant to a state or federal law, or a court order in accordance with HRS sections 92-5(a)(1),(6), and (8), and to consult with the Board's attorney on questions and issues pertaining to the Board's powers, duties, privileges, immunities, and liabilities in accordance with HRS section 92-5(a)(4).

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 10:41 a.m., the Board returned to public session.

#### Applications:

Chairperson Lee Loy asked if any members of the public would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item. There were none.

#### A. Ratification of Issued Licenses

After discussion, it was moved by Vice-Chairperson Nishimoto, seconded by Dr. Lam, and unanimously carried to ratify the following issued licenses:

- i. Federschmidt, Sara Lynn
- ii. Stibbard, Kealaaumoe Sandra
- iii. Plante, Claire
- iv. Anderson, Megan Faith
- iv. Smith, Shannon May
- v. Arnold, Kimberly D.
- vi. Smart, Jocelyn A.N.
- vii. Beebe, Signe E.

#### B. Approval of Restoration Application

After discussion, it was moved by Vice-Chairperson Nishimoto, seconded by Dr. Lam, and unanimously carried to approve the following restoration application for:

- i. Granborg, Susan E

Examinations: Chairperson Lee Loy asked if any members of the public would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item. There were none.

A. Results of the State Veterinary Licensing Examination Administered on October 15, 2021

Candidates Eligible:	8
Exams Administered:	8
Successful:	8
Failed:	0
No Shows:	0

Correspondence: Chairperson Lee Loy asked if any members of the public would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item. There were none.

A. 2021 ICVA Annual Report for Licensing Boards (informational purposes only)

The 2021 International Council for Veterinary Assessment Report for Licensing Boards and was distributed to Board members for their information.

Unfinished Business: Chairperson Lee Loy asked if any members of the public would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item. There were none.

A. On-line Testing Cost Analysis

Executive Officer Shahan reported that she spoke to the Examination Branch Chief David Grupen. Executive Officer Shahan informed the Board that the current fee for the exam is \$30.00 which is set forth by Hawaii Administrative Rules ("HAR") section 16-53-41.

Mr. Grupen indicated that he is unable to provide an answer to what the difference in cost would be between an online exam and the existing written exam for the following reasons:

1. The Board would need to change its current administrative rules in order to start the process.

2. Several testing vendors would need to be contacted in order to research what the cost difference would be.

Other factors that could affect the price would be the number of applicants examined and whether the vendor would need to develop the exam.

Chairperson Lee Loy asked the Board whether they would be interested in pursuing online testing.

Dr. Lam indicated that he would be in favor of instituting an online testing. Dr. Lam commented that the California Veterinary Board is moving towards eliminating their State exam requirement. He also mentioned that Hawaii and California are the only states that require an exam for licensure. Dr. Lam conceded that while Hawaii has very unique topography and environment concerns that may affect the Board's decision.

DAG Wong stated that the Board has a bank of specific questions for the State exam. Periodically, past Board members have met with the Exam Branch to review and update questions which relate to Hawaii-specific topography, plants, insects and quarantining procedures.

Executive Officer Shahan commented that there is no jurisprudence on the exam. She added that the existence of the bank of questions would most likely lower the cost of offering the exam online. Executive Officer Shahan reminded the Board that the rule change process was slow and cumbersome.

Ms. Ito inquired as to the purpose of this discussion as the agenda item is on-line cost analysis. Was it to establish the cost of offering an online exam?

Chairperson Lee Loy clarified that she had requested to add this agenda item to determine whether online testing was possible. The topic later evolved into how much proctoring the exam online would cost.

Ms. Ito suggested that if the Board wishes to expand its discussion on on-line testing it should be placed on a future meeting agenda.

It was moved by Dr. Lam, seconded by Vice-Chairperson Nishimoto and unanimously carried to discuss amending the administrative rules to allow for on-line testing at a future meeting.

Review & Vote-  
Proposed Legislation  
Concerning Out-of-State  
Veterinarians  
(HRS Section 471-2):

Chairperson Lee Loy asked if any members of the public would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item.

Executive Officer Shahan stated she would highlight changes made to the proposed legislation which reflect concerns raised at the October 13, 2021 meeting, by the PIG group, DCCA administration, and RICO.

The first change was to the definition of “consultation” which has been amended to,

“Consultation means a Hawaii-licensed veterinarian seeks and receives advice in-person, telephonically, electronically or by any other method of communication from a veterinarian or other person whose expertise and the opinion of the licensed veterinarian would benefit a patient. The Hawaii-licensed veterinarian receiving consultation, maintains a veterinary-client-patient-relationship.”

Executive Officer Shahan stated that the “emergency response” definition was also updated due to recent revelations regarding who has the authority to authorize the removal of animals from a dangerous situation.

“Emergency response’ means the response authorized by an Hawaii Sheriff or Police Department or any Hawaii State or County contractor deputized to enforce animal laws, to a situation involving an animal rescue or cruelty case needing urgent attention.”

Executive Officer Shahan stated that she was aware that the Hawaiian Humane Society wished to offer testimony on this definition.

Executive Officer Shahan stated that the proposed definitions for Indirect Supervision and Sponsor had not changed.

Executive Officer Shahan stated that because the veterinary-client-patient relationship is used in the newly amended definition of “consultation”; and since it is not currently defined in statute, a definition was added.

Executive Officer Shahan stated that she was aware that the Hawaii Veterinary Medical Association wished to provide testimony on this definition. She then read the definition:

“Veterinarian-Client-Patient-Relationship” means:

1. Both the veterinarian and client agree for the veterinarian to assume responsibility for making medical judgments regarding the health of the animal(s);
2. The veterinarian has sufficient knowledge of the patient to initiate at least a general or preliminary diagnosis of the medical condition of the patient, which means that the veterinarian is personally acquainted with the keeping and caring of the patient and has recently physically examined the patient or made timely and medically appropriate visits to the premises where the patient is kept; and
3. The veterinarian is readily available or provides for follow-up care and treatment in case of adverse reactions or failure of the regimen of therapy;
4. The veterinarian maintains records that document patient visits, consultations, diagnosis and treatment and other relevant information required under this chapter;
5. A veterinarian designated by a Hawaii-licensed veterinarian with a veterinary-client-patient-relationship who has access to or relevant patient records

may provide on-call or cross-coverage services.”

Executive Officer Shahan indicated that the duplicate wording under the proposed HRS section 471-2(3) has been deleted as follows:

“Any farmer from giving from giving to another farmer the assistance customarily given in the ordinary practice of animal husbandry; or”

Executive Officer Shahan noted that the proposed HRS section 471-2(6) was amended to include the terms, “commonwealth” and “the District of Columbia or the United States of any province of Canada”.

The proposed HRS section 471-2(7) was amended to:

“A veterinarian licensed in a commonwealth, state or the District of Columbia of the United States or Canadian province practicing in Hawaii under the sponsorship and indirect supervision of a Hawaii-licensed veterinarian as part of an emergency response. Sponsors must file notification with the Board regarding the arrival of out-of-state veterinarians. The notification is to include the name of the out-of-state veterinarian; the entity authorizing the emergency response; and the nature of the emergency. The sponsored veterinarian may serve in an emergency capacity for no longer than 21 consecutive days;”

Executive Officer Shahan indicated that she amended the proposed HRS section 471-2(8) to be consistent with the existing administrative rules. She explained that the rules currently state that applicants applying for a temporary permit, must sign up for first available exam. Because the exam was initially only offered twice a year, the current rules were written to accommodate potential scheduling delays. Now that the exam is offered every month, the length of time needed to take the exam should be updated. The proposed HRS section 471-2(8) was amended to:

“Any applicant who meets the licensing requirements of practicing veterinary medicine under a veterinarian by temporary permit; provided the applicant applies for and takes either first available examination scheduled by the board or no later than seven months from first becoming eligible for the exam. A This temporary permit shall not be renewed;”

Executive Officer Shahan stated that the American Veterinary Medical Association (“AVMA”) requested that permittees be subject to RICO and Board discipline. The language of the proposed HRS sections 471-2(9) and 471-2(10) has changed to reflect this accommodate this request.

The last change was to add the following language for the proposed HRS section 471-2(11):

“In no case shall an individual be issued a courtesy permit and an emergency permit within the same calendar year.”

Executive Officer Shahan noted that the relief permit is unsupervised and can be renewed from the original 30 days to an additional 30 days for a total of 60 days.

Chairperson Lee Loy recognized Stephanie Kendrick of the Hawaiian Humane Society. Ms. Kendrick commented that she had some concerns regarding the changes to the definition of “emergency response”. Ms. Kendrick stated that while the current definition is sufficient for animal rescue situations, she had wanted the definition to include natural disaster situations such as hurricanes or tsunamis.

Ms. Kendrick also expressed her reservations regarding the permit overlap clause. She indicated her preference for a 60-day practice cap as opposed to making the respective permits mutually exclusive. Ms. Kendrick explained that there may be situations in which an out-of-state veterinarian may be brought in for two weeks on a relief permit to relieve a Hawaii-licensed veterinarian but may also wish to perform spay and neuter services afterward, requiring a courtesy permit. Rather than restricting a willing veterinarian’s type of practice or depriving the Hawaii Humane Society of these services, a max cap on practice days might be more

practical. Ms. Kendrick indicated that she understands the Board's position regarding unlicensed practice and is thankful for the opportunity to have participated in the Permitted Interaction Group ("PI Group").

Executive Officer Shahan explained that the language regarding natural disasters was removed with the understanding that the Governor would issue an emergency proclamation that would supersede the Board's rules and statutes.

Ms. Ito explained that the current language in this draft was meant to narrow the definition of an "emergency response". A broad definition of "natural disaster" outside of one declared by the Governor, would be open to interpretation. Initially, the PI Group proposed that the State Veterinarian could declare a state emergency or disaster. The State Veterinarian stated that he does not have this authority; State Sheriffs and Police Departments have the authority to declare an emergency response and deputize state and county contractors to enforce animal laws involving animal rescue or cruelty requiring urgent attention.

Ms. Kendrick indicated that most of the scenarios she is referring to would result in the Hawaii Emergency Management Agency ("HIEMA") declaring a disaster or state of emergency. She suggested including language regarding a natural disaster recognized by HIEMA.

Ms. Ito suggested that a separate section could be added to reference that.

Dr. Odani posited that there may be situations in which a zoonotic disease, one that only affects animals and not humans, might require special expertise to be brought in on an emergency basis. An email from the State Veterinarian to declare an animal emergency could be sufficient.

Executive Officer Shahan shared an email from Dr. Maeda, the State Veterinarian, who indicated that he does not have the ability to declare animal emergencies in statute or in administrative rule. He is able to initiate quarantine orders for disease incidents but would still need to seek approval from the Chair of the Board of Agriculture.

Dr. Odani indicated that he is able to do that really quickly.

Dr. Lam commented that there was an ambiguity in whether veterinarians are included in medical declarations of emergency by the governor. Dr. Lam indicated that veterinarians were considered emergency personnel but it was unclear whether they could administer Covid-19 vaccines. Dr. Lam mentioned that Hawaii is one of the few states that do not have a state animal response team; which is a collaborative network between the private and public sector to deal with these issues. The director of this response team would be the one to declare an animal emergency. Dr. Lam expressed doubt that relying on the Governor to declare an emergency would be sufficient for the veterinary community. Dr. Lam stated that he would like to see either the State Veterinarian or the Board have the authority to declare an animal emergency.

Ms. Ito stated that the State Veterinarian has indicated in an email that he does not have the authority to declare an emergency response. The Board cannot leave it open for interpretation on who is authorized to declare an animal emergency. Creating broad language could be interpreted to mean anyone could declare an emergency. She suggested that the Board address this issue, perhaps with a separate bill.

DAG Wong reminded the Board that the bigger issue at hand was the sponsorship issue. She commented that there was not enough time to address this issue and finalize the bill for introduction for the 2022 Legislative Session. She suggested creating another PIG to address this issue.

Dr. Odani agreed with DAG Wong, indicating that she does not want to hold up the bill to clarify this issue.

Ms. Kendrick stated that there still might be a chance to clarify what the State Veterinarian's powers are prior to the legislative session. She commented that the bill could always be amended during the legislative process but would also like to see this measure move forward.

Dr. Lam asked whether it would be possible for the language to say, “when an animal emergency or disaster is declared” to avoid specifying who is declaring the disaster.

Ms. Ito reiterated that leaving the language too broad is the issue; because anyone could declare an animal emergency or disaster.

Dr. Lam asked whether the language could be amended to, “by authorized department or individual”.

Ms. Ito stated that the language was still too vague.

Dr. Odani expressed concern regarding the “veterinary-client-patient-relationship” definition that was presented. Specifically, the addition of, “which means that the veterinarian is personally acquainted with the keeping and caring of the patient and has recently physically examined the patient or made timely and medically appropriate visits to the premises where the patient is kept”.

Dr. Odani stated that she receives phone calls from neighbor island clients who for either personal or financial reasons do not seek veterinary help until it’s needed. While veterinarians are currently able to establish a veterinarian-client-patient relationship through telemedicine under the current Governor’s Proclamation, it may become more difficult to continue care after the proclamation expires. Dr. Odani feels that veterinarians are able to use professional judgment to diagnose through telemedicine without having first physically examined an animal. She expressed concern that animals may potentially be excluded from care due to the language.

Dr. Lam commented that the neighbor islands rely on telemedicine due to the shortage of veterinarians. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the State allowed telemedicine without a physical relationship. Dr. Lam stated that it was unclear whether veterinarians were included in the emergency definition. He explained that there were pros and cons to loosening the language to this section. If the language were too broad, it opens up the potential for out-of-state veterinarians to practice telemedicine. For example, there are several telemedicine companies nationally who are

recruiting veterinarians licensed in different states to practice telemedicine from home at discounted rates. Allowing this may open up the state to potential liability or malpractice concerns. On the other side, patients in rural areas with no available veterinarian may not receive adequate care.

Vice-Chairperson Nishimoto commented that the Hawaii Veterinary Medical Association (“HVMA”) also follows the AVMA’s guidance regarding veterinarian-client-patient relationship; emphasizing that physical examination is necessary to establish veterinarian-client-patient relationship.

Dr. Odani agreed that the language presented is consistent with the AVMA definition, but not the American Association of Veterinary State Boards; definition of veterinarian-client-patient relationship. She stated that it’s a slippery slope in allowing looser interpretations.

Dr. Lam stated that in these situations, especially in rural areas with no available veterinarian, he believes that the State Veterinarian should have the authority to declare an animal emergency. If no available veterinarians can be provided in a timely fashion, the State Veterinarian should be able to declare an emergency that allows for telemedicine and to bring in out-of-state veterinarians to those locations in emergencies.

Chairperson Lee Loy mentioned that a bill was recently passed that allowed vets to treat animals in an emergency situation.

Executive Officer Shahan confirmed that there was a provision passed that allowed for the emergency care of any animal without repercussion or legally liable in the event of an adverse outcome as the veterinarian is acting in good faith.

Dr. Odani cited Act 091, SLH 2021 (House Bill 1086 HD1 SD1) – Relating to Veterinarians:

“Exception to liability; emergency care; veterinarian-client-patient relationship

- a. Any veterinarian duly licensed under this chapter who in good faith without remuneration or expectation of remuneration renders emergency care to a sick or injured animal at-large shall not be liable to the owner of that animal for any civil damages resulting from the vet's acts or omissions, except for damages as may result from the veterinarian's gross negligence or wanton acts or omissions."

Dr. Odani stated that this does not apply, because these are not "at-large animals". However, she also cited the next section:

- b. "A veterinarian duly licensed under this chapter may, in good faith, render necessary and prompt care and treatment to an animal patient without establishing a veterinarian-client-patient relationship if conditions do not allow the establishment of the relationship in a timely manner. A veterinarian who renders emergency treatment shall not be liable to the owner of the animal for any civil damages resulting from the veterinarian's acts or omissions, except for damages as may result from the veterinarian's gross negligence or wanton acts or omissions."

Ms. Kendrick indicated that telemedicine could apply in this situation.

Dr. Odani confirmed that she is in agreement with the language as there is an existing exemption. She also expressed support for a cap on practice days rather than having mutually exclusive permits.

Executive Officer Shahan explained that the current database does not allow for a second type or permit to be issued because of the allowance to renew a 30-day permit for an additional 30 days would take the permittee up to 60 days and the courtesy permit is valid for 60 days as well. Allowing an individual to obtain both permits in the same year would potentially allow an individual to practice for 120 days.

Ms. Ito added that if an individual is applying for two permits, that perhaps they should apply for a license at that point.

Executive Officer Shahan agreed, stating that all materials for licensure would have been received if a permit was issued.

Vice-Chairperson Nishimoto added that the courtesy/relief permittee could then apply for a temporary permit.

DAG Wong inquired how the seven-month limit was determined in the proposed HRS section 471-2(8).

Executive Officer Shahan explained that when the statute was established the exam was only offered twice a year. Applicants were required to sign up for the next exam, which was possibly six or seven months down the road depending on how it fell. It appeared that the Board at the time desired that the applicant to take the exam in a timely manner.

DAG Wong pointed out that the exam is offered every month.

Executive Officer Shahan indicated she is willing to amend the language.

Ms. Ito recommended striking out “no later than seven months” as the timing seems arbitrary.

Dr. Lam stated that he was in favor of extending it to one full year.

Ms. Ito inquired whether leaving it as, “applies and takes the first available examination scheduled by the Board”, gives the Board flexibility in allowing an applicant to take the exam at a later date?

DAG Wong replied that it would.

Executive Officer Shahan confirmed that the section would be changed to, “provided that the applicant applies for and takes the examination scheduled by the Board”.

Vice-Chairperson Nishimoto stated that he had a question regarding the proposed HRS section 471-2(9)(h). What does “renewed in a subsequent year” mean?

Ms. Kendrick stated that there was a reason for the different rules between a courtesy and relief permit. The courtesy permit was intended to allow specialists to practice for a couple of days; whereas the relief permit was intended for applicant who came regularly. It was intentional to leave the courtesy permit as renewable.

Executive Officer Shahan confirmed that the intention was to allow the courtesy permit to be renewed in subsequent years.

Ms. Ito inquired whether the current understanding was that the courtesy permit was limited to be issued once a year, after which point it was renewed annually or was the intention to have the applicant reapply after two years with a new application and providing new license verifications?

Executive Officer Shahan confirmed Ms. Ito’s summarization, stating that it was modeled on how the renewals are structured.

Ms. Ito stated that it would be easier to manage administratively if the applicant applies annually.

Executive Officer Shahan amended the proposed HRS section 471-2(8) to, “A courtesy permit to practice issued under this section shall be effective for 60 calendar days.”

DAG Wong inquired as to the wording of the proposed HRS section 471-2(9)(i)(5),

“Pay all costs associated with any out-of-state investigation enforcement and collection efforts associated with the relief permit.”

Executive Officer Shahan clarified that it should read “courtesy permit”

Executive Officer Shahan summarized the discussed amendments to the proposed legislation presented:

- 1) Leave the “consultation” definition as is.
- 2) Leave the definition of “emergency response” as is.
- 3) Leave the VCPR section as written.
- 4) Changed the proposed HRS section 471-2(8) to read,

“any applicant who meets the licensing requirements of practicing veterinarian medicine under a veterinarian by temporary permit provided that the applicant applies for and takes the examination scheduled by the Board. This temporary permit shall not be renewed.”

- 5) Change the proposed HRS section 471-2(9)(h) to read,

“A courtesy permit to practice under this section shall be effective for a period of sixty calendar days.”

Ms. Ito added that it should also include that the applicant can only apply for one courtesy permit per year.

- 6) Leave the proposed HRS section 471-2(11) as written.
- 7) Change “relief permit” to “courtesy permit” in the proposed HRS section 471-2(9)(i)(5)
- 8) Remove duplicate wording in the proposed HRS section 471-2(3)
- 9) Make language consistent in sections that use the terms “commonwealth”

DAG Wong inquired as to why the distinction was being made to include “commonwealth”. DAG Wong commented that she was not aware of other boards or programs utilizing the same terms.

Executive Officer Shahan stated that the change was based on language the AVMA suggested to use.

Ms. Ito inquired whether the Board was okay with the DAG removing the added terms to make it consistent with other Boards and statutes?

Vice-Chairperson Nishimoto indicated that he was okay with removing the language.

DAG Wong commented that it is more important to be in alignment with Hawaii statutory language than the language used by the national organization.

It was moved by Vice-Chairperson Nishimoto, seconded by Dr. Lam, and unanimously carried to accept the proposed legislation including the above amendments as summarized by Executive Officer Shahan.

Executive  
Officer's  
Report:

Chairperson Lee Loy asked if any members of the public would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item. There were none.

A. 2022 Board Meeting Dates

Executive Officer Shahan announced that the Board will be meeting monthly until the proposed legislation goes through. She stated that the schedule was subject to change as necessary. Currently, the Board is still scheduled to meet virtually.

B. Two Open Board Positions (licensed members)

Executive Officer Shahan announced that there are two Board openings for licensed members and indicated that they would need to be residents of the neighbor islands (not from Honolulu county) in order to meet the statutory requirements.

Ms. Ito reminded the Board that potential future Board members should be made aware of the time required to serve on the Board as well as the importance of remaining impartial and objective. The Board was further reminded that it is tasked with protecting the consumers of Hawaii.

Next Meeting:

(Tentatively)  
Friday, December 10, 2021  
10:00 a.m.  
Virtual Videoconference Meeting  
Zoom Webinar

Adjournment:

12:32 p.m.

Reviewed and approved by:

Taken and recorded by:

/s/ Kerrie Shahan

/s/ Leanne Abe

---

Kerrie Shahan  
Executive Officer

---

Leanne Abe  
Secretary

KS:la

11/29/21

Minutes approved as is.

Minutes approved with changes. See minutes of.