

**Hilo, Hawaii
Tuesday, October 16, 2007**

The regular meeting of the Merit Appeals Board, County of Hawai`i, was held in the conference room of the Department of Human Resources, 101 Pauahi Street, Suite 2, Hilo, Hawai`i, on Tuesday, October 16, 2007.

Present:

**Mr. G. Rick Robinson, Chair
Mr. Clifford Kaminaka, Vice Chair
Ms. Kaliko Chun, Member
Mr. Joel Cohen, Member
Mr. Michael R. Ben, Director of Personnel
Ms. Diane Noda, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Ms. Velma Y. Menezes, Secretary-Reporter
Ms. Yumi Nakamura, Clerk III**

Excused:

Ms. JoAnne Balberde-Kamalii, Member

Chair Robinson called the meeting to order at 9:43 a.m.

MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 18, 2007

MOTION: Mr. Cohen moved that the minutes of September 18, 2007 be approved as circulated. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Kaminaka and unanimously carried.

COMMUNICATIONS

Communication No. 07-12, dated September 25, 2007, from Lincoln S. T. Ashida, Corporation Counsel, regarding the

extraordinary efforts made and assistance provided by Human Resources Director Michael R. Ben.

The Board members expressed their appreciation of Mr. Ben's efforts. The communication was received and filed.

NEW BUSINESS

Communication No. 07-13, received October 3, 2007, from Blake J. Decker, appealing his failure to pass the hose bundle obstacle course at the Fire Fighter Recruit performance test on September 29, 2007.

The Board scheduled Mr. Decker's appeal for November 20, 2007, at 10:00 a.m.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Ben reported the following:

- 1) The department's new trainer came on board today. Her name is Suzanni Hopp.**
- 2) The recruitment for the department's new Safety Specialist position is currently open.**
- 3) The caseload for the department's two claims specialists is down to about 50-60 cases each, which is now below industry standards.**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Evaluation of Director of Human Resources for Period July 2006 to June 2007.

Mr. Cohen commented that he is pleased to hear the Mr. Ben has these two staff people on board, as he had made the motion to

extend this item for more conversation, primarily because of these issues. There were concerns regarding an ongoing scenario of having appeals sent to the Board because of sometimes inadequate training, and to have another staff person working on the supervisor manager training would be very helpful. In fact, it came out in a couple of comments on the survey that this is necessary. They also heard, as far as safety training, that classes are scheduled and people don't show up, and also people working on the roadways and highways may not be adequately trained to handle the serious accidents.

Mr. Ben confirmed that he received the Board's memorandum regarding his evaluation. Mr. Ben responded to each item in the memorandum.

Working Relationship. Mr. Ben is still not clear if everything stated in the memorandum pertains to the evaluation period. The last time he had an evaluation, the same kinds of issues were brought up, and without knowing the specifics, he acknowledged that he would in all probability be guilty. He explained the kinds of situations in which he would be guilty. Nobody said "notwithstanding that, Mr. Ben, you're wrong, or you should try and improve," but even without that instruction, Mr. Ben had made that attempt, so unless the Board can tell him specifically what he did during this evaluation period, he thinks it's inappropriate to address it in the evaluation. Mr. Ben is happy to accept criticism or reprimands when the Board can tell him exactly what he did wrong.

Chair Robinson responded that from the responses that were received, there were several people who had indicated that relations with Mr. Ben or the attempt to ask questions or to get information regarding personnel matters from Mr. Ben were met in a gruff and, in some cases, an abrasive manner. Human resources is just that. It's human, and human relations, as well.

From the responses received, no one ever questioned Mr. Ben's competency. They understood that Mr. Ben is very competent and understands his subject very well, but the delivery and selling the service as a service industry was in question.

Mr. Ben stated that he understands the expectation, but what he's saying is that for him to understand the "negative" evaluation, he needs to know the specifics. It's unfair that the Board would accept the word of a person who makes that criticism without asking him about the circumstance in which it arose. Because part of his tools and techniques in dealing with people is to address them in the way he thinks will get results from them, or to change their behavior, he can get gruff with them, especially when they keep coming to him with the same, exact situation numerous times. As he already stated, since the previous evaluation, he has made a conscious attempt not to project that negative image. However, he may have done so if someone had irked him again over the same issue that he'd discussed with them time and again. Therefore, he will accept whatever reprimand the Board may want to give out, but he asks that the Board tell him what exactly it is about. He has no issues taking responsibility for what he did, but during the evaluation period, he cannot recall any specific instances where he put someone down.

Mr. Cohen noted that the questionnaire is only part of the process, and there may be too much emphasis on what was in the questionnaire, because by and large they got positive responses. He doesn't think that the questionnaire itself is the full picture, and the Board did pass a motion that basically stated that Mr. Ben meets expectations.

Mr. Ben reminded the Board that during their discussions on the questionnaire, he did ask the Board to identify what exactly he did so that he wouldn't have to deal with generalizations.

Chair Robinson stated that there were several criticisms received in the responses. One said that their staff had called Mr. Ben and had been so just taken back by his response that she just didn't want to have to deal with him anymore. In another instance, a department head said that he preferred not to go to Mr. Ben for advice on human relations because of the way in which it was presented. No one is questioning Mr. Ben's competency or his knowledge of the subject. It primarily dealt with the method of delivery.

Mr. Ben reiterated that from his last evaluation, he took it to heart and made an attempt, and he cannot recollect the situations the Board is describing. He asked that the Board tell him which ones they were so that he'd know and would be able to learn from it.

Vice Chair Kaminaka responded by stating the following:

Mr. Ben is saying that he made an attempt but is saying that he had contact with only two people. Mr. Ben was surprised that he got 16 responses. Mr. Ben cannot have the information he is requesting for the following reasons. A lot of these departments are dependent on Mr. Ben and need his expertise. If the Board were to come up with specifics or even give Mr. Ben an opportunity to rebut what the departments had to say, Vice Chair Kaminaka believes the department heads would fear reprisal. Mr. Ben is saying that he wants an opportunity to perhaps challenge some of these specifics. What the Board sees are the various comments, and they are all "singing the same song."

Mr. Ben stated that he is not asking to rebut and challenge them. He wants the Board to ask for his side of the story and then make an evaluation. Then if the Board still wants to say that he is wrong, therefore, he gets this evaluation, he would have no problem with that.

Vice Chair Kaminaka stated that what he would like to hear in response to the first item in the evaluation is what Mr. Ben tried to do this past year and what he intends to do to improve. He'd like to hear that Mr. Ben went ahead and made 16 contacts and tried to change his image.

Mr. Ben stated that that should have been asked before being put in writing. He acknowledged that people have talked to him, and he's politely answered the questions the best way he could.

Vice Chair Kaminaka recognized that Mr. Ben has a very hard job and noted Mr. Ashida's communication on the agenda. When Vice Chair Kaminaka looks at Mr. Ben's staff, he sees that Mr. Ben

has “good fruits.” He doesn’t think people appreciate what Mr. Ben goes through, but how can they put it in context so they can all work together and provide a better product?

Mr. Ben responded that the context has to be that the Board lets him know what specifically he has done and in what instances so that he can learn and move from there. At this point, he’s still trying to clarify whether it actually occurred during the evaluation period. He had made a specific request that the responses be limited to the evaluation period.

Chair Robinson noted that when the Board sent out the first questionnaire, they got a very spotty response. He believes that was primarily due to people being worried about their evaluations not being held in confidence. When they decided next to invite people to the Board’s meeting, only one person showed up. To him, that was an indication they were afraid to come to the Board meeting, so when the Board did with the current evaluation questionnaire and assured them of confidence, with the Mayor’s support in getting them to submit their responses, then the responses were overwhelming.

Mr. Ben responded that he has no issues with that. As he stated previously, he accepts the memorandum, and it goes into his record. What he is asking, however, is a better methodology into how the Board evaluates him. If an employee came to him with such an evaluation and asked him to remove it from his/her record, Mr. Ben would grant it, because it’s too vague and general. They always tell supervisors that they have to document when something is wrong and let the employee know specifically what is wrong so that they can move from there.

As for the issue of retaliation, that’s a “bunch of crock.” At this level, the Board can tell him he can’t retaliate otherwise he will be fired.

Vice Chair Kaminaka commented that the evaluation is a perception of Mr. Ben and his performance. Regardless of what Mr. Ben says he does, what matters is the department heads’

perception and how they are looking at him as a director of the department.

Mr. Ben stated that if the Board cannot tell him specifically what caused that perception, then he's never going to be satisfied. However, he will continue to keep trying and will treat people courteously.

Vice Chair Kaminaka suggested postponing the discussion until after the scheduled hearing.

MOTION: Ms. Chun moved to continue the discussion to after the appeal hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cohen.

Discussion:

Mr. Cohen stated that this not just an individual involved but a whole culture. The Board is being proactive, as people who live in the community and work with staff people including department heads. Sometimes they're happy and sometimes they're not, and they're looking to the Department of Human Resources to take the lead on some of these things. He thinks that's where certain people are coming from.

The motion was voted on and carried unanimously.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting was scheduled for November 20, 2007 at 9:30 a.m., followed by Blake Decker's appeal hearing at 10:00 a.m.

The meeting recessed at 10:10 a.m.

**Hilo, Hawaii
Tuesday, October 16, 2007**

CONTINUATION OF APPEAL HEARING – PAUL S. PAIVA – DID THE FIRE CHIEF VIOLATE ANY CIVIL SERVICE LAWS, RULES, OR REGULATIONS IN DENYING THE APPELLANT “BUREAU OPPORTUNITY BENEFIT INCENTIVE” PAY RETROACTIVE TO JULY 1, 2005?

Present:

**Mr. G. Rick Robinson, Chair
Mr. Clifford Kaminaka, Vice Chair
Ms. Kaliko Chun, Member
Mr. Joel Cohen, Member
Mr. Julian White, Deputy Attorney General
Ms. Yumi Nakamura, Clerk III
Ms. Velma Y. Menezes, Secretary-Reporter**

Excused:

Ms. JoAnne Balberde-Kamalii, Member

Others Present:

**Mr. Paul S. Paiva, Appellant
Ms. Diane A. Noda, Deputy Corporation Counsel**

Chair Robinson called the hearing to order at 10:12 a.m.

Vice Chair Kaminaka stated that he’s ready to make a decision. Based on the merits of that HRS 76-14, he believes that the Merit Appeals Board does not have jurisdiction over Mr. Paiva’s appeal. Just to let Mr. Paiva know his opinion, however, if he were to rule on Mr. Paiva’s appeal based on the merits, it would not be in his favor because he feels that it’s pyramiding.

MOTION: Vice Chair Kaminaka moved that the Motion to Dismiss based on lack of jurisdiction be upheld. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cohen.

Discussion:

Mr. Cohen stated that the Board heard Mr. Paiva loud and clear on the timeliness issue of the decisions that are being made. It's gone on very long, which is unfortunate. If they were to make a decision, he too would stand by the County's position regarding pyramiding and the compensation and pay issue. That is something that's basically getting into contracts and is not appropriate for the Board. Another reason that he would make that decision is that there's an executive order that says that people need to be comparable, and there is a differential between pay ranges between the captain and battalion chief.

Ms. Chun stated that she would have voted for the jurisdiction to hear Mr. Paiva's appeal, because she is looking at a liberal interpretation of their jurisdiction.

She doesn't see a date indicating when the Fire Chief interpreted the rules and decided that it was pyramiding, and she doesn't think that he has been clear on it. However, in looking at the rest of the case, she believes that Mr. Paiva should accept one or the other.

The Board voted on the motion with Mr. Cohen, Vice Chair Kaminaka, and Chair Robinson voting aye, and Ms. Chun voting nay. The motion carried 3-1.

Mr. Paiva thanked the Board members for their patience and commitment to the County.

The hearing adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

**Hilo, Hawaii
Tuesday, October 16, 2007**

APPEAL HEARING – RANDOLPH T. KAI, SR. – WHETHER OR NOT THERE WERE VIOLATIONS OF ANY CIVIL SERVICE LAWS, RULES, OR REGULATIONS IN THE OPERATION OF EQUIPMENT APPLICABLE TO THE POSITIONS IN THE CLASS OF EQUIPMENT OPERATOR III.

Present:

**Mr. G. Rick Robinson, Chair
Mr. Clifford Kaminaka, Vice Chair
Ms. Kaliko Chun, Member
Mr. Joel Cohen, Member
Mr. Julian White, Deputy Attorney General
Ms. Yumi Nakamura, Clerk III
Ms. Velma Y. Menezes, Secretary-Reporter**

Excused:

Ms. JoAnne Balberde-Kamalii, Member

Others Present:

**Mr. Randolph T. Kai, Sr., Appellant
Ms. Diane A. Noda, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Ms. Gabriella M. Cabanas, Personnel Program Specialist
Mr. Ralph Fike, Acting Highways Superintendent**

The following witnesses were sworn in and testified:

**Mr. Randolph T. Kai, Sr.
Ms. Gabriella M. Cabanas
Mr. Ralph Fike**

The following exhibits were entered into the record:

**Appellant's Exhibit No. 1 - Internal Recruitment
Announcement**

**Employer's Exhibit No. 1 - Class Specification for Equipment
Operator III**

**Employer's Exhibit No. 2 - Internal Recruitment
Announcement**

Employer's Exhibit No. 3 - Internal Recruitment Transmittal

Employer's Exhibit No. 6 - Training Record-Driver Training

**Employer's Exhibit No. 7 - Memorandum from Hiram K.
Keliikoa**

Employer's Exhibit No. 8 - Certification by Hiram K. Keliikoa

**(Employer's Exhibits 4 and 5 were not entered into the
record.)**

**A document, Declaration of Hiram Kelilikoa; Exhibits "A"-
"D", was entered into the record.**

Chair Robinson called the hearing to order at 10:58 a.m.

The Appellant requested a closed hearing.

OPEN SESSION

The Board entered into deliberations:

Mr. Cohen noted that two applicants were referred by the Department of Human Resources for the Equipment Operator III position. Mr. Henry Cho III qualified for that position, had experience doing that work, was audited and basically re-certified for that assignment, and was appointed. He does not see any violations of rules.

Mr. Kaminaka commented that in listening to Mr. Fike's testimony, he impressed the importance of that job and how skilled the operator needs to be. That is not to say that Mr. Kai is not a skilled operator, but he thinks the department, Public Works, reserves the right to select the person they feel will meet those qualifications. The County has presented enough evidence to show that there were no violations of any civil service laws in the selection.

Ms. Chun stated that she appreciates Mr. Kai's questions. She feels that Mr. Kai filed his appeal because he was not given enough information from the first time he applied nor did he get a response. Then he made his second application and felt he did not have adequate information as to how the application was handled.

Exhibits and testimony were provided, and Ms. Cabanas testified that she only certifies the names, then sends them back to the department, who makes the final selection. The department is also supposed to contact the applicants but failed to.

In the audit sheet #6, she doesn't think Mr. Hiram Keliikoa's signature is very clear and it doesn't match others; however, he did certify in a statement in exhibit 9 and confirms with the signature that is on exhibit 7, so whether she has a question or not that the scribble is his becomes moot because he confirms it in the other document, which they all looked at.

She also thinks, as Mr. Kaminaka stated, that there's evidence that the County followed all the rules and didn't violate any, which

is the only thing that the Board can really review. She encourages Mr. Kai to apply again because he was one of only two, and it's essential to the workings of the Public Works department that they have people who are able to operate the equipment.

Vice Chair Kaminaka noted that the Board is not an investigative body. They make decisions based on the merits of the case, and they cannot go out of their circle to make such investigations.

MOTION: Vice Chair Kaminaka moved that Mr. Kai's appeal be denied. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cohen and unanimously carried.

The hearing adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

The Board reconvened into its regular meeting at 1:35 p.m. to continue its discussion on the evaluation of the Director of Human Resources for fiscal year July 2006 to June 2007.

Mr. Ben revisited the issue of retaliation. As he had expressed earlier, he thinks it's a non-issue. When talking about department heads, they should not be fearful of retaliation. If Mr. Ben is doing something wrong, they need to bring it to his attention or to the Mayor's attention or to the Board's attention. Then it would be up to these individuals to set Mr. Ben straight. At the level of a department head, retaliation is a non-issue. Mr. Ben can tell the Board for a fact that his staff can attest that he has never retaliated even though they've told him that people have not wanted to submit certain things thinking they are not going to get it anyway because Mr. Ben is going to retaliate over something. His staff will verify that they have never decided anything based upon what departments have done to them. It's always based on the merits of the case.

Issue/Subject. Mr. Ben noted that there is nothing to respond to.

Results of Conversation. Mr. Ben's only comment is the same as he had expressed on the very first issue, working relationship. He doesn't have any idea what, in particular, was bad, so he has no indication on what the Board is focusing on. It's coming down to "he said, she said," and then, "he said this so I'm going to tell him that." It's an issue of credibility, and that's why they need discussion. The Board has to find a way to help him understand what's wrong. Mr. Ben cannot respond in any fashion to "he said, she said," when there's no discussion with him. Where is his due process that the Board is supposed to provide?

Understanding Written Policies and Procedures Memos. There's nothing Mr. Ben issued in 2006 concerning anti-discrimination policy and procedures, which was cited in the Board's memo to him.

There was a policy issued in 2005, which is out of the evaluation period, but, nevertheless, Mr. Ben had Ms. Menezes go

through the document. There were a lot of typos. There were no missing pages. The typos were capitalization and punctuation errors, and Mr. Ben will accept responsibility for them. That can be corrected by more enforcement on the staff, but as to whether or not it caused confusion, he asks the Board to read it themselves, because he doesn't think it caused any confusion.

As for the missing pages, that was poor judgment on his part. When the document was finally finished after having been worked on repeatedly, Mr. Ben took it over and had the Mayor sign it. The way Mr. Ben likes to number his pages is this way: page 1 of 10, page 2 of 10, page 3 of 10, etc. The Mayor signed the first page. There was a page break on the second to the last page, so half the page was missing. They would have had to re-prepare the document, and he did not want to alter the original document. Rather than go back and have the Mayor re-sign, Mr. Ben noted that it was very simple to determine that it continues on the next page. Nevertheless, it was bad judgment on his part, and it caused this comment. Mr. Ben stated that he finds it ironic that while he's being criticized for typos, they're citing the wrong year (typo).

Mr. Cohen commented that he's brought his thoughts to the table a number of times on how important the evaluation process is because it's a personal relationship between a supervisor and an employee. In this case, the Board is like the supervisor. Mr. Cohen doesn't think this type of communication is best in an open hearing, as misunderstandings can occur. It's not a good venue because it's public record, which can be interpreted by other people, perhaps in a very negative way, and that is not how the Board wants to come across. He believes Mr. Ben's department is a very well-run organization. There are some issues that came up regarding communication that may be old ones or new ones, but he thinks they learn from their experiences. He feels strongly about the evaluation process where something is put together in writing. It's a draft, and then it's discussed, and then they finish it and finalize it. He believes that is the way it should be done, and he thinks it should be done in closed session.

Mr. Ben stated that he appreciates Mr. Cohen's comments and understands what he said, but unfortunately Mr. Cohen does not

have the option of doing it in a closed session, because Mr. Ben will always insist that it stays open. He's not at the level of an employee. He's at the level of a department head, and it should be an open session. If there's anything to be said about Mike Ben, the public needs to know. It's not going to be an option for the Board to close the meeting.

Chair Robinson stated that he's a little taken aback by Mr. Ben's forceful objection to what's contained in the summation of the survey that was done. If anything, he thinks Mr. Ben would note the opportunity to change some things and reflect on things. Whether they occurred in 2005, 2006, or 2007, it's a tool to help make the human resources department better.

Mr. Ben stated that he does not disagree with the Chair at all on that point, but there should be different venues for that and not in a document identified as evaluation. He reiterated that his concern about this summary document is that he doesn't know what he's being hit for. The comments are about the same things that have been repeated over and over. Mr. Ben has acknowledged it and has explained what he's going to do, and now he's telling the Board that he can't recollect when he was gruff. He'll just have to continue to say that he's been trying, he's been doing, and he doesn't know what the Board is talking about. That's his perspective. If the Board can tell him specifics, such as "when so-and-so called you, you said this," Mr. Ben would be able to address it.

The other thing about communication is that half the people said communication was clear and precise, and they understand; the other half said no. How does Mr. Ben know what it is that he's doing that is making this other half not understand? He happens to be in the half that thinks it's clear and understandable, so he needs an example that he can look at and analyze to see what's wrong.

From the last evaluation, all memos now have to pass through Mr. Ben, so he's reading them and correcting them. His staff will confirm they get a lot of red ink coming back to them.

There's information missing that would help him to try to get out memoranda that 100% of the people will understand, and there are no questions coming in to staff that would give him an indication of the areas they don't understand.

Mr. Cohen suggested using opportunities such as the cabinet meetings, at which the specialists could explain various policies to the department heads.

Communication Skills. Mr. Ben interprets the memo to mean that the Board considers the two noted instances something of a concern warranting the comment that "on occasion there's no need to be direct and uncompromising with staff, rather than the need to be facilitative and compassionate in difficult situations." Mr. Ben asked how he can determine the kinds of occasions the Board feels he doesn't need to be direct and uncompromising and instead be facilitative and compassionate.

Chair Robinson responded that he's thinking for all occasions. If Mr. Ben is providing a service, in this case human resources, and someone calls or approaches him with a question or concern, Mr. Ben should always be open, helpful, and willing to discuss items and facilitate the discussion.

Mr. Ben agreed but asked to know the circumstances that arose in that situation. He explained again that a department head who keeps asking him the same thing four to five times may get a more caustic response. But before he gets judged on it, where is his due process to explain the circumstances?

Mr. Cohen thought that was a good question and asked what Mr. Ben's suggestion would be in resolving the communication problem.

Mr. Ben responded that while he needs to be specific, the Board needs to assure the department heads that there will be no retaliation. As for the confidentiality issue, he'd tell the department heads that it should not be a concern of theirs. They're department heads who get paid \$100,000 a year. If Mr. Ben is saying something inappropriate, why aren't the department heads

telling him? Why hasn't the Mayor told him? As someone who has to negotiate for the County, he uses a whole variety of methods to get what he needs to get done, and sometimes it requires a heavier hand. He's not trying to make any excuses. As an example, if he "bops someone on the head," and the Board doesn't like it, the Board should tell him that it's inappropriate and instruct him not to do it again. If he does it again, and the Board confirms that he did it again and he shouldn't have, the Board has the option to fire him. That's what the evaluation is for, to make corrective action. If the person doesn't satisfactorily correct the action, the next step is to do the negative evaluation or whatever else is in their means.

Vice Chair Kaminaka suggested that Mr. Ben respond in writing because of the time constraint and continue this at their next meeting. He'd like Mr. Ben to develop a plan of action. If Mr. Ben's style results in departments and agencies within the County not seeking the advice of Human Resources prior to making personnel decisions, then that is a situation that must be corrected. The Merit Appeals Board would like Mr. Ben to develop a plan of action to address these concerns and institute a closer working relationship with the various departments of the County.

Mr. Ben noted that he is almost done and stated that he would like to bring this to a close.

Merit Appeals Board and Human Resources Support. There were comments about the department heads working with Mr. Ben's staff, and he doesn't know what's wrong with that. He's expressed to the Board after his last evaluation, and again when Mr. Takahashi became his deputy, that he would be assuming a consultative role with his staff and that they should be doing all the work. Mr. Ben will work with department heads when they call him, and take care of their concerns, and again, he thinks he's done that although evidently someone is saying he hasn't, but he can't address it because he doesn't know what the circumstances are. He hasn't gotten any feedback that says it's not working. If advice is not getting out there to give them guidance then yes the Board should be concerned, but there's no evidence of that. Mr. Ben's plan is to continue consulting with his division chiefs and staff. They run the day to day. Mr. Ben will work with the

departments when they have key issues such as Mr. Ashida with the mediation or if there's something going on with the Mayor. His plan is to be the person they come to for consultation. The Board's role is to tell him what their expectation is. Mr. Ben doesn't think the Board has the authority at all to tell him that he should develop something. The Board is strictly an appeals board. Although the Board has the power to hire and fire, to tell him to do something specifically is out of its jurisdiction.

Vice Chair Kaminaka asked that Mr. Ben come up with a plan of action that they can share with the departments so they recognize that they are doing something together. That's how they improve services – by getting constructive criticism. How Mr. Ben performs and what his image is is really an image of the Board. They want to promote a good image, and they have to do it together.

The plan of action should focus on what Mr. Ben is going to do or what he is already doing that the Board may not be aware of.

Mr. Ben stated that he will give the Board a plan that's acceptable to them.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Mr. Kaminaka moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cohen and unanimously carried.

The meeting adjourned at 2:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary, Civil Service Commission

APPROVED:

**G. Rick Robinson
Chair**

vym