

Approved

OPEN SESSION MEETING MINUTES

Board/Commission		Salary Commission	Meeting Date	February 13, 2025
Location	Piikoi Building, Boards and Commissions Conference Room Suite 300, 4444 Rice Street, Līhu‘e, Hawai‘i 96766		Start of Meeting: 9:03 a.m.	End of Meeting: The meeting was recessed at 12:29 p.m. on February 13, 2025. The meeting will be continued to February 20, 2025.
Present	<p>Chair Joshua Uyehara, Vice Chair Wayne Katayama; Commissioners Bernadette Akiona-Arruda, Stacie Chiba-Miguel, Patrick Ono, Nancy Kanna, and Paul Toner (in at 9:10 a.m. and out at 1:55 p.m.)</p> <p>Also present, Boards and Commissions Support Staff: Administrator Ellen Ching and Support Clerk Mercedes Omo. Deputy County Attorney Andrew Michaels (via Microsoft Teams). Invited Guests: Director of Economic Development Nalani Kaauwai Brun, Planning Director Ka‘āina Hull, Managing Director Reiko Matsuyama, and Human Resources Manager III Janine Rapozo.</p>			
Excused				
Absent				



SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
MEETING CALLED TO ORDER/ROLL CALL TO ASCERTAIN QUORUM	<p>Chair Joshua Uyehara called the Salary Commission Meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.</p> <p>Commission Support Clerk Mercedes Omo verified attendance by roll call: Commissioner Bernadette Akiona-Arruda replied present. Commissioner Nancy Kanna replied present. Commissioner Stacie Chiba-Miguel replied present. Commissioner Patrick Ono replied present. Commissioner Paul Toner was absent at roll call (in at 9:10 a.m.). Vice Chair Wayne Katayama replied present.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Chair Joshua Uyehara replied present.</p> <p>Ms. Omo stated that Deputy County Attorney Andrew Michaels was present via Microsoft Teams and Administrator Ellen Ching was present at the meeting.</p>	<p>Quorum was established with six Commissioners present.</p>
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	<p>Chair Uyehara asked for a motion to approve the agenda as circulated.</p> <p>Administrator Ching stated that the last four departments are present to make their presentations, and she would like to address those departments so that they do not need to return in the following weeks ahead. Following their presentations, the Commission can then discuss the draft Salary Resolution that was distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting. Administrator Ching stated that Chair Uyehara had interest in discussing the appointment of a de factor deputy, and that the discussion on that can be held during discussion on the first draft of the Salary Resolution.</p>	<p>Mr. Ono moved to approve the agenda as circulated. Ms. Akiona-Arruda seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	<p>There was no one present from the public to testify on any agenda item.</p>	
APPROVAL OF OPEN SESSION MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 30, 2025, MEETING		<p>Mr. Ono moved to approve the minutes of the January 30, 2025, meeting, as circulated. Ms. Akiona-Arruda seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
BUSINESS SC 2025-1	<p>Discussion and decision-making on submitting a Salary Resolution to establish maximum salary caps for certain County officers and employees included in Section 3-2.1 of the Kaua'i County Code for Fiscal Years 2025/2026, 2026/2027 and 2027/2028.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>A. Presentation by Managing Director Reiko Matsuyama on issues and recommendations related to a Salary Resolution.</p> <p>B. Presentations by the Directors, Department heads, or their representatives as necessary; discussion and possible action on reports received by the following Offices, Departments, and Agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Office of the Mayor ii. Department of Finance iii. Department of Human Resources iv. Department of Liquor Control v. Department of Parks and Recreation vi. Department of Water vii. Fire Department viii. Housing Agency ix. Office of the County Clerk x. Office Economic Development xi. Office of the County Attorney xii. Office of the Prosecuting Attorney xiii. Planning Department xiv. Police Department xv. Public Works Department <p>C. Presentation by Director of Human Resources Annette Anderson or her representative in the following reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Collective bargaining: across the board percentage increases 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Collective bargaining: step movements, lump sum award, etc. iii. Collective bargaining: differentials, other pay iv. Collective bargaining: summary of costs v. Comparison of county department data and resident population vi. Salary inversion vii. Salary comparison report viii. State Executive Salary recommendations ix. Market analysis on average salaries in the private sector for engineers and attorneys x. Recommendations on addressing engineers and attorney vacancies xi. Issues and Recommendations related to a Salary Resolution <p style="text-align: center;">D. Presentation by Director of Finance Chelsie Sakai or her representative on the following reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consumer price index ii. County of Kaua'i financial overview <p>Administrator Ching stated that the remaining departments for review include the Office of Economic Development, Planning Department, Office of the Mayor, and Office of Boards and Commissions.</p> <p>The Commission heard from Nalani Kaauwai Brun, Director of Economic Development, who presented the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Her position is appointed by the Mayor. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • She has 9 positions in the Office of Economic Development. Currently 8 are hired and she has a vacancy in the Business Specialist position. • The Office’s budget is approximately \$3.7M. Of that, about \$2.1M is mostly for grants. Most of what the Office does is to work with other outside organizations to accomplish the goals that are set by outside plans that other offices/departments have worked on, including the General Plan, Kaua’i Destination Management Action Plan, etc. • All the positions in the Office are exempt. Many of her hires come from the private sector of business. <p>Chair Uyehara asked Ms. Brun if she finds recruiting a challenge for her Office. Ms. Brun responded that she has not had a challenge filling positions so far in her tenure. The last time the Business Specialist position was vacant, she ended up hiring someone from off-island. When she recruits, she is not just looking for talent and someone who can do what the position description calls out, but she is looking for someone who can blend in with the established team. Almost everyone in the Office is included in the interview process so that she can see who might jive the best together as a cohesive group. Fortunately, the Office has not had turnover in recent years so is going through the hiring process for the first time in a while.</p> <p><i>Mr. Toner was noted as present at 9:10 a.m.</i></p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked if Ms. Brun had any concerns going into the hiring process for the position. Ms. Brun responded that she works with the workforce for many different sectors of the economy, she is very aware of</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>the situation in the hiring market out there with there being less available applicants. Ms. Brun hopes that the way her Office is structured being a family-type atmosphere, she is hopeful that that attracts someone to apply. All positions in her Office are exempt, so as the Administration changes, there could be turnover in the Office depending on who the new Administration decides to keep or not. The fact that the position is appointed might be a deterrent for those seeking a stable position in the long run. She is looking for someone who can work with the entire community, including those who may not be as happy as others, in this position. The person filling the position is expected to visit every business out in the community to let them know that they are supported. The person filling the position also must understand how the State of Hawai'i works and how their programs can assist the businesses on the island. All the positions within the Office touch the community and that is a primary focus of what Mayor Kawakami wants. She believes that the best ideas come from the community, so she sees the importance of seeing those communication channels always open.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Administrator Ching where Ms. Brun was located on the chart comparing salaries of similar positions across the state. Chair Uyehara and Administrator Ching responded that it would fall under the Research and Development category.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if the other counties have a Director of Economic Development and how the City and County of Honolulu handles that role. Administrator Ching stated that she was unsure of the answer to that question. Ms. Brun responded that every county has an economic development office. These offices are usually called something different.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Vice Chair Katayama asked what Maui’s office of economic development is called. Ms. Brun responded that on Maui they are called the Office of Economic Development which is under the Office of the Mayor. Ms. Brun explained her Office is also under the Office of the Mayor. She is not her own department. Research and Development is an old office who has carried that name through the years. Most other counties retitled their offices to Office of Economic Development. The City and County of Honolulu did not have a separate Office of Economic Development until the most current Administration took office. They just created one and previously used other offices to do that economic development work. Vice Chair Katayama asked if Administrator Ching could research that further and update the chart as necessary. Administrator Ching responded that she could do so.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Ms. Brun what wage structure she follows for the exempt positions in her Office. Ms. Brun responded that she follows the Hawai’i Government Employees Association (HGEA) pay scale, but that she does have more flexibility in the amount of salaries, because they are exempt. Economic Development Specialist IV is the top-level position. There are a couple of Economic Development Specialist IIIs. Those in the Economic Development Specialist II positions are advancing to the III position and the Office is looking at getting additional Specialist II hires.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama clarified that the Office follows the salary schedule as HGEA. Ms. Brun confirmed that Vice Chair Katayama was correct, but that they are not a part of the bargaining unit. Vice Chair Katayama asked if they followed HGEA Bargaining Unit 3. Ms. Brun responded that she has white-collar workers who follow HGEA Bargaining Unit 13.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if her employees received any other entitlements or other compensation cost items. Ms. Brun responded that her staff receive their base salary and all the fringe benefits, however, the staff rarely get compensated for overtime, though they are eligible for it. Ms. Brun further stated that the employees in her Office are very involved in the community, so they work various hours depending on when events are held, etc.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if the current salary structure under Bargaining Unit 13 was adequate to meet the Office’s recruitment and retention needs. Ms. Brun responded that based on how the Office operates now, the salary structure is adequate. However, the Office has structured its operations and how it does its work to account for the salary that is provided.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if the positions are assigned a specific grade and follow the step movements. Ms. Brun responded that Vice Chair Katayama is correct. She further explained that because they are exempt employees, she does have a lot of flexibility with job descriptions so that helps her fit her employees into odd molds that the Office of Economic Development is as they do not operate like any other department.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if all the employees in the Office serve at the will of the Mayor. Ms. Brun responded that Vice Chair Katayama was correct.</p> <p>Mr. Toner asked if there was a lot of turnover from administration to administration. Ms. Brun responded that in the near past there has not been too much turnover. However, in those previous turnover years, the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mayors were closely aligned and had similar groups of supporters and appointees. There was some turnover in the Office when Mayor Kawakami took office. Mayor Kawakami asked the Office to meet the needs in the community that he felt were necessary and that is how the Office came to be in its present state as it is today. Ms. Brun stated that she is not sure what will happen with the new administration.</p> <p>Mr. Ono thanked Vice Chair Katayama for asking questions to help fill in the gap on the comparative chart. Mr. Ono stated that for the Big Island, the economic development office has a much larger staff than Kaua'i. He wondered if they had any differing objectives or priorities than what Kaua'i does. Ms. Brun responded that most economic development offices receive the tasks and projects that no one knows what to do with and who to assign it to. That is how the office is growing. On the Big Island, they have a large staff working on broadband initiatives. On Kaua'i, the Business Specialist took on the role of working on Kaua'i's broadband initiatives to work within the means of what the Office has. However, the work that does get assigned to the Office is overwhelming at times. That is why the Office works with so many partners as they do not have the staff necessary to get everything done. Ms. Brun also noted that the Big Island's office also has portions of housing within that office as well. The Big Island office is also very good at using the Vista Program like how the County of Kaua'i uses it. Those Vista Programs are used to build up their staff and their abilities.</p> <p>Mr. Ono asked Ms. Brun to elaborate on what the Vista Program was. Ms. Brun responded that the Vista Program focuses on many different things. Her Office has been able to use the AmeriCorps Vista Program, which is a national program that has people who apply to it and the program's goal is</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>for those people to go out for a year to learn about something that they are interested in. Currently, the Office has 3 former Vista Program participants who have turned into full-time employees. The Office was able to have them learn about how the Office operates, what the problems are, whether the Office is a nice fit, etc. and the Vista Program participants were such a good fit that the Office offered them positions. One of the Vista participants was from Kaua'i and the other two were from elsewhere. Ms. Brun further noted that they are kind of like interns.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if the Office's \$3.7M budget includes the various grants that the Office handles or if that was just the Office's Operating Budget. Ms. Brun responded that approximately \$2.1M of the \$3.7M is for grants. Some of the grants are direct grants which go to organizations like the Kaua'i Visitors Bureau, Kaua'i Economic Development Board, etc. There are also grants that are distributed through various requests for proposals (RFPs) and they are geared around innovation and economy. There is a large amount of funding that goes towards agricultural farm expansion as that is a goal of the Administration. There are grants that are more community-centered such as Hawaiian events, cultural programs, etc. that are not only great for the non-profits that receive them, but they are also great for the Office, because it allows them to further work and touch the community.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked what the Office's Operating Budget was less the amounts distributed as grants. Ms. Brun responded that her Operating Budget was approximately \$1M. Ms. Brun clarified that she also has some funding for matching funds as the Office serves as grant writers who go out seeking Federal funds for large programs like additional electric vehicle charging stations, electric vehicle fast chargers, etc. When those monies</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>are received by the County, the County needs to show matching funds in the budget to show the County’s match.</p> <p>Administrator Ching referred the Commission to the Executive Salary/Jurisdiction Comparison report. She noted that on the State-side, the comparative department head related to Ms. Brun’s position is the head of the Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism (DBEDT). For the other counties, the position would fall under Research and Development. The figures provided are for Honolulu and Hawai’i county, with the one missing amount being the County of Maui.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara noted that he does notice that DBEDT is also a department that the State sticks everything into when they cannot find a proper home for them. Administrator Ching responded in agreement and noted that DBEDT is broader than what the Office of Economic Development does. Ms. Brun responded that DBEDT is similar in what they do, but that the State has such a broad number of responsibilities that it encapsulates all the additional responsibilities it is given each year. In previous years DBEDT took over the Hawai’i Tourism Authority. In the current year, it appears DBEDT is now overseeing the State Foundation of Culture and the Arts. DBEDT appears to exponentially be getting larger. Any task that has an economic development theme is usually assigned to these offices.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if Administrator Ching would get the salary amount for the director on Maui. Administrator Ching responded that she would work on that.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Ms. Brun to clarify her statement that the City and County of Honolulu just started their office of economic development.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Brun repeated the information provided earlier whereas the current administration there created an Office of Economic Development when they took office.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked Ms. Brun if there was anything that the Commission should have asked her that they did not. Ms. Brun responded that she would like peace to the world.</p> <p>Administrator Ching stated that the Commission usually asks department heads if they have any recommendations for the Commission. Ms. Brun responded that the Commission does not have an easy job. They will have to work with varying positions and what the Commission wants to see from these positions. A department like DBEDT must have economists like Dr. Eugene Tian on-staff as they are responsible for that level of data. Ms. Brun stated that she is in her position because of her expertise as a community specialist. She is all about working with the community. For her position, she was not necessarily looking for a high salary, but if the Administration is looking for someone that needs an economics, technology, or agriculture technology background, there may need to be a higher salary amount to attract qualified applicants to meet those specific needs. What those needs are at this time are not known, but she imagines the starting salary for those kinds of applicants would be higher.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Administrator Ching to clarify whether the salary amounts listed were just base salary or whether they included fringe benefits. Administrator Ching responded that the amounts listed were base salary. She was tasked with providing information on what the salary commissions in other counties offered their department heads. Administrator Ching further noted that the County of Kaua'i is the only</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>county that sets a maximum salary and allows the appointing authority flexibility to give below that maximum amount. All the other jurisdictions, including the State set the exact salary for the position. There is no flexibility or range.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked for clarification that for Kaua'i, the amount is the maximum salary and for all the other jurisdictions the salary amount listed is that position's actual salary. Administrator Ching responded in the affirmative.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama stated that Ms. Brun brought up an interesting concept. He asked Ms. Brun if her Office needed the ability to provide a proficiency pay adjustment if there was a need to hire a specialist that has a Ph.D., like an economist. Vice Chair Katayama asked if the HGEA Bargaining Unit 13 salary structure would give her the flexibility to do that. Ms. Brun responded that she believes it does, but that she has not really had to delve into that level of detail. She does recall looking at figures of salaries for people who have a higher scientific background.</p> <p>Mr. Toner asked if Ms. Brun would hire someone with that level of scientific background or if she would contract them. Ms. Brun responded that right now she contracts with them as they would not have the budget to support that position. Ms. Brun further stated that she has heard comments made by others as to why her Office does not have a researcher or economist on board. Ms. Brun stated that she responds to those queries with a response that the Office contracts with the University of Hawai'i's economic team to help get that kind of analyses done. The Office has so far been able to make do with the services received by the University of Hawai'i to be able to support requests from the Mayor, Council, and other entities. Ms. Brun</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>further noted that if her Office was asked to do the research or analysis in-house, she does not have the staff or the capability to do that.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if that type of research work is contracted, where that would be budgeted. Ms. Brun responded that the Office has a Consultant Services budget line item. There are some consultants that are budgeted for work related to business in Japan and the need for translation services. The Office also has business support and business mentors on contract to assist businesses who want to take a major leap in their business. Since the University of Hawai'i Economic Research Organization (UHERO) is a government entity, the Office can utilize a government-to-government agreement to work with them to get research done.</p> <p>The Commission thanked Ms. Brun for her appearance before the Commission.</p> <p>Your Commission heard from Ka'āina Hull, Planning Director, who presented the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The position of Planning Director is appointed by the Planning Commission. • The Department has an Operating Budget of approximately \$3.7M from the General Fund and \$375,000 from Federal funds. In total that budget encompasses the funding for 33 positions. • The Department is broken down into 4 separate divisions. <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Mr. Hull how many positions Federal funding pays for. Mr. Hull responded that Federal funds are used to fund 4 positions that have been funded for 40 years. There is a new Federally funded position coming on board that has been funded for 3 years. That</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>position is considered temporary in nature. The total number of Federally funded positions would then be 5.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Mr. Hull what bargaining unit contract his employees fell under. Mr. Hull responded that the vast majority of his employees fall under Bargaining Unit 3 or 13 of HGEA. There are 4 division managers. 3 of them are excluded managerial (EM) positions. The fourth position is in the process of being transferred into an EM position as well. Technically, that position is under HGEA Bargaining Unit 13. The consultation process with HGEA has been completed for that remaining division chief to upgrade the position to an EM position. The Federal positions, 3 of them are technically under HGEA Bargaining Unit 13 and 1 is under HGEA Bargaining Unit 3. The last Federally funded position that has yet to be filled would be excluded.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if any other compensation items are paid for, for positions outside of the Director and Deputy Director positions. Mr. Hull responded that the other positions in his Department receive overtime or compensatory time compensation when they are assigned work to warrant that. The Department also has a robust training and travel program that some in the Department consider as a form of compensation. The Department also has a robust enforcement division pool of monies. In enforcing illegal vacation rentals, the Department sometimes folds in the entire staff to do searches on the internet because how one person enters and seeks out data could be very different than how an enforcement officer does it. Twice a year the Department allows as much overtime or compensatory time as anyone is willing to work to engage in doing these searches to help with enforcement efforts of illegal vacation rentals.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Administrator Ching if there are any inversion issues within the Planning Department. Administrator Ching responded that she would guess that at the time the inversion chart was prepared there were no inversion issues present in the Planning Department as none are listed. Mr. Hull responded that there is one position that has a salary inversion over the salary of the Deputy Director. Mr. Hull further stated that the last transfer of the division chief to an EM position will also cause an inversion over the Deputy Director’s salary, but not the Director’s salary. Vice Chair Katayama clarified that the inversion occurs over the base salary.</p> <p>Mr. Ono stated that he recognized there were salary inversions with the Deputy Director’s position and salary. Mr. Ono stated that when the Commission looked at data back in 2023, they noticed overtime costs but not costs that were extremely high. Mr. Ono asked if Mr. Hull sees the inversion issue magnified because of the allowance of an unending amount of overtime to those who are willing to work it. Mr. Hull responded that there is a high probability of the deputy chiefs getting paid more than the Deputy Director because of their salary rate with overtime. In the past, the division chiefs have not taken advantage of the “scorched earth” program, which is voluntarily offered for all staff to work. The potential is there, but this has not been experienced in the past.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked if the Planning Program Manager made more than others because of the tenure of that employee. Mr. Hull responded that the person in that position has been employed for a much longer period. Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked if that was the main reason why the Planning Program Manager made more than the Deputy Director. Mr. Hull responded in the affirmative.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if the “scorched earth” program funds itself based upon the fines collected. Mr. Hull responded that the fines are not used for the “scorched earth” program because of the possibility of litigation and that would be a liability point. Vice Chair Katayama stated that it appears that there would be a conflict of interest. Mr. Hull continued his response noting that vacation rental monies are used for enforcement of illegal vacation rentals. That pool of funds is robust and is not taken from taxes. The pool of funds is taken from the re-registration fees of existing non-conforming vacation rental certificates. Those fees fund among other things, the “scorched earth” program.</p> <p>Mr. Ono asked if there was a reason why the program was called the “scorched earth” program. Mr. Hull responded that the vacation rental programs approximately 7 or 8 years ago were hitting illegal vacation rentals. The estimate received from professionals was that there were approximately 1,500 illegal units. Over time the Department engaged in searching the internet at all times of the day or night as some advertised outside of typical working hours. Over the years, the Department has been able to bring that number down. The Department also brought in a third party to help them monitor online activities. That work allowed the Department to bring the illegal vacation rental number down to approximately 700. In 2019 or 2020, the County signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with Airbnb and VRBO, the main platforms who were allowing everyone and anyone to advertise on their websites. The County of Kaua’i was the first in the County to voluntarily sign the agreement to share data. Once the data was shared, within two years, the number of illegal vacation rentals was brought down to less than 50. In being able to work with the main platforms and get backdoor access to all their data and information, the illegal operators will go to the crevasses of the world to</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>operate. The Department’s efforts and instructions to staff were to search the world wide web using various search platforms and entries. They were told to search the world wide web and that is where the name “scorched earth” came from.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if Mr. Ono was volunteering to help with the search. Mr. Hull stated that there is a laptop in his office that can access inappropriate and “not safe for work” websites, but he does not even have the password for that laptop.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Administrator Ching how the Deputy Director’s salary was set knowing that the Director’s salary was set based on any Salary Resolution that was previously passed. Administrator Ching responded that the Deputy Director’s salary was set in the same fashion. Vice Chair Katayama asked if the Director could set the Deputy Director’s salary based upon the range provided. Administrator Ching responded that Vice Chair Katayama was correct.</p> <p>Administrator Ching stated that a lot of department heads are humble in the work that they do. The County of Kaua’i is lucky to have one of the best, if not the best, planning departments in the country. A lot of other counties have had difficulties with vacation rentals. The County of Kaua’i has not had those problems because they have been at the forefront of enforcement and ensuring that vacation rentals are operating legally. The Planning Department was the first to look at climate change and sea level rise. Mr. Hull is often invited to participate on national panels and the Department has been recognized nationally for their planning initiatives. Administrator Ching stated that her personal feeling is that the smallest county in the Pacific has the best planning department.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Administrator Ching if there was a schedule for all the deputy positions who do not fall under a bargaining unit agreement, but serve at the pleasure of the Mayor, and what their salary ranges are, including minimum qualifications for those positions. Vice Chair Katayama asked if Administrator Ching could provide that information. Vice Chair Katayama stated that perhaps department heads could justify if their deputies came in with additional qualifications, that it could perhaps justify a higher salary amount.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked Mr. Hull if there were any special licenses, qualifications, or certifications that might benefit someone serving in his Department, including the Deputy Director. Mr. Hull responded that there is a professional planning certification given by the American Planning Association. That is one certification that might be beneficial. Mr. Hull noted that it is not just a coincidence that all planning departments across the state have or have had an attorney serving in the Deputy Director or Director role, or even both, at certain times. Philosophically, Mr. Hull feels that perhaps two attorneys should not both be “running the ship,” but feels having an attorney in one of the two leadership positions would be beneficial. Vice Chair Katayama stated that he could agree with that sentiment.</p> <p>Mr. Toner asked if Mr. Hull could increase someone’s pay if they obtained that planning certification. Mr. Hull responded that the certification requires a certain number of years in the field, which is 5 years and happens to be the same number of years needed to qualify for the Planning Director position in the County of Kaua’i. The certification requires several years in the field before one can even apply to take the examination. That would</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>lead to someone who knows the field and can meet the certification requirements.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if that would be helpful for recruiting. Mr. Hull responded that he was unsure. He noted that the planners are not at the disparity level that is experienced with engineers, however, there is a huge disparity between government planners and private sector planners. Mr. Hull would acknowledge the ability to provide a higher salary amount for someone who has those certifications but would caution the Commission about making it a requirement to fill the position. While the certification is a good metric, it is not a necessity. Vice Chair Katayama stated that the position could have minimum qualifications, but if additional qualifications are met, that could warrant a higher salary amount.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked if Mr. Hull had a recommended number of years of experience that might be equivalent for the certification. Mr. Hull responded that it is difficult for him to provide an exact number of years. Mr. Hull noted that the Planning Director before him did an excellent job, and he did not have 8 years of experience. Mr. Hull noted that 5 years is a number that has worked as that is the standard for the Planning Director stated in the Charter and that is the number of years set by the American Planning Association for qualification to take the certification examination.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked Mr. Hull if the current spread between the senior staff members and the Deputy Director a limitation on the willingness of people to take on leadership roles. Mr. Hull asked for clarification if Chair Uyehara was referring to the Planning Director position. Chair Uyehara responded that he was referring to the Planning Director or Deputy Director positions. Chair Uyehara stated that he is asking because the Director and Deputy</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Director serves at the pleasure of the Mayor. Mr. Hull quickly clarified that he serves at the pleasure of the Planning Commission, though he does take directives from the Mayor. Chair Uyehara clarified that he meant that the two positions come with less security than staff positions. Mr. Hull responded that Chair Uyehara is correct on that point. Chair Uyehara asked if that would make it difficult to entice someone to step into the role from a civil service position into a department head role. Mr. Hull responded that the job security concern does make it difficult to entice someone to take on the leadership role from a civil service position. Mr. Hull further noted that in the past decade, the Department has not been able to recruit any mid- to higher-level planners to the County from outside of the Department. Everyone in those higher positions have worked their way up. The exception to this fact is 2 mid-level planners who were very clear that they were coming to Kaua'i based on the work that the Planning Department was doing. These planners were attracted to the job, making note that the salary was not up to par with comparable positions elsewhere, but ultimately made the sacrifice in salary to take the position with the County. These employees were eventually promoted so it worked out.</p> <p>Mr. Hull stated that he sees the biggest factor in trying to fill the department head and deputy positions in his Department from the private sector, taking base salary out of the equation, is the dynamic of working with the public. The Department is there to help and manage the built environment, and how the island grows or chooses not to grow in certain areas. Ultimately, the Department is managing change and identity, and what comes with that identity politics with the changes that are taking place. That is an emotional but important process for the community. The public does get frustrated with the various changes or lack of changes and</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>being able to navigate those identity issues with the community while some of them are sometimes screaming is something that has become a more regular occurrence. There have been more police presence at Planning Commission meetings in the recent year than has been experienced in the 20 years prior. Navigating the frustration of the community with seven volunteers serving on the Planning Commission is a tall task to ask of anyone. Mr. Hull noted that he is not envious of the Planning Commission having to find a new Director if he steps down at the end of Mayor Kawakami's final term in office.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that the comments made by Mr. Hull are good food for thought.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked Mr. Hull to clarify his statement that he intends to step down at the end of the Mayor's term. Mr. Hull responded that though the Director position is appointed by the Commission, there have been directors in the past who may not have seen eye-to-eye with the incoming Administration, but who have expressed a desire to remain in the position with the support of the Planning Commission. Mr. Hull clarified that he does not intend to force himself on a new Administration as the new Mayor should be able to assemble the team that they want. Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked Mr. Hull if the new Administration asked him to stay on if he would and if they asked him to step down whether he would do so. Mr. Hull responded that if a new Administration asked him to step down, he would do so. Whether he would continue serving in the Director's role if asked by a new Administration, Mr. Hull responded that that would be up for discussion if that does occur. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that the reason she asked the question was because it gives the Commission a different angle to view the salary structure for that position if the position is filled versus</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>if it is vacant and someone will need to be enticed to fill the role with the proper compensation package. Ms. Chiba-Miguel noted that her thought process is different thinking about the position and salary package with someone currently filling the role versus making it attractive for someone new stepping into the role.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that it might be beneficial for the Commission to hear from a representative from the Planning Commission about their thoughts on compensation, etc. Administrator Ching stated that the Commission heard the Mayor’s remarks about wanting to see a 3-year Salary Resolution so that he can set up the new Administration for a successful transition. Administrator Ching noted that any department head, whether you are commission-appointed or mayoral-appointed, the question for any sitting department head is whether they see eye-to-eye with the new Administration. If they do not, it would make no sense to stay as department head. Staying on when not in agreement with the Administration would lead to a difficult working situation.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama expressed that the Planning Department and Office of Economic Development have a critical role in shaping the community and comprehending what the individual communities on the island will look like. Those two departments tend to be the most underappreciated. Vice Chair Katayama asked the Commission to look at how the Commission can present their findings to the public to give them a sense of ability and feeling that Kaua’i will be kept as they know it as opposed to being transformed, pointing back to the important work that the Planning Department and Office of Economic Development does to impact that. Vice Chair Katayama stated that the department heads not only need to be on board with the Administration, but they also need to be able to temper</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>the community’s response to the work being done. Vice Chair Katayama pointed to the example of the President of the United States of America. The easy thing to do is to step down at times, but the right thing to do is to make sure the needs of the community are articulated and represented. The community plans that the Planning Department have developed are critical. The Department of Water and Kaua’i Island Utility Cooperative need to be critical components of many of these plans. Vice Chair Katayama thanked the Commission for allowing him to share his philosophical viewpoint with them to put the Planning Department’s and Office of Economic Development’s roles on par with departments that may sometimes get more recognition based on their specific public-facing responsibilities.</p> <p>Administrator Ching stated that the current Administration is different than other administrations as they have a lot of attorneys in key positions. The Director of Human Resources is an employment attorney. The Housing Director is an attorney. The Planning Deputy Director is an attorney. Vice Chair Katayama asked if that fact was good or bad. Administration Ching responded that she is married to an attorney, so she is speaking positively about it. Vice Chair Katayama again noted that perhaps the Commission can look at minimum qualifications with additional compensation being given to those who have additional certifications, being an attorney, etc.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama expressed concern with being able to figure out how to compensate fairly for the various positions. Chair Uyehara noted that that is the role and responsibility of the Salary Commission.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara commended the Planning Department and their efforts in tackling tough issues like the vacation rental problem that was experienced</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>previously. Chair Uyehara asked Mr. Hull to submit a memorandum displaying the various recognitions and achievements of the Department so that the information can be shared with the public. The information should show various metrics of how the Department achieved compliance, enforcement, etc. in cracking down on illegal activities. Chair Uyehara asked Mr. Hull to put himself in the shoes of the Salary Commission to be able to justify to the public the proposals being made. Mr. Hull responded that he could provide that information to the Commission. Vice Chair Katayama asked Mr. Hull to include information for not just the Regulatory Division, but for the Long-Range Planning Division as well. Mr. Hull responded that he understood the direction. Ms. Kanna stated that the Planning Department are the rockstars of the planning world throughout the nation, and they should be recognized and compensated as such. Mr. Hull thanked the Commission for their comments.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that by the Salary Commission setting the maximum salaries for the various positions and creating a salary range, the Administration can use that to decide what kind of vision they have for the various departments and whether the vision is to be a minimal department or an aggressive one. Ultimately, the Department will need to go before the Council to justify the budgeted salary amount that will be paid .</p> <p>The Commission thanked Mr. Hull for his appearance before the Commission.</p> <p>The Commission heard from Reiko Matsuyama, Managing Director, who presented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office of the Mayor provides services to all the County's departments. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office of the Mayor’s Operating Budget is approximately \$2.5M, excluding the Office of Boards and Commissions. • There are 11 employees in the Office, which includes the Public Information Office (PIO) team, Executive Administration team, and the Mayor and Managing Director. <p>Mr. Ono asked if the Office of the Mayor includes the Agency on Elderly Affairs, Kaua’i Emergency Management Agency, Transportation Agency, and the Department of Water. Ms. Matsuyama responded that each of those agencies/departments are separate. There is a distinction between agencies and how that was developed through Charter or through Ordinance. If it was created through an ordinance, the office is technically an agency. An example of that would be the Housing Agency. The Agency is under the Office of the Mayor umbrella and the employees are hired not necessarily through the civil service process. For the Salary Commission exercise, those departments/agencies do not fall under the Office of the Mayor.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked if there were any issues with openings or vacancies. Ms. Matsuyama responded that she has only been in the position for a very short time. Since she has occupied the position, she has been lucky to not have many vacancies. There were two PIO positions that had turnover, and both were filled relatively quickly.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Ms. Matsuyama to explain the difference between dotted lines, solid lines, and shaded lines in her organizational chart. Ms. Matsuyama explained that there are Executive Assistants to the Mayor which are appointed positions. Those positions are housed in specific departments to assist them with their operations. There is an</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Executive Assistant to the Mayor in Real Property Assessment for example. They occupy a position within that department. There are a couple of Executive Assistants to the Mayor in the Department of Public Works.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if Ms. Matsuyama could explain the employees noted with dotted lines. Ms. Matsuyama repeated her earlier response that those employees are embedded in the different departments. Vice Chair Katayama asked if those employees are physically in the Mayor’s Office. Ms. Matsuyama responded that they are not physically in the Office of the Mayor but are physically located or embedded in the different departments. Those employees are hired specifically to help those departments with whatever tasks need to get done. In Real Property Assessment, the Mayor hired a prior employee who has a lot of knowledge in the field. Through the typical civil service process, the County could not compensate him fairly for his knowledge and experience, so he was appointed an Executive Assistant to the Mayor at a higher salary amount.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked if those employees are within departments but report to the Office of the Mayor. Ms. Matsuyama responded that Ms. Chiba-Miguel was technically correct in her assessment.</p> <p>Mr. Toner asked if those employees work together with the different departments they are assigned to daily. Ms. Matsuyama responded that Mr. Toner was correct.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked what wage structure those employees were under. Ms. Matsuyama responded that it is up to the discretion of the Mayor as to what salary level to pay them at. All those positions are appointed and in 2026 when the Mayor’s term is up those positions would</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>be at the mercy of the new Administration.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama again asked Ms. Matsuyama what wage structure those employees fell under. Ms. Matsuyama responded that the Mayor could pay them at any salary level.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that it appears those employees do not follow any of the bargaining units' salary schedules. Ms. Matsuyama responded that Ms. Chiba-Miguel was correct.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if there was an issue with wage inversion with people being embedded into the different departments with an undetermined wage level. Administrator Ching responded that there is a tradeoff with those types of positions. For example, the entire Office of Boards and Commissions are in appointed positions. Job security is given up for the flexibility on salary levels. Most of the positions in the Office of Boards and Commissions are clerical positions and are comparable to HGEA Bargaining Unit 3. If Bargaining Unit 3 has an annual increase of 2%, then all the positions in the Office of Boards and Commissions will get a 2% increase as well. However, the employees in her Office are started at a higher pay rate as appointed employees. Administrator Ching further stated that she does not pull salary amounts "out of the sky" but looks at comparable positions, including those within the Office of the Mayor to set her baseline on what level of salaries she will pay the employees in her Office. Appointed positions sacrifice job security for higher salary levels.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that the soft cap on pay ranges for appointed positions is that all the salary amounts must pass the County Council for approval through the budget process. Ms. Matsuyama concurred. Ms.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Matsuyama further noted that when all base salaries are set, comparable salaries within the County and across the state through other jurisdictions are always looked at and evaluated. The Administration tries to prevent inversion issues at the onset of setting salaries.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked how many Executive Assistant to the Mayor positions there were and if they were the 5 that were noted. Ms. Matsuyama responded that Vice Chair Katayama was correct. Vice Chair Katayama asked if those 5 positions were part of the 11 she had on her staff in the Office of the Mayor. Ms. Matsuyama responded that those 5 positions were not counted as a part of the 11 in the Office of the Mayor.</p> <p>Mr. Ono stated that if you add those 5 positions to the 11, the total number becomes more comparable to other jurisdictions. Mr. Toner stated that with changes in the Administration the people filling those positions may possibly lose their jobs. Ms. Matsuyama responded that Mr. Toner was correct and that it would be ideal for the County to keep them based on their experience and knowledge.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked what salary structure the employees in the Office of the Mayor follows. Ms. Matsuyama responded that the Office uses HGEA Bargaining Unit 13 salary structure, however, the Mayor has the discretion to determine the actual range and step for each position though comparable positions are used for that determination.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked if the embedded positions could be eliminated with a new Administration. Ms. Matsuyama responded that the position number would remain with that department, but the position itself might change depending on the needs of that department. If the department decided to</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>hire for a different position, the dotted line on the organizational chart would be removed as that employee would now be a bona fide employee of the department and no longer an embedded employee reporting to the Office of the Mayor.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked if the salaries of the embedded employees came out of the Office of the Mayor’s budget. Ms. Matsuyama responded that their salaries are paid by the individual departments they are housed in.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if any of the positions within the Office of the Mayor were funded by Federal funds. Ms. Matsuyama responded that they were not. Most of the positions are funded by General Funds. Some of the embedded positions indicated with the dotted lines on the organizational chart are funded by the G.E. Tax Fund or the Highway Fund.</p> <p>Mr. Toner asked if the Managing Director had any recommendations for the Commission’s consideration. Ms. Matsuyama responded that the County has a lot of responsibilities. With the introduction of social media and those platforms, the demands of the public have increased not just in quantity but in immediacy. The public wants immediate action. The expectations from the public have grown significantly. The current Administration has addressed some of that increased demand by increasing the funded positions within the budget. There will always be an increasing demand and expectation placed on the County. There are so many different modes of communication these days and when action is not taken immediately, feedback is given immediately by the public. Most of the feedback is negative because there are very few times when someone will provide compliments. The expectation from the public to take immediate action by all departments is highlighted immensely, which</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>causes a strain on everyone. Ms. Matsuyama explained that she does not have a specific recommendation, but asked the Commission to consider how the job has changed over the years.</p> <p>Mr. Toner asked if Ms. Matsuyama wanted the Commission to consider increased compensation due to the increased demands. Ms. Matsuyama responded that she feels like she is too new with the County and in her position to make a statement. Ms. Kanna stated that there is probably not enough that can be paid for the work that Ms. Matsuyama does.</p> <p>Mr. Ono asked about the effectiveness of the prior Salary Resolution. He noted that at the time, the Salary Commission worked very hard at putting forward a Salary Resolution that would not only be effective at retaining employees but that would also help in attracting the most qualified employees to fill the critical department head positions. Mr. Ono asked Ms. Matsuyama for her take on how effective the last Salary Resolution was. Ms. Matsuyama responded that the last Salary Resolution was very much appreciated by the department heads across the County. Some of the departments have a lot more responsibilities, public interaction, and complaints than others. The lift for those departments is a lot greater than others. Overall, as the County recovered from the pandemic, everyone was very appreciative of any salary increase given by the Salary Commission. At the time, the Salary Resolution had to be approved by the Council so the political balance that needed to be maintained was also understood. Ms. Matsuyama stated that the last Salary Resolution did its job regarding recruitment and retention. There has not been a lot of turnovers in the last 3 years. There have been some departures with the Deputy Director of Parks and Recreation and the Executive on Aging, but outside of those departures, it did not appear the departures were salary driven, though the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>former Deputy Director of Parks and Recreation makes a lot more in his new position.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama stated the Salary Resolution process this time around is a lot different than the last round. He asked Ms. Matsuyama what she would recommend to the Commission in terms of public engagement to educate the community. The City and County of Honolulu presented their salary recommendations and that were not well received by the public too well. Vice Chair Katayama explained that whatever the Commission puts forward will be the final salary maximum amounts. Vice Chair Katayama asked if Ms. Matsuyama had any recommendations on how to inform the public as no one wants to find out decisions were made after the fact or through news media coverage. Ms. Matsuyama responded that she does feel the Salary Commission’s work will go public and that the Commission should not expect to be able to fly under the radar with their decisions. The Commission’s work could go on a Council Meeting agenda, but once it reaches that point, the Commission’s work would have already been concluded. Ms. Matsuyama explained that an option for consideration could be to do an editorial piece in The Garden Island, but that she was not sure how effective that mode of media is these days. The editorial could come from the Chair of the Salary Commission. The Public Information Office of the County could also assist with public outreach. Ms. Matsuyama stated that she would not suggest calling a public meeting as that would probably invite only negative feedback. She recommended the Commission make information available as much as possible. Ms. Matsuyama stated that a piece in The Garden Island would be her immediate recommendation.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that with his experience with controversial issues it</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>turned out to be helpful to go on KKCR to do a longform interview with them. He wondered if that might be helpful currently with the many podcasts and streaming platforms that are popular in the community. Ms. Matsuyama responded that she felt that might be helpful and would not disagree with that suggestion at all.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama stated that social media should also be utilized as that is how a lot of the public stays informed. Vice Chair Katayama asked if the PIOs could help the Commission with this part of their task. Administrator Ching responded that the PIOs could help with anything that the Commission may need. Once the memorandum goes over to the Council and it is placed on an agenda, in advance of that, the Commission may want to look at having a public statement ready so that it can be released depending on what the response is to the agenda item. That would be worked out in advance. Anything that is released by a board or commission flows through the Public Information Office. Administrator Ching noted that if there is anticipation that there will be issues from the public that may arise, statements or press releases are usually prepared in advance to be released should the situation warrant it.</p> <p>Mr. Toner stated that the Commission can set the ranges at a higher level and that does not mean that the appointing authority needs to give those amounts. Vice Chair Katayama stated that the Commission must justify the salary levels based on minimum qualifications and other qualifications to justify the levels of pay. Vice Chair Katayama further stated that the Commission will need to look at the annual increases once the base salaries are set.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked if the County Auditor fell under the Office of the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mayor. Ms. Matsuyama responded that the County Auditor falls under the County Council. Administrator Ching added that the County Council has the authority to conduct audits under the Charter.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked Ms. Matsuyama for feedback based on her experience about tying a performance incentive to a performance-based metric. A possible metric could be tying an incentive to a department head managing their department within the set budget or managing overtime within targets set by their respective commission. Ms. Matsuyama responded that she appreciates having goals and objectives. She noted that perhaps the Salary Commission could make a recommendation to the Mayor or the board/commission that if their appointee does this or that, then that appointing authority could then manage the incentive at that point. Ms. Matsuyama expressed some angst about writing that kind of detail into the Salary Resolution. That feeling does not mean adding benchmarks or goals for department heads is not something that should not be considered. Chair Uyehara responded that the Commission could structurally add that the Mayor or board/commission could add objective metrics upon agreement with the County Council that would allow the appointing authority to offer a conditional wage increase. Ms. Matsuyama further responded that she could get behind that approach and could think of additional metrics for the Commission. Chair Uyehara stated that it would be incumbent on the Managing Director to create metrics that would be presented to the County Council to initiate any performance metric increases. Ms. Matsuyama stated that the goals and performance metrics would need to change annually. She further noted that the concept is very different, but having come from the private sector, she is a performance-based compensation proponent. She does not necessarily like across-the-board salary increases that most of the civil servants enjoy. Ms.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Matsuyama also stated that the salaries for the appointed employees are flexible within a range, and she does like performance-based structure that could be tied to salary increases.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that he could see the public understanding, for example, the Planning Department having the difficult task of tackling the vacation rental problem and that would have theoretically been a performance metric that could have been chosen. If the Director of the Planning Department was successful in completing the performance metric, then they would deserve a salary increase. Chair Uyehara further explained that if the salary structure was not based on a performance metric system, then the Commission could possibly end up providing a higher starting salary based on the work of the previous incumbent of that position and is not necessarily tied to that new individual’s performance. There is the possibility that a new department head could get the max cap amount of salary without tying it to performance-based metrics. Ms. Matsuyama cautioned the Commission that those metrics would need to be broad. For a department like the Department of Public Works, their issues revolve around solid waste. If all the metrics are focused solely on solid waste issues, the department head might focus all their attention there ultimately leaving the other divisions out of receiving the needed attention they justifiably deserve. Ms. Matsuyama asked the Commission to ensure that the larger departments can focus on all their responsibilities and not allow any balls to drop because they are so focused on achieving their performance metric for just one area they are responsible for.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama stated that the head of the department would play a role in determining what the key metrics are, and the Mayor would determine whether those key metrics are fulfilling what is in the best</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>interest of the public. Vice Chair Katayama asked if the Mayor and Managing Director should have the performance-based metric incentive as a part of their compensation as well or should the Salary Commission just decide on the amount that those two positions are paid as he wondered who grades the Mayor and the Managing Director. Ms. Matsuyama responded that Vice Chair Katayama posed an interesting question. She noted that the Mayor’s position would be hard to set metrics for. The Managing Director position could have high-level performance metrics that are tied to departmental accomplishments and goals. Ms. Matsuyama expressed that the concept would be difficult, but that it could be a possibility for the Managing Director position.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked what the minimum qualifications were for the Managing Director position. Ms. Matsuyama responded that she had to provide a resume and a copy of her diploma, which she did not need to when she was appointed the Director of Finance. She responded that she has no idea what the minimum qualifications are for her position outside of showing a copy of her college diploma. Ms. Matsuyama further noted that there may be a residency requirement or have voted in the last few election cycles. She stated that she should stop talking as she could feel the Deputy County Attorney “rolling his eyes” at her responses.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama stated that as the Commission reviews options for a performance-based salary structure, setting the appropriate base salary for the various positions, and in reviewing the minimum qualifications for the positions, this same exercise was done when the County modified the salary schedule for the engineering positions and what the Commission may possibly evaluate for attorneys. The question for the Commission to answer is whether the County should subsidize for college education or</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>other educational requirements related to student loan assistance or forgiveness.</p> <p>The Commission thanked Ms. Matsuyama for appearing before the Commission.</p> <p>The Commission heard from Ellen Ching, Boards and Commissions Administrator. Vice Chair Katayama jokingly asked if Administrator Ching had to declare a conflict of interest. Administrator Ching presented the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office of Boards and Commission has 6 positions including an Administrator, an Administrative Specialist, and 4 Support Clerks. • Currently, the Office employs an Emergency Hire who works on the minutes for the Salary Commission. She is working on another Emergency Hire as she has two executive searches going on with the Liquor Control Commission and the Police Commission. In total, that would bring the Office's total to 7 full-time equivalent positions as the 2 Emergency Hires are working on a part-time basis. • The purpose of the Office is to provide administrative support for 17 boards, commissions, and committees. • The Administrator is a Mayoral appointee. <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked what an Emergency Hire was. Administrator Ching responded that the minute that she was given the task of spinning up a Salary Resolution in a short period of time, she asked the Administration for the ability to seek an Emergency Hire, because she knew that she would need to have an accelerated schedule of meetings and that would entail almost weekly meetings. She wanted to ensure that the Commission would be able to get their minutes finished on a timely basis</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>because of the rapid schedule. Rather than overwhelming the current full-time staff with an additional responsibility for staffing and completing minutes for weekly meetings, Administrator Ching explained that she needed to seek out an Emergency Hire. Vice Chair Katayama asked for clarification on the difference between the hiring process for an Emergency Hire versus a regular hire. Administrator Ching clarified that for an Emergency Hire, she had to get a position number which she borrowed from the Department of Parks & Recreation, and that person is assigned to work on the minutes for the Salary Commission. Vice Chair Katayama asked if the emergency work will ever end or if that position becomes a permanent position. Administrator Ching responded that the Emergency Hire position is just a temporary position. This Emergency Hire will remain filled for a little while after the conclusion of the work of the Salary Commission. Prior to that, an Emergency Hire was needed to do work for the Office as there was a vacancy in the Office that was not filled for a couple of years. For the Office to not fall behind on the work that would have been completed by the staff member, the duties of the boards or commissions that would have been staffed by that position were divided up between the remaining staff members. The task of transcribing the minutes of the meetings for those 4 boards or commissions was given to the Emergency Hire so that the Office would not fall behind or be in violation of the Sunshine Law. The vacant position was just recently filled, then the task of having to have weekly Salary Commission meetings was put on her task list. The Emergency Hire agreed to continue to work on Salary Commission minutes due to the expedited timeline. Just recently, Administrator Ching received notice of another resignation from her Office, so the Office will be in a similar type of situation.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if the Emergency Hire provision sunsets.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Administrator Ching responded that it will sunset when the Office no longer has the need for it. For example, if the Salary Commission returns to monthly meetings, then she would not need someone to transcribe expedited meeting minutes. Vice Chair Katayama asked if the position was being filled from wherever she was borrowing the position from. Administrator Ching acknowledged that the position number is being filled by someone that she selected. Vice Chair Katayama asked if the position being discussed is like the Mayor's positions that were indicated with the dotted line. Administrator Ching responded that Emergency Hires are temporary hires. The Mayor's positions are embedded in the various departments as full-time employees, and they are placed there to move forward on construction projects. In the Mayor's first term, there was a large amount of Federal dollars to do various housing projects such as the one by the Department of Water. There were strict timelines tied to the Federal funding and those dollars would have been lost if the project was not expedited. Housing development projects that usually take 10+ years were done within 1 year. This was done using one of the Mayor's Executive Assistant to the Mayor positions. Another Executive Assistant to the Mayor position is used to expedite construction and capital projects, and that position is housed in the Department of Public Works.</p> <p>Mr. Ono stated that he is not sure how other offices of boards and commissions operate but expressed his appreciation to Administrator Ching and her staff for the management of the various boards and commissions and to keep the volunteer commissioners on task. Mr. Ono also expressed his admiration for Administrator Ching being able to place commissioners in appropriate roles, especially on boards or commissions that have the responsibility to retain and recruit department heads. Mr. Ono further stated that he appreciates the staff being able to provide any</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>necessary information requested so that they can make informed decisions that will best serve the public. Mr. Ono asked if there was much comparison in other counties related to the Office of Boards and Commissions. Administrator Ching responded that she has not had much contact with Mayor Bissen’s or Mayor Almeida’s staff. Previous to Mayor Almeida, Administrator Ching had a lot of contact with former Mayor Roth’s person in charge of boards and commission on the Big Island. There was just one person in the Office of the Mayor. That person indicated that they had difficulty getting people confirmed for boards and commissions. They expressed themselves having difficulty filling positions. In former Mayor Victorino’s office, Administrator Ching had a contact that she kept in touch with. On the Big Island, their Managing Director was looking into proposing a charter amendment to look at forming an Office of Boards and Commissions due to the interaction that she had with them. The role of getting volunteers to sit on boards and commissions is a detailed process. The Administrator needs to keep their ear to the ground to hear if there is any opposition to various appointments and to gain support for that nominee during their appointment process before the County Council. There is a vetting process for everyone person applying to serve on a board or commission. That happens before the application is sent to the Council. There is also the aspect of providing training and support prior to the board or commission meeting and the work that is needed to provide support to the board or commission during meetings and in follow-up requests. Administrator Ching stated that she personally staffs all the Permitted Interaction Groups (PIGs), so she has to draft up the reports that are presented from the PIGs to the boards or commissions. Administrator Ching explained the enormous amount of front-end and back-end work that needs to get done to adequately support the work of each board or commission as defined in the Charter.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Administrator Ching stated that she shockingly loves her job, and she never thought she would work in government. She has met a lot of people that she would otherwise have not met. Each board and commission are very different and the work that is done is fascinating to her. She calls this job her “retirement hobby,” and it has been a great hobby.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked how long the Office had been in place. Administrator Ching responded that the Office of Boards and Commissions was established in 2006.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Administrator Ching where her position would be placed amongst positions in other jurisdictions if she had to find a comparable position or type of position. Administrator Ching responded that she would need to do more research on that question. In the other counties, there is no office of boards and commissions. At the State level, there is an Office of Boards and Commissions, but she is not clear on how that office is staffed.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked Administrator Ching if she had any recommendations for the Commission. Ms. Kanna stated that she feels Administrator Ching might be the boldest with her recommendations. Administrator Ching reminded the Commission that she is a Mayoral appointee. She had been given the assignment to put forward a Salary Resolution before the Council by March 15. Her recommendation is to review the draft Salary Resolution that was prepared. The draft was done based on the discussions that have occurred and taking the Mayor’s message to heart about trying to look at inversions and trying to deal with that. Administrator Ching stated that she knows the Commission can see that the issue of inversion is a very complex</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>issue to tackle. Administrator Ching further stated that the Commission will have the unenviable task to propose a salary structure that will not only attract people to serve in leadership positions but one that also helps to retain qualified individuals to want to continue their service. Administrator Ching stated that her recommendation would be to look at a very minimalist Salary Resolution for 3 years and to put that before the County Council, and then to continue meeting monthly to dig into the salary inversion and other issues that are important to the Commission. Those other complex and textured Salary Resolution items can be targeted to deal with some of the more complex issues that the Commission has discussed. Those issues include salary inversions and performance-based incentives. Those two issues in and of itself will take additional meetings of discussion.</p> <p>Administrator Ching stated that the Salary Resolution that she would propose is in draft form. Administrator Ching distributed a handout to the Commission. The handout was a press release from the Governor that teed up the budget process at the State Legislature. The Governor talked about having budget set aside for 3.5% increase for new collective bargaining contracts. Administrator Ching stated that from a union perspective, if the State and counties are entering into union negotiations currently, those do not typically get completed until at the earliest the end of summer. Administrator Ching noted that if the State disclosed the ceiling at 3.5%, the unions will probably start their negotiations at a much higher amount like 10% salary increases. Based on input from the Department of Human Resources (HR), it would be prudent for the Commission to not compromise the State and counties negotiation position by proposing extraordinary salary increases, but instead modest 3.5% increases across-the-board for 3 years. That amount is very minimal, but it also affords the Commission the time to look at and dig deeper into the other issues that</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>have been brought up in discussion. These proposals can be floated in a subsequent Salary Resolution in the near future. Administrator Ching stated that her recommendation would be for the Commission to wait until the union negotiations have been completed, slated for the end of the summer to see where everything lands in the negotiation process. Administrator Ching further explained that her recommendation to the Commission is probably a lot lower than what department heads and deputies are anticipating, however, her recommendation is very conservative considering the ongoing union negotiations and the other factors that warrant consideration. She feels confident in bringing that proposal to the Mayor’s cabinet and providing the justification behind it.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked if the Commission could put forward a Salary Resolution and then amend it at a future time. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that she understood Administrator Ching wanting to get a simple proposal before the Mayor and the Council and then work on more detailed aspects of a future Salary Resolution. Administrator Ching responded in the affirmative.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Administrator Ching what the cost of the 3.5% increase over 3 years would cost. Administrator Ching responded that she could pencil that cost out for the Commission. The draft Resolution also incorporates the Commission electing to allow, because of the free health insurance premiums, the allowance of monthly medical benefits in Article IV of the draft Resolution. If department heads do not elect for any medical benefit from the County, then they will be eligible to receive the monthly stipend afforded to other employees. For full disclosure, Administrator Ching stated that that benefit would benefit her personally as she does not get health insurance from the County.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked if the monthly medical benefit stipend was not already being offered. Administrator Ching responded that it was not afforded to the department heads and deputies and was not included in the last Salary Resolution. Chair Uyehara mentioned that he was going to comment that when he read the draft Resolution the other day upon receipt, that the language needs to be clarified that the amount that would be allowed would not be accounted for against the established salary cap or increases the cap by the amount of the benefit. Administrator Ching asked Deputy County Attorney Michaels if he heard Chair Uyehara’s comment. Deputy County Attorney Michaels asked Chair Uyehara to repeat his request. Chair Uyehara stated that language needs to be added for clarification in Article IV that the cap for the position is increased by the amount of benefit if they elect to take that particular benefit, otherwise the language states that the benefit can be taken, but their salary cap would not be increased accordingly. The way the language was drafted makes it appear as if the benefit is elected, the cap would have to include accounting for that benefit instead of being in addition to the benefit. Deputy County Attorney Michaels acknowledged the Chair’s request.</p> <p>Administrator Ching further explained that in the draft Salary Resolution, it includes the recommendations of HR to allow an existing employee that steps into a director or deputy director position, that the person would be allowed to maintain their civil service. Vice Chair Katayama asked if that language was contained in Article III of the draft Resolution. Administrator Ching confirmed that Vice Chair Katayama was correct. She further noted that she asked HR to be present to get more into details on that recommendation. HR will also be providing an explanation for that recommendation as Administrator Ching anticipated that the Commission</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>would inquire about the cost of that proposed recommendation.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked how the County defines “salary.” He noted that he thought the issue boiled down to additional pay and other pay compensation items that caused the problems. Administrator Ching responded that the salary structure is what led to many of the problems. If the leadership positions do not get or work overtime then the problem would be different. Vice Chair Katayama explained that someone in a civil service position would lose portions of overtime, other compensation, and additional compensation. The definition of salary is important and whether that includes historic compensation in its entirety or just the base salary amount. Administrator Ching responded that HR was on their way.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked for a short recess.</p> <p>There being no objections, the meeting was recessed at 10:56 a.m.</p> <p>There being no objections, the meeting was called back to order at 11:02 a.m. and proceeded as follows:</p> <p>Administrator Ching noted that Ms. Rapozo had a prior engagement at 12:00 p.m. Administrator Ching reminded the Commission that they are currently reviewing Article III. Administrator Ching distributed a handout to the Commission that Ms. Rapozo was going to review with them.</p> <p>The Commission heard from Janine Rapozo, HR Manager III. Ms. Rapozo explained that Administrator Ching had asked her to prepare the cost of the potential cost of the salary increases if Section III was passed by the Commission. Section III would allow a current civil servant to keep their</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>compensation structure if they elect to take a leadership position. Ms. Rapozo stated that she did a very quick analysis using whole numbers. She did not use what the Salary Commission was reviewing or what any current employee is making. The comparison is not one-for-one. If that civil servant moves into the department head or deputy position, and they are going to take their salary with them, then whoever takes that person's place is probably not going to be making that same level of salary as it will probably be filled with someone with less experience or different employment situations. Cost-wise, it may be less to allow HR to implement Section III, it could amount to more, or it could stay the same. The color-coded sheet that was distributed to the Commission includes various scenarios of what might occur depending on variables. Ms. Rapozo explained the following situations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Employee A was a civil servant and the Salary Commission recommended the Deputy for that position gets paid \$150,000, but the civil servant does not want to take the position because he/she gets paid \$200,000, the total cost to the department is \$350,000 no matter where that person goes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The first scenario would be the person saying they will not be willing to take the Deputy position, and the department needs to hire someone from the outside. That cost would be \$200,000 + \$150,000 = \$350,000. ○ The next example says that Employee A agrees to take the Deputy position because they can now keep their \$200,000 salary. The Deputy is now going to get paid \$200,000. The replacement for that civil service position could be \$150,000 and in that example, there would be no added cost. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The next example in yellow says that the person filling the vacancy is going to be making less than the previous incumbent, so the department would realize a cost savings. ○ The final example, which is very unlikely, is that the person filling the vacancy would be making more. This would mean the department brought in someone who has more experience than the person filling the civil service position and has probably been there for many years. ○ The chart reflects the various scenarios explained above and how that cost could vary if Section III were to be implemented. <p>Mr. Toner stated that getting to the \$200,000 for that hypothetical employee includes overtime costs. There are various scenarios that could play out with someone electing to work overtime, someone who does not work overtime, and someone filling the civil service position and not working the same amount of overtime. Ms. Rapozo responded that Mr. Toner is correct. There are some civil service positions that are very high and close to \$200,000. There are two positions who are engineers. Both are licensed engineers, and they are paid a base salary of \$184,000. With their overtime, most times department heads instruct their staff to have their lower-level positions do the overtime work. Similarly for the Police Department, an Assistant Chief who is at \$170,000, the lower-level officers should be assigned overtime work. There are times that the Assistant Chief might have to be present when they had the fugitive who ran away, the Assistant Chief had to work on that case. Other than that, as someone advances through the chain of command, their overtime should decrease if it is properly managed. In certain cases, the inversion may not continue to be there. Right now, the inversion is so great and that is why the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>inversion report is so massive. That has decreased as the Salary Commission has provided higher salaries throughout the County. Right now, the County is at another point where the inversion continues to get worse. It depends on what the salary base is set at and that will determine the overtime cost factor and whether it is a factor or not in causing inversion.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that the language is written so that the employee is compensated as if they did not leave their civil service position, which points to the structure of their compensation package. Chair Uyehara asked if his understanding that those employees would still be eligible for overtime but would not necessarily get the same level of compensation if they do not work the overtime hours in their new position was accurate. Ms. Rapozo responded that Chair Uyehara was correct. Ms. Rapozo further stated that when someone works overtime, the hours still need to be put in. It is not as if the person is just getting an amount for not working the hours. These employees are working overtime hours to get the overtime pay in their current position. The benefit that is missing for department heads or deputies is the ability to work overtime even though most work more than 40 hours per week, as that compensation was supposedly built into their higher base salary amount.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked if there is even a mechanism in place to track overtime for the Salary Resolution positions. As an example, Chair Uyehara used the example of Mr. Hinazumi at the Department of Water. He asked if Mr. Hinazumi was to take the Deputy position as a result of Article III passing, if there was a mechanism to track his overtime as the Deputy Manager of the Department of Water. Ms. Rapozo responded that there is a way for overtime to be tracked and that Mr. Hinazumi is a good example to use.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Right now, Mr. Hinazumi is functioning as the Deputy, but he stayed in his civil service position. He is occupying 2 positions, which is not an ideal situation as one of those other positions cannot be filled. If he were to move to the Deputy position under proposed Article III, he would go into the position as if he never left his civil service position similar to what the current Deputy Chief of Police did, and Mr. Hinazumi’s civil service position can then be filled.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked if the department head or deputy fills out time sheets like other employees. Ms. Rapozo responded that every employee completes a time sheet. Chair Uyehara stated that he was unaware of that.</p> <p>Mr. Ono asked if the proposed Article III would be applicable to the department head or deputy positions. Ms. Rapozo responded that for most departments it would be applicable to both. There are a couple of agencies where the head of the department is a civil service employee like the Kaua’i Emergency Management Agency, Transportation Agency, or Agency on Elderly Affairs. Administrator Ching stated that the proposed Article III would only cover positions that are covered by the Salary Resolution, which are most department head and deputy positions. If the Commission is concerned about potential abuse, then overtime for the deputy is not so much of an issue because the department head would need to approve that. If the Commission wanted to institute a prohibition of overtime for the director’s positions, that would be a reasonable inclusion. Anyone taking a department head position does so with the understanding that they need to work the hours needed to get the job done. Administrator Ching stated that she comes from the private sector and the position is what it is. If someone wants the position then they need to understand that working longer hours comes with the position. Ms. Rapozo added that</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>when someone is in an exempt position, they do not need to put in 40 hours per week as well while still getting the salary assigned to you. If you work a lot of hours one week, you can make the adjustments the following week to balance your schedule. Those employees will still get paid their salary regardless.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked if there is a cost benefit for allowing someone to take their current compensation structure instead of taking their total compensation and making that their new base in a deputy role without the possibility of overtime. For an employee, that would be beneficial for their retirement calculations. Ms. Chiba-Miguel further asked if retirement was based on total compensation. Ms. Rapozo reminded the Commission that as she had previously explained to them, retirement calculations are based on when that employee was hired. Employees hired before July 2012; overtime is considered in retirement calculations. For employees hired after July 2012, overtime is not considered in retirement calculations. Ms. Rapozo explained that the concern with allowing overtime is the potential abuse of someone setting themselves up with a bulk of overtime so that they can take that with them as a part of their base. It leaves room for that kind of abuse to occur. There may also be complaints from someone who says they may not have worked overtime in the current year, but worked a lot the previous year. The simplest form would be to allow someone to take their salary structure with them.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked the philosophical question about department heads and deputies taking the job, having their performance rated by performance-based measurements, and understanding that it takes what it takes to get the job done. By initiating Article III, is the Commission now adding in the expectation that department heads and deputies are now</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>eligible for overtime. Ms. Rapozo responded that overtime hours still must be approved. Vice Chair Katayama interjected and asked that as a management philosophy, should the Mayor get overtime. As a department head or deputy, the expectations are way different than if the person is a regular employee within the department. There are bargaining unit considerations that drive the allowance of overtime and that is the HR structure of the County. To take that and inject that into the department head and deputy positions, Vice Chair Katayama asked if that is something philosophically right to do. Ms. Rapozo responded that philosophically, the proposed Article III should not be eligible for elected officials. For department heads and deputies, Ms. Rapozo explained that she lived through that as the former Director of HR. Right now, if she remained in the Director position, she would lose approximately \$40,000 per year if she stayed as the Director, and that is without overtime compensation. Ms. Rapozo stated that she often works late and does not claim overtime compensation. Ms. Rapozo stated that overtime in her opinion is a management issue. The Mayor can administratively decide that none of his department heads or deputies can receive overtime. Commissions could make the same decision for their appointees. Ms. Rapozo stressed that again, overtime is a management issue. When she sees high-level positions taking overtime, it is bothersome to her. She feels those positions know going in that to get the job done, overtime might be worked. Unfortunately, the collective bargaining aspect of government allows for those higher-level employees to get compensated for the worked overtime. Ms. Rapozo stated that she is allowed to get compensation for the overtime she works, but she was brought up in the old-style where you work, get the job done, and work the hours needed to get the job done. There are not too many who live under those sets of values in the workforce.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if in today’s environment, whether there needs to be that line in the sand as the workforce is a lot different than with previous generations. Vice Chair Katayama expressed that Ms. Rapozo was a part of the older generation. Vice Chair Katayama explained that as the senior member in the room, he has the latitude to make that kind of comment. Mr. Toner explained that in the private sector, one of the fundamental challenges that he sees is that the occurrence of what is being discussed is happening at the entry-level management positions as well as with the higher-level positions. The wage inversion occurs because there is not a higher differential between the regular employees and the department heads and deputies. Mr. Toner feels that the salary differential is truly the crux of the problems being experienced. The fact is that the department heads and deputies will always work more hours than they get compensated for.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that Chief Raybuck noted that fact in his testimony to the Commission. Right now, the Deputy does work a lot of overtime, but he does not log any of it. The Deputy could log that overtime, he just does not out of principle. Administrator Ching stated that it really depends on the directive given by the Administration. Administrator Ching explained that her former boss told them that if anyone wants overtime they can go find another job. The message from that former boss was very clear. Under this current Administration the directive is that if someone is appointed, do not even try to claim overtime compensation.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo stated that the intent of the proposed Article III was to at least provide the option for someone to take their higher base salary with them. That is where the inversion occurred for a lot of the employees.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Vice Chair Katayama asked what the definition of “base salary” was. Ms. Rapozo responded that the base salary is indicated in the first column of the spreadsheet. Ms. Chiba-Miguel chimed in that the base salary is the left-hand column of the spreadsheet and total compensation was the right-hand column of the spreadsheet. Vice Chair Katayama stated that when reading the proposed Article III, it just references “salary.” Chair Uyehara corrected Vice Chair Katayama and stated that the draft Resolution reads, “...in lieu of the respective salary...” someone will take their total compensation. Vice Chair Katayama stated that total compensation includes their overtime compensation and to him, that is where it becomes problematic. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that someone could take their salary structure and perhaps that could become a key performance indicator (KPI) for the director to decide on for the deputy.</p> <p>Mr. Toner asked if the deputies were non-exempt employees. Ms. Rapozo responded that deputies are exempt employees. Mr. Toner asked if they do not qualify for overtime. Ms. Rapozo responded that Mr. Toner was correct. The only position that is afforded overtime is the Deputy Chief of Police position. Ms. Rapozo clarified that even in his Assistant Chief, Mr. Ozaki was exempt, however, the collective bargaining agreement is what is driving some of the overtime. Those from the private sector would not understand the collective bargaining agreement provisions because typical companies only pay overtime for hours worked over 40 hours per week. Mr. Ozaki was eligible for overtime for any hours worked over 8 hours per the collective bargaining agreement. Some collective bargaining agreements allow overtime after just 5 hours of work if there is no lunch break given. All those structural items would be what Mr. Ozaki is allowed to take with him into the Deputy Chief position. Mr. Ozaki would not be</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>allowed to take with him the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) overtime no matter where he is. The only thing he brought to his new position is the provisions from the collective bargaining agreement.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if that overtime is separate from that which is allowed in the comparable Bargaining Unit agreement. Ms. Rapozo responded that Mr. Ozaki is already excluded managerial. He is not in the collective bargaining agreement but is in an excluded managerial civil service position which gives him no less than what the collective bargaining agreement gives him. The County must give him all the overtime and differentials that the collective bargaining agreement gives him, which includes night differential, additional pay cost items, etc. For some of the other positions it is very minimal. The office department heads or deputies would not have much additional pay as their positions do not have any of those cost items attached to their positions. If the Commission wants to allow that structure to be given without the overtime tie, the Commission could decide to do that. The reason that the Commission afforded that to the Deputy Chief position was to allow those in the civil service ranks to have the motivation to want to become department heads and deputies. Without looking at overtime, people at their base were already declining. If the Commission wants to pass the provision in the proposed Article III taking out the ability to collect overtime, that might be a strong consideration for the Commission.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked what the mechanism is that she is describing. Ms. Rapozo responded that Mr. Ozaki is treated in the Deputy Chief position as if he is still an Assistant Chief. Everything he received as an Assistant Chief; he would still receive. If he does not work overtime hours, he will not get it. He must work overtime and record it to get paid for it.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if all the rules about working a certain number of hours during the workday and receiving various differentials, if that would accompany Mr. Ozaki in his role as the Deputy Chief. Ms. Rapozo responded that Vice Chair Katayama was accurate in his assessment. Vice Chair Katayama asked if there was a name for that specific mechanism. Ms. Rapozo responded that HR refers to it “as if you never left the position.” Vice Chair Katayama asked if that was the technical term. Ms. Rapozo responded that there was no other technical term, so she was unsure exactly what Vice Chair Katayama was asking for.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama how that process was created and under what statute. Chair Uyehara and Administrator Ching responded that the Salary Commission created that through Salary Resolution 2020-2. Vice Chair Katayama asked if that was only specific to Fire and Police. Administrator Ching responded that it was only for the Police Department. Ms. Rapozo responded that it was only for the Deputy Chief of Police position as well. Administrator Ching further noted that there are a couple of reasons why the provision specific to the Deputy Chief of Police is being recommended for other departments is to encourage internal employees to consider leadership positions whether it be the deputy or department head. In addition to that, there are situations like with the Department of Water and Department of Public Works where the specific provision would help to address inversion within those departments. Vice Chair Katayama also stated that it would also help with the Engineering Division. Administrator Ching stated that there is inversion with the County Engineer and with the Deputy Manager of the Department of Water, and the provision would help to address some of the inversion occurring and to encourage internal applicants to apply for leadership positions.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Toner asked if the goal is to keep the same base salary but also includes the other pay and additional pay categories to the amount to keep the entire compensation whole. Ms. Rapozo responded that the key component is the overtime pay amount which affects the total compensation. Mr. Toner asked if the person would come in with a lower base salary. Chair Uyehara responded that the person would move into the higher position with the same base salary and pay structure that they had in their civil service position. Mr. Toner asked if someone was hired from outside the County, if that person would have a higher base salary. Chair Uyehara responded that that would not necessarily be the case. Ms. Rapozo also responded that the person would not necessarily come in with a higher salary and would think that someone from the outside would come in at a lower salary amount. Mr. Toner clarified that he was talking just about base salary and not total compensation.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara explained that the proposed Article III is a stopgap measure that is conceptually simple that at least allows current staff to step up without losing anything. Chair Uyehara continued that the real solution may not necessarily be what the proposed Article III is proposing to do. Right now, it is the simplest stopgap. Mr. Toner responded that he understands that clearly. He was just trying to do the math to see how it pencils out. He noted that the civil service pay for Employee A was \$200,000. The position that the person had before had a base salary that was less, with the inversion problem occurring generally because of overtime and everything else. Ms. Rapozo and Chair Uyehara both responded that that was not always the case. Ms. Rapozo further elaborated that in her situation that was not the case. If she came over with a base salary of \$200,000 because she is “old” and has been with the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>County for many years, she does not have any overtime, but her salary is still higher. Mr. Toner said that he understood the example that Ms. Rapozo was providing.</p> <p>Mr. Toner asked if some inversion situations involved overtime pay. Ms. Rapozo responded that overtime pay was the cause of the inversion in the Fire Department. Mr. Toner asked if that person were to take the higher position if they would be advanced with just their base salary or their base salary plus the overtime amount. Ms. Rapozo responded that their maximum would just be their base salary amount. Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked if the Salary Commission could then increase the range for the position if that person has a total compensation amount of \$220,000. She further asked if the Salary Commission at that time would have the authority to give that person a small raise since the employee is now serving in an elevated role or whether they would have to remain at that base because they chose to stay within their current structure. Mr. Toner stated that he agrees that the provision proposed in Article III should be done, he is just unsure of the specific mechanics of it should the Commission be questioned as to why that provision was added to the Salary Resolution.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Ms. Rapozo to help him understand a hypothetical situation. Vice Chair Katayama explained that in the salary inversion schedule, there is a Police Captain. His base salary is \$140,000 and had additional pay of \$16,000 and other pay of \$14,000. His overtime was \$41,000. His total compensation was \$211,000. Vice Chair Katayama asked if that Police Captain decides to step up as the Deputy Chief of Police, what his salary would be. Ms. Rapozo responded that the \$140,000 would be carried over as the base salary. If the proposed Article III is passed, then for sure the person would carry over his base salary amount. The other and</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>additional pay amounts may include a subsidized vehicle allowance, standard of conduct differential, etc. If the amounts are given to the employee no matter what position you are in you do not have to work it to get it, as in overtime, that amount would also be carried over as a part of his base salary amount. It would be no different than when the Salary Commission allowed the Chief of Police and Fire Chief to get a uniform allowance, gun allowance, standard of conduct pay, etc. In a real-life example, the Chief has a base salary of \$147,000 as his base salary. The \$15,064 and \$1,300 were amounts due to the passage of previous Salary Commission Resolutions which afforded those additional allowances to the Chief. Those amounts would come to the hypothetical person as well. Right now, previous Salary Resolutions address those other and additional pay amounts already. No other department other than Police and Fire has those types of allowances. No other department head or deputy would have any of those other types of differentials added to their base salaries automatically.</p> <p>Again, Vice Chair Katayama referenced the Police Captain example stepping into the Deputy Chief of Police role, he asked what that person's salary would be under the Salary Resolution and proposed Article III. Ms. Rapozo responded that she was not sure if some of the additional pay amounts were for meal allowances. Vice Chair Katayama asked Ms. Rapozo to assume that all those amounts would be included. Ms. Rapozo responded that you could subtract the \$41,358, because he must work that overtime as the Deputy to get that pay. The overtime pay amount could be \$0 or it could be more than \$41,358. The assumption is that when you move into that position, you will not be doing as much overtime. Ms. Rapozo elaborated on the importance of management's responsibility when it comes to controlling overtime. Vice Chair Katayama stated that</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>the inversion would not be solved as the employee is set to lose approximately \$41,000. Ms. Rapozo responded that the employee is also working less hours. He is not working that much overtime so on an hourly rate, he will be making out. He is not working those hours.</p> <p>Ms. Kanna asked if that person were to work overtime, if that person would get overtime at a higher rate. Ms. Rapozo responded that he would get overtime at his current rate. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that the rate would increase as the Commission is proposing to take additional pay and other pay and adding it to the base salary. Chair Uyehara responded that that would not be an accurate statement. Ms. Rapozo stated that the base salary amount would come over as-is. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that she understood. Ms. Rapozo noted that if the collective bargaining agreement changes, that all those numbers will also change. Right now, if the collective bargaining increases salaries by 5-10% and the Salary Commission does nothing for department heads and deputies, there will already be a salary inversion issue. Since the Salary Resolution does not indicate that whatever the collective bargaining units receive will also be received by those on the Salary Resolution, there will always be the issue of inversion. It is very difficult to predict where the union negotiations will end up at and what each collective bargaining unit will receive. Right now, there is no contract on the table. If they receive 10% and the Salary Commission only gives increases of 8%, the positions on the Salary Resolution are behind the 8-ball again. Ms. Rapozo noted that that is a part of the ongoing problem. No one ever knows where the collective bargaining will end up. Each collective bargaining unit's agreement could be much different than others within the County. Unfortunately, that is the collective bargaining system that is in place.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Ono asked if someone enacting proposed Article III and stepping up to a leadership position’s salary would remain the same and never change. Ms. Rapozo responded that it would because if the collective bargaining agreement changes, then that person’s salary would change as well. That would help that person go up with their collective bargaining counterparts. They are not losing out on any of the raises because they are still in the position that gives them those raises. They do not have to wait for the Salary Commission to make a decision. Chair Uyehara added that the language contained in proposed Article III is set so that the employee would track as if they were still in their previous collective bargaining position. If the collective bargaining agreement is changed so they get an additional benefit, then that person stepping into the leadership role with that provision would also get that additional benefit. Mr. Ono stated that he was trying to look at the issue through a different lens as it appears overtime plays a major role for those who use the “track as if you never left” provision. Mr. Ono suggested that the Commission add in a note that would read, “not to exceed 20%” so in that way, the overtime and other pay items would be included in the salary total. Mr. Ono provided an example of a Police Lieutenant making a salary of \$186,000 a year. The Deputy position is \$149,000. The \$186,000 includes additional pay, other pay, and overtime pay. Rather than maintaining the \$186,000, the person does not need to work overtime...Mr. Ono stated that he was just thinking of way to make things as simplified as possible by lumping everything into one single salary figure versus having to track all the different allowances, etc. Ms. Rapozo responded that she had thought the Chief of Police recommended amounts of not less than 5% over the highest line employee’s salary for the Deputy Chief and Chief of Police positions. Ms. Rapozo stated that she told Chief Raybuck that his concept is problematic because if you have a department like the Office of the County Attorney,</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>their highest civil servant is very low because they just have Legal Clerks. Their salary is going to be very low and that would not be fair to the attorneys in that office. In the Office of the County Attorney, there are no civil service attorneys so you would never have a situation where someone would move from a civil service position into an appointed department head or deputy position. There are a lot of idiosyncrasies with the proposed Article III, but HR thought that that was the best way to immediately address some of the inversion issues while also attracting internal applicants to take leadership roles. Ms. Rapozo noted that based on the last few department head hiring processes, there may have been one person per department who was an internal applicant interested in taking on a leadership role from an internal position. No one applied internally for the Chief of Police position. There was 1 internal applicant for the Fire Chief position. There were no internal applicants for the Director of Liquor Control position. All the applicants came from outside of the County. Administrator Ching stated that there was one applicant from Hawai'i, but was not internal from the County of Kaua'i. Ms. Rapozo stated that for the Director of Human Resources, there was one internal applicant. The fact that there were minimal to no internal applicants was a frustration expressed by the County Council. These people coming from the mainland can double-dip into their retirement from another jurisdiction while collecting pay and benefits from their new County positions. Retirees from within the State of Hawai'i retirement system, which includes the County, cannot collect from their retirement and their salaries as they are all a part of the same retirement system. Administrator Ching stated that what Ms. Rapozo just explained was one of the criticisms from all the boards or commissions responsible for hiring department heads. The comment made by these boards or commissions was always why is no one local ever hired or why are there never internal applicants interested in the position.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Administrator Ching stated that if no one local applies for the position then one cannot be hired and there are also no internal applicants.</p> <p>Mr. Ono stated that approximately 60% of the inversion issues are because of overtime. If someone is taking a deputy or director position and you are not required to make late calls or other pay opportunities, that position is already losing out on the opportunity to maintain their salary by taking a higher position. Mr. Ono stated that he is struggling with that fact and how the position can be made attractive knowing that a loss in salary is inevitable. Chair Uyehara responded that there needs to be distinction whereas the Chief of Police stated that he is always on call as they serve as a public affairs official and always must be ready to respond. The Fire Chief on the other hand stated that he had a much better work-life balance working 40-45 hours per week and he appreciated the ability to be with his family. The Fire Chief was able to see the tradeoff because he saw his work-life balance benefit of not working the overtime hours. Both positions worked hours that would qualify for overtime, they are just not collecting for them. Mr. Ono wondered if the Fire Chief was making the statement as someone who is already retired and not needing to work the overtime hours to make a living. He noted that the situation could be completely different for someone who may be the best qualified for the position but does not have a retirement status coming in or who is from Hawai'i and they cannot "double dip."</p> <p>Chair Uyehara reiterated that the proposed Article III is a stopgap measure. Conceptually, it is the simplest thing that can be done to at least let internal candidates step up. That is not necessarily the right solution because it only applies to internal candidates, there is an issue with lost overtime, etc. It incrementally improves the issue relating to internal candidates applying,</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>but they would still need to deal with the loss of overtime or the political ramifications of recording overtime if you are the Chief of Police, etc. Chair Uyehara noted that there is a much more complicated, but necessary structural set of changes that could potentially fix the problem the right way. The Commission may not be able to figure that out by the March 15 deadline. Administrator Ching, Ms. Kanna, and Ms. Chiba-Miguel expressed concurrence. Administrator Ching reiterated that her recommendations were a very conservative approach that in her mind the Commission could possibly take in order to meet the March 15 deadline. Administrator Ching stated that Chair Uyehara is exactly right. It is not going to solve all the problems. The proposal is to take a stab at a few things in anticipation of a larger and broader action in the future.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama stated that he agrees that the Commission needs to fix the inversion issues as those are not right. He noted that internally, he is having a challenge coming to grips with taking a bargaining unit or collective bargaining unit-type of position with a Deputy and possibly even the Chief, and saying that if you step up internally, all the things you enjoyed under the collective bargaining agreement are still enjoyed as the Chief or Deputy Chief. There is also an overtime issue. Vice Chair Katayama expressed that he is concerned that someone moving from a Police Captain position into the Chief's position will lose all of his/her overtime. Ms. Rapozo responded that she failed to add in the report a per hour rate that would remain relatively the same. He is putting in many more hours with overtime. Vice Chair Katayama stated that what Ms. Rapozo is explaining still does not address the inversion issue. Ms. Rapozo responded that it does address the work-life balance concern. Someone moving into that kind of position needs to make that decision that if they take a higher position, they will not have to put in 40 more hours a week, but the pay will</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>be at a different level. That is the choice that everyone must make. Vice Chair Katayama responded that as the Chief or Deputy Chief, someone will probably put in a lot more than 40 hours per week. Vice Chair Katayama stated that he is not arguing with the right-hand column. What he is having trouble with is the fact that someone can be the head of the department or the #2 in the department, yet you are governed by collective bargaining rules for compensation. Vice Chair Katayama stated that philosophically he is having difficulty convincing himself that that is the right thing to do. Vice Chair Katayama noted that he was more comfortable giving the person who had 200 hours of overtime pay the same amount of pay as a part of their new base salary amount. The expectation is that that person will be doing and working the hours that are needed to get the job done. If there is an incident that requires that person to be out in the field for 24 hours a day, 5 days straight, the expectation is that they are there, but not necessarily filling out a timesheet for that time. Mr. Ono stated that he was going down the same path. Ms. Chiba-Miguel also expressed concurrence with that concept Mr. Ono stated that perhaps the overtime amount can be rolled into the base salary but not to exceed 20% of what was originally set as the maximum salary cap. That way the overtime is rolled in, and that person will still have the benefit of leading the team. Vice Chair Katayama stated that the proposal does not hurt the individual moving into a higher position.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that the Chief of Police recommended a hard salary amount of \$185,000 for the base salary. She further suggested that the Commission could take the base salary plus overtime and that amount becomes the new base, but it cannot exceed 5% of the Chief's maximum salary amount so that the Chief is always higher than the Deputy Chief. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that she believes the total compensation number</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>needs to be considered and not just base salary. The person should not be working that much overtime in the new role, so you are giving them the elevation of the new role with a promotional increase that includes the pay they receive when they did work the overtime hours. Quality of life also comes with the position as they do not have to be out in the field 80 hours per week. The people filling these positions are also not taking the overtime pay, as is the case with the Deputy Chief of Police. Effectively, the Deputy Chief might be making less money now because even if he took the pay structure with him, he is not capitalizing on the structure. That fact does not help fix the inversion issue.</p> <p>Mr. Toner asked if the proposal was to take the total compensation and roll that up into that person’s new base salary amount, leaving them eligible for overtime. As the Chief or Deputy Chief, there may be times when they need to work overtime, but those boards or commissions would need to manage the individuals in those positions accordingly. Chair Uyehara stated that he believes the amount of overtime that can be carried into the base salary amount would need to be capped to avoid the potential for abuse. Someone could inflate their overtime numbers if they think they will become eligible for a promotional opportunity. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that that is perhaps when a cap on the salary can come into play. They may “juice” their overtime, but they still cannot make an amount which would bring them inside 5% of what the Chief is making. Chair Uyehara stated that the issue is that there is no referenced salary that is not inverted for the Chief to begin with. Ms. Chiba-Miguel responded that if the Chief’s recommendation of \$185,000 was taken into account, then the Deputy Chief can make no more than 10% of \$185,000. If someone is coming in with a total compensation of \$211,000 because you have worked \$41,000 in overtime, then if you exceed that, then the maximum that you</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>can make is the 10% less than what the Chief is making. Chair Uyehara responded that that would be a good solution if the Commission set the un-inverted salary level for every department head. Otherwise, the problem is only solved for that one position. That would be like the recommendation made by the Chief Manager and Engineer of the Department of Water based on his previous experience. Ms. Chiba-Miguel interjected and stated that it is harder for the Department of Water because the manager does not need to be an engineer. Those engineers at the Department of Water get additional pay because they have certifications and licenses. The same holds true for the Department of Public Works. If you are not going to require the director to be a licensed engineer and have that certification, you are always going to have that inversion. There could be someone with 30 years of experience moving into a position, but even new engineers recently hired coming in with various certifications will receive additional pay that will bring them higher. Ms. Chiba-Miguel expressed that she is not sure if the inversion problem can ever be fixed in its entirety as that is a consequence of the collective bargaining structure.</p> <p>Mr. Toner stated that in the instance described by Ms. Chiba-Miguel her realization may hold true, but for employees moving up into those positions from lower-level positions, the realization may not always be the case. Vice Chair Katayama stated that the County could hire someone from the outside with a professional engineering license and they should get that additional pay as well.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that there was also discussion that ended in a request to the Office of the County Attorney as to whether the salary cap amounts can be tiered to account for various license or certification</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>requirements. Vice Chair Katayama responded that the response had been provided.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked for Ms. Rapozo’s opinion if the Commission rolled the total compensation figure into the new base salary for someone moving into a leadership position. Ms. Rapozo responded that the Commission needs to be very careful. The inversion issue only affects 5 or 6 departments and there are 18 total departments. The Commission is not answering the question of salary levels for the remaining departments that do not experience inversion. Ultimately the discussion is leading to the Commission not doing anything for an office like the Office of the County Attorney because they do not experience inversion. Ms. Rapozo cautioned the Commission in using the figures provided on the salary inversion chart. The information provided is a snapshot in time. The Commission is looking at that and wanting to give them that exact amount. The salary discrepancies can be extreme based on the situation and scenario of specific positions and employees. Ms. Rapozo stated that she is very weary about going down the path being discussed as the departments not experiencing inversion are not being included. Vice Chair Katayama stated that the Commission needs to look at departments individually in respect to the market that they are in. As an example, the Commission needs to look at the market for attorneys to decide the salary caps for the County’s attorneys. Vice Chair Katayama reminded the Commission that discussion was also made regarding attorneys carrying heavy burdens of student loans and that there should be a range to address the different levels of attorneys. Ms. Rapozo questioned the Commission as to who would be setting that range and deciding the amounts. Vice Chair Katayama responded that the appointing authority would make those decisions. Ms. Rapozo stated that past Mayors and County Attorneys have hired all their</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>attorneys at the maximum salary levels. Now that takes any salary decision out of the hands of the Salary Commission. In that situation an entry-level attorney can get the highest salary amount. Vice Chair Katayama stated it then becomes a budget issue as they would need to go before the Council to get the budgeted salary amount approved. Vice Chair Katayama expects someone on the Council to question an office that might have all brand-new attorneys getting paid the maximum salary amount. Ms. Rapozo responded that the budget practice is that the salary amounts in the budget indicate the position's maximum salary as it is never known who will be hired for that position. The maximum amount is budgeted also because there could be mid-year salary increases given by the appointing authority that would need to be budgeted for to be given out. Ms. Rapozo stated that she has been with the County for a long time, so she has seen many different scenarios play out as far as how department heads pay or how Mayor's pay.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if there was a standard that sets the different positions within an office. Ms. Rapozo responded that in the Office of the County Attorney, he has many Deputy County Attorneys and can pay all of them at the maximum salary amount if he chooses to do so. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that the job of the Commission is to set the maximum salary amounts based on a market analysis, cost of living, etc. The department heads decide to do is their prerogative and it is up to the County Council to approve it or not. Ms. Rapozo stated that when Ms. Chiba-Miguel mentioned market analysis, HR always looks at total compensation because for the County, the benefits account for 60-80% of the salary amount. Compared to other places, if only salary is looked at the County may appear to be low paying. When total compensation is looked at, including post-retirement pension and medical benefits, those are items that other places</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>of business cannot offer their employees. After 10 years post-retirement medical is covered at the 50% level. After 25 years 100% coverage of post-retirement medical is covered. Ms. Rapozo stated that she was told by the Chief of Police that when he retired from Las Vegas, he had a pension, but he did not have medical. He does not have enough years with the County of Kaua'i to get post-retirement medical coverage so when he ends up retiring, he will have to go out and purchase medical coverage post-retirement. That benefit is something often overlooked but is afforded only to government employees in Hawai'i. You do not realize the true value of the benefit until you are closer to retirement age. When she hears market value, Ms. Rapozo cautioned the Commission to take that with a grain of salt because they need to ask themselves what the true market value of County employment is and that includes total compensation.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked how HR views total compensation when there are so many different categories of pay, free medical premium benefits, retirement pension and medical coverage, etc. Vice Chair Katayama asked Ms. Rapozo as HR recruits, what value does HR promote to potential applicants. Ms. Rapozo responded that the County only has so much control in terms of what the County can pay and what the benefits are. Right now, the labor force is looking for pay because the housing market is terrible. HR can tell an applicant that if they work for the County they will have a defined retirement plan or post-retirement benefits, but at this point many people are just trying to survive in daily life. Unfortunately, HR cannot control that. Through negotiations, HR has tried to ask unions to give concessions in vacation and sick leave so that the County can pay more in wages, but the unions are not willing. In return the County continues to struggle to attract a workforce which leads to lower dues for the unions. The collective bargaining situation is bad. If the benefits could shrink to</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>give employees more in pay, she would love to do that. She cannot do that given the collective bargaining structure in place. Ms. Rapozo stated that if she owned the company that is what she would look at doing. Ms. Rapozo explained that the County bargains with the entire state. The Governor has 4 votes, and it appears like the collective effort continues to go down the same path expecting different results. Ms. Rapozo explained that the counties and State continually ask the unions to give a little from their side, but they do not. The benefits just go over everyone's heads. New hires do not care about the other benefits received in government employment. They are only looking at the straight salary amount to pay their everyday expenses. Ms. Rapozo stated that when she first started working for the County, the County was the place to be. Right now, she does not think the government is very attractive because 8% is taken off the top of the salary as it must go towards the Employees' Retirement System. 8% goes towards Federal taxes. Another 20-30% goes towards other taxes. 8% goes towards retirement. The resulting take home pay is not much.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if that viewpoint is the same for department heads and deputies that the Salary Commission is responsible for. Ms. Rapozo responded that at the level that the Salary Commission is responsible for, there are more seasoned employees who are going to be at a higher salary level. Vice Chair Katayama stated that these employees do not qualify for the long-term benefits generally. Ms. Rapozo responded that it really depends. Commission-appointed hires could possibly be around for a long time. The Planning Director has been around the County for a while and took leave from his civil service position. He was not making as much as what the department head was making so he did not have the inversion issue. Mr. Hull could technically remain in the Planning Director's</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>position until the Commission decides otherwise. Ms. Rapozo further stated that if Mr. Hull decided to go back to his civil service position, it would be as if he never left the position. All the raises would be granted to give him present value for what his salary would be.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that it might be true for anyone leaving their civil service position and which employees actually make that return back to a civil service position. If you are an elected official position and collect 10 years total, the benefit would be the same as someone who was in a civil service position for 10 years. You would not necessarily get the same benefits as someone in a civil service position, but they would be vested after 10 years.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that the Commission will need to decide what the proper solution is that will address the many discrepancies discussed during the review process, including items such as with the attorneys who do not have the inversion problem. The Commission must decide whether they want to expedite trying to address all those issues between now and March 15th or whether the Commission wants to say that they are proposing a placeholder and though it does not address all of the issues, it is intended to just be a placeholder with a commitment that the Commission will further discussion and do additional work throughout the year. The Commission discovered during its due diligence that the issues are very complicated, departments/agencies are not the same in terms of their roles and responsibilities or what services they provide to the public, etc. Chair Uyehara noted that when the differences are understood, if you try to tackle the issue comprehensively, it is not possible to do an across-the-board blanket adjustment for all departments. Chair Uyehara explained that perhaps the Commission might want to structure the Salary</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Resolution by departments. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that perhaps the Commission could break things down by department first and see where certain positions could fit in based on that breakdown.</p> <p>Mr. Ono stated that he agreed with Chair Uyehara. Mr. Ono noted that it is important to address the initial salaries and move forward with that component. Mr. Ono further stated that the Commission went off on a tangent related to proposed Article III, but it is not that the Commission did not want to do so or that it would resolve all the inversion issues. Mr. Ono noted that he sees proposed Article III as the first step that can be implemented and if it does not take care of all the inversion issues, the Commission can move forward by looking at other options.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked how the Commission could walk back proposed Article III if the Commission decides that it wants to fine-tune it. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that she had the same question. Chair Uyehara responded that it depends on practice. It is like pulling back the retirement pension benefit that included overtime and then pulling it back and not allowing overtime to be included. There would have to be a date set where you are allowed Article III if you were hired before a certain date and not allowed if you were hired after that date. You could end up in a situation where you have a Deputy Chief of Police who ends up with a higher total compensation that the Commission arrives at as a long-term solution because they were given that position under Article III. That might survive until that individual leaves that position.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that Article III is a very broad statement across all employees and not just the ones that have inversion issues. She stated that it may be too broad of a stroke for what the Commission wants to</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>accomplish in the first round. Ms. Chiba-Miguel noted the Civil Engineer VII with the Department of Water. He is coming into the position with a base salary that is more than the Manager and Chief Engineer. If he keeps the structure that is not going to fix any inversions at the Department of Water. He is coming into the position making almost \$100,000 more than the Department of Water Manager. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that the proposed Article III is a good provision for the Police Department, but that she was unsure it would be good for all departments.</p> <p><i>Mr. Toner was noted as not present at 11:55 a.m.</i></p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that in practice, the provision was probably targeting just a few departments. Administrator Ching responded that the issues that the County is currently facing is with the Department of Water and the Department of Public Works. The proposed provision would also have an impact on the Police Department as the Police Commission is going through the executive search process. The minute the Chief of Police vacates his position, the Police Commission will have to appoint an Interim or Acting Chief of Police. The proposed Article III will greatly impact if anyone internally is willing to step up from within the Department. The Police Commission does not want chaos for such a short period of time. The provision may also impact the Department of Liquor Control as well.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel suggested that perhaps the Commission might want to throw in just those two departments who are embarking on executive searches for this initial Salary Resolution. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that she is not as concerned with the Department of Liquor Control as Mr. Rapozo did not seem very concerned with the salary levels. Ms. Rapozo noted that without the provision, the pool of applicants who may want to apply for</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>the Director position may be limited. The applicants could be coming from any other department in the County as the requirements for the Director of Liquor Control include just 5 years of management experience. Ms. Chiba-Miguel again offered the suggestion to address the Police Department and Department of Liquor Control in the first pass at a Salary Resolution including them in the proposed Article III group. Thereafter, the Commission can review all the other departments closer to see if proposed Article III would be beneficial for them. Administrator Ching suggested that the Commission consider limiting the group to Police, Liquor Control, Public Works, and Water. Ms. Chiba-Miguel responded that she feels the Commission might need more time to further evaluate the impacts for the Department of Public Works and Department of Water. Ms. Chiba-Miguel noted that she is looking to create a stopgap for the two departments going through the executive search process. Administrator Ching stated that if that was the intent, then the Commission could limit it to Police and Liquor.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo stated that at the Department of Water, no one can be temporarily assigned (TA) to Mr. Hinazumi's position because he is still occupying it. That person is working as a TA but is not getting the pay because Mr. Hinazumi is occupying two positions. Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked if Mr. Hinazumi was not wanting to take the promotion because he will have to take a cut in pay. Ms. Rapozo responded that that is absolutely the reason why. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that even if that is going on, she feels there are so many other factors like licenses, certification levels, etc. that need to be evaluated by the Commission to determine an adequate compensation structure.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that it appears the Commission is looking at targeting solutions to the immediate issues while continuing work on others. The</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>two immediate concerns are the executive searches for Police and Liquor, and the inversion with Mr. Hinazumi’s position at the Department of Water. Administrator Ching stated that the Department of Public Works should also be reviewed as the County Engineer did take a pay cut to step into his position from a civil service position. The situation is the same as what is happening with Mr. Hinazumi.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo stated that when the last Salary Commission passed the Salary Resolution relating to the Deputy Chief of Police, she expressed concern to Administrator Ching that the Commission may need to look at the issue more globally. Ms. Rapozo would hate to see the Commission hold off on looking closer at the issue and having it languish. She noted that the Deputy Chief of Police change occurred in 2022. Right now, heading into the final two years of Mayor Kawakami’s term, not many will be interested in taking an appointment for just two years. The Deputy Director of Parks and Recreation recently resigned from his position and there may not be a long list of candidates willing to take a two-year appointment. If the Commission fails to look at other departments as well, the inversion issue could affect those departments as well. The difficulty is that no one knows when anyone is planning to leave. If you leave people out of the discussion, you may be taking care of one position but alienating another who may be in the same situation. Ms. Rapozo stated that the reason HR had recommended that everyone be covered by proposed Article III was because they do not know when someone decides to retire or resign.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked Ms. Rapozo to explain temporary assignment. Ms. Rapozo responded that TA just means that you are temporarily assigned to a higher- or lower-level position temporarily. That person did not or does not get the position permanently. Ms. Rapozo asked for</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>additional information on why the question was being asked for her to provide the proper response. Vice Chair Katayama expressed interest in learning how the Department of Water’s situation was utilizing TA. Ms. Rapozo responded that what Mr. Hinazumi is doing is functioning as the Deputy Manager, but in theory, he never really went to that position. He is on paper the highest-level civil servant as a Civil Engineer VII. Mr. Hinazumi’s position is under the Manager and Chief Engineer and the Deputy Manager, but right now he is functioning as both his Civil Engineer VII position and the Deputy Manager since he cannot get the higher pay in the Deputy Manager position.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked why more departments are not doing what the Department of Water is doing. Administrator Ching responded that it is not the responsibility of the individual departments, it is the responsibility of the Salary Commission to ensure the inversion does not happen. Vice Chair Katayama asked if it was the responsibility of the Salary Commission to place people into TA positions. Administrator Ching stated that she misunderstood the question. Ms. Rapozo responded that since Mr. Hinazumi is occupying two positions, the fourth person in the organizational chart cannot move because he is taking two positions.</p> <p>Administrator Ching stated that in response to Vice Chair Katayama’s original question as to why more departments are not using TA, she noted that first the department head must convince someone to take the TA assignment. They are preserving their salary but taking on additional work. With TA, employees are doing two jobs for the same pay or possibly a little higher pay. With Mr. Ozaki’s situation, he was able to step into the Deputy Chief role, albeit by getting a pay reduction, but the Department is now able to fill the position previously occupied by Mr. Ozaki because he moved</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>positions. Mr. Ozaki was more willing to vacate his civil service position because of the Salary Resolution relating to the Deputy Chief of Police as it made the pay reduction smaller than if he had totally left his civil service salary structure behind and took the maximum from the Salary Resolution. The goal of the proposed Article III is to attract internal candidates to apply and get them to step into leadership roles without having to do so by enduring an extreme reduction in pay. Both department head positions and deputy positions experience turnover towards the end of a Mayor's term. All appointees know that if they want to continue employment with the County or elsewhere, they better start looking to secure something prior to the end of the Mayor's final term.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama again asked why departments could not utilize temporary assignments more often. Administrator Ching stated that the difficult part is getting someone to agree to doing multiple jobs. Ms. Rapozo responded that with the TA process, someone is occupying two positions meaning they are going to have to do two jobs. A regular employee would do the job, move up, and then someone else would take over their responsibilities when they move up.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked if Mr. Hinazumi's overtime of \$73,000 was attributable to him doing two jobs. Ms. Rapozo responded that in her opinion, the overtime cost was a management issue. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that if it is a management issue and Mr. Hinazumi should not be getting that much overtime or if it is because he is doing two roles, then the total compensation figure including overtime will be very high. Ms. Rapozo responded that that is why she told the Commission to take the data with a grain of salt.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that she feels the Commission must take a step back to look at each position. Some positions are filled with long-term tenured employees. The Commission should look at the total maximum salary of each position, the total compensation that is out there, including the additional, other, and overtime pay items, and looking at the market rate salary for someone entering the position brand new. There is an inversion because of the current employees and their overtime. If the search for the Chief of Police ends up going externally, there might be an issue with the Chief's salary compared to Deputy Chief Ozaki. The Commission will need to look at current promotions as well as hiring new people to fill in positions and what those salaries might look like to help the Commission figure out where the maximum salaries should be set. Chair Uyehara stated that he concurs with Ms. Chiba-Miguel as to what the Commission will have to do.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that the Commission needs to identify how many of the issues can be taken care of with the proposed Article III and if the Commission is committed to doing the work quickly to fix the broader issue, then there is less of a concern of other positions opening in the meantime. There will just be a gap between March 15th and whenever the Commission can finish the bigger project task. If the Commission is committed to working on the bigger project by Fall of 2025, then that limits the window where additional issues could arise. There is nothing stopping the Commission from broadening the proposed Article III with an amendment later on. If someone leaves in July, the Commission could amend proposed Article III if needed. Administrator Ching reminded the Commission that once they pass something over to the Council on March 15th, the Commission is going to continue to work. Whatever that other draft Salary Resolution turns into, that Salary Resolution does not come into effect until</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>July 1, 2026. If the Commission adopts the conservative stopgap measure as their Salary Resolution, the conservative stopgap goes into effect on July 1, 2025. The next Salary Resolution will go into effect on July 1st of the following year. Administrator Ching stated that for Police and Liquor Control, the proposal put forth by the Commission will have an impact on their executive searches. Chair Uyehara stated that the Commission can either leave it broad or guess over the next year. Ms. Kanna asked if anyone had a crystal ball.</p> <p>Administrator Ching stated that if in future iterations the Commission decided that the proposed Article III was not working out well, the Commission could eliminate it. Chair Uyehara stated that regardless of the language of the proposed Article III, perhaps the Salary Resolution could be restructured to make it clear that the proposed Article III was intended to be temporary so that it is transparent.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo stated that the Commission may want to note in the Salary Resolution that there should be a report back to the Commission as to how everything is working out so that the Commission can decide whether things are working as intended or whether modifications will need to be made moving into the future. The requirement of a report to the Commission will help the Commission see if the provision did what it was intended to do. Chair Uyehara stated that the reporting requirement was a good idea. Ms. Kanna stated that the Commission does not want any unintended consequences and would like to learn from the process.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that the Commission should look at the 80%/20% with overtime to see how the numbers are affected so that there is no overtime abuse. As for Mr. Hinazumi, the Commission wanted to know</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>how much of the overtime was due to performing a dual role. Chair Uyehara stated that if Mr. Hinazumi carries the structure as is in the current Article III, that would go down because he is not going to work as much. Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that Mr. Hinazumi is also coming in at a much higher salary amount.</p> <p>Administrator Ching notified the Commission that Ms. Rapozo had another meeting scheduled for 12:00 p.m., but the time is already 12:17 p.m.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo reminded the Commission that with Mr. Hinazumi’s situation, the requirements changed. He is currently in a position that he is overly qualified for. He is a licensed engineer, and that license is no longer needed for the Deputy Manager position.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel stated that it is not that she is less concerned about the inversion happening in the Department of Public Works and the Department of Water, it is that she understands the reason for the inversion. There are certifications and licensing that come into play. That is where the concept of doing a tiered system was discussed previously.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked to focus on the items that need to be delivered by March 15th. Administrator Ching stated that the month of February is set aside to work on the Salary Resolution. Administrator Ching stated that she needed a motion from the Commission that indicates their intention to move forward with a Salary Resolution by March 15th. Deputy County Attorney Michaels is going to take the comments that the Commission made. The Salary Resolution will be redrafted for further consideration at the Commission’s next meeting. Secondly, Administrator Ching asked for a motion from the Commission that along with the Salary Resolution that the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Commission would like a memorandum to accompany the Salary Resolution. That gives Administrator Ching the authorization to start working on drafting the memorandum. She noted that by the end of February, the Commission will see a final draft of the memorandum and the Salary Resolution that will be transmitted to the Mayor and the Council. In the very worst-case scenario, the Commission would meet on March 13th to give final approval.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama referred to proposed Article II and asked what the language meant. Administrator Ching responded that Article II follows along historically what has been done by the Salary Commission on Kaua'i. Kaua'i is the only county that sets a range because the Salary Commission sets the maximum salary amount. The Salary Commission gives the appointing authority the latitude to give less than the maximum amount. In other counties, the amount that their salary commissions set is those positions' actual salaries.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if in 2019, the Commission set the maximum annual salaries and whether that had to be readjusted. Administrator Ching responded that the maximum annual salary cap was set in that year. The amount noted was a maximum so someone's salary could be lower. Ms. Chiba-Miguel asked if the Commission needed to increase it due to inflation, etc. Vice Chair Katayama stated that the Police Captain example shows that the Police Captain exceeds the maximum salary amount listed. Chair Uyehara responded that Article III states that the appointing authority may choose to compensate the employee as though they had remained in their civil service position.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama explained that in the 2019 Salary Resolution, \$123,000</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>as the maximum salary cap. If someone is brought in from the outside, that is the maximum salary they could offer them. Administrator Ching responded that Vice Chair Katayama's amount is not accurate. Ms. Rapozo asked Administrator Ching if there was another Salary Resolution after 2019. Administrator Ching responded that there was a Salary Resolution in 2022. Ms. Rapozo responded that the Salary Resolution in 2022 gave department heads and deputies 5% increases three times. Chair Uyehara noted that Administrator Ching recommended 3.5% placeholder for the next 3 years. That could be replaced if the Commission continues to work and takes a more comprehensive look at all the various issues.</p> <p>Administrator Ching noted that the Commission has a few options at their disposal. Hypothetically, if the Commission passes a Salary Resolution with 3.5% increases for the next 3 years, the Commission could build off that come July 1, 2026. The Commission could at that point say they would like to give another 5% increase on top of the original 3.5%. The Commission could also decide to get rid of the recommendation put forth for future years in their March 15th Salary Resolution and go with a completely new Salary Resolution after the original recommendation was enacted on July 1, 2025. Administrator Ching again reminded the Commission that they could do several things and have various options to consider.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked when the last Salary Resolution was. Administrator Ching responded that it was from 2022. Vice Chair Katayama asked if the Commission received that information. Administrator Ching responded that the Commission was given that document.</p> <p>Mr. Ono stated that he agrees with Administrator Ching and that the two motions she mentioned earlier would provide a pathway to where the</p>	<p>Mr. Ono moved that the Salary Commission would work towards finalizing and submitting a Salary Resolution to the Mayor and Council by March 15, 2025. Ms. Kanna seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0 (Mr. Toner was noted as silent).</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Commission is headed. Administrator Ching stated that the motions at least give her and Deputy County Attorney Michaels some direction on how to move forward. Chair Uyehara stated that knowing that the motions would just set work into motion but that it would not lock in any concrete aspects of the Salary Resolution, he asked for the two motions noted by Administrator Ching.</p> <p>Mr. Ono stated that the transmittal memorandum that would accompany the Salary Resolution is very important. The information provided by the Office of Boards and Commissions shows historically how Salary Resolutions are transmitted and what data might be necessary to include in the transmittal of the Salary Resolution to the Mayor and the Council. With the Charter being changed to give more authority to the Salary Commission, the accompanying materials will be increasingly important for understanding the discussion and thought process that went into its preparation. Administrator Ching stated that she is targeting for a final draft to be submitted to the Commission at their last meeting in February, on February 27, 2025. If there are still amendments that the Commission wants to work on after presentation of the final draft, the Commission's next meeting would be March 13, 2025 which is a couple of days before the March 15th deadline. Nothing will be transmitted to anyone unless the Commission approves it. Mr. Ono stated that he was afraid that if the second motion was made, the timeline might be tight for Administrator Ching to work on drafting the memorandum. Chair Uyehara reminded Mr. Ono that the motion will be for Administrator Ching to start working on it, not necessarily having to finalize it.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked what the memorandum would describe. Chair Uyehara responded that the memorandum would be a cover letter to the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Salary Resolution that explains what is being done. Administrator Ching stated that if the Commission refers to Salary Resolution 2020-2, that is an example of a memorandum with all the attachments. The memorandum is a recap of what information the Commission reviewed and considered, and a justification of how the Commission came up with the Salary Resolution. Vice Chair Katayama asked if portions of the memorandum could be added as “Whereas” statements in the actual Salary Resolution so that it is codified in the Salary Resolution. Deputy County Attorney Michaels stated that the purpose of the memorandum is to provide the context for the Salary Resolution. It was used in the past for the Council to better understand what went into the preparation of the Salary Resolution. Deputy County Attorney Michaels further stated that given that the Salary Resolution no longer is approved by the Council, the memorandum may not be as important, but that he would leave that determination up to Administrator Ching. Administrator Ching stated that though it is not an official part of the Salary Resolution, the memorandum is a permanent public record once it is transmitted to the Council. Administrator Ching further clarified that the Salary Resolution would state just the highlights of what the Commission reviewed. The memorandum would state similar information but also include the relevant and pertinent documents reviewed by the Commission by attachment.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama explained what he would like to see contained in the transmittal and Salary Resolution so that everyone has context as to what they are reviewing. Administrator Ching responded that the Salary Resolution is usually more factually based. She believes that the information Vice Chair Katayama asked to be contained in the Salary Resolution would be better suited to be included in the memorandum as appendices. Administrator Ching stated that she would work on</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>wordsmithing so that everyone understands that the Salary Resolution is a stopgap initial measure to address the specific issues and that soon, the Salary Commission will continue their work on a much broader level to address some of the other perennial issues that the County faces.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that if you include it in the recital of the Resolution, oftentimes you will see that color the information contained in the Resolution. Vice Chair Katayama stated that what Chair Uyehara noted was what he was hoping for. Chair Uyehara stated that including all the detail is a double-edged sword. It adds an interpretive layer, but it makes interpretation more complicated. One could argue that the Resolution remains more factual because it is easier to interpret, but if one wanted to make it more nuanced, then that could be the approach taken as well. Administrator Ching stated that in the past if something was questioned, the Commission would refer to the meeting minutes to see what happened. The minutes are a part of the legislative history of what happened. It provides discussion and context of what occurred during the decision-making process. This is one of the commissions where the context in detail is contained in the meeting minutes. That is what people will and have asked for in the past. Deputy County Attorney Michaels added that if there is ever any ambiguity, that is where the legislative history would come into play. If someone is interpreting the Salary Resolution and they think there is an ambiguity in one of the provisions, they might request the legislative history which includes the meeting minutes, testimony provided, etc. to further clarify their question.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that the concern of Vice Chair Katayama as he understands it is whether the recitals set within the Resolution itself privileged over what is in the memorandum in interpreting legislative</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>intent and is that privileged over the history of meeting minutes. If there is a tiering of that interpretation then it is a question of whether there are certain parts of the Commission’s intent that the Commission may want to bring to the floor in interpreting into the future. The Commission would want to structure it in a way where the most important things that the Commission wants people to understand and about how the Commission thought about it should be contained in the recitals. From a factual perspective, the relevant background and data information would be the information contained in the memorandum. If someone really wants to see how the Commission got to that point, then someone would have to look at the legislative history and meeting minutes.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if that is not the hierarchy of legislation. Chair Uyehara responded that Vice Chair Katayama was correct and that the Commission should make it known what they want to prioritize and in what areas. Vice Chair Katayama stated that the Commission should avoid ambiguity.</p> <p>The Commission thanked Ms. Rapozo for her time and appearance before the Commission.</p>	<p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel moved that a memorandum be prepared to transmit and accompany the Salary Resolution. Ms. Kanna seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0 (Mr. Toner was noted as silent).</p>
SC 2025-2	<p>Discussion and decision-making on drafting a memorandum to accompany the Salary Resolution for transmittal to Chair Mel Rapozo and Members of the Kaua’i County Council.</p>	<p>There was no discussion on this agenda item.</p> <p>No action was taken regarding this agenda item.</p>
SC 2025-3	<p>Presentation of a Memorandum of Transmittal relating to the Salary Commission Resolution No. 2025-1 (Relating to establishing maximum salary caps for certain County of Kaua’i officers and employees included in</p>	<p>There was no discussion on this agenda item.</p> <p>No action was taken regarding this agenda item.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	Section 3-2.1 of the Kaua'i County Code for Fiscal Years 2025/2026, 2026/2027, and 2027/2028, from the Salary Commission to Mayor Derek Kawakami and Council Chair Mel Rapozo and Members of the Kaua'i County Council.	
SC 2025-4	Discussion and decision-making on designating two or three members and alternates from the Salary Commission to appear before the County Council to address any questions related to the Salary Resolution to establish maximum salary caps for certain County officers and employees included in Section 3-2.1 of the Kaua'i County Code for Fiscal Years 2025/2026, 2026/2027, and 2027/2028.	There was no discussion on this agenda item. No action was taken regarding this agenda item.
EXECUTIVE SESSION	<u>EXECUTIVE SESSION CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC:</u> Under HRS § 92-7(a), the Commission may, when deemed necessary, hold an executive session on any agenda item without a written public notice if the executive session was not anticipated in advance. Any such executive session shall be held pursuant to HRS § 92-4 and shall be limited to those items described in HRS § 92-5(a).	There was no Executive Session held.
CONTINUANCE OF MEETING AND NEXT MEETING DATE	The meeting was recessed at 12:29 p.m. on February 13, 2025. The meeting will be continued to February 20, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. The next Salary Commission meeting will be held at the Boards and Commissions Conference Room, Suite 300 on February 20, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. Any subsequent, continued meetings pertaining to SC 2025-1, SC 2025-2, SC 2025-3, and/or SC 2025-4—will be held at the Boards and Commissions Conference Room, Suite 300 on February 27, March 13, and 20 at 9:00 a.m.	

Submitted by: _____
Mercedes Omo, Staff Support Clerk

Reviewed and Approved by: _____
Joshua Uyehara, Chair

Approved as circulated on February 20, 2025.

Approved as amended. See minutes of _____ meeting.