

OPEN SESSION MEETING MINUTES

| | | | | |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Board or Commission | | Kaua'i Salary Commission | Meeting Date | June 12, 2025 |
| Location | Piikoi Building, Boards and Commissions Conference Room Suite 300 4444 Rice Street, Līhu'e, Hawai'i 96766 Remote Access VIDEO by Microsoft Teams Click on the URL below or type the URL into your computer or smartphone https://bit.ly/44ArYul Meeting ID: 236 601 594 943 Passcode: qZ3Rr9oP | | Start of Meeting: 9:05 a.m. | End of Meeting: 11:53 a.m. |
| Present | Chair Joshua Uyehara; Vice Chair Wayne Katayama (<i>via Microsoft Teams</i>); Commissioners Bernadette Akiona-Arruda (<i>in at 9:24 a.m.</i>), Stacie Chiba-Miguel, Patrick Ono, and Paul Toner. Also present: Deputy County Attorney Andrew Michaels and Boards and Commissions Support Staff: Administrator Ellen Ching and Support Clerk Mercedes Omo. Invited Guests: Director of Human Resources Annette Anderson; Human Resource Manager III Janine Rapozo; Director of Finance Chelsie Sakai; and Budget Administrator Ken Shimonishi. | | | |
| Excused | | | | |
| Absent | | | | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|--|--|--------|
| MEETING CALLED TO ORDER/ROLL CALL TO ASCERTAIN QUORUM | Chair Uyehara called the Salary Commission Meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Support Clerk Mercedes Omo verified attendance by roll call: Commissioner Bernadette Akiona-Arruda was not present at roll call (<i>in at 9:24 a.m.</i>). Commissioner Stacie Chiba-Miguel replied present. Commissioner Patrick Ono replied present. Commissioner Paul Toner replied present. | |

Salary Commission Open Session Minutes
of the June 12, 2025, Meeting

Page 2

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Vice Chair Wayne Katayama replied present (<i>via Microsoft Teams</i>). Chair Joshua Uyehara replied present.</p> <p>Deputy County Attorney Andrew Michaels was present via Microsoft Teams and Administrator Ellen Ching was present at the meeting.</p> | Quorum was established with five Commissioners present. |
| APPROVAL OF AGENDA | <p>Chair Uyehara asked for a motion to approve the agenda.</p> <p>There was no one present from the public wishing to testify on this agenda item.</p> | Mr. Toner moved to approve the agenda as circulated. Mr. Ono seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0. |
| PUBLIC TESTIMONY ON ANY AGENDA ITEM | <p>Individuals may testify on any agenda item or wait for the item to come up.</p> <p>There was no one present from the public wishing to testify on any agenda item.</p> | |
| CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENT | The next regular monthly Salary Commission meeting will be held at 9:00 a.m., on Thursday, July 10, 2025, in the Office of Boards and Commissions Conference Room, Suite 300. | |
| APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 8, 2025, MEETING | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> May 8, 2025, Open Session Meeting | Mr. Ono moved to approve the May 8, 2025, Open Session Meeting minutes. Mr. Toner seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0. |
| COMMUNICATION | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Email dated May 22, 2025, from Ms. Nancy Kanna to Ellen Ching, Boards and Commissions Administrator, regarding her resignation from the Salary Commission effective immediately.</u> <p>Administrator Ching reminded the Commission that her original plea to Commissioners was to serve until the work to meet the March 15, 2025</p> | |

Salary Commission Open Session Minutes
of the June 12, 2025, Meeting

Page 3

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>deadline was completed. The Commission has since decided to continue its work, but Ms. Kanna’s ultimate passion is serving on the Public Access, Open Space, and Natural Resources Preservation Fund Commission. Ms. Kanna was nominated to serve in the Open Space Commission’s At-Large position and so she has resigned from the Salary Commission effective immediately. Ms. Kanna will be starting her service on the Open Space Commission effective on June 12, 2025, as they also have a meeting.</p> | <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel moved to receive the Communication for the record. Mr. Toner seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0.</p> |
| <p>BUSINESS SC 2025-1</p> | <p><u>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.</u></p> <p>Administrator Ching stated that the items provided are informational reports that the Commission had requested at past meetings. In essence, the Commission’s work is beginning again as the Commission is looking at submitting another Salary Resolution by the March 15, 2026 deadline. The other jurisdictions in the state have completed their respective Salary Resolutions so that information changes the jurisdictional comparisons that the Commission reviewed previously. Administrator Ching thanked the Department of Human Resources (HR) for doing the heavy lifting in putting together the requested information for the Commission’s use.</p> <p><u>Department of Human Resources</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Executive Salary Jurisdiction Comparisons for City & County of Honolulu, Maui, Kauai, and Hawaii counties. 2. History of Collective Bargaining Increases (ATB) July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2029. 3. History of Collective Bargaining Increases (Non-ATB) July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2029. | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>4. History Collective Bargaining Increases (Other Pay) July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2029.</p> <p>5. Salary Resolution Salaries from 2008 – 2025.</p> <p>The Committee heard from Janine Rapozo, HR Manager III. Ms. Rapozo noted that for item 3, the report covers the period through June 30, 2029. Ms. Rapozo noted the following in her presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The reports provided were previously submitted to the Commission so that they could be used in preparation of the Salary Resolution prior to the March 15, 2025, deadline.• HR has updated the reports since new information became available.• For Report #1, the State of Hawai'i, City and County of Honolulu, County of Maui, and the County of Kaua'i figures have been updated.• The various jurisdictions all made their salary increases very differently.• Administrator Ching has the State of Hawai'i report as well as the County of Maui's consultant's report on how they came up with their figures.• HR also has available the City and County of Honolulu's report.• She has not heard anything from the County of Hawai'i making any changes to executive salaries. <p>Mr. Ono expressed his appreciation to HR for the comparative data as it allows the Commission to make real-time comparisons. Chair Uyehara echoed the sentiments.</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|
| | <p>Ms. Rapozo continued her presentation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reports #2-4 must be taken together.• What happens in collective bargaining is that there is a pot of money available and different bargaining units decide to use those funds differently.• ATB stands for across-the-board.• There were five bargaining units that have settled and three that have not yet settled.• In Report #2, the last four lines should be highlighted.• Bargaining Unit 1 are blue collar workers. For the period 07/01/2025-06/30/2026, they are getting a 3.5% across-the-board increase. The next year, 07/01/2026-06/30/2027, they are getting a 3.79% increase. The next year, 07/01/2027-06/30/2028, they are getting a 4% increase, which is also the same increase for 07/01/2028-06/30/2029.• Bargaining Units 2 and 4 have the same increases as Bargaining Unit 1.• Bargaining Unit 3, which are the clerical employees, and Bargaining Unit 13, do not have the same increases.• Bargaining Unit 3 has salary increases of 3.5%, 0%, 4%, and 0.37%. On face value, it appears as if they are getting less of a salary increase. However, you must look at the other two reports to see what else that Bargaining Unit received that was not considered an across-the-board increase.• For Bargaining Unit 3, in the two years where they get 0% and 0.37%, what they are taking instead is a step movement, which is moving on the salary schedule from Step C to Step D. A step movement is approximately 4% salary increase. What this does is it keeps the salary schedule the same for new employees coming | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>in for at least two years. That union decided for the incumbent employees to move a step instead of getting an across-the-board salary increase. Right now, there is no step movement plan, and they would stay on the same step. Bargaining Unit 3 decided to take step movements in years 2 and 4. Since there was little left in the pot, they also added to the 0.37% across-the-board increase as well as the step movement.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked whether the step movements were just for incumbents and not new hires. Ms. Rapozo confirmed that Chair Uyehara was correct, and that the salary schedule would stay the same. Mr. Toner asked if his understanding that there would be no step movement between years 1 and 2 was accurate. Ms. Rapozo confirmed that Mr. Toner was correct.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo continued her presentation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bargaining Unit 13 received smaller raises across-the-board each year, because they have a step movement plan.• The beginning steps are taken every two years and then every three years for the steps later in one's career.• In totality, the across-the-board increases in addition to the step movements would equate to what the other bargaining units without step movements would receive.• Everyone may not receive the step movement during the first year, but at some point, within the contract, they will receive their step movement. It is dependent on their anniversary date, and it will occur every two to three years depending on where they are on that salary schedule. | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|
| | <p>Mr. Ono asked if the step movements are based on length of service. Ms. Rapozo responded that Mr. Ono was correct.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo continued her presentation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Looking at other charts, one can see how the different charts intertwine with each other.• In the history of non-ATB increases, there are similarly the last four lines that are highlighted.• The units that are in arbitration are Bargaining Units 15 (Ocean Safety Officers), Unit 11 (Fire Fighters), and Unit 12 (Police Officers). Right now, there are no contracts in place for the aforementioned three units. The County still must go through Arbitration with those bargaining units. They will not have a contract as of July 1, 2025.• On the non-ATB report, one can see how the step movements come in.• For Bargaining Unit 13, it reads “Continue step movement, \$2,000 lump sum for employees not eligible for step movement.” Basically, there is an end step. Step M is the last step on the scale. There are some employees on Step M. For those employees, they would get a \$2,000 lump sum because they are not going to get a step movement. <p>Mr. Toner asked whether those employees have reached the maximum allowable step. Ms. Rapozo confirmed that Mr. Toner was correct.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo continued her presentation as follows:</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Report #4 reflects the history of collective bargaining other pay amounts. This would include items like allowances that are negotiated as well.• The highlights are all over the place because certain items like uniform allowances may have been negotiated previously. For certain bargaining units, the uniform allowance will increase.• The meal allowance increased for Bargaining Units 1 and 3. Other units had already negotiated those items earlier.• For uniform allowance, Unit 3 now gets the same as the other units that may have received it during another round of negotiations.• For travel, it will be \$30 instead of \$20 for one-day travel. The County will also be moving towards a Federal-type reimbursement rate versus giving employees per diem. This will start on July 1, 2026, for all units that have settled.• Ms. Rapozo noted that she also put in the chart other negotiated items because it is not necessarily a part of the larger contract but is given to employees to remedy problems with recruiting or that there is something that they should be getting more for.• For Police Dispatcher positions, there are 21 positions allocated with only 10 filled. They are getting \$750 per month the first year they are there and then they get \$1,400 after the first year, per month, added to their regular pay. Even if they are an SR-20 and someone else is in the same bargaining unit as them, they would get the additional amount on top of the salary that they would be getting just based on their salary schedule. <p><i>Ms. Akiona-Arruda was noted as present at 9:24 a.m.</i></p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Similarly, HR knows that there are places like the DMV, pool staff, liquor staff, and parks security officers, where those positions were hard to fill. Those positions are getting additional pay as well. For those positions, they are paid their overtime rate if they do not take lunch after their fifth hour. Their sixth, seventh, and eighth hours are paid at the overtime rate. They do not take lunch so the County gains 45 minutes of counter time so that they can be on the line. The positions are difficult to fill and if everyone does not take their 45-minute lunch break, there is additional coverage. <p>Chair Uyehara asked with those supplemental agreements what is the mechanism for approving the implementation of a program like that. Ms. Rapozo responded that HR works with the department. The program must be approved by the Mayor, HR Director, as well as the union. Different unions do it differently. The United Public Works (UPW) must get a ratification vote. The Hawai'i Government Employees Association (HGEA) also gets a ratification vote. HGEA's process is a little more informal as they go around and speak to the incumbents to ensure that they are okay with the proposed changes. Supplemental agreements are not always pay-related. It could be regarding things like drug and alcohol testing or a travel allowance. For certain agreements, Council approval is not needed if a department can pay for the increase within their current budgeted appropriation. Chair Uyehara stated that some of what Ms. Rapozo just talked about are items that the Commission is struggling to figure out solutions for, regarding positions on the Salary Resolution. Chair Uyehara asked what a possible solution might be to address certain items for Salary Resolution positions. Ms. Rapozo responded that the difficulty for the Commission is that the Commission is only able to do it</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>once a year. However, if there is a difficult to fill position, the Commission could decide to meet and propose a solution via another Salary Resolution. The Salary Resolution could also possibly be more robust than it is currently to address some of the issues. Ms. Rapozo noted that she does not have enough background knowledge to know whether the Commission could make changes outside of the March 15th deadline each year so that the Commission could have more flexibility in the decisions that are made regarding positions on the Salary Resolution.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo noted that one situation that has arisen is the departure of Chief Raybuck. Now with what has happened in other counties across the state, the County of Kaua'i may be in competition with two other counties for Chief of Police applicants.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked how often a supplemental agreement has required Council approval. Ms. Rapozo responded that she does not believe a supplemental agreement has ever required Council approval. Mr. Toner asked if the supplemental agreement could proceed if it fits within the budgetary constraints. Ms. Rapozo responded that Mr. Toner was correct.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo stated that one of the larger increases made with a supplemental agreement was related to the engineer salaries. Engineers were boosted out of Bargaining Unit 13 so that they have a separate salary schedule. All those salaries were able to be covered within the budget. Engineers are only in the Department of Public Works and the Department of Water, so it was not across the entire County.</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>The free medical that was offered countywide to employees had to go to the Council for approval as it was a big change that affected the budget.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked whether the \$2,000 lump sum payment or the increases for Police Dispatchers become a part of the program or whether it is blended into the collective bargaining agreement salary structure. Ms. Rapozo responded that the items that are highlighted in the report are good for the four-year contract. After that, the employer and union can renegotiate something else. Similarly, with the supplemental agreements, those are even less permanent as they are being negotiated outside of the confines of the contract. Either side can say at any time that they no longer want that supplemental agreement to be implemented.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo reminded the Commission that for Reports # 2-4, all reports must be looked at together as they are all related.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo continued her presentation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The final report includes the Salary Resolution Salaries from 2008-2025 that could possibly reveal why the County of Kaua'i is where it is at currently.• Footnotes were included because during former Mayor Carvalho's term there was not a lot of money or revenue coming in. He did a lot of things with the Salary Commission to freeze the salaries of the department heads and deputies that he appointed. What he could have done was just not give them the salary increases because the maximum was at a certain level. Former Mayor Carvalho only had control over the positions that were | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|
| | <p>under his appointing authority so other salaries in the County continued to increase on a regular schedule.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In 2008, all the salaries are on the chart. In 2009, only the positions under the Legislative Branch and Office of the Prosecuting Attorney had increases in the Salary Resolution as all of the other positions' salaries were frozen.• In 2012, there was a push to get the positions for Fire and Police increases, so that is what happened in that year.• In July 2016, the Council got involved and stated that they did not feel it was appropriate that some department heads get raises and others do not. The Council at that time decided that some positions should not get raises in the maximum salary levels.• From 2019 to current, raises to the maximum salary levels became a more regular occurrence. There have always been various tiers of department heads and deputies.• Throughout the period noted, there were other allowances for certain department heads and deputies were also passed. Those allowances are noted in the footnote section. <p>Chair Uyehara asked if there was enough information available to expand Report #4 to include the years that would match the across-the-board increase table. Ms. Rapozo responded that 2008 was all the data that she had in her possession and that she would have to check with the Office of Boards and Commissions to see if they had resolutions from prior years. The chart for across-the-board was from 1997-1998. Administrator Ching stated that she will check with her staff. Chair Uyehara stated that if there was a way to get a directly comparable number as far as the department heads and deputies versus the collective bargaining units.</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>Administrator Ching asked if Chair Uyehara wanted to see the percentage increase from the beginning to current. Chair Uyehara responded that he would like that information along with an analysis of how that compares with the cumulative across-the-board increases that the bargaining units received. Administrator Ching stated that she understood Chair Uyehara's request. Ms. Rapozo stated that another thing that the Commission could do is to start the cumulative comparison from 2008 and take out the years prior from the other charts to match the last chart. Chair Uyehara stated that Ms. Rapozo's solution would be acceptable if salary resolutions from prior to 2008 could not be located. Chair Uyehara further stated that he would like to understand the other supplemental agreements and the non-across-the-board movements make the across-the-board cumulative percents a lower boundary because the actual raise, they received would have been higher with those adjustments. Ms. Rapozo responded that Chair Uyehara was correct in his analysis.</p> <p>Administrator Ching asked if it would be okay to use the across-the-board report and add to that the Salary Resolution data along with percentages, if that would work. Chair Uyehara responded that he believes it would work, but that the Commission could do the math on the cumulative percent increases on the across-the-board amounts.</p> <p>Administrator Ching noted that in 2025, the percentage increase amount is 3.5%. In 2023 and 2024, those increases were 5%. Chair Uyehara responded that one could take the mayor's position and take the \$172,854/\$114,490 that would give you the total cumulative increase from 2008 to 2025. Chair Uyehara further stated that he is looking for the equivalent number by multiplying all of the increases that the across-</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>the-board table has for bargaining unit for the same number of years. Administrator Ching responded that she could provide an individual increase based on the current year along with the cumulative increase and percentage. Chair Uyehara responded that he would also like the same cumulative percent increase for the same period on the across-the-board table. In essence, he would like to see, for example, that the mayor received xx% increases from 2008-2025, and the bargaining units received xx% increases during that same period.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo stated that she did the math real quickly and the salary amounts for the Salary Resolution positions received an approximately 50% salary increase. For simplicity, Ms. Rapozo took the UPW increase for that same period and that amounted to approximately 70% increases. Ms. Rapozo noted that she also understood what Administrator Ching was trying to convey in that there was a substantial increase of approximately 25% which would be added to the 50% amount plus an additional two years of 5% and 5%. Administrator Ching chimed in that she and Ms. Rapozo could figure out what to provide for the Commission. Chair Uyehara stated that this information could show the Commission whether the salary levels kept pace with the collective bargaining increases.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked what the impact of large or non-permanent wage adjustments were. Ms. Rapozo responded that step movements are large increases. In the past Bargaining Units 2, 3, and 4 had step movements and that is why their percentage increases for across-the-board were always lower. By doing away with step movements they were able to now increase their across-the-board so that everyone is getting it and their starting pay could go up. There is no guarantee that it will</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|
| | <p>continue. The County negotiated step movements away with Units 2, 3, and 4. They could get a higher across-the-board increase during years when step movements were taken away. There is a large impact when step movements are taken away in terms of across-the-board percent increases that are negotiated. Ms. Rapozo noted that what was happening is that Unit 2 supervises Unit 1. Unit 1 was overtaking their supervisors, so their subordinates were making more than their supervisors, so something had to be done. No one ultimately wanted to be a supervisor. Unit 2 had a salary schedule that was 10 steps. They reduced that to 5 steps and then down to 3 steps. They are now at 1 step so that they are where they need to be. Unit 3 basically froze step movements so they could get higher across-the-board increases. That is difficult because incumbents are feeling that they are left out of the picture by not receiving step movements anymore. Unit 3 and Unit 4 have been difficult to negotiate. Unit 13 professionals still want step movements and feel that since they have worked in the County longer they do offer more than someone just coming into the position. Mr. Toner noted that it must also help with retention. Ms. Rapozo responded that she agrees.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama stated that the information Chair Uyehara was looking for is not going to fully reflect what he thinks Chair Uyehara was looking for. Chair Uyehara responded that Vice Chair Katayama is correct, but that he prefaced his request noting that it is the lower boundary of what the actual increase was for any person or position. It is a complicated task to figure out how to make everyone closer to comparable. Vice Chair Katayama responded that the challenge is deciding how much work versus utilitarian value will be gained by going through the exercise. Chair Uyehara stated that Vice Chair Katayama</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|
| | <p>might be right that it may not be worth the effort, but he wants to try to get an idea of what level of increases the past salary resolutions warranted compared to what the collective bargaining units were able to negotiate during the same period. Chair Uyehara stated that he thinks the salary resolutions could not have kept up with the collective bargaining increases and that is why many people have not stepped up to take on leadership positions. In the end, it would be a pay cut for someone from the rank and file to take on a leadership position. Vice Chair Katayama stated that he feels that is a true part of the issue. Vice Chair Katayama further stated that the pay of department heads and deputies has not kept up with the increases given to the people they are managing. Vice Chair Katayama also explained that this inequity is what causes the difficulty in retaining employees and keeping corporate knowledge within the organization as well.</p> <p>Administrator Ching stated that the situation with appointed department heads and deputies is that they are appointed as well so their job status for the future is not as solid as civil servants. At best, someone could hold their position for 8 years or less (based on the term of the mayor) for Mayoral appointees, sometimes longer if they are Commission-appointed.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked what the salary difference between the County of Kaua'i has historically been for its positions compared to the other jurisdictions throughout the state. Ms. Rapozo asked for clarification as to whether Vice Chair Katayama was asking where the County of Kaua'i falls in comparison for Salary Resolution positions. Vice Chair Katayama responded that Ms. Rapozo was correct. Ms. Rapozo stated that historically the Salary Commission has always looked at Kaua'i</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>as being the smallest county and always felt that they should be lower than the other counties. However, there has never been a rationale given as to how much lower Kaua'i should be. In the past, the other jurisdictions went with percentage increases. This year, the County of Maui did an entire study, so they went rogue and did something different. The State did something very different as well, recognizing that they are having difficulty getting department heads. In the past though, most jurisdictions just used a percentage increase to increase salaries. Most times, the County of Kaua'i Salary Commission followed suit. Since the other jurisdictions were already higher, the County of Kaua'i positions ended up being a little lower. Vice Chair Katayama asked if there was ever a standard set like being 80% of the City and County of Honolulu's salary amount, etc. Ms. Rapozo responded that that was never looked at. Vice Chair Katayama stated that he would review Report #1 a little closer. Ms. Rapozo noted that there was another report that she previously submitted to the Commission that had the size of the other jurisdictions for comparative purposes.</p> <p>Mr. Toner asked if the cost of housing was included. Ms. Rapozo responded that she could not recall if housing was included. Mr. Toner noted that even though Kaua'i is smaller, the cost of living on Kaua'i is not lower.</p> <p>Mr. Ono stated that review and analyses of the information really depend on what you are looking for. The Salary Commission should be trying to ensure that the County of Kaua'i has the best and the brightest serving in its leadership positions. Mr. Ono further stated that the various studies and reports provided have value, as does how things were done historically, but that it should not preclude the Commission from</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|
| | <p>exploring other alternatives moving forward. Chair Uyehara stated that he sees the historical information as informing decisions made by the Commission as opposed to constraining what the Commission could do.</p> <p>Administrator Ching stated that the current Salary Commission is the first Salary Commission that has the full authority to set the maximum salaries. All other salary commissions prior had to consider receiving Council approval for their actions who receives enormous amounts of public input that affects their decision-making process to accept or reject previous salary resolutions. Past salary commissions had to determine how the public might react to the proposal, as well as how the Council would see the proposals. The political side of things probably played a role in the thought process and recommendations made by previous salary commissions. Ms. Rapozo added that the political nature of things in the past has affected salary commissions in the past. There have been salary resolutions that have not received Council approval. For some of the years provided in the HR reports, there are blank spaces which indicated that the Council did not approve of those increases, not that the salary commission did not recommend an increase. Ms. Rapozo noted that she has heard from past councils' comments about how high salaries were for leadership positions and one even comparing their job to the department head or deputy and asking why his or her salary was not at that level, noting how hard he or she worked as a councilmember.</p> <p>Administrator Ching further noted that there have also been salary commissions who have declined to put forth a salary resolution during an election year because of how political the process could be. The current Administration requested that the Charter Amendment relating to the Salary Commission be floated during the election year to give the</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>Commission the full authority.</p> <p>Administrator Ching stated that what happened in past years is that when the Salary Resolution hits the Council agenda, the public would blame the Council or the Mayor for the proposal for increased salaries not understanding how the process works.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that he can appreciate the difference in the process as politics can drive the outcome of a process. It could also translate into the collective bargaining outcomes versus the Commission-related position increases. Chair Uyehara further noted that the Commission will have the responsibility to try to explain their decisions to the public as it is a good faith move and a part of being transparent in how the Commission made the decisions it made even if technically the Commission does not have to appear before the Council any longer.</p> <p>Administrator Ching stated that the memorandum that accompanies a salary resolution is very important as it assists Councilmembers who get calls from their constituents about the increases, they have information to refer to.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara thanked Ms. Rapozo for her time and for the work she put into the reports. Administrator Ching thanked Ms. Rapozo and Ms. Anderson for being present and for the heavy lift in the reports that the Commission asked them to prepare. HR is currently in the middle of arbitration, so their workload is immense currently.</p> <p>Mr. Ono thanked HR for the overall information on benefits as well as the entire compensation package that must be reviewed in how you look at</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>someone is being compensated by the County for the work that they do.</p> <p><i>Ms. Rapozo and Ms. Anderson were noted as not present at 9:55 a.m.</i></p> <p><u>Department of Finance</u></p> <p>1. Presentation of the County Budget, Projected Revenue and Expense.</p> <p>The Commission heard from Chelsie Sakai, Director of Finance and Ken Shimonishi, Budget Administrator.</p> <p>Mr. Shimonishi explained that the Commission received a copy of a presentation that is typically done before the County Council but in a slightly truncated version.</p> <p>Mr. Shimonishi presented the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The County has two policies that it follows related to Long-Term Financial Planning. The first is regarding the preparation of a structurally balanced budget where recurring expenditure should be covered by recurring revenues. Prior to adopting the Structurally Balanced Budget Resolution the Charter basically stated that the revenues and resources need to tie out to what is presented as the budgeted expenditure amount. While you could present a statutorily balanced budget, it may not be structurally balanced and that is what was discovered prior to 2012. At that time, the County was not budgeting in a structurally balanced way, but rather statutorily balanced only. The second policy is a Reserve Fund Policy where the County maintains a minimum of 30% of the previous year's General Fund revenues. Based on the Fiscal Year 2024 revenues that would be \$80,512,448 that the | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>County should hold in reserves. Anything above that amount could be used for other purposes such as in paying down debt, one-time expenditures such as Capital Improvement Project projects, affordable housing, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Fiscal Year 2026 budget, the Administration identified that they had approximately \$6.5 million more than reserves and that was used to support contributions to capital improvement projects of \$33.7 million, excluding what was contributed for affordable housing projects. • Slide 3 shows the revenue by fund for the Operating Budget. The chart reflects the Fiscal Year 2026 budget, Fiscal Year 2025 budget, the change in dollars, and the change in percentages. In total, the Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2026 is \$372,211,021. In Fiscal Year 2025, the Operating Budget was \$353,324,899 or an approximately \$19M increase. • The General Fund had an approximately \$11M increase or 4.3% increase from the previous fiscal year. The G.E. Tax Fund had an increase of approximately \$3.3M or 9.3%. The remaining funds are listed on the slide. • Slide 4 depicts a pie chart graph of the various funds and how they make up the overall Operating Budget. The General Fund revenues amount to 77% of the County's total revenue. The second largest fund is the G.E. Tax Fund, followed by the Highway, Sewer, and Solid Waste Funds. The aforementioned 5 funds make up 98% of the County's revenues. <p>Mr. Toner asked if any of the revenues include any Federal grant funds. Mr. Shimonishi responded that there are no Federal funds budgeted in the Operating Budget. There are components within the County's</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>Operating Budget that would rely on Federal funding, one example being the County's Coastal Zone Management program. In the General Fund, there are positions that are partially funded with Federal grants, so they are not fully funded. If the grant funding does not come through, those positions would then need to be funded through other means.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if State funds were included in the Operating Budget. Mr. Shimonishi responded that like Federal funding, no State funds were reflected in the Operating Budget. There are positions that may have been partially funded with State funds and if those funds are not realized, then funding would have to come from another source. The Operating Budget reflects the County's revenue only. Similarly, when the discussion turns to expenditures, the figures presented will only represent the County's share of any shared costs.</p> <p>Mr. Shimonishi continued his presentation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Slide 5 reflects that real property taxes make up 84% of the County's General Fund revenue followed by the County's Transient Accommodations Tax at \$30.1M or 11% of the General Fund revenue.• The County did budget more in interest income and is still a fraction of what is anticipated to be received.• Slide 6 provides a narrative of how revenues were budgeted.• The General Fund increased by \$11.7M or 4.3% and that was primarily attributable to real property taxes which was a \$5.9M increase or 2.5%.• The Transient Accommodations Tax increase was \$900,000 or 3.1%.• Interest earned was budgeted at \$4.6M. | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Highway Fund increased by \$550,000 or 3% and this was due to increases in fuel taxes or the motor vehicle weight tax. • The G.E. Tax Fund increased by \$3.3M or 9.3%, attributable to interest earned and an increase in the G.E. Tax of \$920,000 or 2.6%. • The Solid Waste Fund increased by \$1.2M or 11.8% due to interest earned and charges for current services. • The Sewer Fund increased by \$1.7M or 16.4% based on the recent 6 months of data. • The Golf Fund increased by \$223,600 or 15.3% due to green and locker fees, and rent. • Overall, interest earned increased by \$8.1M across all funds. <p>Chair Uyehara asked if Mr. Shimonishi knew the average duration of the investments relates to interest earned. Mr. Shimonishi responded that by statute or Code, the County invests in short-term investments no longer than 5 years in maturity. This is through various funds. Chair Uyehara asked if the investments are held to maturity yield. Mr. Shimonishi responded that that information would need to be requested from the County Treasurer.</p> <p>Mr. Shimonishi continued his presentation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slide 7 shows the expenditure in the budget. Expenditures are grouped by general categories like Salaries & Related, Utilities, Operations, Road & Bridge Repairs, etc. • Road & Bridge Repairs are separated out as those are within the G.E. Tax Fund. • In Fiscal Year 2025, expenditures budgeted was roughly \$351.6M. In Fiscal Year 2026, expenditures budgeted is | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>\$347.1M. Though it appears to be a decrease, the affordable housing components were budgeted under CIP instead of the Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2026.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The rationale for budgeting the affordable housing projects in the CIP is so that the funds are always there and appropriate to complete affordable housing projects. The Operating Budget remaining funds will lapse and those need to be reappropriated each year.• The Operating Budget expenditure reflects a decrease of \$4.5M or 1.3%. If affordable housing projects were budgeted in the same manner, the Operating Budget would have increased by \$15.3M or a 4.3% increase.• Of note is that Salaries & Related represented 52.7% of the total budget in Fiscal Year 2025, and that is now at 55.9% in Fiscal Year 2026. <p>Mr. Toner asked why the budgeted expenditure amount for Auto; Equip. & Heavy Equip. was down. Mr. Shimonishi responded that the County shifted to outright purchases for some of the larger pieces of equipment to leases. In the Fiscal Year 2026 budget, there is a lease for a new helicopter which is valued at \$16M. In Solid Waste, new trash collection trucks are being leased.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked if the Salaries & Related would be lower if doing an apples-to-apples comparison. Mr. Shimonishi responded that Chair Uyehara was correct.</p> <p>Mr. Shimonishi continued his presentation as follows:</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Slide 8 reflects that there are unknown HR-related expenses including anticipated wage increases for SHOPO, HFFA, and Ocean Safety Officers. There is also potential for temporary hazard pay for fire fighters to be settled in Fiscal Year 2026, and that amount has not been included in the budget. <p>Chair Uyehara asked if the temporary hazard pay was COVID-19-related. Mr. Shimonishi responded that Chair Uyehara was correct.</p> <p>Mr. Shimonishi continued his presentation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Slide 9 reflects the change in the way the County is budgeting the affordable housing contributions. Basically, the General Fund is contributing \$14,125,000 into the Housing Development Fund. Previous years' contribution remaining of \$19,000,000 is being put back into the Housing Development Fund from the General Fund as well. This amounts to roughly \$33,125,000 for affordable housing projects in the CIP Budget.Slide 10 shows pie charts of the Fiscal Year 2025 Operating Budget compared to the Fiscal Year 2026 Operating Budget broken down by the different components. Of note is the affordable housing component reflected in the Fiscal Year 2025 budget is much larger than what is shown in the Fiscal Year 2026 budget and that is what was previously explained.Salaries & Related remains the largest piece of the Operating Budget. <p>Chair Uyehara asked if the residual amount for affordable housing was related to debt service or operations. Mr. Shimonishi responded that it was related to operations. The \$250,000 remaining could be used for</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|
| | <p>consulting for future parcels, etc.</p> <p>Mr. Shimonishi continued his presentation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Slide 11 reflects pie charts that show the portion appropriate to the various departments regarding the Operating Budget. This includes all budgeted components.• The Department of Public Works has the largest budget. They have expenditures that span across multiple funds. In Fiscal Year 2025, the Department of Public Works represented 33.4% of the Operating Budget and in Fiscal Year 2026 the Department of Public Works represents 33.6% of the Operating Budget.• Police, Fire, Department of Parks & Recreation, and Department of Finance would be the next largest departments in terms of budget. <p>Chair Uyehara asked if the change in the Housing Agency's budget between the two fiscal years was related to the movement of funding for affordable housing. Mr. Shimonishi confirmed that Chair Uyehara was correct.</p> <p>Mr. Ono asked if Salaries & Related on the overall summary page, whether the reflected revenue surplus is projected to be the same in future fiscal years. Mr. Shimonishi responded that generally, he believes the Fiscal Year 2026 revenue budget will hold firm. The largest piece of the revenue picture comes from real property taxes and that is based off the assessed value of properties. Mr. Shimonishi noted that he does not believe assessed values of properties will go down. The next largest revenue items are the G.E. Tax and the County's Transient Accommodations Tax. Barring significant recession or a drop in visitors</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>to the island, the Transient Accommodations Tax will be collected based on room rates so that it may buffer any downturn in visitor arrivals, etc. In general, Mr. Shimonishi anticipates revenues remaining steady at the Fiscal Year 2026 level, barring any rate change adjustments made by the County Council. In the last budget session, Councilmember Kuali discussed decreasing the Owner-Occupied real property tax rate and spoke about tiering that category with a revenue neutral proposal. This may mean lower rates for lower assessed properties and higher rates for higher assessed properties.</p> <p>Mr. Shimonishi continued his presentation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Slide 12 reflects the General Fund Budget Expense by categories. Salaries & Related amounted to 76.2% in Fiscal Year 2025 and 74.3% in Fiscal Year 2026. A large amount of the expenditures is going to employee costs.• Of note is the slight increase in the Leased category as the County moved towards leasing some of the more expensive pieces of equipment instead of buying them outright.• Slide 13 reflects the General Fund Salaries & Related expenditures budget by department.• Police and Fire make up more than half of the total Salaries & Related budget. 55.1% and 55.2% of the General Fund's Salaries & Related budgets for Fiscal Year 2025 and Fiscal Year 2026, respectively. <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked whether Mr. Shimonishi prepares a slide like Slide 13 for every budgeting cycle. Mr. Shimonishi responded that he does prepare the presentation for the County Council when presenting the budget and has done so for at least 5 or 6 years based on what his</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <p>memory could recall. Vice Chair Katayama asked Mr. Shimonishi to send previous versions of Slide 13 to Administrator Ching, if possible. Mr. Shimonishi responded that he could provide the slide for previous years but added that the slides are prepared for the first budget submittal which is due before or on March 15th of every year. After that, there is supplemental budget communication on or before May 8th of each year, which could have adjustments as well. There are also adjustments made by the Council during their decision-making sessions that could also affect the final figures. Mr. Shimonishi noted that he does not prepare graphs for the supplemental budget submittal or after the Council does their deliberations. Mr. Shimonishi further stated that the charts that will be provided are only for the initial budget submittal each year.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara asked if the proposed budgets include a placeholder for upcoming collective bargaining negotiations. Mr. Shimonishi responded that when the budget is submitted, the Administration may include some flexibility for negotiations, though the amounts would not want to be disclosed for the sake of not revealing the County's financial position in negotiations. Those types of disclosures could be submitted to the Council under confidential cover, if needed.</p> <p>Administrator Ching asked Vice Chair Katayama the years of past reports he was requesting of Mr. Shimonishi. Vice Chair Katayama responded that he was looking at the last 3 or 4 past presentations that were made to the Council.</p> <p>Mr. Shimonishi continued his presentation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Slide 14 reflects the G.E. Tax Fund and the breakdown between the Department of Public Works and Transportation Agency. | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• When the Fund was first started, Councilmembers were worried about how much of the funds were going to be put towards the Transportation Agency versus how much would be used to fix the roads and bridges around the island.• The chart provides a historical look at how the G.E. Tax Fund has been used.• The Department of Public Works budget is going towards road resurfacing or bridge repairs. The Transportation Agency budget goes towards their operations like bus driver salaries or bus purchases.• Historically, the split was 75% for the Department of Public Works and 25% for the Transportation Agency. <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked what the impact is of Federal and State funds to the County's overall budget picture. Mr. Shimonishi responded that one of the requirements with Federal funding is that the County conducts a Single Audit which looks specifically at how much Federal monies are received, spent, and accounted for. Within that Single Audit is a financial statement called a Schedule of Expenditure of Federal Awards or SEFA, and that provides a report of the scheduled expenditures that were made in any given fiscal year. These expenditures include Section 8 housing vouchers or assistance, any Federal Highways assistance received, monies received by the Office of the Prosecuting Attorney, etc. The SEFA reflected the County receiving a little more than \$15M in Federal funds. The Single Audit report is available every year. For State funds, the Department of Finance would need to run a separate report to gather that information.</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|
| | <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if any Federal or State funds are used for operational purposes or to fund salaries. Mr. Shimonishi responded that Federal and State funds are used to fund salaries.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked if the presentation was only focused on County funds. Mr. Shimonishi responded that Vice Chair Katayama was correct. Mr. Shimonishi noted that there are approximately 50 positions funded with Federal funds not counting programs that are funded separately like funds from the Older Americans Act, Meals on Wheels, Section 8 Housing Rental Payments, etc.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked how would impacts of Federal funding impact operations. Mr. Shimonishi responded that the question would best be posed to the Managing Director or the Mayor. Ultimately, there would be tough choices that would need to be made as far as how much the County should fund to continue with those specific programs or positions. Mr. Shimonishi noted that he is not authorized to speak on behalf of the Administration regarding Vice Chair Katayama's inquiry.</p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama explained that as the Commission moves forward to structure the salaries for department heads and deputies, that kind of information will come into play.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that the concern of the Commission is that if a salary adjustment is proposed by the Commission will that increased amount be sustainable to the County. Chair Uyehara further asked if the County would be able to sustain any level of increase looking into the future. Chair Uyehara asked if Mr. Shimonishi had any advice for the Commission. Mr. Shimonishi responded that the task of the Commission</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|
| | <p>is tough. With any Administration, it boils down to what priorities it chooses to fund or not. Mr. Shimonishi further responded that he cannot respond further than that as it is outside of his purview.</p> <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel referred to Slide 2 regarding “recurring expenditures should be covered by recurring revenues” and “maintaining a target minimum of 30% of the previous year’s General Fund revenues,” and asked whether those resolutions were set in stone or whether that could change with a new administration. Mr. Shimonishi responded that the resolutions could be changed. Having worked on the long-term financial planning project, Mr. Shimonishi noted that the original thought was to put everything into a Bill for An Ordinance, so it becomes law. However, the consultants from the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) told the County that they should not have it set in stone. The GFOA recommended that the County should just have a policy and follow it but also have flexibility in the event of an unforeseen circumstance where they can modify the policy accordingly. Making changes through the ordinance process takes longer. At first the Administration did not quite understand the guidance but having gone through some emergencies, it definitely sees the value in having the flexibility to adjust the policies accordingly. The main thing is that the Administration and the Council all understand the necessity for changes and buys into what the policies are meant for.</p> <p>Mr. Ono noted that based on the information provided by HR for 2025, the total of all salaries for the Salary Resolution positions is approximately \$2.83M. The Commission has done a good job to get the discussion to this point. The future challenge is to address the inversion problem and to see how some “potholes” can be filled. Understanding the financial</p> | |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>picture of the County now and in the future is a strong foundational piece that must be explored.</p> <p>Administrator Ching recognized Mr. Shimonishi and Ms. Sakai for their efforts in providing the Commission with various reports and responses to requests. Much of the financial information is prepared by the Department of Finance. The Commission echoed the sentiments of Administrator Ching.</p> <p><i>Ms. Sakai and Mr. Shimonishi were noted as not present at 10:35 a.m.</i></p> | <p>No action was taken regarding agenda item SC 2025-1.</p> |
| <p>SC 2025-5</p> | <p><u>Communication dated May 8, 2025, from Jaclyn Kaina, Chair Charter Review Commission to Chair Joshua Uyehara, Salary Commission requesting proposals to amend the Charter.</u></p> <p>Administrator Ching noted that the communication follows the procedure that the Charter Review Commission has followed to request proposals every other year from other boards and commissions and departments to submit proposed Charter Amendments for their consideration. The deadline to submit proposals is July 31, 2025. The Charter Review Commission will start meeting in August to start reviewing proposals to determine which proposals they would like to move forward with.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara noted that the Commission should plan to target any proposals for future consideration, possibly in 2027 given the Commission's tasks at hand and upcoming meeting schedule.</p> | <p>Mr. Toner moved to receive the Communication dated May 8, 2025, from the Chair of the Charter Review Commission for the record. Ms. Chiba-Miguel seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p> |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|------------------|---|--|
| SC 2025-6 | <p><u>Memorandum dated May 23, 2025, from Kevin Mince, Boards and Commissions Support Clerk to Chair Joshua Uyehara, Salary Commission regarding Police Chief Salary Recommendations.</u></p> <p>Administrator Ching noted that Mr. Mince is an emergency hire that is specifically related to the executive search for the new Chief of Police. Communication details the position of the Police Commission regarding the salary of the Chief of Police, which was recommended to be set at \$180,000 by Chief Raybuck, as well as the Police Commission's position on performance-based bonuses. Communication relays the feedback from the Police Commission to the Salary Commission.</p> <p>Administrator Ching noted that the time was 10:37 a.m. Ms. Chiba-Miguel will have to leave shortly and there are four additional items for the Commission to cover on the agenda. Administrator Ching further noted that Deputy County Attorney Michaels has provided the Commission with a County Attorney opinion which will be covered in Executive Session. Administrator Ching apologized to Deputy County Attorney Michaels for not providing the opinion to the Commission prior to today's meeting, as he had finished drafting the opinion approximately 2 months ago.</p> <p>Administrator Ching asked whether the Commission wanted to go into Executive Session to hear the brief by the Deputy County Attorney or continue with the agenda knowing that there will be a hard stop at 11:45 a.m.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that he thinks the Commission should convene in Executive Session to address those matters then address matters</p> | <p>Ms. Chiba-Miguel moved to receive the Communication dated May 23, 2025, from Kevin Mince for the record. Ms. Akiona-Arruda seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p> |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>regarding Permitted Interaction Group formation depending on the outcome of the Executive Session.</p> <p>There being no objections Executive Session ES SC 2025-2 was taken out of order.</p> | |
| <p>EXECUTIVE SESSION SC 2025-2</p> | <p><u>Under Hawaii Revised Statutes §94-4 (a) (b) and §92-5 (a) (4), the purpose of this Executive Session is for Deputy County Attorney Andrew Michaels to brief the Commission on a confidential opinion dated April 23, 2025, to Joshua Uyehara, Chair, County of Kauai Salary Commission regarding HRS Section 46-24; Temporary Assignments; Definition of Salary; Interpretation of the Phrase “Maximum Salaries; and Sec. HRS 78-18.3.</u></p> <p>Vice Chair Katayama asked whether the Commissioners would need to identify who they would like to be present in Executive Session. Administrator Ching stated that she would like to be present in Executive Session. Deputy County Attorney Michaels would also be present as would Commission Support Clerk Mercedes Omo.</p> <p>Administrator Ching read the Executive Session posting language into the record.</p> <p>Chair Uyehara confirmed that Administrator Ching and Ms. Omo would be included in the Executive Session.</p> <p>There being no objections, the Open Session Meeting was recessed at 10:44 a.m. for the Commission to convene in Executive Session.</p> | <p>Mr. Ono moved to enter Executive Session. Ms. Chiba-Miguel seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p> |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|--|---|---|
| RETURN TO OPEN SESSION/RATIFY THE ACTION TAKEN IN EXECUTIVE SESSION | <p><i>Ms. Chiba-Miguel was noted as not being present at 11:00 a.m. (departed during Executive Session).</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Ono was noted as not present at 11:30 a.m. (departed during Executive Session).</i></p> <p>There being no objections, the Open Session Meeting reconvened at 11:45 a.m. and proceeded as follows:</p> <p>Administrator Ching called on Deputy County Attorney Michaels to present the Executive Session Report pursuant to HRS § 92-4(b).</p> <p>Deputy County Attorney Michaels reported that the Commission covered questions that were asked by the Office of the County Attorney by the Salary Commission, as well as short answers to those questions. Additionally, any follow-up questions during the Executive Session were also answered and discussed. Those questions had to do with Hawai‘i Revised Statutes (HRS) 46-24, temporary assignments, definition of salary, interpretation of the phrase “maximum salaries,” and HRS Section 78-18.3.</p> | <p>No action was taken regarding this agenda item.</p> |
| SC 2025-7 | <p><u>Discussion and action on adopting guidelines for the Salary Resolution.</u></p> <p>Chair Uyehara stated that with the limited time remaining before quorum is lost, the Commission should defer agenda items SC 2025-7, SC 2025-8, and SC 2025-9 to the Commission’s next meeting in July.</p> | <p>Mr. Toner moved to defer agenda item SC 2025-7 to the Commission’s July 2025 meeting. Ms. Akiona-Arruda seconded the motion. Motion carried 4:0.</p> |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
|--------------------|--|--|
| SC 2025-8 | <u>Discussion and action on making recommendations to include performance-based increases in the salary resolution by forming a permitted interaction group (PIG) pursuant to HRS § 92-2.5(b)(1) relating to performance-based increases and if so, the assignment of commission members to the PIG, the determination of the scope of the PIG, and the defining of each member's authority.</u> | Mr. Toner moved to defer agenda item SC 2025-8 to the Commission's July 2025 meeting. Ms. Akiona-Arruda seconded the motion. Motion carried 4:0. |
| SC 2025-9 | <u>Discussion and action on making recommendations to formulate a plan to provide salary increases that will address the unique challenges in each department as opposed to broad percentage increases across all elected and appointed positions by forming a permitted interaction group (PIG) pursuant to HRS § 92-2.5(b)(1) relating to an individualized plan for increases and if so, the assignment of commission members to the PIG, the determination of the scope of the PIG, and the defining of each member's authority.</u> | Mr. Toner moved to defer agenda item SC 2025-9 to the Commission's July 2025 meeting. Ms. Akiona-Arruda seconded the motion. Motion carried 4:0. |
| ADJOURNMENT | Chair Uyehara asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. There being no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 11:53 a.m. | Mr. Toner has moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Akiona-Arruda seconded the motion. Motion carried 4:0. |

Submitted by: _____
Mercedes Omo, Staff Support Clerk

Reviewed and Approved by: _____
Joshua Uyehara, Chair

(X) Approved as circulated on July 10, 2025

() Approved as amended. See minutes of _____ meeting.