

ATTACHMENT I

**FACT-FINDING PROCEEDINGS
RICHARD FINCHER, FACT-FINDER**

In the Matter of Fact-Finding between

**THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY
INVESTIGATORS ASSOCIATION (DAIA)**

And

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

(Non-Binding Fact-Finding)

March 19, 2026

Jurisdiction

This matter comes before the undersigned Fact-finder selected by the parties under the impasse provisions of Nevada state law (NRS Chapter 288). The matter was virtually heard on December 17, 2025. The Parties had the opportunity to make opening statements, examine and cross-examine witnesses, and fully argue the issues in dispute. All witnesses testified under oath. There was no transcript. The parties submitted timely post-hearing briefs.

The goal of fact-finding is to recommend a decision that, as nearly as possible, approximates what the parties would have reached had they continued to bargain with determination and good faith. This report and recommendations are based on review and study of all evidence and testimony entered into evidence.

Appearances

Mr. Adam Levine, Counsel for Union
Law Office of Daniel Marks

Ms. Allison Kheel, Counsel for County
Fisher and Phillips, LLP

Issues in impasse

The primary issue in dispute is Article 29 “Compensation,” which includes a) wages increases from COLA, b) increases to the salary schedule itself, and c) wage increases of individual employees within the salary scale (in addition to performance pay). The discussion includes employees whose current wages

are near the bottom, middle, and top of the salary schedule. Secondary issues in impasse concern duration of the CBA, retroactivity of the implementation date, and incorporation of an education incentive.

Jurisdiction under Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS)

Nevada has enacted a statutory mechanism for resolving impasses during collective bargaining, as NRS 288.200. Because more than six (6) total meetings had occurred by June 16, 2025, DAIA advanced this matter to statutory fact-finding. The parties participated in mediation without resolution.

NRS states that the fact-finder must compare the final offers of the County and the Union, assessing the reasonableness of each proposal, with “due regard for the obligation of the local government employer to provide facilities and services guaranteeing the health, welfare and safety of the people residing within the political subdivision.”

The findings and recommendations of the fact-finder are not binding unless the parties otherwise agree to make them binding. The parties have not reached an agreement to make the findings and recommendations binding. Because this is fact-finding, and not binding interest arbitration, the fact-finder may select from among the proposals of each party, or to modify such proposals, and is not obligated to select the proposal of one party or the other in its entirety.

If one or both parties do not agree to adopt the fact-finding recommendations, then the matter would move to binding fact-finding under NRS 288.200(6) which mirrors the interest arbitration provisions of NRS 288.200.215 and provides for an arbitrator to select one side’s final written offer in what is colloquially referred to as a “baseball style” arbitration.

Background

The employer is the largest and most complex government agency in the state. The parties have entered into a collective bargaining Agreement (CBA), ending June 30, 2025 which has technically expired with a continuation of terms. The bargaining unit consists of twenty-two (22) criminal investigators employed by the Clark County District Attorney’s Office. The focus of the argument concerns the Special Investigator II classification. Investigators are not police officers. The employer is the District Attorney, not the Metro Police Department.

Stipulations

The parties stipulate that the Fact-finder may recommend either a one-year or a two-year term, without prejudice to either party to insist upon a one-year agreement should the matter proceed to a binding fact-finding under NRS 288.200(6).

County ability to pay

Clark County is not asserting an inability to pay increased wages. Therefore, the Fact-finder makes a determination as to the financial ability of the local government employer based on all existing available revenues as established by the local government employer and within the limitations set forth in NRS 354.6241, with due regard for the obligation of the local government employer to provide facilities and services guaranteeing the health, welfare and safety of the people residing within the political subdivision.

In the event of a multi-year contract, Clark County is not asserting an inability to pay for a second year.

Statutory Criteria

1. An addition to determining the financial ability of the County to grant monetary benefits, the statute refers to applying the “normal criteria of interest disputes including compensation of other government employees, both in and out of the State and use normal criteria for interest disputes regarding the terms and provisions to be included in an agreement in assessing the reasonableness of the position of each party as to each issue in dispute and the fact finder shall consider whether the Board found that either party had bargained in bad faith.
2. Cost of living adjustment based on the CPI
3. Data of market competitiveness from a recent compensation study
4. Data on vacant job opportunities in the unit
5. Data on employee turnover in the unit
6. Data on productivity in the unit, if available and relevant
7. Comparison of non-wage benefits (pension, health and welfare), if available and relevant
8. Economic parity between bargaining units, such as traditional parity between police and fire units, if available and relevant
9. Comparison with other similarly situated jobs with comparative investigative and police units in the state and outside of the state.

Distinctive considerations

1. Some CBAs have a set number of “steps” within the salary schedule and employees progress through the schedule on their anniversary date. Here, County employees are subject to a “performance management” system whereby they receive annual “merit” increases based upon the employee’s job performance.
2. Longer-term investigators have longevity pay and shorter-term investigators do not.
3. Under Nevada’s Public Employee Retirement System, the pension benefit is based upon an employee’s three (3) highest consecutive years. So (in theory) increasing base wages also increases

pension benefits. But PERs has the ability to increase the deductions for retirement, which is not offset by the County.

4. Thirteen (13) investigators out of 22 investigators are topped out from the salary schedule.

Prior bargaining history

During negotiations for the previous CBA, the parties agreed to a one (1) year collective bargaining agreement (CBA), with a commitment for the outcome of an external compensation study. Accordingly, the parties agreed to an agreement which moved the top and bottom of the wage scales 3.5% and granted every employee a 5% wage increase including COLA. The FY 25 Agreement states:

- Effective July 1, 2024, the salary schedules for all employees covered in Appendix A will be adjusted for cost of living by an annual percentage increase of 3%.
- Effective July 1, 2024, the salary schedules for all employees in Appendix A will be adjusted for cost of living by an additional 2.0%.
- Effective July 1, 2024, there shall be a 3.50% increase to the top and bottom of all salary schedules and ranges in Appendix A. This does not represent an additional cost of living allowance (COLA).

Outcomes from the compensation study of 2025

As discussed in the prior negotiation, a relevant compensation study was completed by an external consulting firm. The intent of the study was to determine the County’s competitive market position against similar organizations. For the investigator two position, the current entry level on the salary scale is \$64,126 and the top of the scale is \$99,465.

The consulting firm determined that the entry-level on the salary schedule for the Investigator two position was 29.6% below the market median; the midpoint of the salary schedule was 21.9% below the market median; and the top of the salary schedule was 16% below the market median. These monetary findings are not in dispute.

The consulting firm recommended the County adjust the salary ranges from 11.9% to 21.9% With knowledge that the salary ranges and wages are lagging the market, the parties commenced negotiations for the FY 2026 CBA.

Final proposals in 2025

Over time, Clark County seeks to compensate its employees at 95% of the market median. The Union does not dispute this objective target in market position. However, the record is silent as to “how much

time” it will take to reach the 95% market position. The compensation consulting firm opined that implementing the salary schedule (alone) would serve to reach the 95% level. The Union disagrees that the goal only involves moving the salary schedule.

The County made a two (2) year proposal. The County proposed increasing the top and bottom of the wage scales by 17%, while dividing the increase over two (2) years. COLA would increase wages by 2.6% for both years.

The Union proposed a one-year contract. The Union learned that the County was intending to only to increase the entry-level and top of the salary schedules, as opposed to moving everybody within the salary schedule. The Union proposed moving the top and bottom of the wage scale by 17% in the first year and moving (adjusting) individual employees on the wage scale by 10%, plus a merit increase and plus COLA.

Union Argument

1. *Moving the top and bottom of the salary schedule without moving employee wages is not reasonable*
 - Investigators are undercompensated relative to the market. Moving employee salaries, in addition to moving the top and bottom of the wage scales, is more consistent with the statutory criteria.
 - Clark County does not wish to lead the market, nor does it wish to lag the market. The significant lagging of the market continues even after the one-year deal for FY 2025, which provided a 5% wage increase to employees.
 - If the schedules are moved, but the employee does not move with those schedules, those years of service are effectively lost and wage compression results.
 - Clark County’s rejection of a commonsense definition of “undercompensated” further loses sight of the fact that every year that an Investigator II has not been paid under a salary schedule commensurate with the market, the employees have not had the benefit of this money.
 - A post-probationary employee with 2-3 years of service would be better off leaving Clark County, waiting 12 months and one day, and returning to serve a new probationary period, as they will make more money upon completion of this one-year than they were already making.
2. *Both parties agree that the salary schedule should be increased by 17%.* The Union proposes that the entire increase occur in one year; but the County proposes that it be increased 13% in year one and 4% in year two.
 - Clark County should be compensating employees appropriately for the work they are performing in light of their tenure and service history. Today they are not.

Comparative salary data with other employers in law enforcement

- The Fact-Finder need look no further than Washoe County (which encompasses Reno) and is the only other significant urban area within the State of Nevada. Investigators in Washoe County are represented by the Washoe County District Attorney Investigators.
- Resulting from a recent compensation study, the Washoe County Investigators received a 15% “salary range adjustment” in addition to a 3% COLA.
- Arbitrator John Kagle (acting as a Fact finder) recently rejected the argument of Clark County that merit increases are somehow properly considered as a substitute for other forms of appropriate compensation.

Internal Equity

- Presumably, the concern articulated by witness Colvin is related to the County’s desire to maintain “internal equity” amongst its bargaining units. However, that internal equity relates only to the subject of COLAs and not other forms of compensation.
 - In the absence of any other bargaining unit being so far behind the market, such concerns of possible whipsawing are unfounded.
 - The Fact-finder should recognize that Clark County’s proposal to move only the salary schedules, and not the employees, perpetrates an injustice to those members of the bargaining unit who are already at the top of the wage scale and are getting close to retirement.
3. *The Fact-finder should recommend education incentive pay in light of the fact that a 10% movement of the employees within the salary schedule will not bring employees to 95% of the market median.*
- Additional compensation for peace officers achieving such certification is “very common” in Nevada. The District Attorneys in Washoe County with the WCDAIA receive 2.5% upon attaining their Intermediate certificate, and an additional 5% upon obtaining their Advanced certificate.
 - On June 9, 2025, DAIA modified its proposal to 1.5% for achievement of the Intermediate certificate, and an additional 2.5% for achievement of the Advance certificate, for a total of 4%.

Retroactive implementation

- The County’s proposals are not reasonable because they are not retroactive to July 1, 2025. Its proposal for both a COLA tied to CPI, and to move the top and bottom of the salary schedules, state that it would become effective “July 1, 2025, or upon approval of the Clark County Board of Commissioners, *whichever is later.*” The County’s proposal to not have COLAs or salary schedules move retroactively is contrary to the plain language of the statute.

County Argument

1. *The County offers a substantial increase in salary schedule and employee wages over two years.*

- The County proposes a two-year contract. The County's final offer proposes a 17% increase to the salary schedules of Investigators over two years, bringing the unit into alignment at 95% of the market.
- Article 15(3) of the CBA provides for an annual merit increase to 6.0%. However, almost every employee in the DAIA unit receives the full 6.0%, with an average annual merit of 5.6%. Increasing the top of the salary schedules by 17% means all Investigators become eligible for a maximum merit increase of 6.0%, including all previously topped out employees.
- The County proposal also provides a CPI based Cost of Living Adjustment ("COLA") which would increase the wages of every DAIA employee by 2.6% regardless of where they fall on the new salary schedule.
- Overall, the County's proposal would result in a yearly wage increase of 8.6% (2.6% COLA + 6.0% merit) for all Investigators. That increase is fair. The historical practice in the County is that compensation studies do not result in wage increases to every member of the unit.
- Washoe County is not a valid comparator to Clark County.

2. *Rebuttal to Union proposal*

- The Union's proposal includes everything in the County's proposal and then seeks to add an additional ten percent (10%) wage increase on top of what the County is proposing.
- The Union seeks to add education incentives to Article 16 providing up to 4.0% more pay to Investigators.
- The Union's proposal would result in an increase of 22.6% (2.6% COLA + 10% additional COLA + 4.0% education incentives + 6.0% merit).

3. *Internal equity across other units in the County*

- If the Fact-finder recommended the Union's proposal for an additional ten percent increase for every employee (which is essentially an additional 10% COLA), the impact could be widespread as other County bargaining units would seek to achieve the same level of increases. The Union's proposal would be detrimental to the County's ability to maintain this consistent pattern across its bargaining units.
- Therefore, because the Union's total proposal is an extreme break from this important and consistent pattern, it should be rejected.

4. *Educational incentive*

- The County does not offer educational incentives for certifications that are not required for the job. The Union is unable to point to any bargaining unit, within reasonable proximity, that has the same or even similar job functions to the DAIA investigators and receives this educational incentive. Investigators are not police officers.

- Educational incentives would violate the status quo doctrine because the Union fails to prove that “maintenance of the status quo would be unfair” in any way.

Discussion

When assessing the reasonableness of final proposals, the statute directs the fact-finder to consider “to the extent appropriate” the compensation of other “government” employees. “Reasonableness” must be informed using the normal criteria for interest disputes. These criteria include the bargaining history between the parties, internal patterns, the impact of external competitors on the County’s ability to recruit and retain employees, competing obligations of the County, and current fluctuations in the economy.

The moving party, here the Union, must come forward with compelling reasons to justify their proposed terms.

This fact-finding concerns moving compensation towards market competitiveness, but the parties disagree on how to achieve that goal. The recommendation does not intend to fully compensate employees for any years that they allegedly have been underpaid compared to the market. That issue is beyond the scope of the Fact-finding and the statutory criteria.

Ability to Pay

As noted prior, Clark County is not asserting an inability to pay increased compensation in the next two years, therefore this criteria is not contested.

Employment criteria

The data concerning vacant job opportunities suggests that current market competitiveness is not impeding job retention. The currently occupied positions are at 85%. The data concerning employee turnover in the unit suggests that current market competitiveness is not motivating excessive turnover, excluding non-retirement or promotional turnover. This data is persuasive.

Company witness Shell testified that the tenure of investigators is above average in the County, and (post-covid) there was no problem hiring investigators, unlike problems in law enforcement. She objects to a 10% wage increase and education incentive adjustment of 4%, on top of annual merit and COLA. She opines that compression is minimal and is properly managed by the County.

Duration of Agreement

The County proposes a two-year term covering Fiscal Year 2026 (“FY 26”) (covering July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026), and Fiscal Year 2027 (“FY 27”) (covering July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027).

The Union would consider a two-year contract. Given that the current CBA has expired, the parties presumably need “breathing room” before starting over. The Fact-finder recommends a two-year contract.

Cost of living

For 2026, the County calculates a Consumer Price Index (“CPI”) based Cost of Living Adjustment (“COLA”) which would increase the wages of each unit employee by 2.6% regardless of where they fall on the new salary schedule. For 2027, while the CPI calculation for FY 27 was unknown at the time of the hearing, the calculation based on CPI data provides that the COLA for FY 27 would also calculate to 2.6%.

COLA is a wage increase not typically available to workers in the private sector, intended to maintain purchasing power. The Fact-finder gives due regard to internal equity and the strong internal pattern for COLA increases consistently established across all 10 bargaining units. The Fact-finder recommends a COLA increase in the first year of 2.6%. Given global events into the foreseeable future, and the objective rise in cost of petroleum products to-date, the Fact-finder recommends a COLA increase in the second year of 2.8%. This slight increase with COLA is part of the statutory criteria reflecting “current fluctuations in the market.”

Annual merit increase

Neither the Union nor the County has proposed a change to Article 15(3) of the CBA, which provides for an annual merit increase of 0% to 6.0%. A 0% merit increase is rare and would only occur under discipline. When a new hire completes their first year, they typically receive a 6% merit increase and an additional 6% “off of probation” bonus for an increase of 12%.

According to a spreadsheet, the annual maximum merit increases at 6% for DAIA is the highest of all of the bargaining units. The County proposes to maintain the opportunity for a 6.0% merit increase for all Investigators. Historically, most employees in the Unit receive the full 6.0%, with an average annual merit of 5.6%. To restate, the parties seek no change to Article 15(3).

Comparable communities for external equity

The parties disagree on appropriate external comparisons. No evidence was presented that the County was attracting lateral transfers from LV Metro or other cities in the state. Under these facts and the small size of the bargaining unit, cost data for the unit is not at issue.

The Union contends that Washoe County/Reno area is an appropriate comparative employer. The Logic Group firm also considered Washoe as a comparator for purposes of the salary schedule.

According to Union testimony, Washoe County recently conducted a compensation study for its investigators (by Korn Ferry consultants) which confirmed they were compensated below market. There are apparently 12-14 investigators in the Washoe unit. As a consequence of the study, the Washoe County Investigators received a 15% “wage adjustment,” in addition to a 3% COLA. All employee salaries moved up 15%. Washoe investigators are also eligible for a 5% merit salary adjustment. However, the Union did not produce a witness (with bargaining history) from Washoe County to fully explain the entire compensation package, and if there were tradeoffs during negotiations. The entire testimony concerning Washoe County was hearsay.

The Union also contends that police officers in the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro) are an appropriate comparative employer. In contrast, the County denies Washoe and Metro are comparative employers. Investigators are not a law enforcement unit. The Fact-finder agrees that detectives in law enforcement for Metro are not a direct comparator to investigators in the DA office.

The Fact-finder finds that only Washoe County is a comparator, but not a heavily weighted comparator given the lack of first-hand evidence concerning the compensation study, the adjustment, and lack of detailed bargaining history.

Internal equity with the other ten bargaining units.

On the record, Clark County does not apparently have any other bargaining unit whose salary schedule is so far behind the market as is the case with DAIA unit.

The County contends that accepting the Union proposal would encourage whipsawing by other bargaining units, as other units would seek to achieve the same level of wage increases. Given the degree of under-compensation and small size of the unit, the Fact-finder finds this fear by management to be unpersuasive.

The Union contends that the County proposal (no individual wage increases beyond COLA and merit) would create large compression problems between investigators that could hurt morale, when new hires who pass their probationary period will leapfrog over other longer-term employees who are at or near the bottom of the new salary scales. In contrast, the County contends that wage compression is not a historical problem. The County has managed this issue in the past and has a workable (unstated) solution to minimize compression at the lower end of the salary schedules. The Union did not rebut the County assertion that compression can be managed.

The Fact-finder intends to recommend terms that do not materially violate internal equity with other units in the County

Movement of the salary schedule

The parties have agreed on a 17% increase to the salary schedule but disagree as to the amount per year of the planned increase. As previously mentioned, the evidence indicates that 13 of the 22 investigators in the unit are currently topped out on the current schedule. This issue is a priority for the Union.

During bargaining, the record does not reveal an agreement as to how long in time that “catch-up” will be. The County asserts that the catch-up will take two years and be complete upon the full adjustment of the salary schedule. The Union wants it immediately, with an emphasis on those who are topped out.

The County final offer divides up the percentage per year, for a total of 17 per cent. The Fact-finder agrees that the increase should be divided up into two years, with front-loading the first year. Because of the significant under-market salary position of the unit, the Fact-finder recommends the County proposal for a first-year increase of 13% and a second-year increase of 4%. Any employee whose salary falls below the new minimum of the salary range would receive an adjustment to the new bottom of the range. Employees who had previously reached the top of the range would no longer be frozen and would be eligible for annual merit increases, COLA increases, and potential wage individual adjustments, until they reach the new top of the range.

Increasing the top of the Salary Schedules by 17% (over two years) means all DAIA Investigators become eligible for an annual merit increase of 6.0%, including all previously topped out employees.

Individual wage increases

This issue is highly contested, with the parties in stark disagreement as to whether any individual wage increases are justified. The Fact-finder observes that some individual wage increases are justified, but the County has proposed an increase in individual wages that (at none) is too low, while the Union has proposed an increase in wages that is excessive and far beyond statutory criteria.

The Union contends that the prior contract was a “placeholder” anticipating additional individual wage increases beyond merit pay and COLA. The Union seeks to front-load the wage increase in the first year. The Union argues that an additional 10% wage increase is necessary due to years of historic underpayment and to avoid compression. The Union justifies its proposed additional 10% wage increase by noting that Washoe County gave across the board wage increases following a compensation study conducted for its investigator unit.

The County denies any characterization of an expectation of a placeholder. The County opines that the proposed wage 10% increase (added to the wages of every individual employee) would act as an additional (and unreasonable) COLA. Once the salary schedules are adjusted by 17%, the compensation of the investigators is considered to be aligned with the market and any alleged issues of “lagging” the market are considered addressed. The County denies Washoe County is a valid comparator for fact-finding, as Clark County is not competing with Washoe for people to fill Investigator positions.

Company witness Messer (from the consulting firm) testified that investigators are not grossly underpaid at this time and recommends “only an adjustment to the salary schedule.” She opines that once the schedule is increased by 17%, the unit becomes competitive in the market. Company witness Shell testified that studies of market competitiveness “do not concern” movement of individual employee wages.

The Fact-finder agrees that moving individual salaries (in addition to moving the top and bottom of the salary schedule) is more consistent with the statutory criteria. As noted earlier, the record establishes that the parties have conferred with an intent to “catch-up” to market competitiveness, but have not agreed on how to achieve that goal or what timeline to achieve that goal.

However, another respected Arbitrator found that interest arbitrations are not intended to make up for “alleged inequities” of prior contracts negotiated between the parties. The past is done. This logic applies here.

Other bargaining units in the County would not accept the Union’s argument that the prior contract was a “placeholder” with a guarantee of a large wage increases in the next year.

Because of the magnitude of the under-compensation to market, the Fact-finder recommends a wage adjustment of 5% in the first year and a wage adjustment of 5 % in the second year, plus annual COLA increases and annual merit increases. For year one, that would be 5% wage increase, plus 6% merit, plus 2.6% COLA, for a total of 13.6%.

Retroactive changes to the CBA

The prior CBA between the parties has already expired, thus the effective date of any changes is contested between two options. Pursuant to the CBA, the Union contends that wage increase should be retroactive to July 1, 2025. The Union cites NRS 288.215(10) which is one of the incorporated sections states “Any award of the arbitrator is retroactive to the expiration date of the last contract”.

Pursuant to the CBA, the County contends that changes to the CBA should not be retroactive and instead should be effective upon approval by the Board of County Commissioners, presumably in 2026. The County opines that language providing full retroactivity erodes the employer's bargaining power and creates an incentive for a Union to insist on an extreme position throughout a protracted impasse procedure without facing any significant financial risk. Further, the inclusion of non-retroactive language in its Proposal is the only mechanism the County has to protect itself against the Union's unjustified insistence on unreasonable, unjustified, and outrageously high proposals.

The Fact-finder finds no evidence that the Union negotiators (by themselves) protracted the impasse, and recommends adoption of the retroactive proposal to the expiration date of the last contract.

Article 16 Section 3-Education Incentive

The Union proposal seeks to compensate employees who obtained their Intermediate and Advance Certificates from the Nevada Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training ("POST"). The Investigators with a minimum of 3 years who earn their POST Intermediate certificate would receive an additional 2.5% pay increase; those who earn their POST Advanced certificate would receive an additional 2.5% pay increase for a total of 5%.

The Union concedes that the educational incentives are tied to certifications which are "not required" to perform the job duties of the Investigator II. The County has rejected the proposal. The proposed incentive is not the same, for example, as bilingual pay.

The County contends the Union proposal is a "breakthrough" proposal seeking to change the status quo which should require some quid pro quo in return. No such concession has been offered by the Union. Further, the Union has not shown any widespread pattern of educational incentive language in comparable contracts of union members performing similar work to DAIA.

Factfinders generally agree that a party seeking to add a novel provision or benefit to a contract bears a high burden of demonstrating the necessity and reasonableness of the new provision. In addition, fact-finding abhors recommending novel (unprecedented) terms to the CBA, as those changes should rather be negotiated outside of fact-finding. However worthy in the broad context, fact-finding is not for recommending "breakthrough" terms of employment. Here, the Union did not meet its burden to show that a change to the status quo of the CBA is reasonable and necessary at this time. The Fact-finder recommends the proposal not be adopted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This advisory fact-finding report has been prepared pursuant to NRS 288.200(7) following a good faith impasse between the parties. Having considered all evidence, authority, and argument submitted by the Parties, and, pursuant to the procedures outlined in the Statute, the Fact-finder issues the following written recommendations:

The Fact-finder recommends a two-year contract, remaining in effect until June 30, 2027.

The Fact-finder recommends a COLA increase of 2.6% in year one and an increase of 2.8% in year two.

The Fact-finder recommends movement of the salary schedule for the first year of 13% and movement in the second year of 4%.

The Fact-finder recommends a wage increase for individual investigators of 5% in the first year and 5% in the second year, in addition to the annual COLA and the annual merit increase.

The Fact-finder recommends a retroactive wage increase from contract expiration on July 1, 2025.

The Fact-finder does not recommend adoption of the proposed Education Incentive.

Sincerely,

Richard Fincher, Fact-finder

Arizona

March 19, 2026