

REGULAR SESSION

Salary Commission  
Hilo Council Chambers  
Hawai'i County Building  
25 Aupuni Street, First Floor, Room 1401  
Hilo, Hawai'i  
September 24, 2025 (Wednesday)

**Call to Order (Item 1)**

The regular meeting 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 Wednesday, September 26, 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  
Mr. Kazuo S. K. L. Todd, Chief, Fire 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 of the Hawai'i County Salary Commission at 10 a.m.

We'll do rollcall starting on this end.

MR. DUDOIT: Commissioner Dudoit, present.

MR. RIORDAN: Commissioner Riordan, present.

MS. NAMAHOE: Commissioner Namahoe, present.

CHR. PAVAO: Chair Pavao, present.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Commissioner Kawa'auhau, present.

MR. NELSON: Commissioner Nelson, present.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Sommer Tokihiro, Director of Human Resources.

MS. FRENZ: Good morning, Chair, Deputy Corporation Counsel Cody Frenz. On behalf of the Commission, we also have Glynis Yamada, our Secretary present.

CHR. PAVAO: Thank you.

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

(There were none.)

**Approval of Minutes (Item 3)**

**August 28, 2025**

---

CHR. PAVAO: Thank you. So, we have minutes from the August 28, 2025, meeting. Any questions, comments, corrections of the minutes? If not, the Chair would entertain a motion to accept the minutes as circulated.

MS. NAMAHOE: Commissioner Namahoe—I move to accept the minutes.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. Is there a second?

MR. DUDOIT: Second.

CHR. PAVAO: It's been moved and second. Any further discussion on the minutes? Seeing none, all those in favor of accepting the minutes of August 28, 2025, signify by saying aye. Any opposed?

The voice vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Dudoit, Kawa'auhau, Namahoe, Nelson, Riordan, and  
Chair Pavao – 6.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSENT & EXCUSED: None.

CHR. PAVAO: Motion carried.

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

**Communication No. 25-04**, From Salary Commission Chair Steven Pavao, Dated September 4, 2025, Regarding Their Inquiry To The Appointing Authorities Concerning Proposed Salary Adjustments For Department Heads And Deputies. The Salary Commission Is Proposing To Mirror The Hawai'i Government Employees Association (HGEA) Salary Increases For The Next Four Years: 3.5% Increase, Effective January 1, 2026; 3.79% Increase, Effective July 1, 2026; 4% Increase, Effective July 1, 2027; And 4% Increase, Effective July 1, 2028 (See Exhibit "A"):

**Communication No. 25-04.01**, From Fire Chief Kazuo Todd, Dated September 14, 2025, Responding To The Salary Commission's Inquiry Dated September 4, 2025; *And*

**Communication No. 25-04.02**, From County Clerk Jon Henricks, Dated September 15, 2025, Responding To The Salary Commission's Inquiry Dated September 4, 2025.

**Communication No. 25-04.03**, From Prosecuting Attorney Kelden B. A. Waltjen, Received On September 17, 2025, Responding To The Salary Commission's Inquiry Dated September 4, 2025

---

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. And then we go on to "Communications." Any comments about the communication—Fire Chief Todd, did you want—do you have any comments, you want to say something in regards to your communication?

(At this time, Mr. Kazuo S. K. L. Todd, Chief, Fire Department, came forward.)

MR. TODD: I mainly came to be present in case there are any questions on my submitted letter to you guys. I'm available in case you want an opinion or wanted a little bit more detail or anything like that.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. Thank you. Anybody have any questions for the Chief? Thank you very much.

I—just for me to add some comments—I think with the Prosecuting Attorney's raising an important point and that's something that we had talked about of doing a deeper dive and looking

at specific positions but, at this point, we're just trying to maintain parity, I think, as a mindset of the Commission with collective bargaining.

But I think that this, definitely, warrants further discussion and inquiry looking especially at the results or the findings of the Maui contracted HR service—no sense in us reinventing the wheel. They did a real deep dive in looking at salaries and—yeah, so I think we can have further discussion about that.

Okay, any other comments about the communications? If not, we'll move on to "New Business."

MR. NELSON: I just had a comment. I—when I looked at his letter, he recommended raising the salary for the Prosecuting Attorney, but not necessarily Corporate (sic.) Counsel. So, I mean, that part, I don't know how to (inaudible), I mean, it wasn't clear to me. I do think that there needs to be further clarity on what he's looking for.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MR. NELSON: Basically, he's talking about bumping up quite a bit—Prosecuting Attorney—but then leaving the Corporate Counsel alone.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah. Well, he was—but I think part of the major suggestions he's making as the Prosecuting Attorney's salary should be equal or equivalent to a circuit court judge and that—I don't know—that's something we need to look at and see if that's standard or is that true of other counties and other states—it's something to, definitely, look at.

I think he has a good point especially for the deputies—deputy prosecutors—they carry huge loads and work more than 40 hours. So does the Corporate—Corp. Counsel Office. So, yeah, I think it's important that we get input from the Corporation Counsel as well as we do a deeper dive in looking and seeing where we are with those salaries.

MR. NELSON: I think it might be worth to ask if they were to come in and comment (inaudible)—I suggest. I mean, that's my suggestion, 'cause I don't think what was presented and looking at the Maui salary data—just the prosecuting attorneys—I don't know that it justifies what he's asking for.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MR. NELSON: Okay, but if he could pitch it, I think it might be worth—

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah. I mean, something to consider for sure. He has—makes a valid point but it's something to consider. But that's a good idea to actually have him come to the Commission and be able to discuss his recommendations.

MS. FRENZ: I just want to jump in—this is DCC Cody. My guess—and I am reaching out to Prosecuting Attorney Waltjen to see if he’s possibly available today, but he was putting in and responding to this inquiry from this body for input. And my best guess is that he stayed in his lane as far as he is the Prosecuting Attorney, this is his recommendation, and to not speak on behalf of Corporation Counsel or what would be appropriate.

I think it’s also fair to look at both the range currently set for the Office of Corporation Counsel as well as the Office of the Prosecuting Attorney and they’re identical. So, theoretically, what you do for one, you could also consider doing for the other, and he’s just opining as to the office that he holds.

And so, I don’t think it was intentional to not include Corporation Counsel. I just think he stayed in his lane in that regard, for what that’s worth.

MR. NELSON: I don’t understand how it works exactly. I just looked at it and I was like, “Oh, why does the one guy get the (inaudible).”

CHR. PAVAO: One more—criminal attorneys—

MR. NELSON: Part of the reason for the increase on the Prosecuting Attorney was that it’s easier to get Corporation Counsel (inaudible) in his letter, which I don’t know if that’s true or not, but that’s what he’s saying, and I thought (inaudible).

CHR. PAVAO: Historically, as Cody’s saying—is, historically, the Prosecuting Attorney and the Corporation Counsel have had the same salaries. But, yeah, something to discuss and he can give us input—will be important to also have input from the Corporation Counsel as well before we make any decisions about that.

Anyhow, we can move on.

### **New Business (Item 6)**

**Communication No. 25-05: Proposed Findings Of Fact By The 2025 County Of Hawai‘i Salary Commission, Dated August 28, 2025 - Pursuant To Section 13-28 Of The Hawai‘i County Charter (2024), As Amended, The County Of Hawai‘i Salary Commission Makes Its Findings In Support Of Its Decision To Adjust The Salaries And Salary Schedule Of Elected And Appointed Officials Of The County Of Hawai‘i, To Be Effective January 1, 2026. (A Table Of The Proposed Salary Increases Are Set Forth And Attached As Exhibit “A”**

---

CHR. PAVAO: So, where are we now—to the “New Business.” You should all have the table—the proposed salary increases and the Findings of Fact that was submitted at this point. Any comments? The salary schedule is attached to the letter that was sent out to the appointing authorities.

MR. NELSON: So I assume the math is correct in the memo. I mean, I didn't check it. I had assumed you guys (inaudible)—take that as a given.

MS. FRENZ: So, just to clarify, I—what I did in my process for drafting the Proposed Findings of Fact for this Commission is I used my notes, I drafted—I created a draft and then sent it to Director Tokihiro to double-check the numbers. And based on that, she made the corrections—and based on the motion before you that you guys made at the last hearing—they drafted exhibit—the exhibits that you have a copy of, from this very communication that shows you what that would actually propert to be, if those raises were to take effect.

I wanted to address one issue that was brought to my attention between our last hearing and now. I think that the—and part, Chair already touched on it earlier today—about whether or not this body was going to do an in-depth review of each department, right, which is why I think you also got some communications that showed the position description, the requirements for certain department heads.

But what I learned very recently was that—and I can't speak as to Fire but I presume Fire would likely be similar. But my understanding for the Police Department in a conversation I had—is that there's \$100.00 difference between the base pay of the Assistant Chief and the Deputy Chief. The biggest difference is the Assistant Chief's get overtime—the Deputy Chief and the Chief do not. And the very—that concerned me if your efforts and attempt to make these changes are to avoid inversion and disparity between the appointed—the Fire Chief, the Deputy Chief, the Police Chief, the Deputy Police Chief—if there's that small of a difference—and I, again, I can't speak as to Fire. I think it might be possibly different, but I could be incorrect.

But if the intent was to avoid disparity, that—the current proposed changes would not do that. So, if you are concerned about that, one option would be to remove Police and Fire from your proposed action, assuming you still want to continue course. You would remove those two departments and wait to see what those two departments' unions actually result in for the step increases and the movements that those affected members would get—and then adjust for the Chief—Fire Chief, Police Chief, and Deputies—accordingly, thereafter.

I believe Director Tokihiro can indicate some of the dates. I think one is a little closer to a resolution and one is for the end of the year/early next year. So, it might require pushing those out but that—if the intent of this body is to ensure we don't have that disparity and the inversion, then—from what I understand, but I—Director Tokihiro is far more informed than I am. I don't know that we hit that—we meet that mark as you intend for those two—at a bare minimum, I know for Police from what I was told—and I suspect Fire as well.

MS. TOKIHIRO: So, good morning, Sommer Tokihiro, Director of Human Resources. So, yes, the bargaining units for SHOPO and HFFA are different from HGEA. And so, we're—we've completed arbitration with the Police Officers Union—that arbitration award should be issued by the end of September but would need to be approved by all legislative bodies, but you would have that information within the next couple of months.

Arbitration with HFFA is pending. We don't have a firm date scheduled yet. I believe it's going to occur in December or January. So, that process will likely take several months—and so, you wouldn't receive that information until probably, at least, March or April of next year. But those bargaining units are different and have different structures than HGEA.

MS. NAMAHOE: Question for HRD. Knowing what we know now about Police and the inversion that exist, do you have access to all of the information that could let us know what other inversions currently exist?

MS. TOKIHIRO: Yes. Sorry, I'm looking to my Classification and Pay Division Manager, Jamie Martines, and then Michele Lamkin is also here from Classification and Pay. I just want to make sure that I'm not committing to provide something that they can't provide—but, yes, we can get you that information.

MS. NAMAHOE: Let me ask it in a different way, outside of Bargaining Units 11 and 12—would we have the information for the rest of the leadership? In terms of inversions, meaning we're looking at the directors—the department heads—do we have any inversions in their leadership or their top line, overtime earning staff?

So, again, this is Commissioner Namahoe. We know that there are some unusual circumstances with HFFA and SHOPO but with the rest of the departments, the rest of the bargaining units—does it currently exist where we have inversions going on where the leadership is not making the same or making less than their subordinates?

(At this time, Ms. Jamielyn Martines, Human Resources Manager II, with the Classification and Pay Division, Human Resources Department, came forward.)

MS. MARTINES: I can't confirm that now, but I think that if you give us time, we can go back and see if there are current issues with inversion, with the other department heads.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, may I make that request.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Yes.

MS. NAMAHOE: Okay, thank you.

CHR. PAVAO: Any other questions?

MR. NELSON: No, not for her—but I guess if we're going to do inversions, I mean, I think, right now, we're talking about a percentage increase, kind of a match of things—maybe if we're going to do more than that, I think it would be a subject of a separate meeting—

CHR. PAVAO: Mm.

MR. NELSON: —‘cause, like, the arbitration for the Police and the Fire—it’s not going to happen for another couple of months—given our process, that pushes anything out for more months, right? So, I don’t know that—I think if we proceed on the path, at least, the folks would get something. Okay. And we keep them higher—it might be \$100.00 difference or something, but it’s better than nothing, right? And then, if there is a big inversion we can address that down the road, at a later date.

CHR. PAVAO: We could make an adjustment, yeah.

MR. NELSON: Since—that’s what I’m thinking.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, again, Namahoe. Just to be clear, we know that we also have to put some laser focus on at least two of the department heads—the wages that they currently earn right now, and how they are out of the competitive range. I believe the last time we met, we were talking about DPW and Environmental Management.

So, yes, to Mr. Nelson’s point. It’s true, we do need to take things in steps but to the degree that we can catch all of it in one fell-swoop—I’m for that. I mean, some of us are off this Board by the end of the year, so I’d like to get it done sooner than later.

MS. FRENZ: This is DCC Cody. I’ll just add, I know that there has been—there are ongoing Council matters—bills or—I don’t recall if it’s a bill or a resolution—to modify the position description and the requirements for the DPW Director and the DEM Director to remove the requirement that there be an engineering license because it’s, traditionally, been difficult for the mayor to find qualified parties willing to take those positions given—

CHR. PAVAO: Their current salaries.

MS. FRENZ: —their current salaries, right. So, there are active efforts being made to change those requirements and I don’t know if that—assuming it were to pass, I can’t speak as to that—but they are also—so, Council is watching what we’re doing here. And I also think it’s important for this body to know what they’re doing there.

Because it begs the question if they were to remove that engineering license requirement—what does this body think? Does that make a difference or does it not? And if it doesn’t, then proceed as accordingly. If it does, then do you need to see what happens there? I can’t speak as to either of those things. I just know that they’re—we’re running on parallel tracks and they’re both related to each other.

CHR. PAVAO: That—the issue is going to take some time because I think the Council passed that resolution, but it has to go to the Charter—it has to be on the ballot, and the public has to vote—approve it through a Charter amendment. So, that’s not going to happen until after the ’26 election.

MS. FRENZ: That’s correct.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MR. NELSON: And, normally, if you take away a requirement—a salary would be reduced. In this case you can't find anybody, 'cause the salary supposedly not enough, right? So, I don't know that (inaudible).

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, I don't think you can reduce the salary but then you're going to have inversion for sure.

MR NELSON: Right. So I don't know—

CHR. PAVAO: I mean, if you take away the requirement because that person is supervising engineers, like in DPW, so I mean, if you take away the requirement, theoretically, I guess you could have inversion, you could have subordinates making more because they're licensed engineers and the administrator is not—but, yeah.

This Council did pass it from what I understand but there was a differing view—some people thought they should retain and raise the salaries so that the mayor's office can find good candidates—and recruit and retain people in those positions—but at the current salary, very difficult. It's not competitive with the private sector.

MS. FRENZ: And I think that that's—that's the Mayor's Administration matter, right. We—I think it's important to respect what the Mayor's Administration thinks in that regard. He is the appointing authority for those positions. And I think, under our Rules for the Salary Commission, you have a duty and obligation to confer and consult with the department heads—the appointing authorities.

So, you guys have done that, but there's been very little feedback, right, received. And granted there was a very tight turn-a-round for that feedback to come in. So, does this Commission want to extend the opportunity to receive additional feedback? It may be that you don't get any, right? We can't speak as to whether or not people are going to feel comfortable or compelled to respond and provide their input. You have, technically, met your obligation under the Rules to collaborate with the appointing authorities but, again, it was a tight timeframe.

So, the reason why I ask is for scheduling purposes, it all matters, right. Currently, your proposed Findings, which is what we're discussing now, are or had been advertised as, theoretically, taking effect come January of 2026. In order for that to actually be possible, we need to do the publication, we need to finalize the Proposed Findings today, theoretically. Like we did last time, we go through all of the lines, and we make the adjustments. In the hearing, then a motion would be to adopt, as amended, if amendments are required or requested. And then, the Secretary and I would work on publication in the newspaper. We hold our public hearing and then we come back for an actual—for the motion to, theoretically, adopt those, if you still felt so compelled after everything in the public hearing and/or public testimony.

So, it really, I think, requires this body to decide how you want to proceed, as a whole. And in order to adopt any changes, such as are being proposed here—we're going to need a two-thirds vote of this membership. So, I think it's all relevant and I think, ultimately, you need to know how is it that you want to proceed as a body? Do you find it necessary to carve out any of the ones that may or may not have changes?

I know that HR has already indicated to Commissioner Namahoe that she could provide us that information about possible inversions. So, if you want that, then I guess I caution you to keep pushing forward right now with adopting Findings that would, theoretically, cover all of the departments—if you're not going to have had time to see what those potential inversion situations are.

So, in fairness, right, what we do—what this body does is super important. So, I want to make sure you have all the necessary facts and information to ensure that you're comfortable adopting or continuing to propose the potential adoption of these Findings, 'cause right now it sounds like you don't necessarily have all of that information. So, yeah.

CHR. PAVAO: I think that—department, definitely, is inversion because most of the collective bargaining units got pay raises July 1<sup>st</sup> and the appointing and elected officials didn't—so, there's already some level of inversion.

Ask Chief Todd—if you have an opinion about removing the Fire and the Police Chief's positions from this, until we get the findings of the collective bargaining?

MR. TODD: So, I understand you guys want to proceed. Why not just align it with whatever that organizations primary bargaining unit is, so if they primarily recognize HGEA—or 51% of the employees in an organizational unit or department or HGEA—then align—leave directors salary increases with the same for the primary unit represented.

Basically, what's good for the goose is good for the gander. You don't want to end up with an inversion. So, you just say, "All right, HFFA is the primary one for Fire"—so it aligns with the director or the Fire Chief aligns with whatever HFFA gets. And then you don't have to set a designated number. It's just—we're saying we want to maintain, basically, a same alignment, right—and then that way you're not worried about when the arbitration ends or how it finalizes and everything else. And then, for example, if Fire ends up taking another two years or something like—they can always be back dated at some other point in the future.

But, yeah, I believe we're scheduled for December, so it'll probably take a few months after that, but I'm not particularly worried—you guys do pay me very well. Thank you very much. I appreciate you very much.

With that said, I put my letter in because I think from the County's perspective, our goal should be to have the best quality of leadership, if we're looking to produce the best government. And then, vice-versa, if we want to offer middling salaries, we'll get middling leaders running our departments and a government that does a middling job. So, that's my opinion.

Is it possible to ask a random question because I'm ignorant—

CHR. PAVAO: Okay.

MR. TODD: Yeah—why don't we negotiate individual director salaries within a range? And I bring this up because I get constant offers to come and apply as a Fire Chief across the United States. And your issue with, like, engineering degrees or other things—we put them in there because the salary's set, so we want to make sure they have a certain level of qualification.

But in a lot of organiza—for a lot of governments—local governments, state governments, and whatever—what they do is they just have a salary range and what they say is, “These are the qualities we're looking for, but they're not required”—and they offer a range that's large enough that they're going to get good candidates. And then after they found the one they want, then they sit down and there's a whole negotiation process that, I assume, would be run by, like, HR and the mayor's office, if they're appointed by the mayor or the commissions—if they're appointed by commissions.

I bring this up 'cause in my pocket I actually have a flier for some organization out there that's looking for a fire chief in Vancouver and they're offering between 170,000.00 and 297,000.00—and it's a huge range, but they don't actually have—they have some general things—we want you to have been in a leadership position, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah—but the range is big enough that you're going to have interest and what you'll end up is with people with all kinds of qualifications that you really want to hire. And then, it's about, kind of, negotiating. And I'm assuming the laws in our current system don't allow for that, but a part of me says that maybe, as we move forward in the next decade or something like that—it might be a way for us to attract top talent but also be competitive and make sure we don't run into these inversion issues and things like that.

MS. NAMAHOE: Hi, Commissioner Namahoe. Thank you for bringing up several issues just now, that I think came to our attention when we convened back in 2022-2023. At that time, none of the leadership had received a raise since January 2018. The way the Charter is written, the Salary Commission has to address all of that. Having also sat, previously, on the Fire Commission—that was not a bargaining chip we had. Having sat on the MAB, that was not a bargaining chip we had when we hired HRD.

So, I think that you bring up a wonderful point, but that's going to be the Charter Commission that convenes what—every decade—to address. And we've never tightened that up. So, this Commission—this body did not have quorum until that year, and the inflationary adjustments was to address the appreciation for the middling leadership that kept doing their job at fantastic and phenomenal levels—'cause remember, what did we have in 2018? We had lava flows, we were still dealing with the aftermath of Iselle, we had fires, we had random little germs that we had to suppress, before we had other pandemics outside of COVID.

And I say that because I appreciate the point that you're making but we've never had that. That's not our purview, but I want to say that because all of this is going into public record—you brought up good questions. I want that response written up.

CHR. PAVAO: Thank you. Yeah, I—Chair Pavao—I agree with Commissioner Namahoe that the range is a good idea but, unfortunately, our hands are tied because I think it would take a Charter amendment. The Charter is real specific that we set an exact salary.

There is precedence for a range is people in excluded unit have ranges—they have salary ranges and some of them are pretty significant. Look at the state excluded units—some ranges go from, like 95,000 to 130,00—pretty large ranges. So, I mean, I personally think that's a great idea but, unfortunately, we don't have that power. It would have to go through a Charter amendment, I think.

But I think your idea is a good idea, too. Instead of putting out—taking police and fire out of the current Findings of Fact—we could add language to say that once their collective bargaining—primary collective bargaining units have settled on an agreement, that we would address their salaries so that's equal—the same percentage.

MR. NELSON: The question is, can we do that without knowing the exact number (inaudible). I think that's a question for Cody—we won't know what the number is.

MS. FRENZ: This is DCC Cody. So, that's correct, you would not know what those numbers are until maybe, at the latest, middle of next year, theoretically, right? So, it sounds like Chair Pavao was saying you would continue with the current path forward, include some sort of notation that any positions that continue to have inversion issues—because it may be other than Police and Fire, hypothetically—that this body will re-evaluate those at any given time—or when the issue is right, to further adjust, if necessary. Something very broad but specific to what the need would be that indicates to the public—'cause you can do it, frankly, at any time under the Charter and your Rules.

But I think that would be an indication to the public and anybody who is interested to know that it's possible there could be additional increases, if there are inversion issues. So, you could make that clear in your proposed Findings for publication purposes, if you wanted to.

MR. NELSON: And if you did that, you wouldn't have to go back to (inaudible) process?

MS. FRENZ: We would. No matter what, we would still need to do that entire process, so—

MR. NELSON: (Inaudible) So, there's no real save—time-saving necessarily other than alerting the public with what you're going to do.

MS. FRENZ: True. But it also could be that if the information comes to you, whenever relevant—when available—and there is no inversion that you think requires further action by this Commission, then there's nothing left to do, and you've already done it.

So, I mean, in the event that it turns out that you don't need to take any further action, then you just don't need to do it. So, pros and cons either way, to possible options for you guys.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, I think that some of the proposed salary increases that we have in our schedule would address some of the inversion. I think because then the collective bargaining units all got the increases effective July 1<sup>st</sup>—well, the majority of them—and HGEA and UPW—and then, appointed and elected officials did not.

So, there might—I'm sure that there are some inversion, at this point, and HR can give us those exact numbers. But to avoid further inversion, I think makes sense, in my mind, if we go ahead and maintain this Findings of Fact and this increase, so that we can at least try to maintain parity. And then as—if issues come up, like in Corp. Counsel—Cody was telling us that we can address them as we become aware of them, as HR gives us the information.

MS. NAMAHOE: Commissioner Namahoe. So—just so that I'm clear, what I'm hearing—one, we have the immediate need of bringing in parity for the end of calendar year 2025. And then, two—we also have to deal with a separate issue of the leadership for at least two, potentially four, maybe five—if we throw in Prosecutor's, right—departments that—so, it's two separate things.

But, right now, we are—we appear to be on the same page for the first issue, which is at least deal with the raise issues, the pay correction now. And then, the other one is going to be going forward, and it's really going to be up to department leadership to make their case.

But I also want to make it said that we, right now, are operating at bones. So, if we don't get on new membership, which is at the—that's the decision of the Office of the Mayor, he could shut us all down right now—and once we're off, not have quorum.

So, there's so many different ways that this could go. I am of the mind to get it all done, sooner than later. Anyway—

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, I—Chair Pavao. I agree with you 'cause that's how we ended up with tremendous inversion in the past and because this Commission didn't meet for years—and then we had to make those major catch-up. So, that's something we want to avoid. And I think we've done a pretty good job with trying to maintain parity and this is one of the main purposes of this meeting and this current Findings of Fact in the proposal.

But I agree with you that we should try to do as much as we can to do a deeper dive into those positions and ask for them to come to the meetings so that we can make informed decisions and then, again, get all the information we can get about any inversion that currently exist, so we can address those issues as well.

Where are we on the agenda? Okay, so we're going back to—oh, we're on Number 5, “New Business”—so any further discussion or is there a motion?

MS. FRENZ: So, just to clarify—this is DCC Cody. If the—this Commission's consensus is to keep moving forward, then what's currently before you, the agenda item we're on now, is the Proposed Findings of Fact.

And so, as we've done previously a couple years ago, we need—in order for all of us to keep moving to accommodate the timeframe that you would like, if it's possible—and I'm going to be conferring with our wonderful secretary who's trying to finagle all the dates for us—we need to go line-by-line on the proposed Findings that are before you and you tell me what adjustments, if any, you want—changes, additions, et cetera—and then we would need to have a motion to finalize that today in order to stay on track.

MR. RIORDAN: And this is Commissioner Riordan. So, we're talking about that we're going to give the Police and the Fire Department the HGEA raise—everybody gets the same raise and then later on down the road, next year, we may look back and say, “Oh, the Fire Chief needs more money”—or that type of thing.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MR. RIORDAN: Is that correct? Is that what I'm—

CHR. PAVAO: If SHOPO comes back—yeah—if SHOPO—

MR. RIORDAN: That's what we said. Yeah.

CHR. PAVAO: If SHOPO comes back with a collective bargaining agreement that's more than 3.5%, we can adjust accordingly, I think, yeah. Okay, so you're going to review the Findings of Fact—

MS. FRENZ: Yes. Okay. So, everyone has before you the Proposed Findings of Fact Dated August 28, 2025?

MR. RIORDAN: Thank you for drafting that for us.

MS. FRENZ: Yes, of course.

MR. RIORDAN: Appreciate it.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. The red tab, right—all the way in the back, the red tab in the far end. There you go.

MS. FRENZ: Okay, turning to Number 1, first. Are there any changes that you would like made? It currently states, “The COH...” County of Hawai'i “...Salary Commission has the

authority to review and set compensation for all county executive positions, elected positions and appointed positions of directors and deputy directors (collectively hereinafter “Covered Positions”) so that their total compensation and benefits have an equitable and reasonable relationship to compensation in the public and private sectors.”

Any request to changes?

CHR. PAVAO: No, not from me.

MS. FRENZ: Moving on to Number 2, “The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission last adjusted compensation for Covered Positions on January 1, 2024 with a 22.44% inflationary adjustment increase, and on July 1, 2024 with a 5% pay increase to account for pay adjustments to stay in line with the relevant collective bargaining agreement pay increases for union members.”

CHR. PAVAO: Looks good.

MS. FRENZ: Any changes? No? Okay. Number 3 is something that you included in your previous Findings—although I adjusted somewhat to indicate from then till now.

CHR. PAVAO: Mm-hmm.

MS. FRENZ: I don’t know whether or not you guys need or want that there. If you would like me to strike it, I can strike it.

MR. NELSON: I think we can take it out. I don’t think it’s necessary—

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MR. NELSON: (Inaudible) needs to be in there?

CHR. PAVAO: I agree. It doesn’t apply to the current situation, I think, yeah, this history.

MR. RIORDAN: Does Number 2 need to be in there? Do you need to say that these people got a 22% raise?

MS. FRENZ: You don’t, if you don’t want to. It’s just providing the history of how we got here, but you’re not required to do that. It’s just context.

CHR. PAVAO: If you have Number 2, then you almost have to have Number 3, I think, because Number 3 explains why you had such a big increase, yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: Or we could modify just to say—‘cause the last increase was an actual pay increase, and scratch the inflationary adjustment, and just put it at 5 at July 1<sup>st</sup>—since that was the last time we made a pay increase.

MR. NELSON: I don't think we even need Number 2. I think you can take out Number 2.

MR. RIORDAN: That's what I think.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, because one explains the other.

MR. NELSON: (Inaudible.)

MR. RIORDAN: It doesn't need to be there.

MR. NELSON: Yeah, we're just basically—'cause we're addressing the future. We're not necessarily addressing the past.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, I would take 2 and 3 out, yeah. 'Cause if you get into that, then you have to explain the reason that there wasn't quorum in this body for years—

MS. NAMAHOE: Right.

CHR. PAVAO: —so that's why it was—

MS. NAMAHOE: This is our resume.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: Two and 3. Okay. Got it.

CHR. PAVAO: I would take 2 and 3 out. That would be my recommendation.

MS. NAMAHOE: All in favor.

MS. FRENZ: Looking at Number 4, which will now become Number 2—

CHR. PAVAO: Mm-hmm.

MS. FRENZ: Subject to what this body passing a motion at the end of this discussion—indicates “Historically, the salaries established by the County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission have been indexed to the increases given to County of Hawai‘i employees in collective Bargaining Units 11 (HFFA), 12 (SHOPO), and 13 (HGEA – Professional and Scientific Employees) (“collectively, BUs”) and the various Civil Service managerial employees who are excluded from collective bargaining (“Excluded Managers”), but whose salaries are tied to the BUs.”

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, I mean, that's important.

MR. NELSON: (Inaudible.)

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MS. FRENZ: So, if you would—I would consider just formatting purposes, that second line, that word “collective”—with a capital “C”. I would also, the first parenthesis that say “(“collectively, BUs”)”—I think that “collectively”—if we’re going to be consistent with Number 1, it would say “(collectively hereinafter”—and only “BUs” would be in parenthesis because “collectively” is not a part of the term.

CHR. PAVAO: Mm-hmm.

MS. FRENZ: So, it would say, “(collectively hereinafter,”—and then in parenthesis “(“BU’s”)” closed parenthesis—closed quote, closed parenthesis. Just to ensure that consistency throughout how we attack number—how we approach Number 1, to say “(collectively hereinafter)””; and I would also then add the last parenthesis, in this section in front of “(“Excluded Managers”)” I would also include “(collectively hereinafter)””.

CHR. PAVAO: Mm—that’s good, be consistent, yeah.

MS. FRENZ: Any other changes for Number 4, which will become the new Number 2. Okay.

Moving on to current Number 5, which will, theoretically, become the new Number 3, it states, “After its 2024 adjustments, the County of Hawai’i Salary Commission deferred further salary adjustments to afford the collective bargaining units to negotiate contracts for the next four years. HGEA negotiated the following raises for its members in bargaining unit 13 for the next four years: year one: 3.5% increase, year two: 3.79% increase, year three: 4% increase and year four: 4% increase.”

MR. NELSON: Can I just suggest changing—instead of the—

MS. FRENZ: Microphone.

MR. NELSON: I’m just suggesting to change in the first sentence to say, delete the “After its 2024 adjustments”—just say, “In 2024, the COH Salary Commission deferred salary adjustments”—so delete the “further” and delete “After its 2024 adjustments”—

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, I think that’s good—

MR. NELSON: Just to make it consistent with the tell of the story going forward—what we did in 2024—so we’re going to wait, which is what we did, going to see what the Unions negotiated, and then take it from there. So, just changing that a little.

CHR. PAVAO: I agree with that—“After its 2024 adjustments”—kind of refers to Number 2, but Number 2 is not there anymore, yeah.

MR. NELSON: So, just say “In 2024, we deferred salary adjustments”—

MS. NAMAHOE: Okay, I’m going to quibble on this one, then. If we’re not going to have 2 and 3, then I’d rather it just say, “After July 2024 pay increase”—since that was the last increase. We’re not going to talk about the January 2024 inflationary adjustment—I’d rather not use the word “adjustment” because the last pay differential was a pay increase of 5%.

CHR. PAVAO: Your thoughts in what would be good semantics?

MR. NELSON: So, what are you changing it to?

MS. NAMAHOE: So, the word “adjustment” plural—

MR. NELSON: Yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: —is because we’ve taken out 2 and 3, we know that we did an inflationary adjustment in January of 2024, and a pay increase July 2024. But for the purposes of not clarifying that at all, the very last thing we did was a pay increase, effective plan year/calendar year or County fiscal year 2024.

So, I—the words “2024 adjustments” shows a collective—I use that same word again—that I would like it to just be what’s the last thing we did—we did after the 5% pay increase effective July 2024. Just keep it clear that was the last thing we did.

CHR. PAVAO: Mm. Yeah, so you could say that, I guess, “After its 2024 5% pay increase”—

MS. NAMAHOE: Right—‘cause that’s what we did.

CHR. PAVAO: —“the County of Hawai‘i—this Commission deferred further salary”—yeah, I guess you could say that’s fine. That’s a public record. We didn’t make any increases since then.

MS. NAMAHOE: And the correction in January is in the past.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: And that was in inflationary adjustment anyway.

CHR. PAVAO: And that was playing catch-up, too, yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: Which is why I don’t want the word “adjustment” there. More than anything, I’d rather this say, “pay increase effective July 2024.”

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: ‘Cause that was an increase.

CHR. PAVAO: So, “After its July 2024 pay increase”—

MS. NAMAHOE: Yeah.

CHR. PAVAO: —“the County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission deferred”—

MS. NAMAHOE: —“deferred further salary adjustments”—

CHR. PAVAO: —“further salary adjustments”—

MS. NAMAHOE: Yeah. ‘Cause then, right? Yeah.

CHR. PAVAO: That’s fine, that makes sense.

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: So, this is Commissioner Kawa‘auhau. So, the beginning—‘cause, if I’m correct, you corrected it to, “In 2024, the COH Salary Commission deferred salary adjustments to afford the collective bargaining”—blah, blah. And then, you want to add back—so you want to make it specific to say, “After pay increases in 2024”—I mean, (inaudible)—

MS. NAMAHOE: “After the July 2024 5% pay increase, the COH Salary Commission deferred further salary adjustments.”

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: Okay, ‘cause then your language doesn’t have “adjustments” in it either, right. It just says, “in 2024.” And then, you wanted to add back—

MS. NAMAHOE: Well, I just wanted—so one, the word “adjustment” was (inaudible) me out—and second, just to focus on what’s the last thing we did.

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: Okay. And then, the adjustment, again, is okay—that second adjustment?

CHR. PAVAO: You’re taking the “adjustment” out.

MS. NAMAHOE: Yeah, because “further salary adjustments” then becomes a generic label. It’s just descriptive—whereas, previously, we’ve had to use adjustments as a proper noun—

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: Right.

MS. NAMAHOE: Right?

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: Yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, to me, after the pay increase—‘cause that what it was—so, just for clarity. I mean, it’s—yes, it’s anal but—

MS. FRENZ: So, let me read what I—sounds like this body might be okay with.

“After its July 2024 5% pay increase, the County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission deferred salary adjustments to afford the collective bargaining units”—and then everything else would remain the same.

CHR. PAVAO: Mm-hmm.

MS. NAMAHOE: And thank you—that’s it. Thank you.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, that makes sense. I mean, it specifically talks about the last thing that we did as far as any kind of pay increase and doesn’t address the earlier adjustments and catch-up and all that—but, yeah, I think that (inaudible).

MS. FRENZ: So, let me read it in its entirety, again, to make sure everyone’s okay with it. It would now say, “After its July 2024 5% pay increase, the County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission deferred salary adjustments to afford the collective bargaining units to negotiate contracts for the next four years. HGEA negotiated the following raises for its members in bargaining unit 13 for the next four years: year one: 3.5% increase, year two: 3.79% increase, year three: 4% increase and year four: 4% increase.”

MS. TOKIHIRO: Just a point of clarification. In the first sentence, it’s not necessarily a given that all contracts will be for a four-year period.

So, the current contract with HGEA is for a four-year period but I might caution removing that because not all contract periods will be four years. So, maybe the sentence ends with—

MS. FRENZ: Negotiate contracts.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Yes.

CHR. PAVAO: Bargaining unit 13—I guess you can just take out the—

MS. FRENZ: So, the first sentence, which is the only one we’ve adjusted so far—would now read, “After its July 2024 5% pay increase, the County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission deferred salary adjustments to afford the collective bargaining units to negotiate contracts.”

CHR. PAVAO: That’s fine.

MS. NAMAHOE: Can we put the word “further” back in there—“deferred further salary adjustments to afford the collective bargaining units”—

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: Commissioner Kawa‘auhau. I was the type to close my eyes, listening to the sentence to see if it read all right—and it sounds okay, but I was thinking about adding “further” back in. But then, “further” refers to salary adjustments and we changed it to another word in the beginning. So, “further salary adjustments” insinuates previous salary adjustments, and then—

MS. NAMAHOE: Which is what a pay increase was (inaudible), it’s—

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: Yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: —(inaudible) salary adjustment is a descriptive.

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: Right. But then, if we use it—so it may just depend on how comfortable we feel with saying “further adjustments” when “adjustments” was just if we use it as a proper noun—whatever, you know what I mean?

MS. NAMAHOE: Yeah, (inaudible).

MR. NELSON: “Further” was taken out because we deleted it entirely. But now that we’ve put it in, we could put “further” back.

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: If you’re okay—like, the only thing I—if you’re okay with having “adjustments” after “further” that’s all I care about, ‘cause you had that word—

MS. FRENZ: Let me just throw out an idea. It could say, “After its July 2024 5% pay increase, the County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission deferred further salary increases to afford the collective bargaining units to negotiate contracts.”

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, “increases” is more appropriate I think.

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: I’m okay—I mean, I’m okay with “adjustments” or “increases” as long as everybody is okay with it.

MS. NAMAHOE: The English nerd in me doesn’t want two big words in the same sentence twice—that’s all. So, but I stand down.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, get the word “adjustments” twice in the same sentence.

MS. NAMAHOE: I want synonyms.

CHR. PAVAO: I like “increases.”

MS. NAMAHOE: Okay, moving on. Moving on.

MS. FRENZ: So, are we using “adjustment” or “increase?”

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: I say “increases.”

CHR. PAVAO: “Increases” is better, I think.

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: Just to match because it’s referring back to the first topic of the sentence and it’s clear.

MR. RIORDAN: Oh, sorry, Riordan. Just start with the “Salary Commission deferred further salary adjustments to afford the collective bargaining units to negotiate contracts.” That’s what we did, and we don’t need to say we gave them a 5% raise or (inaudible).

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, that’s fine, too.

MS. NAMAHOE: I’m cool with scratching the 5% but also having it on record that something—so, this is the argument for it—it’s not inconsistent with the increases as laid out at the end of this paragraph. Five percent in 2024, nothing in 2025, and going forward in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 as this paragraph lays out, shows that we are—we’re not being—we’re being responsible. We’re still in line. They didn’t get a raise. They got a 5% raise and then they got nothing. So, we’re still being frugal. So, I do like the 5%.

MS. FRENZ: Okay, moving on to Number 6.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, we’re going to raise it, like, 16 points in this—

MS. FRENZ: Yes. “In accordance with the Charter and Hawai‘i Revised Statutes Chapter 92, the County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission held a meeting on August 28, 2025”—that’s last month’s hearing when you made that—the motion that’s currently on the table. I would also include our tentative future dates to be set, which we need to discuss with this body and with Glynis’ assistance—“(\*include future meetings here)” we would then indicate—“; were duly noticed and afforded opportunities for public comment and testimony was received.”

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, that’s good.

MS. FRENZ: Old Number 7 indicates, “To facilitate and assist in its review of compensation for the Covered Positions, and as required by the Charter, the County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission consulted with those boards and commissions which have appointing authority for department heads, specifically, it solicited input from the Police Commission, Fire Commission, and Merit Appeals Board. The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission also afforded the Mayor of the County of Hawai‘i and all Covered Positions to submit input and/or recommendations for the County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission to consider. The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission also considered all testimony both written and oral received to date, current cost-of-living index information, the purchasing price of a dollar in 2025, the March 3, 2025 Classification and Compensation Study conducted by MGT for the County of Maui, historical salary data, salaries of excluded managers within the County of Hawai‘i, the schedule of raises for both included and

excluded subordinates over the past five years, challenges with recruitment for positions within the County of Hawai‘i, the duties and responsibilities of the Covered Positions with the County of Hawai‘i, salaries of the Covered Positions’ counterparts in other county jurisdictions within the State, inversion challenges, and other public and private industry data.”

CHR. PAVAO: That’s good—very, very thorough.

MS. FRENZ: I was also just updated that the Merit Appeals Board doesn’t meet until this Friday, a few days from now. And it’s possible, should they choose to take action—it sounds like they would, they may be submitting information and/or position for this body’s consideration at that time.

MS. NAMAHOE: This is Namahoe. Are you bringing that up meaning that is it irresponsible to include them in this big paragraph right now or—

MS. FRENZ: No, I’m bringing it up because—bringing that up because it was just told to me. But the reality is that the Charter and the Rules require that you consult. You have consulted, you have solicited input—we knew and I reminded everyone at the last hearing that it—depending on when the various boards and commissions that are the appointing authorities—those being Police Commission, Fire Commission, and Merit Appeals Board—depending on when their hearings are—our deadline may or may not align with their ability to have met, considered, and received a board or commission action to take a formal position on behalf of the person that they appoint.

So, we knew that going in. If this body wants to wait and defer—because it was such a tight period and I said that at the start of this meeting, right? If you want to put this off another month, then all it will mean is we just push everything back another month and we wouldn’t start potential increases—assuming this body took their final action in January of next year. In the event you receive input that compels you to change course from where you’re currently at.

We can’t speak to—we can’t speculate as to what you might get and whether or not, it’s going to change your position. We just can’t speculate because you don’t have it—assuming it’s coming, right?

CHR. PAVAO: They still have opportunity to give us what, if any, input they want to have at the next meeting. Nothing is going to be etched in stone between now and then—

MS. FRENZ: That’s correct.

CHR. PAVAO: —so we can—

MS. FRENZ: And Police Commission, for example, just had a meeting, but I don’t believe I saw any input from the Police Commission in that regard. So, I don’t know whether it’s—they got it with enough time to agendize it or they just are choosing not to respond. Again, I don’t want to speculate about something that’s out of my purview.

So, it was shared with me that they have a meeting coming up on Friday. It sounds as though they're—they will be submitting it. But maybe their input will say, "We agree, and we support"—maybe it'll seek further adjustments—up or down—or maybe it'll say we take no position. So, I'm sharing that information because it was shared with me.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, thank you.

MR. NELSON: I think we—I think as a group we've decided that we're going to try go down this path—(inaudible) inversion, we get other information—we can deal with that separately. So, I think that's still the path to go on.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MR. NELSON: And, right, we get more information, we'll be able to (inaudible) at that time.

CHR. PAVAO: I agree. At this point, we have—whatever information we have on hand, we make sound decisions and if at the next meeting we get additional information, we can adjust accordingly.

MS. FRENZ: So, with that in mind, does anybody have any suggested changes to Number 7?

CHR. PAVAO: No, I don't.

MS. FRENZ: Okay, moving on to Number 8. "The County of Hawai'i Salary Commission has not awarded any inflationary adjustment for the Covered Positions since January 1, 2024. The County of Hawai'i Salary Commission has not met to evaluate the salaries of Covered Positions since 2023."

MR. NELSON: So, we need to change all the dates, right? So, it should be July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024—not January 1. And then I think the second sentence—

MS. FRENZ: Actually—

CHR. PAVAO: July was a pay raise, not an inflationary adjustment.

MS. FRENZ: That's correct. So, I think technically January 1 was the inflationary adjustment. What we could do, if you want to specify it—so, we're going back to 2 and 3 above—

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MS. FRENZ: —or do we cut Number 8—old Number 8, right? Because we don't—this body chose not to clarify and distinguish the inflationary increase and the pay increase, up above, but here, right—do we want that there as well? Or do we want to cut it or do you—if you want, we could say we haven't—so, "1" is accurate. We have not—this body has not awarded any

inflationary adjustments since January 1, 2024. We could insert, “This County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission has not awarded any pay increase for the covered positions since July 1, 2024.”

MS. NAMAHOE: Hi, this is Namahoe. I believe that we addressed it when we were talking about “further” and increases and inflation. I think we can strike the whole thing at Number 8.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah. I believe Number 8 needs to be deleted altogether. I think that’s a good idea because that, kind of, refers back to the Number 2, which we already deleted.

MS. FRENZ: Okay.

MS. NAMAHOE: Strike ‘em.

MS. FRENZ: Okay. So moving on to old Number 9. It states, “The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission acknowledges that interest arbitrations are currently pending for employees in Bargaining Units 11, 12, and 15”—and I think we should verify with Director Tokihiro that that continues to be accurate as we sit here—“and any pay raises for contract period July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2029 have not yet been finally determined. Employees whose positions are included in or indexed to BU 13 are set to receive a cumulative total of 15.29% in salary increases for the period July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2029. Covered Positions have not and currently are not scheduled to receive any increase in salaries since 2024.”

And I could clarify there—“July 1, 2024”—because they did get that 5% pay increase.

MS. NAMAHOE: Yes, please. I think this is an important paragraph.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, so that’s important.

MR. NELSON: Okay. Yeah, I agree, and I guess I’m just wondering that we talked about the inversions—is this where we put some language in that that we revisit this in case the arbitration or—if, basically, the results of those negotiations result in inversions, the Board would consider that. I think this may be the place where that goes.

MS. FRENZ: It could also—if I would ask everyone to take a look at the paragraph 10, just below it where we actually start to talk—I start to talk about inversion on your behalf. So, it could go either here, it could go there, or anywhere else. If you’d like it to be in old Number 9, I could insert it there.

MR. NELSON: If we got it down below, we don’t need it in Number 9, okay.

MS. FRENZ: Okay.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, there’s an inversion in paragraph number 10.

MS. NAMAHOE: I think this is important language. It's also, like, small language on a prospectus kind of thing. This is an important index point. I'd almost want to move this to the very end, just to bookend the whole work. This is an important paragraph. It should be happily-ever-after. We are also doing all of this to make sure that we're including inversion issues.

MS. FRENZ: Are you still talking about old Number 9?

CHR. PAVAO: Ten.

MS. NAMAHOE: I'm talking about old Number 10.

MS. FRENZ: Oh, okay. So, before we move on to that one, let's finish—I don't think we got confirmation everyone's okay with old Number 9.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, nine is fine.

MS. FRENZ: And can we just verify with Director Tokihiro that it continues today to be an accurate statement about BUs 11, 12, and 15?

MS. TOKIHIRO: Yes. As of today.

MS. FRENZ: Okay, thank you. So, the only adjustment for old Number 9 would be the last sentence, and it would be inserting in front of 2024, "July 1."

MS. NAMAHOE: That's right.

CHR. PAVAO: Mm-hmm.

MS. FRENZ: Okay. All right. So—okay, moving on to old Number 10. Go ahead, Commissioner Namahoe—apologies.

MS. NAMAHOE: I—no, all I wanted to say was that this was an important point. I almost would like to pull it out and make it the last point about inversion because it might get lost in it. It's—there's a lot of meat that we have to go through here. I almost want this to be the last—I'd like this—I mean, the last point.

Because people are going to read it and then they're going to get—they're not going to catch that point, but we need people to understand, that's really why we're here.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Commission Kawa'auhau. So, if we do move it—Number 12 talks about it, again—like, refers back to it. I know Number 12 says, "...avoid further inversion scenarios..."—so then, that would be moved, too, so that—'cause then, if this comes out of nowhere and we didn't talk about inversion yet, then it might not be as clear as to what inversion is.

So, it further clarifies inversion in 12—so, if we move 10, we would have to move 12, too.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, just get 11 out of the way. “The Salary Commission considered all of the above information and determined it was necessary to be competitive with current compensation of Covered Positions to ensure the County’s ability to both retain and recruit qualified employees.”

Like, make that the precursor to what is now 11 and 12? So, I’m—so, again, I’m looking at old 11—taking old 11, put it right behind Number 9. And then, moving 11, right in front of 12. And then we can look at—‘cause Number 11 is short and sweet; 10 is also good. I think both of these are all solid points, but if we can focus on Number 12 and, kind of, make sure that we’re cleaning that up and not being duplicative/repetitive.

MS. FRENZ: So, if I understand correctly, you want to move old 11 to where?

MS. NAMAHOE: To behind Number 9.

MS. FRENZ: Old Number 9, right?

MS. NAMAHOE: Yeah. So, “Covered Positions have not and currently are not scheduled to receive any increases in salaries since July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024.”

“The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission considered all the above information and determined it was necessary to be competitive with the current compensation of Covered Positions to ensure the County’s ability to”—retain qualified employees.

Then going into, “The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission notes that it’s quite often department heads”—it’s almost like then 11—by moving old 11 behind 9, then it starts the defense of looking at the inversion concerns. Eleven seems like precursor language. We good with that?

MR. RIORDAN: So you want 11 to become 10?

MS. NAMAHOE: Yes. And then, 10 could be 11. ‘Cause 11 needs to be—

CHR. PAVAO: It’s fine. I’m fine with that (inaudible).

MS. NAMAHOE: Yeah, that needs to be next to 12.

MR. NELSON: That’s fine. I think we just need to add somewhere in there that if there becomes an inversion as a result of the negotiations, we will re-address it. That’s not included in here—that needs to be added, basically, I think, right?

And I think it should be added in that new paragraph 11.

MS. FRENZ: So, what I did is the paragraph that starts, “The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission considered all of the above information and determined it was necessary to be competitive”—move that to, right behind—

MS. NAMAHOE: July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024.

MS. FRENZ: Correct. So, old Number 10 is now going to say—right after our— “Covered Positions have not and currently are not scheduled to receive any increase in salaries since July 1, 2024.”

The next paragraph would now be, “The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission considered all of the above information and determined it was necessary to be competitive with the current compensation of Covered Positions to ensure the County’s ability to both retain and recruit qualified employees.”

MS. NAMAHOE: Right.

MS. FRENZ: So, then our next paragraph—

MS. NAMAHOE: —“Notes that quite often the department heads and deputy department heads are suffering from salary inversion”—because that above information is kind of an introduction to what’s now Number 10, and what’s now Number 12.

So, it goes, “Covered Positions have not and currently are not scheduled to receive any increase”—then, “County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission consider all the above information determined it was necessary”—then it goes into, “The Salary Commission notes that quite often department heads and deputy heads”—

MS. FRENZ: Okay, I’m with you.

MS. NAMAHOE: Got it?

MS. FRENZ: Got it.

MS. NAMAHOE: Thank you.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Just a point of clarification. After this body made that last inflationary increase and then the 5% increase as of July 1, 2024—that was intended to reduce those inversion instances. So, I don’t know if this paragraph now, given the current situation after those other adjustments—I don’t know that it is quite often occurring anymore but may—this body may want to recognize that inversion may occur.

CHR. PAVAO: It might be so isolated (inaudible).

MS. NAMAHOE: Right, but that was—right—and at the beginning of the meeting this morning, that was my concern—was we know about Police, but do we know of others? And, for me, I ask that question across-the-board because I’m wondering if that’s a Public Work’s issue as well, since—

MS. TOKIHIRO: So, the difference as Jamie mentioned, is when we’re talking about salary—we’re talking about base salary. So, there may be inversions that exist because subordinate positions are able to earn overtime, whereas the department heads are not.

So, if we’re talking about base salary inversion, there may be instances of that—but it’s not going to be as prevalent as other inversions that may occur because subordinate positions are able to earn overtime. So, I think the majority of the inversion would be because of that and not at the base salary.

So, even in the instance that Deputy Corporation Counsel Frenz mentioned between the Deputy Police Chief and the Assistant Chief, the salary difference of \$100.00 means that there isn’t an actual inversion, but because the Assistant Chiefs are eligible to earn overtime, their overall compensation would be greater, in some instances, than the Deputy Police Chief.

So, the—so actual salary inversion is going to be quite rare as opposed to compensation inversion, which is not really something that this Commission can address because of that overtime issue.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, thank you for that. So, just to make sure as we go back into that—where, again, here in these points are you seeing this, perhaps, being irrelevant or inaccurate—which statement? Old Number 10?

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: Yeah—would it make sense if we changed it to “The COH Salary Commission notes that department heads and deputy department heads may suffer from salary inversion”—

MS. NAMAHOE: Versus “are suffering”—

MS. TOKIHIRO: Yes—or versus “quite often”—

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: —so note “quite often” and adding “may suffer” instead of “are suffering”—

MS. NAMAHOE: Okay. Fabulous.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, “may” is much better.

MS. FRENZ: So, it begs the question maybe, Director Tokihiro, as we continue that sentence, would we say “where subordinate civil servant employees are paid higher salaries”—is that clear

enough because we're talking about the overtime—it's not the salary, right, it's part of the compensation?

MS. TOKIHIRO: Yeah. And I think the—correct. But also it's not necessarily subordinate civil servant because there's—it's—that likely inversion is going to occur with excluded managerial employees who are—so it's not just the civil servant.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, then the word that needs to be corrected is “salaries”—

MS. FRENZ: It could also—I think it's also—it's that, but it's also subordinate civil servant and/or excluded managers, right—to ensure that—'cause I think that you're right, that it was—it's more likely than not going to be an EM, than it would be a civil servant employee.

CHR. PAVAO: More likely EM—but the excluded are technically civil servants. They're just excluded from collective bargaining, but they're still civil servant.

MS. TOKIHIRO: I think because this body is addressing the actual salaries, that I think salaries should remain because that's what we're talking about—apples and apples, right?

So, when you're setting the salary for department heads, you're wanting to make sure—or this body is evaluating whether or not an inversion occurs with subordinate salaries. And because overtime is an employee benefit, that this body wouldn't be addressing, right?

MS. NAMAHOE: Okay, so—suggestion—can we look at point old Number 12 and see if that language there is encompassing enough where we wouldn't need 10 at all? We could strike it? So, to keep up “with CPI inflation rates”?

MR. NELSON: I think we need to mention inversion 'cause we had a big conversation about it and we want to address it in case the arbitrations go—create ones. So I do think we need to keep that text in there.

MS. NAMAHOE: Okay. I mean, 12 is pretty—it goes in the weeds—that's a (inaudible) but it doesn't—I mean, I don't see inversion. I just see examples.

So, “...avoid further inversion scenarios where Civil Servants are paid more than their managers”—

MS. TOKIHIRO: I think it's a little confusing as well because this—these were the items in the prior Findings of Fact, right—when the situation was different and when this body was trying to address both inflation and inversion and all of those issues. And, again, that may be a little different now.

MS. NAMAHOE: For 12? Because 12 is going to 2026, '27, '28—this is current?

CHR. PAVAO: That's the proposed increases.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, we don't—I'm confused. What is it that's now previous—what are the previous Findings that are now out-of-date? Which point are you making?

MS. TOKIHIRO: I'm not saying they're necessarily out-of-date. I'm just saying that these Findings were modeled after what was previously put forth in the prior Findings and then the amounts were updated.

So, as far as, like, addressing inversion—that clarification that it may not be happening quite often any more. I mean, it's still maybe an issue but just clarifying some of that, but the surrounding information, may be, a little different now for perspective.

MS. NAMAHOE: Yeah, thank you. I guess, what I'm trying to do is interpret what you're seeing or suggesting—like, where we put that in, in terms of correction. Am I looking at it correctly?

MS. TOKIHIRO: Yes. So, my only correction as far as where we're at right now, the former Number 10, which I now believe is the new Number 8—we talked about removing “quite often”—I think, I'm not sure that DCC Frenz has provided us with the, kind of, read back of what that revised sentence might be because we had moved on to the next one. So—

MS. FRENZ: I haven't quite yet because I think Commissioner Namahoe was suggesting the consideration of—if old Number 12 was sufficient, maybe we don't need old Number 10. So, I think we, kind of, skipped to that one to look into whether or not that captures the intent of old Number 10.

If the answer is, “No, it doesn't”—then, we'll go back to old Number 10 and get back to work there.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, I guess my question—this is Namahoe—what does 10 say that 12 doesn't? What's 10 covering that 12 is not?

MR. NELSON: It specifically mentions the inversion language, which is not included in the other one. The other one just talks about what the adjustments are.

CHR. PAVAO: What our proposal is, yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: Yeah, it does include—

MR. NELSON: It doesn't address how we agreed, I think, as a group, that we would go back if we had further information—that review other—consider other changes.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, I think 10 tries to address the inversion or the potential for inversion.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: This is Commissioner Kawa'auhau. To me, the 12 is the shortened version—okay, this says, "...further inversion scenarios where Civil Servants..."—(inaudible) and it defines it. But it defines it broadly, which is fine 'cause it's clear. And then, this one—the old 10 is more specific and gets into more detail.

MS. NAMAHOE: About inversion.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: Yeah.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Yeah. So, if we think that's important, it's just flushing it out a little bit more—but 12 mentions it and it defines it broadly and that could be enough, too.

CHR. PAVAO: I think one of the—is one of the major reasons if we were proposing pay increases is to avoid inversion. I think that we should keep 10 in so it's well-defined. I mean, yeah, it does briefly mention it in 12 but not really defining fully, I think.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Yeah, and what I like about 10 is that I like that this is the sentence—where did it go—that how it made people not want to get the job. They don't want to (inaudible)—yeah, I like that sentence, so if I can find it.

So, if we put that in Number 12 and I would be okay with it—we're getting rid of 10. I'm also okay with keeping it because I don't under—I don't really care about having more information. So, either way is fine, but if we do remove 10 that we should say that we don't disincentive people from coming and applying.

CHR. PAVAO: It says the mayor and the department heads have hard time (inaudible) positions, yeah.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, again, I wasn't trying to put a speed bump where none is needed on the highway. I was trying to recognize the cautions that HRD was pointing out here in terms of those were old assumptions.

But if we all think that 10 is still evergreen enough to keep it, then let's just keep it and then move on to 12—because I want to make sure that 12 is meat. So, we got to make sure we choke this one done.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah. I think the main thing in 10 is that they got the words "quite often" but, otherwise, I think it still applies. I'm sure there's some isolated inversion and one of the major reasons we're advocating for this salary increase is to avoid further inversion.

MS. NAMAHOE: Can we just take out “are suffering” and just put “risks”—risks from— “...notes that quite often. .”—or “...notes that..”—or “...it has happened that Department Heads and Deputy Department Heads are risk salary inversion...”—

MS. FRENZ: I think what was suggested or what I typed in is “may suffer”—either—

MS. NAMAHOE: May suffer—okay.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, “may.”

MS. FRENZ: Let me read to you what I—where we’re at.

MS. NAMAHOE: Okay.

MS. FRENZ: Okay. Old Number 10—and I’ve added some words just to stay consistent, “The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission notes that Department Heads and Deputy Department Heads may suffer from salary “inversion” where subordinate Civil Servant”—and I’ve added, “and/or Excluded Manager”...“employees are paid higher salaries than the Department Heads and Deputy Department Heads who supervise them and oversee their work. This inversion provides a disincentive for experienced Civil Servant...” and I’ve added, “...and/or Excluded Managers” “...to step into Department Head and Deputy Department Head positions when they are vacated and makes it difficult for the Mayor and appointing boards and commissions to appoint or promote experienced”—and I’ve stricken the word “managerial”—and just said “...experienced employees from within the County of Hawai‘i or to recruit qualified candidates for employment. The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission considered inversion information, which compared base salaries that did not also include other forms of monetary compensation, such as overtime pay and step increases. None of the Covered Positions are eligible for overtime pay or step increases.”

SPEAKER: Fantastic.

MR. RIORDAN: I think that was good.

MS. FRENZ: Okay. Old Number 11 is stricken—okay? Old Number 12, which will be new Number 9 is the paragraph—I have, again, added, the second line where it says, “...where Civil Servants...”—I’ve added in “...and/or Excluded Managers...”—to, again, remain consistent. I see a date correction in about the middle where it says, “July 1, 2207”—to “2027.”

Short of that, what other changes or adjustments would this body like?

MS. NAMAHOE: Now, I mean—

MS. KAWA‘AUHAU: I’m good.

CHR. PAVAO: I’m fine with it.

MS. NAMAHOE: As long as the dates are good. This is a solid paragraph to make. The adjustments are consistent with the wages paid to other employees in collective bargaining units who receive across the board pay increases, step movements, and overtime. Yeah, blah, blah, blah.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, that's good.

MS. FRENZ: Okay.

MS. TOKIHIRO: I don't know if we need to clarify, again, like in this old Number 12—do we need to say civil servants and excluded managers? Because then it—the sentence is, “Civil Servants are paid more than their managers...”—so I don't know if we want to—because now we're using “managers”—

MS. FRENZ: I would say, “may be paid more than”—or is it better to just—instead of specifying Civil Servants and/or Excluded Managers—keep it generic with “employees.” But if whatever we do here, we need to do consistently throughout the rest of the Findings.

MS. TOKIHIRO: And then, I don't know if instead of—“...where Civil Servants or employees are paid more than their managers”—I don't know if you want to say, “department heads and deputies”—

CHR. PAVAO: You probably need “department heads and deputies”—yeah—not “manager” there. And, technically, they're excluded—managers are civil servants—they're just not exempt—they're just exempt from collective bargaining.

MS. FRENZ: So, let me re-read that first sentence—or are there any other changes currently recommended? No? Okay, I'm going to read, “To keep pace with CPI inflation rates, pay increases granted to BU 13 employees, and to avoid further inversion scenarios where Civil Servants and/or Excluded Managers may be paid more than their Department Head and Deputy Department Heads. The County of Hawai'i Salary Commission...”—and it would continue.

CHR. PAVAO: That's good.

MR. NELSON: Sounds good.

MS. NAMAHOE: I like it.

MS. FRENZ: Are there any other requested changes for old Number 12?

CHR. PAVAO: No.

MS. FRENZ: Okay. Moving on to old Number 13. “The County of Hawai'i Salary Commission acknowledges that these proposed salary adjustments...” adding in “s”—“...for the

next four (4) years may not level the historic disparity but it is, nonetheless, a step in the right direction. The County of Hawai'i Salary Commission strongly recommends that this Commission meet annually, before the budget cycle begins, and make the appropriate adjustments going forward.”

I recall now that we've never added that sentence about potential—

MR. NELSON: The disparity—I think there's something about disparity needs to go away, right, just 'cause it's not really relevant. I would delete that whole first sentence, I think, maybe, right? And somewhere—like I said, we need to talk about reviewing other information and maybe that's where this goes, all right—and maybe this is the paragraph where that goes, right.

We understand there's going to be arbitration between the other unions for the Fire and the Police and maybe further information from the County—and so we would meet annually to try to review that data. I mean, maybe that's—I think maybe that's where this belongs.

MS. FRENZ: Now that we've moved a little further through our Findings, if you guys want to take a look at where we're at now, and going back to what would have—the paragraph—I guess, old 8—it starts with, “The County of Hawai'i Salary Commission acknowledges that interest arbitrations are currently pending for...”—looking at—and we kind of waited to see if our inversion paragraph would cover it—is that where you want to include it, at the very end—“Covered Positions have not and currently not scheduled to receive any increase in salaries since July 1, 2024”—or do you want it somewhere else to talk about the—adding the sentence that would indicate “upon this Commission receiving any”—or “upon the finalization of ongoing bargaining unit negotiations and/or information that identifies inversion situations that the Commission will further”—where do you want to include that?

MR. RIORDAN: (Inaudible)—Commissioner Riordan. Isn't that what we're—our Charter is? And so, do we really need to spell that out that we're going to say that, that we're going to meet again, next year and possibly give people—

CHR. PAVAO: I think we mentioned 11, 12, and 15—somewhere else?

MS. FRENZ: So, I did indicate, I think, earlier that—that is your job, right?

MR. RIORDAN: Yeah.

MS. FRENZ: So, you're not required—I think the idea was to just let the public know, “Hey, we might be back sooner rather than later”—sooner than expected because you now have new information that shows that there are these potential inversion situations you want to adjust them now, as opposed to—and I think it would just be, kind of, the road map if you were to come back sooner because, theoretically, this action would no longer require you to—you would just, kind of, annually renew, which is what the Charter—review—which is what the Charter requires. But not necessarily need to take action until the tail-end of the CBA contract period ending, right, in the four years or whatever it may be that the current final period contract that you're looking at.

So, you don't need to do it, but I think it was—I think Commissioner's Nelson's intent was to provide the public with, "Hey, we might be back sooner" because of this one small thing that we're not—still waiting to get out and see how that shakes out. So, that really is up to this body, whether or not you include it or not.

CHR. PAVAO: And Number 9 says that, right—depending—

MS. FRENZ: The old Number 9?

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, the old Number 9, says pending Bargaining Unit 11, 12, and 15.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Commissioner Kawa'auhau. I think Number 9 says that while we acknowledge that we don't know these numbers yet, we do have these numbers, but it doesn't necessarily commit us to doing anything once we get those numbers.

So, we have to commit ourselves to what we're going to do once we get those numbers—and I just wanted to clarify, when we do get those numbers, are we committing ourselves to matching what that bargaining unit—the percentages are? Or—

SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Yeah, yeah—no, after we get them and we review them, are we saying that we are going to match what the Fire and Police bargaining units came out with. Or are we just saying that we're going to acknowledge them and—

CHR. PAVAO: We're going to review them and make a decision. I don't think we can commit to—

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Okay.

CHR. PAVAO: —matching them without looking at it first, I think, personally—but.

MR. NELSON: But I'm—but to the point is, we basically—we're putting an increase to those positions now, okay. And then potentially there could be a further increase down the road. So, this is just creating the history showing, "Okay, yeah, we did that"—we also said we might increase it later, right—that's the point.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: But to clarify it, we have to look at it first. But, I mean, I don't—but I wouldn't—so, we looked at the bargaining units' outcomes and then we match them. So, when the bargaining unit outcomes come through with Police and Fire, we would have to look at them to know what they are.

So, saying we have to look at them is, to me, kind of redundant because of course we're going to look at them, 'cause that's how we would know what they were.

MS. NAMAHOE: This is Namahoe. I am now being inspired to toss it out, so that you can—so that this Commission can make the decision at the time that it needs to make a new decision.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Right. Okay.

MS. NAMAHOE: If we're not going to put committal language in it—

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Why is it there.

MS. NAMAHOE: —take the potential of that—of being held to it out because there's always negotiations going on.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: I guess, to further that, like, what would be the purpose of having it in there, if we're not saying what we're going to do with it?

MR. NELSON: It's really just a flag to let people know that this is what we would consider, right. We can't commit—to learn till we know what it is, all right—but it is to let them know we're going to look at it and there's a potential in adjusting, depending on what happened.

But I just—we can leave it off. You're right. I mean, we don't have to alert people. We could—we're probably not going to—we probably wouldn't—be addressed till next year anyway, so not real time-sensitive, right.

MR. RIORDAN: Riordan here. I agree with that—that we just leave it off because there's other things that could come up next year also, that cause us to make decisions on other people's salaries. So, I'm okay with that.

MS. NAMAHOE: Yeah, I think—I said this earlier, and I want to say it again—we've had some—there are some seats that aren't being filled, and if—right now, we have quorum. We may not have quorum, so we don't know what this Board will have the potential to do.

Because again, that's not to call anybody out—but if the people who are in charge of the County's budget feels that they cannot afford all of this, then the easiest way to not deal with it is to not convene the Salary Commission—and then, nothing gets done. We came on to this Board because of that.

So, this is benign to me. We could take it off, we can leave it in—I mean, I—more is more but if you're going to put it there then that means you're going to commit to something. So, I don't—are we going to be responsible or are we going to be shrewd, or are we going just focus on the task at-hand? Up to you guys. I agree with whatever you choose. Right now, we're quorum.

MR. NELSON: So, we could leave it off. I mean, I—it's a flag but we don't—we can deal with it at a future time.

CHR. PAVAO: When it comes up, we can address it. I think it's probably the best way to deal with it, at this point. When we get the information and the recent agreement and all the legislative bodies have approved it, which is going to be next year, then we'll address it, I guess.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: I'm okay with leaving it off because it's in the record. So as long as we review our record and remember what we were planning on doing, that's fine.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay.

MS. FRENZ: Okay. So, back to old Number 13. It looks like the first sentence in its entirety is going to be stricken. And the only sentence, I believe, would be "The County of Hawai'i Salary Commission strongly recommends that this Commission meet annually, before the budget cycle begins, and make the appropriate adjustments going forward."

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: I like that.

CHR. PAVAO: That's fine. That's good.

MS. NAMAHOE: Yes, please.

MS. FRENZ: Okay. Old Number 14 states, "On August 28, 2025, the County of Hawai'i Salary Commission acknowledged its charge pursuant to the Charter is to review and compensate all county elected officials and appointed Directors and Deputy Directors..."—I guess I question here, we used "Department Head and Deputy Department Heads" up above as opposed to "Director" and Deputy Directors"—

CHR. PAVAO: Can be consistent probably.

MS. FRENZ: Is there a correct term, Director Tokihiro? I mean, is it—what is more in line with the actual positions that are relevant? Is it "Directors and Deputy Directors" or is it "Department Heads and Deputy Department Heads" 'cause we should use the same terminology throughout.

MS. TOKIHIRO: I'm just wanting to make sure that I'm recognizing all of these—all of our different department and agency heads, right. Because in certain cases, we have an agency head who is an administrator as opposed to a director or—

MS. NAMAHOE: Are they considered—is there a generic title for them all in the Charter?

MS. TOKIHIRO: Probably safest to go with "department head" and "deputy"—it's more broad and encompassing.

MS. NAMAHOE: Should "county" become capitalized there, too—"County elected officials"—thank you.

MS. FRENZ: Okay, so let me re-read from the top, “On August 28, 2025, the County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission acknowledged its charge pursuant to the Charter is to review and compensate all County elected officials and appointed Department Head and Deputy Department Heads so that their total salaries and benefits have a reasonable relationship to compensation in the public and private sectors. The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission approved these Proposed Findings of Fact on...”—I have inserted today’s date, theoretically, assuming a motion carries today—“...recommending the salary adjustments for FY 2026-2028 for Covered Positions as further detailed in Exhibit “A”, and will hereafter ensure publication at least once in two daily newspapers of general circulation, submit said Proposed Findings of Fact to the Office of the County Clerk and the Office of the Mayor for public inspection and will hold a public hearing on these Proposed Findings of Fact on a date to be announced in the aforementioned newspaper publication. Any adjustment that increases or decreases any salary by more than ten percent shall require an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the entire membership of the County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission. Following public hearing, the County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission may vote to approve the recommended salary increases attached hereto as Exhibit “A” at its next duly scheduled and noticed meeting.”

CHR. PAVAO: That’s good.

MR. RIORAN: Doesn’t it go to 2029?

MS. FRENZ: No—I was wondering that as well—and I scrolled back up to see. It—in old paragraph 12, Year four—4% on July 1, 2028, so I’m guessing that’s why it’s—technically, it goes 2028 through 2029, but the last increase would be on July 1, 2028, for that fiscal year.

But is it more accurate to say—

MR. RIORDAN: In Number 9, we say, “June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2029”—from July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2025, through June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2029.

MS. FRENZ: Okay. Any other recommended or requested changes for old paragraph 14?

CHR. PAVAO: No—

MS. FRENZ: No?

CHR. PAVAO: Looks good.

MS. FRENZ: All right. Moving on to old paragraph 15, “The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission is comprised of volunteer commissioners who are mindful of current economic conditions and anticipated concerns of the public. The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission balanced such against their obligation to set salaries consistent with the principles of adequate compensation for work performed while preserving a reasonable relationship between the salaries it sets for Covered Positions so that their total salaries and benefits have a reasonable relationship to compensation in the public and private sectors, mindful that the salaries of other

County of Hawai'i employees have regular salary increases. In total, the recommended salary increase for the Covered Positions for fiscal year 2024 are approximately \$484,107 or 0.06% of the County operating budget, while the recommended salary increases for fiscal year 2025 are an additional \$264,216 or roughly 0.03% of the current operating budget. These potential salary increases were accounted for when the fiscal year 2024 budget was prepared."

I needed to get that last couple of sentences confirmed by Department of Human Resources 'cause that's not information that I had. So, I did have to seek some assistance, and I appreciate the help from Human Resources.

MS. NAMAHOE: Thank you for including that.

CHR. PAVAO: Looks good. Yeah, I don't have any issues with that paragraph.

MS. FRENZ: No recommended changes? Then I'm going to move on to our last full bullet point, which is old paragraph 16. It states, "The County of Hawai'i Salary Commission is aware that salaries offered for equivalent work in the private sector may be higher than that offered by the County of Hawai'i. The County of Hawai'i Salary Commission also notes that other employees may continue to make higher wages based on their ability to receive overtime pay. The County of Hawai'i Salary Commission's intent is to bring Covered Positions up to a fair and equitable salary consistent with these Proposed Findings of Fact to facilitate recruitment and retention of qualified Covered Positions."

MR. NELSON: I suggest deleting the first sentence just because all these positions are government positions for the most part. There's no real private analog for the police chief, the fire chief, the mayor, the council—so I don't know if that is actually correct.

MS. KAWA'AUHAU: Commissioner Kawa'auhau. The only reason that I'm okay with "private sector" in there is because when you're trying to find a qualified employee, you don't take—you might not take the job that's not private sector. The public sector job because the pay is better in private sector. And I've made those decisions myself—private sector oftentimes pay higher than public sector and it's important to be on par. If there's no real alignment—'cause there is no police chief in private sector—you would have to look at how we look at the different departments and the different areas under the public sector to see how they're alike, to see how we can make their salary equal.

You do the same with the private sector, you find a company or an organization or something that have the similar purview or the similar organizational structure, similar amount of people that they manage—and you look at the two salaries and you make sure that they're on par. Otherwise, someone who would be—who could be a police chief might go into private sector and do something completely different—but be responsible for the same amount of people—maybe the same amount of risk—just in a different way. That's how you would look at it.

So, I think that a private/public sector comparison is important to ensure that we are attracting qualified employees who we might lose to the private sector, and not just people who are only interested in public sector. And that's just what I think.

MS. FRENZ: I would just also add, for your information and consideration, I do understand where Commissioner Nelson is coming from. In—there are a few carve-outs that are very distinct, right—but, currently, the DEM Director and the DPW Director have the requirement for the engineering license and that's where there are those similarities. The Prosecutor's Office and the Office of the Corporation Counsel law license—private sector will always pay more than what the County can ever afford its attorneys.

Looking at, for example, the County of Maui—a Deputy Corporation Counsel with 10 years, starts at \$213,000.00—right, so there is always—and every—so every jurisdiction will have its own disparities based on their tax brackets and it's never going to be perfect.

But there are enough, I think, similarities to the private sector, as was just discussed, to make it appropriate—if everybody else is okay with that.

So, I just wanted to clarify, we do have enough similarities for that to be a relevant statement, as a proposed Finding.

CHR. PAVAO: I mean, I agree with Commissioner Nelson's concern, but the majority of the positions, I think, still have something comparable in the private sector. And working for the State myself is one of the major issues we have, is that we're—our salary schedule is not competitive in the private sector. So, somewhere—40% of our positions are vacant because we're not being competitive and falling behind the private sector. So, I think it's important to leave in.

MS. NAMAHOE: Namahoe—I do appreciate the language of “equivalent work in the private sector”—but I also appreciate the fact that there are no analogs for things like public safety. If there were, they're still (inaudible) or there are other governments. But, even that, I mean, to Chief Todd's point—they still head hunt. They still fish in this barrel. This is an amazing County—and we learned this in Lahaina—Maui might pay more but who do they have to turn to when they were facing chaos? They came to County of Hawai'i for their consultants because we've dealt with it—not them. No offense to them.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay.

MS. NAMAHOE: Okay, thank you.

MS. TOKIHIRO: I just had a question about former paragraph 15. At the end—so “In total, the recommended salary increase for the Covered Positions for fiscal year 2024 are approximately” 484,000—that's already passed, right.

So, we would be—are we trying to capture what the figures are going to be for increases from January 1, 2026, through—I guess I'm just concerned about those last couple of sentences because it hasn't been accounted for in the budget, to my knowledge, because Finance didn't know what the outcome of this would be. And then, just wanting to clarify the dates. I'm not—yeah—

MS. FRENZ: So, that's a great point. I have no concerns if you guys want to strike that very last sentence. I had it initially highlighted yellow as something I kicked to Human Resources—was that not updated?

MS. TOKIHIRO: No, because that's actually going to be a Finance question.

MS. FRENZ: Okay.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Yeah. I mean, based on—if you want to get what those costs are and what percent of the budget for whatever period you're talking about, then we would have to confirm that with Finance. But, I guess, it would—wondering if the Commission would like to further clarify what you're talking about—the increases in total over the period from January 1, 2026, through July 1, 2028—I'm not sure. It just seems that those couple sentences may need a little re-working.

MS. FRENZ: My recollection is we included that in our—in this body's last proposed Findings to, kind of, calm the public concern given how the 22.44% increase and—to show how small in the grand scheme of the County's operating budget those catch-up increases actually were.

So, that may not be necessary now. And we could strike the last two complete sentences from “In total...” all the way to the end.

CHR. PAVAO: The numbers cannot be accurate either because the fiscal year '24 would only be six months right—from January to June.

MS. FRENZ: Well, this was accurate in our last one.

CHR. PAVAO: Oh, okay.

MS. FRENZ: So, if you don't think we need to—we did—I recall this body's intent in calling that out was to calm any concerns about the big increase.

MR. NELSON: I suggest taking it out.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah.

MR. NELSON: Because, right, 2024 is past. It's really not relevant.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, I would take that out.

MR. NELSON: I guess it shouldn't be in there. We don't really know what the current estimate is, it's not a lot of money from the total budget, but—

MS. FRENZ: So, the sentence, the paragraph would end with "...regular salary increases."

CHR. PAVAO: This is all ancient history, it's the previous raises. I thought this is fiscal year '26—it's for '24, yeah.

MS. FRENZ: So, let me just recap, so that someone can make a motion to adopt. If I understand correctly, there may be forthcoming a motion to approve, as modified, the proposed Findings of Fact by the 2025 County of Hawai'i Salary Commission, dated August 28, 2025, with the following adjustments:

Striking original paragraphs 2 and 3 in their entirety.

Original old paragraph 4 will now be paragraph 2; and second line "collective Bargaining Units"—capital "C"; fourth line down where it said originally "(collectively, BUs)" in parentheses, the first quote will be deleted in front of "collectively"—the word "hereinafter" will be inserted immediately after the word "collectively"—and a quote will be in front of the "B" for "BUs" because the only thing we're trying to quote is "BUs" and not "collectively BUs"; additionally in that paragraph, the next "(Excluded Managers)" in quotes—we will add—we will insert in front of that "collectively hereinafter" to be consistent. That's all the changes for old paragraph 4.

Old paragraph—sorry.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Sorry, just as we were reading it—so that sentence after "(collectively hereinafter, 'BU's)"—"and the various Civil Service managerial employees who are excluded from collective bargaining"—I think we can remove "Civil Service" because they're excluded and it can just be "managerial."

MS. FRENZ: Okay. I've made that correction as well.

Old paragraph 5, soon to be new paragraph 3. We have stricken "After its 2024 adjustments"—and we now say, "After its July 2024 5% pay increase"; we also struck on the second line after "salary", we struck "adjustments" and inserted "increases"; and then we end our sentence after "negotiate contracts"—period. We have stricken "for the next four years." That's the only changes for old paragraph 5 currently proposed.

Old paragraph 6—the only thing left to do after we finalize, if there is a motion, as we're discussing now—would be to insert our upcoming meeting dates, which we need to do before we end this meeting. There are no other changes for current—old paragraph 6, which will be new paragraph 4.

Old paragraph 7, soon to be new paragraph 5. There are no changes requested at this time.

Old paragraph 8, is to be stricken in its entirety.

The next paragraph, which will now be 6 states, “The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission acknowledges...”—that paragraph—the only adjustment there is the very last sentence in front of “2024”—we are inserting “July 1” to clarify when the last increase in salaries occurred.

Old paragraph 9, new paragraph 7—we have moved from below the paragraph that states, “The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission considered all the above information and determined it was necessary to be competitive with the current compensation of Covered Positions to ensure the County’s ability to both retain and recruit qualified employees.”—that was moved to what will now be new paragraph 7. It was moved up. It was not, otherwise, modified. It was just moved in place.

Old paragraph 10, which will soon be new paragraph 8, we struck the words “quite often”; and we struck “are suffering” and we inserted “may suffer” instead “...from salary “inversion”...”; “where subordinate Civil Servants” we inserted “and/or Excluded Manager”; down below onto the next one, where it says again, “Civil Servants”—we inserted “and/or Excluded Managers” to, again, stay consistent. Few lines down where it says, “promote experienced managerial employees”—we struck the word “managerial”—otherwise, there are no other recommended changes for that paragraph.

You’ll see the next paragraph is what was stricken and moved up.

Old paragraph 12, that starts, “To keep pace with...”—the only changes there were after, second line, “Civil Servants”—we inserted “and/or Excluded Managers” to stay consistent; and instead of “are” we have inserted “may be paid more than ...”—we struck “managers” and we have inserted “Department Head and Deputy Department Head”...“the County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission...”—I think it should be “Department Heads”—plural. The only other correction to that paragraph is, where it said, “year three”—it said “July 1, 2207”—it’s being corrected to “2027”—there are no other changes being recommended, at this time, for old paragraph 12.

Moving on to old paragraph 13, which will now be Number 10. The entire first sentence was stricken. The only sentence that will remain is the second that states, “The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission strongly recommends that this Commission meet annually, before the budget cycle begins, and make the appropriate adjustments going forward.”

Old paragraph 14, new paragraph 11—and, again, with in mind, that we will make sure that the numbering all coincides. The changes are changing—we have stricken the word “Directors” and replaced it with “Department Head and Deputy Department Heads”; the word “county” in the second line is being corrected to a capital “C”; and we are going to be inserting today’s date, assuming the motion carries to approve these proposed Findings, as modified. And we have corrected fiscal year “2026-2028” to end “2029”—those are all of the changes from that—from old paragraph 14, currently on the table.

Moving on to old paragraph 15, the entire last two sentences that start with “In total, the recommended salary increase...” from there on, will all be deleted and stricken.

Old paragraph 16, that starts, “The County of Hawai‘i Salary Commission is aware...”—there are no changes recommended, currently, by this body.

If I have captured all of the discussed changes, then someone can adopt that motion.

MS. NAMAHOE: Namahoe—I make a motion that we approve the changes in the Fact of Finding.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, motion made to approve the Findings of Fact.

MR. RIORDAN: Commissioner Riordan seconds it.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay—and a second. Any further comments? If not, we’ll go ahead and vote. All those in favor of approving the Findings of Fact, as amended, signify by saying aye. Any opposed?

The voice vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Dudoit, Kawa‘auhau, Namahoe, Nelson, Riordan, and  
Chair Pavao – 6.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSENT & EXCUSED: None.

CHR. PAVAO: The motion carried. Okay.

MS. FRENZ: And then, if you’ll—while we look to dates, our amazing Secretary, Ms. Yamada, is offering to run the adopted—so I was making, using track changes, everybody’s’ requested changes. Now that the motion has passed, I have accepted all the changes, fixing formatting issues, and subject to our future upcoming hearings, Ms. Yamada is offering to run a corrected copy right now, so you can all review it one more time to make sure that you don’t need anything else done. Is that okay with everyone?

CHR. PAVAO: That’s fine.

The next meeting is October 23<sup>rd</sup>?

MS. FRENZ: That’s what we need to discuss. So, as a reminder to everyone about what the Charter requires and our Salary Commission Rules require—let me just refresh everyone’s recollection about our noticed—our procedures for salary adjustment proposals.

So, this is our Salary Commission Rules, Chapter 204, subsection 204-1—“Procedure for salary adjustment proposals. 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. All salary adjustment proposals shall be determined in accordance with a plan adopted by the Commission (as amended), which shall include, at a minimum, consultation with those boards and commissions that have appointing authority for department heads.”

So, we have done that. So, I’m just reminding you that that’s a requirement and we have done that.

Section 204-2 Notice to the public. “At least thirty days prior to the Commission’s approval of any of its salary adjustment proposals, the Commission shall:” First, subsection “(a) Publish at least once in at least two daily newspapers of general circulation in the county a detailed account of its proposal, or proposals, including specific increases or decreases in both actual dollar amounts and percentages and notification that the report required in subsection (c) below is available for public inspection at the offices of the county clerk and the mayor.”

So, we’re starting off with 30 days before you take final action, you have to run, at least once, in at least two daily newspapers.

Now, Step 2, at least 30 days prior we have to also have held at least one public hearing in either East Hawai‘i or West Hawai‘i provided that any public hearing shall be conducted using videoconference technology to allow for public participation from both east and west Hawai‘i.

So, again, working backwards—30 days prior to you taking final action, you have to have held at least one public hearing in either East or West Hawai‘i allowing for Zoom as we currently do now.

And, finally, “(c) Submit copies of a detailed report of the Commission’s findings and conclusions used to develop its proposal, or proposals, to the office of the county clerk and the office of the mayor for public inspection.”

And then, finally, subsection 3, Public hearing—“The public hearing required to be held by...” this Commission—by “...the Commission on its salary adjustment proposal shall be conducted in accordance with section 202-3 above.”

So, I wanted to remind you of the legal requirements we have for running it in the newspaper and holding the public hearing. All of that needs to occur 30 days prior to your final meeting where you take that action.

If you recall, I believe, in 2023, I reminded everyone of how critically important it was going to be to have your attendance, technically, the action that you’re proposing to take individually is not more than 10% increase, but collectively it would be more than a 10% increase. I’d rather

not split a hair and have someone take—move to take action because, if we don't have a quorum—there's quorum and then there's a two-thirds vote.

My point is, collectively, the pay increases that you are currently recommending would exceed 10% and that would require two-thirds vote. When you take it together as a whole, not individually per fiscal year.

So, I do believe my interpretation of the Charter and our Rules requires a two-thirds vote of this body, which means all six of you here, which is the only current members that we have.

So, in other words, everyone needs to be present at a bare minimum, on the final date that you take action or this body will not have the authority to take the requested and recommended action currently proposed by this body. If that makes sense.

So, working backwards because there are so many—and this room is heavily used by council and various boards and commissions—Glynis and I did a bunch of work today and throughout the meeting trying to find some dates and Glynis has been absolutely amazing. I just want everyone to know all the work that she's done to put in to figuring this out.

So, if you can all be ready to check your calendars to confirm your availability to commit to these dates. So, assuming, which you all have already done, you have adopted the proposed Findings with the amendments that we talked about—and she is currently running you copies of those amend—that final document now.

Glynis would be working with me and Director Tokihiro, and the newspaper to publish on October 12<sup>th</sup>, “Notice of the Public Hearing” in the Hawai‘i Tribune-Herald and the West Hawai‘i Today newspaper. Our public hearing and regular meeting date would be tentatively—if everyone can commit to it—November 17<sup>th</sup>, a Monday.

MS. NAMAHOE: Is the next one not October 23<sup>rd</sup>?

MS. FRENZ: So, if we—

MR. NELSON: I can't make the October 23<sup>rd</sup>, so—

MS. FRENZ: So, the only way—yeah, so if we—it begs the question, and I believe in 2023 what we ended up doing was striking that October date because there was nothing to work on in the interim. We held the public hearing, we went straight the following 30 days later, and we did our vote.

So, if you still want to meet in October, we can find a date—but if we don't need to—we don't need to.

MR. NELSON: I can't make it, so—

MS. FRENZ: Okay.

MR. NELSON: Personally, I got a conflict—I'm supposed to be in Honolulu on that day.

MS. FRENZ: So, if we don't need to meet in October, we can strike any tentative proposed October date, but that requires commitment to—for everyone's availability on Monday, November 17<sup>th</sup>. Is that currently a date that everyone can commit to? Anybody not available? Okay.

If that's the case, then in order to ensure that we—currently, we're scheduled for our November date, would be November 26. Glynis is proposing to cancel that. It is—it would, technically, be 30 days after November—well, I'm sorry—would not be 30 days after November 17<sup>th</sup>.

So, our regularly scheduled meeting would be cancelled. And the reason why we would do that is because the only other date we can find available in December, for you to take the final action, if you still choose to do so—is December 22<sup>nd</sup>—and November 26<sup>th</sup> is not 30 days prior to.

So, that's why November 17<sup>th</sup> would work because December 22<sup>nd</sup>, it would be 30 days. So, the reason why it gets a little “iffy” is it's the holidays, right? And people travel. You can appear by Zoom but—so whether you can be here in-person or not, I need you at a bare minimum to commit to either in-person or by Zoom—one or the other for those two dates in order for what you have said you want to do, to be able to come to fruition, given the meeting demand and public hearing notices that we need to comply with.

So, let me recap—because you have approved the Findings today, we would publish your Findings on—in the newspaper on October 12<sup>th</sup> to comply with the Rule and the Charter. We would then hold our public hearing and our regular meeting, if there are any other communications that come in about the proposed salary increases, they would be considered by this body at that time—and that would be on Monday, November 17<sup>th</sup>—I presume, also at 10 a.m.—unless somebody want to start earlier and, say, 9 a.m.—but 10 a.m. has continued to be a consistent time for us. We would strike our regularly scheduled meeting of November 26 and, instead meet on or—approving the Findings and the regular meeting on Monday, December 22<sup>nd</sup>.

SPEAKER: Twenty-second?

MS. FRENZ: That's correct. We were supposed to have a meeting—our previously scheduled meeting would have been Friday, December 26<sup>th</sup>, the day after Christmas. I was really concerned about that kind of date with the holiday, but we would cancel that meeting because we would have already met a couple of days before the holiday, which might be more convenient for everyone on December 22<sup>nd</sup>.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, that's good for me.

MS. FRENZ: Can everybody here commit to that?

SPEAKERS: (Inaudible).

MS. FRENZ: Great. Anybody not available—cannot commit to those dates? No? Okay.

SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. FRENZ: So, we would be cancelling—everyone, if you want to note it on your—and we would strike our regularly scheduled meeting of November 26<sup>th</sup>—and we would also strike our regularly scheduled meeting of December 26<sup>th</sup>.

MS. TOKIHIRO: And that would in addition to striking the October meeting as well?

MS. FRENZ: That's correct. I believe that it sounds like everyone's going to be okay to not meet in October.

SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. FRENZ: At 10 a.m. So, now, just to clarify, Ms. Yamada has passed out to everyone—I see another paragraph that needs to be deleted—but short of formatting spaces—if you could re-review to ensure that all of the—that the motion you made, which incorporated all of the changes—I reiterated you sought in today's hearing—have, in fact, been effectuated—and short of the extra paragraph spacing, I see in between 1 and 2 and an extra space in the word “reasonable” under paragraph 1—you're, otherwise, okay with it.

And I will also, with your permission, as we indicated as a part of your motion—will be inserting the dates you all just committed to of November 17 and December 22<sup>nd</sup>—into paragraph 4.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, is that it?

MS. FRENZ: I need you guys to make sure that you've reviewed.

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, I'm good with it.

MS. FRENZ: So, looking at paragraph 4, everyone, what it will now read is, “In accordance with the Charter and Hawai'i Revised Statutes Chapter 92, the County of Hawai'i Salary Commission held a meeting on August 28, 2025 and will hold meetings on November 17, 2025 and December 22, 2025.” And then it says, “...were duly noticed and afforded opportunities for public comment and testimony was received.” I think that could be slightly cleaned up a little to just read better. It could be a period after December 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025—and then say, “These meetings were duly noticed and afforded opportunities...”—“These meetings were duly noticed and afforded opportunities for public comment and testimony was received.”

CHR. PAVAO: Sounds good. Thank you.

MS. FRENZ: I also want to make sure everyone has, in fact, reviewed “Exhibit A” which is going to be attached to these Findings.

MS. TOKIHIRO: Sorry, Cody, in Number 1—“county executive”—should “county” be capitalized, the beginning of line 2.

MS. FRENZ: Oh, yes. Thank you.

MS. NAMAHOE: Hi, Namahoe. Number 9—Years—“year one, year two, year three”—capitalize those? Number 9.

MS. FRENZ: Number 9, thank you—sorry.

MS. NAMAHOE: Yeah, “Year One, Year Two, Year Three”—capitalized.

MS. FRENZ: Just the “y” or the “o”, too?

MS. NAMAHOE: The “Y” and the number.

MS. FRENZ: Okay.

MS. NAMAHOE: Proper nouns.

MR. RIORDAN: (Inaudible.)

MS. FRENZ: “Year Two, Year Three, and Year Four.” Any other changes? Corrections?

And just to clarify everyone, “Exhibit A” is attached to Communication number 25-04, which is the letter that this body sent out to the mayor and/or appointing authorities in Covered Positions.

MS. NAMAHOE: Also, capitalize “years one, two, and three”—in Number 3—which then there’s a consistency issue because in Number 3 versus Number 9—Number 9 has “numbers” in “parenthesis” whereas in 3, it does not.

MS. FRENZ: Do you want the numbers there?

MS. NAMAHOE: I don’t. Personally, I think 3 reads cleaner than Number 9.

MS. FRENZ: Okay.

MS. NAMAHOE: So, I would remove the numbers in parenthesis in 9.

MS. FRENZ: Is everyone okay with that?

CHR. PAVAO: Yeah, that’s fine.

MS. FRENZ: Any other—

CHR. PAVAO: Any other corrections, otherwise, ready to adjourn?

MS. FRENZ: So, then, Chair, turning back to your agenda, for—moving on to Number 8, Scheduling—

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, yes, the scheduling—so, the next meeting is 10 a.m., November 17<sup>th</sup>, right—

MS. FRENZ: Yes. Just—because we made a few extra typographical changes—if we could get a—someone to make a motion to approve the changes that we just discussed to the final draft that’s before you, which was removing the “parenthesis One, parenthesis Two, parenthesis Three, and Four”—and then capitalizing “Year One, Year Two, Year Three”; and then correcting one other “county” from lower case “c” to a capital “C”—just to be squeaky clean, if you guys don’t mind.

CHR. PAVAO: Can we get a motion to accept the Findings of Fact, as amended—

MR. NELSON: This is Nelson. I’ll make a motion.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. Is there a second?

MR. RIORDAN: Riordan—second.

CHR. PAVAO: Any comments. If not, all those in favor of approving the Findings of Fact, as amended, signify by saying aye. Any opposed?

The voice vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Dudoit, Kawa‘auhau, Namahoe, Nelson, Riordan, and  
Chair Pavao – 6.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSENT & EXCUSED: None.

CHR. PAVAO: The motion carries.

### **Unfinished Business (Item 7)**

#### **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**

---

(There was no further discussion.)

**Announcements (Item 8)**

(There were none.)

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

MS. FRENZ: So, then, Chair, agenda Item number 9, next meetings—our next meeting will be November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025, 10 a.m. It's a Monday, here in the Council Chambers. We will have the Zoom feature available—that will be our November 17<sup>th</sup>—that will be our public hearing and our regular meeting. In the event this body receives any future communications for consideration—our Secretary also indicated the conference in Kona will be available if someone wants to join in-person from the West side. So, we'll make sure that that's on the agenda, as an FYI to anyone—but we'll also have the Zoom available.

So, upcoming meetings—November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025, 10 a.m., here in Hilo. There will be a Kona Conference Room available, we will also have Zoom available for anyone—wherever they are on the island—that would be public hearing, following our publication in the newspaper, and our regular meeting—for any future communications that may be received. And our final meeting of 2025 will be on December 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025, Monday, 10 a.m.—again, this location.

Theoretically, if your position remains the same, you would be able to take action at that time to approve and adopt the Findings with a start date of January 1, 2026—and that will also be a regular—that'll be a regular meeting—and where you would approve those Findings, if so.

We will cancel what may have been penciled in by anyone, November 26<sup>th</sup>, a Wednesday, 2025—that is cancelled. And December 26<sup>th</sup>, Friday, 2025, that was a proposed hold date. You could also cancel that date as well.

So, again, only upcoming meetings are November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025, 10 a.m.—December 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025, at 10 a.m. as well. Are there any questions on the upcoming meetings—and everyone here, all six—our two-thirds have committed to those dates. I don't have anything else, Chair.

**Adjournment (Item 10)**

CHR. PAVAO: Okay, that's it then. Anybody else have anything else? Otherwise, we'll adjourn.

MS. NAMAHOE: Happy Halloween.

CHR. PAVAO: Thank you very much.

MS. FRENZ: Move to adjourn—motion to adjourn.

CHR. PAVAO: Motion to adjourn?

MR. NELSON: I'll make a motion to adjourn.

CHR. PAVAO: And a second?

MR. RIORDAN: Second.

CHR. PAVAO: Okay. All those in favor of adjourning say aye. Any opposed?

The voice vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Dudoit, Kawa'auhau, Namahoe, Nelson, Riordan, and  
Chair Pavao – 6.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSENT & EXCUSED: None.

CHR. PAVAO: The motion carried. We're adjourned. Thank you very much. (The meeting adjourned at 12:19 p.m.)

Respectfully submitted,

Glynis Yamada, Secretary-Reporter

APPROVED:

Steven Pavao, Chair  
Salary Commission