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## Executive Summary

The Commission on Salaries (Commission) was established as a result of a constitutional amendment of Article XVI of the Constitution of the State of Hawai` i (Constitution) which was approved in November 2006. The Commission is charged with reviewing and making recommendations for the salaries of justices and judges of all State courts, members of the Legislature, the Governor and Lieutenant Governor, and specified appointed officials within the State Executive branch. Section 26-56, Commission on salaries, Hawai`i Revised Statutes (HRS), provides supplemental information and guidance relating to the Commission.

The 2006 Commission was convened in December 2006 and is submitting its report and recommendations to the 2007 State Legislature. Pursuant to Article XVI of the Constitution, the recommendations of the Commission shall become effective unless the Legislature disapproves the entire recommendation by adoption of a concurrent resolution prior to the adjournment of the 2007 Legislative Session.

The State Attorney General has issued an opinion indicating that the Commission is to dissolve after submitting its recommendations to the Legislature and cannot reconvene. This would mean that, if the recommendations are disapproved, the salary adjustments recommended by the former Executive, Judicial and Legislative salary commissions would remain in effect until their respective expiration dates.

Section 26-56, HRS, specifies that the Commission shall not recommend salaries that are lower than the salaries recommended by prior commissions that have been replaced by the current Commission. Therefore, the recommendations of the prior Executive, Judicial and Legislative salary commissions effectively set a floor for the recommendations of this Commission. The intent of this Commission is to recommend salaries that are fair, and take into account the following:

- The economic condition of the State and the fiscal impact of the increases
- Appropriate pay relationships with other governmental employees
- Attracting and retaining qualified applicants
- Since 1990, long periods during which no pay increases were granted
- Fairness and equity

The recommendations of the 2006 Commission will go into effect on July 1, 2007 for the Executive and Judicial branch officials. The recommendations will go into effect on January 1, 2009 for legislators, because Article XVI of the Constitution states that any salary change shall not apply to the Legislature to which the recommendations were submitted. The following recommendations, which were unanimously adopted by the Commission, are over and above the salaries that were to go into effect on July 1, 2007, for Executive branch and Judicial branch officials and January 1, 2009, for legislators.

## A. EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Effective July 1, 2007

- Increase the salaries of all positions, i.e., Governor, Lieutenant Governor (LG), Administrative Director of the State (AD), department heads and deputy department heads by 5\%.

Effective July 1, 2008

- Place the AD in Tier 1 (with the Attorney General), and the AD shall receive the Tier 1 rate.
- Compensate the LG at the same rate as the Attorney General and AD.
- Move Tier 4 department heads from the departments of Agriculture, Hawaiian Home Lands, Public Safety, and Human Resources Development to Tier 3 where they shall receive the Tier 3 rate. Eliminate Tier 4 for department heads.
- Move Tier 4 deputy department heads from the departments of Agriculture, Hawaiian Home Lands, Public Safety, and Human Resources Development to Tier 3 where the appointing authority shall specify the salary within the Tier 3 salary range. Eliminate Tier 4 for the deputy department heads.
- Increase the salaries of the Governor, LG, AD and Tiers 1 through 3 department heads and deputy department heads by 5\%.


## Effective July 1, 2009

- Move Tier 3 department heads from the departments of Human Services, Labor and Industrial Relations, Land and Natural Resources, Business and Economic Development and Tourism, Agriculture, Hawaiian Home Lands, Public Safety, and Human Resources Development to Tier 2 where they shall receive the Tier 2 rate. Eliminate Tier 3 for department heads.
- Move Tier 3 deputy department heads from the departments of Human Services, Labor and Industrial Relations, Land and Natural Resources, Business and Economic Development and Tourism, Agriculture, Hawaiian Home Lands, Public Safety, and Human Resources Development to Tier 2 where the appointing authority shall specify the salary within the Tier 2 salary range. Eliminate Tier 3 for the deputy department heads.
- Increase the salaries of the Governor, LG, AD, and Tier 1 and 2 department heads and deputy department heads by $5 \%$.

Effective July 1, 2010; July 1, 2011; and July 1, 2012

- Increase the salaries of all positions by $3.5 \%$ each year.


## B. JUDICIAL BRANCH

Effective July 1, 2007

- Increase the salaries of justices and judges by $10 \%$.

Effective July 1, 2008

- Increase the salaries of justices and judges by 3.5\%.

Effective July 1, 2009

- Increase the salaries of justices and judges by $10 \%$.

Effective July 1, 2010

- Increase the salaries of justices and judges by 3.5\%.

Effective July 1, 2011

- Increase the salaries of justices and judges by 10\%.

Effective July 1, 2012

- Increase the salaries of justices and judges by 3.5\%.


## C. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Effective January 1, 2009

- Increase the salaries of senators and representatives by $\$ 12,808$ per annum.
- The President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives will continue to receive $\$ 7,500$ more per year than senators and representatives.

Effective January 1, 2010; January 1, 2011; January 1, 2012; January 1, 2013; and January 1, 2014

- Increase the salaries of senators and representatives by 3.5\% each year.
- The President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives will continue to receive $\$ 7,500$ more per year than senators and representatives.


## Overview

## Legal Framework

## A. Constitution and State Statutes

This report fulfills the amendment to the Constitution (House Bill No. 1917) which was approved by the electorate of Hawai'i on November 7, 2006, and the companion legislative mandate in Act 299, Session Laws of Hawaì i (SLH), 2006 (House Bill No. 1918).

House Bill No. 1917, Regular Session of the Twenty-Third State Legislature 2006, amended Section 2, Article XVI of the Constitution by adding a new section to be appropriately designated and to read as follows:

## "SALARY COMMISSION

Section . There shall be a commission on salaries as provided by law, which shall review and recommend salaries for the justices and judges of all state courts, members of the legislature, department heads or executive officers of the executive departments and the deputies or assistants to department heads of the executive departments as provided by law, excluding the University of Hawai'i and the department of education. The commission shall also review and make recommendations for the salary of the administrative director of the State or equivalent position and the salary of the governor and the lieutenant governor.

Any salary established pursuant to this section shall not be decreased during a term of office, unless by general law applying to all salaried officers of the State.

Not later than the fortieth legislative day of the 2007 regular legislative session and every six years thereafter, the commission shall submit to the legislature its recommendations and then dissolve.

The recommended salaries submitted shall become effective as provided in the recommendation, unless the legislature disapproves the entire recommendation as a whole by adoption of a concurrent resolution prior to adjournment sine die of the legislative session in which the recommendation is submitted; provided that any change in salary which becomes effective shall not apply to the legislature to which the recommendation for the change in salary was submitted."

House Bill No. 1918 which became Act 299, SLH, 2006, was a companion to House Bill No. 1917. It amended Sections 26-51, 26-52, 26-53, 26-54, 601-3, 602-2, 602-52, 603-5 and 604-2.5, HRS, repealed Section $26-55$, HRS, and created a new

Section 26-56, HRS, which indicates that (see Appendices, A-1 for the entire content of House Bill No. 1918):

1. The Commission shall consist of seven members of whom: two members shall be appointed by the Governor, two by the President of the Senate, two by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and one by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.
2. The Commission may recommend different salaries for department heads and executive officers and different salary ranges for deputies or assistants to department heads; provided that the Commission shall recommend the same salary range for deputies or assistants to department heads within the same department; provided further that the appointing official shall specify the salary for a particular position within the applicable range.
3. The Commission shall not recommend salaries lower than salary amounts recommended by prior Commissions replaced by this section.
4. Not later than the fortieth legislative day of the regular session of 2007, and every six years thereafter, the Commission shall submit a report of its findings and its salary recommendations to the Legislature, through the Governor. The Commission may include incremental increases that take effect prior to the convening of the next salary Commission.
5. The recommended salaries submitted by the Commission shall become effective July 1 of the next fiscal year unless the Legislature disapproves the recommended salaries submitted by the Commission through the adoption of a concurrent resolution, which shall be approved by a simple majority of each house of the Legislature, prior to adjournment sine die of the legislative session in which the recommended salaries are submitted; provided that any change in salary which becomes effective shall not apply to the Legislature to which the recommendation for the change in salary was submitted.
6. Effective July 1, 2007, and every six years thereafter, the salary of the Adjutant General shall be as last recommended by the Commission, pursuant to Section 26-56, HRS, unless rejected by the Legislature, except that if the State salary is in conflict with the pay and allowance fixed by the tables of the regular army or air force of the United States, the latter shall prevail.
7. The Governor shall include the salary amounts recommended by the Commission and approved by the Legislature for employees of the Executive branch in the Executive budget.

## B. Attorney General Opinion

An Attorney General Opinion dated February 26, 2007, concerning the Commission on Salaries was forwarded to the Commission by Speaker of the House of Representatives Calvin Say. The opinion indicates that because the 2006 constitutional amendment states that "the commission shall submit to the legislature its recommendations and then dissolve," the Attorney General's office opines this precludes the current Commission from reconvening should its recommendations be disapproved by the Legislature. The opinion further states that the constitutional amendment is clear in requiring the Commission to submit its salary recommendations to the "2007 regular legislative session and every six years thereafter." The constitutional amendment does not contemplate submissions outside of this six-year cycle.

Should the Legislature reject the Commission's recommendations, the salaries of the Executive, Judicial, and Legislative branch will continue under the existing salary schedules. Under the Attorney General's opinion, the next salary recommendation will be issued by a Commission instituted in 2013. (See Appendices, A-2 for the entire Attorney General Opinion Concerning Salary Commission.)

## C. Judiciary's Administrative Director and Deputy Administrative Director of the Courts

The Judicial Salary Commission, which was repealed by Act 299, SLH 2006, made recommendations on the salaries of the Judiciary's Administrative Director and Deputy Administrative Director of the Courts. The 2006 constitutional amendment does not provide authority for this Commission to make salary recommendations for those positions. Therefore, the Commission has not made any recommendations on these two Judiciary positions. The Commission is aware that the Judiciary has, by request, introduced legislation to remedy this situation by linking these positions to other Judicial salaries.

## Prior Pay Increases

The last Executive Salary Commission submitted recommendations to the 2004 Legislature for the eight-year period July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2012, (December 4, 2006, to noon on the first Monday in December 2014 for Governor, Lieutenant Governor and Administrative Director of State). The recommendations were not disapproved and will continue to be in effect if this Commission's recommendations are disapproved. Prior to July 1, 2004, Executive salaries were last adjusted on January 1, 1990.

The last Judicial Salary Commission also submitted recommendations to the 2004 Legislature for the same eight-year period, but the first pay increase recommended by the Commission took effect on July 1, 2005, instead of July 1, 2004. The recommendations were not disapproved and will continue to be in effect if this Commission's recommendations are disapproved. Prior to the July 1, 2005, pay
increases, Judicial salaries were adjusted on January 1, 1990, July 1, 1999, and on July 1, 2000.

The last Commission on Legislative Salary submitted recommendations to the 2003 Legislature covering the eight-year period January 2005 to December 2012. The recommendations were not disapproved and will continue to be in effect if this Commission's recommendations are disapproved. Unlike the recommendations of the Executive Salary Commission and the Judicial Salary Commission, the recommended pay increases would take effect every two years after the first increase as opposed to each year. Prior to the January 1, 2005, increase, legislative salaries were last adjusted in January 1993.

## 2006 Commission on Salaries

This is the report and recommendations of the first Commission on Salaries authorized by the November 2006 State of Hawai' i constitutional amendment which mandates combining three previously separate salary commission functions - the Executive, the Judicial and the Legislative. This Commission's review will cover a sixyear period. For Executive and Judicial salaries, the recommendations cover the period July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2013. For legislative salaries, the recommendations cover the period January 1, 2009, through December 31, 2014.

## Process

The Commission was convened on December 28, 2006. At that time, Commissioner Benjamin A. Kudo was elected as Chairperson and Commissioner Paul T. Oshiro was elected as Vice-Chairperson. A brief orientation was provided by staff of the Department of Human Resources Development (DHRD) and there was agreement on a tentative schedule. Commissioners were provided with a folder of documents to review prior to the next meeting. They also asked that information be provided to them regarding past Executive branch pay increases and the compensation of top-level officials within the University of Hawai i and Department of Education. The Commission also indicated that they wanted to have a presentation by the Director of Budget and Finance regarding the financial condition of the State.

Testimony from the public was solicited at all subsequent meetings, but none was received.

The second meeting of the Commission was held on January 10, 2007, at which time a representative from the DHRD provided some observations regarding the salary structure resulting from the recommendations of the Executive Salary Commission and pay relationships. Representatives of the Judiciary also made a presentation regarding possible salary recommendations. Additional information provided to the Commission included: estimated tax revenue, historical data regarding Executive and Judicial pay increases, an organization chart of top-level Executive branch jobs, salary information regarding top-level University of Hawai' i and Department of Education officials, and information regarding collective bargaining pay increases.

The third meeting of the Commission was held on January 22, 2007. A representative of the Employees' Retirement System made a presentation regarding retirement benefits, and the Director of Budget and Finance made a presentation regarding the financial condition of the State. Additional information provided to the Commission included: prior reports of the Executive, Judicial and Legislative salary commissions, and a Legislative Reference Bureau Report concerning the Judicial salary structure. The Commission decided to divide into three subcommittees to determine recommendations for each of the branches of State government. The Executive branch subcommittee members were Commissioners Stanley Shiraki and Wayne Yamasaki. The Judicial branch subcommittee members were Commissioners Doris Ching, Michael Irish, and Benjamin Kudo. The Legislative branch subcommittee members were Commissioners Barbara Annis and Paul Oshiro.

The fourth meeting of the Commission was held on January 31, 2007. Presentations and recommendations were made by each subcommittee and there was substantial discussion regarding each of the recommendations. The Commissioners agreed to study each of the subcommittee reports prior to the next meeting. Staff was asked to provide data showing what the Executive, Judicial and Legislative salaries would be if increases comparable to the increases for Bargaining Unit 13 (Professional
and Scientific Employees) had been granted during the period of time when there were no pay increases to the present. In addition, projections were prepared to show what the salaries would be if annual increases of $3 \%, 3.5 \%$, and $4 \%$ had been granted for the same period.

Meetings were held on February 7, 2007, and February 14, 2007, and after substantial discussion, recommendations were unanimously agreed upon. Staff was instructed to begin drafting the report and each subcommittee was to draft the rationale used for the recommendations.

Meetings were held on March 2, 2007, and March 7, 2007, to review the draft report. The report was approved by the Commission at a meeting held on March 14, 2007.

## Rationale and Recommendations

General Rationale

The Commission's general rationale is that the compensation of the elected and appointed officials should be fair and equitable, and sufficient to attract and retain high quality individuals while at the same time being prudent in the expenditure of public funds. In order to do so, the Commission asked to be briefed on the State system of Judicial, Legislative and Executive branch retirement benefits; State tax revenue projections for FY 2007 to FY 2013; and the State of Hawai' i Updated State General Fund Financial Plan for FY 2006 to FY 2013.

It was also noted by the Commission that there were long periods during which other State employees received pay increases while elected and appointed officials and justices and judges did not receive pay increases.

## Executive Branch

In reaching its recommendations for the "executive salaries," the Commission reviewed the compensation of executives in the State of Hawaii i, i.e., University of Hawaii i, Department of Education, and State employees covered by the Excluded Managerial Compensation Plan (EMCP). Although the Commission does not have jurisdiction over, nor is it involved with setting the salaries for the University of Hawai' i and Department of Education, the salaries were reviewed since they are an integral part of Hawaii i's government structure. (See Appendices, A-32)

Additionally, salaries of county executives were also reviewed, i.e., mayors, deputy managing directors, department heads, deputy department heads, prosecuting attorneys, etc., for the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii i County, Maui County and Kauai County. (See Appendices, A-10)

The Book of the States 2006 edition was reviewed to determine how other jurisdictions compensated their respective governors, lieutenant governors, and comparable department heads. Although the compensations from other jurisdictions were not compared to the compensations of Hawai i's executives, they did show that there is no consistent method of setting executive salaries.

After reviewing the materials cited above and additional information, the Commission determined that pay equity and compensation levels need to be addressed for executive salaries if the State is to recruit and retain qualified executives to the Executive branch of government. It is important to remember that the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, department heads, deputy department heads, etc., are called upon to administer programs that affect the health and welfare of our residents, which include annual budgets that collectively exceed $\$ 9.8$ billion per year. The State needs to recruit and retain the "best and brightest" for these positions because of the daily impact these positions have on our State.

The pay equity issue needs to be addressed because of the demoralizing impact that the current salary levels create. There are currently five (5) excluded (from collective bargaining coverage) managerial employees in the Excluded Managerial Compensation Plan (EMCP) that are being paid more than the Attorney General at the Tier 1 level. At the Tier 2 level, there are 22 excluded managerial employees in the EMCP that are paid more than department heads at this Tier 2 level. Additionally, there are 78 excluded managerial employees in the EMCP being paid more than the department heads in the Tier 4 level; in fact, $43 \%$ of the Department of Transportation excluded managerial employees are being paid more than the department heads in the Tier 4 level. The salaries of excluded managerial employees not only exceed the salaries of the department heads, but also the salaries of the deputy department heads who in many cases directly supervise them.

In addressing the compensation levels, the Commission realizes that the State will not be able to match salaries and benefits of executives in the private sector, but
feels that the State will be able to attract qualified candidates with a reasonable compensation level. A factor that the Commission will not be able to quantify in this report is the willingness of individuals to service the public. The Commission believes that there are qualified candidates who are willing to provide public service and make financial sacrifices within certain limits. Many of these qualified candidates would be providing public service for 4-8 years, depending on the term of the Governor, without any additional outside employment compensation since State law prohibits their outside employment.

To address the issue of pay equity and compensation level, the following recommendations are made by the Commission utilizing the existing four tiers, which will be modified as follows (see Figure 1):

Effective July 1, 2007

- Increase the salaries of all positions, i.e., Governor, Lieutenant Governor (LG), Administrative Director of the State (AD), department heads and deputy department heads by $5 \%$.

Effective July 1, 2008

- Place the AD in Tier 1 (with the Attorney General), and the AD shall receive the Tier 1 rate.
- Compensate the LG at the same rate as the Attorney General and AD.
- Move Tier 4 department heads from the departments of Agriculture, Hawaiian Home Lands, Public Safety, and Human Resources Development to Tier 3 where they shall receive the Tier 3 rate. Eliminate Tier 4 for department heads.
- Move Tier 4 deputy department heads from the departments of Agriculture, Hawaiian Home Lands, Public Safety, and Human Resources Development to Tier 3 where the appointing authority shall specify the salary within the Tier 3 salary range. Eliminate Tier 4 for the deputy department heads.
- Increase the salaries of the Governor, LG, AD, and Tiers 1 through 3 department heads and deputy department heads by 5\%.

Effective July 1, 2009

- Move Tier 3 department heads from the departments of Human Services, Labor and Industrial Relations, Land and Natural Resources, Business and Economic Development and Tourism, Agriculture, Hawaiian Home Lands, Public Safety, and Human Resources Development to Tier 2 where they shall receive the Tier 2 rate. Eliminate Tier 3 for department heads.
- Move Tier 3 deputy department heads from the departments of Human Services, Labor and Industrial Relations, Land and Natural Resources, Business and Economic Development and Tourism, Agriculture, Hawaiian Home Lands, Public Safety, and Human Resources Development to Tier 2 where the appointing authority shall specify the salary within the Tier 2 salary range. Eliminate Tier 3 for the deputy department heads.
- Increase the salaries of the Governor, LG, AD, and Tier 1 and 2 department heads and deputy department heads by $5 \%$.

Effective July 1, 2010; July 1, 2011; and July 1, 2012

- Increase the salaries of all positions by $3.5 \%$ each year.

With the implementation of these recommendations, there will be only two (2) tiers on July 1, 2009. Tier 1 will include the Administrative Director and the Attorney General. The placement into Tier 1 of the Attorney General recognizes his/her training, knowledge and recognition as the chief legal officer for the State. The salary of the Lieutenant Governor will parallel the salary of the Administrative Director and the Attorney General. Tier 2 will include all the department heads and their deputy department heads in recognition of scope, complexity, and diversity of responsibilities in the health, safety and welfare of the public, financial management and economic development, infrastructure and other services.

The Commission recognizes that the salaries recommended for the Executive Branch would place the salary of the Adjutant General, Department of Defense, at a lower salary than what the Adjutant General is currently receiving and would be in conflict with the pay and allowance fixed by the tables of the regular army or air force of the United States for officers of comparable rank and time in service. Section 26-52, HRS, provides that if the salary is in conflict with the pay and allowance fixed by the tables of the regular army or air force of the United States, the latter shall prevail in setting the salary. Therefore, the Commission recommends that the salary and future salary increases for the Adjutant General be set by the pay and allowance tables of the regular army or air force of the United States over the period covered by this Commission's recommendation. Additionally, the Commission recommends the salary of the Deputy Adjutant General be set by the pay and allowance tables of the regular army or air force of the United States for officers of comparable rank and time in service over the period covered by this Commission's recommendation.

Executives in the public service are expected to work extended hours; participate in community service events, forums and meetings; be accessible on a 24 -hour, 7 -day-a- week basis for emergency situations; and exercise effective leadership in addressing emergency and crisis situations.

Figure 1 - Executive Salary Recommendations

| Position | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Current } \\ \text { 7/1/2006 } \end{gathered}$ | 7/1/2007 | 7/1/2008 | 7/1/2009 | 7/1/2010 | 7/1/2011 | 7/1/2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Governor | 112,000 | 117,600 | 123,480 | 129,660 | 134,196 | 138,888 | 143,748 |
| Lieutenant Governor | 100,000 | 105,000 | 120,444 | 126,468 | 130,896 | 135,480 | 140,220 |
| Tier 1 <br> Admin. Director of the State | 100,000 | 105,000 | 120,444 | 126,468 | 130,896 | 135,480 | 140,220 |
| Tier 1 Dept. Head Attorney General | 109,242 | 114,708 | 120,444 | 126,468 | 130,896 | 135,480 | 140,220 |
| Tier 2 Dept. Heads DOH, DOT, DAGS, DCCA, TAX, B\&F | 104,040 | 109,248 | 114,708 | 120,444 | 124,656 | 129,024 | 133,536 |
| Tier 3 Dept. Heads ${ }^{2}$ DHS, DLIR, DLNR, DBEDT | 98,838 | 103,776 | 108,960 | Move to Tier 2 |  |  |  |
| Tier 4 Dept. Heads ${ }^{1}$ DOA, DHHL, PSD, DHRD | 93,636 | 98,316 | Move to Tier 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Tier 1 Deputy Dept. Head Attorney General | $\begin{gathered} \hline 95,041- \\ 100,503 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 99,792-1 \\ & 105,528 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline 104,784- \\ 110,808 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 110,028-1 \\ 116,352 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 113,880- \\ 120,420 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 117,864- \\ 124,632 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline 121,992- \\ 129,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Tier 2 Deputy Dept. Heads DOH, DOT, DAGS, DCCA, TAX, B\&F | $\begin{array}{r} 90,515- \\ 95,717 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95,040- \\ & 100,500 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 99,792- \\ 105,528 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 104,784- \\ 110,808 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 108,456-1 \\ 114,684 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 112,248- \\ 118,692 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 116,172- \\ 122,844 \end{array}$ |
| Tier 3 Deputy Dept. Heads ${ }^{2}$ DHS, DLIR, DLNR, DBEDT | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 85,989-1 \\ 90,931 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90,288- \\ 95,472 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 94,800- \\ & 100,248 \end{aligned}$ | Move to Tier 2 |  |  |  |
| Tier 4 Deputy Dept. Heads ${ }^{1}$ DOA, DHHL, PSD, DHRD | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 81,463- \\ 86,145 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 85,536- \\ 90,456 \end{array}$ | Move to Tier 3 |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Effective $7 / 1 / 2008$, Tier 4 positions shall move to Tier 3 . Tier 3 shall consist of DHS, DLIR, DLNR, DBEDT, DOA, DHHL, PSD, and DHRD. Tier 4 shall be eliminated.
${ }^{2}$ Effective $7 / 1 / 2009$, Tier 3 positions shall move to Tier 2 . Tier 2 shall consist of DOH, DOT, DAGS, DCCA, TAX, B\&F, DHS, DLIR, DLNR, DBEDT, DOA, DHHL, PSD, and DHRD. Tier 3 shall be eliminated.

See Table 1 for cost.

## Judicial Branch

Basis and Considerations of Salary Recommendations. The basis of the Commission on Salaries' Judicial salary recommendations for FY 2007 to FY 2012 is equity and fairness. In determining equity and fairness, the Commission considered: 1) significance and seriousness of Judicial application and interpretation of State laws and their profound effect of justice in a democratic society; 2) relationship of actual salary and consumer-price-index adjusted salary; 3) Hawaii i's ranked position in the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) study of Salary Comparison Among States; 4) probability of attracting qualified applicants and retaining competent, experienced justices and judges; 5) impact of ten years of no increase in Judicial salaries between 1990 and 1999; 6) reasonableness within the context of salaries of employees of other State departments; 7) minimum requirements of skill and experience for Judicial positions; 8) affordability in light of the State economy and projected State revenues for FY 2007 to FY 2013; and 9) the totality of all of the above considerations.

The Commission was briefed on the State system of Judicial, Legislative and Executive branch retirement benefits; State tax revenue projections for FY 2007 to FY 2013; and the State of Hawaii i Updated State General Fund Financial Plan FY 2006 to FY 2013. The Commission also consulted various pertinent documents (see Appendices for complete list and set of documents).

In comparing Judicial salaries with other states, the Commission reviewed the states' rankings in both non-adjusted salaries and COLA adjusted salaries (adjusted for cost of living), as provided by the NCSC-published Survey of Judicial Salaries. The Commission weighted the ranking of the COLA adjusted salaries more heavily on the basis of fairness. The Adjusted Salary Comparison Among States, based in part on information provided by the Council for Community and Economic Research-known as ACCRA, the most widely accepted U.S. source of cost-of-living indices-found Hawaìi's Judicial salaries, indexed to the national average, as lowest and last among all states, which the Commission considered to be an unfair and inaccurate reflection of our State's regard for the Judiciary and its effect on Judicial decisions and justice throughout the State.

The Commission considered the impact of ten years of no increase in Judicial salaries from 1990 to 1999. Clearly, the impact has been substantially negative. Had Judicial salaries been adjusted at similar levels as collective bargaining increases or at reasonable levels of $3 \%, 3.5 \%$ or $4 \%$ during 1990-1999, current Judicial salaries would be as follows (see Appendices, A-40):

- The current salary of the Chief Justice is $\$ 144,900$. Had the salary kept pace with collective bargaining increases from January 1, 1990, to July 1, 2006, the current salary would be $\$ 183,037$. Had the salary increased annually by $3 \%$, the current salary would be $\$ 156,657$; at $3.5 \%$ annual increase, the current salary would be
$\$ 170,099$; at $4 \%$ annual increase, the current salary would be $\$ 184,622$. The Commission's recommended salary for July 1, 2007, is $\$ 159,396$.
- The current salary of the Associate Justice is $\$ 139,725$. Had the salary kept pace with collective bargaining increases from January 1, 1990, to July 1, 2006, the current salary would be $\$ 181,119$. Had the salary increased annually by $3 \%$, the current salary would be $\$ 155,004$; at $3.5 \%$ annual increase, the current salary would be $\$ 168,305$; at $4 \%$ annual increase, the current salary would be $\$ 182,674$. The Commission's recommended salary for July 1, 2007, is $\$ 153,696$.
- The current salaries of judges range from $\$ 134,550$ (Intermediate Court of Appeals chief judge) to $\$ 118,611$ (District/Family Court judge). Had the salaries kept pace with collective bargaining increases from January 1, 1990, to July 1, 2006, the current salaries would range from $\$ 176,324$ (ICA chief judge) to $\$ 158,104$ (District/Family Court judge). Had the salaries increased annually by $3 \%$, the current salaries would range from $\$ 150,872$ to $\$ 135,170$; at $3.5 \%$ annual increase, the current salaries would range from $\$ 163,818$ to $\$ 146,769$; at $4 \%$ annual increase, the current salaries would range from $\$ 177,804$ to $\$ 159,299$. The Commission's recommended salaries for July 1, 2007, range from \$148,008 to $\$ 130,476$.

The Commission also considered Judicial retirement benefits and the Judicial mandatory retirement age of 70 .

Imperative Considerations. The Hawai' i Judiciary applies and interprets laws and addresses legal issues of the State of Hawai i. As one of three branches of State government, the Hawai'i Judiciary is responsible for administration of justice with the highest possible levels of impartiality, efficiency and accessibility. The Hawai' i State courts operate within an integrated statewide system; and court rules, procedures and forms are consistent through all jurisdictions within the State.

Decisions of the Judiciary are based solely on relevant laws and evidence presented, regardless of public opinion and other external influences. Thus, the Judiciary serves as guardian and interpreter of State law. While decisions of the courts can have lifelong consequences for the individuals involved, Judiciary decisions, nevertheless, speak to the heart of the law and are made with commitments to protect individual rights and freedoms and assurance of equal justice under law, which are keys to a sound democracy.

Reasonable Recommendations. While the Commission had hoped to raise Hawai'i's rank on the NCSC Salary Comparison Among States from lowest and last to a slightly higher position of $42^{\text {nd }}$ or $43^{\text {rd }}$, it chose, instead, to recommend a more moderate and affordable salary adjustment, in light of salaries of employees of other State departments. Thus, despite the recommended increases, Hawai'i's adjusted salary comparison among all states will remain lowest and last. Nevertheless, the recommended increases will narrow the equity gap that currently exists.

Recommendations Justified. The recommendations of the Commission are justified in terms of the above considerations to determine equity and fairness of Judicial salaries. In order to attract and retain competent and experienced individuals, salaries commensurate with their abilities are critical. Fair and just compensation is an imperative in creating the most qualified Judicial applicant pool and retaining a proficient Judiciary.

The Commission's recommendations for the Judicial branch are as follows (see Figure 2):

Effective July 1, 2007

- Increase the salaries of justices and judges by $10 \%$.

Effective July 1, 2008

- Increase the salaries of justices and judges by 3.5\%.

Effective July 1, 2009

- Increase the salaries of justices and judges by $10 \%$.

Effective July 1, 2010

- Increase the salaries of justices and judges by 3.5\%.

Effective July 1, 2011

- Increase the salaries of justices and judges by $10 \%$.

Effective July 1, 2012

- Increase the salaries of justices and judges by 3.5\%.
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Figure 2 - Judicial Salary Recommendations

| Position | Current <br> $7 / 1 / 2006$ | $7 / 1 / 2007$ | $7 / 1 / 2008$ | $7 / 1 / 2009$ | $7 / 1 / 2010$ | $7 / 1 / 2011$ | $7 / 1 / 2012$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Chief Justice, Supreme | 144,900 | 159,396 | 164,976 | 181,476 | 187,824 | 206,604 | 213,840 |
| Associate Justice, Supreme | 139,725 | 153,696 | 159,072 | 174,984 | 181,104 | 199,212 | 206,184 |
| Chief Judge, Intermediate | 134,550 | 148,008 | 153,192 | 168,516 | 174,420 | 191,868 | 198,588 |
| Associate Judge, <br> Intermediate | 129,375 | 142,308 | 147,288 | 162,012 | 167,688 | 184,452 | 190,908 |
| Circuit Court Judge | 125,856 | 138,444 | 143,292 | 157,620 | 163,140 | 179,460 | 185,736 |
| District/Family/Per Diem <br> Court Judge | 118,611 | 130,476 | 135,048 | 148,548 | 153,744 | 169,116 | 175,032 |

See Table 2 for cost.

## Legislative Branch

In formulating recommendations on salary adjustments for members of the State Legislature, the Commission reviewed and evaluated the duties, responsibilities, and estimated time commitments of State legislators; conducted a comparative analysis with the duties, responsibilities, estimated time commitments and salaries of county council members; evaluated the ability of State legislators to supplement their legislative salary with a profession, business or other employment; evaluated the salaries of legislative staff; reviewed non-salary benefits of legislators; considered the fact that legislative salaries remained unchanged for twelve years from 1993 to 2005; took into account that legislative salary adjustments offered by the Commission will not go into effect until 2009; and considered several other items of relevance and interest.

State legislative duties include but are not limited to: law making functions; State budget appropriations; fact finding and other similar investigations; receiving and considering petition requests from groups or individuals; confirming certain officers appointed by the Governor (Senate function); proposing amendments to the State Constitution; and addressing community and constituent inquiries and concerns.

Requirements and expectations placed upon legislators by constituents, along with the increasing complexity of issues that come before the Legislature, necessitate legislators to expend extensive amounts of time and effort on legislative matters during the months that the Legislature is in session and during the interim period between their annual and special legislative sessions. While legislators are considered to be part-time employees, it is apparent that their duties and responsibilities require more than that of a part-time employee. They perform many complex and time-consuming duties both during the legislative session as well as during the interim period between sessions. During session, legislators are involved with daily legislative sessions, public hearings, decision-making meetings on a wide variety of bills and resolutions, meetings and discussions with advocates, community meetings, and meetings and discussions on constituent concerns and inquiries. During the interim period between legislative sessions, legislators are often involved with community meetings, addressing community issues, handling legislative inquiries, conducting site visitations and research, researching and drafting of legislative bills and resolutions, and the handling of constituent inquiries and concerns.

The Commission conducted a general comparison of the duties, responsibilities, and estimated time commitments of State legislators and county council members. While the county council members have their council and committee meetings spaced throughout the calendar year, State legislators have their daily floor sessions and various committee meetings compressed over a four-month period. The estimated time commitments for both county council members and State legislators were found to be generally comparable.

The many demands imposed upon State legislators and the time required to fulfill their duties and responsibilities, restrict the ability of legislators to supplement their salary with a profession, business or other employment. The legislators' ability to supplement their income is further limited by conflicts, or a perception of conflict, with legislative responsibilities and duties. Fortunately, qualified individuals have been willing to serve despite concern regarding compensation. However, inadequate compensation, coupled with the restrictions to supplement the compensation, may limit the number of qualified individuals willing to serve as State legislators in the future.

The current salary for senators and representatives (excluding the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate) is $\$ 35,900$. The highest paid House session staff employee (excluding the Speaker's office) is $\$ 39,600$ or $\$ 3,700$ more per year than that of a legislator. Office managers in the House receive an annual salary of $\$ 35,048$ or $\$ 852$ less than a legislator. The current salary for Maui County Council members is $\$ 52,500$ or $\$ 16,600$ more than a legislator. The current salary for Honolulu City Council members is $\$ 46,900$ or $\$ 11,000$ more than a legislator. The current salary for Big Island County Council members is $\$ 39,240$ or $\$ 3,340$ more than a legislator. The current salary for Kauai County Council members is $\$ 35,100$ or $\$ 800$ less than a legislator.

Legislative salaries remained unchanged for twelve years (1993-2005). If legislative salaries had kept pace with collective bargaining increases over the period from 1993 to January 1, 2007, the current legislative salary would be $\$ 53,495$ or $33 \%$ greater than the current salary of $\$ 35,900$. If legislative salaries had been adjusted annually by $3 \%$ from 1993 to January 1, 2007, the current legislative salary would be $\$ 48,403$ or $26 \%$ greater than the current salary of $\$ 35,900$. If legislative salaries had been adjusted annually by $3.5 \%$ from 1993 to January 1, 2007, the current legislative salary would be $\$ 51,798$ or $31 \%$ greater than the current salary. If legislative salaries had been adjusted annually by $4 \%$ from 1993 to January 1, 2007, the current legislative salary would be $\$ 55,414$ or $35 \%$ greater than the current salary.

Any salary recommendation offered by the Commission will not go into effect until January 1, 2009. However, consideration was given to normal salary and cost of living increases over the next two years between January 1, 2007 and January 1, 2009.

The Commission also considered the non-salary benefits that legislators receive. Legislators earn no vacation or sick leave and are not eligible for overtime compensation. Legislators receive the same holidays as other State employees. Medical and other insurance are determined on the same basis as other State employees, as well as personal savings options such as deferred compensation and savings bond deductions. Legislators are eligible for a contributory retirement plan of $3.5 \%$. While on official business, legislators are eligible to receive an $\$ 80$ per diem for neighbor island travel (this includes neighbor island legislators attending session on O`ahu) and a $\$ 130$ per diem for mainland travel. This is consistent with other State employees. Legislators are eligible for downtown parking stalls at the standard State
rate. Free parking at all State airports is offered. Legislators receive a $\$ 5,000$ expense account, which is subject to very stringent regulations and limitations as to its use.

The Commission's salary recommendations for members of the State Legislature (excluding the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate) are generally comparable to salaries of Honolulu City Council members. Salary recommendations also provide an adequate differential between State legislators and their legislative session and year round office staff.

Consideration was given to the additional duties and responsibilities of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Commission believes that the additional requirements to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of the Senate President and House Speaker warrant a differential in salary from other members of the Legislature.

The Commission's recommendations for the Legislative branch are as follows (see Figure 3):

- Effective January 1, 2009 - Increase the annual salaries of legislators by $\$ 12,808$ and maintain the $\$ 7,500$ additional annual differential for the Senate President and House Speaker.
- Effective January 1, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014 - Increase the salaries of legislators by $3.5 \%$ each year and maintain the $\$ 7,500$ annual differential for the Senate President and the House Speaker each year.

Figure 3 - Legislative Salary Recommendations

| Position | Current <br> $1 / 1 / 2007$ | $1 / 1 / 2009$ | $1 / 1 / 2010$ | $1 / 1 / 2011$ | $1 / 1 / 2012$ | $1 / 1 / 2013$ | $1 / 1 / 2014$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| House Speaker/Senate <br> President | 43,400 | 56,208 | 57,912 | 59,676 | 61,500 | 63,396 | 65,352 |
| Representative/Senator | 35,900 | 48,708 | 50,412 | 52,176 | 54,000 | 55,896 | 57,852 |

See Table 3 for cost.

## Conclusion

In addition to the above recommendations, the Commission would like to offer the following recommendations and comments for future consideration:

1. Individuals who occupy appointed positions in the Executive Branch that are subject to the Commission's salary recommendations do not enjoy the same degree of control over their duration of employment as most other State employees as they are appointed for set terms of office. It may be appropriate that their retirement benefits be re-examined in light of that difference.
2. The Commission is charged with making salary recommendations covering a six-year period. The Commission, however, recognizes that the future status of the State's economy is difficult to predict. The Commission also recognizes that provisions for adjustment during the sixyear salary period should be allowed to accommodate the uncertainties of the future.

We, the undersigned members of the Commission hereby respectfully submit this report and recommendations to the Twenty-Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii.


Barbara A. Annis


Michael P. Irish

## Tables

Table 1 - Executive Salaries and Costs


Deputy Department Head salaries costed at recommended range maximum.
${ }^{1}$ Governor: Current annual salary of \$112,000 effective 12/4/2006.
7/1/2006 total salaries = \$94,780/annum @ 5 mos + \$112,000/annum @ 7 mos = \$104,825.00
${ }^{2}$ Lt. Governor, Admin. Director of the State: Current annual salary of $\$ 100,000$ effective 12/4/2006 $7 / 1 / 2006$ total salaries $=\$ 90,041 /$ annum $@ 5 \mathrm{mos}+\$ 100,000 /$ annum $@ 7 \mathrm{mos}=\$ 95,850.42$
${ }^{3}$ Effective 7/1/2008
Lt. Governor, Admin. Director of the State: $14.7 \%$ increase
Tier 4 Dept. Heads, Tier 4 Deputy Dept. Heads: $10.8 \%$ increase
${ }^{4}$ Effective 7/1/2009
Tier 3 and 4 Dept. Heads, Tier 3 and 4 Deputy Dept. Heads: $10.5 \%$ increase

[^0]Table 2 - Judicial Salaries and Costs


## Effective 7/1/2012

Current salaries approved to 6/30/2012. 7/1/2012 current costs computed at 7/1/2011 rates.

Table 3 - Legislative Salaries and Costs

|  |  |  | Current 1/1/2007 |  | 1/1/2009 |  | 1/1/2010 |  | 1/1/2011 |  | 1/1/2012 |  | 1/1/2013 |  | 1/1/2014 |  | Total Salaries 1/1/2009 to 12/31/2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position |  | No. of Empl. | Annual Salary | Total Salaries | Annual Salary | Total Salaries | Annual <br> Salary | Total <br> Salaries | Annual Salary | Total Salaries | Annual Salary | Total Salaries | Annual Salary | Total <br> Salaries | Annual Salary | Total <br> Salaries |  |
| House Speaker/Senate President | Current | 2 | 43,400 | 86,800 | 45,000 | 90,000 | 45,000 | 90,000 | 46,700 | 93,400 | 46,700 | 93,400 | 46,700 | 93,400 | 46,700 | 93,400 | 553,600 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 29.5\% |  | 3.0\% |  | 3.0\% |  | 3.1\% |  | 3.1\% |  | 3.1\% |  |  |
|  | Recommend | 2 | 43,400 | 86,800 | 56,208 | 112,416 | 57,912 | 115,824 | 59,676 | 119,352 | 61,500 | 123,000 | 63,396 | 126,792 | 65,352 | 130,704 | 728,088 |
| Representative/Senator | Current | 74 | 35,900 | 2,656,600 | 37,500 | 2,775,000 | 37,500 | 2,775,000 | 39,200 | 2,900,800 | 39,200 | 2,900,800 | 39,200 | 2,900,800 | 39,200 | 2,900,800 | 17,153,200 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 35.7\% |  | 3.5\% |  | 3.5\% |  | 3.5\% |  | 3.5\% |  | 3.5\% |  |  |
|  | Recommend | 74 | 35,900 | 2,656,600 | 48,708 | 3,604,392 | 50,412 | 3,730,488 | 52,176 | 3,861,024 | 54,000 | 3,996,000 | 55,896 | 4,136,304 | 57,852 | 4,281,048 | 23,609,256 |
| Total Current Salaries |  | 76 |  | 2,743,400 |  | 2,865,000 |  | 2,865,000 |  | 2,994,200 |  | 2,994,200 |  | 2,994,200 |  | 2,994,200 | 17,706,800 |
| Total Recommended Salaries |  | 76 |  | 2,743,400 |  | 3,716,808 |  | 3,846,312 |  | 3,980,376 |  | 4,119,000 |  | 4,263,096 |  | 4,411,752 | 24,337,344 |
| Difference between Recommended Salaries and Current Approved Salaries |  |  |  |  |  | 851,808 |  | 981,312 |  | 986,176 |  | 1,124,800 |  | 1,268,896 |  | 1,417,552 | 6,630,544 |
| Percent Increase |  |  |  |  |  | 29.7\% |  | 34.3\% |  | 32.9\% |  | 37.6\% |  | 42.4\% |  | 47.3\% | 37.4\% |
| Year-to-year increase in Recommended Salaries Percent Increase |  |  |  |  |  | 973,408 |  | 129,504 |  | 134,064 |  | 138,624 |  | 144,096 |  | 148,656 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 35.5\% |  | 3.5\% |  | 3.5\% |  | 3.5\% |  | 3.5\% |  | 3.5\% |  |

Note: Legislative Salaries costed by calendar year due to the increases becoming effective January 1 of each year beginning in 2009.

## Effective 7/1/2012

Current salaries approved to $12 / 31 / 2012$. $1 / 1 / 2013$ and $1 / 1 / 2014$ current costs computed at $12 / 31 / 2012$ rates

# Appendices 

## Section A

## Appendices for Material Reviewed by the Commission

Report Title:
Commission on Salaries; Legislature; Executive Branch; Judiciary
Description:
Pursuant to a proposed constitutional amendment, establishes a commission on salaries to recommend the salary of the governor, lieutenant governor, the members of the legislature, justices and judges of all state courts, the administrative director of the State or an equivalent position, and the department heads or executive officers and the deputies or assistants to the department heads of all state departments. (HB1918 CD1)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE, 2006 H.B. NO.
STATE OF HAWAII S.D. 2
C.D. 1

## A BILL FOR AN ACT

RELATING TO COMMISSION ON SALARIES.

## BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF HAWAII:

SECTION 1. Chapter 26, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended by adding a new section to be appropriately designated and to read as follows:
"§26- Commission on salaries. (a) Pursuant to article XVI, section , of the Constitution of the State of Hawaii, there is established a commission on salaries within the department of human resources development, for administrative purposes only.

The commission shall consist of seven members of whom:
(1) Two members shall be appointed by the governor;
(2) Two members shall be appointed by the president of the senate;
(3) Two members shall be appointed by the speaker of the house of representatives; and
(4) One member shall be appointed by the chief justice of the supreme court.

Vacancies in these positions shall be filled in the same manner. The members of the commission shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for expenses, including travel expenses, necessary for the performance of their duties.
(b) The commission shall review and recommend an appropriate salary for the governor, lieutenant governor, members of the legislature, justices and judges of all state courts, administrative director of the State or an equivalent position, and department heads or executive officers and the deputies or assistants to the department heads of the departments of:
(1) Accounting and general services;
(2) Agriculture;
(3) The attorney general;
(4) Budget and finance;
(5) Business, economic development, and tourism;
(6) Commerce and consumer affairs;
(7) Defense;
(8) Hawaiian home lands;
(9) Health;
(10) Human resources development;
(11) Human services;
(12) Labor and industrial relations;
(13) Land and natural resources;
(14) Public safety;
(15) Taxation; and
(16) Transportation.

The commission shall not review the salary of any position in the
department of education or the University of Hawaii.
The commission may recommend different salaries for department heads and executive officers and different salary ranges for deputies or assistants to department heads; provided that the commission shall recommend the same salary range for deputies or assistants to department heads within the same department; provided further that the appointing official shall specify the salary for a particular position within the applicable range.

The commission shall not recommend salaries lower than salary amounts recommended by prior commissions replaced by this section.
(c) The commission may seek assistance from the department of human resources development and any other agency in conducting its review, and all agencies shall fully cooperate with the commission and provide any necessary information to the commission upon request.
(d) The commission shall convene in the month of November 2006, and every six years thereafter. Not later than the fortieth legislative day of the regular session of 2007, and every six years thereafter, the commission shall submit a report of its findings and its salary recommendations to the legislature, through the governor. The commission may include incremental increases that take effect prior to the convening of the next salary commission.

The recommended salaries submitted by the commission shall become effective July 1 of the next fiscal year unless the legislature disapproves the recommended salaries submitted by the commission through the adoption of a concurrent resolution, which shall be approved by a simple majority of each house of the legislature, prior to adjournment sine die of the legislative session in which the recommended salaries are submitted; provided that any change in salary which becomes effective shall not apply to the legislature to which the recommendation for the change in salary was submitted.

The governor shall include the salary amounts recommended by the commission and approved by the legislature for employees of the executive branch in the executive budget. If the salary amounts recommended by the commission are disapproved by the legislature, the commission shall reconvene in the November next following the legislative disapproval to review the legislature's reasons for disapproving its salary recommendation. The commission may submit a report of its findings and submit a new salary recommendation to the legislature at the next regular session. The commission's reconvening following a legislative disapproval shall not toll the six-year cycle."

SECTION 2. Section 26-51, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended to read as follows:
"§26-51 Governor; lieutenant governor. Effective [Janur ], 1989, and Januany 1, 1990, the calary of the geverner of the state chall be $\$ 90,699$ and $\$ 94,780$ a yoar, repectively, ㄷffective January 14 1989, and January 1, 1990, the calary of the lieutonant governox ehall be $\$ 86,164$ and $\$ 90,041$ a yoar, repeetively, and, offective] at noon on December 4, 2006, [and wory dight yeare thereafter,] the salaries of the governor and the lieutenant governor shall be as last recommended by the executive salary commission. Effective July 1, 2007, and every six years thereafter, the salaries of the governor and lieutenant governor shall be as last recommended by the [elurid commission on salaries pursuant to section [26-55,] 26-, unless rejected by the legislature."

SECTION 3. Section 26-52, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended to read as follows:
"§26-52 Department heads and executive officers. The salaries of the following state officers shall be as follows:
(1) The salary of the superintendent of education shall be set by the board of education at a rate no greater than $\$ 150,000$ a year;
(2) The salary of the president of the University of Hawaii shall be set by the board of regents;
(3) [The\} Effective July 1, 2004, the salaries of all department heads or executive officers of the departments of accounting and general services, agriculture, attorney general, budget and finance, business, economic development, and tourism, commerce and consumer affairs, Hawaiian home lands, health, human resources development, human services, labor and industrial relations, land and natural resources, public safety, taxation, and transportation shall be [\$85,302 a year and effoctive July 1, 2004, and overy oight yoare hol bel as last recommended by the executive salary commission. Effective July 1, 2007, and every six years thereafter, the salaries shall be as last recommended by the commission on salaries pursuant to section [26-55] 26 -, unless rejected by the legislature; and
(4) The salary of the adjutant general shall be $\$ 85,302$ a year [and, ffectw, July 1, 2004, and every oight yoane thoweaftor, chall be ac lact coermmended by the ovecutive ealay commiceion]. Effective July 1, 2007, and every six years thereafter, the salary of the adjutant general shall be as last recommended by the commission on salaries pursuant to section [26-55]

26-, unless rejected by the legislature, except that if the state salary is in conflict with the pay and allowance fixed by the tables of the regular army or air force of the United States, the latter shall prevail."

SECTION 4. Section 26-53, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended to read as follows:
"§26-53 Deputies or assistants to department heads. [The] Effective July 1, 2004, the salaries of deputies or assistants to the head of any department of the State, other than the department of education, shall be [eet by the governor win the nange from $\$ 69,748$ to $\$ 74,608$ and $\$ 72,066$ to $\$ 77,966$ a yoar, effective Jamury 1, lese, and January 1, 1900, repeetively, and, offective July 1, 2004, and orexy oight your thereater] within the range or ranges for the specific positions as last recommended by the executive salary commission. Effective July 1, 2007, and every six years thereafter, the salaries shall be as last recommended by the commission on salaries and specified by the appointing official, if appropriate, pursuant to section [55] 26-, unless rejected by the legislature."

SECTION 5. Section 26-54, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended to read as follows:
"§26-54 Administrative director of the State. Effective-[ 1989, and Jonu 1, 1990] July 1, 2004, the salary of the
administrative director of the State shall be [\$86,164 and \$90, 041
a yoar, wepervely, and, offective July l, loon, and overy oight therel as last recommended by the executive salary commission. Effective July 1, 2007, and every six years thereafter, the salary of the administrative director of the State shall be as last recommended by the [entire commission on salaries pursuant to section [26-55, ]

26-, unless rejected by the legislature."
SECTION 6. Section 601-3, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended as follows:

1. By amending subsection (a) to read:
"(a) The chief justice, with the approval of the supreme court, shall appoint an administrative director of the courts to assist the chief justice in directing the administration of the judiciary. The administrative director shall be a resident of the [ state for a continuous period of three years prior to the administrative director's appointment, and shall be appointed without regard to chapter 76 and shall serve at the pleasure of the chief justice. The administrative director shall hold no other office or employment. [ㅍffective July ], 2000, the oalay of the

2dminictuative director chall be no greator than provided in
coction $26-54$ and chall be detormined by the chiof juctice baeed mon merit and other Effective July 1, 2004, [and owery oight yoare thereaftor,] the salary of the
administrative director shall be as last [determined] recommended by the judicial salary commission. Effective July 1, 2007, and every six years thereafter, the salary shall be as last recommended by the commission on salaries pursuant to section [601.54] 26- , unless disapproved by the legislature."

## 2. By amending subsection (c) to read:

"(c) The administrative director [hal], with the approval of the chief justice, shall appoint a deputy administrative director of the courts without regard to chapter 76 and such assistants as may be necessary. [sweh] The assistants shall be appointed without regard to chapter 76. Effective July 1, 2000, the salary of the deputy administrative director shall be no greater than provided in section 26-52(3) and shall be determined by the chief justice based upon merit and other relevant factors. Effective July 1, 2004, [and erey dight your theqter, the salary of the deputy administrative director shall be as last [determined] recommended by the judicial salary commission [punt to lecel dieppered the legiclature . The administrative director shall be provided with necessary office facilities."

SECTION 7. Section 602-2, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended to read as follows:
"§602-2 Salary, supreme court justices. [Rffoctive July 1, 1999, the calary of the chief juctice of the cuprome eount chall be $\$ 105,206$ a your and the calary of each acceciate juctice of the eupreme count chall be $\$ 104$, 096 a yoar. Iffeet ealary of the chiof juctice of the cupreme seut chall be $\$ 116,779$ a year and the calary of each acceciate juctice of the oupreme equell be $\$ 115,547$ a yourc] Effective July 1, 2004, [and owory ght the salary of the chief justice of the supreme court and the salary of each associate justice of the supreme court shall be as last [determined] recommended by the judicial salary commission. Effective July 1, 2007, and every six years thereafter, the salary of the chief justice of the supreme court and the salary of each associate justice of the supreme court shall be as last recommended by the commission on salaries pursuant to section [

SECTION 8. Section 602-52, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended to read as follows:
"§602-52 Salary. [fffective July 1, 1999, the calary of the chiof judge of the intormediate appellate eourt chall be $\$ 101,321$ a 10 on and the cal ary of each asecciate judge chall be $\$ 99,656$ a yoart Fffective July 1, 2000 , the calary of the ehief judge of the
intexmediate appellate court ohall be $\$ 112,466$ a yoar and the
falany of each acceciate judge ohall be $\$ 110,618$ a yoax, Effective July 1, 2004, [and orey oight yoarer the salary of the chief judge of the intermediate appellate court and the salary of each associate judge shall be as last [demed recommended by the judicial salary commission. Effective July 1, 2007, and every six years thereafter, the salary of the chief judge of the intermediate appellate court and the salary of each associate judge shall be as last recommended by the commission on salaries pursuant to section [1, 26-, 26 , unless disapproved by the legislature."

SECTION 9. Section 603-5, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended to read as follows:
"§603-5 Salary of circuit court judges. [fffectre July 1, 1999, the oalary of each oireuit count judge of the varioue oireuit eunte of the state chall be $\$ 96,326$ a year. Iffective July 1 , 2000 , the ealary of each oirouit court judge of the varioue oirouit eurte of the state chall be $\$ 106,922$ a yoar.] Effective [on] July 1, 2004, [and orry oight yourc the salary of a circuit court judge shall be as last [ recommended by the judicial salary commission. Effective July 1, 2007, and every six years thereafter, the salary of each circuit court judge of the various circuit courts of the State shall be as last recommended by the commission on salaries pursuant to section [608.5-] 26-, unless disapproved by the legislature."

SECTION 10. Section 604-2.5, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended to read as follows:
"§604-2.5 Salary of district judges. [ ealary of each dictriet oourt judge of the rarioue dietriet ounte of the state chall be $\$ 90,776$ a year. Pffeetive July 1, 2000, the ealary of each dictriet count judge of the warioue dictrict ounte f the state chall be $\$ 100,761$ a yoar] Effective [on] July 1, 2004, [and owery oight your theaftore salary of a district court judge shall be as last [ recommended by the judicial salary commission. Effective July 1, 2007, and every six years thereafter, the salary of each district court judge of the various district courts of the State shall be as last recommended by the commission on salaries pursuant to section [60 1-5, $]$ 26-, unless disapproved by the legislature.

Whenever the chief justice appoints a district court judge of any of the various district courts of the State to serve temporarily as a circuit court judge of any of the various circuit courts of the State, the judge shall receive per diem compensation for the days on which actual service is rendered based on the monthly rate of compensation paid to a circuit court judge. For the purpose of determining per diem compensation in this section, a month shall be deemed to consist of twenty-one days."

SECTION 11. Section 26-55, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is repealed.


#### Abstract

["f826-55] Eweoutive ealaxy oemmieoion. (a) There ic octabliched within the department of human receureec development, for adminietrative purpeces only, the ovecutive calary commiccion. The eommicsion chall concict of five membexc. Twe momberg ohall be pppointed by the precident of the cenate, twe membere chall be appointed by the opealior of the houer of representativec, and one momber chall be zppointed by the ohief juetice of the cupreme eout. Vaeance in theee peoitione chall be filled in the came manner. The membere of the eemmiceion chall gerve without eompencation but ohall be roimbureed for oxponeec neevecury for the performanee of their dutieer


(b) The commiceion chall reviow the calariec of the gorerner, the lieutonant governor, the adminictrative directer of the state, and the departmont heade or oveoutive officere of the departmente of acounting and goneral services, agriculture, attorney general, budget and finanee, bucinece, oconemis development, and touricm, eommeree and concumer affaire, Hawai ion home lande, hoalth, human reoureeg dowelopment, human corviceo, labor and inductrial nelatione, land and natural necoureec, public cafoty, tavation, and trameportation. The commiccion chall alce xoviow the ealary of the deputy to the euperintendent of edueation. The cemmiceion chall recommend an appropxiate cal ary for the govornor, the lieutenant gowerner, and each department head or overutive officer, and appopriate calary rangee for the doputy department heade. The eommiccion may reeommend different calaries for dopartmont heade and overutiv officere and different calary rangec for doputiog of aeoiotante to dopartmont heade, provided that the oommicoion chall coeommend the came calary range for deputioc or accictante to department heade within the came dopartment, provided further that the appointing official chall epecify the ealary for a parieulaw peoition within the applicable ranger
> (c) The commiccion may ceol accictance from the department of human recourees development and any other ageney in oondueting ite nowiow, and all agenciec ohall fully ceoperate with the oemmicoion and prowide any noceccary information to the oommiceion upon requet.
(d) The commiceion ohall convone in the month of November 2003 , and evory oight yourg thereafter. Net later than the fortieth logiclative day of the regular ceccion of 2004, and overy oight yoarc thereafter, the oommiocion ohall oubmit a weport of ite findinge and ite ealary roemmendatione to the logiclature, theough the gorernox. The commiccion may include inexomental inexeacec that take effect over the opan of yoarc oceurring prior to the eonvoning of the next calary commicoion. The recommended calariec cubuitod by the commiocion ohall beome offective July 1 of the novt ficeal yoar unlece the legiclature dieapprover the reeommended calories eubmitted by the commiceion theough the adoption of a coneuneont
neoelution，which chall be ppprexed by a simplo majoxity of each houce of the legiclature，prior to adjournment gine die of the legiclative ceceion in which the woe日mmonded cal uries ane eubmitted，provided that，purguant to seetion 3 of article iv of the State conet itution，the ealarieq of the govompr and the lioutenant gerexpex ohall net be deereueed for thoir wepeetiry toxme and the new galaries chall not tale offect until tho beginning of the nevt toxm for thees offices．The gexomor ohall include the callary ameunts，weecmmended by the semmiecion and approred by the legiclature，in the evecutive budget．If the galaxy ameunte peeommended by the eommiseion are dicapproyed by the logiclaturet the commiceion chall woe日学ene in the month of Nowombex following the logiclative dicapprowal to wowiow the legiclaturglg woueong for dicapprowing itc salary reoemmendation．The sommicgion may eubmit o popert of ite findinge and oubmit a now oalayy wecommondation to the logiclature of the noxt regulax seocion．The eommiceion＇s poe日mroning following a legiclative diovpprowal shall not toll the eight yoar gyeler＂］

SECTION 12．Section 608－1．5，Hawaii Revised Statutes，is repealed．
［＂f608 1．5 Judieia］aqlay eemmioeien，（a）There－chal］be a judicial calary semmiecion to nowiow and detoxmine the calawiec of juctioes and judges of all atate counte and appeinted judiciany adminictrative officexc．The judigial ealary commiceion ohall be attached to the judicial eoungil for udminictwative puppeser．The eommiscion chall be cempeced of five momberc．one member chall be ppeinted by the governex，twe mombexe chall be appointed by the president of the cenate，and two mombore ohall be appeinted by the epeaker of the houes of repwecentatiweo，and prewided furthex that wacanciec in thees peeitione chall be filled in the came mannex． Membere ohall net wee日ive sompencation fox thoin corvises，but chall be woimburged fox twaveling and othox oxponeoc ingidental to the performanee of commiseion dutiee．
（b）The sommiseion may geot acoictanee from any othor agoncy in eonducting ite weyiow and all agongiec chall cooporate fully with the sommiceion and puowide any noeeceary information to the eommiccion upen nequect．In detexmining the oalaries of the juctisec and judges and zppeinted judiciaxy adminictrative officon，the sommiogion may oet diffoxont galuriec for the ohiof juct ice of the ouprome count，the aceegiate juctieec of the guprome esunt，the chiof judge of the intormediate appellate count，the aceeviate judgec of the intermediate appellate eount，the judgee of the oirguit sounte，and the judgeg of the dietwiet courte and different calaries ox calary wanger for appointed adminicteatite judiciany offieque，with the calary for a paxticular pecition to be eperified within the appligable range by the appeinting official．
（g）The gemmiegion chall senvene in the month of Nowember 2003 ，and owery oight yoarc thereaftox．Net Iator than the foxtioth logiolative day of the regular coccion of 2004 ，and orrour aight

Yeare thereaftor, the oommiccion chall oubmit a repert of ite findinge and ite calary poommendatione to the logiclature, through the chiof juetice. The commiocionle olayy woemmendation may inelude inexomental inexeaces that tave offoct orox the cpan of youcourring prior to the convening of the next calary eommiceion. The reeommended calariec oubmittod by the commiouion ehall beome offective July l of the novt ficeal year unlege the legiclature dicappeovec the cal ary woommondatione oubmitted by the eommiccion through the adoption of a concurnent woelution, which ehall be rppeored by a cimple majoxity of eweh houee of the Iogiclature prior to adjeumment cine die of the legiclative eeccion in which the recommended alaries are oubmitted, prowided that purcuant to artiole VI, eotion 3 of the stato conetitution, the ealarie of juetiees and judgeo chall not be decreaced during their reppetive torme of office. At the noxt regular legiclative eoceion, the calary amounte woommonded by the commiocion, and not dicappegred by the legiclature, chall be cubmitted by the ohief juctice ac part of the judiciarylg propeeed budget pureuant to the budgetary proeedures opeoified in chaptor 37 and oection 601 2(c) If the cal ary mmeunte noemmonded by the eommiccion ane dicappuoved by the legiclature, the oemmiccion chall woonvene in the month of Nerember following the legiclative dicapproval to weview the legiolature'g weane for dieqperowing ito calary reommondation The commiceion may oubmit a woport of ite findinge and eubmit a now ealary necommondation to the legiclature of the next regulan eeccion. The oommiccion'c recenvoning following a legiolative dicapproval ehall not toll the oight yoar oyoler"]

SECTION 13. Statutory material to be repealed is bracketed and stricken. New statutory material is underscored.

SECTION 14. This Act shall take effect upon ratification of a constitutional amendment establishing a commission on salaries to review and recommend salaries for the governor, lieutenant governor, legislators, justices and judges of all state courts, the administrative director of the State, and department heads or executive officers of the executive departments and their deputies or assistants.


## HOUSE OP REPRESENTATMES

STATI OF MAMAN staIE CNPTID
нovoull，huNan geng


February 6， 2007

Mar．Mark J．Bigmert，Attornay General日tata of Hawail
Eale Auhau
425 Guenn Screer
Honolulu， HI $^{96813}$
Deas Mr．Bonantt：
At the general election in Movember 2006，a constitutional amendenent was approvad to require the periodic antabilahnont of a salary commasion to revietr and make racommandations on malary adjustmenta for cartain state officers．The amandment includas tha following psoviaion：＂耳at latex than the fartieth lagislative day of the 2007 requiar legislative session and evasy aix years theraafter， the ocmiasion ahall submit to the legislatura its zecommandations and than dissolve（underacoring added）．＂

Act 299，Session Laws of Havaii 2006，is the implamanting legialation for the constitutional amendment．The lase paragraph of saction 26 ＿＿（d），Hawail Reviaed Statutal（RRs），as addad by the Rot， providas that，if the Legislature disapproves the galary conmission＇a recomendation during a requiar seasion，the salary commiasion may reconvene in the following Vovember to aubait a new racommendation to the Legialatura．

Pleasa provida an opinion on whether the provision in aaction 26－＿＿（d），HRS，allowing a salary comission to reconvene following the diamproval．of ita recomandation is legally valid．

A 天asponae to this raquast by March 16， 2007 would be appreciatad．


## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

STATE OP NAWAI
STATE CAPITOL
HONOUHL, HAWAl Sasis

Fobruary 13, 2007

Mr. Mark J. Bennett, Attorney General
State of Hawall
Hale Auhau
425 Queen Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

## Dear Mr. Bennett:

Act 299, Session Laws of Hawall 2006, amends the salary statutes for various state officers by adding language in substantlally the following form: "Effective July 1, 2007, and every slx years thereafter, the salary of [state officar] shall be as last recommended by the commission on salaries pursuant to section 26- $\qquad$ [which establlshes the commission on salaries under Act 299] uniess rejected by the legislature."

Your opinion on the following question would be appreciated:
If the Leglslature rejects the salary recommendations of the 2006-07 Commission on Salaries that are submitted during the 2007 Regular Session, what will be the salaries on July 1, 2007 of the state officers subject to Act 299?

I would appreclate your response by March 6, 2007.
Sincerely,


Calvin K.Y. Say Speaker

DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL


STATE OF HAWAII 425 Clem 8 Test Ноноии, НИwNu 98313 (808) 56e-1500

February 26, 2007

Dear Speaker Say:
The Honorable Calvin K.Y. Say Speaker of the House of Representatives The Twenty-Fourch State Legislature state Capitol, Room 431
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
j) CKKS
 SPEAKERS OFFICE

Re: Act 299, SLH 2006
By letters dated February 6 and February 13, 2007, you requested advice regarding the 2006 constitutional amendment providing for a salary commission and Act 299, Session Laws of Hawaii 2006 (SLH 2006), the statute that implements the constitutional amendment. Your questions are:

1. Is the provision in section 26-_(d), Hawaii Revised statutes (HRS), allowing a salary commission to reconvene following the disapproval of its recommendation, legally valid?
2. If the Legislature rejects the salary recommendations of the 2006-2007 Commission on Salaries that are submitted during the 2007 Regular Session, what will be the salaries on July 1, 2007 of the state officers subject to Act 299?

We advise that although statutes enacted by the Legislature are presumptively valid, given the clear and unambiguous language in the constitutional amendment that " $n \mathrm{n}]$ ot later chan the fortieth legislative day of the 2007 regular legislative session and every six years thereafter, the commission shall submit to the legislature its recommendations and then dissolve," we believe that section 26 - $\qquad$ (d) of Act 299, SLH 2006, that allows a salary commission to reconvene following the disapproval of its recommendation, is invalid because it conflicts with the constitutional provision.

The new section added to article XVI of the Scare

[^1]The Honorable Calvin K.Y. Say February 26, 2007
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Constitution, as proposed by the Legislature by H.B. No. 1917 and ratified by the electorate at the 2006 November General Election, provides as follows:

There shall be a commission on salaries as provided by law, which shall review and recommend salaries for the justices and judges of all state courts, members of the legislacure, department heads or executive officers of the executive departmenta and the deputies or assistants to department heads of executive departments as provided by law, excluding the University of Hawaii and the department of education. The commiasion shall also review and make recomendations for the salary of the administrative director of the State or equivalent position and salary of the governor and lieutenant governor.

Any salary established pursuant to this section shall not be decreased during a term of office, unless by general law applying to all salaried officers of the state.

Not later than the fortiath legislative day of the 2007 regular legislative aession and every six years thereafter, the commission shall submit to the legislature ita recomendations and then dissolve.

The recommended salaries submitted shall become effective as provided in the recommendation, unless the legislature disapproves the entire recommendation as a whole by adoption of a concurrent resolution prior to adjourrment sine die of the legislative session in which the recommendation is submitted; provided that any change in salary which becomes effective shall not apply to the legislature to which the recommendation for the change in salary was submitted. [Emphasis added.]

The wording of the constitutional amendment is clear and unambiguous in providing that once the commission submits its recommendations to the Legialature it mast then dissolve. It does not provide for a second recommendation upon disapproval. When the worda used in a conatitutional provision "are clear and unambiguous, they are to be construed as they are written."

The Honorable Calvin K.Y. Say
February 26, 2007
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Spears v. Honda, 51 Haw. 1, 6, 449 P.2d 130, 134 (1968). The provision of the constitutional amendment that aays that "the commisaion shall submit to the legislature ita recommendations and then dissolve," we believe, precludes the commisaion from reconvening should its recommendations be disapproved by the Legislature.

The legislative history clearly shows that the Legialature intended a six-year cycle. The Senate Committee on Ways and Means, in Standing Committee Report No. 3485, dated April 7, 2006, scated, "[t]his measure requires the commission to make salary recommendations to the legislature every six yeara."

In enacting Act 299, SLH 2006, the Legislature provided that "[i]f the salary amounta recommended by the commisaion are disapproved by the legislature, the commission shall reconvene in the November next following the legislative diaapproval to review the legislature's reasons for disapproving its salary recommendation. The commission may submit a report of its findings and submit a new salary recommendation to the legislature at the next regular session." The constitutional amendment is clear in requiring the commission to submit its salary recommendations to the $\mathrm{N}_{2} 007$ regular legislative session and every six years thereafter." The constitutional amendment does not contemplate submisaions outside of this six-year cycle.

As to your aecond question, we believe chat, if the Legislature rejects the salary recommendations of the 2006-2007 Commission on salaries, the salaries of state officers of the executive, judicial, and legislative branches, who are subject to Act 299, would, on July 1, 2007, continue to be the salaries determined pursuant to the lase recommendations of the Executive Salary Commission, the Judicial Salary Commisaion, and the Commission on Legislative Salary, including percentage increases as described in the recommendations. Act 299 amended several sections pertaining to state officers' salaries to expressly state that the salaries shall be as last recommended by the Executive Salary Commission or the Judicial Salary Commisaion and that, effective July 1, 2007, and every six years thereafter, the salaries shall be as last recommended by the Commission on Salaries, "unless rejected by the legislature" or "unless disapproved by the legislature." If the recommendations of the Commission on Salaries are "rejected" or "disapproved" by the Legislature, then, on July 1, 2007, the last recommendations of the Executive Salary Commission or the Judicial Salary Commission
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would remain in effect.
For the Legislature, the constitutional amendment and Act 299 provide that "any change in salary which becomes effective shall not apply to the legislature to which the recommendation for the change in salary was submitted." Consequently, whether the recommendations of the Commsaion on Salaries for the legislators' aalaries are approved or disapproved by the TwentyFourth Legislature, there would be no change in aalary on July 1 , 2007, and the ealaries of legislators would ramain the same, including percentage increases, as last recommended by the Commission on Legislative Salaries.

We hope that we have adequately responded to your inquiry. Please let us know if we can be of further assistance.

Very truly yours,
 Deputy Actorney General


EARL I. ANZAI ATTORNEY GEMERA

STATE OF HAWAII DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

425 Queen Street
Honolulu, Hawall 96813
(808) 586-1500

October 2, 2001

## MEMORANDUM

TO:
Members of State Boards and Commissions
FROM: Department of the Attorney General
SUBJECT: The Sunshine Law and Procedures For Conducting State Board and Commission Meetings

## I. THE SUNSHINE LAW

The Sunshine Law is set out in part I of Haw. Rev. Stat. chapter 92. All state and county boards and commissions must conduct board business in accordance with the Sunshine Law.
A. The Objectives of the Sunshine Law -- Defer to openness, Construe Exceptions Strictly

The Sunshine Law became the law of Hawaii in 1975. Since then, the purpose and policies of the Sunshine Law have been set out, without amendment, at Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-1:

Declaration of policy and intent. In a democracy,
the people are vested with the ultimate decision-making power. Governmental agencies exist to aid the people in the formation and conduct of public policy. Opening up the governmental processes to public scrutiny and participation is the only viable and reasonable method of protecting the public's interest. Therefore, the legislature declares that it is the policy of this State that the formation and conduct of public policy the discussions, deliberations, decisions, and action of governmental agencies - shall be conducted as openly as possible. To implement this policy the legislature declares that:
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(1) It is the intent of this part to protect the people's right to know;
(2) The provisions requiring open meetings shall be liberally construed; and
(3) The provisions providing for exceptions to the open meeting requirements shall be strictly construed against closed meetings.

## B. The Sunshine Law Applies to "Boards"

The Sunshine Law applies to state and county "boards," including any "agency, board, commission, authority, or committee of the state or its political subdivisions which is created by constitution, statute, rule, or executive order, to have supervision, control, jurisdiction or advisory power over specific matters and which is required to conduct meetings and to take official actions." Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-2.

To be a "board," an entity must embody five distinct elements: (1) be an entity of the State or one of its counties; (2) be created by a provision of the State Constitution, a state statute, an administrative rule, or an executive order, or pursuant to authority conferred by the constitution, a statute, a rule, or an executive order; (3) supervise, control, or have jurisdiction or advisory power over a topic, subject, or matter; (4) deliberate or make a decision; and (5) take official action, even if only to make recommendations or give advice.

## C. The Sunshine Law Applies to All Meetings of a Board

A "meeting" is defined as "the convening of a board for which a quorum is required in order to make a decision or to deliberate toward a decision upon a matter over which the board has supervision, control, jurisdiction, or advisory power." Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-2. Thus, except for the exemptions and the situations carved out of the definition of "meeting" discussed in Section I-D below, the Sunshine Law will apply whenever a board deliberates or acts on board business.

The Sunshine Law defines five different types of meetings: (1) open meetings; (2) executive meetings; (3) chance meetings;
(4) emergency meetings; and (5) limited meetings. It also allows
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board meetings to be held by videoconference. ${ }^{1}$
Under the Sunshine Law, all communication, interactions, conversations, and discussion between and among the members of a board must fall within one of these five types of meetings, or the exceptions described in Section I-D below. "How" the communication, interaction, conversation, or discussion takes place, whether face-to-face, by telephone or telegram, or through the mails or e-mail, is not significant for determining compliance with the Sunshine Law.

1. Open Meetings -- Most board meetings must be "open meetings." To be "open," meetings must be held at a reasonable date and time, and in a place that is accessible to and capable of accommodating the public. At an open meeting, persons may submit written testimony conveying data, views, or arguments, or present oral testimony on any item on the agenda. Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-3. Proceedings may be recorded by sonic reproduction, as long as the recording does not actively interfere with the meeting. Haw. Rev. Stat. § 929(c). Any person who deliberately disrupts a meeting may be removed from an open meeting. ${ }^{2}$ Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-3. Material prepared and distributed to members to assist them with matters on the agenda, must be available for public inspection prior to the meeting unless disclosure is limited by the Uniform Information Practices
'The terms "regular meeting" or "special meeting" are terms that boards may assign to describe their meetings but the terms are not significant for purposes of the Sunshine Law. Ordinarily, the terms differentiate between meetings which are pre-scheduled, e.g., held every second and fourth Monday, and ones which are ad hoc. In either instance, however, notice of the meeting must be filed and posted in conformance with the Sunshine Law.
${ }^{2}$ The person should be removed pursuant to action taken by the board as a whole or by a member designated by the board's rules of practice and procedure. The reasons for removal should be a matter of record and included in the minutes of the meeting.
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Act, Haw. Rev. Stat. ch. 92 F ("UIPA"). ${ }^{3}$
2. Executive Meetings -- An "executive meeting" is a meeting from which the public is excluded. As long as discussions in an executive meeting relate directly to the purpose for which an executive meeting is convened, a board may both deliberate and decide matters without the public present. An executive meeting may be suggested either as an item on the notice for a meeting, or during the course of an open meeting. However, to hold an executive meeting, two-thirds of the board members present must affirmatively vote for an executive meeting during an open meeting. ${ }^{5}$ Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-4. Executive meetings may be held for one or more of the following purposes:
a. To consider and evaluate personal information relating to individuals applying for professional or vocational licenses cited in Haw. Rev. Stat. § 26-9 or both;
${ }^{3}$ Under Haw. Rev. Stat. § 91-2 of the Hawaii Administrative Procedure Act ("HAPA"), state and county agencies, including boards and commissions, are required to adopt rules of practice and procedure which describe how the public may obtain information, or make submittals or requests to an agency, or the formal or informal procedures the agency will use to perform its duties and responsibilities. A board's rules of practice and procedure may include reasonable time limits for receiving oral testimony from the public, and criteria for determining when a person may be removed from a meeting for disruption.
${ }^{4}$ A quorum is required before any meeting of a board can be held. Therefore, before an executive meeting can be held, at least a majority of the members of a board must be present to vote, and two-thirds of those who are present must vote to go into an executive meeting. For example, a board of nine members can go into an executive meeting only if at least five members are present at an open meeting, and at least four of them vote affirmatively on the question; if all nine members are present, at least six members must vote for the executive meeting.
${ }^{5}$ The reason for holding an executive meeting, and each board member's vote on the question must be recorded and entered into the minutes of the open meeting.

Members of State Boards and Commissions
October 2, 2001
Page 5
b. To consider certain personnel matters, provided that the personnel concerned does not request an open meeting;
c. To facilitate labor negotiations or negotiations to acquire public property;
d. To consult with the board's attorney on questions and issues pertaining to the board's powers, duties, privileges, immunities, and liabilities;
e. To investigate criminal misconduct;
f. To consider sensitive matters relating to public safety or security;
g. To solicit or consider gifts or donations; and
I. To deliberate or make a decision that will involve consideration of information which is confidential under federal or state law, or court order.
3. Chance Meetings -- A "chance meeting" is a social or informal assemblage of two or more members of a board at which board business is not discussed. The Sunshine Law specifically prohibits the use of a "chance meeting or electronic communication . . . to circumvent the spirit or requirements of this part to make a decision or to deliberate toward a decision upon a matter over which the board has supervision, control, jurisdiction, or advisory power." Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-5 (b).
4. Emergency Meetings -- A board may hold a meeting with less than six calendar days notice to the public, if at least two-thirds of all members to which the board is entitled, find that (a) an imminent peril to the public health, safety, or welfare exists, or (b) an unanticipated event demands that the board meet to act on a matter for which it is responsible ${ }^{6}$ and the
${ }^{6}$ Note that "imminent peril to the public health, safety, or welfare" and "unanticipated event" are broad concepts and will require a case-by-case assessment of the particular circumstances
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Attorney General concurs with the board's finding. ${ }^{7}$ The board must prepare written findings for calling the emergency meeting, and file them with its agenda for the emergency meeting in the Office of the Lieutenant Governor and the board's office. Persons who have requested that notice of board meetings be mailed to them must be notified of an emergency meeting by mail or telephone as soon as practicable. Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-8.
5. Limited Meetings -- If a board determines that it needs to meet at a location that is dangerous to the public's health or safety, the board may hold a limited meeting at that location. A limited meeting is not open to the public. A board may deliberate but cannot make decisions at a limited meeting. To hold a limited meeting, two-thirds of all members to which the board is entitled must agree that a meeting must be held at a particular site, and that the site is dangerous to the health or safety of the public. The Attorney General must concur with the board's determination, and notice of the limited meeting must be provided in accordance with $\$$ 92-7. In addition to minutes, a limited meeting must be videotaped unless the Attorney General waives the requirement. The videotape must be available at the next open meeting of the board.
6. Videoconference Meetings -- A board may meet by videoconference when all of the following prerequisites are satisfied: the notice of the board's meeting filed at least six days before the meeting specifies the location of each videoconference meeting site where the public may attend the meeting; at least one board member is present at each videoconference meeting site; all
of each situation that suggest the necessity for an emergency meeting.
${ }^{7}$ A form to describe a situation which a board believes constitutes an unanticipated event that warrants an emergency meeting and to secure the Attorney General's concurrence is attached to this handout. Copies have been distributed to board staff and departments.
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meeting sites are connected by both audio and video communication; the meeting is terminated immediately if both audio and video communication can not be maintained at any meeting site.
D. Exemptions From the Sunshine Law and Its Definition of "Meeting"

The Sunshine Law does not apply to the following entities or situations:

1. The Judiciary, Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-6;
2. The Legislature or any of its members, Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-10;
3. True "chance meetings" between board members, Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-5 (b);
4. Adjudicatory proceedings of a board governed by HAPA's contested case and declaratory ruling provisions, including the investigatory, preliminary determination, formal hearing, deliberation and final decision-making stages of a proceeding. ${ }^{8}$

In addition, under Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-2.5, certain interactions between and among board members are specifically exempted from the Sunshine Law's definition of "meeting." These interactions may occur in private even though multiple board members participate and board business is discussed. These interactions include communications between:

1. Two members, to gather information from each other about board business, as long as a commitment to vote is neither sought nor given;
2. Two or more members but less than a quorum of a board, commissioned to conduct an investigation for the board at a prior open meeting of the
${ }^{8}$ The Land Use Commission's deliberations and discussions in a contested or adjudicatory/quasi-judicial case are excepted from this exemption. The Land Use Commission's deliberations and decision must be conducted in open meetings.
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board;
3. Two or more members but less than a quorum of a board, commissioned to make presentations for, discuss positions of, or negotiate on behalf of a board at a prior open meeting of the board;
4. Two or more members but less than a quorum of $a$ board, to select board officers;
5. Any and all members of a board and the Governor, about any board business other than contested cases pending before the board;
6. Any and all members of a board and the head of the department to which the board is administratively attached, about administrative matters specified in Haw. Rev. Stat. § 26-35.
E. Notice of Meetings

1. Written notice of a board meeting specifying the date, time, and place of a meeting, must be filed in the Office of the Lieutenant Governor and in the board's office, at least six calendar days before a meeting. An agenda that specifically describes the matters to be considered at the meeting must be attached or incorporated into the notice. Generalized descriptions such as "Old Business", "Concerns," "Unfinished Business" are not sufficiently specific items for an agenda.
2. When notice of a meeting is filed less than six calendar days before a meeting, the meeting is automatically canceled by law and cannot be held. The Lieutenant Governor is responsible for notifying the chairperson of the board or the director of the department within which the board is established or placed, of the late filing and automatic cancellation. The chairperson or director shall ensure that a notice canceling the meeting is posted at the place where the meeting was to be held.
3. Whenever feasible, notice of a meeting should be posted at the site of the meeting prior to the meeting.
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4. If a board is unable to finish its agenda, the board may continue a meeting without publishing and filing a notice for the continued meeting. However, the board must announce the date, time, and place of the continued meeting and the items which will be considered at that continued meeting, before the originating meeting is adjourned or recessed. A meeting should not be continued if it will reduce public participation of a controversial matter. Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-7 (d). Although a notice of the continued meeting need not be filed in the Office of the Lieutenant Governor or the board, sound practice counsels its filing.
5. The board must maintain a list of names and addresses of all persons who ask that notice of all board meetings be mailed to them. Notices of board meetings must be mailed to these persons no later than the date that the notice of meeting is filed in the Lieutenant Governor's office.
6. Agendas may only be revised at an open meeting and by the votes of at least two-thirds of all members to which the board is entitled (as distinguished from members present). However, no item can be added to an agenda if the item is of reasonably major importance and action by the board will affect a significant number of persons. ${ }^{\text {n }}$ Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-7(b).

## F. Minutes of Meetings

Boards must keep written minutes of all meetings, including executive and limited meetings, and irrespective of whether the meeting is open to the public. Although a tape recording or transcript of a meeting is not required, the minutes must be sufficiently complete to give a true and accurate record of the matters discussed at the meeting and the views of all participants. The minutes must include the date, time, and place of a meeting, the members present at or absent from a meeting, and the substance of all matters proposed, discussed, or decided, and a record, by individual member, of any votes taken at the
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meeting. They must also include any other information that any member of the board requests be included or reflected in the minutes. Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-9(a).

Minutes must be available for public inspection no more than thirty days after the meeting to which they relate was held, unless the disclosure the minutes of an executive meeting would defeat the meeting's lawful purpose. Minutes of an executive meeting may be withheld from inspection for as long as is necessary to respect the confidential purpose for which the executive meeting was held. Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-9(b).

## G. Ensuring Compliance with the Sunshine Law's Requirements

Any final action taken in wilful violation of the notice or open meeting requirement of the Sunshine Law, may be voided if the Attorney General or an interested person institutes a civil action in a state court within ninety days of the alleged violation, and the court concludes that a member or members of a board intentionally violated those provisions of the Sunshine Law. Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-11.

In addition, any person who wilfully violates any provision of the Sunshine Law can be charged with a misdemeanor by the Attorney General or a prosecutor. A person convicted of a wilful violation of the Sunshine Law may be fined up to $\$ 1,000$ and imprisoned for up to one year. A board member may also be summarily removed from a board. Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-13.

Similarly, persons may file suit to require a board to comply, or to prevent violations, or determine the applicability of the Sunshine Law to discussions or decisions of a board. If the person prevails, the person is entitled to receive reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-12.

During the 1998 legislative session, the Sunshine Law and the UIPA were amended to make the Office of Information Practices ("OIP") responsible for administering the Sunshine Law, and overseeing state and county board compliance with all of its requirements. See Act 137, Haw. Sass. Laws (1998). The OIP was directed to establish procedures for receiving and resolving complaints of non-compliance by state and county boards, and to advise all government boards and the public about compliance with Haw. Rev. Stat. ch. 92. The civil and criminal enforcement powers conferred upon the Attorney General and the respective
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county prosecutors by Haw. Rev. Stat. §§ $92-12$ and $92-13$ were not repealed, and we anticipate that OIP will forward complaints it is unable to satisfactorily resolve to the Attorney General or respective county prosecutor for possible judicial action. The Attorney General will also continue advising state boards and their members about the faithful performance of their duties, including compliance with the Sunshine Law, pursuant to Haw. Rev. Stat. § 28-4.
II. PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING STATE BOARD MEETINGS

In the private sector, it is common practice for meetings to be conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order or similar parliamentary procedure handbook. However, meetings of state boards must be conducted in accordance with state laws, including administrative rules of practice and procedure adopted to satisfy the requirements of Haw. Rev. Stat. $\$ 91-2$ of HAPA. When these laws or rules impose different requirements than those included in Robert's Rules of Order or other parliamentary procedure handbooks, the procedures prescribed by state statutes or rules must be used.

## A. Quorum Requirements

A quorum is the minimum number of board members that must be present at a meeting before a board can conduct business. Under Haw. Rev. Stat. § 92-15, a quorum consists of "a majority of all the members to which the board or commission is entitled." This general requirement applies unless a different requirement is imposed by a statute enacted to apply to a particular board or boards. Thus, unless a statute specifies otherwise, the quorum for a board consisting of nine members is five. To hold a meeting, at least five of the boards members must be present at the appointed time and place of the meeting. The result is not different if one or more member positions are vacant.

One of the most frequently asked Sunshine-related questions is why, if a quorum is needed for a board to conduct a meeting in the first place, a group of less than a quorum of a board's members discussing board business would be regarded as engaged in a "meeting" (and possibly violating the Sunshine Law's notice and open meeting requirements). Our response has consistently been that the existence of a quorum is not what determines whether a meeting is lawful under the Sunshine Law. The Sunshine Law requires boards to meet only after giving notice to the public and only at a time and place accessible to the public. It
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prohibits "chance meetings," i.e., unnoticed encounters between two or more board members where board business is discussed. What is discussed rather than how many members engage in the discussion is determinative of whether a meeting has or has not taken place. A "quorum" is simply the minimum number of members of a board that is needed to transact board business. A board that lacks a quorum cannot conduct board business, but the members who were precluded from conducting board business would still be engaged in a board meeting if they were discussing board business.
B. Voting: Number of Votes Necessary to Take Action

The state law departs from Robert's Rules of Order with respect to the number of votes necessary to carry any motion or to make any action of the board valid. Unless otherwise specified by statute, the concurrence of a majority of all the members to which a board is entitled, is necessary to make any action of the board valid. Thus, in most cases, the minimum number of votes necessary to carry any action is the same as the quorum. In the example of the nine-member board, five votes would be necessary for it to validate an action. If only a quorum--five members--show up, all five must alike for the motion to be adopted.

## C. Voting Procedure-Chairperson Votes

Under state law, the chairperson has the same voting rights and responsibilities as any other member of a board, and is authorized to vote, and should vote on every question put to the board.

## D. Proxy Voting Not Allowed

Proxy votes are those made for an absent member of a board. In the private sector, a proxy vote is often permissible. Under state law, however, proxy voting is not allowed. A member is either present or absent at a meeting. Members present at a meeting may vote for or against a measure or question, or abstain from voting.

Substitutes for board members are permitted only under Haw. Rev. Stat. § 26-36, which authorizes the Governor to appoint an acting member when a board member is temporarily absent from the State or ill, or state statutes that expressly authorize a member to designate a substitute, e.g., Haw. Rev. Stat. $\$ 87-11$ (the State's Director of Finance may designate a substitute to attend meetings of the Public Employees' Health Fund in the director's place.

PROCEDURE TO OBTAIN ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CONCURRENCE AS TO THE NECESSITY FOR AN EMERGENCY MEETTNG DUE TO AN UNANUTICIPATED EVENT

During the 1996 Legislature, the Sunshine Law, Hawaii Revised Statutes 5 92-8, zmergency meetings, was amended by Act 267, Session Laws of Hawaii 1996, to authorize emergency meetings to address board business prompted by "unanticipated events." In addition to imminent peril to public health, safety, or welfare. Under this second basis for convening an emergency meeting, the Attorney General must concur before the meeting is held, that an unanticipated event necessitates a board meeting with less than six days' notice to the public.

The procedure set forth below should be used to obtain the Attorney General's concurrence and to hold the emergency meeting.

1. Complete the attached Request for the Attorney General's Concurrence for Emergency Meeting form (referred to as "REQUEST").
2. Prepare an agenda for the proposed emergency meeting indicating the time and place of the emergency meeting.
3. Fax or deliver the REQUEST and the agenda for the proposed emergency meeting, to the Attorney General at:

Hale Auhau
425 Queen Street
586-1282 (Tel)
586-1239 (Fax)
4. File, with the office of the Lieutenant Governor (if a state board) or respective county clerk, copies of the completed REQUEST ${ }^{1}$ and agenda.
5. Notify members, and all persons who have submitted requests to receive notices of board meetings, of the time and place of the proposed emergency meeting.
6. Convene the board at the time and place designated in the agenda to determine or revise reasons specified in the REQUEST (item 2 of form) previously sent to the Attorney General.
(a) If two-thirds of the members entitled to sit on the board or commission do not agree that an

[^3]unanticipated event or events necessitates a meeting of the board in less than six days' time, the meeting shall be immediately adjourned.
(b) If the board, by two-thirds vote of the members to which it is entitled, adopts the reasons specified in the REQUEST previously sent to the Attorney General, without any revision, and the Attornay General concurs that the conditions necessary for an emergency meeting exist, the board may proceed with its emergency meeting.
(c) If the board, by two-thirds vote of the members to which it is entitled, adopts the reasons specified in the REQUEST previously sent to the Attorney General, without any revision, but the Attorney General is still considering the board's findings, the meeting cannot proceed. The Attorney General should be contacted immediately and asked to concur with or reject the board's findings. When concurrence is secured, the board may proceed with its emergency meeting.
(d) If, by two-thirds vote of the members to which it is entitled, the board adopts reasons that are different from the ones previously sent to the Attorney General, or the Attorney General does not concur that the conditions necessary for an emergency meeting outlined in the board's previously submitted REQUEST exist, then another REQUEST must be completed and sent to the Attorney General. The second completed REQUEST should indicate that the board has recessed momentarily to await the Attorney General's immediate response, or identify the time and date that the board intends to reconvene if concurrence is provided.

All materials prepared in anticipation of the emergency meeting, including the REQUEST concurred in by the Attorney General, should be preserved as part of the minutes of the emergency meeting. A copy of the REQUEST, concurred in by the Attorney General, must be filed with the office of the Lieutenant Governor or county clerk, as appropriate, to satisfy the requirement of Hawail Revised Statutes 5 92-8(b)(3).

Requests from boards for the Attorney General's concurrence as to the necessity for an emergency meeting will be given immediate attention. To facilitate expeditious processing of such requests, the boards and comissions should make every effort to secure the Attorney General's concurrence in advance of the time specilied for the emergency meeting.

REQUEST FOR AITORNEY GENERNLIS


Date:
Name of Commission or Board:
Board Contact Pērson:
Telephone Number:
Fax Number:
Date of Proposed Emergency Meeting: _________ Time:
Place/Location of Proposed Emergency Meeting:
Name/Tel. No. of Attorney providing legal advice to commission or board:

Tel.
Please attach copy of agenda for proposed emergéncy meeting. Attached additional sheets and number appropriately if needed.

1. Describe unanticipated event(s) which prompts this request
2. Reason(s) unanticipated event(s) necessitates board meeting in less than 6 days.
3. When did the unanticipated event(s) occur?
4. When did you find out about the unanticipated event?
5. What issue/matter needs to be considered?
6. How is the issue/matter within the board's supervision, control, jurisdiction, or advisory power?
(Please attach a copy of any supporting executive order, charter, ordinance, rule, or statute.)
7. What board action is required?
8. What may occur if board action is not taken because it is not permitted to meet within the statutory six-day notice period?

SUBMITTED BY:

Name:

I/ CONCUR,* the conditions necessary for an emergency meeting exist.
/_/ DO NOT CONCUR

Attorney General

* This concurrence is based upon the statements provided on this form, and is rescinded if any statement provided on this form is amended by the board in any way.


## Consumer Price Index for Honolulu

| CPI-U |  | Annual | Change | 1st Half | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1990 | 138.1 | 7.30\% | 135.5 | 7.20\% |
|  | 1991 | 148.0 | 7.17\% | 146.8 | 8.34\% |
|  | 1992 | 155.1 | 4.80\% | 153.9 | 4.84\% |
|  | 1993 | 160.1 | 3.22\% | 158.6 | 3.05\% |
|  | 1994 | 164.5 | 2.75\% | 163.4 | 3.03\% |
|  | 1995 | 168.1 | 2.19\% | 166.9 | 2.14\% |
|  | 1996 | 170.7 | 1.55\% | 170.5 | 2.16\% |
|  | 1997 | 171.9 | 0.70\% | 172.1 | 0.94\% |
|  | 1998 | 171.5 | -0.23\% | 172.0 | -0.06\% |
|  | 1999 | 173.3 | 1.05\% | 172.7 | 0.41\% |
|  | 2000 | 176.3 | 1.73\% | 175.9 | 1.85\% |
|  | 2001 | 178.4 | 1.19\% | 178.1 | 1.25\% |
|  | 2002 | 180.3 | 1.07\% | 180.1 | 1.12\% |
|  | 2003 | 184.5 | 2.33\% | 183.2 | 1.72\% |
|  | 2004 | 190.6 | 3.31\% | 189.2 | 3.28\% |
|  | 2005 | 197.8 | 3.78\% | 195.0 | 3.07\% |
|  | 2006 |  |  | 206.4 | 5.85\% |
| CPI-W |  | Annual | Change | 1st Half | Change |
|  | 1990 | 138.9 | 7.09\% | 136.3 | 6.99\% |
|  | . 1991 | 148.9 | 7.20\% | 147.7 | 8.36\% |
|  | 1992 | 155.9 | 4.70\% | 154.6 | 4.67\% |
|  | 1993 | 160.7 | 3.08\% | 159.4 | 3.10\% |
|  | 1994 | 164.7 | 2.49\% | 163.5 | 2.57\% |
|  | 1995 | 168.4 | 2.25\% | 167.2 | 2.26\% |
|  | 1996 | 171.0 | 1.54\% | 170.8 | 2.15\% |
|  | 1997 | 172.2 | 0.70\% | 172.4 | 0.94\% |
|  | 1998 | 171.6 | -0.35\% | 172.3 | -0.06\% |
|  | 1999 | 173.4 | 1.05\% | 173.0 | 0.41\% |
|  | 2000 | 176.4 | 1.73\% | 176.0 | 1.73\% |
|  | 2001 | 179.1 | 1.53\% | 178.6 | 1.48\% |
|  | 2002 | 180.6 | 0.84\% | 180.4 | 1.01\% |
|  | 2003 | 184.3 | 2.05\% | 183.4 | 1.66\% |
|  | 2004 | 190.2 | 3.20\% | 188.8 | 2.94\% |
|  | 2005 | 197.2 | 3.68\% | 194.6 | 3.07\% |
|  | 2006 |  |  | 205.6 | 5.65\% |

CPI-U CPI for All Urban Consumers
CPI-W CPI for Urban Wage Earners Clerical Workers 08/15/06

ESTIMATES OF GENERAL FUND TAX REVENUE: FY 2007 to FY 2013


Notes:
1/ Deposits of $44.8 \%$ of TAT revenues to counties (Act 156, SLH 1998); 32.6\% to the tourism special fund and 5.3\% to the TAT trust fund (Act 250 , SLH 2002 ); $17.3 \%$ to the convention center enterprise fund (Act 253, SLH 2002); all net of general fund deposits of excess of fund ceilings. Act 235, SLH 2005, increases allocation to the tourism special fund to $34.2 \%$ and repeals the TAT trust fund. Effective on July 1, 2007. Act 209, SLH 2006, increases ceiling on allocation to the convention center enterprise fund to $\$ 33$ million. Effective on July 1, 2006.

2/ Act 100 , SLH 2003, provides a nonrefundable attractions \& educational facilities tax credit equal to $100 \%$ of certain costs incurred after May 31 , 2003, \& before June 1, 2009, for the development of such facilities at Ko Olina Resort \& Marina \& the Makaha Resort. Of the maximum $\$ 7.5$ million credit per year, the general fund loss is estimated at $\$ 4$ million.
3/ Transfers $\$ 16.5$ million of the litigated claims fund.
4/ Act 156, SLH 2004, increases conveyance tax rates based on a sliding scale. Deposits of $10 \%$ of conveyance tax revenues to the land conservation fund; $30 \%$ to the rental housing trust fund; $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ to the natural area reserve fund. Effective on July 1, 2005.
5/ FY 2008 includes $\$ 30$ million, estimated spillover from June 30 , 2007 falling on a weekend. FY 2012 excludes $\$ 30$ million, due to June 30 , 2012 falling on a weekend.
$6 /$ Act 113, SLH 2004, changes the due date for withholding tax on wages. Applies to withholding requirements for payroll periods beginning on or after December 31 , 2004.
$7 /$ Act 110, SLH 2006, increases standard income tax deduction and expands income tax brackets. Effective on January $1,2007$.
8 / Act 100 , SLH 2006, increases allocation to the rental housing trust fund to $50 \%$. It takes effective on July 1, 2006 and will be repealed on June 30 , 2007.

* Includes inheritance and estate tax.


## PAST, CURRENT, AND FUTURE ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE SALARIES

| Effective Dates | Representatives <br> and Senators | House Speaker and <br> Senate President |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| November 1988 | $\$ 27,000$ | $\$ 32,000$ |
| January 1993 | 32,000 | 37,000 |
| January 1, 2005 | 34,200 | 41,700 |
| January 1, 2007 | 35,900 | 43,400 |
| January 1, 2009 | 37,500 | 45,000 |
| January 1, 2011 | 39,200 | 46,700 |

## CURRENT LEGISLATIVE NON-SALARY BENEFITS

Legislators earn no vacation or sick leave and are not eligible for overtime. They receive the same holidays as other State employees.

Medical and other insurance are determined on the same basis as other State employees, as well as personal savings options such as deferred compensation and savings bond deductions.

Contributory retirement for legislators is consistent with that of State judges 3.5 percent multiplier.

While on official business, all legislators are eligible to receive $\$ 120$ per diem for neighbor island travel (this includes neighbor island legislators attending session on Oahu) and $\$ 130$ per diem for mainland travel.

All legislators are eligible for downtown parking stalls during the session at the standard State rate. Free parking at all State airports is offered.

All legislators receive a $\$ 7,500$ expense account, with very stringent regulations on how the money may be spent.

## CURRENT LEGISLATIVE SALARIES

|  | $01 / 01 / 05$ | $01 / 01 / 07$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE | $\$ 34,200$ | $\$ 35,900$ |
| SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE AND | $\$ 41,700$ | $\$ 43,400$ |
| PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE |  |  |

## COMPARISON OF COUNCIL SALARIES FOR COUNTY JURISDICTIONS

|  | COUNCIL <br> CHAIR | COUNCIL <br> MEMBERS |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HAWAI`I & \(\$ 43,574\) & \(\$ 39,240\) & \((12 / 06 / 04)\) \\ CITY \& COUNTY OF HONOLULU & \(\$ 52,400\) & \(\$ 46,900\) & \((07 / 01 / 06)\) \\ MAUI & \(\$ 57,500\) & \(\$ 52,500\) & \((07 / 01 / 05)\) \\ KAUA`I | $\$ 39,500$ | $\$ 35,100$ | $(12 / 01 / 05)$ |



## Legislator Compensation 2005

Updated November 1, 2005

| State | Salary | Per Diem (Allowance for Daily Expenses) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | \$10/day (C) | $\$ 2,280 /$ month plus $\$ 50 /$ day for three days during each week that the legislature actually meets during any session (U). |
| Alaska | \$24,012/year | $\$ 200 /$ day effective June 1, 2005 until 10/1/05 then $\$ 156 /$ day until 5/1/06 then $\$ 200 /$ day ( U ) tied to federal rate. Legislators who reside in the Capitol area receive $75 \%$ of the federal rate. |
| Arizona | \$24,000/year | $\$ 35 /$ day for the 1st 120 days of regular session and for special session and $\$ 10$ /day thereafter. Members residing outside Maricopa County recelve an additional \$25/day for the 1st 120 days of reg. session and for special session and an additional $\$ 10 /$ day thereafter (V). Set by statute. |
| Arkansas | \$14,067/year | \$110.00/day (V) plus mileage tied to federal rate. |
| California | \$110,880/year | \$138.00 per day for each day they are in session. |
| Colorado | \$30,000/year | $\$ 45 /$ day for members living in the Denver metro area. \$99/day for members living outside Denver (V). Per diem is determined by the legislature. |
| Connecticut | \$28,000/year | No per diem is paid. |
| Delaware | \$39,785/year | No per diem is paid. |
| District of Columbia | \$92,500/year | No per diem is paid. |
| Florida | \$29,916/year | \$117/day (V) tied to federal rate. Earned based on the number of days in session. Travel vouchers are filed to substantiate. |
| Georgia | \$16,524/year | \$128/day (U) set by the legislature. |
| Guam | N/R | N/R |
| Hawaii | $\$ 34,200 /$ year $(\$ 35,000 /$ year effective 2006) | \$80/day for members living outside Oahu; \$10/day for members living on Oahu (V) set by the legislature. *NOTE: The per diem for legislators will be adjusted for the 2006 session. The specific amount is to be determined by the Speaker and the President. |
| Idaho | \$15,646/year | $\$ 99 /$ day for members establishing second residence in Boise; $\$ 38 /$ day if no second residence is established and up to $\$ 25 /$ day travel (V) set by Compensation Commission. |
| Illinois | \$57,619.00/year | \$102/day (U) tied to federal rate. |
| Indiana | \$11,600/year | \$134/day (U) tied to federal rate. |
| Iowa | \$21,380.54/year | $\$ 86 /$ day (U). $\$ 65 /$ day for Polk County legislators (U) set by the legislature. State mileage rates apply. |
| Kansas | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 82.12 / \text { day (C) } \\ & (\$ 83.14 \text { effective 12/4/05) } \end{aligned}$ | \$91/day (U) tied to federal rate. |
| Kentucky | \$170.17day (C) | \$100.10/day (U) tied to federal rate (110\% Federal per diem rate). |
| Louisiana | \$16,800/year | \$113/day (U) tied to federal rate. Additional \$6,000/yr (U) |


|  |  | expense allowance. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maine | $\$ 11,384 /$ year for first regular session; \$8,655/year for second regular session. Annual COLAs apply. In addition, legislators receive a constituent service allowance ( $\$ 2,000 /$ year for Senators and $\$ 1,500 /$ year for Representatives) | $\$ 38$ /day housing, or mileage and tolls in lieu of housing (at rate of $0.34 /$ mile up to $\$ 38 /$ day). $\$ 32 /$ day for meals. Per diem limits set by statute. |
| Maryland | \$40,500/year | Lodging \$96/day; meals $\$ 32 /$ day (V) tied to federal rate and compensation commission. <br> $\$ 225.00 /$ day for out of state travel. Includes meals and lodging. |
| Massachusetts | \$55,569.39/year | From \$10/day-\$100/day, depending on distance from State House (V) set by the legislature. |
| Michigan | \$79,650 /year | $\$ 12,000$ yearly expense allowance for session and interim (V) set by compensation commission. |
| Minnesota | \$31,140.90/year | Senators receive $\$ 66 /$ day and Representatives receive $\$ 66 /$ legislative day (U) set by the legislature. |
| Mississippi | \$10,000/year | \$91/day (U) tied to federal rate. |
| Missouri | \$31,351/year | $\$ 76.80 /$ day (U) tied to federal rate. Verification of per diem is by roll call. $\$ 76.80 /$ day ( $U$ ) tied to federal rate. Verification of per diem is by roll call. |
| Montana | \$76.80/day (L) | \$90.31/day (U). |
| Nebraska | \$12,000/year | $\$ 91 /$ day outside 50 -mile radius from Capitol; $\$ 31 /$ day if member resides within 50 miles of Capitol (V) tied to federal rate. |
| Nevada | \$130/day maximum of 60 days of session | Federal rate for Capitol area (V). Legislators who live more than 50 miles from the capitol, if require lodging, will be paid Hud single-room rate for Carson City area for each month of session. |
| New Hampshire | \$200/two-year term | No per diem is paid. |
| New Jersey | \$49,000/year | No per diem is paid. |
| New Mexico | None | \$146/day (V) tied to federal rate \& the constitution. |
| New York | \$79,500/year | Varies (V) tied to federal rate. |
| North Carolina | \$13,951/year | \$104/day (U) set by statute. \$559.00/month expense allowance. |
| North Dakota | \$125/day during legislative sessions (C) | Lodging reimbursement up to \$900/month (V). |
| Ohio | \$56,260,62/year | No per diem is paid. |
| Oklahoma | \$38,400/year | \$116/day (U) tied to federal rate. |
| Oregon | \$16,284/year | \$91/day (U) tied to federal rate. |
| Pennsylvania | \$69,647/year | $\$ 128 /$ day (V) tied to federal rate. Can receive actual expenses or per diem. |
| Puerto Rico | \$60,000/year | $\$ 122 /$ day within 50 Km . of Capitol; $\$ 132 /$ day if outside the 50 Km. |
| Rhode Island | \$12,646/year | No per diem is paid. |
| South Carolina | \$10,400/year | $\$ 95 /$ day for meals and housing, for each statewide session day and cmte meeting (V) tied to federal rate. |
| South Dakota | \$12,000/two-yr term | \$110/legislative day (U) set by the legislature. |
| Tennessee | \$16,500/year | \$141/legislative day (U) tied to federal rate. |
| Texas | \$7,200/year | \$128/day (U) set by Ethics Commission. |
| Utah | \$120/day (C) | $\$ 79 /$ day (U) lodging allotment for each calendar day, tied to federal rate, \$39/day meals (U). |


| Vermont | \$589/week during session $\$ 118$ per day for special sessions or interim committee meetings | Federal per diem rate for Montpelier \$69/day for lodging and \$35/day for meals for non-commuters; commuters receive $\$ 35 /$ day for meals plus mileage. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Virgin Islands | \$65,000 | \$30/day (U) set by the legislature. |
| Virginia | $\$ 18,000 /$ year Senate <br> $\$ 17,640 /$ year House | \$130/day (U) tied to federal rate. |
| Washington | \$34,227/year | \$90/day. Tied to federal rate (80\% Olympia area). |
| West Virginia | \$15,000/year | \$115/day during session (U) set by compensation commission. |
| Wisconsin | \$45,569/year | $\$ 88 /$ day maximum (U) set by compensation commission ( $90 \%$ of federal rate). |
| Wyoming | \$150/day (L) | $\$ 85 /$ day (V) set by the legislature, includes travel days for those outside of Cheyenne. |

$\mathrm{L}=$ Legislative day
$C=$ Calendar day
(V) Vouchered (U) Unvouchered
$N / R=$ No Response
NCSL 2005
cc 2006 National Conference of State Legislatures, All Rights Reserved
Denver Office: Tel: 303-364-7700 | Fax: 303-364-7800| 7700 East First Place | Denver, CO 80230 | Map
Washington Office: Tel: 202-624-5400 | Fax: 202-737-1069 | 444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515 | Washington, D.C. 20001

Annual Salary Recommendation for the Governor (Gov) Lieutenant Governor (LG), Administrative Director of the State (ADS) Department Heads and Deputy Department Heads

Attachment 5 (amended 2/23/04)

| Dept |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { No. of } \\ \text { Ees } \end{array}$ | Present Salary | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gov | 1 | 94,780.00 | - | - | 112,000.00 | 114,240.00 | 116,524.80 | 118,855.30 | 121,232.40 | 123,657.05 | 126,130.19 | 128,652.79 |
|  | Lt. Gov | 1 | 90,041.00 | - | - | 100,000.00 | 102,000.00 | 104,040.00 | 106,120.80 | 108,243.22 | 110,408.08 | 112,616.24 | 114,868.57 |
|  | ADS | 1 | 90,041.00 | - | - | 100,000.00 | 102,000.00 | 104,040.00 | 106,120.80 | 108,243.22 | 110,408.08 | 112,616.24 | 114,868.57 |
| AG | Dept Head | 1 | 85,302.00 | 105,000.00 | 107,100.00 | 109,242.00 | 111,426.84 | 113,655.38 | 115,928.48 | 118,247.05 | 120,612.00 | n/a | n/a |
|  | Deputy | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 72,886.00 \\ & 77,966.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 91,350.00 \\ & 96,600.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93,177.00 \\ & 98,532.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 95,040.54 \\ 100,502.64 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 96,941.35 \\ 102,512.69 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 98,880.18 \\ 104,562.95 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100,857.78 \\ & 106,654.21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 102,874.94 \\ & 108,787.29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 104,932.44 \\ 110,963.04 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | n/a | n/a |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { DOH, DOT, } \\ & \text { DAGS, } \\ & \text { DCCA, } \\ & \text { TAX,'B\&F } \end{aligned}$ | Dept Heac | 6 | 85,302.00 | 100,000.00 | 102,000.00 | 104,040.00 | 106,120.80 | 108,243.22 | 110,408.08 | 112,616.24 | 114,888.57 | n/a | n/a |
|  | Deputies | 11 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 72,886.00 \\ 77,966.00 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 87,000.00 \\ & 92,000.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88,740.00 \\ & 93,840.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90,514.80 \\ & 95,716.80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92,325.10 \\ & 97,631.14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 94,171.60 \\ & 99,583.76 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 98,055.03 \\ 101,575.43 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 97,976.13 \\ 103,606.94 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 99,935.65 \\ 105,679.08 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | n/a | n/a |
| DHS,'DLIR, DLNR, DBEDT | Dept Heads | 4 | 85,302.00 | 95,000.00 | 96,900.00 | 98,838.00 | 100,814.76 | 102,831.06 | 104,887.68 | 106,985.43 | 109,125.14 | n/a | n/a |
|  | Deputies | 5 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 72,886.00 \\ 77,966.00 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82,650.00 \\ & 87,400.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 84,303.00 \\ & 89,148.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 85,989.06 \\ & 90,930.96 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 87,708.84 \\ & 92,749.58 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 89,463.02 \\ & 94,604.57 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 91,252.28 \\ & 96,496.66 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 93,077.32 \\ & 98,426.60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 94,938.87 \\ 100,395.13 \end{array}$ | n/a | n/a |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DHRD, } \\ & \text { HHL, DOA, } \\ & \text { PSD } \end{aligned}$ | Dept Heads | 4 | 85,302.00 | 90,000.00 | 91,800.00 | 93,636.00 | 95,508.72 | 97,418.89 | 99,367.27 | 101,354.62 | 103,381.71 | n/a | n/a |
|  | Deputies | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 72,886.00 \\ & 77,966.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 78,300.00 \\ & 82,800.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 79,866.00 \\ & 84,456.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 81,463.32 \\ & 86,145.12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83,092.59 \\ & 87,868.02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 84,754.44 \\ & 89,625.38 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 86,449.53 \\ & 91,417.89 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 88,178.52 \\ & 93,246.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 89,942.09 \\ & 95,111.17 \end{aligned}$ | n/a | n/a |

Footnotes:

1. Abbreviations: $\mathrm{Gov}=\mathrm{Governor} ;$ Lt. Governor $=$ Lieutenant Govemor; $\mathrm{ADS}=$ Administrative Director of the State (Chief of Staff). AG = Attorney General; DOH = Department of Health; DOT = Department of Transportation; DAGS = Department of Accounting and General Services; DCCA = Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs; TAX = Department of Taxation; B\&F = Department of Budget and Finance; DHS = Department of Human Services; DLIR = Department of Labor and Industrial Relations; DLNR = Department of Land and Natural Resources; DBEDT = Department of Business and Economic Development and Tourism; DHRD = Department of Human Resources Development; HHL = Department of Hawailan Home Lands; DOA = Department of Agriculture; PSD = Department of Public Safety
2. After initial recommended salaries (effective July 1, 2004, for Department Heads and Deputies; effective 2006, for the Governor, Lieutenant Governor and Administrative Director of the State), all subsequent figures represent an annual two percent compounded adjustment made annually for all these salaries/salary ranges for their respective time periods.
3. After reviewing the salary of the Deputy to the Superintendent of Education, the Commission decided to recommend deferring to the Board of Education on this matter.

COMPARISON OF EXECUTIVE PAY RATES FOR STATE, COUNTIES, AND JUDICIARY

|  | STATE | JUDICIARY | C\&C HONOLULU | HAWAII | MAUI | KAUAI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average job count for 2005 | 23,800 <br> Incl Judiciary and Legislative branches, excludes DOE and UH | 2,000 ${ }^{2}$ | 11,450 | 2,350 | 2,300 | 1,150 |
| EFFECTIVE DATES EXCEPT AS NOTED: |  | 7/1/06 | 7/1/06 | Rates on the anniversary dates of executives | 1/1/06 | 7/1/04 |
| POSITION |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GOVERNOR <br> LT. GOVERNOR | $\begin{aligned} & 112,000 \\ & 100,000 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHIEF JUSTICE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE |  | $\begin{aligned} & 144,900 \\ & 139,725 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| ICA CHIEF JUDGE ASSOCIATE JUDGE |  | $\begin{aligned} & 134,550 \\ & 129,375 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE |  | 125,856 |  |  |  |  |
| DISTRICT/FAMILY COURTJUDGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADMINSTRATIVE DIRECTOR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OF THE COURTS |  | 108,675 |  |  |  |  |
| DEPUTY ADMINISTRATIVE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DIRECTOR OF THE COURTS |  | 103,500 |  |  |  |  |
| MAYOR |  |  | 122,000 | 99,998 | 107,500 | 80,000 |
| MANAGING DIRECTOR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASSISTANT |  |  | 115,500 | 95,236 | 101,000 | 77,000 |
| DEPUTY MANAGING |  |  |  |  |  | Admin Assistant |
| DIRECTOR |  |  | 109,470 | 89,803 |  |  |
| ATTORNEY GENERALI PROSECUTING ATTORNE | $\begin{gathered} \text { 7/1/06 } \\ \mathbf{1 0 9 , 2 4} \end{gathered}$ |  | 107,850 | 95,236 | 93,000 | 75,000 |
| 1ST DEPUTY AG/P.A. |  |  | 102,350 | 90,701 | 88,350 | 63,480-69,000 |
| DEPUTIES <br> AG, Pros Atty \& Corp Counsel | 95,041-100,503 |  | 39,417-109,430 | 45,351-85,704 | $\begin{aligned} & 47,664-85,440(10 / 1 / 05) \\ & 49,332-88,632(10 / 1 / 06) \end{aligned}$ | 60,720-66,000 |


|  |  | 1/1/06 ${ }^{3}$ | PUBLIC SAFETY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 140,000 ${ }^{3}$ | 109,212 ${ }^{3}$ | 107,200 POLICE | 75,000 |
|  | WATER | WATER | 94,000 FIRE | CORP COUNSEL, PLANNING |
|  |  |  | 93,000 PROS ATTY | =INANCE, PUBLIC WKS, FIRE, POLICE, WATER, COUNTY |
|  | 119,000 | 92,497 | 87,400 LIQUOR | CLK |
|  | POLICE, FIRE | POLICE, FIRE |  |  |
|  |  |  | INFRASTRUCTURE |  |
| 104,040 | 107,850 | TIER 3 | 99,000 PUBLIC WKS | 72,000 |
| 1st - HEALTH, TRANS, DAGS, | ALL OTHERS | 90,701 | 92,500 WATER | 三RSONNEL, COMMUNITY ASST, |
| COMMERCE, TAX, |  | CORP COUNSEL, CIVIL SVC, | 92,000 PARKS | ECONOMIC DEV, LIQUOR |
| 98,838 |  | PLANNING, FINANCE, HSING, | 91,500 PLANNING |  |
| 2nd - HUMAN SVCS, LABOR, |  | PUBLIC WKS, ENVIRON MGT | 88,000 TRANS |  |
| DLNR, DBED |  |  |  |  |
| 93,636 |  | TIER 4 | ADMINISTRATION |  |
| 3 3 - DHRD, DHHL, AGRI, |  | 86,382 | 93,500 FINANCE |  |
| PUBLIC SAFETY |  | DATA SYS, LIQUOR, PARKS, RESEARCH \& DEV, | 93,000 CORP COUNSEL 90,000 PERSONNEL |  |
|  |  | 85,527 - COUNTY CLERK | 89,500 HOUSING |  |
| DEPUTIES |  |  |  |  |
| 90,515-95,719 | TBD ${ }^{3}$ | 101,940 ${ }^{3}$ | PUBLIC SAFETY | 63,480-69,000 |
| 1st | WATER | WATER |  | CORP COUNSEL, |
|  |  |  | 101,840 POLICE | PLANNING, |
|  |  |  | 89,000 FIRE | FINANCE, PUBLIC WORKS, |
| 85,989-90,931 | 113,500 | 88,093 | 88,350 PROS ATTY | FIRE, POLICE, WATER, |
| 2nd | POLICE, FIRE | POLICE | 83,000 LIQUOR | COUNTY CLERK |
|  |  | TIER 3 | INFRASTRUCTURE |  |
| 81,463-86,145 | 102,350 | 86,382 | 94,050 PUBLIC WKS |  |
| 3 rd | ALL OTHERS | 85,527 - PUBLIC WKS, PLANNING | 87,500 WATER |  |
|  |  | CIVIL SERVICE | 87,000 PARKS |  |
|  |  |  | 86,500 PLANNING |  |
|  |  | TIER 4 | 83,500 TRANS |  |
|  |  | 82,269 |  |  |
|  |  | 81,454 - RESEARCH \& DEV | ADMINISTRATION |  |
|  |  | DEP COUNTY CLERK | 88,500 FINANCE |  |
|  |  |  | 88,350 CORP COUNSEL |  |
|  |  |  | 85,500 PERSONNEL |  |
|  |  |  | 85,025 HOUSING |  |
| 1/1/07 |  |  |  |  |
| SPEAKER/PRESIDENT 43,400 |  |  |  |  |
| MEMBERS HOUSE/SENATE 35,900 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 12/4/06 | 7/1/05 | 12/1/05 |
| CHAIRPERSON | 52,400 | 44,482 | 57,500 | 39,500 |
| COUNCIL MEMBERS | 46,900 | 40,058 | 52,500 | 35,100 |

${ }^{1}$ Source: Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Job Count by Industry (CES).
${ }^{2}$ Judiciary website, Hawaii Courts at a Glance


Source: State Dept of Budget and Finance websiteThe Operating and

FB 07-09 Operating Budget Statewide Totals By Department - All Funds

Capital Budget-Statewide Summaries

|  | Allocation <br> FY 2007 | \% of <br> Total | FY 2008 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | FY 2009 | \% of <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accounting \& General Sves | 797.50 |  | 827.00 |  | 827.00 |  |
|  | 140,171,890 | 1.4\% | 145,160,635 | 1.4\% | 145,750,869 | 1.4\% |
|  | 346.50 |  | 353.00 |  | 353.00 |  |
| Agriculture | 37,628,988 | 0.4\% | 41,075,787 | 0.4\% | 38,074,036 | 0.4\% |
|  | 566.50 |  | 625.00 |  | 630.00 |  |
| Attorney General | 72,525,423 | 0.7\% | 77,818,400 | 0.8\% | 77,660,940 | 0.7\% |
| Business, Econ. Dev. \& Tourist | 179.00 |  | 184.00 |  | 184.00 |  |
|  | 210,493,212 | 2.1\% | 251,046,501 | 2.4\% | 253,752,132 | 2.4\% |
|  | 290.00 |  | 306.00 |  | 313.00 |  |
| Budget and Finance | 1,541,610,755 | 15.7\% | 1,560,083,371 | 15.2\% | 1,620,421,144 | 15.4\% |
|  | 344.00 |  | 397.00 |  | 397.00 |  |
| Commerce \& Consumer Affairs | 44,393,978 | 0.5\% | 44,933,272 | 0.4\% | 44,881,172 | 0.4\% |
|  | 195.50 |  | 221.50 |  | 221.50 |  |
| Defense | 89,168,231 | 0.9\% | 92,972,257 | 0.9\% | 93,041,239 | 0.9\% |
|  | 19,954.60 |  | 19,871.10 |  | 19,883.10 |  |
| Education | 2,263,700,882 | 23.1\% | 2,313,116,043 | 22.5\% | 2,344,776,216 | 22.3\% |
| Charter Schools | 47,107,520 | 0.5\% | 51,635,990 | 0.5\% | 51,635,990 | 0.5\% |
|  | 555.55 |  | 555.55 |  | 555.55 |  |
| Public Libraries | 31,967,670 | 0.3\% | 34,841,064 | 0.3\% | 35,164,137 | 0.3\% |
|  | 37.00 |  | 37.00 |  | 37.00 |  |
| Governor | 3,974,947 | 0.0\% | 3,894,690 | 0.0\% | 3,894,690 | 0.0\% |
|  | 195.00 |  | 195.00 |  | 195.00 |  |
| Hawaiian Home Lands | 14,612,306 | 0.1\% | 32,318,456 | 0.3\% | 26,777,485 | 0.3\% |
|  | 3,118.50 |  | 3,229.50 |  | 3,229.50 |  |
| Health | 889,080,386 | 9.1\% | 979,429,096 | 9.5\% | 985,353,922 | 9.4\% |
|  | 2,836.25 |  | 2,836.25 |  | 2,836.25 |  |
| HHSC | 381,309,599 | 3.9\% | 433,165,232 | 4.2\% | 456,981,961 | 4.4\% |
|  | 112.00 |  | 112.00 |  | 112.00 |  |
| Human Resources Development | 22,170,114 | 0.2\% | 22,433,749 | 0.2\% | 22,431,151 | 0.2\% |
|  | 2,327.00 |  | 2,498.50 |  | 2,498.50 |  |
| Human Services | 1,779,062,078 | 18.1\% | 1,844,495,187 | 17.9\% | 1,889,646,662 | 18.0\% |
|  | 699.24 |  | 708.24 |  | 708.24 |  |
| Labor and Industrial Relations | 301,514,098 | 3.1\% | 299,389,287 | 2.9\% | 299,313,932 | 2.9\% |
|  | 718.50 |  | 784.50 |  | 819.50 |  |
| Land and Natural Resources | 94,374,261 | 1.0\% | 102,064,316 | 1.0\% | 103,131,255 | 1.0\% |
|  | 8.00 |  | 8.00 |  | 8.00 |  |
| Lieutenant Governor | 1,254,852 | 0.0\% | 1,261,092 | 0.0\% | 1,261,138 | 0.0\% |
|  | 2,590.20 |  | 2,671.20 |  | 2,671.20 |  |
| Public Safety | 224,417,320 | 2.3\% | 244,486,369 | 2.4\% | 241,685,506 | 2.3\% |
| Subsidies | 1,230,000 | 0.0\% |  | 0.0\% |  | 0.0\% |
|  | 372.50 |  | 402.50 |  | 402.50 |  |
| Taxation | 23,337,968 | 0.2\% | 25,876,865 | 0.3\% | 25,586,095 | 0.2\% |
|  | 2,114.00 |  | 2,148.00 |  | 2,149.00 |  |
| Transportation | 623,820,968 | 6.4\% | 632,378,585 | 6.2\% | 611,444,046 | 5.8\% |
|  | 6,669.25 |  | 6,912.25 |  | 7,025.75 |  |
| University of Hawaii | 974,796,794 | 9.9\% | 1,047,941,566 | 10.2\% | 1,125,823,776 | 10.7\% |
|  | 45,026.59 |  | 45,883.09 |  | 46,056.59 |  |

Note: Figure above each departmental allocation represents the Page 72 of 508 of poeitions in the department.

Supervising Deputy Attorney General
As of 12/21/06

| Descr | Monthly <br> Salary | Annual <br> Salary |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 8417 | 101,004 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 8417 | 101,004 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 8417 | 101,004 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 8417 | 101,004 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 8084 | 97,008 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 8084 | 97,008 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 8084 | 97,008 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 7834 | 94,008 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 7834 | 94,008 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 7834 | 94,008 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 7834 | 94,008 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 7834 | 94,008 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 7834 | 94,008 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 7834 | 94,008 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 7417 | 89,004 |
| Supvg Deputy Attorney General | 6834 | 82,008 |

EM 5 and above
As of 11/30/06

| Descr | Comment | Grade | Comp <br> Rate | SD | TD | Monthly <br> Total <br> Comp | Annual <br> Total <br> Comp | Dept |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plant Industry Administrator |  | EM08 | 8,758 |  |  | 8,758 | 105,096 | AGR |
| Veterinary Prgm Admr (DVM) |  | EM08 | 7,455 |  |  | 7,455 | 89,460 | AGR |
| Quality Assurance Admr |  | EM08 | 5,919 |  |  | 5,919 | 71,028 | AGR |
| Veterinary Prgm Mgr II (DVM) |  | EM07 | 7,679 |  |  | 7,679 | 92,148 | AGR |
| Agricultural Marketing Admr |  | EM07 | 6,367 |  |  | 6,367 | 76,404 | AGR |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 6,260 | 1,340 |  | 7,600 | 91,200 | AGR |
| Agricultural Loan Admr |  | EM07 | 5,803 |  |  | 5,803 | 69,636 | AGR |
| Aquaculture Dev Program Mgr |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | AGR |
| Administrative Svcs Offcr I |  | EM05 | 7,253 |  |  | 7,253 | 87,036 | AGR |
| Veterinary Prgm Mgr I (DVM) |  | EM05 | 6,908 |  |  | 6,908 | 82,896 | AGR |
| Pesticides Program Manager |  | EM05 | 6,707 |  |  | 6,707 | 80,484 | AGR |
| Commodities Program Manager |  | EM05 | 6,321 |  |  | 6,321 | 75,852 | AGR |
| Plant Quarantine Manager |  | EM05 | 5,980 |  |  | 5,980 | 71,760 | AGR |
| Measurement Stds Prgm Mgr |  | EM05 | 5,735 |  |  | 5,735 | 68,820 | AGR |
| Veterinary Prgm Mgr I (DVM) |  | EM05 | 5,678 |  |  | 5,678 | 68,136 | AGR |
| Agricultural Pest Control Mgr |  | EM05 | 5,630 |  |  | 5,630 | 67,560 | AGR |
| Business Development Prgm Mgr | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  |  | AGR |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accounting System Manager |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | AGS |
| Administrative Svcs Offcr I |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | AGS |
| Data Procssg Systs Mgr |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | AGS |
| Departmental Pers Officer III |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | AGS |
| Data Procssg Systs Mgr |  | EM05 | 7,474 | 88 |  | 7,562 | 90,744 | AGS |
| Data Procssg Systs Mgr |  | EM05 | 7,516 |  |  | 7,516 | 90,192 | AGS |
| Data Procssg Systs Mgr |  | EM05 | 7,265 | 217 |  | 7,482 | 89,784 | AGS |
| Data Procssg Systs Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,962 | 501 |  | 7,463 | 89,556 | AGS |
| Data Procssg Systs Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,742 | 533 |  | 7,275 | 87,300 | AGS |
| Accounting System Manager |  | EM05 | 6,852 |  |  | 6,852 | 82,224 | AGS |
| Accounting System Manager |  | EM05 | 6,850 |  |  | 6,850 | 82,200 | AGS |
| Central Services Manager |  | EM05 | 6,782 |  |  | 6,782 | 81,384 | AGS |
| Land Surveyor Asst Admr |  | EM05 | 6,349 | 364 |  | 6,713 | 80,556 | AGS |
| Archives Administrator |  | EM05 | 5,316 |  |  | 5,316 | 63,792 | AGS |
| Data Procssg Systs Mgr |  | EM05 | 5,115 | 163 |  | 5,278 | 63,336 | AGS |
| Data Procssg Systs Mgr |  | EM05 | 5,115 |  |  | 5,115 | 61,380 | AGS |
| Asst Admr, Info and Com Svcs |  | EM06 | 6,954 | 199 |  | 7,153 | 85,836 | AGS |
| Business Management Offcr II |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,092 | AGS |
| Public Works Manager |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,092 | AGS |
| Public Works Manager |  | EM07 | 8,052 | 237 |  | 8,289 | 99,468 | AGS |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 8,287 |  |  | 8,287 | 99,444 | AGS |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 7,613 | 410 |  | 8,023 | 96,276 | AGS |
| Public Works Manager |  | EM07 | 7,497 | 482 |  | 7,979 | 95,748 | AGS |
| Public Works Manager |  | EM07 | 6,973 | 800 |  | 7,773 | 93,276 | AGS |


| Descr | Comment | Grade | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Comp } \\ & \text { Rate } \end{aligned}$ | SD | TD | Monthly <br> Total <br> Comp | Annual Total Comp | Dept |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Public Works Manager |  | EM07 | 6,722 | 993 |  | 7,715 | 92,580 | AGS |
| Land Surveyor Admr |  | EM07 | 6,730 | 819 |  | 7,549 | 90,588 | AGS |
| Public Works Manager |  | EM07 | 5,972 | 1,514 |  | 7,486 | 89,832 | AGS |
| Leasing Program Manager |  | EM07 | 7,250 |  |  | 7,250 | 87,000 | AGS |
| Automotive Services Admr |  | EM07 | 5,972 |  |  | 5,972 | 71,664 | AGS |
| State Procurement Asst Admr |  | EM07 | 5,746 |  |  | 5,746 | 68,952 | AGS |
| Accounting System Admr |  | EM08 | 8,758 |  |  | 8,758 | 105,096 | AGS |
| Information \& Comn Svcs Admr |  | EM08 | 8,758 |  |  | 8,758 | 105,096 | AGS |
| Public Works Administrator |  | EM08 | 8,758 |  |  | 8,758 | 105,096 | AGS |
| Audit Administrator |  | EM08 | 7,660 |  |  | 7,660 | 91,920 | AGS |
| Central Services Administrator |  | ES02 | 9,292 |  |  | 9,292 | 111,504 | AGS |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCJDC Administrator |  | EM08 | 8,876 |  |  | 8,876 | 106,514 | ATG |
| Chief Special Investigator |  | EM07 | 6,661 |  |  | 6,661 | 79,935 | ATG |
| HCJDC Assistant Administrator |  | EM07 | 6,240 | 362 |  | 6,602 | 79,224 | ATG |
| Administrative Svcs Offcr I |  | EM05 | 5,115 |  |  | 5,115 | 61,380 | ATG |
| Data Procssg Systs Mgr | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  |  | ATG |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Energy Program Administrator |  | ES03 | 9,570 |  |  | 9,570 | 114,840 | BED |
| Planning Program Admr II |  | ES02 | 9,292 |  |  | 9,292 | 111,504 | BED |
| Business \& Industry Dev Admr | Temp Pr | EM08 | 8,541 |  |  | 8,541 | 102,492 | BED |
| Economics Research Admr |  | EM08 | 8,188 |  |  | 8,188 | 98,256 | BED |
| Business \& Industry Dev Admr | LOA to Exempt Pos | EM08 | 6,922 |  |  | 6,922 | 83,064 | BED |
| Foreign Trade Zone Admr | Temp Pr | EM08 | 6,762 |  |  | 6,762 | 81,144 | BED |
| Foreign Trade Zone Admr | LOA to Exempt Pos | EM08 | 5,692 |  |  | 5,692 | 68,304 | BED |
| Business \& Industry Dev Admr | Vacant,Position | EM08 |  |  |  |  |  | BED |
| Planning Program Admr I |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,092 | BED |
| Planning Program Manager |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | BED |
| Energy Conservation Prgm Mgr |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | BED |
| Economics Research Program Mgr |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | BED |
| Planning Program Manager |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | BED |
| Tourism Program Officer |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | BED |
| Planning Program Manager |  | EM05 | 7,407 |  |  | 7,407 | 88,884 | BED |
| Business Development Prgm Mgr |  | EM05 | 7,309 |  | 958 | 8,267 | 99,204 | BED |
| Business Development Prgm Mgr |  | EM05 | 7,088 |  |  | 7,088 | 85,056 | BED |
| Research \& Statistics Offcr |  | EM05 | 6,656 |  |  | 6,656 | 79,872 | BED |
| Ocean Resources Dev Manager |  | EM05 | 6,609 |  |  | 6,609 | 79,308 | BED |
| Business Development Prgm Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,577 |  |  | 6,577 | 78,924 | BED |
| Research \& Statistics Offcr |  | EM05 | 6,469 |  |  | 6,469 | 77,628 | BED |
| Business Development Prgm Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,193 |  |  | 6,193 | 74,316 | BED |
| Film Industry Dev Manager |  | EM05 | 5,988 |  |  | 5,988 | 71,856 | BED |
| Administrative Svcs Offcr I |  | EM05 | 5,387 |  |  | 5,387 | 64,644 | BED |


| Descr | Comment | Grade | Comp <br> Rate | SD | TD | Monthly <br> Total <br> Comp | Annual <br> Total <br> Comp | Dept |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ES03 | 8,582 |  |  | 8,582 | 102,984 | BUF |
| Prgm \& Budget Analysis Admr |  | EM08 | 8,291 |  |  | 8,291 | 99,492 | BUF |
| Funds Management Administrator |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,092 | BUF |
| Prgm \& Budget Analysis Mgr II |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,092 | BUF |
| Prgm \& Budget Analysis Mgr II |  | EM07 | 8,278 |  |  | 8,278 | 99,336 | BUF |
| Prgm \& Budget Analysis Mgr II |  | EM07 | 8,002 |  |  | 8,002 | 96,024 | BUF |
| Prgm \& Budget Analysis Mgr II |  |  | EM07 | 7,810 |  |  | 7,810 | 93,720 |
| BUF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative Svcs Offcr II |  |  | EM05 | 7,445 |  |  | 7,565 |  |


| Descr | Comment | Grade | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Comp } \\ & \text { Rate } \end{aligned}$ | SD | TD | Monthly Total Comp | Annual <br> Total <br> Comp | Dept |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Public Welfare Asst Admr |  | EM07 | 7,675 |  |  | 7,675 | 92,100 | HMS |
| Departmental Pers Officer IV |  | EM07 | 6,844 |  |  | 6,844 | 82,128 | HMS |
| Corrections Manager IV |  | EM07 | 5,750 |  |  | 5,750 | 69,000 | HMS |
| Vocational Rehab Admr |  | EM07 | 5,638 |  |  | 5,638 | 67,656 | HMS |
| Social Services Manager II | Vacant,Position | EM07 |  |  |  |  |  | HMS |
| Med-Quest Assistant Admr | Vacant,Position | EM07 |  |  |  |  |  | HMS |
| State Housing Development Admr | Vacant,Position | EM07 |  |  |  |  |  | HMS |
| Asst Admr, Info and Com Svcs |  | EM06 | 7,012 | 553 |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | HMS |
| Fiscal Management Officer |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | HMS |
| Vocational Rehab Asst Admr |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | HMS |
| Self-Suff/Supp Svcs Mgr |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | HMS |
| Prgm \& Budget Analysis Mgr I |  | EM05 | 7,516 |  |  | 7,516 | 90,192 | HMS |
| Pub Welf Adm Appls Prgm Offcr |  | EM05 | 7,402 |  |  | 7,402 | 88,824 | HMS |
| Medical Assistance Prgm Offcr |  | EM05 | 6,446 |  |  | 6,446 | 77,352 | HMS |
| Social Services Manager I |  | EM05 | 5,366 |  |  | 5,366 | 64,392 | HMS |
| Social Services Manager I |  | EM05 | 5,319 |  |  | 5,319 | 63,828 | HMS |
| Administrative Svcs Offcr I | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  |  | HMS |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Program Admr |  | EM08 | 8,758 |  |  | 8,758 | 105,096 | HRD |
| Personnel Program Admr |  | EM08 | 8,574 |  |  | 8,574 | 102,888 | HRD |
| Personnel Program Admr |  | EM08 | 8,076 |  |  | 8,076 | 96,912 | HRD |
| Personnel Program Admr |  | EM08 | 7,920 |  |  | 7,920 | 95,040 | HRD |
| Personnel Program Manager |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | HRD |
| Personnel Program Manager |  | EM05 | 7,418 |  |  | 7,418 | 89,016 | HRD |
| Personnel Program Manager |  | EM05 | 7,204 |  |  | 7,204 | 86,448 | HRD |
| Personnel Program Manager |  | EM05 | 6,558 |  |  | 6,558 | 78,696 | HRD |
| Administrative Svcs Offcr I |  | EM05 | 6,396 |  |  | 6,396 | 76,752 | HRD |
| Personnel Program Manager |  | EM05 | 6,302 |  |  | 6,302 | 75,624 | HRD |
| Personnel Program Manager |  | EM05 | 6,232 |  |  | 6,232 | 74,784 | HRD |
| Data Procssg Systs Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,104 | 650 |  | 6,754 | 81,048 | HRD |
| Personnel Program Manager |  | EM05 | 5,780 |  |  | 5,780 | 69,360 | HRD |
| Personnel Program Manager |  | EM05 | 5,115 |  |  | 5,115 | 61,380 | HRD |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| District Health Officer (M.D.) |  | ES03 | 9,570 |  |  | 9,570 | 114,840 | HTH |
| Public Hlth Prgms Admr (MD/DO) |  | ES03 | 8,467 | 2,218 |  | 10,685 | 128,220 | HTH |
| District Health Officer (M.D.) |  | ES03 | 7,464 | 2,532 |  | 9,996 | 119,952 | HTH |
| Public Hlth Prgms Admr (MD/DO) |  | ES03 | 6,470 | 2,215 |  | 8,685 | 104,220 | HTH |
| Crippled Chldrn's Prgm Mgr, MD |  | ES02 | 9,246 | 817 |  | 10,063 | 120,756 | HTH |
| EMS Prgm Mgr (M.D./D.O.) |  | ES02 | 6,281 | 2,231 |  | 8,512 | 102,144 | HTH |
| TB Control Prgm Mgr (M.D.) | Vacant,Position | ES02 |  |  |  |  |  | HTH |
| Engineering Program Admr |  | EM08 | 8,758 |  |  | 8,758 | 105,096 | HTH |
| Devlpmtl Disabilities Admr |  | EM08 | 8,758 |  |  | 8,758 | 105,096 | HTH |
| Environmental Hlth Prgm Admr |  | EM08 | 8,758 |  |  | 8,758 | 105,096 | HTH |
| Public Health Administrator |  | EM08 | 8,758 |  |  | 8,758 | 105,096 | HTH |


| Descr | Comment | Grade | Comp Rate | SD | TD | Monthly <br> Total <br> Comp | Annual <br> Total <br> Comp | Dept |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dental Health Administrator |  | EM08 | 8,543 | 137 |  | 8,680 | 104,160 | HTH |
| Business Management Offcr III |  | EM08 | 8,132 |  |  | 8,132 | 97,584 | HTH |
| Public Health Administrator |  | EM08 | 7,063 |  |  | 7,063 | 84,756 | HTH |
| District Health Officer (M.D.) | Vacant,Position | EM08 |  |  |  |  | 0 | HTH |
| District Health Officer II | Vacant,Position | EM08 |  |  |  |  | 0 | HTH |
| Public Health Administrator | Vacant,Position | EM08 |  |  |  |  |  | HTH |
| District Health Officer II | Vacant,Position | EM08 |  |  |  |  | 0 | HTH |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,092 | HTH |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,092 | HTH |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,092 | HTH |
| State Laboratories Admr |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,092 | HTH |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 7,571 | 482 |  | 8,053 | 96,636 | HTH |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 7,530 | 368 |  | 7,898 | 94,776 | HTH |
| Departmental Pers Officer IV |  | EM07 | 7,107 |  |  | 7,107 | 85,284 | HTH |
| Alcohol And Drug Abuse Admr |  | EM07 | 6,660 |  |  | 6,660 | 79,920 | HTH |
| District Health Officer I | Vacant,Position | EM07 |  |  |  |  | 0 | HTH |
| Nursing Service Manager III |  | EM06 | 8,395 |  |  | 8,395 | 100,740 | HTH |
| Dental Health Program Manager |  | EM06 | 6,323 | 830 |  | 7,153 | 85,836 | HTH |
| Data Procssg Systs Mgr |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | HTH |
| Public Health Program Manager |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | HTH |
| Public Health Program Manager |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | HTH |
| Public Health Program Manager |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | HTH |
| Public Health Program Manager |  | EM05 | 7,392 |  |  | 7,392 | 88,704 | HTH |
| Research \& Statistics Offcr |  | EM05 | 7,185 |  |  | 7,185 | 86,220 | HTH |
| Public Hlth Chemical Lab Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,746 |  |  | 6,746 | 80,952 | HTH |
| Environmental Health Prgm Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,565 |  |  | 6,565 | 78,780 | HTH |
| Public Hlth Micro Lab Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,512 |  |  | 6,512 | 78,144 | HTH |
| Environmental Health Prgm Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,321 |  |  | 6,321 | 75,852 | HTH |
| Environmental Mgmt Prgm Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,020 |  |  | 6,020 | 72,240 | HTH |
| Public Health Program Manager |  | EM05 | 5,853 |  |  | 5,853 | 70,236 | HTH |
| Environmental Health Prgm Mgr |  | EM05 | 5,851 |  |  | 5,851 | 70,212 | HTH |
| Comprehensive Hlth Pling Offcr |  | EM05 | 5,849 |  |  | 5,849 | 70,188 | HTH |
| Public Health Program Manager |  | EM05 | 5,647 |  |  | 5,647 | 67,764 | HTH |
| Public Health Program Manager |  | EM05 | 5,632 |  |  | 5,632 | 67,584 | HTH |
| Public Health Program Manager |  | EM05 | 5,578 | 408 |  | 5,986 | 71,832 | HTH |
| Environmental Health Prgm Mgr |  | EM05 | 5,266 |  |  | 5,266 | 63,192 | HTH |
| Public Health Program Manager |  | EM05 | 5,115 |  |  | 5,115 | 61,381 | HTH |
| Public Health Program Manager | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  | 0 | HTH |
| Public Health Program Manager | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  | 0 | HTH |
| Public Health Program Manager | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  | 0 | HTH |
| Public Health Program Manager | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  | 0 | HTH |
| Comprehensive Hlth Plng Offcr | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  | 0 | HTH |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workforce Development Admr |  | EM08 | 8,758 |  |  | 8,758 | 105,096 | LBR |
| Disability Compensation Admr |  | EM08 | 8,758 |  |  | 8,758 | 105,096 | LBR |


| Descr | Comment | Grade | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Comp } \\ \text { Rate } \end{array}$ | SD | TD | Monthly <br> Total <br> Comp | Annual <br> Total <br> Comp | Dept |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OSH Administrator |  | EM08 | 8,588 |  |  | 8,588 | 103,056 | LBR |
| Unemployment Insurance Admr |  | EM08 | 8,102 |  |  | 8,102 | 97,224 | LBR |
| Labor Law Enforcement Admr |  | EM08 | 6,033 |  |  | 6,033 | 72,396 | LBR |
| Business Management Offcr II |  | EM07 | 7,114 |  |  | 7,114 | 85,368 | LBR |
| Labor Programs Field Manager |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | LBR |
| Research \& Statistics Offcr |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | LBR |
| Unempl Ins Prgm Dev Offr |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | LBR |
| Workforce Dev Prgm Offrr |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | LBR |
| Workforce Development Manager |  | EM05 | 7,506 |  |  | 7,506 | 90,072 | LBR |
| Employment Securty Appls Offcr |  | EM05 | 7,491 |  |  | 7,491 | 89,892 | LBR |
| Labor Programs Field Manager |  | EM05 | 6,985 |  |  | 6,985 | 83,820 | LBR |
| Unemployment Insurance Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,558 |  |  | 6,558 | 78,696 | LBR |
| Labor Programs Field Manager |  | EM05 | 5,700 |  |  | 5,700 | 68,400 | LBR |
| Departmental Pers Officer III | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  |  | LBR |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Engineering Program Admr |  | EM08 | 8,249 | 492 |  | 8,741 | 104,892 | LNR |
| State Parks Administrator |  | EM08 | 8,142 |  |  | 8,142 | 97,704 | LNR |
| State Lands Administrator |  | EM08 | 6,963 |  |  | 6,963 | 83,556 | LNR |
| Forestry \& Wildlife Admr |  | EM08 | 6,329 |  |  | 6,329 | 75,948 | LNR |
| Aquatic Resources Program Admr |  | EM07 | 7,920 |  |  | 7,920 | 95,040 | LNR |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 7,530 | 368 |  | 7,898 | 94,776 | LNR |
| Conservation \& Rescs Enfc Admr |  | EM07 | 7,239 |  |  | 7,239 | 86,868 | LNR |
| State Parks Assistant Admr |  | EM07 | 6,404 |  |  | 6,404 | 76,848 | LNR |
| State Lands Asst Admr |  | EM07 | 6,093 |  |  | 6,093 | 73,116 | LNR |
| Planning Program Admr I |  | EM07 | 5,916 |  |  | 5,916 | 70,992 | LNR |
| Boating \& Ocean Recr Admr |  | EM07 | 5,638 |  |  | 5,638 | 67,656 | LNR |
| Engineering Program Mgr | Vacant,Position | EM07 |  |  |  |  |  | LNR |
| Forestry \& Wildlife Manager |  | EM05 | 7,565 |  |  | 7,565 | 90,780 | LNR |
| Registrar of Conveyances |  | EM05 | 7,142 |  |  | 7,142 | 85,704 | LNR |
| Forestry \& Wildlife Manager |  | EM05 | 6,897 |  |  | 6,897 | 82,764 | LNR |
| Forestry \& Wildlife Manager |  | EM05 | 6,614 |  |  | 6,614 | 79,368 | LNR |
| Consvtn \& Rescs Enfc Asst Admr |  | EM05 | 6,459 |  |  | 6,459 | 77,508 | LNR |
| Fiscal Management Officer |  | EM05 | 6,272 |  |  | 6,272 | 75,264 | LNR |
| Forestry \& Wildlife Manager |  | EM05 | 6,149 |  |  | 6,149 | 73,788 | LNR |
| Parks Program Manager |  | EM05 | 5,818 |  |  | 5,818 | 69,816 | LNR |
| Aquatic Resources Program Mgr |  | EM05 | 5,598 |  |  | 5,598 | 67,176 | LNR |
| Departmental Pers Officer III |  | EM05 | 5,579 |  |  | 5,579 | 66,948 | LNR |
| Aquatic Resources Program Mgr | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  |  | LNR |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corrections Program Admr |  | EM08 | 8,758 |  |  | 8,758 | 105,096 | PSD |
| Corrections Program Admr |  | EM08 | 5,919 |  |  | 5,919 | 71,032 | PSD |
| Corrections Manager IV |  | EM07 | 8,287 |  |  | 8,287 | 99,450 | PSD |
| Departmental Pers Officer IV |  | EM07 | 7,978 |  |  | 7,978 | 95,742 | PSD |


| Descr | Comment | Grade | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Comp } \\ & \text { Rate } \end{aligned}$ | SD | TD | Monthly Total Comp | Annual <br> Total <br> Comp | Dept |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Svcs Offcr II |  | EM07 | 6,494 |  |  | 6,494 | 77,923 | PSD |
| Corrections Manager IV | Vacant,Position | EM07 |  |  |  |  |  | PSD |
| Corrections Manager III |  | EM05 | 7,364 |  |  | 7,364 | 88,373 | PSD |
| Chief Investigator |  | EM05 | 7,175 |  |  | 7,175 | 86,098 | PSD |
| Corrections Manager III |  | EM05 | 7,096 |  |  | 7,096 | 85,149 | PSD |
| Departmental Pers Officer III |  | EM05 | 6,964 |  |  | 6,964 | 83,568 | PSD |
| Corrections Manager III |  | EM05 | 6,812 |  |  | 6,812 | 81,743 | PSD |
| Corrections Manager III |  | EM05 | 6,684 |  |  | 6,684 | 80,213 | PSD |
| Corrections Education Manager |  | EM05 | 6,453 |  |  | 6,453 | 77,434 | PSD |
| Inspections \& Invstgs Offcr |  | EM05 | 6,429 |  |  | 6,429 | 77,154 | PSD |
| Substance Abuse Program Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,347 |  |  | 6,347 | 76,166 | PSD |
| Food Services Manager |  | EM05 | 6,191 |  |  | 6,191 | 74,287 | PSD |
| Paroles \& Pardons Admr |  | EM05 | 5,844 |  |  | 5,844 | 70,122 | PSD |
| Public Safety Training Officer |  | EM05 | 5,589 |  |  | 5,589 | 67,063 | PSD |
| Corrections Manager III | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  |  | PSD |
| Corrections Manager III | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  |  | PSD |
| Public Safety Training Officer | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  |  | PSD |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Taxation Compliance Admr |  | EM08 | 8,403 |  |  | 8,403 | 100,836 | TAX |
| Tax Research \& Planning Offcr |  | EM07 | 8,270 |  |  | 8,270 | 99,240 | TAX |
| Taxation Services Admr |  | EM07 | 8,187 |  |  | 8,187 | 98,244 | TAX |
| Administrative Svcs Offcr I |  | EM05 | 6,646 |  |  | 6,646 | 79,752 | TAX |
| District Tax Manager |  | EM05 | 6,512 |  |  | 6,512 | 78,144 | TAX |
| Data Procssg Systs Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,097 | 553 |  | 6,650 | 79,800 | TAX |
| Tax Collector |  | EM05 | 5,851 |  |  | 5,851 | 70,212 | TAX |
| District Tax Manager |  | EM05 | 5,213 |  |  | 5,213 | 62,556 | TAX |
| Tax Assessor II (Field Audit) | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  |  | TAX |
| District Tax Manager | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  |  | TAX |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harbors Administrator |  | ES03 | 9,570 |  |  | 9,570 | 114,840 | TRN |
| Highways Administrator |  | ES03 | 9,570 |  |  | 9,570 | 114,840 | TRN |
| Airports Administrator |  | EM08 | 8,673 |  |  | 8,673 | 104,076 | TRN |
| Departmental Pers Officer IV |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,093 | TRN |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,092 | TRN |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,092 | TRN |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,092 | TRN |
| Administrative Svcs Offcr II |  | EM07 | 8,341 |  |  | 8,341 | 100,092 | TRN |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 8,287 |  |  | 8,287 | 99,444 | TRN |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 8,259 |  |  | 8,259 | 99,108 | TRN |
| Airports District Manager III |  | EM07 | 8,259 |  |  | 8,259 | 99,108 | TRN |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 8,243 | 95 |  | 8,338 | 100,056 | TRN |
| Administrative Svcs Offcr II |  | EM07 | 8,243 |  |  | 8,243 | 98,916 | TRN |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 8,201 | 35 |  | 8,236 | 98,832 | TRN |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 8,126 | 208 |  | 8,334 | 100,008 | TRN |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 8,005 | 138 |  | 8,143 | 97,716 | TRN |


| Descr | Comment | Grade | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Comp } \\ & \text { Rate } \end{aligned}$ | SD | TD | Monthly <br> Total <br> Comp | Annual <br> Total <br> Comp | Dept |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 7,570 | 482 |  | 8,052 | 96,624 | TRN |
| Harbor District Mgr III |  | EM07 | 7,478 |  |  | 7,478 | 89,736 | TRN |
| Engineering Program Mgr |  | EM07 | 7,240 | 500 |  | 7,740 | 92,880 | TRN |
| Administrative Svcs Offcr II |  | EM07 | 6,968 |  |  | 6,968 | 83,616 | TRN |
| Right-Of-Way Manager |  | EM07 | 6,654 |  |  | 6,654 | 79,848 | TRN |
| Airports Operations Officer |  | EM07 | 6,523 |  |  | 6,523 | 78,276 | TRN |
| Visitor Info Prgm Offcr |  | EM07 | 6,433 |  |  | 6,433 | 77,196 | TRN |
| Planning Program Admr I | Vacant,Position | EM07 |  |  |  |  |  | TRN |
| Prgm Evaluation Analysis Mgr | Vacant,Position | EM07 |  |  |  |  |  | TRN |
| Harbor District Mgr II |  | EM05 | 7,151 |  |  | 7,151 | 85,812 | TRN |
| Civil Rights Coordinator (DOT) |  | EM05 | 6,473 |  |  | 6,473 | 77,676 | TRN |
| Data Procssg Systs Mgr |  | EM05 | 6,438 | 206 |  | 6,644 | 79,728 | TRN |
| Airports District Manager II |  | EM05 | 5,949 |  |  | 5,949 | 71,388 | TRN |
| Commercial Harbors Manager |  | EM05 | 5,887 |  |  | 5,887 | 70,644 | TRN |
| Motor Vehicle Safety Admr |  | EM05 | 5,646 |  |  | 5,646 | 67,752 | TRN |
| Airports Constr \& Mtnce Supt |  | EM05 | 5,217 | 619 |  | 5,836 | 70,032 | TRN |
| Airports District Manager II |  | EM05 | 5,216 |  |  | 5,216 | 62,592 | TRN |
| Airports District Manager II |  | EM05 | 5,216 |  |  | 5,216 | 62,592 | TRN |
| Business Management Offcr I |  | EM05 | 5,213 |  |  | 5,213 | 62,556 | TRN |
| Harbor District Mgr II |  | EM05 | 5,115 |  |  | 5,115 | 61,380 | TRN |
| Airports District Manager II | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  |  | TRN |
| Fiscal Management Officer | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  |  | TRN |
| Airports District Manager II | Vacant,Position | EM05 |  |  |  |  |  | TRN |

## GOVERNORS

Table 4.3
THE GOVERNORS: COMPENSATION, STAFF, TRAVEL AND RESIDENCE

| State or other jurisdiction | Salary | Governor's office slaff (a) | Acress to state iransportation |  |  | Travel allowunce | Official residence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Automuhile | Airplune | Helic opver |  |  |
| Alabama .................... | \$96,361 | 43 | * | * | * | (b) | * |
| Alaska ........................ | 125.000 | 70 | * | * | . $\cdot$ | (k) | * |
| Arizona ....................... | 95,000 | 39 | * | * | $\cdots$ | (b) | . |
| Arkanses_.....-.............. | 77,028 | 55 | * | * | * | * | * |
| California ..................- | 175,000 (m) | 185 | * | - | . | (c) | (d) |
| Colorado ..................... | 90,000 | 39 | * | * | $\ldots$ | (c) | * |
| Connecticut ................. | 150,000 | 30 | * | * | * | (c) | * |
| Delaware....................- | 132,500 | 32 | * | ... | ... | ... | * |
| Florida ....................... | 129,060 | 278 | * | * | $\cdots$ | (b) | * |
| Georgia ....................... | 131,481 | 87 | * | * | * | (c) | * |
|  | 94,780 | 67 | * | * | * |  |  |
| Idaho | 98.500 | 24 | * | * | ... | *(c) | (a) |
| Illinois ......................... | 154.100 | 130 | * | * | * | (b) | * |
| Indiana........................ | 95,000 | 34 | * | * | * | (b) | * |
| lowa ............................ | 130,000 | 19 | * | ... | ... | (b) | * |
| Kansas ........................ | 98,331 | 24 | * | * | . | (b) | * |
| Kentucky ..................... | 130,705 | 80 | * | * | * | (b) | * |
| Louisinna ..................... | 95,000 | 123 (1) | * | * | * | (b) | * |
| Maine.......................... | 70,000 | 19 | * | * | * | (b) | * |
| Maryland ..................... | 150,000 | 84 | * | * | * | (e) | * |
| Massachusetts.............. | 135,000 (j) | 78 | * | .. | * | (b) | $\cdots$ |
| Michigan | 177,000 | 56 | * | * | ** | (e) | * |
| Minnesota | 120.303 | 45 | * | * | * | (c) | * |
| Mississippi .................. | 122,160 | 29 | * | * | * | (c) | * |
| Missouri................... | 120,087 | 38 | * | * | $*$ | (c) | * |
| Montana ...................... | 96,462 | 18 | * | * | * |  |  |
| Nebraska........................ | 85.000 | 9 | * | * | $\cdots$ | (b) | * |
| Nevada ........................ | 117,000 | (g) | * | * | ... | (c) | * |
| New Hampshire........... | 96,060 | 23 | * | ... | ... | (e) | *() |
| New Jersey ................. | 157.000 | 156 | * | ... | * | \$61,000 | * |
| New Mexico |  |  | * |  |  |  |  |
| New York | 179,000 | 180 | * | * | * | (b) | * |
| North Carolian ............. | 123,819 | 76 | * | * | * | \$11,500 | * |
| North Dakota............... | 88.926 | 17 | * | * | $\ldots$ | (b) | * |
| Ohio .-...................... | 130.291 | 60 | * | * | * | (f) | * |
| Oklahoma .................... | 110,299 | 34 | * | * | $\ldots$ | (b) | * |
| Oregon ........................ | 93.600 | 29 | * | ... | ... | (c) | * |
| Pennsylvania ............... | 161,173 | 68 | * | * | ... | (b) | * |
| Rhode Island ............... | 105,194 | 49 | * | *- | ... | N.A. | $\ldots$ |
| South Carolina ............ | 106,078 | 22 | * | * | ... | (b) | * |
| South Dakota................ | 105.544 | 23 | * | * | $\cdots$ | (b) | * |
| Tennessee .................... | 85,000 | 36 | * | * | * | (c) | * |
| Texat .......................... | 115,345 | 266 | * | * | * | (b) | - * |
| Utah | 104,100 | 16.5 | * | * | * | \$76,000 | * |
| Vermont...................... | 138,465 | 14 | * | $\star$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { * }}{ }$ | ${ }^{*}$ |
| Virgiais........-............. | 124,855 | 45 | * | * | * | (b) | * |
| Washington................. | 148,035 | 36 | * | * | $\ldots$ | (c) | * |
| West Virginis ............... | 95.000 | 56 | * | * | * | (h) | * |
| Wisconsin.................... | 131,768 (n) | 39.75 | * | * | $\ldots$ | (c) | * |
| Wyoming.................... | 105,000 | 8 | * | * | ... | (b) | * |
| American Samoa .......... | 50,000 | 23 | * | ... | $\ldots$ | \$105.000 (c) | * |
| Guam ........................ | 90,000 | 42 | * | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | S218/day | * |
| No. Mariana Islands .... | 70,000 | 16 | * | ... | ... | (c) (i) | * |
| Puerto Rico................- | 70,000 | 370 | * | ... | . . | ... | * |
| $\underline{\text { U.S. Virgin Islands ....... }}$ | 80,000 | 86 | * | $\cdots$ | ... | (b) | * |

See footnotes at end of table.

## THE GOVERNORS: COMPENSATION, STAFF, TRAVEL AND RESIDENCE - Continued

Source: The Council of State Govemments' survey, January 2006.
Key:

* -Yes
$\ldots$ - No
N.A. - Not available.
(a) Definations of "governor's office staff" vary across the states-from general office support to slaffing for various operations within the executive office.
(b) Reimbursed for travel expenses. Alabama-reimbursed for travel expenses. Arizona-receives up to $\$ 38 /$ day for meals based on location; receives per diem for lodging out-of-state; default $\$ 28$ /day for meals and $\mathbf{5 5 0 / d a y}$ lodging in-state. Forida-reimbursed at same rate as other state officials: in-state, choice between $\$ 50$ per diem or actual expenses: out-of-state. actual expenser. Indiana-statute allows $\$ 12,000$ but due to budget cuts the amount has been reduced to $\$ 9,800$ and reimbursed for actual expenses for travel//lodging. Illinois-no set allowance. lown-reimbursed for expenses, limit set in annual office budget. Kentucky-mileage at sume rate as other state officials. Kansas-reimbursed for actual expenses. Louisiana-reimbursed for actual expenses. Massachusetts-as necessary. Montana-reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses. Nebraska-reimbursed for travel expenses. New York-reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses. North Dakota-reimbursed at state rate. Oklahoma-reimbursed for actual expenses. Pennsylvania-reimbursed for reasonable expenses. Texas-full reimbursement. South Dakota-reimbursed at state rate. Virginia-feimbursed for travel related to the dutiex of office. Wyoming- $\mathbf{5 8 5} /$ day or actual. U.S. Virgin Islands-reimbursed 100 percent.
(c) Amount includes travel allowance for entire staff. Missouri amount not available. Califormia- $\$ 145,000$ in-state; $\$ 36,000$ out-of-state. Nevads-these figures include travel expenses for governor and staff, $\$ 22,254$ in-state; $\$ 16,596$ out-of-state. New Mexico- $\$ 79,200$ (in-state $\$ 45,600$, oul-of-state $\$ 33,600$ ).
(d) In Californis-provided by Govemor's Residence Foundation, a nonprofit organization which provides a residence for the governor of California. No rent is charged; maintenance and operational costs are provided by California Deparument of Gencral Services.
(e) Travel allowance included in office budget.
(f) The current governor does not occupy the official residence.
(g) Nineteen active and 25 authorized staff.
(h) Included in general expense account.
(i) Governor has a "contingency account" that can be used for iravel expenses and expenses in other departments or other projects.
(j) Governor Romney waives his salary.
(k) Travel allowance-Alaska- $\mathbf{\$ 4}$ /day per diem plus actual lodging expenses.
(1) Figure does not include 39 part-time employees.
(m) Governor Schwarzenegger waives his salary.
(n) Governor Doyle remits a portion of his salary to the state,
(o) J.R. and Esther Simplot donated their home to the state of Idaho in December 2004 for use as future Governor's residence. Efforts are under way to raise private monies for renovation, with projected completion in August 2006.

Table 4.11
SELECTED STATE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIALS: ANNUAL SALARIES BY REGION

| State or other jurisdiction | Liewtenant <br> governor |  | crelary <br> sfate |  | Treasurer | $\binom{\text { Adjutant }}{\text { general }}$ |  | gricaltor | Auditor | Banking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastern Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut | \$150,000 | \$110,000 | \$110,000 | \$110,000 | \$110,000 | \$148.816 | \$144,200 | \$110,000 | (mm) | \$121.200 |
| Delaware. | 132,500 | 73,100 | 119,700 | 136,600 | 106,200 | 114,300 |  | 111,700 | 101.600 | 104,300 |
| Maine. | 70.000 | (s) | N.A. | 78,062 | 71.032 | 91,208 | 91,208 | 87.692 | 84,302 | 85,758 |
| Massachusetts | 135,000 (j) | 120,000(ji) | 120,000 | 122,500 | 120,000 | 132.091 | 150,000 | 99,617 | 120,000 | 108.105 |
| New Hampshire | 102,704 | (s) | 89.128 | 99,317 | 89,128 | 89.128 | 99,317 | 84.232 | N.A. | 89.128 |
| New Jersey | 175,000 | (s) | 141.000 | 141,000 | 141,000 | 141,000 |  | 141.000 | 132,000 | 141,000 |
| New York | 179.000 | 151,500 | 120,800 | 151.500 | 109.190 | 120,800 | 120,800 | 120.800 | 151.500 | 127.000 |
| Pennsylvania | 161,173 | 135,383 | 116,045 | 134,096 | 134,096 | 116,045 | 136,255 | 116,045 | 134,096 | 116,045 |
| Rhode Island | 105,194 | 88.584 | 88.584 | 94,121 | 88,584 | 85,067 | 110,321 | 54,864 | 137,418 | 77,867 |
| Vermont | 138.465 | 58,760 | 87.796 | 105,102 | 87.796 | 81.348 | 125,320 | 106.246 | 87.796 | 93,537 |
| Regional average | 134.904 | 73.733 | 99,305 | 117.230 | 105,703 | 111.980 | 97,742 | 103,220 | 115.171 | 106,394 |
| Midwestern Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Illinois | 154,100 | 117,800 | 135,900 | 135,900 | 117,800 | 100.400 | 123,600 | 115,700 | 115,100 | 123,600 |
| Indiana. | 95,000 | 76,000 | 66,000 | 79,400 | 66,000 | 106.723 | 96,915 | 102,004 | 66,000 | 93,210 |
| lowa. | 130.000 | 103,212 | 103,212 | 123,669 | 103,212 | 119,357 | 129,205 | 103,212 | 103,212 | 89,872 |
| Kansas | 98,331 | 111,523 | 76,389 | 76,389 | 76,389 | 91,232 | 91,350 | 91.362 | 96,804 | 80,185 |
| Michigan. | 177,000 | 123,900 | 124,900 | 124,900 | 118,616 | 136,333 | 129.842 | 129,842 | 145,230 | 112,199 |
| Minnesota | 120,303 | 78,197 | 90,227 | 114,288 | (v) | 136,200 | 108.388 | 108.388 | 102,257 | 82,852 |
| Netraska | 85.000 | 60,000 | 65,000 | 75,000 | 60,000 | 83,679 | 111,792 | 90,124 | 60,000 | 87,549 |
| North Dakot | 88,926 | 69,035 | 70,739 | 77,655 | 66,805 | 125,112 |  | 72,669 | 70,739 | 76,968 |
| Ohio. | 130,291 | 130,020 | 105.185 | 105,185 | 105,185 | N.A. | 126,006 | 107,827 | 105,185 | 112,320 |
| South Dakota | 105.544 | 14,399 (cc) | ) 71.713 | 89,618 | 71.713 | 86,269 | 90,227 | 99.874 | 90,000 | (a-26) |
| Wisconsin | 131,768 | 69,579 | 62,549 | 127,868 | 62,549 | 98,217 | 131,767 | 111,094 | 113,516 | 96,163 |
| Regional average | 119,660 | 86,697 | 88,347 | 102,716 | 86,969 | 98,502 | 103,554 | 102,918 | 97.095 | 95,634 |
| Southern Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama... | 96,361 | 48,966 | 71.500 | 153,927 | 71.500 | 80,916 | 103,880 | 71.003 | 71,500 | 139,920 |
| Arkansas | 77.028 | 37,229 | 48,182 | 64,189 | 48,182 | 93,223 | 124,402 | 80,091 | 48,182 | 110,730 |
| Florida | 129,060 | 123,688 | 119,000 | 127,771 | 127,771 | 136,184 | 124,320 | 127,771 | 143,424 | (a-4) |
| Georgia | 131.481 | 86,442 | 116,664 | 130,020 | 121,882 | 136.184 | 121,882 | 114,701 | 129,132 | 124.950 |
| Kentucky | 130,705 | 95,815 | 95,815 | 95,815 | 95,815 | 130,705 | N.A. | 95.815 | 95,815 | 90,000 |
| Louisiana | 95.000 | 85,008 | 85,000 | 85,000 | 85,000 | 153,795 | 185,744 | 85,000 | 120,000 | 103,901 |
| Maryland | 150,000 | 125,000 | 87,500 | 125,000 | 125,000 | 94,367 (b) | 101,633 (b) | 101.633 (b) |  | 53,236 (b) |
| Mississippi | 122,160 | 60,000 | 90.000 | 108,960 | 90,000 | 111,400 | 108,000 | 90.000 | 90,000 | 127.179 |
| Missouri. | 120.087 | 77,184 | 96,455 | 104.332 | 96,455 | 81,672 | 112,356 | 97,044 | 96,455 |  |
| North Carolina | 123,819 | 109,279 | 109,279 | 109,279 | 109,279 | 91,946 | 106,765 | 109.279 | 109,279 | 109.279 |
| Oklahoma | 110,299 | 85,500 | 90,000 | 103,109 | 87,875 | 132,091 | 76,100 | 78,100 | N.A. | 130,704 |
| South Carolina | 106,078 | 46,545 | 92,007 | 92,007 | 92.007 | 92,007 | 146,076 | 92,007 | 101,794 | 89.168 |
| Tennessee. | 85,000 | 49,500 (s) | 139,116 | 129.948 | 139,116 | 98,004 | 139,116 | 98,004 | 139,116 | 98,004 |
| Texas. | 115,345 | 115.345 | 117,546 | 125,000 | (a-9) | 105,000 | N.A. | 92,217 | 180,000 | 135,951 |
| Virginia. | 124.855 | 36.321 | 135,311 | 110,667 | 118,644 | 103,285 | 135,311 | 135,311 | 141,612 | 136,796 |
| West Virginis | 95.000 | (5) | 70,000 | 85,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 60,000 |
| Regional average. | 113,267 | 73.864 | 97,711 | 109,377 | 98,484 | 107,236 | 103.780 | 96.436 | 96,332 | 102,349 |
| Western Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alaska. | 125,000 | 100,000 | (a-1) | 124,752 | 100,476 | 124,752 | 124.752 | 73,404 | 87,800 | 100,476 |
| Arizona. | 95,000 | (a-2) | 70,000 | 90,000 | 70,000 | 103,175 | 140,000 | 97.632 | 120.080 | 93,000 |
| California | 175,000 | 131,250 | 131,250 | 148,750 | 140,000 | 177,366 |  | 131,412 | 131,412 | 123,255 |
| Colorado | 90,000 | 68.500 | 68,500 | 80,000 | 68,500 | 133,575 | 134.823 | 143,82, | 132,079 | 103,428 |
| Hawaii | 94,780 | 90.041 | (a-1) | 107,100 | (a-6) | 181.525 |  | 91.300 | 102,000 | 84.552 |
| Idaho.. | 98.500 | 26.750 | 82,500 | 91.500 | 82,500 | 120,162 | 84,552 | 86,778 |  | 86.278 |
| Montana. | 96.462 | 74,173 | 76,539 | 85,762 | (a-5) | 86,870 | 86,870 | 86,870 | 76,579 | 82,468 |
| Nevada, | 117,000 | 50,000 | 80,000 | 110,000 | 80,000 | 106,080 | 115,770 | 97,410 |  | 88,740 |
| New Mexico | 110.000 | 85.000 | 85,000 | 95,000 | 85.000 | 101,000 | 99,000 | 131.560 | 85,000 | 80.956 |
| Orcgon | 93.600 | (a-2) | 72,000 | 77.200 | 72,000 | 126,240 | 126,000 | 103,884 | 101,844 | N.A. |
| Utah | 104,100 | 81.000 | (a-1) | 98,895 | 81,000 | $88,38,5$ | 99,012 | 88,385 | 83.500 | 88,385 |
| Washingion. | 148.035 | 77,382 | 103,736 | 134,577 | 103,736 | 115,000 | 115,000 | 115.000 | 103,736 | 115,000 |
| Wyoming | 105.000 | (a-2) | 92,000 | 100.776 | 92,000 | 103,000 | 91,764 | 78,000 | 92,000 | 75.684 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Guam. | 90,000 | 85,000 |  | 90,000 | 58,199 | 68,152 | 74,096 | 60,850 | 82,025 | 74,096 |
| No. Mariana Islands....... | 70,000 | 65,000 |  | 80,000 | 40,800 (b) |  | 54,000 | 40,800 (b) | 80,000 | 40,800 (b) |
| U.S. Virgin Islands......-- | 80,000 | 75,000 | 75,000(a-1) | 1) 76,500 | 76,500 | 85.000 | 76.500 | 76,500 | 76.500 | 75,000 |

[^4]
## Key:

N.A. - Not available.
.... - No spectific chief administrative official or agency in charge of function.
(a) Chief administrative official or agency in charge of function:
(a-1) Lieutenant governor.
(a-2) Secretary of state.

## EXECUTIVE BRANCH

## SELECED OFFICIALS: ANNUAL SALARIES - Continued DAGS

| State or orher jurisdiction | witget | Civil rights | nume | Community uffairs | Cumptrolle | Consumer affairs | orrections | Economic ievelopment | Election administration |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastern Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut. | \$153,787 | \$117,420 | \$135,457 | \$150,000 | \$110,000 | \$121,199 | \$153,281 |  | \$135,457 | \$148,525 | \$116,868 |
| Delaware | 138,600 | 69.000 | (a-2) |  | 138.532 | 99.024 | 138,600 | 119,700 | 150,700 | 75.500 |
| Maine | 80.267 | 61,672 | (a-11) | N.A. | 80.267 | 75,171 | 91,208 | 91.208 | 91,208 | 67,330 |
| Massachusetis | 95,000 | 127,307 | (a-11) | 50.000 | 137.500 | 108,000 | 132.667 | 150,000 | 181,640 | (a-2) |
| New Hampshire | 99,317 | 61,913 | 96,461 | 69,322 | 75,806 | 82,504 | 99.317 | 77,255 | 85.753 | (a-2) |
| New Jersey ................. | 125.950 | 114,970 | 141,000 | 141,000 | 125,950 | 122,400 | 141,000 | 155,000 | 141,000 | 112,801 |
| New York | 165,998 | 109,800 | 120,800 | 120.800 | 151,500 | 101,600 | 136,000 | 120.800 | 170,165 | 109,800 |
| Pennsylvania. | 155,404 | 110,768 | 122,490 | 106,093 | 128,627 | 103,003 | 128.938 | 122,490 | 128,938 | 76,167 |
| Rhode Island............- | 106,679 | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | 95,874 | (2-3) | 118,914 | N.A. | 135,516 | N.A. |
| Vermont | (a-15) | 84,406 | 99,028 | 77,022 | (2-15) | 84,406 | 95,721 | 82.513 | 117,104 | (a-2) |
| Regional average.......... | 120,811 | 85,726 | 102,905 | 71.424 | 113,117 | 99,143 | 123,565 | 105,442 | 135,055 | 85,140 |
| Midwestera Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Illinois..................... | 125,839 | 100,400 | 123,600 | (a-7) | 117,800 | ( s -3) | 130,500 | (a-7) | 142,500 | 108,204 |
| Indiana ...................... | 112,203 | 102,004 | 1 | 86,716 | (a-23) | N.A. | 104,052 | 1 | 79,400 | 66,000 |
| lowa. | 127,630 | 84,250 |  | 84,594 |  | 119,107 | 119,107 | 140,000 | 123,900 | 70,242 |
| Kansas. | 86,528 | 39,354 | (a-1) | 64,349 | 79,590 | 70,410 | 93,887 | (o) | 137,280 | (p) |
| Michigan | 135,252 | 129.842 | 128,250 |  | 112,734 |  | 135,252 |  | 168,300 | (c) |
| Minnesota. | (v) | 108,388 | 108,388 | (a-11) | (v) | 82,434 | 108,388 | 108,388 | 108,388 | (a-2) |
| Nebraska | (a-5) | 65,000 | (a-11) | 83.011 | 99,669 | (a-3) | 106,006 | 94,62! | 151,276 | 66,023 |
| North Dakota, | (tu) | 60,000 | 112,008 | 72,669 | (kk) | 74,196 | 70,008 | 77,983 | 80.532 | 28,200 |
| Ohio... | 114.738 | 57,798 | 112.320 | 130,020 | N.A. | 105,185 | 124,852 | 130,020 | 209,456 | (a-2) |
| South Dakota | (a-15) | N.A. | (a-26) | (a-28) | (a-23) | N.A. | 92,740 | (3-23) | 147,444 | N.A. |
| Wisconsin. | 109.933 | 69,971 | 107,102 |  | 101,615 | 75,933 | 118,481 | 87,126 | N.A. | 105,576 |
| Regional average.......... | 108.512 | 74,273 | 80,304 | 78,024 | 81,213 | 67,106 | 109,443 | 88,705 | 122,589 | 77,734 |
| Southern Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama. | 153.678 | $\ldots$ | 137,800 | 80,916 | 126,056 | 69,628 | 100,700 | (a-8) | 164,300 | 52,915 |
| Arkansas. | 102,168 | . $\cdot$. | (a-11) | (2-27) | 124,402 | 80,767 | 118,700 | 111.172 | 122,295 | 53,218 |
| Florida. | 134,680 | 123.578 |  | 119,140 | (a-4) | 92.953 | 124,320 | (a-28) | 225,000 | 104,118 |
| Georgia. | 125,000 | N.A. | 150,000 | 137,700 | N.A. | 106,182 | 124,032 | (a-7) | 117,332 | 88,464 |
| Kentucky ................... | 155,000 | 96,600 | 130,038 | N.A. | 100,253 | (a-3) | 101,130 | 225,000 | 200,744 | 104,108 |
| Louisiana. | 140,000 | 71,053 | (a-11) | N.A. | ( $\mathrm{a}-5$ ) | 80,000 | N.A. | 223,600 | 202,259 | 100,000 |
| Maryland. | 117,952 (b) | 81.414(b) | 117,952(b) | ) ... | 125,000 | 73,795 (b) | 87,642(b) | 117,952(b) | 175,000 | 75,647 (b) |
| Mississippi................ | 108.000 | ... | 90,000 | 59,328 | 108,000 | 75,000 | 108,400 | 5,000() | 292,500 | (4) |
| Missouri | 92,064 | 68,268 | 97,032 | N.A. | 86,364 | (t-3) | 97,044 | 97,032 | 154,128 | 59,088 |
| North Curolina | (a-15) | 67,678 | 106,765 | 84,598 | 135,997 | N.A. | 106,765 | 104,550 | 109,279 | 92.892 |
| Oklahoma. | 98,000 | 61,320 | 107,060 | N.A. | 83,700 | 58,416 | 110,000 | N.A. | 95,898 | 76.057 |
| South Carolina. | 116,034 | 89,739 | (c) | N.A. | 92,007 | 96,545 | 132,934 | (a-7)(c) | 92,007 | 82,349 |
| Tennessee. | 100,500 | 78,540 | 104,304 | ( $\mathbf{a}-11$ ) | 139,116 | 65,784 | 108,000 | 104.304 | 104,304 | N.A. |
| Texas... | 139,526 | 78,324 | N.A. | 117,516 | 92,217 | 99,289 | 165,000 | N.A. | 164,748 | (ff) |
| Virginis. | 123.197 | 76,240 | 135,311 | 104.867 | 110,469 | 95,130 | 130,466 | 198.284 | 135,311 | 76,355 |
| West Virginis............. | 88,548 | 45,000 | 90,000 | 85.908 | 75,000 | 99,406 | 75,000 | (a-8) | 146,100 | 70,000 |
| Regional average......... | 121,387 | 58,610 | 114,360 | 63,918 | 107,006 | 86,203 | 105,633 | 108,011 | 156.325 | 77,632 |
| Western Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alaska ...................... | 125,004 | 104,496 | 124,752 | $\cdots$ | 90,324 |  | 124,752 | $\cdots$ | 124,752 | 78,660 |
| Arizona. | 104,192 | 122,803 | 125,091 | (a-7) | 99,666 | 106.270 | 138,312 | (a-7) | 85,000 | (a-2) |
| California ...-n............ | (a-15) |  | . ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 108,753 | 140,000 | 123,255 | 131,412 | ... | 148.750 | 123,996 |
| Colorsdo. | 124,836 | 103,428 | N.A. | 129,285 | 111.240 | (a-3) | 131,078 | 128,580 | 171,032 | 91,704 |
| Hawaii. | 102.000 | 86,041 | 100,000 |  | 102,000 | 84,552 | 91,800 | 96.900 | 150.000 | 79,866 |
| Idaho... | 88,962 | 65,728 | 94,910 | 57.491 | 82,500 | 91,500 | 115,523 | 57,491 | 82,500 | 82,500 |
| Montana | 91.599 | 61,082 | 86,870 | 67,935 | 74,660 | 50.232 | 88,173 | 96,461 | 89,472 | 49,680 |
| Nevada .......-n........... | (a-5) | 79,560 | 115,770 | ... | 80.000 | 88,740 | 115,770 | 106,080 | 112,200 | (00) |
| New Mexico .............. | 79,135 | 76,964 | 106,835 | 74,158 | ... | 86,543 | 101,000 | 106,835 | 138.002 | 66,136 |
| Orgon. | 94,284 | 74,028 | N.A. | 103,884 | 103,884 | 114,516 | 126,000 | N.A. | 72.000 | 103,884 |
| Utah. | 98,365 | 72,696 | 88,385 | 95,121 | 83,500 | 88, 385 | 102,792 | 128,523 | 168,168 | 65,208 |
| Washington......... | 150,000 | 103,200 | 115,000 | 106.128 | (2-4) | 134.577 | 135,000 | 135,000 | 105,861 | 103,736 |
| Wyorsing................. | 84,864 | 60,972 | 146,580 | 146,580 | 92,000 | 146,580 | 114.576 | 146,580 | 92,000 | 70,000 |
| Regional average <br> Repional average | 106.956 | 77,769 | 34,938 | 78,033 | 89,501 | 91.935 | 116.630 | 86,734 | 118,441 | 84,591 |
| without California .... | 104.918 | 84,250 | 92.016 | 75.473 | 85,293 | 89.325 | 115,398 | 93,962 | 115.916 | 81,776 |
| Guam ........................ | 88,915 |  | 75,208 |  | 68,152 | 46,596 | 67.150 | 82,025 | 98,430 | 61,939 |
| No. Mariana Isiands ..... | 54,000 | 49,000 | 52,000 | 52,000 | 40,800 (b) | 52,000 | 40.800 (b) | 45,000 | 80.000 | 53,000 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands....... | 76.500 | 60.000 | 76.500 | (hh) | 76.500 | 76,500 | 76.500 | 85,000 | 76.500 | 76,500 |

(a-3) Attorney general.
(a-10) Consumer affairs.
(a-4) Treasurer.
(a-11) Economic development.
(a-5) Administration.
(a-12) Education (chief state school officer)
(a-6) Budget.
(a-7) Commerce.
(a-8) Community affairs.
(a-9) Comptroller.
(a-14) Environmental protection.
(a-15) Finance.
(a-16) General services.

## SELECTED OFFICIALS: ANNUAL SALARIES - Continued

| State or other jurisdicion | Emergency management | Enquioyment services | Energy | Environmental protection | Finunce | Fish 8 widlife | General services | Hralth | Higher education | Highways |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastera Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut....- | \$123,600 | \$121,200 | \$110,865 | 5127.250 | \$150,000 | (rs) | \$144,200 | \$148,816 | \$160,000 | \$153,281 |
| Delaware | 76.800 | 89,700 | 52,790 | ( $\mathrm{a}-19)$ | 138,600 | 92,100 | (a-5) | 154,100 | 85,900 | (a-29) |
| Maine | 64,667 | N.A. | 80.267 | 91.208 | (a-5) | 91,208 | 80.267 | 91,208 | N.A. | (a-29) |
| Massachusetts | 82,559 | 100,913 | 99,162 | 117,678 | 150.000(a-5) | 106,358 | 105,000 | 119,125 | 180,000 | 110.000 |
| New Hampshire | 71.482 | 89,128 | 70,005 | 96,461 | (a-5) | 84,232 | 99.317 | 77,255 | 66,779 | (a-29) |
| New Jersey. | 126,000 | 120,000 | 108,018 | 141,000 | 120.554 | 101,704 | (pp) | 141,000 | 121,900 | 120,000 |
| New York | 124,705 | (a-18) | 120.800 | 136.000 (ss) | (a-9) | 136,000(ss) | 136) 13.000 | 136,000 | 170.165 | (a-29) |
| Pennsylvania. | 115,013 | 113,233 | 108,362 | 109,927 | 155,404 | 103,707 | 122,490 | 128,938 | 99,247 | 123,032 |
| Rhode lsland. | 68,311 | 108,460 | 77,867 | 108.460 | ( $\mathrm{a}-6$ ) | 108,460 | N.A. | [10,321 | 134,639 | (a-29) |
| Vermort | 74,859 | 99,028 | 93,537 | 82,513 | 87,110 | 77,022 | 90,459 | 116,729 |  | (a-29) |
| Regional averagr | 92,800 | 96,866 | 92.167 | 113.020 | 125,037 | 104,122 | 99,353 | 122,349 | 101.863 | 118,602 |
| Midwestern Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Illinois, | 100,400 | 123,600 | (a-7) | 115,700 | (a-6) | (a-19) | (a-5) | 130,500 | 182,000 | (a-29) |
| Indiana | (m) | 91,806 | N.A. | 97.929 | (a-6) | 98,260 | (a-5) | (m) | 144,939 | (a-29) |
| Iowa | 78,315 | 126,000 |  | 106,122 | 105,643 | 92.222 | 106,122 | 128,856 |  | 135,595 |
| Kansas. | 57,948 | 92.086 | 47,789 | 86,525 |  | 46.509 | (a-5) | 80,000 | 149,025 | (a-29) |
| Michigan | 100,617 | 105.647 |  | 140,452 | (3-6) | (w) |  | 135,252 | 100,617 | (a-29) |
| Minnesota | 108,388 | 95,192 | 106,759 | 108.388 | 108,388(v) | 99,180 | (a-5) | (1) | 261,494 | (z-1) |
| Nebraska | 73,574 | 81,505 | 67,091 | 101,419 | (z) | (as) | 78,252 | 105,587 | 146,160 | 102,954 |
| North Dikota | 63.600 | 75,408 |  | 74,988 | 87,360 | 84,996 | 97,760 | 137,904 | 183,750 | (a-29) |
| Otio. | 94,640 | 94,484 | N.A. | 111,358 | 105,185 | 92,638 | 98,592 | 149,864 | 220,480 | 117,884 |
| South Dakot | 86.269 | (a-21) | N.A. | (a-19) | 104,170 | 99,874 | (a-5) | 99,874 | 201.151 | ( n ) |
| Wisconsin. | 92.217 | N.A. | 90,782 | 114,262 | 109.933 | 114,262 | 131,767 | 118.481 | 320,000 | 114,262 |
| Regional average. | 77.815 | 88.846 | 39,638 | 105,183 | 96,990 | 94,712 | 92,998 | 108,610 | 173,601 | 108,711 |
| Southera Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama. | 132,500 | 82,677 | 86,918 | 128,199 | 80,916 | 100,888 | 73,135 | 207,059 | 162,136 | 80.916 |
| Arkansas. | 75,000 | 117.219 | 95.110 | 103,526 | (a-9) | 105,531 | 110,224 | 176,077 | 125,679 | (a-29) |
| Florida. | 112,835 | 124,320 | 61,198 | 124,320 | (a-4) | 125.660 | 124.320 | 155,000 | N.A. | 134,726 |
| Georgia. | N.A. | 87.869 | 109,884 | 124,032 | 124,032 | 100,572 | 94,109 | 153,000 | 425,000 | (a-29) |
| Kettucky | 38,200 | N.A. | 74,383 | 98,000 | 130,038 | 121,958 | N.A. | 151,470 | 233,000 | 120.155 |
| Louisians. | N.A. | 96,200 | 100,172 | 124,100 | (a-5) | 111,758 | (a-5) | 208.000 | 283,896 | (a-29) |
| Maryland. | 81,414(b) | 81.414(b) | 69,109 (b) | ) 109,476 (b) | 117.952 (b) | N.A. | (a-5) | 117,952(b) | 109,476(b) | 152,250 |
| Mississippi, | 83,000 | 104,150 | 85,951 | 122,250 | 108,000 | 104,000 | 82, | 188.057 | 325,000 | (a-29) |
| Missouri | 73,872 | N.A. |  | 86,200 | 90,317 | (y) | 82,380 | 103,224 | 135,000 | (a-29) |
| North Carolin | 36,292 | 108,986 | 82,179 | 91,452 | 126,960 | 102.764 | 106,765 | 144,868 | 425,000 | 138.161 |
| Oklahoma. | 70,000 | 88,752 | N.A. | 89.450 | 98,000 | 96,511 | 75,920 | 182,100 | N.A. | (a-29) |
| South Carolin | 86,477 | 120,510 | 96,548 | 144,817 | 146,076 | 118,466 | 108,000 | 130,043 | N.A. | (a-29) |
| Tennessee | 85,380 | 115.932 | 97.332 | 98,004 | 139,1 16 | 98,004 | 98,004 | 144.720 | 165,228 | 98.004 |
| Texas.. | 124,000 | 131,000 | N.A. | 128.004 | (a-9) | 130,000 | N.A. | 175,000 | 150,000 | (a-29) |
| Virginia | 92,269 | 110,469 | 123,534 | 134,280 | 135,311 | 111,865 | 122,801 | 155,636 | 134,310 | 156.636 |
| West Virginia. | 45,000 | 82,620 | 85,000 | (a-13) | (a-5) | 74,304 | 75,000 | 90.000 | 180,000 | (a-29) |
| Regional average. | 77,265 | 90,757 | 72,957 | 111,944 | 118,866 | 98,701 | 89,743 | 155,138 | 178.358 | 132,535 |
| Western Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alaska. | 93,576 | 84,036 | 168,000 | 124,752 | 97,080 | 124,752 |  | 124,752 | 128.257 | 100,476 |
| Arizona, | 86.394 | 105,148 |  | 127,634 | 72,774(b) | 121,000 | 115.938 | 127,125 | 160.000 | 111,000 |
| California | 114,191 | 123,255 | 123,000 | 131,412 | 131,412 | 129,418 | 129.418 | 123,255 | (gg) | (a-29) |
| Colcrado. | 103,428 | 134.823 | 121,200 | 116.700 | N.A. | 126.768 | 134823 | 134,823 | 134,823 | 134,823 |
| Hawail. | 79,866 | 68,628(b) | 75,012 (b) | (b) 68,628 (b) | (vv) | 68,628 (b) | (a-9) | 102,000 | 341.256 | 75,012(b) |
| Idaho. | 57,179 | 94,910 | 71.469 | 84,510 | 86,278 | 107,016 | . 74.3 | 104,978 | 104.686 | (a-29) |
| Montana | 69,500 | 80,169 | 80,498 | 86,870 | 74,660 | 86.870 | 74,362 | (a-27) | 150.075 | (1-29) |
| Nevada, | 79,550 | 115.770 | 61,200 | 112,200 |  | 106,080 | ... | 106,080 | $23.600(\mathrm{nr})$ | ) (a-29) |
| New Mexico | 104,998 | 100,000 | 101.695 | 99,998 | 120,000 | 95,000 | 99,000 | 111,925 | 102.000 | 105,000 |
| Oregon | 103.884 | 114,516 | 94,284 | 103,884 | (a-4) | 103,884 | (a-5) | 114,516 | 219.504 | 94,284 |
| Utah | 56,950 | 112.459 | 74,692 | 102.792 | 95.368 | 97,988 | 95,368 | 112,892 | 179.469 | (2-29) |
| Washington. | 89,352 | 135,000 | 115,000 | 135,000 | 150,000 | 135,000 | (a-5) | 135,000 | 105.361 | (a-29) |
| Wyoming....... | 63,648 | 90,168 | 62.124 | 95,470 | 92,000 | 105,000 | 70,000 | 175.000 | 90.120 | (2-29) |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { Regional average........... } & 84,810 & 104,529 & 88,321 & 106,912 & 85,998 & 108.262 & 81,685 & 119,940 & 145,953 & 111,186 \\ \text { Regional average } & & & & & & & \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regional average without Califormin | 82,361 | 102,969 | 85.431 | 104,870 | 81,858 | 106,499 | 77,708 | 119,663 | 144.971 | 110,181 |
| Guam | 68,152 | 73,020 | 55.303 | 60,850 | 88,915 | 60,850 | 47,918 | 74,096 | 160.000 | 88.915 |
| No. Mariana Islands. | 45,000 | 40,800(b) | 45,000 | 58,000 | 54,000 | 40.800 (b) | ) 54,000 | 80,000 | 80.000 | 40,800(b) |
| $\underline{\text { U.S. Virgin Islands ... }}$ | 71.250 | 76.500 | 69,350 | 76,500 | 76,500 | 76,500 | 76,500 | 76,500 | 76.500 | 65,000 |

```
(a-17) H.ghways
(a-18)Labor.
(a-19) Natural reiources,
(a-20) Parks and recreation.
(a-21) Personnel
(a-22) Post audit.
(a-23) Pre-audit.
(a-24) Public utility regulation.
(a-25) Purchasing.
(a.26) Revenasin
(a-26) Revenue.
(a.27) Social services
(a-28) Tounism.
(a-29) Transportation
    (a-30) Welfare.
```


## EXECUTIVE BRANCH
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| State or ofter jurisdiction | Information s) stems | Insarance | Labor | ensimp | Mental health 4 retardarion | Natural resources | Parks 4 recreation | Prsonne | Min | Post audit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastern Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut....... | \$145,000 | \$121,200 \$ | \$135.456 | \$96,047 | (d) | \$126,401 | \$116,868 | \$144,200 | \$110,365 | (a-31) |
| Delaware | 150,700 | 101,600 | 111.700 | 91,300 | ( 5 | 119,700 | 92,700 | 105,000 | 88.836 | (a.31) |
| Maine | 82,451 | 91.208 | 91,208 | 75.171 | 91.208 | 91.208 | 40,134 | 80.267 | 80.267 | 82,659 |
| Massachuset | 129,708 | N.A. | 108,000 | 102.599 | (u) | 99,617 | 115.595 | 127.307 | (a-5) | (a-31) |
| New Hampshirt | 95,000 | 84,670 | 30,213 |  | 31.191 | 96,461 | 64,036 | 75.806 | 69.322 | (a-9) |
| New Jersey ....-.............- | 122,801 | 141,000 | 141,000 | 122.400 | (99) | 120,000 | 112,410 | 141.000 | 93,636 | 132,000 |
| New York. | 143.500 | 127.000 | 127,000 | (bb) | (ii) | (a-14) | 127,000 | 120.800 | (2-11) | (a-9) |
| Pennsylvania. | 113,252 | 116,045 | 128,938 | 95,062 | 110,866 | 122,490 | 110,768 | 128.979 | 125,204 | (a-31) |
| Rhode Island................... | 85,067 | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | 108,460 | 68,311 | 95,874 | 68,311 | N.A. |
| Vermont. | 78.873 | 93.537 | 99,028 | 69,992 | 116,729 | 99,028 | 77,022 | 83.033 |  | (a-31) |
| Regional average | 114,635 | 87.626 | 102,254 | 85,776 | 117.319 | 111,937 | 92,484 | 110,227 | 90,724 | 104,454 |
| Midwestern Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hilinois | (a-5) | (2-32) | 107.800 | (2.32) | (4-27) | 115,700 | (a-19) | (a-5) |  | (a-31) |
| Indiana | 93,853 | 90,129 | 94,867 | 84,162 | 86,716 | 98,260 | 98,260 | 91,806 | . . | 97,929 |
| Jows | 142,563 | 92,000 | 96,500 |  | 116,563 | 119,107 | 92.277 | 105,643 |  |  |
| Kansas. | 96,42,5 | 76,359 | 92,086 | 63,665 | N.A. | 94.311 | 51,272 | 72,100 | N.A. | 98,254 |
| Michigan | 146,017 | 112,199 | 128.250 | 113,173 | 118,616 | 135.252 | 103.020 | 139,077 |  | 145.230 |
| Minnesota | 119.997 | 89.387 | 108,388 | 95,985 | (1) | 108.388 | 104,588 | 108,388 | N.A. | (a-31) |
| Nebraska | 111,243 | 85,792 | 82,470 | 88,525 | 97,001 | 94,270 | 96.524 | 87,859 | 111.792 | (a-31) |
| North Daikota | N.A. | 70,059 | 60,000 | (a-2) | 72,684 | 71,532 | 72.281 | 72,936 |  |  |
| Ohio.. | 109,226 | 124.800 | 94,484 | 96.850 |  | 124,852 | 94,640 | 103,818 | N.A. | 105,185 |
| South Dakota | 119,604 | N.A. | 97,053 | N.A. | 93,300 | 99,874 | 99.874 | 91,580 | N.A. | (a-31) |
| Wisconsin. | 97,366 | 97,366 | 91,495 | 92,310 | 101,940 | 114,262 | 99,479 | 95,252 |  | (a-31) |
| Regional average.............. | 105,445 | 87,429 | 95.763 | 75,364 | 84,155 | 106,392 | 93,447 | 99,278 | 10.163 | 84,316 |
| Southera Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama .............. | 139,131 | 80,916 | 80,916 | . | 129,178 | 80,916 | 78,720 | 129.178 | ( $\mathrm{a}_{\text {- }}$ ) | 161.444 |
| Arkansas. | 112.371 | 103,989 | 102,396 |  | 89,348 | 88,484 | 97,007 | 87,862 |  | 127.238 |
| Florida. | (b) | (a-4) | 111.718(ss) | 101.000 | (i) | (a-14) | (a-14) | 90,000 | 119,140 | (a-4) |
| Georgia.......................... | 134,232 | 114,070 | 114,714 | 89,776 | 121,992 | 124,032 | 106,054 | 145,000 | 125,000 | (a-31) |
| Kertucky | 111.353 | 100.942 | 107,048 | N.A. | 100,000 | 107,047 | N.A. | 130,038 | 130,038 | 95,815 |
| Louisiana. | 114.275 | 85,000 | 120,203 |  | 102,128 | 116,876 | 100,402 | 97,822 | 104,141 | 123,735 |
| Maryland. | 101,633 (b) | 101,633 (b) | ( 101,633 (b) | 81,414(b) | ) 136,784(b) | 109,476(b) | 64,729 (b) | 94,367 (b) | ) 101,633 (b) | N.A. |
| Mississippi | 140.000 | 90.000 | 97,0.9 | , $\ldots 4.000$ | 142,561 | 122,250 | 104,000 | 102,450 | 77,385 | (a-31) |
| Misscuri | 109344 | 97,104 | 97,044 | 74,000 | 94,128 | 97,044 | 84,876 | 82,390 |  | (a-31) |
| North Carolina | 135.915 | 109,279 | 109.279 | ... | 119,787 | 106,765 | 82,772 | 106,765 | N.A. | (a-31) |
| Oklahoma | 94,500 | 99,875 | 80,750 | *** | 124,987 | 82,000 | 82,000 | 76,100 |  |  |
| South Caroliaa | 129.000 | 100,000 | 111,320 | ( $\mathrm{a}-18$ ) | (dd) | 118,466 | 109,803 | 1,308,665 | 85,214 | (uu) |
| Tennessee | 127,308 | 98,004 | 115,932 | 60,000 | 104,304 | 98,004 | 75,000 | 98,004 | N.A. | (a-9) |
| Texas | 135,000 | 163,800 | 131.000 | 112.500 | 141,000 | 128,004 | 130.000 | N_A. | 112,000 | 180,000 |
| Virginia ..........-........... | 155.636 | 136,796 | 111,371 | 94,166 | 155,636 | 135,311 | 113,359 | 122,171 | (a-6) | 141.612 |
| West Virginia .............. | 109.999 | 60,000 | 60,000 | .... | 90,000 | 70,000 | 74,964 | 82,632 | (a-8) | 80,400 |
| Regional average............. | 119,781 | 104,503 | 97.208 | 45,261 | 118,806 | 106,812 | 89.250 | 172,090 | 71.536 | 106,053 |
| Western Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alaska. | 78,660 | 93,576 | 124,752 | 93,576 | 87,192 | 124,752 | 78,660 | 90,324 |  | 93,576 |
| Arizona. ........................ | 111.027 | 109,650 | 134,999 | , | 105,462 | 114.450 | 123,053 | 109.836 | (a-6) | N.A. |
| California | N.A. | 140,000 | 131.412 | 123,255 | (ww) | 131.412 | 123,255 | 123.255 | ... | N.A. |
| Colorado. | 117,000 | 105.576 | 134,823 | 124,836 | 103,428 | 133,575 | 126,768 | 134.823 | 124,836 | 132,079 |
| Hawaii............................ | 68.628 (b) | 89.148 | 96,900 | 65,764(b) | (k) | 96,900 | 68,628 (b) | 91.800 | 72,828 (b) | 68,628(b) |
| Idaho ......-................... | 84.552 | 83,304 | 94,910 | 58,802 | … | 88,234 | 88,816 | 82,098 | 461 | (a-9) |
| Montana | 100,000 | 76,579 | 36.870 | 78,594 | 89,944 | 86,870 | 64,168 | 76,390 | 96.461 | 112,719 |
| Nevada. | 112,200 | 106,080 | 88,740 |  | 112,200 | 115.770 | ... | 97,410 | ... | . |
| New Mexico | 95,000 | 91.425 | 100,000 | 97,678 | 81.401 | 101,695 | 84.594 | 86,483 | $\ldots$ | 85,000 |
| Oregon .......................... | N.A. | 114,516 | 72,000 | 74,028 | 109,128 | 103,884 | 103,884 | 94,284 | ... | 103,834 |
| Utah ...n-.........e............. | 112.898 | 88,385 | 38,385 | 88,550 | 90.334 | 99,994 | 92,810 | 102,792 | (a-6) | 83,500 |
| Washington................... | 135,000 | 103,736 | 135,000 | 115,000 | 150,000 | 105,861 | 111,000 | 135,000 | ( $\mathrm{a}-15$ ) | 150,000 |
| Wyoming...................... | 81.468 | 81.156 | 74,616 | 61,000 | 136.000 | 37,572 | 83,280 | 76,384 | 79,560 | (a-9) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regional average without California $\qquad$ | 91.369 | 95,261 | 102,566 | 71.452 | 96.367 | 100,796 | 85,472 | 98,177 | 60.520 | 83.657 |
| Guam .......................... | 74.096 | 74,096 | 73,020 | 74,096 | 67,150 | 60,850 | 60,850 | 74,096 | 75,208 | 82.025 |
| No, Mariana Islands ......... | 45000 | 40,800(b) | ) 45,000 | 45,360 | 40,800(b) | 52.000 | 40,800(b) | 60,000 | 45,000 | 80.000 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands ......... | 71,250 | 75,000 | 76,500 | 76,500 | 70,000 | 76,500 | 76.500 | 76,500 | 76.500 | 55,000 |

(a-31) Auditer.
( $\mathrm{a}-32$ ) Bankitg.
(b) Salary ranges and top figure in ranges follow: Arizona: Finance. \$123,057: Welfare, \$123,057. Hawaii: Employment Services, \$101,544; Energy, 5110,912 ; Environmental Protection, 5101.544 ; Fish and Widlife. 5101,544; Highways, 5110.952 ; Information Sysiems, $\$ 101.544$; Licensing. \$96,708; Parks and Recreation, $\$ 101.544$; Planning, $\$ 107.736$; Post-Audit,
\$101 544; Pre-Audit, \$101.544. Solid Wasie Management, \$96.708: Welfare, $\$ 101,544$. Maryland: Mi numumn figare in range: lop of range foilows: Adjutant general, $\$ 126,542$; Administration, $\$ 136,305$; Agriculture, $\$ 136,305$; Banking. \$82.542; Budget, \$158.232; Civil rights, \$109,134; Commerce, $\$ 158,232$; Consumer affairs, $\$ 114,905$; Corrections, $\$ 117,503$; Economic deveiopment. \$158.232; Election administration, \$101,387; Emergency management,
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| State or owher jurisdiction | Pre- <br> andit de |  | Public utility regulation | Srchasing | TAX | Social <br> ervices <br> m | Solid waste magement | State police | Tourism | Welfare |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastern Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut. | (a-9) 5 | 5103,890 | \$149,307 \$ | \$101,372 | \$153,281 | \$153,281 | \$109,872 | \$149.350 | \$122,004 | \$153.281 | 153,281 |
| Delaware | (a-31) | 78,000 | 89,700 | (d-16) | 116,900 | (g) | 155.397 | 141,600 | 59,000 | 129.600 | 107,700 |
| Maine | (2-9) | 77,438 | 101.420 | 69.326 | 85,758 | 91.208 | 58.573 | 80,267 | 69,326 | 91,208 | 73,590 |
| Massachusets | (a-31) | 73,918 | 99,162 | (a-16) | 132,026 | 128.555 | (a-14) | 133,976 | 100.883 | 120,000 | 124,970 |
| New Hampskire | (0-9) | 77,255 | 94,024 | 53,586 | 99,317 | 102,704 | 75,806 | 89,128 | 77,255 | 99,317 | 89,321 |
| New Jersey ............... |  |  | 141,000 | 120,702 | 110.269 | 141.000 | 98,246 | 126,000 | 96,300 | 141,000 | 118,154 |
| New York............... | (a-9) | (a-12) | 127,000 | (a.16) | 127,000 | 136,000 | (a-14) | 127,000 | (2-11) | 136,000 | 136,000 |
| Pennsylvania. | (a-4) | 97,663 | 124,990 | 100,499 | 122,490 | N.A. | 92,871 | 122.490 | 104,431 | 128,938 | 128,938 |
| Rhode Island...........- | (a-9) | 85,067 | 106,679 | 99,471 | 110,278 | 110.321 | 68.311 | 124,114 | N.A. | 117.337 |  |
| Vermont. | (a-15) | 83.075 | 113,360 | 90,459 | 86,715 | 98,009 | 82,513 | 99.028 | 76,939 | 106,246 | 98,009 |
| Regional average...... | 95,625 | 84,647 | 114,664 | 95,642 | 114,403 | 111.307 | 99.527 | 119,295 | 82.694 | 122,293 | 102,996 |
| Midwestern Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Illinois ................... | ( $\mathrm{b}-9)$ | 84,972 | 117,000 | (a-5) | 123,600 | 130,500 | (a-14) | 115,100 | (a-7) | 130,500 | 123,600 |
| Indiana | 90,792 | 64,818 | 94,848 | 97,929 | 97.929 | 110,175 | N.A. | 120,179 | N.A. | 97.929 | 91,806 |
| lowa | 79,331 | 106,413 | 99.521 | 92,227 | 130,000 | 132,483 | 92.227 | 111,238 | 90.397 | 128.232 |  |
| Kansas. | (r) | 77,557 | 81,200 | 80,000 | 91,350 | 94,856 | 75,795 | 82.215 | 60,900 | 91,350 | 72,000 |
| Michigan ................ | ... | 127,296 | 113,612 | 114,000 | 111.726 | 130.050 | 118.616 | 129,842 |  | 140.000 | (a-27) |
| Minnesota. | (a-31) | N.A. | (1) | 95,985 | 108,388 | (t) | 108,388 | 94,774 | 106,759 | ( $\mathrm{a}-1$ ) | (1) |
| Nebraska | 99,609 | 83,275 | 97,897 | 78,252 | 95,106 | 105,583 | 59,320 | 94,760 | 63.500 | 102,954 | 105.583 |
| Norlh Dakota | 87,360 | 68,952 | 72,669 | 58,728 | 76,774 | 110,820 | 61,164 | 70,950 | 73,188 | 100.880 | 110.820 |
| Ohio. | 105,185 | N.A. | N.A. | 90,038 | N.A. | 122,512 | 79,872 | 118,300 |  | 121,108 | 122,512 |
| South Dakota | 71,713 | N.A. | 93,634 | 90,227 (a-5) | 5) 97,053 | 97.053 | N.A. | ( n ) | 104,915 | 99,957 | (a-27) |
| Wisconsin. | (2-31) | 102,356 | 112,000 | 85.682 | 114,262 | 118,481 | 99,479 | 93.139 | 94,196 | 114,262 | 89,972 |
| Regional average., | 83,000 | 65,058 | 88,308 | 91,515 | 95,108 | 114,627 | 73.687 | 101.524 | 65,223 | 109.579 | 95.617 |
| Southern Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama | (a-9) | 91.224 | 86.801 | 117,029 | 80.916 | 147,669 | 91.379 | 80,916 | 80,916 | (a-17) | (a-27) |
| Arkansas. | 59.596 | 86,941 | 96,577 | 87,862 | 94,110 | 128,417 | 51,153 | 94,260 | 97,007 | 130,290 | (a-27) |
| Florida. | (a-4) | 96,762 | 128,605 | 99,425 | 128,537 | 134,680 | 90.000 | 125,980 | 116,446 | 145,040 | 111,888 |
| Georgia. | (a-31) | 124.500 | 109.884 | 125,000 | 129.132 | N.A. | 96.591 | 124,032 | 110,000 | 150,132 | 127,000 |
| Kentucky | (a-15) | 99,826 | 98,826 | 85,000 | 111.353 | 105,000 | 102,868 | 100,494 | 114,694 | 130,038 | 105,000 |
| Lowisiana | 97,552 | 88,400 | 93,000 | 90.022 | 112.528 | 113,256 | 100,838 | 115,481 | 100,693 | 142,165 | 91,482 |
| Maryland | 87,642 (b) | ) 81,414 (b) | ) 116,880 | 75,647 (b) | 87,542 (b) | 109.476(b) | 81.414 (b) | 109,476(b) | ) 87,642 (b) | 117.952(b) | 109,476 (b) |
| Mississippi. | (a-31) | 80,500 | 107.350 | 70,818 | 118,935 | 126.500 | 64,253 | 110,600 | 87,062 | 137,635 | 126,500 |
| Missouri. | 86,364 | 76,200 | 80,000 | 82,380 | 103,224 | 103,224 | N.A. | 92,748 | 74,200 | (a-17) | 88,188 |
| North Carolina | (a-31) | 90,211 | 121,701 | 94,612 | 106,765 | 103,952 | 89,589 | 102,137 | 90,211 | 106,765 | N.A. |
| Oklahoms. | (a-9) | 74,100 | (cc) | 71,700 | 98,400 | 155.000 | 88,374 | 88,400 | 82,000 | 112.100 | 155,000 |
| South Carolina ........ | (a-9) | 82,182 | 140,000 | 92,544 | 115,113 | 138,036 | 144,817 | 98,913 | 109.803 | 142,381 | 138,036 |
| Tennessee. | 99,258 | 100,668 | 98,004 | 65,508 | 98,004 | 98,004 | 81,888 | 98,004 | 98,004 | 98,004 | 98.004 |
| Texas.... | (a-9) | 88,500 | 105,000 | 81.808 | (a-9) | N.A. | N.A. | 15,000 | N.A. | 130.000 | 200,000 |
| Virginia ................... | (a-9) | 117,686 | 136.796 (11) | (1) (a-16) | 125,031 | 139,019 | (a-14) | 126,841 | 150,000 | 135.311 | (a-27) |
| West Virginia. | (a-31) | 66,996 | 75,000 | 94,836 | 75,000 | 85,908 | 74,784 | 75,000 | 70.000 | N.A. | 90,000 |
| Regional average....... | 99,799 | 90,382 | 101,922 | 92,090 | 105,951 | 105,244 | 80.741 | 96,587 | 92,069 | 120,052 | 116,414 |
| Western Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alarka .. | -.. | 93,576 | 84,036 | 93,852 | 124,752 | 124,752 | $\ldots$ | 93,576 | 96,984 | 124.752 | 91,200 |
| Arizona | (a-9) | 114,946 | 100,124 | 86,445 | 134,224 | 137,295 | 90,000 | 104,253 | 110.853 | 130,000 | 72,774(b) |
| Califomia | 133,333 | 108,744 | 117,818 |  | 123,255 | 123,255 | 117,818 | 131,412 | N.A. | 123,255 | 131,412 |
| Colorado. | (a-9) | 100.730 | 107,424 | 97,248 | 134,823 | 134.823 | 103.428 | 125,868 | 70,041 | 134,823 | N.A. |
| Hawail. | 68,628(b) | ) 115,000 | 79,866 | 79,866 | 102,000 | 96,900 | 65.364 (b) |  | 240,000 | 102,000 | 68,628(b) |
| Idaho. | (a-9) | 82,992 | 82,740 | 70,345 | 71,708 | 104,978 | ... | 87,214 | 73.819 | 130,000 | 78,000 |
| Montana | 112,719 | 75,152 | 77,418 | 53,948 | 86,870 | 86,870 | 86.870 | 79,384 | 67,699 | 86,871 | (a-29) |
| Nevada |  | (x) | 112,200 | 88,740 | 115.770 | 115,770 | ( $\mathrm{a}-14$ ) | 115,770 | 106,080 | 115,770 | 106,080 |
| New Mexic | 87,210 | 67,704 | N.A. | 83,943 | 104,713 | N.A. |  | 104,998 | 97.608 | 105,000 | 122,938 |
| Oregon | (a-6) | 94,284 | 109,080 | 81,504 | 114,516 | N.A. | 103.884 | 120,040 | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. |
| Utah | (a-15) | 95.368 | 76,773 | 95,368 | 95,004 | 112,898 | 97.988 | 95,368 | 91.915 | 112.459 | 112.898 |
| Washington, | (a-4) | 89,004 | 115,000 | 115,000 | 135,000 | 150,000 | 135,000 | 135,000 | 135,000 | 153,472 | (a-27) |
| Wyoming.-............ | (a-9) | 75,636 | 91,000 | 66,000 | 89.000 | 90,000 | 82.803 | 89,736 | 92,292 | 103,000 | (a-27) |
| Regional average......- | 83,130 | 93,425 | 88,729 | 77,905 | 110,126 | 98,272 | 76,566 | 98,663 | 90,945 | 109.339 | 85,446 |
| Regional average without California - | 78,946 | 92,247 | 86,305 | 84,397 | 109,032 | 96,191 | 73,128 | 95,914 | 98,524 | 108,179 | 81,616 |
| Guam | 74,096 | 55.303 | 12,000 | 74,096 | 74,096 | 74,096 | 88,915 | 74,096 | 74,000 | 74,096 | 74,096 |
| No. Mariana Islands ..- | 54,000 | 45,000 | 80,000 | 40.800 (b) | 45,000 | 40,800 (b) | 54,000 | 54,000 | 70,000 | 40,800(b) | 52,000 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands.... | 76,500 | 53.350 | 54,500 | 76,500 | 76.500 | 76.500 | 76.500 | 76.500 | 76,500 | 65.000 | 76.500 |

protection, \$146,845; Finance, \$158,232; General Services, \$136, 305; Health,

- \$158,232; Higher education, $\$ 146.845$; Information systems, $\$ 136,305$; Insurance, $\$ 136.305$; Labor, $\$ 136.305$; Licensing. $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 9 , 1 3 4 ; \text { Mental Health, } \$ 2 1 8 \text { , }}$ 415; Nalural resources, $\$ 146,845$; Parks and recreation, $\$ 100,636$; Persannel, \$126,542: Planning, \$136.305; Pre-audit, \$117.503; Public library development, $\$ 109,134 ;$ Purchasing. $\$ 101,387$; Revenue. $\$ 117,503$; Social services,
\$146,845; Solid waste management, \$109,134; Police, \$146.845; Tourism,
 Islands: $\$ 49.266$ top of range applies to the following positions: Treasurer, Banking. Comptroller, Correctinns, Employment Services. Fish and Wildlife, Highways, Insurance, Mental Healih and Retardation, Parks and Recreation, Purchasing, Socia//Human Services, Transpertation.
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（c）The present Secretary of Commeree forgoes regular salary and receives $\$ 1$ in compensation．
（d）Responsibilities shared between Commissioner Thomas Kirk，Mental Health：$\$ 153,281$ and Commissioner Peter O＇Meara，Retardation：$\$ 153.281$. （e）Responsibilities shared between Secretary of State，$\$ 124,900$ and Bureau Director，$\$ 107,291$.
（f）Responsibilities stared berween Director，Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health，Department of Health and Secial Services，\＄132，800 and Director， Division of Developmental Disabilities Service，same department，$\$ 107,600$ ．
（g）Function split between two cabinet positions：Secretary，Dept．of Health and Social Services：$\$ 138,600$（if incumbent holds a medical license，amount is inereased by $\$ 12,000$ ）and Secretary，Dept．of Services for Children，Youth and their Families，$\$ 124,700$ ；if a Board－certified physicias，a supplement of 53,000 is added．
（h）Position is vacant at press time．Salary range is $\$ 66,800-\$ 275,059$ ．
（i）Responsibilities shared between，Director of Mental Health，Department of Children and Family Services，$\$ 102.564$ ；and Director，Substance Abuse， same department，$\$ 102,500$ ．
（j）Maximum salary available is $\$ 183.240$ ；incumbent has requested a reduced salary．
（k）Responsibilities shared between Deputy Director of Mental Health， \＄93，840 and Deputy Director of Retardation，$\$ 93,840$ ．
（1）Respoasibilities thared between five commissioners with salaries of $\$ 88.448$ cach．
（m）Contractual．
$(\mathrm{n})$ Under Emergency Management， $\mathbf{\$ 3 6 , 2 6 9 .}$
（o）Responsibilities shared between Lieutenant Governor，S111．523；Direc－ tor，Business Development Division，same department，$\$ 86,275$ ；and President， Kansas Inc．，salary unavailable．
（p）Respossibilities shared between Secretary of State，576，389 and Deputy Socretary of State， $\mathbf{\$ 6 2 , 3 0 1}$ ．
（q）Responsibilities shared between Assistant Secretary of State，$\$ 80,000$ and Senior Counsel for Elections，$\$ 60,000$ ．
（r）Responsibilities shared between Central Account Service Manager，Divi－ sion of Accounts \＆Reperts，Department of Adminisiration， 570,428 ；and Team Leader．Audit Services，same division and department， $\mathbf{5 5 7 . 9 4 8}$ ．
（s）In Maine，New Hampshire，New Jerrey，Tennessee and West Virginia， the presidents（or speakers）of the Senate are sext in line of succession to the governorship．In Teanessee，the speaker of the Senate bears the statutory title of lieutenant governor．
（t）Commissioner of Health and Human Services also oversees Meatal Health and Retardation and Welfare（Human Services），$\$ 108,388$.
（u）Responsibilities shared between Commissioner，Department of Mental Retardation，\＄182．831；and Commissioner，Department of Mertal Health． \＄126，871．
（v）Slate Treasurer Position was abolished in Janvary 2003．Functions now served by The Department of Finance，Commissioner， $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 8 , 3 8 8}$.
（w）Responsibilities shared betweea Director，Dept．of Natural Resources，
$\$ 135,200$ ，and Chief，Fish，$\$ 107,291$ ，and Chief，Wildlife，$\$ 92,257$ ．
（x）Responsibilities shared between Dirtetor，Department of Caltural Affairs， $\$ 106,080$ and Division Administrator，Library and Archives， 598,740 ，
（y）Responsibilities shared between Administrator，Depariment of Censer－
vation， 582,800 ：Administration，Division of Provection，same department， 592，832．
（z）Respensibilities shared between，State Auditor $\mathbf{\$} \mathbf{5 0 , 0 0 0}$ ；Director of Administration－ 5111,792 and State Tax Administrator－595，106．
（aa）Responsibilities shared between Game \＆Parks Director－\＄96．524； Game \＆Parks Assistant Directer－Fish \＆Wildlife $-574,461$ ；Wildlife Divi－ sion Administrator $-\$ 68,313$ ．
（bb）Responsibilities shared between Commissioner，State Education De－ partment，$\$ 170,165$ ；Secretary of State，Department of State，$\$ 120,300$ ．
（ce）Responsibilities shared between three Commissioners， 587,875 ， 587,875 ，and 589,875 ，and Direstor，577，805．
（dd）Responsibilities shared between Director for Mental Retardation， $\$ 150,367$ and Director of Mental Health，\＄131，235．
（ee）Annual salary for duties as presiling officer of the Senate．
（If）Responsibilities shared between Secretary of State，$\$ 117,546$ ；and Division Director，\＄104，056．
（gg）Responsibilities shared between Chancellor of California Community Colleges，$\$ 185,484$ and California Post Secondary Education Commission $\$ 130,000$ ．
（hh）Responsibilities for SL．Thomas， $\mathbf{5 7 4 , 4 0 0 ; \text { St．Croix，} 5 7 6 . 5 0 0 ; \text { St．John，}}$ $\$ 74,400$ ．
（ii）Responsibilities shared between Commissioner of Mental Health． $\$ 136,000$ and Commissioner of Mental Retardation，$\$ 136,000$ ．
（ii）Governor Romney and Lieutenunt Governor Healcy waive their salaries．
（kk）Responsibilities shared between Director of Fiscal Maragement，$\$ 87,360$ and Director of Management and Budget，597，760．
（II）Banking has this responsibility．
（ mm ）Responsibilities shared between Kevin Johnston，$\$ 159,053$ and Robert Jaekle．$\$ 159.083$.
（ na ）James Rogers，the Interim Chancellor，only accepts the minimum amount of pay permitted through FLSA，$\$ 23,660$ ．
（oo）Responsibilities shared between Secretary of State，580，000；Deputy Secretary of State for Elections，$\$ 97,410$ ；and Chief Deputy Secretary of Stale，$\$ 106,080$ ．
（pp）Responsibilities shared between Director，Division of Purchaxing，Dept． of the Treasary，$\$ 120,702$ and Dirtetor，Division of Property and Masagement． Dept．of the Treasury，$\$ 114,444$ ．
（qq）Responsibilities shared between Director，Division of Mental Health Services，Dept．of Human Services，5113，566 and Director，Division of Devel－ opmental Disabilities，Dept．of Haman Services，$\$ 117$ ，565．
（ m ）Responsibilities shared between Direcior of Wildlife，$\$ 116,868$ ，Director of Inland Fisheries，\＄110，593 and Director of Marine Fisheries，\＄121，212．
（ss）This is the statutory salary．The current incumbent＇s salary is less than this amount．
（it）Responsibilities shared between Assistant Executive Budgel Analyst， \＄67，908 and Director of Management and Budgel，$\$ 97,760$ ．
（uu）Responsibilities shared between Director George Schroeder，$\$ 93,429$ and Suate Auditor Thomas Wagner，$\$ 107,469$ ．
（vv）Responsibilities shared between Director of Budget and Finance． $\$ 102,000$ and Comptrollet，$\$ 102,000$ ．
（ww）Responsibilities shared betwees Director of Mental Health，$\$ 123,255$ and Director of Developmental Services，\＄123．255．

State of Hawaii
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT SALARY SCHEDULE
Effective Date: 10/01/2006
Bargaining Unit 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35 Excluded Managerial

|  |  | STEP | STEP |  |  | STEP | STEP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | MN | MX |  |  | MN | MX |
| EM01 | ANN | 50,472 | 74,676 | ES01 | ANN | 73,188 | 108,240 |
|  | MON | 4,206 | 6,223 |  | MON | 6,099 | 9,020 |
|  | 8HR | 194.16 | 287.20 |  | 8HR | 281.52 | 416.32 |
|  | HRLY | 24.27 | 35.90 |  | HRLY | 35.19 | 52.04 |
| EM02 | ANN | 52,992 | 78,444 | ES02 | ANN | 75,372 | 111,504 |
|  | MON | 4,416 | 6,537 |  | MON | 6,281 | 9,292 |
|  | 8HR | 203.84 | 301.68 |  | 8HR | 289.92 | 428.88 |
|  | HRLY | 25.48 | 37.71 |  | HRLY | 36.24 | 53.61 |
| EM03 | ANN | 55,668 | 82,344 | ES03 | ANN | 77,640 | 114,840 |
|  | MON | 4,639 | 6,862 |  | MON | 6,470 | 9,570 |
|  | 8HR | 214.08 | 316.72 |  | 8HR | 298.64 | 441.68 |
|  | HRLY | 26.76 | 39.59 |  | HRLY | 37.33 | 55.21 |
| EM04 | ANN | 58,440 | 86,472 |  |  |  |  |
|  | MON | 4,870 | 7,206 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8HR | 224.80 | 332.56 |  |  |  |  |
|  | HRLY | 28.10 | 41.57 |  |  |  |  |
| EM05 | ANN | 61,380 | 90,780 |  |  |  |  |
|  | MON | 5,115 | 7,565 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8HR | 236.08 | 349.12 |  |  |  |  |
|  | HRLY | 29.51 | 43.64 |  |  |  |  |
| EM06 | ANN | 64,440 | 95,340 |  |  |  |  |
|  | MON | 5,370 | 7,945 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8HR | 247.84 | 366.72 |  |  |  |  |
|  | HRLY | 30.98 | 45.84 |  |  |  |  |
| EM07 | ANN | 67,656 | 100,092 |  |  |  |  |
|  | MON | 5,638 | 8,341 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8HR | 260.24 | 384.96 |  |  |  |  |
|  | HRLY | 32.53 | 48.12 |  |  |  |  |
| EM08 | ANN | 71,028 | 105,096 |  |  |  |  |
|  | MON | 5,919 | 8,758 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8HR | 273.20 | 404.24 |  |  |  |  |
|  | HRLY | 34.15 | 50.53 |  |  |  |  |

## Judicial Salary Commission Recommendations

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FYO6 } \\ & (7 / 1 / 105) \end{aligned}$ | FY07 (7/1106) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FYO8 } \\ & (77 / 1 / 07) \end{aligned}$ | FYO9 17/1/08) | FY10 $(7 / 1 / 09)$ | FY11 (7/1/10) | FY12 (7/1/11) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chief Justice: | \$140,000 | \$144,900 | -\$149,972 | \$155,221 | \$160,654 | \$166,277 | \$172,097 |
| Associate Justice: | \$135,000 | \$139,725 | \$144,615 | \$149,677 | \$154,916 | \$160,338 | \$165,950 |
| ICA Chief Judge: | \$130,000 | \$134,550 | \$139,259 | \$144,133 | \$149,178 | \$154,399 | \$159,803 |
| Associate Judge: | \$125,000 | \$129,375 | \$133,903 | \$138,590 | \$143,441 | \$148,461 | \$153,657 |
| Circuit Court Judge: | \$121,600 | \$125,856 | \$130,261 | \$134,820 | \$139,539 | \$144,423 | \$149,478 |
| Dist./Fam. Court Judge: | \$114,600 | \$118,611 | \$122,762 | \$127,059 | \$131,506 | \$136,109 | \$140,873 |
| Administrative Director of the Courts: | \$105,000 | \$108,675 | \$112,479 | \$116,416 | \$120,491 | \$124,708 | \$129,073 |
| Deputy Administrative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director of the Courts: | \$100,000 | \$103,500 | \$107,123 | \$110,872 | \$114,753 | \$118,769 | \$122,926 |


|  | Actual Salaries |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | General | Intermediate | Highest | Administrator |
| Hawaii | $\$ 125,856$ | $\$ 129,375$ | $\$ 139,725$ | $\$ 108,675$ |
| National Average | $\$ 122,559$ | $\$ 132,102$ | $\$ 137,074$ | $\$ 123,325$ |
| Hawaii Ranking | $19 / 51$ | $20 / 39$ | $21 / 51$ | $37 / 51$ |

Source: "Survey of Judicial Salaries" published by the National Center for State Courts, Vol. 31, No. 1.
except for the "ACCRA Adjusted Salaries" which is calculated using the actual salary divided by the ACCRA factor for the Intermediate, Highest, and Administrator (but not General), times 100.

Notes:

1. Intermediate: Not all states have an intermediate appellate court. Salaries are for an Associate Judge.
2. Highest: Salaries are for an Associate Justice of the court of last resort.
3. ACCRA Adjusted Salaries - from the NCSC survey:
"The ACCRA organization is the most widely accepted U.S. source of cost-of-living indices, with nearly 400 reporting jurisdictions across America. The ACCRA cost-of-living factors in this report were developed by examining the average costs of goods and services (for the latest four running quarters). The factors reflect an average of the reporting jurisdictions in a particular state (i.e., the ACCRA factor for Virginia is the average of the ACCRA factors for each of the nine reporting jurisdictions in Virginia). An ACCRA factor of " 1.00 " would indicate that a state had a cost-of-living equal to the national average. States with factors above " 1.00 " have a higher than average cost-of-living, while those with a factor less than " 1.00 " have a lower than average cost-of-living. More detailed information can be found at www.accra.org."

Source: www.costofliving.org/about.asp
ACCRA, founded in 1961 as the American Chamber of Commerce Researchers Association, is a non-profit professional organization comprising research staff of chambers of commerce, economic development organizations, and related entities throughout the United United States and Canada. Originally titled Inter-City Cost of Living Indicators Project, the ACCRA Cost of Living Index has been published quarterly since 1968.

Note: ACCRA changed its name to the Council for Community and Economic Research, but still uses the letters ACCRA.

2006 Hawaii Actual Salaries vs. National Actual Average


Hawaii Adjusted Salaries vs. National Adjusted Average


SALARY COMPARISON AMONG STATES, 2006: GENERAL TRIAL COURTS (eff. 7/1/2006)

| Rank | State | Actual Salary |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | Delaware | $\$ 168,100$ |
| 2 | District of Columbia | 165,200 |
| 3 | Illinois | 157,824 |
| 4 | Alaska | 152,760 |
| 5 | California | 150,696 |
| 6 | New Jersey | 141,000 |
| 7 | Michigan | 139,919 |
| 8 | Florida | 139,497 |
| 9 | Connecticut | 139,128 |
| 10 | Virginia | 138,028 |
| 11 | New York | 136,700 |
| 12 | Pennsylvania | 135,293 |
| 13 | Rhode Island | 133,216 |
| 14 | Nevada | 130,000 |
| 15 | Maryland | 128,352 |
| 16 | Washington | 128,143 |
| 17 | Arkansas | 126,111 |
| 18 | lowa | 126,020 |
| 19 | Hawaii | $\mathbf{1 2 5 , 8 5 6}$ |
| 20 | South Carolina | 125,265 |
| 21 | Texas | 125,000 |
| 22 | Tennessee | 122,580 |
|  | National Average | $\mathbf{1 2 2 , 5 5 9}$ |
| 23 | Kentucky | 121,744 |
| 24 | Minnesota | 121,712 |
| 25 | Arizona | 120,750 |
| 26 | New Hampshire | 120,000 |
| 27 | Oklahoma | 118,450 |
| 28 | Nebraska | 117,333 |
| 29 | Ohio | 116,100 |
| 30 | West Virginia | 116,000 |
| 31 | North Carolina | 115,289 |
| 32 | Indiana | 115,282 |
| 33 | Kansas | 114,813 |
| 34 | Utah | 98,070 |
| 35 | Georgia | 94,093 |
| 36 | Vermont | 113,400 |
| 37 | Colorado | 113,369 |
| 38 | Massachusetts | 113,232 |
| 39 | Wisconsin | 112,777 |
| 40 | Alabama | 112,457 |
| 41 | Louisiana | 111,973 |
| 43 |  | 110,964 |
| 42 |  | Mis |

Source: "Survey of Judicial Salaries" published by the National Center for State Courts, Vol. 31, No. 1.

ADJUSTED SALARY COMPARISON AMONG STATES, 2006: COURT ADMINISTRATORS (eff. 7/1/2006)

| Rank | State | Actual Salary | Adj. Salary | ACCRA Factor ${ }^{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Illinois | \$171,991 | \$177,171 | 97.08 |
| 2 | Arizona ${ }^{2}$ | 172,125 | 164,772 | 104.46 |
| 3 | lowa ${ }^{1}$ | 145,430 | 153,872 | 94.51 |
| 4 | Pennsylvania | 152,039 | 150,242 | 101.20 |
| 5 | Michigan | 142,381 | 142,734 | 99.75 |
| 6 | Georgia | 131,580 | 140,579 | 93.60 |
| 7 | Oklahoma | 124,200 | 139,057 | 89.32 |
| 8 | Tennessee | 123,600 | 136,049 | 90.85 |
| 9 | Virginia | 140,556 | 135,951 | 103.39 |
| 10 | California ${ }^{3}$ | 184,512 | 134,617 | 137.06 |
| 11 | Ohio | 129,130 | 134,172 | 96.24 |
| 12 | Kentucky | 121,744 | 131,888 | 92.31 |
| 13 | Alaska | 163,200 | 128,901 | 126.61 |
| 14 | Florida | 130,950 | 127,677 | 102.56 |
| 15 | Missouri | 115,000 | 126,905 | 90.62 |
| 16 | Connecticut | 159,984 | 125,898 | 127.07 |
| 17 | South Carolina | 118,672 | 125,873 | 94.28 |
| 18 | Kansas | 114,813 | 125,817 | 91.25 |
| 19 | Wisconsin | 119,205 | 124,282 | 95.91 |
| 20 | Delaware | 125,800 | 124,099 | 101.37 |
| 21 | North Carolina | 118,602 | 123,285 | 96.20 |
| 22 | Louisiana | 117,195 | 122,599 | 95.59 |
| 23 | Minnesota | 121,712 | 122,014 | 99.75 |
|  | National Average |  | 120,117 |  |
| 24 | Utah | 114,400 | 119,902 | 95.41 |
| 25 | Colorado | 120,807 | 119,510 | 101.09 |
| 26 | New York | 147,600 | 118,823 | 124.22 |
| 27 | Nebraska | 106,000 | 117,627 | 90.12 |
| 28 | Washington | 121,736 | 117,340 | 103.75 |
| 29 | Texas | 104,500 | 116,763 | 89.50 |
| 30 | District of Columbia | 165,200 | 116,263 | 142.09 |
| 31 | West Virginia | 111,000 | 116,165 | 95.55 |
| 32 | Maryland | 130,200 | 115,990 | 112.25 |
| 33 | Alabama | 105,105 | 114,079 | 92.13 |
| 34 | Arkansas | 99,596 | 113,218 | 87.97 |
| 35 | New Jersey | 150,000 | 112,885 | 132.88 |
| 36 | Idaho | 105,100 | 112,744 | 93.22 |
| 37 | Oregon ${ }^{6}$ | 119,448 | 111,790 | 106.85 |
| 38 | Indiana | 104,559 | 109,555 | 95.44 |
| 39 | South Dakota | 98,992 | 106,691 | 92.78 |
| 40 | New Mexico | 105,120 | 104,172 | 100.91 |
| 41 | Nevada | 116,688 | 103,166 | 113.11 |
| 42 | Wyoming | 104,114 | 101,557 | 102.52 |
| 43 | Massachusetts | 122,050 | 98,444 | 123.98 |
| 44 | North Dakota | 89,232 | 96,154 | 92.80 |
| 45 | Vermont | 113,369 | 95,879 | 118.24 |
| 46 | Rhode Island | 118,846 | 95,246 | 124.78 |
| 47 | Montana ${ }^{4}$ | 90,542 | 89,514 | 101.15 |
| 48 | Mississippi | 69,100 | 76,104 | 90.80 |
| 49 | Hawaii | 108,675 | 67,676 | 160.58 |
| Maine <br> New Hampshire |  | 105,300 | N/A | N/A |
|  |  | 97,900 | N/A | N/A |

Source: "Survey of Judicial Salaries" published by the National Center for State Courts, Vol. 31, No. 1.
except for the "Adj. Salary" column which is calculated using the "Actual Salary" column divided by the ACCRA factor, times 100.
${ }^{1}$ lowa has a range from $\$ 95,055$ to $\$ 145,430$.
${ }^{2}$ Arizona has a range from $\$ 105,808$ to $\$ 172,125$.
${ }^{3}$ California has a range from $\$ 167,760$ to $\$ 184,512$.
${ }^{4}$ Longevity supplement may apply.
${ }^{5}$ Also see ACCRA notes from the Adjusted General Trial Court listing.
${ }^{6}$ Oregon has a range from $\$ 89,160$ to $\$ 119,448$.
The following states tie the administrator salary to another:
District of Columbia: tied to salary of Superior Court.
Colorado: tied to salary of Court of Appeals.
Minnesota: cannot exceed salary of District Court Judge.
Missouri: tied to salary of Court of Appeals.
Washington: Approximately $95 \%$ of Superior Court Judge salary.
Wisconsin: tied to salary of Court of Appeals.

SALARY COMPARISON AMONG STATES, 2006: INTERMEDIATE APPELLATE COURT (eff. 7/1/2006)

| Rank | State ${ }^{1}$ | Actual Salary ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | California | \$172,452 |
| 2 | Illinois | 171,991 |
| 3 | Georgia | 156,814 |
| 4 | Alaska | 156,084 |
| 5 | Michigan | 151,441 |
| 6 | Alabama | 151,027 |
| 7 | Pennsylvania | 150,903 |
| 8 | New Jersey | 150,000 |
| 9 | Florida | 148,524 |
| 10 | Connecticut | 144,680 |
| 11 | New York | 144,000 |
| 12 | Virginia | 141,248 |
| 13 | Texas | 137,500 |
| 14 | Indiana | 134,968 |
| 15 | Washington | 134,598 |
| 16 | Maryland | 134,552 |
| 17 | lowa | 134,060 |
|  | National Average | 132,102 |
| 18 | Arkansas | 130,253 |
| 19 | Minnesota | 129,656 |
| 20 | Hawaii | 129,375 |
| 21 | South Carolina | 128,561 |
| 22 | Tennessee | 128,100 |
| 23 | Kentucky | 127,072 |
| 24 | Ohio | 126,250 |
| 25 | Oklahoma | 124,200 |
| 26 | Arizona | 123,900 |
| 27 | North Carolina | 121,915 |
| 28 | Kansas | 121,310 |
| 29 | Nebraska | 120,504 |
| 30 | Utah | 120,100 |
| 31 | Wisconsin | 119,205 |
| 32 | Colorado | 118,101 |
| 33 | Massachusetts | 117,467 |
| 34 | Louisiana | 117,195 |
| 35 | Missouri | 115,000 |
| 36 | Idaho | 109,500 |
| 37 | Mississippi | 105,050 |
| 38 | Oregon | 102,800 |
| 39 | New Mexico | 101,612 |
|  | Delaware | N/A |
|  | District of Columbia | N/A |
|  | Maine | N/A |
|  | Montana | N/A |
|  | Nevada | N/A |
|  | New Hampshire | N/A |
|  | North Dakota | N/A |
|  | Rhode Island | N/A |
|  | South Dakota | N/A |
|  | Vermont | N/A |
|  | West Virginia | N/A |
|  | Wyoming | N/A |

[^5]${ }^{1}$ Not all states have an intermediate appellate court.
${ }^{2}$ This table reflects the salary for an Associate Judge in an intermediate appellate court.

## ADJUSTED SALARY COMPARISON AMONG STATES, 2006: INTERMEDIATE APPELLATE COURT (eff. 7/1/2006

| Rank | State ${ }^{1}$ | Actual Salary ${ }^{2}$ | Adj. Salary | ACCRA Factor ${ }^{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Illinois | \$166,658 | \$171,677 | 97.08 |
| 2 | Georgia | 156,814 | 167,539 | 93.60 |
| 3 | Alabama | 151,027 | 163,922 | 92.13 |
| 4 | Texas | 137,500 | 153,636 | 89.50 |
| 5 | Michigan | 151,441 | 151,816 | 99.75 |
| 6 | Pennsylvania | 150,903 | 149,120 | 101.20 |
| 7 | Arkansas | 127,431 | 144,860 | 87.97 |
| 8 | Florida | 148,524 | 144,811 | 102.56 |
| 9 | Kentucky | 126,672 | 137,227 | 92.31 |
| 10 | Virginia | 141,248 | 136,620 | 103.39 |
| 11 | Tennessee | 123,888 | 136,366 | 90.85 |
| 12 | Indiana | 129,800 | 136,002 | 95.44 |
| 13 | South Carolina | 124,817 | 132,390 | 94.28 |
| 14 | Ohio | 126,250 | 131,180 | 96.24 |
| 15 | lowa | 123,120 | 130,267 | 94.51 |
| 16 | Washington | 134,598 | 129,737 | 103.75 |
| 17 | Nebraska | 116,711 | 129,514 | 90.12 |
| 18 | Kansas | 116,971 | 128,182 | 91.25 |
| 19 | Minnesota | 127,740 | 128,057 | 99.75 |
| 20 | Missouri | 115,000 | 126,905 | 90.62 |
|  | National Average |  | 126,624 |  |
| 21 | California | 170,694 | 124,536 | 137.06 |
| 22 | Wisconsin | 119,205 | 124,282 | 95.91 |
| 23 | Utah | 116,600 | 122,208 | 95.41 |
| 24 | Oklahoma | 108,336 | 121,296 | 89.32 |
| 25 | North Carolina | 115,559 | 120,122 | 96.20 |
| 26 | Arizona | 123,900 | 118,607 | 104.46 |
| 27 | Louisiana | 112,041 | 117,207 | 95.59 |
| 28 | New York | 144,000 | 115,925 | 124.22 |
| 29 | Mississippi | 105,050 | 115,698 | 90.80 |
| 30 | Maryland | 128,302 | 114,299 | 112.25 |
| 31 | Connecticut | 144,680 | 113,855 | 127.07 |
| 32 | Colorado | 114,996 | 113,761 | 101.09 |
| 33 | New Jersey | 150,000 | 112,885 | 132.88 |
| 34 | Idaho | 103,168 | 110,671 | 93.22 |
| 35 | New Mexico | 101,612 | 100,695 | 100.91 |
| 36 | Oregon | 102,800 | 96,209 | 106.85 |
| 37 | Massachusetts | 117,467 | 94,747 | 123.98 |
| 38 | Alaska | 118,584 | 93,662 | 126.61 |
| 39 | Hawaii | 125,000 | 77,842 | 160.58 |
|  | Delaware | N/A | N/A | 101.37 |
|  | District of Columbia | N/A | N/A | 142.09 |
|  | Maine | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|  | Montana | N/A | N/A | 101.15 |
|  | Nevada | N/A | N/A | 113.11 |
|  | New Hampshire | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|  | North Dakota | N/A | N/A | 92.80 |
|  | Rhode Island | N/A | N/A | 124.78 |
|  | South Dakota | N/A | N/A | 93 |
|  | Vermont | N/A | N/A | 118.24 |
|  | West Virginia | N/A | N/A | 95.55 |
|  | Wyoming | N/A | N/A | 102.52 |

Source: "Survey of Judicial Salaries" published by the National Center for State Courts, Vol. 31, No. 1. except for the "Adj. Salary" column which is calculated using the "Actual Salary" column divided by the ACCRA factor, times 100.

[^6]
## SALARY COMPARISON AMONG STATES, 2006: HIGHEST COURT* (eff. 7/1/2006)

| Rank | State | Actual Salary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Delaware | \$184,300 |
| 2 | California | 183,946 |
| 3 | Illinois | 182,739 |
| 4 | District of Columbia | 175,100 |
| 5 | Alaska | 165,204 |
| 6 | Michigan | 164,610 |
| 7 | Virginia | 162,182 |
| 8 | Florida | 160,375 |
| 9 | New Jersey | 158,500 |
| 10 | Georgia | 157,779 |
| 11 | Pennsylvania | 155,783 |
| 12 | Connecticut | 154,047 |
| 13 | Alabama | 152,027 |
| 14 | New York | 151,200 |
| 15 | Texas | 150,000 |
| 16 | Rhode Island | 147,964 |
| 17 | Maryland | 144,352 |
| 18 | lowa | 144,000 |
| 19 | Washington | 141,394 |
| 20 | Nevada | 140,000 |
| 21 | Hawaii | 139,725 |
| 22 | Indiana | 138,844 |
| 23 | Minnesota | 137,601 |
|  | National Average | 137,074 |
| 24 | Ohio | 135,450 |
| 25 | Arkansas | 134,392 |
| 26 | Tennessee | 134,364 |
| 27 | Kentucky | 132,412 |
| 28 | South Carolina | 131,858 |
| 29 | Oklahoma | 131,100 |
| 30 | New Hampshire | 128,000 |
| 31 | North Carolina | 127,215 |
| 32 | Massachusetts | 126,943 |
| 33 | Nebraska | 126,847 |
| 34 | Arizona | 126,525 |
| 35 | Wisconsin | 126,358 |
| 36 | Utah | 125,850 |
| 37 | Louisiana | 123,625 |
| 38 | Kansas | 123,590 |
| 39 | Missouri | 123,000 |
| 40 | Colorado | 122,972 |
| 41 | West Virginia | 121,000 |
| 42 | Vermont | 119,254 |
| 43 | Mississippi | 112,530 |
| 44 | Maine | 112,300 |
| 45 | Wyoming | 111,400 |
| 46 | South Dakota | 111,389 |
| 47 | Idaho | 110,500 |
| 48 | North Dakota | 107,210 |
| 49 | New Mexico | 106,960 |
| 50 | Oregon | 105,199 |
| 51 | Montana | 100,884 |

Source: "Survey of Judicial Salaries" published by the National Center for State Courts, Vol. 31, No. 1.

* Note: This table reflects the salary for an Associate Justice of the court of last resort.


## ADJUSTED SALARY COMPARISON AMONG STATES, 2006: HIGHEST COURT (eff. 7/1/2006)

| Rank | State | Actual Salary ${ }^{1}$ | Adj. Salary | ACCRA Factor ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Illinois | 182,739 | 188,242 | 97.08 |
| 2 | Delaware | 184,300 | 181,808 | 101.37 |
| 3 | Georgia | 157,779 | 168,570 | 93.60 |
| 4 | Texas | 150,000 | 167,603 | 89.50 |
| 5 | Michigan | 164,610 | 165,018 | 99.75 |
| 6 | Alabama | 152,027 | 165,007 | 92.13 |
| 7 | Virginia | 162,182 | 156,868 | 103.39 |
| 8 | Florida | 160,375 | 156,366 | 102.56 |
| 9 | Pennsylvania | 155,783 | 153,942 | 101.20 |
| 10 | Arkansas | 134,392 | 152,773 | 87.97 |
| 11 | lowa | 144,000 | 152,359 | 94.51 |
| 12 | Tennessee | 134,364 | 147,897 | 90.85 |
| 13 | Oklahoma | 131,100 | 146,783 | 89.32 |
| 14 | Indiana | 138,844 | 145,479 | 95.44 |
| 15 | Kentucky | 132,412 | 143,445 | 92.31 |
| 16 | Nebraska | 126,847 | 140,761 | 90.12 |
| 17 | Ohio | 135,450 | 140,739 | 96.24 |
| 18 | South Carolina | 131,858 | 139,859 | 94.28 |
| 19 | Minnesota | 137,601 | 137,942 | 99.75 |
| 20 | Washington | 141,394 | 136,288 | 103.75 |
| 21 | Missouri | 123,000 | 135,733 | 90.62 |
| 22 | Kansas | 123,590 | 135,435 | 91.25 |
| 23 | California | 183,946 | 134,204 | 137.06 |
|  | National Average | 137,074 | 133,792 | N/A |
| 24 | North Carolina | 127,215 | 132,239 | 96.20 |
| 25 | Utah | 125,850 | 131,902 | 95.41 |
| 26 | Wisconsin | 126,358 | 131,740 | 96 |
| 27 | Alaska | 165,204 | 130,484 | 126.61 |
| 28 | Louisiana | 123,625 | 129,325 | 95.59 |
| 29 | Maryland | 144,352 | 128,597 | 112.25 |
| 30 | West Virginia | 121,000 | 126,631 | 95.55 |
| 31 | Mississippi | 112,530 | 123,936 | 90.80 |
| 32 | Nevada | 140,000 | 123,777 | 113.11 |
| 33 | District of Columbia | 175,100 | 123,230 | 142.09 |
| 34 | New York | 151,200 | 121,721 | 124.22 |
| 35 | Colorado | 122,972 | 121,652 | 101.09 |
| 36 | Connecticut | 154,047 | 121,226 | 127.07 |
| 37 | Arizona | 126,525 | 121,120 | 104.46 |
| 38 | South Dakota | 111,389 | 120,053 | 92.78 |
| 39 | New Jersey | 158,500 | 119,282 | 132.88 |
| 40 | Rhode Island | 147,964 | 118,581 | 124.78 |
| 41 | Idaho | 110,500 | 118,537 | 93.22 |
| 42 | North Dakota | 107,210 | 115,526 | 92.80 |
| 43 | Wyoming | 111,400 | 108,664 | 103 |
| 44 | New Mexico | 106,960 | 105,995 | 100.91 |
| 45 | Massachusetts | 126,943 | 102,391 | 123.98 |
| 46 | Vermont | 119,254 | 100,856 | 118.24 |
| 47 | Montana | 100,884 | 99,739 | 101.15 |
| 48 | Oregon | 105,199 | 98,454 | 106.85 |
| 49 | Hawaii | 139,725 | 87,012 | 160.58 |
| MaineNew Hampshire |  | 112,300 | N/A | N/A |
|  |  | 128,000 | N/A | N/A |

Source: "Survey of Judicial Salaries" published by the National Center for State Courts, Vol. 31, No. 1.
except for the "Adj. Salary" column which is calculated using the "Actual Salary" column divided by the ACCRA factor, times 100
${ }^{1}$ This column reflects the salary for an Associate Justice of the court of last resort.
${ }^{2}$ Also see ACCRA notes from the Adjusted General Trial Court listing.

## JURTS

COMPEISATION OF JUDGES OF APPELIATE COURTS AND CENERAL TRUL COURTS

| Shate ar osher juriatiction | Apelliow cosers |  |  |  |  |  | General triel cours | Selary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Court of last resort | Chief Juarice salariest | Asucietry huatice saleriest | Internuriliester aperillate cemert | ChieflPresiding salaries | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jadges } \\ & \text { saleries } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Aletame | Sapreme Coun | \$153,000 | \$152,000 | Cont of Criminal A preels | \$152,000 | \$151,000 | Circuit covits | \$112.000 |
| Alata. | Supreme Count | 126,000 | 126,000 | Count of Appeals | 119.000 | 119,000 | Superior courts | (e) |
| Arthese | Supreme Coent | 129,000 | 127,000 | Count of Appeels | 124,000 | 124,000 | Suptrier comut | 121,000 |
| Artanes. | Suprene Coun | 142.000 | 132,000 | Conert of Appeals | 129,000 | 127,000 | Chancery cometa | 123,000 |
| Collibersle | Supveme Count | 199.000 | 122,000 | Cown of Apreals | 178.000 | 171,800 | Smperior comat | 149.000 |
| Celoredo. | Supreme Comer | 122,000 | 120,000 | Court of Appents | 118,000 | 115,000 | District courts | 110,255 |
| Comenetieat | Sopreme Court | 166,000 | 154,000 | Appellese Comer | 152,000 | 145.000 | Superior coments | 139.000 |
| Delmwere. | Supreme Court | 189,000 | 180,000 |  |  |  | Smperior comuts | 164.000 |
| Pheries. | Sopreme Count | 160,000 | 160,000 | District Comert of Appeels | 149,000 | 149.000 | Cincuit cowts | 139.000 |
| Gevergla | 5 Spreme Court | 158,000 | 158,000 | Conen of Appeelt | 157,000 | 157,000 | Superior comer | (a) |
| Hewnil | Supreme Cont | 140,000 | 135,000 | Internedite Comen | 130,000 | 128.000 | Clicouk conts | 122.000 |
|  | Supreme Cout | 106,000 | 104,000 | Count of Appeela | 103.000 | 103.000 | District comit | 99,000 |
| Illimols | Supreme Court | 177.000 | 177,000 | Cownt of Appeala | 167,000 | 167,000 | Circuit coents | 153.000 |
| Indinse. | Supreme Court | 134,000 | 134,000 | Count of $A$ ppeels | 130000 | 130,000 | Circuit comit | 110,000 |
| lowe | Supreme Court | 133,000 | 128,000 | Comen of Appenls | 128,000 | 123.000 | District cowns | 117.000 |
| Kames | Supeme Court | 124.000 | 121,000 | Comen of Appeals | 120000 | 117,000 | District coents | 105,000 |
| Senancity | Supreme Court | 137,000 | 132,000 | Comen of Appeals | 130000 | 127.000 | Circuit comits | 121,000 |
| Leminome | Superme Count | 124.000 | 118,000 | Count of Appeels | 118,000 | 112,000 | District courta | 10\%,000 |
| Masme. | Supueme lumiciel Court | 125.000 | 104000 |  |  |  | Saperior coserta | 102.000 |
| Merylend | Cownt of Appeals | 156,000 | 137,000 | Count of Special Appeath | 131,000 | 128,000 | Clucuit cemits | 123,000 |
| Meseetresetta | Suppume hadiciel Comi | 132,000 | 127,000 | Appellise Court | 122,000 | 117,000 | Seperier counts | 113,000 |
| Mactione. | Supreme Cown | 165,000 | 165,000 | Comen of Appeals | 151.000 | 151,000 | Clicuit cours | 140,000 |
| Manmente | Supreme Cown | 149.000 | 136,000 | Conet of Appeels | 134,000 | 124.000 | District comits | 120.000 |
| menemipel. | Supreme Court | 115,000 | 113,000 | Comen of Appeals | 108,000 | 105,000 | Chencery courts | 104000 |
| meneeri | Supreme Court | 12x.000 | 123,000 | Comen of Appela | 115,000 | 115,000 | Circmith coumta | 100.000 |
| Mentane | Supreme Court | 102,000 | 101,000 |  |  |  | Diturict comms | 94,000 |
| Netremera | Supreme Court | 123,000 | 123,000 | Comet of Appeels | 117,000 | 117,000 | District comits | 114,000 |
| Neveta | Supreme Court | ( $)$ | () | $\cdots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | District comil | (g) |
| New Hevpidiem | Supreme Court | 132,000 | 128.000 |  |  |  | Superior comata | 120,000 |
| New Jerny- | Supreme Court | 164,000 | 159.000 | Aprellise division of | $\ldots$ | 150.000 | Seperiore courta | 141,000 |
| New Menteo | Supene Court | 109.000 | 107,000 | Court of Appeede | 104,000 | 102.000 | District courts | 97.000 |
| Now Meert | Count of Appeala | 156,000 | 151.000 | Appelline divisiones of | 148,000 | 144,000 | Supreme count | 131.000 |
| Nerth Corallee | Sopreme Court | 124.000 | 121.000 | Count of Appenta | 118,000 | 116,000 | Smperior courts | 109.000 |
| Nerth Doketa. | Supreme Court | 106000 | 103.000 |  |  |  | District courts, min | 94.000 116.000 |
| Onle | Supreme Count | 144.000 | 135,000 | Count of Appenis | 126,000 | 126,000 | Counts of cemmen pleas | 116,000 |
| Outabuma | Supreme Court | 118,000 | 114,000 | Comen of Appeals | 110,000 | 108,000 | Didtrict comes | 103,000 |
| Orugen. | Supreme Count | 108,000 | 105,000 | Cown of Appeals | 105,000 | 103,000 | Cinculis conts | 96,000 |
| Premeigtrande | Sopeme Court | 160,000 | 136,000 | Superior Cosent | 153,000 | 151,000 | Courts of conmon pleas | 133.000 |
| minede lilome | Sopreme Count | 158,000 | 144,000 | . |  |  | Seperior conits | 129,000 |
| Senth Carelline. | Sapreme Cont | 134,000 | 123,000 | Comen of Appents | 127,000 | 125,000 | Clicuis coerts | 122,000 |
| Sowil Doketa. | Supreme Coun | 110000 | 104.000 |  |  |  | Clicuin cownta | 101,000 |
| Temenver | Supreme Comt | 130,000 | 130,000 | Comen of Appests | 124,000 | 124,000 | Chancery cemers | 119.000 |
| Tense | Supreme Cour | 153,000 | 150,000 | Count of Appeala | (b) | (b) | District comes | (c) |
| Utah. | Supreme Cour | 124.000 | 122,000 | Cown of Appeals | 118.000 | 117,000 | District courta | 111.000 |
| Verment | Supreme Cont | 125,000 | 119,000 | ... | ... | ... | Superieo/Distric/Fmeily | 113.000 |
| Virgene | Sopreme Comi | 159.000 (d) | 149.000 (d) | Comen ef Appeeth | 142,000 (d) | 141,000 (d) | Circuin courts | 138,000 |
| Weringtes | Supreme Comi | 141,000 | 141,000 | Count of Appesila | 135,000 | 135,000 | Superier convo | 121,000 |
| Weet Virgme | Supreme Count | 121,000 | 121,000 | $\ldots$ |  |  | Circuil cownte | 116,000 |
| Wheenem | Supreme Count | 134.000 | 128,000 | Comet of Appeels | 119.000 | 119.000 | Circuit cours | 112.000 |
| Wrombe | Supreme Cont | 111.000 | 111.000 | ... |  | ... | Diserict comits | 104,000 |
| But ef Cabmete | Count of Appeals | 176,000 | 175,000 | $\ldots$ |  |  | Superior courts | 165,000 |
| Amertcen Semen. | High Coust | 120,000 | 115,000 | *** | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | Ditrict comita | 76000 |
| Guer | Sopreme Court | (0) | (i) | ... | ** | $\ldots$ | Superior comits | (1) |
| No. Mertesa litome | Commoementh | 130000 | 124000 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | Superior cosins | 120000 |
| Preate ficos- | Soppene Comet | 125,000 | 120.000 | Apperlest Cont | 105,000 | 105,000 | Seperior coume | 90.000 |
| Us. Virjo himelo | Terrimerinal Coun | 143,000 | 135 ,000 | ... | ... | $\cdots$ | ... | $\ldots$ |

[^7]The Book of the States 2006

Toblo 5.5
SELECTED DATA ON COURT ADMIMIISTRATIVE OFFICSS

| Stale or ocher furisaticrion | $\pi$ me | Established | Appointed by (a) | Salary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alatoma | Adminisentive Ditestor of Counts | 1971 | $\mathrm{Cl}(\mathrm{b})$ | \$105,000 |
| Alakas | Adminisentive Disector | 1959 | Cl (b) | 124,000 |
| Artsoen | Administrative Diestor of Courts | 1960 | 5 C | (5) |
| Arkames. | Divecter, Adminitestive Office of den Courts | 1965 | Cl(c) | 97,000 |
| Calliferne | Adminiturive Difector of the Courts | 1960 | IC | (b) |
| Colorsto | Stum Court Administruor | 1959 | ${ }_{5}$ | 118.000 |
| Consecticat | Clief Coun Administritor (d) | 1965 | CJ | 160,000 |
| Deleware | Direcore, Adminigentive Offloe of the Courts | 1971 | CI | 122.000 |
| Floride. | Susin Comts Administruar | 1972 | ${ }^{5}$ | 131,000 |
| Georyla | Directos, Administative Oftlos of the Courts | 1973 | IC | 132.000 |
| Hawnll | Administrative Dinctior of ine Courts | 1959 | Cl (b) | 105,000 |
| Idale | Adminiserative Dirscior of de Cours | 1967 | sc | 99.000 |
| Hilinola | Administrative Disector of ina Courts | 1959 | SC | 167,000 |
| Indiana. | Exacutive Disrector, Division of State Court Administration | 1975 | CJ | 103,000 |
| lows. | Coent Administritor | 1971 | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | (i) |
| Kanme | Judicial Administrior | 1965 | CJ | 106,000 |
| Kentacky | Administruive Dirsector of ine Courts | 1976 | CJ | 121.000 |
| Lealolana. | Judicial Administrutor | 1954 | SC | 112,000 |
| Malse | Coent Adminiterutor | 1975 | CJ | 102,000 |
| Maryland. | Stuse Coert Administrutar | 1955 | Cl (b) | 129,000 |
| Marsachustis. | Chief Justice for Administration \& Managemeat | 1978 | sc | 122,000 |
| Michigram | Sute Coart Administrutor | 1952 | SC | 142,000 |
| Minsesota. | Stay Court Administrutor | 1963 | SC | 120,000 |
| Mlastectppi. | Court Administrucr | 1974 | SC | 69.000 |
| Misosur | Suta Courts Administrutor | 1970 | sc | 115,000 |
| Montamas | Stute Court Administritor | 1975 | sc | 90,000 |
| Nebrata | Stuea Coart Administruitor | 1972 | CI | 103,000 |
| Nevide | Disector, Office of Count Administration | 1971 | sc | 112,000 |
| New Hempehtre. | Disector of the Administrutive Ofmice of the Court | 1980 | SC | 98,000 |
| New Jerney | Administruive Dissetor of the Courts | 1948 | C | 150,000 |
| Now Merieo - | Director. Administrative Oftce of the Coarta | 1959 | SC | 105,000 |
| New Yort | Chief Administrutor of the Courts | 1978 | CI | 148,000 |
| North Carolina. | Difrector, Administraive Office of the Coerts | 1965 | CI | 112.000 |
| North Dakota. | Court Administritor (1) | 1971 | cl | 82.500 |
| Ohle | Administrative Dirsector of the Courts | 1955 | SC | 129,000 |
| Orcainomes | Administraive Difrector of the Courts | 1967 | sc | 108,000 |
| Oropoen | Count Administrutar | 1971 | sc | 119,000 |
| Peanalivania | Cout Administrucr | 1968 | SC | 147,000 |
| Rhoode Ilarat- | Sute Court Administrutor | 1969 | CI | 115,000 |
| South Carollias. | Director of Court Administruioa | 1973 | CJ | 115,000 |
| South Dakota. | Sute Court Administruor | 1974 | sc | 96,000 |
| Teasemen- | Disector | 1963 | Sc | 120,000 |
| Taxse | Administraive Director of the Courts (i) | 1977 | ${ }_{5} \mathrm{C}$ | 98,000 |
| Utal | Court Administritor | 1973 | sc | 111.000 |
| Verneont. | Court Adminiserator | 1967 | SC | 113,000 |
| Virgale | Execative Secretary to the Supreme Court | 1952 | sc | 141,000 |
| Wachiogton- | Administrutor for the Courts | 1957 | sc (e) | 122,000 |
| Weat Virginia. | Administrative Director of the Supreme Court of Appeals | 1975 | sc | 105,000 |
| Wraconale | Dirsector of Stase Cours | 1978 | sc | 119,000 |
| Wyoming | Court Coondinutor | 1974 | sc | 95,000 |
| Dist of Columbla | Executive Offices, Courts of D.C. | 1971 | (f) | 165,200 |
| Americas Samon. | Administruof/Comptroller | N.A. | N.A. | (j) |
| Guarn | Administraive Dirsector of Superior Court | N.A. | $\mathrm{CI}(\mathrm{m})$ | 90,000 |
| No. Mariana Ialaeds - Puerto Rles |  |  |  | 70,000 |
| Puerto Rice. $\qquad$ U.S. Virgia Islands $\qquad$ | Administraive Director of the Courts | 1952 | CI | 111,000 |
| U.S. Virgin lalands- | Courv/Administraive Clert | N.A. | NA. | 88,500 |
| Somrer: Salary information was taken from National Center for Sutse Courth, Survey of Judicial Salaries Vol. 30 No. 2 (as of Jenuary 2006). <br> Note: Compensuioa showa is rounded so the nearest thousand, and is reported according to moat recent legialation, even though laws may not yet have taken effect. Other information froes State Court Adminisurntor Web sites. <br> Kry: <br> SC - State court of last resort. <br> CI - Chief jurtice or chief judge of coart of last resort. <br> JC - Judicial coumell. <br> N.A. - Not avzilable. <br> (a) Term of office for all court administrators is it pleasure of appointing authority. <br> (b) With approval of Supreme Court. <br> (c) Whth approval of Judicial Council. <br> (d) Administrator is an asociase judge of the Supreme Court. <br> (e) Appointed from list of five subminted by governor. <br> (f) Joint Commintee on Jodicial Administration. <br> (g) Salary fange is berween $\$ 101,000$ and $\$ 163,000$. <br> (h) Salary range is berween $\$ 168,000$ and $\$ 185,000$. <br> (i) Salary range is berween $\$ 95,000$ and $\$ 143,000$. <br> (i) Salary nage is berween $\$ 29,000$ uad $\$ 63,000$, plus $\$ 1,170 y \mathrm{y}$. increment. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

HISTORY OF STATE EXECUTIVE ANNUAL SALARIES

| Dept |  | 1/1/1986 | 1/1/1989 | 1/1/1990 | 7/1/2004 | 7/1/2005 | 7/1/2006 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gov | 80,000.00 | 90,699.00 | 94,780.00 | -- | -- | **112,000.00 |
|  | Lt. Gov | 76,000.00 | 86,164.00 | 90,041.00 | -- | -- | **100,000.00 |
|  | ADS | -- | -- | 90,041.00 | -- | -- | **100,000.00 |
| AG | Dept Head | 68,400.00 | 81,629.00 | 85,302.00 | 105,000.00 | 107,100.00 | 109,242.00 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 1st Deputy } \\ & \text { 2nd Deputy } \\ & \text { Deputies } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { *61,560.00 } \\ \text { *55,404.00 } \\ \text {-- } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | -- | 72,886-77,966 | 91,350-96,600 | 93,177-98,532 | 95,040.54-100,502.64 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { DOH, DOT, } \\ & \text { DAGS, } \\ & \text { DCCA, TAX, } \\ & \text { B\&F } \end{aligned}$ | Dept Head | 68,400.00 | 84,629.00 | 85,302.00 | 100,000.00 | 102,000.00 | 104,040.00 |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 1st Deputy } \\ \text { 2nd Deputy } \\ \text { Deputies } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { *61,560.00 } \\ & \text { *55,404.00 } \end{aligned}$ | 69,748-74,608 | 72,886-77,966 | 87,000-92,000 | 88,740-93,840 | 90,514.80-95,716.80 |
| DHS,DLIR, DLNR,DBEDT | Dept Head | 68,400.00 | 84,629.00 | 85,302.00 | 95,000.00 | 96,900.00 | 98,838.00 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 1st Deputy } \\ & \text { 2nd Deputy } \\ & \text { Deputies } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { *61,560.00 } \\ \text { *55,404.00 } \\ -- \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 69,748-74,608 | 72,886-77,966 | 82,650-87,400 | 84,303-89,148 | 85,989.06-90,930.96 |
| DHRD,HHL, DOA,PSD | Dept Head | 68,400.00 | 84,629.00 | 85,302.00 | 90,000.00 | 91,800.00 | 93,636.00 |
|  | 1st Deputy 2nd Deputy Deputies | $\begin{gathered} \text { *61,560.00 } \\ \text { *55,404.00 } \\ \text {-- } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 69,748-74,608 | 72,886-77,966 | 78,300-82,800 | 79,866-84,456 | 81,463.32-86,145.12 |

Footnotes:
*1 $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Deputy single salary rate.
**Effective December 4, 2006.

## Abbreviations:

Gov = Governor; Lt. Governor; ADS = Administrative Director of the State (Chief of Staff). AG = Attorney General; DOH = Department of Health; DOT = Department of Transportation; DAGS = Department of Accounting and General Services; DCCA = Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs; TAX = Department of Taxation; B\&F = Department of Budget and Finance; DHS = Department of Human Services; DLIR = Department If Labor and Industrial Relations; DLNR = Department of Land and Natural Resources; DBEDT = Department of Business and Economic Development and Tourism; DHRD = Department of Human Resources Development; HHL = Department of Hawaiian Home Lands; DOA = Department of Agriculture; PSD = Department of Public Safety

H:\CCR\XAS\History of State Executive Pay Rates.xls
Footnote: H:\CCR\XAS\History of State Executive Pay Rates_Footnote

## Twenty Year History of Judicial Salaries

|  | Chief Justice | Associate Justice | ICA Chief Judge | ICA <br> Associate Judge | Circuit <br> Court <br> Judge | District/ Family Court Judge | Act |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1/1/1986 | \$80,000 | \$78,500 | \$75,500 | \$73,500 | \$69,500 | \$59,500 | Act 128, SLH 1986 |
| 7/1/1987 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/1/1988 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/1/1989 | \$90,699 | \$89,699 | \$87,199 | \$85,699 | \$82,699 | \$77,699 | Act 72, SLH 1990 |
| 1/1/1990 | \$94,780 | \$93,780 | \$91,280 | \$89,780 | \$86,780 | \$81,780 | Act 72, SLH 1990 |
| 7/1/1991 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/1/1992 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/1/1993 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/1/1994 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/1/1995 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/1/1996 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/1/1997 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/1/1998 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/1/1999 | \$105,206 | \$104,096 | \$101,321 | \$99,656 | \$96,326 | \$90,776 | Act 65, SLH 1999 (but as amended by Act 2, SLH 2000) |
| 7/1/2000 | \$116,779 | \$115,547 | \$112,466 | \$110,618 | \$106,922 | \$100,761 | Act 2, SLH 2000 (also retroactively amended 1999) |
| 7/1/2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/1/2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/1/2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/1/2004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/1/2005 | \$140,000 | \$135,000 | \$130,000 | \$125,000 | \$121,600 | \$114,600 | 2004 Judicial Salary Commission Recommendations |
| 7/1/2006 | \$144,900 | \$139,725 | \$134,550 | \$129,375 | \$125,856 | \$118,611 | 2004 Judicial Salary Commission Recommendations |



Source: Position count and budget allocation for FY 2007 per Budget and Finance 2007-2009 Operating Budget.
Executive salaries effective 7/1/06; except the Governor, Lt. Gov., and ADS effective 12/4/06.
${ }^{1}$ Salaries of incumbents in salary ranges EM 5 and above as of 11/30/07.

## Department of Education and University of Hawaii Salaries

As of 9/30/06 (except as noted)

Job Title
Department of Education
SUPT OF EDUCATION
DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT
STATE LIBRARIAN*
ADM ASST TO THE SUPT
ASST SUPT, CURR/INST
ASST SUPT, INFO/TECH SVCS
COMPLEX AREA SUPT
University of Hawaii
PRESIDENT \& PROFESSOR
VICE CHANCELLOR, UHM
INTERIM CHANCELLOR \& PROFESSOR
CHANCELLOR
VICE CHANCELLOR, UHM
VICE CHANCELLOR, UHM
CHANCELLOR
VICE CHANCELLOR, UHM
CHANCELLOR
CHANCELLOR
ASSOC VICE PRES \& PROF (CC)
ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT
PROF/FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT
CHANCELLOR
ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT
INTERIM CHANCELLOR
CHANCELLOR \& ASSOC. PROF., CC
CHANCELLOR
ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT
ASST VICE CHANCELLOR, UHM
VICE CHANCELLOR (UHWO)
CHANCELLOR
INTERIM ASSOC VICE PRESIDENT
INTERIM VICE CHANCELLOR, UHM
INTERIM ASST VICE CHANCELLOR
ASSOC VICE CHANCELLOR, UHM
VICE CHANCELLOR (CC) \& PROF,CC
VICE CHANCELLOR (CC)
ADMIN ASST TO CHANCELLOR, UHM
VICE CHANCELLOR (CC)
VICE CHANCELLOR (CC)
IER CHANCELLOR

Annual
Salary
No. of Employees

| $\$ 150,000.00$ | 1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$ 120,000.00$ | 1 |
| $\$ 120,000.00$ | 1 |
| $\$ 114,999.96$ | 1 |
| $\$ 114,999.96$ | 1 |
| $\$ 114,999.96$ | 1 |
| $\$ 114,999.96$ | 14 |

$\$ 360,000.00 \quad 1$
\$257,280.00 1
\$254,016.00 1
\$239,376.00 1
\$215,016.00 1
\$212,880.00 1
\$191,016.00 1
\$169,608.00 1
\$150,696.00 1
\$148,248.00 1
\$146,976.00 1
\$135,816.00 1
\$133,665.24 1
\$132,696.00 1
\$132,264.00 1
\$131,976.00 1
$\$ 130,680.00 \quad 1$
\$126,360.00 2
\$124,872.00 1
\$123,000.00 1
$\$ 120,000.00 \quad 1$
\$118,464.00 1
\$117,480.00 1
$\$ 114,000.00 \quad 1$
\$110,616.00 1
\$106,032.00 1
\$94,632.00 1
\$94,296.00 1
\$84,960.00 1
\$83,328.00 1
\$80,112.00 1
\$42,489.60 1
*As of 1/1/07

## Summary of Collective Bargaining Increases for Bargaining Units in the Executive Branch

Contract Period 7/03 to 6/05

|  | Group 1 | Group 2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1st year | $0 \%$ | $4-6 \%$ |
| 2nd year | $7-10 \%$ | $4-6 \%$ |

Some bargaining units received $0 \%$ in the first year and $7-10 \%$ in the second year. Others received $4-6 \%$ in the first year and $4-6 \%$ in the second year.

Group 1 includes: Bargaining Unit 1 - Blue Collar, Non-supervisory
Bargaining Unit 2 - Blue Collar, Supervisory
Bargaining Unit 3 - White Collar, Non-supervisory
Bargaining Unit 4 - White Collar, Supervisory
Bargaining Unit 13 - Professional and Scientific
Group 2 includes: Bargaining Unit 9 - Registered Professional Nurse Bargaining Unit 10 - Institutional, Health and Correctional Worker Bargaining Unit 11 - Firefighter

Contract Period 7/05 to 6/07

| 1st year | $4-7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2nd year | $4-8 \%$ |

# The Judiciary, State of Hawaii January 10, 2007 Presentation to the Commission on Salaries 
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## Goal:

- To establish a means for setting judicial salaries that provide a regular and equitable review of appropriate salary levels.


## Objectives:

- To create the most qualified judicial applicant pool.
- To retain an experienced judiciary by providing fair and just compensation for Hawaii’s justices, judges, and administrative officers.
- To have all salaries, adjusted for the cost of living, at the national average.


## The Objectives, Restated

To have good judges, a state must be able to get good lawyers to leave the practice of law. To do this, judicial salaries need not equal, but must have a reasonable relationship to the compensation of the more competent and experienced practicing attorneys from whose ranks judges should come, and to whose ranks they can return. It is axiomatic in business that you get what you pay for. Because of this correlation between quality and compensation, a state cannot expect to attract and retain good judges and thereby maintain a quality court system at compensation levels that are comparable to those of the less experienced or less competent lawyers.

## Pool of Eligible Individuals ${ }^{1}$

| US Citizens ${ }^{2}$ | 299,398,484 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Residents of Hawaii ${ }^{2}$ | 1,285,498 |
| Licensed to practice law ${ }^{3}$ | 6,884 |
| Five years of experience ${ }^{3}$ | 6,081 |
| Ten years of experience ${ }^{3}$ | 5,491 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Hawaii Constitution, Article VI, Section 3. ${ }^{2}$ US Census ${ }^{3}$ 32/26/06 email from Lyn Flanigan, Executive Director, Hawaii State Bar Association |  |

## Pool of Eligible Individuals



## A Brief History

- July 8, 2002 - The Cades Foundation contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to conduct a study of salary setting mechanisms and, based on this study, to propose a model for setting judicial salaries in Hawaii.


## NCSC Findings

- January 2003 - The NCSC report found the following impediments to meeting the Judiciary's goal and objectives:
- Advisory nature of the commission.
- Process is unduly politicized.
- Irregularity of salary increases.
- Lack of equitable compensation (for the Judiciary,

Legislature, and Executive Branches).

## NCSC Model Proposed

1. Unitary commission.
2. Broad-based membership.
3. Force of law salary recommendations.
4. Regularity in salary adjustments.
5. Objective criteria for salary determination.

# NCSC Model: 1. Unitary Commission 

- Creation of a salary commission for elected legislative and executive branch officials, judges, top appointed officials of the judiciary, department heads and executive officers and their deputies or assistants, and possibly legislative office heads and their deputies or assistants.


# NCSC Model: 2. Broad-Based Membership 

- Includes experts on finance, benefits, and personnel procedures.


## NCSC Model: 3. Force of Law

- Salary recommendations with the force of law unless rejected by the Legislature and a general depoliticization of the salary process.


# NCSC Model: 4. Regularity in Salary Adjustments 

- Regularity in salary adjustments, possibly best achieved by an escalator that ensures that real dollar value compensation does not shrink over time. Examples include cost of living indexes or mirroring the increases given to other state employees such as those in the Excluded Managerial Compensation Plan.


## NCSC Model: 5. Objective Criteria for Salary Determination

- Objective criteria that among other things ensure that the salary of top officials is not less than that of managers who answer to them.


## Objective Criteria Defined

- Skill and experience for the position.
- Time required and opportunity for other earned income.
- Overall compensation package for those in a state retirement system.
- Cost of living as measured by available indices.
» Cont.


## Objective Criteria (cont.)

- Average percentage salary increases received by managers in the excluded managerial compensation plan.
- Compare positions in other states, the federal government, or urbanized local governments.
- Comparable positions in the private sector.


## Criteria 1: Skill \& Experience

- Ten years as a licensed attorney to meet the minimum requirement for the Supreme Court, Intermediate Court of Appeals, and Circuit Courts.
- Five years as a licensed attorney to meet the minimum requirement for the District Courts.


## Criteria 2: Time Required \& Opportunity for Other Earned Income

- For the most part, justices and judges are full time employees. Further, under the Constitution, unlike legislators, they are prohibited from practicing law, or from running for or holding any other office or position of profit. In other words, they may not receive earned income from any other source.


## Criteria 3: Overall Compensation

 Package- Justices and Judges are covered by the Hawaii Employees' Retirement System.
- Prior to 1999, retirement eligibility requirements were similar to legislators (i.e., 10 years of service or age 55 and five years of service). After 1999, 25 years of service or age 55 and five years.
- Judges are not included in the new hybrid plan.
- Retirement is mandatory at age 70.


## Criteria 4: Cost of Living

General Trial Courts Consumer Price Index vs. Actual Salary


# Criteria 5: Excluded Managerial Compensation Plan 

- The average percentage salary increase received by employees in the Excluded Managerial Compensation Plan from 2005 to 2006 was 5\%.


## Criteria 6: Comparable Public Sector Positions in Other States

Hawaii Adjusted vs. National Adjusted


## Criteria 7: Private Sector

 Comparison| $\$ 2,518,958$ | Chairman, CEO, \& Director - BancWest Corp. |
| ---: | :--- |
| $\$ 1,800,273$ | President, COO, \& Director - BancWest Corp. |
| $\$ 1,684,011$ | Vice Chairman of Matson |
| $\$ 1,306,005$ | Chairman, President, \& CEO - HEI |
| $\$ 1,181,004$ | Executive VP - BancWest Corp. |
| $\$ 1,126,674$ | President \& CEO - Alexander \& Baldwin |
| $\$ 1,096,177$ | President \& CEO - American Savings |
| $\$ 1,027,170$ | Exec. VP, CFO, \& Treasurer - A\&B |
| $\$ 815,220$ | President \& CEO, Hawaiian Electric Co., Inc. |
| $\$ 740,985$ | Vice Chairman \& Director - BancWest Corp. |

## Federal Judges

| $\$ 212,100$ | Chief Justice |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 203,000$ | Associate Justices |
| $\$ 175,100$ | US Circuit Courts of Appeals |
| $\$ 165,200$ | US Administrative Director |
| $\$ 165,200$ | US District, Claims, \& International Trade Courts |
| $\$ 151,984$ | US Bankruptcy and Magistrate Courts |

## Top 10 UH Law School Salaries

| $\$ 350,304$ | Dean (UHM), Law \& Prof |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 167,177$ | Prof \& Kudo Chair of Law |
| $\$ 144,048$ | Assoc. Dean of Academic Affairs, Law |
| $\$ 137,962$ | Professor, Law, 9-months |
| $\$ 132,812$ | Professor, Law, 11-months |
| $\$ 127,795$ | Professor, Law, 9-months |
| $\$ 124,751$ | Professor, Law, 9-months |
| $\$ 122,977$ | Professor, Law, 9-months |
| $\$ 122,977$ | Professor, Law, 9-months |
| $\$ 122,977$ | Professor, Law, 9-months |

## The Legislative Outcome

| Act 123, SLH 2003 | Included | Not <br> Included |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Unitary commission |  | X |
| Broad-based membership |  | X |
| Force of law | X |  |
| Regularity in salary adjustments | X |  |
| Objective criteria |  | X |

## FY05 Salary Recommendations Deferred to FY06

|  | FY05 <br> $(7 / 1 / 04)$ | FY06 <br> $(7 / 1 / 05)$ | FY07 <br> $(7 / 1 / 06)$ | FY08 <br> $(7 / 1 / 07)$ | FY09 <br> $(7 / 1 / 08)$ | FY10 <br> $(7 / 1 / 09)$ | FY11 <br> $(7 / 1 / 10)$ | FY12 <br> $(7 / 1 / 11)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chief Justice | -defer- | $\$ 140,000$ | $\$ 144,900$ | $\$ 149,972$ | $\$ 155,221$ | $\$ 160,654$ | $\$ 166,277$ | $\$ 172,097$ |
| Assoc. Justice | -defer- | $\$ 135,000$ | $\$ 139,725$ | $\$ 144,615$ | $\$ 149,677$ | $\$ 154,916$ | $\$ 160,338$ | $\$ 165,950$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICA Chief Judge | -defer- | $\$ 130,000$ | $\$ 134,550$ | $\$ 139,259$ | $\$ 144,133$ | $\$ 149,178$ | $\$ 154,399$ | $\$ 159,803$ |
| Assoc. Judge | -defer- | $\$ 125,000$ | $\$ 129,375$ | $\$ 133,903$ | $\$ 138,590$ | $\$ 143,441$ | $\$ 148,461$ | $\$ 153,657$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Circuit Court Judge | -defer- | $\$ 121,600$ | $\$ 125,856$ | $\$ 130,261$ | $\$ 134,820$ | $\$ 139,539$ | $\$ 144,423$ | $\$ 149,478$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dist./Fam. Court Judge | -defer- | $\$ 114,600$ | $\$ 118,611$ | $\$ 122,762$ | $\$ 127,059$ | $\$ 131,506$ | $\$ 136,109$ | $\$ 140,873$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Admin. Director | -defer- | $\$ 105,000$ | $\$ 108,675$ | $\$ 112,479$ | $\$ 116,416$ | $\$ 120,491$ | $\$ 124,708$ | $\$ 129,073$ |
| Deputy Admin. Director | -defer- | $\$ 100,000$ | $\$ 103,500$ | $\$ 107,123$ | $\$ 110,872$ | $\$ 114,753$ | $\$ 118,769$ | $\$ 122,926$ |

## General Fund Revenues

December 2003 vs. December 2006 Estimated General Fund Tax Revenue


## Actual and Projected Increased Revenue
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## Salary Options

- The following suggestions are offered as starting points for discussion:
- Option A - Recovery of the Deferred Year
- Option B - 2004 Salary Proposal
- Option C - Salaries Indexed to the National Average (adjusted for the cost of living).


## Option A: Recovery of the Deferred

## Year

|  | State | Present Actual Salary |  | State | ACCRA Adjusted |  | State | Option A Actual |  | State | Option A ACCRA Adjusted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Delaware | \$168,100 | 1 | Delaware | \$165,827 | 1 | Delaware | \$168,100 | 1 | Delaware | \$165,827 |
| 2 | Dist. of Columbia | 165,200 | 2 | Illinois | 162,577 | 2 | Dist. of Columbia | 165,200 | 2 | Illinois | 162,577 |
| 3 | Illinois | 157,824 | 3 | Arkansas | 143,359 | 3 | Illinois | 157,824 | 3 | Arkansas | 143,359 |
| 4 | Alaska | 152,760 | 4 | Michigan | 140,266 | 4 | Alaska | 152,760 | 4 | Michigan | 140,266 |
| 5 | California | 150,696 | 5 | Texas | 139,669 | 5 | California | 150,696 | 5 | Texas | 139,669 |
| 6 | New Jersey | 141,000 | 6 | Florida | 136,010 | 6 | New Jersey | 141,000 | 6 | Florida | 136,010 |
| 7 | Michigan | 139,919 | 7 | Tennessee | 134,926 | 7 | Michigan | 139,919 | 7 | Tennessee | 134,926 |
| 8 | Florida | 139,497 | 8 | Pennsylvania | 133,694 | 8 | Florida | 139,497 | 8 | Pennsylvania | 133,694 |
| 9 | Connecticut | 139,128 | 9 | Virginia | 133,506 | 9 | Connecticut | 139,128 | 9 | Virginia | 133,506 |
| 10 | Virginia | 138,028 | 10 | lowa | 133,335 | 10 | Virginia | 138,028 | 10 | lowa | 133,335 |
| 11 | New York | 136,700 | 11 | South Carolina | 132,866 | 11 | New York | 136,700 | 11 | South Carolina | 132,866 |
| 12 | Pennsylvania | 135,293 | 12 | Oklahoma | 132,620 | 12 | Pennsylvania | 135,293 | 12 | Oklahoma | 132,620 |
| 13 | Rhode Island | 133,216 | 13 | Kentucky | 131,888 | 13 | Hawaii | 134,820 | 13 | Kentucky | 131,888 |
| 14 | Nevada | 130,000 | 14 | Nebraska | 130,204 | 14 | Rhode Island | 133,216 | 14 | Nebraska | 130,204 |
| 15 | Maryland | 128,352 | 15 | Kansas | 125,817 | 15 | Nevada | 130,000 | 15 | Kansas | 125,817 |
| 16 | Washington | 128,143 | 16 | Washington | 123,516 | 16 | Maryland | 128,352 | 16 | Washington | 123,516 |
| 17 | Arkansas | 126,111 | 17 | Minnesota | 122,014 | 17 | Washington | 128,143 | 17 | Minnesota | 122,014 |
| 18 | Iowa | 126,020 | 18 | Alabama | 121,533 | 18 | Arkansas | 126,111 | 18 | Alabama | 121,533 |
| 19 | Hawaii | 125,856 | 19 | West Virginia | 121,398 | 19 | lowa | 126,020 | 19 | West Virginia | 121,398 |
| 20 | South Carolina | 125,265 | 20 | Georgia | 121,231 | 20 | South Carolina | 125,265 | 20 | Georgia | 121,231 |
| 21 | Texas | 125,000 | 21 | Indiana | 120,791 | 21 | Texas | 125,000 | 21 | Indiana | 120,791 |
| 22 | Tennessee | 122,580 | 22 | Alaska | 120,656 | 22 | Tennessee | 122,580 | 22 | Alaska | 120,656 |
|  | Natl. Average | 122,559 | 23 | Ohio | 120,634 |  | Natl. Average | 122,559 | 23 | Ohio | 120,634 |
| 23 | Kentucky | 121,744 | 24 | Utah | 119,902 | 23 | Kentucky | 121,744 | 24 | Utah | 119,902 |
| 24 | Minnesota | 121,712 | 25 | North Carolina | 119,842 | 24 | Minnesota | 121,712 | 25 | North Carolina | 119,842 |
| 25 | Arizona | 120,750 |  | Natl. Average | 119,323 | 25 | Arizona | 120,750 |  | Natl. Average | 119,323 |
| 26 | New Hampshire | 120,000 | 26 | Missouri | 119,180 | 26 | New Hampshire | 120,000 | 26 | Missouri | 119,180 |
| 27 | Oklahoma | 118,450 | 27 | Wisconsin | 117,247 | 27 | Oklahoma | 118,450 | 27 | Wisconsin | 117,247 |
| 28 | Nebraska | 117,333 | 28 | Dist. of Columbia | 116,263 | 28 | Nebraska | 117,333 | 28 | Dist. of Columbia | 116,263 |
| 29 | Ohio | 116,100 | 29 | Louisiana | 116,081 | 29 | Ohio | 116,100 | 29 | Louisiana | 116,081 |
| 30 | West Virginia | 116,000 | 30 | Arizona | 115,592 | 30 | West Virginia | 116,000 | 30 | Arizona | 115,592 |
| 31 | North Carolina | 115,289 | 31 | Nevada | 114,936 | 31 | North Carolina | 115,289 | 31 | Nevada | 114,936 |
| 32 | Indiana | 115,282 | 32 | Mississippi | 114,729 | 32 | Indiana | 115,282 | 32 | Mississippi | 114,729 |
| 33 | Kansas | 114,813 | 33 | Maryland | 114,344 | 33 | Kansas | 114,813 | 33 | Maryland | 114,344 |
| 34 | Utah | 114,400 | 34 | South Dakota | 112,133 | 34 | Utah | 114,400 | 34 | South Dakota | 112,133 |
| 35 | Georgia | 113,470 | 35 | Colorado | 112,016 | 35 | Georgia | 113,470 | 35 | Colorado | 112,016 |
| 36 | Vermont | 113,369 | 36 | Idaho | 111,135 | 36 | Vermont | 113,369 | 36 | Idaho | 111,135 |
| 37 | Colorado | 113,232 | 37 | New York | 110,048 | 37 | Colorado | 113,232 | 37 | New York | 110,048 |
| 38 | Massachusetts | 112,777 | 38 | California | 109,945 | 38 | Massachusetts | 112,777 | 38 | California | 109,945 |
| 39 | Wisconsin | 112,457 | 39 | Connecticut | 109,486 | 39 | Wisconsin | 112,457 | 39 | Connecticut | 109,486 |
| 40 | Alabama | 111,973 | 40 | Rhode Island | 106,762 | 40 | Alabama | 111,973 | 40 | Rhode Island | 106,762 |
| 41 | Louisiana | 110,964 | 41 | New Jersey | 106,112 | 41 | Louisiana | 110,964 | 41 | New Jersey | 106,112 |
| 42 | Missouri | 108,000 | 42 | North Dakota | 105,677 | 42 | Missouri | 108,000 | 42 | North Dakota | 105,677 |
| 43 | Wyoming | 106,100 | 43 | Wyoming | 103,494 | 43 | Wyoming | 106,100 | 43 | Wyoming | 103,494 |
| 44 | Maine | 105,300 | 44 | Vermont | 95,879 | 44 | Maine | 105,300 | 44 | Vermont | 95,879 |
| 45 | Mississippi | 104,170 | 45 | New Mexico | 95,660 | 45 | Mississippi | 104,170 | 45 | New Mexico | 95,660 |
| 46 | South Dakota | 104,041 | 46 | Montana | 93,025 | 46 | South Dakota | 104,041 | 46 | Montana | 93,025 |
| 47 | Idaho | 103,600 | 47 | Massachusetts | 90,964 | 47 | Idaho | 103,600 | 47 | Massachusetts | 90,964 |
| 48 | North Dakota | 98,070 | 48 | Oregon | 89,658 | 48 | North Dakota | 98,070 | 48 | Oregon | 89,658 |
| 49 | New Mexico | 96,531 | 49 | Hawaii | 78,375 | 49 | New Mexico | 96,531 | 49 | Hawaii | 83,958 |
| 50 | Oregon | 95,800 |  | Maine | N/A | 50 | Oregon | 95,800 |  | Maine | N/A |
| 51 | Montana | 94,093 |  | New Hampshire | N/A | 51 | Montana | 94,093 |  | New Hampshire | N/A |

## Option A Costs

|  | No. of Judges | Current FY07 (7/1/2006) Salary | Cost | FY08 (7/1/2007) Salary | Diff | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Supreme Court |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chief Justice | 1 | 144,900 | 144,900 | 155,221 | 10,321 | 155,221 |
| Associate Justice | 4 | 139,725 | 558,900 | 149,677 | 9,952 | 598,708 |
| Intermediate Court of Appeals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chief Judge | 1 | 134,550 | 134,550 | 144,133 | 9,583 | 144,133 |
| Associate Judge | 5 | 129,375 | 646,875 | 138,590 | 9,215 | 692,950 |
| Circuit Courts |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Judge | 33 | 125,856 | 4,153,248 | 134,820 | 8,964 | 4,449,060 |
| District/Family/Per Diem |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Judge | 46 | 118,611 | 5,456,106 | 127,059 | 8,448 | 5,844,714 |
|  | 90 |  | 11,094,579 |  |  | 11,884,786 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 790,207 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.12\% |

# Option B: 2004 Salary Proposal 

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Option B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Present |  |  | ACCRA |  |  | Option B |  |  | ACCRA |
|  | State | Actual Salary |  | State | Adjusted |  | State | Actual |  | State | Adjusted |
| 1 | Delaware | \$168,100 | 1 | Delaware | \$165,827 | 1 | Delaware | \$168,100 | 1 | Delaware | \$165,827 |
| 2 | Dist. of Columbia | 165,200 | 2 | Illinois | 162,577 | 2 | Dist. of Columbia | 165,200 | 2 | Illinois | 162,577 |
| 3 | Illinois | 157,824 | 3 | Arkansas | 143,359 | 3 | Illinois | 157,824 | 3 | Arkansas | 143,359 |
| 4 | Alaska | 152,760 | 4 | Michigan | 140,266 | 4 | Hawaii | 154,721 | 4 | Michigan | 140,266 |
| 5 | California | 150,696 | 5 | Texas | 139,669 | 5 | Alaska | 152,760 | 5 | Texas | 139,669 |
| 6 | New Jersey | 141,000 | 6 | Florida | 136,010 | 6 | California | 150,696 | 6 | Florida | 136,010 |
| 7 | Michigan | 139,919 | 7 | Tennessee | 134,926 | 7 | New Jersey | 141,000 | 7 | Tennessee | 134,926 |
| 8 | Florida | 139,497 | 8 | Pennsylvania | 133,694 | 8 | Michigan | 139,919 | 8 | Pennsylvania | 133,694 |
| 9 | Connecticut | 139,128 | 9 | Virginia | 133,506 | 9 | Florida | 139,497 | 9 | Virginia | 133,506 |
| 10 | Virginia | 138,028 | 10 | Iowa | 133,335 | 10 | Connecticut | 139,128 | 10 | Iowa | 133,335 |
| 11 | New York | 136,700 | 11 | South Carolina | 132,866 | 11 | Virginia | 138,028 | 11 | South Carolina | 132,866 |
| 12 | Pennsylvania | 135,293 | 12 | Oklahoma | 132,620 | 12 | New York | 136,700 | 12 | Oklahoma | 132,620 |
| 13 | Rhode Island | 133,216 | 13 | Kentucky | 131,888 | 13 | Pennsylvania | 135,293 | 13 | Kentucky | 131,888 |
| 14 | Nevada | 130,000 | 14 | Nebraska | 130,204 | 14 | Rhode Island | 133,216 | 14 | Nebraska | 130,204 |
| 15 | Maryland | 128,352 | 15 | Kansas | 125,817 | 15 | Nevada | 130,000 | 15 | Kansas | 125,817 |
| 16 | Washington | 128,143 | 16 | Washington | 123,516 | 16 | Maryland | 128,352 | 16 | Washington | 123,516 |
| 17 | Arkansas | 126,111 | 17 | Minnesota | 122,014 | 17 | Washington | 128,143 | 17 | Minnesota | 122,014 |
| 18 | Iowa | 126,020 | 18 | Alabama | 121,533 | 18 | Arkansas | 126,111 | 18 | Alabama | 121,533 |
| 19 | Havaii | 125,856 | 19 | West Virginia | 121,398 | 19 | Iowa | 126,020 | 19 | West Virginia | 121,398 |
| 20 | South Carolina | 125,265 | 20 | Georgia | 121,231 | 20 | South Carolina | 125,265 | 20 | Georgia | 121,231 |
| 21 | Texas | 125,000 | 21 | Indiana | 120,791 | 21 | Texas | 125,000 | 21 | Indiana | 120,791 |
| 22 | Tennessee | 122,580 | 22 | Alaska | 120,656 | 22 | Tennessee | 122,580 | 22 | Alaska | 120,656 |
|  | Natl. Average | 122,559 | 23 | Ohio | 120,634 |  | Natl. Average | 122,559 | 23 | Ohio | 120,634 |
| 23 | Kentucky | 121,744 | 24 | Utah | 119,902 | 23 | Kentucky | 121,744 | 24 | Utah | 119,902 |
| 24 | Minnesota | 121,712 | 25 | North Carolina | 119,842 | 24 | Minnesota | 121,712 | 25 | North Carolina | 119,842 |
| 25 | Arizona | 120,750 |  | Natl. Average | 119,323 | 25 | Arizona | 120,750 |  | Natl. Average | 119,323 |
| 26 | New Hampshire | 120,000 | 26 | Missouri | 119,180 | 26 | New Hampshire | 120,000 | 26 | Missouri | 119,180 |
| 27 | Oklahoma | 118,450 | 27 | Wisconsin | 117,247 | 27 | Oklahoma | 118,450 | 27 | Wisconsin | 117,247 |
| 28 | Nebraska | 117,333 | 28 | Dist. of Columbia | 116,263 | 28 | Nebraska | 117,333 | 28 | Dist. of Columbia | 116,263 |
| 29 | Ohio | 116,100 | 29 | Louisiana | 116,081 | 29 | Ohio | 116,100 | 29 | Louisiana | 116,081 |
| 30 | West Virginia | 116,000 | 30 | Arizona | 115,592 | 30 | West Virginia | 116,000 | 30 | Arizona | 115,592 |
| 31 | North Carolina | 115,289 | 31 | Nevada | 114,936 | 31 | North Carolina | 115,289 | 31 | Nevada | 114,936 |
| 32 | Indiana | 115,282 | 32 | Mississippi | 114,729 | 32 | Indiana | 115,282 | 32 | Mississippi | 114,729 |
| 33 | Kansas | 114,813 | 33 | Maryland | 114,344 | 33 | Kansas | 114,813 | 33 | Maryland | 114,344 |
| 34 | Utah | 114,400 | 34 | South Dakota | 112,133 | 34 | Utah | 114,400 | 34 | South Dakota | 112,133 |
| 35 | Georgia | 113,470 | 35 | Colorado | 112,016 | 35 | Georgia | 113,470 | 35 | Colorado | 112,016 |
| 36 | Vermont | 113,369 | 36 | Idaho | 111,135 | 36 | Vermont | 113,369 | 36 | Idaho | 111,135 |
| 37 | Colorado | 113,232 | 37 | New York | 110,048 | 37 | Colorado | 113,232 | 37 | New York | 110,048 |
| 38 | Massachusetts | 112,777 | 38 | California | 109,945 | 38 | Massachusetts | 112,777 | 38 | California | 109,945 |
| 39 | Wisconsin | 112,457 | 39 | Connecticut | 109,486 | 39 | Wisconsin | 112,457 | 39 | Connecticut | 109,486 |
| 40 | Alabama | 111,973 | 40 | Rhode Island | 106,762 | 40 | Alabama | 111,973 | 40 | Rhode Island | 106,762 |
| 41 | Louisiana | 110,964 | 41 | New Jersey | 106,112 | 41 | Louisiana | 110,964 | 41 | New Jersey | 106,112 |
| 42 | Missouri | 108,000 | 42 | North Dakota | 105,677 | 42 | Missouri | 108,000 | 42 | North Dakota | 105,677 |
| 43 | Wyoming | 106,100 | 43 | Wyoming | 103,494 | 43 | Wyoming | 106,100 | 43 | Wyoming | 103,494 |
| 44 | Maine | 105,300 | 44 | Vermont | 95,879 | 44 | Maine | 105,300 | 44 | Hawaii | 96,351 |
| 45 | Mississippi | 104,170 | 45 | New Mexico | 95,660 | 45 | Mississippi | 104,170 | 45 | Vermont | 95,879 |
| 46 | South Dakota | 104,041 | 46 | Montana | 93,025 | 46 | South Dakota | 104,041 | 46 | New Mexico | 95,660 |
| 47 | Idaho | 103,600 | 47 | Massachusetts | 90,964 | 47 | Idaho | 103,600 | 47 | Montana | 93,025 |
| 48 | North Dakota | 98,070 | 48 | Oregon | 89,658 | 48 | North Dakota | 98,070 | 48 | Massachusetts | 90,964 |
| 49 | New Mexico | 96,531 | 49 | Havaii | 78,375 | 49 | New Mexico | 96,531 | 49 | Oregon | 89,658 |
| 50 | Oregon | 95,800 |  | Maine | N/A | 50 | Oregon | 95,800 |  | Maine | N/A |
| 51 | Montana | 94,093 |  | New Hampshire | N/A | 51 | Montana | 94,093 |  | New Hampshire | N/A |

## Option B Costs

|  | No. of Judges | ```Current FY07 (7/1/2006) Salary``` | Cost | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Proposed } \\ \text { FY08 } \\ \text { (7/1/2007) } \\ \text { Salary } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Diff | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Supreme Court |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chief Justice | 1 | 144,900 | 144,900 | 168,984 | 24,084 | 168,984 |
| Associate Justice | 4 | 139,725 | 558,900 | 167,201 | 27,476 | 668,804 |
| Intermediate Court of Appeals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chief Judge | 1 | 134,550 | 134,550 | 162,743 | 28,193 | 162,743 |
| Associate Judge | 5 | 129,375 | 646,875 | 160,068 | 30,693 | 800,340 |
| Circuit Courts Judge | 33 | 125,856 | 4,153,248 | 154,721 | 28,865 | 5,105,793 |
| District/Family/Per Diem Judge | 46 | 118,611 | 5,456,106 | 145,804 | 27,193 | 6,706,984 |
|  | 90 |  | 11,094,579 |  |  | 13,613,648 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,519,069 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.71\% |

## Option C: Indexed to the National

Average

|  | State | Present <br> Actual Salary |  | State | ACCRA Adiusted |  | State | Option C Actual |  | State | Option C ACCRA Adjusted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Delaware | \$168,100 | 1 | Delaware | \$165,827 | 1 | Hawaii | \$191,610 | 1 | Delaware | \$165,827 |
| 2 | Dist. of Columbia | 165,200 | 2 | Illinois | 162,577 | 2 | Delaware | 168,100 | 2 | Illinois | 162,577 |
| 3 | Illinois | 157,824 | 3 | Arkansas | 143,359 | 3 | Dist. of Columbia | 165,200 | 3 | Arkansas | 143,359 |
| 4 | Alaska | 152,760 | 4 | Michigan | 140,266 | 4 | Illinois | 157,824 | 4 | Michigan | 140,266 |
| 5 | California | 150,696 | 5 | Texas | 139,669 | 5 | Alaska | 152,760 | 5 | Texas | 139,669 |
| 6 | New Jersey | 141,000 | 6 | Florida | 136,010 | 6 | California | 150,696 | 6 | Florida | 136,010 |
| 7 | Michigan | 139,919 | 7 | Tennessee | 134,926 | 7 | New Jersey | 141,000 | 7 | Tennessee | 134,926 |
| 8 | Florida | 139,497 | 8 | Pennsylvania | 133,694 | 8 | Michigan | 139,919 | 8 | Pennsylvania | 133,694 |
| 9 | Connecticut | 139,128 | 9 | Virginia | 133,506 | 9 | Florida | 139,497 | 9 | Virginia | 133,506 |
| 10 | Virginia | 138,028 | 10 | Iowa | 133,335 | 10 | Connecticut | 139,128 | 10 | Iowa | 133,335 |
| 11 | New York | 136,700 | 11 | South Carolina | 132,866 | 11 | Virginia | 138,028 | 11 | South Carolina | 132,866 |
| 12 | Pennsylvania | 135,293 | 12 | Oklahoma | 132,620 | 12 | New York | 136,700 | 12 | Oklahoma | 132,620 |
| 13 | Rhode Island | 133,216 | 13 | Kentucky | 131,888 | 13 | Pennsylvania | 135,293 | 13 | Kentucky | 131,888 |
| 14 | Nevada | 130,000 | 14 | Nebraska | 130,204 | 14 | Rhode Island | 133,216 | 14 | Nebraska | 130,204 |
| 15 | Maryland | 128,352 | 15 | Kansas | 125,817 | 15 | Nevada | 130,000 | 15 | Kansas | 125,817 |
| 16 | Washington | 128,143 | 16 | Washington | 123,516 | 16 | Maryland | 128,352 | 16 | Washington | 123,516 |
| 17 | Arkansas | 126,111 | 17 | Minnesota | 122,014 | 17 | Washington | 128,143 | 17 | Minnesota | 122,014 |
| 18 | Iowa | 126,020 | 18 | Alabama | 121,533 | 18 | Arkansas | 126,111 | 18 | Alabama | 121,533 |
| 19 | Hawaii | 125,856 | 19 | West Virginia | 121,398 | 19 | Iowa | 126,020 | 19 | West Virginia | 121,398 |
| 20 | South Carolina | 125,265 | 20 | Georgia | 121,231 | 20 | South Carolina | 125,265 | 20 | Georgia | 121,231 |
| 21 | Texas | 125,000 | 21 | Indiana | 120,791 | 21 | Texas | 125,000 | 21 | Indiana | 120,791 |
| 22 | Tennessee | 122,580 | 22 | Alaska | 120,656 | 22 | Tennessee | 122,580 | 2 | Alaska | 120,656 |
|  | Natl. Average | 122,559 | 23 | Ohio | 120,634 |  | Natl. Average | 122,559 | 23 | Ohio | 120,634 |
| 23 | Kentucky | 121,744 | 24 | Utah | 119,902 | 23 | Kentucky | 121,744 | 24 | Utah | 119,902 |
| 24 | Minnesota | 121,712 | 25 | North Carolina | 119,842 | 24 | Minnesota | 121,712 | 25 | North Carolina | 119,842 |
| 25 | Arizona | 120,750 |  | Natl. Average | 119,323 | 25 | Arizona | 120,750 |  | Natl. Average | 119,323 |
| 26 | New Hampshire | 120,000 | 26 | Missouri | 119,180 | 26 | New Hampshire | 120,000 | 26 | Havaii | 119,323 |
| 27 | Oklahoma | 118,450 | 27 | Wisconsin | 117,247 | 27 | Oklahoma | 118,450 | 27 | Missouri | 119,180 |
| 28 | Nebraska | 117,333 | 28 | Dist. of Columbia | 116,263 | 28 | Nebraska | 117,333 | 28 | Wisconsin | 117,247 |
| 29 | Ohio | 116,100 | 29 | Louisiana | 116,081 | 29 | Ohio | 116,100 | 29 | Dist. of Columbia | 116,263 |
| 30 | West Virginia | 116,000 | 30 | Arizona | 115,592 | 30 | West Virginia | 116,000 | 30 | Louisiana | 116,081 |
| 31 | North Carolina | 115,289 | 31 | Nevada | 114,936 | 31 | North Carolina | 115,289 | 31 | Arizona | 115,592 |
| 32 | Indiana | 115,282 | 32 | Mississippi | 114,729 | 32 | Indiana | 115,282 | 32 | Nevada | 114,936 |
| 33 | Kansas | 114,813 | 33 | Maryland | 114,344 | 33 | Kansas | 114,813 | 33 | Mississippi | 114,729 |
| 34 | Utah | 114,400 | 34 | South Dakota | 112,133 | 34 | Utah | 114,400 | 34 | Maryland | 114,344 |
| 35 | Georgia | 113,470 | 35 | Colorado | 112,016 | 35 | Georgia | 113,470 | 35 | South Dakota | 112,133 |
| 36 | Vermont | 113,369 | 36 | Idaho | 111,135 | 36 | Vermont | 113,369 | 36 | Colorado | 112,016 |
| 37 | Colorado | 113,232 | 37 | New York | 110,048 | 37 | Colorado | 113,232 | 37 | Idaho | 111,135 |
| 38 | Massachusetts | 112,777 | 38 | California | 109,945 | 38 | Massachusetts | 112,777 | 38 | New York | 110,048 |
| 39 | Wisconsin | 112,457 | 39 | Connecticut | 109,486 | 39 | Wisconsin | 112,457 | 39 | California | 109,945 |
| 40 | Alabama | 111,973 | 40 | Rhode Island | 106,762 | 40 | Alabama | 111,973 | 40 | Connecticut | 109,486 |
| 41 | Louisiana | 110,964 | 41 | New Jersey | 106,112 | 41 | Louisiana | 110,964 | 41 | Rhode Island | 106,762 |
| 42 | Missouri | 108,000 | 42 | North Dakota | 105,677 | 42 | Missouri | 108,000 | 42 | New Jersey | 106,112 |
| 43 | Wyoming | 106,100 | 43 | Wyoming | 103,494 | 43 | Wyoming | 106,100 | 43 | North Dakota | 105,677 |
| 44 | Maine | 105,300 | 44 | Vermont | 95,879 | 44 | Maine | 105,300 | 44 | Wyoming | 103,494 |
| 45 | Mississippi | 104,170 | 45 | New Mexico | 95,660 | 45 | Mississippi | 104,170 | 45 | Vermont | 95,879 |
| 46 | South Dakota | 104,041 | 46 | Montana | 93,025 | 46 | South Dakota | 104,041 | 46 | New Mexico | 95,660 |
| 47 | Idaho | 103,600 | 47 | Massachusetts | 90,964 | 47 | Idaho | 103,600 | 47 | Montana | 93,025 |
| 48 | North Dakota | 98,070 | 48 | Oregon | 89,658 | 48 | North Dakota | 98,070 | 48 | Massachusetts | 90,964 |
| 49 | New Mexico | 96,531 | 49 | Hawaii | 78,375 | 49 | New Mexico | 96,531 | 49 | Oregon | 89,658 |
| 50 | Oregon | 95,800 |  | Maine | N/A | 50 | Oregon | 95,800 |  | Maine | N/A |
| 51 | Montana | 94,093 |  | New Hampshire | N/A | 51 | Montana | 94,093 |  | New Hampshire | N/A |

## Option C Costs

|  | No. of Judges | FY07 Current Salary | Cost | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Proposed } \\ \text { FY08 } \\ \text { (7/1/2007) } \\ \text { Salary } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Diff | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Supreme Court |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chief Justice | 1 | 144,900 | 144,900 | 223,208 | 78,308 | 223,208 |
| Associate Justice | 4 | 139,725 | 558,900 | 220,115 | 80,390 | 880,460 |
| Intermediate Court of Appeals Chief Judge | 1 | 134,550 | 134,550 | 361 | 11 |  |
| Associate Judge | 5 | 129,375 | 646,875 | 212,130 | 82,755 | 1,060,650 |
| Circuit Courts Judge | 33 | 125,856 | 4,153,248 | 191,610 | 65,754 | 6,323,130 |
| District/Family/Per Diem Judge | 46 | 118,611 | 5,456,106 | 187,879 | 69,268 | 8,642,434 |
|  | 90 |  | 11,094,579 |  |  | 17,340,243 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 6,245,664 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 56.29\% |

## Cost Comparison



OPTION A (Shifted One Year): PROPOSED SALARIES FOR JUSTICES AND JUDGES

|  | No. of Judges | Current FY07 (7/1/2006) Salary | Cost | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Proposed } \\ \text { FYos } \\ \text { (7/1/2007) } \\ \text { Salary } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Diff | Cost | Proposed <br> FY09 <br> (7/1/2008) <br> Salary <br> 3 | Diff | Cost | $\begin{gathered} \text { Proposed } \\ \text { FY10 } \\ \text { (7r1/2009) } \\ \text { Salary } \end{gathered}$ | Diff | Cost | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Proposed } \\ \text { FY11 } \\ \text { (7/1/2010) } \\ \text { Salary } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Diff | Cost | $\begin{gathered} \text { Proposed } \\ \text { FY12 } \\ \text { (7/1/2011) } \\ \text { Salary } \end{gathered}$ | Diff | Cost | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Proposed } \\ \text { FY13 } \\ \text { (7/1/2011) } \\ \text { Salary } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Diff | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual Percentage Increase |  |  |  | 7.12\% |  |  | 3.5\% |  |  | 3.5\% |  |  | 3.5\% |  |  | 3.5\% |  |  | 3.5\% |  |  |
| Supreme Court |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chief Justice | 1 | 144,800 | 144,900 | 155,221 | 10,321 | 155,221 | 160.654 | 5.433 | 160.654 | 166.277 | 5,623 | 166.277 | 172.097 | 5,820 | 172,097 | 178,120 | 6,023 | 178,120 | ${ }^{184,354}$ | 6.234 | 184,354 |
| Associate Justice | 4 | 139,725 | 558,900 | 149,677 | 9,952 | 696,708 | 154.916 | 5. 239 | 619.664 | 160.338 | 5.422 | 641,352 | 165.950 | 5.612 | 663,800 | 171,758 | 5,808 | 687,032 | 177,770 | 6,012 | 711,000 |
| Intermediate Court of Appeals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chief Judge | 1 | 134,550 | 134,550 | 144,133 | 9,583 | 144,133 | 149,178 | 5.045 | 149.178 | 154,399 | 5,221 | 154,399 | 159,803 | 5,404 | 159,803 | 165,386 | 5,593 | 165,396 | 171,185 | 5,789 | 171,185 |
| Associate Judge | 5 | 129,375 | 646,875 | 138,500 | 9,215 | 692,950 | 143,441 | 4,851 | 717.205 | 148,461 | 5,020 | 742,305 | 153,657 | 5,196 | 768,285 | 159,035 | 5,378 | 795,175 | 164,601 | 5,566 | 823,005 |
| Circuit Courts Judae | 33 | 125,856 | 4,153,248 | 134,820 | 8,964 | 4,449,060 | 139,539 | 4,719 | 4,604,787 | 144,423 |  | 4,765,959 | 149,478 | 5,065 | 4,932,774 | 154,710 | 5.232 | 5,105,430 | 160,125 | 5.415 | 5.284,125 |
| District/Family ${ }^{\text {//Per Diem }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Judge | 46 | 188,611 | 5.456,106 | 127,059 | 8,448 | 5.844,714 | 131,506 | 4.447 | 6.049.276 | 136,10日 | 4,603 | 6,201,014 | 140,873 | 4,764 | 6,480,158 | 145.804 | 4,931 | 6,706,9e4 | 150,907 | 5,103 | 6,941,722 |
|  | 90 |  | 11,094,579 |  |  | 11,854,786 |  |  | 12.300 .764 415.978 |  |  | 12,731, 306 |  |  | 13,176,917 |  |  | 13,638,137 |  |  | 14,115,471 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.50\% |  |  | 477,334 $3.50 \%$ |

Curently, tivee of the Famly Cour judges are Cirout Cout level jubges. Hence, theik salaries are budgeted and displayed on the Cirout Court line. The remainder of the Farily Cout judges are
identfied as District/Famiey Court judges and are paid at the District Court judge salary level.
${ }^{2}$ For budgeting purposes, based on historical data, a FTE of 10 is used for the number of per diem judges unlized per year.
Note: All numbers are rounded.

OPTION B (2004 Proposal): PROPOSED SALARIES FOR JUSTICES AND JUDGES

|  | No. of Judges | Current FYo7 (7/1/2006) |  |  | Diff | Cost | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Proposed } \\ \text { FYo9 } \\ \text { (771/2008) } \\ \text { Salary } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Diff | Cost | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Proposed } \\ \text { FY10 } \\ \text { (7/1/2009) } \\ \text { Salary } \end{array}$ | Diff | Cost | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered}\text { Proposed } \\ \text { FY11 } \\ \text { (71/1/2010) } \\ \text { Salary }\end{gathered}\right.$ | Diff | Cost | Proposed FY12 (7/1/2011) Salary | Diff | Cost | Proposed FY13 $(7 / 1 / 2012)$ Salary | Diff | Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Cost |  |  |  | 5.0\% |  |  | 5.0\% |  |  | 5.0\% |  |  | 5.0\% |  |  | 5.0\% |  |  |  |
| Supreme Court |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 215.671 |  | 215,671 |  |
| Chier Justice | 1 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 144,900 \\ & 139,725 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 144,900 \\ & 558,900 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 168,9 e 4 \\ & 167,2004 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24,0 e 4 \\ & 27,476 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 168,984 \\ & 668,804 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 177,433 \\ & 175,561 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8,449 \\ & 8,380 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 177,433 \\ & 702,244 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 186,306 \\ 184,339 \end{array}$ | 8,872 8.778 | 186505 737,356 | 193,620 193,556 | 9,217 | 774,224 | 203,234 | 9,678 | 812,998 | ${ }_{2}^{213,396}$ | 10,162 | 853,584 |  |
| Intermediate Court of Appeals Chief Judga | 1 | 134,550 | 134,550 | 162,743 | 28,193 | 162,743 | 170.880 | 8. 137 | 170,880 | 179,424 | 8.544 | 179,424 | 188,395 | 8,971 | 188.395 | 197.815 | 9,420 | 197,815 | 207706 | 9.891 | ${ }^{2077,706}$ |  |
| Associale Judge | 5 | 129,375 | 646.875 | 160,068 | 30,693 | 800,340 | 168.071 | 8.003 | 840.355 | 176,475 | 8,404 | 882,375 | 185.299 | 8,824 | 926,495 | 194,564 | 9.265 | 972,820 | 204.292 | 9.728 | 1,021,460 |  |
| Circuit Courts Judge | 33 | 125,856 | 4,153,248 | 154.721 | 28.865 | 8,106,793 | 162,457 | 7.736 | 5,361,081 | 170,690 | 8,123 | 5,629,140 | 179,109 | 8.529 | 5,910,597 | 188,064 | 8,955 | 6,206,112 | 197,467 | 9,403 | 6,516,411 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { District/Family }{ }^{\frac{1}{1 / P e r}} \text { Diem }^{2} \\ & \text { Juogege } \end{aligned}$ | 46 | 118,611 | 5,456,106 | 145.804 | 27,193 | 6,706,984 | 153,094 | 7.280 | 7,042,324 | 160,749 | 7,655 | 7,394,454 | 168,786 | 8,037 | 7,764,156 | 177,225 | 8,439 | 8,152,350 | 186,086 | 8,861 | 8,559,956 |  |
|  | 90 |  | 11,094,579 |  |  | $13,613,648$ $2,519,069$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 14,294,317 \\ 650,669 \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 15.009 .054 \\ 714,737 \end{array}$ |  |  | 15,759,487 750,433 |  |  | $16,547,434$ 787,947 5 |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 17,374,788 \\ 827,354 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.71\% |  |  | 5.00\% |  |  | $5.00 \%$ |  |  | $5.00 \%$ |  |  | 5.00\% |  |  | $5.00 \%$ | 47.71\% |

'Currenty, three of the Family Court juxges are Crcuit Court level judges. Hence, their saiaries are budgetod and displayed an the Circuit Court line. The remainder of the Farnity Court judges are identified as DistrictFamily Court judges and are paid at the District Court jutge salary lemel.
${ }^{2}$ For butgeting purposes, based on historical data, a FTE of 10 is used for the number of per diem judges uttized per year.
Note: All mumbers are rounded.

OPTION C (National Average): PROPOSED SALARIES FOR JUSTICES AND JUDGES

|  | No. of Judges | FY07 <br> Current Salary | Cost |  | Diff | Cost | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { FY09 } \\ \text { (7/11/2008) } \\ \text { Salary } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Diff | Cost | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY10 } \\ \text { (7//1/2009) } \\ \text { Salary } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Diff | Cost | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY11 } \\ \text { (771/2010) } \\ \text { Salary } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Diff | Cost | FY12 (771/2011) Salary | Diff | Cost | FY13 (771/2012) <br> Salary | Diff | Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5\% |  |  | 3.5\% |  |  | 3.5\% |  |  | 3.5\% |  |  | $3.5 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Supreme Court |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chiel Justice | 1 | 144,900 | 144,900 | 223,208 | 78,308 | 223,208 | 231,020 | 7.812 | 231,020 | 239,106 | 8.086 | 239,106 | 247,475 | 8,369 | 247,475 | 256,137 | 8,662 | 256,137 | 265,102 | 8,965 | 265,102 |  |
| Associate Justice | 4 | 139,725 | 558,900 | 220,115 | 80.390 | 880,460 | 227.819 | 7.704 | 911,276 | 235,793 | 7,974 | 943,172 | 244,046 | 8.253 | 976,184 | 252,588 | 8.542 | 1,010,352 | 261,429 | 8,841 | 1,045,716 |  |
| Intermediate Court of Appeals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chief Judge | 1 | 134,550 | 134,550 | 210,361 | 75.811 | 210,361 | 217,724 | 7,363 | 217724 | 225.344 | 7,620 | 225.344 | 233, 231 | 7,887 | 233,231 | 241,394 | 8,163 | 241,394 | 249,843 | 8.449 | 249,843 |  |
| Associate Jubge | 5 | 129,375 | 646,875 | 212,130 | 82,755 | 1,060,650 | 219,555 | 7.425 | 1,097,775 | 227.239 | 7,684 | 1,136,195 | 235,192 | 7,953 | 1,175,960 | 243,424 | 8,232 | 1,217,120 | 251,944 | 8,520 | 1,259,720 |  |
| Circuit Courts Judge | 33 | 125.856 | 4,153,249 | 191,610 | 65,754 | 6,323,130 | 198,316 | 6,706 | 6,544,428 | 205,257 | 6.941 | 6,773,481 | 212,441 | 7,184 | 7,010,563 | 219,876 | 7,435 | 7,255,908 | 227,572 | 7,606 | 7,509,876 |  |
| District/Family ${ }^{1 / P e r}$ Diem $^{2}$ Judge | 46 | 118,611 | 5,456,106 | 187,879 | 69,268 | B,642,434 | 194,455 | 6,576 | 8,944,930 | 201,261 | 6.806 | 9,258,006 | 208,305 | 7,044 | 2.582,030 | 215,596 | 7,291 | 9,917,416 | 223,142 | 7,546 | 10,264,532 |  |
|  | 90 |  | 11,094,579 |  |  | 17 340,243 |  |  | 17,947,153 |  |  | 18,575,304 |  |  | 19225,433 |  |  | 19,898,327 |  |  | 20,594,789 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $6.245,664$ <br> $56.29 \%$ |  |  | 606,910 <br> $3.50 \%$ |  |  | 628,151 $3.50 \%$ |  |  | 650,129 $3.50 \%$ |  |  | 672,894 $3.50 \%$ |  |  | 696,462 $3.50 \%$ | 73.797 |

'Currenty, three of the Family Court judges are Circult Court level judges. Hence, their salaries are budgeled and displayed on the Circuil Court line. The remeinder of the Family Court judges are idenffed as District/Family Court Judges and are paid at the District Court judge salary level.
${ }^{2}$ For budgeting purposes, based on historical data, a FTE of 10 is used for the number of per diem judges utilized per year.
In adation, due to different court structures, the salary shown is the highest of the firmied jurisdiction courts for that state. This may not be directiy analogous to Hawai's District Courts.
Nole: Al numbers are founded but the numbers for Chiet Justice, Chiet Judge, and District Judges are rounded to the nearest 1,000 .

# OBSERVATIONS REGARDING CURRENT SALARY STRUCTURE AND SCHEDULED PAY INCREASES FOR EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICIALS 

## Pay Relationships

- The current compensation structure for department heads and deputy department heads has four tiers, with different salaries for departments assigned to each tier, and the salaries of deputy department heads are tied to the department head that they serve under. Initially (July 1, 2004) the salary for the highest tier was set at $\$ 105,000$ per year and the annual salary for each lower tier was $\$ 5,000$ less. The salary ranges for deputy department heads was set at $87 \%$ to $92 \%$ of the salary of the department heads. The recommendations of the Executive Salary Commission covered a six-year period and provided a $2 \%$ increase each year.
- Organizationally, departments are broken down into divisions and the divisions are further broken down into branches. Most division chiefs are civil service employees occupying Excluded Managerial Compensation Plan (EMCP) positions assigned to EM-07 and EM-08 salary ranges, but some division chiefs are assigned to higher salary ranges (ES-01, ES-02, and ES-03). About half of the civil service branch chiefs are EMCP employees assigned to the EM-05 salary range, but some branch chiefs are assigned to higher salary ranges up to EM-07. Most departmental staff officers occupy EMCP positions assigned salary ranges EM-05 through EM-08. The folders that were provided to you at the first meeting contain listings of the EMCP positions broken down by department. Typically, division chief position titles contain the term "Administrator" and branch chief titles normally contain the term "Manager". Staff officer titles normally contain the term "Officer".
- Division chiefs, branch chiefs and staff officers represent a potential pool of candidates for department head and deputy department head positions as they have substantial technical knowledge of the programs within their departments as well as State governmental operations in general. However, division chiefs, branch chiefs, and departmental staff officers may not pursue or accept such appointments if the appointments would result in pay cuts. Many departments have division chiefs that are paid more than their department heads and branch chiefs that are paid more than their deputy department heads. In a few instances there are branch chiefs that are paid more than their department heads. In the case of the Department of Human Resources Development, all four of the division chiefs are paid more than the department head.
- The maximum salary for deputy department heads in the two most highly paid tiers exceeds the salary for the department heads in the lowest tier. A situation occurred where the Deputy Director of a department assigned to the second highest tier was appointed as the director of a department assigned to the lowest tier, and this resulted in a pay cut. The number of tiers (four) and the difference in compensation between tiers contributed to that outcome.
- The department head for the Department of Public Safety is currently assigned to the lowest tier. Aside from the Department of Education and the University of Hawaii, the Department of Public Safety is one of the four largest departments in terms of staffing. The corrections program, which is within the department, is among the most controversial and problem prone within State government, and involves correctional facilities that operate twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. When the previous director resigned, the administration encountered significant difficulty in finding a qualified individual willing to accept the department head position at the specified salary. Another department which may be misplaced is the Department of Human Services. It is assigned to the second lowest tier, but is one of the four largest departments, aside from the Department of Education and the University of Hawaii, and some of the programs within the department are complex and controversial.
- Generally, State departments tend to be substantially larger and more complex than county departments and often involve operations on multiple islands rather than a single island. Other than the Attorney General, department heads within the State are paid less than department heads within the City and County of Honolulu. All of the deputy department heads within the State are paid less than the deputy department heads in the city and Honolulu.


Future Pay Increases
The compensation recommendations of the commission will cover a six-year period, and the commission can recommend annual pay increases. The scheduled salary increases for department heads and deputy department heads provide $2 \%$ increases each year through July 1, 2011.

- Collective bargaining increases for Fiscal Biennium 2005-2007 resulted in average pay increases of over $4.5 \%$ per year in each year of the biennium. The pay increases for Bargaining Units (BUs) 2 (Blue Collar Supervisory), 3 (White Collar), 4 (White Collar Supervisory), and 13 (Professional and Scientific) provided for 3.5\% across-the-board increases and step movements after a specified number of years of creditable service. Those step movements account for an average increase of more than 1\%. The pay increases for BUs 1 (Blue Collar) and 10 (Institutional Workers), provided for increases comparable to BUs 2, 3, 4, and 13, but they were all in the form of across-the-board increases. The increases for BUs 9 (Registered Nurses) and 11 (Fire Fighters) were higher than the increases for BUs 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, and 13.
- The pay increases for bargaining unit employees for the next biennium have not been determined at this time. However, it is known that the budget picture for the State, which is the largest of the local employers that bargain collectively, is better
than it was when the last negotiations occurred. Therefore, the pay increases could be as good or better during the next biennium. It is important that proper pay relationships be established at the beginning of the period covered by the commission's recommendations, and just as important that the proper pay relationships be maintained for the entire period covered by the recommendations.
- Some department heads are paid less than their subordinate civil service division chiefs. If those subordinate division chiefs continue to receive pay increases that average more than $2 \%$ per year, the existing pay disparities will increase.

EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM MEMBERSHIP COMPARISON CHART

| Category | Elected Officials | Legislative Officers | Judges - Hired Before 7/1/99 | Judges - Hired After 6/30/99 | $\frac{\text { Executive \& Administrative }}{\text { Emplovees }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Mayor, Legislator, Council Member and Prosecuting Attorney for each county, Office of Hawaiian Affairs. | Chief Clerk, Assistant Chief Clerk, Sergeant at arms, Assistant Sergeant at arms of either house of the legislature. | Justices \& Judges of the State of Hawaii Justice of Supreme Court, Judge of Intermediate Appellate Court, Judge of Circuit Court, Judge of District Court, District Family Court. |  | Department heads, Executive Officers, Deputies, Assistants to department heads, Superintendent of Education, President of UH, Adjutant General, Managing directors, Administrative Assistant to the Mayor, First Deputies; County Clerk, Deputy County Clerk of each county, etc. |
| Retirement Plan | Contributory -Membership optional <br> -(Note: 2007 legislative proposals are being introduced to repeal optional membership \& add a one-time irrevocable option to join ERS in order to maintain ERS tax-qualified status.) | Contributory | Contributory | Contributory | Contributory - current contributory member in service prior to 7/1/06 and appointed after 7/1/06 with no break in service. <br> Hybrid - new member appointed after 6/30/06. <br> Noncontributory - current noncontributory member in service prior to 7/1/06 and appointed after 7/1/06 with no break in service. |
| Employee Contribution (\% of Salary) | 7.8\% | 7.8\% | 7.8\% | 7.8\% | 7.8\% Contributory <br> 6.0\% Hybrid <br> $0 \%$ Noncontributory |
| Pension Benefit Formula | $31 / 2 \% \times$ Years of Service $x$ AFC plus Annuity. | $31 / 2 \% \times$ Years of Service x AFC plus Annuity. | $31 / 2 \% \times$ Years of Service x AFC plus Annuity. | $31 / 2 \% \times$ Years of Service x AFC plus Annuity. | Mixed Calculations - <br> $2 \%$ x Years of Service x AFC <br> (Contributory \& Hybrid) plus <br> $11 / 4 \%$ x Years of Service x AFC (Noncontributory) |
| Annuity (on retirement contributions) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Not applicable |
| Januarv <br> Page | "Annuity" is a benefit payment for life based on the actuarial equivalent of the member's accumulated contributions (includes interest) derived from that designated occupation. 51 of 508 |  |  |  |  |


| Category | Elected Officials | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { Legislative }}{\text { Officers }} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Judges - Hired } \\ & \text { Before 7/1/99 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Judges - Hired } \\ \text { After 6/30/99 } \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{\text { Executive \& Administrative }}{\text { Employees }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average Final Compensation | Bifurcation for service after 6/30/97. | Bifurcation for service after 6/30/97. | No Bifurcation | No Bifurcation | No Bifurcation |
|  | "AFC" or Average Final Compensation is an average of the highest (gross) salaries including overtime, temporary assignment and differential pay during any 3 years excluding vacation pay if membership is on or after $1 / 1 / 71$ or during any 5 years including vacation pay if membership before $1 / 1 / 71$. <br> "Bifurcation" requires separate AFC calculations for each category of service. (Section 88-81) |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum <br> Benefit Payable <br> (\% of AFC) | 75\% Maximum | 75\% Maximum | 75\% Maximum | 75\% Maximum | None. |
|  | The maximum benefit payable can be exceeded with additional unused sick leave credits. Every 20 days of unused sick leave will be converted to an additional month of service credit provided the minimum of the 60 days requirement is met. |  |  |  |  |
| Unused Sick Leave Credits for Retirement | -Legislator, Council Member: No <br> -Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Mayor: Yes, | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Normal <br> Service <br> Retirement | -Age 55 \& 5 years credited service <br> -If over age 65 , member of the State legislature may retire \& receive a pension while continuing to serve in elected position. | Age 55 and 5 years credited service. | Age 55 and 5 years credited service. | Age 55 and 5 years credited service. | Contributory-Age 55 and 5 years credited service. <br> Hybrid-Age 62 and 5 years credited service or Age 55 and 30 years credited service. <br> Noncontributory - Age 62 and 10 years credited service or Age 55 and 30 years credited service. |


| Category | Elected Officials | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { Legislative }}{\text { Officers }} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Judges - Hired } \\ & \text { Before 7/1/99 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Judges - Hired } \\ & \text { After 6/30/99 } \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\text { Executive \& Administrative }}{\text { Employees }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Early Retirement | -Any age and 10 years (mixed) credited service. <br> -No pension reduction for service in this capacity. <br> - Age reduction factors applied to "other" service if below age 55 . | -Any age and 10 years (mixed) credited service. <br> -No pension reduction for service in this capacity. <br> -Age reduction factors applied to "other" service if below age 55 . | -Any age and 10 years (mixed) credited service. <br> -No pension reduction for service in this capacity. <br> -Age reduction factors applied to "other" service if below age 55 . | -Any age and 25 years (mixed) credited service. <br> -Age reduction factors applied to all service if below age 55. | Contributory - <br> -Any age and 25 years (mixed) credited service. <br> -Age reduction factors applied to all service if below age 55 . <br> Hybrid - <br> -Age 55 and 20 years (mixed) credited service. <br> -Age reduction factors applied to all service if below age 62 . <br> Noncontributory - <br> -Age 55 and 20 years (mixed) credited service. <br> -Age reduction factors applied to all service if below age 62 . |
|  | "Age reduction factors" -Contributory -$\quad$Maximum allowance reduced $5 \%$ for each year below age 55 plus $4 \%$ for each year below age 50 plus $3 \%$ for each <br> year below age 45 plus $2 \%$ for each year below age 40.Hybrid -$\quad$Maximum allowance reduced $5 \%$ for each year below age 62.Noncontributory - Maximum allowance reduced $6 \%$ for each year below age 62. |  |  |  |  |
| Vested/Deferred Retirement | -Termination of membership prior to age 55 with at least 5 years of credited service. <br> -Accrued maximum allowance payable at age 55 . | -Termination of membership prior to age 55 with at least 5 years credited service. <br> -Accrued maximum allowance payable at age 55 . | -Termination of membership prior to age 55 with at least 5 years of credited service. <br> -Accrued maximum allowance payable at age 55. | -Termination of membership prior to age 55 with at least 5 years of credited service. <br> -Accrued maximum allowance payable at age 55. | Contributory - <br> - Termination of membership prior to age 55 with at least 5 years credited service. <br> - Accrued maximum allowance payable at age 55. (Contributions left in the ERS) <br> Hybrid - <br> - Termination of membership prior to age 62 with at least 5 years credited service. <br> - Accrued maximum allowance payable at age 62. (Contributions left in the ERS) <br> Noncontributory - <br> - Termination of membership prior to age 62 with at least 10 years credited service. <br> - Accrued maximum allowance payable at age 65. |

## EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

| Category | Elected Officials | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { Legislative }}{\text { Officers }} \end{aligned}$ | Judges - Hired Before 7/1/99 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Judges - Hired } \\ \hline \text { After 6/30/99 } \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{\text { Executive \& Administrative }}{\text { Employees }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Act 90, Session Laws of Hawaii 1971 Applicability | Yes | Not applicable | Yes | Yes | Not applicable |
|  | Any elected official or judge after attaining an allowance of $75 \%$ of the AFC, may elect to retire and be eligible to receive a retirement benefit at a future separation date and continue in service as a judge or elected official. Elected officials and judges may also elect not to retire and continue membership in the ERS. (Note: 2007 Legislative Proposals are being introduced to repeal sections 88-59.6, 88-61 (c) and 88-73(e) to maintain ERS tax-qualified status.) |  |  |  |  |
| Ordinary Disability Retirement | -10 years credited service. <br> -Any age with no penalty. <br> $\cdot 31 / 2 \%$ x Years of Service x AFC plus Annuity. <br> -Minimum of $30 \%$ of the AFC. | - 10 years credited service. <br> -Any age with no penalty. <br> - $31 / 2 \%$ x Years of Service x AFC plus Annuity. <br> -Minimum of $30 \%$ of the AFC . | - 10 years credited service. <br> -Any age with no penalty. <br> $-31 / 2 \% \times$ Years of Service x AFC plus Annuity. <br> -Minimum of 30\% of the AFC. | - 10 years credited service. <br> - Any age with no penalty. <br> $\cdot 31 / 2 \% \times$ Years of Service x AFC plus Annuity. <br> -Minimum of $30 \%$ of the AFC . | Contributory - <br> -10 years credited service. <br> - Any age with no penalty. <br> $\cdot 13 / 4 \% \times$ Years of Service x AFC. <br> - Minimum of $30 \%$ of the AFC. <br> Hybrid - <br> -10 years credited service. <br> -Any age with no penalty. <br> -Split Formula - 2\% x Years of Service $x$ <br> AFC.(contributory \& hybrid) plus $11 / 4 \%$ x <br> Years of Service x AFC (noncontributory) <br> $\cdot$ Minimum of $25 \%$ of the AFC. <br> Noncontributory - <br> -10 years credited service. <br> -Any age with no penalty. <br> $\cdot 11 / 4 \%$ x Years of Service x AFC. <br> - Minimum of $12.5 \%$ of the AFC. |


| Category | Elected Officials | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { Legislative }}{\text { Officers }} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Judges - Hired } \\ & \text { Before 7/1/99 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Judges - Hired } \\ & \text { After 6/30/99 } \end{aligned}$ | Executive \& Administrative Employees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service- <br> Connected <br> Disability <br> Retirement | Contributory - <br> $\bullet$ No minimum service. <br> -Any age with no penalty. <br> - For accidents that occur on or after July 7, 1998, 50\% of AFC plus return of contributions and interest. <br> - For accidents that occur prior to July 7, 1998 <br> Total Benefit $-66-2 / 3 \%$ of the AFC plus annuity based on contributions. <br> Occupational benefit $-66-2 / 3 \%$ of the AFC plus annuity based on contributions, and then reduced to $33-1 / 3 \%$ after 3 years. |  |  |  | Contributory - <br> -No minimum service. <br> - Any age with no penalty. <br> -For accidents that occur on or after July 7, 1998, $50 \%$ of the AFC plus return of contributions and interest. <br> -For accidents that occur prior to July 7, 1998 <br> Total Benefit $-66-2 / 3 \%$ of the AFC plus annuity based on contributions. <br> Occupational benefit $-66-2 / 3 \%$ of the AFC plus annuity based on contributions, and then reduced to $33-1 / 3 \%$ after 3 years. <br> Hybrid- <br> -No minimum service. <br> - Any age with no penalty. <br> $-35 \%$ of the AFC plus return of contributions and interest. <br> Noncontributory - <br> -No minimum service. <br> - Any age with no penalty. <br> -For accident that occur on or after July 1, $2004,35 \%$ of the AFC. <br> -For accidents that occur prior to July 1, 2004, $11 / 4 \% \times$ Years of Service x AFC, with a minimum of $15 \%$ of the AFC . |

## Sample of Pension Calculation for Judge Service

| PENSION CALCULATION |
| :--- |
| Judge Service |
| The basic formula is: |
| $31 / 2 \% \times$ Years of Credited Service $\times$ AFC* |
| plus Annuity** |
| *Average Final Compensation |
| *Annuity is an annual lifetime benefit payment based on |
| member's age at retirement and amount of employee |
| contributions and interest made while employed as a |
| Judge, Elected Official, or Logislative Officer. |

## AFC is... <br> Average <br> Final <br> Compensation

- Included in the AFC are actual gross earnings, including overtime, temporary assignment, and differential pay.
- Federal tax limit on the amount of annual compensation that can be used to determine an employee's retirement benefit.
- For 2005 calendar year, the maximum compensation limit is $\$ 210,000$. Once an employee reaches the limit, his/her contributions will be stopped.


## MAXIMUM BENEFIT PAYABLE

- The annual maximum benefit for Judges, Elected Officials, and Legislative Officers is $75 \%$ of the member's AFC.
- If the $75 \%$ limitation is exceeded, the member is refunded the excess contributions.
- The refund is applicable only to contributions derived from judicial, elected official, or legislative officer service.

| SAMPLE RETIREMENT ESTIMATE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|   <br> MEMBER'SAGE 55 <br> BENEFICIARY AGE 57 <br> EARNED SERVICE 12 YRS OMOS (JUdge) <br> ACQURED SERVICE YRS O MOS (General) <br> UNUSED SICKLEAVE* 27 YRS OMS <br> TOTAL MEMBERSHIP SERVICE 27 MOS (Mixed) <br> TOTAL COMPUTED SERVICE 27 YRS O MOS (Mixed) |  |

${ }^{*}$ Sick Leave is NOT used in estimate computation. II is included when you actually retire and your estimated pension is finalized.
AFC: $\$ 106,921$
Total Contributions: $\$ 220,000$
(General Employes: $\$ 120,000+$ Judge: $\$ 100,000$ )
Service Annuity Value of member age 55: 13.6314

Sample of Pension Calculation for Judge Service


## SAMPLE RETIREMENT ESTIMATE

## Summary:

- Computed annual pension $(\$ 84,319)$ is more than the $75 \%$ AFC limitation $(\$ 80,190)$
- Since the annual maximum pension is limited to $\$ 80,190$, the member will receive a refund of $\$ 56,284$ for excess contributions.
- Balance of the member's contributions (for Refund Retirement Options) is $\$ 163,716$ ( $\$ 220,000$ total less the $\$ 56,284$ excess contributions refund)


## Sample of Pension Calculation for Judge Service

| RETIREMENT OPTION | RETIREE'S MONTHLY PENSION | BENEFICIARY'S CONTINUING PENSION | POP UP TO RETIREE | INSURANCE RESERVE | REFUND AMOUNT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { REFUND } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowance | \$6,682 | $\cdots$ | *. | *** | *. | . . |
| One | \$6,548 | $\cdots$ | . | \$1,093,144 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
| Two (100\% Survivor) | \$6,074 | \$6,074 | \$6,682 | - | - | $\cdots$ |
| Three (50\% Survivor) | \$6,361 | \$3,180 | \$6,682 | $\cdots$ | - | . . |
| Four ( 58 Max ) | \$6,482 | -20) | $1-20$ | OTo | 881,862 | 50\% |
| Four 5.8 Max ) | \$5,931 |  | 3 | - | \%122.793. | 75\% |
| Four (5 \& 1) | \$6,058 |  |  | \$1,011,279 | \$81,862 | $50 \%$ |
| Four (5 \& 1) | \$5:813 |  |  | \$970,347 | \$122793 | 75\% |
| Four ( 582 ) | \$5,619 | \$5,519 | \$6,182 | - | S 581862 | 50\% |
| Four (58) | \$5,382 | \$5392 | 15,931 | 人8. | \$122793 | 75\% |
| Four (583) | \$5,885 | \$2,942 | \$6,182 | 5-5.0. | \$81;862 | 50\% |
| Four (5 \& 3) | \$5,647 | 32,823 | \$5,831 | 3 | \$122.793 | 75\% |
| Five | \$5,681 | ** | * | -.. | \$163,716 | 100\% |

Note: Excess contributions refund of $\$ 56,284$ not included in this estimate.

## ACT 90/71 RETIREMENT PROVISIONS

Retirement benefits under Act 90/71Sections 88-61(c) and 88-73(e)

- Any Judge or Elected Official, after attaining the 75\% AFC limitation, may elect to retire and continue in service as a judge or elected official and be eligible to receive a retirement benefit at a future separation date.
- Any excess contributions on member's account above the $75 \%$ AFC limitation will be refunded to the member after the election is made.
- Post-retirement allowances will accrue from the date of the election until the date you actually retire.

UPDATED
GENERAL FUND FINANCIAL PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 06-13
(in millions of dollars)

REVENUES:
Executive Branch:
Tax revenues
Nontax revenues
Judicial Branch revenues
Other
$\quad$ TOTAL REVENUES

## EXPENDITURES

Executive Branch:
Operating
CIP
Specific appropriations
Legislative Branch
Judicial Branch
OHA
Counties
Lapses

TOTAL EXPENDITURES
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FROM THE UPCOMING ISSUE

States Push for J udicial Pay Raises<br>Amanda Bronstad / Staff reporter<br>March 5, 2007

States across the nation that are struggling with the demoralizing impact of lagging pay for state judges are proposing the first pay hikes for their jurists in years.

But the size of the pay raises varies from state to state, reflecting different strategies and budget limitations.

The chief justice of Oregon, Paul De Muniz, is pushing for a 30.5\% increase in judicial salaries in his state.
"We need to be able to attract to the bench the best lawyers from private practice we can get, and we need to be able to retain those who go into a career of judicial service," De Muniz said. "Right now, we're having trouble doing both."

J udges in Georgia, NewJ ersey, New York and Oregon are pushing for their first raises in nearly five years. In the past year, some of the most substantial increases in recent years were approved in Alaska, Arizona, Massachusetts, Missouri, Pennsylvania and Tennessee.

In some states, the raises come as salaries rise among private practice lawyers and judges in comparable states. In others, the hikes are designed to closely mirror federal judicial salaries even as U.S. Chief J ustice J ohn G. Roberts J r. is lobbying Congress for higher pay on the federal side.

But raises aren't the norm in most states. Last year, the majority of state judges that reported increases saw their salaries bump up an average of $2.4 \%$, which is nearly on par with inflation and the first slowdown in rate increases since 2003.

Experts who track judicial salaries said the slowdown is due to lower inflation rates last year and increasing constraints on state budgets due to federal programs such as Medicare and Social Security.

## Playing Catchup

More than half the states reported some type of salary jump in 2006, according to the National Center for State Courts. Most of those states report regular increases, often for cost-of-living adjustments.

But several states hadn't given their judges a raise or cost-of-living adjustment in years and opted last year to play catchup. They cited salaries that had not kept up with the rising compensation of lawyers in private practice and judges in other states.

J udges in Massachusetts, for example, received a 15\% raise last year after going without any raise or cost-of-living adjustment since 2000, when a three-year increase ended. The new salaries became effective retroactively on J an. 1, 2006. Trial court judges now earn \$129,694.
"There hadn't been a pay raise in Massachusetts of any nature, including cost of living, since one was enacted in 1998," said J ames G. Collins, a circuit justice and former vice president of the Massachusetts J udges Conference. "As a result, we had fallen to 48th in the nation when adjusted for the cost of living."

In Missouri, a citizens' commission recommended a $\$ 1,200$ bonus across the board and a 4\% raise that is expected to boost salaries for circuit court judges to \$113,520. Missouri hasn't granted a judicial raise in six years, which has been a "demoralizing factor with our state judges," said Catherine Barrie, senior legislative counsel at The Missouri Bar.

In appealing for raises, judges looked to salaries in other states and noted that the average salary for a private practice lawyer in Missouri is $\$ 185,000$, she said.

## A 16-year Drought

Legislators in Tennessee considered the salaries of judges in other states and private practice lawyers when approving a $14 \%$ raise last year, said Sue Allison, a spokeswoman for the Administrative Office of the Courts in Tennessee. In that state, judges received the first salary adjustment, other than cost-of-living increases, in 16 years, she said. The state's trial court judges now earn \$140,000.
"Everyone agreed that after 16 years, it was not unreasonable to review their salaries," Allison said.

In Arizona, the same comparisons came up when a salary commission approved a $12.5 \%$ increase in annual compensation for state judges that became effective this year. Arizona's last raise was approved five years ago.
"The issue was always, 'If we're not going to have higher salaries, why would qualified attorneys leave private practice?' " said Cari Gerchick, a spokeswoman at the Arizona Supreme Court.

J udicial and business leaders in Oregon compared the salaries of its state judges to the salaries of attorneys in public service and of judges in four surrounding states as part of a new task force assembled last year to look at pay increases, said De Muniz.

J udges in Oregon have not received a salary increase or cost-of-living adjustment since 2002. De Muniz said the task force has recommended that trial court judges earn $\$ 125,000$. Right now, they make $\$ 95,800$, the lowest salary in the country.

He said the governor has included enough money in a proposed budget this year to meet those requests.

The House of Representatives in Georgia passed a bill last month that would institute the first increase in base salaries for judges since 1999, said Kelly Moody, project coordinator at the Administrative Office of the Courts in Georgia. She said one reason for the increase was the growing disparity between judges and lawyers at private law firms.

J udges in the state have received a cost-of-living increase every year of about 3\%. But the new increase would boost the salaries of superior court judges by $10 \%$, to $\$ 128,400$.

## Looking at Federal Salaries

Other states looked to federal judicial salaries as guidance for salary increases.
Roberts is petitioning Congress to increase federal salaries, which he said have not kept up with inflation, resulting in several judges leaving the bench in recent years, particularly as the private sector offers much higher pay. Federal district court judges now make \$165,200 a year.

In New York, for example, four judges have sued the state to raise state trial court judge salaries from about \$136,000 to about the same as federal judges, said Nassau County Supreme Court J ustice J oseph A. DeMaro, one of the judges in the suit. The raise would be the first since 1999.
"We're seeking a significant increase to bring us up to speed with what we think we should be-to the level of the federal district judges," he said.

Meanwhile, New York Governor Eliot Spitzer has said he allocated judicial raises in a proposed budget earlier this year.

Last month, New York Chief J udge J udith S. Kaye called for legislation that would allowjudges and other state officials to regularly receive annual cost-ofliving adjustments. She also suggested that a state commission be formed this year to recommend annual salary adjustments and that, beginning in 2011, a new commission would meet every four years to reassess those salaries.

New J ersey Chief J ustice J ames R. Zazzali has been pushing legislators in recent weeks to increase state judicial salaries for the first time in seven years so that they match, or come close to, the pay of federal judges.
"Today, we are substantially behind federal salaries. They're \$165,000. Our trial judges are at $\$ 141,000$, , he said. "I'm concerned about the ability to attract judges."

New J ersey's judges last received a pay raise in 2000 that was spread out over three years.

In Alaska, court administrators who sought out a substantial increase last year cited the salaries of federal district court judges. Two years earlier, Alaska's state judges had received a $6.5 \%$ raise that boosted salaries to $\$ 116,076$ due to a general state salary shift.

But Alaska's trial court judges sought and received a 31\% raise on top of that. The judges now earn \$152,760.
"We'd fallen quite behind," said Rhonda McLeod, manager of fiscal operations at the Administrative Office of the Courts in Alaska.

In Pennsylvania, a bill has been introduced that would sever a newly established link between state and federal judicial salaries. In 2005, state legislators approved a salary hike that, for the first time, was based on a formula including federal judicial salaries. The increase boosted trial court judge's pay from $\$ 135,293$ and was the first major raise since the 1990s.

The raise proved controversial, prompting legislators to repeal the law, which also included increases to their own salaries. Several judges sued to retain their raises.
"The contention was that the state constitution did not permit the legislature to decrease salaries of judges and therefore the act repealing the increase, they contended, was unconstitutional," said Art Heinz, spokesman for the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts.

In September 2006, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court reinstated the increase retroactively so that judges began receiving their raise on J an. 1 of this year, he said. Most trial court judges now receive $\$ 152,115$, which includes a cost-of-living increase.

But the effect that federal salaries could have on future increases remains unclear. "There is some uncertainty about the implications for that," Heinz said.

## Return to Normalcy

Most states last year raised salaries by an average of $2.4 \%$, which is barely above inflation. Those raises, which include cost-of-living adjustments, are the first slowdown since increases began climbing after 2003.

In 2005, judges received an average salary increase of 4.5\%.
Court administrators in Minnesota, for example, are recommending a 5\% raise in judicial salaries in this year's budget after failing to get their requested compensation in past years.

Minnesota judges, like other state employees, have received a raise every year for the past decade. In 2005, a commission that reviews judicial salaries recommended a 3\% raise for that year and 2006. State legislators approved 1.5\%.
"That's the smallest raise they've gotten in the last 10 years," said Sandy Neren, a lobbyist for the Minnesota District J udges Association and a lawyer in the St. Paul office of Minneapolis-based Messerli \& Kramer. "Raises before then were quite a bit more because we were trying to catch up for years of no raises from back in the '90s."

At \$121,712, Minnesota's trial judges earn about the same as a first-year associate at a local law firm, she said. Even lawyers in the public sector earn more.

She said she was "hopeful" judges would get a raise this year, although she wasn't sure it would be 5\%. She said the state's budget had a limited amount of money to spend.
"Health care costs are eating up a huge part of almost every state's budget," she said. "People are trying to figure out a way to contain health care costs. That is a high priority." Also, other costs such as education and transportation are taking preference in the state budget.

Benjamin Wise, research assistant at the National Center for State Courts, which compiles the data on judicial salaries, called the recent dip a "return to normalcy.
"States were recovering from adverse fiscal conditions, and so they were starting to improve judicial pay," Wise said.

He said that last year's increase rates also could be attributed to a decline in the overall inflation rate and increased costs in state budgets associated with federal programs such as Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. Many of those programs are administrated by the states, which have been forced to absorb costs left unfunded from federal block grants.
"In the near future, that will have a bigger and bigger impact on state budgets in general," he said. "They'll have a trickle-down effect on state budgets that'll make it harder to raise salaries without a concerted effort."

Collective Bargaining Adjustment (BU 13)

| Effective Date of Pay Increase | Governor |  |  | Lt. Governor/ Admin Dir of State |  |  | Effective Date of Pay Increase | Dept. Head Attorney Genera |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1/1/1990 pay } \\ & \text { adjusted by } \\ & \text { CB increases } \end{aligned}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by CB increases |  |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{gathered} 1 / 1 / 1990 \\ \text { adjustec } \\ \text { CB incre } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pay } \\ & \text { d by } \\ & \text { ases } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1/1/1990 | 94,780 | 94,780 |  | 90,041 | 90,041 |  | 1/1/1990 | 85,302 | 85,302 |  |
| 12/4/2006 | 112,000 | 183,037 | -39\% | 100,000 | 173,948 | -43\% | 7/1/2006 | 109,242 | 164,859 | -34\% |


| Effective Date of Pay Increase | Dept. Head <br> Health, Transportation, Acctg <br>  <br>  <br> Finance |  |  | Dept. Head <br> Human Svcs, Labor \& Indust Rels, Land \& Nat Res, Bus Econ Dev \& Tourism |  |  | Dept. Head <br> Human Res, Hawaiian Homelands, Agriculture, Public Safety |  |  | Deputy <br> Attorney General |  |  | Deputy <br> Health, Transportation, Acctg \& Gen Svcs, Commerce \& Cons Affairs, Tax, Budget \& Finance |  |  | Deputy <br> Human Svcs, Labor \& Indust Rels, Land \& Nat Res, Bus Econ Dev \& Tourism |  |  | Deputy <br> Human Res, Hawaiian Homelands, Agriculture, Public Safety |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1990 adjusted CB incre |  | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1990 adjust CB incr |  | $\begin{array}{c\|\|} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 1/1/199 } \\ \text { adjuste } \\ \text { CB incr } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/199 adjuste CB incr |  | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1990 adjusted CB incre |  | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1990 adjusted CB incre |  | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1990 adjusted CB incre | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { pay } \\ & \text { by } \\ & \text { ases } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1/1/1990 | 85,302 | 85,302 |  | 85,302 | 85,302 |  | 85,302 | 85,302 |  | 77,966 | 77,966 |  | 77,966 | 77,966 |  | 77,966 | 77,966 |  | 77,966 | 77,966 |  |
| 7/1/2006 | 104,040 | 164,859 | -37\% | 98,838 | 164,859 | -40\% | 93,636 | 164,859 | -43\% | 100,503 | 150,789 | -33\% | 95,717 | 150,789 | -37\% | 90,931 | 150,789 | -40\% | 86,145 | 150,789 | -43\% |

3.00\% Annual Increase

| Effective Date of Pay ncrease | Governor |  |  | Lt. Governor/ Admin Dir of State |  |  | Effective <br> Date of Pay Increase | Dept. Head Attorney General |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 1/1/1990 pay } \\ \text { adjusted by } \\ 3.00 \% \text { annually } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { 1/1/199 } \\ \text { adjuste } \\ 3.00 \% \text { ar } \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 / 1 / 1990 \\ \text { adjusted } \\ 3.00 \% \text { ann } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pay } \\ & \text { by } \\ & \text { nually } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 1/1/1990 | 94,780 | 94,780 |  | 90,041 | 90,041 |  | 1/1/1990 | 85,302 | 85,302 |  |
| 12/4/2006 | 112,000 | 156,657 | -29\% | 100,000 | 148,824 | -33\% | 7/1/2006 | 109,242 | 140,991 | -23\% |


| Effective Date of Pay Increase | Dept. Head <br> Health, Transportation, Acctg <br>  <br>  <br> Finance |  |  | Dept. Head <br> Human Svcs, Labor \& Indust Rels, Land \& Nat Res, Bus Econ Dev \& Tourism |  |  | Dept. Head <br> Human Res, Hawaiian Homelands, Agriculture, Public Safety |  |  | Deputy <br> Attorney General |  |  | Deputy <br> Health, Transportation, Acctg \& Gen Svcs, Commerce \& Cons Affairs, Tax, Budget \& Finance |  |  | Deputy <br> Human Svcs, Labor \& Indust Rels, Land \& Nat Res, Bus Econ Dev \& Tourism |  |  | Deputy <br> Human Res, Hawaiian Homelands, Agriculture, Public Safety |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{r} 1 / 1 / 1990 \\ \text { adjusted } \\ 3.00 \% \text { anr } \end{array}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{r} 1 / 1 / 199 \\ \text { adjuste } \\ 3.00 \% \text { an } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1 / 1 / 19 ¢ \\ \text { adjust } \\ 3.00 \% \text { a } \end{array}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { 1/1/199 } \\ \text { adjuste } \\ 3.00 \% \text { ar } \end{array}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{r} 1 / 1 / 199 \\ \text { adjust } \\ 3.00 \% \text { a } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{r} 1 / 1 / 199 \\ \text { adjust } \\ 3.00 \% \end{array}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{r} 1 / 1 / 199 \\ \text { adjust } \\ 3.00 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bay } \\ & \text { by } \\ & \text { ually } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 7/1/2006 | 85,302 104,040 | 85,302 140,991 | -26\% | 85,302 | 85,302 140,991 | -30\% | 85,302 | $\begin{array}{r} 85,302 \\ 140,991 \end{array}$ | -34\% | 77,966 100,503 | $\begin{array}{r} 77,966 \\ 128,866 \end{array}$ | -22\% | 77,966 | 77,966 128,866 | -26\% | 77,966 90,931 | $\begin{array}{r} 77,966 \\ 128,866 \end{array}$ | -29\% | $\begin{aligned} & 77,966 \\ & 86,145 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 77,966 \\ 128,866 \end{array}$ | -33\% |

3.50\% Annual Increase

| Effective Date of Pay Increase | Governor |  |  | Lt. Governor/ Admin Dir of State |  |  | Effective Date of Pay Increase | Dept. Head Attorney General |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by $3.50 \%$ annually |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{r} 1 / 1 / 199 \\ \text { adjuste } \\ 3.50 \% \text { an } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | pay by ually |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 / 1 / 1990 \mathrm{r} \\ \text { adjusted } \\ 3.50 \% \text { ann } \end{gathered}$ | pay by ually |
| 1/1/1990 | 94,780 | 94,780 |  | 90,041 | 90,041 |  | 1/1/1990 | 85,302 | 85,302 |  |
| 12/4/2006 | 112,000 | 170,099 | -34\% | 100,000 | 161,594 | -38\% | 7/1/2006 | 109,242 | 153,089 | -29\% |


| Effective Date of Pay Increase | Dept. Head <br> Health, Transportation, Acctg <br>  <br>  <br> Finance |  |  | Dept. Head <br> Human Svcs, Labor \& Indust Rels, Land \& Nat Res, Bus Econ Dev \& Tourism |  |  | Dept. Head <br> Human Res, Hawaiian Homelands, Agriculture, Public Safety |  |  | Deputy <br> Attorney General |  |  | DeputyHealth, Transportation,Acctg \& Gen Svcs,Commerce \& Cons Affairs,Tax, Budget \& Finance |  |  | Deputy <br> Human Svcs, Labor \& Indust Rels, Land \& Nat Res, Bus Econ Dev \& Tourism |  |  | Deputy <br> Human Res, Hawaiian Homelands, Agriculture, Public Safety |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1990 adjusted $3.50 \%$ ann | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { pay } \\ & \text { by } \\ & \text { ually } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1990 adjuste $3.50 \%$ an | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ay } \\ & \text { by } \\ & \text { tally } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1990 adjuste $3.50 \%$ an | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ayy } \\ & \text { by } \\ & \text { fally } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 1/1/1990 } \\ \text { adjusted } \end{gathered}$ $3.50 \% \text { anr }$ | pay by ually | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1990 adjuste $3.50 \%$ an | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pay } \\ & \text { by by } \\ & \text { nually } \end{aligned}$ | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1990 adjuste $3.50 \%$ an | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { pay } \\ & \text { by } \\ & \text { lually } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{r} 1 / 1 / 199 \mathrm{c} \\ \text { adjuste } \\ 3.50 \% \text { an } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | pay by nually |
| $1 / 1 / 1990$ $7 / 1 / 2006$ | 85,302 104,040 | 85,302 153,089 | -32\% | 85,302 <br> 98,838 | 85,302 153,089 | -35\% | 85,302 93,636 | 85,302 153,089 | -39\% | 77,966 | 77,966 139,924 | -28\% | 77,966 | 77,966 139,924 | -32\% | 77,966 | 77,966 139,924 | -35\% | 77,966 86,145 | 77,966 139,924 | -38\% |

4.00\% Annual Increase

| Effective Date of Pay Increase | Governor |  |  | Lt. Governor/ Admin Dir of State |  |  | Effective Date of Pay Increase | Dept. Head Attorney General |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1/1/1990 pay } \\ \text { adjusted by } \\ 4.00 \% \text { annually } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 / 1 / 199 \\ \text { adjuste } \\ 4.00 \% \text { an } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pay } \\ & \text { by } \\ & \text { ually } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 / 1 / 1990 \\ \text { adjuste } \\ 4.00 \% \text { an } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | pay by nually |
| 1/1/1990 | 94,780 | 94,780 |  | 90,041 | 90,041 |  | 1/1/1990 | 85,302 | 85,302 |  |
| 12/4/2006 | 112,000 | 184,622 | -39\% | 100,000 | 175,391 | -43\% | 7/1/2006\|| | 109,242 | 166,160 | -34\% |


| Effective <br> Date of Pay Increase | Dept. Head <br> Health, Transportation, Acctg \& Gen Svcs, Commerce \& Cons Affairs, Tax, Budget \& Finance |  |  | Dept. Head <br> Human Svcs, Labor \& Indust Rels, Land \& Nat Res, Bus Econ Dev \& Tourism |  |  | Dept. Head <br> Human Res, Hawaiian Homelands, Agriculture, Public Safety |  |  | Deputy <br> Attorney Genera |  |  | Deputy <br> Health, Transportation, Acctg \& Gen Svcs, Commerce \& Cons Affairs, Tax, Budget \& Finance |  |  | Deputy <br> Human Svcs, Labor \& Indust Rels, Land \& Nat Res, Bus Econ Dev \& Tourism |  |  | Deputy <br> Human Res, Hawaiian Homelands, Agriculture, Public Safety |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|\|c\|} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 / 1 / 1990 \\ \text { adjusted } \\ 4.00 \% \text { anr } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ay } \\ & \text { by } \\ & \text { ually } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1 / 1 / 199 \\ \text { adjust } \\ 4.00 \% \mathrm{a} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1/1/1990 adjusted 4.00\% an |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { 1/1/1990 } \\ \text { adjusted } \\ 4.00 \% \text { ann } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ay } \\ & \text { y } \\ & \text { ally } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { 1/1/199 } \\ \text { adjuste } \\ 4.00 \% \text { ar } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { pay } \\ & \text { b by } \\ & \text { nually } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1 / 1 / 199 \\ \text { adjust } \\ 4.00 \% \text { a } \end{array}$ | pay by ually | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{r} 1 / 1 / 1990 \\ \text { adjusted } \\ 4.00 \% \text { an } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { pay } \\ & \text { l by } \\ & \text { mually } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| $1 / 1 / 1990$ $7 / 1 / 2006$ | 85,302 104,040 | 85,302 166,160 | -37\% | 85,302 98,838 | 85,302 166,160 | -41\% | 85,302 <br> 93,636 | 85,302 166,160 | -44\% | 77,966 100,503 | 77,966 151,870 | -34\% | 77,966 95,717 | 77,966 151,870 | -37\% | 77,966 90,931 | 77,966 151,870 | -40\% | 77,966 86,145 | 77,966 151,870 | -43\% |

## Collective Bargaining Adjustment (BU 13)

| Effective | Chief Justice |  |  | Associate Justice |  |  | ICA Chief Judge |  |  | ICA Associate Judge |  |  | Circuit Court Judge |  |  | District/Family Court Judge |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pay Increase | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by CB increases |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by CB increases |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by CB increases |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by CB increases |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by CB increases |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by CB increases |  |
| 1/1/1990 | 94,780 | 94,780 |  | 93,780 | 93,780 |  | 91,280 | 91,280 |  | 89,780 | 89,780 |  | 86,780 | 86,780 |  | 81,780 | 81,780 |  |
| 7/1/2006 | 144,900 | 183,037 | -21\% | 139,725 | 181,119 | -23\% | 134,550 | 176,324 | -24\% | 129,375 | 173,447 | -25\% | 125,856 | 167,693 | -25\% | 118,611 | 158,104 | -25\% |

3.00\% Annual Increase

| Effective | Chief Justice |  |  | Associate Justice |  |  | ICA Chief Judge |  |  | ICA Associate Judge |  |  | Circuit Court Judge |  |  | District/Family Court Judge |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Pay } \\ \text { Increase } \end{gathered}$ | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1/1/1990 pay } \\ \text { adjusted by } \\ 3.00 \% \text { annually } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1/1/1990 pay } \\ \text { adjusted by } \\ 3.00 \% \text { annually } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 / 1 / 1990 \text { pay } \\ \text { adjusted by } \\ 3.00 \% \text { annually } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 1 / 1 / 1990 \text { pay } \\ \text { adjusted by } \\ 3.00 \% \text { annually } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Historical// } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \end{array}$ | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by $3.00 \%$ annually |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 / 1 / 1990 \\ \text { adjusted } \\ 3.00 \% \text { ann } \end{gathered}$ | pay by ually |
| 1/1/1990 | 94,780 | 94,780 |  | 93,780 | 93,780 |  | 91,280 | 91,280 |  | 89,780 | 89,780 |  | 86,780 | 86,780 |  | 81,780 | 81,780 |  |
| 7/1/2006 | 144,900 | 156,657 | -8\% | 139,725 | 155,004 | -10\% | 134,550 | 150,872 | -11\% | 129,375 | 148,393 | -13\% | 125,856 | 143,434 | -12\% | 118,611 | 135,170 | -12\% |

3.50\% Annual Increase

| Effective | Chief Justice |  |  | Associate Justice |  |  | ICA Chief Judge |  |  | ICA Associate Judge |  |  | Circuit Court Judge |  |  | District/Family Court Judge |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 / 1 / 1990 \text { pay } \\ \text { adjusted by } \\ 3.50 \% \text { annually } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 1/1/1990 pay } \\ \text { adjusted by } \\ 3.50 \% \text { annually } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by $3.50 \%$ annually |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1/1/1990 pay } \\ \text { adjusted by } \\ 3.50 \% \text { annually } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by $3.50 \%$ annually |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by $3.50 \%$ annually |  |
| 1/1/1990 | 94,780 | 94,780 |  | 93,780 | 93,780 |  | 91,280 | 91,280 |  | 89,780 | 89,780 |  | 86,780 | 86,780 |  | 81,780 | 81,780 |  |
| 7/1/2006 | 144,900 | 170,099 | -15\% | 139,725 | 168,305 | -17\% | 134,550 | 163,818 | -18\% | 129,375 | 161,126 | -20\% | 125,856 | 155,742 | -19\% | 118,611 | 146,769 | -19\% |

### 4.00\% Annual Increase

| Effective | Chief Justice |  |  | Associate Justice |  |  | ICA Chief Judge |  |  | ICA Associate Judge |  |  | Circuit Court Judge |  |  | District/Family Court Judge |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pay Increase | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by 4.00\% annually |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1/1/1990 pay } \\ \text { adjusted by } \\ 4.00 \% \text { annually } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1/1/1990 pay } \\ \text { adjusted by } \\ 4.00 \% \text { annually } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Historical/ <br> Current <br> Pay | 1/1/1990 pay adjusted by 4.00\% annually |  | Historical/ <br> Current <br> Pay | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1/1/1990 pay } \\ \text { adjusted by } \\ 4.00 \% \text { annually } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Historical/ <br> Current <br> Pay | $\begin{array}{r} 1 / 1 / 1990 \\ \text { adjuste } \\ 4.00 \% \text { an } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | pay by ually |
| 1/1/1990 | 94,780 | 94,780 |  | 93,780 | 93,780 |  | 91,280 | 91,280 |  | 89,780 | 89,780 |  | 86,780 | 86,780 |  | 81,780 | 81,780 |  |
| 7/1/2006 | 144,900 | 184,622 | -22\% | 139,725 | 182,674 | -24\% | 134,550 | 177,804 | -24\% | 129,375 | 174,883 | -26\% | 125,856 | 169,039 | -26\% | 118,611 | 159,299 | -26\% |
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## 1993 Legislative Salaries Adjusted by

Collective Bargaining Increases and Various Annual Increases

## Collective Bargaining Adjustment (BU 13)

| Effective Date | Representatives and Senators |  |  | Speaker and President |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1993 pay a by CB increas | s ${ }^{\text {justed }}$ | Historical/ Current Pay | 1/1/1993 pay adjusted by CB increases |  |
| 1/1/1993 | 32,000 | 32,000 |  | 37,000 | 37,000 |  |
| 1/1/2007 | 35,900 | 53,495 | -33\% | 43,400 | 61,658 | -30\% |

3.00\% Annual Increase

| Effective Date | Representatives and Senators |  |  | Speaker and President |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{gathered} 1 / 1 / 1993 \text { pay a } \\ \text { by } \\ 3.00 \% \text { annt } \end{gathered}$ |  | Historical/ Current Pay | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 1/1/1993 p } \\ \text { adjusted b } \\ 3.00 \% \text { annu } \end{array}$ |  |
| 1/1/1993 | 32,000 | 32,000 |  | 37,000 | 37,000 |  |
| 1/1/2007 | 35,900 | 48,403 | -26\% | 43,400 | 55,966 | -22 |

### 3.50\% Annual Increase

| Effective Date | Representatives and Senators |  |  | Speaker and President |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1/1/1993 pay adjusted by <br> $3.50 \%$ annually |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Historical/ } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1 / 1 / 1993 \mathrm{p} \\ \text { adjusted b } \\ 3.50 \% \text { annu } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| 1/1/1993 | 32,000 | 32,000 |  | 37,000 | 37,000 |  |
|  |  | 50,047 |  |  | 57,866 |  |
| 1/1/2007 | 35,900 | 51,798 | -31\% | 43,400 | 59,892 | -28\% |

4.00\% Annual Increase

| Effective <br> Date | Representatives and Senators |  | Speaker and President |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Historical/ <br> Current <br> Pay | $1 / 1 / 1993$ pay adjusted <br> by <br> $4.00 \%$ annually | Historical/ <br> Current <br> Pay | $1 / 1 / 1993$ pay <br> adjusted by <br> $4.00 \%$ annually |
| $1 / 1 / 1993$ | 32,000 | 32,000 |  | 37,000 |
| $1 / 1 / 2007$ | 35,900 | 55,414 | $-35 \%$ | 43,400 |
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## INTRODUCTION

## Chapter 1

## INTRODUCTION

## Objective of the Study

The Legislature, recognizing the direct relationship between judicial compensation and judicial retention, has acknowledged that insufficient compensation creates the risk that judges will leave the bench, thus depriving the public of the significant value of experienced jurists. 1 Accordingly, the Legislature has declared that "there is a paramount need to ensure that the most highly qualified individuals are willing and able to serve in the State's judicial branch without unreasonable economic hardship; . . . ." 2 To that end, the Legislature, during the Regular Session of 1997, adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2, Senate Draft No. 1, (hereafter Resolution) entitled "Requesting a Study to Assist the Legislature in Establishing an Appropriate Salary Structure and Pay Increments for Length of Continuous Creditable Judicial Service to the State". The text of the Resolution appears as Appendix A.

The Resolution is premised upon the following two basic assumptions: that, because of the absence of an objective, statutorily established mechanism that ensures fair and adequate compensation, Hawaii's judges are continuously drawn into the potentially compromising task of lobbying each Legislature for salary increases and improvements in benefits; and that such lobbying of the Legislature by members of the Judiciary is inconsistent with the traditional role of the courts as an independent and separate branch of government. On this latter point, the Resolution stresses the fundamental importance of the Judiciary's political neutrality and independence, in fact as well as in appearance. ${ }^{3}$

The Resolution directs the Legislative Reference Bureau (hereafter the Bureau) to study and make recommendations on an appropriate salary structure for all state judges, ${ }^{*}$ including pay supplements by increments for length of continuous creditable service on the bench, and to address the feasibility of indexing judicial salary increases to the consumer price index or increases in compensation for other state civil service employees. The Resolution further requests the Bureau to consult with the Judicial Salary Commission to obtain relevant information.
*For purposes of this study, the terms "judge" and "judges" include both judges and justices.

[^8]
## Methodology of Study

In responding to the Resolution, Bureau staff reviewed the relevant history relating to judicial salaries and the judicial salary structure in Hawaii and also examined the judicial salary structure and statutory provisions in other states. In addition, Bureau staff reviewed the relevant literature relating to judicial compensation issues. Finally, Bureau staff solicited input from the Judicial Salary Commission and the Judiciary with respect to judicial compensation issues.

## Organization of the Report

This Chapter presents an introduction to the report.
Chapter 2 provides a historical framework for the study by reviewing the present judicial salary structure as well as previous attempts to establish an appropriate salary structure.

Chapter 3 discusses objective mechanisms that states have adopted to provide periodic adjustments to judicial salaries and reviews specific state statutory provisions relating to these mechanisms.

Chapter 4 discusses factors involved in determining fair and reasonable judicial compensation.

Chapter 5 summarizes input obtained from members of the Hawaii Judicial Salary Commission on the subject of judicial compensation.

Chapter 6 presents a summary and the Bureau's recommendations.

## Chapter 2

## HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK FOR JUDICIAL SALARY STUDY

This study is not the first to attempt to recommend an appropriate salary structure for Hawaii's judges. There have been a number of such attempts over the years. Nevertheless, while judicial salaries have increased at sporadic intervals, the salary structure itself has remained basically unchanged. Although the reasons why these previous attempts have been unsuccessful may be open to debate, what becomes apparent, upon a review of the history, is that the determination of judicial salaries has been a complex process, complicated even more by the political linking of judicial salaries with other pay issues. This chapter discusses the judicial salary structure presently in place and reviews the previous attempts to establish an appropriate salary structure and determine reasonable salary levels.

## Present Judicial Salary Provisions

The Hawaii State Constitution requires a salary commission to review and recommend salaries of all state court justices and judges, but states no specific requirements as to the Commission's composition, duties, or operation. The Constitution further states that the judicial salaries shall be "as provided by law" and prohibits the reduction of judicial salaries during a judge's term of office, except by general law applicable to all salaried officers of the State. 1 Accordingly, the actual salaries of Hawaii's judges are determined by the Legislature by statute. The Legislature periodically appointed temporary commissions to fulfill the constitutional requirement for a salary commission, until the Legislature created an on-going, permanent Judicial Salary Commission in 1989 and charged it with reviewing and recommending salaries of all justices, judges, and appointed judiciary administrative officers. ${ }^{2}$ The statute creating the Commission requires it to submit a report to the Legislature, with copies to the Governor and Chief Justice, by October 15 of each year preceding a fiscal biennium. ${ }^{3}$ Salary amounts recommended by the Commission are submitted to the Legislature by the Chief Justice as part of the Judiciary's proposed budget, per the statute.

Judicial salaries were last increased in 1990, when the Legislature enacted a two-step increase, retroactive to January 1, 1989 and January 1, 1990, respectively. ${ }^{4}$ Present salaries are as follows: the Chief Justice of the supreme court receives $\$ 94,780$ and each associate justice receives

[^9]\$93,780; 5 the Chief Judge of the intermediate appellate court receives $\$ 91,280$ and each associate judge receives $\$ 89,780 ; 6$ each circuit court judge receives $\$ 86,780 ; 7$ each district court judge receives $\$ 81,780 ; 8$ and each district family court judge receives $\$ 81,780.9$

## Relevant History of Judicial Salaries in Hawaii

Judicial salaries in Hawaii have frequently been held hostage to the political process and, on occasion, have been fraught with controversy. Before the permanent Judicial Salary Commission was established, special advisory committees were convened in 1975, 1980, 1984, and 1989 to study the issue of judicial compensation. Each one of these concluded that the level of judicial compensation was inadequate.

In 1975, the Special Committee of the Judicial Council on Judicial Salaries recommended an approximately $45 \%$ pay increase for Hawaii's judges, whose salaries had been stuck at 1969 levels, and urged that "provision . . . be made for periodic adjustments to [judicial salaries] to cover cost-of-living adjustments." 10 The Committee based its recommendations upon the determination that salaries should meet these three tests:
(1) Be commensurate with responsibilities;
(2) Provide security for judges and their families; and
(3) Be competitive with what private attorneys make to attract successful and experienced practitioners to the bench. ${ }^{11}$

The Legislature eventually passed a pay bill for judges, but it was clouded in controversy. Two separate actions by the 1975 Legislature aroused violent public furor in the dying days of the session: a conference committee amendment that raised legislative pensions by $150 \%$ without advance hearings or public notice; and a conference committee pay bill that lumped together, in a "take or leave it" package, generous pay increases for judges and top state officials, and also

[^10]${ }^{11}$ See Honolulu Star Bulletin, February 25, 1975 (editorial).
included pay raises for the Governor and Lieutenant Governor, both of whom had been left out of earlier versions of the pay bill. 12 The public outrage reportedly was so great over the pension bill that legislators petitioned the Governor to veto it, which he did. However, the public animosity carried over to the pay bill as well. In the end, legal challenges to the 1975 executive and judicial pay bill reached the Hawaii Supreme Court, where the justices, refusing to disqualify themselves, upheld its legality. 13 The ensuing "freeze" on state officials' pay, including that of judges, has been attributed directly to the public wrath that followed the 1975 session. 14

In this aftermath, the Legislature would not entertain the issue of pay increases for judges again until the regular session of 1981. After the defeat of proposed legislation to establish a permanent advisory judicial salary commission, pursuant to Section 3, Article VI of the Hawaii Constitution, the Judicial Council had reactivated its second Special Committee of the Judicial Council on Judicial Salaries. 15 The Special Committee proposed an across-the-board \$25,000 annual raise for Hawaii's judges to the 1981 Legislature. The Committee's report stated: "We believe that failure to adjust judicial salaries cannot fail to adversely affect the state's ability to recruit and retain adequately qualified judges." 16 The Committee noted that: in the ensuing years since the last judicial pay raise, the cost of living in Hawaii had risen 50\%; the public employees collective bargaining units had received pay raises of approximately $41 \%$; and Hawaii's judges fared poorly in comparisons with salaries of experienced local attorneys and those of jurists in other jurisdictions. ${ }^{17}$

During this time period, there was much public hand-wringing about the widening disparity between pay levels of state and county officials, as well as between collective bargaining unit employees and exempt employees. City and county of Honolulu pay levels had jumped ahead of their state counterparts, primarily because city and county administrative salaries were boosted whenever the pay for top-level union workers was increased, while salaries for state officials and judges had been frozen in place since 1976. This system of tying pay for top officials to levels negotiated for city and county workers in collective bargaining was widely and severely criticized as creating an inherent conflict of interest by giving city and county executives who handle union
${ }^{12}$ See e.g., Jerry Burris \& Sandra Oshiro, "Panel OKs $18 \%$ hike in top state salaries," The Honolulu Advertiser, April 24, 1982; A.A. Smyser, "Public Service Pay in Hawaii, Honolulu Star Bulletin, May 11, 1981; "The real pay issue," The Honolulu Advertiser, July 11, 1975 (editorial); "The Pay Package," Honolulu Star Bulletin, July 9, 1975 (editorial).

13 "'75 raise upheld by top Isle court," The Honolulu Advertiser, May 13, 1977, at A-10.
${ }^{14}$ See A.A. Smyser, "Public Service Pay in Hawaii, Honolulu Star Bulletin, May 11, 1981; See also Jerry Burris \& Sandra Oshiro, "Panel OKs $18 \%$ hike in top state salaries," The Honolulu Advertiser, April 24, 1982.
${ }^{15}$ Hawaii, Report of Public Officers and Employees Compensation Review Commission (Honolulu: February 1983), at 11.

16"Top Judicial Pay of \$72,500 Is Urged," Honolulu Star Bulletin, March 2, 1981 (Boswell's Capitol Journal).
${ }^{17}$ See Hawaii, Report of Public Officers and Employees Compensation Review Commission (Honolulu: February 1983), at 11-12; "Governor, Judges Deserve Pay Raises," Honolulu Star Bulletin, March 19, 1981, at A-16.
negotiations a vested interest in reaching higher settlements. 18 Collective bargaining contributed to the pay disparity by pushing up the pay for government employees while the salary levels for toplevel state officials and judges remained frozen. This resulted in growing numbers of collective bargaining employees making more than their supervisors. 19

Legislators also were wrestling with problems stemming from the long standing tradition of using the Governor's salary as a benchmark in setting the salaries of all other government officials. Under this system, the Governor's salary was set at the apex of the salary scale, with the pay of cabinet members, the president of the University of Hawaii, and judges set at levels just below that of the Governor and the salary of other, lesser officials at descending levels below that. 20 The salary ceiling created by this system was criticized as hampering efforts to keep competent people and to recruit highly qualified new ones. In addition, it created absurd situations whereby top University of Hawaii administrators could get pay raises by quitting and resuming their tenured


#### Abstract

${ }^{18}$ See, Gregg Kakesako, "Ariyoshi Signs Executive Pay Hike, but Won't Take His," Honolulu Star Bulletin, May 28, 1982 (lawmakers say county executives in conflict-of-interest position every time they negotiate a pay increase for unionized workers); "Beyond pay raises, The Honolulu Advertiser, May 4, 1982 (editorial) (city executives have direct vested interest in increased wages for government workers under them); A.A. Smyser, "Public Service Pay in Hawaii," Honolulu Star Bulletin, May 11, 1981 (removes incentive for city officers to represent the taxpayers in holding out for restrained collective bargaining increases); A.A. Smyser, "Public Service Pay in Hawaii," Honolulu Star Bulletin, May 11, 1981 (removes incentive for city officers to represent the taxpayers in holding out for restrained collective bargaining increases); "Better system needed: Raising government pay, The Honolulu Advertiser, March 11, 1981 (editorial) (system gives city executives a vested interest in higher settlements for workers they oversee); Jerry Burris, "Citizens panel urges legislators to give top state aides 20\% raise," The Honolulu Advertiser, January 9, 1981 (inherent conflict of interest in that union negotiations that are handled by county executives directly impact executives' own salaries).


${ }^{19}$ See Vance C. Cannon, "State Commission on Government Salaries, Honolulu Star Bulletin, February 26, 1983 (commission's research continually found subordinates making more than their superiors); Jerry Burris, "Legislature faces trouble over secret talks on pay, The Honolulu Advertiser, April 29, 1981 (with defeat of 1981 pay bill, estimated that by 1982, there would be approximately: 578 unionized workers earning more than appointed cabinet officers in jobs superior to theirs; and 200 non-unionized supervisory personnel denied raises given to coworkers because salary ceiling prevents them from earning more than their bosses).
${ }^{20}$ See e.g., Richard Borreca, "Governor's commission proposes hefty pay hikes," Honolulu Star Bulletin, March 3, 1989 (commission recommended rising executive salaries to ensure governor made more than other elected officials in Hawaii); "Government pay" Honolulu Star Bulletin, February 26, 1989 (editorial) (long considered impossible for any state official to be paid more than the governor); Rob Perez, "Bill would make justices highestpaid state officials," Honolulu Star Bulletin, February 18, 1989 (quotes Senator Ron Menor, Chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee, regular session of 1989, as saying, "If the chief justice of the Supreme Court makes substantially more than the governor, I don't know if the public would buy that or if I'll buy that"); Jerry Burris, "State officials asked to propose a figure for governor's raise," The Honolulu Advertiser, February 26, 1985 (Comment that, "as a matter of principle, governor should be highest-paid public official in the state," attributed to Senator Gerald Machida, Chair of the Senate Labor and Employment Committee); Vance C. Cannon, "State Commission on Government Salaries, Honolulu Star Bulletin, February 26, 1983 (commission made determination that position of governor should be highest paid public office in state); Douglas Boswell, "Top Judicial Pay of \$72,500 Is Urged," Honolulu Star Bulletin, March 2, 1981 (Boswell's Capitol Journal) (long-standing custom to use governor's salary as benchmark in setting salaries of other government officials); Greg Kakesako, "Several Legislators Back Higher State Executive Salaries, Honolulu, Star Bulletin, January 9, 1981 ("governor should be the highest paid political office in the state," quoting Senate President Richard S.H. Wong, regular session of 1981).
teaching positions. ${ }^{21}$ Other critics pointed out that this system failed to take into account the personal residence staffed with help, the limousine and driver, and other perquisites the Governor receives in addition to an annual salary. 22

These concerns led to calls for a better and more permanent method of determining a salary structure that achieves a realistic relationship between pay levels in government service. ${ }^{23}$ As the Star Bulletin put it:

Pay matters are complicated concerns. They affect the government's ability to attract and keep talent. They affect morale and a sense of equity. They are potential dynamite politically.

The state has complicated matters by allowing more than five years to pass between top level readjustments.

For judicial salaries, at least, this is a longer gap between adjustments than in any other state. In level of judicial pay we have dropped from No. 8 among the states to No. 35.

We need not just pay raises for top personnel and judges from this Legislature but a better on-going way of setting and administering them. ${ }^{24}$

In the swirl of such controversy, the 1981 pay bill died, in part because of a standoff between the House and Senate over the amount of the raise and because of public concern expressed over the closed door negotiations of a special subcommittee of the conference committee, which resulted in a tentative agreement on the final version of the pay package. 25 However, in an extended 1982 session, the Legislature finally approved the first salary increase since 1976 for judges, the Governor, his cabinet, University of Hawaii president, and other state officials. In addition to an $18 \%$ pay hike, the pay bill: included a freeze on county salaries until the state salary levels could catch up; outlawed the city and county's automatic linkage of salaries of certain elected and appointed county officers to union pay raises; and provided for a reduction in state grants to the counties in an amount equal to any mandatory salary adjustment at the county level that is directly or indirectly dependent upon or related to collective bargaining negotiated salary adjustments. This latter provision was enacted in case either of the first two provisions were struck down by the courts. 26 This prohibition on mandatory increases tied to collective bargaining agreements is codified as section 78-18.3 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes. (See Appendix B)
${ }^{21}$ See A.A. Smyser, "Public Service Pay in Hawaii," Honolulu Star Bulletin, May 11, 1981.
${ }^{22}$ See e.g., A.A. Smyser, "Public Service Pay in Hawaii," Honolulu Star Bulletin, May 11, 1981; Jerry Burris, "Citizens panel urges legislators to give top state aides $20 \%$ raise," The Honolulu Advertiser, January 9, 1981.
${ }^{23}$ See e.g., "Governor, Judges Deserve Pay Raises," Honolulu Star Bulletin, March 19, 1981, at A-16; "Better System Needed: Raising government pay," The Honolulu Advertiser, March 11, 1981.

24 "Governor, Judges Deserve Pay Raises," Honolulu Star Bulletin, March 19, 1981, at A-16.
${ }^{25}$ See, A.A. Smyser, "Public Service Pay in Hawaii," Honolulu Star Bulletin, May 11, 1981; Jerry Burris, "Legislature faces trouble over secret talks on pay," The Honolulu Advertiser, April 29, 1981.
${ }^{26}$ See, 1982 Haw. Sess. Laws, Act 129, Part IV. See also Jerry Burris \& Sandra Oshiro, "Panel OKs $18 \%$ hike in top state salaries," The Honolulu Advertiser, April 24, 1982. The constitutionality of these provisions in Act 129 were upheld in City \& County of Honolulu v. Ariyoshi, 67 H. 412, 689 P. 2757 (1984).

With respect to the city and county's automatic adjustment of top-level officials' salaries based upon collective bargaining agreements, the Legislature stated:

Such an automatic adjustment provision is unsound and inadvisable public policy which is detrimental to the public interest. A basic conflict of interest exists when the county officers whose salaries are adjusted according to collective bargaining agreements are parties in negotiating the collective bargaining agreements. On the other hand, these county officers have a duty to engage in negotiations of collective bargaining agreements with the public interest foremost. The public interest requires the minimum expenditure of public moneys necessary for the efficient operation of government. On the other hand, these county officers will receive higher salaries if significant or substantial, or indeed if any, salary or wage increases are provided under the collective bargaining agreements. Thus the conflict of interest is obvious.

The legislature further finds that such automatic adjustments for any top-level officer of any level of government are anathema to good government and to present sunshine laws of this State. The people of this State deserve to see the methodology of salary increases for top-level officers of all levels of government, and the people should have the opportunity to testify for or against such increases. Such open government is basic to a democracy and the automatic adjustment of salaries of toplevel officers, who have the greatest responsibilities to the public, without public display and input violates the principles of a democratic society. 27

The Legislature also found the "inequitable, unintegrated, and uncoordinated compensation system" that existed between and among the top-level elected and appointed officers or employees of the state and county government, particularly with respect to the counterpart positions at these two levels of government, to be an "urgent and important matter of statewide concern and interest" that adversely affected overall officer and employee morale and required immediate action." 28 Accordingly, the Legislature created a commission to review salaries and to develop and recommend a meaningful, integrated, and equitable comprehensive salary schedule for state and county government officers and employees. 29

The Public Officers and Employees Compensation Review Commission submitted its report on a statewide integrated compensation structure in February 1983. The Compensation Review Commission relied upon the traditional "benchmark approach," with the Governor's salary at the apex, to recommend specific compensation levels and individual classification rates. 30 The

[^11]Compensation Review Commission's proposed Hawaii state integrated salary system appears as Appendix C. The Compensation Review Commission also recommended that a permanent compensation commission be established by the Legislature to provide for the on-going evaluation and review of executive compensation. 31

The Compensation Review Commission adopted a set of principles to guide it in its deliberations, including that: compensation rates should be sufficiently adequate to attract qualified personnel; compensation rates should be sufficiently competitive in the marketplace; and compensation structure should provide for adjustment due to changing conditions. 32 Furthermore, the Compensation Review Commission observed that, in view of past legislative action taken in response to previous compensation commission recommendations, it considered comparisons within the private sector, with due consideration to the labor market existing in Hawaii, to be more relevant to its decision making than factors such as changes in the consumer price index, comparisons with demographic data, or compensation rates of government executives in other jurisdictions. 33 Although the Compensation Review Commission received some praise for its work, 1983 was a time of painful budget cuts, and no steps were taken to implement any of the Compensation Review Commission's recommendations. 34

In July of 1984, a Commission on Judicial Salaries was jointly established by the Chief Justice, the Governor, the Senate President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. After conducting a thorough review of factors relevant to determining salaries, including comparisons of: salaries of judges across the nation and in the federal system; cost of living and personal income per capita across the country; income of private attorneys locally; and salaries of city and state employees, the Commission submitted its report in November 1984. Concluding that the then present salary levels for judges were "woefully inadequate," neither "fair" nor "just," and "an unwarranted obstacle to the recruitment and retention of talented individuals" for the bench, the Commission warned of a "continuing erosion in the quality of justice . . . brought about not by dishonesty and corruption but by mediocrity engendered by the hidden costs associated with public service." 35 The Commission further noted that "inadequate judicial compensation" was a "recurring" problem. ${ }^{36}$ The Commission recommended that the State: adopt a goal of compensating its jurists at a level comparable with judges of similar responsibility in the federal

[^12]court system; and establish a permanent judicial salary commission, pursuant to Article VI, Section 3, of the State Constitution, to provide on-going salary review and recommendations of fair, reasonable, and just salary levels. 37

Despite the Commission's strongly worded report, Hawaii's judges would not see another pay increase until the regular session of 1986, an interval of four years since the previous increase. In 1986, the Legislature raised salaries for the associate supreme court justices by $47 \%$, the appellate court judges by $41 \%$, the circuit court judges by $37 \%$, and the district court judges by $25 \%$. The salary for the Chief Justice of the supreme court increased from $\$ 56,430$ to $\$ 80,000$, and the salary for the Chief Judge of the intermediate appellate court increased from \$53, 460 to \$75,500. 38

In 1989, a Citizens' Salary Commission proposed an $18.5 \%$ increase for the Governor and top state executives. At the same time, a separate Advisory Committee on Judicial Salaries, appointed by the Chief Justice, submitted its report recommending salary increases for judges of 20 to $25 \%$, stating that it was "imperative" that the level of judges' salaries have "at least a reasonable relationship" to what they could earn otherwise, in order to attract and retain qualified attorneys to the bench. The Advisory Committee conceded that, because judicial office offers "attractions [that are] entirely independent of financial considerations," comparisons between judicial salaries and those in the private sector "cannot be considered in a vacuum." Nevertheless, it maintained that financial compensation must be "at least marginally competitive" and, while not the "principal incentive for public service, neither should it be a deterrent" to public service. 39

The Advisory Committee also emphasized the valuable contribution that experienced judges provide and concluded that encouraging these judges to remain on the bench would be in the "best interests of the judiciary and the community." 40 To achieve this goal, the Advisory Committee also recommended a three-tiered salary structure for circuit and district court judges that would provide for periodic salary increases based upon years of service in each court. The Advisory Committee proposed that: district court judges receive a $\$ 5,000$ salary increase after their first sixyear term, thus encouraging them to apply for retention, and another $\$ 5,000$ salary increase after ten years on the district court bench; and circuit court judges receive a $\$ 5,000$ salary increase halfway through their first term (at five years) and another $\$ 5,000$ salary increase after the start of their second ten-year term. Under this proposed salary structure scheme, district court judges with ten years of experience would receive as much as a newly appointed circuit court judge, and circuit court judges with more than ten years of experience would earn as much as an associate judge on
${ }^{37}$ Id. at iii \& 25. A $4 \%$ pay hike had just gone into effect on July 1, 1984, for federal judges, setting the pay at $\$ 80, \overline{400}$ for judges of the United States courts of appeal and at $\$ 76,000$ for judges of the United States district courts. Id. at 17.

38 Stirling Morita \& Gregg Kakesako, "Governor, Cabinet Officers, State Judges Given Pay Raises," Honolulu Star Bulletin, May 14, 1986. The increase was retroactive to January 1, 1986.

[^13]the intermediate court of appeals. The Advisory Committee reasoned that this would allow judges who enjoy their work to remain at their current court level without either financial sacrifice or feeling compelled to apply for a higher level judgeship simply to increase their salaries. ${ }^{41}$

The regular session of 1989 ended with hefty pay raises of $18.4 \%$ for the Governor and $24.7 \%$ for department directors. The executive raises were in two phases; the first retroactive to January 1, 1989; and the second effective January 1, 1990.42 There were no salary increases for judges, however. Nevertheless, the Legislature did finally establish a permanent Judicial Salary Commission, charged with reviewing judicial salaries and submitting recommendations by October 15 of each year preceding a fiscal biennium. 43

The next year, the Legislature approved a two-step salary increase for Hawaii's judges, similar to the executive raises passed the previous year: the first step was an average $18.22 \%$ increase retroactive to January 1, 1989; and the second was an average of $4.78 \%$ increase retroactive to January 1, 1990.44 This increase brought the salary of the Chief Justice even with that of the Governor.

Although the newly created Judicial Salary Commission submitted reports to the Legislature in 1994 and 1995, concluding that salaries of Hawaii's judges were inadequate, it reportedly "withdrew" its recommendations for any increase "in deference to the State's slower economy and concerns regarding state finances." 45

Prior to the Regular Session of 1997, however, the Judicial Salary Commission made a strong case for a pay raise for Hawaii's judges. Noting in its report to the Legislature that the salaries of Hawaii's judges were below the national median at every judicial level, the Commission contended that Hawaii's judges fared even worse when salary comparisons among the states were adjusted to eliminate disparity caused by differences in per capita income. (See Appendix D. 1 to D.3). 46 Moreover, relying upon 1996 data, the Commission reported that Hawaii was the only state that had not increased the salary of its judges since 1990 and was one of

[^14]only four states that had not increase judges' salaries at least twice since 1990.47 The Commission recommended a $15 \%$ judicial salary increase, $5 \%$ of which would be retroactive to July 1, 1996.48 The Commission observed, at the time, that such an increase would raise Hawaii's national ranking for judicial salaries from 35th to 14th in the nation. 49

In considering many factors relevant to determining fair and reasonable salary levels, the Commission's Report made the following observations:

- Federal jurists in Hawaii have received salary increases totaling approximately $38 \%$ over the last four years, and presently the lowest paid federal magistrate makes $\$ 28,132$ more than the Chief Justice of the Hawaii Supreme Court;50
- Compensation of Hawaii's judges is substantially lower than the income of Hawaii attorneys in private practice; 51
- Since 1990, collective bargaining unit 13 (professional and scientific employees), the University of Hawaii Professional Assembly, and collective bargaining unit 8 (the University of Hawaii administrative, professional, and technical employees) have received a $14.44 \%, 14.51 \%$, and a $14.45 \%$ salary increase, respectively; 52
- At least eighty individuals at the University of Hawaii, including executives, deans and directors, researchers, and professors receive salaries that are higher than the Chief Justice's salary - this group includes the dean of the School of Law and a professor of law; ${ }^{53}$ and
- Judicial pay scales have not kept pace with the cost of living in Hawaii. 54

[^15]In addition to recommending the judicial salary increase, the Commission made the following recommendations: that judicial salaries should automatically increase in the same percentage as the median percentage of other state civil service compensation plan adjustments, to obviate the need for large, catch-up increases; and that a study should be conducted to establish an appropriate salary structure for all judges, with the rates of compensation at each court level supplemented by increments for length of service on the bench. 55

During the 1997 regular session, the Legislature, in evident agreement with the Commission that Hawaii's judges deserved a salary increase, enacted House Bill No. 1393, C.D. 1, which appropriated salary increases of $4 \%$ for each of fiscal years 1996-1997, 1997-1998, and 1998-1999 for supreme court justices, intermediate appellate court judges, circuit court judges, and district court judges. However, the Governor vetoed the bill, contending that a pay raise without pension changes would only provide judges incentive to leave the bench with full pension after their ten-year vesting period on the bench. 56

[^16]
## Chapter 3

## JUDICIAL SALARY PROVISIONS OF OTHER STATES

In determining a fair and equitable salary structure for Hawaii's judges, it is useful to look at other states' judicial salary provisions. The National Center for State Courts regularly publishes a Survey of Judicial Salaries. Relying upon the National Center's July 1996 edition of its "Survey of Judicial Salaries", the Judicial Salary Commission's 1996 report had noted that Hawaii was the only state that had not increased the salary of its judges since 1990 and was one of only four states that had not increase judges' salaries at least twice since 1990.1 The passage of time has done nothing to improve Hawaii's dismal record in this regard. The National Center's Fall 1997 edition of the salary survey, which reflects judges' salaries as of July 1, 1997, indicates that: thirty-eight states have reported changes in the salaries of judges since the Commission's 1996 report; and thirteen states already have enacted increases in judicial salaries that will be effective sometime at the end of 1997 or during $1998 .{ }^{2}$

The National Center for State Courts reported the following salary ranges as of July 1, 1997:

- Salaries of associate justices of the highest courts range from $\$ 78,762$ to $\$ 133,600$, with a mean (average) of $\$ 103,965$ and a median of $\$ 104,554$;
- Salaries of judges of intermediate appellate courts range from $\$ 79,413$ to $\$ 124,200$, with a mean of $\$ 102,527$ and a median of $\$ 101,591$;
- Salaries of judges of general jurisdiction trial courts range from $\$ 73,616$ to $\$ 115,300$ with a mean of $\$ 93,041$ and a median of $\$ 91,433.3$

Hawaii's judicial salaries fall near the bottom of these ranges. The National Center's Survey ranked Hawaii's judicial salaries as follows among the other states: the justices on the supreme court and the intermediate court of appeals rank 36 out of 50 and 30 out of 39 , respectively, and the circuit court judges rank 30 out of 50.4 The Judicial Salary Commission has contended that the salary rankings for Hawaii's judges fall even lower when salary comparisons among the states are adjusted to eliminate disparity caused by differences in per capita income. 5

[^17]Although actual judicial salary levels are an undeniably important element of an adequate salary structure, more critical perhaps is the establishment of an on-going objective mechanism that ensures regular judicial salary adjustments are made at a fair and reasonable level. At least twenty jurisdictions have adopted some mechanism that attempts to provide periodic increases to judicial salaries, while avoiding some of the political entanglements that often are involved in such endeavors. Three types of mechanisms for judicial salary adjustments will be discussed in this chapter.

The first mechanism, referred to in the literature as an automatic salary escalator provision, involves tying judicial salary increases to some factor that, when it occurs, will result in an automatic increase in pay for all judges. For example, judges salaries may be tied to pay increases for a certain group of state employees or to a cost of living pay increase given across the board to all state employees or to increases occurring in an economic indicator, such as the consumer price index. Often a maximum cap is imposed upon any increase. Usually the automatic escalator provision is specified in a state's statutes, but in a few states, this mechanism exists as a matter of practice or has been instituted by action of a salary commission.

The second mechanism, used by four states, is longevity pay supplements provided to judges based on length of service on the bench.

The third mechanism involves giving greater control to salary commissions to set judges' salaries and, in some states, salaries for other officials as well. A number of states, including Hawaii, have advisory commissions to recommend salary levels for judges. In these states, the legislature is under no obligation to act upon these recommendations. However, in eight states, the commission's determinations carry greater weight, becoming law unless the legislature affirmatively acts to modify or reject them. In addition, in Washington State, the citizens' salary commission's determination becomes law without any input whatsoever from the legislature.

The various state statutory provisions concerning these mechanisms are discussed in the remainder of this chapter. It should be noted that a few states, such as Illinois, Maryland, and Nevada, may use more than one of these mechanisms, and thus, may be discussed in more than one section of this chapter.

## AUTOMATIC ESCALATOR MECHANISMS


#### Abstract

ALASKA Judges' salaries in Alaska are tied to salary increases for state exempt classified employees. If the monthly basic salary for Step E, Range 28, of the salary schedule for classified and exempt state employees of the executive branch increases, the monthly base salary of judges will increase by the same percentage. 6 In addition, compensation may be supplemented with a geographic cost-of-living adjustment depending upon the location of a judge's primary office assignment. 7 The geographic cost-of-living adjustment is a variable percentage, depending upon location, that applies to the first $\$ 40,000$ of the yearly base salary of a justice of the supreme court or a judge of the superior or district court. ${ }^{8}$ Alaska also has tied judicial salaries to performance with a unique provision that conditions the issuance of a salary warrant to a judge upon the judge filing an affidavit with the state officer designated to issue salary warrants stating that no matter referred to the judge for opinion or decision has been uncompleted or undecided by the judge for a period of more than six months. 9


## CALIFORNIA

In California, the salaries of judges are increased every July 1, by an amount produced by multiplying the then existing salary of each judge by the average percentage salary increase for the current fiscal year for state employees. Any dollar limitation the legislature places on salary increases for state employees applies to judges in the same manner applicable to state employees in comparable wage categories. ${ }^{10}$

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The compensation of the judges in the District of Columbia is tied to that of judges on the federal bench and thus increases automatically as federal judges receive pay increases based upon the Employment Cost Index (ECI), per the Ethics Reform Act of 1989.11 The judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals are compensated at the same rate prescribed by law as judges of the United States courts of appeals, except that the chief judge receives an additional

[^18]$\$ 500$ per annum. 12 Likewise, the judges of the superior court are compensated at the rate prescribed by law for judges of the United State district courts, with the chief judge receiving an additional $\$ 500$ per annum. ${ }^{13}$

## ILLINOIS

The salaries of Illinois judges are tied to an automatic escalator by action of the Illinois Compensation Review Board, which, at least biennially, reviews the salaries of judges, elected constitutional officers of the state, members of the general assembly, and certain appointed officers of state government. In its May 1990 report to the legislature, the Compensation Review Board recommended that on July 1, 1991 and on July 1 of each year thereafter, the salary of each office or position provided for in the report or any subsequent reports of the Compensation Review Board, be increased by a percentage increase equivalent to that of the "Employment Cost Index; Wages and Salaries, By Occupation and Industry Groups: State and Local Government Workers: Public Administration", as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, for the calendar year immediately preceding the year of the respective July 1 st increase date. The increase under this provision is to be no less than zero and no greater than five percent. ${ }^{14}$ The Compensation Review Board's report containing its recommendations with respect to salaries becomes law unless the Illinois General Assembly (legislature), within thirty days after session is convened, disapproves the report in whole or reduces it proportionately by a resolution, adopted by a record vote of the majority of the members elected in each house, directed to the Compensation Review Board. ${ }^{15}$ Thus far, the General Assembly has never disapproved the Compensation Review Board's recommendation that judges automatically receive the cost of living adjustment given to state and local government workers. Additional information relating to the Compensation Review Board is presented in the last section of the chapter. ${ }^{16}$

## KANSAS

In Kansas, increases in judges salaries are tied to those received by state classified civil service employees. If the rates of compensation of the pay plan for civil service employees are increased, the judicial salaries are increased by an amount (adjusted to the nearest dollar) computed by multiplying the average of the percentage increase in all monthly steps of the pay plan by the judges' annual salaries in effect prior to the effective date of the increase. 17 If increases are

[^19]1525 ILCS at § $120 / 5$.
${ }^{16}$ See infra notes $54-56$ and accompanying text.
${ }^{17}$ Kan. Stat. Ann. §75-3120(1)(a) (Supp. 1996). A similar provision recently has been enacted to increase the annual salary of the governor, lieutenant governor, the attorney general, the secretary of state, the state treasurer, and the commissioner of insurance. Id. at §75-3111(a).
authorized in the monthly rates of compensation from step movements of the pay plan, the judges' annual salaries are increased by an amount (adjusted to the nearest dollar) computed by multiplying the average percentage increase in the monthly rate of compensation from step movements on the pay plan by the judges' annual salaries in effect prior to the effective date of the increase. 18 The secretary of administration may certify the percentage that equals the estimated average of the percentage increase in all monthly rates of compensation from step movements on the pay plan.

## KENTUCKY

The Kentucky Revised Statutes state that the Kentucky General Assembly sets the salaries for judges in the judicial branch budget bill and may accept or modify the salaries recommended by the chief justice in the judicial branch budget recommendation. 19 As a matter of practice, however, the General Assembly gives judges the same rate of percentage increase for cost of living given to all state employees as part of the budgeting process. The General Assembly sets the percentage cost of living increase and writes it into the biennial budget. 20

## MAINE

Pursuant to law, annually on July 1, the state court administrator adjusts the salaries of all associate justices and judges by any percentage change in the consumer price index from January 1st to December 31st of the previous year, not to exceed a maximum increase of 4\%. The chief justice or chief judge receives $105 \%$ of the salary of the other justices or judges. ${ }^{21}$ The legislature has amended this provision to withhold the cost of living adjustment in certain fiscal years. For example, no cost of living adjustment was made for fiscal years 1992-1993 through 1994-1995.22

[^20]${ }^{22}$ Id. at tit. 4, §4(2-A).

## MARYLAND

Maryland has both an automatic escalator provision and an affirmative judicial salary commission recommendation. Under the former provision, whenever a general salary increase is awarded to state employees, Maryland's judges receive the same percentage increase in salary as awarded to the lowest step of the highest salary grade for classified service employees in the Standard Pay Plan. 23 The Compensation Commission is discussed in the final section of this chapter. ${ }^{24}$

## MISSOURI

The salaries of Missouri's judges may be adjusted in any one year by an amount not to exceed the salary adjustment for the executive department contained in the pay plan applicable to other state employees at a similar salary level for the fiscal year. If no adjustment or a lower salary adjustment is granted in a particular year, then any salary adjustment granted the next fiscal year may exceed the salary adjustment of the executive department by the amount of the difference in the prior year. 25

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

In New Hampshire, judges receive, as a matter of practice, the same percentage increase given to state employees. The legislature extends any negotiated agreement or legislatively granted salary increase for state employees to all legislative and judicial employees, including judges, by way of a footnote in the budget. ${ }^{26}$

## PENNSYLVANIA

Pursuant to statute, on January 1st of each year, the annual salaries of Pennsylvania's judges are increased by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for Urban Workers for the immediately preceding twelve-month period. This cost of living adjustment provision, which began on January 1, 1994, is scheduled to sunset on January 1, 2001.27

[^21]
## SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota law provides that the salaries of South Dakota's judges and various constitutional officers, including the governor, shall be adjusted annually "by the same rate appropriated as the across-the-Compensation Review Board increase to base salaries of state employees under the general appropriations Act in each corresponding year." 28

## TENNESSEE

On July 1st of each year, the base salaries of Tennessee's judges are adjusted to reflect the percentage of change in the average consumer price index (all items-city average), as published by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, between the two calendar years preceding July 1 of the year in which the adjustment is made. 29 However, no reduction in salary may be made by way of adjustment on account of any decrease in the average consumer price index. Furthermore, no yearly adjustment may exceed $5 \%$ per annum, unless the average consumer price index exceeds $10 \%$. Under the latter circumstances, the adjustment is calculated at equal to $5 \%$, plus $1 \%$ for each $1 \%$ or fraction thereof beyond the $10 \% .30$

## LONGEVITY PAYMENTS

## CONNECTICUT

Connecticut judges receive semiannual longevity payments as follows:

1. For ten or more years but less than fifteen years of service, one-quarter of three percent of the annual base pay;
2. For fifteen or more years but less than twenty years of service, one-half of three percent of the annual base pay;

[^22]3. For twenty or more years but less than twenty-five years of service, three-quarters of three percent of the annual base pay;
4. For twenty-five or more years, three percent of the annual base pay.

The longevity payments are for service as a judge (not including a retired judge) at any level court or any combination of court or other state service or service as any elected officer of the state or any combination of such service. 31

## NEVADA

In addition to their annual base salary, Nevada judges receive longevity payments based upon years of service. District court judges (general jurisdiction court) who have served on the bench at least five years are entitled to an additional salary of $1 \%$ of their base salary for each year of service; provided that the additional salary may not exceed $22 \%$ of the base salary. 32 Supreme court justices receive an additional $6 \%$ at 7 years on the bench and an additional $1 \%$ each year thereafter for a maximum of $22 \% .33$

## NORTH CAROLINA

Pursuant to North Carolina law, the judges in North Carolina receive, in lieu of merit and other increment raises paid to regular state employees, longevity payments in an annual amount equal to:

1. $4.8 \%$ of the annual salary set forth in the Current Operations Appropriations Act payable monthly after 5 years of service;
2. $9.6 \%$ after 10 years of service;
3. $14.4 \%$ after 15 years of service; and
4. $19.2 \%$ after 20 years of service. ${ }^{34}$
[^23]
## RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island judges receive longevity payments of 5\% after 5 years, $10 \%$ after 11 years, $15 \%$ after 15 years, $17.5 \%$ after 20 years, and $20 \%$ after 25 years. 35 Rhode Island also has an unclassified pay plan board that determines the salaries of judges and other officials. This is discussed in the last section of this chapter. ${ }^{36}$

## COMPENSATION COMMISSIONS

A number of states have compensation or salary commissions authorized by statute or constitution to evaluate and recommend salaries for state judges. The National Center for State Courts reports the following states have such commissions: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Rhode Island, Utah, and Washington. 37 In addition to these, Maine and Nevada have commissions that review and recommend judicial salaries. 38 Similar to Hawaii's Judicial Salary Commission, many of these commissions are solely advisory in nature and are given little direction in carrying out their duties. However, a few like Maine are given statutory directives such as: to study the salary, benefits, and retirement to be paid to all judges and recommend a compensation structure that is adequate to ensure the most highly qualified lawyers in the State, drawn from diverse life and professional experiences, are not deterred from serving or continuing to serve in the state judiciary and are not demoralized while serving on the bench because compensation levels do not meet certain criteria. 39

In addition, Maine is one of the few states to specify criteria that the commission must consider in making salary recommendations. These include:

1. Skill and experience required of the particular judgeship.
2. Time required.
3. Opportunity for other earned income.
${ }^{35}$ See NCSC Salary Survey, supra note 2 , at 6 .
${ }^{36}$ See infra notes 66-69 and accompanying text.
${ }^{37}$ National Center for State Courts, Information Services Memorandum No. S94.0547 (Judicial Compensation Commissions) (Williamsburg: March 15, 1994), at 1.
${ }^{38}$ See Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. tit. 4, $\S 1701$ (section establishing judicial compensation commission is repealed on December 31, 1999); Nev. Rev. Stat. §§281.157-281.1575(reviews compensation paid to constitutional officers, supreme court justices, district court judges, and elected county officers).
${ }^{39} \mathrm{Me}$. Rev. Stat. Ann. tit. 4 §1710(11). See also infra notes 57 and 71, and accompanying text.
4. Value of compensable services performed by judges as determined by reference to judicial compensation in other states and the federal government.
5. Value of comparable services performed in the private sector, including private judging, arbitration, and mediation, based upon the responsibility and discretion required in the office and the demand for those services in the private sector.
6. The compensation of attorneys in the private sector.
7. The consumer price index and changes in that index.
8. Overall compensation presently received by public officials and employees; and
9. Other factors normally or traditionally taken into consideration in the determination of compensation. 40

In a handful of states, these commissions are more than mere advisory. In eight states, the recommendations of the compensation or salary commission becomes law, unless the state legislature affirmative modifies or rejects the recommendation. In Washington state, the commission's recommendations become law without any action required by the legislature. The remainder of this section discusses the statutory provisions relating to these states' compensation or salary commissions.


#### Abstract

ALABAMA The Alabama Judicial Compensation is composed of five members: one appointed by the governor, one by the president of the senate, one by the speaker of the house, and two by the governing Compensation Review Board of the Alabama state bar. No member may hold any other public office or office in any political party or be eligible for appointment to the bench while a member of the commission and for two years thereafter. 41 The Commission is charged with recommending to the legislature the salary and expense allowances to be paid from the state treasury for all judges of the state, except municipal and probate judges. ${ }^{42}$ The Alabama Code states that the Commission may submit a report to the legislature at any time within the first five calendar days of any session, and these recommendations become law upon the adjournment of the session in which submitted, unless rejected by a joint resolution or altered by act of the legislature during the session. ${ }^{43}$ The legislature, relying upon this provision, routinely had accepted the


[^24]Commission's recommendations (which apparently tracked cost of living increases given to public employees) until a few years ago, when conflicting language was noted in a parallel provision in the Alabama State Constitution. ${ }^{44}$ That language provides that the recommendations of the Commission become law upon confirmation by a joint resolution or the recommendations may be altered by the legislature during the session. 45 Since this discovery, the legislature has exercised greater discretion in this area, sometimes giving Alabama judges the cost of living salary increase received by public employees
and sometimes not. 46

## ARIZONA

Arizona has a Commission on Salaries for Elective State Officers, which biennially reviews the rates of pay of judges of all courts of record, clerks of the superior court, and elective state officers to determine the pay levels appropriate to the duties and responsibilities of the respective offices and positions. 47 The Commission is composed of five members appointed from private life as follows: two by the governor (one of whom is designated as chairperson); one by the president of the senate; one by the speaker of the house; and one by the chief justice of the supreme court. 48 Greater modification of the Arizona Commission's recommendations is possible than with other state salary commissions discussed herein. Unlike other commissions that submit their proposed salary recommendations directly to their state legislatures, the Arizona Commission submits its report and recommendations to the governor, who may then include his or her own recommendations on the exact rates of pay in the budget transmitted by the governor to the legislature. These recommendations take effect on the first Monday of January of the following calendar year, unless: specifically disapproved, in whole or in part, by either house of the legislature; or a statute is enacted that establishes rates of pay other than those proposed. 49

## DELAWARE

The Delaware Compensation Commission is charged with studying and establishing the rate of remuneration for the: members of the general assembly; governor; members of the governor's's cabinet; lieutenant governor; state auditor; state treasure; attorney general; insurance

[^25]commissioner; justices of the supreme court; chancellor and vice-chancellors of the court of chancery and all judges of the superior court, court of common pleas, and family court; chief magistrate; justices of the peace; and public defender. 50 The Commission is composed of six members as follows: two are appointed by the governor; one by the president pro tempore of the senate; one by the speaker of the house of representatives; the fifth is the president of the Delaware Round Table; and the personnel director of the state serves as an ex officio and nonvoting member. The appointees may not be employed substantially full time by the state during their term. 51 The Commission prepares a report every four years for submission to the Delaware General Assembly on the first day of session. The rate of remuneration established in the report for offices which salaries are more than $\$ 25,000$ are limited to $120 \%$ of the remuneration received in the fiscal year in which the report is submitted. 52 The remuneration of all offices established by the Commission's report become law as of the first day of February following submission, unless the general assembly, by joint resolution, rejects the report in its entirety within thirty days following commencement of its session. 53

## ILLINOIS

The Illinois Compensation Review Board reviews biennially the salaries of judges, elected constitutional officers of the state, members of the Illinois General Assembly, and certain officers of state government. The twelve members of the Compensation Review Board are appointed, three each, by the speaker of the house of representatives, the minority leader thereof, the president of the senate, and the minority leader thereof; provided that, no member may be an employee or member, or a former employee or member, of the judicial, legislative, or executive branches of state government or a registered lobbyist. ${ }^{54}$ In determining the compensation for each officer, the Compensation Review Board is statutorily required to consider the following factors:

1. Skill required.
2. Time required.
3. Opportunity for other earned income.
4. Value of public services as performed in comparable states.

[^26]5. Value of such services as performed in the private sector in Illinois and in comparable states based upon the responsibility and discretion required of the office.
6. Average consumer prices, commonly known as the cost of living.
7. Overall compensation presently received by public officials and all other benefits received.
8. Interests and welfare of the public and the financial ability of the state to meet those costs.
9. Other factors normally or traditionally taken into consideration in the determination of compensation. 55

The Compensation Review Board is required to conduct public hearings prior to filing its report and must allow interested persons to present their views. The Compensation Review Board then submits its report containing its recommendations with respect to salaries, which become law unless the Illinois General Assembly, within thirty days after session is convened, disapproves the report in whole or reduces it proportionately by a resolution, adopted by a record vote of the majority of the members elected in each house. 56

## MARYLAND

Maryland's Judicial Compensation Commission is directed to study and make recommendations with respect to all aspects of judicial compensation, including salary and pension, to the end that the compensation structure is "adequate to assure that highly qualified persons will be attracted to the bench and will continue to serve there without unreasonable economic hardship." ${ }^{57}$ The Commission must review judicial salaries and pensions every two years and make recommendations at least every four years. The Commission's recommendations with respect to salaries are introduced as a joint resolution in each house of the Maryland General Assembly, not later than the fifteenth day of the session. The General Assembly may amend the joint resolution to decrease the amount, but may not increase it, except to comply with the law relating to automatic salary increases. 58 If the joint resolution is adopted or amended within fifty days after its introduction, the salaries so provided apply; however, if the General Assembly fails to adopt or amend it within this time period, the salaries recommended by the Commission apply. If the General Assembly rejects any or all of the Commissions' salary recommendations, the

[^27]salaries of the judges affected remain unchanged, unless modified by the automatic salary increase provision. The Commission's recommendations concerning pensions are introduced by the presiding officers of each house in the form of legislation, which becomes effective only if passed by both houses. In appointing commission members, special consideration is to be given to individuals who have knowledge of compensation practices and financial matters. 59

## MICHIGAN

Michigan's State Officers' Compensation Commission determines the salaries and expense allowances of the justices of the supreme court, as well as that of the governor, lieutenant governor, and members of the legislature. 60 The Commission files its report each even numbered year, and its determination takes effect January 1 of the following year, unless the legislature, by concurrent resolution adopted by a two-thirds vote, rejects either the entire determination or specific determinations for specific positions. 61 The salaries of judges serving on the court of appeals, circuit court, and district court are determined based upon a formula using a percentage of the salary of supreme court justices. 62

## MINNESOTA

Although Minnesota's Compensation Council's recommendations are characterized as becoming law unless specifically modified or rejected by the state legislature, the exact statutory language indicates that Minnesota's model is somewhat weaker than other states' models. The Compensation Council is created each even-numbered year to establish the compensation of all judges, as well as constitutional officers, legislators, and the heads of certain state and metropolitan agencies. 63 The Council must submit its recommendations by May 1, of each odd-numbered year, with the recommended salaries scheduled to take effect on the first Monday in January of the next odd-numbered year after that, with no more than one adjustment scheduled to take effect on January 1 of the following year. However, the recommendations become law only if an appropriation of money to pay the recommended salaries is enacted after the recommendations are submitted and before their effective date. Furthermore, the statute allows the recommendations to

[^28]${ }^{62}$ See id. at $\S \S 27 A .304,27 A .555$, and 27A. 8202.
${ }^{63}$ Minn. Stat. Ann. §15A.082(1) (1988 \& Supp. 1997).
be expressly modified or rejected. 64 The statute is silent as to how the modification or rejection may occur, but as there is no requirement such action be taken jointly, it presumably may be done by either house and approved by the other. In making its compensation recommendations, the Council is directed by statute to consider the following factors: the amount of compensation paid in government service and the private sector to persons with similar qualifications; the amount of compensation needed to attract and retain experienced and competent persons; and the ability of the state to pay the recommended compensation. 65

## RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island law provides for a form of salary commission to determine the salaries of judges, directors of all state departments, and judges of the workers' compensation court. The Unclassified Pay Plan Board is a permanent government agency, consisting of seven members, whose duties are to establish a pay plan for the unclassified employees of the state and to allocate all new unclassified positions to existing grades within the plan. 66 The Unclassified Pay Plan Board meets each January to determine salaries for the following year. In determining these salaries, the Board is directed to take into consideration: the duties and responsibilities of the positions; related factors such as salaries paid to executive and judicial positions in other states and levels of government and in comparable positions anywhere that require similar skills, experience, or training; the amounts of salary adjustments made for other state employees during the period in which the pay for directors, judges, and workers' compensation judges was set last. 67 The Board must refer the proposed salaries to the Rhode Island General Assembly by the last day of each February. The proposed salaries go into effect thirty days hence, unless within that time, the house and senate, acting concurrently, formally reject the proposed salaries. 68 According to the National Center for State Courts, under this procedure, judges have received at least the same percentage of flat increases negotiated or given to state employees generally, although an increase given to unionized employees in 1990 was postponed for judges until 1991 when no additional increase was scheduled. 69

[^29]
## WASHINGTON

The salaries of Washington's judges, as well as all of its elected officials of the executive branch and members of the legislature, are set biennially by the Citizens' Commission on Salaries for Elected Officials by an affirmative vote of not less than nine out of the sixteen members. ${ }^{70}$ In setting the salaries for these positions, the Citizens' Commission is charged with studying the relationship of salaries to the respective duties involved. 71 The Citizens' Commission is required to hold no fewer than four public hearings within four months immediately preceding the filing of its schedule of salaries with the secretary of state no later than the first Monday of June every oddnumbered year. Each schedule is then filed in legislative bill form, assigned a chapter number, published with the session laws, and codified by the statute law committee. The schedules becomes effective ninety days after the filing, without requiring action by the legislature. 72

Interestingly to note, Washington is one of the few states to impose any type of qualifications on the Citizens' Commission members. Seven of sixteen members must have experience in the field of personnel management. Of these, five are selected jointly by the speaker of the house of representatives and the president of the senate, with one from each of the following five sectors in the state: private institutions of higher education; business; professional personnel management; legal profession; and organized labor. Of the remaining two of these seven, one is recommended by the chair of the Washington personnel resources Compensation Review Board and one is recommended by a vote of the presidents of the state's four-year institutions of higher education. ${ }^{73}$

[^30]
## Chapter 4

## CONSIDERATIONS INVOLVED IN DEVELOPING A FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPENSATION STRUCTURE FOR JUDGES

## The Impact of Inadequate Compensation

Conventional wisdom holds that, while inadequate judicial compensation substantially impacts the quality of justice by forcing experienced judges to quit the bench in search of better pay, fair and reasonable pay encourages judges to remain on the bench from which, as experienced judges, they dispense a higher caliber of justice. Critics of the inadequate level of judicial pay in Hawaii suggest that the situation here is proving the conventional wisdom correct. Since 1992, nine experienced, seasoned judges in Hawaii have left the bench at an average age of 48.4 years old, far below the mandatory retirement age. Another judge has just recently announced his intent to retire at the end of May 1998. Chief Justice Ronald Moon, in his first State of the Judiciary address to the Legislature during the Regular Session of 1997, acknowledged the link between adequate pay, experienced judges, and the quality of justice and expressed deep concern over the adverse effect that the continuing loss of experienced and seasoned judges was having on the Judiciary, and ultimately the public:

> judging are entirely different. Although knowledge of the law is certainly basic to both, the skills, techniques, and advocacy style of a successful lawyer do not necessarily make a good judge. Just as lawyers gain proficiency through their practice of law [by] handling numerous cases over many years, judges learn the art of judging through the many cases that they handle on a daily basis. When we lose judges after much time, effort, and monies have been spent to raise their level of expertise and productivity - not because they are ready to retire but because of a lack of a salary increase - judicial excellence, as a whole, declines and service to the public is adversely affected. Although the honor of public service substitutes, in part, for the monetary rewards of private practice, it will become increasingly more difficult to attract and retain quality jurists without a fair increase in judicial salaries.

Chief Justice Moon's words echo those of the Iowa Commission to Review Judicial Compensation and Benefits, in cautioning that inadequate pay was driving experienced judges from the bench and thus posing a threat to the quality of justice:

[^31]It is difficult to assess the real cost of replacing a highly qualified and experienced judge who resigns at the pinnacle of his (or her) career, but the implications for the judicial system are several. It takes years for a qualified attorney, once appointed the bench, to reach a peak efficiency. Early departure creates a gap in the system which, at best, cannot be filled for a period of years, and, at worst, may result in a permanent diminution in the capabilities of the service. ${ }^{2}$

The literature is replete with ratiocination concerning the intrinsic relationship between quality, experience, and adequate compensation on the bench. This statement by the American Judicature Society, whose goal is effective administration of justice at the state and federal levels, is illustrative of the conventional thinking on the correlation between reasonable compensation and judicial excellence:

No precept to the American justice system is more fundamental than the need for excellence in the judicial officers who preside over the system. Without excellence, judges lose the aura of neutrality and independence that is central to their role as ultimate arbiters....[W]ithout adequate compensation - including salary as well as retirement, health, and other benefits - the quality of the applicant pool can be diminished.... To draw the brightest minds into the applicant pool, compensation must be offered that, if not quite competitive with the private sector, is at least adequate to permit such people to enter judicial service without significant financial sacrifice. ${ }^{3}$

Critics of inadequate judicial compensation contend that low salaries not only are responsible for experienced judges quitting the bench, but also discourage the more competent, highly qualified attorneys from leaving their well-paid positions to seek judicial careers. ${ }^{4}$ The clear implication is that, as a consequence of low pay, judicial vacancies are being filled by less qualified, and therefore less desirable, candidates. 5 In December 1986, the United States Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries expressed such a concern, while warning of the ramifications of inadequate judicial compensation: "As new recruitment at inadequate salaries threatens to bring less qualified men and women to the bench, the real cost

[^32]cannot be calculated in dollars. The real cost will be in the insidious and long-term drain imposed on the nation's judicial system . . . " 6 The American Bar Association also claimed that low judicial salaries for judges "diminish the dignity of the office and engender low public esteem for the courts."

Edward B. McConnell, the widely respected president emeritus of the National Center for State Courts, has written of the association between judicial pay, experience on the bench, and judicial excellence:

To have good judges, a state must be able to get good lawyers to leave the practice of law and go on the bench, and must keep good judges from leaving the bench to return to the practice of law. To do this, judicial salaries need not equal, but must have a reasonable relationship to the compensation of the more competent and experienced practicing attorneys from whose ranks judges should come, and to whose ranks they can return. It is axiomatic in business that you get what you pay for. Because of this correlation between quality and compensation, a state cannot expect to attract and retain good judges and thereby maintain a quality court system at compensation levels that are comparable to those of the less experienced or less competent lawyers. 8

Despite the weight of commentary concerning the deleterious effects of inadequate compensation on the quality of justice, some may reasonably question whether higher pay in fact guarantees better qualified judges. Can the conventional wisdom be substantiated by empirical evidence or scientific method or only by subjective or anecdotal accounts? While such a direct connection may not lend itself to scientific verification, reform efforts over the last several decades, such as judicial merit selection, judicial retention, and judicial performance evaluation, have been aimed at ensuring that only qualified individuals are appointed to and retained on the bench.

Judicial performance evaluation programs, in particular, have provided the judiciary, retention commissions, and, in many cases, the public with meaningful information concerning judicial performance factors, such as knowledge and application of the law, treatment of parties and counsel, case management, and communication and administrative skills. ${ }^{9}$ The concept of judicial performance evaluation was pioneered by the Alaska Judicial Council in 1976 to provide reliable information to voters to assist them in making informed decisions in judicial retention elections. 10 As of 1993, eleven states, including Hawaii, had established permanent judicial performance evaluation programs and another ten states were in the process of developing such

[^33]programs. ${ }^{11}$ The goal of judicial performance evaluation programs is to provide fair, responsible, and constructive information about judicial performance, which may be used to: improve judicial performance individually and institutionally; enhance the judicial reappointment or retention process; enrich judicial education; and promote more effective assignment of judges. ${ }^{12}$ Although scientific measurement of the impact of these programs on performance is admittedly "inherently complex"; nevertheless, researchers have found a "growing body of evidence [that] validates the value of the process for individual judges and for the judicial system as a whole." 13

Hawaii's Judicial Performance Program, which has been in existence for about three and one-half years, is designed to evaluate and improve performance on an individual and institutional level. 14 Judges are evaluated by attorneys who appear before them. The evaluation covers three primary areas: legal ability, judicial management skills, and comportment. Each judge is evaluated twice during the judge's term. Survey results are compiled and given to the Chief Justice, who meets with the judges individually and reviews the results with them. The evaluation results are confidential under the rationale that the goal of the program is to encourage self-improvement. However, the results are given to the Judicial Selection Commission to assist the Commission in its evaluation and retention process. In addition, the results have been used by the Judiciary to help focus the judicial education program on specific areas that need work. 15

## Is Inadequate Compensation a Menace to Judicial Independence?

McConnell advised that "[j]udicial compensation should be sufficient to ensure that judges are of high-caliber, free from the distractions of personal economic pressures, and independent of

[^34]${ }^{12}$ See generally Susan Keilitz \& Judith White McBride, "Judicial Performance Evaluation Comes of Age," State Court Journal 4-13, Winter 1992. Methods used to assess and evaluate performance include: questionnaires; self assessment; peer evaluation; direct, in court observation; and videotaping.
${ }^{13}$ Id. at 13 .

[^35]15 Discussions with Chief Justice Ronald Moon, Administration Director of the Courts Michael Broderick, and Budget and Statistics Division Administrator Larry Coldiron, July 14, 1997.
outside influences." ${ }^{16}$ This statement recognizes that the pay issue extends beyond the connection between compensation and judicial excellence, striking at the very heart of judicial independence. The Iowa Commission to Review Judicial Compensation and Benefits also perceived the critical significance of these issues with respect to judicial independence:

An independent and highly competent judiciary is the life blood of the democratic process...

The citizens of Iowa rightfully expect competence and high standards from their judges. Public acceptance of judicial decisions rests primarily on the reputation of judges for independence, scholarship and integrity. The Code of Judicial Conduct makes judges almost completely reliant upon judicial salaries of earned income .... Fundamental fairness requires fair and just compensation for this responsible position. ${ }^{17}$

The American Bar Association, in adopting its standards for judicial compensation in 1990, minced no words in warning of the inimical effects of inadequate judicial compensation: "While some financial sacrifice is expected of private citizens who assume major governmental posts, there is a threshold below which subpart compensation poses a very real threat to the independence and quality of the judiciary."

The danger posed by inadequate compensation to the judiciary's independence is real indeed. The principle of judicial independence ${ }^{18}$ derives from the doctrine of separation of powers, which is fundamental to the very existence of our democratic government. 19 Flowing from the doctrine of separation of powers is the independence of each branch of government to carry out its constitutional functions. In so doing, each branch has "exclusive cognizance of the matters within its jurisdiction, and is supreme within its own sphere," and may not invade another's sphere of operation. 20 Thus, absent specific constitutional authority, one branch of government may not be controlled by, subjected either directly or indirectly to the coercive

[^36]
#### Abstract

18 According to Flaherty, the principle of judicial independence dates back to the American Declaration of Independence, which contains this major grievance against King George III of England: "He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries." See e.g., Flaherty, "Judges Are Militant, Bitter Over Pay," 21 Court Review 5, 10 (Summer 1984) [hereinafter cited as Flaherty].


[^37]influences of, or even embarrassed by another branch of government. ${ }^{21}$ It may be arguable that the failure of the legislative or executive branch to provide fair and reasonable judicial compensation is an indirect attempt to control, influence, or embarrass the judiciary and, as such, constitutes a menace to judicial independence.

## Determining Fair and Reasonable Compensation

## Salary comparisons

Although it may be easy to conclude that judges should be paid an adequate salary, it is not so simple to determine what constitutes a fair and reasonable level of compensation. The American Bar Association, Judicial Administration Division's Handbook on State Judicial Salaries, has suggested the following factors as relevant in determining the appropriate level for judicial salaries:

- Income of private attorneys;
- Compensation of top attorneys in public service, including the attorney general's staff, county, city, and district attorneys, and state law school deans and professors;
- Compensation of federal judges and state judges elsewhere, particulary those of comparable and surrounding states; and
- An adequate judicial pension system, including retirement, disability, and survivor benefits. 22

The Maryland Judicial Compensation Commission has identified a broader range of compensation principles or guidelines as relevant to determining appropriate judicial compensation:

- Salary comparability with other state officials and jurists in other states;
- Comparability with private lawyer income;
- Achievement of an appealing career ladder for jurists, commencing with an attractive entry salary;
- Recognition of upward trends in and responsiveness to economic indicators, such as cost of living and per capita income;
- Recognition of risks inherent in the work and in competitive elections;

[^38]- Urgency to recruit highly qualified persons for the bench;
- Retention of competent jurists; and
- Recognition of the status and prestige of the bench. 23

As may be seen from these examples, there is a tendency to measure reasonable salary levels through salary comparisons. However, there appears to be no one agreed upon standard by which to compare judicial salaries. ${ }^{24}$ Many commentators urge that the most appropriate measure should be what a judge could earn in private practice. 25 In particular, they contend that judicial salaries should be compared with private attorneys who are in the top quarter level of income, based upon the reasoning that judges generally come from among the most experienced and able attorneys. ${ }^{26}$ Others, however, have rejected this notion, including the New York Temporary Commission on Judicial Compensation, which observed that "public service, particularly in higher office[,] has always entailed sacrifice relative to the private sector." 27

In practice, it appears that states tend to give significant weight to the salaries of judges at similar court levels in other jurisdictions. Some commentators have urge parity between the compensation of state court judges and that of federal court judges. This view is supported by an ABA resolution calling for substantial parity between the salaries of justices of the highest courts of the states and those of judges of the United States courts of appeal, and between salaries of state general jurisdiction trial court judges and those of federal district court judges. Supporters of this view cite, as rationale for such parity, the comparable levels of training, skill, and experienced required and comparability of the number and complexity of cases handled. 28 Few states have adopted parity with the federal courts as a goal, however. Moreover, the New York Temporary State Commission on Judicial Compensation found that the latest increase in salaries for federal judges made parity an "unrealistic and unachievable" goal, declaring that the ability of the federal government to pay and incur debt is "fundamentally different from New York's constitutionally-
${ }^{23}$ Maryland, 1986 Report of the Judicial Compensation Commission (Annapolis: 1986), at 7.
${ }^{24}$ Commentators appear to be general agreement that the focus of such comparisons should be determining an appropriate salary for judges. Thus, while judges' incomes are admittedly high in comparison to that of an average wage earner, this type of comparison is irrelevant.
${ }^{25}$ See Flaherty, supra note 18, at 6; McConnell, supra note 2, at 181 .
${ }^{26}$ See id.
${ }^{27}$ State of New York, Temporary State Commission on Judicial Compensation: Final Report, January 1993, at 8.

281996 Hawaii Salary Commission Report, supra note 3, at 12, citing American Bar Association, Annual Report of the American Bar Association, Including Proceedings of the One Hundred Fourth Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana, August 10-12, 1981, vol. 106 (Chicago: American Bar Association, 1985) at 687.
imposed requirement for a balanced budget." 29 Similarly, the Maryland Judicial Compensation Commission, while admitting that federal-state parity might be desirable but for existing state fiscal constraints that are absent in the federal system, noted that "the federal government runs on deficit financing and the State of Maryland does not." 30 Thus, the greater tendency among states has been to compare salaries with those of other state court judges, particularly in neighboring or comparable states. 31

Commentators also draw comparisons between judicial salaries and those of law school faculty, frequently citing instances in which professors in state law schools are paid more that the state chief justice. Critics of this situation pointed out that the position of chief justice requires legal skill and ability at least equal to, and requires administrative responsibilities far greater than, those of a law school dean. 32

Historically, there has been a tendency to link judicial pay with that of top government officials in the executive branch. ${ }^{33}$ This policy has been criticized as inappropriate because of the distinct nature and function of the judiciary. This view was summarized by the Utah Committee on Judicial Compensation in its October 1987 report:

The judiciary provides a unique and critical function. Consequently, issues to be considered when making judicial compensation decisions are different in many ways from those impacting salaries of other elected/appointed officials or career service employees.

- The Judiciary -comprises the third branch of government. Its strengths, quality and independence must be ensured. The need for adequate salaries to attract and retain quality individuals to the bench should not be limited by tying salaries to unrelated positions elsewhere in state government.
- Almost all judges become career employees. Salaries should support and encourage career decisions,

[^39]${ }^{30}$ Maryland, 1986 Report of the Judicial Compensation Commission (Annapolis: 1986), at 9.
${ }^{31}$ See McConnell, supra note 2 , at 182.

32 Id. at 181.
${ }^{33}$ The tendency in Hawaii to tie judicial pay raises together with those of the executive branch has had some bizarre results, such as when the justices of the Hawaii supreme court had to uphold the 1975 executive and judicial pay raise which was being challenged on several grounds, including that it had been attached to a bill appropriating funds for collective bargaining. See "'75 raise upheld by top Isle court," The Honolulu Advertiser, May 13, 1977, at A-10. See also notes 10-14 in Chapter 2 and accompanying text.

It is critical that compensation levels reflect these unique characteristics. Compensation policies and activities for other positions should not determine the establishment and maintenance of adequate salary (sic) for judges. 34

In a similar vein, Chief Justice Moon, in his 1996 State of the Judiciary address, elaborated on the distinction between the Judiciary and the other branches of government:

Judicial independence, as it relates to judges, means that our decisions must be based solely on the legal merits of a case - not on popular opinion polls or surveys, or views of special interest groups. In the words of United States Supreme Court Chief Justice Rehnquist, judicial independence is "one of the crown jewels of our system of government today . . . and is essential to [the Judiciary's] proper functioning and must be retained .... [M]embers of the legislative branch and the heads of the executive branch of government . . . are, under our system of government, guided by popular opinion and are expected to carry out the will of the people. On the other hand, judges are prohibited from having constituents or from engaging in politics because our decisions must be based solely on the legal merits of a case. And therein lies the crucial distinction between judges and representatives of the legislative and executive branches. 35

The 1984 Hawaii Commission on Judicial Salaries, noting that judges make a lifetime commitment to the bench in the "tradition of an independent judiciary," likewise distinguished service on the bench from other public service positions:
[I]t is essential to remember that appointments to the courts are unlike election to public office, appointment of senior positions in State government .... [J]udges are expected to devote full energy and attention to the cause of justice, to eliminate personal, professional or economic interest that could conflict with the exercise of independent and dispassionate judgment in criminal and civil cases. 36

Some commentators have further noted that, whereas public officials typically make only a shortterm commitment to public service, after which they return to the private sector to capitalize on their governmental experience, attorneys who leave their practice for public service on the bench generally are expected to do so permanently. 37 Thus, the financial sacrifice judges make in public service is both significant and enduring.

[^40] 8.

## What should comparisons include?

"Perks". With respect to imposing a ceiling on judicial salaries at the pay level of elected or appointed officials, it has been pointed out that many such officials have perks in addition to their salary. For example, it was estimated in 1989 that Governor Waihee received approximately $\$ 290,000$ in added benefits per year, including an official mansion, servants, limousines, free food, and household expenses. 38 Commentators maintain that any linkage of judicial salary levels to those of elected or appointed officials, in the absence of consideration of the value of such perks, is arbitrary and unfair. Accordingly, it is submitted that any comparison of judicial compensation with that of other state officials should take into account whether the officials receive other perquisites, such as housing, transportation, personal staff, expense accounts, and other extras.

Ability to earn outside income. Similarly, commentators have suggested that, in addition to the inclusion of "perks," a fair comparison of judicial compensation with that of others should include the ability to earn outside income. 39 These commentators explain that many others with whose salaries judicial salaries frequently are compared are free to supplement their income. For example, practicing attorneys may earn extra income by teaching a law school course or other class or by undertaking writing or speaking commitments. Likewise, law school faculty members, including deans, are permitted to supplement their salaries by practicing law or engaging in other professional work, consulting, and teaching summer school courses. In contrast, judges are constrained by the Code of Judicial Conduct from earning income outside their judicial salaries. 40 Commentators contend that this constraint from earning outside income, coupled with low pay, puts judges at a distinct disadvantage compared to those in the private sector.

Fringe benefits. Furthermore, it has been suggested that comparisons of judicial compensation with the compensation of others, regardless of whether attorneys in private practice, other state officials, or judges in other jurisdictions, should be between total compensation packages. Although salary is the most significant form of compensation judges receive, other forms of compensation may include: retirement, disability, and death benefits; leave for vacations, holidays, and sickness; and various forms of insurance coverage.

[^41]In Hawaii, these fringe benefits account for a significant percentage of a judge's compensation. An exact figure of the value of fringe benefits as a percentage of compensation is difficult to determine, according to staff at the Department of Human Resources Development, because the figures change depending upon which benefits are included. 41 For example, the Department of Budget and Finance recently calculated a composite fringe benefit rate, generally applicable to all state employees, at $36.97 \%$ of employees' base salaries. 42 However, this figure includes computed rates only for the following fringe benefit items: pension accumulation and administration retiree health insurance, employees health fund, workers' compensation, unemployment compensation, and social security. (See Appendix E) Several important benefits, including holidays, sick leave, and vacation, were excluded from this figure. Accordingly, it seems logical to conclude that the value of all fringe benefits received by Hawaii's judges would result in a somewhat higher figure.

Given the significant percentage of compensation that fringe benefits comprise, commentators maintain that a fair and meaningful comparison of Hawaii's judicial compensation levels with the compensation of others requires comparison between total compensation packages. For example, any comparison of judicial compensation with that of attorneys in private practice should take into account whether the attorneys' compensation package includes benefits such as health, life, and disability insurance and pension or profit sharing plans or whether attorneys must provide for such benefits out of their gross professional income. Similarly, any comparison of Hawaii's judicial compensation with that of other states should consider all benefits provided to judges, in addition to salary. It should be noted that, although much has been made of Hawaii's low judicial salary ranking vis a vis the other states, discussed previously in Chapter 3, this ranking is based solely on salary levels and does not take into account other aspects of judicial compensation, which may differ substantially from state to state.

A comprehensive review and comparison of state judicial compensation packages would require the competent services of a compensation/benefits specialist. Although such a task is clearly beyond the scope and time requirements for the present study, it is important to comprehend just how varied the fringe benefit provisions for judges are among the states. The following discussion is merely an attempt to illustrate the diversity that exists and to highlight a few notable provisions. It is not intended to be a complete discussion of all benefit provisions available in a particular state nor a complete summary of how all states treat a particular benefit. The information is taken from the ABA's 1996 survey of state fringe benefits report, which summarizes benefit provisions by state and may be referred to for further information. 43 No attempt has been made to verify or update the information contained therein.

[^42]
## a. Retirement/Vesting periods

With respect to judicial pensions, the American Bar Association, Judicial Administration Division's Committee on State Judicial Salaries' noted that judges who are at least age 65, with a minimum of 15 years of service, should be eligible to receive a pension equal to $75 \%$ of the currently effective salary of the office from which the judge retired. Reference to the "currently effective salary" was an attempt to ensure provision of cost-of-living adjustments. 44 In Hawaii, judges contribute $7.8 \%$ of their salary to the Employees' Retirement System. Their retirement benefits are equal to $3.5 \%$ of a judge's average final salary (based on the average of the highest three years), multiplied by the number of years of service, plus an annuity equal to the actuarial equivalent of a judge's accumulated contributions to the retirement system, not to exceed a maximum of $75 \%$ of the judge's average final compensation. Retired judges also receive an annual $2.5 \%$ cost of living increase in retirement benefits and federal social security benefits and do not pay state income taxes on their retirement benefits when they are received. Provisions also exist for judges to elect early retirement with reduced benefits.

Governor Cayetano's veto message accompanying the judicial pay bill, 45 warned that "[i]ncreasing [judicial] salaries across the board without adjusting retirement benefits . . . will only provide [judges] with a greater incentive to leave" the bench. 46 The Governor seemed particularly concerned with the Judiciary's right to benefits based upon three and a half percent of the average final salary, based upon the average of the highest three years, and the "right to retire without consideration of an age limit." 47 Given Governor Cayetano's rationale for vetoing the judicial pay bill, a review of Hawaii's retirement benefits vis a vis other states might prove particularly enlightening.

However, as most states' provisions are unique, meaningful comparison of these provisions are problematic in the absence of the services of a benefits specialist. For example:

- In Alabama, judges contribute 6\% of their annual salary and receive $75 \%$ of their salary at date of retirement plus cost-of-living increases;
- In Arizona, judges contribute $6 \%$ of their salary, and the benefit equals $3.3 \%$ of final salary, multiplied by years of service to a maximum of $80 \%$ of final salary. Cost-ofliving increases are granted from time to time;
${ }^{44}$ See McConnell, supra note 2 , at 182.
${ }^{45}$ See note 56 , in Chapter 2 and accompanying text.
${ }^{46}$ Benjamin J. Cayetano, Governor of Hawaii, Statement of Objections to House Bill No. 1393, Regular Session of 1997 (June 20, 1997).
${ }^{47}$ Id.
- In Colorado, judges contribute $8 \%$ of their annual salary, and benefits are equal to $2.5 \%$ of final average salary (high three), multiplied by years of service up to 20 years. After 20 years, judges receive an additional $1 \%$ of their final average salary for each year in excess of 20 , up to a maximum of $70 \%$ of final average salary. Benefits are subject to an annual cost-of-living increase up to $1 \%$ per year, but retired judges must pay state income taxes on benefits when received;
- In Idaho, judges contribute $6 \%$ of their annual salary, but after 20 years of service, make no contribution. Benefits equal $4 \%$ of current salary, multiplied by number of years of service up to 10 years, plus $2.5 \%$ of current salary for service in excess of 10 years, up to maximum of $62.5 \%$ of salary. Retired judges pay state income taxes on benefits when received;
- In Illinois, judges contribute $7.5 \%$ of their annual salary, plus $1 \%$ toward an automatic increase in annuity. Benefits are equal to $3.5 \%$ of salary base for the first 10 years of service, plus $5 \%$ of the base for each year after that, up to a maximum of 85\%;
- In Nevada, judges do not contribute to the state judicial retirement plan or to the federal social security system. The retirement benefit is equal to $75 \%$ of a judge's salary immediately preceding retirement and is subject to periodic cost-of-living increases provided after 3 years;
- In New Jersey, judges contribute $3 \%$ of the difference between their salary on January 9, 1982 and on January 18, 1982. Benefits equal $75 \%$ of a judge's final salary, and judges receive social security benefits; however, they have to pay state income taxes on benefits received;
- Under Pennsylvania's standard plan, judges must contribute 5\% of gross earnings, and the maximum annual pension is equal to $2 \%$ of the judge's final average salary (high three) for each year of service. Judges may enroll in optional and/or supplemental retirement plans to increase benefits;
- Minnesota has one of the most complicated sounding formulas. Judges contribute $6.27 \%$ of their annual salary. Benefits for judges who retire at age 65 , with at least 5 years of service, are calculated by taking the average of the five highest annual salaries paid to the judge within the 10 years preceding retirement and multiplying that amount by $2.5 \%$ for each year of service before July 1, 1980, and by $3 \%$ for each year of service after June 30, 1980. The actual amount paid is computed by converting this amount to a monthly amount and subtracting from that $75 \%$ of the judge's monthly social security benefits, to a maximum of $65 \%$ of the final salary. Retired judges have to pay state income taxes on benefits they receive after recouping their investment.

One can readily see that a meaningful comparison of Hawaii's retirement benefits with these and other states would require in depth computations and analyses.

Fortunately, the usefulness of comparing vesting periods for full retirement benefits may be more readily apparent. In Hawaii, judges are eligible for full retirement benefits regardless of age, provided they have at least 10 years of service, or 5 years of service if they are at least age 55. Only Pennsylvania is somewhat similar to Hawaii in allowing judges to vest for pension benefits regardless of age, upon accrual of at least 10 years of retirement service credit, or after age 60 with at least 3 years of service. Most states have higher minimum age requirements for judicial retirement and/or longer service requirements for vesting than Hawaii. Some states have a short vesting period similar to Hawaii, but it is coupled with a higher age requirement, such as age 60 ; furthermore, most of these states also offer full benefits upon retirement at a younger age, but coupled with substantially more service years, such as 20 years. The following are illustrative of these variations:

- Alaska grants benefits to judges who are at least 60 years old, with at least 5 years of service.
- In Idaho, benefits are available to judges at least 65 years old, with at least 4 years of service, or at any age, with at least 20 years of service.
- Illinois which allows retirement of judges who are at least 60 years old, with at least 10 years of service, or at least 62 years, with between 6 and 10 years of service.
- In Mississippi, a judge may retire after age 60 , with at least 4 years of service, or at any age, with at least 25 years of service.
- In Montana, judges who are at least 65 years of age, with 5 years of service, are eligible to retire.
- In New Mexico, judges are eligible for retirement if they have at least 5 years of service and retire when they are at least 64 or have at least 15 years of service and retire when they are at least 60 .
- Tennessee grants benefits to judges who are age 65 , with 8 years of service, or age 55 , with 24 years of service.
- Vermont requires judges to be at least 62 years old and have 5 years of service or be at least 65 years old.
- Virginia grants benefits to judges who are age 65 , with at least 5 years of service, or age 60 with 30 years of service.

A number of states have descending years of service requirements as age increases. For example:

- Colorado allows retirement at: ages 55 to 59 with 30 years of service; ages 60 to 64 with 20 years of service; and age 65 or over with at least 5 years of service.
- Louisiana allows a judge to retire: at any age with 18 years of service; at age 70 with any number years of service; after age 55 with at least 12 years of service; or at 50 years or after with at least 20 years of state service, 12 of which were as a judge.
- To qualify for benefits in New Jersey, judges must have: at least 10 years of service and retire on their 70th birthday; at least 15 years of service and retire when they are at least 65 ; or at least 20 years of service and retire when they are at least 60 years old.
- South Carolina provides benefits to judges who retire after: 25 years of service regardless of age; 20 years of service at age 65; or 15 years of service at age 70 .
- Before Alabama changed its eligibility requirements to at least age 60 with at least one full term on the bench, it allowed a judge to retire at: age 60 with at least 18 years of service; age 62 with at least 15 years of service; age 65 with at least 12 years of service; and age 70 with at least 10 years of service.

A number of states have relatively simple provisions with higher age or service requirements than Hawaii. Illustrative are: Arizona which allows judges to retire at age 60, with at least 25 years of service, or at age 62, with at least 10 years of service; Nebraska provides benefits for judges retiring on or after reaching age 65; North Dakota grants benefits at age 65 or when age added to years of service equals at least 88; and South Dakota grants benefits to judges who retire after age 65 and have participated in the retirement system for at least 15 years.

Several states also allow for reduced benefits upon early retirement, such as Nevada, which provides full benefits for retirement after age 60, with at least 22 years of service, and partial benefits for judges who retire after age 60, with at least 10 years of service. North Carolina allows early retirement with reduced benefits for judges reaching age 50, with 5 years of service; judges who retire on or after age 65, with at least 5 years of service, or after age 50, with at least 24 years of service, are eligible for full retirement benefits.

## b. Retired judges' health benefits

A few states continue to provide health insurance coverage to retired judges, similar to Hawaii, which provides full health and life insurance coverage (except that judges retiring with less than 10 years service must share the cost). For example, in California, judges receive full health and dental benefits. Maine pays for health and life insurance for retired judges (basic plan), but the dental insurance ceases. In Maryland, retired judges with at least 16 years of service get the same
health insurance subsidy as provided to active judges (those with less than 16 years get a reduced subsidy). In Idaho and Pennsylvania, the state provides fully paid health/medical insurance for judges. However, in Pennsylvania, the coverage applies only to those judges who retire with 10 or more years of service and includes hospital, medical/surgical, major medical, dental, vision, hearing, and prescription drugs.

A few states continue to provide benefits, but at a lower level than that provided active judges. For example, in Delaware, health care continues at the same level as for an active employee for those retired judges who are under 65; but the state pays only the cost of Medicare supplement for retired judges (and spouses of retired judges) over age 65. Kentucky pays only the cost of Medicare supplement for retired judges. Finally, a few states continue benefits only for some judges. For example, Michigan pays life insurance for all retired judges, but continues health insurance coverage only for retired supreme court justices and court of appeals judges.

## c. Paid leave provisions

It is perceived, within the State at least, that Hawaii has a generous leave policy for public employees, including judges. Judges receive 21 days of vacation leave and 21 days of sick leave per year. Additionally, as in nearly all states, judges are granted 15 days of military leave each calendar year when called for active duty or to participate in training exercises. Furthermore, Hawaii is the only state noted as having paid funeral leave (up to 3 days for an immediate family member). Several states, however, have equally or even more generous leave policies. For example, Alaska gives judges 30 days of vacation leave, unlimited sick leave as needed each year (not charged against vacation leave), and five days educational leave. 48 In Maryland, judges are entitled to 27 vacation days per year, plus 3 personal days; sick leave is taken as needed and not charged against vacation or personal leave. Minnesota judges have 30 working days of vacation leave and 10 days for education leave per year, (no mention was made of sick leave, however). Rhode Island judges receive six weeks of vacation leave, sick leave on an as needed basis, and up to 4 days of personal leave.

A number of states have no formal specified leave provisions, including Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, 49 Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Nebraska, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, 50 and Washington. In between these extremes are states such as Idaho, whose judges are eligible for 22.5 vacation days and accrue sick leave at one day a month, or Utah, whose judges receive 20 days of vacation per year.

[^43]Hawaii's judges have 14 paid holidays in an election year, as does New Jersey. Pennsylvania has from 12 to 14 holidays per year. Only Maryland, with 14 days in a nonelection year and 15 days in an election year, and West Virginia, which has 13 to 15 holidays per year, have more than Hawaii. Alabama, Delaware, Massachusetts, Vermont have 13 holidays per year. A number of states have 10 holidays a year, including Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington. Iowa has only 9 holidays per year; and Texas has no formal holiday provisions. The other states generally have between 11 or 12 holidays per year.

## d. Health/Medical benefits

Because of the variety of health plans available to judges in the states, no attempt was made to compare these health benefits. It is interesting to note, however, that a few states include dental coverage for their judges in their health benefits package. Alaska is the most generous in providing dental coverage for judges and their family members. More typical are Alabama, Idaho, Michigan, (coverage varies by court plan) Minnesota, and Rhode Island, which provide dental coverage only for judges, but allow judges to add family members at their own cost.

## e. Life Insurance benefits

Hawaii provides active judges under age 65 with $\$ 25,000$ of life insurance benefits, with descending amounts as age increases. Several states are more generous than this, basing benefits on salary levels. For example, in Illinois and Oregon, ${ }^{51}$ judges' life insurance benefits are equal to their most recent annual salary. Similarly, Idaho judges have coverage equal to $100 \%$ of their salary, until they reach 65 years of age; then it drops to $75 \%$ of their salary, and $50 \%$ of their salary at age 70. Michigan is also generous: for active judges, the state coverage is equal to two times their annual salary, and in addition, most local governmental units provide varying amounts of coverage; 52 for retired judges it is $25 \%$ of the coverage immediately preceding retirement. In Minnesota, judges have $\$ 55,000$ in life insurance coverage.

On the other hand, most states provide judges with considerably less insurance coverage than in Hawaii. As an example, Arizona's basic noncontributory life insurance coverage is $\$ 5,000$, but $\$ 10,000$ if death results from auto accident where seat belts were worn (additional contributory coverage allowed). Colorado provides $\$ 12,000$ in coverage. Alaska provides only $\$ 2,000$ in basic life insurance coverage for judges, but also provides $\$ 1,000$ for spouses, and $\$ 500$ for dependents three years or older. New Mexico provides only contributory life insurance: ( $\$ 25,000$ of benefits is provided, with judges contributing $\$ 4.42$ and the state contributing $\$ 6.652$ per month). Several states, such as Alabama, New York, and Rhode Island do not pay for any life insurance coverage for judges.
${ }^{51}$ In Oregon, the amount is rounded up to the next multiple of $\$ 1,000$. Id. at 140.
${ }^{52}$ Coverage for Maryland's judges is similar, except it is unclear whether judges must pay for some of the coverage. The report states that Maryland's judges "are eligible" for life insurance at one, two, or three times their salary, rounded to the next $\$ 1,000$ for a maximum of $\$ 100,000, \$ 200,000$, or $\$ 300,000$. See id. at 78 .

## f. Transportation

Most states provide parking for judges and make some reimbursement for mileage under specified circumstances. In addition, a few states provide the chief justice of the supreme court with a car, including Alaska, Hawaii (car and gasoline), and Tennessee (including gasoline, maintenance, and insurance). In Georgia, the chief justice is given a car and driver, and the chief judge of the court of appeals is given a car. Similarly, in Rhode Island, the chief justice and all chief judges are provided with a state car. North Dakota is quite generous, making cars and gasoline available to all of its judges. In states where judges must travel far, judges may be provided with a car and gasoline (such as in Utah) or receive a monthly car allowance (such as in Texas). In some states, certain judges receive an annual travel or car allowance. In North Carolina, superior court judges receive a $\$ 7,000$ travel allowance each year for subsistence, in addition to $\$ 0.28$ per mile for travel. Justices of the Pennsylvania supreme court receive an annual car allowance of $\$ 9,000$, which is intended to reimburse them for the purchase or lease of an automobile, plus operating costs such as insurance, gasoline, and maintenance. In addition, the president judges of the lesser appellate courts have access to a state owned car, while the associate judges are reimbursed for travel costs.

## g. Expenses

Most, but not all, states reimburse judges for expenses in connection with approved education or judicial conferences and bar dues. A few states provide only limited reimbursement of such expenses. For example, in Arizona, it appears that only appellate judges are reimbursed for dues, conferences, and travel. In Arkansas, judges are not reimbursed for dues or expenses, although registration fees are waived for judges at state bar association meetings and seminars. At least two states provide some judges with expense allowances. In Indiana ${ }^{53}$ and Pennsylvania, the justices of the supreme court and judges of the intermediate appellate court receive statutorily prescribed expense allowances; and in Virginia, the justices of the supreme court and judges of the court of appeal receive a $\$ 6,500$ allowance annually.

## h. Recreational privileges

A few states provide some type of recreational privilege to their judges. New Hampshire judges receive $50 \%$ discounts on admissions to all state-owned recreational facilities. Additionally, one of the eligible HMOs in which judges may participate offers free health club membership as part of its wellness program. Also, North Dakota has discounted fees for judges at the YMCA, depending upon location, and Oregon judges receive a $50 \%$ discount off regular initiation fees charged by the Northwest Athletic Clubs Association.

## i. Miscellaneous benefits

A few states have other miscellaneous benefits. The most remarkable of these are

[^44]Arizona's state-sponsored day care, in which judges are eligible to participate, and its stateoperated cafeterias in which judges may dine.

Clearly fringe benefits comprise a significant percentage of a judge's total compensation. The exact value of the benefits package naturally depends upon the particulars of the benefits provided. Although the foregoing discussion illustrates the complications involved in comparing such packages, it also highlights the necessity for including consideration of fringe benefits if a fair and accurate comparison of compensation is to be achieved.

## Economic indicators

Although commentators concede that one should not expect to reach full economic potential on the bench, they nonetheless maintain that it is unreasonable to allow inadequate compensation to erode a judge's economic position to the point that personal and family financial concerns become a distraction. They contend that the issue extends beyond a simple judicial pay raise, noting that lengthy waits between judicial pay increases, coupled with the rising cost of living, seriously diminishes judicial purchasing power. The present situation in Hawaii is a prime example of this. The 1996 Judicial Salary Commission Report found that the salaries of Hawaii's judges are far below their respective consumer price index adjusted salary levels. Using the 1995 consumer price index for urban dwellers for Honolulu, the Commission determined that the salary of the chief justice was about $70 \%$, and the salaries of circuit court judges were about $72 \%$, of 1969 salary levels, respectively. ${ }^{54}$ Furthermore, the Commission found that, in addition to the erosion in their salaries, Hawaii's judges pay a relatively higher cost for goods and services than judges on the mainland. The Commission concluded that the representative consumption basket in Honolulu is $25 \%$ more expensive than in the average mainland urban area; and when estimates of personal income taxes and insurance are included, Honolulu is $34 \%$ more expensive than the Mainland. 55

To obviate this situation and ensure regular adjustments in salary that, at a minimum, keep pace with the cost-of-living, it has been suggested that salaries of judges be tied to some economic indicator. It is unclear, however, which indicator should be used. Some commentators have urged that judges' salaries be tied to cost-of-living; however, reference to "cost-of-living" is problematic. Cost-of-living refers to the amount of money it takes to live in a particular place at a particular lifestyle or quality of life. Therefore, no fixed level for cost-of-living exists, as it differs according to location and lifestyle.

Although comparisons may be made between what it costs to buy the same goods and services at different locations, these still do not accurately and fully reflect the actual cost of living. One example of such a comparison is the American Chamber of Commerce's cost of living differential showing comparisons between major urban areas. This index does not include

[^45]55 Id. at 23.

Honolulu, however. Moreover, it has been criticized as having a narrow, consumption-based perspective. 56 Other cost of living comparisons exist, but the reliability of these appear uncertain. According to the Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism, the Bank of Hawaii, following methodology employed by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, in their discontinued family budget studies, (which made official comparisons of Honolulu and mainland living costs), unofficially calculates the cost-of-living based upon a hypothetical budget for a four-person family at an intermediate standard. 57 In addition, the United States Office of Personnel Management compiles a comparison of prices in Hawaii and Washington D.C. to provide a basis for cost of living adjustments for federal employees in Hawaii. The Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism advises, however, that the data from these two sources are subject to "technical limitations and must be interpreted with considerable caution." ${ }^{\prime} 8$ Accordingly, there appears to be no reliable measure of the actual cost-of-living.

Furthermore, the term "cost of living" is often confused with, or incorrectly used to refer to, the consumer price index, which is widely used as an indicator of the rate of inflation that the average consumer faces. 59 The consumer price index is a relative index that measures the average change in prices over time for a specific set of goods and services, including food, clothing, shelter, fuels, transportation, medical services, drugs, and other goods and services that people buy for day-to-day living. Consequently, the consumer price index is depicted symbolically as a market basket of goods and services. Because the consumer price index does not measure actual price levels (only change in prices), and it excludes certain non-consumption items, including income taxes and social insurance taxes, such as social security, it is not a true cost of living indicator. However, by measuring price changes from an arbitrarily designated reference date, the consumer price index provides a valid measure, in times of rising prices, of the relative rate of inflation or, conversely, of the diminution in the value of a dollar against a fixed base year. Thus it provides a reliable measure of the change in the cost of living. 60

The Bureau of Labor Statistics publishes a consumer price index for two population groups: a Consumer Price Index of All Urban Consumers (CPI-U), which covers approximately

[^46]${ }^{58}$ Id. Brewbaker acknowledges inherent weaknesses in the underlying estimating methodology, one of which is that the "market basket," relied upon by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, reflects consumption and employment patterns of a family in the 1960 s and has never been updated to reflect current consumption patterns. See Paul H. Brewbaker, Hawaii's Cost of Living in 1990: Urban Four-Person Family Budgets at an Intermediate Standard of Living" (Bank of Hawaii, Honolulu: 1991).

59 Telephone conversation with Robert Shore, Chief, Economic Branch, Research \& Economic Analysis Division, Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism, October 10, 1997 [hereinafter cited as Shore].
${ }^{60}$ See Hawaii, Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, Quarterly Statistical and Economic Report, 1st Quarter (Honolulu: 1989), at 9-10.
$80 \%$ of the total population and a Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W), which covers $32 \%$ of the total population. The CPI-U includes such groups as professional, managerial, and technical workers, the self-employed, short-term workers, the unemployed, and retirees and others not in the work force, in addition to the urban wage earners and clerical workers covered under the CPI-W. Separate indexes also are published by size of city, region of the country, for cross-calculations of regions and population-size classes, and for twenty-eight local areas, including Honolulu. 61

There are other factors that can be indexed also, such as per capita income or employment cost, but again, these are not a complete reflection of a state's cost of living. It has been noted previously that the District of Columbia (which tracks the compensation of federal court judges), the federal Judiciary, and Illinois base judicial salary adjustments upon changes in the employment cost index. ${ }^{62}$ According to the Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism staff, the employment cost index reflects an average of the combined wages and salaries of employees in other designated sectors or groups. The value of this index would be to determine whether increases in all average wages and salaries were keeping up with increases in the cost-ofliving. The per capita income index is a variation of the average wage and salary index, but it includes a broader range of income in addition to wages and salaries, including imputed income, which makes it more volatile. 63

Finally, an objection raised, from a labor theory perspective, to the association of salary adjustments to any economic indicator is that it is an arbitrary measure having little to do with the major theories behind compensation, (such as the productivity and contribution of the person receiving the adjustment or the shortage of skilled workers to fill critical positions), and, therefore, the consumer price index, or any other economic indicator, by itself, does not provide an adequate basis for determining the appropriate amount of a salary increase. On the other hand, it has been observed that measuring productivity, proficiency, and performance is more difficult to do in the public sector than in a market economy. Furthermore, if the intent is only to compensate for a change in the cost-of-living, as opposed to substituting for merit or performance pay, then use of the consumer price index provides a valid and traditional indicator.

## Conclusion

The consensus of commentators appears to be that inadequate compensation has a significant effect on the quality of justice and raises a threat to judicial independence. The difficulty lies in determining what constitutes reasonable compensation. It is apparent that this is a complex issue and that a number of factors may be relevant in determining what constitutes reasonable compensation for judges. This discussion has examined various ideas concerning how reasonable judicial compensation may be achieved and has reviewed factors relevant to a determination of reasonable compensation.
${ }^{61}$ For a more detailed description of the consumer price index, see generally id. at 9-12.

62 See notes 11-16 in Chapter 3 and accompanying text.

63 See Shore, supra note 59.

## Chapter 5

## VIEWS OF THE JUDICIAL SALARY COMMISSION ON THE SUBJECT OF JUDICIAL COMPENSATION

As directed in the Resolution, the Bureau sought information from the Hawaii Judicial Salary Commission and offered the Commission members an opportunity to discuss their views on the subject of judicial compensation. This Chapter summarizes the input obtained from the Commission members.

## Views of the Judicial Salary Commission

The Bureau offered members of the Judicial Salary Commission the opportunity to provide additional input into the study, either by meeting individually or in a group with Bureau staff or by submitting a written response. With the exception of one member, the Commission decided to respond as a whole by way of letter. The Commission's written response is summarized here. A complete copy of the response is reproduced as Appendix $\mathbf{F}$.

While advising that Hawaii's judges are "significantly underpaid, relative to jurists in other states, on the federal bench, and in private practice," the Commission reported that: the most recent figures available from the National Center for State Courts indicate that, by July 1, 1997, Hawaii's Supreme Court Justices had fallen from a national ranking of 35th to 38th; and when Hawaii's cost-of-living is taken into account, Hawaii's justices now rank 45th in the nation. The Commission also noted its concern about the eroding value of judges' salaries and contended that "sporadic, lump sum raises simply put off the issue of maintaining judicial salaries at a level commensurate with judicial responsibilities and at a level to attract and retain the best to serve in Hawaii's Judiciary."

The Commission reiterated its "strong support" for the adoption of an automatic salary escalator for judges, stating that "[i]n light of the Governor's veto of the judicial salary increase passed by the 1997 Legislature, we are increasingly persuaded that an automatic salary escalator is imperative." Finally, the Commission, submitting that "an experienced Judiciary is the cornerstone to judicial excellence and judicial independence," maintained that judges, similar to other public employees who "commit a significant portion of their professional careers to public service, should be compensated commensurate with the length of their [public] service" and that "[r]etention increases, or pay supplements for length of judicial service, are an idea whose time has come." The Commission concluded its response by urging implementation of "these long overdue and urgently needed adjustments to the salaries and salary structure of Hawaii's dedicated judges and justices."

## Former Co-Chair of the Commission

Mr. Max J. Sword, who was Co-Chair of the Commission at the time it submitted its report to the 1997 Legislature, accepted the Bureau's offer to meet concerning this study. Shortly before the actual meeting date, Mr. Sword was appointed to the Judicial Selection Commission and resigned from the Judicial Salary Commission. Given Mr. Sword's significant contribution to the work of the Commission and the Resolution's directive to consult with the Commission, the Bureau considered it appropriate to include Mr. Sword's comments. Mr. Sword emphasized during his meeting with Bureau staff that the opinions expressed were his personal views and did not necessarily represent those of the Commission. Mr. Sword's comments are summarized in the remainder of this section.

Mr. Sword was asked his reaction to the traditional approach, historically favored by many in Hawaii, of using the Governor's salary as a bench mark in setting the salaries of all other exempt government officials, including judges. Mr. Sword explained that he was a firm believer in the separation of power within three distinct branches of government. Each branch of government has a different role and function, and compensation should be set accordingly. Furthermore, judicial independence requires there to be a fair and impartial mechanism for achieving judicial salary adjustments that avoids politics as much as possible. Accordingly, Mr. Sword indicated he does not accept the traditional approach that the Governor's salary should be used as bench mark in setting the salaries of other exempt government officials. If this approach were to be used, however, Mr. Sword pointed out, as have others, ${ }^{1}$ that because the Governor has a number of "perks" (house, use of car and driver, etc.) in addition to his cash compensation, any fair comparison using the Governor's compensation should take into account the value of these perks.

Mr. Sword was asked his response to concerns raised that the Commission's proposals may be perceived as granting judges special treatment not afforded other exempt employees. Comparing the operation of state government to that of a large corporation, Mr. Sword stated that he feels strongly that salaries should be adequate to attract good people in all areas of government. In that context, he observed that the Governor and his cabinet also should be paid more and conceded that department heads and deputies deserved to have a similar, but separate, salary escalator, with the Governor's salary set at the top of that pay scale. He noted, however, that the rationale justifying longevity pay for judges does not apply to department heads because they generally serve in the same position only as long as the Governor holds office.

With respect to the advantages of having a sitting judge serve out a long tenure on the bench, Mr. Sword stated that, generally, as with most things, the more experience a judge has on the bench, the better the judge is able to perform. He conceded that this may not always be the case, however, and indicated that, in his opinion, any judge who is not performing his or her duties adequately should not be retained. Mr. Sword acknowledged that the Commission wrestled with the issue of how judicial performance should be evaluated and found resolution of the issue difficult. He noted that it requires a different standard of evaluation than in a business

[^47]environment, where assessments are made using objective criteria. Judges have to interpret common law and statutory law and rule on the legal merits, given a particular set of facts. It is not a simple question of whether you agree or disagree with their rulings.

With respect to whether retirement and other benefits should be addressed in tandem with salary provisions, Mr. Sword acknowledged that judges' retirement benefits are very favorable and may not encourage long tenure. Conceding that the Governor may have a point with respect to judicial retirement benefits, ${ }^{2}$ he suggested that the entire compensation package be examined to arrive at a good package that strikes a balance between compensation that is both equitable and commensurate with the duties required of the office and that will attract the best legal minds to the bench. Mr. Sword acknowledged that the Commission, in comparing judicial salaries in Hawaii with those of judges in other jurisdictions and with those of local private attorneys, did not take into account the value of fringe benefits, such as vacation, health insurance, pension, and retirement benefits, as part of the overall compensation package. According to Mr. Sword, one problem the Commission had in making such comparisons was that too much disparity exists to permit any kind of summary or conclusion with respect to the value of the benefits. Furthermore, this information with respect to private law firms is difficult to obtain, because many firms are unwilling to divulge such information.

Mr. Sword was asked whether he had a preference for one method, over another, of achieving an automatic salary escalator provision. He responded that he personally has philosophical reservations about tying judicial salaries to those in any other branch of government, such as the executive branch through collective bargaining increases, because he believes there needs to be a sufficient nexus between the amount of pay awarded and the work performed. Mr. Sword noted that previous reports of the Commission had recommended tying judicial salary increases to some type of cost of living increase. ${ }^{3}$ He explained that this method, on the other hand, raised the problem of deciding which numbers to use to arrive at a cost of living increase, because there is no agreement on a formula or equation to use to determine cost of living. Consequently, he concluded that both methods have positives and negatives associated with them. Nevertheless, he maintained that some objective mechanism is critically needed to ensure regular judicial salary increases.

With respect to the issue of longevity pay for judges, Mr. Sword explained that this issue was raised just before the deadline for submission of the Commission's report. He indicated that the Commission recognized that it would be very difficult to devise a system that would reward a sitting judge's experience on the bench but, at the same time, take into account the greater duties and prestige of higher courts and avoid overlapping salaries between court levels. Mr. Sword observed that, although the obvious way to avoid this overlapping of salaries with a longevity pay system would be to create larger differentials between salaries at the different court levels, this solution might be politically and economically infeasible. He noted that, given the complications involved, the Commission did not have sufficient time to address this issue in its report. Nevertheless, Mr. Sword indicated that, because he believes there should be a strong sense of civic
${ }^{2}$ See notes 46-47 in Chapter 4 and accompanying text.
${ }^{3}$ See Hawaii, Report of the Judicial Salary Commission (Honolulu: October 1994), at vii and 29.
duty on the part of a person wanting to be a judge, he feels it is important to recognize and reward such commitment to public service by providing for judicial salary increases tied to length of service on the bench.

## Conclusion

The sources whose views are presented here indicated that the continuing failure to maintain reasonable judicial salary levels has been counter productive to the Judiciary. The sources contend that the need to preserve judicial independence and excellence and maintain an experienced judiciary necessitate paying judges reasonable levels of compensation. They contend, moreover, that there must be an objective mechanism to ensure reasonable increases are made to judicial salaries on a regular basis. An automatic salary escalator and some system for additional pay for judges based upon length of service were suggested as means toward achieving these goals.

## Chapter 6

## SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## General Findings and Summary

1. The Bureau finds that the current system for determining judicial pay increases has failed to provide adequate judicial compensation on a regular basis; and this failure to maintain reasonable levels of compensation has had a detrimental effect on, and threatens to compromise the independence of, the Judiciary.

The lack of a judicial pay increase in more than seven years reportedly accounts for the decision within the last several years by a number of judges to step down. Since the last judicial increase in 1990, judges' purchasing power has decreased by $25 \%$ as a result of inflation and the rising cost of living. This present interim between pay increases is only the latest of many such lengthy interludes. ${ }^{1}$ Moreover, history reveals that judicial pay raises have often been held hostage to the political process. The need to depoliticize the process is apparent. The absence of an objective, statutorily established mechanism to ensure fair and reasonable salary increases on a regular basis forces the Judiciary into the potentially compromising position of lobbying the Legislature for increases in salary and benefits.

The independence of the Judiciary is further compromised when personal economic pressures become a distraction sufficient to interfere with the exercise of "independent and dispassionate judgment." ${ }^{2}$ A lifetime commitment to the bench, in the "tradition" of an independent judiciary, entails considerable financial sacrifice, given that most judges could earn far higher salaries by remaining in the private sector. Judges are at a further economic disadvantage in comparison to private attorneys, law school faculty, and others, because, unlike these latter groups, judges are largely precluded by the Code of Judicial Conduct from supplementing their salaries from outside sources. These financial sacrifices are inherent in any judicial career; however, when coupled with inadequate salaries, such sacrifices are greatly exacerbated.

Conventional wisdom holds that fair and adequate compensation is necessary to ensure qualified and experienced judges. Conversely, insufficient compensation apparently has the concomitant effect of driving experienced judges from the bench and discouraging highly qualified attorneys from applying for judicial vacancies. These effects, in turn, diminish the quality of the bench. The Legislature has repeatedly dealt with the problem of insufficient judicial compensation by granting sporadic, lump-sum increases. History demonstrates, however, that this type of response cannot adequately rectify the problem. As judges are bypassed while other state workers receive salary increases, the effect is not only demoralizing and frustrating for judges, but the

[^48]failure of judicial salaries to at least keep pace with inflation causes judges to lose ground as their purchasing power shrinks. Moreover, the lump-sum salary increases that then become necessary, every four to eight years, to bring judges current with inflation concomitantly raise the public ire and contribute to the Legislature's reluctance to increase judicial salaries. This response has become a pattern that perpetuates itself because of its inadequacy. As the 1984 Commission on Judicial Salaries' observed, this failure to maintain reasonable levels of compensation "accumulate problems that in the long-run are more costly to correct than modest adjustments made on a regular basis." 3

This continuing failure to maintain reasonable salary levels has resulted in mounting calls for a permanent, objective process that would: ensure reasonable and regular salary adjustments; obviate the need for controversial, lump-sum, catch-up adjustments; and preserve the integrity and independence of the Judiciary. In response, the Legislative Reference Bureau, through Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2, Senate Draft No. 1, was requested to study and recommend an appropriate judicial salary structure.

An examination of judicial salaries across the country reveals that Hawaii now ranks near the bottom. The National Center for State Courts' latest judicial salary ranking by state demonstrates that, as of July 1997, Hawaii's rank has fallen: to number 38 out of 50 and 34 out of 39 for salaries paid to justices on the supreme court and judges on the intermediate court of appeals, respectively; and to 34 out of 50 for salaries paid to circuit court judges. ${ }^{4}$ According to the Judiciary, when the National Center's salary data are "normalized" to eliminate the disparity caused by differences in per capita income among the states, Hawaii's rank drops even farther to: 44 out of 50 and 35 out of 39 for salaries paid to justices on the supreme court and judges on the intermediate court of appeals, respectively; and to 44 out of 50 for salaries paid to circuit court judges. (See Appendix G. 1 to G.3)
2. The Bureau finds that objective mechanisms have been used in other jurisdictions to provide regular and reasonable judicial salary adjustments; however, implementation in Hawaii of only one such mechanism, alone, may be insufficient to resolve the problems posed by inadequate judicial salaries and to ensure regular and reasonable salary adjustments.

A comprehensive review of the statutory salary provisions and structure for judges in all states and the District of Columbia indicates that twenty-two states and the District of Columbia have one or more objective mechanisms in place to effect regular and reasonable judicial salary adjustments. These mechanisms include: an automatic salary escalator to afford judges an automatic increase upon the happening of a certain event, such as a pay increase for state workers or an increase in the consumer price index; longevity payments based upon length of service; and authoritative compensation commissions whose recommendations are determinative, unless affirmatively rejected by the Legislature. Nevertheless, it appears use of these mechanisms alone may not secure a high ranking of a state's judicial salaries. For example, Maine provides for adjustment of judicial salaries according to any percentage change in the consumer price index, not to exceed $4 \%$. However, the Legislature can withhold this cost-of-living adjustment in certain

[^49]fiscal years. This proviso may account for Maine's low ranking at number 40 out of 50 and 35 out of 50 for the court of last resort and the general jurisdiction trial court, respectively. In addition to Maine, eight other states that employ some type of salary adjustment mechanism have one or more courts that are ranked number 30 or below in the National Center for State Courts' latest salary ranking. ${ }^{5}$

This finding lends support for the conclusion that determining reasonable compensation is a complex process, requiring consideration of a number of factors in arriving at an adequate and reasonable level of compensation. Moreover, it also points out that, despite the advantages presented by these various mechanisms, implementation of only one mechanism, by itself, may not be a panacea for the problems posed by inadequate judicial salaries. Each mechanism has a primary focus that may fail to address other concerns sufficiently. For example, an automatic salary escalator is an attempt to keep salaries increases consistent with those of other workers or with increases in the cost of living, but may fail to achieve reasonable and regular compensation levels for judges if those other workers are given either no increase or an insufficient increase or if the rate of inflation slows. Furthermore, an automatic salary escalator does little to recognize the valuable experience and longevity of sitting judges. Similarly, while longevity payments are an attempt to reward experience and encourage longevity in a position, they would affect only those limited individuals who meet the required years of service. Thus it would provide little assistance in keeping judicial salaries across the board current with inflation. Compensation commissions ideally should remove the issue of compensation from the political arena and provide for reasoned consideration of all relevant factors in determining reasonable salaries. However, as seen in Chapter 3, a commission may be only advisory or, even if authoritative, the commission's authority may be watered down. 6 Also, compensation commissions may fail to consider all relevant criteria in their decision making. For example, given the high percentage of overall compensation comprised by fringe benefits, ${ }^{7}$ a fair comparison of the compensation of judges in Hawaii with that of others, whether judges in other jurisdictions or private attorneys or others, requires comparing total compensation packages, not merely salaries. Yet, this has not been done, primarily because of the complexities involved in comparing compensation packages, as even the brief examination, in Chapter 4, of fringe benefits afforded by other states illustrates. This observation points out the need for input into the Judicial Salary Commission's decision-making by qualified benefits/compensation specialists.

[^50]${ }^{7}$ See notes 41-42 in Chapter 4 and accompanying text.

Finally, it should be pointed out that these mechanisms are prospective in nature and are designed, if implemented, to ensure regular and reasonable salary increases in the future. Implementation of one or more of these mechanisms, alone, would not remedy the present situation, in which Hawaii's judges find themselves, of having sub par base salaries.

## Bureau Recommendations

Based upon the foregoing discussion, the Bureau concludes that an appropriate salary structure should include one or more objective mechanisms to: remove judicial salary issues from the political arena; and ensure both reasonable and regular salary adjustments that, at a minimum, keep pace with increases in the cost-of-living and alleviate the need for large catch-up adjustments. Accordingly, the Bureau makes the following recommendations to the Legislature.

1. Recommendation No. 1: The Legislature should enact a judicial salary increase as proposed in House Bill No. 1393, C.D. 1, regular session of 1997.

As noted, implementation of one or more of the objective mechanisms discussed, alone, will do nothing to ensure that the present base pay of judges is raised. Failure to increase judicial base salaries to a reasonable level, prior to implementing any of these mechanisms, would have the effect of locking judges in at an unfair baseline at the outset and, thereby, preventing their salaries from ever "catching up" to inflation. Therefore, given that Hawaii's judges have had no pay increase in nearly eight years, the Bureau suggests that, in conjunction with implementing objective mechanisms to ensure periodic, reasonable salary adjustments, the Legislature also increase judicial base salaries. The Bureau would note that the judicial pay raise proposed in House Bill No. 1393, C.D. 1, and approved by the Legislature during the regular session of 1997 would seem a logical starting position.
2. Recommendation No. 2: The Legislature should adopt one or more objective mechanisms to provide regular and reasonable judicial salary adjustments.

Several options are available by which the Legislature may implement an objective mechanism.

Option 1. The Legislature could enact a statute that provides an automatic salary increase for judges tied to increases given to other state employees.

An automatic salary escalator mechanism would achieve predictability and consistency in judicial salary adjustments and avoid the necessity for large catch-up increases that have historically taken place. In addition, the regular, systematic nature of this approach should reduce the politics that accompany any salary increase for judges and obviate the need for lobbying of legislators by the Judiciary, thus preserving judicial independence. The mechanism most commonly used by other states is tying judicial salary adjustments to increases given, either as negotiated increases or cost-of-living increases, to all or certain segments of state workers.

It has been suggested that adjustments to judicial salaries in Hawaii be tied automatically to collective bargaining negotiated increases, particularly those of unit 13 (professional and scientific employees) or to increases given to the managerial white-collar officers and employees in the excluded managerial compensation plan, pursuant to section 77-13.1, of the Hawaii Revised Statutes. Proponents of this mechanism have promoted it for its element of fairness, in ensuring that judges receive salary adjustments on a regular cycle with the vast majority of other state employees. Moreover, there appears to be some precedence for tying salary adjustments for excluded employees to collective bargaining negotiated increases, based upon chapter 89C, Hawaii Revised Statutes, which permits pay adjustments, for certain excluded officers and employees, of an amount not less than that provided under collective bargaining agreements for comparable officers and employees. 8 Finally, because collective bargaining for public employees is such an accepted principle in Hawaii, it has been suggested that this mechanism may be seen as more palatable than others for which no local precedent exists, such as tying raises to the consumer price index.

On the other hand, it has been pointed out that, although the tying of judicial salary increases to those of other employees may be acceptable if the increase is intended to be a cost of living increase, but if, instead, the increase is intended to be commensurate with what a particular collective bargaining unit has earned, it may seem both arbitrary and unfair to tie judges' salaries to this percentage increase. Furthermore, because any collective bargaining unit's salary increases must be negotiated as part of the contract agreement, tying judicial salary adjustments to collective bargaining increases, or for that matter, to increases given to other state employees, will not guarantee that judges receive either reasonable or regular salary increases. It will only guarantee that they receive whatever increase, if any, that another group of employees receives. Thus, if a salary increase is consistently denied to the particular group of employees, judges could face the same situation confronting them at present: that is, a sub par judicial salary base with severely diminished purchasing power.

In any event, the primary impediment to tying judicial salaries to collective bargaining negotiated increases is that such action is presently prohibited under state law. As discussed in Chapter 2, section 78-18.3, Hawaii Revised Statutes, forbids any mandatory salary adjustment or increase for certain elected or appointed officers and employees, including judges, that is dependent upon or related to negotiated salary adjustments or increases received under collective bargaining agreements by civil service employees or other public employees covered by collective bargaining. 9 The Legislature, in enacting this provision, stated its strong opposition to an automatic adjustment provision, specifically declaring it "unsound and inadvisable public policy" that is "detrimental to the public interest" and "anathema to good government and to present sunshine laws . . .." 10 The Legislature's reasoning appears to have been that the public deserves

[^51]${ }^{9}$ Haw. Rev. Stat. §78-18.3.

101982 Haw. Sess. Laws Act 129, §34. See also notes 26-27 and accompanying text in Chapter 2.
input into salary discussions of top-level government officials "who have the greatest responsibilities to the public . . . ." 11

Although judges were included under this provision, in reality, they are neither political appointees nor elected officials who are responsible to the public. In contrast, they are members of an independent judiciary, and as such, they must base their deliberations upon the legal merits of a case before them and must not be guided by popular opinion or the will of the people. Therefore, it could be argued that judges should not be subject to the constraints of section 78-18.3. However, the original intent of the statute was to eliminate the inherent conflict of interest that arises when the salaries of state or county officials who are parties in negotiating the collective bargaining agreements are adjusted based upon those negotiated agreements. Even though judges are not direct parties to collective bargaining negotiations, there is a possibility under some scenario, although admittedly remote, that a collective bargaining dispute could end up in the courts for judicial review. 12

Accordingly, using collective bargaining negotiated increases to trigger adjustments to judicial salaries faces several impediments. To overcome these, the Legislature would have to revisit the position it took with respect to section 78-18.3, and at a minimum, amend the section to exclude its applicability to judges. Therefore, tying judicial salaries to those of the managerial white-collar officers and employees in the excluded managerial compensation plan may provide a more feasible alternative than collective bargaining negotiated increases, because this would not strictly fall within the prohibitions of section 78-18.3.

The following language is suggested to implement this option:
§ - Automatic judicial salary increases. Whenever officers and employees in the excluded managerial compensation plan who have been designated as holding managerial white-collar positions, pursuant to section 77-13.1, receive a general salary increase pursuant to chapter 89 C , the salary of each justice and judge shall be increased by an amount, adjusted to the nearest dollar, computed by multiplying the average of the percentage increases in all monthly steps of the managerial white-collar compensation plan by the annual salary of the justice or judge that is being received as provided by law and that is in effect prior to the effective date of the increase for the managerial white-collar positions. The increase for justices and judges shall take effect when the increase for managerial white-collar officers and employees in the excluded managerial compensation plan takes effect and may be retroactive, if consistent with the provisions of the increase for the excluded managerial white-collar officers and employees.

Option 2. If the tie to other state employees' pay is unacceptable, the Legislature could enact a statue that provides an automatic salary increase for judges tied to the Consumer Price Index.

[^52]An alternative means of achieving an automatic salary escalator is to tie salary adjustments for judges to increases in an economic index. Three states tie judicial salary increases to the consumer price index and Illinois, the District of Columbia, and the federal system tie judicial salary adjustments to increases in the employment cost index. Although there are a number of indexes available, as discussed in Chapter 4, the consumer price index is a trustworthy and reliable figure published by the United States government and is the traditional indicator of change in the cost-of-living. 13 Use of the consumer price index would ensure regular salary adjustments that, at minimum, would keep pace with the rising cost of living and forestall the decline in judicial purchasing power.

It has been suggested that using the consumer price index to trigger judicial salary adjustments may not be as politically acceptable as relying upon collective bargaining negotiated increases. The crux of the problem appears to be that no other group of employees presently is guaranteed a salary increase. Although new contracts are negotiated for collective bargaining unit employees on a regular basis, any salary increases must be negotiated as part of the contract agreement; such increases are not guaranteed. Excluded employees who, under Chapter 89C, Hawaii Revised Statutes, are permitted pay adjustments tied to collective bargaining agreements for comparable officers and employees also are not guaranteed a salary increase; they receive only whatever the bargaining unit negotiates, and thus, there is no guarantee they will receive anything. Consequently, guaranteeing judges an automatic increase may result in complaints that singling out one group of employees for special treatment is arbitrary and unfair.

Another drawback, from the perspective of whether this mechanism will achieve the goal of ensuring reasonable salary levels, is that tying salary adjustments to the consumer price index will only keep pace with inflation; and thus, if the rate of inflation is low, as it is at present, this mechanism will not provide an adequate substitute for merit or performance increases. If this is a concern, the Legislature could rely upon the consumer price index to ensure regular adjustments that keep pace with inflation, coupled with another mechanism, such as longevity pay or an authoritative compensation commission, to provide additional, reasonable salary increases on a periodic basis. It should be pointed out, however, that charts, prepared by the Judiciary to compare what judicial salaries would look like if salary adjustments were tied to the Consumer Price Index (see Appendix H) or to the average negotiated increases for collective bargaining unit 13 (see Appendix I), reveal that salary levels would be within close range of one another under either method.

The following language is suggested to implement an automatic salary escalator tied to increases in the consumer price index:
§ - Annual cost of living adjustment. Beginning July 1, 1998, and every July 1, thereafter, the compensation provided for in sections 571-8.2, 602-2, 602-52, 603-5, and 604-2.5 shall be adjusted to reflect the percentage of increase in the consumer price index for urban wage earners and clerical workers: Honolulu, (all items), as published by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, from January 1st to December 31st of the previous year. However, no reduction shall be made by way of adjustment on account of any decrease in the consumer price index for Honolulu between two successive calendar years.

[^53]Option 3. The Legislature could enact a statute providing for longevity pay to individual judges, based upon their years of creditable service on the bench.

A noted commentator has advised that there "is no public advantage to a judicial pension system that encourages early retirement. Rather, the system should provide incentives for judges to remain in public service." 14 The Bureau concurs with this view and recommends that the Legislature consider awarding individual judges longevity pay, based upon their length of service, as an incentive to remain on the bench. The practice of granting employees additional pay for years of creditable service is a common employment practice meant to reward employees for their service and encourage longevity and loyalty. Extending this practice to judges would encourage them to remain in service, thereby ensuring experienced judges on the bench. It also may provide some partial compensation to career judges for the financial sacrifice required of them in foregoing nearly all other sources of outside earned income. 15

In addition, longevity pay would reaffirm the value of work performed at each court level and should reduce the insidious pressure on judges who, despite enjoying their work, may feel compelled to apply for appointment to a higher court simply for the increase in salary. Under the present salary structure, judicial salaries are established based upon court level, with judges at each court level making the same as the other judges at that court level, except for the positions of chief justice and chief judge; and the salary established at a particular court level is less than that for the next highest court level. As an illustration, a judge with twenty years experience on district court makes the same as a newly appointed district court judge and makes less than a newly appointed circuit court judge; and a circuit court judge with twenty years experience on circuit court makes the same as a newly appointed circuit court judge and makes less than a newly appointed intermediate appellate court judge. Thus, barring a legislative increase, generally the only way for a sitting judge presently to obtain a higher salary on the bench is to receive an appointment to a higher level court. ${ }^{16}$

It has been suggested that, instead of awarding longevity payments to judges, longevity could be achieved and experienced judges retained simply by making the terms of judicial appointments longer. This suggestion misses the point, however. Unless salaries are increased, a longer term will only lock judges into a longer period at an inadequate salary level. Such tactic may backfire by causing more judges to leave the bench in search of adequate pay and by discouraging qualified attorneys from applying for appointment to the bench. A catch-up salary increase, as history has shown, will only alleviate the problem temporarily and will not achieve the goal of providing incentives for judges to serve longer terms. The solution calls for an objective mechanism to maintain reasonable salary levels. A longevity payment provision is one means of providing reasonable, regular salary adjustments to individual judges.

[^54]15 Judges in Hawaii are permitted to perform marriages for which they receive a nominal fee outside their normal salary.

[^55]There are several ways in which longevity pay can be awarded. For example, each of the four states providing longevity payments for judges do so using different formulas. Each state's provisions are discussed in more depth in Chapter 3. In general, however, the following provisions apply. The longevity payments are in addition to, and are figured as a percentage of, the annual base salary. Although the actual percentages for determining longevity payments are different in each state, the percentages generally increase (although at varying rates among the states) with the number of years of service, up to a specified cap. With the exception of Nevada's treatment of its supreme court justices, a state's formula applies across the board to all court levels. Typically, a minimum of five years of service is required before the longevity payments kick in; except that, Nevada requires a minimum of seven years of service for its supreme court justices, and Connecticut requires a minimum of ten years of service for all judges.

The Bureau prefers a simple longevity payment formula for ease of implementation. Rhode Island's formula presents the best example of simplicity. In Rhode Island, all judges receive longevity payments of $5 \%$ of their base salary after five years, $10 \%$ after eleven years, $15 \%$ after fifteen years, $17.5 \%$ after twenty years, and $20 \%$ after twenty-five years. 17 Nevada's formula is also relatively simple. In Nevada, the district court (the general jurisdiction trial court) judges receive an additional $1 \%$ of their base salary for each year of service starting at five years of service, and supreme court justices receive an additional $6 \%$ of their base salary at seven years, plus an additional $1 \%$ for each year thereafter. The longevity payment for judges at both court levels is subject to a maximum of $22 \%$ of the base salary. 18

The Legislature could adopt a longevity payment system based upon a simple formula such as these or could establish a step salary schedule, similar to that offered for discussion purposes by the Judiciary. Under the Judiciary's scenario, each step provides a $4 \%$ increase over the previous step, with step movements for the first three steps occurring on the 2nd, 4th, and 6th anniversary of appointment as a permanent judge; and thereafter, step movements occurring on the 3rd anniversary of the award of the currently existing step. Thus, according to this schedule, a judge would receive a $4 \%$ longevity increase to base pay after each of two, four, six, nine, twelve, fifteen, eighteen, twenty-one, etc., years on the bench. Appendices $\mathbf{J}$ and $\mathbf{K}$ show how this would affect judicial salaries. Appendix $\mathbf{J}$ is based upon present pay levels and Appendix K reflects pay levels assuming a $15 \%$ one-time pay increase is first made to the existing judicial base pay. In addition, Appendix $L$ contains the Judiciary's summary of the basic features of this longevity pay step schedule.

The longevity pay step schedule offered by the Judiciary appears to track the step movements, effective as of July 1, 1995, of collective bargaining unit 13 under the 1993-1997 contract agreement. Under this agreement, the minimum years of creditable service required at an existing step, before movement to the next highest step, was two years between steps C (the lowest step), D, and E, respectively, and three years between steps G, H, I, J, and K, respectively. 19 The average percentage increase between steps was approximately $4 \%$. However,
${ }^{17}$ See note 36 in Chapter 3 and accompanying text.
${ }^{18}$ See notes $32-33$ in Chapter 3 and accompanying text.
${ }^{19}$ HGEA-AFSCME, Unit 13 Professional and Scientific 199301997 Contract Agreement at 13.
this step schedule reflects only the minimum number of years of satisfactory creditable service required for movement to the next highest step; it did not guarantee movement to the next step upon reaching this minimum. Upon reaching the minimum number of years, an employee needed a satisfactory job performance evaluation to qualify for movement to the next step. Moreover, because the number of longevity steps and movement between steps within a salary range are subject to collective bargaining negotiations, it is possible that the number of service years required at one step before movement to the next highest step could be increased in the future. 20 The Bureau also would point out that the salary level obtainable at the combination of the highest salary range (SC03) and step (step L ), where step movements are spaced every three years apart, is slightly below the salary of a district court judge, whereas the salary levels are considerably below that of a district court judge at salary range SC03 for steps $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}$, and E , where step movements are spaced only two years apart. See Appendix M. Thus, at the higher salary levels, the steps are set farther apart; whereas, at lower salary levels, the steps are closer together.

In view of these considerations, if the Legislature were to implement this type of longevity pay step schedule, it may be more reasonable to provide for step movements on the third anniversary of appointment as a permanent judge and every three years thereafter (as opposed to every two years for the first six years and every three years thereafter). 21 The Bureau notes that this is generous compared to what other states offer as longevity payments, which, with the exception of Connecticut, roughly averages $1 \%$ a year. Furthermore, as noted previously, the other states require judges to serve at least a minimum of five years on the bench before becoming eligible for longevity payments. Finally, it should be pointed out that the longevity payments under a longevity pay step schedule are cumulative; whereas, longevity payments under a simple payment formula, such as exists in Rhode Island, are not cumulative.

The Bureau envisions that any formula or structure for longevity payment would apply across the board to all court levels. Also, given the small differentials between current salaries for the various court levels, it would be difficult to maintain the established relationships between these salaries. Therefore, overlapping of salaries would be inevitable under any longevity pay plan. Thus, a district court judge with several years of experience could make more than a newly appointed circuit court judge and, depending upon number of years on the bench, conceivably could make more than a newly appointed supreme court justice. The Bureau believes that this scenario is reasonable and appropriate, if the intent is to reward experience and encourage longevity. Moreover, the Bureau considers that the substantial salary increases at the higher court levels that would be required to avoid this overlapping are unwarranted, especially given the present need to first raise the base salary level of all Hawaii judges. Therefore, if a sitting judge were appointed to a higher court, the salary transition would be from the currently existing pay level to the lowest level at the higher court that exceeds the current pay level. Furthermore, if a

[^56]longevity pay provision were to be implemented, sitting judges should automatically move to the pay level at the appropriate court that is reflective of their total years on the bench as of the provision's effective date. ${ }^{22}$ Also, because longevity payments are determined as a percentage of base salary, if judicial base salaries are adjusted, longevity payments would be adjusted automatically to reflect the most current judicial base pay amount.

The following alternatives are suggested to implement a longevity payment system:

## ALTERNATIVE 1: (*Alternative Preferred by the Legislative Reference Bureau)

\$ - Longevity payments for judges; bonus. (a) Beginning July 1, 1998, and each July 1st thereafter, each justice and judge shall receive as longevity pay an annual amount as follows:
(1) Five per cent of the person's annual base salary after five years of service;
(2) Ten per cent of the person's annual base salary after ten years of service;
(3) Fifteen per cent of the person's annual base salary after fifteen years of service;
(4) Seventeen and one-half per cent of the person's annual base salary after twenty years of service; and
(5) Twenty per cent of the person's annual base salary after twenty-five years of service.
(b) For purposes of this section, the term "service" means sitting as a permanently appointed judge or justice on any state court including any combination of court levels.

## ALTERNATIVE 2:

\$ - Longevity pay steps for judges; salary increase. (a) Begining July 1, 1998, and each July 1st thereafter, each justice and judge shall receive a longevity pay step salary increase in an amount equal to four per cent of the person's base pay after each of the following increments of service:
(1) Three years of service;
(2) Six years of service;
(3) Nine years of service;
(4) Twelve years of service;
(5) Fifteen years of service;
(6) Eighteen years of service;
(7) Twenty-one years of service;
(8) Twenty-four years of service;
(9) Twenty-seven years of service; and
(10) Thirty years of service.
(b) For purposes of this section, the term "service" means sitting as a permanently appointed judge or justice on any state court including any combination of court levels.

[^57]OPTION 4. The Legislature could amend the statute relating to the Judicial Salary Commission to:
(A) Provide that the Commission's recommendations are determinative, unless affirmatively rejected by the Legislature;
(B) Require the Commission to consider mandatory criteria in its decision-making; and
(C) Change the Commission's composition.

Another objective means of obtaining reasonable, periodic judicial salary adjustments could be achieved by granting the Judicial Salary Commission more authority in determining judicial salaries. As discussed in Chapter 3, eight states have authoritative salary commissions whose recommendations become law, unless affirmatively rejected by a majority of both chambers of the Legislature, and the recommendations of the Washington State Citizens' Commission become law automatically, without any action on the part of the Legislature.

The Bureau notes that precedence for such a change in Hawaii's Judicial Salary Commission already exists in the operation of the Hawaii Commission on Legislative Salary. The Hawaii Constitution provides that the recommendations of the Commission on Legislative Salary become effective as provided in its recommendation, unless the Legislature disapproves the recommendation by adoption of a concurrent resolution prior to adjournment sine die of the legislative session in which the recommendation is submitted, or the Governor may disapprove the recommendation by a message of disapproval transmitted to the Legislature prior to adjournment. 23

The Bureau would recommend the Legislature give similar authority to the Judicial Salary Commission. However, in order to remove the issue of judicial salaries from the political arena as much as possible, without going so far as to recommend the Washington model, the Bureau would propose inclusion of the following provisions: make the Commission's recommendations effective automatically, unless the Legislature rejects or modifies the recommendations by a two-thirds vote of each house in joint session; and allow only a short window of time (such as that provided in several states, ${ }^{24}$ ) as opposed to the entire session, during which the Legislature could reject or modify the Commission's recommendations.

In addition, the Bureau recommends that the Legislature consider adopting mandatory criteria to guide the Judicial Salary Commission in its decision making. A few states have articulated such criteria to guide their compensation commissions. 25 Interestingly, under the

[^58]${ }^{25} \underline{\text { See }}$ note 40 in Chapter 3 and accompanying text.

Hawaii Revised Statutes, arbitration panels in arbitration cases involving collective bargaining units 11 and 12 are required to consider similar factors and include an explanation, in the panel's written opinion, of how these factors were taken into account in the panel's decision making. Accordingly, the Bureau suggests the following factors be included in this mandatory criteria:

- Skill and experience required of the particular court level;
- The overall compensation package presently received by judges, including direct wage compensation, vacation, holidays and excused time, insurance, pensions, medical and hospitalization benefits, the continuity and stability of employment, and all other benefits received;
- Opportunity for other earned income;
- Changes in the consumer price index;
- The average percentage of negotiated salary increases received by members of collective bargaining unit 13 and the average percentage of salary increases for officers and employees in the excluded managerial compensation plan under section 77-13.1, Hawaii Revised Statutes, since the last Judicial Salary Commission report;
- The value of compensable services performed by judges, as determined by reference to judicial compensation packages in other states and the federal government;
- Comparison of judicial compensation packages with those of local attorneys in the private sector;
- Comparison of wages, hours, and conditions of employment of judges with the wages, hours, and conditions of employment of persons performing comparable work for the State or county;
- Interests and welfare of the public; and
- Present and future general economic condition of the State.

Furthermore, in view of the foregoing, the Bureau suggests that the composition of the Commission be modified to ensure that Commission members have the background and expertise necessary to interpret and apply this criteria appropriately. Accordingly, the Bureau recommends the Legislature make the following changes to the Judicial Salary Commission membership:

- Increase the number of members from five to nine, with two selected by the Governor, two by the Chief Justice, and the remaining five selected jointly by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate;
- Require the Governor and Chief Justice to appoint persons with knowledge of compensation benefits and practices and financial matters;
- Require that, of the five members appointed jointly by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, one should represent each of the following five sectors of the State: institutions of higher education, business, professional personnel management, legal profession, and organized labor.

The Bureau considers all of these provisions necessary to enable the Commission to set reasonable levels of compensation on a regular basis. Any watering down of these provisions may make it impossible for the Commission to achieve this goal.

The following language is suggested to implement this option:
§608-1.5 Judicial salary commission. (a) There shall be a judicial salary commission to review and recommend salaries of justices and judges of all state courts and appointed judiciary administrative officers. The commission shall be composed of [five] nine members, two to be appointed by the governor, [one] five jointly by the president of the senate[, one by] and the speaker of the house[,] of representatives, and [one] two by the chief justice. The governor and the chief justice shall each appoint one member who has knowledge of compensation benefits and practices and one member who has knowledge of financial matters. Of the five members appointed by the president of the senate and the speaker of the house of representatives, one member shall represent each of the following: institutions of higher education, business, professional personnel management, legal profession, and organized labor. Members shall be appointed for terms of four years each. Members shall not receive compensation for their services, but shall be reimbursed for traveling and other expenses incidental to the performance of commission duties. For administrative purposes only, the commission shall be attached to the judicial council.
(b) The commission shall consider the following factors in carrying out its responsibilities:
(1) Skill and experience required of the particular court level;
(2) The overall compensation package presently received by judges, including direct wage compensation, vacation, holidays and excused time, insurance, pensions, medical and hospitalization benefits, the continuity and stability of employment, and all other benefits received;
(3) Opportunity for other earned income;
(4) Changes in the consumer price index;
(5) The average percentage of negotiated salary increases received by members of collective bargaining unit 13 and the average percentage of salary increases received by managerial white-collar officers and employees in the excluded managerial compensation plan under section 77-13.1, since the last judicial salary commission report;
(6) The value of compensable services performed by judges, as determined by reference to judicial compensation packages in other states and the federal government;
(7) Comparison of judicial compensation packages with those of local attorneys in the private sector;
(8) Comparison of wages, hours, and conditions of employment of judges with the wages, hours, and conditions of employment of persons performing comparable work for the State or county;
(9) Interests and welfare of the public;
(10) Present and future general economic condition of the State; and
(11) Other factors normally or traditionally taken into consideration in the determination of compensation.
(c) By October 15 of each year preceding a fiscal biennium, the commission shall submit its recommendations in a report to the legislature, with copies to be submitted to the governor and chief justice. [At the next regular legislative session, the amounts recommended by the commission shall be submitted by the chief justice as part of the judiciary's proposed budget pursuant to the budgetary procedures specified in chapter 37 and section 601-2(c).] The salary amounts recommended by the commission shall become effective on July 1 of the following year, unless, at the regular legislative session following the submittal of the commission's recommendation, the legislature disapproves or modifies the recommendation, by a concurrent resolution adopted by a two-thirds vote of each house in joint session, within thirty days after the legislature convenes. The legislature shall appropriate the salary amount recommended, or as modified, as part of the judiciary's budget. Salary amounts in the budget as enacted shall take precedence over any inconsistent statutes.

## 3. Recommendation 3: The Legislature should consider increasing the minimum number of years of service and age requirements for a judge to obtain full retirement benefits.

As discussed in Chapter 4, the conventional wisdom insists that compensation is a significant factor in retaining experienced judges, who, on the whole, perform at a higher level by virtue of their experience. Such wisdom further holds that having experienced judges who make a career on the bench is not only consistent with but enhances the principle of judicial independence. Chief Justice Moon and others, expressing concern over the continuing loss of experienced judges from the bench, have urged pay raises for Hawaii's judges. However, as noted previously, Governor Cayetano has warned that a judicial pay increase without a concomitant adjustment to retirement benefits will only provide judges with a greater incentive to leave the bench. 26

Although the issue of whether retirement benefits should be adjusted is beyond the scope of this particular study, to the extent that the issue impacts the retention of experienced judges, the Bureau feels compelled to comment. After reviewing the other states' vesting requirements to obtain full retirement benefits (see Chapter 4), the Bureau concedes that Hawaii's minimum requirement of ten years of service for judges younger than age 55 or five years of service for

[^59]judges age 55 or older is fairly generous in comparison to most states. 27 It is also generous compared to the vesting requirements for many other Hawaii public employees. 28 Thus, an increase in the required minimum number of years of service or of age to vest for full benefits may be reasonable. The Legislature could consider changing the vesting requirements for judges to achieve a balance between age and service requirements, with the number of years of service requirements descending as age increases. As an example, full vesting could be achieved after: age 55 with at least twenty-five years of service; age 60 with at least fifteen years of service; or at age 65 with at least five years of service. Another alternative would be to impose vesting requirements similar to those of class $C$ members of the employees retirement system: members must have a minimum of ten years of credited service and have attained age 62 or have thirty years of credited service and have attained age 55. As the discussion in Chapter 4 reveals, any number of other options combining higher years of service and age for vesting are available from which the Legislature may choose.

With respect to Hawaii's actual retirement benefits, however, a comparison, albeit superficial, of these benefits with those of other states did not reveal that Hawaii's benefits are outrageously out of line with those offered elsewhere. Moreover, the Bureau submits that any reduction in actual retirement benefits may discourage qualified applicants from seeking the bench and may encourage sitting judges to return to the private sector and its offer of higher salaries to ensure that they and their families are provided for adequately. Accordingly, the Bureau would counsel that any steps toward adjusting judicial retirement benefits should be preceded by a comprehensive review of retirement benefits by qualified benefits specialists.

## Conclusion

The present system for considering judicial salary increases in Hawaii does not work. It has resulted in sporadic, lump sum funding of judicial salaries that has failed to maintain reasonable salary levels. The denial of a judicial pay increase for nearly eight years has produced judicial salaries that are significantly under par. Moreover, the increasing cost of living in Hawaii has seriously eroded judicial buying power, resulting in financial distractions that threaten the exercise of independent and dispassionate judgment. The principle of judicial independence, which demands that the judiciary be free from outside pressures and influences, requires that there be an objective mechanism that removes the issue of judicial salaries from the political arena and that ensures reasonable increases are made to judicial salaries on a regular basis. Furthermore, judicial excellence cannot be preserved unless compensation levels are sufficient to attract qualified applicants to, and ensure qualified sitting judges remain on, the bench. The Bureau would reiterate that determining an appropriate level of judicial compensation is a complex task, involving a myriad of factors. The mechanisms discussed in this Chapter are intended to provide an objective means of making reasonable judicial salary adjustments on a regular basis. However, because the

[^60]${ }^{28}$ See, for example, the vesting requirements of class C members who must have ten years of credited service and have attained age 62 or have thirty years of credited service and have attained age 55. Haw. Rev. Stat. §88-281.
focus of each mechanism is different, implementation of no one mechanism, alone, is guaranteed to meet this goal adequately. Accordingly, it may be advisable to implement more than one of these mechanism, such as: longevity pay, to reward sitting judges and encourage them to remain on the bench, combined with either a salary escalator tied to the Consumer Price Index, to ensure all judicial salaries keep pace with inflation, or an authoritative Judicial Salary Commission, to review salaries periodically, to ensure salary levels are maintained at a reasonable level.

## Appendix A

| NOAT．AP：STUG！CH！ PRESIDEN？ |
| :---: |
| hbide：：EVAN VICE PRESIDENT |
| LES：HAス～～IF． MIKE MEこん́FTVE： MAJORTTY LEADERS |
| Whitinet mivep． minority leader |
| FIAST DISTFICT MALAMA SOLOMON |
| SECONE C：STR：CT wayne metcalf |
| Thisd distaict ANDRE＇LEVIN |
| FOUFTH DESTET hoskiyn t．Eaker |
| FIFTH DISTRICT JOE TANAKA |
| SIXTH DISTAICT avery chumbley |
| SEVENTH DISTRICT LEHUA FERNANDES SAILING |
| Eigrith oistact sam slom |
| RINTH D：STR：CT MATT MATSUNAGA |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TENTH DISTD:CT } \\ & \text { LES HARA. JR. } \end{aligned}$ |
| ELEVETH ESTR：CT gRIAN TANIGUCHI |
| TWELPTH DISTFICT CAROL FUKUNAGA |
| THRRTEENTH DISTRICT ROD TAM |
| FOURTEENTH DISTACT suzanns chun oakland |
| FIFTEENTH DISTRIC？ norman mizuguchi |
| SIXFEENTH ESTACT NORMAN SAKAMOTO |
| SEVENTEENTM DESTRICT davic ige |
| EIGHTEE：ATH DISTRICT Ranoy iwase |
| NINETEENTH DISTAICT CALVIN KAWAMOTO |
| TVENTETM EETECT brian kanno |
| TWENTYFIFST ESTERT JAMES AKI |
| TWENTY．SECOME OISTRICT hoeert bunda |
| TUENTV．TH：AO D：STRICT mike mccaptney |
| TWENTY－CORPTH DETETCT MAFSHAL：IGE |
| TWENTY．FIFTH ETSTPICT WHITNEYT ANDERSON |
| Chisf C：ERK paul t．kawaguchi |

PRESIDEN：
ALIEPE：LENN


WhiTivet Aivepsonn MINORITY LEADER

FIAST DISTAICT MALAMA SOLOMON

SECONE C：STR：CT
THISD DISTAICT ANDRE＇LEVIN
FOUATH DETFET

FIfTH DISTRICT joe tanaka

SIXTH DISTAICT avery chumbley

ENTH DISTRICT
EIGrith DISTFにT
RINTH CISTF：CT matt matsunaga
TENTH DISTD：CT LES HARA，JR． A sisif：C canol ROD TAM

OUTEENiRDISinict suzanne chun oakland

H Distric：
SIXEENTH CSTEICT NORMAN SAKamOTO VENTEENTH CESTRICT IGHTEE：TTH DISTRICT Ranoy iwase StAC ENTiETH me：＝er brian kanno

WENTYFISS CETFICT JAMES AKI
WENTY．SECOME DSTACT hoeert bunda
VENTV．TH：SD D：STRICT
KE McCar？NEY

MAFSHAL：IGE
NEMTVFIFIF EISTRKT
HiEF C：ERK paul t．kawaguch

The Senate
The $\begin{gathered}\text { Ninnetenth Tingislature }\end{gathered}$
of the
State of 胃aforaii


STATE CAPITOL
HONOLULU，HAWAll 96813
May 6， 1997


MRAAtG5
REFEESUE MGEAG

Mr．Wendell Kimura，Director
Office of the Legislative Reference Bureau
State Capitol
Honolulu，Hawai 96813
Dear Mr．Kixnura：
I have the honor to transmit herewith Senate
Concurrent Resolution No．2，S．Q．1，which was
adopted on April 10， 1997 by the Senate of the
Nineteenth Legislature of the State of Hawai Regular Session of 1997.

Sincerely yours，


PAUL T．KAWAGUCHI
Clerk of the Senate

Enclosure

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

## REQUESTING A STUDY TO ASSIST THE LEGISLATURE INESTABLISHING AN APPROPRIATE SALARY STRUCTURE AND PAY I NCREMENTS FOR LENGTH OF CONTINUOUS CREDITABLE JUDICIAL SERVICE TO THE STATE.

WHEREAS, there is a paramount need to ensure that the most highly qualified individuals are willing and able to serve in the State's judicial branch without unreasonable economic hardshipi and

WHEREAS, the relationship between judicial compensation and judicial retention is simple and direct; and

WHEREAS, insufficient compensation creates the risk that judges will leave the bench, depriving the public of the significant value of their experience; and

WHEREAS, judicial salaries and benefits must be such that, when combined with other relevant factors such as the prestige and honor of public service, the total compensation of a judicial position is comparable to that offered by other career opportunities in the legal profession; and

WHEREAS, the salary structure for judges and justices should be based on realistic, objective standards and the sal ary range at each court level should encourage the best and brightest at all levels of the court system to remain on the bench for long periods; and

WHEREAS, the Judicial Salary Commission of the State of Hawai‘i was established by the Legislature in Act 271, session Laws of Hawai 1989, to review and recommend salaries of justices and judges of all state courts and appointed judiciary administrative officers;

WHEREAS, the Judicial Salary Commission submitted reports to the respective legislatures during the 1992, 1994, 1995, and 1996 |egislative sessions, citing in each report concerns related to the eroding effects of inflation on judicial salaries and suggesting annual judicial salary increases to reflect increased costs of living, among other factors; and

WHEREAS, each report to the Legislature of the Judicial Salary Commission included data justifying salary increases for Hawai i's judges and justices to levels commensurate, with the responsibilities, legal experience, and qualifications required to fulfill the constitutional and statutory mandates of Hawaii's I aws; and

WHEREAS, adequate judicial compensation for Hawai i's judges and justices affects every resident of the state, as stated by the American Bar Association in A Handbook on State Ludicial salaries, "...there is clearly a direct relationship between the level of judicial salaries, the competence of judges, and the quality of our justice system..."; and

WHEREAS, as indicated in the American Bar Association's Standards for Judicial Compensation, "Fair and adequate compensation for all state court judges clearly is in the public interest, since an able and independent judiciary is at the heart of the democratic process."; and

WHEREAS, without an objective, statutorily established mechanism that ensures fair and adequate judicial compensation, for all state judges and justices, judges are drawn into the potentially compromising and perpetual task of lobbying each legislature for increases in judicial salaries and improvements in benefits; and

WHEREAS, Iobbying of the Legislature by members of the judiciary for judicial salary increases is inconsistent with the traditional role of the courts as an independent and separate branch of government; and

WHEREAS, the Judiciary's political neutrality and independence, in fact and in appearance, is fundamental to public support of the justice system; and

WHEREAS, eight states have judicial salary increases indexed to changes in cost-of-living measures, such as the consumer price index, and four states have judicial salary increases tied to increases in compensation for other state civil service employees; and

WHEREAS, it is incumbent on the whole government to maintain the highest level' of public confidence in the state's judicial branch through highly, qualified applicant pools, lengthy judicial tenures, and judicial independence; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Senate of the Nineteenth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1997, the House of Representatives concurring, that the Legislative Reference Bureau conduct a study and make recommendations on an appropriate salary structure for all state justices and judges, including pay supplements by increments for length of continuous creditable service in the state judiciary; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the study include the feasibility of indexing judicial salary increases to the consumer price index or increases in compensation for other state civil service employees; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislative Reference Bureau consult with the Judicial Sal ar Commission to obtain rel event information; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a report including findings and recommendations of the Legislative Reference Bureau, be submitted to the Legislature not later than sixty days prior to the convening of the 1998 Regular Session; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the Director of the Legislative Reference Bureau, the members of the Judicial Salary Commission, and the Chief Justice of the Hawaii Supreme Court.


## Appendix B

## Section 78-18.3, Hawaii Revised Statutes

[§78-18.3] Prohibition on certain increases in salaries for certain state and county officers or employees. Any law to the contrary notwithstanding, neither the State nor any of the counties shall provide or pay to the following state or county officers or employees any adjustment or increase in the officer's or employee's respective salary or compensation where such adjustment or increase constitutes a mandatory adjustment or increase which is, directly or indirectly, dependent upon and related to negotiated salary adjustments or increases received under collective bargaining agreements by civil service or other public employees covered by collective bargaining: any elected or appointed officer or employee in the executive and judicial branches of state government and the executive branch of any county government (1) whose salary or compensation is fixed, limited, or otherwise specified by statute, ordinance, or other legislative enactment whether or not in express dollar amounts or express dollar amount ceilings; (2) who is not subject to chapters 76 and 77; and (3) who is excluded from collective bargaining and not subject to chapter 89C. [L 1982, c 129, pt of §34A; gen ch 1985]

## Appendix C

## STATEWIDE INTEGRATED COMPENSATION STRUCTURE PROPOSED IN THE REPORT OF

# PUBLIC OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION REVIEW COMMISSION PRESENTED TO THE 12th HAWAII STATE LEGISLATURE 

February 28, 1983

## PROPOSED HAWAII STATE INTEGRATED SALARY SYSTEM

| Grade | Job Title | Salary Range |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | Agriculture Coordinating Committee - Special Assistant | \$26,400-32,600 |
| 11 | * Marine Affairs Coordinator | 30,400-35,600 |
| 111 | Federal Programs Coordinator (not an active position) Broadcast Authority - Executive Director Credit Unions - Deputy (not an active position) Ethics Commission - Executive Director <br> *Children \& Youth - Director | $34,400-42,600$ |
| IV | Bandmaster (City \& County) <br> Director of Municipal Reference \& Records Center (C \& C) <br> Director of Information and Complaint (City \& County) <br> Stadium Authority - Manager <br> Office of Aging - Director <br> Paroling Authority - Chairman <br> Consumer Protection - Director <br> Insurance Commissioner <br> District Superintendent (DOE) | 40,400-48,600 |
| V | Hawai Housing Authority - Executive Director <br> Labor \& Industrial Relations Appeals Board - Chairman Office of Collective Bargaining - Chief Negotiator hPERB - Chairman <br> Public Utilities Commission - Chairman Assistant Superintendent ( $D O E$ ) <br> Deputy Department Heads (Neighbor Islands) <br> * Ombuds man | 43,400-52,600 |
| VI | Deputy Department Heads (City 81 County) <br> Department Heads (Neighbor Islands) <br> Deputy City Clerk (City \& County) <br> Deputy Director of Council Services (City \& County) <br> Corporation Counsel, First Deputy (City \& County) <br> Prosecuting Attorney, First Deputy (City \& County) | 48,400-56,600 |


| Grade | Lob Title | Salary Range |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VII | Deputy Department Heads <br> Department Heads (City 8 County) | \$50,400-60,600 |
|  | Managing Director (Neighbor Islands) <br> City Clerk (City \& County) <br> Director of Council Services (City \& County) <br> Deputy Superintendent of Schools |  |
|  | Public Defender |  |
|  | Deputy Administrative Director (Judiciary) |  |
|  | Corporation Counsel ( City \& County) |  |
|  | Prosecuting Attorney (City \& County) |  |
|  | Legislative Reference Bureau - Director |  |
|  | Legislative Auditor (State) |  |
|  | District Court Family Judge |  |
|  | District Court Judge |  |
|  | Deputy Managing Director ( City \& County) |  |
|  | Assistant Adjutant General (Army) (\$61,778) |  |
|  | Assistant Adjutant General (Air) (\$64,666) |  |
| VIII | Department Heads (State) | 56,400-65,600 |
|  | Superintendent of Schools |  |
|  | ```Administrative Director (Judiciary) Adjutant General ($72,578)``` |  |
| IX | Managing Director ( City \& County) | 60,400-72,600 |
|  | Mayor (Neighbor Islands) |  |
|  | Circuit Court Judge |  |
|  | Administrative Director of the State |  |
|  | Associate Judge, Intermediate Court of Appeals |  |
| X | Mayor ( City \& County) | 70,400-84,600 |
|  | Chi ef Judge, Intermediate Court of Appeals AssociateJustice |  |
| XI | *Lt. Governor | 74,400-86,600 |
|  | Chief Justice |  |
|  | President, University of Hawaii |  |
| XII |  | 78,400-92,600 |
| XIII | Governor | 89,400-106,600 |

Appendix D. 1

NORMALIZED JUDICIAL SALARY COMPARISON, 1996: HIGHEST COURT

| Actual Salary - Jutly, 1996 * |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bank | State | Amount |
| \% | New jersey | \$132,250 |
| 2 | Ceaffornia | 131,065 |
| 3 | Hirnois | 126,579 |
| 4 | Now York | 125,000 |
| 5 | Pennsyivaria | 119,750 |
| 6 | Mictrigan | 118,758 |
| 7 | Frorida | 116244 |
| 8 | Alaberna | 115,695 |
| 9 | Georgia | 114,932 |
| 10 | Delaware | 113,700 |
| 11 | Conrrectiont | 113,042 |
| 12 | Alaska | 109,908 |
| 13 | Washington | 109,880 |
| 14 | Massactuesetts | 107,730 |
| 15 | Froda itsland | 107,535 |
| 16 | Vaginia | 107,373 |
| 17 | Missouri | 105,717 |
| 18 | Inctiana | 105,000 |
| 19 | Tennessee | 104,676 |
| 20 | Ohio | 104,200 |
| 21 | Maryland | 104,100 |
| 22 | Arizona | 101.130 |
| 23 | Wisconsin. | 100,690 |
| 24 | towa | 100,600 |
| 25 | South Canolina | 100,436 |
| 26 | Arkanses | 100,035 |
| 27 | Utah | 98,500 |
| 28 | Louisiana | 97,700 |
| 29 | North Carolina | 96,000 |
| 30 | New Hampshire | 95,623 |
| 31 | Nebraska | 94,891 |
| 32 | Texas | 94,686 |
| 33 | Minnesota | 94,395 |
| 34 | Kentucky | 94,095 |
| 35 | HAWAI! | 93,780 |
| 36 | Kansas | 93,226 |
| 37 | Cotarado | 91,000 |
| 38 | Mississippl | 90,800 |
| 39 | Oregon | 89,600 |
| 40 | Mainé | 88,003 |
| 41 | Ofdahroma | 87,700 |
| 42 | Nevada | 85,000 |
| 43 | Wyoming | 85,000 |
| 44 | West Varginia | 85,000 |
| 45 | New Mexico | 83,593 |
| 46 | Idaho | 83,142 |
| 47 | Vermont. | 80,031 |
| 46 | North Dakota | 77.448 |
| 49 | South Dakota | 76.466 |
| 50 | Montana | 66,674 |


| Normalized Salary ** |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hank | State | Arnount | P.C.P.1 ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ |
| 1 | Alabama | \$152391 | \$18.781 |
| 2 | Arcansas | 141,986 | 17.429 |
| 3 | Catiormia | 136,832 | 23,699 |
| 4 | Mississippi | 135,879 | 16,531 |
| 5 | Utah | 133,715 | 18,223 |
| 6 | Georgia | 133,621 | 21,278 |
| 7 | South Carolira | 132,243 | 18,788 |
| 8 | Lounsiana | 128,374 | 18,827 |
| 9 | Penrsytvania | 127,255 | 23,279 |
| 10 | Tenressee | 127,085 | 20,376 |
| 11 | Mincois | 126,451 | 24,763 |
| 12 | Florida | 125,486 | 22916 |
| 13 | Kentucky | 125,066 | 18,612 |
| 14 | Mictuigan | 124,744 | 23,551 |
| 15 | Arizona | 122,509 | 20,421 |
| 16 | hrdiana | 122,103 | 21.273 |
| 17 | Missouri | 120,924 | 21,627 |
| 18 | Oldahoma | 119,520 | 18,152 |
| 19 | lowa | 118,439 | 21,012 |
| 20 | West Virginia | 117,373 | 17,915 |
| 21 | Otio | 117,056 | 22,021 |
| 22 | Delaware | 116,594 | 24,124 |
| 23 | Now York | 115,460 | 26,782 |
| 24 | North Carolina | 115,262 | 20,604 |
| 25 | Westrington | 114,988 | 23.639 |
| 26 | New Mexico | 114,636 | 18,055 |
| 27 | Phode tsland | 114,123 | 23,310 |
| 26 | Wisconsin | 114,056 | 21,839 |
| 29 | Texas | 113,409 | 20,654 |
| 30 | Now Jersey | 113369 | 28,858 |
| 31 | Virginia | 112,565 | 23,597 |
| 32 | Alaska | 112.435 | 24,182 |
| 33 | Nebreska | 108,161 | 21,703 |
| 34 | dsaho | 106,767 | 19,264 |
| 35 | Maire | 106,056 | 20,527 |
| 36 | Kansas | 105,669 | 21,825 |
| 37 | North Dakota | 102,658 | 18,663 |
| 36 | Oregon | 101,975 | 21,736 |
| 39 | Mirnesota | 101,010 | 23,118 |
| 40 | Maryiand | 99,326 | 25,927 |
| 41 | Massactrusetts | 96.727 | 26,994 |
| 42 | Wyoming | 98,622 | 21,321 |
| 43 | South Dakota | 96,979 | 19,506 |
| 44 | colorado | 96,002 | 23,449 |
| 45 | Vermont | 94,605 | 20,927 |
| 46 | New Hampshire | 94,053 | 25,151 |
| 47 | HAWAl'! | 93,780 | 24,738 |
| 48 | Connecticat | 92.282 | 30,303 |
| 49 | Montaria | 92,187 | 18,482 |
| 50 | Nevada | 84,065 | 25,013 |

National Center for State Courts, "State Court Peport,"duly 1996:

*** P.C.P.I. is Per Capita Personal Income. Source: United States Department of Commerce, Bureeu of Economic Anal "Per Capita Personal frcome by State, 1989-1995,' May 15.1996.
MEDLAN $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 0 , 2 3 6} \quad \$ 114.762$

S ource: From the Hawaii Judicial Salary Commission's Report_on_Judicial Salaries (Honolulu: October 1996).

## Appendix D. 2

NORMALIZED JUDICIAL SALARY COMPARISON, 1996: INTERMEDIATE APPELLATE COURTS

| Actual Salary - Juty, 1996 * |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank | State | Amount |
| 1 | Now dersey | \$124.200 |
| 2 | Colfiomia | 122993 |
| 3 | Hirnois | 119,133 |
| 4 | New York | 119,000 |
| 5 | Pernsytvania | 116,000 |
| 6 | Alabama | 114,615 |
| 7 | Georgia | 114,203 |
| 8 | Michigan | 144,007 |
| 9 | Frorida | 110,432 |
| 10 | Connectiaut | 105,111 |
| 11 | Wastuington | 104,448 |
| 12 | Alaska | 103,824 |
| 13 | Vrginia | 102,004 |
| 14 | Tenressoe | 99,804 |
| 15 | Massachusetts | 99,690. |
| 16 | Missouri | 98,727 |
| 17 | Arizoma | 96.722 |
| 18 | Marytand | 97,300 |
| 19 | Otio | 97,050 |
| 20 | Arkansas | 96,872 |
| 21 | fowa | 96,700 |
| 22 | South Carclina | 96,415 |
| 23 | Indiana | 95,000 |
| 24 | Wisconsin | 94,804 |
| 25 | Utah | 94,050 |
| 26 | Texas | 93,686 |
| 27 | Louisiana | 92,500 |
| 28 | North Caralina | 92,000 |
| 29. | Kertucky | 90,254 |
| 30 | Kansas | 89,898 |
| 31 | HAWAr'1 | 89,780 |
| 32 | Minnesota | 88,945 |
| 33 | Oregon | 87,600 |
| 34 | colorado | 86,500 |
| 35 | Nussissippi | 84,000 |
| 36 | Hebraska | 83,749 |
| 37 | deaho | 82.142 |
| 38 | Ofdahome | 81,500 |
| 39 | Now Mexico | 79,413 |
| 40 | Deleware | 0 |
| 41 | Maine | 0 |
| 42 | Montana | 0 |
| 43 | Nevada | 0 |
| 44 | Now Hampshire | 0 |
| 45 | North Dakota | 0 |
| 46 | Fhode tsland | 0 |
| 47 | South Dakota | 0 |
| 48 | Vermont | 0 |
| 49 | West Virginia | 0 |
| 50 | Wyoming | 0 |


| Normefized Selary ** |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reank | State | Amount | P.C.P.L. ${ }^{*}$ |
| 1 | Alabama | \$150,969 | \$18,781 |
| 2 | Arkanses | 137,496 | 17,429 |
| 3 | Georgia | 132,773 | 21,278 |
| 4 | Cafifornia | 128.281 | 23,699 |
| 5 | Utah | 127,674 | 18,223 |
| 6 | Mississippi | 125,703 | 16,531 |
| 7 | South Carolina | 125,632 | 18,788 |
| 8 | Perrsyivania | 123,270 | 23,279 |
| 9 | Louisiana | 121.542 | 18,827 |
| 10 | Tennessoe | 121,170 | 20.376 |
| 11 | Kentucky | 119,900 | 18,612 |
| 12 | Mictigan | 119,753 | 23,551 |
| 13 | Arizona | 119,592 | 20,421 |
| 14 | Florida | 119,212 | 22.916 |
| 15 | \#tinois | 119,013 | 24,763 |
| 16 | lowa | 113848 | 21,012 |
| 17 | Missouri | 112,929 | 21,027 |
| 18 | Texas | 112,211 | 20,654 |
| 19 | OXiahoma | 111,070 | 18,152 |
| 20 | Incliana | 110,474 | 21,273 |
| 21 | Iforth Carolina | 110.459 | 20,604 |
| 22 | Now York | 109,918 | 26,782 |
| 23 | Washington | 109,304 | 23,639 |
| 24 | Ofio | 109,024 | 22.021 |
| 25 | Now Mexico | 108,807 | 18,055 |
| 26 | Wisconsin | 107,389 | 21,839 |
| 27 | Varginia | 106,936 | 23,597 |
| 28 | New dersey | 106,468 | 28,868 |
| 29 | Alaska | 106,211 | 24,182 |
| 30 | Idatro | 105,483 | 19,264 |
| 31 | Kansas | 104,897 | 21,825 |
| 32 | Oragon | 99,699 | 21,736 |
| 33 | Nebraska | 95.461 | 21,703 |
| 34 | Minnesota | 95,178 | 23,118 |
| 35 | Marylard | 92,838 | 25,927 |
| 36 | Massachusetts | 91,358 | 26,994 |
| 37 | Colorado | 91,255 | 23,449 |
| 38 | HAWAI'I | 89,780 | 24,738 |
| 39 | Connecticart | 85,808 | 30,303 |
| 40 | New Hampstire | 0 | 25,151 |
| 41 | Neveda | 0 | 25,013 |
| 42 | Delaware | 0 | 24,124 |
| 43 | Phode istand | 0 | 23,310 |
| 44 | Wyoming | 0 | 21,321 |
| 45 | Vermort | 0 | 20,927 |
| 46 | Maine | 0 | 20.527 |
| 47 | South Dakota | 0 | 19.506 |
| 48 | North Dakota | 0 | 18,663 |
| 49 | Montana | 0 | 18,482 |
| 50 | West Virginia | 0 | 17.915 |

[^61]| MEDIAN | 96872 |
| :---: | :---: |

Source: From the Hawaii Judicial Salary Commission's Report on Judicial Salaries (Honolulu: October 1996).

NORMALIZED JUDICIAL SALARY COMPARISON, 1996: TRIAL COURTS

| Actual Salary - Juty, 1996 * |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank | State | Amount |
| 1 | Now dersey | \$ $\mathbf{1 1 5 , 0 0 0}$ |
| 2 | Now York | 113,000 |
| 3 | Elinois | 109,321 |
| 4 | Delaware | 108,100 |
| 6 | Califoria | 107,390 |
| 6 | Nictugan | 104,863 |
| 7 | Florida | 104,619 |
| 8 | Penrsyivania | 104,000 |
| 9 | Alaska | 101,628 |
| 10 | Connectiout | 100,411 |
| 11 | Vinginia | 99,678 |
| 12 | Washington | 99,015 |
| 13 | Phode istand | 96,817 |
| 14 | Arizorre | 96,314 |
| 15 | Massachusotts | 95,710 |
| 16 | Tennessee | 95,496 |
| 17 | South Carcirra | 95,415 |
| 18 | Arkansas | 93,702 |
| 19 | Maryiand | 93,600 |
| 20 | Texas | 92,686 |
| 21 | kowa | 92,000 |
| 22 | Missouri | 91,463 |
| 23 | Wisconsin | 90,661 |
| 24 | Now Hampstire | 89,646 |
| 25 | Utah | 89,550 |
| 26 | Nebraska | 87.775 |
| 27 | Lovisiana | 87,300 |
| 28 | North Carolina | 87,000 |
| 29 | HAWAI' | 86,780 |
| 30 | Kentucky | 86,413 |
| 31 | Inciana | 85,000 |
| 32 | Minnesota | 83,494 |
| 33 | Maine | 83226 |
| 34 | Georgia | 82,488 |
| 35 | colorado | 82.000 |
| 36 | Oregon | 81.6730 |
| 37 | Mississippi | 81,200 |
| 38 | Kansas | 81,046 |
| 39 | Alabame | 80,615 |
| 40 | West Virginia | 80,000 |
| 41 | Nevada | 79,000 |
| 42 | Ohio | 78,450 |
| 43 | Idaho | 77,926 |
| 44 | Wyoming | 77,000 |
| 45 | Vermont | 76,021 |
| 46 | New Mexico | 75,443 |
| 47 | Okiahoma | 75,000 |
| 48 | North Dekrota | 71.472 |
| 49 | South Dakota | 71.413 |
| 50 | Montana | 67,513 |


| Normalized Salary ** |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank | State | Amount | P.C.P.L. *** |
| 1 | Arkansas | \$132,997 | \$17,429 |
| 2 | South Carolina | 125,632 | 18,788 |
| 3 | Utah | 121,565 | 18,223 |
| 4 | Mississippi | 121,513 | 16,531 |
| 5 | Arizona | 116,675 | 20,421 |
| 6. | Tennessee | 115,939 | 20,376 |
| 7 | Kentucky. | 114,855 | 18.612 |
| 8 | Louisiara | 114,709 | 18,827 |
| 9 | Florida | 112,937 | 22,916 |
| 10 | Caiforria | 112,098 | 23.699 |
| 11 | Texas | 111,013 | 20,654 |
| 12 | Delaware | 110,851 | 24,124 |
| 13 | Penroytvaria | 110,518 | 23,279 |
| 14 | West Virginia | 110,468 | 17,915 |
| 15 | Mictigan | 110,148 | 23,551 |
| 16 | Elinois | 109,211 | 24,763 |
| 17 | lowa | 108,314 | 21,012 |
| 18 | Alabama | 106,185 | 18,781 |
| 19 | Missouri | 104,620 | 21,627 |
| 20 | Virgiria | 104,498 | 23,597 |
| 21 | North Carolina | 104,456 | 20,604 |
| 22 | Now York | 104,376 | 26,782 |
| 23 | Alaska | 103,965 | 24,182 |
| 24 | Weshington | 103,618 | 23,639 |
| 25 | Now Mexico | 103,368 | 18,055 |
| 26 | Phode tsland | 102,748 | 23,310 |
| 27 | Wisconsin | 102,696 | 21,839 |
| 28 | Oddahorma | 102,212 | 18,152 |
| 29 | Maire | 100,299 | 20,527 |
| 30 | daho | 100,069 | 19264 |
| 31 | Nobraska | 100,050 | 21,703 |
| 32 | traiana | 98.846 | 21,273 |
| 33 | Now Jersey | 98,582 | 28,858 |
| 34 | Georgia | 95,901 | 21,278 |
| 35 | North Dakota | 94,737 | 18,663 |
| 36 | Oregon | 92,870 | 21,736 |
| 37 | Kansas | 91,863 | 21,825 |
| 38 | South Dakota | 90,558 | 19,506 |
| 39 | Mortana | 90,366 | 18,482 |
| 40 | Vermont | 89,865 | 20,927 |
| 41 | Winnesota | 89,345 | 23,118 |
| 42 | Wyoming | 89.340 | 21,321 |
| 43 | Maryland | 89,308 | 25,927 |
| 44 | New Hempshire | 86,174 | 25,151 |
| 45 | Otio | 88,129 | 22.021 |
| 46 | Massactusetts | 87,711 | 26,994 |
| 47 | HAWAI'I | 86,780 | 24,738 |
| 48 | Colorado | 86,508 | 23,449 |
| 49 | Conrecticut | 81,971 | 30,305 |
| 50 | Nevada | 78,131 | 25,013 |

[^62]MEDIAN \$88.663 \$103.058

Source: From the Hawaii Judicial Salary Commission's_Report on_Judicial_Salaries (Honolulu: October 1996).

## Appendix E

## FRINGE BENEFIT RATE FOR FY 98
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FROM:
A11 Department Reade
Eari I, Rntai
Diractor of Einance $C$
SUBJECT: Fringe Benefit Rate for EY 98

A composite fringbenefit rate of 36.979 has been approved by the U-S. Department of Heal th and auman Services (DHES) for ure during FY 98. The composite rate consists of the following fringe benefit itams and computed rates:

It, m
Pension Acoumulation Ponsion Administration Retires Health Insurance Employees' Bealth Fund Workers' Compensation Unemployment compenzation Social Security

Composite Rate

Bata
14.49혁
.06\%
5.999
$7.05 \%$
. $57 \%$
$2.26 \%$
7. 651
36.974

Platse note that the rate for Social Security incIudes 1.450 for Medicare. The rate will be formally published when the Statewide Cost Allocation Plan for FY 98 is approved by the DHHS.

If chere are any questions, please have your staff contact Mr. James Nakamura, Administrator of this department's Budget, Program Planaing and Nanagement Division, at 586-7530.

# Appendix F 

State of Hawai'i
Judicial Salary Commission
August 28, 1997

Charlotte Carter-Yamauchi<br>Research Attorney<br>Legislative ReferenceBureau<br>State of Hawaii<br>State Capitol<br>Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Carter-Yamauchi:
The Judicial Salary Commission is in receipt of your letter dated June 26, 1997, offering the Commission the opportunity to provide input on your study pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2, S.D. 1, Requesting a Study to Assist the Legislature in Establishing an Appropriate Salary Structure and Pay Increments for Length of Continuous Creditable Judicial Service to the State.

As you know, the Judicial Salary Commission undertook its own study of judicial salaries prior to submitting its Report to the Legislature in October, 1996, and a letter to the members of the Nineteenth Legislature in January, 1997, specifying the Commission's recommendations for a judicial salary increase of fifteen percent distributed over three fiscal years. Both documents state our unequivocal conclusion that Hawaii's judges and justices are significantly underpaid relative to jurists in other states, on the federal bench, and in private practice. We take this opportunity to re-iterate that conclusion.

In our report, we also noted that sporadic, lump sum raises simply put off the issue of maintaining judicial salaries at a level commensurate with judicial responsibilities and at a level to attract and retain the best to serve in Hawaii's Judiciary. Previous Commissions have advocated an automatic salary escalator, and we repeat our strong support for the adoption of such an escalator for Hawaii's judicial salaries. Simple fairness dictates that Hawaii's judges and justices should receive salary increases at rates that match the increases granted other public employees. Nationally, the two most common escalators are tied to increases in cost-of-living indices and increases in civil service salaries. In light of the Governor's veto of the judicial salary increase passed by the 1997 Legislature, we are increasingly persuaded that an automatic salary escalator is imperative.

The Commission also submits that an experienced judiciary is the cornerstone to judicial excellence and judicial independence- In our opinion, judges, like other state employees who commit a significant portion of their professional careers to public service, should be compensated commensurate with the length of their service to the State. Retention increases, or pay supplements for length of judicial service, are an idea whose time has come.

A final note: According to the most recent figures available from the National Center for State Courts, by July 1, 1997, the salaries of Hawaii's Supreme Court justices had fallen from 35th to 38th; when Hawaii's cost-of-living relative to other states is taken into account, our justices now rank 45th in the nation. We are increasingly concerned about the erosion in the value of the salaries of Hawaii's judges and justices, and we are persuaded by their actions in the 1997 session that the members of the Legislature share our concern. It is time to implement these long overdue and urgently needed adjustments to the salaries and salary structure of Hawaii's dedicated judges and justices.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on S.C.R. No. 2, S.D. 1. We are hopeful that reason and fair play will prevail when next the Legislature and the Governor consider judicial salary increases.

Respectfully,


George Chaplin, Co-Chair

## Lawreace Ma. Johnson



Source: Response from Judicial Salary Commission (August 28, 1997).

## Appendix G. 1

## NORMALIZED JUDICIAL SALARY COMPARISON, 1997: HIGHEST COURT

| Fall 1997 Hank | Fall ISS7 <br> State | Fall 1997 <br> Actual Wages | $\begin{gathered} 1997 \\ \text { NW Renk } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1997 <br> State | Normalized ${ }^{\text { }}$ Salary | P.C.P.I. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Florida | 133.609 | 1 | Alabama | 145.999 | 20,131 |
| 2 | New Jersey | 132.260 | 2 | Mississippi | 142.089 | 17.575 |
| 3 | California | 131.065 | 3 | Arkanses | 141,373 | 18.959 |
| 4 | Hlinos | 130.250 | 4 | Florida | 140.096 | 24.226 |
| 5 | New York | 125.000 | 5 | South Carolina | 135.703 | 19.977 |
| 6 | Pennsytvenia | 122.864 | 6 | Louisiana | 133500 | 19,664 |
| 7 | Michigan | 121.727 | 7 | Georgia | 132,675 | 22.977 |
| 8 | Delaware | 121.200 | 8 | California | 131,385 | 25.346 |
| 9 | Georgia | 120.009 | 9 | Arizona | 129,400 | 21.363 |
| 10 | Alabama | 115.695 | 10 | Indiana | 129262 | 22601 |
| 11 | Connecticut | 115,303 | 11 | Utah | 128.997 | 19,595 |
| 12 | Indiana | 115,000 | 12 | Kenticicky | 126,763 | 19,797 |
| 13 | Washington | 112,078 | 13 | Pennsyivenia | 125.841 | 24.803 |
| 14 | Virginia | 112644 | 14 | Tennessee | 124,792 | 21.949 |
| 15 | Alaska | 111.552 | 15 | Texas | 124272 | 22282 |
| 16 | Phode Island | 110.761 | 16 | Michigan | 123.967 | 24.945 |
| 17 | Texas | 109.000 | 17 | Alinois | 123.245 | 26,848 |
| 18 | Arizona | 108,816 | 18 | Oklahoma | 122,185 | 19.544 |
| IS | Miiri | 106,763 | 19 | Missouri | 120.038 | 23,022 |
| 20 | Tennessee | 107.629 | 20 | West Virginia | 118.906 | 18,160 |
| 21 | Massachusetts | 107,730 | 21 | lowa | 117.989 | 22,306 |
| 22 | Ohii | 107.350 | 22 | Ohio | 116.269 | 23.457 |
| 23 | Maryland | 107,300 | 23 | Alaska | 116.152 | 24.398 |
| 24 | South Carolina | 106.713 | 24 | North Carolina | 114.773 | 22,265 |
| 25 | Arkanses | 105,507 | 25 | Phode island | 114511 | 24,572 |
| 26 | Iowa | 103.600 | 26 | Washington | 113.044 | 25.107 |
| 27 | Louisiana | 103.336 | 27 | New Mexico | 112.939 | 18.803 |
| 28 | Wisconsin | 100,699 | 28 | Virginia | 112697 | 25,212 |
| 29 | North Carolina | 100.320 | 29 | Delaware | 111.056 | 27.724 |
| 30 | Utah | 99,500 | 30 | Idaho | 110.734 | 19637 |
| 31 | Kentucky | 98.800 | 31 | Maine | 109,916 | 21,011 |
| 32 | Mississippi | 98.300 | 32 | w-sin | 109.688 | 23.320 |
| 33 | Nebraska | 97,739 | 33 | New York | 108,821 | 29,181 |
| 34 | Kansas | S6.489 | 34 | Nebraska | 108346 | 22,917 |
| 35 | New Hampshire | 95,623 | 35 | New Jersey | 107.222 | 31.334 |
| 36 | Minnesota | 94,395 | 36 | Kansas | 105.815 | 23.165 |
| 37 | Oklahoma | 94,000 | 37 | Oregon | 103,052 | 23.074 |
| 37 | Colorado | 94.000 | 36 | Montma | 101.928 | 19.214 |
| 38 | Hawaii | 93,780 | 39 | Wyoming | 106229 | 21.544 |
| 39 | Oregon | 93.600 | 40 | North Dakota | 99,105 | 2g. 446 |
| 40 | Maine | 90,909 | 41 | Maryland | S8.698 | 27,618 |
| 41 | Idato | 86.468 | 42 | South Dakota | 95,758 | 20,895 |
| 42 | Nevada | 85.000 | 43 | Vermont | 93.91s | 22,470 |
| 43 | West Virginia | 85.000 | 44 | Hawail | 93,780 | 25,404 |
| 44 | Wyoming | 85.000 | 45 | Minnesota | 93.442 | 25.663 |
| 45 | New Mexico | 83593 | 46 | Colorado | 92.963 | 25.704 |
| 47 | Vermont | 83.072 | 47 | Massachusetts | 91,363 | 29.792 |
| 43 | North Dakota | 79.771 | 48 | New Hempshire | 91.272 | 26.615 |
| 49 | South Dakota | 78.762 | 49 | Connecticut | 86.470 | 33,875 |
| 50 | Montma | 77.092 | 50 | Nevada | 83.016 | 26.011 |

[^63]Source:USDepartment of Commerce.Bureau of Economic Analvsis," "PCPI bv State. 1991-1996.", release date of September 19. 1 S97

* The "normatizing" techniqua is used to eliminate the disperity caused by differences in per capita income among the states. The formula used is as follows: (Per Capitaincoma in Hawaill divided by (Per Capita Income in Stare "A"I multiplied by (Actual Judicial Salary in State "A"). Comparisons of "normalized" salaries should be viewed with some caution sinca "per capita income" alone is considered to be an incomptete assassmant of a state's cost of living index.

Source: Provided by the Judiciary.

## Appendix G. 2

## NORMALIZED JUDICIAL SALARY COMPARISON, 1997: INTERMEDIATE APPELLATE COURT

| Fall 1997 Pank | Fall 1997 <br> State | Fall 1997 <br> Actud Wege | $\begin{gathered} 1997 \\ \text { N w Renk } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1997 <br> State | 1997 Normalized* ${ }^{*}$ $\qquad$ Wage $\qquad$ | P.C.P.I. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Now Jersey | 124,200 | 1 | Alabema | 144.637 | 20.131 |
| 2 | Catiornia | 122.893 | 2 | Arkanses | 136.903 | 18.959 |
| a | Mlinois | 122666 | a | Mississippi | 132.260 | 17.575 |
| 4 | Frorida | 120240 | 4 | South Carolina | 136.614 | 19.971 |
| 5 | Pennsytuenia | 119.016 | 5 | Louisiana | 126,614 | 19.664 |
| 6 | Now York | 119.000 | 6 | Arizona | 126.318 | 21,363 |
| 7 | Alabama | 114,615 | 7 | Fiorida | 126.067 | 24.226 |
| 6 | Michigar | 114.007 | a | Indiana | 123.642 | 22.601 |
| 9 | Indiana | 110,000 | 9 | Calitornia | 123.174 | 25,346 |
| 10 | Georgia | 103.246 | 10 | Utah | 121.931 | 19.595 |
| 11 | Connecticut | 107.214 | 11 | Pennsytvania | 121,900 | 24.603 |
| 12 | Washington | 106.537 | 12 | Kentucky | 121.607 | 19,797 |
| 13 | Virginia | 106. 442 | 13 | Georgia | 120.785 | 22977 |
| 14 | Arizona | 106. 226 | 14 | Tennessee | 116.966 | 21,949 |
| 15 | Aleska | 105. 334 | 15 | Texas | \$18.059 | 22.282 |
| 16 | Texas | 103.550 | 16 | Mictigan | 116.105 | 24,946 |
| 17 | Ternessee | 102304 | 17 | Milinos | 115,995 | 26.343 |
| 18 | South Carolina | 102711 | 18 | Oklahoma | 114,336 | 19.644 |
| 19 | Arkanses | 102171 | 19 | lowa | 113.433 | 22.306 |
| 20 | Missouri | 101.691 | 20 | Missouri | 112102 | 23.022 |
| 21 | Meryland | 100.300 | 21 | North Cerolina | 109.991 | 22.205 |
| 22 | Ohio | 99.950 | 22 | Alaska | 109.729 | 24,396 |
| 23 | Massachusetts | 99,600 | 23 | Idato | 109.453 | 19.837 |
| 24 | Lowa | 99.600 | 24 | Ohi i | 103246 | 23.457 |
| 26 | Lovisiana | 97.928 | 25 | Washington | 107.465 | 25.187 |
| 26 | North Carolina | 96.146 | 26 | New Mexico | 107. 292 | 18.303 |
| 27 | Wisconsin | 94.604 | 27 | Virginia | 107. 253 | 26212 |
| 23 | Kertucky | 94.767 | 23 | New York | 103.597 | 29.101 |
| 29 | Utah | 94.050 | 29 | Wisconsin | 103.276 | 23.320 |
| 30 | Kansas | 93.044 | 30 | Nebreska | 102.926 | 22917 |
| 31 | Nebraska | 92.652 | 31 | Kansas | 102037 | 23.165 |
| a2 | Mississippi | 91.500 | 32 | Oregon | 100,740 | 23.074 |
| a3 | Oregon | 91.500 | a3 | Now Jersey | 100.695 | 31.334 |
| 34 | Hawaï | 89,780 | 34 | Mieryland | 92.269 | 27.613 |
| 35 | Colorado | 89.500 | 35 | Hawair | 89.780 | 25,404 |
| a6 | Minnesota | 36.946 | 36 | Colorado | 88.455 | 25.704 |
| 37 | Oklahoma | 63.000 | 37 | Minnesota | 36.047 | 25.663 |
| a 6 | Idaho | 66.468 | 38 | Messachusetts | 86.007 | 29,792 |
| a 9 | New Mexico | 79,413 | 39 | Connecticut | 80.403 | 33.876 |
| 40 | Nevada | 0 | 40 | Nevada | 0 | 26.011 |
| 41 | Maine | 0 | 41 | Vermont | 0 | 22470 |
| 42 | West Virginia | 0 | 42 | West Virginia | 0 | 16.160 |
| 43 | Vermont | 0 | 43 | Wyoming | 0 | 21.644 |
| 44 | Wyoming | 1 | 44 | Delaware | 0 | 27,724 |
| 45 | Montana | 0 | 45 | Maine | 0 | 21.011 |
| 46 | North Dakota | 0 | 46 | New Hampshire | 0 | 26.615 |
| 47 | New Hompshire | 0 | 47 | Phode island | 0 | 24.572 |
| 43 | Rhode island | 0 | 48 | North Dakota | 0 | 20.448 |
| 49 | Delaware | 0 | 49 | Montena | 0 | 19.214 |
| 50 | South Dakota | 0 | 53 | South Dakota | 0 | 20.895 |

Survey of Judicial Salaries Peport. Volume 22 Nurnber 2. Fall 1997.
PCPI is Per Cepita Personed Incorre. Normaliced Sedary = [(P.C.P.I. Hawaii)/(P.C.P.I. State "A")]x(Salary Stare "A")
Source: US Department of Commerce. Bureau of Economic Aralysis, PCPI by State, 1991-1996.", release date of September 19. $199^{\circ}$

* The "normalizing" tecthniqua is used to efirminate the desperity caused by diffarences in per capita income among the states. The formula used is as follows: (Per Capita Income in Hawaill dividap by (Per Capita income in State "A7 muttiplied by (Acturat Judiciel Salery in State "A"). Comparisons of "normalized" selaries ahould be wiewed with torne cartion since "per capits income" alone is considerad to be an incomplete assessment of a state's cost of living index.

Source: Provided by the Judiciary.

NORMALIZED JUDICIAL SALARY COMPARISON, 1997: TRIAL COURTS

| Fall 1997 Rank | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fell } 1997 \\ \text { State } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Fall 1997 <br> Actual Wage | $\begin{gathered} 1997 \\ \text { NW Reark } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1997 \\ & \text { State } \end{aligned}$ | 1997 Normalized * Wage | P.C.P.I. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Delaware | 115.300 | 1 | Arkansas | 132424 | 18.959 |
| 2 | New Jersey | 116,099 | 2 | South Carolina | 128,917 | 19.977 |
| 3 | New York | 113,093 | 3 | Mississippi | 128,213 | 17,675 |
| 4 | Illinois | 112491 | 4 | Arizona | 123,237 | 21.363 |
| 5 | Michigan | 199.267 | 5 | Alaska | 122,664 | 21.363 |
| 6 | Forida | 107.758 | 6 | Louisiana | 119,527 | 19,664 |
| 7 | California | 107,390 | 7 | Utah | 117.264 | 19.695 |
| 8 | Pennsylvania | 166,704 | 8 | Kentucky | 116,432 | 19,797 |
| 9 | Virginia | 104.014 | 9 | Georgia | 114.744 | 22977 |
| 10 | Georgia | 103,762 | 10 | Tennessee | 113.848 | 21.949 |
| 11 | Arizona | 103,634 | 11 | Florida | 112998 | 24226 |
| 12 | Alaska | 103,152 | 12 | West Viinia | 111.912 | 18.169 |
| 13 | Connecticut | 102470 | 13 | Texas | 111.845 | 22,262 |
| 14 | South Carolina | 101.377 | 14 | Michigan | 111, 267 | 24.946 |
| 15 | Washington | 100.996 | 15 | Pennsylvania | 109.290 | 24.863 |
| 16 | Phode Island | 99.722 | 16 | lowa | 107.966 | 22.396 |
| 17 | Arkanses | 96.828 | 17 | California | 107.636 | 25.346 |
| 18 | Tennessee | 98.364 | 18 | Oklahoma | 106. 557 | 19.544 |
| 19 | Texas | 99,100 | 19 | Hincis | 106,441 | 26.848 |
| 20 | Maryland | 96.500 | 29 | Delaware | 105,651 | 27.724 |
| 21 | Massachusetts | 95.710 | 21 | Viinii | 104,866 | 25.212 |
| 22 | lowa | 94.896 | 22 | North Carolina | 104,013 | 22.266 |
| 23 | Missouri | 94.116 | '23 | Maine | 103,951 | 21.011 |
| 24 | Louisiana | 92.520 | 24 | Missouri | 103663 | 23.022 |
| 25 | Ohii | 91.966 | 25 | Idaho | 103.787 | 19.837 |
| 26 | North Carolina | 90.91s | 26 | Rhode Island | 103.099 | 24.672 |
| 27 | Kentucky | 96.734 | 27 | New Mexico | 101,928 | 18.803 |
| 28 | w - i n | 90,661 | 26 | Wastingion | 101.865 | 25.187 |
| 29 | Uteh | 90.450 | 29 | Alabama | 101.731 | 29.131 |
| 30 | Nebraska | 90.408 | 30 | Inciana | 101.162 | 22.601 |
| 31 | Indiana | 90.000 | 31 | Nebraska | 100.219 | 22.917 |
| 32 | New Hampshire | 89646 | 32 | Ohio | 99.582 | 23.467 |
| 33 | Mississippi | 88.700 | 33 | Wisconsin | 98.763 | 23.320 |
| 34 | Hawail | 66.780 | 34 | New York | 98,374 | 29.181 |
| 36 | Maine | 86.973 | 36 | Montana | 96.261 | 19.214 |
| 36 | Oregon | 85,300 | 36 | Oregon | 93.914 | 23.074 |
| 37 | Colcrado | 85.000 | 37 | Now Jersey | 93.206 | 31,344 |
| 36 | Kansas | 83.883 | 36 | Karsas | 91.991 | 23.165 |
| 39 | Minnesota | 83.494 | 39 | North Oakota | 91.468 | 29.448 |
| 40 | Oklahoma | 82.000 | 40 | Wyoming | 90.796 | 21.344 |
| 41 | Idaho | 81.043 | 41 | South Oakota | 89.429 | 20.896 |
| 42 | Alabama | 89.616 | 42 | vernlont | 89.214 | 22.470 |
| 43 | West Virginia | 80.000 | 43 | Maryland | 88.764 | 27.818 |
| 44 | Nevada | 79.000 | 44 | Hawail | 86,780 | 25.404 |
| 45 | Vermont | 78.919 | 46 | New Hampshire | 85.567 | 26.615 |
| 46 | Wyoming | 77.000 | 46 | Colorado | 84.968 | 26.764 |
| 47 | New Mexico | 75.443 | 47 | Minnesota | 82.651 | 25.863 |
| 48 | North Dakota | 73.618 | 48 | Massachusetts | 81.613 | 29.792 |
| 49 | South Oakota | 73.666 | 49 | Nevada | 77.156 | 26.011 |
| 50 | Montana | 72,042 | 50 | Connecticut | 76.846 | 33.875 |

Survey of Judicial Salaries R-sport. Volume 22. Number 2Fzill997.
PCPI is Per Capita Personal Income. Normalized Salary =[(P.C.P.I. Hawain)/(P.C.P.I.State "A"]x(Salary State "A")
Source: USDepartment of Commerce.Bureau of Economic Analysis. "PCPI by State. 1991-1996.", release date of September19. 1997

[^64]Source: Provided by the Judiciary.

## Appendix H

## JUSTICES/JUDGES SALARIES

WHAT THEY WQULD LOOK LIKE
BASED ON
CHANGING HAWAII CPI-U

|  |  | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1998 | $1997$ | $1998$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CPI-U hdex (Adjusted) | 100 | 107.2 | 112.3 | 115.9 | 119.1 | 121.7 | 123.6 | $\overline{125.5}$ | 128 |
|  | Annual Increase from Base |  | 7.2\% | 5.1\% | 3.6\% | 3.2\% | 2.6\% | 1.9\% | 1.9\% | 2.5\% |
|  | Supreme Court | Base Pay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ch ief Justice Associate Justice | $\begin{aligned} & 94,780 \\ & 93,780 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 101,604 \\ & 100,532 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 106,438 \\ & 105,315 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 109,850 \\ & 108,691 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 112,883 \\ & 111,692 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 115,347 \\ & 114,130 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 117,148 \\ & 115,912 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 118,949 \\ & 117,694 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 121,318 \\ & 120,038 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | intermediate Court of Appeals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underbrace{\infty}_{0}$ | Chlef Judge Associate Judge | $\begin{aligned} & 91,280 \\ & 89,780 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97,852 \\ & 96,244 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 102,507 \\ & 100,823 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 105,794 \\ & 104,055 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 108,714 \\ & 106,928 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 111,088 \\ & 109,262 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 112,822 \\ & 110,968 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 114,556 \\ & 112,674 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 116838 \\ & 114,918 \end{aligned}$ |
| Circuit Courts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Judge | 86,780 | 93,028 | 97,454 | 100,578 | 103,355 | 105,611 | 107.260 | 108,909 | 111,078 |
| Family Courts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Circuit Judge Judge | $\begin{aligned} & 86,780 \\ & 81,780 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93,028 \\ & 87,668 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97,454 \\ & 91,839 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100,578 \\ 94,783 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 103,355 \\ 97,400 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 105.61 \text { I } \\ 99,526 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 107,260 \\ & 101,080 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 108,909 \\ & 102,634 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 111,078 \\ & 104,678 \end{aligned}$ |
| District Courts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Judge <br> PerDiem Judges (Dct/Fam) | $\begin{aligned} & 81,780 \\ & 81,780 \end{aligned}$ | 87,668 | 91,839 | 94.783 | 97,400 | 99,526 | 101,080 | 102,634 | 104,678 |

[^65]b:baneyonsllf harryluat pb 07,25,97

## Appendix I

## PROJECTION OF JUDICIAL SALARIES IF TIED TO AVERAGE NEGOTIATED

 SALARY ADJUSTMENTS RECEIVED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING UNIT 13
## JUSTICES/JUDGES SALARIES

## WHAT THEY WOULD LOOK LIKE

BASED ON
AVERAGE NEGOTIATED ADJUSTMENTS (CB 13)

0 htermediata Court of Appeals

| Chief Judge Associate Judge | $\begin{aligned} & 91,280 \\ & 89,780 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95,753 \\ & 94,179 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99,879 \\ & 98,040 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 101,673 \\ & 100,001 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 105,740 \\ & 104,001 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 107,855 \\ 106,081 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 114,596 \\ & 112,711 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Circuit Courts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Judge | 86,780 | . 91,032 | 94,764 | 96,659 | 100,525 | 102,536 | 108,945 |
| Family Courts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cirarit Judge | 86,780 | 91,032 | $94,764$ | $96.659$ | $100,525$ | $102,536$ | 108,945 |
| J udge | 81,780 |  | $89,304$ | 91,090 | $94,734$ | 96,629 | 102,668 |
| District Courts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Judge | 81,780 | 85,787 | 89,304 | 91,090 | 94,734 | 96,629 | 102.668 |
| PerDiem Judges (Dct/Fam) | 81,780 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1) Based on H.G.E.A. Bargaining Unit 13Professional and Scientific Salary Schedule

Source: Provided by the Judiciary.
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## Appendix J

hat ho we foxithlimyindepit - ios

The Judiciary
State of Hawaii
Salary Schedule

|  | Supreme Court | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (1) } \\ & \text { Base } \\ & \hline \text { Pay } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\text { Step } \mathrm{A}^{\frac{\text { 2) }}{\text { 3) }}}$ | $\operatorname{sep} B$ | $\text { _Step_c }{ }^{3)}$ | $\text { Stap }{ }^{11}$ | Sep E | $\text { Step F }{ }^{4}$ | Step G | Staph | Step 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Chief Ustice | 94,780 | 98,571 | 102,514 | 106,615 | 110679 | 115314 | 119,927 | 124,724 | 129,713 | 134901 |
|  | Associate Ustice | 93,780 | 97531 | 101,432 | 105,490 | 109,709 | 114,098 | 118,662 | 123,408 | 128,344 | 133,478 |
|  | Intermediate Courtof Appeals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Chief Judge | 91280 | 94931 | 98,728 | 102,678 | 106,785 | 111,056 | 115,498 | 120,118 | 124923 | 129.920 |
|  | Associate Judge | 89.780 | 93,371 | 97,108 | 100990 | 105,030 | 109231 | 113.600 | 118,144 | 122370 | 127,785 |
|  | Circuit Courts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Judge | 88,780 | 90251 | 93,881 | 97,618 | 101520 | 105,581 | 109,804 | 114,197 | 118,784 | 123,515 |
| $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | Family Courts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Circuit ludge Judge | $\begin{aligned} & 86,780 \\ & 81,780 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90251 \\ & 85,051 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93681 \\ & 88,463 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97,818 \\ & 91,991 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 101,520 \\ 95,871 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 105,581 \\ 99,498 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 109,804 \\ & 103,478 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 114,197 \\ & 1070817 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 118,764 \\ & 111922 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 123,515 \\ & 116,398 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | District Counts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Judge | 81,780 | 85,051 | 88,453 | 91,991 | 95,671 | 99,498 | 103,478 | 107,617 | 111922 | 118,398 |
|  | PerDiem ludges (Dot/Fam) | 81,780 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1) Base pay and step amounts adjusted periodically based onlegislative action (current base pay reflects salaries approved as of 1990)
2) Each step providesfor a four pencent increase over the previous step
3) Step movementoccurs on the 2nd, 4th, and 6th anniversary of appointment as a permanentjudge
4) Step movement occurs on the 3rd anniversary ct the award of the current step

Source: Offered by the Judiciary for discussion purposes.

## Appendix K

## LONGEVITY STEP SALARY SCHEDULE REFLECTING A ONE-TIME 15\% PAY INCREASE TO EXISTING SALARY LEVELS

The Judiciary
State of Hawail
Salary Schedule

|  |  | Proposed | $\operatorname{sen}^{31}{ }^{31}$ | Step $B^{3)}$ | $\operatorname{sep} C^{3)}$ | Stop ${ }^{4}$ | Step ${ }^{\text {f) }}$ | Step ${ }^{4 \prime}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Supreme Court | Base Pay | Step A | Step B | Stop C | Step D | Step E | Step F | Step G | Step H | Step1 |
|  | Chief Ustice | 108,997 | 113,357 | 117891 | 122,607 | 127,511 | 132,812 | 137,918 | 143,433 | 149,170 | 155,137 |
|  | Associate Uustice | 107847 | 112,181 | 118,847 | 121,313 | 128,166 | 131212 | 138,481 | 141,919 | 147,598 | 153,500 |
|  | Intermediate Court of Appeals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Chief Judge' | 104,972 | 109,171 | 113,538 | 118,079 | 122802 | 127,714 | 132,823 | 138,136 | 143,661 | 149,408 |
|  | Associate Judge | 103247 | 107,377 | 111,672 | 116,139 | 120,784 | 125,616 | 130,640 | 135866 | 141,301 | 146,953 |
| N | Circuit Courts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Judge | 99,797 | 103,789 | 107,940 | 112258 | 116,748 | 121,418 | 126275 | 131,326 | 136,579 | 142,042 |
|  | Family Courts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Circuit Judge | 99,797 | 103,789 | 107940 | 112258 | 116,748 | 121,418 | 126275 | 131,326 | 136,579 | 142,042 |
|  | Judge | 94,047 | 97809 | 101,721 | 105,790 | 110,022 | 114,423 | 118,999 | 123,759 | 128,710 | 133,858 |
|  | District Courts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Judge | 94,047 | 97,809 | 101,721 | 105,790 | 110,022 | 114,423 | 118,999 | 123,759 | 128,710 | 133,858 |
|  | PerDiem Judges (Dat/Fam) | 94,047 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1) Base pay and step amounts adjusted periodically based on legislative action (adjusted to reflect proposed one-time 15\% catch-up pay Increase)
2) Each step provides for a four percent increase over thepreviousstep
3) Step movement occurs on the 2nd, 4th, and 6th anniversary of appointment as a permanent fudge
4) Step movement occurs on the 3rd anniversary of tha award of the current step

Source: Offered by the Judiciary for discussion purposes.

## Appendix L

## BASIC FEATURES OF LONGEVITY PAY STEP SCHEDULE

## LONGEVITY PAY STEPS <br> FOR <br> JUSTICES/JUDGES

Basic Features

## SEPARATE TRACKS FOR EACH LEVEL OF JUSTICES/JUDGES

Assumes only a limited number of justices/judges move from court to court.

## SAVE PAY PROVISION FOR JUSTICESIJUDGES THAT DO CHANGE COURTS

Transition would be from current pay step to the step on the new court that . exceeds current pay level.

PAY INCREASE FOR EACH ADDITIONAL TERM AS A JUDGE
P rovides for an automatic permanentone step increase each time a DistrictCourt (District/F amily) level judge is appointed to a new term and a two step increase each time a Circuit Court or above level justice/judge is appointed for a new term.

## STEP MOVEMENTS

During the first six years of service, justices/judges would qualify for a step increase on the second, fourth and sixth anniversary of their first appointment. Thereafter, they would qualify for a step increase on the third anniversary of the previous permanentstep movement.

## IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFECTIVE DATE

Currentjustices/judges will automatically move to the step in their court program that is reflective of their total years on the bench effective J uly $1,1998$.

There will be no retroactive pay related to the initial step placement of current judges.

## BASE PAY AND STEP AMOUNTS

S alary schedules amounts will automatically be adjusted to reflect the mostcurrent base pay amount as approved by the Legislature.

ONE-TIME CATCH UP PAY INCREASE -(15\%)
Based on salary commission's recommendation to the nineteenth legislative session.
h:Thome YOasit Narry yudcpi1.doc
source: Offered by the Judiciary.

## Appendix M

## SALARY SCHEDULE FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING UNIT 13, EFFECTIVE 7/1/95 (1993-1997 CONTRACT AGREEMENT

STATE OF HAWAII<br>DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL SERVICES<br>SALARYSCHEDULE

EFFECTIVE DATE: 07/01/95
BARGAINING UNIT: 13 Professional 8 Scientific, Non-supervisor

|  |  | STEP $\overline{\mathrm{C}}$ | STEP D | STEP | STEP F | $\begin{gathered} \text { STEP } \\ G \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{H}{\text { STEP }}$ | STEP | $\begin{gathered} \text { STEP } \\ \mathbf{j} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STEP } \\ K \end{gathered}$ | STEP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR24 | ANN | 36,636 | 38,100 | 39,624 | 41,208 | 42,852 | 44.556 | 46,356 | 48,192 | S0.136 | 52,152 |
|  | HON | 3,053 | 3,175 | 3,302 | 3, 434 | 3.571 | . 3.713 | 3,863 | 4,016 | 4.178 | 4,346 |
|  | 8 HR | 140.88 | 146.56 | 152.40 | 158.48 | 164.80 | 171.36 | 178.32 | 185.36 | 192.80 | 200.56 |
|  | HRLY | 11.61 | 18.32 | 19.05 | 19,81 | 20.60 | 21.42 | 22,29 | 23.17 | 24.10 | 25.07 |
| S225 | ANN | 38,100 | 39,624 | 41,208 | 42,852 | 44,556 | 46,356 | 48,192 | S0.136 | 52,152 | 54,228 |
|  | MON | 3.175 | 3,302 | 3,434 | 3,571 | 3,713 | 3,863 | 4,016 | 4,178 | 4,346 | 4,519 |
|  | 8HR | 146.56 | 152.40 | 158.48 | 164.80 | 171.36 | 178.32 | 185.36 | 192.80 | 200.56 | 208.56 |
|  | HRLY | 18.32 | 19.05 | 19.81 | 20.60 | 21.42 | 22.29 | 23.17 | 24.10 | 25.07 | 26.07 |
| SR26 | 6 ANN | 39,624 | 41,208 | 42,852 | 44,556 | 46.356 | 48,192 | 50,136 | 52,152 | 54,228 | 56,388 |
|  | HON | 3,302 | 3.434 | 3,571 | 3,713 | 3,863 | 4,016 | 4,178 | 4,346 | 4,519 | 4,699 |
|  | 8HR | 152.40 | 158.48 | 164.80 | 171.36 | 178.32 | 185.36 | 192.80 | 200.56 | 206.56 | 216.88 |
|  | HRLY | 19.05 | 19.81 | 20.60 | 21.42 | 22.29 | 23.17 | 24.10 | 25.07 | 26.07 | 27.11 |
| S R 27 | ANN | 41,208 | 42,852 | 44.556 | 46,356 | 48,192 | S0.136 | 52,152 | 54,228 | 56,388 | 58,644 |
|  | MON | 3,434 | 3,571 | 3,713 | 3,863 | 4,016 | 4,178 | 4,346 | 4,519 | 4,699 | 4,887 |
|  | 8HR | 158.48 | 164.80 | 171.36 | 178.32 | 185.36 | 192.80 | 200.56 | 208.56 | 216.88 | 225.52 |
|  | HRLY | 19.81 | 20.60 | 21.42 | 22,29 | 23.17 | 24.10 | 25.07 | 26.07 | 27.11 | 28.19 |
| SR28 | A N N | 44,556 | 46,356 | 48,192 | 50.136 | 52.152 | 54.228 | 56,388 | 58.644 | 60.984 | 63,420 |
|  | MON | 3,713 | 3,863 | 4,016 | 4,178 | 4,346 | 4.519 | 4,699 | 4,887 | 5.082 | 5,285 |
|  | 8 HR | 171.36 | 178.32 | 185.36 | 192.80 | 200.56 | 208.56 | 216.88 | 225.52 | 231.56 | 243.92 |
|  | HRLY | 21.42 | 22.29 | 23.17 | 24.10 | 25.07 | 26.07 | 27.11 | 28.19 | 29.32 | 30.49 |
| SR29 | ANN | 46,356 | 48,192 | S0.136 | 52. 152 | S4.228 | 56,388 | 58,644 | 60,984 | 63,420 | 65.964 |
|  | MON | 3,863 | 4,016 | 4,178 | 4,346 | 4.519 | 4.699 | 4,887 | 5,082 | 5,285 | 5.497 |
|  | 8HR | 178.32 | 185.36 | 192.80 | 200.56 | 208.56 | 216.88 | 225.52 | 234.56 | 243.92 | 253.68 |
|  | HRLY | 22.29 | 23.17 | 24.10 | 25.07 | 26.07 | 27.11 | 28.19 | 29.32 | 30.49 | 31.71 |
| SR30 | A N N | 48,192 | 50,136 | S2. 152 | 54,228 | 56,388 | 58,644 | 60,984 | 63,420 | 65,964 | 68,616 |
|  | MON | 4,016 | 4,178 | 4,346 | 4,519 | 4,699 | 4,887 | 5,082 | 5,285 | 5,497 | 5,718 |
|  | 8HR | 185.36 | 192.80 | 200.56 | 208.56 | 216.88 | 225.52 | 234.56 | 243.92 | 253.68 | 263.92 |
|  | HRLY | 23.17 | 24.10 | 25.07 | 26.07 | 27.11 | 28.19 | 29.32 | 30.49 | 31.71 | 32.99 |
| SR31 | AN N | 50,136 | 52.152 | 54,228 | 56,388 | 58,644 | 60,984 | 63,420 | 65,964 | 68,616 | 71.340 |
|  | MON | 4,178 | 4,346 | 4.519 | 1,699 | 4,887 | 5,082 | 5.285 | 5,497 | 5,718 | 5.945 |
|  | 8HR | 192.80 | 200.56 | 208.56 | 216.88 | 225.52 | 234.56 | 243.92 | 253.68 | 263.92 | 274.40 |
|  | HRLY | 24.10 | 25.07 | 26.07 | 27.11 | 28.19 | 29.32 | 30.49 | 31.71 | 32.99 | 34.30 |
| SCOI | ANN |  | 54,228 | $56,388$ | 58.644 | 60,984 | 63,420 | 65.964 | 68,616 |  | 74,208 |
|  | HON | 4,346 | 4.519 | 4,699 | 4,887 | 5,082 | 5,285 | 5.497 | 5.718 | 5.945 | 6,184 |
|  | 8HR | 200.56 | 208.56 | 216.88 | 225.52 | 234.56 | 243.92 | 253.68 | 263.92 | 274.40 | 285.44 |
|  | HRLY | 25.07 | 26.07 | 27.11 | 28.19 | 29.32 | 30.49 | 31.71 | 32.99 | 34.30 | 35,68 |
| SCO2 | A N N | 54,228 | 56.388 | 58,644 | 60.984 | 63,420 | 65,964 | 68,616 | 71.340 | 74,208 | 77.172 |
|  | MON | 4,519 | 4,699 | 4,887 | 5.082 | 5,285 | 5,497 | 5,718 | 5,945 | 6,184 | 6,431 |
|  | $8 H R$ | 208.56 | 216.88 | 225.52 | 234.56 | 243.92 | 253.68 | 263.92 | 274.40 | 28S.44 | 296.80 |
|  | HRLY | 26.07 | 27.11 | 28.19 | 29.32 | 30.49 | 31.71 | 32.99 | 34.30 | 35.68 | 37.10 |
| SC03 | A N N | 56,388 | 58.644 | 60,984 | 63.420 | 65,964 | 68,616 | 71,340 | 74,208 | 77,172 | 80,256 |
|  | HON | 4,699 | 4,887 | 5,082 | 5,285 | 5,497 | 5,718 | 5.945 | 6,184 | 6,431 | 6,688 |
|  | 8HR | 216.88 | 225.52 | 234.56 | 243.92 | 2S3.68 | 263.92 | 274.40 | 285.44 | 296.80 | 308.64 |
|  | HRLY | 27.11 | 28.19 | 29.32 | 30,49 | 31.71 | 32.99 | 34.30 | 35,68 | 37.10 | 38.58 |

## LEGISLATIVE SALARY COMMISSION 2002

## A Report to the Legislature and Governor



# Submitted by the <br> Department of Accounting and General Services 

March 2003

March 25, 2003

The Honorable Linda Lingle
Governer. State of Hawai i
State Capitol, $5{ }^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Honolulu, Hawai i 96813

The Honorable Robert Bunda, President
and members of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 003
Honolulu, Hawai 196813

The Honorable Calvin K.Y. Say, Speaker
and members of the House of Representatives
State Capitol, Room 431
Honolulu, Hawai`i 96813

Aloha Governor Lingle, President Bunda, Speaker Say, and members of the Twenty-Second State Legislature:

The 2002 Legislative Salary Commission, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission," has completed its salary recommendations for the 2005 and future members of the Hawai i State Legislature. The following report is the product of intensive Commission deliberations.

The Commission wishes to thank all the individuals and organizations that provided the Commission with information regarding legislative salaries. The Commission would also like to thank Mr. Russ Saito. State Comptroller - Department of Accounting and General Services (DAGS) for providing the staff support of Kerry Yoneshige, Mr. Mark Bennett, State Attorney General (AG) for providing the staff support of Russell Suzuki, and Ms. Mary Lou Kobayashi. Acting Director - Office of Planning, for providing the staff support of Dick Poirier. Hamid Jahanmir. and Scott Derrickson.

Respectfully submitted.


Jrave Qhanmen
Marie Okamura, Vice-Chair
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## Executive Summary

This report supports the 2002 Legislative Salary Commission's recommendation regarding the future salaries for members of the Hawai i State Legislature. The Commission recommends:

- Increasing legislative salaries by $6.7 \%$ in 2005 to $\$ 34,200$.
- Adjusting salaries every two years thereafter $(2007,2009,2011)$ using an Average Annual Wage index, and
- Increasing the salary differential for the House Speaker and Senate President from $\$ 5,000$ to $\$ 7,500$.

This Commission has reviewed the work of past commissions and intensively studied various methods and indices that might be utilized to meet their mandate. The Commission concluded that the most appropriate method among the options considered for adjusting legislative salaries would be through the application of an Annual Average Wage index, with adjustments being made every two years. This index provides a gauge to what is going on in our economy and represents fairly, other wage increases within the Hawai`i economy.

In a thoughtful and deliberate way the Commission has determined the following:

- The Hawai' i State legislators deserve a salary increase
- The last adjustments to legislative salaries were made in 1993
- This Commission's recommendation would not take effect until 2005
- In the absence of any recommended salary adjustment this year, Legislative salaries could not be adjusted until 2013, which would represent a 20 year period without a salary increase.

While legislators are considered to be part-time employees, it is apparent that their role requires much more than what a part-time position would does. These factors lead the Commission to conclude that an increase in salary is justified and overdue:

- Since 1993, the minimum wage has been increased by $19.2 \%$
- Since 1993, the Honolulu Consumer Price Index (CPD) has increased by $12.6 \%$
- Since 1993, the Average Wage Index has increased by $17.7 \%$

The Commission has operated under the following points:

1. A system needs to be established to benchmark or index any legislative salary increases.
2. The frequency of adjustments should be appropriate and timely in order to match State budgeting cycles.
3. Any method for adjusting legislative salaries should be fair and easy to implement.

We believe that the overall methodology is sound, fair, and reasonable. By implementing this recommendation. the long lag between salary adjustments could be eliminated. The next Salary Commission will have the opportunity to extend this recommended methodology or to establish a new one.

## Overview

The periodic appointment of public individuals to review and make recommendations on legislative salaries is mandated by the Hawai i State Constitution. The 2002 Legislative Salary Commission is the fourth such commission established pursuant to Article III. Section 9 of the State Constitution. which provides:
"There shall be a commission on legislative salarv, which shall be appointed by the governor on or before November 30, 1978. and every eight vears thereafter. Not later than the fortieth legislative dav of the 1979 regular legislative session and every eight years thereafter, the commission shall submit to the legislature and the governor recommendations for a salary for members of the legislature, and then dissolve. The recommended salary submitted shall become effective as provided in the recommendation unless the legislature disapproves the recommendation bv adoption of a concurrent resolution prior to adjournment sine die of the legislative session in which the recommendation is submitted or the governor disapproves the plan bv a message of disapproval transmitted to the legislature prior to such adjournment. Any change in salary which becomes effective shall not apply to the legislature to which the recommendation for the change in salary was submitted."

The 2002 Commission is required to submit its recommendations to adjust the salaries of the State Legislature to both the Legislature and the Governor. These recommendations take effect unless the Legislature or the Governor disapproves the recommendations by the end of the 2003 legislative session. The Commission is dissolved upon submission of its recommendations. The next Commission will be appointed by the Governor on or before November 30, 2010.

## Commission's Philosophy

Even in difficult fiscal times. it is the Constitutional mission of the Legislative Salary Commission to objectively review current legislative salaries and to determine what should be considered a fair compensation to carry out legislative duties. In this regard. the 2002 Commission adopted the following philosophy to guide its actions and recommendations:

- Hawai`i State Legislators deserve an increase in salary, as opposed to maintaining the same level or imposing a decrease.


## Rationale:

Hawai'i's legislators have not received a salary adjustment for 10 years and have earned the same salary since 1993 ( $\$ 32,000$ for general members: $\$ 37,000$ for the Senate President and the Speaker of the House). In 1995, the Legislature did not approve any salary adjustments recommended by the 1994 Legislative Salary Commission. The time frame between the operation of each commission, their recommendations, and any subsequent salary adjustments is twelve years. If the current Commission recommends any salary adjustments, the soonest these adjustments could take effect would be in 2005 . Should no salary adjustments be recommended or approved under this Commission, the next opportunity for salary adjustments will not be effective until 2013 or a time lag of 20 years.

- Though the Hawai $\because$ Legislature is officially considered part-time, the amount of time that is actually required to sufficiently address constituency demands throughout the year could go far beyond the regular definition of part-time work.


## Rationale:

The increasing requirements placed on legislators by constituents and the intensifying complexities of legislative work necessitate that legislators spend extensive amounts of time in legislative matters during the four months when the Legislature is in session and the eight month interim when it is in recess. These demands strain legislators' ability to successfully undertake employment other than that of a legislator. The results of the survey relating to employment of current legislators who served in the 2002 legislature are included in Appendix C.

- Any salary increase should occur every two years.

Rationale:
A bi-annual arrangement would coincide with each new legislature and reflect traditional budgeting cycles.

Non-salary legislator benefits will be considered in the Commission's deliberations although the Commission does not have the power to affect these benefits.

## Rationale:

The Commission realizes that monetary compensation is one factor that makes up any employee's benefits package. Any salary increase recommended by the Commission should take the following non-salary benefits into account:

- Legislators earn no vacation or sick leave and are not eligible for overtime. They receive the same holidays as other State employees.
- Medical and other insurance are determined on the same basis as other State employees, as well as personal savings options such as deferred compensation and savings bond deductions.
- Contributory retirement for legislators is consistent with that of State judges -3.5 percent.
- While on official business. all legislators are eligible to receive $\$ 80$ per diem for neighbor island travel (this includes neighbor island legislators attending session on $\mathrm{O}^{\prime}$ ahu) and $\$ 130$ per diem for mainland travel. This is consistent with other State employees. During the interim, however, all legislators are eligible to receive $\$ 10$ per diem for official business conducted on their home island.
- All legislators are eligible for downtown parking stalls during the session at the standard State rate. Free parking at all State airports is offered.
- Although all legislators receive a $\$ 5,000$ expense account, there are very stringent regulations as to how the money may be spent.

The Commission recognizes that the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives have additional duties and responsibilities that warrant a differential in salary from other members of the legislature.

## Rationale:

The Commission realizes that the requirements, both in time and responsibility, of the Senate President and House Speaker are greater than those of other members of the Legislature. Therefore, additional compensation over that of general members of the Legislature is justified.

## Methodology and Rationale

The proposed upward adjustment in legislative salary levels is based on changes in the average annual wages for the State of Hawai i's wage and salary jobs. In 1993. the average annual wage was $\$ 26.544$ as compared to the legislative salary level at that time of $\$ 32.000$. In 2001, the latest year for which data are available, the average wages had increased by 17.7 percent to $\$ 31.241$ (Table 2).

Adjusting the legislative salary levels by average wages was chosen over the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Inasmuch as the CPI would reflect the change in prices of goods on the market. average wages were considered to be a more appropriate index - reflecting both inflation and changes in wages within the labor market.

The recommended increase of $6.7 \%$ in the 2005 salary level is based on the average annual growth rate of average wages for the last seven years for which data are available. As such, the 2003 salary level is first estimated by adjusting the current $\$ 32,000$ level by the average annual growth rate of average wages from 1992 to 1999. After determining an estimate of a salary level for 2003, the level for 2004 is estimated by adjusting the 2003 level by the average annual growth rate of average wages from 1993 to 2000. Similarly, the 2005 level is adjusted by the growth rate of average wages between 1994 and 2001.

Average changes over seven years were chosen to reduce the impact of the year-to-year fluctuations in average wages. Since average wage data for 2002 are not available until October of 2003, the change was estimated over seven years rather than eight years, which is the time period between the past and current salary commission.
When the average wages for 2005 are available in 2007, the Commission proposes that a new salary level should be determined for 2007 based on the average annual growth rate of average wages between 1998 and 2005, representing the last seven years for which current data are available.

For example the adjustment factor in 2007:

$$
=\{[(\text { average wages in } 2005) /(\text { average wages in } 1998)]\} \wedge(1 / 7)
$$

This adjustment factor is multiplied by the 2005 salary level to compute the 2007 level. Accordingly, the salary levels for 2009 and 2011 could be adjusted when the average wage data become available for the previous two years. It should be noted that the Commission proposes a cap of 2.5 percent per year or 5.0 percent for two years on any increase.
The estimated figures in Tables 1 and Table 2 for years 2007.2009. and 2011 are for illustrative purposes only and do not reflect the Commission's actual proposals for these years. Salaries in those years will need to be calculated using the Average Annual Wage index as provided for in the above example.

The rationale for the increase from $\$ 5.000$ to $\$ 7.500$ of the extra salary for the Senate President and the House Speaker is generally based on the current difference in salary leveis between State agency department directors and their deputies.
Table 1. Recommended Legislative Salary Adjustment for 2005 and Example of Proposed

| Year | (1) Legislative Salary | (2) <br> Percent <br> Change <br> in Average <br> Annual <br> Wages | (3) <br> Average <br> Annual <br> Wages | (4) <br> Percent Change <br> (7 Yr. Av.) | (5) Adjusted Legislative Salary by Wages $(7$ Yr. Av.) | (6) <br> Percent Change in Adjusted Salaries $1 /$ (Every 2 yrs.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 | \$32,000 | 2.2 | \$34,082 | 2.3 | \$34,200 | 6.7 |
| 2006 | \$32,000 | 2.2 | \$34,832 | 2.3 | \$35,000 |  |
| 2007 | \$32,000 | 2.2 | \$35,598 | 2.2 | \$35,900 | 5.0 |
| 2008 | \$32,000 | 2.2 | \$36,382 | 2.2 | \$36,700 |  |
| 2009 | \$32,000 | 2.2 | \$37,182 | 2.2 | \$37,500 | 4.6 |
| 2010 | \$32,000 | 2.2 | \$38,000 | 2.2 | \$38,300 |  |
| 2011 | \$32,000 | 2.2 | \$38,836 | 2.2 | \$39,200. | 4.4 |
| 2012 | \$32,000 | 2.2 | \$39,690 | 2.2 | \$40,000 |  |

[^66]Table 2. 2002 LEGISLATIVE SALARY COMMISSION WORKSHEET


[^67][^68]Figure 1: Options for Legislative Salary Increase
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## Recommendations of the Commission

Based on its objective analysis, the 2002 Legislative Salary Commission proposes the following recommendations for upward adjustment of the legislative salary levels starting in 2005.

## Recommendations:

- Increase the current $\$ 32,000$ legislative salary level by $6.7 \%$ in 2005 to $\$ 34,200$.
- Increase the legislative salary levels every two years thereafter $(2007.2009,2011)$ based on the annual average growth rate in annual average wages. The annual average growth rate of average wages is calculated using the last seven years for which current wage data are available from the Department of Labor \& Industrial Relations. However, this percentage increase should not exceed 2.5 percent per year or a total of 5.0 percent for any two year period after 2005.
- Increase in 2005, the salary differential for the Senate President and the House Speaker from $\$ 5.000$ to $\$ 7,500$. This annual $\$ 7,500$ difference in salary levels will be in effect and should remain the same at least through 2011 when the next salary commission's recommendations would take effect.
- Recommend that the non-salary components of compensation for the legislators including per diem be reviewed by the agencies/entities, which can effectuate changes to those items as appropriate.

Table 1 summarizes the Commission's recommendations and illustrates an example of the proposed salary changes for 2007, 2009 and 2011, if average wages were increasing hypothetically by 2.2 percent per year between 2002 and 2011. It should be noted that based on the proposed 2.5 percent maximum allowable growth cap in salary levels between 2005 and 2011, the proposed increase in salary level could not exceed $\$ 40,500$ in 2011. This represents a maximum allowable increase of 18.4 percent by 2011 over the current level.

## Justification:

Since 1993, private and public salary levels have been upgraded while legislative salary levels have been held at $\$ 32,000$ per year. If legislative salaries had been periodically increased to correspond with economic changes, the current salary level would exceed the 2002 Commission's recommendation for the 2005 legislature.

For example, between 1993 and 2002, the CPI increased by 12.6 percent (from 160.1 to 180.3 ). Had the legislative salary kept pace with the CPI, 2002 salary levels would have risen to $\$ 35,250$. Using another statistical index, the average annual wages in Hawai i increased by 17.7 percent from $\$ 26,544$ in 1993 to $\$ 31.241$ in 2001 (see Table 2).

The Commission's recommendation of a 6.7 percent upward adjustment for 2005 is considerably less than the increases in either of these two statistical indices since 1993 (see Figure 1). The Commission's proposed incremental increase for 2007.2009 and 2011 are less than or equal to 2.5 percent per year.

## APPENDIX A

## Questions \& Answers

The following questions and answers provide an overview of what the 2002 Legislative Salary Commission is doing and why.

## 1. What is the $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ Legislative Salary Commission?

The periodic appointment of public individuals to review and make recommendations on legislative salaries is mandated by our State Constitution. The 2002 Commission is the third such commission established pursuant to Article III, Section 9 of the Hawai` i State Constitution, which provides:
"There shall be a commission on legislative salary, which shall be appointed by the governor on or before November 30, 1978, and every eight years thereafter. Not later than the fortieth legislative day of the 1979 regular legislative session and every eight years thereafter, the commission shall submit to the legislature and the governor recommendations for a salary for members of the legislature, and then dissoive. The recommended salary submitted shall become effective as provided in the recommendation unless the legislature disapproves the recommendation by adoption of a concurrent resolution prior to adjournment sine die of the legislative session in which the recommendation is submitted or the governor disapproves the plan by a message of disapproval transmitted to the legislature prior to such adjournment. Any change in salary which becomes effective shall not apply to the legislature to which the recommendation for the change in salary was submitted."

The 2002 Legislative Salary Commission is required to submit recommendations to adjust the salaries of the Hawai'i State Legislature to both the Legislature and the Governor. Those recommendations take effect unless the Legislature or the Governor disapproves by the end of the 2003 legislative session. Upon submission of its recommendations, the Commission is dissolved. The next Commission will be appointed by the Governor on or before November 30, 2010.

Members of the 2002 Commission are: Warren Daspit (Chair), Sharon Narimatsu, Marie Okamura (Vice-chair), Tom Sugita, and Howard Tagomori.

## 2. What is the $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ Commission's philosophy?

In carrying out its task to make recommendations regarding legislative salary adjustments for the eight years between 2005 and 2012, the Commission reviewed and analyzed Hawai' $i$ 's legislative salaries dating back to 1978. Even in these difficult fiscal times, it is the mission of the Legislative Salary Commission to fairly review current legislative salaries and to determine what should be considered fair compensation for carrying out legislative duties. In this regard, the Commission has discussed and adopted the following to guide its mission:

- Hawai'i State legislators are deserving of some form of an increase in salary in 2005 , as opposed to maintaining the status quo or imposing a decrease in pay.
- Though the Hawai i Legislature is officially considered part-time, the amount of time and energy actually required to sufficiently address constituency demands throughout the year carries beyond the regular definition of part-time.
- Any salary increase should occur every two-years to coincide with each new legislature and to reflect traditional budget cycles.
- Non-salary benefits will be considered in its deliberations, although the Commission cannot make recommendations affecting these benefits.
- The Commission recognizes and wants to maintain a minimum $\$ 5,000$ pay differential for the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.


## 3. When do the Commission's recommendations become effective?

- The salary recommendations offered by the Commission affect the Legislators between 2005 and 2012. The current Legislature is unaffected by the 2002 Commission's recommendations.


## 4. What are legislators current salaries?

- State legislators in Hawai` i currently earn $\$ 32,000$ per year, with the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House receiving $\$ 37,000$ per year.


## 5. What are legislators' current non-salary benefits?

- Legislators earn no vacation or sick leave and are not eligible for overtime. They receive the same holidays as other State employees.
- Medical and other insurance is determined on the same basis as other State employees, as are personal savings options such as deferred compensation and savings bond deductions.
- Contributory retirement for legislators is consistent with that of State judges $3.5 \%$.
- While on official business, all legislators are eligible to receive $\$ 80$ per diem for neighbor island travel (this includes neighbor island legislators attending session on $O^{`}$ ahu) and $\$ 130$ per diem for mainland travel. This is consistent with other State employees. During the interim, however, all legislators are eligible to receive $\$ 10$ per diem for official business conducted on their home island.
- Ail legislators are eligible for downtown parking stalls during session at the standard State rate. Free parking at all State airports is offered.
- All legislators receive a $\$ 5,000$ expense account, though there are stringent regulations and limitations on how that money may be spent.


## 6. Why does the Commission feel a raise is necessary?

- Hawai'i's legislators have not received a salary adjustment for 10 years and have earned the same salary since 1993. In 1995, the Legislature did not approve any salary adjustments recommended by the 1994 Legislative Salary Commission.
- The time frame between the operation of each commission, their recommendations, and any subsequent salary adjustments can be as much as twelve years. If the current Commission should recommend salary adjustments, the soonest these could take effect would be in 2005, and illustrates the potential twelve year lag between 1993 and 2005.
- Should no salary adjustments be recommended or approved under this Commission, the next opportunity for salary adjustments will not be until 2012 or a time lag of 19 years.


## 7. How can the public receive information or provide comments?

- Handouts will be available at each of the public informational meetings. Anyone wishing to have information mailed to them can call either Kerry Yoneshige at 586-0696 or Scott Derrickson at 587-2805.
- The Commission has a web site where information about the Commission and downloadable files covering common questions and the draft methodologies and salary options are available. The address of the site is:
www.hawaii.gov/dbedt/op/Salary_Commission
- The general public can provide comments orally at public informational meetings scheduled on March 13 (Maui), March 14 (Hilo, Lihu`e), or March 17 ( \(\mathrm{O}^{`} \mathrm{ahu}\) ) or at any of the regular scheduled public meetings of the Commission.
- Written comments will be received up until March 21, 2003 and can be sent to P.O. Box 119, Attn: Kerry Yoneshige, Honolulu, Hawai` i 96810-0119. Another option is providing comments via e-mail to kerry.k.yoneshige@hawaii.gov or sderrick@dbedt.hawaii.gov


## APPENDIX B

## Scenarios \& Options

The following scenarios and options are being presented by the 2002 Legislative Salary Commission for review and comment. All salary levels shown in this document are for the purpose of illustrating the application of a given scenario. Once a specific method for determining legislative salaries has been selected, the proposed salary levels may vary from the figures shown.

Although the current Commission was appointed in 2002 and makes its recommendations to the Governor and Legislature in 2003, any salary adjustments will not go into effect until 2005 at the earliest. This is pursuant to language within Article III, Section 9 of the Hawai i State Constitution. Therefore, the draft salary options contained within this document show adjusted salaries beginning with 2004 when the Commission makes the recommendations.

## DEFINITIONS

## Scenario:

As used within this document, a scenario is a method used to determine how legislative salaries could be calculated. The Commission is currently considering the use of two different scenarios: Scenario 1 utilizes the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and Scenario 2 utilizes an Average Annual Wages index. These scenarios provide commonly used statistical measures that would allow either one-time or periodic adjustments to occur.

## Consumer Price Index (CPI):

The consumer price index (CPI) is a statistical measure of change over time in the prices of various commodities and services in major expenditure groups such as food, housing, apparel, transportation, health and recreation typically purchased by urban consumers. Essentially it measures the purchasing power of consumers' dollars by comparing what a fixed market basket of goods and services costs today with what that same market basket cost at an earlier date. The CPI is often called the "cost of living index" since it reflects the buying habits of a population. However it measures only price changes which is just one of several important factors affecting living costs.

## Average Annual Wages:

The statewide average annual wages for all workers covered by State and federal unemployment insurance programs are tabulated by the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations (DLIR). DLIR computes the average annual wages by dividing total wages by the corresponding average annual employment. According to DLIR, employment reflects the number of employees who worked for employers subject to Unemployment Insurance, technically referred to as covered employment. This represents all full-time and part-time employees who worked during or received pay for the payroll period including the twelfth of each month. Wages include all remuneration paid to covered civilian workers.

## Option:

As used within this document, an option represents different ways or assumptions to adjust the base salary using one of the scenarios. The Commission currently is considering two different options for each of the Scenarios. Option 1 (Adjust from 2002) assumes that a scenario will be applied beginning in 2002, the year in which this Commission was appointed and began its deliberations. Option 2 (called Catch Up) assumes a scenario will be applied starting with 1994, the year when the last Legislative Salary Commission made recommendations.

## SCENARIO 1: CPI INDEX

The last time Legislative salaries were adjusted was in 1993. Between 1993 and 2003, these salaries have remained the same at $\$ 32.000$. Therefore, it may be argued that legislative salaries have not kept pace with increases in the cost of living in Hawai'i. Based on changes in the Honolulu Consumer Price Index for urban dwellers (CPI-U) since 1993, the current legislative salary level is 10.2 percent below a CPI-adjusted salary level for 2002. To recoup this diminished buying power, legislators would have had to earn about $\$ 36,700$ in 2004 verses their current salary of $\$ 32,000$. This erosion in earning power will continue and worsen if salaries are not adjusted to reflect the higher prices of goods and services in market. Scenario 1 uses the rate of change in the CPI to adjust salaries.

The CPI fluctuates from year to year. In order to smooth out these yearly fluctuations, the CPI factor that will be used to adjust salaries for a given year represents a moving eight year average. This average uses the previous eight years CPI to arrive at a CPI factor that is then multiplied by the current year salary. The resulting figure represents the next year's salary. The most current CPI figures are for 2002. Therefore, for the purpose of illustrating the application of Scenario 1 under each option - CPI rates for future years has been assumed to be $2.0 \%$ per year.

Option 1 (Adjust from 2002)
This option begins application of the CPI starting with 2002 and adjusts the current base salary of $\$ 32,000$. Under Option 1, the 2003 salary level is adjusted by average annual change in CPI from 1993 to 2001 . Once the salary level for 2003 is estimated, it is adjusted by the average annual change in CPI between 1994 and 2002 to adjust the 2004 salary level. In a similar fashion the 2012 salary level is adjusted by the average annual change in CPI between 2002 and 2010. See Table 1 under Scenario 1, Option 1.

## Option 2 (Catch Up)

This option begins application of the CPI starting with 1994 and begins adjusting the base salary at that time which was $\$ 32,000$. The "catch up" option attempts to make the 2004 year salary level equal in buying power to that of $\$ 32,000$ in 1994. To do that, each year the salary is readjusted by the average annual change in CPI up to 2004. Each year thereafter, until 2012, the salary is readjusted by the annual change in CPI. See Table 1 under Scenario 1, Option 2.

Table 1. Draft Legislative Salary Options for 2004 1/ and 2012

|  | Options | Adjusted Salary | 2004 | $20123 /$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Scenarios | Scenario 1 | Option 1 <br> (adj, from <br> 2002) <br> Option 2 <br> (catch up) | Using the growth rate in CPI 2/ | $\$ 32,800$ |

1/ Not implemented until 2005.
2/ Average annual growth rate in CPI for previous 8 years.
$3 /$ These projected salary levels are purely hypothetical based on the assumption that CPI will increase by 2 percent annualiy and average wages will increase by 2.2 percent annually.

## SCENARIO 2: Average Annual Wages

The last time Legislative salaries were adjusted was in 1993. Between 1993 and 2003, these salaries have remained the same at $\$ 32,000$. Legislative salaries in 1993 were approximately the same as average annual wages for that year. Therefore, it may be argued that legislative salaries have not kept pace with increases in the average annual wages in Hawai'i. Scenario 2 uses the rate of change in the average annual wages to adjust salaries.

The Annual Average Wages generally increases from year to year to reflect positive changes in productivity and inflation. In order to smooth out these yearly variations, the Annual Average Wages factor that could be used to adjust salaries for a given year represents a moving seven year average. This average uses the previous seven years Average Annual Wages figures to arrive at an Average Annual Wages factor that is then multiplied by the current year salary. The resulting figure represents the next year's salary. The most current Average Annual Wages figures are for 2001. Therefore, for the purpose of illustrating the application of Scenario 2 under each option - the growth in Average Annual Wages for future years has been assumed to be $2.2 \%$ per year.

Option 1 (Adjust from 2002)
This option begins application of the Average Annual Wages factor starting with 2002 and adjusts the current base salary of $\$ 32,000$. Under Option 1, the 2003 salary level is adjusted by the yearly growth in the average annual wages from 1993 to 2000. Once the salary level for 2003 is estimated, it is adjusted by the yearly growth in average annual wages between 1994 and 2001 to adjust the 2004 salary level. In a similar fashion the 2012 salary level is adjusted by the yearly growth in average annual wages between 2002 and 2009. See Table 2 under Scenario 2, Option 1.

## Option 2 (Catch Up)

This option begins application of the Average Annual Wages factor starting with 1994 and begins adjusting the base salary at that time which was $\$ 32,000$. The "catch up" option attempts to make the 2004 year salary level and beyond equal to the average wage for each year. To do that, each year the salary is readjusted by the yearly growth in average annual wages. The salary is readjusted accordingly until 2012. See Table 2 under Scenario 2, Option 2.

Table 2. Draft Legislative Salary Options for 2004 1/ and 2012

| Scenarios | Options | Adjusted Saiary | 2004 | $20123 /$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario 2 | Option 1 <br> (adj. from <br> 2001) <br> Option 2 <br> (catch up) | Using the growth rate in average wages 2/ | $\$ 33,400$ | $\$ 40,100$ |

$1 /$ Not implemented until 2005.
$2 /$ Average annual growth rate in average wages for previous 7 years.
$3 /$ These projected salary levels are purely hypothetical based on the assumption that CPI will increase by 2 percent annually and average wages will increase by 2.2 percent annually.

## APPENDIX C

## Results of State Legislator Survey

## 2002 Legislative Salary Commission Results of Legislator Survey

 (sent to all 2003 Legislators who held office in 2002)Number of Surveys sent to Legisiators $=76$
Number of Surveys returned by Legisiators $=\mathbf{4 3}$
Survey Response rate $=\mathbf{5 7} \%$

## Responses to Questions

1) Please estimate the number of hours per week you spent on legislative duties or activities during calendar year 2002.

## Average during session $=62$ hours/week

Average during interim $=30$ hours/week
2) Do you consider the Legislature your primary employment?

$$
Y e s=30 \quad N o=12
$$

3) Did you have employment other than as a Legislator during 2002?

$$
Y e s=32 \quad N o=11
$$

If yes, how many hours per week did you work at all other employment combined in 2002?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Average during session }=8 \text { hours/week } \\
& \text { Average during interim }=25 \text { hours/week }
\end{aligned}
$$

4) The 1986 Legislative Salary Commission recommended an incremental increase after four years of an eight-year salary plan. Would you prefer twoyear increases, four-year increases, or some other increment if the total was the same?

Two-year $=23$
Four-year $=7 \quad$ Other $=9$
No
increase $=2$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Annual }=1 \\
& \text { Every } 8 \text { years }=6
\end{aligned}
$$

## APPENDIX D

Public Meetings Notice and Press Release

## NEWS RELEASE

For immediate release: March 24, 2003

## 2002 Legislative Salary Commission To Make Recommendation

At 10:00 a.m. on March 25, 2003, the Legislative Salary Commission (the Commission) will convene to approve its final report and to submit to the Legislature and the Govemor, its recommendation for legislative salary adjustments which would be effective from 2005. "The recommendation embodies a goal of the Commission to establish a process to keep the Legislature's salaries somewhat comparable with the market place," said Chair Warren Daspit.

Key points of the recommendation will be.

- Increases based on the average annual growth rate in the average annual wages over the previous seven years period.
- Salary adjustments to occur every two years based on the changes in the index.
- A salary cap of 2.5 percent for any increase in any given year.
- Additional compensation for the Senate President and House Speaker increased from $\$ 5,000$ to $\$ 7,500$.

The Commission's meeting on March 25, 2003 will be at the Kalanimoku Building, Room 410, 1151 Punchbowl Street. The final report will be available at the Commission's website - http://www.hawaii.gov/dbet/op/salary commission.htm after March 25, 2003. For hardcopy requests of the final report, contact Kerry Yoneshige at (808) 586-0696 or Scott Derrickson at (808) 587-2805.

For Immediate Release: March 11, 2003
Legislative Salary Commission News Release

## 2002 LEGISLATIVE SALARY COMMISSION PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS

STATEWIDE - The 2002 Legislative Salary Commission has scheduled a series of public informational meetings to discuss proposed salary recommendations for State Legislators. These meetings will be for the purpose of presenting draft recommendations to the public and soliciting public input. The meeting will begin with formal presentations to provide an overview of the Commission's mandate, discuss the methodology and salary options under consideration, and then solicit public comment on the draft recommendations.
The Hawaii State Constitution, Article III Section 9, calls for the appointment of a legislative salary commission every eight years to make recommendations to the Governor and the State Legislature for adjusting the salaries of State legislators. Members of the Legisiative Salary Commission were appointed by former Governor Benjamin J. Cayetano on November 30, 2002. The Commission's purpose is to submit to the State Legisiature and the Governor recommendations for a salary for members of the Legislature no later than March 25th of the regular session of 2003.

Meetings will be held using the State's video-conferencing capabilities at three neighbor island sites and the State Capitol Auditorium. Further information on the meetings and draft recommendations can be found at the Salary Commission's website -
http://www.hawaii.gov/dbedt/op/salary_commission.htm.

Thursday March, 13
4:15-6:00 p.m.
Wailuku Videoconference Center
Wailuku Judiciary Building
2145 Main Street, First Floor
Friday March 14
4:15-6:00 p.m.
Lihu` Videoconference Center
Lihu'e State Office Building
3060 Eiwa Street, Basement

Friday, March 14
4:15-6:00 p.m.
Hilo Video Conference
Hilo State Office Building
75 Aupuni Street, Basement
Monday, March 17
4:15-6:00 p.m.
State Capitol Auditorium
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

For additional information or to have information mailed to you - contact: Kerry Yoneshige at (808) 586-
0696 or Scott Derrickson at (808) 587-2805. Public comments will be accepted by mail at P.O Box 119, Attention: Kerry Yoneshige, Honolulu, Hawai' $96810-0119$ or via e-mail to kerry.k.yoneshige@hawaii.gov or sderrick@dbedt.hawaii.gov.

## Public Notice <br> 2002 Legislative Salary Commission <br> Public Informational Meetings

The 2002 Legislative Salary Commission will be holding public informational meetings at the locations and dates listed below. These meetings will be for the purpose of presenting draft recommendations to the public and soliciting public input. The meetings will be utilizing the video-conferencing facilities at State office buildings.

The Hawai` i State Constitution calls for the appointment of a legislative salary commission every eight years to make recommendations to the Governor and the State Legislature for adjusting the salaries of State legislators.

The meeting will begin with formal presentations to provide an overview of the Commission's mandate, discuss the methodology and salary options under consideration, and then solicit public comment on the draft recummendations. . Copies of the draft options and other material will be available at the meeting sites or can be viewed and downloaded from the internet from the Salary Commission's website: www.hawaii.gov/dbedt/op/Salary Commission.htm

Thursday March, 13
4:15-6:00 p.m.
Wailuku Videoconference Center
Wailuku Judiciary Building
2145 Main Street, First Floor
Wailuku, HI 96793
Monday March 17
4:15-6:00 p.m.
State Capitol Auditorium
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Friday March, 14
4:15-6:00 p.m.
Hilo Videoconference Center
Hilo State Office Building
75 Aupuni Street, Basement
Hilo, HI 96720
Friday March 14
4:15-6:00 p.m.
Lihu'e Videoconference Center
Lihu'e State Office Building
3060 Eiwa Street, Basement
Lihu'e, HI 96766

For additional information or to have information mailed to you - contact: Kerry Yoneshige at (808) $586-0696$ or Scott Derrickson at (808) 587-2805. Public comments will be accepted by mail at 1151 Punchbowl Street, Room 412, Attention: Kerry Yoneshige, Honolulu, Hawai`i 96813 or via e-mail to kerry.k.yoneshige@hawaii.gov or sderrick@dbedt.hawaii.gov

## APPENDIX E

## Local Media Coverage

# Starbulletin.com 

Tuesday, March 18, 2003

# Panel considers legislator pay raise 

## Raises of 2.5 percent to

 14.7 percent are being suggestedBy Richard Borreca<br>rborreca@starbulletin.com

A new legislative salary commission is considering various plans to give pay raises to the 76 legislators ranging from 2.5 percent to 14.7 percent every two years until 2012.
The suggested raises would then put the salaries at between $\$ 40,100$ and $\$ 46,400$ by 2012 , depending on what method is used to calculate the increase.

The salary commission meets every eight years to recommend a salary for the legislators. The pay raises go into effect automatically unless two-thirds of each chamber or the governor reject them.

Because the Legislature previously rejected a pay raise, the legislative pay has remained at $\$ 32,000$ since 1993.

Commission members said in a draft statement, "Legislators are deserving of some form of an increasing salary in 2005, as opposed

The commission must send its recommendations to the Legislature before the legislative sessions ends in May.

Commission members are Warren Daspit, chairman; former state Tax Director Marie Okamura, vice chairwoman; Sharon Narimatsu; Tom Sugita; and former Maui police Chief Howard Tagomori.

The salary increases would be for lawmakers starting in 2005. Commissioners are also recommending that salary increases should occur every two years to coincide with each new legislative cycle.

The commission said it also wanted to retain the $\$ 5,000$ pay differential above a legislator's salary for the Senate president and speaker of the House.
Besides the $\$ 32,000$ pay, lawmakers now get $\$ 5,000$ for personal expenses. They also are eligible for downtown state parking at rates lower than those for private facilities, and free parking at state airports. They get the same medical and insurance benefits as other state employees, and contributory retirement is the same as for state judges.
Commissioners are basing their choices on adjusting the salary through either the consumer price index or average annual wages.

Legislative reaction appears divided on the need for an increase.
Senate Democratic leader Colleen Hanabusa said the plan would have to come to the Legislature before any discussion can take place.
"They should look at a cost-of-living increase," said Hanabusa (D, Nanakuli-Makua). "It has been a number of years since there has been a pay raise."
She added, "The bottom line is, let us debate it and decide."
Republican Sen. Sam Slom, however, said he was against any pay raise.
"This is public service," said Slom (R, Diamond Head-Hawaii Kai).
"All of us got in here knowing they would make a financial sacrifice."

But Sen. Brian Taniguchi (D, Manoa), Ways and Means Committee chairman, said that while he "wasn't really thinking of this as being a moneymaking venture," he acknowledges that a pay increase is needed.
"I am hoping they do something that will be reasonable," Taniguchi said.
"If you don't, just the wealthy and the really poor would be able to run," he said.
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## Lawmakers likely to get raise in 2005

By Bruce Dunford

Associated Press
The state's Legislative Salary Commission, a panel named by the governor once every eight years, voted yesterday to recommend that pay for members of the House and Senate be increased every two years, based on the growth rate in the average annual wages in Hawai'i.

The increase, starting in 2005, would be the first pay raise for the 25 senators and 51 representatives since 1987 , when their pay was set at $\$ 32,000$ with an additional $\$ 5,000$ each for the Senate president and House speaker.

Under the state constitution, lawmakers, before the 2003 session ends May 1, would need to approve a concurrent House and Senate resolution to reject the latest commission's recommendation, or Gov. Linda Lingle could reject it. Otherwise, the recommendation goes into effect.
Because it won't take effect until 2005, only 13 members of the Senate who are now serving four-year terms would get the higher pay without first having to be re-elected. House members all serve two-year terms.

Lawmakers now make $\$ 32,000$ a year. Under the proposal, pay for lawmakers in office in 2005 would go to $\$ 34,200$, based on the average annual growth rate in the average annual wages over the previous seven years.
It's estimated the salaries would climb to $\$ 35,900$ in 2007, \$37,600 in 2009 and $\$ 39,200$ in 2011 at which time the next salary commission would be convened. The annual growth based on the average annual wages would be capped at 2.5 percent.

In a separate motion yesterday, the commission voted to recommend the additional pay for House speaker and Senate president increase from $\$ 5,000$ to $\$ 7,500$, effective in 2005 , putting the salaries for those offices at about $\$ 46,700$.

Commission Chairman Warren Daspit said the commission wanted to establish a system linking the pay of legislators to the growth in wages in the community.
"That's why we moved to a two-year indexing process because we feel that'll be helpful in terms of keeping the Legislature's salaries somewhat in line with what goes on in the regular marketplace," he said.
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## 2004 REPORT OF THE

## EXECUTIVE SALARY COMMISSION

FEBRUARY 17, 2004

Members:
Mr. Raymond H. Fujii, Chairperson
Ms. Sherrilee K. Dodson, Vice-Chairperson
Mr. Harold W. Bradshaw, Jr.
Ms. Clarice Y. Hashimoto
Mr. Dean K. Hirata

The Honorable Members of the
Twenty-Second Legislature
State of Hawai'i
State Capitol
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Ladies and Gentlemen:

## Introduction and Legislative Intent

In 2003, Act 122 established Section 26-55, Hawaii Revised Statutes, which created the Executive Salary Commission (ESC). Act 122 specifically mandates:
"(a) There is established within the department of human resources development, for administrative purposes only, the executive salary commission. The commission shall consist of five members. Two members shall be appointed by the president of the senate, two members shall be appointed by the speaker of the house of representatives, and one member shall be appointed by the chief justice of the supreme court. Vacancies in these positions shall be filled in the same manner. The members of the commission shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for expenses necessary for the performance of their duties.
(b) The commission shall review the salaries of the governor, the lieutenant governor, the administrative director of the State, and the department heads or executive officers of the departments of accounting and general services, agriculture, attorney general, budget and finance, business, economic development, and tourism, commerce and consumer affairs, Hawaiian home lands, health, human resources development, human services, labor and industrial relations, land and natural resources, public safety, taxation, and transportation. The commission, shall also review the salary of the deputy to the superintendent of education. The commission shall recommend an appropriate salary for the governor, the lieutenant governor, and each department head or executive officer, and appropriate salary ranges for the deputy department heads. The commission may recommend different salaries for department heads and executive officers and different salary ranges for deputies or assistants to department heads;
provided that the commission shall recommend the same salary range for deputies or assistants to departments heads within the same department; provided further that the appointing official shall specify the salary for a particular position within the applicable range.
(c) The commission may seek assistance from the department of human resources development and any other agency in conducting its review, and all agencies shall fully cooperate with the commission and provide any necessary information to the commission upon request.
(d) The commission shall convene in the month of November 2003, and every eight years thereafter. Not later than the fortieth legislative day of the regular session of 2004, and every eight years thereafter, the commission shall submit a report of its findings and its salary recommendations to the legislature, through the governor. The commission may include incremental increases that take effect over the span of years occurring prior to the convening of the next salary commission. The recommended salaries submitted by the commission shall become effective July 1 of the next fiscal year unless the legislature disapproves the recommended salaries submitted by the commission through the adoption of a concurrent resolution, which shall be approved by a simple majority of each house of the legislature, prior to adjournment sine die of the legislative session in which the recommended salaries are submitted; provided that, pursuant to section 3 of article V of the State Constitution, the salaries of the governor and the lieutenant governor shall not be decreased for their respective terms and the new salaries shall not take effect until the beginning of the next term for those offices. The governor shall include the salary amounts, recommended by the commission and approved by the legislature, in the executive budget. If the salary amounts recommended by the commission are disapproved by the legislature, the commission shall reconvene in the month of November following the legislature disapproval to review the legislature's reasons for disapproving its salary recommendation. The commission may submit a report of its findings and submit a new salary recommendation to the legislature of the next regular session. The commission's reconvening following a legislative disapproval shall not toll the eight year cycle."

After reviewing various 2003 standing committee reports relating to Act 122, we, the Executive Salary Commission have clearly addressed a number of the Legislative concerns and intentions found therein. Most notably, the Commission's recommendations will address Legislative
concerns and intentions regarding incremental increases throughout the eight year span occurring prior to the convening of the next salary commission; present Executive salaries have not been modified since 1990, resulting in grossly outdated salaries when compared to other states and the private sector; and many qualified individuals are not presently willing or financially able to serve in appointed government positions because the financial sacrifice is too great. As mentioned in one committee report, "The public will benefit from efficient management of government operations and services as a result of greater numbers of qualified individuals willing to serve in government positions". This will be a direct positive result of our following recommendations to increase salaries for State executives incrementally in the coming years.

## Process and Findings

On November 4, 2003, the Executive Salary Commission held its initial meeting. We nominated and unanimously elected Mr. Raymond H. Fujii as our chairperson and Ms. Sherrilee K. Dodson as vice-chairperson. Other Commission members are Mr. Harold W. Bradshaw, Jr.; Ms. Clarice Y. Hashimoto and Mr. Dean K. Hirata.

After reviewing Act 122, related State \& Counties (See Attachment 1), and National Data, we decided additional data would be useful and requested the following information:
a. Input from the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, each Department Head, each Deputy Department Head, the Administrative Director of the State, and the Deputy to the Superintendent of Education regarding salary recommendations and information for their individual positions.
b. A copy of the Council of Revenues latest forecast.
c. Revised tables covering National Data on Selected State Administrative Officials from the Book of the States.

At our next meeting on December 2, 2003, we received the additional requested information on the "Council of Revenues" latest forecast report (see Attachment 2) and revised tables covering the National Data on selected States Administrative Officials from the 2003 Book of the States (See Attachment 3). We were also provided information on retirement benefits that the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Administrative Director of the State, State Directors, and Deputy Directors are entitled to from Mr. David Shimabukuro, Employees' Retirement System Administrator.

At our next meeting on December 9, 2003, we acknowledged receipt of the "Departmental Submissions for the Executive Salary Commission" and the Department of Education's responses which amounted to over one inch of
printed material. After discussion, we decided to divide the fifteen departments into groups of three for further study by individual Commission members who would report their findings back to the entire Commission at subsequent meetings. We decided to utilize the following factors to evaluate the Departments:
a. Number of employees supervised.
b. Amount of operating budgets.
c. Comparison to comparable private sector jobs (market data).
d. Other state's and counties' data.
e. Benefits.

Other significant factors we considered were the last State executive pay raises had been effective January 1, 1990; incremental raises would be part of our recommendations; different rates for the various departments would be explored; and the current and future economic condition of the State needed to be considered. We also felt that all present incumbents entered these Executive positions knowing what the current salaries are, thus it is a fair expectation for them to continue to receive no less than those current salaries.

At this meeting, we also heard a presentation from Mr. Mark Fukuhara, Hawaii Employer - Union Health Benefits Trust Fund Administrator. Mr. Fukuhara pointed out there are no difference in the health fund benefits provided to top level executives and all other State employees.

Our next two meetings (December 19 and January 7) were spent receiving reports on the fifteen departments from our individual Commission members and seeking additional data as necessary. Materials presented were summarized and placed in a table - see Attachment 4.

## Recommendations

We decided to individually go over all materials presented and formulate tentative salary recommendations for all jobs being reviewed by ourselves. Then, we all got together at our next meeting (January 15), discussed the jobs one by one, resolved any differences, and unanimously came up with our final recommendations. In our final overall review, two major factors we weighed heavily were (1) the "Council of Revenues" projections which links into the current and future economic conditions of the State; and (2) the fact that the last State executive pay raises were granted on January 1, 1990 - this means sixteen (16) years will have passed since our Governor, Lieutenant Governor and Administrative Director of the State will possibly receive recommended raises in 2006, and fourteen (14) years will have passed since our State Department Heads and Deputy Department Heads will possibly receive recommended raises
in 2004. Both of these factors, coupled with the State's tough financial economic position and our concern for the ability of our citizens to fund these increases, led us to our salary recommendations. The following table reflects our recommendations (effective July 1, 2004, for Department Heads and Deputies; effective 2006, for the Governor, Lieutenant Governor and the Administrative Director of the State):

| Department | Eff Dt | Title | Amount | Annual \% Increase Since Jan. 1, 1990 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | Governor | \$112,000 | 1.05\% |
|  | 2006 | Lt. Governor | \$100,000 | .66\% |
|  | 2006 | Administrative Director of the State | \$100,000 | .66\% |
| Dept of Attorney General | 2004 | Dept Head | \$105,000 | 1.50\% |
|  |  | Deputy Dept Head | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 91,350- \\ & \$ 96,600 \end{aligned}$ | 1.54\% |
| Dept of Health, Dept of Transportation, Dept of Accounting \& General Services, Dept of Commerce \& Consumer Affairs, Dept of Taxation, Dept of Budget \& Finance | 2004 | Dept Heads | \$100,000 | 1.14\% |
|  |  | Deputy Dept Heads | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 87,000- \\ & \$ 92,000 \end{aligned}$ | 1.19\% |
| Dept of Human Services, Dept of Labor \& Industrial Relations, Dept of Land and Natural Resources, Dept of Business \& Economic Development and Tourism |  | Dept Heads | \$95,000 | .77\% |
|  |  | Deputy Dept Heads | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 82,650- \\ & \$ 87,400 \end{aligned}$ | .82\% |
| Dept of Human Resources Development, Dept of Hawaiian Home Lands, Dept of Agriculture, Dept of Public Safety | 2004 | Dept Heads | \$90,000 | .38\% |
|  |  | Deputy Dept Heads | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \$ 78,300- \\ \$ 82,800 \end{array}$ | .43\% |

In addition, we recommend a two percent compounded adjustment be made annually as reflected on Attachment 5.

Upon our review of the salary for the Deputy to the Superintendent of Education, we recommend deferring to the Board of Education on this matter.

The Commission respectfully submits these recommendations for your final review and approval.

Sincerely,

Raymond H. Fujii, Chairperson

Sherrilee K. Dodson, Vice-Chairperson

Harold W. Bradshaw, Jr.

Clarice Y. Hashimoto

Dean K. Hirata

## COMPARISON OF EXECUTIVE PAY RATES FOR STATE AND COUNTIES

|  | STATE | C\&C HONOLULU | HAWAII | MAUI | KAUAI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Positions |  |  |  |  |  |
| GOVERNOR | 94,780 |  |  |  |  |
| LT. GOVERNOR | 90,041 |  |  |  |  |
| MAYOR |  | 112,200 | 85,050 | 96,000 | 73,118 |
| M.D./ADMIN. ASS'T. |  | 107,100 | 79,296 | 90,000 | 70,193 |
| DEPUTY M.D. |  | 102,000 | 75,516 |  |  |
| PROS ATTORNEY |  | 99,807 | 80,208 | 83,000 | 69,371 |
| 1ST DEPUTY P.A. |  | 94,554 | 75,516 | 79,000 | 64,168 |
| DEPUTIES <br> (Pros Atty \& Corp Counsel) |  | 35,382-98,508 | 40,104-72,192 | 44,136-69,264 | 41,622-64,168 |
| DEPT. HEADS | 85,302 | $99,807$ 110,206 <br> (Police, Fire) | $\begin{gathered} 75,516 \\ 94,068 \\ \text { (Water) } \end{gathered}$ | 83,000 <br> (Police, Public Wks, Water) | $69,371$ <br> (Corp Counsel ,Planning, Finance, Public Wks, Water) |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 106,044 \\ \text { (Water) } \end{gathered}$ | $91,599$ <br> (Police, Fire) | $80,000$ <br> (Corp Counsel, Finance Per, Planning, Fire, Transportation) | $\begin{gathered} 66,073 \\ \text { (Per, Fire, Comm Asst. } \\ \text { Police, C. Clerk) } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | 79,512 <br> (City Clerk) |  | 77,000 <br> (Liquor, Hsing, Personnel) | 64,731 <br> (Eco Dev) |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 55,000 \\ \text { (Liquor) } \end{gathered}$ |
| DEPUTIES | 72,886-77-966 | $\begin{gathered} 94,554 \\ \text { 104,583 } \\ \text { (Police Fire) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 71,928 \\ 87,804 \\ \text { (Water) } \end{gathered}$ | $79,000$ <br> (Police, Public Works, Water) | 41,622-64,168 <br> (Planning, Finance, <br> Public Wks, Water) |
|  |  | $100,992$ <br> (Water) | $87,232$ <br> (Police, Fire) | $76,000$ <br> (1st Corp Counsel, Fire, Finance, Per., Planning | $\begin{gathered} 36,671-61,118 \\ \text { (Police, C Clerk) } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  | $73,000$ <br> (Hsing, Personnel Liquor) |  |
| SPEAKER/PRES | 37,000 |  |  |  |  |
| MEMBERS HSE/SEN | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON |  | 48,450 | 36,312 | 48,000 | 31,938 |
| COUNCIL MEMBERS |  | 43,350 | 32,700 | 44,000 | 28,744 |



RICK VON GNECHTEN<br>VICE-CHAIRMAN<br>\section*{MEMBERS:}<br>Carl S. Bonham<br>Vito Galati<br>Pearl Imada Iboshi<br>Ernest K. Nishizaki<br>Jack P. Suyderhoud

# COUNCIL ON REVENUES 

September 15, 2003

The Honorable Linda Lingle
Governor, State of Hawaii
Executive Chambers
State Capitol, Fifth Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

## Dear Governor Lingle:

At its meeting of September 15, 2003, the Council on Revenues confirmed that the general fund tax growth rates for the current fiscal biennium will be $6.2 \%$ for FY2004 and $6.9 \%$ for FY2005. Details of the updated forecasts of state general fund tax revenues for FY2004 to FY2010 are presented in the attached table 1.

The latest economic data indicate that Hawaii's economy was growing slightly better than expected in FY2003. For FY2004, while the visitor industry is expected to grow moderately, the Council found that the construction industry output will increase at a rapid pace. The indicator of future private construction, the value of private building authorizations, grew more than $40 \%$ in FY2003. State government construction expenditures, based on data provided by the Department of Budget and Finance, are projected to grow about $25 \%$ in the current fiscal year. The Department of Taxation estimated that recent changes in the federal tax laws will provide an estimated increase in disposable income of about $\$ 420$ million in FY2004. Also, the Council expects that total personal income will increase about 5.0\% in FY2004 and 5.2\% in FY2005.

Tax revenue data for the first two months of the current fiscal year indicate that the Council's tax revenue projections are very consistent with the current trend, considering technical factors such as weekend effect, the $\$ 16.5$ million transfer of franchise tax payment under protest from the general fund to the litigated claims fund and variations in income tax refunds. While tax credits will continue to impact the growth rate of tax revenues, forecasts of tax credits are subject to large measurement errors due to lack of data. As a result, the Council continues to reiterate the challenge of forecasting revenues over the next several years as the impacts of significant changes in tax laws, especially recent business incentive tax credits, interact with external factors such as volatile capital market and geopolitical events.

As always, the Council assumes that the State will not be subject to any other unusual occurrences, potential losses due to decreases in federal allocations, or any prolonged or crippling strikes, and has considered existing tax laws only.

Estimates for general fund non-tax revenues have been increased for FY2004, primarily due to transfers from non-general funds pursuant to Act 178, SLH 2003. Special Fund non-tax revenues have been increased for FYs 2004-09, primarily due to increased federal grants for the Unemployment Insurance

Program and increased transfers from general obligation bond funds to the Educational Facilities Improvement Special Fund. Other than Special Fund Revenues have been increased for FYs 2004-09, primarily due to higher amounts for federal grants; including Department of Human Services (Medicaid, Social Services Block grants, and Foster Care) and Department of Education (English as a Second Language and At-Risk Student) federal grants; including Department of Defense impact aid to the Department of Education.

Please advise us if we can be of further assistance or if we can answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. SKLARZ
Chairman
Attachments

ESTIMATES OF GENERAL FUND TAX REVENUE: FY 2004 to FY 2010

| (in thousands of dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TYPE OF TAX | ACTUAL |  | ESTIMATED |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | FY 2004 | FY 2005 | FY 2006 | FY 2007 | FY 2008 | FY 2009 | FY 2010 |
| General Excise \& Use 4/ | \$1,612,333 | \$1,792,699 | \$1,865,713 | \$1,949,538 | \$2,047,110 | \$2,148,665 | \$2,251,990 | \$2,364,068 | \$2,481,682 |
| Income - Individual | 1,071,239 | 1,037,706 | 1,132,657 | 1,233,142 | 1,312,050 | 1,403,795 | 1,492,021 | 1,587,282 | 1,684,810 |
| Income - Corporation | 45,477 | 8,262 | 26,256 | 34,960 | 34,746 | 72,139 | 78,219 | 85,162 | 91,029 |
| Public Service Company | 93,406 | 114,115 | 126,870 | 138,713 | 149,907 | 160,744 | 171,410 | 182,069 | 192,851 |
| Insurance Premiums | 67,941 | 73,240 | 78,509 | 83,089 | 86,523 | 97,025 | 107,505 | 116,081 | 122,244 |
| Tobacco \& Licenses 1/ | 64,469 | 71,273 | 88,320 | 94,469 | 96,335 | 98,388 | 100,602 | 102,742 | 104,959 |
| Liquor \& Permits | 39,091 | 41,186 | 42,477 | 43,822 | 45,032 | 46,264 | 47,506 | 48,746 | 50,001 |
| Banks \& Other Fin Corps 5/ | 5,164 | 20,341 | $(8,517)$ | 9,784 | 11,688 | 13,182 | 14,292 | 15,496 | 16,598 |
| Inheritance \& Estate 2/ | 16,624 | 15,524 | 10,490 | 5,468 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Miscellaneous | 5,515 | 6,231 | 6,791 | 7,230 | 7,520 | 7,793 | 8,058 | 8,317 | 8,579 |
| Transient Accommodation Tax 3/ | 27,271 | 1,466 | 8,400 | 10,374 | 10,942 | 11,545 | 12,175 | 12,826 | 13,509 |
| NET TOTAL | \$3,048,530 | \$3,182,043 | \$3,377,966 | \$3,610,589 | \$3,801,853 | \$4,059,540 | \$4,283,778 | \$4,522,789 | \$4,766,262 |
| GROWTH RATE | -3.5\% | 4.4\% | 6.2\% | 6.9\% | 5.3\% | 6.8\% | 5.5\% | 5.6\% | 5.4\% |

## Notes:

1/ Act 246, SLH 2002, raises the cigarette tax to 6 cents each on October 1, 2002; to 6.5 cents on July 1, 2003; and to 7 cents on July 1, 2004.
2/ Federal Economic Growth and Tax Relief Act of 2001 phases out the federal estate tax and the state credit.
3/ Deposits of $44.8 \%$ of TAT revenues to counties (Act 156, SLH 1998); 32.6\% to tourism special fund and $5.3 \%$ to TAT trust fund (Act 250, SLH 2002); $17.3 \%$ to convention center enterprise fund (Act 253, SLH 2002); all net of general fund deposits of excess of fund ceilings.
4/ Act 100, SLH 2003, provides a nonrefundable attractions \& educational facilities tax credit equal to $100 \%$ of certain costs incurred after May 31, 2003, \& before June 1, 2009, for the development of such facilities at Ko Olina Resort \& Marina \& the Makaha Resort. Of the maximum $\$ 7.5$ million credit per year, the General Fund loss is estimated at $\$ 4$ million.
5/ Transfers \$16.5 million of the franchise tax to the Litigated Claims Fund in 2004.

Extracted from "The Book of the States, 2003, Volume 35"
The Council of State Governments

| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Gov | Key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New York | E | 179,000 |  |
| 2 | Michigan | M | 177,000 |  |
| 3 | California | W | 175,000 |  |
| 4 | New Jersey | E | 157,000 |  |
| 5 | Illinois | M | 150,691 |  |
| 6 | Connecticut | E | 150,000 |  |
| 7 | Pennsylvania | E | 144,416 |  |
| 8 | Washington | W | 139,087 |  |
| 9 | Massachusetts | E | 135,000 | jj |
| 10 | Wyoming | W | 130,000 |  |
| 11 | Georgia | S | 127,303 |  |
| 12 | Ohio | M | 126,485 |  |
| 13 | Virginia | S | 124,855 | kk |
| 14 | Wisconsin | M | 122,406 |  |
| 15 | Minnesota | M | 120,303 |  |
| 16 | Florida | S | 120,171 |  |
| 17 | Missouri | S | 120,087 |  |
| 18 | Maryland | S | 120,000 |  |
| 19 | North Carolina | S | 118,430 |  |
| 20 | Nevada | W | 117,000 |  |
| 21 | Texas | S | 115,345 |  |
| 22 | Delaware | E | 114,000 |  |
| 23 | Iowa | M | 107,482 |  |
| 24 | South Carolina | S | 106,078 |  |
| 25 | Kentucky | S | 103,018 |  |
| 26 | Mississippi | S | 101,800 |  |
| 27 | Alabama | S | 101,432 |  |
| 28 | Oklahoma | S | 101,040 |  |
| 29 | New Hampshire | E | 100,690 |  |
| 30 | Utah | W | 100,600 |  |
| 31 | Idaho | W | 98,500 |  |
| 32 | Kansas | M | 95,446 |  |
| 33 | South Dakota | M | 95,389 |  |
| 34 | Arizona | W | 95,000 |  |
| 35 | Indiana | M | 95,000 |  |
| 36 | Louisiana | S | 95,000 |  |
| 37 | Rhode Island | E | 95,000 |  |
| 38 | Hawaii | W | 94,780 |  |
| 39 | Oregon | W | 93,600 |  |
| 40 | Colorado | W | 90,000 |  |
| 41 | New Mexico | W | 90,000 |  |
| 42 | West Virginia | S | 90,000 |  |
| 43 | Montana | W | 88,190 |  |
| 44 | Vermont | E | 88,026 |  |
| 45 | Tennessee | S | 85,000 |  |
| 46 | Alaska | W | 83,280 |  |
| 47 | North Dakota | M | 83,013 |  |
| 48 | Arkansas | S | 71,738 |  |
| 49 | Maine | E | 70,000 |  |
| 50 | Nebraska | M | 65,000 |  |


| RANK | 38 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 111,354 |
| MEDIAN | 102,409 |


| Regional average | E | 123,086 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | M | 112,565 |
| Regional Average | W | 107,311 |
| Regional average | S | 105,908 |
| Regional Average <br> without California | W | 101,670 |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Lt Gov | Key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New York | E | 151,500 |  |
| 2 | California | W | 131,250 |  |
| 3 | Michigan | M | 123,000 |  |
| 4 | Massachusetts | E | 120,000 | (j) |
| 5 | Pennsylvania | E | 119,399 |  |
| 6 | Illinois | M | 115,235 |  |
| 7 | Florida | S | 115,112 |  |
| 8 | North Carolina | S | 104,523 |  |
| 9 | Maryland | S | 100,000 |  |
| 10 | Texas | S | 99,122 |  |
| 11 | Hawaii | W | 90,041 |  |
| 12 | Kentucky | S | 87,580 |  |
| 13 | Louisiana | S | 85,008 |  |
| 14 | Georgia | S | 83,148 |  |
| 15 | Rhode Island | E | 80,000 |  |
| 16 | Utah | W | 78,200 |  |
| 17 | Connecticut | E | 77,756 |  |
| 18 | Alaska | W | 77,712 |  |
| 19 | Missouri | S | 77,184 |  |
| 20 | Iowa | M | 76,698 |  |
| 21 | Indiana | M | 76,000 |  |
| 22 | Oklahoma | S | 75,530 |  |
| 23 | Ohio | M | 73,715 | (b) |
| 24 | Washington | W | 72,705 |  |
| 25 | Wisconsin | M | 69,579 |  |
| 26 | Colorado | W | 68,500 |  |
| 27 | New Mexico | W | 65,000 |  |
| 28 | North Dakota | M | 64,452 |  |
| 29 | Minnesota | M | 62,980 |  |
| 30 | Montana | W | 62,471 |  |
| 31 | Delaware | E | 60,000 |  |
| 32 | Mississippi | S | 60,000 |  |
| 33 | Nebraska | M | 60,000 |  |
| 34 | Vermont | E | 50,253 |  |
| 35 | Nevada | W | 50,000 |  |
| 36 | Tennessee | S | 49,500 | (s) |
| 37 | Alabama | S | 48,620 |  |
| 38 | South Carolina | S | 44,737 |  |
| 39 | Virginia | S | 36,321 |  |
| 40 | Arkansas | S | 34,673 |  |
| 41 | Kansas | M | 26,967 |  |
| 42 | Idaho | W | 26,000 |  |
| 43 | South Dakota | M | 12,635 | (ee) |


| RANK | 11 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 75,421 |
| MEDIAN | 75,530 |


| Regional Average | W | 74,914 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | M | 69,206 |
| Regional average | S | 68,816 |
| Regional average | E | 65,891 |
| Regional Average <br> without California | W | 70,219 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| Maine | E |  | (s) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Hampshire | E |  | $(\mathrm{s})$ |
| New Jersey | E |  | $(\mathrm{s})$ |
| West Virginia | S |  | $(\mathrm{s})$ |
| Arizona | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-2)$ |
| Oregon | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-2)$ |
| Wyoming | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-2)$ |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Secretary of State | Key |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New Jersey | E | 137,165 |  |  |
| 2 | Virginia | S | 128,479 |  |  |
| 3 | Tennessee | S | 127,308 |  |  |
| 4 | Michigan | M | 124,900 |  |  |
| 5 | California | W | 123,750 |  |  |
| 6 | Illinois | M | 123,700 |  |  |
| 7 | New York | E | 120,800 |  |  |
| 8 | Massachusetts | E | 120,000 |  |  |
| 9 | Texas | S | 117,546 |  |  |
| 10 | Florida | S | 116,056 |  |  |
| 11 | Georgia | S | 112,776 |  |  |
| 12 | Wyoming | W | 110,000 |  |  |
| 13 | Delaware | E | 103,900 |  |  |
| 14 | Pennsylvania | E | 102,343 |  |  |
| 15 | North Carolina | S | 94,552 |  |  |
| 16 | South Carolina | S | 92,007 |  |  |
| 17 | Ohio | M | 90,725 |  |  |
| 18 | Missouri | S | 90,471 |  |  |
| 19 | [Hawaii | W |  | (a-1) | 90,041] |
| 20 | Oklahoma | S | 90,000 |  |  |
| 21 | Washington | W | 89,004 |  |  |
| 22 | Louisiana | S | 85,000 |  |  |
| 23 | Iowa | M | 82,940 |  |  |
| 24 | Kentucky | S | 82,521 |  |  |
| 25 | Idaho | W | 80,000 |  |  |
| 26 | Nevada | W | 80,000 |  |  |
| 27 | Rhode Island | E | 80,000 |  |  |
| 28 | Vermont | E | 75,317 |  |  |
| 29 | Mississippi | S | 75,000 |  |  |
| 30 | Kansas | M | 74,148 |  |  |
| 31 | Oregon | W | 72,000 |  |  |
| 32 | Arizona | W | 70,000 |  |  |
| 33 | Maryland | S | 70,000 |  |  |
| 34 | Colorado | W | 68,500 |  |  |
| 35 | North Dakota | M | 68,000 |  |  |
| 36 | Montana | W | 67,512 |  |  |
| 37 | Alabama | S | 66,722 |  |  |
| 38 | Minnesota | M | 66,169 |  |  |
| 39 | Indiana | M | 66,000 |  |  |
| 40 | New Hampshire | E | 65,540 |  |  |
| 41 | Nebraska | M | 65,000 |  |  |
| 42 | New Mexico | W | 65,000 |  |  |
| 43 | West Virginia | S | 65,000 |  |  |
| 44 | South Dakota | M | 64,812 |  |  |
| 45 | Wisconsin | M | 62,549 |  |  |
| 46 | Connecticut | E | 50,000 |  |  |
| 47 | Arkansas | S | 43,000 |  |  |


| RANK | 19 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 87,526 |
| MEDIAN | 81,261 |


| Regional average | S | 91,027 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | E | 85,507 |
| Regional Average | W | 82,440 |
| Regional average | M | 80,813 |
| Regional Average <br> without California | W | 78,997 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| Alaska | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-1)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Hawaii | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-\mathbf{1})$ |
| Utah | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-1)$ |
| Maine | E |  | N.A. |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Attorney general |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New York | E | 151,500 |
| 2 | California | W | 148,750 |
| 3 | New Jersey | E | 137,165 |
| 4 | Illinois | M | 132,963 |
| 5 | Wisconsin | M | 127,868 |
| 6 | Washington | W | 126,443 |
| 7 | Georgia | S | 125,871 |
| 8 | Alabama | S | 124,951 |
| 9 | Michigan | M | 124,900 |
| 10 | Massachusetts | E | 122,500 |
| 11 | Florida | S | 118,957 |
| 12 | Tennessee | S | 118,416 |
| 13 | Pennsylvania | E | 118,262 |
| 14 | Delaware | E | 114,400 |
| 15 | Virginia | S | 110,667 |
| 16 | Nevada | W | 110,000 |
| 17 | Iowa | M | 105,430 |
| 18 | North Carolina | S | 104,523 |
| 19 | Missouri | S | 104,332 |
| 20 | Maryland | S | 100,000 |
| 21 | Oklahoma | S | 94,349 |
| 22 | Ohio | M | 93,434 |
| 23 | Minnesota | M | 93,000 |
| 24 | Texas | S | 92,217 |
| 25 | South Carolina | S | 92,007 |
| 26 | Mississippi | S | 90,800 |
| 27 | Vermont | E | 90,272 |
| 28 | Arizona | W | 90,000 |
| 29 | Wyoming | W | 89,067 |
| 30 | Alaska | W | 88,548 |
| 31 | Idaho | W | 88,500 |
| 32 | Kentucky | S | 87,580 |
| 33 | New Hampshire | E | 85,753 |
| 34 | Hawaii | W | 85,302 |
| 35 | Kansas | M | 85,267 |
| 36 | Louisiana | S | 85,000 |
| 37 | Rhode Island | E | 85,000 |
| 38 | Utah | W | 84,600 |
| 39 | Connecticut | E | 81,562 |
| 40 | South Dakota | M | 80,995 |
| 41 | Colorado | W | 80,000 |
| 42 | Indiana | M | 79,400 |
| 43 | Maine | E | 78,062 |
| 44 | Oregon | W | 77,200 |
| 45 | Montana | W | 75,550 |
| 46 | West Virginia | S | 75,000 |
| 47 | New Mexico | W | 72,500 |
| 48 | North Dakota | M | 71,076 |
| 49 | Nebraska | M | 64,500 |
| 50 | Arkansas | S | 59,781 |


| RANK | 34 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 91,404 |
| MEDIAN | 91,404 |


| Regional average | E | 106,448 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | S | 99,028 |
| Regional average | M | 96,258 |
| Regional Average | W | 93,574 |
| Regional Average <br> without California | W | 88,976 |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Adjutant general | Key |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | California | W | 146,785 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Hawaii | W | 143,879 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Connecticut | E | 140,272 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | New Jersey | E | 137,165 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Louisiana | S | 129,130 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | New York | E | 120,800 |  | RANK |  | 2 |
| 8 | North Dakota | M | 117,936 |  | AVERAGE |  | 98,786 |
| 9 | Michigan | M | 112,717 |  | MEDIAN |  | 92,248 |
| 10 | Washington | W | 112,594 |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Florida | S | 112,594 |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Georgia | S | 112,594 |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Oklahoma | S | 112,593 |  | Regional average | S | 95,436 |
| 14 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  | Regional average | M | 97,583 |
| 15 | Kentucky | S | 104,445 |  | Regional Average without California | W | 99,009 |
| 16 | Idaho | W | 102,440 |  | Regional average | E | 101,369 |
| 17 | Pennsylvania | E | 102,343 |  | Regional Average | W | 102,684 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

Massachusetts E ---

| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Administration | key |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Louisiana | S | 153,920 |  |  |
| 2 | South Carolina | S | 148,000 |  |  |
| 3 | Arizona | W | 129,224 |  |  |
| 4 | Virginia | S | 128,479 |  |  |
| 5 | Tennessee | S | 127,308 |  |  |
| 6 | California | W | 123,255 |  |  |
| 7 | Wisconsin | M | 122,000 |  |  |
| 8 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |  |
| 9 | Oregon | W | 120,876 |  |  |
| 10 | Illinois | M | 120,861 |  |  |
| 11 | Michigan | M | 120,000 |  |  |
| 12 | Massachusetts | E | 117,500 |  |  |
| 13 | Georgia | S | 116,093 |  |  |
| 14 | Arkansas | S | 115,960 |  |  |
| 15 | Pennsylvania | E | 115,000 |  |  |
| 16 | Florida | S | 113,877 |  |  |
| 17 | Missouri | S | 111,156 |  |  |
| 18 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  |  |
| 19 | Washington | W | 106,130 |  |  |
| 20 | Iowa | M | 105,772 |  |  |
| 21 | Rhode Island | E | 105,570 |  |  |
| 22 | Nevada | W | 103,301 |  |  |
| 23 | North Carolina | S | 102,119 |  |  |
| 24 | Maryland | S | 99,379 | (b) |  |
| 25 | Delaware | E | 96,900 |  |  |
| 26 | Kansas | M | 93,884 |  |  |
| 27 | Maine | E | 91,208 |  |  |
| 28 | Vermont | E | 90,210 |  |  |
| 29 | Indiana | M | 89,962 |  |  |
| 30 | South Dakota | M | 89,918 |  |  |
| 31 | Alaska | W | 88,548 |  |  |
| 32 | New Hampshire | E | 85,753 |  |  |
| 33 | [Hawaii | W |  | (a-9) | 85,302] |
| 34 | Mississippi | S | 85,000 |  |  |
| 35 | Kentucky | S | 84,580 |  |  |
| 36 | Wyoming | W | 84,067 |  |  |
| 37 | Connecticut | E | 84,000 |  |  |
| 38 | Idaho | W | 82,098 |  |  |
| 39 | Alabama | S | 81,600 | (b) |  |
| 40 | Texas | S | 81,120 |  |  |
| 41 | Nebraska | M | 78,663 |  |  |
| 42 | Utah | W | 76,000 | (b) |  |
| 43 | Oklahoma | S | 75,000 |  |  |
| 44 | West Virginia | S | 75,000 |  |  |
| 45 | Ohio | M | 73,715 | (b) |  |


| RANK | 33 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 102,787 |
| MEDIAN | 102,710 |


| Regional average | S | 104,752 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | M | 100,318 |
| Regional Average | W | 99,012 |
| Regional Average <br> without California | W | 96,991 |
| Regional average | E | 78,614 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| New Jersey | E |  | N.A. |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| New York | E |  | N.A. |
| North Dakota | M |  | N.A. |
| Hawaii | W |  | $(a-9)$ |
| Montana | W |  | $(a-4)$ |
| New Mexico | W |  | $(a-16)$ |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Agriculture | key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New Jersey | E | 137,165 |  |
| 2 | California | W | 131,412 |  |
| 3 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |
| 4 | New York | E | 120,800 |  |
| 5 | Michigan | M | 120,000 |  |
| 6 | Florida | S | 119,415 |  |
| 7 | Illinois | M | 113,114 |  |
| 8 | Connecticut | E | 110,913 |  |
| 9 | Georgia | S | 110,247 |  |
| 10 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  |
| 11 | Washington | W | 106,130 |  |
| 12 | North Carolina | S | 104,523 |  |
| 13 | Pennsylvania | E | 102,343 |  |
| 14 | Wisconsin | M | 100,800 |  |
| 15 | Arizona | W | 100,000 |  |
| 16 | Oregon | W | 99,396 |  |
| 17 | Maryland | S | 99,379 | (b) |
| 18 | Delaware | E | 96,900 |  |
| 19 | Missouri | S | 95,846 |  |
| 20 | Texas | S | 92,217 |  |
| 21 | South Carolina | S | 92,007 |  |
| 22 | Virginia | S | 90,327 |  |
| 23 | South Dakota | M | 89,918 |  |
| 24 | Tennessee | S | 89,688 |  |
| 25 | Massachusetts | E | 89,001 |  |
| 26 | Kansas | M | 88,640 |  |
| 27 | Iowa | M | 87,990 |  |
| 28 | Maine | E | 87,692 |  |
| 29 | Kentucky | S | 87,580 |  |
| 30 | Arkansas | S | 86,587 |  |
| 31 | Hawaii | W | 85,302 |  |
| 32 | Idaho | W | 85,072 |  |
| 33 | Louisiana | S | 85,000 |  |
| 34 | Nevada | W | 82,451 |  |
| 35 | Montana | W | 80,703 |  |
| 36 | Nebraska | M | 80,693 |  |
| 37 | Oklahoma | S | 80,000 |  |
| 38 | Mississippi | S | 75,000 |  |
| 39 | Vermont | E | 74,859 |  |
| 40 | Indiana | M | 74,431 |  |
| 41 | Wyoming | W | 73,568 |  |
| 42 | Alaska | W | 71,604 |  |
| 43 | New Mexico | W | 70,512 |  |
| 44 | West Virginia | S | 70,000 |  |
| 45 | Ohio | M | 66,851 | (b) |
| 46 | North Dakota | M | 66,509 |  |
| 47 | Alabama | S | 66,258 |  |
| 48 | Utah | W | 64,600 | (b) |
| 49 | New Hampshire | E | 64,036 |  |
| 50 | Rhode Island | E | 46,379 | (b) |


| RANK | 31 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 90,869 |
| MEDIAN | 88,821 |


| Regional average | E | 93,009 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | M | 90,668 |
| Regional average | S | 90,292 |
| Regional Average | W | 90,150 |
| Regional Average <br> without California | W | 86,712 |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Budget | key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Kentucky | S | 185,000 |  |
| 2 | New York | E | 161,949 |  |
| 3 | California | W | 131,412 |  |
| 4 | Connecticut | E | 130,118 |  |
| 5 | Georgia | S | 126,283 |  |
| 6 | Michigan | M | 125,000 |  |
| 7 | Pennsylvania | E | 122,500 |  |
| 8 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |
| 9 | Illinois | M | 120,500 |  |
| 10 | New Jersey | E | 120,000 |  |
| 11 | Florida | S | 119,982 |  |
| 12 | Virginia | S | 116,977 |  |
| 13 | Texas | S | 115,648 |  |
| 14 | Maryland | S | 115,456 | (b) |
| 15 | Delaware | E | 111,200 |  |
| 16 | Massachusetts | E | 110,496 |  |
| 17 | Oregon | W | 109,620 |  |
| 18 | South Carolina | S | 105,168 |  |
| 19 | Louisiana | S | 104,811 |  |
| 20 | Arizona | W | 100,000 |  |
| 21 | Alaska | W | 99,732 |  |
| 22 | North Dakota | M | 96,228 |  |
| 23 | Arkansas | S | 95,224 |  |
| 24 | Rhode Island | E | 95,188 | (b) |
| 25 | Indiana | M | 93,561 |  |
| 26 | Iowa | M | 93,376 |  |
| 27 | Nebraska | M | 91,693 |  |
| 28 | Wisconsin | M | 91,417 |  |
| 29 | Tennessee | S | 88,008 |  |
| 30 | New Hampshire | E | 85,753 |  |
| 31 | Hawaii | W | 85,302 |  |
| 32 | Kansas | M | 83,989 |  |
| 33 | Washington | W | 81,723 |  |
| 34 | Montana | W | 80,704 |  |
| 35 | Maine | E | 80,267 |  |
| 36 | Oklahoma | S | 80,000 |  |
| 37 | New Mexico | W | 76,877 |  |
| 38 | Utah | W | 76,000 | (b) |
| 39 | Alabama | S | 74,113 |  |
| 40 | Ohio | M | 73,715 | (b) |
| 41 | West Virginia | S | 72,396 |  |
| 42 | Wyoming | W | 71,294 |  |
| 43 | Mississippi | S | 58,876 |  |


| RANK | 31 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 101,832 |
| MEDIAN | 96,228 |


| Regional average | E | 109,176 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | S | 106,526 |
| Regional average | M | 96,862 |
| Regional Average | W | 93,667 |
| Regional Average <br> without California | W | 90,490 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| Missouri | S |  | N.A. |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Nevada | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| Idaho | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-15)$ |
| Minnesota | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-15)$ |
| North Carolina | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-15)$ |
| South Dakota | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-15)$ |
| Vermont | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-15)$ |


| Rank | State or other <br> jurisdiction | Region | Finance | key |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Connecticut | E | 178,001 |  |  |
| 2 | South Carolina | S | 148,000 |  |  |
| 3 | California | W | 131,412 |  |  |
| 4 | Washington | W | 131,246 |  |  |
| 5 | Tennessee | S | 127,308 |  |  |
| 6 | Pennsylvania | E | 122,500 |  |  |
| 7 | North Carolina | S | 121,435 |  |  |
| 8 | Arkansas | S | 115,960 |  |  |
| 9 | Maryland | S | 115,456 | (b) |  |
| 10 | Virginia | S | 112,653 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Delaware (h) | E | 111,200 |  |  |
| 12 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  |  |
| 13 | New Jersey | E | 106,742 |  |  |
| 14 | Kentucky | S | 104,445 |  |  |
| 15 | Arizona | W | 100,748 |  |  |
| 16 | Wisconsin | M | 98,000 |  |  |
| 17 | South Dakota | M | 96,445 |  |  |
| 18 | North Dakota | M | 96,228 |  |  |
| 19 | Missouri | S | 93,211 |  |  |
| 20 | Oklahoma | S | 90,000 |  |  |
| 21 | New Mexico | W | 86,447 |  |  |
| 22 | [Hawaii | W |  | (a-6) | $85,302]$ |
| 23 | Mississippi | S | 85,000 |  |  |
| 24 | Vermont | E | 81,723 |  |  |
| 25 | Idaho | W | 80,122 |  |  |
| 26 | Wyoming | W | 77,000 |  |  |
| 27 | Alaska | W | 76,536 |  |  |
| 28 | Alabama | S | 74,113 |  |  |
| 29 | Utah | W | 68,350 | (b) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| RANK | 22 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 104,953 |
| MEDIAN | 102,597 |


| Regional average | E | 114,314 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | S | 108,986 |
| Regional average | M | 99,948 |
| Regional average | W | 91,203 |
| Regional average <br> without California | W | 87,853 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| Colorado | W |  | $(a-9)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Florida | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-9)$ |
| Georgia | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-4)$ |
| Hawaii | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-6)$ |
| Illinois | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-6)$ |
| Indiana | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-6)$ |
| Iowa | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-9)$ |
| Kansas | M |  | --- |
| Louisiana | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| Maine | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| Massachusetts | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| Michigan | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-6)$ |
| Montana | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-6)$ |
| Nebraska | M |  | $(\mathrm{z})$ |
| Nevada | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-9)$ |
| New Hampshire | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| New York | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-9)$ |
| Ohio | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-6)$ |
| Oregon | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-4)$ |
| Rhode Island | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-6)$ |
| Texas | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-9)$ |
| West Virginia | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
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| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Commerce | key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Mississippi | S | 152,700 |  |
| 2 | Georgia | S | 141,755 |  |
| 3 | New Jersey | E | 137,165 |  |
| 4 | Wyoming | W | 130,000 |  |
| 5 | Virginia | S | 128,479 |  |
| 6 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |
| 7 | Illinois | M | 120,861 |  |
| 8 | New York | E | 120,800 |  |
| 9 | Michigan | M | 120,000 |  |
| 10 | Maryland | S | 115,456 | (b) |
| 11 | North Dakota | M | 115,008 |  |
| 12 | Arizona | W | 115,000 |  |
| 13 | Texas | S | 112,352 |  |
| 14 | Oregon | W | 109,620 |  |
| 15 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  |
| 16 | Kansas | M | 108,246 |  |
| 17 | Pennsylvania | E | 108,028 |  |
| 18 | Washington | W | 106,130 |  |
| 19 | Oklahoma | S | 105,660 |  |
| 20 | Nevada | W | 103,301 |  |
| 21 | Wisconsin | M | 101,899 |  |
| 22 | Alabama | S | 100,000 |  |
| 23 | North Carolina | S | 92,378 |  |
| 24 | Idaho | W | 88,858 |  |
| 25 | Alaska | W | 88,548 |  |
| 26 | New Hampshire | E | 85,753 |  |
| 27 | Hawaii | W | 85,302 |  |
| 28 | South Dakota | M | 84,760 |  |
| 29 | Vermont | E | 82,160 |  |
| 30 | Indiana | M | 79,950 |  |
| 31 | Ohio | M | 73,715 | (b) |
| 32 | Iowa | M | 71,768 |  |
| 33 | Montana | W | 70,420 |  |
| 34 | West Virginia | S | 70,000 |  |
| 35 | Utah | W | 64,600 | (b) |


| RANK | 27 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 103,436 |
| MEDIAN | 106,130 |


| Regional average | M | 97,074 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | W | 97,452 |
| Regional average <br> without California | W | 97,452 |
| Regional average | E | 100,296 |
| Regional average | S | 113,641 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| Tennessee | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-11)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Arkansas | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-11)$ |
| Kentucky | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-11)$ |
| Louisiana | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-11)$ |
| Maine | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-11)$ |
| Massachusetts | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-11)$ |
| Missouri | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-11)$ |
| Nebraska | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-11)$ |
| New Mexico | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-11)$ |
| Rhode Island | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-11)$ |
| Delaware | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-2)$ |
| South Carolina | S |  | $(\mathrm{c})$ |
| Connecticut | E |  | --- |
| Florida | S |  | --- |
| California | W |  | N.A. |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Comptroller | key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New York | E | 151,500 |  |
| 2 | California | W | 140,000 |  |
| 3 | North Carolina | S | 130,078 |  |
| 4 | Tennessee | S | 127,308 |  |
| 5 | Pennsylvania | E | 123,032 |  |
| 6 | Florida | S | 118,957 |  |
| 7 | Massachusetts | E | 116,016 |  |
| 8 | Colorado | W | 115,776 |  |
| 9 | Alabama | S | 115,458 |  |
| 10 | Illinois | M | 115,235 |  |
| 11 | Iowa | M | 110,739 |  |
| 12 | Georgia | S | 110,234 |  |
| 13 | Virginia | S | 104,891 |  |
| 14 | Michigan | M | 100,246 |  |
| 15 | Maryland | S | 100,000 |  |
| 16 | North Dakota | M | 96,228 |  |
| 17 | Wisconsin | M | 96,025 |  |
| 18 | Oregon | W | 94,692 |  |
| 19 | Texas | S | 92,217 |  |
| 20 | South Carolina | S | 92,007 |  |
| 21 | Delaware | E | 90,100 |  |
| 22 | Kentucky | S | 87,664 |  |
| 23 | Nebraska | M | 86,351 |  |
| 24 | Hawaii | W | 85,302 |  |
| 25 | Alaska | W | 85,296 |  |
| 26 | Missouri | S | 85,164 |  |
| 27 | Mississippi | S | 85,000 |  |
| 28 | Rhode Island | E | 81,404 | (b) |
| 29 | Montana | W | 80,704 |  |
| 30 | Maine | E | 80,267 |  |
| 31 | Idaho | W | 80,000 |  |
| 32 | Nevada | W | 80,000 |  |
| 33 | Kansas | M | 77,254 |  |
| 34 | Oklahoma | S | 77,000 |  |
| 35 | Wyoming | W | 77,000 |  |
| 36 | Connecticut | E | 70,687 |  |
| 37 | West Virginia | S | 70,000 |  |
| 38 | New Hampshire | E | 67,473 |  |
| 39 | Arizona | W | 53,179 |  |


| RANK | 24 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 96,166 |
| MEDIAN | 92,007 |


| Regional average | S | 104,116 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | E | 98,220 |
| Regional average | M | 92,248 |
| Regional average | W | 86,365 |
| Regional average <br> without California | W | 81,895 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| New Jersey | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-6)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Louisiana | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| New Mexico | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-4)$ |
| Ohio | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-4)$ |
| Washington | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-4)$ |
| Indiana | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-23)$ |
| South Dakota | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-23)$ |
| Arkansas | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-15)$ |
| Minnesota | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-15)$ |
| Utah | W |  | $(\mathrm{a}-15)$ |
| Vermont | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-15)$ |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Corrections | key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Texas | S | 150,000 |  |
| 2 | Connecticut | E | 140,272 |  |
| 3 | New Jersey | E | 137,165 |  |
| 4 | New York | E | 136,000 |  |
| 5 | California | W | 131,412 |  |
| 6 | Arizona | W | 129,500 |  |
| 7 | South Carolina | S | 128,598 |  |
| 8 | Illinois | M | 127,576 |  |
| 9 | Michigan | M | 125,000 |  |
| 10 | Virginia | S | 123,879 |  |
| 11 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |
| 12 | Georgia | S | 119,576 |  |
| 13 | Massachusetts | E | 116,016 |  |
| 14 | Oregon | W | 115,101 |  |
| 15 | Rhode Island | E | 113,793 |  |
| 16 | Pennsylvania | E | 113,714 |  |
| 17 | Delaware | E | 111,200 |  |
| 18 | Arkansas | S | 110,897 |  |
| 19 | Florida | S | 110,639 |  |
| 20 | Oklahoma | S | 110,000 |  |
| 21 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  |
| 22 | Wisconsin | M | 107,664 |  |
| 23 | Washington | W | 106,130 |  |
| 24 | Iowa | M | 105,772 |  |
| 25 | Nevada | W | 103,301 |  |
| 26 | North Carolina | S | 102,119 |  |
| 27 | Kansas | M | 96,385 |  |
| 28 | Indiana | M | 96,193 |  |
| 29 | Missouri | S | 95,844 |  |
| 30 | Maine | E | 91,208 |  |
| 31 | Nebraska | M | 91,166 |  |
| 32 | Vermont | E | 89,694 |  |
| 33 | Tennessee | S | 89,688 |  |
| 34 | Alaska | W | 88,548 |  |
| 35 | Louisiana | S | 86,520 |  |
| 36 | New Mexico | W | 86,447 |  |
| 37 | Maryland | S | 85,594 | (b) |
| 38 | Hawaii | W | 85,302 |  |
| 39 | Kentucky | S | 85,000 |  |
| 40 | Mississippi | S | 85,000 |  |
| 41 | Alabama | S | 83,699 |  |
| 42 | New Hampshire | E | 83,477 |  |
| 43 | South Dakota | M | 81,619 |  |
| 44 | Wyoming | W | 81,567 |  |
| 45 | Montana | W | 77,600 |  |
| 46 | Utah | W | 76,000 | (b) |
| 47 | West Virginia | S | 75,000 |  |
| 48 | Ohio | M | 73,715 | (b) |
| 49 | North Dakota | M | 72,720 |  |


| RANK | 38 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 103,325 |
| MEDIAN | 103,301 |


| Regional average | S | 119,809 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | E | 113,254 |
| Regional average | W | 100,176 |
| Regional average | M | 98,746 |
| Regional average <br> without California | W | 97,336 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

Idaho W —| N.A.

| Rank | State or other <br> jurisdiction | Region | Economic <br> development | key |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Kentucky | S | 162,750 |  |
| 2 | Mississippi | S | 152,700 |  |
| 3 | Wyoming | W | 130,000 |  |
| 4 | Connecticut | E | 123,961 |  |
| 5 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |
| 6 | New York | E | 120,800 |  |
| 7 | Virginia | S | 116,113 |  |
| 8 | Massachusetts | E | 116,016 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Maryland | S | 115,456 | (b) |
| 10 | Louisiana | S | 114,400 |  |
| 11 | Alabama | S | 110,000 | (b) |
| 12 | Oregon | W | 109,620 |  |
| 13 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  |
| 14 | Iowa | M | 108,125 |  |
| 15 | Pennsylvania | E | 108,028 |  |
| 16 | Washington | W | 106,130 |  |
| 17 | Delaware | E | 103,900 |  |
| 18 | Arkansas | S | 103,761 |  |
| 19 | New Jersey | E | 99,800 |  |
| 20 | Missouri | S | 95,832 |  |
| 21 | Tennessee | S | 95,448 |  |
| 22 | Montana | W | 95,000 |  |
| 23 | Nevada | W | 92,243 |  |
| 24 | Maine | E | 91,208 |  |
| 25 | New Mexico | W | 86,466 |  |
| 26 | North Carolina | S | 86,285 |  |
| 27 | Utah | W | 85,425 |  |
| 28 | Hawaii | W | $\mathbf{8 5 , 3 0 2}$ |  |
| 29 | Alaska | W | 85,296 |  |
| 30 | Nebraska | M | 83,210 |  |
| 31 | South Dakota | M | 77,250 |  |
| 32 | Ohio | M | 73,715 | (b) |
| 33 | Wisconsin | M | 73,441 |  |
| 34 | Indiana | M | 73,125 |  |
| 35 | Vermont | E | 69,867 |  |
| 36 | New Hampshire | E | 64,036 |  |
| 37 | Idaho | 63,918 |  |  |
| 38 | Rhode Island | E | 535 | (b) |


| RANK | 28 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 99,102 |
| MEDIAN | 97,816 |


| Regional average | S | 119,809 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | W | 97,967 |
| Regional average <br> without California | W | 97,967 |
| Regional average | E | 95,525 |
| Regional average | M | 74,808 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| California | W |  | N.A. |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Michigan | M |  | N.A. |
| Oklahoma | S |  | N.A. |
| Kansas | M |  | (o) |
| West Virginia | S |  | (a-8) |
| South Carolina | S |  | (a-7)( c) |
| Arizona | W |  | (a-7) |
| Georgia | S |  | $(a-7)$ |
| Illinois | M |  | $(a-7)$ |
| North Dakota | M |  | $(a-7)$ |
| Texas | S |  | (a-7) |
| Florida | S |  | $(a-28)$ |


| Rank | State or other <br> jurisdiction | Region | General <br> services | key |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Connecticut | E | 140,272 |  |  |
| 2 | New York | E | 136,000 |  |  |
| 3 | California | W | 123,255 |  |  |
| 4 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |  |
| 5 | Virginia | S | 116,003 |  |  |
| 6 | Florida | S | 113,877 |  |  |
| 7 | Pennsylvania | E | 108,028 |  |  |
| 8 | Wisconsin | M | 105,836 |  |  |
| 9 | Rhode Island | E | 105,570 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | South Carolina | S | 102,944 |  |  |
| 11 | Arkansas | S | 102,863 |  |  |
| 12 | Michigan | M | 100,767 |  |  |
| 13 | Arizona | W | 97,690 |  |  |
| 14 | North Dakota | M | 96,228 |  |  |
| 15 | Texas | S | 95,000 |  |  |
| 16 | Tennessee | S | 89,688 |  |  |
| 17 | Georgia | S | 88,864 |  |  |
| 18 | New Mexico | W | 86,447 |  |  |
| 19 | New Hampshire | E | 85,753 |  |  |
| 20 | Vermont | E | 81,682 |  |  |
| 21 | Maine | E | 80,267 |  |  |
| 22 | Missouri | S | 80,196 |  |  |
| 23 | [Hawaii | W |  | (a-25) | $72,886]$ |
| 24 | Alabama | S | 72,101 |  |  |
| 25 | Utah | W | 64,750 | (b) |  |
| 26 | West Virginia | S | 59,756 |  |  |
| 27 | Nebraska | M | 59,000 |  |  |
| 28 | Montana | W | 58,275 |  |  |
| 29 | Ohio | M | 54,974 | (b) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| RANK | 23 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 93,832 |
| MEDIAN | 95,614 |


| Regional average | S | 130,592 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | E | 105,775 |
| Regional average | W | 93,257 |
| Regional average | M | 93,237 |
| Regional average <br> without California | W | 89,924 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| Alaska | W |  | N.A. |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Idaho | W |  | N.A. |
| Mississippi | S |  | N.A. |
| Nevada | W |  | N.A. |
| New Jersey | E |  | N.A. |
| Delaware (h) | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| Illinois | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| Indiana | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| Iowa | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| Kansas | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| Kentucky | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| Louisiana | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| Maryland | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| Massachusetts | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| Minnesota | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| North Carolina | S |  | (a-5) |
| Oklahoma | S |  | (a-5) |
| Oregon | W |  | (a-5) |
| South Dakota | M |  | (a-5) |
| Washington | W |  | (a-5) |
| Wyoming | W |  | (a-5) |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Health | key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Alabama | S | 177,076 |  |
| 2 | Arkansas | S | 165,287 |  |
| 3 | Georgia | S | 160,490 |  |
| 4 | Mississippi | S | 157,000 |  |
| 5 | Florida | S | 152,000 |  |
| 6 | Virginia | S | 147,778 |  |
| 7 | Connecticut | E | 140,272 |  |
| 8 | Delaware (h) | E | 138,000 |  |
| 9 | New Jersey | E | 137,165 |  |
| 10 | New York | E | 136,000 |  |
| 11 | Tennessee | S | 132,444 |  |
| 12 | Oregon | W | 129,942 |  |
| 13 | Illinois | M | 127,576 |  |
| 14 | Kansas | M | 126,875 |  |
| 15 | Rhode Island | E | 126,292 |  |
| 16 | Iowa | M | 126,141 |  |
| 17 | North Carolina | S | 125,966 |  |
| 18 | Arizona | W | 125,000 |  |
| 19 | Michigan | M | 125,000 |  |
| 20 | California | W | 123,255 |  |
| 21 | Missouri | S | 122,436 |  |
| 22 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |
| 23 | South Carolina | S | 116,199 |  |
| 24 | Massachusetts | E | 116,016 |  |
| 25 | Maryland | S | 115,456 | (b) |
| 26 | Pennsylvania | E | 113,714 |  |
| 27 | Texas | S | 112,352 |  |
| 28 | Washington | W | 112,216 |  |
| 29 | Indiana | M | 111,286 |  |
| 30 | Oklahoma | S | 110,000 |  |
| 31 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  |
| 32 | Louisiana | S | 103,416 |  |
| 33 | Wisconsin | M | 101,778 |  |
| 34 | Kentucky | S | 101,568 | (b) |
| 35 | Vermont | E | 99,091 |  |
| 36 | Idaho | W | 99,029 |  |
| 37 | Maine | E | 91,208 |  |
| 38 | West Virginia | S | 90,000 |  |
| 39 | South Dakota | M | 89,918 |  |
| 40 | New Mexico | W | 86,447 |  |
| 41 | Hawaii | W | 85,302 |  |
| 42 | Alaska | W | 85,296 |  |
| 43 | Nevada | W | 85,053 |  |
| 44 | North Dakota | M | 83,820 |  |
| 45 | Nebraska | M | 83,640 |  |
| 46 | Utah | W | 82,800 | (b) |
| 47 | Montana | W | 80,704 |  |
| 48 | Wyoming | W | 79,567 |  |
| 49 | New Hampshire | E | 76,603 |  |
| 50 | Ohio | M | 73,715 | (b) |


| RANK | 41 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 114,356 |
| MEDIAN | 114,585 |


| Regional average | S | 126,527 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | E | 119,474 |
| Regional average | M | 105,286 |
| Regional average | W | 99,678 |
| Regional average <br> without California | W | 97,713 |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Labor | key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New Jersey | E | 137,165 |  |
| 2 | California | W | 131,412 |  |
| 3 | New York | E | 127,000 |  |
| 4 | Connecticut | E | 123,961 |  |
| 5 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |
| 6 | Texas | S | 115,000 |  |
| 7 | Pennsylvania | E | 113,714 |  |
| 8 | Florida | S | 111,718 |  |
| 9 | Georgia | S | 110,260 |  |
| 10 | Washington | W | 110,015 |  |
| 11 | Arizona | W | 109,615 |  |
| 12 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  |
| 13 | Massachusetts | E | 108,000 |  |
| 14 | Wisconsin | M | 107,146 |  |
| 15 | Tennessee | S | 106,104 |  |
| 16 | Virginia | S | 105,748 |  |
| 17 | Illinois | M | 105,366 |  |
| 18 | North Carolina | S | 104,523 |  |
| 19 | Kentucky | S | 104,445 |  |
| 20 | South Carolina | S | 104,423 |  |
| 21 | Nevada | W | 103,301 |  |
| 22 | Louisiana | S | 102,752 |  |
| 23 | Ohio | M | 101,442 |  |
| 24 | Maryland | S | 99,379 | (b) |
| 25 | Rhode Island | E | 96,980 |  |
| 26 | Arkansas | S | 95,442 |  |
| 27 | Delaware (h) | E | 93,600 |  |
| 28 | Missouri | S | 92,952 |  |
| 29 | Maine | E | 91,208 |  |
| 30 | Kansas | M | 90,725 |  |
| 31 | Iowa | M | 89,958 |  |
| 32 | Alaska | W | 88,548 |  |
| 33 | Indiana | M | 88,505 |  |
| 34 | New Mexico | W | 86,447 |  |
| 35 | Idaho | W | 86,278 |  |
| 36 | Hawaii | W | 85,302 |  |
| 37 | Montana | W | 80,704 |  |
| 38 | South Dakota | M | 79,602 |  |
| 39 | Alabama | S | 74,113 |  |
| 40 | Nebraska | M | 72,521 |  |
| 41 | Oregon | W | 72,000 |  |
| 42 | Vermont | E | 70,533 |  |
| 43 | Oklahoma | S | 69,000 |  |
| 44 | Wyoming | W | 64,637 |  |
| 45 | Utah | W | 64,600 | (b) |
| 46 | New Hampshire | E | 64,036 |  |
| 47 | North Dakota | M | 60,600 |  |
| 48 | West Virginia | S | 60,000 |  |


| RANK | 36 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 95,633 |
| MEDIAN | 98,180 |


| Regional average | E | 102,620 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | S | 97,057 |
| Regional average | M | 93,099 |
| Regional average | W | 92,620 |
| Regional average <br> without California | W | 89,387 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| Mississippi | S |  | --- |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Michigan | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-7)$ |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Natural resources | key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | California | W | 131,412 |  |
| 2 | Virginia | S | 128,479 |  |
| 3 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |
| 4 | Michigan | M | 120,000 |  |
| 5 | Connecticut | E | 115,673 |  |
| 6 | South Carolina | S | 114,197 |  |
| 7 | Illinois | M | 113,114 |  |
| 8 | Georgia | S | 111,753 |  |
| 9 | New Jersey | E | 110,000 |  |
| 10 | Texas | S | 109,200 |  |
| 11 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  |
| 12 | Pennsylvania | E | 108,028 |  |
| 13 | Wisconsin | M | 108,000 |  |
| 14 | Maryland | S | 107,106 | (b) |
| 15 | Arizona | W | 107,000 |  |
| 16 | Iowa | M | 105,781 |  |
| 17 | Nebraska | M | 105,398 |  |
| 18 | Rhode Island | E | 103,789 |  |
| 19 | Nevada | W | 103,301 |  |
| 20 | North Carolina | S | 102,119 |  |
| 21 | Washington | W | 99,462 |  |
| 22 | Massachusetts | E | 99,396 |  |
| 23 | Louisiana | S | 96,063 |  |
| 24 | Missouri | S | 95,808 |  |
| 25 | Kansas | M | 92,225 |  |
| 26 | Maine | E | 91,208 |  |
| 27 | Indiana | M | 90,090 |  |
| 28 | South Dakota | M | 89,918 |  |
| 29 | Tennessee | S | 89,688 |  |
| 30 | Kentucky | S | 88,648 |  |
| 31 | Alaska | W | 88,548 |  |
| 32 | New Mexico | W | 86,447 |  |
| 33 | Oregon | W | 85,944 |  |
| 34 | New Hampshire | E | 85,753 |  |
| 35 | Hawaii | W | 85,302 |  |
| 36 | Vermont | E | 76,877 |  |
| 37 | Utah | W | 76,000 | (b) |
| 38 | Alabama | S | 74,113 |  |
| 39 | Ohio | M | 73,715 | (b) |
| 40 | Wyoming | W | 71,567 |  |
| 41 | Montana | W | 70,420 |  |
| 42 | West Virginia | S | 70,000 |  |
| 43 | North Dakota | M | 66,840 |  |
| 44 | Arkansas | S | 52,399 | (b) |


| RANK | 35 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 96,145 |
| MEDIAN | 97,730 |


| Regional average | E | 102,696 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | M | 97,575 |
| Regional average | S | 94,461 |
| Regional average | W | 93,884 |
| Regional average <br> without California | W | 90,472 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| Delaware (h) | E |  | N.A. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Idaho | W |  | $\ldots$ |
| Oklahoma | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-28)$ |
| Florida | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-14)$ |
| Mississippi | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-14)$ |
| New York | E |  | $(\mathrm{a}-14)$ |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Personnel | key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New Jersey | E | 137,165 |  |
| 2 | Alabama | S | 133,494 |  |
| 3 | Michigan | M | 127,508 |  |
| 4 | Connecticut | E | 123,961 |  |
| 5 | California | W | 123,255 |  |
| 6 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |
| 7 | New York | E | 120,800 |  |
| 8 | Pennsylvania | E | 119,042 |  |
| 9 | Georgia | S | 116,119 |  |
| 10 | Massachusetts | E | 116,016 |  |
| 11 | Virginia | S | 116,003 |  |
| 12 | South Carolina | S | 112,041 |  |
| 13 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  |
| 14 | Iowa | M | 105,772 |  |
| 15 | Kentucky | S | 104,445 |  |
| 16 | Delaware (h) | E | 103,900 |  |
| 17 | North Carolina | S | 102,119 |  |
| 18 | Washington | W | 100,589 |  |
| 19 | Oregon | W | 99,396 |  |
| 20 | Texas | S | 93,929 |  |
| 21 | Alaska | W | 91,824 |  |
| 22 | Wisconsin | M | 90,000 |  |
| 23 | Tennessee | S | 89,688 |  |
| 24 | Arizona | W | 88,500 |  |
| 25 | Nevada | W | 86,776 |  |
| 26 | Maryland | S | 85,594 | (b) |
| 27 | Hawaii | W | 85,302 |  |
| 28 | Missouri | S | 85,164 |  |
| 29 | Florida | S | 85,000 |  |
| 30 | Indiana | M | 84,142 |  |
| 31 | New Mexico | W | 83,000 |  |
| 32 | South Dakota | M | 82,451 |  |
| 33 | Idaho | W | 82,098 |  |
| 34 | Arkansas | S | 81,714 |  |
| 35 | Vermont | E | 81,682 |  |
| 36 | Rhode Island | E | 81,404 | (b) |
| 37 | Maine | E | 80,267 |  |
| 38 | Nebraska | M | 77,267 |  |
| 39 | New Hampshire | E | 76,603 |  |
| 40 | Utah | W | 76,000 | (b) |
| 41 | Mississippi | S | 75,000 |  |
| 42 | Ohio | M | 73,715 | (b) |
| 43 | Wyoming | W | 72,477 |  |
| 44 | Kansas | M | 68,074 |  |
| 45 | Oklahoma | S | 65,661 |  |
| 46 | Montana | W | 64,154 |  |
| 47 | Louisiana | S | 60,925 | (b) |
| 48 | North Dakota | M | 59,712 |  |
| 49 | West Virginia | S | 55,000 |  |


| RANK | 27 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 92,946 |
| MEDIAN | 86,776 |


| Regional average | E | 104,084 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | S | 91,369 |
| Regional average | M | 90,724 |
| Regional average | W | 90,352 |
| Regional average <br> without California | W | 87,610 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| Illinois | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-5)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Revenue | key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New York | E | 127,000 |  |
| 2 | Connecticut | E | 123,962 |  |
| 3 | South Carolina | S | 123,874 |  |
| 4 | California | W | 123,255 |  |
| 5 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |
| 6 | Illinois | M | 120,861 |  |
| 7 | Virginia | S | 118,718 |  |
| 8 | Arizona | W | 118,000 |  |
| 9 | Georgia | S | 116,093 |  |
| 10 | Massachusetts | E | 116,016 |  |
| 11 | Florida | S | 114,800 |  |
| 12 | Washington | W | 112,216 |  |
| 13 | Oregon | W | 109,620 |  |
| 14 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  |
| 15 | Pennsylvania | E | 108,028 |  |
| 16 | Delaware (h) | E | 104,800 |  |
| 17 | Kentucky | S | 104,445 |  |
| 18 | Nevada | W | 103,301 |  |
| 19 | New Jersey | E | 103,000 |  |
| 20 | North Carolina | S | 102,119 |  |
| 21 | Missouri | S | 102,024 |  |
| 22 | Michigan | M | 100,803 |  |
| 23 | Wisconsin | M | 100,291 |  |
| 24 | Louisiana | S | 96,200 |  |
| 25 | Kansas | M | 95,854 |  |
| 26 | Rhode Island | E | 95,188 | (b) |
| 27 | Mississippi | S | 91,000 |  |
| 28 | Alabama | S | 90,186 | (b) |
| 29 | Tennessee | S | 89,688 |  |
| 30 | Alaska | W | 88,548 |  |
| 31 | Indiana | M | 88,120 |  |
| 32 | Arkansas | S | 87,588 |  |
| 33 | New Mexico | W | 86,447 |  |
| 34 | Maine | E | 85,758 |  |
| 35 | New Hampshire | E | 85,753 |  |
| 36 | Hawaii | W | 85,302 |  |
| 37 | Oklahoma | S | 85,000 |  |
| 38 | Nebraska | M | 83,636 |  |
| 39 | Vermont | E | 81,723 |  |
| 40 | Montana | W | 80,704 |  |
| 41 | South Dakota | M | 79,602 |  |
| 42 | Wyoming | W | 79,567 |  |
| 43 | Maryland | S | 79,458 | (b) |
| 44 | West Virginia | S | 75,000 |  |
| 45 | Ohio | M | 73,715 | (b) |
| 46 | Idaho | W | 70,304 |  |
| 47 | Utah | W | 69,900 | (b) |
| 48 | North Dakota | M | 68,277 |  |


| RANK | 36 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 97,403 |
| MEDIAN | 96,027 |


| Regional average | E | 103,123 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | S | 98,026 |
| Regional average | W | 96,028 |
| Regional average <br> without California | W | 93,759 |
| Regional average | M | 93,663 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| Iowa | M |  | $(a-9)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Texas | S |  | $(a-9)$ |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Social services | key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Georgia | S | 148,235 |  |
| 2 | New Jersey | E | 137,165 |  |
| 3 | New York | E | 136,000 |  |
| 4 | Alabama | S | 135,252 |  |
| 5 | Washington | W | 131,246 |  |
| 6 | Illinois | M | 127,576 |  |
| 7 | Michigan | M | 125,000 |  |
| 8 | Oklahoma | S | 125,000 |  |
| 9 | California | W | 123,255 |  |
| 10 | Oregon | W | 120,876 |  |
| 11 | Arkansas | S | 120,107 |  |
| 12 | South Carolina | S | 116,199 |  |
| 13 | Rhode Island | E | 113,901 |  |
| 14 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  |
| 15 | Maryland | S | 107,106 | (b) |
| 16 | Ohio | M | 106,683 |  |
| 17 | Wisconsin | M | 106,400 |  |
| 18 | Pennsylvania | E | 104,763 |  |
| 19 | Massachusetts | E | 104,485 |  |
| 20 | North Dakota | M | 104,472 |  |
| 21 | Nevada | W | 103,742 |  |
| 22 | Kentucky | S | 100,379 |  |
| 23 | Arizona | W | 99,960 |  |
| 24 | North Carolina | S | 99,428 |  |
| 25 | Nebraska | M | 99,111 |  |
| 26 | Texas | S | 95,500 |  |
| 27 | Missouri | S | 95,086 |  |
| 28 | Virginia | S | 94,778 |  |
| 29 | Kansas | M | 92,073 |  |
| 30 | Vermont | E | 91,645 |  |
| 31 | Maine | E | 91,208 |  |
| 32 | Tennessee | S | 89,688 |  |
| 33 | South Dakota | M | 89,585 |  |
| 34 | Alaska | W | 88,548 |  |
| 35 | New Hampshire | E | 85,753 |  |
| 36 | Iowa | M | 85,571 |  |
| 37 | Hawaii | W | 85,302 |  |
| 38 | New Mexico | W | 83,502 |  |
| 39 | Utah | W | 82,800 | (b) |
| 40 | Indiana | M | 82,000 |  |
| 41 | Montana | W | 80,704 |  |
| 42 | Wyoming | W | 79,567 |  |
| 43 | Louisiana | S | 77,875 |  |
| 44 | West Virginia | S | 70,644 |  |
| 45 | Idaho | W | 15,646 |  |


| RANK | 37 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 101,383 |
| MEDIAN | 99,960 |


| Regional average | E | 107,436 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | S | 105,377 |
| Regional average | M | 102,443 |
| Regional average | W | 92,236 |
| Regional average <br> without California | W | 89,223 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| Colorado | W |  | N.A. |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Connecticut | E |  | N.A. |
| Florida | S |  | N.A. |
| Mississippi | S |  | N.A. |
| Delaware (h) | E |  | (g) |


| Rank | State or other jurisdiction | Region | Transportation | key |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Georgia | S | 158,000 |  |
| 2 | Texas | S | 155,000 |  |
| 3 | Washington | W | 153,472 |  |
| 4 | Connecticut | E | 140,272 |  |
| 5 | New Jersey | E | 137,165 |  |
| 6 | New York | E | 136,000 |  |
| 7 | South Carolina | S | 129,780 |  |
| 8 | Virginia | S | 128,479 |  |
| 9 | Illinois | M | 127,576 |  |
| 10 | Arkansas | S | 126,865 |  |
| 11 | Arizona | W | 125,500 |  |
| 12 | California | W | 123,255 |  |
| 13 | Louisiana | S | 121,501 |  |
| 14 | Idaho | W | 121,451 |  |
| 15 | Colorado | W | 121,200 |  |
| 16 | Oregon | W | 120,582 |  |
| 17 | Michigan | M | 120,000 |  |
| 18 | Florida | S | 118,589 |  |
| 19 | Maryland | S | 115,456 | (b) |
| 20 | Iowa | M | 115,211 |  |
| 21 | Pennsylvania | E | 113,714 |  |
| 22 | Massachusetts | E | 112,500 |  |
| 23 | Rhode Island | E | 112,284 |  |
| 24 | Oklahoma | S | 110,000 |  |
| 25 | Minnesota | M | 108,400 |  |
| 26 | Kentucky | S | 104,446 |  |
| 27 | Delaware (h) | E | 103,900 |  |
| 28 | Nevada | W | 103,301 |  |
| 29 | Wisconsin | M | 102,000 |  |
| 30 | Kansas | M | 97,617 |  |
| 31 | South Dakota | M | 97,240 |  |
| 32 | North Dakota | M | 92,700 |  |
| 33 | North Carolina | S | 92,378 |  |
| 34 | Maine | E | 91,208 |  |
| 35 | Indiana | M | 90,636 |  |
| 36 | West Virginia | S | 90,000 |  |
| 37 | Tennessee | S | 89,688 |  |
| 38 | Alaska | W | 88,548 |  |
| 39 | Vermont | E | 86,466 |  |
| 40 | New Hampshire | E | 85,753 |  |
| 41 | Hawaii | W | 85,302 |  |
| 42 | Wyoming | W | 83,563 |  |
| 43 | Utah | W | 82,800 | (b) |
| 44 | Montana | W | 80,705 |  |
| 45 | Ohio | M | 73,715 | (b) |


| RANK | 41 |
| :--- | :---: |
| AVERAGE | 111,375 |
| MEDIAN | 112,392 |


| Regional average | S | 116,086 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regional average | E | 111,926 |
| Regional average | W | 105,856 |
| Regional average <br> without California | W | 104,406 |
| Regional average | M | 101,421 |

## JURISDICTIONS WITH FOOTNOTES

| Alabama | S |  | (a-17) (b) |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Mississippi | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-17)$ |
| Missouri | S |  | $(\mathrm{a}-17)$ |
| Nebraska | M |  | $(\mathrm{a}-17)$ |
| New Mexico | W |  | (a-17) |

Source: The Council of State Governments’ survey of state personnel agencies, January 2002 and December 2002.
Note: The chief administrative officials responsible for each function were determined from information given by the states for the same function as listed in State Administrative Officials Classified by Function, 2002, published by The Council of State Governments.
Key:
N.A. - Not available.
-- - No specific chief administrative official or agency in charge of function.
(a) Chief administrative official or agency in charge of function:
(a-1) Lieutenant governor.
(a-2) Secretary of state.
(a-3) Attorney general.
(a-4) Treasurer.
(a-5) Administration.
(a-6) Budget.
(a-7) Commerce.
(a-8) Community affairs.
(a-9) Comptroller.
(a-10) Consumer affairs.
(a-11) Economic development.
(a-12) Education (chief state school officer).
(a-13) Energy.
(a-14) Environmental protection.
(a-15) Finance.
(a-16) General services.
(a-17) Highways.
(a-18) Labor.
(a-19) Natural resources.
(a-20) Parks and recreation.
(a-21) Personnel.
(a-22) Post audit.
(a-23) Pre-audit.
(a-24) Public utility regulation.
(a-25) Purchasing.
(a-26) Revenue.
(a-27) Social services.
(a-28) Tourism.
(a-29) Transportation.
(a-30) Welfare.
(b) Salary ranges and top figure in ranges follow:

Alabama: Salary normally at a statutory maximum of $\$ 74,113$.
Arkansas: Salary ranges for, Natural Resources: \$33,850-66,461; Pre-audit: \$36,030-70,767; Public utility regulation: \$38,368-75,396; Solid waste management: \$36,030-70,767.
Florida: Salary range for Information Systems: \$48,539-98,912.
Hawaii: Minimum figure in range: top of range follows: Employment services,\$85,512; Energy,\$93,444; Fish \& wildlife,\$ 81,444; Highways, $\$ 85,512$; Information systems, $\$ 85,512$; Mental health $\&$ retardation, $\$ 73,872$; Parks \& recreation, $\$ 85,512$; Pre-Audit, $\$ 85,512$; Solid waste management, $\$ 81,444$; Welfare,\$85,512.
Idaho: Salary range for Licensing: \$47,377-74,026.
Kentucky: Minimum figure in range: top of range follows: Emergency management,\$80,728; Employment services, \$88,805; Energy, \$80,728; Health, \$162,504; Highways, \$97,683; Licensing, \$ 80,729; Solid waste management, \$60,655.
Louisiana: Minimum figure in range: top of range follows :Employment services,\$66,581; Historic preservation, \$50,794; Licensing:, \$83,413; Personnel, \$99,920; Planning, \$76,228; Pre-audit, \$81,564; Welfare, \$87,274.
Maryland: Minimum figure in range: top of range follows: Adjutant general, \$115,014; Administration, \$133,538; Agriculture, \$133,538; Banking, \$98,396; \$106,769; Budget, \$155,141; Civil rights, Commerce, \$155,141; Community affairs, \$106,769; Consumer affairs, \$112,454; Corrections, \$115,014; Economic development, \$155,141; Election administration, \$99,136; Emergency management, \$86,118; Employment services, \$92,049; Energy, \$105,183; Environmental protection, $\$ 143,922$; Finance, $\$ 155,141$; Fish and Wildlife, \$92,049; Health, \$155,141; Higher education, \$143,922; Highway, \$133,538; Historic preservation, \$99,136; Information systems, \$123,919; Insurance, \$133,538; Labor, \$133,538; Licensing, \$106,769; Natural resources, \$143,922; Parks and recreation, \$98,396; Personnel, \$115,014; Planning, \$133,538; Pre-audit, \$106,769; Public library development, \$106,769; Purchasing, \$99,136; Revenue, \$106,769; Social services, \$143,922; Solid waste management, \$92,069; Police, \$143,922; Tourism, \$106,769; Transportation, \$155,141
Minnesota: Minimum figure in range: top of range follows: Emergency management, \$88,719; Fish \& wildlife, \$88,719; Planning, \$46,834;
Ohio: Minimum figure in range: top of range follows: Lieutenant Governor, \$132,350; Administration, \$132,350; Agriculture, \$122,574; Banking, \$102,918; Budget, \$132,350; Civil Rights, \$112,320; Commerce, \$132,350; Corrections, \$132,350; Economic development, \$132,350; Elections administration, \$86,258; Emergency Management, \$ 102,918; Employment services, \$132,350; Energy, \$94,182; Environmental protection, \$132,350; Fish and Wildlife, \$102,918; General services, $\$ 102,918$; Health, $\$ 132,350$; Information systems, $\$ 112,320$; Insurance, $\$ 122,574$; Licensing, $\$ 102,918$; Mental health and retardation, \$132,350; Natural resources, \$132,350; Parks and recreation, \$102,918; Personnel, \$102,918; Public library development, \$112,320; Public utility regulation, \$132,350; Purchasing, \$102, 918; Revenue, \$132,350; Solid waste management, \$81,598; State police, \$132,350; Transportation, \$132,350; Welfare, \$132,350 Rhode Island: Minimum figure in range: top of range follows: Agriculture, \$52,501; Banking, \$74,514; Budget, \$105,529; Civil rights, \$56,726; Commerce, \$65,369; Community affairs, \$43,149; Comptroller, \$91,745; Economic development, \$65,369; Emergency management, \$65,369; Energy, \$74,514; Finance, \$105,529; Historic preservation, \$67,624; Information systems, \$77,958; Insurance, \$74,514; Licensing, \$58,828; Parks \& recreation, \$65,369; Personnel, \$91,745; Post audit, \$58,828; Public library development, \$105,529; Purchasing, \$95,188; Revenue, \$105,529; Solid waste management, \$81,404; Tourism, \$65,369; Welfare, \$74,514
Utah: Minimum figure in range: top of range follows:Administration, \$102,600; Agriculture, \$87,500; Banking, \$87,500; Budget, \$102,600; Civil rights, \$80,433; Commerce, $\$ 87,500$; Community affairs, $\$ 94,300$; Consumer affairs, $\$ 76,190$; Corrections, $\$ 102,600$; Elections administration, $\$ 41,433$; Emergency management, \$94,723; Employment services, \$111,800; Energy, \$64,750; Environmental protection, \$102,600; Finance, \$102,670; Fish \& wildlife, \$94,723; General services, \$97,260; Health, \$111,800; Higher education, \$160,000; Highways, \$111,800; Historic preservation, \$80,433; Information systems, \$105,500; Insurance, \$87,500; Labor, \$87,500; Licensing, \$82,640; Mental health \& retardation, \$94,723; Natural resources, \$102,600; Parks \& recreation, \$94,723; Personnel, \$102,600; Planning, \$102,600; Pre-audit, \$102,670; Public library development, \$80,433; Public utility regulation, \$94,300; Purchasing, \$97,260; Revenue, \$94,300; Social services, $\$ 111,800$; Solid waste management, $\$ 124,155$; State police, $\$ 94,723$; Transportation, $\$ 111,800$; Welfare, $\$ 111,800$
(c) The present Secretary of Commerce forgoes regular salary and receives $\$ 1$ in compensation.
(d) Responsibilities shared between Director, Fisheries Division, \$105,085; and Director, Wildlife Division, \$99,557.
(e) If recommended by Budget Director and approved by Controller General and co-chairs of State's Joint Finance Committee may be adjusted for the CIO of proposed Dept. of Information and Technology.
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(f) Responsibilities shared between Director, Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health, Department of Health and Social Services, $\$ 119,400$; and Director, Division of Mental Retardation, same department, \$103,900.
(g) Function split between two cabinet positions: Secretary, Dept. of Health and Social Services: $\$ 102,000$ : if incumbent holds a medical license, amount is increased by $\$ 12,000$; if a Board-certified physician , a supplement of $\$ 3,000$ is added.
(h) Salaries represent those reflected for the position in section 10a of FY2002 Budget Act effective 7/21/2001.
(i) Responsibilities shared between, Director of Mental Health, Department of Children and Family Services, $\$ 83,890$; and Director, Substance Abuse, same department, \$77,738.
(j) Department of Fish And Wildlife, \$113,522.
(k) Responsibilities shared between State Auditor, Office of the Auditor, $\$ 85,302$; and Division Head, Division of Audit, Department of Accounting \& General Services, \$62,520.
(l) Responsibilities shared between Director of Dept. of Administration; \$82,098 and Administrator of Information Technology and Communication; \$73,299.
(m) Responsibilities shared between Co-Directors, Election Commission, \$50,500.
(n) Responsibilities shared between Executive Director, Health Professions Bureau, \$54,274; and Executive Director, Professional Licensing Agency, \$61,915.
(o) Responsibilities shared between Secretary, Department of Commerce and Housing, \$108,246; Director, Business Development Division, same department, \$73,328; and President, Kansas Inc., \$98,186
(p) Responsibilities shared between Secretary of State, $\$ 74,148$ and Deputy Secretary of State, $\$ 55,102$.
(q) Responsibilities shared between Secretary of Department of Human Resources: \$90,724 and Director of Employment and Training: \$71,750.
(r) Responsibilities shared between Central Account Service Manager, Division of Accounts \& Reports, Department of Administration, \$68,370; and Team Leader, Audit Services, same division and department, \$56,243.
(s) In Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Tennessee and West Virginia, the presidents (or speakers) of the Senate are next in line of succession to the governorship. In Tennessee, the speaker of the Senate bears the statutory title of lieutenant governor.
(t) Responsibilities shared between Director, Mental Hygiene Administration, $\$ 85,594-\$ 115,014$; and Director, Developmental Disabilities Administration, Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, \$85,594-\$115,014.
(u) Responsibilities shared between Commissioner, Department of Mental Retardation, $\$ 108,328$; and Commissioner, Department of Mental Health, Executive Office of Human Services, \$110,496.
(v) Responsibilities shared between Chair, Dept. of Telecommunications and Energy, \$102,359 and Commissioner , Electricity /Energy \$ 94,506.
(w) Responsibilities shared between Director, Dept. of Natural Resources, $\$ 120,000$ and Chief, Fish, $\$ 97,223$ and Chief, Wildlife, $\$ 86,660$.
(x) Responsibilities shared between Director, Dept. of Community Health, $\$ 125,000$ and Deputy Director , Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services, \$107,438.
(y) Responsibilities shared between Chief, Division of Fisheries, Department of Conservation, \$87,540; Chief, Division of Protection, same department, \$84552; and Chief, Division of Wildlife, same department, \$90,432.
(z) Responsibilities shared between State Tax Commissioner, Department of Revenue, \$83,636; Administrator, Budget Division, Department of Administrative Services, \$91,693; and Auditor of Public Accounts, \$49,500.
(aa) Responsibilities shared between Director, Game \& Parks Commission, $\$ 87,880$; Administrator, Wildlife Division, same commission, $\$ 60,369$; and Assistant Director, Fish \& Wildlife, same commission, \$65,322
(bb) Responsibilities shared between Commissioner, State Education Department, $\$ 170,165$; Secretary of State, Department of State, $\$ 120,800$.
(cc) Responsibilities shared between Commissioners, Corporations Commission, varying salary levels for four commissioners, $\$ 68,000 ; \$ 72,000 ; \$ 76,000$; and \$82,004.
(dd) Responsibilities shared between Director for Mental Retardation , \$138,396 and Director of Mental Health, \$140,000.
(ee) Annual salary for duties as presiding officer of the Senate.
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(ff) Responsibilities shared between Secretary of State, \$117,546; and Division Director, \$86,811.
(gg) Responsibilities shared between Secretary, Department of Education and the Arts, $\$ 75,000$; and Superintendent, Department of Education, $\$ 146,000$.
(hh) Responsibilities for St. Thomas, \$60,000; St. Croix, \$65,000; St. John, \$60,000.
(ii) Responsibilities shared between Commmissioner of Mental Health, $\$ 136,000$ and Commissioner of Mental Retardation, $\$ 136,000$.
(jj) Governor Romney and Lieutenant Governor Healey plan to forfeit their salaries for the next four years.
(kk) Governor returns 10 percent of his salary annually to the State Treasury.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT HEADS COMPARATIVE DATA AS OF JANUARY 2004

| Department | DHRD | HHL | TAX | B\&F | DOA | DCCA | DBEDT | AG | DLNR | DLIR | DAGS | DHS | DOT | PSD | DOH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current | 85,302 | 85,302 | 85,302 | 85,302 | 85,302 | 85,302 | 85,302 | 85,302 | 85,302 | 85,302 | 85,302 | 85,302 | 85,302 | 85,302 | 85,302 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of employees | 115 | 118-134 | 337 | 350 | 367 | 426 | 577 | 638-700 | 797 | 990 | 1,100 | 2,350 | 2,280 | 2,630 | 6,600 |
| Operating budget | \$14.6 m | \$8-\$10 m | \$26.9 m | \$525 m | \$29.8 m | \$38 m | \$266 m | \$63.5-65 m | \$70.4 m | \$295.4 m | \$109 m | \$1.34 b | \$536.7 m | \$165.7 m | \$913 m |
| Private sector data | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline \$ 80,000-1 \\ \$ 100,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\$ 150,000$ $\& \$ 400,000$ | \$137,553 | \$144,471 |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \$ 94,892- \\ \$ 97,746 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 400,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | \$144,471 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \$ 100,000- \\ & \$ 125,000 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|} \$ 90,000 \\ \$ 170,000 \end{array}$ |
| Other states data: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Western region average | \$90,352 |  | \$96,028 | \$93,667 | \$90,150 | \$97,452 | \$97,967 | \$93,574 | \$93,884 | \$92,620 | \$99,012 | \$92,236 | \$105,856 | \$100,176 | \$99,678 |
| Western region avg w/o CA | \$87,610 |  | \$93,759 | \$90,490 | \$86,712 | \$97,452 | \$97,967 | \$88,976 | \$90,472 | \$89,387 | \$96,991 | \$89,223 | \$104,406 | \$97,336 | \$97,713 |
| Counties data: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Honolulu | \$99,807 |  | \$99,807 | \$99,807 |  |  |  | \$99,807 |  |  | \$99,807 | \$99,807 | \$99,807 |  |  |
| Hawaii | \$77,516 |  | \$75,516 | \$75,516 |  |  |  | \$75,516 |  |  | \$75,516 | \$75,516 |  |  |  |
| Maui | \$77,000 |  | \$80,000 | \$80,000 |  |  |  | \$80,000 |  |  | \$83,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Kauai | \$66,073 |  | \$69,371 | \$69,371 |  |  |  | \$69,371 |  |  | \$69,371 | \$66,073 |  |  |  |

## Footnotes:

1. AG = Attorney General; DOH = Department of Health; DOT = Department of Transportation; DAGS = Department of Accounting and General Services; DCCA = Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs; TAX = Department of Taxation; B\&F = Department of Budget and Finance; DHS = Department of Human Services; DLIR = Department of Labor and Industrial Relations; DLNR = Department of Land and Natural Resources; DBEDT = Department of Business and Economic Development and Tourism; DHRD = Department of Human Resources Development; HHL = Department of Hawaiian Home Lands; DOA = Department of Agriculture; PSD = Department of Public Safety
2. Other state's data is from the "Book of the States 2003, Volume 35", Council of State Governments

| Dept |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { No. of } \\ \text { Ees } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Present } \\ \text { Salary } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gov | 1 | 94,780.00 | -- | -- | 112,000.00 | 114,240.00 | 116,524.80 | 118,855.30 | 121,232.40 | 123,657.05 | 126,130.19 | 128,652.79 |
|  | Lt. Gov | 1 | 90,041.00 | -- | -- | 100,000.00 | 102,000.00 | 104,040.00 | 106,120.80 | 108,243.22 | 110,408.08 | 112,616.24 | 114,868.57 |
|  | ADS | 1 | 90,041.00 | -- | -- | 100,000.00 | 102,000.00 | 104,040.00 | 106,120.80 | 108,243.22 | 110,408.08 | 112,616.24 | 114,868.57 |
| AG | Dept Head | 1 | 85,302.00 | 105,000.00 | 107,100.00 | 109,242.00 | 111,426.84 | 113,655.38 | 115,928.48 | 118,247.05 | 120,612.00 | n/a | n/a |
|  | Deputy | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 72,886.00 \\ & 77,966.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 91,350.00 \\ & 96,600.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93,177.00 \\ & 98,532.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 95,040.54 \\ 100,502.64 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 96,941.35 \\ 102,512.69 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 98,880.18 \\ 104,562.95 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100,857.78 \\ & 106,654.21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 102,874.94 \\ & 108,787.29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 104,932.44 \\ 110,963.04 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | n/a | n/a |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DOH, DOT, } \\ & \text { DAGS, } \\ & \text { DCCA, } \\ & \text { TAX, B\&F } \end{aligned}$ | Dept Heads | 6 | 85,302.00 | 100,000.00 | 102,000.00 | 104,040.00 | 106,120.80 | 108,243.22 | 110,408.08 | 112,616.24 | 114,868.57 | n/a | n/a |
|  | Deputies | 11 | $\begin{aligned} & 72,886.00 \\ & 77,966.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87,000.00 \\ & 92,000.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88,740.00 \\ & 93,840.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90,514.80 \\ & 95,716.80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92,325.10 \\ & 97,631.14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 94,171.60 \\ & 99,583.76 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 96,055.03 \\ 101,575.43 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 97,976.13 \\ 103,606.94 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 99,935.65 \\ 105,679.08 \end{array}$ | n/a | n/a |
| DHS, DLIR, DLNR, DBEDT | Dept Heads | 4 | 85,302.00 | 95,000.00 | 96,900.00 | 98,838.00 | 100,814.76 | 102,831.06 | 104,887.68 | 106,985.43 | 109,125.14 | n/a | n/a |
|  | Deputies | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 72,886.00 \\ & 77,966.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82,650.00 \\ & 87,400.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 84,303.00 \\ & 89,148.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85,989.06 \\ & 90,930.96 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87,708.84 \\ & 92,749.58 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89,463.02 \\ & 94,604.57 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 91,252.28 \\ & 96,496.66 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93,077.32 \\ & 98,426.60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 94,938.87 \\ 100,395.13 \end{array}$ | n/a | n/a |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { DHRD, } \\ & \text { HHL, DOA, } \\ & \text { PSD } \end{aligned}$ | Dept Heads | 4 | 85,302.00 | 90,000.00 | 91,800.00 | 93,636.00 | 95,508.72 | 97,418.89 | 99,367.27 | 101,354.62 | 103,381.71 | n/a | n/a |
|  | Deputies | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & 72,886.00 \\ & 77,966.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78,300.00 \\ & 82,800.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79,866.00 \\ & 84,456.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81,463.32 \\ & 86,145.12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83,092.59 \\ & 87,868.02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 84,754.44 \\ & 89,625.38 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 86,449.53 \\ & 91,417.89 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88,178.52 \\ & 93,246.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89,942.09 \\ & 95,111.17 \end{aligned}$ | n/a | n/a |

Footnotes:

1. Abbreviations: Gov = Governor; Lt. Governor = Lieutenant Governor; ADS = Administrative Director of the State (Chief of Staff).

AG = Attorney General; DOH = Department of Health; DOT = Department of Transportation; DAGS = Department of Accounting and General Services; DCCA = Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs; TAX = Department of Taxation; B\&F = Department of Budget and Finance; DHS = Department of Human Services; DLIR = Department of Labor and Industrial Relations; DLNR = Department of Land and Natural Resources; DBEDT = Department of Business and Economic Development and Tourism; DHRD = Department of Human Resources Development; HHL = Department of Hawaiian Home Lands; DOA = Department of Agriculture; PSD = Department of Public Safety
2. After initial recommended salaries (effective July 1, 2004, for Department Heads and Deputies; effective 2006, for the Governor, Lieutenant Governor and Administrative Director of the State), all subsequent figures represent an annual two percent compounded adjustment made annually for all these salaries/salary ranges for their respective time periods.
3. Aftepreyjemyiobthesizalary of the Deputy to the Superintendent of Education, the Commission decided to recommend deferring to the Board of Education on this matter.
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## GLOSSARY

| ADOC | Administrative Director of the Courts |
| :--- | :--- |
| CD | Conference Draft |
| CPI-U | Consumer Price Index - Urban |
| HB | House Bill |
| HRS | Hawaii Revised Statutes |
| HSBA | Hawaii State Bar Association |
| ICA | Intermediate Court of Appeals |
| NCSC | National Center for State Courts |
| SB | Senate Bill |
| SLH | Session Laws of Hawaii |
| YOS | Years of Service |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Purpose

To create the most qualified judicial applicant pool and retain an experienced judiciary by providing fair and just compensation for Hawaii's justices, judges, and appointed administrative officers ${ }^{1}$.

## Act 123, SLH 2003

Act 123, Session Laws of Hawaii, 2003 (hereinafter Act 123), amended Sections 601-3, 602-2, 602-52, 603-5, 604-2.5, and 608-1.5, Hawaii Revised Statutes, by providing for, among other things ${ }^{2}$ :

1. Effective July 1, 2004, and every eight years thereafter, the salaries of the justices, judges, and appointed administrative officers shall be as last determined by the Judicial Salary Commission (the Commission), unless disapproved by the Legislature.
2. The composition of the Commission shall be one member appointed by the Governor, two by the President of the Senate, and two by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
3. In determining the salaries of the justices, judges, and appointed administrative officers, the Commission may set different salaries for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, Chief Judge of the Intermediate Court of Appeals, Associate Judges of the Intermediate Court of Appeals, judges of the Circuit and District Courts, and appointed administrative officers.
4. The Commission shall convene in the month of November 2003, and every eight years thereafter. Not later than the fortieth legislative day of the Regular Session of 2004, and every eight years thereafter, the Commission shall submit a report of its findings and its salary recommendations to the Legislature, through the Chief Justice. The Commission's recommendations may include incremental increases that take effect over the span of years occurring prior to the convening of the next Salary Commission.

[^69]5. The recommended salaries submitted by the Commission shall become effective July 1 of the next fiscal year unless the Legislature disapproves the salary recommendations by the adoption of a concurrent resolution, which shall be approved by a simple majority of each house of the Legislature prior to adjournment sine die of the legislative session in which the recommend salaries are submitted. At the next legislative session, the salary recommendations not disapproved by the Legislature shall be submitted by the Chief Justice as part of the Judiciary's proposed budget.
6. If the salary amounts recommended by the Commission are disapproved by the Legislature, the Commission shall reconvene in the month of November following the legislative disapproval to review the Legislature's reasons for disapproving its recommendations. The Commission may submit a report of its findings and submit a new salary recommendation to the Legislature of the next regular session.

## Findings in Brief

The Judicial Salary Commission finds that present judicial and administrative officer salaries are neither fair nor just as indicated by the following:

1. Judicial independence is a critical factor in maintaining the functions of the three separate branches of government and appropriate salary levels are a key element of this independence.
2. Judges rule on matters involving the life, liberty, and property of our citizens, and thus play an integral part in defining the quality of life in Hawaii and in giving meaning to the State's Constitution and statutes.
3. Becoming a judge requires years of experience. Applicants or nominees for the Supreme Court, the Intermediate Court of Appeals, and the Circuit Court must have been licensed by the Hawaii Supreme Court to practice law for at least 10 years preceding the nomination. Applicants or nominees for District Court must have been licensed for at least five years preceding nomination. Justices and Judges are prohibited from engaging in the private practice of law and they may not hold any other state or federal office of trust or profit during the term of office.
4. Judicial salaries have not kept pace with the Consumer Price Index. For 2003, the most recent data available, the Consumer Price Index for urban dwellers (CPI-U) for Honolulu was 183.5. To put this in perspective, a Circuit Court judge's adjusted salary should be $\$ 127,972$ just to keep level with the increased cost of living since 1975. In other words, the present Circuit Court judge's salary of $\$ 106,922$ reflects a loss in spending power of over \$20,000 in 2003.
5. Adjusted by the cost-of-living index, Hawaii is $48^{\text {th }}$ out of 48 states reporting in 2003 for salaries of general trial court judges (i.e., Circuit Court judges).
6. The lowest level federal magistrate makes $\$ 35,000$ more, at $\$ 142,324$ (not including approximately $\$ 35,000$ in federal cost of living allowance for this region) than a Hawaii Circuit Court judge.
7. National salaries for attorneys in private practice have outpaced Hawaii judicial salaries thus creating a disincentive to become a judge or remain as one. FindLaw indicates the national average for $5^{\text {th }}$-year legal associates is $\$ 153,000$ and $8^{\text {th }}$-year associates at $\$ 187,000$.
8. Hawaii salaries for attorneys in private practice have also outpaced judicial salaries. An informal survey of four local law firms found that a District Court judge could be making between $\$ 5,000$ to $\$ 25,000$ more per year while a Circuit Court judge could be making between $\$ 19,000$ to $\$ 193,000$ more per year as an attorney.
9. There has not been a judicial salary increase since July 1, 2000.
10. In addition to the need for an increase in base salaries, there is also a need to differentiate the salaries of justices and judges at the various court levels.
11. The appointed judiciary administrative officers' (Administrative Director of the Courts and the Deputy) salaries are also found to be inadequate based on the salary comparisons made.
12. The December 2003, Council on Revenues, Estimates of General Fund Tax Revenue ${ }^{3}$ projects an average General Fund growth rate of six percent per year from FY 2004 through FY 2010 (projected total increase of 41.7 percent).

[^70]13. The UCLA Anderson Forecast for the Nation and California indicates an average Consumer Price Index - Urban (CPI-U) increase of 2.9 percent per year since the last judicial salary adjustment in 2000 to 2005.
14. From 1996 through 2003, the salary increases for Circuit Court judges averaged 3.51 \% nationally.

## Recommendations

After full and free discussion, the Commission has agreed unequivocally to recommend and does recommend to the Legislature the following:

1. Although the Commission is charged with recommending a salary adjustment starting with FY 2005, we recommend deferring all increases until FY 2006.
2. For FY 2006, we recommend an overall average salary increase of 14.0 percent $^{4}$, or $\$ 1,311,746$ (see Appendix A for the details). This is an average of 2.8 percent per year from the last salary increase on July 1, 2000 to the next on July 1, 2005. This is in line with the U.S. Department of Labor, Consumer Price Index - Urban average increase of 2.9 percent per year for this same period.
3. Incremental increases of 3.5 percent per year from FY 2007 through FY 2012 for justices, judges, and appointed judiciary administrative officers. This is in line with the national average of $3.51 \%$ for Circuit Court judges over the last eight years.
[^71]
## Proposed Changes in Statutes

While the Salary Commission is not tasked with recommending amendments to statutes nor, to our understanding, do such recommendations have the force of law, our experience over the last few months gives rise to two concerns. Hence, we respectfully submit the following proposals for consideration:

1. That the Judicial Salary Commission convene every four years rather than every eight.
2. That it begin its work in September rather than November.

In its deliberations, the Commission found the current eight year period creates a great deal of uncertainty as to the appropriate level of salary adjustment given the need to predict the performance of the Hawaii economy and the need for fair and reasonable adjustments.

In addition, convening in September, rather than November, will provide the Commission time to complete its recommendations and submit it to the Legislature prior to the opening of session rather than the present 40 days into the session.

## INTRODUCTION

It will readily be understood, that the fluctuations in the value of money and in the state of society, rendered a fixed rate of compensation [for judges]...inadmissible. What might be extravagant today, might in half a century become penurious and inadequate. Alexander Hamilton in The Federalist No. 79 (Lodge ed. 1908), pp. 491-492.

This is the first report of the newly re-constituted Judicial Salary Commission as established by Act 123. As such, it would be productive to review the history of judicial salary setting before examining the current Commission's Process, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations.

For many years, the Judiciary has had an interest in establishing a means for setting judicial salaries that provided a regular and equitable review of appropriate salary levels. The two objectives have always been: (a) to create the most qualified judicial applicant pool, and (b) to retain an experienced judiciary by providing fair and just compensation for Hawaii's justices, judges, and administrative officers.

Edward B. McConnell, the widely respected President Emeritus of the National Center for State Courts (NCSC, an independent non-profit organization whose mission is to improve the administration of justice through research and education), got to the heart of the matter when he wrote about the association between judicial pay, judicial excellence, and experience on the bench:

To have good judges, a state must be able to get good lawyers to leave the practice of law. To do this, judicial salaries need not equal, but must have a reasonable relationship to the compensation of the more competent and experienced practicing attorneys from whose ranks judges should come, and to whose ranks they can return. It is axiomatic in business that you get what you pay for. Because of this correlation between quality and compensation, a state cannot expect to attract and retain good judges and thereby maintain a quality court system at compensation levels that are comparable to those of the less experienced or less competent lawyers. ${ }^{5}$

[^72]The American Bar Association, when it promulgated standards for judicial compensation in 1990, maintained that:

Fair and adequate compensation for state court judges clearly is in the public interest, since an able and independent judiciary is at the heart of the democratic process...Compensation which does not provide adequate monetary recognition of the importance of the role filled by our state judiciary will not attract and retain as judges those best qualified to serve.

While some financial sacrifice is expected of private citizens who assume major governmental posts, there is a threshold below which subpar compensation poses a very real threat to the independence and quality of the judiciary. ${ }^{6}$

Due to both economic pressures and political realities, regular pay adjustments for judges and justices have not occurred. For example, between 1975 and 2002, Hawaii's judges and justices received five increases; four of them phased in over a biennium. This is an average of 5.4 years between pay increases; with one notable period of nine years without any pay increase.

These long gaps between salary adjustments have made it difficult to meet the two objectives posed above. The widely spaced intervals set a pattern, whereby the increases do not reflect inflationary pressures on salaries, deny judges and justices interim costs of living adjustments, and invite controversy because of the size of the catch-up pay increases.

During the period 1992 through 2003, 13 seasoned and experienced judges, under the age of 55 , left the bench; several of these judges cited the low salary as a reason for leaving.

Recently, the Cades Foundation entered into a contract with the NCSC to conduct a study of mechanisms for setting judicial salary levels nationally with the purpose of proposing a model for Hawaii.

[^73]In what it termed "A New Approach"7, the NCSC/Cades report proposed considering, among other things:

- Creation of a judicial salary commission.
- Salary recommendations with the force of law.
- Regularity in salary adjustments.

Acknowledging the need to review and recommend salaries on a regular basis and the requirement that salaries need to be set as provided by law ${ }^{8}$, the Legislature passed S.B. No. 1333, C.D. 1, which became Act 123.

Act 123 provides for the regular evaluation of judicial base salaries, the possibility of incremental increases that take effect over the span of years occurring prior to the convening of the next salary commission, and that the Commission's recommendations have the force of law unless the Legislature disapproves the recommendations through the adoption of a concurrent resolution, approved by a simple majority of each house of the Legislature.

The Act further mandates that the Commission submit a report of its findings and recommendations to the Legislature, through the Chief Justice, not later than the $40^{\text {th }}$ legislative day of the regular session of 2004, and every eight years thereafter.

In summary, fundamental changes in how judicial salaries are determined came to fruition with Act 123. These reforms are vital steps toward securing the most qualified judicial applicant pool and retaining an experienced judiciary for the State of Hawaii.

The next section, Process, describes the methodology that the Commission used to research judicial and administrative officer salaries.

[^74]
## PROCESS

The purpose of this section is to provide the reader with a strong sense of the lengthy but crucial deliberations the Commission went through to reach its current salary recommendations. The next section, Findings, delineates what the Commission found.

November 17, 2003. During the first Commission meeting members reviewed Act 123, which revised the makeup of the Commission and the effect of its work, the NCSC's "Survey of Judicial Salaries" which compares judicial salaries among the states, and the NCSC/Cades Foundation study.

In addition, Commission members decided to: (a) informally survey local law firms to determine a typical salary for attorneys with varying years of experience, (b) review the job descriptions for justices, judges, and Judiciary administrative officers, and (c) obtain a listing of salaries for senior law school professors at the William S. Richardson School of Law at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, salaries of the justices and judges of the Federal Judiciary, Consumer Price Index adjustments, and salaries of top executive officers within the State.

December 1, 2003. The Administrator of the Judiciary Policy and Planning Division provided a presentation on judicial salaries that included information requested in the first meeting. Also discussed was the process used by the Judicial Evaluation Review Panel to evaluate judges, with the intent to link salary to performance. An alternative suggestion was to use years-of-service (YOS) salary incentives to keep experienced judges on the bench.

After discussion, the Commissioners decided the base salary adjustment should be determined first followed by incremental adjustments for the following years. In addition, they decided to work on judicial salaries prior to determining the salaries for the Administrative Director of the Courts (ADOC) and the Deputy Administrative Director of the Courts.

December 16, 2003. Although not required by law, the 2003 Judicial Salary Commission decided to open this and its future meetings to the public. It was made explicit that the decision to open Commission meetings to the public was not a waiver of any rights the Judiciary may have under Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapters 91, 92, or other applicable laws, nor does it require this or any other Judicial Salary Commission to open future meetings to the public.

The Commission discussed nine salary scenarios, most based on longevity increases to salaries. In addition, a scenario was proposed in which there would be an increase to the base salary, plus increases based on longevity, inflation, and a percentage for meritorious service. Present salary differences between judges of the various courts are close and often do not adequately reflect the responsibilities and complexities of the higher courts. One objective for the Commission might be to address this problem.

December 29, 2003. The Commission determined that an increase should be enacted for 2004 to correct base salaries in order to address the issue of fair and just compensation and to recognize that there has not been a salary increase since July 1, 2000. The impact on the state resources must be kept in mind.

A salary proposal that would adjust the base salaries to provide greater separation between the courts, an annual inflation increase, and an additional amount for meritorious service was considered. In addition, it was decided to phase in the base salary increase over two years and begin the incremental increases after that. It was suggested that longevity also be included but that it not start until after 10 years of service. Discussion indicated that 10 years is an extremely long period and may not act as sufficient incentive to keep qualified judges. Further suggested was that criteria, such as, but not necessarily limited to, comparisons to other jurisdictions, inflation, how much an experienced judge could earn in the private sector, and the duties and responsibilities of the position be used to determine the salaries.

January 12, 2004. Written and/or oral statements from local attorneys: James A. Kawachika, past president of Hawaii State Bar Association (HSBA) and present member of the Board of Directors of the Hawaii Chapter of the American Judicature Society; Richard Turbin, Vice President/President-Elect of the HSBA; Michael W. Gibson, past president of the HSBA and former Director of the Hawaii Legal Aid Society supported a significant salary adjustment for judges (all except Gibson, who was not at the meeting, orally stated a 20 percent increase would not be unreasonable).

Attorney David Bettencourt, member of the Hawaii Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, supported, philosophically, an increase to at least the same salary as a federal Magistrate but also indicated some members of his association were concerned that court appointed counsel fees have not been increased in some time. Mr. Bettencourt also voiced strong reservations about merit pay.

David M. Louie, Esq., Vice Chair of the Hawaii Supreme Court Rule 19 Committee, reported on how the judicial evaluation program promotes judicial competence and excellence. He related how judges are evaluated by lawyers on a multi-page questionnaire that covers legal ability, judicial management skills, comportment, and settlement and/or plea agreement ability. Some of the areas within these topics are knowledge of relevant law, procedure and evidentiary rules, courtesy and fairness to parties and attorneys, and absence of bias. The Judiciary then publishes the collective evaluation scores. Mr. Louie also supported an increase in judicial salaries of 20 percent.

A salary proposal that provided for an overall increase for the first two years (starting July 1, 2004 and July 1, 2005, respectively) and an amount for inflation thereafter through July 1, 2011 was distributed. It was noted that the salary differences between the District and Circuit Courts, as presented in the proposal, were perhaps too wide and should be brought closer since, it was felt, the stress levels for judges at the District Court level seemed comparable to judges at the Circuit Court.

The Commissioners deliberated over the question of whether their final salary recommendation should reflect what the Commissioners felt the judges' salaries should be (perhaps a 20 percent or more increase to the base) or whether they should adjust the recommendations downward to reflect the fiscal restraints faced by the State. On the other hand, even with the salary increase proposal currently being discussed, the relatively low salary of Hawaii judges, as compared to judges on the mainland, would not be improved when salaries were projected to 2011 (the scheduled date for the next Judicial Salary Commission to meet).

January 26, 2004. A revised salary schedule that narrowed the salary gap between Circuit and District/Family Court judges and between the Supreme Court and District/Family Courts was distributed. Another salary proposal that would provide a lower increase in the first two years but slightly more in the following years was discussed. In addition, a suggested longevity increase for every five years of service came before the Commission.

Discussion centered on whether longevity, as a way of creating stepwise salaries, complicates the Commission's work. Further discussion included the judges' compensation/retirement package (which is different from that of other state employees).

February 9, 2004. The Administrator of the Judiciary Policy and Planning Division provided a brief overview of where he understands the Executive Salary Commission to be in their process. He mentioned that the Commission appeared to be heading towards four separate salary brackets.

Copies of a draft salary spreadsheet were distributed. The core change is to further narrow the salary gap between Circuit and District/Family Court judges, and between the Supreme Court and District/Family Court. The revised draft still keeps the overall percentage increases in the first two years discussed earlier and an inflation guard after that.

The Commission continued its discussion on how to adjust base salaries, that is, whether to provide more of an increase up front or to spread the increase over a number of years. Longevity and step increases were also discussed at length.

February 23, 2004. Copies of a draft salary spreadsheet that amends an earlier draft were distributed. The core change is to shift the salary increase to FY 2006 and set the remaining years at 3.5 percent per year.

The Commission continued its discussion on how to adjust base salaries, that is, whether to provide the increase up front or spread over a number of years. Longevity and step increases were also discussed again.

March 8, 2004. The Commission decided to defer increases for FY 2005 and finalized its recommendations for FY 2006 through FY 2012. See the Recommendations section for specific details.

The next section, Findings, discusses the information that the Commission used to create the salary recommendations.

## FINDINGS

This section uses the criteria generated by the Commission to provide guidance as to what, if any, salary increase would be required to meet the dual objectives of creating the most qualified judicial applicant pool and retaining an experienced judiciary by providing fair and just compensation for Hawaii's justices, judges, and administrative officers.

## Skill and Experience for the Position

Judges rule on matters involving property, taxes, probate, guardianship, divorce, custody, paternity, and other civil and criminal matters. In ruling on the life, liberty, and property of our citizens, they play an integral part in defining the quality of life in Hawaii and in giving meaning to the State's Constitution and statutes.

To qualify for judicial office each person who applies or is nominated to be a justice or judge must be a resident and citizen of Hawaii and the United States. Applicants or nominees for the Supreme Court, the Intermediate Court of Appeals (ICA), and the Circuit Court must have been licensed by the Hawaii Supreme Court to practice law for at least 10 years preceding the nomination. Applicants or nominees for District Court must have been licensed for at least five years preceding nomination. Justices and Judges are prohibited from engaging in the private practice of law and they may not hold any other state or federal office of trust or profit during the term of office.

In addition to the constitutional qualifications set out above, the Judicial Selection Commission considers each applicant's and petitioner's background, professional skills, and character, and may consider the applicant's or nominee's: (1) integrity and moral courage, (2) legal ability and experience, (3) intelligence and wisdom, (4) compassion and fairness, (5) diligence and decisiveness, (6) judicial temperament, and (7) such other qualities that the Commission deems appropriate.

All justices and judges participate in community outreach efforts (e.g., visiting schools, hosting students in courtrooms, speaking to community and school organizations, serving as panelists at conferences and seminars, judging mock trial and moot court competitions, etc.). All justices and judges attend and participate in continuing education events conducted by the Judiciary or professional organizations.

To qualify for the position of the ADOC, the individual must be a resident of the State of Hawaii for a continuous period of three years prior to his/her appointment. This individual serves at the pleasure of the Chief Justice.

While there is no similar residency requirement for the position of Deputy ADOC, he or she is appointed by the Administrative Director of the Courts and serves at the pleasure of the appointing authority.

The specific duties and responsibilities of each position are found in the Appendix B.

## Judges' Retirement Package

Prior to Act 65, SLH 1999, judges, (as well as legislators and certain legislative officers) could retire after 10 years of service below the age of 55 . They also receive $3.5 \%$ of the average of the three highest salary years for each year of service, like elected officers, house and senate clerks, assistant clerks, sergeants-at-arms, and assistant sergeants-at-arms.

Act 65, SLH 1999, changed the eligibility age and years of service required to accrue retirement benefits for judges appointed after June 30, 1999. Judges appointed after July 30, 1999, can retire after 25 years of service or with five or more years of service after reaching age 55. For judges retiring under age 55, penalties apply.

Retirement benefits include:

- Retirement benefits for a judge are $3.5 \%$ of average final salary (the average of a judge's three highest annual salaries without vacation payment) multiplied by the number of years of service;
- Judges also receive an annuity equal to the actuarial equivalent of a judge's accumulated contributions to the retirement system; according to statute, the retirement benefit for any judge is not to exceed $75 \%$ of the judge's average final compensation;
- Judges also receive federal Social Security benefits;
- Provisions also exist for judges to elect early retirement at reduced benefit levels;
- Judges are not required to pay state income taxes on their retirement benefits at the time they are received;
- Judges receive life insurance benefits at no premium cost; and
- Medical, drug, dental, and vision coverage is provided judges for life (all state employees are eligible for this benefit). There are deduced benefits for judges and employees hired after June 30, 1996.

More information can be found in Appendix F.

## Cost of Living as Measured by Available Indices

For the most part ${ }^{9}$, judicial pay scales have not kept pace with the cost of living in Hawaii. For 2003, the most recent data available, the Consumer Price Index for urban dwellers (CPI-U) for Honolulu was 183.5. To put this in perspective, a Circuit Court judge's adjusted salary should be $\$ 127,972$ just to keep level with the increased cost of living since 1975. In other words, the present Circuit Court judge's salary of $\$ 106,922$ reflects a loss of over \$20,000 in 2003.

Using information from the UCLA Anderson Forecast for the Nation and California ${ }^{10}$, we find the national CPI-U, from 2000 (when the last judicial pay adjustment occurred) to 2005, averaged 2.9 percent per year. For 2006 through 2010, the average increase is estimated to be 3.2 percent per year.

## Comparable Positions in Other States and the Federal Government

Whether you compare Hawaii judicial salaries to all other states or the federal government, it is clear salaries have not kept pace with the times.

In 2003, Hawaii's general trial court judges' (i.e., Circuit Court judges) salaries ranked $32^{\text {nd }}$ out of 51 states and the District of Columbia. Adjusted for the Cost of Living Index, Hawaii is $48^{\text {th }}$ out of 48 states reporting (see Appendix D).

The National Center for State Courts regularly gathers judicial salary information from the states in its Survey of Judicial Salaries. Compiling the

[^75]results from 1996 through 2003, the average salary increase for the equivalent of our Circuit Court judge is $3.51 \%$.

A U.S. federal magistrate, the lowest level federal judge, makes $\$ 142,324$ (not including a federal COLA of $25 \%$ for this region). Hence, their base salary is $\$ 35,402$ more than that of a Hawaii Circuit Court judge.

## Comparable Positions in the Private Sector (Profit and Non-Profit)

While judicial salaries have steadily declined due to inflation, privatesector salaries have risen. Even though rendering public service is an intangible benefit that helps compensate for the reduced salary levels associated with the bench, and even though salary should not be the sole inducement to seeking the bench, the disparity between judges' salaries and those of his or her peers is growing and is becoming a disincentive to join or to stay on the bench.

## Attorney Salaries

An incoming District Court judge must have at least five years of experience as a licensed attorney. For the Circuit Court and above, the minimum requirement is 10 years. To get as complete a range as possible, the information below compares averages for associate attorneys with five and eight years of experience from various sources.

The FindLaw Career Center uses salary data found at Infirmation.com ${ }^{11}$. FindLaw advertises its database as "the most comprehensive, accurate attorney salary database available anywhere..." Using the information there, the national average for $5^{\text {th }}$-year associates is about $\$ 153,000$ and $8^{\text {th }}$-year associates about $\$ 187,000$.

Using data from the Salary.com ${ }^{12}$ website, an attorney with two to five years of experience has a median salary of $\$ 109,182$, and those with five to eight years of experience have a median salary of $\$ 144,575$.

The National Association for Law Placement published a 2003 salary survey ${ }^{13}$ and found a median of $\$ 110,000$ for fifth-year associates and $\$ 124,900$ for eighth-year associates.

[^76]An informal survey of four local law firms found the following:

|  | Associate (new) | Partner (new*) | Partner (senior**) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Law Firm No. 1 | $\$ 72,500$ | $\$ 110,000-\$ 120,000$ | $\$ 200,000-\$ 220,000$ |
| Law Firm No. | $\$ 60,000-\$ 75,000$ | $\$ 100,000-\$ 125,000$ | $\$ 125,000-\$ 300,000$ |
| Law Firm No. | $\$ 65,000-\$ 77,000$ | $\$ 105,000$ |  |
| Law Firm No. 4 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\$ 130,000-\$ 190,000$ |  |

* After six to seven years as an Associate. ** After 10 to 15 years as a Partner


## For-Profit Salaries

The considerable gap in salaries between the Chief Justice and officers of private for profit business is particularly worrisome. While we do not presume that the level of complexity or scope of responsibilities managing the Judiciary's almost 2,000 employees is the same as running a business, the magnitude of the difference is nonetheless astonishing.

Ranked by 2001 Annual Compensation Excluding Options Salary
\$2,387,053 \$1,930,852 \$1,352,596 \$1,012,906
\$ 980,241
\$ 948,788
\$ 725,916
\$ 599,997
\$ 594,426
\$ 581,250
\$ 579,797
\$ 578,257
\$ 577,273
\$ 516,717
\$ 514,094
\$ 509,226 Former President CPB Inc.
Source: Pacific Business News, 2003 Book of Lists; p. 76.

[^77]
## Non-Profit Salaries

While private non-profit salaries do not reach the level of their forprofit brethren, the salaries are by no means parsimonious.

## Pacific Business News List of Non-Profit Salaries

Aloha United Way $\$ 162,342$
Kalihi Palama Health Center \$122,325
Catholic Charities of Hawaii $\$ 103,432$
Salvation Army \$ 79,133
Source: Pacific Business News 2003 Book of Lists, Non-Profit Service Providers (see p.38)

## Star-Bulletin List of Non-Profit Salaries

YMCA of Honolulu $\$ 139,010$

Boy Scouts Aloha Council $\$ 126,500$
American Cancer Society $\$ 123,000$
American Red Cross \$120,000
Child and Family Service $\$ 110,000$
Hawaiian Humane Society $\$ 105,434$
Hale Kipa \$100,000
Parents and Children Together \$100,000
Source: Robert Perez. "Raising Cane." Honolulu Star Bulletin, October 6, 2002.
http://starbulletin.com/2002/10/06/news/perez.html

## Top 10 University of Hawai'i Law School Salaries

|  | Job Title | Annual Salary |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | DEAN (UHM), LAW | $\$ 308,904$ |
| 2. | PROF \& KUDO CHAIR OF LAW | $\$ 136,404$ |
| 3. | PROF, LAW, 9-MO | $\$ 128,808$ |
| 4. | PROF, LAW, 9-MO | $\$ 112,572$ |
| 5. | PROF, LAW, 11-MO | $\$ 108,372$ |
| 6. | PROF, LAW, 9-MO | $\$ 104,268$ |
| 7. | PROF, LAW, 9-MO | $\$ 102,303$ |
| 8. | PROF, LAW, 9-MO | $\$ 100,345$ |
| 9. | PROF, LAW, 9-MO | $\$ 100,344$ |
| 10. | PROF, LAW, 9-MO | $\$ 100,344$ |

Source: "University of Hawai'i System Report: Report to the 2004 Legislature of the Salaries Paid to All University of Hawai'i Executive and Managerial Personnel, including the President, and Faculty Members" dated October 2003.

City \& County of Honolulu: 2003 Public Officials' Salaries (eff. 7/1/03)

Mayor of Honolulu $\$ 112,200$
Corporation Counsel \$ 99,807
Prosecuting Attorney \$ 99,807
Source: City \& County of Honolulu's Department of Human Resources

## Estimates of General Fund Tax Revenue

The Council on Revenues (the Council), established under section 37111, HRS, prepares state revenue estimates for each fiscal year of the sixyear state program and financial plan.

Estimates prepared by the Council are considered by the Governor in preparing the state budget, recommending appropriations, and controlling expenditures; they are considered by the Legislature in appropriating funds and enacting revenue measures.

On December 22, 2003, the Council published its most recent estimate of General Fund tax revenues: ${ }^{14}$

|  | FY04 | FY05 | FY06 | FY07 | FY08 | FY09 | FY10 | Avg. | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Growth Rate: | $5.2 \%$ | $7.9 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $41.7 \%$ |

[^78]
## CONCLUSIONS

The American Judicature Society, an organization devoted to the promotion of effective administration of justice at both the state and federal level, has spoken to the fundamental linkage between judicial compensation and judicial quality:

No precept of the American justice system is more fundamental than the need for excellence in the judicial officers who preside over that system. Without excellence, judges lose the aura of neutrality and independence that is central to their role as ultimate arbiters...[W]ithout adequate compensation--including salary as well as retirement, health, and other benefits--the quality of the applicant pool, can be diminished....To draw the brightest minds into the applicant pool, compensation must be offered that, if not quite competitive with the private sector, is at least adequate to permit such people to enter judicial service without significant financial sacrifice. ${ }^{15}$

The two objectives of the Commission are to create the most qualified judicial applicant pool and retain an experienced judiciary by providing fair and just compensation for Hawaii's justices, judges, and administrative officers.

The criteria used to determine what is fair and just are:

1. Skill and experience required to be a judge.
2. Overall compensation package of a judge.
3. Cost of living as measured by available indices.
4. Comparable positions locally, in other states, or the federal government.
5. Comparable positions in the private sector (profit and nonprofit).

A sixth, but unwritten, criterion is the State's overall financial picture. The Commission is not unmindful of the competing needs of other state programs within the environment of fiscal restraint.

[^79]Using all of the criteria above, the Commission's unequivocal conclusion is that Hawaii's judges are significantly under-compensated. Whether measured against what responsibilities judges are tasked with, their mandatory years of experience, judicial salaries in other jurisdictions, federal judicial salaries here in Hawaii, or other comparable positions here and on the mainland, the inescapable conclusion is that Hawaii's judges deserve, but are not receiving, a fair and just salary.

If we are to expect quality justice from our courts regardless of what courthouse we enter, then we must do more to ensure that we are, in fact, attracting and retaining the most highly qualified individuals in the State. If we should put off to the future, adequate judicial compensation, we run the clear and significant risk of jeopardizing the tradition of excellence established within our Judiciary. Judicial excellence cannot be preserved unless compensation levels are sufficient.

The Commission concludes, therefore, that in order to ensure that the most highly qualified individuals will be attracted to judicial service and will be able to serve and continue to serve without unreasonable economic hardship and with a level of judicial independence unaffected by financial concerns, a salary adjustment for state judges is essential.

The Commission also concludes, after examining judicial responsibilities, complexities of judicial service, mandatory years of experience, and other factors, that there should be a significant level of differentiation in salaries for the different court programs. Thus, the recommendation provides for a varying percentage of increase in base salaries for the justices and judges of the different court programs.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In accordance with Act 123, SLH 2003, the following recommendations are submitted to the 2004 Legislature. They will become effective on July 1, 2004, unless both houses of the Legislature approve a concurrent resolution that disapproves the recommendations.

1. Although the Commission is charged with recommending a salary adjustment starting with FY 2005, we recommend deferring all increases until FY 2006.
2. For FY 2006, we recommend an overall average salary increase of 14.0 percent ${ }^{16}$, or $\$ 1,311,746$ (see Appendix A for the details). This is an average of 2.8 percent per year from the last salary increase on July 1, 2000 to the next on July 1, 2005. This is in line with the U.S. Department of Labor, Consumer Price Index - Urban average increase of 2.9 percent per year for this same period.
3. Incremental increases of 3.5 percent per year from FY 2007 through FY 2012 for justices, judges, and appointed judiciary administrative officers. This is in line with the national average of $3.51 \%$ for Circuit Court judges over the last eight years.

The recommended increases would result in the salary structure shown on page 19 and in Appendix A.

## Proposed Changes in Statutes

While the Salary Commission is not tasked with recommending amendments to statutes nor, to our understanding, do such recommendations have the force of law, our experience over the last few months gives rise to two concerns. Hence, we respectfully submit the following proposals for consideration:

1. That the Judicial Salary Commission convene every four years rather than every eight.
2. That it begin its work in September rather than November.
[^80]In its deliberations, the Commission found the current eight year period creates a great deal of uncertainty as to the appropriate level of salary adjustment given the need to predict the performance of the Hawaii economy and the need for fair and reasonable adjustments.

In addition, convening in September, rather than November, will provide the Commission time to complete its recommendations and submit them to the Legislature prior to the opening of session rather than the present 40 days into the session.

## Judicial Salary Commission Recommendations

|  |  | FYO6 <br> (7/1/05) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY07 } \\ & (7 / 1 / 06) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY08 } \\ & (7 / 1 / 07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY09 } \\ & (7 / 1 / 08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY10 } \\ & \text { (7/1/09) } \end{aligned}$ | FY11 <br> (7/1/10) | FY12 <br> (7/1/11) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Chief Justice: | \$140,000 | \$144,900 | \$149,972 | \$155,221 | \$160,654 | \$166,277 | \$172,097 |
|  | Associate Justice: | \$135,000 | \$139,725 | \$144,615 | \$149,677 | \$154,916 | \$160,338 | \$165,950 |
|  | ICA Chief Judge: | \$130,000 | \$134,550 | \$139,259 | \$144,133 | \$149,178 | \$154,399 | \$159,803 |
|  | Associate Judge: | \$125,000 | \$129,375 | \$133,903 | \$138,590 | \$143,441 | \$148,461 | \$153,657 |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ | Circuit Court Judge: | \$121,600 | \$125,856 | \$130,261 | \$134,820 | \$139,539 | \$144,423 | \$149,478 |
|  | Dist./Fam. Court Judge: | \$114,600 | \$118,611 | \$122,762 | \$127,059 | \$131,506 | \$136,109 | \$140,873 |
|  | Administrative Director of the Courts: | \$105,000 | \$108,675 | \$112,479 | \$116,416 | \$120,491 | \$124,708 | \$129,073 |
|  | Deputy Administrative Director of the Courts: | \$100,000 | \$103,500 | \$107,123 | \$110,872 | \$114,753 | \$118,769 | \$122,926 |

Respectfully submitted:


## APPENDICES

## Appendix A. Salary Schedule

| PTO18(Final) | B | C | D | E | $F$ | G | H | 1 | J | K |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name | Number | Present Salary | FY05 | FY06 | FY07 | FY08 | FY09 | FY10 | FY11 | FY12 |
| CJ Supreme | 1 | \$116,779 |  | \$140,000 | \$144,900 | \$149,972 | \$155,221 | \$160,654 | \$.166,277 | \$172,097 |
|  |  | \$116,779 |  | \$140,000 | \$144,900 | \$149,972 | \$155,221 | \$160,654 | \$166,277 | \$172,097 |
|  |  |  |  | 1.1988 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | $\cdots$ | 1.0350 |
| AJ Supreme | 4 | \$115,547 |  | \$135,000 | \$139,725 | \$144,615 | \$149,677 | \$154,916 | \$160,338 | \$165,950 |
|  |  | \$462,188 |  | \$540,000 | \$558,900 | \$578,460 | \$598,708 | \$619,664 | \$641,352 | \$663,800 |
|  |  |  |  | 1.1684 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | ". 0350 | 1.0350 |
|  |  |  |  | -\$5,000 | -\$5,175 | -\$5,357 | -\$5,544 | -\$5,738 | -\$5,939 | -\$6,147 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CJ Intermediate | 1 | \$112,466 |  | \$130,000 | \$134,550 | \$139,259 | \$144,133 | \$149,178 | \$154,399 | \$159,803 |
|  |  | \$112,466 |  | \$130,000 | \$134,550 | \$139,259 | \$144,133 | \$149,178 | \$154,399 | \$159,803 |
|  |  |  |  | 1.1559 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 |
|  |  |  |  | -\$5,000 | -\$5,175 | -\$5,356 | -\$5,544 | -\$5,738 | -\$5,939 | -\$6,147 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AJ Intermediate | 5 | \$110,618 |  | \$125,000 | S129,375 | \$133,903 | \$138,590 | \$143,441 | \$148,461 | \$153,657 |
|  |  | \$553,090 |  | \$625,000 | \$646,875 | \$669,515 | \$692,950 | \$717,205 | \$742,305 | \$768,285 |
|  |  |  |  | 1.1300 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 |
|  |  |  |  | -\$5,000 | -\$5,175 | -\$5,356 | -\$5,543 | -\$5,737 | -\$5,938 | -\$6,146 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Circuit | 31 | \$106,922 |  | \$121,600 | \$125,856 | \$130,261 | \$134,820 | \$139,539 | \$144,423 | \$149,478 |
|  |  | \$3,314,582 |  | \$3,769,600 | \$3,901,536 | \$4,038,091 | \$4,179,420 | \$4,325,709 | \$4,477,113 | \$4,633,818 |
|  |  |  |  | 1.1373 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 |
|  |  |  |  | -\$3,400 | -\$3,519 | -\$3,642 | -\$3,770 | -\$3,902 | -54,038 | -\$4,179 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dist/Fam/Per Diem* | 46 | \$100,761 |  | \$114,600 | \$118,611 | \$122,762 | \$127,059 | \$131,506 | \$136,109 | \$140,873 |
|  |  | \$4,635,006 |  | \$5,271,600 | \$5,456,106 | \$5,647,052 | \$5,844,714 | \$6,049,276 | \$6,261,014 | \$6,480,158 |
|  |  |  |  | 1.1373 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 |
|  |  |  |  | -\$7,000 | -\$7,245 | -\$7,499 | -\$7,761 | -\$8,033 | --58,314 | -\$8,605 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Admin Director | 1 | \$90,041 |  | \$105,000 | \$108,675 | \$112,479 | \$116,416 | \$120,491 | \$124,708 | \$129,073 |
|  |  | \$90,041 |  | \$105,000 | \$108,675 | \$112,479 | \$116,416 | \$120,491 | \$124,708 | \$129,073 |
|  |  |  |  | 1.1661 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deputy Director | 1 | \$85,302 |  | \$100,000 | \$103,500 | \$107,123 | \$110,872 | \$114,753 | \$118,769 | \$122,926 |
|  |  | \$85,302 |  | \$100,000 | \$103,500 | \$107,123 | \$110,872 | \$114,753 | \$118,769 | \$122,926 |
|  |  |  |  | 1.1723 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 | 1.0350 |
|  |  |  |  | -\$5,000 | -\$5,175 | -\$5,356 | -\$5,544 | -\$5,738 | -\$5,939 | -\$6,147 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 90 | \$9,369,454 |  | \$10,681,200 | \$11,055,042 | \$11,441,951 | \$11,842,434 | \$12,256,930 | \$12,685,937 | \$13,129,960 |
|  |  |  |  | \$1,311,746 | \$373,842 | \$386,909 | \$400,483 | \$414,496 | \$429,007 | \$444,023 |
|  | Percentage Increase |  |  | 14.00\% | 3.50\% | 3.50\% | 3.50\% | 3.50\% | 3.50\% | 3.50\% |

* For budgeting purposes, based on historical data, a FTE of 10 is used for the number of per diem judges utilized per year. In addition, three Family Court

D: \DatalWinwordISalary Commission\Report\PTO18.XLS

## Appendix B. Position Duties and Responsibilities

## Chief Justice

The Chief Justice is a constitutional officer selected by the Governor, subject to Senate confirmation, from a list of qualified candidates submitted by the Judicial Selection Commission. The Chief Justice is appointed for a 10 -year term. Mandatory retirement age is 70 years.

The Chief Justice is the administrative head of the Judiciary. The Chief Justice bears overall responsibility for managing the courts' caseloads and is specifically responsible for assigning judges from one circuit to another, for assigning District judges to serve temporarily on the Circuit Court, for assigning Circuit judges to serve temporarily on the ICA or the Supreme Court, for assigning ICA judges to serve temporarily on the Supreme Court, for appointing per diem judges to serve temporarily on the District Courts and District Family Courts, and for assigning retired justices and judges to serve on the court from which each retired when such assignments are needed. In addition, the Chief Justice is tasked with organizing and administering, through the Office of the Administrative Director of the Courts, the programs and services assigned to the Judiciary.

In addition to administrative duties, the Chief Justice is presiding justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii. In that role, the Chief Justice organizes the work of the Court, monitors its case management, and directly supervises the Chief Clerk and the Court Staff Attorney.

The Chief Justice maintains, as one of the five members of the Supreme Court, a full caseload. That is, together with the other members of the Court, the Chief Justice hears and decides appeals and original proceedings ${ }^{17}$ that come within the Supreme Court's jurisdiction.

The Chief Justice is the State's official representative of the third branch of government and, in that capacity, attends and participates in ceremonial functions, meetings, conferences, and other events.

The Chief Justice participates in judicial evaluations and counsels judges when warranted or requested.

[^81]
## Associate Justice

Each Associate Justice is a constitutional officer selected by the Governor, subject to state Senate confirmation, from a list of qualified candidates submitted by the Judicial Selection Commission. Each Associate Justice is appointed for a 10-year term. Mandatory retirement age is 70 years.

Each Associate Justice, together with the other members of the Court, hears and decides appeals and original proceedings that come within the Supreme Court's jurisdiction. Each Associate Justice, as assigned by the Chief Justice, may be responsible for monitoring one or more aspects of case processing or regulation of attorneys or court reporters. Current assignments include responsibility for assignment of cases to either the ICA or the Supreme Court, assignment of cases to primary justices, substantive motions, original proceedings, procedural motions, defaults, judicial education, bar and disciplinary matters, and court reporters.

## ICA Chief Judge

The Chief Judge of the ICA is a constitutional officer selected by the Governor, subject to state Senate confirmation, from a list of qualified candidates submitted by the Judicial Selection Commission. The Chief Judge is appointed for a 10-year term. Mandatory retirement age is 70 years.

The Chief Judge of the ICA is responsible for monitoring and managing the ICA's caseload. That is, the Chief Judge constitutes/organizes the ICA panels, assigns cases to panels, designates the presiding judge for each panel, and the primary judge for each case.

The Chief Judge maintains, as one of the members of a panel, a full caseload. Together with the other members of the Court, the Chief Judge hears and decides appeals and other matters assigned by the Supreme Court to the ICA. ${ }^{18}$ The Chief Judge may sit, when assigned by the Chief Justice, with the Supreme Court to hear and decide matters before the Supreme Court. The Chief Judge may be assigned by the Chief Justice to sit on one or more of the committees that advise the Chief Justice or the Supreme Court about court and Judiciary administration or court rules.
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## ICA Associate Judge

Each Associate Judge of the ICA is a constitutional officer selected by the Governor, subject to state Senate confirmation, from a list of qualified candidates submitted by the Judicial Selection Commission. Each Associate Judge is appointed for a 10-year term. Mandatory retirement age is 70 years.

Each Associate Judge hears and decides, along with two other members of the court, appeals or other matters assigned to the ICA by the Supreme Court.

An Associate Judge may sit, when assigned by the Chief Justice, with the Supreme Court to hear and decide matters before the Supreme Court. An Associate Judge may be assigned by the Chief Justice to sit on one or more committees that advise the Chief Justice or the Supreme Court about matters of court and Judiciary administration and court rules.

## Circuit Court Judge

Each Circuit Judge is a constitutional officer selected by the Governor, subject to state Senate confirmation, from a list of qualified candidates submitted by the Judicial Selection Commission. Each Circuit Judge is appointed for a 10-year term. Mandatory retirement age is 70 years.

Each Circuit Judge hears and decides, with or without a jury, cases that come within the jurisdiction of the Circuit courts. Circuit Judges may be assigned to sit with the ICA or the Supreme Court for specific cases.

A Circuit Judge may be appointed by the Chief Justice to serve as Chief Judge or Deputy Chief Judge to assist with caseload management and other administrative matters. A Circuit Judge may be assigned to sit on one or more committees that advise the Chief Justice and the Supreme Court about court and Judiciary administration and court rules.

## District Court and District Family Court Judges

Each District Judge or District Family Judge (together, District Judge) is a constitutional officer selected by the Chief Justice, subject to state Senate confirmation, from a list of qualified candidates submitted by the Judicial Selection Commission. Each District Judge is appointed for a sixyear term. Mandatory retirement age is 70 years.

Each District Judge hears and decides, without a jury, cases that come within the jurisdiction of the District or District Family Courts. District Judges may be assigned to sit on the Circuit Court when needed. A District Judge may be assigned to sit on one or more committees that advise the Chief Justice and the Supreme Court about Judiciary administration and court rules.

## Per Diem Judges

Per Diem Judges are appointed by the Chief Justice to serve on the District Court or the District Family Court on a temporary basis. By statute, Per Diem Judges are paid at the daily rate for District Judges. Per Diem Judges perform the same adjudicatory functions that are performed by their full-time counterparts.

## Administrative Director of the Courts

The ADOC is appointed by the Chief Justice, with the approval of the Supreme Court, and assists the Chief Justice in directing the administration of the Judiciary. The ADOC, subject to the direction of the Chief Justice, performs the following functions:

1. Examines the administrative methods of the courts and makes recommendations to the Chief Justice for their improvement;
2. Examines the state of dockets of the courts, secures information as to their needs of assistance, if any, prepares statistical data and reports of the business of the courts and advises the Chief Justice to the end that proper action may be taken;
3. Examines the estimates of the courts for appropriations and presents to the Chief Justice the ADOC's recommendations concerning them;
4. Examines the statistical systems of the courts and makes recommendations to the Chief Justice for a uniform system of judicial statistics;
5. Collects, analyzes, and reports to the Chief Justice statistical and other data concerning the business of the courts;
6. Assists the Chief Justice in the preparation of the budget, the six-year program and financial plan, the variance report and any other reports requested by the Legislature;
7. Carries out all duties and responsibilities that are specified in Hawaii Revised Statutes, Title 7, as it pertains to employees of the Judiciary; and
8. Attends to such other matters as may be assigned by the Chief Justice.

## Deputy Administrative Director

The Deputy Administrative Director serves as deputy to the ADOC and assists in the administration of the Judiciary, with responsibility for the efficient operation of the courts and for the expeditious dispatch of all judicial business.

The Deputy Administrative Director serves as Acting ADOC in the absence of the supervisor.

As Deputy to the ADOC participates in policymaking, analysis, and evaluation of Judiciary plans and programs to implement improvements in the provision of administrative services to the courts.

The Deputy Administrative Director represents the ADOC at legislative and other hearings and meetings. Initiates legislative proposals and/or change in behalf of the Judiciary, reviews proposed legislation affecting the Judiciary, keeps the ADOC apprised of legislative activities as they affect the Judiciary.

The Deputy Administrative Director serves as liaison between the Judiciary and the various levels of government and agencies in coordinating activities crossing jurisdictional lines.

## Appendix C. Federal System Judicial Salaries

(As of 01/01/03)

Chief Justice ..... \$198,600
Associate Justices ..... \$190,100
U.S. Circuit Courts of Appeals Judges ..... \$164,000
U.S. District Court Judges ..... $\$ 154,700$ **
U.S. Claims Court Judges ..... $\$ 154,700$
U.S. Court of International Trade Judges ..... \$154,700
U.S. Bankruptcy Judges * ..... \$142,324 **
U.S. Magistrate Judges * ..... \$142,324 **

## Notes:

* Set by law at $92 \%$ of U.S. District Court judge's salary
** Federal judges in Hawaii also receive a cost of living adjustment (COLA) of 25\%

Appendix D. Salary Comparisons Among States, 2003

## SALARY COMPARISON AMONG STATES, 2003: GENERAL TRIAL COURT (eff. 4/1/03)

| Rank | State | Actual Salary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | District of Columbia | \$154,700 |
| 2 | New Jersey | 141:000 |
| 3 | Delaware | 140,200 |
| 4 | Michigan | 139,919 |
| 5 | California | 139,476 |
| 6 | New York | 136,700 |
| 7 | iliniouis | 136,546 |
| 8 | Florida | 133,250 |
| 9 | Nevada | 130,000 |
| 10 | Connecticut | 125,000 |
| 11 | Virginia | 123,027 |
| 12 | Washington | 121,972 |
| 13 | Georgia | 121,938 |
| 14 | Pennsylvania | 121,225 |
| 15 | Arizona | 120,750 |
| 16 | Maryland | 119,600 |
| 17 | Rhode Island | 119,579 |
| 18 | Arkansas | 115,659 |
| 19 | Minnesota | 114,700 |
| 20 | South Carolina | 113,535 |
| 21 | Kentucky | 113,266 |
| 22 | Massachusetts | 112,777 |
| 23 | Alabama | 111,973 |
| 24 | Tennessee | 111,060 |
| 25 | Nebraska | 110,330 |
| 26 | lowa | 109,810 |
| 27 | Texas | 109,158 |
| 28 | Alaska | 109,032 |
| 29 | Wisconsin | 108,950 |
| 30 | ivissuuri | 108,000 |
| 31 | Ohio | 107,600 |
| 32 | Hawaii *** | 106,922 |
| 33 | New Hampshire | 106,187 |
| 34 | Colorado | 104,637 |
| 35 | North Carolina | 104,523 |
| 36 | Utah | 103,700 |
| 37 | Vermont | 102,813 |
| 38 | Louisiana | 100,743 |
| 39 | Wyoming | 100,000 |
| 40 | Kansas | 98,744 |
| 41 | Maine | 98,377 |
| 42 | Oklahoma | 95,898 |
| 43 | Oregon | 95,800 |
| 44 | Idaho | 95,718 |
| 45 | Mississippi | 94,700 |
| 46 | South Dakota | 94,029 |
| 47 | North Dakota | 90,671 |
| 48 | Indiana | 90,000 |
| 49 | West Virginia | 90,000 |
| 50 | New Mexico | 86,896 |
| 51 | Montana | 82,600 |

SALARY COMPARISON AMONG STATES, 2003: GENERAL TRIAL COURT (eff. 4/1/03)

| Rank | State | Actual Salary | Adj. Salary | ACCRA Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Michigan | \$139,919 | \$138,181 | 1.01 |
| 2 | Delaware | 140,200 | 137,796 | 1.02 |
| 3 | Florida | 133,250 | 137,033 | 0.97 |
| 4 | Illinois | 136,546 | 134,943 | 1.01 |
| 5 | Georgia | 121,938 | 132,213 | 0.92 |
| 6 | Arkansas | 115,659 | 129,794 | 0.89 |
| 7 | Maryland | 119,600 | 126,489 | 0.95 |
| 8 | Nevada | 130,000 | 126,348 | 1.03 |
| 9 | Tennessee | 111,060 | 123,976 | 0.90 |
| 10 | Kentucky | 113,266 | 123,233 | 0.92 |
| 11 | Arizona | 120,750 | 122,908 | 0.98 |
| 12 | Alabama | 111,973 | 121,710 | 0.92 |
| 13 | Pennsylvania | 121,225 | 121,060 | 1.00 |
| 14 | Virginia | 123,027 | 120,915 | 1.02 |
| 15 | Texas | 109,158 | 120,328 | 0.91 |
| 16 | South Carolina | 113,535 | 116,836 | 0.97 |
| 17 | lowa | 109,810 | 116,403 | 0.94 |
| 18 | Nebraska | 110,330 | 116,238 | 0.95 |
| 19 | Missouri | 108,000 | 115,104 | 0.94 |
| 20 | District of Columbia | 154.700 | 114.918 | 1.35 |
| 21 | Washington | 121,972 | 114,642 | 1.06 |
| 22 | New York | 136,700 | 113,400 | 1.21 |
| 23 | Wisconsin | 108,950 | 112,745 | 0.97 |
| 24 | California | 139,476 | 112,465 | 1.24 |
| 25 | Minnesota | 114,700 | 111,440 | 1.03 |
| 26 | Ohio | 107,600 | 110,927 | 0.97 |
| 27 | Utah | 103,700 | 110,454 | 0.94 |
| 28 | North Carolina | 104,523 | 107,698 | 0.97 |
| 29 | Vermont | 102,813 | 105,775 | 0.97 |
| 30 | Oklahoma | 95,898 | 105,354 | 0.91 |
| 31 | Kansas | 98,744 | 104,536 | 0.94 |
| 32 | Louisiana | 100,743 | 104,060 | 0.97 |
| 33 | Idaho | 95,718 | 102,649 | 0.93 |
| 34 | Colorado | 104,637 | 102,052 | 1.03 |
| 35 | Mississippi | 94,700 | 101,726 | 0.93 |
| 36 | Wyoming | 100,000 | 99,970 | 1.00 |
| 37 | North Dakota | 90,671 | 99,498 | 0.91 |
| 38 | New Jersey | 141,000 | 98,393 | 1.43 |
| 39 | Connecticut | 125,000 | 97,319 | 1.28 |
| 40 | West Virginia | 90,000 | 96,235 | 0.95 |
| 41 | South Dakota | 94,029 | 05,066 | 0.98 |
| 42 | Indiana | 90,000 | 95,156 | 0.94 |
| 43 | Oregon | 95,800 | 91,303 | 1.05 |
| 44 | Massachusetts | 112,777 | 90,459 | 1.25 |
| 45 | New Mexico | 86,896 | 87,368 | 0.99 |
| 46 | Alaska | 109,032 | 86,005 | 1.27 |
| 47 | Montana | 82,600 | 84,530 | 0.98 |
| 48 | Hawaii "** | 106,922 | 72,293 | 1.48 |
| 49 | Maine | 98,377 | N/A | N/A |
| 50 | New Hampshire | 106,187 | N/A | N/A |
| 51 | Rhode Island | 119,579 | N/A | N/A |

Source" "Survey of Judicial Salaries" published by the NCSC, Vol. 28, No. 1, As of April 1, 2003.
.". This table reflects the salary for a General Trial Court Jưge.
The ACCRA Cost of Living index ineasures ielative price ieveis fur cursurner youds and services in paricipating areas. Note: Since the ACCRA factor is rounded off to two decimal places, the final rankings for several states, based on their adiusted salaries, mav be affected.

## SALARY COMPARISON AMONG STATES, 2003: HIGHEST COURT (eff. 4/1/03)

| Rank | State | Actual Salary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | California | \$170,319 |
| 2 | Michigan | 164,610 |
| 3 | District of Columbia | 164,100 |
| 4 | New Jersey | 158,500 |
| 5 | iliinois | 158,103 |
| 6 | Florida | 153,750 |
| 7 | Georgia | 153,086 |
| 8 | Alabama | 152,027 |
| 9 | New York | 151,200 |
| 10 | Delaware | 147,000 |
| 11 | Nevada | 140,000 |
| 12 | Pennsylvania | 139,585 |
| 13 | Connecticut | 138,404 |
| 14 | Washington | 134,584 |
| 15 | Rhode Island | 132,817 |
| 16 | Virginia | 132,523 |
| 17 | Maryland | 131,600 |
| 18 | Minnesota | 129,674 |
| 19 | Massachusetts | 126,943 |
| 20 | Arizona | 126,525 |
| 21 | Ohio | 125,500 |
| 22 | Arkansas | 123,475 |
| 23 | Kentucky | 123,335 |
| 24 | Missouri | 123,000 |
| 25 | Wisconsin | 122,418 |
| 26 | Tennessee | 121,740 |
| 27 | lowa | 120,100 |
| 28 | South Carolina | 119,510 |
| 29 | Nebraska | 119,276 |
| 30 | Alaska | 117,900 |
| 31 | Hawaii * | 115,547 |
| 32 | North Carolina | 115,336 |
| 33 | Indiana | 115,000 |
| 34 | Utah | 114,050 |
| 35 | Colorado | 113,637 |
| 36 | New Hampshire | 113,266 |
| 37 | Kansas | 113,073 |
| 38 | Texas | 113,000 |
| 39 | Louisiana | 112,668 |
| 40 | Vermont | 108,149 |
| 41 | Oklahoma | 106,706 |
| 42 | Oregon | 105,200 |
| 43 | Wyoming | 105,000 |
| 44 | Maine | 104,329 |
| 45 | Idaho | 102,125 |
| 46 | Mississippi | 102,000 |
| 47 | South Dakota | 100,671 |
| 48 | North Dakota | 99,122 |
| 49 | New Mexico | 96,283 |
| 50 | West Virginia | 95,000 |
| 51 | Montana | 89,381 |

Source: "Survey of Judicial Salaries" published by the NCSC, Vol. 28, No. 1, As of April 1, 2003.
*This table reflects the salary for an Associate Justice of the Hawail' Supreme Court.

SALARY COMPARISON AMONG STATES, 2003: HIGHEST COURT (eff. 4/1/03)

| Rank | State | Actual Salary | Adj. Salary | ACCRA Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Georgia | \$153,086 | \$166,398 | 0.92 |
| 2 | Alabama | 152,027 | 165,247 | 0.92 |
| 3 | Michigan | 164,610 | 162,980 | 1.01 |
| 4 | Florida | 153,750 | 158,505 | 0.97 |
| 5 | Illinois | 158,103 | 156,538 | 1.01 |
| 6 | Delaware | 147,000 | 144,118 | 1.02 |
| 7 | Pennsylvania | 139,585 | 139,585 | 1.00 |
| 8 | Arkansas | 123,475 | 138,736 | 0.89 |
| 9 | Maryland | 131,600 | 138,526 | 0.95 |
| 10 | California | 170,319 | 137,354 | 1.24 |
| 11 | Nevada | 140,000 | 135,922 | 1.03 |
| 12 | Tennessee | 121,740 | 135,267 | 0.90 |
| 13 | Kentucky | 123,335 | 134,060 | 0.92 |
| 14 | Missouri | 123,000 | 130,851 | 0.94 |
| 15 | Virginia | 132,523 | 129,925 | 1.02 |
| 16 | Ohio | 125,500 | 129,381 | 0.97 |
| 17 | Arizona | 126,525 | 129,107 | 0.98 |
| 18 | lowa | 120,100 | 127,766 | 0.94 |
| 19 | Washington | 134,584 | 126,966 | 1.06 |
| 20 | Wisconsin | 122,418 | 126,204 | 0.97 |
| 21 | Minnesota | 129,074 | 125,697 | 1.03 |
| 22 | Nebraska | 119,276 | 125,554 | 0.95 |
| 23 | New York | 151,200 | 124,959 | 1.21 |
| 24 | Texas | 113,000 | 124,176 | 0.91 |
| 25 | South Carolina | 119,510 | 123,206 | 0.97 |
| 26 | District of Columbia | 164,100 | 121,556 | 1.35 |
| 27 | Utah | 114,050 | 121,330 | 0.94 |
| 28 | Indiana | 115,000 | 121,053 | 0.95 |
| 29 | Kansas | 113,073 | 120,290 | 0.94 |
| 30 | North Carolina | 115,336 | 118,903 | 0.97 |
| 31 | Oklahoma | 106,706 | 117,259 | 0.91 |
| 32 | Louisiana | 112,668 | 116,153 | 0.97 |
| 33 | Vermont | 108,149 | 111,494 | 0.97 |
| 34 | New Jersey | 158,500 | 110,839 | 1.43 |
| 35 | Colorado | 113,637 | 110,327 | 1.03 |
| 36 | Idaho | 102,125 | 109,812 | 0.93 |
| 37 | Mississippi | 102,000 | 109,677 | 0.93 |
| 38 | North Dakota | 99.122 | 108,925 | 0.91 |
| 39 | Connecticut | 138,404 | 108,128 | 1.28 |
| 40 | Wyoming | 105,000 | 105,000 | 1.00 |
| 41 | South Dakota | 100,671 | 102,726 | 0.98 |
| 42 | Massachusetts | 126,943 | 101,554 | 1.25 |
| 43 | Oregon | 105,200 | 100,190 | 1.05 |
| 44 | New Mexico | 96,283 | 96,283 | 0.99 |
| 45 | West Virginia | 95,000 | 95,000 | 0.94 |
| 46 | Alaska | 117,900 | 92,835 | 1.27 |
| 47 | Montana | 89,381 | 89,381 | 0.98 |
| 48 | Hawaii * | 115,547 | 78,072 | 1.48 |
| 49 | Maine | 104,929 | N/A | N/A |
| 50 | New Hampshire | 113,266 | N/A | N/A |
| 51 | Rhode Island | 132,817 | N/A | N/A |

Source: "Survey of Judicial Salaries" published by the NCSC, Vol. 28, No. 1, As of April 1, 2003.

* This table reflects the salary for an Asscciate Justice of tion Hawai't Gupreme Court.

The ACCRA Cost of Living Index measures relative price levels for consumer goods and services in participating areas.
Note: Since the ACCRA factor is rounded off to two decimal places, the final rankings for several states, based on their adjusted salaries, may be affected.

## SALARY COMPARISON AMONG STATES, 2003: INTERMEDIATE APPELLATE COURT (eff. 4/1/03)

| Rank | State 1] | Actual Salary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | California | \$159,657 |
| 2 | Georgia | 152,139 |
| 3 | Michigan | 151,441 |
| 4 | Alabama | 151,027 |
| 5 | New Jersey | 150,000 |
| 6 | Illinois | 148,803 |
| 7 | New York | 144,000 |
| 8 | Florida | 141,963 |
| 9 | Pennsylvania | 135,213 |
| 10 | Connecticut | 129,988 |
| 11 | Washington | 128,116 |
| 12 | Virginia | 125,899 |
| 13 | Arizona | 123,900 |
| 14 | Maryland | 123,800 |
| 15 | Minnesota | 122,186 |
| 16 | Arkansas | 119,569 |
| 17 | Kentucky | 118,300 |
| 18 | Massachusetts | 117,467 |
| 19 | Ohio | 117,000 |
| 20 | South Carolina | 116,521 |
| 21 | Tennessee | 116,064 |
| 22 | lowa | 115,540 |
| 23 | Wisconsin | 115,490 |
| 24 | ivissouri | 115,000 |
| 25 | Nebraska | 113,312 |
| 26 | Alaska | 111,384 |
| 27 | Hawaii «* | 110,618 |
| 28 | North Carolina | 110,530 |
| 29 | Indiana | 110,000 |
| 30 | Kansas | 109,157 |
| 31 | Colorado | 109,137 |
| 32 | Utah | 108,900 |
| 33 | Texas | 107,350 |
| 34 | Louisiana | 106,706 |
| 35 | Oregon | 102.800 |
| 36 | Oklahoma | 101,714 |
| 37 | Idaho | 101,125 |
| 38 | Mississippi | 95,500 |
| 39 | New Mexico | 91,469 |
| 40 | Maine | 0 |
| 40 | South Dakota | 0 |
| 40 | Wyoming | 0 |
| 40 | Nevada | 0 |
| 40 | West Virginia | 0 |
| 40 | Montana | 0 |
| 40 | Delaware | 0 |
| 40 | Vermont | 0 |
| 40 | North Dakota | 0 |
| 40 | New Hampshire | 0 |
| 40 | Rhode Island | 0 |
| 40 | District of Columbia | 0 |

Source: "Survey of Judicial Salaries" published by the NCSC, Vol. 28, No. 1, As of April 1, 2003.
*- This table reflects the salary for an Associate Judge of the Hawar' Intermediate Court of Appeals.
1] Note: Not all states have an intermediate appellate court.

SALARY COMPARISON AMONG STATES, 2003: INTERMEDIATE APPELLATE COURT (eff. 4/1/03)

| Rank | State | Actual Salary | Adj. Salary | ACCRA Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Georgia | \$152,139 | \$165,368 | 0.92 |
| 2 | Alabama | 151,027 | 164,160 | 0.92 |
| 3 | Michigan | 151,441 | 149,942 | 1.01 |
| 4 | Illinois | 148,803 | 147,330 | 1.01 |
| 5 | Florida | 141,963 | 146,354 | 0.97 |
| 6 | Pennsylvania | 135,213 | 135,213 | 1.00 |
| 7 | Arkansas | 119,569 | 134,347 | 0.89 |
| 8 | Maryland | 123,800 | 130,316 | 0.95 |
| 9 | Tennessee | 116,064 | 128,960 | 0.90 |
| 10 | California | 159,657 | 128,756 | 1.24 |
| 11 | Kentucky | 118,300 | 128,587 | 0.92 |
| 12 | Arizona | 123,900 | 126,429 | 0.98 |
| 13 | Virginia | 125,899 | 123,430 | 1.02 |
| 14 | lowa | 115,540 | 122,915 | 0.94 |
| 15 | Missouri | 115,000 | 122,340 | 0.94 |
| 10 | Wastington | 128,110 | 120,004 | 4.06 |
| 17 | Ohio | 117,000 | 120,619 | 0.97 |
| 18 | South Carolina | 116,521 | 120,125 | 0.97 |
| 19 | Nebraska | 113,312 | 119,276 | 0.95 |
| 20 | Wisconsin | 115,490 | 119,062 | 0.97 |
| 21 | New York | 144,000 | 119,008 | 1.21 |
| 22 | Minnesota | 122,186 | 118,627 | 1.03 |
| 23 | Texas | 107,350 | 117,967 | 0.91 |
| 24 | Kansas | 109,157 | 116,124 | 0.94 |
| 25 | Utah | 108,900 | 115,851 | 0.94 |
| 26 | Indiana | 110,000 | 115,789 | 0.95 |
| 27 | North Carolina | 110,530 | 113,948 | 0.97 |
| 28 | Oklahoma | 101,714 | 111,774 | 0.91 |
| 29 | Louisiana | 106,706 | 110,006 | 0.97 |
| 30 | Idaho | 101,125 | 108,737 | 0.93 |
| 31 | Colorado | 109,137 | 105,958 | 1.03 |
| 32 | New Jersey | 150,000 | 104,895 | 1.43 |
| 33 | Mississippi | 95,500 | 102,688 | 0.93 |
| 34 | Connecticut | 129,988 | 101,553 | 1.28 |
| 35 | Oregon | 102,800 | 97,905 | 1.05 |
| 36 | Massachusetts | 117,467 | 93,974 | 1.25 |
| 37 | New Mexico | 91,469 | 92,393 | 0.99 |
| 38 | Alaska | 111,384 | 87,704 | 1.27 |
| 39 | Hawaii ** | 110,618 | 74,742 | 1.48 |
| 40 | Delaware | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 40 | Rhode Island | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 40 | New Hampshire | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 40 | North Dakota | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 40 | Vermont | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 40 | District of Columbia | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 40 | Montana | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 40 | West Virginia | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 40 | Nevada | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 40 | Wyoming | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 40 | South Dakota | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 40 | Maine | 0 | N/A | N/A |

Source: "Survey of Judicial Salaries" published by the NCSC, Vol. 28, No. 1, As of April 1, 2003.
** This table reflects the salary for an Associate Judge of the Hawail Intermediate Court of Appeals.
The ACCRA Cost of Living Index measures relative price levels for consumer goods and services in participating areas.
Note: Since the ACCRA factor is rounded off to two decimal places, the final rankings for several states, based on their
adiusted salaries mav he affertad

| Rank | State | Actual Salary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | California | \$176,000 |
| 2 | District of Columbia | 155,000 |
| 3 | New Jersey | 150,000 |
| 4 | Hlinois | 149,000 |
| 5 | New York | 148,000 |
| 6 | Connecticut | 144,000 |
| 7 | Arizona | 136,000 |
| 8 | Pennsylvania | 134,000 |
| 9 | Florida | 128,000 |
| 10 | Michigan | 126.000 |
| 11 | Virginia | 125,000 |
| 12 | lowa | 123,000 |
| 13 | Massachusetts | 122,000 |
| 14 | Maryland | 119,000 |
| 15 | Georgia | 117,000 |
| 16 | Tennessee * | 116,000 |
| 17 | Alaska* | 116,000 |
| 18 | Washington * | 116,000 |
| 19 | Wisconsin * | 115,000 |
| 20 | Ohio * | 115,000 |
| 21 | Minnesota * | 115.000 |
| 22 | Kentucky | 113,000 |
| 23 | Colorado | 112,000 |
| 24 | Oregon * | 108,000 |
| 25 | Missouri * | 108,000 |
| 26 | Delaware * | 108,000 |
| 27 | North Carolina* | 108,000 |
| 28 | Louisiana * | 107,000 |
| 29 | Rhode Island * | 107,000 |
| 30 | Alabama | 105,000 |
| 31 | Utah | 104,000 |
| 32 | Vermont | 103,000 |
| 33 | Oklahoma | 102,000 |
| 34 | Nevada | 100,000 |
| 35 | Kansas* | 99,000 |
| 36 | South Carolina* | 99,000 |
| 37 | Indiana * | 99,000 |
| 38 | Texas | 98,000 |
| 39 | Idaho * | 97,000 |
| 40 | Nebraska* | 97,000 |
| 41 | New Hampshire | 96,000 |
| 42 | New Mexico | 94,000 |
| 43 | Maine | 92,000 |
| 44 | Montana* | 91,000 |
| 45 | Arkansas* | 91,000 |
| 46 | Hawaii | 90,000 |
| 47 | South Dakota | 89,000 |
| 48 | West Virginia | 88,000 |
| 49 | North Dakota | 84,000 |
| 50 | Mississippi * | 83,000 |
| 51 | Wyoming * | 83,000 |

[^83]SALARY COMPARISON AMONG STATES, 2003: STATE COURT ADMINISTRATORS (eff. 4/1/03)

| Rank | State | Actual Salary | Adi. Salary | ACCRA Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Illinois | \$149,000 | \$147.525 | 1.01 |
| 2 | California | 176,000 | 141,935 | 1.24 |
| 3 | Arizona | 136,000 | 138,776 | 0.98 |
| 4 | Pennsylvania | 134,000 | 134,000 | 1.00 |
| 5 | Florida | 128,000 | 131,959 | 0.97 |
| 6 | lowa | 123,000 | 130,851 | 0.94 |
| 7 | Tennessee * | 116,000 | 128,889 | 0.9 |
| 8 | Georgia | 117,000 | 127,174 | 0.92 |
| 9 | Maryland | 119,000 | 125,263 | 0.95 |
| 10 | Michigan | 126,000 | 124,752 | 1.01 |
| 11 | Kentucky | 113,000 | 122,826 | 0.92 |
| 12 | Virginia | 125,000 | 122,549 | 1.02 |
| 13 | New York | 148,000 | 122,314 | 1.21 |
| 14 | Wisconsin * | 115,000 | 118,557 | 0.97 |
| 15 | Ohio * | 115,000 | 118,557 | 0.97 |
| 16 | Missouri * | 108,000 | 114,894 | 0.94 |
| 17 | District of Columbia | 155,000 | 114,815 | 1.35 |
| 18 | Alabama | 105,000 | 114,130 | 0.92 |
| 19 | Connecticut | 144,000 | 112,500 | 1.28 |
| 20 | Oklahoma | 102,000 | 112,088 | 0.91 |
| 21 | Minnesota * | 115,000 | 111,650 | 1.03 |
| 22 | North Carolina * | 108,000 | 111,340 | 0.97 |
| 23 | Utah | 104,000 | 110,638 | 0.94 |
| 24 | Louisiana * | 107,000 | 110,309 | 0.97 |
| 25 | Washington * | 116.000 | 109.434 | 1.06 |
| 26 | Colorado | 112,000 | 108,738 | 1.03 |
| 27 | Texas | 98,000 | 107,692 | 0.91 |
| 28 | Vermont | 103,000 | 106,186 | 0.97 |
| 29 | Delaware * | 108,000 | 105,882 | 1.02 |
| 30 | Kansas* | 99,000 | 105,319 | 0.94 |
| 31 | New Jersey | 150,000 | 104,895 | 1.43 |
| 32 | Idaho* | 97,000 | 104,301 | 0.93 |
| 33 | Indiana* | 99,000 | 104,211 | 0.95 |
| 34 | Oregon* | 108,000 | 102,857 | 1.05 |
| 35 | Arkansas* | 91,000 | 102,247 | 0.89 |
| 36 | Nebraska* | 97,000 | 102,105 | 0.95 |
| 37 | South Carolina * | 99,000 | 102,062 | 0.97 |
| 38 | Massachusetts | 122,000 | 97,600 | 1.25 |
| 39 | Nevada | 100,000 | 97,087 | 1.03 |
| 40 | New Mexico | 94,000 | 94,949 | 0.99 |
| 41 | West Virginia | 88,000 | 93,617 | 0.94 |
| 42 | Montana * | 91,000 | 92,857 | 0.98 |
| 43 | North Dakota | 84,000 | 32,308 | 0.31 |
| 44 | Alaska* | 116,000 | 91,339 | 1.27 |
| 45 | South Dakota | 89,000 | 90,816 | 0.98 |
| 46 | Mississippi * | 83,000 | 89,247 | 0.93 |
| 47 | Wyoming * | 83,000 | 83,000 | 1.00 |
| 48 | Hawaii | 90,000 | 60,811 | 1.48 |
| 49 | Maine | 92,000 | N/A | N/A |
| 50 | New Hampshire | 96,000 | N/A | N/A |
| 51 | Rhode Island * | 107,000 | N/A | N/A |

Source: "Survey of Judicial Salaries," published by the NCSC, Vol. 28, No. 1, As of April 1, 2003.
Salary information obtained for State Court Adminlstrators nationwide have been rounded off.
*At the indicated level, two or more states provided the same salaries (actual salaries) so the ranking is only a relative standing.

# Appendix E. Comparison of Actual and CPI-Adjusted 

 Salaries

CHANGES IN HONOLULU CONSUMER PRICE INDEX (URBAN) AS COMPARED TO CHANGES IN CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES' SALARIES, 1969-2003
[1982-1984 (CPI AVERAGE = 100)]

| YEAR | CPI-U | \% CHANGE | ACTUAL SALARY | SALARY BASED ON CPI CHANGES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1969 | 39.4 |  | 27,500 |  |
| 1970 | 41.5 | 5.3 | 30,250 | 28,958 |
| 1971 | 43.2 | 4.1 | 30,250 | 30,145 |
| 1972 | 44.6 | 3.2 | 30,250 | 31,110 |
| 1973 | 46.6 | 4.5 | 30,250 | 32,510 |
| 1974 | 51.5 | 10.5 | 30,250 | 35,924 |
| 1975 | 56.3 | 9.3 | 39,100 | 39,265 |
| 1976 | 59.1 | 5.0 | 42,500 | 41,228 |
| 1977 | 62.1 | 5.1 | 42,500 | 43,331 |
| 1978 | 66.9 | 7.7 | 42,500 | 46,667 |
| 1979 | 74.3 | 11.1 | 42,500 | 51,847 |
| 1980 | 83.0 | 11.7 | 42,500 | 57,913 |
| 1981 | 91.7 | 10.5 | 46,750 | 63,994 |
| 1982 | 97.2 | 6.0 | 50,490 | 67,834 |
| 1983 | 99.3 | 2.2 | 50,490 | 69,326 |
| 1984 | 103.5 | 4.2 | 50,490 | 72,238 |
| 1985 | 106.8 | 3.2 | 50,490 | 74,550 |
| 1986 | 109.4 | 2.4 | 69,500 | 76,339 |
| 1987 | 114.9 | 5.0 | 69,500 | 80,156 |
| 1988 | 121.7 | 5.9 | 69,500 | 84,885 |
| 1989 | 128.7 | 5.8 | 82,699 | 89,808 |
| 1990 | 138.1 | 7.3 | 86,780 | 96,364 |
| 1991 | 148.0 | 7.2 | 86,780 | 103,302 |
| 1992 | 155.1 | 4.8 | 86,780 | 108,260 |
| 1993 | 160.1 | 3.2 | 86,780 | 111,724 |
| 1994 | 164.5 | 2.7 | 86,780 | 114,741 |
| 1995 | 168.1 | 2.2 | 86,780 | 117,265 |
| 1996 | 170.7 | 1.5 | 86,780 | 119,024 |
| 1997 | 171.9 | 0.7 | 86,780 | 119,857 |
| 1998 | 171.5 | -0.2 | 86,780 | 119,617 |
| 1999 | 173.3 | 1.0 | 96,326 | 120,813 |
| 2000 | 176.3 | 1.7 | 106,922 | 122,867 |
| 2001 | 178.4 | 1.2 | 106,922 | 124,341 |
| 2002 | 180.3 | 1.1 | 106,922 | 125,709 |
| 2003 | 183.5 | 1.8 | 106,922 | 127,972 |



## CHANGES IN HONOLULU CONSUMER PRICE INDEX (URBAN) AS COMPARED TO

 CHANGES IN SUPREME COURT CHIEF JUSTICE'S SALARIES, 1969-2003 [1982-1984 (CPI AVERAGE = 100)]| YEAR | CPI-U | \% CHANGE | ACTUAL SALARY | SALARY BASED ON CPI CHANGES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1969 | 39.4 |  | 30,800 |  |
| 1970 | 41.5 | 5.3 | 33,880 | 32,432 |
| 1971 | 43.2 | 4.1 | 33,880 | 33,762 |
| 1972 | 44.6 | 3.2 | 33,880 | 34,842 |
| 1973 | 46.6 | 4.5 | 33,880 | 36,410 |
| 1974 | 51.5 | 10.5 | 33,880 | 40,233 |
| 1975 | 56.3 | 9.3 | 45,125 | 43,975 |
| 1976 | 59.1 | 5.0 | 47,500 | 46,174 |
| 1977 | 62.1 | 5.1 | 47,500 | 48,529 |
| 1978 | 66.9 | 7.7 | 47,500 | 52,266 |
| 1979 | 74.3 | 11.1 | 47,500 | 58,068 |
| 1980 | 83.0 | 11.7 | 47,500 | 64,862 |
| 1981 | 91.7 | 10.5 | 52,250 | 71,673 |
| 1982 | 97.2 | 6.0 | 56,430 | 75,973 |
| 1983 | 99.3 | 2.2 | 56,430 | 77,644 |
| 1984 | 103.5 | 4.2 | 56,430 | 80,905 |
| 1985 | 106.8 | 3.2 | 56,430 | 83,494 |
| 1986 | 109.4 | 2.4 | 80,000 | 85,498 |
| 1987 | 114.9 | 5.0 | 80,000 | 89,773 |
| 1988 | 121.7 | 5.9 | 80,000 | 95,070 |
| 1989 | 128.7 | 5.8 | 90,699 | 100,584 |
| 1990 | 138.1 | 7.3 | 94,780 | 107,927 |
| 1991 | 148.0 | 7.2 | 94,780 | 115,698 |
| 1992 | 155.1 | 4.8 | 94,780 | 121,252 |
| 1993 | 160.1 | 3.2 | 94,780 | 125,132 |
| 1994 | 164.5 | 2.7 | 94,780 | 128,511 |
| 1995 | 168.1 | 2.2 | 94,780 | 131,338 |
| 1996 | 170.7 | 1.5 | 94,780 | 133,308 |
| 1997 | 171.9 | 0.7 | 94,780 | 134,241 |
| 1998 | 171.5 | -0.2 | 94,780 | 133,973 |
| 1999 | 173.3 | 1.0 | 105,206 | 135,313 |
| 2000 | 176.3 | 1.7 | 116,779 | 137,613 |
| 2001 | 178.4 | 1.2 | 116,779 | 139,264 |
| 2002 | 180.3 | 1.1 | 116,779 | 140,796 |
| 2003 | 183.5 | 1.8 | 116,779 | 143,330 |



CHANGES IN HONOLULU CONSUMER PRICE INDEX (URBAN) AS COMPARED TO CHANGES IN SUPREME COURT ASSOCIATE JUSTICES' SALARIES, 1969-2003 [1982-1984 (CPI AVERAGE = 100)]

| YEAR | CPI-U | \% CHANGE | ACTUAL SALARY | SALARY BASED ON CPI CHANGES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1969 | 39.4 |  | 29,700 |  |
| 1970 | 41.5 | 5.3 | 32,670 | 31,274 |
| 1971 | 43.2 | 4.1 | 32,670 | 32,556 |
| 1972 | 44.6 | 3.2 | 32,670 | 33,598 |
| 1973 | 46.6 | 4.5 | 32,670 | 35,110 |
| 1974 | 51.5 | 10.5 | 32,670 | 38,797 |
| 1975 | 56.3 | 9.3 | 41,400 | 42,405 |
| 1976 | 59.1 | 5.0 | 45,000 | 44,525 |
| 1977 | 62.1 | 5.1 | 45,000 | 46,796 |
| 1978 | 66.9 | 7.7 | 45,000 | 50,399 |
| 1979 | 74.3 | 11.1 | 45,000 | 55,993 |
| 1980 | 83.0 | 11.7 | 45,000 | 62,544 |
| 1981 | 91.7 | 10.5 | 49,500 | 69,111 |
| 1982 | 97.2 | 6.0 | 53,460 | 73,258 |
| 1983 | 99.3 | 2.2 | 53,460 | 74,870 |
| 1984 | 103.5 | 4.2 | 53,460 | 78,015 |
| 1985 | 106.8 | 3.2 | 53,460 | 80,511 |
| 1986 | 109.4 | 2.4 | 78,500 | 82,443 |
| 1987 | 114.9 | 5.0 | 78,500 | 86,565 |
| 1988 | 121.7 | 5.9 | 78,500 | 91,672 |
| 1989 | 128.7 | 5.8 | 89,699 | 96,989 |
| 1990 | 138.1 | 7.3 | 93,780 | 104,069 |
| 1991 | 148.0 | 7.2 | 93,780 | 111,562 |
| 1992 | 155.1 | 4.8 | 93,780 | 116,917 |
| 1993 | 160.1 | 3.2 | 93,780 | 120,658 |
| 1994 | 164.5 | 2.7 | 93,780 | 123,916 |
| 1995 | 168.1 | 2.2 | 93,780 | 126,642 |
| 1996 | 170.7 | 1.5 | 93,780 | 128,542 |
| 1997 | 171.9 | 0.7 | 93,780 | 129,442 |
| 1998 | 171.5 | -0.2 | 93,780 | 129,183 |
| 1999 | 173.3 | 1.0 | 104,096 | 130,475 |
| 2000 | 176.3 | 1.7 | 115,547 | 132,693 |
| 2001 | 178.4 | 1.2 | 115,547 | 134,285 |
| 2002 | 180.3 | 1.1 | 115,547 | 135,762 |
| 2003 | 183.5 | 1.8 | 115,547 | 138,206 |



CHANGES IN HONOLULU CONSUMER PRICE INDEX (URBAN) AS COMPARED TO CHANGES IN ICA CHIEF JUDGE'S SALARIES, 1979-2003
[1982-1984 (CPI AVERAGE = 100)]

| YEAR | $\underline{\text { CPI-U }}$ | \% CHANGE | ACTUAL SALARY | SALARY BASED ON CPI CHANGES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1969 | 39.4 |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 41.5 | 5.3 |  |  |
| 1971 | 43.2 | 4.1 |  |  |
| 1972 | 44.6 | 3.2 |  |  |
| 1973 | 46.6 | 4.5 |  |  |
| 1974 | 51.5 | 10.5 |  |  |
| 1975 | 56.3 | 9.3 |  |  |
| 1976 | 59.1 | 5.0 |  |  |
| 1977 | 62.1 | 5.1 |  |  |
| 1978 | 66.9 | 7.7 |  |  |
| 1979 | 74.3 | 11.1 | 45,000 |  |
| 1980 | 83.0 | 11.7 | 45,000 | 50,265 |
| 1981 | 91.7 | 10.5 | 49,500 | 55,543 |
| 1982 | 97.2 | 6.0 | 53,460 | 58,876 |
| 1983 | 99.3 | 2.2 | 53,460 | 60,171 |
| 1984 | 103.5 | 4.2 | 53,460 | 62,698 |
| 1985 | 106.8 | 3.2 | 53,460 | 64,704 |
| 1986 | 109.4 | 2.4 | 75,500 | 66,257 |
| 1987 | 114.9 | 5.0 | 75,500 | 69,570 |
| 1988 | 121.7 | 5.9 | 75,500 | 73,675 |
| 1989 | 128.7 | 5.8 | 87,199 | 77,948 |
| 1990 | 138.1 | 7.3 | 91,280 | 83,638 |
| 1991 | 148.0 | 7.2 | 91,280 | 89,660 |
| 1992 | 155.1 | 4.8 | 91,280 | 93,964 |
| 1993 | 160.1 | 3.2 | 91,280 | 96,971 |
| 1994 | 164.5 | 2.7 | 91,280 | 99,589 |
| 1995 | 168.1 | 2.2 | 91,280 | 101,780 |
| 1996 | 170.7 | 1.5 | 91,280 | 103,307 |
| 1997 | 171.9 | 0.7 | 91,280 | 104,030 |
| 1998 | 171.5 | -0.2 | 91,280 | 103,822 |
| 1999 | 173.3 | 1.0 | 101,321 | 104,860 |
| 2000 | 176.3 | 1.7 | 112,466 | 106,643 |
| 2001 | 178.4 | 1.2 | 112,466 | 107,923 |
| 2002 | 180.3 | 1.1 | 112,466 | 109,110 |
| 2003 | 183.5 | 1.8 | 112,466 | 111,074 |



CHANGES IN HONOLULU CONSUMER PRICE INDEX (URBAN) AS COMPARED TO CHANGES IN ICA ASSOCIATE JUDGES' SALARIES, 1979-2003
[1982-1984 (CPI AVERAGE = 100)]

| YEAR | CPI-U | \% CHANGE | ACTUAL SALARY | SALARY BASED ON CPI CHANGES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1969 | 39.4 |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 41.5 | 5.3 |  |  |
| 1971 | 43.2 | 4.1 |  |  |
| 1972 | 44.6 | 3.2 |  |  |
| 1973 | 46.6 | 4.5 |  |  |
| 1974 | 51.5 | 10.5 |  |  |
| 1975 | 56.3 | 9.3 |  |  |
| 1976 | 59.1 | 5.0 |  |  |
| 1977 | 62.1 | 5.1 |  |  |
| 1978 | 66.9 | 7.7 |  |  |
| 1979 | 74.3 | 11.1 | 43,750 |  |
| 1980 | 83.0 | 11.7 | 43,750 | 48,869 |
| 1981 | 91.7 | 10.5 | 48,125 | 54,000 |
| 1982 | 97.2 | 6.0 | 51,975 | 57,240 |
| 1983 | 99.3 | 2.2 | 51,975 | 58,499 |
| 1984 | 103.5 | 4.2 | 51,975 | 60,956 |
| 1985 | 106.8 | 3.2 | 51,975 | 62,907 |
| 1986 | 109.4 | 2.4 | 73,500 | 64,417 |
| 1987 | 114.9 | 5.0 | 73,500 | 67,638 |
| 1988 | 121.7 | 5.9 | 73,500 | 71,629 |
| 1989 | 128.7 | 5.8 | 85,699 | 75,783 |
| 1990 | 138.1 | 7.3 | 89,780 | 81,315 |
| 1991 | 148.0 | 7.2 | 89,780 | 87,170 |
| 1992 | 155.1 | 4.6 | 89,780 | 91,354 |
| 1993 | 160.1 | 3.2 | 89,780 | 94,277 |
| 1994 | 164.5 | 2.7 | 89,780 | 96,822 |
| 1995 | 168.1 | 2.2 | 89,780 | 98,952 |
| 1996 | 170.7 | 1.5 | 89,780 | 100,436 |
| 1997 | 171.9 | 0.7 | 89,780 | 101,139 |
| 1998 | 171.5 | -0.2 | 89,780 | 100,937 |
| 1999 | 173.3 | 1.0 | 99,656 | 101,946 |
| 2000 | 176.3 | 1.7 | 110,618 | 103,679 |
| 2001 | 178.4 | 1.2 | 110,618 | 104,923 |
| 2002 | 180.3 | 1.1 | 110,618 | 106,077 |
| 2003 | 183.5 | 1.8 | 110,618 | 107,986 |



CHANGES IN HONOLULU CONSUMER PRICE INDEX (URBAN) AS COMPARED TO CHANGES IN DISTRICT/DISTRICT FAMILY/PER DIEM JUDGES' SALARIES, 1969-2003 [1982-1984 (CPI AVERAGE = 100)]

| YEAR | $\underline{\text { CPI-U }}$ | \% CHANGE | ACTUAL SALARY | SALARY BASED ON CPI CHANGES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1969 | 39.4 |  | 20,000 |  |
| 1970 | 41.5 | 5.3 | 23,670 | 21,060 |
| 1971 | 43.2 | 4.1 | 23,670 | 21,923 |
| 1972 | 44.6 | 3.2 | 23,670 | 22,625 |
| 1973 | 46.6 | 4.5 | 23,670 | 23,643 |
| 1974 | 51.5 | 10.5 | 23,670 | 26,126 |
| 1975 | 56.3 | 9.3 | 36,800 | 28,556 |
| 1976 | 59.1 | 5.0 | 40,000 | 29,984 |
| 1977 | 62.1 | 5.1 | 40,000 | 31,513 |
| 1978 | 66.9 | 7.7 | 40,000 | 33,940 |
| 1979 | 74.3 | 11.1 | 40,000 | 37,707 |
| 1980 | 83.0 | 11.7 | 40,000 | 42,119 |
| 1981 | 91.7 | 10.5 | 44,000 | 46,541 |
| 1982 | 97.2 | 6.0 | 47,520 | 49,333 |
| 1983 | 99.3 | 2.2 | 47,520 | 50,418 |
| 1984 | 103.5 | 4.2 | 47,520 | 52,536 |
| 1985 | 106.8 | 3.2 | 47,520 | 54,217 |
| 1986 | 109.4 | 2.4 | 59,500 | 55,518 |
| 1987 | 114.9 | 5.0 | 59,500 | 58,294 |
| 1988 | 121.7 | 5.9 | 64,500 | 61,733 |
| 1989 | 128.7 | 5.8 | 77,699 | 65,314 |
| 1990 | 138.1 | 7.3 | 81,780 | 70,082 |
| 1991 | 148.0 | 7.2 | 81,780 | 75,128 |
| 1992 | 155.1 | 4.8 | 81,780 | 78,734 |
| 1993 | 160.1 | 3.2 | 81,780 | 81,253 |
| 1994 | 164.5 | 2.7 | 81,780 | 83,447 |
| 1995 | 168.1 | 2.2 | 81,780 | 85,283 |
| 1996 | 170.7 | 1.5 | 81,780 | 86,562 |
| 1997 | 171.9 | 0.7 | 81,780 | 87,168 |
| 1998 | 171.5 | -0.2 | 81,780 | 86,994 |
| 1999 | 173.3 | 1.0 | 90,776 | 87,864 |
| 2000 | 176.3 | 1.7 | 100,761 | 89,358 |
| 2001 | 178.4 | 1.2 | 100,761 | 90,430 |
| 2002 | 180.3 | 1.1 | 100,761 | 91,425 |
| 2003 | 183.5 | 1.8 | 100,761 | 93,071 |

## Appendix F. Judges' Retirement Package

A. Judges Covered by the Hawaii Employees' Retirement System
i. Supreme Court Justices
ii. Intermediate Court of Appeals Judges
iii. Circuit Court Judges
iv. Family Court Judges
v. District Court Judges
B. Basic Eligibility Requirements for Judges Appointed prior to Act 65, SLH 1999
i. Judges must be at least 55 years old with at least 5 years of service; or
ii. Judges must have at least 10 years of service (regardless of age).
B. (1) Basic Eligibility Requirements for Judges Appointed after June 30, 1999 (Act 65, SLH 1999)
i. Judges must be at least 55 years of age with 5 years minimum service; or
ii. Judges must have at least 25 years of service.

For Judges retiring under the age of 55, penalties apply.
Mandatory retirement is compulsory at age 70.

## C. Judges' Contributions

i. Judges contribute $7.8 \%$ of their salaries to the Employees' Retirement System (as do state employees in the contributory plan); and
ii. Judges (as do all other state employees) also contribute to the federal Social Security System.
D. Benefits
i. Retirement benefits for a judge are $3.5 \%$ of average final salary (the average of a judge's three highest annual salaries without vacation payment) multiplied by the number of years of service;
ii. Judges also receive an annuity equal to the actuarial equivalent of a judge's accumulated contributions to the retirement system; according to statute, the retirement benefit for any judge is not to exceed $75 \%$ of the judge's average final compensation;
iii. Judges also receive federal Social Security benefits;
iv. Provisions also exist for judges to elect early retirement at reduced benefit levels;
v. Judges are not required to pay state income taxes on their retirement benefits at the time they are received;
vi. Life insurance benefits at no premium cost; and vii. Medical, drug, dental, and vision coverage provided for life (all state employees are eligible for this benefit). Reduced benefits for judges and employees hired after June 30, 1996.

## Prior to Act 65, SLH 1999

Prior to Act 65, SLH 1999, judges, (as well as legislators and certain legislative officers) could retire after 10 years of service below the age of 55. They also receive $3.5 \%$ of the average of the three highest salary years for each year of service, like elected officers, house and senate clerks, assistant clerks, sergeants-at-arms, and assistant sergeants-at-arms.

## Since Act 65, SLH 1999

Act 65, SLH 1999, changed the eligibility age and years of service required to accrue retirement benefits for judges appointed after June 30, 1999. Judges appointed after July 30, 1999, can retire after 25 years of service or with five or more years of service after reaching age 55. For judges retiring under age 55, penalties apply.

## Allowance on Service Retirement (See § 88-74, HRS)

Judges and other qualified individuals (i.e., elected officers, house and senate clerks, assistant clerks, sergeants-at-arms, and assistant sergeants-atarms) receive a retirement allowance pursuant to Hawaii Revised Statutes Section 88-74. Specifically, $£ 88-74(3)(A)(B)(C)$ and (D), HRS, defines the service allowance for judges.
"(3) If the member has credited service as a judge, the member's retirement allowance shall be computed on the following basis:
a) For a member who has credited service as a judge before July 1, 1999, irrespective of age, for each year of credited service as a judge, three and one-half per cent of the member's average final compensation in addition to an annuity that is the actuarial equivalent of the member's accumulated contributions allocable to the period of such service; and
b) For a member who first earned credited service as a judge after June 30, 1999, for each year of credited service as a judge, three and one-half per cent of the member's average final compensation in addition to an annuity that is the actuarial equivalent of the member's accumulated contributions allocable to the period of such service. If the member has not attained age fiftyfive, the member 's retirement allowance shall be computed as though the member has attained age fiftyfive, reduced in accordance with factors of actuarial equivalence adopted by the board upon the advice of the actuary; or
c) For a judge with other credited service, as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2). If the member has not attained age fifty-five, the member's retirement allowance shall be computed as though the member had attained fiftyfive, reduced in accordance with factors of actuarial equivalence adopted by the board upon the advice of the actuary; or
d) For a judge with credited service as an elective officer or as a legislative officer, as provided in paragraph (4).

No allowance shall exceed seventy-five per cent of the member's average final compensation. If the allowance exceeds this limit, it shall be adjusted by reducing the annuity included in subparagraphs ( $A$ ) and ( $B$ ) and the portion of the accumulated contributions specified in the subparagraphs in excess of the requirements of the reduced annuity shall be returned to the member. The allowance for judges under this paragraph, together with the retirement allowance provided by the federal government for similar services, shall in no case exceed seventy-five per cent of the member's average final compensation;"

See also § 88-73, HRS (under SERVICE RETIREMENT)

## Appendix G. Act 123, SLH 2003

## ACT 123

THE SENATE TWENTY-SECOND LEGISLATURE, 2003 S.B. NO.

1333 S.D. 1 H.D. 2 CD. 1

## A BILL FOR AN ACT

RELATING TO THE COMPENSATION OF OFFICIALS IN THE JUDICIAL BRANCH OF STATE GOVERNMENT.

## BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF HAWAM:

SECTION 1. Section 6O1-3, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is

amended as follows:

1. By amending subsection (a) to read:
"(a) The chief justice, with the approval of the supreme court, shall appoint an administrative director of the courts to assist the chief justice in directing the administration of the judiciary. The administrative director shall be a resident of the State for a continuous period of three years prior to the administrative director's appointment, and shall be appointed without regard to chapter 76 and shall serve at the pleasure of the chief justice. The administrative director shall hold no other office or employment. Effective July 1, 2000, the salary of the administrative director shall be no greater than provided in section 26-54 and shall be determined by the chief justice based upon merit and other relevant factors. Effective July 1 , 2004, and every eight years thereafter, the salary of the administrative director shall be as last determined by the
```
judicial salary commission pursuant to section 508-1.5, unless
disapproved by the legislature."
2. By amending subsection (c) to read:
"(c) The administrative director shall, with the approval of the chief justice, appoint a deputy administrative director of the courts without regard to chapter 76 and such assistants as may be necessary. Such assistants shall be appointed without regard to chapter 76. Effective July 1, 2000, the salary of the deputy administrative director shall be no greater than provided in section 26-52(3) and shall be determined by the chief justice based upon merit and other relevant factors. Effective July \(I_{\text {, }}\) 2004, and every eight years thereafter, the salary of the deputy administrative director shall be as last determined by the judicial salary commission pursuant to section 608-1.5, unless disapproved by the legislature The administrative director shall be provided with necessary office facilities."
SECTION 2. Section 602-2, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended to read as follows:
"§602-2 Salary, supreme court justices. Effective July 1 , 1999, the salary of the chief justice of the supreme court shall be \(\$ 105,206\) a year and the salary of each associate justice of the supreme court shall be \(\$ 104,096\) a year. Effective July 1 ,

12000 , the salary of the chief justice of the supreme court shall 2 be \(\$ 116,779\) a year and the salary of each associate justice of

3 the supreme court shall be \(\$ 115,547\) a year. Effective July 1 .
4 2004, and every eight years thereafter, the salary of the chief
5 justice of the supreme court and the salary of each associate
6 justice of the supreme court shall be as last determined by the
7 judicial salary commission pursuant to section 608-1.5, unless
8 disapproved by the legislature."
9 SECTION 3. Section 602-52, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended to read as follows:
"§602-52 Salary. Effective July 1, 1999, the salary of
12 the chief judge of the intermediate appellate court shall be
13 \$101,321 a year and the salary of each associate judge shall be 14 \$99,656 a year. Effective July 1,2000 , the salary of the chief

15 judge of the intermediate appellate court shall be \(\$ 112,466\) a
16 year and the salary of each associate judge shall be \(\$ 110,618\) a
17 year. Effective July 1, 2004, and every eight years thereafter,
18 the salary of the chief judge of the intermediate appellate
19 court and the salary of each associate judge shall be as last
20 determined by the judicial salary commission pursuant to section
21 608-1.5, unless disapproved by the legislature."
```
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SECTION 4. Section 603-5, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended to read as follows:
" 5603-5 Salary of circuit court judges. Effective July 1, 1999, the salary of each circuit court judge of the various circuit courts of the State shall be $\$ 96,326$ a year. Effective July 1, 2000, the salary of each circuit court judge of the various circuit courts of the State shall be $\$ 106,922$ a year. Effective on July 1, 2004, and every eight years thereafter, the salary of a circuit court judge shall be as last determined by the judicial salary commission pursuant to section 608-1.5, unless disapproved by the legislature."
SECTION 5. Section 604-2.5, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended to read as follows:
"s604-2.5 Salary of district judges. Effective July 1, 1999, the salary of each district court judge of the various district courts of the State shall be $\$ 90.776$ a year. Effective July 1, 2000, the salary of each district court judge of the various district courts of the state shall be $\$ 100,761$ a year. Effective on July 1, 2004, and every eight years thereafter, the salary of a district court judge shall be as last determined by the judicial salary commission pursuant to section 608-1.5, uniess disapproved by the legislature.

```
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9 of twenty-one days." amended to read as follows:

Whenever the chief justice appoints a district court judge of any of the various district courts of the state to serve temporarily as a circuit court judge of any of the various circuit courts of the State, the judge shall receive per diem compensation for the days on which actual service is rendered based on the monthly rate of compensation paid to a circuit court judge. For the purpose of determining per diem compensation in this section, a month shall be decmed to consist

SECTION 6. Section 608-1.5, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is
"§608-1.5 Judicial salary commission. (a) There shall be a judicial salary commission to review and [feemmend] determine the salaries of justices and judges of all state courts and appointed judiciary administrative officers. The judicial salary commission shall be attached to the judicial council for administrative purposes. The commission shall be composed of five members [, One member shall be appointed by the governor, [ene by the president of the senate, one by the speakex of the houre, and one by the chief justiee. Nembers
 shall be appointed by the president of the senate, and two
Page 6
members shall be appointed by the speaker of the house of
representatives; and provided further that vacancies in these
positions shall be filled in the same manner. Members shall not
receive compensation for their services, but shall be reimbursed
for traveling and other expenses incidental to the performance
of commission duties. 1333
f. 1

\footnotetext{
members shall be appointed by the speaker of the house of representatives; and provided further that vacancies in these
positions shall be filled in the same manner. Members shall not
receive compensation for their services, but shall be reimbursed
for traveling and other expenses incidental to the performance
of commission duties. [fox-administrative purpeses only, the
eommiosion shall be attanhed to the judicial-eouncil.

eommission ohull submit ite weomendations in a repert to the
Iegiglature, with eopies to besubmited to the governox and
(b) The commission may seek assistance from
any other agency in conducting its review and all agencies shall
cooperate fully with the commission and provide any necessary
information to the commission upon request. In determining the
salaries of the justiccs and judges and appointed judiciary
administrative officers, the commission may set different
salaries for the chief justice of the supreme court, the
associate justices of the supreme court, the chief judge of the
intermediate appellate court, the associate judges of the
intermediate appellate court, the judges of the circuit courts,
and the judges of the district courts and different salaries or
salary ranges for appointed administrative judiciary officers,
JHW 2003-0175 SB1333 CDI. doc
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    with the salary for a particular position to be specified within
    the applicable range by the appointing official.
    (c) The commission shall convene in the month of November
    2003, and every eight years thereafter. Not later than the
    fortieth legislative day of the regular session of 2004, and
    every eight years thereafter, the commission shall submit a
    report of its findings and its salary recommendations to the
    legislature, through the chief justice. The commission's salary
    recommendations may include incremental increases that take
    effect over the span of years occurring prior to the convening
        of the next salary commission. The recommended salaries
        submitted by the commission shall become effective July 1 of the
        next fiscal year unless the legislature disapproves the salary
        recommendations submitted by the Commission through the adoption
        of a concurrent resolution, which shall be approved by a simple
        majority of each house of the legislature prior to adjournment
        sine die of the legislative session in which the recommended
        salaries are submitted; provided that pursuant to article VI,
        section 3 of the State Constitution, the salaries of justices
        and judges shall not be decreased during their respective terms
        of office. At the next regular legislative session, the salary
        amounts recommended by the commission, and not disapproved by
        JHW 2003-0175 SBI333 CDI.doc
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the legislature, shall be submitted by the chief justice as part
of the judiciary's proposed budget pursuant to the budgetary
procedures specified in chapter 37 and section 601-2(c).
[Salay amounts in the budget as enacted ohal] taje preeedenee
ovex ani ineoneistent-gtatutes-] If the salary amounts
recommended by the commission are disapproved by the
legislature, the commission shall reconvene in the month of
November following the legislative disapproval to review the
legislature's reasons for disapproving its salary
recommendation. The commission may submit a report of its
findings and submit a new salary recommendation to the
legislature of the next regular session. The commission's
reconvening following a legislative disapproval shall not toll
the eight year cycle."
    SECTION 7. Statutory material to be repealed is bracketed
    and stricken. New statutory material is underscored.
    SECTION 8. This Act shall take effect upon its approval.
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\section*{Appendix H. Estimates of General Fund Tax Revenue}

ESTIMATES OF GENERAL FUND TAX REVENUE: FY 2004 to FY 2010
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Council MEAN Forecasts} & \multicolumn{7}{|r|}{(in thousands of dollars)} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{ACTUAL} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{ESTIMATED} \\
\hline TYPE OF TAX & FY 2002 & FY 2003 & FY 2004 & FY 2005 & FY 2006 & FY 2007 & FY 2008 & FY 2009 & FY 2010 \\
\hline General Excise \& Use 4/ & \$1,612,333 & \$1,792,699 & \$1,854,175 & \$1,949,538 & \$2,047,110 & \$2,148,665 & \$2,251,990 & \$2,364,068 & \$2,481,682 \\
\hline Income - Individual & 1,071,239 & 1,037,706 & 1,119,425 & 1,233,142 & 1,312,050 & 1,403,795 & 1,492,021 & 1,587,282 & 1,684,810 \\
\hline Income - Corporation & 45,477 & 8,262 & 21,390 & 34,960 & 34,746 & 72,139 & 78,219 & 85,162 & 91,029 \\
\hline Public Service Company & 93,406 & 114,115 & 126,884 & 138,713 & 149,907 & 160,744 & 171,410 & 182,069 & 192,851 \\
\hline Insurance Premiums & 67,941 & 73,240 & 78,509 & 83,089 & 86,523 & 97,025 & 107,505 & 116,081 & 122,244 \\
\hline Tobacco \& Licenses 1/ & 64,469 & 71,273 & 88,320 & 94,469 & 96,335 & 98,388 & 100,602 & 102,742 & 104,959 \\
\hline Liquor \& Permits & 39,091 & 41,186 & 42,477 & 43,822 & 45,032 & 46,264 & 47,506 & 48,746 & 50,001 \\
\hline Banks \& Other Fin Corps 5/ & 5,164 & 20,341 & \((9,336)\) & 9,784 & 11,688 & 13,182 & 14,292 & 15,496 & 16,598 \\
\hline Inheritance \& Estate 2 / & 16,624 & 15,524 & 10,490 & 5,468 & - & - & - & - & - \\
\hline Miscellaneous & 5,515 & 6,231 & 6,791 & 7,230 & 7,520 & 7,793 & 8,058 & 8,317 & 8,579 \\
\hline Transient Accommodation Tax 3/ & 27,271 & 1,466 & 8,400 & 10,374 & 10,942 & 11,545 & 12,175 & 12,826 & 13,509 \\
\hline NET TOTAL & \$3,048,530 & \$3,182,043 & \$3,347,525 & \$3,610,589 & \$3,801,853 & \$4,059,540 & \$4,283,778 & \$4,522,789 & \$4,766,262 \\
\hline GROWTH RATE & -3.5\% & 4.4\% & 5.2\% & 7.9\% & 5.3\% & 6.8\% & 5.5\% & 5.6\% & 5.4\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Notes:
1/ Act 246, SLH 2002, raises the cigarette tax to 6 cents each on October 1, 2002; to 6.5 cents on July 1, 2003; and to 7 cents on July 1, 2004.
2/ Federal Economic Growth and Tax Relief Act of 2001 phases out the federal estate tax and the state credit.
3/ Deposits of \(44.8 \%\) of TAT revenues to counties (Act 156, SLH 1998); \(32.6 \%\) to tourism special fund and \(5.3 \%\) to TAT trust fund (Act 250 , SLH 2002); 17.3\% to convention center enterprise fund (Act 253, SLH 2002); all net of general fund deposits of excess
4/ Act 100, SLH 2003, provides a nonrefundable attractions \& educational facilities tax credit equal to \(100 \%\) of certain costs incurred after May 31 , 2003, \& before June 1 , 2009, for the development of such facilities at Ko Olina Resort \& Marina \& the Makaha Resort. Of the maximum \(\$ 7.5\) million credit per year, the General Fund loss is estimated at \(\$ 4\) million.
5/ Transfers \$16.5 million of the franchise tax to the Litigated Claims Fund in FY2004.
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Appendix I. UCLA Anderson Forecast for the Nation and California
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\section*{Forecast Tables - Detailed}

Table 14. Implicit Price Deflators and Other Inflation Indicators (Percent Change)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Table 14. & 1991 & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Implicit Price Deflators} & 200 \\
\hline GDP & 3.6 & 2.4 & 2.4 & 2.1 & 2.2 & 1.9 & 1.9 & 1.2 & 1.4 & 2.1 \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & 1.6 & 2.5 \\
\hline consumption & 3.8 & 3.1 & 2.4 & 2.0 & 2.3 & 2.1
-1.0 & 1.9
-2.3 & -2.4 & -2.6 & -1.7 \\
\hline Durables & 1.4 & 0.9 & 0.8 & 1.6 & 0.5 & 1.7 & -0.2 & -0.8 & 0.2 & 0.4 \\
\hline Motor Vehicles & 3.0 & 2.7 & 3.4 & 3.6 & 3.5 & -4.3 & -5.0 & -4.9 & -5.7 & -4.3 \\
\hline Furniture & -1.2 & -1.5 & -2.0 & -0.8 & -2.9 & -0.3 & -1.0 & -0.7 & -1.7 & -0.9 \\
\hline Dener Durables & 3.2 & 1.9 & 0.5 & 1.4 & 0.6 & & -., 0 & & & \\
\hline & & & & & 1,1 & 2.1 & 1.3 & -0.0 & 2.3 & 3.8 \\
\hline Nonourables & 3.1 & 1.5 & 1.0 & 0.7 & 2.1 & 2.8 & 2.2 & 1.8 & 2.0 & 2.4 \\
\hline Fcod & 3.4 & 1.2 & 1.5 & 1.5 & 2.2 & -1.4 & 0.0 & -2.0 & -1.6 & -1,3 \\
\hline Clothing \& Shoes & 1.9 & 0.7 & -0.5 & -1.7 & -2.4 & 6.1 & 0.0 & -12.9 & 8.8 & 27.8 \\
\hline Gasoline 80 Oil & -1.3 & -0.4 & -1.0 & 0.5 & 1.6 & 11.6 & 0.8 & .9.2 & 1.2 & 39.3 \\
\hline fuel & -3.2 & -3.6 & -0.3 & 4.6 & -0.8 & 11.6 & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & 3.3 & 2.8 & 3.1 & 2.3 & 2.2 & 2.8 \\
\hline Services & 4.8 & 4.3 & 3.5 & 2.8 & 3.3 & 3.1 & 3.0 & 3.3 & 2.8 & 3.2 \\
\hline Housing & 3.2 & 2.7 & 2.7 & 2.8 & 1.1 & 2.0 & 1.7 & -1,1 & -0,2 & 1.8 \\
\hline Househoid Operat. & 3.6 & 2.3 & 2.6 & 1.8 & 1.2 & 1.7 & 0.4 & -3.9 & -0.8 & 1.6 \\
\hline Electricity & 3.7 & 1.9 & 2.0 & 0.1 & 2.2 & 4.2 & 7.1 & -3.3 & 1.5 & 16.9 \\
\hline Natural Gas & 1.3 & 1.8 & 6.1 & 1.9 & -5.1. & 3.6 & 2.5 & 3.3 & 2.3 & 2.5 \\
\hline water and Sewer & 7.7 & 7.1 & 5.5 & 4.9 & 3.2 & 0.3 & 0.2 & -1.4 & -2.6 & -3.8 \\
\hline Telephone & 0.8 & 0.1 & 0.5 & 2.2 & -0.4 & 2.9 & 2.6 & 2.8 & 2.9 & 4.3 \\
\hline Donestic Service & 5.6 & 3.2 & 2.6 & 1.9 & 3.6 & 3.0 & 2.8 & 2.1 & 3.3 & 4.2 \\
\hline Other Operations & 7.3 & 3.4 & 3.2 & 2.0 & 5.5 & 1.7 & 3.5 & 1.3 & 0.4 & 0.5 \\
\hline Transportation & 6.1 & 4.5 & 3.9 & 1.7 & 2.8 & 3.9 & 4.7 & 2.9 & 2.8 & 3.2 \\
\hline Ocher Services & 5.7 & 5.6 & 1.9 & 2.4 & 4.0 & 3.9 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{11}{|l|}{Investrant Deflators: \(\begin{array}{llllllllll} \\ \text { l }\end{array}\)} \\
\hline Nonresidemtial & 1.6 & -0.5 & 0.5 & 0.7 & 0.4 & 2.7 & \(4 . i\) & 3.3 & 1.8 & 4.0 \\
\hline Structures & 1.8 & -0.0 & 3.4 & 3.6 & 4.2 & -2.1 & -2.7 & -3.9 & -2.5 & -1.2 \\
\hline Prod. Dur. Equip. & 1.5 & 0.7 & -0.5 & -0.3 & 0.8 & 2.1 & 2.7 & 2.8 & 3.8 & 4.4 \\
\hline Residential & 1.3 & 1.2 & 4.0 & 3.6 & 3.6 & & & & & \\
\hline & 3.4 & 2.3 & 2.6 & 2.6 & 2.9 & 2.5 & 2.2 & 1.5 & 2.7 & 3.9 \\
\hline Federal & 4.1 & 3.0 & 2.6 & 2.5 & 2.9 & 2.9 & \({ }_{2} 1.6\) & 1.0 & 2.4 & 3.0
4.3 \\
\hline Stare \& Local & 2.9 & 1.8 & 2.6 & 2.6 & 2.9 & 2.3 & 2.6 & 1.7 & 2.9 & 4.3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrrlllllll} 
Exports & 1.4 & -0.3 & 0.0 & 1.1 & 2.4 & -1.3 & -1.5 & -2.2 & -0.8 & 1.4 \\
Imports & -0.5 & 0.2 & -0.9 & 0.9 & 2.7 & -1.8 & -3.6 & -5.4 & 0.1 & 4.5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}



\section*{Erratum}

On pages V and 11, there are references to cost-of-living increases for federal judges of \(25 \%\). While this may be true for other federal employees in this region, it is incorrect to apply it to federal judges. Instead, federal judges may receive adjustments based on the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Employment Cost Index. \({ }^{19}\) However, these increases have not been automatic as Congress and the President have not implemented the increases for fiscal years 1995-1997 and 1999. \({ }^{20}\)

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{19}\) See http://www.bls.gov/news.release/eci.tn.htm for an explanation of the ECI. The eligible percentage for judges is the ECl minus \(0.5 \%\), but no greater than the basic pay rate adjustments for the General Schedule.
\({ }^{20}\) Dennis A. Cardman, "Federal Judicial Pay: An Update on the Urgent Need for Action" The Judges Journal. Summer 2003, at 28.
}
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\section*{ANNUAL REPORT}

REPORT TO THE 2007 LEGISLATURE

Annual Report on
Salaries Paid to Executive and Faculty Employees
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HRS 304A-1004 (2006)

November 2006

DATA AS OF NOVEMBER 27, 2006

CLASS
CAMPUS
GRADE
TITLE

EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE

EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE

SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES

UH AT MANOA UH AT MANOA UH AT MANOA UH AT MANOA UH AT MANOA UH AT MANOA UH AT MANOA

UNIV ASSOC GENERAL COUNSEL
VP FOR ADMINISTRATION
UNIV ASSOC GENERAL COUNSEL
UNIV \& COMM RELATIONS PROG OFF
DIR OF RESEARCH SERVICES
INTERIM VP FOR RES \& PROF ASSOC DIR OF HUMAN RESOURCES ASST TO SENIOR EXECUTIVE IER EXEC ADMIN \& SEC BOR ASSOC VP RES
ACADEMIC PROGRAM OFFICER
ACADEMIC PROGRAM OFFICER
VP ACAD PLNG \& POL \& PROF
ST DIR FOR CAREER AND TECH ED
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER
INTERIM ASSOC VICE PRESIDENT VP LGL AFF \& UNIV GEN COUNSEL
EXEC ASSISTANT TO THE BOR
UNIV ASSOCIATE GEN COUNSEL
PRESIDENT \& PROFESSOR
DIR OF FIN MGT \& CONTROLLER
DIR OF SYSTEM ADMIN AFFAIRS (ON LV)
NT DIR OF UNIV BUDGET
ASST TO SENIOR EXECUTIVE
UNIV \& COMM RELATIONS PROG OFF
INTERIM EXEC ADMIN \&SEC OF BOR
DIR OF INTERNATIONAL AFFRS UNIV ASST GENERAL COUNSEL (ON LV)
VP FOR BUDGET \& FINANCE/CFO
ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT DIRECTOR OF INTERNAL AUDIT DIRECTOR OF EEO \& AA
DIR OF RISK MANAGEMENT
ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT SYSTEM DIR OF HUMAN RESOURCES

DIR MIN STUDNTS UHM-ASSOC SPEC INTERIM ASSOC VC, UHM \& PROF NTERIM ASSOC DEAN\&ASSOC PROF INTERIM DEAN \& PROF DEAN (UHM), NURSING
ASST VICE CHANCELLOR, UHM
ASSOC DEAN ACAD AFFRS \& PROF

DIVISION
SAL

105,840.00 231,360.00 97,752.00
75,960.00
130,968.00 211,752.00
123,264.00 65,040.00 77,001.60 140,760.00 120,336.00 112,200.00 264,840.00
97,608.00
179,712.00 117,480.00 202,200.00 134,736.00 102,000.00 360,000.00 152,712.00 80,256.00 116,064.00 133,224.00 79,704.00 161,832.00 103,056.00 75,168.00 241,512.00 131,112.00 100,392.00 102,288.00 106,200.00 134,904.00 140,736.00

93,120.00 136,512.00 114,336.00 154,560.00 224,280.00 179,304.00

EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE


ASST DEAN STDNT, ENG
ASSOC ATHLETIC DIRECTOR
ASST TO SENIOR EXECUTIVE
ASSOC DEAN ACAD AFFRS, SOEST
ASST TO SENIOR EXECUTIVE
DEAN (UHM), ENGINEERING \& PROF
INTERIM VICE CHANCELLOR, UHM
ASSISTANT DEAN \& PROFESSOR
DEAN (UHM) \& PROF
DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS
DIR AUXILIARY \& COMMERCIAL ENT
INTERIM DIRECTOR OF STU HSG
DEAN, UHM \& PROF
DIRECTOR OF ADMIN SVCS, IFA DIR \& PUBLSHR U PRESS
DEAN DIR RES \& COOP EX \& RES
INTERIM DEAN (UHM) \& PROF VICE CHANCELLOR, UHM
ASSC DEAN AC AFF, CTAHR \& PROF
ADMIN ASST TO CHANCELLOR, UHM DEAN (UHM) TIM \& PROF
DIR CMPUS CTR \& BUR STDNT ACTV
DIR OF FACILITIES GRNDS \& SFTY COUNTY ADMR, CTAHR, MAU ASST DEAN OF STDNT SVCS, PB HT UCAD AFFRS PGRM OFFCR
ASSOC DEAN ACAD AF,EDUC \& PROF ASSOC DEAN ACAD AFFR \& RES NTERIM CHANCELLOR \& PROFESSOR INTERIM ASST VICE CHANCELLOR DIR OF RES INST (IFA) \& ASTRO INT ASST DEAN OF STDNT SVCS ASSOC DEAN ACAD AFFRS, LAW INT ASSOC DEAN ACAD AFF \& PROF DIR OF RES INST (HIMB) \& PROF ASSOC DEAN ACAD AFFRS, NURSING DIR OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, UHM DEAN, SOCIAL WORK \& PROF
DIR OF RES REL (UHM)
ASSOC DIR RESEARCH INSTITUTE
U ACAD AFFRS PGRM OFFCR (UHM)
ASSOC ATHLETIC DIRECTOR
INTERIM ASSOC UNIV LIB \& LIB V
\begin{tabular}{lrr}
\multicolumn{1}{c}{ DIVISION } & FTE & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ ADJUSTED ANN } \\
& & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ SAL } \\
C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & \(108,240.00\) \\
INT ATHLETICS UHM & 1.00 & \(125,016.00\) \\
CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & \(114,936.00\) \\
SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & \(132,312.00\) \\
CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & \(104,976.00\) \\
C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & \(280,008.00\) \\
CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & \(170,568.00\) \\
C OF EDUC & 1.00 & \(103,680.00\) \\
C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & \(170,304.00\) \\
INT ATHLETICS UHM & 1.00 & \(250,008.00\) \\
AUXIL ENT & 1.00 & \(113,472.00\) \\
STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & \(73,464.00\) \\
GRADUATE DIV & 1.00 & \(138,792.00\) \\
INST FOR AST & 1.00 & \(106,608.00\) \\
UNIV OF HAWAII PRESS & 1.00 & \(119,424.00\) \\
C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & \(221,184.00\) \\
C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & \(172,344.00\) \\
STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & \(215,016.00\) \\
C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & \(151,224.00\) \\
CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & \(86,664.00\) \\
SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & \(159,864.00\) \\
STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & \(86,256.00\) \\
FAC \& GRNNS & 1.00 & \(117,456.00\) \\
C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & \(91,944.00\) \\
SCH OF MED & 1.00 & \(83,688.00\) \\
CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & \(91,032.00\) \\
C OF EDUC & 1.00 & \(111,600.00\) \\
C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & \(151,224.00\) \\
CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & \(259,104.00\) \\
CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & \(110,616.00\) \\
INST FOR AST & 1.00 & \(294,864.00\) \\
SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & \(72,120.00\) \\
SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & \(144,048.00\) \\
C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & \(137,616.00\) \\
SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & \(170,112.00\) \\
SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & \(145,032.00\) \\
CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & \(95,952.00\) \\
SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & \(148,104.00\) \\
CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & \(105,072.00\) \\
CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & \(175,008.00\) \\
CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & \(91,032.00\) \\
INT ATHLETICS UHM & 1.00 & \(127,776.00\) \\
LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & \(115,008.00\) \\
& & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 12 & ASST ATHLETIC DIR-SR WMN ADMR & INT ATHLETICS UHM & 1.00 & 84,048.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 15 & INTERIM DIR HIGP \& PLNTY SCI & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 159,048.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 14 & ASSOC DEAN ACAD AFFRS, CTAHR & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 147,024.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 13 & ASSOC DEAN \& ASSOC PROF & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 110,928.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 13 & INT ASSOC DEAN \& ASST SPEC & OUTREACH COLLEGE & 1.00 & 90,936.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 15 & INTERIM DEAN AND PROF & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 161,688.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 14 & ASSOC DEAN ACD AFFRS \& PROF & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 117,192.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & U & VICE CHANCELLOR \& INTERIM DEAN & CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 301,272.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 12 & U ACAD AFFRS PGRM OFF(UHM) & CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 80,568.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 14 & ASST VP FOR RES \& GRAD ED & CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 122,568.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 14 & UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN \& LIB V & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 142,464.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 15 & DIR OF RES INST (HNEI) \& RES & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 166,128.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & U & DEAN, CBA \& FHB DIST PROFESSOR & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 326,184.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 13 & DIRECTOR OF STATE AQUARIUM & WAIKIKI AQU & 1.00 & 110,832.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 13 & ACTING DIRECTOR ADMIN SVCS & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.40 & 41,040.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & U & VICE CHANCELLOR, UHM & CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 170,568.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 12 & ASST UNIVERSITY LIB \& LIB V & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 115,680.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 12 & INT COUNTY ADMR \& ASSOC RES & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 89,160.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 12 & INT CNTY ADMR HAWAII \& CO AGT & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 84,576.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 15 & INTERIM DEAN\& INT AST VC-INT'L & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 132,552.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & U & VICE CHANCELLOR, UHM & CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 229,920.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & U & DEAN (UHM) \& PROFESSOR OF LAW & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 350,304.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 14 & INT ASSOC VICE CHANC,UHM\&PROF & CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 177,552.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 15 & INTERIM DEAN (UHM), OUTREACH & OUTREACH COLLEGE & 1.00 & 116,160.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & U & DEAN, SOEST \& PROFESSOR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 216,000.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 12 & ASST DEAN OF STDNT SVCS, LAW & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 101,568.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 12 & ASST DN ST SVCS(UHM),GR DV & GRADUATE DIV & 1.00 & 79,056.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 14 & IER INTERIM ASSOC DEAN & C OF LLL & 0.40 & 47,318.40 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 12 & INT COUNTY ADMR, CTAHR, OAHU & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 82,920.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & U & DIR CANCER RES CTR \& RES & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 430,512.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 13 & DIRECTOR OF ADMIN SVCS, CTAHR & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 107,160.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 12 & INTERIM ASST TO SENIOR EXEC & CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 107,952.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 14 & ASSOC VICE CHANCELLOR, UHM & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 108,168.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 15 & DEAN (UHM) \& PROF & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 157,608.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT MANOA & 15 & INTERIM DEAN \& PROFESSOR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 143,904.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 13 & DIR OF TECH \& DIST LEARN \&PROF & UH AT HILO & 1.00 & 118,152.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 12 & ASST TO SENIOR EXEC \& ASC SPEC & UH AT HILO & 1.00 & 90,648.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 12 & UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN (UHH) & LIB SERV UHH & 1.00 & 81,432.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 14 & DEAN, UHH & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 126,000.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 14 & INT VC ACAD AFF (UHH) \& PROF & ACADEMIC AFF UHH & 1.00 & 156,408.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 12 & DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS & ATHLETICS UHH & 1.00 & 83,496.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 13 & VC FOR STUD AFF \& SPECIALIST & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 117,960.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 12 & DIR HAWAII SMALL BUS DEV CTR & ACADEMIC AFF UHH & 1.00 & 96,336.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 12 & ASSOC DIR OF MAUNA KEA MGMT & UH AT HILO & 1.00 & 78,432.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 13 & DEAN, UHH & CE\&CS UHH & 1.00 & 84,384.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & U & DEAN, UHH & UH AT HILO & 1.00 & 296,016.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 12 & DIRECTOR OF EEO \& AA (UHH) & UH AT HILO & 1.00 & 62,424.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 14 & DEAN \& PROFESSOR & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 120,768.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 14 & DEAN, UHH & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 123,552.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & 13 & DIR OF MAUNA KEA MANAGEMENT & UH AT HILO & 1.00 & 88,008.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH AT HILO & U & CHANCELLOR AND PROFESSOR & UH AT HILO & 1.00 & 251,352.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH WEST OAHU & U & CHANCELLOR & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 191,016.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH WEST OAHU & 12 & DEAN OF STDNT SVCS (UHWO) & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 73,320.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH WEST OAHU & 13 & VICE CHANCELLOR (UHWO) & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 120,000.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & UH WEST OAHU & 12 & DIR OF ADMIN SVCS & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 89,520.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & COMM COLL ADMIN & 12 & ACAD AFFRS PGRM OFFCR (CC) & VP COMM COLL & 1.00 & 92,616.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & COMM COLL ADMIN & 12 & INST RES\&ANL PRG OFF\&ASOC PROF & VP COMM COLL & 1.00 & 75,072.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & COMM COLL ADMIN & U & INTERIM VP CC \& ASST PROF & VP COMM COLL & 1.00 & 191,664.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & COMM COLL ADMIN & 12 & ASST TO SENIOR EXECUTIVE & VP COMM COLL & 1.00 & 87,312.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & COMM COLL ADMIN & 12 & ACAD AFFRS PGRM OFFCR (CC) & VP COMM COLL & 1.00 & 99,216.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & COMM COLL ADMIN & 12 & DIR OF EEO-AA (CC) & VP COMM COLL & 1.00 & 83,184.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & COMM COLL ADMIN & 14 & ASSOC VICE PRES \& PROF (CC) & VP COMM COLL & 1.00 & 154,320.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & COMM COLL ADMIN & 14 & IER CHANCELLOR,HAWAII CC (TA TO VPCC) & VP COMM COLL & 0.40 & 44,620.80 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & COMM COLL ADMIN & 14 & ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT & VP COMM COLL & 1.00 & 146,688.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & COMM COLL ADMIN & 12 & ACAD AFFRS PGRM OFFCR (CC) & VP COMM COLL & 1.00 & 96,936.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & HONOLULU COMM COLL & 12 & ASST TO SENIOR EXECUTIVE & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 73,464.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & HONOLULU COMM COLL & 12 & ASST DEAN (CC) & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 74,784.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & HONOLULU COMM COLL & 12 & ASST DEAN (CC) & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 70,800.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & HONOLULU COMM COLL & 12 & VICE CHANCELLOR (CC) & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 90,000.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & HONOLULU COMM COLL & 12 & DEAN OF STUDNT SVCS (CC) & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 88,200.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & HONOLULU COMM COLL & 12 & DIR PAC CTR FOR ADV TECH TRNG & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 85,008.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & HONOLULU COMM COLL & 12 & VICE CHANCELLOR (CC) \& PROF,CC & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 102,216.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & HONOLULU COMM COLL & 14 & CHANCELLOR \& ASSOC. PROF., CC & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 141,144.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & HONOLULU COMM COLL & 12 & INTERIM ASST DEAN (TA TO VPCC) & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 85,008.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & 12 & VICE CHANCELLOR (CC) & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 94,296.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & 12 & ASST DEAN (CC) & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 82,632.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & 12 & INT ASST DEAN (CC) \& ASST PROF & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 82,632.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & 12 & DEAN OF STD SVCS,CC \& ASC PROF & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 92,640.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & 12 & PROGRAM DIRECTOR (CC), CIP & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 102,360.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & 12 & ACTING VC ACAD AFF \& ASC PROF & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 97,008.00 \\
\hline EXECUTIVE & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & 14 & INTERIM CHANCELLOR & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 134,616.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE

EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE

EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE

EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE

EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE EXECUTIVE
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline LEEWARD COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline LEEWARD COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline LEEWARD COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline LEEWARD COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline LEEWARD COMM COLL & 14 \\
\hline LEEWARD COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline LEEWARD COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline WINDWARD COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline WINDWARD COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline WINDWARD COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline WINDWARD COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline WINDWARD COMM COLL & 14 \\
\hline WINDWARD COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline WINDWARD COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline KAUAI COMM COLL & 14 \\
\hline KAUAI COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline KAUAI COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline KAUAI COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline KAUAI COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline MAUI COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline MAUI COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline MAUI COMM COLL & 14 \\
\hline MAUI COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline MAUI COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline HAWAII COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline HAWAII COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline HAWAII COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline HAWAII COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline HAWAII COMM COLL & 14 \\
\hline HAWAII COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline HAWAII COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline HAWAII COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline HAWAII COMM COLL & 12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline INT ASST DEAN(CC) \& ASSOC PROF & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 72,240.00 \\
\hline DEAN OF STDNT SVCS (CC) & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 89,112.00 \\
\hline DIR OF ADMIN SVCS (CC) & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 86,496.00 \\
\hline INT VICE CHANC (ACAD AFF), CC & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 96,504.00 \\
\hline CHANCELLOR & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 148,248.00 \\
\hline DEAN OF STDNT SVCS (CC) & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 88,008.00 \\
\hline ASST DEAN (CC) \& PROF(CC) & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 87,672.00 \\
\hline INTERIM ASST DEAN (CC) \& PROF & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 81,888.00 \\
\hline INT ASST DEAN (CC) \& PROF, CC & WINDWARD CC & 0.50 & 38,244.00 \\
\hline DEAN OF STDNT SVCS (CC) & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 73,488.00 \\
\hline DIR VOC\&COMM ED, ASSOC PROF,CC & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 85,680.00 \\
\hline CHANCELLOR & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 128,904.00 \\
\hline DEAN OF INSTR (CC) \& PROF & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 94,272.00 \\
\hline DIR OF ADMIN SVCS (CC) & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 85,056.00 \\
\hline CHANCELLOR & KAUAI CC & 1.00 & 132,696.00 \\
\hline INTERIM DIR OF CONT ED \& TRNG & KAUAI CC & 1.00 & 64,752.00 \\
\hline ACTG DIR OF UH CTR \& ASST PRO & KAUAI CC & 1.00 & 68,472.00 \\
\hline DEAN OF STUDNT SVC \& PROF (CC) & KAUAI CC & 1.00 & 81,552.00 \\
\hline DIR OF ADMIN SVCS (CC) & KAUAI CC & 1.00 & 85,056.00 \\
\hline DIR OF UNIV OF HI CTR (CC) & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 66,888.00 \\
\hline INTERIM VICE CHANCELLOR & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 90,096.00 \\
\hline CHANCELLOR & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 139,344.00 \\
\hline VC CC (STU AFF) \& ASSC PROF & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 78,888.00 \\
\hline VC CC ADM AFF & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 89,208.00 \\
\hline INT DEAN OF STDNT SVCS,CC\&PROF & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 80,016.00 \\
\hline DEAN OF STDNT SV (CC) (REASSIGN HON CC) & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 71,040.00 \\
\hline DIR UNIV OF HI CTR \& PROF CC & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 82,872.00 \\
\hline VICE CHANC (CC) \& ASSC PRF,CC & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 105,000.00 \\
\hline CHANCELLOR & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 150,696.00 \\
\hline DIR OF CONTINUING ED \& TRNG & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 75,096.00 \\
\hline VICE CHANCELLOR (CC) & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 84,120.00 \\
\hline INTERIM ASST DEAN, PROFESSOR & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 80,016.00 \\
\hline INT ASST DEAN (CC) \& PROF, CC & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 87,744.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & SYSTEMWIDE OFFICES & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & VP RESEARCH & 1.00 & 107,860.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A2M11 & JR EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 45,418.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A2M11 & JR EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A2M11 & JR EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 36,363.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A2M11 & JR EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 40,093.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A2M11 & JR EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 35,280.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A2M11 & JR EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.50 & 22,642.86 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A2M11 & JR EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 36,363.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 65,936.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 47,141.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 53,148.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 40,093.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 42,545.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 48,753.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 47,867.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 47,867.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 49,521.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 53,823.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 58,859.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A3M11 & ASST EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A4M11 & ASSOC EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 56,564.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A4M11 & ASSOC EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A4M11 & ASSOC EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A4M11 & ASSOC EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A4M11 & ASSOC EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 52,659.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A4M11 & ASSOC EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 60,460.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A4M11 & ASSOC EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 68,451.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 89,049.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 76,513.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 68,351.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 71,112.12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 68,623.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 70,968.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & A5M11 & COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 46,053.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 38,556.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 46,688.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 44,730.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 40,800.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 0.50 & 19,671.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 47,800.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 0.50 & 27,249.54 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 51,268.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 39,900.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 48,002.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 51,408.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 41,643.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B2M11 & LIBRARIAN II, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 46,200.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 51,140.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 52,513.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 49,623.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 63,963.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 47,164.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 50,752.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 55,370.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 55,650.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 62,971.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 63,963.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 62,971.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 58,129.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 48,851.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 57,239.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 50,752.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 55,991.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B3M11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 59,430.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 59,688.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 76,526.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 54,657.96 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 65,849.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 63,407.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 60,958.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 67,405.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 70,966.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 61,246.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 76,526.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 74,025.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 63,419.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 64,365.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 66,564.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 61,091.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 56,614.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 76,526.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B4M11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 60,958.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B5M11 & LIBRARIAN V, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 65,835.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B5M11 & LIBRARIAN V, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 80,904.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B5M11 & LIBRARIAN V, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B5M11 & LIBRARIAN V, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 85,726.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B5M11 & LIBRARIAN V, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & B5M11 & LIBRARIAN V, UHM, 11-MO & LIBRARY SERV & 1.00 & 89,618.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 49,773.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 46,013.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 0.50 & 18,181.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 43,207.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 41,730.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 46,909.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 40,573.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 42,545.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 45,282.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 58,200.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 44,000.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 39,103.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 72,832.32 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 41,769.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 42,082.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 42,545.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 46,013.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 43,050.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 43,670.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 47,848.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 58,774.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 38,337.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 47,867.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 42,008.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 58,774.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 44,597.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 46,013.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 40,008.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 57,636.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 38,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 45,285.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 57,834.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 0.50 & 21,835.38 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 51,719.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 49,217.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & 46,020.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 40,573.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 33,610.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 45,285.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 42,082.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 89,512.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 37,819.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 41,730.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 44,240.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 0.75 & 32,753.07 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 40,573.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 39,103.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 0.67 & 37,709.55 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & c OFLLL & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 39,103.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 0.50 & 21,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 38,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & І2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 44,241.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & c OFLLL & 1.00 & 43,564.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llllll} 
CLASS & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ CAMPUS } & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 58,200.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 44,782.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 46,010.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 40,008.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 43,670.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 0.30 & 14,493.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 48,312.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 67,551.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 44,782.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF bus & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 56,700.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 43,207.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 43,670.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 43,575.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 43,670.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 59,198.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & COFLLL & 0.50 & 22,642.86 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 66,180.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 46,200.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 40,917.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.75 & 42,423.03 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.20 & 8,715.02 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 18,540.90 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 23,496.66 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M11 & INSTRUCTOR \& CHAIR & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 68,279.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 0.20 & 13,136.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.75 & 40,874.31 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 36,741.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 71,400.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 42,082.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 49,863.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 50,400.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 0.40 & 26,732.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHM, 11-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 52,831.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 12M11 & DIR FOR SIMULATION LEARNING & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 68,703.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & Ізм09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 55,008.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 59,346.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & Ізм09 & ASSISTANT PROFESSOR & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 68,772.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 73,641.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 56,564.04 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

CLASS
CAMPUS
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

GRADE
TITLE
DIVISION
FTE
ADJUSTED ANN SAL
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
I3M09 & ASSISTANT PROFESSOR \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ACT ASST PROF \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & I3M09 \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, LAW, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO \\
I3M09
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 55,981.68 \\
\hline SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 60,532.92 \\
\hline C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 53,823.96 \\
\hline C OF L L L & 1.00 & 48,383.28 \\
\hline C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 65,486.28 \\
\hline C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 73,641.96 \\
\hline SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & 65,494.80 \\
\hline C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 56,000.16 \\
\hline C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 76,608.00 \\
\hline C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 62,000.04 \\
\hline C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline C OF NAT SCI & 0.50 & 27,990.84 \\
\hline C OF NAT SCI & 0.30 & 13,536.00 \\
\hline C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 73,641.96 \\
\hline C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 51,852.24 \\
\hline C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 70,834.20 \\
\hline SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 70,000.00 \\
\hline C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 49,773.24 \\
\hline C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 57,758.40 \\
\hline C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 60,535.32 \\
\hline C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 72,198.00 \\
\hline C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 68,107.32 \\
\hline C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 80,850.00 \\
\hline C OF NAT SCI & 0.55 & 23,483.46 \\
\hline C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 43,000.00 \\
\hline C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 51,675.84 \\
\hline C OFLLL & 1.00 & 49,116.00 \\
\hline SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 69,300.00 \\
\hline SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 81,900.00 \\
\hline C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 57,000.00 \\
\hline C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline C OF L L L & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 51,000.00 \\
\hline C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 73,667.04 \\
\hline SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 66,767.40 \\
\hline C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 52,500.12 \\
\hline SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 116,172.84 \\
\hline C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 69,426.00 \\
\hline C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 60,530.40 \\
\hline C OF LLL & 1.00 & 53,823.96 \\
\hline C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 76,608.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{llll} 
CLASS & & & \\
& & & GRAMPUS
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
CLASS & & & \\
& & & GRAMPUS
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 68,107.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 61,950.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 42,254.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 70,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 69,999.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 63,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 58,858.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 60,798.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 56,000.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 63,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 54,382.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 55,957.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 53,000.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ACTING ASSISTANT PROFESSOR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 54,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 60,535.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 42,254.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 55,978.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 58,800.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 76,605.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 0.50 & 24,376.98 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 0.50 & 22,120.02 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 56,947.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 56,000.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 49,566.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 53,823.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 58,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 52,008.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & 64,396.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROFESSOR OF ORE & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 82,867.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 56,564.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 70,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.15 & 10,002.10 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 70,814.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 0.44 & 17,899.09 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 57,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 106,999.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 65,486.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 70,814.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 52,920.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 57,750.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 56,000.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 107,108.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 72,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 57,758.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 50,744.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 60,535.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 54,180.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 76,605.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 60,535.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 53,823.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 53,823.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 55,981.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 58,193.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 55,976.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 65,004.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 53,823.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 58,193.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 0.70 & 38,052.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & VISITING ASSISTANT PROFESSOR & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 40,524.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 55,981.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 53,550.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & 65,830.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 60,535.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 62,971.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 79,232.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 57,758.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 68,254.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASSISTANT PROFESSOR & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 51,758.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 126,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 56,000.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 65,486.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 76,608.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 53,823.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 61,950.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 55,000.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 49,776.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 61,218.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 54,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 64,827.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 0.50 & 23,867.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 81,318.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 51,758.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 70,900.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 58,193.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & 63,396.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 68,107.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & VISIT ASST PROF & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 47,847.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 58,193.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 51,675.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 71,400.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 68,000.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 59,000.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 53,823.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 55,957.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 0.50 & 34,119.78 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 55,957.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 57,298.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 51,758.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 55,650.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 56,000.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 49,773.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 56,000.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 79,465.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 76,605.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 99,750.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M09 & ASST PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 59,850.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 0.50 & 25,363.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 75,758.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 87,634.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 72,450.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 58,905.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 51,758.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 54,349.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 67,464.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 68,250.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 0.50 & 26,256.72 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN
SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 70,834.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 76,585.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 63,999.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 47,867.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 17,062.53 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 31,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASSISTANT PROFESSOR & SCH OF MED & 0.86 & 51,814.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 3,437.91 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 41,228.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 47,867.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 65,000.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 70,831.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 60,275.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 62,971.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 65,486.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 70,837.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 82,867.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 65,486.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 67,344.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 75,758.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 23,005.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 75,600.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 47,867.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.60 & 28,720.22 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.30 & 17,616.53 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 52,273.86 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 71,499.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 47,865.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 57,052.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 62,582.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ACTING ASST PROF & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 54,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 63,672.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 0.50 & 24,886.62 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 65,486.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 3,437.91 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 77,641.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 74,050.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASSISTANT PROFESSOR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 59,346.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 13M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 65,486.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 56,700.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I3M11 & ASST PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 63,341.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 62,203.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 0.50 & 36,833.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 60,460.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASC PROF & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 92,455.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 63,157.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 79,465.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 63,350.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 61,091.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 68,040.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 77,816.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 66,532.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 82,708.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 62,203.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 96,938.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 79,465.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 61,089.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF/ACTING CHAIR & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 74,765.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 63,086.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 68,351.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 68,351.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 62,335.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 82,470.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 62,203.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 65,849.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 76,605.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 110,213.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 67,941.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 65,349.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 78,712.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 56,422.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 66,862.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 61,104.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 56,714.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 71,985.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 60,045.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 71,588.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & IER ASSOC PROF & C OFLLL & 0.40 & 30,377.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 76,393.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 65,684.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 66,621.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 73,225.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 64,000.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 70,834.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & IER ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 0.40 & 27,338.21 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 76,210.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 78,339.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 70,814.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 86,100.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 61,025.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 72,806.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 61,025.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 85,707.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 80,312.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 65,671.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 67,586.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 77,254.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 67,868.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 68,250.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 84,746.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 125,466.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 69,595.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & VISITING ASSOC PROFESSOR & C OF SOC SCI & 0.14 & 9,850.13 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 61,089.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 58,046.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 73,555.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & IER ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 0.40 & 27,295.82 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 61,696.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 78,750.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 60,045.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 71,400.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 76,605.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 85,707.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 63,977.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 62,582.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 73,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 58,859.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 73,668.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 68,351.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 78,140.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 89,258.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 79,451.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 76,525.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 66,227.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 72,277.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 0.50 & 34,175.94 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 73,698.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 68,994.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 68,239.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 56,714.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 56,056.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 76,645.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 62,216.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 82,867.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 63,407.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 59,259.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 65,850.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 62,203.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 64,864.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 79,638.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & c OFLLL & 0.50 & 35,430.30 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 83,077.32 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & c OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & IER ASSOC PROF & COFLLL & 0.40 & 27,295.82 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF ARCH & 0.50 & 16,999.98 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 58,859.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 66,637.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 66,150.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 96,938.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 68,597.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF / DEPARTMENT CHAIR & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 64,731.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 66,331.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 88,982.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 68,099.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 68,351.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 69,795.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 65,848.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 73,561.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 85,594.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 61,104.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 71,218.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 77,029.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 76,645.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 76,605.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & VISITING ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 71,000.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 54,655.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & VISITING ASSOC PROF & C OF NAT SCI & 0.25 & 17,174.22 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 69,638.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF ARCH & 0.25 & 11,502.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 73,799.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 62,869.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 62,876.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 68,705.16 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF OF PH \& FP/CH & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 92,411.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF L L L & 1.00 & 58,859.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 53,754.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 82,734.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 0.50 & 35,430.30 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 88,982.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & 78,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 74,064.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF \& ASSOC CHAIR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 73,555.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 70,834.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 77,479.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 70,966.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 67,935.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 58,859.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & VISITING ASSOC PROF & C OF NAT SCI & 0.25 & 18,416.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 96,938.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 61,260.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 63,407.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 62,732.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 84,376.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 92,477.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 78,140.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 0.50 & 34,175.94 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 61,025.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 76,446.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 68,477.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 67,948.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 83,648.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 80,550.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 71,602.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 86,110.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 64,977.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 65,500.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 69,364.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF L L L & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 86,146.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 70,648.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 68,054.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.80 & 58,859.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR & SCH OF ARCH & 0.40 & 23,400.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 115,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF OF CHINESE & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 78,140.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 78,140.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 76,605.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 88,731.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF L L L & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 61,091.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 63,419.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 73,698.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 69,206.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 66,532.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 0.50 & 42,803.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 0.40 & 28,386.62 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 95,998.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 60,469.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 89,262.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 61,091.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 65,378.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 69,192.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M09 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 61,025.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 87,847.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& DEPT CHAIRMAN & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 110,626.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 68,704.56 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 90,664.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& ASSOC CHAIR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 86,082.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 130,855.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 86,176.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 71,323.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 79,676.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 89,832.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& DIRECTOR & C OF L L L & 1.00 & 76,857.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF/CHAIRPERSON & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 124,058.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 91,423.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 79,319.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.80 & 50,735.71 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 79,848.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& ACTING DIRECTOR & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 86,082.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 74,202.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& DIR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 78,595.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.45 & 31,887.27 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 79,835.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 81,219.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 72,978.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 78,094.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 81,497.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR, UHM 11-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 86,083.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSO PROF/DIR FACULTY DEVLPMT & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 88,956.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 73,698.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 103,623.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& ASSOC CHAIR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 66,356.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& INT DR OF LYON AR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 73,157.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 84,533.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 86,995.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 92,994.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 65,645.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& DIRECTOR & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 70,826.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 80,436.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 89,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 74,376.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 86,242.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.75 & 85,064.22 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF/CHAIR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 108,121.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 98,090.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF \& DEPT CHAIR & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 92,874.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 133,875.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF/DIR SCH OF ACCTCY & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 134,108.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF NSG \& MED & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 88,982.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.20 & 21,810.94 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 76,407.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 68,358.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 79,676.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOC PROF, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 111,804.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 14M11 & ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 70,826.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 107,594.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF bus & 1.00 & 132,905.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 92,398.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 85,858.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 79,676.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 0.50 & 44,464.98 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 76,857.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 76,529.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 107,674.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR \& DIRECTOR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 84,098.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 125,021.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 123,201.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 73,693.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 113,406.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 85,951.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 76,529.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 92,455.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 132,494.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 93,523.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 76,274.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 86,269.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 107,674.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 78,287.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & MATSON CHAIRHOLDER \& PROF & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 174,722.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 80,289.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROF/NOBORIKAWA CHAIR & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 147,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 71,972.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 74,342.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 79,888.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 123,348.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 95,559.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 0.50 & 36,787.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 104,325.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROF \& ASSOC CHAIR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 90,108.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 71,262.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 96,051.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 73,555.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 76,605.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 73,881.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 82,536.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 87,142.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 0.50 & 39,730.14 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 81,609.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 78,313.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROF \& HENRY WALKER CHAIR & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 174,722.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 79,147.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 107,674.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 73,693.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 79,560.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 83,674.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 133,027.44 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lllll} 
CLASS & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ CAMPUS } & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & title & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 74,024.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 72,634.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 93,165.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 79,451.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 73,667.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 91,338.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 81,133.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 107,674.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 79,083.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 80,722.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 120,739.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 78,710.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 70,939.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 73,498.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, DIRECTOR, UHM,9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 177,158.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 125,466.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 103,213.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 63,999.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 77,227.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 136,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 93,666.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 96,091.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 0.25 & 17,715.15 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 94,595.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 79,460.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 116,202.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 90,108.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 80,484.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 97,627.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 80,550.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 113,622.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 76,923.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 89,630.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 78,750.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 83,939.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 82,840.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 79,875.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 77,214.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 100,274.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 99,493.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 73,693.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 107,674.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 111,010.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR & SCH OF ARCH & 1.00 & 90,796.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 100,870.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 107,780.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 99,761.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 91,974.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 98,183.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 77,029.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF L L L & 1.00 & 91,233.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & IER PROFESSOR & C OF NAT SCI & 0.10 & 11,303.54 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 88,784.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 140,728.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 111,844.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF L L L & 1.00 & 65,849.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 75,612.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & IER PROFESSOR & C OFLLL & 0.40 & 37,891.15 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & IER PROFESSOR & C OF NAT SCI & 0.40 & 38,330.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 126,749.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 121,385.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF L L L & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 113,803.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 103,278.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 73,698.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 108,746.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 107,674.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 75,586.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 73,698.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 77,315.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 72,111.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 98,183.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 77,558.88 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 92,596.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 69,192.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR OF FINANCE & SHIDLER C OF bus & 1.00 & 107,594.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 87,164.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 92,279.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 95,853.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 88,836.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 79,888.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 67,193.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 91,246.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & VISITING PROFESSOR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 80,040.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 78,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 89,472.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 81,609.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 98,818.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR & COFLLL & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 131,581.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 67,179.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 76,526.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF bus & 1.00 & 129,450.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 108,852.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 117,417.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF bus & 1.00 & 108,190.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF buS & 1.00 & 120,448.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 85,977.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 60,460.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 122,857.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 93,219.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 72,184.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 113,035.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 0.50 & 36,787.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 94,608.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 143,226.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 85,707.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROF, IER & C OF LLL & 0.40 & 38,710.22 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 107,674.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 90,041.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 85,951.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM 09-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 201,641.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M09 & IER PROFESSOR & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 0.40 & 50,985.79 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR \& LUKE CHAIR HOLDER & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 190,435.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 107,978.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 75,951.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 115,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 89,310.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 95,998.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & WEINMAN CHAIRHOLDER \& PROF & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 184,147.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 191,322.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 79,460.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 75,295.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 82,840.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 103,041.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 73,508.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 107,674.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 71,972.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROF, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 73,680.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 86,798.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 84,707.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 113,962.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 94,039.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 73,908.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 84,098.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 90,041.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & 117,946.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 93,655.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 80,862.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 81,053.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 0.55 & 49,304.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 77,069.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 81,596.40 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 125,066.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 76,715.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 91,259.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 0.50 & 56,067.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 77,532.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 0.50 & 41,422.02 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 96,157.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 0.50 & 54,049.14 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 73,827.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 79,451.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 84,799.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 78,313.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PRF,CHR JJ SULLIVAN,DR NAT PRD & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 107,674.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 0.50 & 60,900.06 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 97,137.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 71,972.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 132,680.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 130,403.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 98,700.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF L L L & 0.50 & 39,679.62 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 95,164.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 88,638.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 84,005.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 118,542.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, CITIZEN'S CHAIR & C OF L L L & 1.00 & 139,230.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 85,580.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 0.50 & 48,475.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR \& ACTING DIRECTOR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 93,814.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & 85,620.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 138,801.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 78,220.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 90,068.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 84,693.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 120,739.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 79,888.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 107,661.12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 74,084.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 107,674.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 164,092.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M09 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 9-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 77,263.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 128,563.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& EDITOR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 105,787.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF (CORAL CHR) \& RES & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 169,401.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& DIRECTOR & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 107,594.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 130,442.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 88,929.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, UHM, 11-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 91,299.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR AND CHAIR & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 104,079.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF/FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 133,665.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 135,459.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 107,594.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& INTERIM CHAIR & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 225,750.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 131,740.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 151,993.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF \& CHAIR & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 114,874.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 96,051.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 98,565.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 111,804.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 120,567.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 89,883.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& DIRECTOR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 87,750.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 104,417.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & IER PROFESSOR & C OF EDUC & 0.40 & 39,876.82 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 115,153.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF \& CHAIR-OCN ENGINEERING & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 109,699.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF \& CHAIR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 114,703.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 116,172.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF \& CHAIR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 108,124.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF \& CHAIR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 101,554.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF/CURRICULUM COMMITTEE CHR & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 145,246.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR AND CHAIR & C OF L L L & 1.00 & 117,940.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 86,679.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 127,093.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF \& ASSOC CHAIR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 101,320.20 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 101,982.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 111,792.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 167,124.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 103,692.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 141,284.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 130,403.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 97,635.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 116,172.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 151,848.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM,11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 86,221.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 135,526.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 103,755.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 278,544.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROF OF CYT \& ZOOLOGY & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 165,393.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR \& DIRECTOR & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 96,938.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 146,248.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 86,547.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROF, UHM, 11-MO AND CHAIR & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 125,968.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 112,400.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 140,437.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF LLL & 1.00 & 94,595.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 128,832.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 125,465.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & MACDONALD PROF OF VOLCANOLOGY & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 133,090.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 88,320.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 135,473.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF \& SOSHITSU SEN DIRECTOR & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 79,848.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 135,473.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & DIRECTOR FOR RESEARCH & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 111,246.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 107,594.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 141,165.34 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 91,317.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROF \& DIRECTOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 115,540.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 186,433.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF \& ASSOC CHAIR & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 91,580.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 227,130.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 111,246.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& ASSOC CHAIR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 94,239.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 123,082.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 111,804.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 120,700.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF \& CHAIR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 174,249.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 111,804.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & IER PROFESSOR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.40 & 68,443.49 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 123,532.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR/CHAIRPERSON & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 151,212.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 127,233.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.50 & 71,208.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 0.75 & 94,099.23 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 129,584.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 164,622.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 95,231.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 120,739.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 90,942.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 110,612.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 121,162.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROF \& MGR, OREP & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 109,337.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 125,465.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 125,465.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROF \& DIRECTOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 90,790.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROF \& ASSOC CHAIR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 96,443.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 130,403.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 132,680.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & IER PROFESSOR, UHM & CANCER CT HI & 0.30 & 48,620.27 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR & C OF TA \& HR & 0.10 & 11,240.02 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 121,176.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 94,939.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 97,071.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROF \& CHAIR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 103,742.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 91,546.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 95,098.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROF \& CHAIR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 104,047.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR \& ASSOCIATE CHAIR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 120,938.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 116,172.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF \& DIR UHM 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 97,322.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 113,829.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 125,465.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 108,084.72 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR AND CHAIR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 110,904.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 114,875.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 109,064.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 138,491.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE CHAIR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 140,728.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 89,611.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 106,804.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 95,707.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & ACTING CHAIR \& PROFESSOR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 117,801.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 104,854.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 130,403.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 92,173.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 115,418.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 107,978.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 99,479.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF, CURRICULUM COMM CHAIR & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 129,661.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROF \& CHAIR & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 168,249.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 71,768.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 92,850.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 107,594.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 156,018.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 118,449.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 107,594.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR \& ACTING CHAIR & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 83,154.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 104,048.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 125,465.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 147,522.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 116,172.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & I5M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 96,938.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & 15M11 & PROFESSOR, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 0.05 & 4,446.50 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J3M09 & ASST PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 92,343.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J3M11 & ASST PROF, LAW, 11-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 78,161.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J4M09 & ASSOC PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 99,731.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J4M09 & ASSOC PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 99,750.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J4M09 & ASSOC PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 99,731.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J4M09 & ASSOC PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 99,731.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J4M09 & VISITING ASSOC PROF LAW & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 83,000.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J4M11 & ASSOC PROF, LAW, 11-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 118,370.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 122,976.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 122,976.84 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 122,976.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF \& KUDO CHAIR OF LAW & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 167,177.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 122,976.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 122,976.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 0.50 & 53,855.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 124,750.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 107,710.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 124,116.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 122,850.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 127,795.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 137,961.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M09 & PROF, LAW, 9-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 122,976.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & J5M11 & PROF, LAW, 11-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 132,812.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 45,108.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.60 & 40,863.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.77 & 47,540.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M2M11 & INSTRUCTOR, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,062.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 111,804.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,660.95 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,026.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 51,936.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,660.95 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 106,923.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,062.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,524.98 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 29,043.21 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,436.33 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 26,898.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 53,461.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,590.22 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,064.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 107,594.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 106,923.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 23,989.77 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,062.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.40 & 40,326.91 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 9,321.90 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 10,355.74 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,379.74 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,660.95 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 9,321.90 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
CLASS & & & \\
& & GRADE & FAMPUS
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,984.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 102,804.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 111,804.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,797.95 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.35 & 37,658.21 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 23,303.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.40 & 43,037.95 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 46,609.50 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,058.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 46,607.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 9,321.90 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,660.95 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 9,969.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 9,321.90 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 10,759.49 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 47,516.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,379.74 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 104,833.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 49,912.26 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 23,304.75 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.20 & 21,000.02 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,660.95 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 104,854.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 9,969.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,524.98 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.15 & 16,139.23 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.15 & 15,533.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.95 & 102,215.14 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 48,466.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.75 & 80,696.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 10,355.74 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,057.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 96,933.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 25,889.34 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,379.74 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 23,989.77 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.20 & 21,518.98 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 53,797.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 51,778.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.79 & 81,810.31 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.20 & 21,771.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 107,594.88 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,660.95 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 106,923.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,177.87 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,524.98 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 93,219.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 26,898.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 104,860.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 93,219.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 79,682.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 9,595.91 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,241.69 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,660.95 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 93,219.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,660.95 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 99,750.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 99,750.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 53,797.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,590.22 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.60 & 59,815.22 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 96,938.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 83,664.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.20 & 18,643.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.30 & 33,652.51 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,064.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 23,989.77 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.95 & 88,558.05 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,065.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 49,266.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASSISTANT CLINICAL PROFESSOR & SCH OF MED & 0.75 & 81,794.25 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.15 & 16,139.23 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 4,797.95 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.75 & 71,274.06 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 11,180.45 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF MED \& PEDS & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,379.74 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 93,219.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,062.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 10,355.74 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.45 & 41,946.82 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,379.74 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 53,462.04 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M3M11 & ASST PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 9,321.90 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,344.51 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 130,310.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 116,172.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 31,356.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 120,700.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 116,202.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.75 & 94,069.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 120,700.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 12,070.01 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,590.22 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,064.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 140,728.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,064.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 12,546.67 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 6,515.53 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 116,202.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 104,693.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.01 & 1,161.73 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 6,300.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 116,212.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 60,350.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 120,700.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 21,961.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 166,005.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 54,532.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 12,070.01 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,592.10 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.75 & 77,726.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 55,902.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 146,375.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 60,350.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 111,804.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.01 & 1,090.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 11,620.25 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 107,667.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 125,425.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 58,086.42 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 130,310.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 6,271.30 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 30,175.02 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 123,599.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 60,350.04 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 125,425.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 130,310.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 127,569.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 10,587.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 31,356.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 147,770.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 65,155.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,590.22 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 12,542.59 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,064.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 138,579.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 11,180.45 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 32,577.66 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 125,425.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.70 & 76,345.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 103,635.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 127,570.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 125,425.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 107,667.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 125,425.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 60,350.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 27,266.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.25 & 25,908.93 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.51 & 54,910.35 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 5,622.75 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 125,478.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 122,672.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 12,542.59 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 111,804.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M4M11 & ASSOC PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 109,058.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 135,420.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF \& CHAIR & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 146,235.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 120,700.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 135,420.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.93 & 130,877.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 135,420.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 6,825.01 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 135,420.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF SURG \& DIR CL AFF \& TELMD & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 236,211.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 251,685.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 6,037.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 200,549.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.60 & 81,252.14 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.80 & 108,336.19 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF \& DIR CLIN RES & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 245,119.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.20 & 27,084.05 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 6,035.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 7,036.43 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 67,710.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.80 & 104,248.51 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 130,310.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 189,403.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.45 & 56,441.66 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 140,728.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 140,728.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 117,946.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.15 & 21,109.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 6,771.01 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 140,728.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 194,870.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 70,364.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 70,364.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROFESSOR AND CHAIR & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 140,728.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 125,466.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 151,980.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & IER PROFESSOR & SCH OF MED & 0.40 & 56,291.42 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.01 & 1,354.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 179,850.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF OF SURGERY AND PEDIATRICS & SCH OF MED & 0.40 & 56,291.42 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.20 & 21,000.02 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF OF PEDIATRICS \& MED & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 125,466.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 241,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.10 & 12,070.01 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 192,780.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 140,728.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 135,420.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 140,728.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 65,181.78 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 146,235.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 222,827.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.75 & 90,525.06 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.05 & 6,898.75 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.35 & 49,255.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF IN SURGERY \& MED & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 62,739.42 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 135,420.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 212,582.04 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & M5M11 & PROF, MED, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 135,420.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 0.65 & 30,630.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JUNIOR ENTOMOLOGIST & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 39,342.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 37,440.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 40,836.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 40,519.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 55,925.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 42,000.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 57,553.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.50 & 29,400.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.69 & 28,931.51 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 41,500.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 42,783.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.50 & 19,637.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 37,823.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 37,800.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 42,537.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 42,527.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JUNIOR RESEARCHER & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 40,093.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 37,823.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 39,342.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 0.70 & 30,968.03 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 52,756.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 37,905.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 40,118.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 59,850.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 42,082.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 45,517.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 52,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 39,342.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 36,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OFLLL & 0.25 & 12,557.97 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 55,981.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JUNIOR RESEARCHER & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 43,885.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 57,553.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 52,513.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 40,509.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 0.75 & 36,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 45,150.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 42,840.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 58,704.84 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 43,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.80 & 31,473.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & LYON ARBORTM & 1.00 & 53,929.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 42,545.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 40,920.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 48,730.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 39,327.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 44,240.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 40,917.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR ENTOMOLOGIST & C OF TA \& HR & 0.97 & 38,218.39 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 52,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 49,875.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & VISITING JR RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.75 & 32,526.90 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 0.49 & 18,900.03 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JUNIOR RESEARCHER & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R2M11 & JR RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 40,869.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 63,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 76,605.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 0.65 & 39,348.89 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASSISTANT PLANT PATHOLOGIST & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 49,773.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 82,867.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.80 & 71,694.62 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 47,867.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 78,153.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 56,700.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.80 & 52,500.10 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 0.80 & 54,295.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASSISTANT RESEARCHER & C OF NAT SCI & 0.05 & 3,829.25 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 46,781.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 52,920.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 76,618.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 47,847.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 70,132.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.01 & 716.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 58,776.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & VISITING ASST RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 58,776.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & VISITING ASSISTANT ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 72,768.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASSISTANT RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 89,618.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 70,132.56 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 65,486.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 70,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.50 & 23,923.98 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 55,957.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASSISTANT RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 76,605.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 50,916.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 48,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 60,535.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 79,676.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 70,834.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 51,758.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 45,949.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 46,010.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.50 & 30,486.06 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 73,500.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 79,465.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 63,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 62,000.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASSISTANT ASTRONOMER, 11-MO & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 55,957.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASSISTANT ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 55,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 68,107.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASSISTANT RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 76,407.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & VISITING ASST RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.50 & 22,793.82 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASSISTANT RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 63,963.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 0.50 & 34,053.66 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 82,867.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 86,944.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 68,107.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 60,535.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 70,834.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASSISTANT RESEARCHER & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 77,704.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 52,756.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & VISITING ASSISTANT RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 45,108.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 70,834.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 55,000.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASSISTANT RESEARCHER & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 93,219.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASSISTANT RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 82,867.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.80 & 52,500.10 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 53,550.24 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST ASTRONOMER, 11-MO & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 82,867.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 65,468.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 36,720.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 55,957.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 65,486.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 83,934.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & VISITING ASST RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 60,532.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 45,587.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 50,400.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 47,867.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 0.50 & 28,282.02 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & INDS REL CTR & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 57,750.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 65,100.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 70,686.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 82,734.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 68,544.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 0.70 & 40,735.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 56,700.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 61,104.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 47,250.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 79,676.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 61,673.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.80 & 56,280.10 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 52,248.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 73,899.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & VISITING ASST RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 46,010.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R3M11 & ASST RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.50 & 38,203.62 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOCIATE RESEARCHER & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 104,854.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 79,254.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.50 & 44,464.98 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 96,787.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 73,698.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC ANI SCI & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 0.05 & 3,013.75 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC ASTRONOMER \& ASSOC CHAIR & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 102,154.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 89,406.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 86,146.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.10 & 7,935.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 82,634.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 122,566.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 96,955.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & VISITING ASSOCIATE RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.75 & 67,213.71 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 100,817.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 105,000.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOCIATE GEOPHYSICIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.50 & 51,811.86 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.01 & 796.77 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 73,693.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOCIATE HORTICULTURIST & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 0.58 & 41,099.15 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 94,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 99,522.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 96,938.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 88,956.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 99,761.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 0.86 & 85,735.15 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & WATR R R CTR & 0.50 & 39,841.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 89,618.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 76,526.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & VISITING ASSOCIATE RESEARCHER & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 69,999.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 89,024.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 110,000.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOCIATE ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 104,854.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.25 & 25,704.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 76,658.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 120,700.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 89,496.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.40 & 21,951.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R4M11 & ASSOC RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 56,709.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER \& CHAIR & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 95,880.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & PLANT PATHOLOGIST & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN
SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 135,420.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER \& ASSOC CHAIR & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 120,183.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 146,328.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 113,380.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER \& PROF OF ANAT & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 131,727.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & IER ASTRONOMER, UHM, 11-MOS & INST FOR AST & 0.40 & 58,531.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 92,596.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 140,384.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & HORT \& GENET & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 135,618.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.50 & 44,749.62 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 241,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 206,184.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 116,172.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 132,428.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 132,428.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 115,428.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 152,073.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 92,455.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 96,064.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 141,721.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 94,582.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & GEOPHYSICIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 143,799.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 103,635.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 115,158.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & IER RESEARCHER & C OF TA \& HR & 0.40 & 42,194.06 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & PLANETARY SCIENTIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 116,172.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 130,310.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & WATR R R CTR & 1.00 & 107,833.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.25 & 32,577.66 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 0.05 & 5,610.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 134,771.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 125,386.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RES \& CHAIR & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 108,630.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & IER RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.40 & 39,876.82 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.17 & 21,761.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER \& CHAIR & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 132,632.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & SOIL SCIENTIST & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 92,490.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & SENIOR RESEARCH SCIENTIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.80 & 100,372.51 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 151,980.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 96,078.24 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 85,368.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 130,297.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & SCIENTIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER \& ASSOC CHAIR & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 107,594.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.20 & 29,247.07 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & GEOPHYSICIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & GEOPHYSICIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 130,403.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.80 & 66,018.34 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER \& CHAIR & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 130,310.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 119,945.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & PLANT PATHOLOGIST & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 89,260.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 110,692.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 132,632.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO, PROF OF MED & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 179,885.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 140,953.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 134,102.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 151,980.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 138,160.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & PLANETARY SCIENTIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 173,818.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 96,938.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 92,477.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & GEOPHYSICIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 133,875.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & HORTICULTURIST & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 89,022.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER \& CHAIR & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 140,953.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 119,574.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 176,244.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 107,833.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & PLANETARY SCIENTIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 129,794.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 116,172.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & GEOPHYSICIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 140,807.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 89,154.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 140,953.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 111,804.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & GEOPHYSICIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.93 & 92,215.14 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & VISITING RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.25 & 24,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & AGRONOMIST & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & GEOPHYSICIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.50 & 66,624.66 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 132,632.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 123,612.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 107,594.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 135,420.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 92,477.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & INDS REL CTR & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 152,073.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 111,804.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RES \& CHAIR & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 112,016.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 234,053.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 107,667.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 140,728.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 127,543.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 125,465.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 139,457.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & PLANETARY SCIENTIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 120,700.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 131,038.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 124,221.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 85,977.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 215,258.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 0.85 & 72,766.19 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 133,818.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 137,500.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & PLANETARY SCIENTIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 135,473.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 119,799.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & GEOCHEMIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 116,225.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 132,719.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 151,980.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ASTRONOMER & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 133,514.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & SOIL SCIENTIST & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 135,618.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ANI SCI & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 89,154.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & ANIMAL SCIENTIST & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 120,819.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 111,804.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 96,064.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & R5M11 & RESEARCHER, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 92,583.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JUNIOR SPECIALIST & OUTREACH COLLEGE & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & ACC BAC NURS PROG COORDINATOR & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 63,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 0.75 & 31,561.65 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 58,224.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.61 & 24,945.97 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 49,773.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 50,004.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 45,285.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & OUTREACH COLLEGE & 1.00 & 42,545.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 42,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 46,013.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 0.81 & 40,747.07 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 44,240.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 52,920.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 37,823.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 40,895.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 58,224.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 40,917.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 46,013.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 51,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 51,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 54,922.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 0.50 & 26,911.98 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPEC/PROJECT COORDINATOR & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 58,224.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPEC (NICE COORDINATOR) & OUTREACH COLLEGE & 1.00 & 58,841.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 46,013.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 49,945.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 42,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 52,500.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 54,600.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 46,013.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 45,563.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 57,078.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 0.50 & 21,065.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 49,773.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 42,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 47,867.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 39,342.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 53,651.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 52,000.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & OUTREACH COLLEGE & 1.00 & 56,564.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JUNIOR SPECIALIST & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 39,327.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 45,150.12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 47,250.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 43,369.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 42,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 74,550.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 53,214.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & OUTREACH COLLEGE & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 42,543.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 0.80 & 45,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JUNIOR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 39,326.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 47,847.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 50,765.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 40,992.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 40,908.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 50,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 73,667.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 44,000.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 50,400.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 38,958.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 0.67 & 39,010.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 45,285.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 53,811.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & COFLLL & 1.00 & 55,957.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 53,294.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 0.75 & 37,955.34 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 48,753.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 58,212.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & OUTREACH COLLEGE & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 52,752.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 56,564.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 55,981.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & OUTREACH COLLEGE & 1.00 & 49,750.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 54,860.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 47,847.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 37,823.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 55,957.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 48,300.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 42,545.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & WATR R R CTR & 1.00 & 48,753.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 39,342.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 46,061.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 55,956.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S2M11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 48,195.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llllll} 
& & & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llllll} 
& & & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN
SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 70,834.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 66,849.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 70,834.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 79,676.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 58,218.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF LAW & 0.50 & 30,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 54,351.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 66,754.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 62,376.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 64,260.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 55,918.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 56,709.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 0.80 & 58,859.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 111,915.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & DIR OF COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 78,750.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 0.50 & 35,264.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 89,611.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 63,434.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 70,834.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 57,305.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 64,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 52,301.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 47,867.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 54,770.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & IER ASST SPECIALIST, UHM,11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 0.40 & 26,496.29 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 82,000.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 61,091.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 63,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.75 & 64,632.42 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST \& COORDINATOR & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 56,571.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 60,900.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 66,862.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 67,035.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 0.50 & 28,282.02 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 68,107.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 72,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & WATR R R CTR & 0.88 & 45,233.23 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 59,357.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 60,535.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMP \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline GRADE & TITLE \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S3M11 & ASSISTANT SPECIALIST \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST \\
\hline S3M11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPEC/DIRECTOR-OIA \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOCIATE SPECIALIST \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST \& DIRECTOR \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPEC IN PLANT PATH \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO \\
\hline S4M11 & INTERIM DIRECTOR, OSS \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 52,797.24 \\
\hline CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 54,498.48 \\
\hline SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 70,834.20 \\
\hline C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 68,107.32 \\
\hline C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 60,000.00 \\
\hline SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 52,513.44 \\
\hline SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & 63,504.00 \\
\hline SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 55,692.12 \\
\hline C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 52,654.32 \\
\hline C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 68,553.48 \\
\hline SCH SOC WORK & 0.75 & 51,080.49 \\
\hline LAB ANML SV & 1.00 & 62,949.12 \\
\hline STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 62,957.76 \\
\hline CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 50,752.80 \\
\hline C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 60,900.12 \\
\hline STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 87,437.88 \\
\hline INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 96,000.00 \\
\hline SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 68,107.32 \\
\hline C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 86,176.56 \\
\hline C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.49 & 43,912.96 \\
\hline SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 89,539.44 \\
\hline PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 74,434.80 \\
\hline SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.25 & 19,101.78 \\
\hline SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 111,195.00 \\
\hline SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 103,623.72 \\
\hline SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 89,618.28 \\
\hline C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline C OF ENGINRG & 1.00 & 96,390.00 \\
\hline STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 79,465.08 \\
\hline SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 89,618.28 \\
\hline C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 103,887.00 \\
\hline SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 122,672.52 \\
\hline CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 75,850.80 \\
\hline WATR R R CTR & 0.60 & 44,144.64 \\
\hline STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 70,968.24 \\
\hline STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 69,795.96 \\
\hline SCH OF NURSG & 1.00 & 91,403.40 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 96,938.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 52,479.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & LAB ANML SV & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF TIM & 1.00 & 78,750.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 65,803.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 91,035.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 39,999.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 80,295.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 73,655.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH SOC WORK & 1.00 & 80,436.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 123,096.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 111,844.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 72,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 98,566.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 88,824.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 71,369.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 58,859.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF LAW & 1.00 & 39,999.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 79,465.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 64,175.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 79,557.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 71,400.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 77,112.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASST FACULTY SPECIALIST & CHANCELLOR UHM & 0.93 & 48,750.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 113,424.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 85,713.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 70,834.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S4M11 & ASSOC SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 65,000.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 0.50 & 38,292.54 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & IER SPECIALIST & C OF TA \& HR & 0.40 & 35,571.98 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 75,171.36 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 89,035.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 89,496.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 79,081.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST \& CHAIR & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 70,968.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 89,024.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST (UNIV PHYSICIAN) & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 0.50 & 54,504.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CANCER CT HI & 1.00 & 92,729.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & OUTREACH COLLEGE & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 85,707.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 0.50 & 54,532.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OFLLL & 1.00 & 89,049.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 97,362.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C ARTS \& HUM & 1.00 & 76,526.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF MED & 1.00 & 92,451.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 85,726.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 130,000.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CL A\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 75,528.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 89,154.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CLA\&S DEANS & 1.00 & 160,650.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST IN HORT & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 107,806.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & IER SPECIALIST & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 0.40 & 35,571.98 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 99,903.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPCLT \& DIR OF MOP, BIOLOGY & C OF NAT SCI & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SHIDLER C OF BUS & 1.00 & 91,782.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 89,496.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 152,073.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 99,692.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 104,682.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & PAC BI RS CT & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 0.50 & 54,532.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 0.50 & 54,504.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 85,726.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 107,594.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH OF HA\&PS & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST \& DIRECTOR & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 125,465.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF SOC SCI & 1.00 & 111,857.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 0.50 & 52,324.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 103,557.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & CHANCELLOR UHM & 1.00 & 93,086.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 104,364.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & OUTREACH COLLEGE & 1.00 & 68,351.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 0.40 & 41,422.94 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 82,522.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST AND DIRECTOR & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & SCH O\&ES\&T & 1.00 & 109,064.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST \& ASSOC CHAIR & INST FOR AST & 1.00 & 118,621.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 91,259.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 0.50 & 52,324.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & STUDENT AFFAIRS & 0.50 & 50,192.10 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF EDUC & 1.00 & 84,210.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 83,318.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST, UHM, 11-MO & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 116,172.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT MANOA & S5M11 & SPECIALIST \& CHAIR & C OF TA \& HR & 1.00 & 82,519.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & B2H11 & LIBRARIAN II,UHH\&WO 11-MO & LIB SERV UHH & 1.00 & 34,977.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & B2H11 & LIBRARIAN II,UHH\&WO 11-MO & LIB SERV UHH & 1.00 & 41,712.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & B2H11 & LIBRARIAN II,UHH\&WO 11-MO & LIB SERV UHH & 1.00 & 40,895.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & B2H11 & LIBRARIAN II,UHH\&WO 11-MO & LIB SERV UHH & 1.00 & 34,977.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & B2H11 & LIBRARIAN II,UHH\&WO 11-MO & LIB SERV UHH & 1.00 & 51,742.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & B2H11 & LIBRARIAN II,UHH\&WO 11-MO & LIB SERV UHH & 1.00 & 38,948.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & B2H11 & LIBRARIAN II,UHH\&WO 11-MO & LIB SERV UHH & 1.00 & 53,832.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & B3H11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & LIB SERV UHH & 1.00 & 47,164.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & B3H11 & LIBRARIAN III, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & LIB SERV UHH & 1.00 & 56,736.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & B4H11 & LIBRARIAN IV, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & LIB SERV UHH & 1.00 & 63,576.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 39,900.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 40,573.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 46,993.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 43,670.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 41,340.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 37,819.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 40,890.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 37,800.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 34,960.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 45,108.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 48,753.96 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 39,103.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 42,466.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 37,800.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 40,573.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & CE\&CS UHH & 1.00 & 46,432.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 39,342.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 37,700.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 37,823.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 37,078.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & CE\&CS UHH & 1.00 & 32,760.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 45,108.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 44,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 37,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 40,917.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 42,810.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 40,573.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 58,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 39,342.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 12H11 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO 11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 43,670.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 49,750.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 47,847.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13 H 09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 49,773.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13 H 09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 51,408.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 47,847.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13 H 09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 65,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13 H 09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 49,773.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 47,867.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 70,814.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 51,758.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 62,949.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 90,316.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 49,350.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13 H 09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 49,350.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 65,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 48,825.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 53,823.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 92,040.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13 H 09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 64,917.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 55,980.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 47,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 55,650.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 90,606.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 49,750.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 47,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 50,400.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 55,125.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 46,010.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 45,285.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 46,010.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 49,750.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 60,908.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 46,053.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 46,010.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13 H 09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 45,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 49,750.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 50,925.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 51,345.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 51,742.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 42,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 44,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 62,949.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13 H 09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 50,925.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 60,535.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 51,758.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 55,980.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 47,864.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 40,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 42,187.50 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13 H 09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 49,750.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 50,400.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13 H 11 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO 11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 62,949.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13 H 11 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO 11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 65,498.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 13H11 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO 11-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 58,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 56,564.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF\&CHAIR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 61,965.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14 H 09 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR,UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 59,132.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR, UHH\&WO,9MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 70,834.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 53,755.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14 H 09 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR,UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 51,910.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 92,451.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 55,756.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 86,944.32 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 50,323.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 84,680.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 60,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 58,158.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 52,659.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF\&CHAIR, UHH\&WO, 9MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 54,644.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR,UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 60,460.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 55,928.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF\&CHAIR,UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 70,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 56,564.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 103,464.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 57,490.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 54,655.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 50,000.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 54,657.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 56,497.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14 H 09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 63,505.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14 H 09 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR,UHH\&WO,9MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF\&CHAIR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 56,537.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14 H 09 & ASSOC PROF\&CHAIR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 0.75 & 57,006.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC. PROF.\&CHAIR,UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 59,829.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 54,655.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14 H 09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 52,153.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14 H 09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14 H 09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 63,407.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 59,727.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF \& CHAIR, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 47,867.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 55,452.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 51,970.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14 H 11 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14 H 11 & ASSOC PROF\& CHR, UHH\&WO, 11-M0 & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 79,964.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14 H 11 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 0.01 & 828.67 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14 H 11 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 14H11 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 63,421.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 75,705.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 85,077.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR,UHH\&WO, 9MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 69,470.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 83,648.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 72,872.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR \&CHAIR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 81,887.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, UHH\&WO, 9MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 93,880.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 62,971.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR,UHH\&WO,9MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 76,846.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO,9MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 72,091.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 0.40 & 40,676.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, UHH\&WO, 9M0 & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 103,623.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 71,178.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 102,140.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 66,823.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR\&CHAIR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 80,749.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 61,089.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 63,448.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 0.75 & 46,717.65 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 61,089.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 73,203.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 64,108.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 62,061.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR, UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 78,300.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR\&DIRECT,UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 73,084.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR\& CHAIR,UHH\&WO,9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 56,714.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROF,UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 57,324.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 66,122.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 65,141.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15 H 11 & PROFESSOR\&CHAIR,UHH\&WO,11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 103,025.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15 H 11 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 76,882.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15 H 11 & PROF, DIRECTOR, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 98,193.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROF. \& DIRECTOR, UHH\&WO,11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 100,812.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15 H 11 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 89,869.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROFESSOR \& CHR,UHH\&WO,11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 90,697.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15 H 11 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 84,442.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 87,381.12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROF, UHH\& WO, 11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 81,834.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 96,016.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 69,852.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROFESSOR \& CHAIR,UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 96,443.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 89,869.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 90,039.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROF \& DIRECTOR,UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 77,519.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 84,429.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 97,059.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 86,864.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF AGR UHH & 1.00 & 85,726.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & 15H11 & PROF, \& CHAIR, UHH\&WO, \(11-\mathrm{MO}\) & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 86,719.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S2H11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 44,982.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S2H11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 36,363.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S2H11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & UH AT HILO & 1.00 & 42,008.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S2H11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 0.75 & 33,177.42 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S2H11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 44,335.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S2H11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 49,773.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S2H11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 39,413.89 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S2H11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 45,775.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S2H11 & JR SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 56,523.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S3H11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & C OF A\&S UHH & 1.00 & 65,486.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S3H11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & ACADEMIC AFF UHH & 1.00 & 60,535.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S3H11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S3H11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 65,678.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S3H11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S3H11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S4H11 & ASSC SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 66,579.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S5H11 & SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & UH AT HILO & 1.00 & 95,001.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S5H11 & SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 70,968.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH AT HILO & S5H11 & SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & STUDENT SERV UHH & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU & B2H11 & LIBRARIAN II,UHH\&WO 11-MO & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 36,363.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU & B5H11 & LIBRARIAN V, UHH\&WO, 11-MO & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 79,465.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 43,670.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 42,366.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU & 12 H 09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 39,584.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU & 12H09 & INSTRUCTOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 39,584.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 58,913.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 44,236.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 55,980.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU & 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO & UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 52,008.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
CLASS & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ CAMPUS } \\
& \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & HON WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & HON WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & UH WEST OAHU \\
FACULTY & HONOLULULULU COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL \\
FACULULY COMM COLL \\
FACULY & HONOLULU COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL \\
FACULY & HONOLULU COMM COLL \\
FACULY & HONOLULU COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & HOLY
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline GRADE & TITLE \\
\hline 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 13H09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 13 H 09 & ASST PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 14 H 09 & ASSOC PROF \& DIV CHAIR-HUMANIT \\
\hline 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 14H09 & ASSOC PROF, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 15H09 & PROF \& DIV CHAIR-SOC SCIENCES \\
\hline 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline 15H09 & PROF \& DIV CHAIR-PROF STUDIES \\
\hline 15H09 & PROFESSOR, UHH\&WO, 9-MO \\
\hline S3H11 & ASST SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO \\
\hline S4H11 & ASSC SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO \\
\hline S4H11 & ASSC SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO \\
\hline S5H11 & SPECIALIST, UHH\&WO, 11-MO \\
\hline S5H11 & SPEC \& DIRECTOR \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & ACTING INSTRUCTOR,CC,9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 49,750.08 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 54,504.00 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 55,980.00 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 67,140.00 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 55,981.68 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 65,004.00 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 54,655.80 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 50,858.76 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 80,118.00 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 63,765.36 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 66,757.08 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 63,419.64 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 70,026.60 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 71,840.28 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 63,765.36 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 66,386.40 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 0.50 & 35,430.30 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 77,280.84 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 73,349.40 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 63,765.36 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 59,544.72 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 85,707.96 \\
\hline UH AT WEST OAHU & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 43,668.00 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 40,572.00 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 42,082.20 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 42,082.20 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 42,072.00 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 45,288.00 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 42,082.20 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 45,285.72 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 42,814.44 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 47,004.00 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 48,744.00 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 46,530.00 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 45,288.00 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 50,611.20 \\
\hline HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 44,967.96 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llllll} 
& \multicolumn{2}{c}{ CAMPUS } & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llllll} 
CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & & TITLE & DIVISION
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 67,087.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 63,778.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 65,850.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 70,239.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 62,331.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 63,419.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 70,662.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 65,849.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 68,544.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 75,798.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 65,621.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR,CC,9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 62,785.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 58,859.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 63,196.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 70,182.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 65,849.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 92,627.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 70,968.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 65,486.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 65,830.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 69,629.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 72,025.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR,CC,9-MO \& DIV CHAIR & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 87,301.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR,CC,9-MO \& CO-DIV CHR & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 67,551.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 62,418.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 65,849.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 69,652.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR,CC,9-MO \& DIV CHAIR & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 65,335.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 60,045.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 67,022.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 67,865.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 58,854.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 65,849.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 81,000.60 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 76,529.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 80,285.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 74,276.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 68,358.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 69,139.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 68,352.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 68,345.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 74,209.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & HONOLULU COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & HONOLULU CC & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 42,077.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 60,972.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 42,082.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 45,284.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 51,773.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 60,972.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 48,749.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 40,573.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 42,082.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 56,564.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 47,004.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 40,572.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 48,747.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 50,614.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 58,716.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 54,194.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 43,671.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 63,276.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 43,671.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 42,077.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 45,284.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 60,972.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 42,071.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 0.50 & 21,835.38 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 40,573.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 48,749.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 42,077.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 40,572.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 40,572.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 48,749.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 45,285.72 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
CLASS & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ CAMPUS } \\
& \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACCLTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL \\
&
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
GRADE & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ TITLE } \\
& \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR (COUNSELOR), CC \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC (COUNS) \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR (COUNSELOR) \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR,CC,11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR (COUNSELOR), 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTR(COUNSELOR-JOB PLACEMENT) \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR (COUNSELOR) \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR (LIBRARIAN), 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO \\
& \\
INO
\end{tabular}

DIVISION
ADJUSTED ANN SAL

FACULTY
FACULTY LTY

FACULTY
FACULTY
ACULTY FACULTY ACULTY

ACULTY
FACULTY
FACULTY
FACULTY
CULTY
ACULTY
FACULTY
FACULTY
FACULTY
FACULTY
ACULTY
FACULT
ACULTY
FACULTY FACULTY FACULTY ACULTY
FACULTY FACULTY
FACULTY
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\begin{tabular}{llllll} 
CLASS & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ CAMPUS } & GRADE & & TITLE & DIVISION
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 50,752.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 52,513.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 45,448.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 48,894.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC & KAPIOLANI CC & 0.80 & 47,050.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 0.50 & 23,933.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC (COUNSELOR) & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ACTING ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 52,512.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 58,068.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 61,618.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF (COUNSELOR), CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 52,654.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 63,965.29 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 53,175.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF CC 11-MO (COUNSELOR) & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 54,644.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 65,978.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 61,089.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 52,659.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 69,038.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 50,752.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 73,698.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 52,513.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC (COUNSELOR) & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 61,861.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 52,825.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 60,660.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 52,654.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 66,002.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 73,698.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 56,881.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 56,714.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 54,221.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 59,016.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 52,825.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 56,871.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 56,871.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 56,564.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 63,407.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 57,400.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 59,343.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 59,287.92 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, 11-MO \& DEPT CHAIR \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC (COUNSELOR) \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC \& DEPT CHAIR \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF CC 11MO (COUNSELOR) \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, (LIBRARIAN) 11 MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF,CC,11MO(LIBRARIAN) \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF CC 11-MO(LIBRARIAN) \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC \& DEPT CHAIR \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC \& DEPT CHR \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC (COUNSELOR) \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC (COUNSELOR) \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC (COUNSELOR) \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
DIVISION & & FTE
\end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{c} 
ADJUSTED ANN \\
\\
\\
KAPIOLANI CC
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 73,698.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC (LIBRARIAN) & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 65,274.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 62,061.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 66,823.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 69,748.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 66,995.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 73,521.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 59,273.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 0.50 & 30,543.54 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 77,343.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 66,253.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 69,656.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 73,309.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 91,286.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC \& DEPT CHR & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 76,417.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 74,130.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROF,CC,11-MO (DIV CHAIR) & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 73,698.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC (COUNSELOR) & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 72,965.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC \& DEPT CHM & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 82,549.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 79,717.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC \& DEPT CHM & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 104,404.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 92,694.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC \& DEPT CHM & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 97,719.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC (COUNSELOR) & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 72,528.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 79,888.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 89,925.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESOR, CC & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC \& DEPT CHR & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 71,337.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 82,430.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC \& DEPT CHR & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 72,526.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC (COUNSELOR) & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC \& DEPT CHAIR & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 76,882.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC (COUNSELOR) & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 77,730.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & KAPIOLANI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC & KAPIOLANI CC & 1.00 & 85,382.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 38,640.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 43,670.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 42,072.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 0.50 & 21,038.70 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 45,285.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 48,744.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,998.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 42,077.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,616.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,998.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,616.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 43,671.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 48,749.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,614.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 45,290.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 43,670.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 48,749.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 40,573.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,564.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 43,671.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 45,285.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,999.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 48,744.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,556.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 43,671.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 40,572.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 40,573.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 45,288.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 42,077.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 40,572.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 40,573.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,564.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,507.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,616.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,999.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 52,516.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 49,243.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 52,513.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,998.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,505.32 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,611.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,998.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 60,971.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,210.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 43,819.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 52,659.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 47,293.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 47,164.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,671.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 49,165.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,655.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 52,513.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 48,093.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,714.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 52,553.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,351.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 47,164.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 52,654.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 43,819.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,752.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,657.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 60,460.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,752.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 52,654.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,655.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,898.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 48,753.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 47,152.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,564.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 48,753.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO (WRITING) & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 45,577.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 60,460.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 48,912.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,827.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,241.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF CC (ACTNG CHR) 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,676.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 61,203.60 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,716.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,714.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,655.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,655.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 59,158.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 55,842.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,752.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 51,767.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,871.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,644.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 57,405.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,789.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,564.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,714.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 61,203.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,987.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC (DIR) & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO (CHAIR) & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 62,318.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 90,756.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 79,465.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,480.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,964.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,858.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,843.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 66,107.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 62,318.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & IER PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 0.40 & 28,388.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 81,066.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 79,359.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 67,279.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 71,046.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,562.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 67,308.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 61,089.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC (DIV CHM), 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 73,693.44 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,714.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 61,104.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,358.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,451.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 81,066.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,815.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 70,860.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,466.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,817.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 0.50 & 36,138.54 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,964.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,540.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,534.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 73,693.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,859.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,931.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 67,087.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,859.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,843.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 72,449.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROF, CC (DIV CHM) 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,279.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,466.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 62,799.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 76,526.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,964.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 72,382.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 73,812.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC (DIV CHM), 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 83,158.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROF CC (DIV CHM), 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 80,103.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 88,929.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,992.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,351.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 77,016.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,742.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 81,344.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC (COORD) & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 89,035.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROF, CC (CHAIR), 11 MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 76,643.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 90,822.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 79,597.44 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROF, CC (DIV CHM), 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 77,176.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 75,043.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 95,959.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 85,859.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & LEEWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROF, CC (DIV CHM), 11-MO & LEEWARD CC & 1.00 & 76,897.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 40,573.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,999.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 0.94 & 40,941.34 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 0.56 & 24,565.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 43,671.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 0.78 & 31,515.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 43,671.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,998.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 42,071.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,998.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 40,573.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR (COUNSELOR) CC, 11 MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,998.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR (COUNSELOR) & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,616.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR (COUNSELOR), 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 48,749.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC (COUNSELOR) & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,561.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC (COUNSELOR) & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,507.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 52,513.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR (COUNSELOR), CC & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,614.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 0.58 & 27,023.85 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR (COUNSELOR), 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,716.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 52,513.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,182.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 48,747.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,611.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, (COUNSELOR) 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,507.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 0.75 & 36,565.47 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 46,530.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR (COUNSELOR) & WINDWARD CC & 0.75 & 35,249.85 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR (COUNSELOR), 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 52,516.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 47,004.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,507.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,720.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 55,213.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 67,935.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,859.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC (COUNSELOR) & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 50,752.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,709.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC (LIBRARIAN) & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 59,130.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC \& DEPT CHAIR & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,525.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, 9-MO, \& DEPT CHAIR & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 54,813.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 59,287.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 61,089.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,849.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 86,441.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,648.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROF, CC, 9-MO \& DEPT CHAIR & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 67,935.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,843.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 72,753.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,850.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROF, CC, 9-MO \& DEPT CHAIR & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 61,089.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 67,948.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,835.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 63,419.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 73,184.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 61,418.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 67,948.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 70,741.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, 9-MO, \& DEPT CHAIR & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 56,709.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 0.50 & 29,429.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 70,741.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 73,698.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 69,033.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 92,371.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC (COUNSELOR) & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,358.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 82,426.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 76,114.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 68,352.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 73,574.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & WINDWARD COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & WINDWARD CC & 1.00 & 65,849.88 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llllll} 
\\
CLASS & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ CAMPUS } & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
CLASS & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ CAMPUS } \\
& \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTY & KAUAI COMM COLL \\
FACULTYY & MACULTY
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
GRADE & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ TITLE } \\
& \\
C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO \& DIV CHR \\
C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO \\
C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO \\
C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO \\
C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC \\
C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
C4C09 & ASSOC PROF CC 9MO \& DIV CHR \\
C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO \\
C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO \\
C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO \\
C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC \& CO DIV CHR \\
C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C5C11 & PROFESSOR CC, \& DIV CHR \\
& \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO \\
&
\end{tabular}

DIVISION
ADJUSTED ANN SAL
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 42,071.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 0.10 & 5,592.46 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 46,998.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 46,998.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 52,516.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & ACTING INSTRUCTOR, CC & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 47,004.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 48,753.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 60,971.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 46,530.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 54,505.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 0.88 & 41,123.25 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 54,504.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 54,504.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 73,584.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC (COUNSELOR) & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 56,556.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 50,614.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 0.69 & 32,311.13 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 48,749.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 56,561.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 54,504.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 47,004.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 73,584.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 60,363.36 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 73,584.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 54,505.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 0.60 & 33,938.42 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 52,513.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 50,709.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 58,720.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 0.50 & 24,847.38 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 58,337.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 67,738.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF \& DIV CHR & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 50,424.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC \& DIV CHR & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 53,111.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 48,912.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 58,930.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 56,709.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 70,934.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 43,829.64 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 60,989.16 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llllll} 
CLASS & & & & TITLE & DIVISION
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 70,000.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 61,091.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 74,209.68 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 79,492.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 0.50 & 35,794.38 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 72,369.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 62,388.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 80,100.48 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 65,993.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 68,385.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 70,966.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 87,976.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROF \& DIV CHR & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 87,523.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 78,750.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & MAUI COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & MAUI CC & 1.00 & 81,516.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 40,572.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 0.50 & 21,041.10 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 0.50 & 22,642.86 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 46,993.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 0.80 & 36,228.58 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 42,082.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 45,288.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAIICC & 1.00 & 56,556.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 50,616.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 40,572.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 40,572.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 0.20 & 10,121.42 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAIICC & 0.80 & 34,936.61 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 47,004.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 40,572.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 40,572.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 43,668.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAIICC & 1.00 & 52,516.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C09 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 52,513.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 0.69 & 34,795.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & HAWAll CC & 1.00 & 52,512.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 48,753.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 46,998.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 47,004.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 56,714.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 0.50 & 25,998.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 47,004.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C2C11 & INSTRUCTOR, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 47,004.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 46,707.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 68,338.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 54,655.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 68,338.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 0.50 & 23,582.22 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 48,753.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 52,659.00 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9 MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 68,338.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 50,752.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 0.88 & 42,794.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 47,164.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 50,607.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C09 & ASST PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 50,752.80 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 58,854.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 58,721.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, \& DIV CHAIR & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 65,849.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 61,440.72 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C3C11 & ASST PROF, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 61,091.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 59,273.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 61,223.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 61,091.40 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 73,805.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 61,528.20 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 55,912.92 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 58,859.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 54,499.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 52,513.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 56,714.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C09 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 58,859.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 63,407.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 82,651.08 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 85,828.44 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C4C11 & ASSOC PROF, CC, 11-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, DIV CHAIR & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 61,091.40 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline CLASS & CAMPUS & GRADE & TITLE & DIVISION & FTE & ADJUSTED ANN SAL \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 65,711.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9 MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 60,972.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROF, CC, 9-MO \& DIV CHAIR & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 64,706.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROF,CC \& DIV CHAIR & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 65,993.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 65,849.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, \& DIV CHAIR & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 68,239.56 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 68,372.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 76,407.12 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 63,288.84 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROF, CC, \& DIV CHAIR & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 68,366.16 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROF, CC, 9-MO \& DIV CHAIR & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 58,859.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAll CC & 1.00 & 65,849.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 85,607.28 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9 MO & HAWAll CC & 1.00 & 75,996.96 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 58,854.24 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 65,993.04 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO, DIV CHAIR & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 68,107.32 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR ,CC , 9 M0 & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 65,393.52 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAll CC & 0.50 & 34,240.26 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC, 9-MO & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC & HAWAII CC & 1.00 & 70,979.88 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C09 & PROFESSOR, CC & HAWAll CC & 1.00 & 70,754.76 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO & HAWAll CC & 1.00 & 70,860.60 \\
\hline FACULTY & HAWAII COMM COLL & C5C11 & PROFESSOR, CC, 11-MO, DIV CHR & HAWAll CC & 1.00 & 92,694.72 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}```


[^0]:    Effective 7/1/2012
    Current salaries for Dept. Heads and Deputy Dept. Heads approved to 6/30/2012. 7/1/2012 current costs for these positions computed at 7/1/2011 rates.

[^1]:    223008_2. DOC

[^2]:    ${ }^{9}$ Reasons for changing an agenda should be recorded in the minutes.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Because the completed REQUEST describes the unanticipated event and explains how the event raises an issue that requires board action in less than 6 days, filing the completed form with the agenda of the proposed emergency meeting would satisfy the filing requirement of Hawaii Revised Statutes 5 92-8(b)(3).

[^4]:    Soufces: The Council of State Governments" survey of state personnel agencies, January 2005 and January 2006.
    Nore: The chief administrative officials responsible for each function were determined from information given by the states for the same function as listed in State Admunistrative Officials Classified by Function, 2005, published by The Council of State Governments.

[^5]:    Source: "Survey of Judicial Salaries" published by the National Center for State Courts, Vol. 31, No. 1.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Not all states have an intermediate appellate court.
    ${ }^{2}$ This table reflects the salary for an Associate Judge of intermediate appellate courts.
    ${ }^{3}$ Also see ACCRA notes from the Adjusted General Trial Court listing.

[^7]:    
    
    
    

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2, Senate Draft No. 1, Regular Session of 1997, at 1.
    ${ }^{2}$ Id.
    ${ }^{3}$ Id. at 2.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ Haw. Const. art. VI, §3.

    21989 Haw. Sess. Laws, Act 271.
    ${ }^{3}$ Haw. Rev. Stat. §608-1.5.

    41990 Haw. Sess. Laws, Act 72.

[^10]:    5Haw. Rev. Stat. §602-2.
    ${ }^{6}$ Id. at §602-52.
    ${ }^{7}$ Id. at §603-5.
    ${ }^{8}$ Id. at §604-2.5.
    ${ }^{9}$ Id. at §571-8.2 (salaries same as district court judges).
    ${ }^{10}$ Hawaii, Report of the Commission on Judicial Salaries (Honolulu: 1984), at 27, quoting from Hawaii, Report of the Special Committee of the Judicial Council on Judicial Salaries (Honolulu: 1975) at 4.

[^11]:    27 Id. at $\S 34$.

    28 Id. at §34A.
    ${ }^{29}$ Id. at $\S 36$.
    ${ }^{30}$ Hawaii, Report of Public Officers and Employees Compensation Review Commission (Honolulu: February 1983), at 17.

[^12]:    ${ }^{31}$ Id. at 25-29. This idea has been repeatedly voiced by other temporary commissions in the past, including by the Governor's Committee on Executive Salaries, Report dated January 1981. See e.g., id. at 10; Hawaii, Report of the Commission on Judicial Salaries (Honolulu: 1984), at iii.
    ${ }^{32}$ Hawaii, Report of Public Officers and Employees Compensation Review Commission (Honolulu: February 1983), at 23.
    ${ }^{33}$ Id. at 17.
    ${ }^{34}$ See "Stalled pay issue," Honolulu Star Bulletin, February 20, 1983 (editorial).
    ${ }^{35}$ See Hawaii, Report of the Commission on Judicial Salaries (Honolulu: 1984), at iii \& 30.
    ${ }^{36}$ Id. at iii.

[^13]:    ${ }^{39}$ Hawaii, Report of the Advisory Committee on Judicial Salaries (Honolulu: 1989), at 14-15 (emphasis supplied).

    40 Id. at 26.

[^14]:    ${ }^{41}$ See id. at 24-28.
    ${ }^{42}$ See 1989 Haw. Sess. Laws, Act 329, §1, amending Haw. Rev. Stat. §26-51.
    ${ }^{43}$ See 1989 Haw. Sess. Laws, Act 271, codified at Haw. Rev. Stat. §608-1.5.
    ${ }^{44}$ See 1990 Haw. Sess. Laws, Act 72, §§3-6; Hawaii Judicial Salary Commission, Report on Judicial Salaries (Honolulu: October 1996) at 8 [hereinafter cited as 1996 Hawaii Salary Commission Report].

    45 Id. at 8 .
    ${ }^{46}$ Id. at 10-12. The Commission, using 1996 data from the National Center for State Courts, applied the following "normalizing" formula: (per capita income in Hawaii) divided by (per capita income in state "A") multiplied by (actual judicial salary in state "A"). The Commission conceded that such comparisons should be viewed with caution because "per capita income" alone is not considered a complete assessment of a state's cost of living index. Id. at $11, \mathrm{n} .5$.

[^15]:    471996 Hawaii Salary Commission Report, at 10. The Commission relied upon data from the National Center for State Courts, "Survey of Judicial Salaries" (Williamsburg: July 1996 ed.).

    48 The Commission's actual recommendations are contained in a letter from the Commission to the Honorable Members of the Nineteenth Legislature, dated January 13, 1997.
    ${ }^{49}$ Id.
    ${ }^{50}$ See 1996 Hawaii Salary Commission Report, at 12-13.
    ${ }^{51}$ Id. at 16.
    ${ }^{52}$ Id. at 18 (Figure 3).

    53 Id. at 19.
    ${ }^{54}$ Id. at 19-20.

[^16]:    55 Letter from the Judicial Salary Commission to the Honorable Members of the Nineteenth Legislature, dated January 13, 1997.

    56 Benjamin J. Cayetano, Governor of Hawaii, Statement of Objections to House Bill No. 1393, Regular Session of 1997 (June 20, 1997).

[^17]:    ${ }^{1}$ Hawaii Judicial Salary Commission, Report on Judicial Salaries (Honolulu: October 1996). The Commission relied upon data current as of October 1996.
    ${ }^{2}$ See National Center for State Courts, "Survey of Judicial Salaries," (Williamsburg: Fall 1997), at 10 [hereinafter cited as NCSC Salary Survey]. The thirteen states are: Arizona (1/5/98), Arkansas (7/1/98), Connecticut (10/1/98), Florida (7/1/98), Michigan (1/1/98), Nebraska (7/1/98), Nevada (1/3/99), North Dakota (7/1/98), Oklahoma (1/1/98), South Carolina (7/1/98), Texas (9/1/98), Vermont (1/4/98), and Virginia (12/1/97). See id. at 11.
    ${ }^{3}$ Id. at 1.
    ${ }^{4}$ Id. at 10.
    ${ }^{5}$ See Chapter 2, note 46 and accompanying text.

[^18]:    ${ }^{6}$ Alaska Stat. §22.05.140 (supreme court), §22.07.090 (court of appeals), §22.10.190 (superior court), and §22.15.220 (district court) (1996).
    ${ }^{7}$ See id.

    8 Id. at 22.35 .010 .
    ${ }^{9}$ Id. at $\S \S 22.05 .140,22.07 .090,22.10 .190$, and 22.15.220.
    ${ }^{10}$ Cal. Gov’t Code $\S 68203$ (West 1997).
    ${ }^{11}$ See 28 U.S.C. 461 (1994).

[^19]:    12 D.C. Code Ann. §11-703(b) (1995).
    ${ }^{13}$ Id. at § 11-904.
    ${ }^{14}$ Telephone conversation with Elaine Legrande, Illinois Administrative Office of the Courts, Administrative Services, September 5, 1997. See also 5 ILCS $\S \S 290-3$ through 290-3.3 (1996).

[^20]:    ${ }^{18}$ Id. at $\$ 75-3120(\mathrm{l})(\mathrm{b})$.
    ${ }^{19}$ Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. §48.195 (Baldwin 1995).
    ${ }^{20}$ Telephone interview with Jennifer Chandler, Administrative Office of the Courts, September 4, 199
    ${ }^{21}$ Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. tit. 4, §§4(2-A), 102(2-A), 157(4-A) (1989 \& Supp. 1996). For purposes of provision, "consumer price index" means the Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical W United States City Average, All items, 1967+ 100, as complied by the United States Department of Labor, of Labor Statistics or if the index is revised or superseded, the consumer price index is the index represente Bureau of Labor Statistics as reflecting most accurately changes in the purchasing power of the dollar by co

[^21]:    ${ }^{23}$ Md. Cts. \& Jud. Pro. Code Ann. §1-703 (1995).
    ${ }^{24}$ See infra notes 57-59 and accompanying text.
    ${ }^{25}$ Mo. Ann. Stat. $\S 476.405$ (Vern. Supp. 1997). This statutory provision contains the limiting language "[w]ithin the limits of any appropriation made for this purpose . . . ."
    ${ }^{26}$ Telephone interview with Jeff Smith, New Hampshire Administrative Office of the Courts, September 5, 1997.

    2742 Pa. Cons. Stat. Ann. § 3581(I) (Purdon Supp. 1997). The percentage increase must be published in the Pennsylvania Bulletin annually by the supreme court on or before November 30.

[^22]:    ${ }^{28}$ S.D. Codified Laws §3-8-2.1 (1994).
    ${ }^{29}$ Tenn. Code Ann. §8-23-103 (1993).
    ${ }^{30}$ Id.

[^23]:    ${ }^{31}$ Conn. Gen. Stat. §51-47(d) (Supp. 1997).
    ${ }^{32}$ Nev. Rev. Stat. §3.030 (West 1997).
    ${ }^{33}$ See NCSC Salary Survey, supra note 2, at 6 .
    ${ }^{34}$ N.C. Gen. Stat. §7A-10 (1995). The term "service" means service as a judge of any court of record, a member of the utilities commission, a district attorney, or a clerk of the superior court.

[^24]:    ${ }^{40}$ Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. at tit. $4 \S 1701(12)$. See also infra notes 55, 65, and 67 and accompanying text.

    41 Ala. Const. of 1901, Amend. No. 328.

    42 Ala. Code §12-10-4 (1995).

    43 Ala. Code §12-10-5; see also Ala. Const. of 1901, Amend. No. 328.

[^25]:    ${ }^{44}$ Telephone conversation with Rob Bradford, Alabama Administrative Office of the Courts, September 4, 1997.

    45 Ala. Const. of 1901, Amend. No. 426 (Amendment to Amendment No. 328, Article VI, §6.09(d)).
    ${ }^{46}$ Telephone conversation with Rob Bradford, Alabama Administrative Office of the Courts, September 4, 1997.
    ${ }^{47}$ Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. §41-1903 (1991 \& Supp. 1993).
    ${ }^{48}$ Id. at $\S 41-1902$.

    49 See id. at §41-1903 \& 41-1904.

[^26]:    ${ }^{50}$ Del. Code Ann. tit. 29, §3303 (1987 \& Supp. 1996). As used, remuneration includes salaries, emoluments, mileage, per diem, travel, and other expense allowances and reimbursements.
    ${ }^{51}$ Id. at tit. 29 § 3301.

    52 Id. at tit. 29, §3303.

    53 Id. at tit. 29, §3304.

    5425 ILCS §120/2 (1996).

[^27]:    55 Id. at § 120/4.

    56 Id. at $\S \S 120 / 4-120 / 5$.
    ${ }^{57}$ Md. Cts. and Jud. Pro. Code Ann. § 1-708 (1995).

    58 See supra note 23 and accompanying text.

[^28]:    ${ }^{59}$ Md. Cts. and Jud. Pro. Code Ann. §1-708 (1995).
    ${ }^{60}$ Mich. Stat. Ann.§3.255(56) (1996).
    ${ }^{61}$ Id. $\S 3.255(57)$. The legislature must adopt the resolution prior to February 1, of the. year following the filing of the determination. In the case of rejection, the existing salary and expense allowances prevail retroactive to January 1.

[^29]:    ${ }^{64}$ Id. at §15A.082(3).

    65 Id. at § 15A.082(4).
    ${ }^{66}$ R.I. Gen. Laws §§36-4-16 \& 36-4-16.2 (1990 \& Supp. 1996). The Board composition is as follo two members are appointed from the house of representatives by the speaker; two are appointed from the se the majority leader; the director of administration; the state court administrator; and the general treasure.
    ${ }^{67}$ Id. at §36-4-16.4(a).
    ${ }^{68}$ Id. at §36-4-16.4(d).
    ${ }^{69}$ National Center for State Courts, Information Services Memorandum No. S95.2152 (states' respons the question: "Are salaries of any judges tied to any automatic increases (such as cost of living) or tc state government official?") (Williamsburg: March 7, 1996), at 25.

[^30]:    70 Wash. Rev. Code §43.03.310 (1996).
    ${ }^{71}$ Id.
    ${ }^{72}$ Id. at $\S 43.03 .310$.
    ${ }^{73}$ Id. at $\S 43.03 .305$.

[^31]:    ${ }^{1}$ Chief Justice Ronald Moon, State of the Judiciary Address, January 22, 1997, at 9-10.

[^32]:    ${ }^{2}$ See Edward B. McConnell, "State Judicial Salaries: A National Perspective," 61 Journal of State Government 179, 180 (Sept./Oct. 1988) [hereinafter cited as McConnell], quoting from the Report of the Iowa Commission to Review Judicial Compensation and Benefits, March 1978.
    ${ }^{3}$ Hawaii Judicial Salary Commission, Report on Judicial Salaries (Honolulu: October 1996), at 7 [hereinafter cited as 1996 Hawaii Salary Commission Report], quoting from American Judicature Society, JulyAugust, 1994.
    ${ }^{4}$ See e.g., State of New York, Temporary State Commission on Judicial Compensation: Final Report, January 1993, at 2; Flaherty, "Judges Are Militant, Bitter Over Pay," 21 Court Review 5, 10 (Summer 1984).
    ${ }^{5}$ McConnell, supra note 2, at 180. McConnell contends that the public at large is the loser as "good judges leave the bench and qualified lawyers refuse to make the economic sacrifice required to take their place." On the issue of appointing qualified judges to the bench, he further quotes an adviser to the governor in an unidentified state as frankly stating: "We're getting a lot of duds. We're not getting the level of quality we want in candidates, and salary is the reason." Id.

[^33]:    ${ }^{6}$ See id.
    ${ }^{7}$ American Bar Association, Judicial Administration Division, "Standards for Judicial Compensation" (Chicago, 1990), at I.
    ${ }^{8} \mathrm{Mc}$ Connell, supra note 2 , at 180 .
    ${ }^{9}$ See Susan Keilitz \& Judith White McBride, "Judicial Performance Evaluation Comes of Age," State Court Journal 4-13, Winter 1992, at 4.
    ${ }^{10} \underline{\text { Id. }}$

[^34]:    ${ }^{11}$ States with established judicial performance evaluation programs: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Utah. States in the process (as of 1993) of developing their programs: Delaware, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, and Washington. See National Center for State Courts, 1993 State Court Organization (Williamsburg: 1995), at Table 11.

[^35]:    14 The program, which started as a pilot program, was made permanent at the end of August of 1993. Judicial performance is evaluated through the use of questionnaires sent to attorneys, pro se litigants, and guardians ad litem who appear before judges. The Bar's response rate reportedly has been very positive. See "Judiciary Report," Hawaii Bar Journal (November 1994), at 27-28.

[^36]:    16 McConnell , supra note 2 , at 180.
    ${ }^{17}$ McConnell, supra note 2, at 179-180, quoting from Report of the Iowa Commission to Review Judicial Compensation and Benefits, March 1987.

[^37]:    ${ }^{19}$ It has been said that the separation of powers doctrine is the "most important principle of government[,] declaring and guaranteeing the liberties of the people, and preventing the exercise if autocratic power, and ... is a matter of fundamental necessity, ... essential to the maintenance of a republican form of government. ... [N]o maxim has been more universally received and cherished as a vital principle of freedom." 16 Am Jur 2d Constitutional Law §296 (1979 \& Supp. 1997) (footnotes omitted). The doctrine has been explained as the distribution of the powers of government to the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, which operates, by implication, as an inhibition against the imposition, upon any one branch of government, of the powers that belong to one of the other branches, so that no branch may rightfully exercise any of the functions necessarily belonging to another. Id.
    ${ }^{20}$ Id. (footnotes omitted).

[^38]:    ${ }^{21}$ Id., citing O'Donoghue v. United States, 289 U.S. 516 (1932); State v. Shumaker, 200 Ind. 716, 164 N.E. 408 (1928).
    ${ }^{22}$ See McConnell, supra note 2, at 181-182.

[^39]:    ${ }^{29}$ State of New York, Temporary State Commission on Judicial Compensation: Final Report, January 1993, at 8.

[^40]:    ${ }^{34}$ McConnell, supra note 2, at 181-182, quoting from the October 1987 Report of the Utah Committee on Judicial Compensation.
    ${ }^{35}$ Chief Justice Ronald Moon, "State of the Judiciary Address", January 22, 1997, at 3.
    ${ }^{36}$ Hawaii, Report of the Advisory Committee on Judicial Salaries (Honolulu: 1989), at 3.
    ${ }^{37}$ See Maryland, 1986 Report of the Maryland Judicial Compensation Commission (Annapolis: 1886), at

[^41]:    38 Richard Borreca, Governor's commission proposes hefty pay hikes," Honolulu Star Bulletin, March 3, 1989. In addition, a spokesman for the attorney general's office estimated that security costs, travel expenses, and landscaping at Washington Place costs $\$ 250,000$. Id.
    ${ }^{39}$ See McConnell, supra, note 2, at 181. McConnell also quotes the Iowa Commission to Review Judicial Compensation and Benefits on this point: "The Code of Judicial Conduct makes judges almost completely reliant upon judicial salaries for earned income. Judges are required to sacrifice most all sources of earned income, except isolated instances of teaching and writing which do no impinge upon their judicial duties. Fundamental fairness requires fair and just compensation . . . " Id. at 180.
    ${ }^{40}$ See Haw. Rev. Code of Jud. Conduct Cannon 4 (1992). In Hawaii, the Judiciary's policy of prohibiting judges from serving as paid adjunct law professors is based upon Article VI, $\S 3$ of the Hawaii Constitution. See Memorandum from Chief Justice Moon to Administrative Judges and Dean Jeremy Harrison, May 11, 1993.

[^42]:    41 Telephone conversation with Allen Sakamoto, Compensation Specialist, Classification and Compensation Review Division, Department of Human Resources Development (October 1, 1997).
    ${ }^{42}$ Memorandum from Earl I. Anzai, Director of Finance, to All Department Heads, Re Fringe Benefit Rate for FY 98, July 1, 1997.

    43 American Bar Association, National Conference of State Trial Judges, A Survey of State Judicial Fringe Benefits (2 ed.; Chicago: 1996).

[^43]:    ${ }^{48}$ In lieu of vacation and sick leave, Alaska's district court judges receive either 2, 2.25, 2.5, or 3 days of personal leave per month (depending upon years of service). American Bar Association, National Conference of State Trial Judges, A Survey of State Judicial Fringe Benefits (2 ed.; Chicago: 1996), at 7.
    ${ }^{49}$ Colorado has no formal policies, but judges have 25 per year to use at their discretion. Id. at 21.
    ${ }^{50}$ Except district court judges receive 20 vacation days per year, 10 hours of sick leave each month, and 11 days of educational leave. Id. at 178-179.

[^44]:    ${ }^{53}$ In Indiana, the annual subsistence allowance to defray expenses relating to the discharge of duty ranges from $\$ 5,500$ to $\$ 3,000$. Id. at 58 .

[^45]:    541996 Hawaii Salary Commission Report, supra note 3, at 19.

[^46]:    56 See Paul H. Brewbaker, Hawaii's Cost of Living in 1990: Urban Four-Person Family Budgets at an Intermediate Standard of Living" (Bank of Hawaii, Honolulu: 1991), at 1.
    ${ }^{57}$ Hawaii, Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism, 1996 Data Book (Honolulu: 1996), at 365 .

[^47]:    ${ }^{1}$ See note 38 in Chapter 4 and accompanying text.

[^48]:    ${ }^{1}$ See discussion of history of judicial pay increase in Chapter 2.
    ${ }^{2}$ See Hawaii, Report of the Commission on Judicial Salaries (Honolulu: 1984), at 3.

[^49]:    ${ }^{3}$ See id. at 30.

    4National Center for State Courts, "Survey of Judicial Salaries" (Williamsburg: Fall 1997), at 10.

[^50]:    ${ }^{5}$ States tying judicial salary adjustments to those of civil service or state employees: Kansas's court of last resort, intermediate court of appeals, and general jurisdiction trial court rank 34, 30, and 38, respectively; Kentucky's court of last resort ranks 31 (the intermediate court of appeals and the general jurisdiction trial court both rank 29); New Hampshire's court of last resort and general jurisdiction trial court rank 35 and 32, respectively; South Dakota's court of last resort and general jurisdiction trial court rank 46 and 49, respectively. States providing longevity payments: Nevada's court of last resort and general jurisdiction trial court rank 42 and 44 , respectively. States relying on determinative compensation commissions: Alabama's general jurisdiction trial court is ranked 42 (however, its court of last resort and intermediate court of appeals rank 10 and 8, respectively); and Minnesota's court of last resort, intermediate court of appeals, and general jurisdiction trial court rank 36, 36, and 39, respectively.

    6For example, see the descriptions of compensation commissions in Alabama, Arizona, and Minnesota in Chapter 3.

[^51]:    ${ }^{8}$ See Haw. Rev. Stat. §89C-2.

[^52]:    ${ }^{11}$ Id.
    ${ }^{12}$ See Haw. Rev. Stat. §89-11(c) (if parties have not mutually agreed to submit to final and binding arbitration, either party may take any lawful action deemed necessary to end dispute).

[^53]:    ${ }^{13}$ See notes 59-63 in Chapter 4 and accompanying text.

[^54]:    ${ }^{14}$ Edward B. McConnell, "State Judicial Salaries: A National Perspective," 61 Journal of State Government 179, 182 (Sept./Oct. 1988).

[^55]:    ${ }^{16}$ It is possible to increase one's salary on the same court level by being appointed the chief judge on the intermediate court of appeals or the chief justice on the supreme court. See Haw. Rev. Stat. §§602-2 and 602-52.

[^56]:    ${ }^{20}$ See Haw. Rev. Stat. §89-9(a).
    ${ }^{21}$ The Bureau notes one caveat to this recommendation. If the Legislature intends to award longevity payments in lieu of, as opposed to in addition to, any periodic, across the board salary adjustment (which course of action the Bureau does not recommend), then the Bureau would concur with more frequent step movements.

[^57]:    22However, there should be no retroactive payments for sitting judges.

[^58]:    ${ }^{23}$ Haw. Const. art. III, $\S 9$ (change in salary does not apply to the Legislature to which the commission's recommendation was submitted).
    ${ }^{24}$ For example, in Delaware, Illinois, and Rhode Island, the compensation commission recommendations become effective after only 30 days, unless modified or rejected. See notes 53, 56 and 68 in Chapter 3 and accompanying text.

[^59]:    ${ }^{26}$ Benjamin J. Cayetano, Governor of Hawaii, Statement of Objections to House Bill No. 1393, Regular Session of 1997 (June 20, 1997).

[^60]:    ${ }^{27}$ See Haw. Rev. Stat. §88-73. These vesting requirements also apply to elective officers, the chief clerks and assistant clerks, and sergeant at arms and assistant sergeant at arms of either house of the Legislature.

[^61]:    * National Center for State Courts, "State Court Report" Juty 1996.
    ** Normalized Salary = [(P.C.P.1. Hawai')/(P.C.P.L. State *A"] $\times$ (Salary State "A').
    ** P.C.P.L. is Per Capita Personal hncome. Sounce: United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysi "Per Capita Personal Income by State, 1989-1995," May 15, 1596.

[^62]:    * National Center for State Counts, "State Court Poport" July, 1996.
    ** Atrmaized Salary = [P.C.P.L Hawai')/(P.C.P.I. State | AJ ]×(Sahy State -A=).
    ।** P.C.P. is Per Capita Personal trocme. Source: united States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Econcinic At-d 'Per Capita Personal income by State, 1989-1995,' May 15, 1996.

[^63]:    Survey of Judicial Salaries Report, Volume 22. Number 2. Fall 1997.
    PCPI's Per capita Personal Income. Normalized Salary = [P.C.P.I. Hawaii)/(P.C.P.I. State "A" ]) (Salary State "A")

[^64]:    * The "normalizing" technique is used to eliminate the disparity caused by differences in per capita income among the states. The formula used is as follows: (Per Capitalncome in Hawaill divided by (Per Capita Income in State "A") multiplied by (Actual Judicial Salery in State "A"). Comparisons of "normalized" salaries should be viewed with scme caution since "per capita income" alone is considered tobe an incomplete assessmem of a state's cost of living index.

[^65]:    Source: Provideci by the Judiciary.

[^66]:    1/ Salary levels for 2006 and beyond are purely hypothetical figures based on the assumption that average wages will increase at an annual rate of 2.2 percent per year throughout 2012. Source: Table 2. 2002 Legislative Salary Commission Worksheet.

[^67]:    (1) Honolutu Consumer Price Index (CPI). 1982-1984=100. OBEDT. QSER, March. 2003
    (2) Annual percent change in CPI Figues from 2003 to 2012 are guess estimates and onty for illustration purposes
    (3) Average annual percent change in CPI computed as prior 8 years average Like column (2), it is assumed that CPI will increase by 20 percent per year after 2002 (4) Average anmal wages. OH./R. Labor and Occupational Informatuon Hawain (LO'H1).
    (5) Anmal persent wange in average wages Figures from 2002102012 are guess estimates and only for illustration purposes
    (6) Average anmual percent change in wages computed as prior 7 years average Like column (5), it is assumed that average ages wilincrease ty 22 percent per year
    afler 2001.
    (8) Adjusted legislative satary using annual change in CPI. [column (7) $\times$ column (2)/100]
    (9) Adjusted legislative salary using average annuai growth tate in CPI for every 8 years. \{ column (7) $\times$ column (3)/100\}
    (10) Adjusted legislative salary using annual change in wages. [ column (7) $\times$ column (5)/100]
    (11) Adjusted legislative salary using average annual change in wages for every 7 years $\{$ column (7) $\times$ coturnn (6)/100 $]$

[^68]:    - Shaterf area mata ates estimation and/or propection

[^69]:    ${ }^{1}$ The appointed administrative officers are the Administrative Director of the Courts and the Deputy Administrative Director of the Courts. See §601-3, HRS.
    ${ }^{2}$ See Appendix G for a copy of Act 123, SLH 2003.

[^70]:    ${ }^{3}$ See Appendix H .

[^71]:    ${ }^{4}$ The actual percentage increase for FY 2006 varies by court program as reflected in the Appendix A. See Appendix A for this and other details of the increase.

[^72]:    ${ }^{5}$ Edward B. McConnell. "State Judicial Salaries: A National Perspective." Journal of State Government, 61, Sept./Oct. 1988, at 180.

[^73]:    ${ }^{6}$ American Bar Association, Judicial Administration Division, "Standards for Judicial Compensation," (Chicago: American Bar Association, 1990), at i.

[^74]:    ${ }^{7}$ Robert W. Tobin and Kent Pankey Kent Sr. Setting Judicial Salaries in Hawaii: Model Based on Comparative National Study for the Cades Foundation. National Center for State Courts, January 2003, at 40.
    ${ }^{8}$ Hawaii Legislature. Conference Committee Report No. 87 regarding S.B. No. 1333, C.D. 1 (2003) at 1.

[^75]:    ${ }^{9}$ See particularly Appendix E for the Supreme and Circuit Courts.
    ${ }^{10}$ See Appendix $I$.

[^76]:    ${ }^{11}$ http://www.infirmation.com/shared/insider/payscale.tcl
    ${ }^{12}$ Downloaded from the World Wide Web from: http://secure.salary.com/jobvaluationreport/docs/jobvaluationreport/joblisthtmls/jvrjob_LE110 00003.html on January 7, 2003.

[^77]:    ${ }^{13}$ Downloaded from the World Wide Web from:
    http://www.nalp.org/nalpresearch/sumch03.htm on January 7, 2003.

[^78]:    ${ }^{14}$ Downloaded from the World Wide Web: http://www.state.hi.us/tax/cor/2003gf12.pdf on February, 2004. See also Appendix H.

[^79]:    ${ }^{15}$ Judicature, Volume 78, Number 1, July-August, 1994, at 6.

[^80]:    ${ }^{16}$ The actual percentage increase for FY 2006 varies by court program as reflected in the Appendix A. See Appendix A for this and other details of the increase.

[^81]:    ${ }^{17}$ Original proceedings include election contests, extraordinary petitions, bar admission proceedings, attorney discipline proceedings, judicial discipline proceedings, and rule making for all state courts.

[^82]:    ${ }^{18}$ Although the Supreme Court and the ICA generally have concurrent jurisdiction over appeals and original proceedings, the Supreme Court seldom, if ever, assigns original proceedings to the ICA.

[^83]:    Source: "Survey of Judicial Salaries," published by the NCSC, Vol. 28, No. 1, As of April 1, 2003.
    Salary information obtained for State Court Administrators nationwide have been rounded off.

    * At the indicated level, two or more states provided the same salaries (rounded) so the ranking is only a relative standing a relative standing (i.e., there is no difference between the ranking of 16 through 18 and 19 through 21 for example).

