

SALARY COMMISSION
MINUTES
KALANA O MAUI, 7th FLOOR COMMITTEE ROOM
FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2005

Present: Scott Matsuura, Chair Douglas Levin, Vice-Chair Janet Tomita Michael Westfall Jason Williams	Absent: Curtis Franks Helen Nielsen Anthony Lemmo
Staff: Traci Fujita Villarosa, First Deputy Corporation Counsel Lynn Krieg, Director Department of Personnel Services Diane Wakamatsu, Executive Assistant Momi DeMello, Boards & Commissions Secretary	Others: Wayne Hedani, Chair, Police Commission Ron Vaught, Police Commission

I. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order by Chair Matsuura at 8:40 a.m. In attendance are Commissioners Levin, Tomita, Westfall, and Williams. Also, Lynn Krieg is here and Traci is here.

II. Public Testimony

Chair Matsuura: First thing on the agenda is public testimony. We have two public testifiers today. First, I guess, is Wayne Hedani.

Wayne Hedani: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to address the Board's invitation basically to address the Executive Management Compensation Plan (EMCP). Although I don't have prepared remarks for you, I'd like to cover several points. The last time I came before the Salary Review Committee was in 2004 and we were reviewing increases for the Chief of Police and the Deputy Chief of Police who at the time were receiving salaries that were significantly below that of their subordinates. Through the Salary Commission's action, we corrected that particular imbalance and made significant steps for both the Chief and the Deputy Chief which brought them more in line with what our Commission thought was the appropriate salary level with those positions. That took a lot of courage on the part of this particular Commission, I think, and we appreciated that. Part of the recommendation that we had at the last meeting was that in the future the salaries of Chief and the Deputy Chief be

adjusted on an annual basis so that it would be automatically adjusted to ensure that there is a differential between the next lower subordinate and the Deputy's salary and the Chief's. That particular step, we didn't act on as a recommendation, but the opportunity was made for us to come back on an annual basis to review the situation each time. The last increase that we had given them was retroactive, which we appreciated, back to September of 2003. So, what we have today is a situation where the last formal increase that was granted, was granted in September of 2003. They haven't received anything additional to that in 2004, although it was granted in 2004, and now we're in 2005. The concern that I have is that the original recommendation was to take the salary to \$110,000 was the recommendation, with a lower salary for the Deputy. We are currently at \$103,000 for the Chief, plus the Standard of Conduct differential, and what I'd like to do is just go down some real quick points for the Commission - just as kind of a refresher of some of the points that we brought up back in 2003.

Chair Matsuura: Wayne may I make a request? After you finished with your oral testimony, is it possible for you to submit something to the Commission regarding what you're talking about.

Mr. Hedani: Sure. I will put it in writing and get it back to you. We did submit a letter, I'm not sure if you got it yet, but I did sign it on Wednesday, so it should be in your packets somewhere although it is relatively non-descriptive. What that letter basically asked for is if we could consider parity for EMCP positions to keep pace with the SHOPO increases. On Oahu, the SHOPO raises were matched, I believe, and Lynn you can correct me if I'm wrong. I believe on Oahu what they did for the Honolulu Police Department was they matched the increases that SHOPO granted for their EMCP positions so their Captains, their Assistant Chiefs, Majors all got increases that were parity with what the union was granted. I don't believe that that's the case here.

Ms. Krieg: That's correct.

Chair Matsuura: EMCP positions?

Ms. Krieg: EMCP stands for Excluded Managerial Compensation Plan and these are managerial positions which are a separate group that are excluded from collective bargaining.

Chair Matsuura: We don't have jurisdiction over salaries relating to the EMCP?

Ms. Krieg: No.

Chair Matsuura: Okay.

Mr. Hedani: It's tough for me to figure out who is in charge of what actually. So I may be testifying and barking up the wrong tree.

Chair Matsuura: That's why Lynn is here.

Mr. Hedani: Excuse me, if that's the case. What we are asking for is, right now, what we have is a 13% vacancy rate in the Police Department. I don't begrudge the officers at the lowest levels of the Department for any increases that they got. I think it is well deserved and it brings them closer to where they should be in terms of what you should be paid as a Police Officer on the street. The concern that I have is that for the middle-management in the Department that hopefully will eventually become the top management of the Department in the future, we need to ensure that we do not penalize them for not being in the union and to have parity with what happens within the union increases so that we maintain those balances. For the Chief and the Deputy, the Deputy told us on Wednesday that he's happy and as far as he is concerned, no increase is something that he can live with. From my prospective, I felt that what we should be doing is looking at it from a broader view as the position as opposed to the individual.

Chair Matsuura: Go ahead, go ahead.

Mr. Hedani: We should consider increases that would keep pace not only with SHOPO increases but also with the cost of living and inflation. Comparable communities on the mainland, as we testified the last time, for a size community of Maui, the Chief gets \$150,000 they don't have two million visitors that we have on Maui that you have to deal with. The cost of housing on Maui, the median price has just gone past \$600,000, so it's an impact to all of the people in the Department. While we have a record number of visitors, more than the Big Island and Kauai combined, the de facto population of the island is bigger than the Big Island and Kauai combined. Oahu maintains a policy of insuring that there's that differential, whether it's 5% or 10% between the Chief, his Deputy and his Deputy and the next level of support. So, I think we should maintain parity at the Chief and Deputy Chief's level.

Chair Matsuura: Is that a matter of policy or a matter of . . .

Mr. Hedani: It's actually a matter of past practice that whenever the increases came through they automatically looked at it and then made adjustments to maintain that differential. That's what we were asking for was to maintain that differential on a regular basis.

Chair Matsuura: I guess there is a difference between a rule that requires a 5% differential versus practice. I just wanted to make that clear.

Mr. Hedani: Right now, the Police Department has 47 officers vacant. We have a 13% vacancy rate in the Department. What I want to look at is to make sure that Oahu's situation does not become more attractive to our officers to cause them to leave the Department and move to Oahu and use Maui as a stepping stone to go to Oahu. We spend about \$90,000 a year in each recruit that we bring into the Department. We'd like to keep them instead of losing them because we don't have parity with other islands. And I think the other point that I wanted to make is that the last time we testified we actually took the salaries beyond the Mayor's salary and we've corrected that since then. But, I would like to see a situation where the top salary within the Department does not become a glass ceiling

where increases for the middle-management within the Department, the EMCP positions is flattened because of the inability to submit those adjustments. For comparison purposes, I wanted to let the Commission know that in Kaanapali, a Chief Engineer's position with a major hotel, with, from my perspective, a lot less responsible than Chief of Police or Deputy of the Department with 400 people under you makes \$140,000.

The other last point I wanted to make is that when our troops return from Iraq, hopefully very soon, the front line and war on terror becomes United States soil and at that point the Police Department becomes the front line of that particular battle. In the military, they're making adjustments where if you have a death benefit, you die in battle, they increase that from \$12,000 to \$250,000, we haven't made any adjustments for the Police Department in a situation like that.

And the last thing I wanted to say is that, we currently have what I believe is the best Department in the State of Hawaii. We're coming up for accreditation for the fourth time. Honolulu has only been accredited once in the first initial accreditation. We have a wealth of knowledge and a wealth of talent in the leadership of the Department and what we'd like to do is keep that talent available to mentor and train the next and growing set of officers that we have coming up through the ranks. I would also like to thank this Commission for the courage that you folks showed in the last time we got together. It was tough, and we appreciate the efforts that you took. Thank you.

Chair Matsuura: Any questions from the Commissioners? I have a question. You're currently the Chair of . . .

Mr. Hedani: I am currently the Chairman of the Police Commission.

Chair Matsuura: Okay. I know you folks recently must have submitted a budget to the County Council or the Mayor, whichever way it goes. Have you folks changed the salary in the budget that you submitted to the Council?

Mr. Hedani: I don't think they make any presumptions on increases for the salary when they go in for the budget. They go in for the budget based on what their needs are. I don't think that the Chief and the Deputy have included anything for their raises.

Chair Matsuura: And the only reason I ask is I think you also understand that when the Commission makes it's decision, it's pretty much automatic and it does cause some controversy from the budgeting standpoint that you kind of have to take from someplace else to make up for whatever that increase is going to be as it relates to salaries unless it's previously budgeted for. I think the Commission has tried to meet some of that budget deadlines, but you know, even that is pretty tough. But anyway, I just wondered with most of the testimony being in relation to what comparables are or what you guys believe should be the salaries. I just wondered if you folks put a proposal to alter the budget so that coming to the Commission, we don't have to worry about a fiscal impact of something else.

Ms. Krieg: It doesn't work like that.

Chair Matsuura: It can.

Ms. Krieg: Yeah but, see if they had budgeted for increases in the Department Heads salary's now without Council approval, that's the first thing that would have been eliminated when they went for their sit down with the Administration.

Chair Matsuura: Yeah, but I think that at the same time it would probably been, if the Mayor agrees, or if the Council agrees, then it's a little easier for the Commission to take a look at a salary amount. I understand what you are talking about, but what I'm saying is, if you had submitted a proposed budget that included an increase of an anticipated, or what think is a proper salary, then it makes it, as the approval process goes through, it makes is a little easier for the Commission to come to certain decisions and things like that.

Ms. Villarosa: I think that it's important remember too that the budgets are not a line item, so there's just going to be a lump sum for salaries and it's not going to be lined out like the Chief. I mean they'll have details, but the details are not the budget there just like an accompanying document to help the Council. But the actual budget is just going to be like a lump sum for the Department.

Chair Matsuura: Okay.

Ms. Wakamatsu: Scott, I wanted to just mention, because he made reference to sending a letter.

Chair Matsuura: Uh huh.

Ms. Wakamatsu: Well, as of today the Mayor's Office has not received the letter yet, but as soon as we do, we will forward it to the Commissioners.

Chair Matsuura: Great.

Mr. Vaught: Good morning. I would like to thank the Commission for giving us the opportunity to speak on behalf the budget and the Police Department and compensation. And sitting in the back there and being as old as I am, I didn't hear everything that was said. So I want to reiterate, so I want to get it. You folks are not responsible command staff salaries, is that what I heard? And that's up to the Chief and Deputy Chief to make those recommendations and then have that money included in the budget, etc.

Ms. Krieg: For the EMCP?

Mr. Vaught: Yeah.

Ms. Krieg: Yes.

Mr. Vaught: Okay. Well, I want to reiterate just basically what Wayne had said. We have 47 positions open, we don't want any more than that, we don't want that the number to continue to enlarge. And we've got an awful lot of command staff people in the EMCP positions that are eligible for retirement and unless we can get the additional funds for them some of them may just be retiring and that means we gotta move perhaps semi-qualified people up and then that leaves us more open spaces on the bottom. We're just all working in the same direction and I know you folks empathize with this. The Department is in critical situation so the more we can do to stabilize salaries, even at the top and get them some kind of parity, should this Chief leave us and we need to find someone from outside, we'd like to find someone who's really qualified and not somebody that's willing to work for the money he's getting. It may come to that at some point, we don't know how soon that's going to happen. And, I don't want to take a lot of your time, I just want to reiterate what Wayne said because we as Police Commissioners have knowledge; I mean I'm just a citizen too, but we have information and knowledge from inside and the feelings and the concerns of the officers and their command staff. And, we want to stabilize that as much as possible so that, we're a growing community and a growing Department and uh, that's what I have to say. Again, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Chair Matsuura: Okay, thanks Ron. Any questions?

Vice-Chair Levin: Okay. I have actually a question for Lynn while this gentleman is sitting here. Is there, in making the decisions, from what I understand from how this process works, you establish raises for the Excluded Managerial on that pay structure that's been historically provided. And then you and the Mayor sit down and decide, or the Mayor has final approval of that. Is there, and the question I have is this, is that being limited by how much you can provide or what ranges are available to the middle-management of the Police Department that is in this group? Is that being limited by the salaries that we have approved for the Police Chief and the Assistant Chief?

Ms. Krieg: No.

Vice-Chair Levin: So if we gave them raises, that would not affect the raise that you could reasonably propose to the Mayor for the middle group.

Ms. Krieg: No.

Vice-Chair Levin: Okay.

Ms. Krieg: I think the concern that's being expressed by the Police Department at the present time, is that they want EMCP employees of the Police Department to have parity with the rank-and-file employees of the Police Department who are part of collective bargaining. The problem is that the EMCP or the members, or the employees who are in the Excluded Managerial Compensation Plan are from various occupational groups, not just Police. They are a group of managers from different occupations, from different, let's use the word comparable bargaining units. We have white collar professional groups, we have

people from Police, we have different groups. So, you know to just, they were put together, the decision back, I believe it was back in 1989 to establish this group of managers, was to recognize them as a separate group of managers. Not Police managers, Fire managers, Engineer managers or whatever, but just as a group of managers. They all have the same responsibility to manage and that was their primary responsibility and that was what they were supposed to be grouped as. To now break them apart and say that we are going to do their compensation based on their individual comparable collective bargaining, we may as well have the unions bargain for them all over again.

Mr. Vaught: Lynn, there is a considerable difference between the Police Department and the other departments, obviously, no body else carries a gun, at least not that we know of.

Ms. Krieg: No there are other people that carry guns. In the other bargaining units, there are people who carry guns.

Mr. Vaught: Public Works is not carrying guns, but I understand what you're saying. You know this hasn't come up except in the past couple of years that we've had critical situations, with the island growing as fast as it is and the number of police officers that are required and the really difficult time we're having to fill those positions. It would seem that we have kind of a special situation. Is there any special situation clause in there where we can override some of these other things on a temporary basis?

Ms. Krieg: This isn't the forum for this discussion so I would just like to tell you that we've had discussions, and are in discussions, with the Department and I have expressed to the Chief and to the group of EMCP employees that we are very well aware of the problems that we will be approaching regarding the disparity in the pay for the top level, the Captains and the lower level subordinates, and the fact that if we don't do something soon that the lower level guys may not be wanting to take promotions in the very near future. We are very well aware of that so we will, when we fashion the next plan for the increases, we will be taking those into consideration.

Mr. Vaught: Thank you very much, I appreciate that. I'm sorry I brought that up here but, it's not very often that I can sit across the table from Lynn.

Ms. Krieg: Just the other week.

Mr. Vaught: Thank you so much.

Chair Matsuura: Is there any other questions? If not, thanks Ron. Well, that was the last person who signed up to testify. Is there anyone else from the public that would like to testify at this time? Okay, if not, then that closes off our public testimony section.

III. Approval of Minutes

Chair Matsuura: I know that the January 14th Minutes, we just got today so, we may not be comfortable with approving those. But, if I could take at least the December 10th Minutes.

Vice-Chair. Levin: I have a number of changes, if we discuss them personally, it might get time consuming to talk about each one and discuss them, would it be easier to just submit them and then have it re-done and then we go around it again?

Chair Matsuura: Why don't we defer then, approval, and maybe what you can do is send whatever kind of recommendation or you can provide it to the staff and they can make whatever changes are necessary and go over again the next time, would be the easiest.

Vice-Chair Levin: Because otherwise that it would be very time consuming I think to go through line by line.

Chair Matsuura: Okay. then this will double up on it or whatever, just make the changes necessary.

Ms.Wakamatsu: Scott, I just had a question?

Chair Matsuura: Sure.

Ms. Wakamatsu: On a verbatim basis, if we're hearing it as we're typing it?

Chair Matsuura: I think it's just a matter of clarification, I guess that's what he's saying. It will take quite a lot of time if we go through it one by one and ..

Mr. Levin:

And talk about them, I mean there's words, I use certain terms very common, I'll say I respectively submit something and it's down completely different, so I know it's wrong. In other places there's questions, but, so as I go through this I'm mostly looking at my own words and I'm surprised that, I'm surprised at the lack of clarity on this stuff and maybe I just don't know myself very well.

Ms. Wakamatsu:

I just wanted to explain that the traditional transcriber that we hire actually transcribes it, then she gives it to me in draft form and I virtually listen to it and go over everything she's transcribed. So I just wanted to make that clear, that if that's how we hear it being said and this is done on a verbatim basis.... I'm not sure if should change things if that's not what the recording as we hear it is saying.

Ms. Villarosa:

Well, I think the only thing to do is, Doug if you want to listen if you want to have access to the tape? You can check and see if it's accurately, the minutes are accurate. I mean that's the only thing that I could think of that you could do.

Do they change, are they substantive changes or are they just word changes that wouldn't affect the substance of what you are saying?

Mr. Levin:

Um, they are not really substantive changes, they're word changes.

Ms. Villarosa:

O.K.

Mr. Levin:

Maybe we'll have a chance to talk about this after the meeting.

Ms. Villarosa:

O.K., that's fine.

Mr. Levin:

When I have a chance to check this out, I might have a better answer for you, right now maybe it's just the first time I see my own words, maybe I'm just surprised at how they look. And if I do then I'll pass, maybe I do need to listen to it once or twice and then I'll say O.K. I guess that is me and I'll just pass.

Ms. Villarosa:

O.K. Why don't we just defer that.

Mr. Levin:

But at the moment I am quite, what I read I'm just very uncomfortable with and it could be something I just don't know about myself so I'll just pass and we can move on and we can approve this next time.

Chair Matsuura:

So we'll put this back on the agenda for the next time hopefully and staff, we also need to put on the agenda for the next meeting the issue of verbatim versus summary minutes, I think we got a lot of controversy regarding verbatim minutes, so... the time it takes to review as well as now maybe changes are necessary or not necessary or whatever. I think we need to review that whole issue again.

O.K. moving on Unfinished Business.

IV. Unfinished Business

A. Executive Management Compensation Plan

1) Review Subcommittee's report on Executive Management Compensation Plan

Chair Matsuura:

I guess that's what most of the people were here for. Executive Management Compensation Plan, the subcommittee's review report.

Mr. Levin:

Uh yes, Tony and I met and created a tentative agenda for discussion today for the next year about what we would consider various issues in considering prior overall structures of the Salary Commission as well as potential considerations of other issues or other structures that we may want to consider and also when we would consider various different departments and things like that, we created a tentative agenda that I'm gonna hand out here. (Copy of the Agenda is attached).

The structure of the sub-committee meeting was we basically brainstormed for a while and put a list of all the things that we've heard in our time on the commission that we thought was relevant to a decision making process to consider salaries as a group. We did not spend a lot of time considering Council salaries, we talked about everything else, every other department that was out there. We put a whole list up on the board and then we started looking critically at the list which things really weren't relevant or wouldn't be appropriate and some things made this agenda which maybe a bit aggressive, but we at least wanted to have a discussion them so we can put them to bed and go to bed with that. We started off, we suggested a March 11th that some of the more senior members of the Salary Commission give us a sort of historical review of some of the salary peers and other structures that have been used in the past. We don't want to move on without some respect for the work that was done by our predecessors. On April 8th we wanted to discuss establishing a new commission member introduction package of some kind so that when new commission members join us in the future they're brought up to speed very quickly on whatever structure was historically there plus what ever structure we decide to establish so that we are not training new commission members but instead are moving forward. What we thought it would worthy to discuss that as one of our agenda items. In addition on April 8th we wanted to decide on whether, and this is one of the things that we thought was going to be some what critical, as we go through, we're gonna start reviewing individual departments. Do we want to either make a final decision when we are done with that particular day and do particular department with a forward date for establishments as they're all going into affect on the same day or do we want to make a tentative decision and at the very end of the process revisit the whole thing and make a final decision on the whole package. Anyway, we thought that we should at least have a discussion about which approach we want to take so that we can make a final decision on that and then as we start to consider the individual departments, we know which structure we're operating under. On May 13th a gentleman by the name of Ken Taira provided us with a very well thought out letter showing a lot of understanding for the issues that we face and he made some suggestions to us that seemed very relevant, we wanted to have a discussion of his letter and the consideration of the overall structure, we were gonna do. We also considered having a discussion on the affect and importance of cost of living salaries where it's been historically what the rates have been on Maui versus the Mainland, things like that. We also wanted to discuss what kind of timing we need to have for our decisions on a go-for-it basis. Right now, I don't know in my mind or even have a chart when the decisions are going to come out of the various different unions and when the come out of excluded managerial types of decisions, and if we know when those things are coming, we can structure our own agendas in the future to be well timed to deal with and use that

information on our own decision making. We also wanted to discuss salary inversion that day and it's affect on our eventual decision making. On June 10th we thought we would have a discussion of how the job responsibilities and the affect of any change in those have an affect on a person's salary, because sometimes the salary ranges change and do we want to leave ourselves at range to be able to adjust those if there is an adjustment or other kind of things. We also want to have a consideration of whether or not we wanted to go with salary range, again this is where we're getting into some of the stuff that might be a bit aggressive, but we wanted to at least consider it, I'm not expected it to be, but we just wanted to put this on the table so it can be discussed, whether we would establish instead, salary ranges for a position that may be varied for a particular person either based on their performance, which would be very difficult to asses, but maybe it might be easier to asses their experience. So that if someone was being hired as the Planning Director and they came in with 20 years of experience and a PHD in the stuff that would be a different rate from someone who was, had just a bachelor in it and maybe 5 or 10 years of experience so that if the County was wanting to hire someone that was very experienced we would have a bigger range. Coming back to that would be like the Police Commission, if the Police Chief was to leave do we want to leave ourselves a range that they can come to us and ask to go to the higher end of the range to approve someone that they really wanted who came with credentials and that would be worthy of it. We also wanted to, so that one is a very aggressive sort of thing outside the scope that the commission considered before, but we wanted to at least discuss it whether it was something we wanted to consider, we wanted to set aside because of the difficulties involved in it. We also wanted to discuss comparisons with other Counties and whether they were relevant to us. And we also wanted to talk about departmental differences, i.e. tier and the issue that came up. Once we consider all these things, you wanna go back and sort of review the, cause we think a lot of the original structure, the historical structure was based on the tiering, when we're done with all of this if you want to go back and look at tiering again and see whether or not that makes sense, and I think it's going to, but we want to approach that in terms of whether we want to now tier people in that structure once we've considered all these other factors. On July 8th we're gonna, and I put a note here, because I think this is where we would start to discuss the individual departments. The first one we thought was the Corporate Counsel one and we left that one to carry over to the next one because we think that one may be very time consuming because there are a lot of detailed memos about judges salaries and competitive issues in the legal field to attract good members to that department. That one also has the special consideration that all of the members of that department, their salary structures are very closely tiered to whatever we approved for the top two members in addition to that there are student loans and other issues that relate to that so we presume that would be very time consuming.

Ms. Krieg:

Also the Prosecuting Attorney, their office is similar to Corporate Counsel.

Mr. Levin:

O.K.

Chair Matsuura:

We appoint salaries to the Prosecuting Attorneys?

Ms. Krieg:

Uh hum

Mr. Levin:

What frustrates me to some degree as a commission member is how much I don't know about the various processes that go on around us and how critical that is to my decision making. In many ways now that that Board moves forward on periodic where we're replaced every five years and we actually have some continuity and we roll in and we roll out we really only have to, now that this is an established board, we really only have to change people, only a couple of people every year and bring them up to speed with the positions of the rest of the Board, I think that having an educational process for new members, including myself to be honest with you, it would be extremely viable and that new Commission member introductory package, I'm not thinking that that's something that we're going to build once and forget about, as we go through this there's gonna have to be things added to it so that when somebody comes on, say that somebody joins us early next year, all the decisions have been made about our structure and how we're approaching this presumably if we stick with this plan and we can bring them up to speed on the structure we have established and why we think working within it is effective for what we do.

Chair Matsuura:

I tend to agree, the information is there, it's just a matter of organizing it and putting it in a packet so to speak.

Ms. Villarosa:

Well there is a new member package that's given to every member by the Mayor's office.

Mr. Levin:

Yeah, and it's informational and about ethical standards and general standards.

Ms. Villarosa:

Yeah it's standard, and then normally, and maybe this is a good meeting, we need to remind the various Boards and Commissions staff people, there's suppose to be a new member orientation agenda item again April or March or whenever the new members come on board, and that's usually the time when we go over what you're talking about, along with, I usually go over the ethical issues and you know, procedural stuff also, then the Commission itself the members kind of orient the new member about where they are, what they're doing, you know, that kind of a thing, so it's suppose to be done every year when a new member comes on.

Mr. Levin:

Traditionally, this last year because of all the changes in the rules and everything else, new members were coming up all over the place, but you're telling me that they'll all come on on a given day, probably. They'll all come on like, the old ones will retire in March and the new ones will come on in April, so their first one is April right? That makes a lot of sense.

Ms. Villarosa:

Right, that's how it supposed to be.

Chair Matsuura:

I think in consideration for the comments that were made by the Council, this is the first time this Commission is actually going through a single rotation like they're talking about where there are staggered terms and so when we look at these things it's a totally different kind of situation. In the past, you have to remember that there were nine new members that came on every year and at that first meeting, because everyone began as a rookie, it was really like the changing of the guards.

Mr. Westfall:

I think what Doug is getting at, and I totally agree with you, is we need some sort of specific five page memo on how compensation is managed and determined, you know today I finally figured out what an EMCP is, and every meeting there's some new nuance that comes up, the attorneys they reset their salary, everyone get a raise, that's the only department that's like that. Police Commission determines the Police department which is different from any other department, there's all these little things that if we're sitting here discussing it and half the members know it and the other half probably don't.

Chair Matsuura:

I think, I'm sure that's where Lynn's comments are going to lead off from, this whole thing. Yes, I don't think there's any doubt there needs to be some kind of thing. In the past it's been commission leaves and they leave and you guys come on board and you come on board and it's really been more by request, actions have been taken by previous Salary Commissions. It's a whole new ball game, it's as if even though this commission has been in existence for 20 years, this is the first time we ever had to deal with staggered terms so it is a little different in that respect. These kind of things is probably even more important now than it even was before, I think, you could kind of wing it before it's kind of difficult when you come on board and seven other members or majority of the members are moving forward on something, it's really hard for anybody to catch up.

Mr. Levin:

And that may be the paradigm shift (?) I noticed you, now that, I mean I never had experience with that prior, you know, a term where everyone changes at once, I'm familiar now with the staggered terms and so I'm bringing bad ideas to this but I'm thinking to this and I'm thinking that we need some things to deal with that and manage that rationally.

Chair Matsuura:

No, I totally agree.

Mr. Levin:

And I'm hoping that once this particular Board goes through this process, spends this year going through this process and then re-establishing raises, in the future we have a structure set up where all the new Board members are given some education about what we get by

and we may, you know, have it like for instance I'm not expecting anything regarding bonuses or anything else the half of it, maybe three years down the road they go you know what, we really want to get this particular police person and we're gonna consider that type of a structure, but that is built within the overall structure and it's already been gotten by and it's been used for years.

Chair Matsuura:

You know, maybe something else you guys should consider is moving up comparisons to other Counties, up to an earlier session if that can be used as a basis of any determination..

Mr. Levin:

O.K., can we just put a date next to it, what date were you considering?

Chair Matsuura:

I don't know, I think at this point and time, I don't know what we can and cannot do, my intention would be that I know this is very aggressive to start at the next meeting supposedly, but it needs to be a lot of buy-in I think from a lot of the other members as we move forward and some of the suggestions that you have is coming up with various subcommittees to work on various areas and I just think that we're gonna take at least two different meetings to make sure that we can set this whole new system up to run, the way I see it and so this report probably need some adjustments, need some changes, may need other work to it unless everyone around the table is going to volunteer for all the various areas and we can all move forward, but I also think that the work load is, you know Tracy, Lynn, Diane all gotta kinda fit into this schedule. It is aggressive and it is necessary, I think, a lot of those things need to be taken into consideration to move forward, but anyway.

Mr. Levin:

This is not a perfect document, all we were trying to do is create a structure on which to start our discussions about what we want to do.

Chair Matsuura:

Sure, and like I said it was our basis to start, I think it's a good thing, it puts all the ideas and everything down on a piece of paper probably has been all over the place before.

Mr. Levin:

I have a question, the first thing that I was wondering was did we miss anything? Are there any issues that you think are worthy of consideration that we should at least have a discussion about that we missed that should be on the list? That would be my first request for comments on it.

Mr. Westfall:

The only thing I would throw in, and this is sort of going way outside of the box, is there any kind of new approach in determining compensation, you know, performance or whatever, and it may not even be relevant, but maybe Lynn in your going to seminars and

things like that, people talk about that? We're just going by the traditional approaches and I'm not sure if it's relevant or even would fit.

Chair Matsuura:

No, I think that's a valid, I mean, that is something that pops up a lot. Where you stick it in here or unless, that's why I say even as it relates to a review of historical information, that would also bring in I'm sure, current and future things that may be approaching and that's why it's kind of important I think.

Mr. Westfall:

The other aspect I was thinking about, sorry for adding all these things.

Mr. Levin:

That's O.K. I'll put it right at the bottom.

Mr. Westfall:

I'm sure once in a while you get people that come, consultants or people that are experts on Human Resources would we be able to schedule someone that can give us an overview of what they see happening on a national basis with government compensation and things like that?

Ms. Krieg:

There's an organization that you could, if you wanted to, you could contact to see, it's SHIR, Society of Human Resource Management.

Mr. Westfall:

O.K. their in Honolulu.

Ms. Krieg:

Well, it's national, but they have one, the O'ahu chapter, I mean the Hawaii Chapter.

Chair Matsuura:

Or we can call the Civil Service Commission, they volunteered the last time. But yeah, I think that would fall all within like a review of historical things and getting a better understanding, those are all of the background information that we normally go into like you said a packet for new members and it's probably something that we may need for current members.

Ms. Krieg;

In fact one of our commission members is a member of SHIR.

Chair Matsuura:

Well they volunteered the last time to talk about how all this compensation thing works, this would be one of the first steps. O.K. Lynn, you're on the floor.

Ms. Krieg:

My only comment was that I did notice that you did have on the agenda, the Civil Service Commission and the Police Department but that there are other departments that have Commissions.

Mr. Levin:

And part of that, again we were running out of time when we got down on the list. We fully expected to flush the saddle a lit bit more and maybe list each department in there when we issued a final agenda, we just were running out of time, we sort of listing and wondering how we were going to fit the name and we were getting late in the year and we're thinking mmm, do we really have time for all this stuff and do we want to push it into the new year and so we just kind of listed it quickly. There are definitely flaws in this draft.

Ms. Krieg:

Departments that the department heads are appointed by commissions, the department heads tend to have longevity and to me they're a little different animal then the department heads that turn over with the Mayor.

Chair Matsuura:

And that's why, something that you guys should probably seriously think about some understanding that, you know, you have one meeting, you can't whip this thing and as we start to flush it out how much additional work may be involved. This other historical thing. We did have a subcommittee the last time where actually was responsible for talking to the various commissions or the Directors as they felt that they needed to as well as having someone from, you know, whether it be a department head or Mayor or who ever it was that would come forward before the commission to talk about their positions and salaries and things like that.

Mr. Levin:

What happened to that historical, did that subcommittee work?

Chair Matsuura:

Uh huh.

Mr. Levin:

Because when we've set up subcommittees since I have been here in the last year, they've been temporary sort of things to deal with the particular issue. Were there any permanent subcommittees?

Chair Matsuura:

No.

Mr. Levin:

So this would be a temporary subcommittee set up the deal with and go around asking...

Chair Matsuura:

I don't think there are any permanent subcommittees.

Mr. Levin:

Well nothing, I meant, in saying the word permanent I meant one that just traditionally stays around because it has a role that it does regularly.

Chair Matsuura:

I think it's set up primarily to come up with a report and a recommendation to the commission and once they work with Doug, or being Doug, being complete disappeared basically but like with the subcommittee you're on it go on forever until all the different agenda items or recommendations are complete, I mean, it really can be done that way if that's what you think is necessary.

Mr. Levin:

O.K.

Ms. Villarosa:

The other thing, just to add on to what Lynn was saying, the Charter requires that this commission consult with those other departments so not only the Personnel Services and Police, but also Fire and Liquor.

Ms. Krieg:

Is Water included?

Ms. Villarosa:

Not any more.

Ms. Krieg:

The Mayor appoints the Water?

Ms. Villarosa:

That's right.

Mr. Williams:

Doug, when you guys went through the, when you had the meeting, did you go through a priority level as far as establishing a new commission package?

Mr. Levin:

The only priority listings that made this agenda and things that didn't.

Mr. Williams:

O.K.

Mr. Levin:

And listing, listing by what we thought was relevant, a reasonable method, there's no, in other words, the dates on which they occur, there's no correlation to importance, it's just their listed in an order we think makes rational sense to consider them, but you can completely turn it upside down if the other way is to approach it.

Ms. Villarosa:

It seems like the uh, the new commission member package, it seems like it's sort of going to be a work in progress that, you know, as you're going along in this maybe one person can be responsible for taking notes or creating and outline or something at the end, then you repeat it, at the end you have the information to create this document or whatever you wanted to create.

Mr. Levin:

That's why that comment he made about where I thought was permanent subcommittees was very interesting because I think a subcommittee that dealt with the various departments would be very useful, and a subcommittee that constantly worked on and kept the new commission member introduction package up to date would be valuable.

Chair Matsuura:

In the past the commission has never wanted to delegate a lot of that kind of stuff to a single subcommittee, you know they have always wanted to deal with other commissions, other, things on a barter basis, but those things can change, I mean...

Ms. Villarosa:

The updating shouldn't be too bad, I would think...

Mr. Levin:

That might be a good permanent subcommittee.

Ms. Villarosa:

Once you have the basic, you know, document done and then maybe each year the commission could spend/put an item on the agenda to update it, it shouldn't be too bad.

Chair Matsuura:

Yeah, we always thought the new commission member introduction package was always part of the staff responsibility.

Ms. Villarosa:

Well it's different now right, it's different because like you said, this commission has longevity and historical (???)

Chair Matsuura:

That's the problem with this commission, just so that you guys really understand, DPS is not assigned to us, so she's really kind of doing this...

Ms. Krieg:

As a favor.

Chair Matsuura:

Right. That has been one of the problems when we first started was that Personnel Services never attended any of the meetings. Just so you know, six years ago when we first started we had to request to have the Director, or someone from Personnel attend and become a resource, it was only after that first year, I think was that we requested that, and I think we had to do it annually, but then since she, you know then they volunteered to come, but....

Ms. Krieg:

Really, this is a volunteer basis?

Chair Matsuura:

But that's been part of the, just so you know up front, that has been the problem, trying to get the appropriate people to contribute and get us to understand what's going on, it was a problem before and like I said, they are not permanently assigned to this commission either.

Ms. Levin:

Thank you very much Lynn for coming.

Ms. Krieg:

Really, had I known....

Chair Matsuura:

We'll add another responsibility and we'll take up the next agenda item which is the Civil Service Commission's letter request, but any way, can you guys work on this a little bit more or?

Mr. Levin:

I'm not sure what, other than adding couple of things to him, I really don't have any comments, the next thing would be if we move this back, move everything back, hold on I have a few ideas skipping around in my head, let me think about this for a second, I'd be more than, like split stuff up, I couldn't work on historical comments, it wouldn't be anything I have any benefit, you, Janet maybe be a good subcommittee to do that section. I'd be happy, once, once April 15th is over and I have a few weeks to clear my head and get my thing, I'd be happy to throw together a first draft of a new member package, intro package and then you guys bring it to the table and thrash it out, I'd be happy to work with a committee to do that and then we go on from there and deal with different things.

Chair Matsuura:

Let me recommend something, what I'd like to do then is, if you can get the disc or whatever to Diane and then whatever changes we talk about today you can make those and send it to Diane. I want to make sure that all the other commission members have ... this report that was passed out today before we take any action one way or the other. You'll see in the minutes, I think, you know as we get closer to the next time around, the fact that we're gonna be looking for people to volunteer for subcommittee work which may be very very time consuming.

Mr. Levin:

O.K., so let me make some notes here so understand what's going on. First off, the first suggestion I think we need is we should probably individualize each of the departments, somewhere in the timing of the structure.

Chair Matsuura:

And I'm sure we can double up on a couple or whatever it is.

Mr. Levin:

So we need a list, we can definitely double up, we need a list of the departments cause just out of respect we need to do that. And then we should also probably, how many different subcommittees do you think we need to sort of service this, cause certain things are gonna need service like the historical thing and the new commission member introduction package but do we need to have a subcommittee dealing with Ken Taira's letters and the affect on cost of living? I don't know.

Chair Matsuura:

I don't know it's not my, you know Ken Taira's letter is, how would I put it, it's very inclusive, he covered a lot of different issues, his...

Mr. Levin:

I know, he's almost a subcommittee in of itself.

Chair Matsuura:

That may be something we have to work with Lynn on. I don't know, in all honesty Doug, I personally don't know, you could have one subcommittee for every single issue that you have here.

Mr. Levin:

So that the question is, which ones, if you were going through this, quickly which ones do we need one for? Perhaps we can put a little asterisk, we definitely need one for the historical thing and the new member introduction package.

Chair Matsuura:

I think, I personally think that if, it is not expected to have a new commission member introductory package done within a month as we talked, you know the fact that it may be an ongoing thing may even change as we go through our process, that could probably all go to one committee.

Mr. Levin:

O.K., alright, so I got that as one that needs discussion of, as I go through the list, whether or not we make a final or tentative decision, I don't think needs a subcommittee discussion of, discussion of Ken Taira's letter probably does need it, we might have one for affect and importance of the cost of living, I'll put a question mark next to that one.

Chair Matsuura:

Cost of living was also included in Ken Taira's letter.

Mr. Levin:

Yeah, that's true.

Mr. Williams:

I just have a question, are we gonna first figure out more of a timeline, I mean more of a timeline, because for example we're going to subcommittees or figuring out what we need subcommittees for but establishing a new commission member and in also the same meeting discussing whether, you know, what kind of way we're gonna judge salaries as far as our recommendation to do it at one time or do it all at another time. It seems that that's gonna be a four hour meeting and so maybe first we go through and figure out a priority level, what things we should hit first and figure out a realistic meeting for April 8th, May 13th, that would not last for days.

Mr. Westfall:

As I see this maybe there's sort of three categories here, you have sort of category one which is basically background information, and then category two is sort of influences and methods of looking at it and then three is looking at the departments and the commissions individually and you know, as their mentioning establishing the new member packet, that's kind of outside, if you will, I mean it's important, but it's sort of an outside thing.

Mr. Levin:

We're almost actually having the entire discussion of the new commission member intro package right now, because even though it's listed there, it's like I was thinking we should, we should just decide whether we want to establish one, I think we've already reached a consensus that one would be good it's just a matter of getting one to dial up and then reviewing it for appropriateness before we actually hand it out. I've already volunteer to participate with a subcommittee to work on that, but I can't volunteer that time until after April, which unfortunately is bad timing because we'll probably have a new member or two in April. We'll have to just sort of put them on, we'll say well, you know, we'll help you with that later.

Ms. Villarosa:

I think they'll be learning that with you, they'll be coming on board early enough in the process.

Mr. Levin:

And in fact, we may want to put a new member on that. I don't know.

Chair Matsuura:

Again, maybe what we should do right now as it relates to this is, why don't you go ahead and you come up with some of these ideas by listening to the comments that the commission has had today, come up with another piece of paper with some other suggestions as it relates to subcommittee's organization, you know, and then maybe a revised timing schedule and that's something else that we can take up at the next meeting, unless, I sense that, you know, people are a little uncomfortable with setting and making a whole lot of

decisions today as it relates to this and there are at least three other members that should, can be here which may make a difference including Tony who probably worked with you, so.

Mr. Levin:

Alright, Jason was gonna attend but he had a family emergency so he couldn't participate.

Chair Matsuura:

So we can defer any you know, other thing unless there's other comments that you guys wanna give Doug so that he can work on this thing.

Mr. Levin:

So I'll try to thrash it out, so I'm gonna, so just to review very quickly, I'm gonna try and give an idea which one, which particular sections might need some subcommittee work, preparatory work before we do it, I'm gonna try and list all of the different various departments, there's a couple new ideas that you listed and we're also gonna try to back up the dates of it so we can be, you know, more understanding of what's going on here.

Chair Matsuura:

You know, is gonna be a little bit secondary, I think the organizational part is gonna be and the procedural part up front is going to be probably the most important part if we can get through that and decide, like you said, which needs subcommittees, I mean that can all be adjusted, but the idea behind setting up a subcommittee or like you said, if it's background information or the basis for making decision or whatever it is, I think one kind of subcommittee and then maybe the next meeting, we can kind of roll and get our three volunteers or whatever to do these and move forward.

Mr. Levin:

O.K., the only thing, comment I think has to be raised that hasn't been raised yet is this, that to some degree we have given a tentative raise or a patch raise of 8% under the presumption that we were going to revisit this in the coming year and come up with a, with a rational, with an agreed upon basis for making these decisions and then do it again. To the extent we pushed some of this off, you know, considering it again the next time and the next time we may start to really run out of time, so.

Chair Matsuura:

I understand where you're going with that...

Mr. Levin:

No, and I agree, we need to do a bit more work on that.

Chair Matsuura:

As we move, just so you know, in my mind and if you look in our current agenda, we're going to be getting hit with these letters or these requests are going to be coming up and in spite of the timing of the work that is going to be done here, maybe we have to make a whole bunch of other decisions anyway. This will be great stuff to set up and do all of

these things, but I think what could happen is we may have to do more interim types of increases or whatever you wanna talk about as the redevelop of basis or standard or whatever you wanna call it all of this work is done because...

Mr. Levin:

Everybody wants to talk to us

Ms. Villarosa:

Well, I mean, I advise two of those commissions that you need to seek, you know, that you need to consult with as far as salaries go, one is Liquor and one is Fire and so I've been keeping those two commissions up to date on what the salary commission is doing so for those two commissions, when they submit things to you, they're doing it, at least the ones I've seen so far, they're doing it to provide input on this Executive Compensation Plan, there not necessarily doing it to, there not necessarily expecting you to stop what you're doing and then, you know, look at the salaries, you know for their departments. They're more trying to, because if you look at the comments in those letters, there more, these are the things that you should consider when you're establishing salaries, so it more, you're trying to, you know, provide new input within what you're doing so, but you may get other letter, you know, from individual department heads or whatever that may ask for increases but talking for these commissions.

Chair Matsuura:

You know, I'm sure, they may be not from those two commissions, but there'll be as we heard today, that we will be getting requests, whether it gets started off directly from a Director or from the Commissions, many of them don't believe that, they don't wanna wait so, we're not gonna, you know, this doesn't preclude us from doing anything, is what I'm saying, going through this process does not preclude us from doing anything else as it relates to salary, I mean that's my opinion anyway. And if we need to, we look at, you know, another interim thing as we march forward or whatever we want to call it, but I don't think that will stop us from, this will stop us from doing it.

Ms. Villarosa:

And the other suggestion is that, you know, like Mike's suggestion sounded logical, you know, the three, breaking up into three areas, you can have three subcommittees simultaneously working. You don't have to have one or the other and then you can just all report back at each meeting.

Chair Matsuura:

Well that's what, otherwise it's gonna take a long time.

Ms. Villarosa:

Yeah, cause you have eight or nine members.

Chair Matsuura:

That's why we have nine members, so we can split it up.

Mr. Levin:

Please listen to the comments here, I just have one thought, would it be, I just wanna get some feed back, would it be better if we structure it where we did a discussion of structure and picked one of the, one of the departments at a time so we can have a little bit of structure and then we can get testimony, encourage testimony about a department and then we go to the next meeting and discuss more structure and then discuss testimony for the department, would that structure be better so that we're not pushing the departments off until late in the year?

Ms. Villarosa:

To get their input you mean?

Mr. Levin:

Yeah as we go so we're sort of doing, instead of taking one agenda item at a time and having similar ones, we sort of, each week or each month we take a bit of structure and a bit of departmental definitive information. The only downside I see to that is that we were hoping to have a like structure in place at one point which we made decisions and then when we consider the individual ones we can spot them right into the structure so we're building a structure and the individual thing at the same time and that might get clumsy but we might be more respectful and a better way to work through it. I don't know, what do you guys think?

Chair Matsuura:

My personal opinion is I think that you gonna need to set up first structure and then get into the what is individual departments, or individual positions.

Mr. Levin:

And that was our initial thought.

Chair Matsuura:

Because like, you know, what has gone on over the past year has been, all of a sudden now, gee this is the first time I ever heard about or understood what an EMCP was or I didn't know that we didn't create salaries for so and so, I assumed that all of those things were understood earlier but if not then the crux is going to be, what is going to be known and, you know, as far as the structure, the understanding is going to be very, to me anyway is going to be very very important in order for you to make a reasonably good decision as we move down the line.

Mr. Williams:

So is that the historical salary tier, I mean a review of the historical ...

Chair Matsuura:

Yeah and I think the other kinds of things like, you know, maybe getting Lynn or somebody from Civil Service Commission or SHRN or whoever it may be, you know, as we move forward, to do maybe a short presentation or something as we move through the meetings. It may not be the only thing on the agenda but, so we have, we don't need to be experts at

this thing, you know, we have some experts that sit with us. We just need to get a good general, I think, understanding of a little bit of how they think. Anyway, that's kinda, I can tell you that's been a real big problem in the past. And if that's O.K., Doug, maybe we can move on to some of the other stuff so we can kind of whiz through, I think people are all expecting to leave pretty soon.

Mr. Levin:
Very cool.

Chair Matsuura:
So you'll bring something forward to us,

Mr. Levin:
Yeah I'll send it off (?)

Chair Matsuura:
I think staff has our email that is available by email and whoever is not, we can mail it out ahead of time so.

Ms. Villarosa:
So you're going to defer this item?

Chair Matsuura:
Yes. Then it's just a matter of information out there to get to the second and third item.

- 2) Review letter dated January 12, 2006, from the Fire and Public Safety Commission, recommending increases in the salaries for the Fire Chief and Deputy Fire Chief.

Chair Matsuura:
The first letter is from Fire and Public Safety Commission, does everybody have that what there recommendations are? I assume you want to defer this at this point and time. Any comments, questions? What I'd like to do as we defer is to maybe send a letter back to the commission as like the (?) criticizing the other memo to us, but we need to explain to them two things, one that we are embarking on an executive compensation, what is it called, executive management compensation plan but that we would be constantly, I think, reviewing salary levels throughout the year anyway and my take some action by another appropriate (?) but for this time we're gonna defer action on this.

Mr. Levin:
I just have one question about this for Lynn. Lynn the salaries that have been quoted as the current salaries for the Fire Chief and Deputy Chief, are those inclusive of the 8% raise we gave them or not inclusive?

Chair Matsuura:
It looks low.

Mr. Levin:

Yeah, it seems a little low after the raise. I'm thinking they would be higher than this now.

Chair Matsuura:

Maybe the next question too if we could get an updated list of salaries after the increase?

Ms. Krieg:

That's after.

Mr. Levin:

That's after, really?

Chair Matsuura:

It is?

Ms. Krieg:

Yeah.

Chair Matsuura:

This may be one other issue that we may have to pick up in between.

Mr. Levin:

So it was really out of whack before the raise?

Ms. Krieg:

Yeah.

Mr. Levin:

Wow. When do these, do these raises for the Assistant Chiefs are they into affect now or are they going into affect in the future?

Ms. Krieg:

Those are the amounts in affect now.

Mr. Levin:

How long have they been in affect?

Ms. Villarosa:

They're retroactive right to July?

Chair Matsuura:

No. We're looking at the AC

Ms. Villarosa:

Oh, I'm sorry.

Ms. Krieg:

The AC and the BC, I believe was 7/1/04.

Chair Matsuura:

I thought that the increases that you guys reviewed, at one point and time, made sure that it all was above all of the EMCP.

Mr. Levin:

That's what I thought, but I just, I didn't (?) say it, I just took some other people's word for it.

Chair Matsuura:

Again, I think, you know, the simple thing right now, we gonna have to defer this thing and maybe we need to look at it even further at the next meeting. Alright then, if we could leave this on the agenda just so we keep it on the top of our head. I think there's a lot of question in to, like I said, I think everybody thought that they brought everybody above the EMCP number but obviously not.

Ms. Villarosa:

I don't recall that there was discussion, you know, on actual figures, because I think that when you guys came up with that percentage it was a negotiated, you know, it was kind of this, kind of agree upon a percentage and not necessarily looking at how that percentage would impact the various departments and whether or not it would cover the, you know, the salaries.

Mr. Levin:

Somehow though we thought when we did that we completely, at lease, salary conversion would go away.

Chair Matsuura:

I thought that the numbers of the inversion, yeah, that the conversion was better.

Ms. Villarosa:

Maybe the initial, because remember the number that you came up with was not the original proposal.

Mr. Levin:

It was 4% and we made it 8.

Chair Matsuura:

But anyway, we'll take a look at it.

Ms. Wakamatsu:

It was like 13%.

Ms. Krieg:

Yeah, EMCP got a 5% increase January 1st.

Mr. Williams:

Oh, that's what it was.

Ms. Villarosa:

Which we had discussed though, the commission had discussed that, they knew about that increase.

Chair Matsuura:

I think that when they looked at their schedule..

Ms. Krieg:

It wasn't reflected in the schedule.

Ms. Villarosa:

No no, what happened was the, the group that came out with the percentage was much higher and it was because they were, you know, considering this increase that was coming in January but then when it came to the commission, it got negotiated lower because your were trying to agree upon an amount.

Chair Matsuura:

If I remember correctly, when they went to that lower amount, the idea was that the lower amount was still when they went to get out of it, inversion problems, and if I remember correctly, the chart that was given to the commission did not show that 5% increase in January that they are talking about so that's why it probably was missed, but anyway.

Mr. Levin:

Are we, do we have salary inversion again in other departments?

Ms. Krieg:

Uh hum.

Chair Matsuura:

O.K. Lynn that's a discussion for the next meeting.

Mr. Levin:

Can we, can I respectively suggest we put it another, on the next agenda a discussion of salary inversion and another temporary patch until we have a structure then we can consider another 4% or 5% raise?

Chair Matsuura:

O.K., we can put that on the agenda where we can, you know discuss it.

Mr. Levin:

At least discuss it, cause I'm frus...ah..

Chair Matsuura:

I know I hold me nose sometimes when I write the letter to show their pain because I thought the same thing. Anyway, O.K. we'll do that and leave that flyer that are on as a trigger as well as that we need to review inversion increase or something.

Mr. Williams:

And, oh and Lynn are we able to get a new salary sheet? I guess every month there's a new one.

Ms. Krieg:

No, it's just that we're having problems getting a fully updated sheet because the departments.

Chair Matsuura:

Can we get one just for the positions that this commission is responsible for?

Ms. Krieg:

That's what we want. O.K. and one other critical department is Police who have not processed all of their pay increases yet.

Chair Matsuura:

Maybe we should take it away and tell them it was just a (?).

Mr. Levin:

So it was granted, but they just haven't processed it?

Ms. Krieg:

Yeah, so we can't, we can't do a computer run. There are pay increases that have to be manually done because they, there computations on individual seniority kind of things and unless they're done, we can't do a general computer run.

Mr. Levin:

So they're still getting their old pay until they do it and then you'll make it retroactive?

Ms Krieg:

No, payroll is doing it manual.

Mr. Williams:

So they're getting their new pay but they haven't done the paper work for us? O.K.

Ms. Krieg:

Right. And we've send reminders and talked to the Chief. But we can do, I can go and check..

Mr. Williams:

If you can.

Ms. Krieg:

I know, you know, it's really frustrating to have all these people coming and badgering us about, you know, the low morale, but

Mr. Levin:

They're not doing they're paper work. Did you forget to bring that up to me, why didn't you bring that up? Why didn't you bring that up that you need some paper work from him to process somebody's pay.

Ms. Krieg:

I know, I mean, if I talk to the Chief, you know, who else might I talk to?

Mr. Levin:

You can tell the commission so the commission knows that some of it is on the Chief.

Chair Matsuura:

Let's go to number three before I get myself into more trouble.

- 3) Review letter dated February 2, 2005 from Felicidad Borden, Chair of the Civil Service Commission, regarding the salaries of the Director and Deputy Director of Personnel Services.

Chair Matsuura:

The second letter from DPS Civil Service Commissions, I will be sending a response to the various issues that they address in this letter, basically I thought we had informed them that we were going to do this other thing and embark on a plan and everything else but obviously, the oral was not good enough, so I will be sending a letter informing them of such. O.K.?

Mr. Levin:

Thank you for your time doing these things. You're like a subcommittee in of yourself. Thank you for your help.

Chair Matsuura:

Diane is great staff.

Ms. Wakamatsu:

Thank you Scott.

Chair Matsuura:

No, you know, that's why it's hard, they staff a whole bunch of other commissions and you know, even like with Lynn guys, they have daily stuff and their own Civil Service Commission work there, then us, they not even assigned to help us but they have to do all of these things, but they do it and sometimes I

know you guys get upset about timing and stuff, but understand that the staff has a lot of other stuff going on as well. O.K. anyway, moving on.

V. New Business

Chair Matsuura:

There's nothing.

Ms. Villarosa:

Actually, you know, this um, the New Business and Set Agenda for Next Meeting is actually the same thing, just to let you know, you can delete one of them.

Ms. Wakamatsu:

O.K.

Chair Matsuura:

Oh, they are yeah, O.K. I didn't know that either.

VI. Set Agenda for Next Meeting

Chair Matsuura:

- O.K. we pretty much have now the minutes for three meetings
- Unfinished Business of the EMCP
- The letter on Fire
- The review, have inversion review, inversion discussion or whatever it is

Mr. Levin:

Consideration of another raise hike.

Chair Matsuura:

Um, what else did we talk about?

Mr. Williams:

- Minutes verbatim or not.

Chair Matsuura:

Verbatim versus Summary

Mr. Williams:

Because I think the minutes are gonna be a big part of what happens with the package because if we can keep our minutes up it be easy to put it into a packet for new members.

Chair Matsuura:

O.K. anything else that anybody has for the agenda for the next meeting?

VII. Announcements

Chair Matsuura:

O.K. the next meeting is scheduled for March 11th . Are there any more announcements?

Ms. Wakamatsu:

We're back in the Mayor's Lounge.

Ms Villarosa:

Don't forget to submit your Financial Disclosure Forms. I'm just doing and announcement at all of my meetings because Lisa asked.

Ms. Wakamatsu:

It's due by April 15th.

Ms. Villarosa:

So thank you, if you already submitted.

VIII. Adjournment: 10:10 a.m.

Mr. Levin:

The one thing that I wish we had more time for, but Tony and I were starting to run out of time as we got down the list was whether or not we were giving enough service to all the different departments that we have to consider in this area, we were running out of time as the year went on, so obviously we left that for this group to discuss today in setting our agenda for how we want to fit people like the Prosecutors Office and stuff in. On August 12th we would continue Corporate Counsel and move on to the Director of Personnel Services, and the Civil Service Commission request to give raise there. On September 9th we were going to deal with the Police Chief and Deputies and other various department heads and supervised commission requests including any testimony and we were going to leave the other second half of September 9th and October 14th for the other departments. On the 18th we will tentatively schedule the final decision making meeting with the presumption that we will have the structure in place and have heard testimony from the various boards and commissions and or individual members or individual department heads or any public testimony that they wanted to make for the different departments. December 9th we continue the final decision making sessions and start the considerations of the salary for the Council. It's not a perfect agenda, I mean in reviewing it again, a week and a half later, I see gaps in it, I think we should spend a little more time ensuing some of the individual departments, but I think it's a good structure to start our discussions about how to spend our time in the next year.

Chair Matsuura:

Questions?

Ms. Krieg:

I have a comment.

Chair Matsuura:

O.K. hold on Lynn. Any questions from the Commissioners? Any comments from the Commissioners?

Mr. Williams:

Now a few of these, just going back through it again, it would involve Charter changes.

Chair Matsuura:

That may be so. I'm assuming that all of those things whether it's Charter, Ordinance or whatever the changes are as they review everything or even role changes will come up as they progress. Any other questions?

Mr. Westfall:

I guess uh, I wasn't here at the last meeting, so pardon me if I'm asking something that was already covered. So we have all these discussions, is there a plan at the end? Or are we making decisions as we go along?

Mr. Levin:

And that was sort of part of what we would sort of discuss on the April 8th. We realized that there were two really broad avenues in which we could approach this, one was we could go along as we, first we could consider all the various considerations, we were well versed in the issues that were relevant, so we made individual decisions, so now we start the period, I guess it starts in June or July, we would start considering individual departments. We thought it would be relevant to decide ahead of time but we wanted to, when we're done with an individual department make a decision? Probably with an effective date that was in the future so we can get everybody considered and everybody's raises took place the same date. The other broad avenue we thought might work, was to reach some sort of tentative decision, have a discussion and reach a tentative decision but not a final decision and then when we did a final decision we went back and revisited that and did the whole package as a whole. We weren't sure which way to go, both of them seem to have pluses and minuses, I'm not going to comment on which I think is better because I don't real know which one is better, but we did think it was important to decide ahead of time which method we were going to use otherwise we were going to bounce around and have difficulty actually reaching good decisions.

Chair Matsuura:

Any other questions? Doug, dates or the suggested agenda, am I to assume that the subcommittee will be preparing all the information that will be coming before the commission and leading the discussion on each area?

Mr. Levin:

That's a good question.

Chair Matsuura:

I mean, because it is aggressive, we've had these things before, just so you know and it takes hours to go through even a single thing like creating and introduction package or reviewing history unless somebody prepares a set of documents, can lead a discussion it's review it will take a lot of time and I don't think the staff, unless they want to volunteer, it's kind of how it's, historically it's happened before and it's a difficult thing unless someone prepares or there is something that is prepared specifically as it relates to each of these bulleted items.

Mr. Levin:

The um...

Chair Matsuura:

I mean was that even discussed or is it strictly the commission?

Mr. Levin:

It's a very important point, it wasn't discussed in any detail because it was just me and Tony, we were just trying to get ideas that we thought were relevant to what was going on the table. I don't have any, I think that what we should probably do is, I think one subcommittee having responsibility for the whole package might be difficult. I think that what we should probably do is split the subcommittees up into different areas up into different subcommittees and let them be prepared to come that day so maybe if we had three different subcommittees each one will take turns being ready to speak to that particular one because if we had one subcommittee it would be too much work. Also on a personal level between now and April 15th, I'm just so busy I can't even think straight. So it would be very hard for me to participate in that process and be prepared for writing, although I really am very interested in establishing a new commission member introductory package and I would be willing to provide many, many hours working on that and putting a proposal together and having the Board work on that, I just could not do that by April 8th, maybe we'd want to move that one back in the structure so I would have let's say May 13th so I would have some time after the tax season where I'm not working 12 hours a day, to spend a little time working on that. I think your comments are valid, there's a lot of work involved in doing this right if we're gonna do it.

Chair Matsuura:

And the other thing is, maybe that's where Lynn is going to come in but it's going to take an extreme amount of coordination between Personnel Services and trying to even understand some of these things and how it relates across the board. We've kinda done, as you seen in the past year, as we discuss things we get a different prospective. We have one prospective, but obviously within the entire structure sometimes we don't seem to understand how a lot of things work and why things are the way they are. So I don't know, Lynn...

Respectfully submitted,

Diane A. Wakamatsu
Executive Assistant to the Mayor