

PUBLIC HEARING

COUNTY OF HAWAI'I
PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT BY THE
2025 COUNTY OF HAWAI'I SALARY COMMISSION
DATED AUGUST 28, 2025

Hilo Council Chambers
Hawai'i County Building
25 Aupuni Street, First Floor, Room 1401
Hilo, Hawai'i
November 17, 2025 (Monday)

Call to Order (Item 1)

The public hearing of the Salary Commission, County of Hawai'i, was called to order at 10:00 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 Monday, November 17, 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
Mr. Dennis Riordan, Member
Ms. Sommer J. Tokihiro, Ex-Officio Member

Also Present

Ms. Dakota "Cody" Frenz, Deputy Corporation Counsel, Office of the Corporation Counsel
Ms. Jamie Martines, Human Resources Manager II, Human Resources Department
Ms. Michele Lamkin, Human Resources Program Specialist, Human Resources Department
Ms. Kim Kailipaka, Human Resources Technician I, Human Resources Department
Mr. Lance Matsumoto, Clerk III, Human Resources Department
Ms. Glynis Yamada, Secretary-Reporter, Human Resources Department

Call to Order (Item 1)

CHR. PAVAO: Good morning, we'll call the meeting to order. Let's start off with introduction of Commission members.

MR. DUDOIT: Commissioner Dudoit, present.

MR. RIORDAN: Commissioner Riordan.

MS. NAMAHOE: Commissioner Namahoe.

CHR. PAVAO: Commissioner Chair Steve Pavao.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Commissioner Donala Kawa'auhau.

MR. NELSON: Commissioner Nelson.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Ex-Officio Member, Sommer Tokihiro.

MS. FRENZ: And, Chair, Deputy Corporation Counsel Cody Frenz, on behalf of the Salary Commission. Also present is our Secretary Glynis Yamada.

CHR. PAVAO: Also, present in our Kona Council Conference Room, Scott Ruedy.

Okay, we'll go ahead and get started. The purpose of the hearing—the public hearing is being held pursuant to Hawai'i Revised Statutes, Chapter 92, and the provisions of Chapter 204 Rules Applicable to Salary Adjustments, Title IV – Rules of the County of Hawai'i Salary Commission, to hear testimony concerning the proposed Findings of Fact in support of its decision to adjust the salaries and salary schedules of elected and appointed officials of the County of Hawai'i, as set forth as "Exhibit A", to be effective January 1, 2026.

So, "Statements from the Public"—individuals wishing to testify must register with the Salary Commission or the County Clerk staff by filling out the form at the registration table and handing it to them.

Each person may speak for three minutes, however, subject to the Chair's permission, may have an opportunity to extend beyond the time period. A bell will ring to notify you that you have 30-seconds remaining to summarize your statement.

Please submit any written testimony to staff for the Salary Commission's consideration. All written, email, and oral submissions shall be fully considered and included in the record of the hearing.

The Commission will consider all comments and materials and may take final action at its regular meeting scheduled for Monday, December 22nd, at 10 a.m. at the Hilo Council Chambers, Hawai'i County Building, 25 Aupuni Street, First Floor, Room 1401, in Hilo, Hawai'i.

Members of the public may attend the meeting either in-person at the meeting location or via Zoom. For access at the meeting—Zoom—please contact Glynis Yamada at Glynis.Yamada@hawaiicounty.gov or you can call 808-961-8361, or by checking the December 22nd, '25, agenda.

Okay, we'll start with public testimony. Is there any public testimony in Kona?

MR. RUEDY: Good morning, we have no testifiers here in Kona.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, thank you. Okay, so we'll go with public testimony in Hilo—starting with Hugh Ono.

MR. ONO: Good morning, Chair Pavao, and members of the Salary Commission. My name is Hugh Ono. I once was a member of the Salary Commission. I've also been a state employee, a County employee, and also worked in the private sector.

Anyway, I'd like to start off by saying that—I can't read my writing—there we go—I'm almost certain that this Commission has done its homework, and looked at comparables, and gotten advice from other jurisdictions as to setting the salary for the appointed officials or whomever are on the list.

But I'd also like to mention that I believe—and I support that multi-year plan that you've come up with because at the time I worked on the Salary Commission, we were just doing one-time adjustments at a time and that gets—this will take care of salaries over a period of time, which is really good.

It's the right thing to do to adjust the salaries and we all know what the word "*pono*" means—"do the right thing"—and I certainly support that.

Secondly, I've always supported equal pay for equal work. And this goes back to when women were paid less than men. I believe that's still going on to some degree, but it's—the gap is getting closer—and it should not be closer, it should be equal without question.

Public employees—well, people who are for the public, I've never considered them "public servants"—they are "public employees." And so, they need to be treated as such—but I've been referred to as a public servant and, yeah, we try and serve and do our very, very best.

And, in closing, I hope and I'm asking that—hopefully, this Commission can vote unanimously in support of these well-deserved raises. And who knows when the next time will come around—but I thank you, the Commission, for doing such an excellent job. *Mahalo* and thank you.

CHR. PAVAO: Thank you. Next up is Dell Otsuka.

MS. OTSUKA: Good morning, Chair, Commissioners, Counsel, and Secretary. My name is Dell Otsuka, I'm a lifetime resident of Keaukaha—and I would like to thank you for the opportunity to provide this oral testimony, but it's expanding on my written testimony that I had submitted last week.

I have the deepest respect for what you do. I've also been a commissioner for the Environmental Department—termining out this December. So, it is important. I can understand this coming before us, but what I need to say—and I want to be constructive about it—because granting these raises at this time, for this long a period—is not fiscally acceptable for me, anyway.

And that's because our County's future depends upon your decision. We are living in uncertain, yet, undeniably changing times of economic stress and predictable instability. So, this proposal is very hard. And I understand that the increases are being presented as necessary for recruitment and retention. But I ask that you consider carefully how this rationale applies to our County's leadership structure because of the 41 positions that we're talking about—11 are elected, 30 are appointed; and of the 11 elected officials, the concept of retention does not apply since their continued service is dependent upon vote of confidence and performance during their terms—not on the salary level.

A pay raise does not ensure retention in these 11 positions, only accountability and trust can do that. For the 30 appointed positions, this is a real opportunity to strengthen both recruitment and retention strategies through meaningful measures of performance. Compensation should reflect results. Raises should be earned—not expected or inherited.

Another rationale for these raises is in comparison to private and public sector. I worked in public sector. Private, for-profit, public government taxpayer funded—roles are fundamentally different. The government does not operate for profit; therefore, private sector salaries are not an appropriate benchmark unless transparent and justified.

But justifications were specified for comparing the County department head to a corporate CEO or CFO. Which private businesses were named and for what positions exactly to determine what you're planning to do?

A County agency head oversees public health, safety, infrastructure, and all public services—not for profit. A private CEO is judged on behalf of growth—not public services—and accountability. Also, with private sector—no revenue growth, no profits—mean no raises, no commissions, layoffs, and company closures.

My time is running out. I do have—I do want to address a few other agenda items for later, but if you want me to read it, I can do it all now.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, you can do it now.

MS. OTSUKA: Okay, unless anybody else wants to go before me, I can wait.

CHR PAVAO: Okay.

MS. OTSUKA: Thank you—and I'm nervous. The repeated reference to private and sector comparisons lacks clarity and transparency. I haven't read everything that you've provided, so I don't know if you've already done that.

So without identifying which companies, what positions, and what data was used for your Finding—comparisons between public leadership and private business executives become not only meaningless, but misleading.

And in comparison to other jurisdictions, 33 of the 42 Hawai'i County officials make more than the Maui County, except for the mayor, county clerk, and deputy county clerk—and very little are—under the O'ahu officials. And I got this off of—you have a copy, the “Executive Salary Jurisdiction Comparison.” So, of Hawai'i's four counties, Hawai'i County is considered the poorest.

When referencing living wages—\$28.93 for a single adult; a family, two households working with two children, \$58.56 an hour. It's hard to read and acknowledge the amount that we want to give, 'cause right now, they total over six million, the raises will be over a million—and then they'll end up in four years at seven million.

I don't see how we can sustain the raises. I'm not saying they're not—you're not—they're not deserving. I'm not saying that. But these are not the kind of times we're going to make advanced offers for that kind—'cause we don't know what's going to happen. And for like the HR, I'm—because I was on the Environmental Commission, I questioned a lot about that staffing because the critical services that we all provide, the departments that have the critical 365 day-a-year, 24 hours, seven days-a-week departments—they're the ones with the highest vacancies. And it's not all HR's I think—every department head needs to deal with their own department and look for ways to make it better. Because if we do this, I don't see how we can sustain these raises because you're either going to raise the taxes or you're going to cut the services. So, I don't—I can't fathom that.

And of the 68 job postings that I saw recently, 18 of them are below living wages—and this is with the County. So, of all your 3,000 employees, how many of them are just making barely below the minimum wage. So, when we're looking at the optics on giving these raises to officials who already make a lot in our County and in the State—there has to be a balance for those who are actually out there every day, doing their job, holding the County together, and just getting by.

And a lot of it, I think, the vacancies—I'm told all the time that people transfer out or they leave. They don't tell us where they left to or where they transferred out to, but that would be another

indicator that there's some internal issues in that department because you wouldn't have that kind of numbers if it was good.

So, I'm saying, before we can give raises—and it seems to be across-the-board—every head will get the same amount of raises without even validating or even performing or showing us some kind of results to the problems that each department have. So, I think it's—if the departments not doing well, then that department head should not be getting a raise. And in each department, you have your mid-management people who are not subject to the Salary Commissions or even union negotiations. So, they're the ones—if they're transferring out it's because nobody's representing them and their subordinates will be making more than—via overtime.

So, I think it's not only focusing on the top officials but the mid-management who get no representation. And so, that was one of my—and as I mentioned, of the 695 vacancies in the County—the Police, the Fire, the Parks and Rec., Public Works, Department of Environmental Management, Water Supply—account for 577 vacancies. And of the list of employees that are there that supposed to be filled—who's to say that that's the true number because of that number of employees, you have people out on workers' comp., extended sick leave, military leave, or deployments—so, it's not a clear picture—so that 577 vacancies become more because the operations are not being covered because there's nobody.

So, all I'm saying is before you even—you must have already—but before you take a vote on it, please consider every department head should be held accountable for their department. They don't get a blanket raise because everybody else does and because we're piggy-backing off of the union bargaining agreements—because we're none—they're negotiating for wages, better benefits—they're not negotiating for executive raises.

So, this is where I find that the rationale for taking the bargaining unit position on their raises to apply to the officials here, I don't think it's fair—and so that. And I submitted, just so you know—I submitted that jurisdiction to show the different counties and the pay that they're getting. So, I think it's a lot. I do.

And so, I'm just saying, before we even approve it or maybe hold off until you have a full complement of commissioners, so that every district is represented by them—and so, their people can talk to them, so they can come to you—I mean, so you can come to us and say that, “You know what, we can't all agree”—because District 4, District 6—you have to represent them—and they're not always going to participate. So, I'm just saying.

And before I close—

CHR. PAVAO: You're going to have to wrap it up, and we'll give you another 30 seconds.

MS. OTSUKA: Yeah, okay. So, in closing, my request is simply that the Commission consider aligning all proposed salaries and in future raises, the performance standards that demonstrate efficiency, leadership, service to the public, and fairness to the employees that they manage. So, in doing so, we affirm the County's commitment to transparency, fairness, and responsible

stewardship, ensuring that every dollar spent honors trust—honors the trust placed in our leaders by the people they serve.

CHR. PAVAO: Thank you.

MS. OTSUKA: Okay, thank you so much.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, next up, Gabriella Cabanas, on behalf of yourself.

MS. CABANAS: Good morning, Chair Steve Pavao, and Salary Commission Commissioners, and Director of Human Resources Sommer Tokihiro, and Deputy Corp. Counsel Cody Frenz.

I'm Gabriella Marie Cabanas, I'm representing myself. I'm a lifelong resident of this beautiful Island of Hawai'i. And I just happen to be a retired Human Resources Manager who worked for the County of Hawai'i for 37 and-a-half years. I had a wonderful career, and I really enjoyed it.

I want to thank all of you. I know your job is very difficult. It's a complicated matter and hard to please everyone out there, but I know you'll do what is right. Your proposed Findings of Fact is very detailed, so it helps all of us.

The reason why I am here, first of all, I want to say I have not talked to any executive employee whose position is listed. I'm doing it from, really like an outsider reading the newspaper and other information out there.

My suggestions to all of you are more focused. And it's focused on a number of positions. And the reason it's focused is because of the nature of their work—and it's public safety. So, I've looked at the Police Chief and Deputy, and the Fire Chief and Deputy. These are public safety leaders. Our island is unique. It's the largest island, as we all know, in the Hawaiian chain.

For Fire—Fire enters into a state agreement to provide EMS services and that contract is with Department of Health. I don't think it has changed. I've been retired seven years. And our firefighters are trained—all of them—EMT's and a select number become paramedics. They cover the whole island. No other island in the State—ooh, that was fast—no other island in the State has that type of agreement. So, our firefighters serve a dual function. Can I have a little extension, Chair?

CHR. PAVAO: Yes.

MS. CABANAS: I can—okay, thank you. And so, with Police and Fire as well, we have unique circumstances on this island as we all know. We have an active volcano. The only island in the Hawaiian chain that has an active volcano. We have Kilauea Iki, and we have—every now and then Mauna Loa erupting. So, Police and Fire need to be decisive, strong leaders. They need to be paid to do their work.

And when you have—I noticed Number 9 in your proposed Findings of Fact—“To keep pace with CPI inflation rates, pay increases granted to BU 13 employees”—well, Police has Unit 12, the SHOPO contract, which is in arbitration or going to arbitration. And Fire has the contract BU11, which is also going through arbitration. So, those numbers are not definite at this time—hard for you to do something when we don’t know what it is.

However, I feel instead of considering the BU13, which is HGEA—and Police and Fire have HGEA employees, but they have SHOPO, they have the police officers whose salary schedule is very different from BU13—very different. And then, Fire same thing—the fire fighters—their salary schedule is very different from BU13.

So, I ask, somehow, if you can consider that, if you can. I’m not telling you what to do, but if you can consider it. And, perhaps, our HR director can be of some assistance to all of you as she would—you would be getting more info. as time progresses.

So, I just wanted to state that. It’s the scope of their work. You can put the Island of O‘ahu, the size of it, in the Puna District. What does that tell all of us—that our directors for these two departments—Police Chief with the Deputy, Fire Chief with the Deputy—that’s what they have to work with.

And so, I would ask that you give some consideration to their salaries and, perhaps, not follow the BU13—follow their respective contracts because Police and Fire, they’re getting more than BU13—that’s a general statement, ‘cause I don’t have the figures in front of me—but you can get that through the Department of Human Resources. So, that’s what I wanted to say about that.

The next thing that I want to—can I just continue a little bit more, Chair? I’ll wrap it up, but it’s about two positions—well, actually, four because it’s the director and the deputy, the director and the deputy for Environmental Management and Public Works.

CHR. PAVAO: You’re testifying on behalf of yourself and also the Merit Appeals Board?

MS. CABANAS: No, no, I’m testifying right now for myself.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay.

MS. CABANAS: Based on what I have read, based on my HR experience—okay. I’m not representing MAB, yet. I will identify when I do.

So, for Environmental Management and Public Works—these are engineering departments. When I first started with the County, I started at Public Works—and then I took a promotion to the Personnel Department. It was known as “Civil Service” back then—and then the name got changed through a Charter amendment to “Human Resources.”

But there are engineers out there. Are we paying them the industry standard? Public Works and Environmental Management, they have very huge—and I’m going to put that in caps.—HUGE

matters to deal with. And to say that there are no engineers—there are engineers, but we need to pay them fairly, equitably, and logically—in order for them to lead those two departments. Let me give you a real quick example and then I'm going to close.

And this example was—years back I was already with Human Resources and the State decided—because they were having difficulty hiring civil engineers, they decided to declare a Shortage Category, which would give civil engineers a differential amount, in addition to their base pay. Well, what happened? We had some of our engineers from Public Works leave to go work for the State because now, they were going to get their shortage differential.

No other—excuse me—no other island had a shortage differential. So, when that happened, we talked internally in our department, we secured the approval of the mayor—it was Stephen Yamashiro back at that time—that's how way back it goes. And then, we decided, “You know what, we're going to declare a shortage differential” because it became a recruiting matter. It has always been a recruiting issue for civil engineers—even today. It's still on continuous recruitment, right, Sommer? Is that correct?

MS. TOKIHIRO: That's correct.

MS. CABANAS: Yeah. So, even today it's still a recruiting issue, but that shortage differential helps to attract the applicants. So, when we did that, then later Maui and Kaua'i Islands also declared shortages. The idea is, we want to pay them what's logically right to also keep them—otherwise, we would have had musical chairs with more engineers leaving to go work for the State. And I believe you all know, you were the Chief Engineer at State Highways—and he was getting our engineers—and we don't want to lose our engineers. So, no offense.

MR. ONO: Yeah, I'm okay with it.

MS. CABANAS: The word is “competitive”—we need to be competitive. We need to be proactive when you ascertain the salaries, especially for those two departments because they are engineering departments. And to be a good leader, you need to know what you're talking about—you don't want a leader who knows apples and you're dealing with oranges. You need a leader who knows design and semantics and all of that detailed lingo, so that you can have a thorough conversation with your managers, with the subordinates—everyone understands. Historically, the department head for Public Works has always been an engineer—a licensed engineer—that's historically.

So, in closing, I just want to ask if you could please give some consideration to those two department heads and their respective deputies.

And so, I want to thank all of you for listening to me. I know I went over time—but I wanted to share my *mana'o* and ask for your consideration. So, *mahalo*, you have a very difficult job.

CHR. PAVAO: Thank you. So, you were also going to testify on the Merit Appeals Board? Yeah.

MS. CABANAS: Three minutes. Okay. I'm here to represent the Merit Appeals Board of which I am the Chair, and I have been the Chair for the last five years—I have one year more to go.

We sent in a written recommendation to all of you and it was for a 5% pay increase for every year. So, it would total 20%. And the reason it's 5% for every year, the Merit Appeals Board wanted me to come today and explain why 5%. It was to provide more of a cushion between the department head and the managers because the managers salaries are set with input from the Department of Human Resources, but it's set by the Mayor's Office—it's through Executive Order.

And we didn't want to have that inversion of managers coming close or superseding the department head's salary. Now, we noticed it's a four-year contract for the lower-level positions and there's two pay increases for 2026. The first pay increase that you folks have established is for January 1—that's to make up for the year 2025, right.

And then, the second pay increase is July 1st, 2026. And then, move it forward July 1st, 2027—and then the last on 2000—July 1st, 2028—and then, that would take care of it. So, it would be a total of 20%.

The Merit Appeals Board members are Daniel "Niel" Thompson—Niel Thomas, Gilbert Aguinaldo, Suzi Bond is our Vice-Chair, and myself. We have one vacant position we're waiting for the Mayor's Office to nominate someone.

So, that was basically our justification to all of you. And, sorry, our meeting date came after your meeting, so that's why we were more on the later side to submit our written recommendation to all of you.

So, I'll close with that. If you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them. If not, *mahalo*. Like I said, you have a very complicated—it's very complicated. And the public, they don't like to hear the word "pay increases"—I get it. Nobody wants pay increases when taxes might go up—I'm not saying that's going to happen—but in their mind, that's what they think.

So, again, *mahalo*, and best wishes to all of you.

CHR. PAVAO: Thank you. Okay, so we'll—okay, then we'll adjourn the public hearing—yeah, nobody in Kona to testify, right?

MR. RUEDY: That is correct. No testimony here in Kona.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. Anybody else on Zoom that wants to testify? I see somebody with their hand raised on iPhone III. Okay, no other testimony—nobody else on Zoom—then we'll adjourn the public hearing portion of this meeting and then we'll move on to our regular agenda. So, next on our regular agenda is—

(At this time, someone on Zoom spoke.)

SPEAKER: Hello? Aloha.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, hello?

MS. ISAAC: Hello, my name is Megan Isaac, and I did request to participate. Thank you.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay.

MS. ISAAC: Thank you. I would like to contribute, and I am genuinely a member of the public. I've really appreciated the very respectful—and I would imagine helpful *mana'o* from some people who have a background in HR.

I, myself, am an operator of a small business that contributes to actual revenue base in our economy. So, I have some concerns—I just have to look around me and I can see, particularly, in East Hawai'i, that there are—there's a slowdown of tourism—and that concerns me because I know how important that is to a lot, a lot of livelihoods. I could give a lot more testimony than that, but I'll just point out that even in today's paper, there's a story about industry—travel industry people that are starting to make the big noise and ask the State of Hawai'i introduce an interventionary marketing because they perceive the tourism levels are down and they perceive it to be a great concern.

So, I'm just—I could, again, speak for quite some time about this, but I'm just going to say it's been alluded to already—there's—there're actually very hard times going on in our community now and we can anticipate should that many continue. And as the last speaker wrapped up and said—it seems insensitive to even be entertaining raises right now. It is understood that, historically, significant raise came to the executive in 2024. It was the largest ever. It was at—over 27% I believe. So, this is an additional. And as somebody else said it hasn't been tied to performance.

We actually have seen some concerning levels of debt and I'm just going to do my best to quickly run through my understanding of what that debt level is. There—as I understand it, there are several warning indicators that show that Hawai'i County is actually in some financial risk and I'm going to draw on the 2024 financial review and show that there are something like \$400,000,000.00 in bonds—and we're looking at a billion-dollar budget.

When I start to break that down as to what it means for each individual in the County, we're looking at a significant number that's—that reflects what each and every resident is carrying in the way of debt. Of course, I would like to pull those numbers up right now, but what I want to

say about that is, it's—as somebody else has pointed out—these kind of remuneration for our executives, which is not reflected with general worker wages and it's, certainly, not reflected in the general community—is grossly insensitive and I think will bring—I realize that there are a lot of people that aren't aware of this proposal to make a raise, certainly, people I've spoken to.

I think you're at risk of, again, making history but not in a positive way. And I just would urge you to please, please be sensitive to our community and sensitive to the optics of this because when we do the math, it's coming out close to under 50%, but we're talking about a number that's close enough to 50% raise in a material matter of four years—the raise, itself, being ordered in the space of two years—it's extremely insensitive when I can tell you for myself, my own business has seen a reduction in capacity, and that's because I'm in the tourism sector—that much less spending apparently—and, as I said, those should be red flags.

If we were basing these salary increases on performance, it would be one thing. But I actually didn't see our county council do the work I would have liked them to do on just even the budget—they didn't, to me, work hard enough to make cuts in certain departments. We saw part of the surplus go to a \$70 million payout to unions—and all of this is just—not only is it creating wealth gaps in our community that aren't healthy for us, but I feel also that it's—we're certainly sending a wrong message and creating a dangerous level of insulation for our leadership whether—there's a risk that you create in an area of government that's not in touch with the day-to-day struggles that people are going through.

So, I think I'll close there and just say *mahalo*—*mahalo* for all the excellent testimony that we were hearing from people who have an HR background. I really appreciate hearing that and, again, we have a County full of very, very good people and I constantly hear very respectful testimony and very—people that want to help make sure good decisions are made. And I don't notice a lot of the public here today, so I'm representing many, many more people by speaking today. I took time out of my workday to do this—and it's just to urge you to have the utmost (inaudible).

I think we can take these—I think we can take the fact that the tourism industry itself is now making an urgent call for help to be a sign that we could be headed for a war—and it's very, very concerning because, again, if we were going to base things on performance—we saw our county council last year go after quite—they pursued quite hard, the idea of eliminating short-term rentals—a lot of areas on our island. It was very fortunate they stopped that particular pursuit, but they had to be warned of just how much of our economy is dependent on tourism.

So, again, from a performance point of view, we haven't seen stewardship of our economy. And so, when I look around and I see people hurting, I see families struggling—you would want to base any raise for our leadership on some kind of performance metric that was tied to our economic performance.

And so, I really—I urge that not only would you not pursue a raise at this time, but that the Salary Commission start to work on a structure where you could be establishing performance metrics. I believe that idea was (inaudible) today by somebody else who testified. It should

really be based on performance metrics and job. There, again, we do have a very unfortunate situation where somebody or a series of mistakes were made—and now a priceless access to a public park—our coconut island bridge was broken. This is unfortunate that it happened right before this matter of a raise being considered. But, obviously, the community's upset and we'd like to think that we're just going to be sensitive to how is everybody doing—not just the one executive branch of our government.

Thank you very much. I appreciate very much the opportunity to speak. *Mahalo*.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. Thank you. So, that concludes—

MS. ISAAC: I didn't said my name—I beg your pardon, my name is Megan Isaac. I didn't identify myself, and I live in Downtown Hilo. Thank you very much.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, thank you very much.

Adjournment

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, so that concludes our public testimony at 10:42 a.m. So, we'll go on to our regular agenda.

Respectfully submitted,

Glynis Yamada, Secretary-Reporter

APPROVED:

Steven Pavao, Chair
Salary Commission