

REGULAR SESSION

Salary Commission  
Hilo Council Chambers  
Hawai'i County Building  
25 Aupuni Street, First Floor, Room 1401  
Hilo, Hawai'i  
August 28, 2025 (Thursday)

**Call to Order (Item 1)**

The regular meeting of the Salary Commission, County of Hawai'i, was called to order at 10:09 a.m., by Chair Steven Pavao, at the Hilo Council Chambers, Hawai'i County Building, 25 Aupuni Street, First Floor, Room 1401, Hilo, Hawai'i, on Thursday, August 28, 2025.

**Roll Call – Present**

Mr. Steven Pavao, Chair  
Ms. Donala Kawa'auhau, Vice-Chair  
Mr. Jules Dudoit, Member  
Ms. Luahiwa Namahoe, Member  
Mr. Sam Nelson, Member  
Ms. Sommer J. Tokihiro, Ex-Officio Member

**Absent and Excused**

Mr. Dennis Riordan, Member

**Also Present**

Ms. Dakota "Cody" Frenz, Deputy Corporation Counsel, Office of the Corporation Counsel  
Ms. Michele Lamkin, Human Resources Program Specialist, Human Resources Department  
Ms. Jenn Kagiwada, Council Member, Hawai'i County Council  
Ms. Glynis Yamada, Secretary-Reporter, Human Resources Department

**Call to Order (Item 1)**

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, we'll call the meeting to order. We'll start with doing a rollcall, (inaudible) your name and your district.

MR. DUDOIT: Commissioner Dudoit.

MS. NAMAHOE: Commissioner Namahoe.

CHR. PAVAO: Chair Pavao.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Commissioner Kawa'auhau.

MR. NELSON: Sam Nelson.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Sommer Tokihiro.

CHR. PAVAO: Thank you.

MS. FRENZ: Chair, also present, I'm Deputy Corporation Counsel Cody Frenz, and we have our Secretary Glynis Yamada.

**Statements from the Public (Item 2)**

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. On to our agenda. The next item is "Statements from the Public" on Agenda Items. Do we have any statements from the public?

MS. FRENZ: No, Chair.

CHR. PAVAO: None. No statements from the public.

**Approval of Minutes (Item 3)**

CHR. PAVAO: No minutes to approve. So, we'll suspend that.

**Informational Briefings (Item 4)**

**A) Informational Briefing By Deputy Corporation Counsel Dakota "Cody" Frenz: The Informational Briefing May Include, But Is Not Limited To, The Following - Expectations And Responsibilities Of The Salary Commission; Process For Salary Adjustments**

CHR. PAVAO: And informational briefings—Deputy Corp. Counsel Cody Frenz.

MS. FRENZ: Thank you. Chair. Good morning, again, everyone. So, I—everyone that's with us here today had been a party to our previous work in 2024 to adjust the salary wages for appointed and elected officials pursuant to the Charter.

So, I just—does anyone have questions given that we don't have any new members here today?

CHR. PAVAO: No, I don't.

MS. FRENZ: No? Okay. One gentle reminder, under the Charter that if this—if and when this body were to decide to do any increases or decreases of more than 10%, it requires an affirmative two-thirds vote of the entire membership of this body.

And we would, again, need to run any potential salary increases in the newspaper and hold our required public meetings, as we did previously, and draft the proposed Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law as we've previously done.

If you have any questions, you can either let me know or email me and we can meet either after this separately or I can do Zooms with any of you guys, if you have any questions about the duties and responsibilities of this Commission under the Charter.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. Any questions?

**B) Informational Briefing By Director Of Human Resources Sommer J. Tokihiro - The Informational Briefing May Include, But Is Not Limited To, The Following: Exhibit A-1: Salary Ordinance Of 2025 (Ordinance No. 25-39); Exhibit A-2: Compensation Plan For The County Of Hawai'i (As Of July 1, 2025); Exhibit A-3: County Of Hawai'i Pay Plan For Executives And Elected Officials (Effective January 1, 2025); Collective Bargaining Negotiation Updates; Exhibit A-4: Resolution No. 188-25 (Cost Items As Negotiated And Ratified With HGEA For Bargaining Units 02, 03, 04, 13 And Employees Excluded From Those Bargaining Units); Exhibit A-5: Resolution No. 189-25 (Cost Items As Negotiated And Ratified With UPW Bargaining Unit 01); Information Concerning Status Of Unions Where Agreements Are Pending**

---

CHR. PAVAO: If not, we'll move on to Item B—it's just an informational briefing by Director of Human Resources Sommer Tokihiro.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Hi, good morning, everyone. Sommer Tokihiro, Director of Human Resources.

We've provided you with a variety of information for review and consideration. I'm happy to answer questions—there's a lot of information for review.

MR. NELSON: So, this is Nelson—so I was just wondering if all the negotiations with the unions are done? Is that correct? I mean, they got the salary increases are set and that's good for the next four years.

MS. TOKIHIRO: No.

MR. NELSON: Okay.

MS. TOKIHIRO: We have—so we're currently in arbitration with SHOPO—the police officers' union. We will be going to arbitration with the Fire Fighters Association—HFFA, and we'll also be completing arbitration for Bargaining Unit 15—which Bargaining Unit 15 is our Water Safety Officers.

So, the other units have all agreed and we have—yeah, increases for HGEA—for all of the units except for 15—and UPW as well.

So, those increases are outlined in the resolution—Reso. 188-25 and 189-25. But, basically, the increases for both UPW and HGEA is a four-year contract. The first year of the contract was 3.5—and a 3.5% increase, then a 3.79% increase in year two, and then in years three and four—is a 4% increase for each year.

So, the way that the bargaining units' structure those increases is a little bit different. So, for some units they wanted to maintain their “step movements”—and so, their step movements have a value, so we would deduct that from across-the-board increase to the base salary because they're going to get that monies through those step movement process.

But, basically, the sum total of the increases is all the percentages that I gave. It's just structured a little bit differently for each unit based on their membership and how they wanted that structured.

MR. NELSON: So, is that what happened with BU35—'cause I was looking at the percentages and they've got smaller percentage increases—is what it appears to be.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Yeah. So, BU35 is a bargaining unit for our excluded employees. So, like for example, positions in HR follow—we're in BU35, so it's not actually a part of the union but it tracks increases for BU13—for HGEA BU13. Yeah.

So, yes, that's what happened in that case because Bargaining Unit 13 elected to continue step movements, so the percentages were adjusted.

MR. NELSON: Okay. So, effectively, everybody that's in negotiated has got the three-and-a-half—the 3.79 (inaudible).

MS. TOKIHIRO: Correct. Yes.

MR. NELSON: All right. Thank you.

MS. TOKIHIRO: So, there's a lot of concern in the collective bargaining negotiation process about the issues with possible federal spending cuts and how that's going to play out and how that will affect the State and the counties. And so, that was a big part of the discussions in just some of that uncertainty and how we come to an agreement on a contract that is reasonable for all and, hopefully, that we can all—yeah, live with.

MS. NAMAHOE: This is Namahoe. Are you saying that to just, kind of, elucidate what was going on in those meetings or is that going to lead to a conservative conversation about what we should be doing with the salaries—

MS. TOKIHIRO: No—what this Salary Commission decides to do in this—I'm just explaining part of that negotiation process.

MS. NAMAHOE: Got it.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: Okay. Trying to figure out which ears to use when you say that. Thank you.

MS. TOKIHIRO: You're welcome.

CHR. PAVAO: This is Chair Pavao—my perspective is the County has negotiated four-year contracts with the major collective bargaining units and some negotiating without it. But the Unit 13 and the excluded increases, I think, is probably the most applicable comparison to the appointed and elected officials. So, that will be the 3.5, 3.79, and 4%, and 4% for the life of the four-year contract.

I mean, our goal as we had talked about before was trying to have parity. We don't want the situation again, where you have subordinates making more than their appointed supervisors or elected supervisors. So, your thoughts?

MS. NAMAHOE: Luahiwa, again. Wait—Mr. Nelson, go—go ahead.

MR. NELSON: No—so I would just suggest that we mirror those same increases—each one for each year. You're right, that BU35—I mean, it is comparable, and I think that's what you should plug in.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: Hi, Namahoe, again. So, we were all here through 2023 and 2024, and just a quick refresher on how we came about with the decisions that we did.

We were looking at, at the time, there was really high inflation. We started with BU13, but we didn't let that be our biggest driver—as I recall the data and as I recall how some of us were doing the numbers on this. Mr. Farahi, who's no longer on the Board, what we looked at was

tracking it to inflation markers, which is how we came up with a 22.44% parity for January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2025—and then, the correction for July 1<sup>st</sup> of 5%.

So, I just want to remind all of us that we looked, originally, at BU13 and then we realized that was not satisfactory to the needs at hand. We also looked at the other employers, the counties—and, also, realized that wasn't—we didn't track to either what Maui, Kaua'i, or City and County of Honolulu did. That's all.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, thank you. And that's—and it is correct, we did do a deeper dive what was one of the issues to where we were trying to play catch-up. The Commission hadn't met in several years and they were, what—four or five years of no pay increases for the elected and appointed officials.

So, we did look at cost of living, inflation—we did some examination of private sector comparable positions and then, of course, again, looked at BU13 and the excluded Bargaining Unit 35.

At this point, we're—I think we did a good job in getting caught up. So, the goal, I think, of the Commission is to make sure that we stay on that path, that we maintain parity going forward. We could still look at cost of living and other issues and do a deeper dive, for sure. I mean, if that's the will of the Commission—yeah. At this point, at least, we're not playing four or five years of catch up.

SPEAKER: Like we were.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah. Any more discussion?

MR. NELSON: Well, I do think the challenge is if we try to—if we give more than what the union got—I think that's going to be a problem from a parity standpoint, in terms of that. If we give less—again, it's a parity issue, right, and try to—I mean, that was deep—I think where we we're trying—went last time and I think we should try to stick with that same approach.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, I tend to agree with that. I think that if you—we end up giving more than the collective bargaining units received in collective bargaining that might give the union some basis to want to re-open negotiations to get an additional increase.

So, if the goal is parity—my opinion, we should mirror the Bargaining Unit 35 pay raise as the same percentage.

MS. FRENZ: BU 13?

CHR. PAVAO: Thirty-five/13 unit—but it's 35—is pretty much the same with 13 but minus the step movements.

MR. NELSON: The only difference would be if there's individual positions that need to get adjusted. I mean, if there are—I don't know if anybody's going to come back and say, oh—I saw something a while back—"Oh, the Finance Director's not getting paid enough or should be getting paid as much as the OSCER person" or whatever.

So, I don't know if there's any of those things in there. I mean—and I don't know if we need to explore that or we could do that later? I mean, basically, we could do an across-the-board increase—'cause everybody got a pay raise effective on July. So, we're only in August now. So, really, there's no sense of urgency, I guess, necessarily—but, right, I mean, we could (inaudible).

MS. FRENZ: I'm just—this is DCC Cody. I would just clarify that the raises that this body implemented were from 2024. So, the 22.4% was January 1, 2024; 5% was July 1, 2024—so, it's actually been a year-and-a-month since that 5%.

So, I just wanted to clarify, 'cause I think I heard "2025" earlier and it was "2024"—so, it's been a year-and-a-month since the July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024—I mean, neither here nor there regarding what you decide to do—I just to clarify it's been a year-and-a-month—not a month for what that's worth.

MS. NAMAHOE: This is Namahoe, again. You're right. I also want to do one more thing and remind us that I'm really proud of the work that this Board has done because we've also gone through the thorny situation of a Councilperson coming here, giving us some suggestions.

We bit on that too fast and then we had to go through a corrective process in order to provide true parity—if you recall all of those details. I don't need to bring them up, again, but to the point that Mr. Nelson just made, if we do make—need to consider corrections for any other colleague, we now know how to do it and how not to do it.

CHR. PAVAO: I think there's some further discussion on the agenda about specific positions, especially positions that require licenses, like, engineers and attorneys—that those pay salaries might have to be adjusted in order to be competitive, in order to recruit and retain people in those positions—but I think we can vote on this specific issue and deal with that separately. There're other—there's a variety of suggestions about how we can approach that—and that would take more time and energy and a deeper dive.

But if the concern or the intent is to maintain parity, I would suggest that we vote and appropriate—the 3.5, 3.79, and 4%, and 4% over the four years of the current situation—the current contracts that collective bargaining units have. Any more discussion or a motion or—

MR. NELSON: So, I agree. I agree with you on that. Now, the question is for Cody—so if we, basically, vote on that today, we'd have to put it in the paper, and go through that whole process, right? So, when would it take effect, if we did do it?

MS. FRENZ: So, if you were to make a motion and if it was just generalized a certain percentage across-the-board, then you are not looking at specific positions, right—it'll just be a generalized across-the-board.

You would need to provide me with enough information—that's your Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law that support the rationale for that motion. I would then draft that, bring it back to you guys at a subsequent meeting. You would approve that, we would then run it in the newspaper—30 days thereafter, we'd be holding our public hearing—assuming that that motion carried by two-thirds or more—then, and only thereafter, could that hypothetically take action based on a motion to adopt those proposed Findings and Conclusions—and those raises, if (inaudible).

So, theoretically, if we left today with a motion of something very specific with the Findings and Conclusions of Law that supports such, I would draft that between now and the next hearing. I am not available for the next hearing, but I'll have somebody here covering for me and would just be facilitating the adoption of those Findings or modification, which is not a problem—anyone can do that.

We would then work with Ms. Yamada to run that in the newspaper, hold our public hearings—like we did. So, theoretically, it could—it'd be very tight, but it could be as early as January—but that would be a tight one. So, you'd have to have those Findings ready today to help me articulate what I'm going to be drafting.

And, I guess, my only caution in that sense is we've only been meeting for maybe 15 minutes so far, right—I mean, just realistically, right, I'm (inaudible) protect you all. I'm the attorney for this Commission—we've been meeting for 15 minutes and if you're ready to make a motion—that is your *kuleana*, right. That is what you're here for.

But I don't know that I've heard anything that necessarily gives me the basis to draft those findings other than we're just going to track with BU13 and/or 35. And, if that is the basis, then that is the basis—and we will put that forth and receive public testimony and see if that changes your opinion.

But I just want to make sure that we have a—there's a method to the madness, right, that we are taking action—or you are, excuse me—taking action which is supported in fact and law. And we haven't quite gotten through, I would just say—maybe consider—we haven't gotten through the communications. I know that Councilmember Kagiwada is also present and maybe—she had submitted one of the communications—another one of the communications which we haven't gotten through yet—we're still on Director Tokihiro's informative informational briefing—includes what other jurisdictions have done.

So, I think there's a little more to consider before, so I just caution you to make a motion at this precise moment. Maybe when we're through everything, if you still want to—understanding what I need from you to be able to articulate such—I can help you do that, if you're ready to do that.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, we can table that—come back. I mean, if that’s the consensus. I think the Finding of Facts is fairly simple—with the jurisdictions has negotiated through their collective bargaining process with the collective bargaining units—and the goal of the Commission is to maintain parity between the appointed and elected official and the collective bargaining members. So, yeah, based on the negotiated pay increases—pretty simple, I think, in my mind as far as the Findings of Facts are concerned.

But we can move on to the agenda and come back and revisit this issue, if you want—that’s fine. It’s a good idea to be more fully informed. Okay. So, we’ll table this for now and come back to it.

MR. NELSON: (Inaudible.) You got her communication and she’s here.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, Councilmember—

**Communication(s) (Item 5)**

MS. FRENZ: If we want to move on to the “Communication,” section 5, that would be great.

**Communication No. 25-03, From Councilmember Jenn Kagiwada, District 2, Transmitting A Letter Dated August 21, 2025, Requesting Consideration For Pay Increases For The Directors Of The Departments Of Public Works (DPW) And Environmental Management (DEM)**

---

**Communication No. 25-02, From Deputy Corporation Dakota “Cody” Frenz, Submitting For Information The “Supplemental Agreement, BU13, Compensation For Engineering Classes Of Work”**

---

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah. So, we’ll go on to that. Do you—Cody, you want to—maybe we’ll hear from Council Member Kagiwada.

MS. FRENZ: So, Chair, we’re skipping on to Communication number 25-03.

CHR. PAVAO: 25-03—yes. Thank you.

MS. KAGIWADA: *Aloha*, Jenn Kagiwada, Councilmember for District 2. Thank you for taking my communication. I’m here to answer any questions but, basically, we’ve been hearing from the Administration as we did—been debating some of the issues around two positions, in particular—the Director of Public Works and the Director of Environmental Management that these have been very hard positions for the Administration to fill. They have a hard time attracting people and they’ve stated, time after time, that the salary that is not necessarily competitive with the private sector—is one of the main reasons that they have a hard time.

We're debating whether we might reduce some of the qualifications for those positions but, regardless of that, the issue of salary keeps coming back time and time again as a reason why the Administration is not being able to attract those people.

So, just wanted to put this out here so that you guys could know about that—if you weren't already aware—and discuss it. I know that you did a really heavy lift last year and thank you for that—or 2023, I guess, it was. Thank you all for that.

And just, yeah, thank you. If you have any questions, I'm happy to try to answer them.

MR. NELSON: Do you have a recommended salary for those positions? That's an odd question there but (inaudible).

MS. KAGIWADA: I really don't. I don't know. I could connect you with some private sector engineers who might be qualified for that position, and you could talk to them about what the general going rate is of the private sector. If you wanted me to do that, I'm happy to do that. But—yeah, but the main issue that we keep hearing—we hear two things from the Administration—that it's the salary and the fact that it's an appointed position, so there's no (inaudible) security. And there's not really a lot we can do about that one right now. So, the salary one is the one I'm hoping we can, at least, look at.

CHR. PAVAO: The difference with those positions versus other department heads is that they require license—they have to be civil engineers, right—so that's—

MS. KAGIWADA: Different requirements than a lot of others. Yeah. And it's, just like, the breadth of the job. It's huge as far as number of personnel and—yeah, the liability that they personally take on—on some of these projects that have to do with life and safety for our community. So, I think—yeah, attracting the right people is key.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Commissioner Kawa'auhau. Can we request that to the—request the private sector engineer and then also the information about the requirements and the job?

MS. KAGIWADA: Sure.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Yeah.

MS. KAGIWADA: Yeah. I mean, the—sure, I can get that for you. Cody probably can get it for you right there, too—and actually Sommer has them, I'm sure, with the job requirements.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Yes. So, the duties or the requirements for the position are in the County Charter.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: And the staff and amount of personnel and all that stuff?

MS. TOKIHIRO: I could get current numbers of personnel for the departments.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Okay, thank you.

MS. KAGIWADA: That would be great. I'm happy to connect you with some private sector folks that might be able to speak to this issue.

CHR. PAVAO: The one—on the idea, too, is perhaps if the Commission has the power to do it—is to hire a consult or personnel consult firm to do a deeper dive, to do a really good report to us as far as what comps. are between different jurisdictions, in government, with the private sector—so that we can come up with a fully informed, salary appropriate and attractive—so that we can recruit and retain qualified people in those positions.

MS. KAGIWADA: Yeah, okay. Great. Yeah. So, some of the kinds of projects that they have to oversee or have to do with, like, making sure some of our roads and bridges are engineered safely as well as our wastewater systems, which are running in the hundreds of the millions of dollars—the biggest projects that we've ever had for the County. So, overseeing some of those—obviously, very critical for the County and we want to make sure we have the best people in those positions to do that.

CHR. PAVAO: Are both of those positions vacant at this time?

MS. KAGIWADA: No, just the Department of Public Works is vacant at this time. My understanding is—I've had some personal discussions with Wes and he is doing this job, somewhat, as he thinks that it's his job to step up for the County, but he was also ready to retire before he took on this job.

So, I don't know how long he's willing to be in this position but, regardless, even if people stay for four years, it's going to be an issue again, next—

CHR. PAVAO: He's already the second head of that department since the mayor came into office, right?

MS. KAGIWADA: No, just the DPW was the one that stepped down.

CHR. PAVAO: Oh, okay.

MS. KAGIWADA: And we have an "Acting" person who doesn't currently meet the current qualifications in that position.

CHR. PAVAO: Mm—Public Works, yeah.

MS. KAGIWADA: Yeah.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. So, is there a possibility for us to contract somebody to do some investigation for similarly comparable salaries are?

MS. FRENZ: This is DCC Cody. I think I would—I'll probably need to defer, at some point, to Director Tokihiro for procurement and payment purposes 'cause I'm not sure budgetary what's possible, to be frank.

**Communication No. 25-01, From Deputy Corporation Counsel Dakota “Cody” Frenz, Submitting For Information A Study Entitled, “MGT Classification And Compensation Study, Draft Report, March 3, 2025” (County Of Maui, Hawai‘i)**

---

MS. FRENZ: However, I was able to get a very quick response from my counterpart from Maui, who just did it, and they used MGT. And I asked a couple of questions to better understand how—what their process looked like and how their commissioners felt that process went.

There was an approximate cost of just over—just under \$43,000.00 for that evaluation and that study. You have a copy of it. It's about—I think it's about 90 pages—70 pages, something like that. It's pretty significant. They looked at a bunch of different jurisdictions. Theirs went into effect in 2024, so the information is potentially just slightly outdated, but it's pretty expansive. I mean, you could hypothetically use that one, if you wanted to, and see if there are updates in light of that information.

Granted, this was evaluating what their county looks like. And their county is significantly different than ours—probably not even just tax bracket purposes but volume-wise for the departments themselves—but maybe a more smaller analysis could be conducted. Director Tokihiro might have some ideas on how, if that's an easy enough comparison to use what Maui County had and compare it to our departments. So you can take a look at whether or not you want something separate, whether you can work off of this and look at the differences between the Maui departments and our departments to determine whether or not—as Councilmember Kagiwada indicated—as one of my prior communications to you indicated—that this might be an opportunity for you to not just do a blanket approach for the catch-up that you did 2023 for 2024—but to do that while also look at—looking at the demands of every position.

Because there are potential—and I think I heard it from you all in our last meeting, working on the OSCER salary—that the OSCER position doesn't carry the same demands as the Department of Public Works, the Chief of Police, the Director of Finance, the Office of Corporation Counsel, DEM—the specialty license positions, the larger department positions—like, Parks and Recreation is a huge department as well.

So, there are a lot of different considerations—the Department of—the Director of Finance is an integral role to the entire County of Hawai'i. So, there are a lot of different factors versus R&D—there's just a lot of—the Auditor—there's a lot of things to consider that maybe don't lend the same lens of a blanket approach. You can take that blanket approach but also consider the specialties of each department—and maybe that just means the larger departments, the greater demand departments, have a slightly bigger bump than the others. That's really a “you” question, but I think this is an opportunity to take that more specific brush approach and not just a blanket.

So, that's just something to consider and that was a part of my communication to you. I think that Councilmember Kagiwada has already, kind of, touched on the specific to DPW because I think the conversation in that regard is the better approach to reduce the qualifications because the County is struggling to find someone or to just pay those specialty, heavy demand departments more than another position that doesn't carry the same amount of responsibility.

So, with that in mind, you have a very substantive, approximately one-year-old evaluation. That cost was just under 43,000—and I also got input that their commissioners appreciated the study and the analysis to help them guide to make those decisions. And the rest, I mean, up to you what—how you want to utilize that.

MR. NELSON: So, they do have, I looked at the—looking at the report—they do have salary survey information for Hawai'i and for other states and it's based on March 2025 according to the report. So, it is—yeah, I think this is about as timely as it can get from the salary survey stuff.

And so, like for DPW, they've got the mid—the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile they got in here from 150 to 202,500—so it looks like the DPW is, like, 170 right now. So, a little bit in the mid-point. I mean, we could maybe raise it a little bit to try to put it in there. But, I mean, I think—I don't know—I mean, I think the data's about as—just looks about as good as we're going to get, I think, right.

'Cause it has Hawai'i's salaries and state salaries, and so I think we could use that and maybe look at these positions and, kind of—the need, I guess the demand, 'cause—

CHR. PAVAO: To be able to recruit and retain people in those positions. So, that's the question for the Commission is that do you want to focus on those two positions or as our Deputy Corp. Counsel is suggesting—should we hire a consultant to look at all of the positions.

I mean, we could do the across-the-board to retain parity based on what the collective bargaining units did and then do a more thorough assessment of all the positions. It's going to cost more than \$40,000.00, if we're going to do all the positions.

MS. FRENZ: And just to clarify, Chair—this is DCC Cody—I think that utilizing what MGT did for Maui County—

CHR. PAVAO: Mm.

MS. FRENZ: —would be an amazing resource that you could utilize without having to hire your own consultant.

CHR. PAVAO: Mm.

MS. FRENZ: And I think, maybe, I don't know if Director Tokihiro's team would be able to provide—I think it would be easy enough for our County to ask Maui County—can we get more information about your departments? How many personnel are within them? How many divisions are within them? That should be something that is readily accessible and then compare that to what we have here. 'Cause that's really the biggest difference, unless Director Tokihiro has some additional thoughts—but I think it's possible without hiring. But that is a “you” question. I'm not recommending one or the other. I'm just flushing out options for you.

MS. TOKIHIRO: I must say that when it comes to Classification and Pay, I mean, we looked at equal pay for equal work, as we're looking at all of our positions. We most closely align with Maui County in the way that our operations are, so we're much more similar to Maui County than say, Kaua'i or City and County of Honolulu. So, as far as alignment I think that—yeah, we're the most similar. So, just wanted to share that.

MS. NAMAHOE: Namahoe. I believe that we should start with the MGT report. I think it's smart, it's timely, and I want to also remind us that when we were tearing through this in 2023, the complexity of this County versus Maui—we have always had greater needs. We've had to deal with great—a myriad natural disasters—and I, granted, that was before Lahaina. But even after Lahaina, it still became evident that they needed our expertise because they never had to go through the things that we are always seeming to be going through.

And, yet, even when we did the corrective action for calendar year 2024 and then, again, July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024—we still didn't meet parity with Maui because we didn't have the tax bases that we had. We're more rural than they are.

So, if we're going to use it, then I'm concerned that there may be some unintended consequences that will, again, face this Commission to make sure that we meet Maui across-the-board—if not, supersede it.

I have no problem with that. And I don't mind going on record with that, however, we may get pushback from the public.

CHR. PAVAO: I guess we've been through all the communications, right?

MR. NELSON: Sorry, I guess you're here, kind of, worrying about increasing the salary for the DP—or doing something with DPW and the Environmental Management. Are there other positions that you're aware of or anybody else is aware of where there's, kind of, pushback or they can't hire somebody or whatever?

MS. KAGIWADA: Yeah, I would go to the Administration on that. I don't really know—these are the ones that I know because they're coming before the Council as issues from the Administration, but it's really the Administration that does the hiring and appointing.

So, I couldn't tell you especially a more granular level going down the positions, but these two positions have come to our attention as issues that are challenging to fill, so—

**New Business (Item 6)****Review Of Existing “Pay Plan For Executives And Elected Officials” To Include Discussion And Consideration Of Ideas For Adjustments To Future Salaries Of Executives And Officials**

---

MR. NELSON: So, when we did the last salary survey, we sent a communication out to the mayor and the different departments asking them for their input. Okay. Do we need to do—I guess the question for the group is do we need to do that again? Or should we do that again, here? I mean, here we’ve got the Councilmember who’s saying, “Okay, I’m aware of these two positions”—I do—we heard about the Finance Director. You’re right, that’s a key position—I’m looking at the salary, it seems relatively low pay for what the duties are. I don’t know what others there are there, out there—if there are any, right.

But, again, I think when we first started this conversation we talked of parity, okay—and so, if we—I don’t think we should go across-the-board large increases, okay—I think it’s problematic, given that the unions—just what they got, right—just equity for the County and trying to do the right thing.

But I guess the question to the group is should we send out a communication to the mayor and to the other departments? Is that something that we should we do?

CHR. PAVAO: A good suggestion—this is a different Administration, they might have a different perspective—that might be a good communication at this point. I mean, we can still deal with parity and go back and do a deeper dive on examining whether we need to adjust the scale of pay on certain positions, like, DPW and Environmental Management or other positions. Yeah, I think that getting input from the current Administration would be helpful.

MS. FRENZ: This is DCC Cody. You’re actually required to. The Charter says you “shall consult”—so specific to the boards and commissions as well. So, that’s the Police Commission, the Fire Commission—it’s a requirement under the Charter that you consult with the appointing authorities.

So, I would recommend, like we did last time, this body consider a motion for the Chair to sign a letter that would go out to the departments—to the appointing authorities. So, it’d be the Mayor, the Fire Commission, and the Salary Commission—those are the only commissions that I can—Merit Appeals Board—I think does Director of—does Director Tokihiro’s—

MS. YAMADA: (Inaudible.)

MS. FRENZ: I’m sorry—I said those, yeah, got those, yeah. And I think if I—if memory serves correctly, in 2023, you also sent it to the department heads in the event that they wanted to provide their own input and I think some of them didn’t necessarily feel comfortable advocating

for themselves, but I think—if memory serves correctly—you also afforded them notice of the letter and an opportunity to be heard.

So, you could, at a bare minimum for purposes of today—you will need to request that input. So, I would recommend you do it and then consider the fact that those boards and commissions have their own standard meeting—hearing dates and times—so it may not be that you have a response because they require their own committee and their board—a commission action to respond in light. So, it may be more like two months before you have anything in writing from those appointing authorities.

MS. NAMAHOE: Namahoe. I just want to—I want us to go on record to approach this differently than we did in 2023. At the time we were dealing with salary parity in 2023, no one had seen a raise since January 2018 or 2017. But these numbers stick out in my mind—if somebody was hired at \$100,000.00 a year, it was now worth 74,000 or 77,000.

And so, that was a different series of urgencies that we had to attend to, which is why we did the unusual step of a January correction. It was an inflationary adjustment—it wasn't a raise. And then, it was a parity increase for July because that's the plan year—yeah—that's the County fiscal year.

So, if we're going to do this and however we do this, can we please look at this without the urgency of doing another January adjustment, but with the plan of effective July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2026. We comfortable with that?

I recognize that DEM and DPW, I'm sitting here and thinking about them—for the last 20 years I can give you horror stories of both because I live in Pana'ewa and the rubbish dump is right behind me, so DEM has always been in my gun sights—and DPW, I think about Azevedo, who worked every single day, no days off, during the 2018 lava crisis. And, I mean, he was throwing the metal grates over the roads so that people who lived in Kalapana could get in and get out—the access opportunities for those people who lived in lower Kalapana—all depended on Mr. Azevedo himself.

So, I want to make sure that however we do this, I need to be properly removed from the history of that to make sure that we're making methodical decisions. Thank you.

CHR. PAVAO: The problem with July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2026, is that the collective bargaining unit members that have gotten an entire year of raise—and the appointed and elected officials wouldn't for an entire year in July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2025, and July 1<sup>st</sup>, '26—so then, we're kind of playing catchup again. So, we might have to do, at least, a little more that first year, so the parity doesn't, again, become skewed. But, I mean, it's possible—I mean, yeah, I don't think we can—we're going to reach a conclusion today. But, yeah, the sooner we can get to and maintain parity, the better, I think—otherwise, we end up back in the same situation of playing catchup.

MS. KAGIWADA: Chair, the only thing I wanted to add here on timing is that both the DEM and the Public Works Director positions are being considered changing their qualifications that would be put to the public as a Charter amendment in 2026.

And so, making some decision before that so the public has all the information about their salaries and that kind of thing before the public votes, I think, would be important—but that would be 2026—November 2026, I believe.

MS. NAMAHOE: November 2026.

MS. KAGIWADA: I believe so—yeah.

CHR. PAVAO: The election.

MS. KAGIWADA: Yeah. So, you have time, but I just wanted to just note that it would be good for the public to know what the—if there are going to be additional increases that they know that those are coming.

MS. NAMAHOE: Thank you.

MS. KAGIWADA: Yeah.

MR. NELSON: The challenge of changing salaries for any individual positions—it sounds like if you go to—send that to communication, the back and forth. We're probably not read—we wouldn't be ready to do anything for four months—probably, the earliest, right.

And so, I mean, I—and then you vote on it and then it wouldn't happen till July probably for the individual changes. But everybody else, all the union members are all getting these increases now, whereas, all the other guys aren't, right.

So, I don't know if we want to do a two-step process. We could do this one now—okay, there's a salary adjustment for everybody, kind of, across-the-board—just as a parity that's the reason for it. We're trying to match what the unions are, we're trying to avoid any disparity, or I forget what the term is—upside down pay for the union leaders. So, that's kind of the rationale for that.

And at the same time, and then we go out we investigate to try to adjust these other positions down the road for a July timeframe. Does that make sense?

CHR. PAVAO: I mean, this makes sense to me that we try to maintain parity with—keep up with the collective bargaining raises across-the-board and then do a deeper dive on those two positions and, perhaps, the other positions. Where we are as far as the pay scale or whether it's competitive to private sector and the other jurisdictions. Yeah, I think—

MS. NAMAHOE: So, just some more historical context—jog all of our memories. At the year of the 2024, we said because we gave them two raises in that year—January and July—that we were going to wait until the end of collective bargaining before we would come back to the table.

And, here we are, now—I mean, it's—we're still not done, correct?

MS. TOKIHIRO: Correct.

MS. NAMAHOE: For the bargaining that was taking place or supposed to take place at the beginning in 2025. So, it's an entire annual process. Is that fair to say or is this an unusual year?

CHR. PAVAO: (Inaudible.)

MS. TOKIHIRO: No, in some instances it does take longer. If we reach a point of impasse and we need to go to arbitration—the arbitration process is longer.

So, Police, Fire, and Water Safety Officers will be proceeding to arbitration.

MS. NAMAHOE: And this hasn't been a combative year. When I say this year, I'm talking January—calendar year 2025. This hasn't been a combative year, nobody's threatening to strike, it hasn't—we're not underwater. Has it—I mean, (inaudible).

MS. TOKIHIRO: No, we've been working on the collective bargaining process for over a year. So, it began in June of 2024, and we've actively been working with all of the units to try and resolve and come to agreements before the expiration of the contract on June 30, 2025.

So, we didn't get there with all the units, but it's not unusual for SHOPO to go to arbitration—Fire as well. I think they, kind of, track each other in that way—and then, still working to resolve Water Safety Officers.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, I'm asking those questions to take us as a learning lesson for our Commission in that we do not—as much as we wanted to start with BU13 or BU35—as much as we try to achieve parity to their calendar, to their pay increases—it really doesn't work for our Commission to try to tether to them. They're not—their timeline doesn't meet our timeline.

If we don't make those decisions, the non-bargaining staff do not get—they don't see increases, right—that's how we've gotten into the situation that we did in 2024.

So, the biggest urgencies right now, are these two department heads that were not—that have been longstanding problems—keeping them well-staffed, keeping them sticking around, and also not having previous councils battle some of those departments. I mean, right now, all this memory is going off in my head about former department heads.

I'm ready to do whatever we need to do. I just want to make sure that we're not—I mean, I know that it's part of this Commission to play catch up. As much as we want to be ahead of the curve, we give ourselves a break at the end of the year waiting for collective bargaining.

It's almost a lesson for us to think that maybe that's not what we need to be doing. That doesn't serve us.

CHR. PAVAO: But if we want to have parity, then we have to know what the collective bargaining results are. But BU13 and 35, to me, the best measures to compare to the elected and appointed officials. And HGEA and UPW are the two largest collective bargaining units and those have already cut/signed contracts—all the Bargaining Unit 13 staff have—and 35—have gotten raises effective July 1<sup>st</sup>.

So, I'm guessing that today there are BU13 County employees making more than a Deputy Director because they got a raise and the Deputy Director didn't. So, again, in my mind, one of our major goals should be to try to maintain parity so that we can recruit and retain appointed officials.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, Chair, are you suggesting that we do make corrections for January 2026? Is that the work that we should be looking at right now? That's the urgency?

CHR. PAVAO: Well, otherwise, we're going to have to play catch up. I mean, we wait till July 1<sup>st</sup> of '26, I think, in my mind, we're going to have to do more than the 3.5% because they would have lost an entire year. So, yeah, and then we go back to playing catch up again.

I think the sooner we can try to get to parity, the better, then we don't have to go back in hindsight and, kind of, adjust for reverse parity of catch up.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, the area that we need is that we didn't, as this Board—'cause we're still the same people on this Board. The error that we made is that we didn't keep up on it in 2024. We let the collective bargaining get ahead of the—get the cart ahead of the horse, so to speak.

CHR. PAVAO: We have no idea what was going to be negotiated, at that point. So, I think we had to have that information. We had to know what the collective bargaining units were going to get so that we could have parity. So, we had to wait. (Inaudible) as Director Tokihiro told us, the negotiations took a year. It takes some time for collective bargaining—it's just the reality of collective bargaining.

So, it's almost impossible for us to—given the reality of the process that we have to go through—public hearings and everything else—to have the same date, but as close as possible—to, kind of, minimize the amount of time we have to play catch up with.

MS. NAMAHOE: It's frustrating 'cause I want to templatize the work. So, Director Tokihiro, we—how—when did BU13 have their data? When was that set?

MS. TOKIHIRO: When was our tentative agreement reached?

MS. NAMAHOE: Yes.

MS. TOKIHIRO: I would have to go back. And all the dates are, kind of, running together in my head but it was prior—yeah, I'll have to go back and check. But it took—it was—it wasn't June of last year. I mean, we—it's been an intensive process. And so, I want to say maybe April or May.

MS. NAMAHOE: Of this year?

MS. TOKIHIRO: Yes.

MS. NAMAHOE: Okay, so we're just a quarter out. All right.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, historically, the counties negotiate together with the State. So, the way the State does collective bargaining usually is that they try to finish the bargaining before the end of the Legislative Session, because the Legislature has to approve those raises in the budget. So, typically, by the end of May. And then, they quickly try to implement the raises July 1<sup>st</sup>, which did happen this year—sometimes it doesn't happen.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, for us, it's that we didn't meet in June or July? I mean, it's August—but we needed to meet right afterwards.

CHR. PAVAO: The County negotiates with the State, but the County has its own process. The State goes through the Legislature, they get it approved—but the County has its own process and they have to get it approved, come to the Council, then the Council approves in their budget. So, yeah, I mean, technically, we have to wait for the County because although they negotiate together, the County could choose to not accept the decision.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Commissioner Kawa'auhau. So, Chair—and there are subordinates that are going to be making more than their elected bosses (inaudible).

CHR. PAVAO: Director Tokihiro would know that, at this point.

MS. TOKIHIRO: There could be a potential for that. I can't say exactly "yes" or "no" that that is happening, but it could happen.

CHR. PAVAO: So, I don't know if we want to do anything today. You want to—anybody want to make a motion? Do you want to continue it to the next meeting? What's the intention of the body?

MR. NELSON: Yeah, I think we need to send out a communication to the mayor and the department heads asking for input on the positions and I would recommend that we do an across-the-board increase to reflect what we got here.

So, I think there's two separate motions that I would advocate that we move forward with.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, I think it's the thing to do. I mean, we should definitely get—as we're obligated to get information from the Police Commission, Fire Commission, and from the Mayor's Office, of course, as to their position. But, at the same time—yeah, if we can move forward with trying to maintain parity, I think, is important so we don't have to get back into playing catch up again, as much as possible.

Anybody want to make a motion or—

MS. FRENZ: If I could just clarify before we start.

CHR. PAVAO: Go ahead.

MS. FRENZ: If I understand correctly and I think it'll be further clarified once someone considers a motion, if you're going to consider a motion—but it sounds like this body is considering a two-part process because I want to make sure that we still comply with the Charter, right, regarding the conferral that needs to occur.

So, it sounds like this body might be considering an initial motion because the CBA that this body has traditionally tracked has already got their raises, right, to avoid the parity issue that there would be a motion today for a very specific amount for everyone or not—I guess, we'll see what that motion actually is—based on tracking the CBA as we talked about earlier—for purposes of my drafting Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law that I would present to you all for adoption at the next hearing.

And we would be, potentially, looking at implementing that on a very strict schedule, like, maybe January—considering what needs to occur in the interim, right? So, theoretically, if this body were to adopt those proposed Findings and Conclusions at the September hearing, I would be working with our amazing Secretary to get publication occurring. We would have to have a very firm—because we—the Charter says—or it says “At least thirty days prior to the approval”—we shall do the following. And shall do the following is publishing at least once in at least two daily newspapers, with the detailed account of the proposal, including the increases or decreases in both actual dollars and percentages—that was our excel spreadsheet that we had as an exhibit last time.

We hold at least one public hearing in either East Hawai'i or West Hawai'i, provided that we also provide the Zoom—that's not a problem as well. So—and that we submit copies of that to the County Clerk's Office. So, keeping in mind that this needs to occur before that could take effect—we then work backwards, right. So, that would be—sounds like one motion.

Then the separate motion would be that there would be—this body would be drafting a very similar letter to what you did in 2023 to the appointing authorities and/or the Mayor's Office

seeking collaboration and input on potential future raises that would be specific to just raises and not parity—

MR. NELSON: (Inaudible.)

CHR. PAVAO: Not raises, but salary adjustments—

MS. FRENZ: Salary adjustments.

MR. NELSON: (Inaudible.)

CHR. PAVAO: So, they can be appropriate and competitive.

MS. FRENZ: But that would be something that you'd be doing separate and apart—that you'll be looking at taking that action—doing the same process again, but in 2026, more likely—

CHR. PAVAO: Yes.

MS. FRENZ: —by the time you received input from everyone, considered it, and decide what that separate motion would look like.

CHR. PAVAO: (Inaudible.)

MS. FRENZ: Am I understanding correctly?

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, that would take more time. That would be a deeper dive for sure. The one thing we can do, too, is all of the collective bargaining contracts are four-year contracts. You don't have to necessarily have to vote on four years. We could just do January 1<sup>st</sup> for one year—and we have time to wait for the input from the other—from the appointing authorities before making a decision on the balance of the four-year contract or we could do one parity increase January 1<sup>st</sup> and another one July 1<sup>st</sup>, so that we kind of stay on board and don't fall behind schedule.

MS. NAMAHOE: This is Namahoe. I want to write the—I want to make the motion. I am struggling with the language that needs to be provided. I listened to you, Corp. Counsel Frenz, and I—you started to lose me in the parceling of the two motions.

So, the first one is the urgency of starting the work right now, that we undertake—now that the CBA has been resolved for calendar year or County year 2026—is that right? How full does this motion need to be? I want to make sure we only got the guts in it. I don't want to be too wordy about it

CHR. PAVAO: If you look at the history, we've always tried to look at what bargaining unit—HGEA Bargaining Unit 13 and 35 have done. They have a four-year contract. I mean, as I said,

we don't necessarily have to agree to raise all four years, at this point. We can do one year or two years and come back and revisit it.

MS. NAMAHOE: When we were doing salary—I'm sorry—but when we were doing salary adjustments, we were just correcting to the year. We never discussed—that was—that's one thing we've never discussed is doing a big meta year-over-year following the BU13.

MR. NELSON: Well, I do recall we did discuss to try to put something in place proactively but we, basically, held off until we knew what the bargaining units were going to get because we didn't want to go—we can't go over, we didn't want to go under—we tried to—we needed to get that data point, which we have now.

CHR. PAVAO: Mm-hmm.

MR. NELSON: And so, I would argue—go for the four years. Just put it in. Here's what it is. And then, the other things get adjusted, as needed. If you can't hire somebody, if the thing is empty—you got to have it—well, then that's a separate salary increase, but the process takes forever, right?

CHR. PAVAO: Right. Deeper dive.

MR. NELSON: So, you can't have the DPW guy vacant for a year, right? And—

MS. NAMAHOE: Make that motion.

MR. NELSON: Even the 4% increase, the 3.5% for the first—that helps. I mean, that's not ideal, but it's better than nothing, right? So, I think—I do think it's a two-track piece.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, at least it prevents potential for inversion where you have subordinates making more than the Deputy Director.

MR. NELSON: Okay. So, I'll make a motion to—that we go to, basically, we want to—that we recommend that we do a salary adjustment to all the appointed positions of 3.5% on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2026; 3.79%—if we want to do that in June of 2026?

CHR. PAVAO: July 1<sup>st</sup>.

MR. NELSON: July 1<sup>st</sup> of 2026.

MS. FRENZ: Hold on. I'm so sorry. If you're going to take that action, that's going to expand all those years—you're going to have to comply with the Charter and you haven't consulted with the appointing authorities, yet.

MR. NELSON: So, we can't propose anything for the—can we do that or—

MS. FRENZ: Well, you're required to consult. You haven't consulted, yet.

MR. NELSON: Okay.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, the initial motion on the table is to consult with all of the County leadership—the authorities necessary to consider the proposal of tracking for four years the CBA for BU13?

MR. NELSON: Well, I think the consulting is just to ask them to give us input on their—what they recommend for any salary adjustments—is that right, Cody?

MS. FRENZ: It actu—so it says, “The salary commission shall consult with those boards and commissions which have appointing authority for department heads.”

So, when you read the entire subsection (d)—“The commission shall review and compensate all county elected officials and appointed directors and deputy directors so that their total salaries and benefits have a reasonable relationship to compensation in the public and private sectors. The salary commission shall consult with those boards and commissions, which have appointing authority for department heads.” So—

MR. NELSON: So, we got to send out the letter today and then see whatever the input is before we can do any—make any kind of recommendations for any kind of salaries?

MS. FRENZ: I mean, I think that's the cleanest. I mean, you could—it feels like then we have, right now, if we don't—it's cart before the horse, right. And—I mean, while you could hypothetically get input—if you don't get any feedback—you put out the letters and you don't get feedback next month because they've missed their meeting date or time, right? Police Commission, Salary Commission, Merit Appeals Board—when are they actually meeting? And/or input from the mayor, would you then delay or are we going to start posting in the newspaper 'cause once we do that, we really haven't—in good faith—done that consultation. And I want to—as much as I'd love to help you all move forward, I want to make sure that what you do doesn't—can't be set aside and void because we haven't complied with the strict expectations of the County Charter before that consultation phase.

So, you could make that motion, for example—“Pending feedback and consultation with the appointing authorities”—and so, maybe then you're taking that step further. And the letter that's going to be drafted would be in line with what you did two years ago but include—“this is what the Commission is proposing”—give us your feedback, right.

So, maybe that's still that consultation. You say, “Here's the current motion. We want your feedback, we want to consult”—and we see what information you get going forward and, hopefully, we can get some timely feedback from the appointing authorities.

So, maybe that would be—I just want to caution you that it's subject to that further consultation—maybe that's the clarity that we need in the motion to ensure that we comply.

CHR. PAVAO: This—make the same motion but just with that pending language—that way we’re not—we’re complying with the Charter, I think that’s (inaudible). And then, we’re going to have to wait and see when we get their response.

But, yeah, so you could make the same motion but would just be pending the consult from the hiring—appointing and hiring bodies—authorities.

MR. NELSON: But in reality, we’re going back to the department heads looking for input on all their different positions, so it’s more than just kind of across-the board.

CHR. PAVAO: It’d be separate issues because one is going to be more long-term, a deeper dive, I think. We just want to get input from the appointing authorities about this specific parity raise.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, is the motion at-hand to consult with all of the necessary authorities, including the boards and commissions, in order to consider future salary adjustment? Is that sufficient for our needs? Putting a mo—that we make a motion to consult with all of the necessary authorities, including the boards and commissions, in order to consider future salary adjustments. Do we need to be more concise in that?

MS. FRENZ: If you’re going do just that now, then that’s sufficient—and that’s what you guys did in the past.

I guess, I’m trying to find a way to tailor the two together with what it is that you want to do. So, I think figuring out collectively what this body wants to do ‘cause I’ve heard a couple of different things. I’ve heard a two-track, right—we start with some—a smaller bump because the CBA’s already getting theirs. And then we look at more comprehensive, long-term in light of the various responsibilities and duties of each department head—and that second step would afford that further collaboration that complies with the Charter, but then I know that—and then the motion that was starting to be made—and apologies for interrupting just to make sure that we comply with the Charter—seemed to be doing just Step 2—and that’s where I want to make sure that we include that consultation.

So, whichever is the—we can have the motion and see if it passes or fails and keep moving.

MR. NELSON: So, the request for consultation could say, “Hey, we’re—the Commission is considering the following”—okay—“we’re asking you for your input on that and if you have any other further suggestions for what we should do”—is that, would that serve the purpose? And then, so then they can comment on what we’re asking for and then (inaudible) make other adjustments if they think—“my position needs to get, whatever, 100% raise” or something, whatever.

CHR. PAVAO: The communication to the appointing authorities can be two-fold—can be that this body is considering maintaining parity based on the collective bargaining agreements, at the

same time, we're doing a, sort of, deeper dive into seeing whether salaries are appropriate—and asking for input on both issues, so we don't have to get lumped into one issue.

One is going to take more time, obviously. And my concern is that if we go down the path with just one issue that we're going to fall back. It's going to take a long time and we're going to be, again, playing catch up with parity.

MS. FRENZ: This is DCC Cody. So, I think what you—what this body needs to decide first and foremost is—are you doing a one-step or a two-step process? Are you doing an initial one because the CBA is already getting—or are we—are you just doing the one? Because that will, then, I think kind of dictate what that consultation letter looks like. It could, arguably, also be that this body is—has made a motion for x-increase effective this date pending your input and publication in the newspaper and public hearing. But we are also—this body is also looking at the following for the next x-years, right—which is the motion that Commissioner Nelson was starting to make.

It could be two-fold—“please provide your input by so-and-so date”—and maybe they will chime in with something that changes your opinion on the two different possible actions or you just do one.

I need to know what you guys want to do, collectively, so I can help you ensure that we comply with the Charter and have the requisite information I need to draft the Findings. So, I'm going to do Findings for both.

MS. NAMAHOE: Sorry—Namahoe. I just want to make sure that we're efficient. We know of two urgencies right now, but we haven't exhausted all of the departments either. There may be more.

So, obviously, to (inaudible)—but what's the most effective way to get there?

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, we got to get communication from the appointing authorities. So, I think the two-fold path is the best way to do it. We're addressing—trying to address the issue to stay as close to parity as we can and, at the same time, trying to do a deeper dive to see where we are with those two positions and all the positions to see we can get input from the appropriate authorities.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Commissioner Kawa'auhau. I just wanted to add context that's all. I'm remembering now, we did have the plan to start doing the matching with the bargaining units after we've corrected everything.

Because we started off talking about matching the bargaining units and then we said we have too much of an issue here that we have to catch up first. And so, we said we'll put that aside, once we catch up, then we're going to go ahead and start looking at the bargaining units again.

So, actually, it's not something that we're just coming up with. We're actually doing something that we said we were going to do next. So, yeah, I think that's important to know. We're not just jumping and reflecting on something. We actually had this plan.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, that's true. I mean, that was the intent was to wait till we got the results of the collective bargaining agreements, so that we would continue to maintain parity. So, is there an amended motion or another motion?

MR. NELSON: Okay, take another shot at it here. Okay. So, I make a motion that we send a communication out to the department heads—okay, advising them that we are—the Commission is proposing to match the negotiated rates for the BU35 unit—okay—to the appointed positions and we're seeking their input and then also, at the same time, we're seeking their input if they have positions in critical needs or if they have other salary adjustment for their positions that they think need to be adjusted. Is that—

CHR. PAVAO: Amend the motion is the department heads and the appointing authorities—like the Police Commission and the Fire Commission.

MS. FRENZ: So, I think by “department heads” you mean “appointing authority” as well as, maybe, a “cc” to the department heads, again?

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MR. NELSON: If you fill in the right people.

MS. FRENZ: And will that—is that the motion or are you also going to include the very specific increases for the years going forward?

MR. NELSON: So, I was going to match it—that we could put the increases in—3.5% in January of 2026; 3.79 in July of 2020—July 1 of 2026; 4% July 1 of 2027; and 4% on July 1 of 2028.

CHR. PAVAO: Is there a second to the motion?

MR. DUDOIT: I'll second the motion.

CHR. PAVAO: It's been moved and second. Any further discussion?

MS. FRENZ: If, for your discussion, Commissioners, if I could get the requisite language that you're relying on for this purpose. I know that—I believe it's salary adjustment—if you could clarify exactly what language for your proposed Findings of Facts that I can draft accordingly, please.

MS. NAMAHOE: We are in salary adjustment. This isn't inflationary increases—or is this when we use the word “raise”—“pay raises.”

MR. NELSON: I like “adjustment” it’s more—

MS. NAMAHOE: Okay.

MR. NELSON: —‘cause it does cover inflation, I mean, basically, it does cover inflation, but it is (inaudible).

CHR. PAVAO: It’s part of the negotiations that the collective bargaining units bring to the table or when they go to arbitration is one of the evidence they use is “inflation”—usually, it’s a major argument.

So, as far as the basis for Findings—I think, again, it would be about parity. Parity with the collective bargaining units—looking at what the bargaining units got through the collective bargaining process, and we wanted to remain equitable on—and have—maintain parity with the appointed and elected officials, so that there isn’t this pay inversion where subordinates are making more than their supervisors—deputy directors and directors—especially those that are in excluded units like—yeah—the excluded units staff with the pay raises, could, potentially, be making more than the deputy directors.

MS. FRENZ: Any other input from anyone else on the basis for the Findings?

MR. NELSON: So, I do think—base the Finding—it does fol—while we’re calling it a “salary adjustment” it is—the salary is meant—the salary adjustment is meant to cover inflation. I mean, increase cost of living, ‘cause that is a fact, which all of the other (inaudible) employees have and then, these employees as well, will have the same issue. So, it is—it’s a salary adjustment but it is also an inflationary adjustment as well.

MS. FRENZ: Is there a second to that motion?

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, he second.

MS. FRENZ: Jules seconded.

MR. DUDOIT: Commissioner Dudoit—second.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, any further discussion? If not, we’ll go ahead and vote. We’ll start down here (inaudible). You can vote individually.

MR. DUDOIT: Commissioner Dudoit, yes.

MS. NAMAHOE: Namahoe—aye.

CHR. PAVAO: Chair Pavao—aye.

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: Kawa‘auhau—aye.

MR. NELSON: Nelson—yes.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay.

MS. FRENZ: And just to clarify, somebody could also make a motion that Chair Pavao has the authority to sign the communication. I believe that that, the intent of this body, or the motion would be by someone that Chair Pavao will utilize with Glynis and my assistance, the letter that you did to the appointing authorities with a “cc” to department heads back in 2023, seeking input in light of the motion made earlier this morning, and that Chair Pavao has the authority to sign such and then send—and Glynis will send that out.

MR. NELSON: This is Commissioner Nelson. I’ll make a motion that Chairman Pavao can sign that letter to the appointing authorities.

MS. NAMAHOE: Namahoe—seconds.

CHR. PAVAO: Any further discussion? If not, we’ll go ahead and vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

The voice vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Dudoit, Kawa‘auhau, Namahoe, Nelson, and Chair Pavao – 5.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSENT & EXCUSED: Commissioner Riordan - 1.

CHR. PAVAO: All ayes. The motion passes.

MS. FRENZ: So, between now and the next hearing, which I will not be present for, I’ll have my colleague cover for me. I will prepare proposed Findings that support this motion. A copy of that will be circulated to everyone via blind copy so you’ll have ample time to have read it and come prepared for the September hearings to provide corrections, clarifications, expounding whatever needs to be done.

The intent is we have done before—we’ve done the grind, right, in 2023—that at that next hearing, if you want to make adjustments, we would do that via a motion, if you have to go line-by-line like we did last time to adjust it accordingly immediately at the next hearing—so you can make a motion to approve any changes, so that we can then work on the publication and ensuring—and that’s—because we have a small representation at this time—and I’m working with the Mayor’s EA, Micah Alameda, to ensure filling the—our vacancies because I do want to ensure that full representation occurs, right.

I think it’s important that everyone’s going to need to be present at all of our future upcoming hearings for quorum purposes, right. We were intending to meet in July, but we lost quorum.

So, right now we have six of nine positions filled, two of those positions will term out in December of this year—we have a 90-day holdover—that’s possible, so theoretically, the very people here, we should—we could get through the end of March to take any final action, if need be—before we have the replacement of members.

So, historical knowledge is with us—is with this body now. And so, making sure that we can take action accordingly is important. If it doesn’t work, it doesn’t work, right. We’ll re-educate and get our new members caught up, even those that join us throughout this process—that’s a part of the job.

So, I only share this and to emphasize how critically important it is that everyone knows our upcoming dates, everyone can commit to being here. We will include Zoom on our upcoming dates in the event somebody is ill or has a medical issue or a ride issue—you can jump on Zoom, so we can still hit our quorum as required. So, that’s just my gentle reminders that we can keep moving forward accordingly to effectuate what you want to do. Yeah.

CHR. PAVAO: So, September 24<sup>th</sup>, at 10 a.m. is the next meeting, yeah?

MS. FRENZ: Yes, that’s correct. Everybody available—September 24<sup>th</sup>, 10 a.m.? Okay.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, no “Unfinished Business”—okay, somebody make a motion to move to close file on Communications 25-01, 25-02, and 25-03.

MS. NAMAHOE: I make that motion.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. Is there a second?

MR. DUDOIT: Second.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. All—any further discussion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

The voice vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Dudoit, Kawa‘auhau, Namahoe, Nelson, and Chair Pavao – 5.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSENT & EXCUSED: Commissioner Riordan - 1.

CHR. PAVAO: Thank you. Ayes have it—motion carried.

And, “New Business”—I think we’ve already discussed it, have we?

MS. FRENZ: And just to clarify—DCC Frenz—I think our—this body’s communication and the motion was intended to fall under “New Business”—I just think we didn’t call that prior to the conversation. But the motion and discussion is under “New Business.”

**Unfinished Business (Item 7)**

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. And then, we don't have any "Unfinished Business."

**Announcements (Item 8)**

CHR. PAVAO: No "Announcements"—

**Schedule Next Meeting Date (Item 9)**

CHR. PAVAO: And the next meeting is September 24<sup>th</sup>, at 10 a.m. Anything else?

MS. FRENZ: We have anything else from anyone?

**Adjournment (Item 10)**

CHR. PAVAO: Anything else? Otherwise, we're adjourned. Okay, meeting adjourned. Thank you very much. Everybody have a good day. (The meeting adjourned at 11:24 p.m.)

Respectfully submitted,

Glynis Yamada, Secretary-Reporter

APPROVED:

Steven Pavao, Chair  
Salary Commission