

COMMISSION PERSONNEL POLICY ASSESSMENT - 1981

Anthony F. Campagna
Faculty Associate

Mary Anne Decker
Graduate Research Associate

Nat Simons, Jr.
Senior Research Economist

THE NATIONAL REGULATORY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
2130 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

prepared for the

U.S. Department of Energy
Economic Regulatory Administration
Division of Regulatory Assistance

in partial fulfillment of

Grant No. DE-FG01-80-RG10268
Modification A003

December 1981

This report was prepared by The National Regulatory Research Institute under a grant from the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). The views and opinions of the authors do not necessarily state or reflect the views, opinions, or policies of DOE or The National Regulatory Research Institute.

References to trade names or specific commercial products, commodities, or services in this report does not represent or constitute an endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by DOE or The National Regulatory Research Institute of the specific commercial product, commodity, or service.

FOREWORD

This report was prepared by The National Regulatory Research Institute (NRRI) under Grant No. DE-FG-01-80RG10268 from the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Economic Regulatory Administration, Division of Regulatory Assistance. The opinions expressed herein are solely those of the authors and do not reflect the opinions nor the policies of either the NRRI or the DOE.

The NRRI is making this report widely available since the subject matter presented here is believed to be of timely interest to regulatory agencies and to others concerned with utility regulation. Special acknowledgment is due the fine cooperation of state public utility commissions and certain utilities in supplying the data.

Particular thanks go as well to Paul Rodgers, General Counsel of NARUC, and William Newcomb, former chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio for their help in both the design and collection stage of the report. Finally, thanks go to Bonnie Fairall for careful typing of the report.

Douglas N. Jones
Director
1981

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this study is to examine state regulatory commission's personnel policies and practices in terms of six factors commonly seen as barriers to effective regulation. The six factors examined are (1) the size of the professional staff, (2) professional staff recruitment, (3) compensation, (4) staff turnover, especially in professional level positions, (5) workload, and (6) the availability of computer facilities and other support programs.

The primary source of data and information on the six factors previously identified is an inquiry sent to all state commissions. The inquiry was developed by staff from the NRRI in cooperation with the chairman of the NARUC Committee on Administration and the Executive Director of the NARUC Washington Staff at a series of meetings held during April and May, 1981. The resulting inquiry was sent to the chairperson and executive director of each state utility commission.

For each of the factors considered in the study, a series of questions was developed and pre-tested. The inquiry was then sent to each state, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Of the 54 inquiries mailed, a total of 46 inquiries were returned in time to be used in the data base. This represents an 85 percent response.

In addition to the mailed commission inquiry, an attempt was made to gather comparable inquiry information and data from a small sample of Class A and B electric utilities. The administration of this inquiry was coordinated by Carl D. Behnke, Industrial Relations Manager of the Edison Electric Institute (EEI). A total of 69 electric utilities throughout the United States was selected and requested to complete an inquiry similar in design to the one sent to state commissions. The intent was to gather data that may be useful in drawing some tentative comparisons with commission data. A total of 45 inquiries were returned in time to be used in the data base.

To supplement the data collected from the commissions, follow-up interviews were conducted with five respondent states. The commissions selected for follow-up interviews were Ohio, Kentucky, New York, West Virginia, and Colorado. The follow-up interviews were conducted to elicit more in-depth responses to questions contained in the survey.

Finally, additional information and data were obtained from public utility commissions which complied with requests for special studies conducted in-house by their respective staffs, position descriptions, wage and salary survey data, as well as previous studies conducted by the NARUC, and, of course, relevant research studies published in professional journals.

Data from the inquiry were not particularly revealing concerning staff turnover. The average number of years that incumbents remained in their respective professional positions, for the most part, has not changed drastically during the past five years. The data from the inquiry do not address the question of how many professionals have voluntarily terminated or changed positions within the organization during this five-year period.

It does appear that workloads have increased and that professional staff size has not increased in tandem to meet these additional responsibilities. While some may argue, and legitimately so, that numbers alone will not necessarily lead to effective state commission regulation, this issue deserves more careful consideration.

Data from the inquiry indicate that at least 36 commissions do have access to computer facilities; however, there was not sufficient information available to determine to what extent the facilities were used. While support staff was generally considered by the individuals interviewed to be adequate, the results of increased workloads and low overall levels of staffing may prevent commissions from progressing in the development of new regulatory methods and procedures.

With regard to professional staff size, it does appear that many state commissions are attempting to increase the size of their professional staff to meet the demand for more service. The data in this study suggest that while on the whole professional staff size has increased, it does not reflect what state commissions, at least from their point of view, actually need.

Staff recruitment, especially in the professional ranks, is best characterized as "ad hoc" and reactive. In other words, with few exceptions, there does not appear to be among state regulatory commissions well defined, systematic, and comprehensive recruiting systems designed to position the commissions in the labor market on a competitive footing with their counterparts in the private sector. While it is true that state commissions are constrained by civil service regulations and procedures and limited budgets, there appears to be little use of innovative external search techniques, such as internships, to overcome the apparent disadvantage state commissions have in attracting qualified professional staff.

Compensation, especially direct compensation, appears to be a prime source of difficulty for state commissions to attract and retain professionals. The disadvantage that state commissions have in trying to attract professionals based on direct compensation comparisons with the private sector may be somewhat reduced when total compensation packages are emphasized, including whatever nonfinancial rewards commissions can offer prospective candidates as additional employment incentives. This emphasis appears to be lacking and is likely to be a reflection of the need to develop more fully an integrative human resource management system, one that does not treat the reward system and other employment related functions independently of each other.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES		vii
Chapter		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Size of Professional Staff	3
	Professional Staff Recruitment	4
	Compensation	4
	Staff Turnover	6
	Workload	6
	Computer Facilities and Other Support Programs	7
	Study Method	7
	Limitations of the Study	9
2	ANALYSIS OF DATA	11
	Size of Professional Staff	11
	Professional Staff Recruitment	14
	Compensation	18
	Staff Turnover	25
	Workload	27
	Computer Facilities and Other Support Programs	30
3	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	35
	Summary and Conclusions.	35
	Recommendations for Further Study.	38
Appendix		
A	COMMISSION RESPONSES TO MAIL INQUIRY	41
B	UTILITY RESPONSES TO MAIL INQUIRY.	61
C	INQUIRY RESPONDENTS BY STATE	75
D	COMMISSION INQUIRY RESPONSES BY STATE.	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY.		131

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2-1	Commission Total Staff Size 1979 and 1980	11
2-2	Professional Staff Levels Annually 1977 to 1980	13
2-3	Average Professional Staff Size of Commissions 1977 to 1980.	13
2-4	Average Professional Staff Size of Selected Electric Utility Companies 1977 to 1980.	14
2-5	Commission Professional Average Salaries in Annual Amounts (1980-81)	19
2-6	Utility Professional Average Salaries in Annual Amounts (1980-81)	20
2-7	Average Salary Offers to Candidates College Placement Council as of July 1981	21
2-8	Commission Salary Increases as a Percentage of Salaries (1980-81).	22
2-9	Methods of Granting Wage Increases to Commission Professionals (1980-81)	22
2-10	Reported Value of Fringe Benefits as a Percentage of Salaries by Commissions (1980-81)	23
2-11	Benefits Available to Commission Professionals (1980-81)	24
2-12	Commission Professional Incumbent Average Years in Position.	25
2-13	Electric Utility Professional Incumbent Average Years in Position	26
2-14	Approximate Number of Rate Filings Per Commission 1977 to 1980	28
2-15	Average Change in the Number of Rate Filings 1977 to 1980.	29

Table		Page
2-16	Average Change in the Number of Inquiries and Complaints 1977 to 1980	29
2-17	Comparison of Average Change in the Professional Staff Size, Number of Rate Filings, and Number of Inquiries and Complaints for Commissions from 1977 to 1980	31
2-18	Commission Support Staff by Job Classification and Size.	32
2-19	Electric Utility Support Staff by Job Classification and Size.	33
2-20	Approximate Amount of Funding in Commission Travel Budgets (1980-1981)	34

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The traditional role of the states in regulating public utilities has been characterized by relatively stable utility rates, a limited number of intervenors in rate cases who appear before a public utility commission, and relatively clear roles for the regulatory agencies. In the 1970s, however, this relatively stable role, existing pricing principles, and rate structure began to change. By 1973 the oil embargo, inflation, environmental regulations, declining economies of scale and productivity for electric utilities, the high cost of investment capital and the correspondingly high cost of utility construction programs, fuel shortages and disruptions, and the general state of the U.S. economy combined to greatly increase the duties, responsibilities and complexity of utility regulation by state commissions. Another significant change, resulting in more work for the state commissions, occurred when the United States Congress enacted five new laws generally called, "The National Energy Act."¹ Of these new laws, the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (PURPA) most affected the regulation of electric utilities and the public utility regulatory program, especially at the state level.²

In addition to considering six PURPA ratemaking standards in three years, states were required to consider regulatory standards for such matters as master metering, automatic adjustment clauses, procedures for termination of electric services, and charges for promotional and political

¹The five acts are (1) the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978, (2) the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978, (3) the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (4) the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act, and (5) the Energy Tax Act of 1978.

²Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978, Public Law 95-617, 92 Stat. 3117 (1978).

advertising. Consideration of these latter standards was to be accomplished in two years. Title III of the Act suggested that consideration of standards, rules, and retail policies for natural gas utilities comparable to those applying to retail electric utilities, may be required in the future.

As the utility industry has grown and the regulatory process has become more complex, the demands placed on public utility commissions for a professional staff that can respond to an expansion in the level and scope of job responsibilities have also increased. The need, for example, for skilled accountants, attorneys, rate analysts, auditor/examiners, and engineers, as well as the necessary computer facilities and other support staff and equipment to fulfill these expanded responsibilities of the commissions resulted, for the most part, from the factors noted previously. In their attempt to meet the demand, public utility commissions have become a fertile training ground for individuals in these professional occupations. Competition has increased for those individuals, thereby bidding up the price of their specialized skills. The demand for these individuals comes not only from other state agencies, but from the regulated utilities as well as consulting firms and federal agencies.

Conventional wisdom has, in part, asserted that as program costs rise at a rate greater than public revenues, the resulting budget and staff limitations will severely hamper the operations of public utility commissions. In addition, competition for experienced professional staff exists among the agencies in the public sector and between the public and private sectors. Additional pressures of the work environment and increased workloads raise the potential for job dissatisfaction leading to the possibility of greater than usual turnover.

Statement of the Problem

One of the many objectives of the NARUC, the NRRI, and the U.S. Department of Energy, Economic Regulatory Administration program is to help

strengthen the ability of state public utility commissions to achieve and maintain a high quality of regulation. One way to achieve this objective is to obtain and assess information on current staffing resources and personnel policies of state commissions as they affect the commission's ability to perform. This information can be used in the decision-making process that will affect state commission regulation with respect to the current and future demands to be placed upon it by not only a changing regulatory environment but also the new PURPA standards.

The demands placed upon the commissions and their staffs including both the traditional ones as well as contingency and capacity expansion planning, load forecasting, analysis of pooling and interties, and rate design and load management analysis, among others, have markedly increased staff workload in scope and size. As the workload increases, it might be reasonable to expect that commission performance suffers, especially when staff resources decline or remain constant.

Factors commonly seen as barriers to effective state commission regulation are (1) the size of the professional staff, (2) professional staff recruitment, (3) compensation, (4) staff turnover, especially in professional level positions, (5) workload, and (6) the availability of computer facilities and other support programs. The purpose of this study is to examine state commissions in terms of these six factors. Preliminary inquiries made of various state commissions and staffs have indicated that these six factors are among the most important areas of concern as they affect the operations of state commissions. Each of the six factors is discussed below. In addition, key issues of concern are also identified for each factor examined in this study.

Size of Professional Staff

The extent to which the size of the professional staff has increased in response to apparent increases in commission workloads is one of the factors examined in this study. Staff size is a function of a number of

variables that include, but are not limited to, the geographic location of the commission, the number and size of utility companies in the state subject to public regulation and the scope of jurisdictional responsibility for the state commission. While these variables are important and do affect staffing levels, the objective in this study is only to identify the magnitude of increases in hiring professional staff, and also to determine, if possible, whether these increases are attributable to increased commission workloads and additional job responsibilities that relate to a changing regulatory environment and the new PURPA standards.

Professional Staff Recruitment

The second factor considered in this study and assumed to have a strong relationship to the ability of the state commissions in carrying out their respective roles is the process of attracting able professional staff to fill job vacancies. In this study, the term "recruitment" refers to all types of searches conducted by state commissions, both internal and external, although external job search techniques were emphasized.

It is important that public utility commissions are able to recruit well-qualified professional staff, given the apparent intense competition in the labor market for those individuals with skills state utility commissions regard as critical. For our study, six professional job classifications were selected. They include accountant, rate analyst, attorney, economist, auditor/examiner, and engineer. The objective here is to assess the current practice and experience of state commissions in meeting their manpower needs in these professional job classifications.

Compensation

From an employer's viewpoint, compensation policies and procedures are a key component of any progressive human resource management system. As

Heneman, et al., state:

Compensation is a subject of great importance to management and employees. To management it is both a potentially powerful influence on employees' behaviors and attitudes and a cost. To employees, it is a reward that is a source of economic and, sometimes, psychological income. The task in compensation administration is to develop policies and procedures that will attain maximum returns on dollars spent in terms of attracting, satisfying, retaining, and perhaps, motivating employees.³

In an era where both employers and employees are painfully aware of inflation, it has become increasingly difficult for organizations to maintain some sense of stability in the reward systems designed for employees. It is clear that in some sectors of the economy severe pressures have been placed on wage and salary structures. In particular, there has been a tendency for traditional wage and salary differentials to be narrowed, especially in those critical skill classifications that are difficult to fill in a tight labor market. Wages and salaries are bid up in response to competition in the labor markets without a tandem increase to reflect internal wage and salary inequities.

In the study, this and other issues are raised in an attempt to determine, where possible, the extent of the problem that state commissions have in developing and maintaining adequate salary levels and fringe benefit packages for the professional staff in those job classifications considered. Of specific concern are the magnitude of salary increases granted individuals in professional job classifications noted previously and how these, as well as average salary levels, compare with comparable jobs in other state commissions and the prevailing wages and salaries paid in the private sector. In addition, selected fringe benefits are also considered in order to assess overall compensation packages so that the net economic advantages accruing to these professionals can be assessed.

³Herbert G. Heneman, et al., Personnel/Human Resources Management (Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1980), p. 368.

Staff Turnover

In public agencies voluntary turnover may be associated with low levels of satisfaction among the staff as measured by the work itself, compensation level, ability to be promoted, the attitude of co-workers and relationships with supervisors.⁴ Voluntary turnover is often related directly to each staff member's perception of his or her ability to change jobs and the desire to change positions.

To the extent that PUCs are like other public agencies, alternatives within the commission and job satisfaction, as noted above, along with salary increases and promotion possibilities, will affect the perceived desirability of movement. General economic conditions and personal characteristics also affect the ease of movement. In this study, staff tenure is defined as the number of years incumbents remain in their job classification. Key turnover and retention data considered are the number of years in service of certain types of commission professional staff, changes in staff tenure, the differences that exist between tenure at utilities and at commissions, and the factors that affect tenure.

Workload

Agency performance can also be evaluated on the basis of workload. By nearly all accounts a significant change in the size, scope, and complexity of regulatory duties of state commissions has occurred since the early 1970s. These changes in duties, tasks, and responsibilities, it is argued, have resulted in significant changes in the workloads of state regulatory commissions.

The study is concerned with several issues affecting staff workloads. They are increases in the number and complexity of formal rate filings by utilities, expansion of consumer inquiries and complaints, administrative or statutory additions to commission responsibilities, and the relation of these changes to changes in staff size.

⁴Donald E. Klingner, Public Personnel Management: Context and Strategies, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., p. 275-89.

Computer Facilities and Other Support Programs

The term "computer facilities" typically refers to hardware and accompanying software packages. Within the context of this study, this term has been expanded to include the general and technical staff which are an important part of the total support system for the professional staff. A recent survey by The National Regulatory Research Institute found that the NARUC member states have available for use on state computers approximately 434 data bases and computer programs.⁵ Professional staff rely heavily on technical, clerical, and secretarial support for both data and word processing. Data reduction, the resulting technical analyses, and report development also depend upon such staff.

The study will examine the availability and use by the states of computer facilities and analytical software related to utility rate case analyses, and other staff support and programs, including training and travel.

Study Method

The primary source of data and information on the six factors previously identified is an inquiry sent to all state commissions. The inquiry was developed by staff from the NRRI in cooperation with the chairman of the NARUC Committee on Administration and the Executive Director of the NARUC at a series of meetings held during April and May, 1981. The resulting inquiry (see appendix A) was sent to the chairperson and executive director of each state utility commission.

For each of the factors considered in the study, a series of questions was developed and pre-tested at The Ohio State University using personnel

⁵The National Regulatory Research Institute. 1981 Catalog of Computer Programs and Data Bases. Columbus: The National Regulatory Research Institute, 1981.

officers, professional staff, and executives of the Office of Treasurer, Office of Personnel, and the NRRI. In addition, the inquiry was reviewed by the original study design team from the NARUC and the NRRI. The inquiry was then sent to each state, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Of the 54 inquiries mailed, a total of 46 inquiries were returned in time to be used in the data base. This represents an 85 percent response rate which is considered excellent for a mailed inquiry such as this.

In addition to the mailed commission inquiry, an attempt was made to gather comparable inquiry information and data from a small sample of Class A and B electric utilities. The administration of this inquiry was coordinated by Carl D. Behnke, Industrial Relations Manager of the Edison Electric Institute (EEI). A total of 69 electric utilities throughout the United States was selected and requested to complete an inquiry similar in design to the one sent to state commissions (see appendix B). These firms were selected on the basis of their location (state) as opposed to size and thus do not necessarily reflect a true representative sample of all electric utilities operating in the United States. The intent was to gather data that may be useful in drawing some tentative comparisons with commission data. A total of 45 inquiries were returned in time to be used in the data base.

To supplement the data collected from the commissions, follow-up interviews were conducted with five respondent states. The commissions selected for follow-up interviews were Ohio, Kentucky, New York, West Virginia, and Colorado. The follow-up interviews were conducted to elicit in-depth responses to questions contained in the survey. At least two staff professionals and one member of the commission or the executive director were interviewed in each state.

Finally, additional information and data were obtained from public utility commissions which complied with requests for special studies conducted in-house by their respective staffs, position descriptions, wage

and salary survey data, as well as from previous studies conducted by the NARUC, and, of course, relevant research studies published in professional journals.

Limitations of the Study

As with all studies of this type, especially in the absence of readily accessible data bases, a number of limitations must of necessity be noted. The first is the problem of comparability. For example, when commissions identify individuals working in what is purported to be the same job classification, it may well be the case that on closer examination the job duties, tasks, and responsibilities are not, in fact, comparable. We expect that the problem increases when states report significant salary differentials for the same job classification. Based upon our data then, we could not conclude that a state reporting a lower salary is paying its incumbents a substandard salary based upon reported salaries alone.

Another problem occurs when attempting to compare job classifications on the basis of net economic return. It is sometimes assumed that if two similar job classifications are paid differing rates of pay, that again the lower-paid job class is disadvantaged when, in fact, it may be that the job class receiving lower pay enjoys a net economic advantage when total compensation is used as the basis of comparison; that is, when direct and indirect compensation (fringe benefits) are computed and then compared.

Another limitation that should be noted at the outset concerns the data gathered from electric utilities. Our goal was not to conduct a detailed comparison of personnel policies and practices of both state commissions and electric utilities, but to try to gather useful information from the utilities agreeing to participate so that reasonable, if not conclusive, comparisons can be drawn. Further, the fact that only electric utilities were used as opposed to all types of utilities (gas, telephone, and water) should also be kept in mind.

Finally, a word about the professional job classifications selected for more careful study. We recognize that not all professional job classifications were considered, especially those in the computer careers and management or administrative categories. A judgment was made by the study team to concentrate on the six professional categories because of their direct relationship to rate case analysis and the potential for comparability across all state commissions and utilities. The data collected in this study are subject to the limitations noted above primarily because of the lack of resources necessary to examine each state commission's response in depth.

CHAPTER 2
ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present and discuss the data gathered from the commission inquiry. Where appropriate, comparisons are made with data gathered from the electric utility inquiry and other relevant sources from the personnel and human resource management literature. The reader is cautioned to keep in mind the study limitations noted previously.

Size of Professional Staff

Changes in the size of commission staffing levels may be an indication of increases in the workload and in the complexity of the responsibilities of the commissions. Table 2-1 shows a frequency distribution by percentages of the size of commission total staff for the years 1979 and 1980.

TABLE 2-1
COMMISSION TOTAL
STAFF SIZE
1979 and 1980

Size of Commission Staff	Percentage of States	
	1979*	1980**
Under 50	23	20
51 - 100	25	28
101 - 150	21	15
151 - 200	5	11
Over 200	26	26
	100	100

Source: *1979 Annual Report on Utility & Carrier Regulation, Regulation, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (Washington, D.C., 1980), p. 747-56.

**Appendix C.

While 48 percent of the commissions reported a staff of 100 persons or less in 1979 and 1980, there was an increase in the percentage of commissions that reported a total staff size between 51 and 100 persons in 1980. A similar change occurred in the percentage of commissions reporting a staff in the two ranges between 101 to 200 persons. Twenty-six percent of the commissions fell within these ranges for both years, but in 1980 the percentage of commissions with a staff of 151 to 200 persons increased from 5 percent to 11 percent.

Even though the data reflect an overall increase in staff size by some commissions, 80 percent of the commissions responding to our mail inquiry indicated that they had been turned down on requests to increase staff levels within their commissions in recent years. Several of the commissions noted that they had vacant positions at the time of the inquiry. One commission stated that it had 56 vacant positions due to lack of funds. Another commission noted that its staff had increased overall, but did not increase to the desired level.

The commissions were asked to provide the number of utility staff members who were classified as professional from 1977 to 1980. There were 35 commissions which responded to this question for all four years. These professionals could include persons classified as accountants, rate analysts, attorneys, economists, auditor/examiners, engineers and persons working in any other type of position which would be considered to be in a professional job category. The results are shown in table 2-2.

Table 2-2 indicates professional staff levels have remained relatively constant over the four-year period, with a few states reporting modest increases. On a closer inspection of the data, a substantial increase of 26 percent in the average professional staff size over the period from 1977 to 1980 is found as shown in table 2-3. However, the large number of commissions which reported being turned down for staffing level increases might indicate that this 26 percent increase has not been sufficient to meet increased workloads.

TABLE 2-2
 PROFESSIONAL STAFF LEVELS ANNUALLY
 1977 to 1980

Number of Professionals Reported	1977	Number of Commissions		
		1978	1979	1980
15 or less	11	11	9	10
16 to 30	10	8	11	7
31 to 45	7	7	5	6
46 to 60	3	3	1	1
61 to 75	1	3	6	3
76 to 90	1	0	1	6
Over 90	2	3	2	2

N = 35

Source: Appendix C.

TABLE 2-3
 AVERAGE PROFESSIONAL STAFF SIZE
 OF COMMISSIONS
 1977 to 1980

Year	Average Number of Professionals	Percentage Increase
1977	35	-
1978	38	9
1979	40	5
1980	44	10
1977 - 80	-	26

N = 35

Source: Appendix C.

As shown in table 2-4, the average professional staff size of all electric utilities reporting is, as expected, larger than the average professional staff of the commissions for each year from 1977 to 1980. Thirty-five electric utilities responded for all four years. The overall increase in average professional staff size for the electric utilities was 19 percent which is smaller than the percentage increase reported by the commissions. However, a 19 percent increase for the electric utilities equates to 73 persons per company as compared to 9 persons for each commission on average. This indicates that there might be a strong demand for professionals by at least the electric utility companies responding to the survey.

TABLE 2-4
AVERAGE PROFESSIONAL STAFF SIZE OF SELECTED
ELECTRIC UTILITY COMPANIES
1977 to 1980

Year	Average Number of Professionals	Percentage Increase
1977	379	-
1978	401	6
1979	421	5
1980	452	7
1977 - 80		19

N = 35

Source: The NRRI inquiry, "Utility Staff Personnel Policy Assessment Inquiry," 1981.

Professional Staff Recruitment

Most employing organizations use a combination of internal and external search techniques that are sequenced to identify and ultimately select qualified employees. The most common recruitment and selection techniques include promotion from within the organization, selection from a list of certified job candidates based on the administration of a

competitive examination, an internal job posting program, advertisements in newspapers and/or trade journals, and recruitment at institutions of higher education, especially for entry level professionals. This approach to staff recruitment is very common and applies to executive and managerial level positions as well as professional and support staff. The more complex the area of responsibility, the greater dependence upon a broader range of selection methods.

Professional staff recruitment in the public service traditionally has not been competitive with the private sector. Also, in general, civil service employment is stereotyped as being less dynamic than private industry,⁶ and it is this perception of occupational prestige which is likely to guide the career choices of many potential entry level professionals especially those with a degree from an institution of higher education. The lack of forceful recruitment, coupled with unfavorable images of public service, might be an important factor affecting the ability of a public utility commission to achieve its recruitment goal.

In recent years executive search firms that formerly recruited mainly for large corporations are now providing services to trade associations, law firms, and small businesses.⁷ The level of professional sophistication needed for a variety of professional staff positions, even exclusive of administration and management, requires a more extensive search than the usual recruitment process. The competition for talent often requires a national search to find the best people.

The American Public Power Association (APPA) serves constituent public power companies throughout the United States. One function of the APPA is to act as the personnel referral service for the APPA member companies.

⁶James S. Bowman and David L. Norman, Jr., "Attitudes Towards Public Service." Public Personnel Management (March-April 1975), p. 113-21.

⁷Sofen Y. Bassman, "Headhunters for APPA," Public Power (May-June 1981): p. 54-55.

The APPA's traditional method of recruitment and referral was simple and straightforward, acting as a clearinghouse by referring candidate's names to member utilities upon request.

APPA recognized that the talented professionals employed by municipal utilities were being induced to join private industry. The incentives luring the professionals away from the APPA member firms were mainly higher salaries and fringe benefits. Referring to the entire situation, Bassman noted that recruitment was becoming a complex process:

...Taking the recruiting process lightly is not in the best interests of these organizations any longer. In the past, especially in the medium-to-smaller operations, there has generally been a very localized recruitment effort. Though it was important to find a good person, recruiting just was not viewed as particularly important. Recruiting was never seriously viewed as a sophisticated or lengthy undertaking.

Now, however, public power systems have to recruit on a national basis. They are looking for more highly qualified leadership to meet the challenges of a growing industry.⁸

Thus, the Association decided to expand its services. The Office of Personnel Services has been expanded and is now the Office of Educational and Management Services. The new office continues to refer personnel to the member firms. In addition, the office administers an executive search program which is operated by an external search firm. By using this approach, APPA has improved its ability to recruit qualified professional personnel for member public power systems in a competitive recruiting environment.

The degree of success state public utility commissions have in attracting qualified professionals to state service is a function of state civil service laws and regulations. Unlike private sector organizations, the state commissions do not have the degree of autonomy to design

⁸Ibid.

recruitment and selection programs to meet their specific needs. Rather, commission personnel must comply with regulations that cut across all departments of government and then shape their own recruitment and selection procedures within the parameters established by the state. In addition, there is also the matter of funds available to the commissions to recruit in a labor market that is broad in scope and that allows for the use of more innovative recruitment and selection techniques such as assessment centers.

A number of questions concerning recruitment were included in the personnel policy assessment inquiry. Only 12 of the 46 states responding to the inquiry reported that the commissions had a specific budget for the recruitment of professional staff. Fewer than half of the state commissions (22) actively recruit at their own respective state universities, while even fewer (12) recruit through professional societies. Only one state reported that it sought the recruitment services of a private placement organization. It is also interesting to note that only 13 states (29 percent) of those responding reported that they pay for moving expenses for new employees. Five of the 46 states (11 percent) note that they are required to employ only state residents.

The data obtained in this study suggest that there is considerable diversity in the way state commissions recruit new staff especially in the professional job classifications. Recruitment and selection practices range, in the words of several state commission spokespersons, from "passive", having "no set pattern", and requiring "a special waiver to recruit and hire out-of-state residents", to those programs that involve the development of an "upperclass college student public service internship program with the seven universities in the area."

Given this diversity, in recruitment and even selection, it is not surprising to find, as was mentioned previously, that many states encounter problems in recruiting professional staff. In some instances, state

commissions out of necessity have had to compete in a national labor market to fill critical position vacancies.

One state even reported that although it has one of the highest general salary structures, it still is difficult to attract some entry level professionals such as engineers because "industry usually pays more than the state service" and those who are often attracted to the public service commission are motivated by non-salary factors, such as a desire to begin one's professional career in the public service.

Compensation

One of the principal factors considered in this study that relates to the ability of a state commission to attract and retain competent professional staff is its compensation and general reward system. A study by Navarro states that state commission staff salaries are below those for "...analogous positions in federal regulatory agencies...are not competitive with comparable positions in the firms being regulated."⁹ The Navarro study observes generally that the process of ratemaking, especially the complex rate of return analyses, requires a high level of professional training. Therefore, a high level of compensation provided employees at a public utility commission, especially at the professional level, may reflect, as Navarro argued, a "well-staffed, well-trained, well-equipped PUC,"¹⁰ and it might be added, a high performing staff. Because salaries typically are such a large percentage of a commission's budget, a commission with a small budget (relative, of course, to the size of the state and number of utilities it regulates) is less likely to be

⁹Peter Navarro, Public Utility Commission Regulation: Performance, Determinants, and Energy Policy Impacts, E-80-05 (Energy and Environmental Policy Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 1980) p. 17.

¹⁰Ibid.

...able to process rate of return cases in a timely way. As Joskow has observed, when the quiet life of the PUCs was interrupted by inflation and an energy crisis in the early 1970s, 'many state commissions had neither the staff nor administrative resources to deal with th[e] tremendous increase in rate of return cases.' (emphasis added)."¹¹

One of the questions considered in this study is how current salaries paid to professional staff compare with salaries for similar positions in the private sector, especially utilities. Table 2-5 presents data gathered from the commission inquiry which shows average salaries paid by state commissions to individuals in the professional job classifications studied for the budget year 1980-1981. Attorneys and engineers were found to be paid the highest average salaries while accountants and auditors/examiners the lowest.

TABLE 2-5
COMMISSION PROFESSIONAL
AVERAGE SALARIES IN ANNUAL AMOUNTS
(1980-81)

Professional Job Classification	Range		Current Average of Incumbents	Number Reporting
	Min	Max		
Accountant	\$15,715	\$29,410	\$21,001	24
Rate Analyst	16,629	29,192	22,025	29
Attorney	19,687	37,345	27,673	28
Economist	18,441	30,369	23,973	23
Auditor/Examiner	15,568	27,929	20,932	24
Engineer	18,182	33,405	24,925	33

Source: Appendix C.

The data gathered from the electric utility inquiry can be used as a basis for comparison with commission salaries, although the reader is cautioned again about the data limitations based upon differences in sample size and lack of representativeness of all utilities. With these

¹¹Ibid., p. 18. (Joskow's comment is quoted by Navarro from P.L. Joskow, "Inflation and Environmental Concern: Structural Change in the Process of Public Utility Price Regulation," Journal of Law and Economics [October 1974]: 291-311.)

limitations, table 2-6 presents average salaries of similar professional job classifications paid by the electric utilities responding to our inquiry. The data from the utilities show that average salaries paid by utility companies were found to be consistently above the rates paid by the state commissions.

TABLE 2-6
UTILITY PROFESSIONAL
AVERAGE SALARIES IN ANNUAL AMOUNTS
(1980-81)

Professional Job Classification	Range		Current Average of Incumbents	Number Reporting
	Min	Max		
Accountant	\$20,033	\$31,041	\$23,542	27
Rate Analyst	21,169	34,819	26,139	27
Attorney	24,493	41,358	30,434	17
Economist	21,046	34,845	24,775	8
Auditor/Examiner	20,416	31,760	24,068	21
Engineer	22,623	35,052	27,484	26

Source: The NRRI inquiry, "Utility Staff Personnel Policy Assessment Inquiry." 1981.

As a check against the quality and representativeness of this information, other survey data were examined for similar job classifications. Two fairly reliable surveys were used in an attempt to verify some, if not all, of the data gathered in our inquiries. The first is The Endicott Report which is published annually and reports average starting salaries for a range of professional occupations at both the bachelors and masters degree levels of education. The second is the College Placement Council's survey of average salaries offered to job candidates with baccalaureate degrees in a wide range of professional occupations.

While these annual surveys only report average starting salaries, they do provide useful information to gauge the degree of competition in the labor market, especially for those occupations in high demand. Data, for example, on engineering and accounting occupations show that average starting salaries for individuals with bachelor's degrees in 1980 were

\$20,136 and \$15,720 respectively, which is above the rate range minimum reported by the commissions.

Data available from the College Placement Council's survey, presented in table 2-7, show that when average salaries offered to individuals in accounting and economics with a bachelors degree are compared with public utilities, the federal government, and state/local government, the differentials are quite large. Clearly, the private sector has a competitive edge on attracting new college graduates in these fields.

TABLE 2-7
AVERAGE SALARY OFFERS TO CANDIDATES
COLLEGE PLACEMENT COUNCIL AS OF JULY 1981

Bachelors Degree	Public Utility Co.	Fed. Govt.	State/Local Govt.
Accounting	\$17,004	\$15,372	\$15,084
Economics	17,844	13,908	15,552

Source: "CPC Salary Survey," The College Placement Council, July 1981.

Beyond the issue of average salaries paid is the question of salary increases. As table 2-8 shows, the state commissions report that for the most recent year the average salary increase granted each of the professional job classes studied was 8 percent. These increases were generally based on a combination of merit, step and/or cost of living adjustments. Only 4 states reported that salary adjustments were based on collectively negotiated labor agreements. (See table 2-9.)

It is interesting to note, although not necessarily surprising to find, that this increase is consistently below that granted by the utilities responding to our inquiry and clearly below the general rate of inflation.¹²

¹²The inflation rate is usually measured in terms of the increases in The Consumer Price Index (CPI). The rate in 1979 was 11.3 percent (CPI=217.4) and in 1980 was 18.9 percent (CPI=258.4), as reported in the U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, Handbook of Labor Statistics Bulletin 2070 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980), table 135, p. 327.

TABLE 2-8
 COMMISSION SALARY
 INCREASES AS A PERCENTAGE OF SALARIES
 (1980-81)

Professional Job Classification	Percentage Annual Increase	Number Reporting
Accountant	8	25
Rate Analyst	8	30
Attorney	8	31
Economist	8	24
Auditor/Examiner	9	24
Engineer	9	36

Source: Appendix C.

TABLE 2-9
 METHODS OF GRANTING WAGE INCREASES TO
 COMMISSION PROFESSIONALS
 (1980-81)

Method	Number of states	Percentage of states
Merit	1	2
Step	1	2
Cost of Living	2	4
Combined*	38	83
Other**	4	9
Total	46	100

*Wage increases granted by a combination of merit, step, and/or cost of living increase.

**Increases granted through collective bargaining.

Source: Appendix A.

It is also important to note that direct compensation comparisons are often misleading. A more detailed study would be necessary, which is beyond the scope of this analysis, to obtain a more accurate picture of whether the private or public sector offers the potential job candidate a net economic advantage in both direct compensation (salaries paid) and indirect compensation (fringe benefits).

As table 2-10 shows, the value of fringe benefits as a percentage of salary for the professional job classes studied is approximately 23 percent. It is important to note that only eleven major and common fringe benefits, for which data could be gathered, were used in the computation. Thus, it clearly underestimates the true value, since it excludes vacation, holiday, and sick leave pay, which are likely to boost the value of the fringe benefits package. Over 35 percent of a payroll dollar is generally paid for fringe benefits nationally compared to the approximately 37 percent average for the electric utilities responding to our inquiry.¹³

TABLE 2-10
 REPORTED VALUE OF FRINGE BENEFITS AS A
 PERCENTAGE OF SALARIES BY COMMISSIONS
 (1980-81)

Professional Job Classification	Percentage Value	Number Reporting
Accountant	24	25
Rate Analyst	23	30
Attorney	22	33
Economist	23	23
Auditor/Examiner	23	25
Engineer	23	36

Source: Appendix C.

¹³Most surveys now report that the average percentage of payroll dollar is approximately 35-38 percent: See, for example, Chamber of Commerce Survey, Employee Benefits 1977, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D.C., 1977.

Furthermore, the data cannot show the value to individuals that public service has nor the value to individuals often provided in the form of job security for civil servants. Table 2-11 reports the range of benefits available to commission professionals. Of interest here is the fact that while most organizations are likely to provide benefits such as these, it appears that the public sector generally and the state commissions in particular reported more group dental and vision care programs than are likely to be found in the private sector.

As with other factors considered in this study, the problems relating to compensation are not universal, but vary among the state commissions. For example, one commission reported difficulty maintaining competitive professional salaries, but not for engineers. Another state commission reports, however, that the state "has one of the highest general salary structures," but finds it difficult to attract some entry level professionals, especially engineers.

TABLE 2-11
BENEFITS AVAILABLE TO
COMMISSION PROFESSIONALS
(1980-81)

Type of Benefit	Number of States		
	Yes	No	No Response
Major Medical	46	0	0
Group Hospital	45	0	1
Pension Plan	45	1	0
Group Life	43	1	2
Surgical Plan	41	3	2
Disability Plan	30	11	5
Tuition Reimbursement	26	17	3
Prescription Drug Plan	25	15	6
Group Dental	16	24	6
Eye Care Plan	10	28	8
Prepaid Legal	4	36	6

Source: Appendix A.

While we can only speculate about the precise impact that total compensation is likely to have on the commission's ability to attract and retain professionals, it does appear that a number of state commissions are having difficulty adequately compensating individual professionals who perceive they are receiving inadequate salaries relative to the increase that has taken place in job responsibilities and general workloads.

It is likely then that more professional staff may either leave the employ of state commissions or may contemplate a career move in the absence of any effort to alleviate staff shortages or current workloads.

Staff Turnover

In order to address voluntary turnover, the inquiry asked several questions regarding the number of years incumbents worked in a position. There was a very low response rate to these questions by both the commissions and the utility companies. Data were gathered on professionals classified as accountants, rate analysts, attorneys, economists, auditors/examiners, and engineers.

The average number of years commission incumbents have remained in their professional positions is shown in table 2-12. From the data, economists appear to have the shortest average tenure in a position. This

TABLE 2-12
COMMISSION PROFESSIONAL INCUMBENT
AVERAGE YEARS IN POSITION

Professional Job Classification	Average Number of Years	Number of Commissions Reporting
Accountant	7	27
Rate Analyst	6	29
Attorney	5	29
Economist	3	21
Auditor/Examiner	6	24
Engineer	9	35

Source: Appendix C.

may be due to economist positions being a relatively new classification, to economists moving into higher positions more rapidly, or to strong competition within the public and private sector for economists. When examining the responses of the commissions as to whether the average years in a position for the specified professionals had increased, decreased, or remained the same during the past five years, in all cases the most frequent response was that it had remained the same.

The responses for the electric utility companies regarding average years in a position are represented in table 2-13. In comparing the company and commission data, the only position with the same average tenure is that of attorney. On the whole it appears that professionals in the other classifications studied, at the commissions responding, had a longer average number of years in their positions than their counterparts at the utility companies which responded. The utility companies also responded most frequently that the average tenure in a position by the professionals had remained the same. The survey data gave no indication of whether the professionals changed positions within their organization or left the organization at the end of their tenure in a particular position.

When responding to the question about rules or regulations which may affect the retention of staff, several commissions noted that fringe

TABLE 2-13
ELECTRIC UTILITY PROFESSIONAL INCUMBENT
AVERAGE YEARS IN POSITION

Professional Job Classification	Average Number of Years	Number of Electric Utilities Reporting
Accountant	5	28
Rate Analyst	4	31
Attorney	5	19
Economist	4	9
Auditor/Examiner	3	25
Engineer	5	29

Source: The NRRI inquiry, "Utility Staff Personnel Policy Assessment Inquiry," 1981.

benefits such as holidays, vacation, retirement benefits, and job security are seen as positive incentives to employees to remain with the commission. Several of the commissions also noted upward mobility through in-house and interdepartmental transfers and job training and tuition assistance as benefits which may tend to decrease the desire of employees to change positions outside of the commission.

Discussions during the field interviews revealed that turnover was a problem for some commissions. One person stated that there had been an increase in turnover to around 30 percent a year during the past three years from the 10 percent it was six years ago. Another person said his commission had a staff turnover rate of from 15 to 25 percent annually depending on the division. The turnover within the accounting/finance division of one commission was estimated by the individual interviewed to be 50 percent in any five-year period. The reasons cited for this turnover in these instances were non-competitive levels of compensation and increases in the workload. Professionals with a few years of on-the-job training and some college education were said to be able to easily shift to positions in commissions located in other states, to utility companies, or to consulting firms at higher salaries.

Turnover in recent years was seen as less of a problem by other persons interviewed. Their commissions had been able to increase salaries and fringe benefits to enable them to attract and retain professional staff.

Workload

The advent of fuel oil price increases, general economic inflation and the rising costs of energy production, the consumer awareness movement, and changes in both federal and state regulation have altered the traditional regulation of utilities since the mid 1970s. It might be assumed that workload would have increased as commissions implement new programs initiated by these changes.

In measuring changes in workload, one might look at the number of formal rate filings over the period from 1977 to 1980 to determine if there was any increase or decrease in the number of utility rate filings to which a commission must respond. The data in table 2-14 would suggest that there was some change over this period.

In order to assess the actual change in the number of rate filings experienced by the commissions, the average change in the number of utility rate filings was calculated using the number of rate filings for each year as reported by each individual commission. The results of these calculations are shown in table 2-15. The data indicate that while there was a slight decrease from 1977 to 1978 and a modest increase from 1978 to 1979, there was a substantial average increase of 31 percent from 1979 to 1980 in the number of utility rate filings presented to the commissions. Clearly this understates the magnitude of the increase in the number of rate filings that have occurred since the Arab oil embargo which is not included in the time period covered by our study.

As table 2-16 shows, an increase in the number of consumer inquiries and complaints was found for each year reported. This change was

TABLE 2-14
APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF
RATE FILINGS PER COMMISSION
1977 to 1980

Number of Rate Filings Per Commission	Number of Commissions			
	1977	1978	1979	1980
Under 10	4	4	6	5
10 to 50	17	20	18	17
51 to 100	6	4	5	6
101 to 150	2	3	2	1
151 to 200	1	2	2	3
201 to 250	2	1	1	1
Over 250	5	6	7	8
No Response	9	6	5	5

Source: Appendix C.

TABLE 2-15
 AVERAGE CHANGE IN THE NUMBER OF
 RATE FILINGS
 1977 to 1980

Period	Percentage Change
1977-1978	-3
1978-1979	7
1979-1980	31
N = 37	
Source: Appendix C.	

TABLE 2-16
 AVERAGE CHANGE IN THE NUMBER OF INQUIRIES
 AND COMPLAINTS
 1977 to 1980

Period	Percentage Change
1977-1978	25
1978-1979	11
1979-1980	14
N = 36	
Source: Appendix C.	

calculated from the data reported from 1977 to 1980 by each commission. These increases would tend to support the perception of the regulators that there is increasing consumer awareness, interest, and participation by the public in the regulatory process.

During the follow-up interviews, commission personnel were questioned about the general changes that may have occurred in their staff's workload over the past few years and particularly if there has been any impact on the commission's workload as a result of PURPA. Several individuals who were interviewed felt that the cases they process have become more complex and require more technical support. These individuals attribute this development to PURPA and the National Gas Policy Act. On the other hand, other individuals interviewed stated that PURPA itself had not increased the workload since they had already begun to address the same issues prior to its implementation.

The general consensus expressed during the follow-up interviews was that workload had increased for reasons such as inflation, which has caused the utility companies to request rate increases more frequently and, as a result of the general economic conditions, the mix of costs is changing and must be reviewed adequately. Other reasons cited were the need to have better analysis and support documentation for findings and recommendations, increased public awareness and pressure to keep prices low, and the expansion of the workload base into areas requiring research such as the impact of power pooling and the analysis of consumer demand.

As can be seen in table 2-17, it appears that increases in professional staff may not have kept up with increases in rate filings and inquiries and complaints over the past two years for those 22 commissions reporting on all items. This tends to support the feeling of the persons interviewed from the commissions that workload has indeed increased.

Computer Facilities and Other Support Programs

Computer facilities enable a professional staff to organize and analyze large amounts of data in a more rigorous manner, providing much

TABLE 2-17
 COMPARISON OF AVERAGE CHANGE IN THE
 PROFESSIONAL STAFF SIZE, NUMBER OF RATE FILINGS,
 AND NUMBER OF INQUIRIES AND COMPLAINTS
 FOR COMMISSIONS FROM 1977 TO 1980

Period	Percentage Change in Professional Staff Size	Percentage Change in Number of Rate Filings	Percentage Change in Number of Inquiries and Complaints
1977-1978	11	-9	37
1978-1979	5	13	15
1979-1980	15	29	9

N = 22

Source: Appendix C.

needed assistance in the complex analysis of regulatory issues, which appears to be required of the commission with increasing frequency. When the commissions were asked whether they own, lease, or have regular access to a computer, all but two commissions responded. Thirty-six commissions (78 percent) responded that they did have a computer available to them, eight other states (17 percent) said they did not. In contrast, all forty-five (100 percent) of the utility companies responded that they did own or have regular access to a computer. Fewer commissions (27) reported that they owned, leased, or had regular access to computerized data and information sets used in utility analysis. Forty out of forty-one utility companies responded positively to the same question. A reasonable prerequisite to efficient utilization of computer facilities is ownership of, lease of, or regular access to information sets and data bases. The extent to which commissions have ready access to or use these facilities was not determined in this survey.

A professional staff also needs technical, clerical, and secretarial support to assist them in analysis and report development. Table 2-18 shows the distribution by number of persons employed at the commissions in support positions. Table 2-19 is a similar distribution as reported by the

TABLE 2-18
 COMMISSION SUPPORT STAFF BY JOB
 CLASSIFICATION AND SIZE

<u>Staff Classification by Number of Commissions Responding</u>				
Number of Persons	Secretarial/ Clerical	Statistical Clerks	Computer Programmers	Others
Under 25	28	16	18	21
25 - 50	6	0	0	9
51 - 75	4	0	0	2
76 - 100	0	0	0	1
101 - 125	0	0	0	1
Over 125	3	0	0	2
None	<u>0</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>1</u>
Total (N Size)	41	32	32	37

Source: Appendix A.

utility companies. The majority of both commissions and the electric utility companies reported having less than 25 persons, if any, in support roles such as secretarial/clerical staff, statistical clerks, and computer programmers.

The classification of other support staff positions were not identified by type of position, but as can be seen in both table 2-18 and table 2-19, typically the organizations have persons filling support roles other than those mentioned in the inquiry.

Most persons agreed that support staff and facilities were adequate when interviewed during the field interviews, with one person stating that the support staff is more than adequate and the failure to meet deadlines can be attributed to causes other than lack of effort by the support staff. When the discussion turned to computer hardware and software, there were more diverse opinions. It was mentioned that computer facilities and software for utility ratemaking analysis for one commission were still lacking. In another instance, the need to train professionals in the use of the automated data and word processing systems was emphasized. Still others stated the facilities were excellent.

TABLE 2-19
ELECTRIC UTILITY SUPPORT STAFF BY JOB
CLASSIFICATION AND SIZE

<u>Staff Classification by Number of Companies Responding</u>				
Number of Persons	Secretarial/ Clerical	Statistical Clerks	Computer Programmers	Others
Under 25	23	14	16	12
25 - 50	2	2	2	1
51 - 75	0	1	1	3
76 - 100	0	0	1	0
101 - 125	0	0	0	0
Over 125	8	0	1	3
None	<u>0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>
Total (N Size)	33	32	29	30

Source: Appendix B.

Another support program which was considered in the inquiry was travel by the professional staff. All but four commissions responded when asked for the amount of funding in the commission travel budget. The results are shown in table 2-20. Over one-half of the states (24) responded that there have been limitations placed upon staff travel since 1980. Budgetary limitations were noted by 14 states, making it the most frequent response to the question that asked the type of limitations placed on staff travel. The other two limitations mentioned were the requirement of special approval for travel and the actual number of trips which can be made.

During the field interviews, one person stated that today the staff needs more detailed training and a higher level of expertise than was necessary five years ago, since the rate cases are more complicated as well as more numerous. Support resources for training, in the form of tuition reimbursement, were reported to be available in some form by the 26 commissions responding to this question. Not all 26 commissions responded when asked the percentage of this reimbursement which they paid. Of the 20

TABLE 2-20
 APPROXIMATE AMOUNT OF
 FUNDING IN COMMISSION
 TRAVEL BUDGETS
 (1980-81)

Dollar Amount	Number of States
\$ 10,000 to \$ 50,000	11
50,001 to 100,000	9
100,001 to 150,000	5
150,001 to 200,000	4
200,001 to 1,000,000	12
Over \$1,000,000	1
No Response	4

Source: Appendix A.

that did respond, 14 of the states reported that they reimburse 100 percent of the tuition expenses for their professional employees.

CHAPTER 3
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary and Conclusions

It may be argued that the degree of success a state public utility commission achieves in carrying out its mission is a function of the people it employs, the organizational structure created, the technology it uses, and the external environment within which it functions. This report has described certain factors that can be thought to impact on commission personnel policies and practices, with a particular emphasis on the direct impact they have on the employment relationship of selected professional staff.

The six factors identified and analyzed were (1) the size of the professional staff, (2) professional staff recruitment, (3) compensation, (4) staff turnover, especially in professional level positions, (5) workload, and (6) the availability of computer facilities and other support programs. These six factors were defined in chapter 1 and later analyzed in chapter 2. As was noted previously in chapter 2, the purpose of analyzing data and information about these six factors is to permit some judgments to be made about the impact, if any, these factors have on the effectiveness of state commission regulation.

Professional Staff Size

While it is difficult to pinpoint the size of the increase in workload attributable to expanded job responsibilities caused by the implementation of PURPA standards, it does appear that many state commissions are attempting to increase the size of their professional staffs to meet the demand

for more service. The data in this study suggest that while on the whole professional staff size has increased, they do not reflect what state commissions, at least from their point of view, actually need. Many reported that requests for increased staff have been recently denied, yet we do report an overall increase of 26 percent in the average professional staff size from 1977 to 1980.

Perhaps the best way to characterize the problem associated with professional staff size among the commissions is the way one commission staff member articulated this concern: "on net, the workload has increased at a rate faster than staff size." Although not conclusive, it appears many other state commissions face a similar problem.

Staff Recruitment

Staff recruitment, especially in the professional ranks, is best characterized as "ad hoc" and reactive. In other words, with few exceptions, there does not appear to be among state regulatory commissions well defined, systematic, and comprehensive recruiting systems designed to position the commission in the labor market on a competitive footing with their counterparts in the private sector. While it is true that state commissions are constrained by civil service regulations and procedures and limited budgets, there appears to be little use of innovative external search techniques, such as internships, to overcome the apparent disadvantage state commissions have in attracting qualified professional staff.

Compensation

Compensation, especially direct compensation, appears to be a prime source of difficulty for state commissions in attracting and retaining professionals. However, this issue must be examined in relation to total compensation offered, including the value of fringe benefits. The disadvantage that state commissions have in trying to attract professionals based on direct compensation comparisons with the private sector may be

somewhat reduced when total compensation packages are emphasized, including whatever nonfinancial rewards commissions can offer prospective candidates as additional employment incentives. This emphasis appears to be lacking and is likely to be a reflection of the need to develop more fully an integrative human resource management system, one that does not treat the reward system and other employment related functions independently of each other. This would include state civil service personnel policies and procedures, the training and development function, and performance evaluation.

Staff Turnover

Data from the inquiry were not particularly revealing concerning staff turnover. The average number of years that incumbents remained in their respective professional positions, for the most part, has not changed drastically during the past five years. The data from the inquiry, as pointed out, do not address the question of how many professionals have voluntarily terminated or changed positions within the organization during this five-year period. Field interviews, however, do indicate that turnover is a continuing problem for some commissions, and compensation and workload were cited as the primary reasons for this problem.

Workload

It does appear that workloads have increased and that professional staff size has not increased in tandem to meet these additional responsibilities. While some may argue, and legitimately so, that numbers alone will not necessarily lead to effective state commission regulation, this issue deserves more careful consideration. Questions remain unanswered, such as the nature of the tasks that professionals are required to carry out and the extent to which jobs can be redesigned to make better use of the talent and skills available within the commission.

While a number of the commissions have reported significant increases in rate case filings, consumer complaints, and a general increase in

analytical job responsibilities, the issue of how state commissions can better utilize their resources requires more careful and in-depth study.

Computer Facilities and other Support Programs

Data from the inquiry did indicate that at least 36 commissions do have access to computer facilities; however, there was not sufficient information available to determine to what extent the facilities were used. The support staff was generally considered by the individuals interviewed to be adequate.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study has gathered and described data on selected factors characteristic of most working environments which traditionally have been related to employee performance. While data collected and analyzed do not define the exact relationship between the six factors considered and employee performance, they do suggest need for additional in-depth study of state commission personnel policy and practice. For example, one can only speculate on the effect that low staff morale might have on agency performance and effectiveness. One state reported that staff morale is low because of the perception on the part of the consumer that the staff is too lenient and that the commission is a "handmaiden" to the industry regardless of the logic of the particular case situation. Still another reports that staff morale is high because the commission has enjoyed a reputation for integrity and innovation. Given the diversity of opinion that exists among the state commissions, it is important that a more in-depth study of this and other concerns be conducted.

More specifically, the study findings, as noted in this chapter, reveal a need for a more comprehensive data base that will permit commissions to monitor systematically the effect of work environment upon agency performance. Such a data base is not known to exist at any public utility commission. The data base would include more detailed information about

each of the six factors analyzed in this report. It would also include data regarding staff perceptions relating to all work environment variables, such as

- (a) career opportunities within the commission,
- (b) job design,
- (c) performance evaluation,
- (d) training and professional development opportunities,
- (e) co-worker relationships,
- (f) working relations with supervisors, and
- (g) a system of rewards, especially those contingent upon performance.

Commissions responding to this study have begun to analyze and evaluate some aspects of a few of these variables. No agency appears to have developed sufficient data and information on all these important factors that contribute to staff performance and, consequently, the effectiveness of the commissions in fulfilling their regulatory role.

APPENDIX A
COMMISSION RESPONSES TO MAIL INQUIRY

This appendix contains the summarized responses of the state utility commissions to the Commission Personnel Policy Assessment Inquiry. Each question is presented as it appeared in the Inquiry. The responses are tabulated below each question, including the number of nonresponses to each. To simplify the presentation of responses to questions having values or quantitative answers, those data are classified in ranges and corresponding frequencies.

THE NATIONAL REGULATORY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
AND NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGULATORY UTILITY COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSION STAFF PERSONNEL ASSESSMENT INQUIRY

Instructions - Please answer all questions as they relate to gas, electric, and telephone utility regulation. If you have any comments, please note them in the margin or on the back of the question page. If you have any questions please call Nat Simons (614) 422-9404.

A rapid response to this inquiry is important and very much appreciated. Please return the completed inquiry within 3 weeks in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

COMMISSION POLICY AND STAFFING

1. Does the agency have its own specific budget for the recruitment of professional staff? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	12
No	34
No Response	0

2. Is there an active recruitment program pursued by the commission at (a) universities in the state? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	22
No	23
No response	1

- (b) professional societies? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	12
No	33
No Response	1

(c) private placement agencies? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	1
No	45
No Response	0

3. Are professional staff positions included in the state civil service?
Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	36
No	9
No Response	1

4. Indicate the approximate number of utility staff classified as professional in 1977 _____; in 1978 _____; in 1979 _____; in 1980 _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>			
	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>
Under 15 people	11	12	10	12
15 to 30 people	10	9	12	8
31 to 45 people	7	7	5	9
46 to 60 people	3	4	2	2
61 to 75 people	1	3	6	3
76 to 90 people	1	0	1	6
over 90 people	2	3	3	4
No Response	11	8	7	2

5. Rather than employing them directly, does the commission contract for personal services of any professionals from other state agencies (e.g., attorneys from The Office of Attorney General) or on a regular basis by personal services contract? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	13
No	33

6. If the answer to No. 5 is yes, list below the number of persons contracted for in that position classification.

Position
(a) Accountant

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
4 Contracted	1
No Response	45

(b) Rate Analyst

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
No Response	46

(c) Attorney

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
0 Contracted	2
1 "	5
2 "	2
3 "	1
4 "	1
10 "	1
No Response	34

(d) Economist

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
No Response	46

(e) Auditor/Examiner

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
0 Contracted	1
No Response	45

(f) Engineer

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
1 Contracted	1
6 Contracted	1
No Response	44

7. (A) What was the amount of the 1980 total agency budget? \$ _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Less than \$500,000	1
\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	2
\$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000	28
\$5,000,001 to \$10,000,000	8
\$10,000,001 to \$20,000,000	4
Above \$20,000,000	2
No Response	1

(B) Please indicate your agency's fiscal year period. _____

(Responses Not Tabulated)

8. (A) Does the budget in 7(A) exclude major outlay items provided in-kind by other state budgetary agencies, such as annual office rent?

Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	20
No	26

- (B) List each item and the approximate dollar amount:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Amount (\$)</u>
(a) _____	_____
(b) _____	_____
(c) _____	_____
(d) _____	_____

(Responses Not Tabulated)

9. Are new non-resident employees reimbursed for moving expenses when initially employed? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	13
No	32
No Response	1

10. Are there any specific rules or regulations affecting the attraction or retention of staff, such as

(a) employment of state residents only? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	5
No	41

(b) reimbursement for travel cost and per diem? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	39
No	5
No response	2

(c) Others (list)? _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Fringe Benefits	4
Upward Mobility	2
Job Security	1
Recruitment & EEO	1
Rule of Three	1
Paid Job Training	1
Moving Policy	1
2 Yr. Cooling off Period	1
Exempt from State Pay Plan	1
No Answer	33

POSITION DESCRIPTION AND COMPENSATION

11. Is there a position description for each of the following professional positions:

(a) accountant? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	36
No	4
No Response	6

(b) rate analyst? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	35
No	6
No Response	5

(c) attorney? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	37
No	3
No Response	6

(d) economist? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	33
No	7
No Response	6

(e) auditor/examiner? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	35
No	6
No Response	5

(f) engineer? Yes _____ NO _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	40
No	1
No Response	5

For each "yes" response in question 11, please attach the position description, if available.

12. What is the approximate dollar amount of funding in the commission travel budget? \$ _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
\$10,000 to \$50,000	11
\$50,001 to \$100,000	9
\$100,000 to \$150,000	5
\$150,001 to \$200,000	4
\$200,001 to \$1,000,000	12
Over \$1,000,000	1
No Response	4

13. (A) Since FY 1980, were there limitations placed upon staff travel, such as for out-of-state trips? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	24
No	22

(B) Indicate briefly the nature of the limitations. _____

<u>Response</u>	
Budget	14
Special Approval Req'd	8
No. of Trips Limited	4
No Absolute Limits	1
No Response	19

14. Has the commission, for budgetary reasons, been "turned down" in recent years on either of the following kinds of requests:

(a) staffing increases? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	37
No	8
No Response	1

(b) increases in professional staff compensation? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	20
No	22
No answer	4

15. What is the total number of agency staff members? _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Under 10	1
10 to 50	8
51 to 100	13
101 to 200	7
151 to 200	5
Over 200	12
No Response	0

16. Please fill in the information requested for the following classes of key professional staff:

Position	Pay Range		Approximate Number Presently Employed	Average Salary	Estimated Dollar Value of Fringe Benefits (or percent of salaries)	Average Salary Increase from Previous Year
	Maximum	Minimum				
(a) Accountant						
(b) Rate Analyst						
(c) Attorney						
(d) Economist						
(e) Auditor/ Examiner						
(f) Engineer						

<u>Responses</u>		<u>No. of States</u>					
		Pay Range Maximum					
		Account- tant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Under	\$10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$10,000 to	\$15,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$15,001 to	\$20,000	3	2	0	0	3	1
\$20,001 to	\$25,000	6	6	0	3	6	1
\$25,001 to	\$30,000	5	10	6	8	9	7
\$30,001 to	\$35,000	8	10	6	9	6	15
Above	\$35,000	5	3	19	5	3	13
No Response		19	15	15	21	19	9

<u>Responses</u>		<u>No. of States</u>					
		Pay Range Minimum					
		Account- tant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Under	\$10,000	0	0	1	0	0	0
\$10,000 to	\$15,000	14	12	3	6	18	7
\$15,001 to	\$20,000	9	15	17	12	7	18
\$20,001 to	\$25,000	4	4	4	6	2	10
\$25,001 to	\$30,000	0	0	5	1	0	2
\$30,001 to	\$35,000	0	0	2	0	0	0
Above	\$35,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Response		19	15	14	21	19	9

<u>Responses</u>		<u>No. of States</u>					
		Average Salary					
		Account- tant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Under	\$10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$10,000 to	\$15,000	1	0	0	0	3	0
\$15,001 to	\$20,000	9	14	3	6	8	3
\$20,001 to	\$25,000	14	13	10	10	10	18
\$25,000 to	\$30,000	2	4	6	5	1	10
\$30,001 to	\$35,000	0	1	10	3	2	4
Above	\$35,000	1	0	3	1	0	1
No Response		19	14	14	21	22	10

<u>Responses</u>	<u>No. of States</u>					
	Number Employed					
	Accountant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Under 5 people	12	18	16	24	11	9
5 to 10 people	8	10	10	4	6	18
11 to 15 people	3	7	3	1	5	7
16 to 20 people	1	0	3	0	2	3
21 to 25 people	0	0	0	0	0	0
Over 25 people	5	1	5	1	4	5
No Response	17	10	9	16	18	4

<u>Responses</u>	<u>No. of States</u>					
	Fringe Benefits					
	Accountant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Under 10%	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-20%	11	14	17	10	10	16
21-30%	9	11	11	10	10	14
31-40%	5	5	5	3	5	6
No Response	21	16	13	23	21	10

<u>Responses</u>	<u>No. of States</u>					
	Average Salary Increase					
	Accountant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Under 10%	17	21	20	16	16	25
10-20%	7	9	11	8	8	9
21-30%	1	0	0	0	0	2
31-40%	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Response	21	16	15	22	22	10

17. Which of the following best describes how the professional staff receives increases in salary: (circle the appropriate letter)
- (a) increases are on a merit basis?
 - (b) annual step increases?
 - (c) annual cost of living adjustments (COLA)?
 - (d) partially merit _____, partially step _____, partially COLA _____? (check appropriate items)

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Merit	1
Step	1
COLA	2
Combination	38
Other	4

18. On the average, how often are these increases granted?
 annually _____, semi-annually _____, other (describe) _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Annually	39
Semi-annually	1
Combination	3
Varies	3

19. (A) Is the commission restricted from employing former professional staff of the regulated utilities? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	1
No	45

(B) If yes, what is the restriction? _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Conflict of Interest	1
No Response	45

20. Can the regulated utilities employ former commission professional staff? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	45
No	1

21. If the answer to No. 20 is yes, is there a "cooling-off" period or comparable limitation upon that person's professional activity?
 Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	15
No	27
No Response	4

LONGEVITY AND WORKLOAD

22. What is the average tenure (years in the position) of the incumbents in the following positions?

<u>Position</u>	<u>Tenure (years in the position)</u>
(a) accountant?	_____
(b) rate analyst?	_____
(c) attorney?	_____

- (d) economist? _____
 (e) auditor/examiner? _____
 (f) engineer? _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>					
	Accountant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Under 5 years	11	12	14	16	13	8
5 - 10 years	10	15	10	5	10	21
11 - 15 years	4	1	5	0	0	3
Over 15 years	2	1	0	0	1	3
No Response	19	17	17	25	22	11

23. Has the average tenure (years in position) for the following positions increased, declined, or remained the same in the past 5 years? Check the appropriate space for each of the following position:

<u>Position</u>	<u>Increased</u>	<u>Decreased</u>	<u>Remained the same</u>
(a) accountant	_____	_____	_____
(b) rate analyst	_____	_____	_____
(c) attorney	_____	_____	_____
(d) economist	_____	_____	_____
(e) auditor/examiner	_____	_____	_____
(f) engineer	_____	_____	_____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>					
	Accountant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Increased	9	12	10	8	8	14
Decreased	9	5	5	6	5	8
Remained the same	15	13	17	12	10	16
No Response	13	16	14	20	23	8

24. What was the approximate number of utility rate filings in 1977 _____; 1978 _____; 1979 _____; 1980 _____?

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>			
	1977	1978	1979	1980
Under 10	4	4	6	5
10 to 50	17	20	18	17
51 to 100	6	4	5	6
101 to 150	2	3	2	1
151 to 200	1	2	2	3
201 to 250	2	1	1	1
Over 250	5	6	7	8
No Response	9	6	5	5

25. What was the approximate number of inquiries from the public and consumer complaints during 1977 _____, 1978 _____, 1979 _____, 1980 _____?

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>			
	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>
Under 100	1	1	0	0
100 to 2,000	12	11	12	11
2,001 to 4,000	9	10	8	6
4,001 to 6,000	5	4	3	4
6,001 to 8,000	2	4	5	6
8,001 to 10,000	1	1	2	3
Over 10,000	7	8	9	10
No Response	9	7	7	6

26. Are there statutory requirements for the commission to file an annual (or other regular time period) report. Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	38
No	7
No Response	1

27. Approximately what percent of staff time is allocated to preparation and presentation of testimony in any given year? _____%

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Under 25%	18
25% to 50%	8
51% to 75%	5
76% to 100%	2
No Response	13

28. What was the size of the following support staff for the last full reporting year?

<u>Support Staff</u>	<u>Number</u>
(a) secretarial/clerical	_____
(b) statistical clerks	_____
(c) computer programmers	_____
(d) all other support staff	_____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>			
	<u>Secretarial/ Clerical</u>	<u>Statistical Clerks</u>	<u>Computer Programmers</u>	<u>Other</u>
Under 25	28	16	18	21
25 to 50	6	0	0	9
51 to 75	4	0	0	2
76 to 100	0	0	0	1
101 to 125	0	0	0	1
Over 125	3	0	0	2
None	0	16	14	1
No Response	5	14	14	9

29. Does the commission own, lease or regularly have access to a computer?
 Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	36
No	8
No Response	2

30. Does the commission own, lease or regularly have access to computerized data and information sets used in utility analyses? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	27
No	16
No Response	3

FRINGE BENEFITS

31. (A) Are paid vacations authorized for professional employees?
 Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	46
No Response	0

(B) If yes, how are vacations accumulated by years of service?

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>Number of Vacation Days</u>
(a) 0-1	_____
(b) 2-4	_____
(c) 5-9	_____
(d) 10-15	_____
(e) other	_____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>				
	<u>Years of Service</u>				
	<u>0-1</u>	<u>2-4</u>	<u>5-9</u>	<u>10-15</u>	<u>Other</u>
10-12 days	28	22	2	0	0
13-15 days	15	17	27	8	1
16-18 days	0	3	10	20	1
19-21 days	1	2	4	13	13
Over 21 days	0	0	1	3	6
No Response	2	2	2	2	25

32. May professional employees accumulate unused vacation for more than a year? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	43
No	3
No Response	0

33. (A) If yes, how many days of vacation may be carried forward? _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
0	1
1-10	1
11-20	1
21-30	14
31-40	2
41-50	3
51-60	2
Varies	8
2 Times Annual	5
All	5
No Response	4

(B) How many paid holidays are authorized _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
8-9	5
10-11	21
12-13	14
14-15	2
16-17	0
18-19	1
No Response	3

34. Please indicate which of the following benefits apply to professional employees:

Types of Benefits	Yes	No	Percent Paid By Agency	Premium, or Monthly Cost to Employee	
				Single	Married
(a) Group Hospitalization					
(b) Surgical Plan					
(c) Major Medical					
(d) Group Life					
(e) Group Dental					
(f) Disability Plan					
(g) Prescription Drug Plan					
(h) Eye Care plan					
(i) Tuition Reimbursement					
(j) Prepaid Legal Service					
(k) Pension Plan					
(l) Other (list)					

Response	No. of States										
	Types of Benefits Provided										
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)
Yes	45	41	46	43	16	30	25	10	26	4	45
No	0	3	0	1	24	11	15	28	17	36	1
No answer	1	2	0	2	6	5	6	8	3	6	0

Response	No. of States											
	Percentage Paid by Agency											
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)
0%	0	0	0	5	2	3	0	0	0	2	0	0
1 to 25%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25 to 49%	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 to 74%	5	4	4	5	1	3	4	0	3	1	21	0
75 to 99%	6	4	6	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	5	0
100%	23	19	19	19	10	13	8	5	14	0	3	0
Varies	4	3	4	2	1	2	2	1	3	0	2	0
No Response	7	15	12	12	31	23	30	39	26	43	15	46

35. What are the number of years required to fully vest the employees in the pension plan? _____ years.

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Under 5	8
6-10	32
11-15	2
16-20	1
No Response	3

36.

Is personal leave or sick leave granted for the following purposes? (check the appropriate space):

<u>Purpose of Leave</u>	<u>Sick Leave</u>	<u>Personal Leave</u>	<u>None</u>
(a) Family illness			
(b) Jury duty			
(c) Death in family			
(d) Armed forces (military) reserve duty			
(e) Other (specify)			

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>				
	<u>Family Illness</u>	<u>Jury Duty</u>	<u>Death in Family</u>	<u>Armed Forces</u>	<u>Other</u>
Sick Leave	34	3	24	2	2
Personal Leave	4	20	10	21	1
Special Leave	0	13	2	14	0
Education Leave	0	0	0	0	2
Excusable	1	0	1	0	0
None	0	7	1	5	0
No Response	7	3	8	4	41

37. (A) May the employee accumulate unused paid sick leave?

Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	44
No	2
No Response	0

(B) If yes, what is the maximum accumulation in number of days? _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
1 - 50	0
51 - 100	2
101 - 150	2
151 - 200	2
201 - 250	1
No Limit	26
None	3
No Response	10

38. Does your agency regularly use a professional staff performance evaluation and appraisal system? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, please enclose a copy of the evaluation form.

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	35
No	11
No Response	0

39. Has the state personnel office or the commission completed a salary study within the past 5 years? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Yes	31
No	14
No Response	1

40. If that study is available, please send it with this response. Please also enclose position descriptions noted in No. 11 and the latest annual report of the commission.

GENERAL INFORMATION

41. Will your commission be willing to assist in the process of obtaining information from one or more regulated utilities in your state based on a inquiry similar to this? Yes _____ No _____
42. Is your commission willing to participate in a follow-up interview session with an NRRI field team next month? Yes _____ No _____

43. Please supply the name of the appropriate contact person in your agency who will provide further clarification for the answers to this NRRI inquiry. _____

44. Did the person noted in No. 43 prepare the responses to this inquiry
Yes _____ No _____

APPENDIX B
UTILITY RESPONSES TO MAIL INQUIRY

This appendix contains the summarized responses of the utility companies to the mail inquiry, Utility Staff Policy Assessment Inquiry. As in appendix A, the questions are presented as they appeared in the Inquiry. The tabulated responses are presented below each question and include the total nonresponses. Those questions requiring a quantitative or value response are classified in ranges and corresponding frequencies.

THE NATIONAL REGULATORY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
AND NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGULATORY UTILITY COMMISSIONERS

UTILITY STAFF PERSONNEL POLICY ASSESSMENT INQUIRY

GENERAL POLICY AND STAFFING

1. Is there an active recruitment program pursued by the firm at
(a) universities in the state? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	43
No	2
No Response	0

- (b) professional societies? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	14
No	31
No Response	0

- (c) private placement agencies Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	23
No	22
No Response	0

2. Indicate the approximate number of utility staff classified as professional in 1977 _____; in 1978 _____; in 1979 _____; in 1980 _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>			
	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>
0 to 50 people	12	12	13	14
51 to 200	10	9	9	9
201 to 500	4	5	4	5
501 to 1,000	5	4	5	3
1,001 to 2,000	4	6	5	7
2,001 to 3,000	0	0	2	2
Over 3,000	0	1	1	1
No Response	10	8	6	4

(e) Auditor/Examiner _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
0	33
1	1
4	1
5	2
No Response	8

(f) Engineer _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
0	25
1	3
4	1
5	1
10	2
12	1
15	1
20	1
No Response	10

5. Are new non-resident employees reimbursed for moving expenses when initially employed? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	36
No	8
No Response	1

POSITION DESCRIPTION AND COMPENSATION

6. Is there a position description for each of the following professional positions: (a) Accountant? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	35
No	10
No Response	0

- (b) Rate Analyst? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	34
No	11
No Response	0

(c) Attorney? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	23
No	22
No Response	0

(d) Economist? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	16
No	29
No Response	0

(e) Auditor/Examiner? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	31
No	13
No Response	1

(f) Engineer? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	35
No	10
No Response	0

For each "yes" response in question 6, attach the position description, if available.

7. (A) Since FY 1980, were there limitations placed upon staff travel, such as for out-of-state trips? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	18
No	27
No Response	0

(B) Indicate briefly the nature of the limitations. _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Budget	6
Special Approval	7
Number of trips	3
No Response	29

<u>Responses</u>		<u>No. of Utilities</u> Average Salary					
		Account- tant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Under	\$10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$10,000 to	\$15,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$15,001 to	\$20,000	5	7	0	1	5	0
\$20,001 to	\$25,000	16	8	3	4	9	10
\$25,001 to	\$30,000	7	11	7	4	9	13
\$30,001 to	\$35,000	1	5	8	0	1	6
Above	\$35,000	0	0	3	2	0	1
No Response		16	14	24	34	21	15

<u>Responses</u>		<u>No. of Utilities</u> Number Employed					
		Account- tant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Under 5 people		8	29	32	41	25	4
5 to 10 people		13	8	4	1	9	7
11 to 15 people		5	3	0	0	2	3
16 to 20 people		6	1	0	0	1	2
21 to 25 people		3	1	0	0	0	0
Over 25 people		5	1	2	0	0	24
No Response		5	2	7	3	8	5

<u>Responses</u>		<u>No. of Utilities</u> Fringe Benefits					
		Account- tant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Under 10%		0	0	0	0	0	0
10 - 20%		3	3	3	0	3	3
21 - 30%		0	2	1	1	0	1
31 - 40%		21	23	13	7	19	20
Above 40%		8	8	6	5	6	9
No Response		13	9	22	32	17	12

<u>Responses</u>		<u>No. of Utilities</u> Average Salary Increase					
		Account- tant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Under 10%		8	0	4	3	4	9
10 - 20%		26	8	19	9	25	27
21 - 30%		0	29	0	1	0	0
31 - 40%		0	0	0	0	0	0
No Response		11	8	22	32	16	9

9. Which of the following best describes how the professional staff receives increases in salary: (circle the appropriate letter)
 (a) increases are on a merit basis?
 (b) annual step increases?
 (c) annual cost of living adjustments (COLA)?
 (d) partially merit _____, partially step _____, partially COLA _____, (check appropriate items)

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Merit	29
Combination	16
No Response	0

10. On the average how often are these increases granted? annually _____, semi-annually _____, other (describe) _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
Annual	42
Other	3
No Response	0

11. What is the average tenure (years in the position) of the incumbents in the following positions:

<u>Position</u>	<u>Tenure (years in the position)</u>
(a) Accountant	_____
(b) Rate Analyst	_____
(c) Attorney	_____
(d) Economist	_____
(e) Auditor/Examiner	_____
(f) Engineer	_____

<u>Responses</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>					
	Account- tant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Under 5 years	16	20	13	6	18	16
5 - 10 years	10	11	6	3	6	11
11 - 15 years	2	0	0	0	1	2
No Response	17	14	26	36	20	16

12. Has the average tenure (years on position) for the following positions increased, declined, or remained the same in the past 5 years? Check the appropriate space for each of the following positions:

<u>Position</u>	<u>Increased</u>	<u>Decreased</u>	<u>Remained the same</u>
(a) Accountant	_____	_____	_____
(b) Rate Analyst	_____	_____	_____
(c) Attorney	_____	_____	_____
(d) Economic	_____	_____	_____
(e) Auditor/Examiner	_____	_____	_____
(f) Engineer	_____	_____	_____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>					
	Account- tant	Rate Analyst	Attorney	Economist	Auditor/ Examiner	Engineer
Increased	8	7	7	5	6	7
Decreased	6	9	3	2	5	10
Remained the Same	16	15	11	8	16	14
No Response	15	14	24	30	18	14

13. Approximately what percent of staff time is allocated to preparation and presentation of testimony in any given year? _____%

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Under 25%	12
25 to 50%	10
51 to 75%	0
76 to 100%	3
No Response	20

14. What was the size of the following support staff for the last full reporting year?

<u>Support Staff</u>	<u>Number</u>
(a) Secretarial/Clerical	_____
(b) Statistical Clerks	_____
(c) Computer Programmers	_____
(d) All Other Support Staff	_____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>			
	Secretarial/ Clerical	Statistical Clerks	Computer Programmers	All Other Support Staff
None	0	15	8	11
Under 25	23	14	16	12
26 to 50	2	2	2	1
51 to 75	0	1	1	3
76 to 100	0	0	1	0
101 to 125	0	0	0	0
Over 125	8	0	1	3
No Response	12	13	16	15

15. Does the utility own, lease or regularly have access to a computer?
Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	45
No	0
No Response	0

16. Does the utility own, lease or regularly have access to computerized data and information sets used in utility analyses? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	40
No	1
No Response	4

FRINGE BENEFITS

17. (A) Are paid vacations authorized for professional employees? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	45
No	0
No Response	0

(B) If yes, how are vacations accumulated by years of service:

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>Number of Vacation Days</u>
(a) 0-1	_____
(b) 2-4	_____
(c) 5-9	_____
(d) 10-15	_____
(e) Other	_____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>				
	<u>0-1</u>	<u>2-4</u>	<u>5-9</u>	<u>10-15</u>	<u>Other</u>
None	6	0	0	0	0
Under 10	16	1	0	0	0
10-12	21	41	13	0	0
13-15	2	3	30	27	0
16-18	0	0	1	4	0
19-21	0	0	1	14	11
Over 21 days	0	0	0	0	31
No Response	0	0	0	0	3

18. May professional employees accumulate unused vacation for more than a year? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	16
No	28
No Response	1

19. (A) If yes, how many days of vacation may be carried forward? _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
0	28
1 - 10	8
11 - 20	0
21 - 30	0
31 - 40	0
41 - 50	1
Varies	1
2 Times Annual	2
All	1
No Response	4

(B) How many paid holidays are authorized? _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
8 - 9	15
10 - 11	16
12 - 13	11
14 - 15	1
No Response	2

20. Please indicate which of the following benefits apply to professional employees:

<u>Types of Benefits</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Percent Paid By Firm</u>	<u>Premium, or Monthly Cost to Employee</u>	
				<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
(a) Group Hospitalization					
(b) Surgical Plan					
(c) Major Medical					
(d) Group Life					
(e) Group Dental					
(f) Disability Plan					
(g) Prescription Drug Plan					
(h) Eye Care Plan					
(i) Tuition Reimbursement					
(j) Prepaid Legal Service					
(k) Pension Plan					
(l) Other (list)					

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>											
	<u>Type of Benefits Provided</u>											
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)
Yes	40	40	44	45	29	38	19	7	43	0	45	-
No	4	5	0	0	16	7	25	38	2	45	0	-
No Response	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-

Response	No. of Utilities											
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)
0%	4	5	0	6	16	8	25	37	2	45	1	-
1 to 24%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
25 to 49%	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	-
50 to 74%	1	1	2	12	1	4	1	1	7	0	0	-
75 to 99%	11	12	12	3	8	2	4	0	16	0	1	-
100%	25	24	27	13	18	26	12	6	11	0	41	-
Varies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
No Response	4	3	4	6	2	3	3	1	9	0	2	-

21. What are the number of years required to fully vest the employee in the pension plan? _____ years.

Response	No. of Utilities
Under 5	1
6 - 10	42
11 - 15	1
16 - 20	0
No Response	1

22. Is personal leave or sick leave granted for the following purposes? (Check the appropriate space):

Purpose of Leave	Sick Leave	Personal Leave	None		
(a) Family Illness					
(b) Jury Duty					
(c) Death in Family					
(d) Armed Forces (military) Reserve Duty					
(e) Other (specify)					
	Family Illness	Jury Duty	Death in Family	Armed Forces	Other
Sick Leave	3	0	2	0	2
Personal Leave	28	43	41	41	4
None	14	1	1	3	0
No Answer	0	1	1	1	39

23. (A) May the employee accumulate unused paid sick leave?
Yes _____ No _____

Response	No. of Utilities
Yes	19
No	24
No Response	2

(B) If yes, what is the maximum accumulation in number of days? _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
1 - 50	2
51 - 100	2
101 - 150	5
151 - 200	0
201 - 250	1
No Limit	4
None	24
No Response	7

24. Does your utility regularly use a professional staff performance evaluation and appraisal system? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, please enclose a copy of the evaluation form.

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	32
No	12
No Response	1

25. Has the utility personnel office completed a salary study within the past 5 years? Yes _____ No _____

<u>Response</u>	<u>No. of Utilities</u>
Yes	32
No	10
No Response	3

26. If that study is available, please send it with this response. Please also enclose position descriptions noted in No. 6 and the latest annual report of the company.

GENERAL INFORMATION

27. Is your utility willing to participate in a follow-up interview session with an NRRI field team next month? Yes _____ No _____

28. Please supply the name of the appropriate contact person in your firm who will provide further clarification for the answers to this NRRI inquiry. _____

29. Did the person noted in No. 28 prepare the responses to this inquiry? Yes _____ No _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

APPENDIX C

INQUIRY RESPONDENTS BY STATE

This appendix lists alphabetically all states and indicates which states were represented in the study by a response to the personnel policy assessment inquiry by public utility commission and/or electric utility company. Those responses received subsequent to the deadline for inclusion in the study data base are noted.

TABLE C-1

STATES RESPONDING TO THE STAFF PERSONNEL POLICY
ASSESSMENT INQUIRY, BY COMMISSION AND UTILITIES

State	Responses to Inquiry		State	Responses to Inquiry	
	Commission	Utility		Commission	Utility
Alabama	X	X	Mississippi	X	X
Alaska	X	-	Missouri	X	X ¹
Arizona	X	X	Montana	X	-
Arkansas	X	X	Nebraska	X	-
California	X	X	Nevada	X	X
Colorado	X	-	New Hampshire	X	X
Connecticut	X	X	New Jersey	X	X
Delaware	X	-	New Mexico	X	X
District of Columbia	X ¹	-	New York	X	X
Florida	X	X	North Carolina	X	X
Georgia	X	X	North Dakota	X	-
Hawaii	X	X	Ohio	X	X
Idaho	X	X	Oklahoma	-	-
Illinois	X	X	Oregon	X	X
Indiana	X	-	Pennsylvania	X	X
Iowa	X	X	Puerto Rico	X ¹	-
Kansas	X	X	Rhode Island	X ¹	-
Kentucky	X	X	South Carolina	X	X
Louisiana	X	X	South Dakota	X	X
Maine	X	X	Tennessee	X	-
Maryland	X	X	Texas	X	-
Massachusetts	X ¹	-	Utah	X	X
Michigan	X	X	Vermont	-	X
Minnesota	X	X	Virgin Islands	X ²	-

TABLE C-1

(Continued)

State	Responses to Inquiry		State	Responses to Inquiry	
	Commission	Utility		Commission	Utility
Virginia	X	X	Wisconsin	X	X
Washington	X	-	Wyoming	X	-
West Virginia	X	-			

Source: Compilation of Returned Inquiries.

Notes: ¹Indicates that the completed inquiry was received too late to be included in the data set.

²Virgin Islands Public Service Commission reported no professional staff.

APPENDIX D

COMMISSION INQUIRY RESPONSES BY STATE

This appendix contains the actual response, listed in alphabetical order, of each of the 46 states which completed and returned the Commission Personnel Policy Assessment Inquiry in time to be included in the data base. The responses are listed below each question. Questions 7, 8-B, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44 were not included in the data base, due to the nature of the question, which made the response such that it could not be tabulated.

THE NATIONAL REGULATORY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
AND NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGULATORY UTILITY COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSION STAFF PERSONNEL POLICY ASSESSMENT INQUIRY

1. Does the agency have its own specific budget for the recruitment of professional staff: Yes _____ No _____

		<u>Response</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	NO
2	ALASKA PUC	NO
3	ARIZONA CC	YES
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	NO
6	COLORADO PUC	NO
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES
8	DELAWARE PSC	NO
9	FLORIDA PSC	NO
10	GEORGIA PSC	NO
11	HAWAII PUC	NO
12	IDAHO PUC	NO
13	ILLINOIS CC	NO
14	IOWA SCC	NO
15	INDIANA PSC	NO
16	KANSAS SCC	NO
17	KENTUCKY PSC	NO
18	LOUISIANA PSC	NO
19	MAINE PUC	YES
20	MARYLAND PSC	NO
21	MICHIGAN PSC	NO
22	MINNESOTA PUC	NO
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	NO
24	MISSOURI PSC	NO
25	MONTANA PSC	NO
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO
27	NEVADA PSC	YES
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	NO
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	YES
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	NO
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	NO
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES
34	OHIO PUC	YES
35	OREGON PUC	NO
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	NO
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	NO
38	TENNESSEE PSC	NO
39	TEXAS PUC	NO
40	TEXAS RC	NO
41	UTAH PSC	NO
42	VIRGINIA SCC	YES
43	WASHINGTON UTC	NO
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	NO
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES
46	WYOMING PSC	YES

2. Is there an active recruitment program pursued by the commission at
 (a) universities in the state? (b) professional societies?
 (c) private placement agencies? Yes _____ No _____

		<u>Response</u>		
		(a)	(b)	(c)
1	ALABAMA PSC	YES	YES	NO
2	ALASKA PUC	NO	NO	NO
3	ARIZONA CC	NO	NO	NO
4	ARKANSAS PSC	NO	NO	NO
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES	YES	NO
6	COLORADO PUC	NO	NO	NO
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES	YES	NO
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES	NO	NO
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES	YES	NO
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES	YES	NO
11	HAWAII PUC	NO	NO	NO
12	IDAHO PUC	NO	NO	NO
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES	NO	NO
14	IOWA SCC	NO	NO	NO
15	INDIANA PSC	YES	YES	NO
16	KANSAS SCC	N/R	N/R	NO
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES	NO	NO
18	LOUISIANA PSC	NO	NO	NO
19	MAINE PUC	NO	NO	NO
20	MARYLAND PSC	NO	NO	NO
21	MICHIGAN PSC	NO	NO	NO
22	MINNESOTA PUC	NO	NO	NO
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	NO	NO	NO
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES	YES	NO
25	MONTANA PSC	YES	YES	YES
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO	NO	NO
27	NEVADA PSC	NO	NO	NO
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	NO	NO	NO
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	YES	YES	NO
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	NO	NO	NO
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES	NO	NO
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	NO	NO	NO
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES	NO	NO
34	OHIO PUC	YES	NO	NO
35	OREGON PUC	NO	NO	NO
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES	YES	NO
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	NO	NO	NO
38	TENNESSEE PSC	YES	NO	NO
39	TEXAS PUC	NO	NO	NO
40	TEXAS RC	YES	NO	NO
41	UTAH PSC	NO	NO	NO
42	VIRGINIA SCC	YES	NO	NO
43	WASHINGTON UTC	NO	NO	NO
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES	YES	NO
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES	YES	NO
46	WYOMING PSC	YES	NO	NO

3. Are professional staff positions included in the state civil service?
 Yes _____ No _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	YES
2	ALASKA PUC	YES
3	ARIZONA CC	YES
4	ARKANSAS PSC	NO
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES
6	COLORADO PUC	YES
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES
11	HAWAII PUC	YES
12	IDAHO PUC	YES
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES
14	IOWA SCC	YES
15	INDIANA PSC	NO
16	KANSAS SCC	NO
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES
18	LOUISIANA PSC	YES
19	MAINE PUC	YES
20	MARYLAND PSC	N/R
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	YES
24	MISSOURI PSC	NO
25	MONTANA PSC	YES
26	NEBRASKA PSC	YES
27	NEVADA PSC	YES
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES
29	NEW JERSEY RPU	YES
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	NO
34	OHIO PUC	YES
35	OREGON PUC	YES
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES
38	TENNESSEE PSC	NO
39	TEXAS PUC	YES
40	TEXAS RC	NO
41	UTAH PSC	YES
42	VIRGINIA SCC	NO
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES
46	WYOMING PSC	NO

4. Indicate the approximate number of utility staff classified as professional in 1977 _____; in 1978 _____; in 1979 _____; in 1980 _____.

	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	
1	ALABAMA PSC	40	42	55	75
2	ALASKA PUC	N/R	23	23	26
3	ARIZONA CC	16	20	23	25
4	ARKANSAS PSC	30	32	30	49
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
6	COLORADO PUC	17	19	19	22
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
8	DELAWARE PSC	8	8	9	9
9	FLORIDA PSC	N/R	N/R	180	175
10	GEORGIA PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	34
11	HAWAII PUC	6	6	6	6
12	IDAHO PUC	27	27	27	27
13	ILLINOIS CC	41	50	64	63
14	IOWA SCC	56	68	65	68
15	INDIANA PSC	38	40	41	43
16	KANSAS SCC	17	19	25	31
17	KENTUCKY PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	40
18	LOUISIANA PSC	4	4	4	4
19	MAINE PUC	32	33	35	35
20	MARYLAND PSC	45	54	68	76
21	MICHIGAN PSC	115	120	130	130
22	MINNESOTA PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	9
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	2	2	2	2
24	MISSOURI PSC	60	65	70	76
25	MONTANA PSC	6	9	9	9
26	NEBRASKA PSC	6	6	4	4
27	NEVADA PSC	30	30	30	30
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	N/R	12	12	13
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	70	73	73	76
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	12	14	19	21
31	NEW YORK PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	400
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	10	11	13	13
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	8	8	8	8
34	OHIO PUC	37	35	32	84
35	OREGON PUC	40	40	40	40
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	192	207	217	215
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	30	35	41	41
38	TENNESSEE PSC	14	14	16	14
39	TEXAS PUC	N/R	58	58	52
40	TEXAS RC	17	29	24	22
41	UTAH PSC	2	2	2	3
42	VIRGINIA SCC	N/R	N/R	N/R	42
43	WASHINGTON UTC	28	30	30	31
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	55	55	61	76
45	WISCONSIN PSC	87	94	87	88
46	WYOMING PSC	16	16	16	20

5. Rather than employing them directly, does the commission contract for personal services of any professionals from other state agencies (e.g., attorneys from The Office of Attorney General) or on a regular basis by personal services contract? Yes _____ No _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	NO
2	ALASKA PUC	YES
3	ARIZONA CC	NO
4	ARKANSAS PSC	NO
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	NO
6	COLORADO PUC	YES
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	NO
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES
9	FLORIDA PSC	NO
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES
11	HAWAII PUC	NO
12	IDAHO PUC	NO
13	ILLINOIS CC	NO
14	IOWA SCC	NO
15	INDIANA PSC	YES
16	KANSAS SCC	NO
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES
18	LOUISIANA PSC	NO
19	MAINE PUC	NO
20	MARYLAND PSC	NO
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	NO
24	MISSOURI PSC	NO
25	MONTANA PSC	NO
26	NEBRASKA PSC	YES
27	NEVADA PSC	YES
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	NO
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	NO
31	NEW YORK PSC	NO
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	NO
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	NO
34	OHIO PUC	NO
35	OREGON PUC	YES
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	NO
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	NO
38	TENNESSEE PSC	NO
39	TEXAS PUC	NO
40	TEXAS RC	NO
41	UTAH PSC	NO
42	VIRGINIA SCC	NO
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	NO
45	WISCONSIN PSC	NO
46	WYOMING PSC	NO

6. If the answer to No. 5 is yes, list below the number of persons contracted for in that position classification.

		AC	RA	AT	EC	AE	EN
1	ALABAMA PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
2	ALASKA PUC	4	N/R	2	N/R	N/R	6
3	ARIZONA CC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
4	ARKANSAS PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
6	COLORADO PUC	N/R	N/R	4	N/R	N/R	N/R
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
8	DELAWARE PSC	N/R	N/R	1	N/R	N/R	N/R
9	FLORIDA PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
10	GEORGIA PSC	N/R	N/R	0	N/R	N/R	N/R
11	HAWAII PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
12	IDAHO PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
13	ILLINOIS CC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
14	IOWA SCC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
15	INDIANA PSC	N/R	N/R	1	N/R	N/R	N/R
16	KANSAS SCC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
17	KENTUCKY PSC	N/R	N/R	1	N/R	N/R	N/R
18	LOUISIANA PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
19	MAINE PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
20	MARYLAND PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
21	MICHIGAN PSC	N/R	N/R	10	N/R	N/R	N/R
22	MINNESOTA PUC	N/R	N/R	0	N/R	0	N/R
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
24	MISSOURI PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
25	MONTANA PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
26	NEBRASKA PSC	N/R	N/R	1	N/R	N/R	N/R
27	NEVADA PSC	N/R	N/R	2	N/R	N/R	N/R
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	N/R	N/R	1	N/R	N/R	N/R
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
31	NEW YORK PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
34	OHIO PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
35	OREGON PUC	N/R	N/R	3	N/R	N/R	N/R
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
38	TENNESSEE PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
39	TEXAS PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
40	TEXAS RC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
41	UTAH PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
42	VIRGINIA SCC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
43	WASHINGTON UTC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	1
45	WISCONSIN PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
46	WYOMING PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R

7. (A) What was the amount of the 1980 total agency budget? \$ _____

		<u>Budget</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	3168748
2	ALASKA PUC	2101755
3	ARIZONA CC	6370100
4	ARKANSAS PSC	2321956
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	37032871
6	COLORADO PUC	2900000
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	2689000
8	DELAWARE PSC	1284700
9	FLORIDA PSC	11214009
10	GEORGIA PSC	3300263
11	HAWAII PUC	525000
12	IDAHO PUC	2290700
13	ILLINOIS CC	7274700
14	IOWA SCC	3032793
15	INDIANA PSC	2404974
16	KANSAS SCC	6374602
17	KENTUCKY PSC	2400000
18	LOUISIANA PSC	2023459
19	MAINE PUC	1779620
20	MARYLAND PSC	3821266
21	MICHIGAN PSC	12684400
22	MINNESOTA PUC	986100
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	1987852
24	MISSOURI PSC	7281945
25	MONTANA PSC	1022112
26	NEBRASKA PSC	1100000
27	NEVADA PSC	2014500
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	32485
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	4536845
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	1670000
31	NEW YORK PSC	22549700
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	2415051
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	6342324
34	OHIO PUC	9899688
35	OREGON PUC	2369992
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	17260000
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	3721811
38	TENNESSEE PSC	3500000
39	TEXAS PUC	3014952
40	TEXAS RC	1723828
41	UTAH PSC	NO RESPONSE
42	VIRGINIA SCC	12600000
43	WASHINGTON UTC	7420887
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	5031751
45	WISCONSIN PSC	4350190
46	WYOMING PSC	1679524

8. (A) Does the budget in 7(A) exclude major outlay items provided in-kind by other state budgetary agencies, such as annual office rent?
 Yes _____ No _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	NO
2	ALASKA PUC	NO
3	ARIZONA CC	NO
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	NO
6	COLORADO PUC	NO
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	NO
8	DELAWARE PSC	NO
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES
10	GEORGIA PSC	NO
11	HAWAII PUC	NO
12	IDAHO PUC	NO
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES
14	IOWA SCC	YES
15	INDIANA PSC	YES
16	KANSAS SCC	NO
17	KENTUCKY PSC	NO
18	LOUISIANA PSC	YES
19	MAINE PUC	NO
20	MARYLAND PSC	NO
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	NO
24	MISSOURI PSC	NO
25	MONTANA PSC	NO
26	NEBRASKA PSC	YES
27	NEVADA PSC	YES
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	YES
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES
31	NEW YORK PSC	NO
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES
34	OHIO PUC	NO
35	OREGON PUC	NO
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	NO
38	TENNESSEE PSC	NO
39	TEXAS PUC	YES
40	TEXAS RC	NO
41	UTAH PSC	YES
42	VIRGINIA SCC	YES
43	WASHINGTON UTC	NO
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	NO
45	WISCONSIN PSC	NO
46	WYOMING PSC	YES

9. Are new non-resident employees reimbursed for moving expenses when initially employed? Yes _____ No _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	NO
2	ALASKA PUC	YES
3	ARIZONA CC	NO
4	ARKANSAS PSC	NO
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	NO
6	COLORADO PUC	NO
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	NO
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES
9	FLORIDA PSC	NO
10	GEORGIA PSC	NO
11	HAWAII PUC	NO
12	IDAHO PUC	YES
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES
14	IOWA SCC	NO
15	INDIANA PSC	NO
16	KANSAS SCC	YES
17	KENTUCKY PSC	NO
18	LOUISIANA PSC	NO
19	MAINE PUC	NO
20	MARYLAND PSC	NO
21	MICHIGAN PSC	NO
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	NO
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES
25	MONTANA PSC	N/R
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO
27	NEVADA PSC	NO
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	NO
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	NO
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	NO
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES
34	OHIO PUC	NO
35	OREGON PUC	YES
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	NO
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	NO
38	TENNESSEE PSC	NO
39	TEXAS PUC	NO
40	TEXAS RC	NO
41	UTAH PSC	NO
42	VIRGINIA SCC	YES
43	WASHINGTON UTC	NO
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	NO
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES
46	WYOMING PSC	NO

10. Are there any specific rules or regulations affecting the attraction or retention of staff, such as (a) employment of state residents only? (b) reimbursement for travel cost and per diem? Yes _____
 No _____ (c) Others (list)?

	(a)	(b)	(c)	
1	ALABAMA PSC	NO	YES	UPWARD MOBILITY
2	ALASKA PUC	NO	YES	N/R
3	ARIZONA CC	NO	YES	N/R
4	ARKANSAS PSC	NO	NO	N/R
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	NO	YES	PAID JOB REQD TRAINING
6	COLORADO PUC	YES	YES	N/R
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	NO	YES	N/R
8	DELAWARE PSC	NO	YES	N/R
9	FLORIDA PSC	NO	YES	N/R
10	GEORGIA PSC	NO	YES	N/R
11	HAWAII PUC	NO	NO	N/R
12	IDAHO PUC	NO	YES	MOVING POLICY
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES	YES	N/R
14	IOWA SCC	NO	YES	N/R
15	INDIANA PSC	NO	YES	N/R
16	KANSAS SCC	NO	YES	N/R
17	KENTUCKY PSC	NO	YES	JOB SECURITY
18	LOUISIANA PSC	NO	YES	UPWARD MOBILITY
19	MAINE PUC	YES	N/R	FRINGE BENEFITS
20	MARYLAND PSC	NO	NO	2YR COOLING OFF TO & FROM
21	MICHIGAN PSC	NO	YES	N/R
22	MINNESOTA PUC	NO	YES	N/R
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	NO	YES	N/R
24	MISSOURI PSC	NO	YES	N/R
25	MONTANA PSC	NO	YES	EXEMPT FROM ST PAY
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO	YES	FRINGE BENEFITS
27	NEVADA PSC	YES	YES	FRINGE BENEFITS
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	NO	YES	N/R
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	NO	YES	N/R
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	NO	NO	N/R
31	NEW YORK PSC	NO	YES	N/R
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	NO	YES	N/R
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	NO	YES	N/R
34	OHIO PUC	NO	YES	N/R
35	OREGON PUC	NO	N/R	REQUITMENT & EEO
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	NO	YES	RULE OF 3 APPOINT
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	NO	YES	N/R
38	TENNESSEE PSC	NO	YES	N/R
39	TEXAS PUC	NO	YES	N/R
40	TEXAS RC	NO	YES	N/R
41	UTAH PSC	NO	YES	N/R
42	VIRGINIA SCC	NO	YES	N/R
43	WASHINGTON UTC	NO	YES	FRINGE BENEFITS
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	NO	YES	N/R
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES	YES	N/R
46	WYOMING PSC	NO	NO	N/R

11. Is there a position description for each of the following professional positions? (a) accountant? (b) rate analyst? (c) attorney? (d) economist? (e) auditor/examiner? (f) engineer? Yes _____

No _____

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
1 ALABAMA PSC	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
2 ALASKA PUC	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
3 ARIZONA CC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
4 ARKANSAS PSC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
5 CALIFORNIA PUC	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
6 COLORADO PUC	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
7 CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
8 DELAWARE PSC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
9 FLORIDA PSC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
10 GEORGIA PSC	N/R	YES	N/R	YES	YES	N/R
11 HAWAII PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	YES	YES
12 IDAHO PUC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
13 ILLINOIS CC	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES
14 IOWA SCC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
15 INDIANA PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
16 KANSAS SCC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
17 KENTUCKY PSC	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
18 LOUISIANA PSC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
19 MAINE PUC	YES	YES	YES	N/R	N/R	YES
20 MARYLAND PSC	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
21 MICHIGAN PSC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
22 MINNESOTA PUC	N/R	YES	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
23 MISSISSIPPI PSC	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
24 MISSOURI PSC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
25 MONTANA PSC	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
26 NEBRASKA PSC	YES	YES	YES	N/R	YES	YES
27 NEVADA PSC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
28 NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES	N/R	N/R	YES	YES	YES
29 NEW JERSEY BPU	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
30 NEW MEXICO PSC	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
31 NEW YORK PSC	YES	YES	YES	YES	N/R	YES
32 NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
33 NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
34 OHIO PUC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
35 OREGON PUC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
36 PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
37 SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
38 TENNESSEE PSC	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
39 TEXAS PUC	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES
40 TEXAS RC	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
41 UTAH PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
42 VIRGINIA SCC	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
43 WASHINGTON UTC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
44 WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
45 WISCONSIN PSC	N/R	N/R	YES	YES	YES	N/R
46 WYOMING PSC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

12. What is the approximate dollar amount of funding in the commission travel budget? \$ _____

		<u>Budget</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	205000
2	ALASKA PUC	67656
3	ARIZONA CC	207400
4	ARKANSAS PSC	126760
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	UNCODED
6	COLORADO PUC	47000
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	15000
8	DELAWARE PSC	20500
9	FLORIDA PSC	512096
10	GEORGIA PSC	121750
11	HAWAII PUC	26000
12	IDAHO PUC	90000
13	ILLINOIS CC	340200
14	IOWA SCC	196000
15	INDIANA PSC	98000
16	KANSAS SCC	271475
17	KENTUCKY PSC	138000
18	LOUISIANA PSC	98928
19	MAINE PUC	10000
20	MARYLAND PSC	48000
21	MICHIGAN PSC	736000
22	MINNESOTA PUC	16300
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	322042
24	MISSOURI PSC	525430
25	MONTANA PSC	25752
26	NEBRASKA PSC	220000
27	NEVADA PSC	100000
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	NO RESPONSE
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	38000
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	64000
31	NEW YORK PSC	680000
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	57828
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	192029
34	OHIO PUC	NO RESPONSE
35	OREGON PUC	66877
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	190000
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	372000
38	TENNESSEE PSC	252000
39	TEXAS PUC	116802
40	TEXAS RC	10760
41	UTAH PSC	11000
42	VIRGINIA SCC	NO RESPONSE
43	WASHINGTON UTC	144000
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	181500
45	WISCONSIN PSC	85295
46	WYOMING PSC	NO RESPONSE

13. (A) Since FY 1980, were there limitations placed upon staff travel, such as for out-of-state trips? Yes _____ No _____
 (B) Indicate briefly the nature of the limitations.

	A	B	
1	ALABAMA PSC	NO	N/R
2	ALASKA PUC	YES	BUDGET
3	ARIZONA CC	YES	BUDGET
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES	SPECIAL APPROVAL
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES	SPECIAL APPROVAL
6	COLORADO PUC	NO	BUDGET
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES	BUDGET
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES	BUDGET
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES	BUDGET
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES	BUDGET
11	HAWAII PUC	NO	N/R
12	IDAHO PUC	NO	N/R
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES	SPECIAL APPROVAL
14	IOWA SCC	YES	UNCODED
15	INDIANA PSC	NO	N/R
16	KANSAS SCC	NO	N/R
17	KENTUCKY PSC	NO	SPECIAL APPROVAL
18	LOUISIANA PSC	NO	N/R
19	MAINE PUC	YES	BUDGET
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES	BUDGET
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES	NO OF TRIPS LIMITED
22	MINNESOTA PUC	NO	N/R
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	NO	N/R
24	MISSOURI PSC	NO	N/R
25	MONTANA PSC	YES	BUDGET
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO	N/R
27	NEVADA PSC	NO	N/R
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES	SPECIAL APPROVAL
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	NO	N/R
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	NO	N/R
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES	SPECIAL APPROVAL
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES	NO OF TRIPS LIMITED
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES	BUDGET
34	OHIO PUC	YES	NO OF TRIPS LIMITED
35	OREGON PUC	YES	BUDGET
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES	NO OF TRIPS LIMITED
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	NO	N/R
38	TENNESSEE PSC	NO	SPECIAL APPROVAL
39	TEXAS PUC	NO	N/R
40	TEXAS RC	NO	N/R
41	UTAH PSC	NO	N/R
42	VIRGINIA SCC	NO	N/R
43	WASHINGTON UTC	NO	N/R
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES	SPECIAL APPROVAL
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES	BUDGET
46	WYOMING PSC	YES	BUDGET

14. Has the commission, for budgetary reasons, been "turned down" in recent years on either of the following kinds of requests:

(a) staffing increases? Yes _____ No _____
 (b) increases in professional staff compensation? Yes _____ No _____

	(a)	(b)	
1	ALABAMA PSC	NO	NO
2	ALASKA PUC	YES	NO
3	ARIZONA CC	YES	YES
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES	YES
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES	N/R
6	COLORADO PUC	YES	NO
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES	YES
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES	YES
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES	YES
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES	NO
11	HAWAII PUC	YES	NO
12	IDAHO PUC	YES	N/R
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES	NO
14	IOWA SCC	YES	YES
15	INDIANA PSC	YES	YES
16	KANSAS SCC	NO	NO
17	KENTUCKY PSC	NO	NO
18	LOUISIANA PSC	YES	YES
19	MAINE PUC	YES	YES
20	MARYLAND PSC	N/R	N/R
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES	YES
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES	NO
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	YES	YES
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES	YES
25	MONTANA PSC	YES	YES
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO	NO
27	NEVADA PSC	YES	YES
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES	NO
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	NO	NO
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES	YES
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES	N/R
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES	YES
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES	NO
34	OHIO PUC	YES	NO
35	OREGON PUC	NO	NO
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES	YES
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES	NO
38	TENNESSEE PSC	YES	NO
39	TEXAS PUC	YES	YES
40	TEXAS RC	YES	NO
41	UTAH PSC	YES	NO
42	VIRGINIA SCC	NO	NO
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES	YES
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES	NO
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES	NO
46	WYOMING PSC	NO	YES

15. What is the total number of agency staff members? _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	128
2	ALASKA PUC	41
3	ARIZONA CC	191
4	ARKANSAS PSC	78
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	974
6	COLORADO PUC	95
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	112
8	DELAWARE PSC	14
9	FLORIDA PSC	296
10	GEORGIA PSC	110
11	HAWAII PUC	17
12	IDAHO PUC	61
13	ILLINOIS CC	286
14	IOWA SCC	126
15	INDIANA PSC	94
16	KANSAS SCC	193
17	KENTUCKY PSC	77
18	LOUISIANA PSC	86
19	MAINE PUC	70
20	MARYLAND PSC	117
21	MICHIGAN PSC	337
22	MINNESOTA PUC	26
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	74
24	MISSOURI PSC	250
25	MONTANA PSC	34
26	NEBRASKA PUC	57
27	NEVADA PSC	71
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	40
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	251
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	41
31	NEW YORK PSC	648
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	76
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	61
34	OHIO PUC	333
35	OREGON PUC	346
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	527
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	145
38	TENNESSEE PSC	155
39	TEXAS PUC	118
40	TEXAS RC	55
41	UTAH PSC	6
42	VIRGINIA SCC	450
43	WASHINGTON UTC	203
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	166
45	WISCONSIN PSC	158
46	WYOMING PSC	44

16. Please fill in the information requested for the following classes of key professional staff:

Position	Pay Range		Approximate Number Presently Employed	Average Salary	Estimated Dollar Value of Fringe Benefits (or percent of salaries)	Average Salary Increase from previous year
	Maximum	Minimum				
(a) Accountant						
(b) Rate Analyst						
(c) Attorney						
(d) Economist						
(e) Auditor/ Examiner						
(f) Engineer						

16. (continued)
(a) Accountant

		<u>Max</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Avg</u>	<u>FB</u>	<u>Inc</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	31369	15171	6	21407	19	7
2	ALASKA PUC	.	.	7	38863	29	24
3	ARIZONA CC
4	ARKANSAS PSC
5	CALIFORNIA PUC
6	COLORADO PUC	31860	23784	.	23784	.	15
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	20706	17395	2	19602	33	11
8	DELAWARE PSC	29800	18800
9	FLORIDA PSC	19210	12820	2	16230	30	9
10	GEORGIA PSC
11	HAWAII PUC
12	IDAHO PUC	.	.	8	21300	23	7
13	ILLINOIS CC	41088	12804	17	23028	20	.
14	IOWA SCC	26686	20883	3	22714	12	.
15	INDIANA PSC	33000	14000	12	20100	20	8
16	KANSAS SCC
17	KENTUCKY PSC
18	LOUISIANA PSC	20280	13572	2	18930	25	5
19	MAINE PUC	21900	12376	6	17971	18	3
20	MARYLAND PSC	23760	15591	2	21250	40	7
21	MICHIGAN PSC	23636	16954	1	20295	38	9
22	MINNESOTA PUC
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	31116	22172	0	.	.	.
24	MISSOURI PSC	32500	16963	29	18500	.	3
25	MONTANA PSC	25400	19286	.	20287	18	5
26	NEBRASKA PSC	.	.	2	13601	18	7
27	NEVADA PSC
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	28086	13408	28	19015	21	5
30	NEW MEXICO PSC
31	NEW YORK PSC	43930	14045	65	28900	30	7
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	39756	17028	7	27000	15	10
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	34236	23172	1	21656	16	8
34	OHIO PUC	20000	11900	32	15600	21	5
35	OREGON PUC	19884	14184	3	18972	27	10
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	.	.	0	.	.	.
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	31716	13976	13	20315	15	11
38	TENNESSEE PSC	23952	14472	10	.	.	.
39	TEXAS PUC	35028	16980	10	23390	28	.
40	TEXAS RC
41	UTAH PSC
42	VIRGINIA SCC	26190	14670	8	19858	31	12
43	WASHINGTON UTC	34416	12504	12	24324	19	5
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	41196	13704	31	20896	37	10
45	WISCONSIN PSC
46	WYOMING PSC	.	.	1	.	.	9

16. (continued)
 (b) Rate Analyst

	<u>Max</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Avg</u>	<u>FB</u>	<u>Inc</u>	
1	ALABAMA PSC	24232	16172	14	20709	19	7
2	ALASKA PUC	.	.	3	32756	29	0
3	ARIZONA CC	28644	21078	2	24567	.	5
4	ARKANSAS PSC	26624	14846	7	20000	22	20
5	CALIFORNIA PUC
6	COLORADO PUC	31860	13236	5	17736	.	15
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	22812	18718	2	19741	33	11
8	DELAWARE PSC	33600	21600	1	23078	25	.
9	FLORIDA PSC	28439	13614	14	21428	29	6
10	GEORGIA PSC	39108	17058	9	24768	26	13
11	HAWAII PUC
12	IDAHO PUC	.	.	2	23500	23	7
13	ILLINOIS CC
14	IOWA SCC	30867	24378	4	28170	12	.
15	INDIANA PSC
16	KANSAS SCC	27000	18000	7	25000	15	9
17	KENTUCKY PSC	33312	15288	7	18854	15	15
18	LOUISIANA PSC	29076	13572	2	18624	20	5
19	MAINE PUC	18054	13915	1	18054	18	0
20	MARYLAND PSC	20473	13455	2	18960	40	8
21	MICHIGAN PSC	34535	18249	9	26392	38	9
22	MINNESOTA PUC	32094	15205	6	23657	17	.
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	29307	17014	2	19007	18	8
24	MISSOURI PSC	32500	21879	5	25000	.	2
25	MONTANA PSC	23306	17684	1	18991	18	5
26	NEBRASKA PSC	.	.	2	16558	18	7
27	NEVADA PSC	.	.	1	.	15	.
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	28086	13408	14	18500	21	5
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	31752	18576	3	24900	16	13
31	NEW YORK PSC	40329	14045	14	27100	30	7
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC
34	OHIO PUC	19000	14000	12	17000	21	5
35	OREGON PUC	32508	19956	13	28636	27	13
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	31824	14142	66	22197	37	8
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	21426	15116	1	18108	15	11
38	TENNESSEE PSC	23952	15036	2	.	.	.
39	TEXAS PUC
40	TEXAS RC	26052	19380	3	.	.	.
41	UTAH PSC
42	VIRGINIA SCC
43	WASHINGTON UTC	28248	19500	4	24984	19	5
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	41196	13704	10	24896	37	10
45	WISCONSIN PSC	26354	14810	13	19677	22	7
46	WYOMING PSC	.	.	6	.	.	9

16. (continued)
(c) Attorney

		<u>Max</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Avg</u>	<u>FB</u>	<u>Inc</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	44369	17134	4	31079	19	7
2	ALASKA PUC
3	ARIZONA CC
4	ARKANSAS PSC	28288	17940	4	20000	22	20
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	49260	21900	38	.	30	10
6	COLORADO PUC
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA
8	DELAWARE PSC	.	29300	1	29300	25	9
9	FLORIDA PSC	37333	15284	17	25501	29	7
10	GEORGIA PSC
11	HAWAII PUC
12	IDAHO PUC	.	.	6	22600	23	7
13	ILLINOIS CC	44016	13464	18	30840	20	.
14	IOWA SCC	39437	30867	4	35948	12	.
15	INDIANA PSC	27000	18000	10	21700	20	8
16	KANSAS SCC	35000	18000	13	25000	15	11
17	KENTUCKY PSC	39000	9384	4	28431	15	15
18	LOUISIANA PSC	.	.	1	39888	11	5
19	MAINE PUC	27768	19614	9	21867	18	4
20	MARYLAND PSC	29781	19483	4	24690	40	10
21	MICHIGAN PSC	44704	16954	16	30829	38	9
22	MINNESOTA PUC
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	31999	31999	1	31999	17	.
24	MISSOURI PSC	32550	17740	15	22000	.	2
25	MONTANA PSC	27668	14763	3	23035	18	5
26	NEBRASKA PSC	.	.	2	21006	18	7
27	NEVADA PSC	.	.	7	.	15	.
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	39522	26551	10	29000	21	5
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	40536	24900	3	31752	16	13
31
32	NEW YORK PSC	44887	19505	26	32200	30	7
33	NORTH CAROLINA UC	45852	24684	4	34000	15	10
34	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	39624	18156	3	30660	16	8
35	OHIO PUC	33000	14000	32	24000	21	5
36	OREGON PUC	39540	29484	4	39540	27	10
37	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	38494	18328	69	26267	37	8
38	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	38885	17004	5	18192	15	11
39	TENNESSEE PSC	30744	26400	3	.	.	.
40	TEXAS PUC	35028	15888	14	22983	27	6
41	TEXAS RC	27840	16980	9	.	.	.
42	UTAH PSC
43	VIRGINIA SCC	40890	20960	9	29657	31	12
44	WASHINGTON UTC	34416	25584	7	33384	19	5
45	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	41196	16464	26	19907	37	10
46	WISCONSIN PSC	44866	19115	4	30389	22	7
47	WYOMING PSC	.	.	5	.	.	9

16. (continued)
(d) Economist

	<u>Max</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Avg</u>	<u>FB</u>	<u>Inc</u>
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						
33						
34						
35						
36						
37						
38						
39						
40						
41						
42						
43						
44						
45						
46						

16. (continued)
 (e) Auditor/Examiner

		<u>Max</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Avg</u>	<u>FB</u>	<u>Inc</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	28626	15665	8	21110	19	7
2	ALASKA PUC
3	ARIZONA CC	23691	18035
4	ARKANSAS PSC	26624	14846	14	20000	22	20
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	45444	14904	50	.	30	10
6	COLORADO PUC
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	27411	17395	16	24641	33	11
8	DELAWARE PSC	24800	13300	3	14168	25	9
9	FLORIDA PSC	28439	13614	50	20160	30	6
10	GEORGIA PSC	28704	13278	13	15156	26	13
11	HAWAII PUC
12	IDAHO PUC
13	ILLINOIS CC
14	IOWA SCC	24222	19386	5	21590	12	.
15	INDIANA PSC
16	INDIANA PSC
17	KANSAS SCC	32000	18000	12	25000	15	9
18	KENTUCKY PSC	27420	12576	8	17025	15	15
19	LOUISIANA PSC	33372	13080	2	24456	21	5
20	MAINE PUC
21	MARYLAND PSC	37516	14482	18	23805	40	7
22	MICHIGAN PSC	34535	14469	27	24502	38	9
23	MINNESOTA PUC
24	MISSISSIPPI PSC	24731	12937	4	15636	19	8
25	MISSOURI PSC	18063	14871	3	15000	.	3
26	MONTANA PSC	17936	13570	1	14890	18	5
27	NEBRASKA PSC
28	NEVADA PSC	.	.	13	.	15	.
29	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC
30	NEW JERSEY BPU	25474	14078	7	18000	21	5
31	NEW MEXICO PSC	24900	14964	3	18576	16	13
32	NEW YORK PSC
33	NORTH CAROLINA UC
34	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	31044	21024	1	31044	16	8
35	OHIO PUC	20000	12000	14	17000	21	5
36	OREGON PUC	28068	19956	4	22728	27	6
37	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	30494	14142	27	21236	37	8
38	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	24101	13976	6	17579	15	11
39	TENNESSEE PSC	.	.	0	.	.	.
40	TEXAS PUC
41	TEXAS RC	26052	14868	6	.	.	.
42	UTAH PSC
43	VIRGINIA SCC	31290	22910	4	27097	31	12
44	WASHINGTON UTC
45	WEST VIRGINIA PCC
46	WISCONSIN PSC	40518	19115	2	31970	22	7
47	WYOMING PSC

16. (continued)
(f) Engineer

		<u>Max</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Avg</u>	<u>FB</u>	<u>Inc</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	32877	14729	18	20225	19	7
2	ALASKA PUC	.	.	5	43524	29	22
3	ARIZONA CC	34394	23137	5	26894	.	3
4	ARKANSAS PSC	26624	16822	6	20000	22	20
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	44388	18696	198	.	30	10
6	COLORADO PUC	39324	28908	10	33456	.	.
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	27411	17395	18	23745	33	11
8	DELAWARE PSC	22700	14500	1	17340	25	9
9	FLORIDA PSC	34870	15284	47	23075	28	9
10	GEORGIA PSC	35742	19386	7	23304	26	13
11	HAWAII PUC
12	IDAHO PUC	.	.	5	24500	23	7
13	ILLINOIS CC	41088	15732	15	27120	20	.
14	IOWA SCC	32406	25563	5	31812	12	.
15	INDIANA PSC	33200	18000	13	22800	20	8
16	KANSAS SCC	26000	16000	4	24000	15	9
17	KENTUCKY PSC	33312	18588	5	27845	15	5
18	LOUISIANA PSC	36288	22536	3	.	28	5
19	MAINE PUC	28932	20914	7	25609	18	2
20	MARYLAND PSC	37516	14482	10	27335	40	7
21	MICHIGAN PSC	35976	16787	26	26382	38	9
22	MINNESOTA PUC
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	34380	18699	2	24543	16	8
24	MISSOURI PSC	26399	20481	11	22000	.	2
25	MONTANA PSC	19473	14763	1	19097	18	5
26	NEBRASKA PSC	.	.	1	20800	18	7
27	NEVADA PSC	.	.	5	.	15	.
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	28086	16258	9	23000	21	5
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	40536	23700	3	30240	16	13
31	NEW YORK PSC	39770	16100	115	27900	30	7
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	32820	22428	1	25000	15	10
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	39624	15684	6	24768	16	7
34	OHIO PUC	32000	15000	13	20500	21	5
35	OREGON PUC	30996	19008	11	28516	27	9
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	31824	14142	30	24718	37	8
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	32985	15116	8	20683	15	11
38	TENNESSEE PSC	31200	20832	1	.	.	.
39	TEXAS PUC	35028	16980	12	27995	29	22
40	TEXAS RC	27840	20712	7	.	.	.
41	UTAH PSC
42	VIRGINIA SCC	37400	22910	6	26227	31	12
43	WASHINGTON UTC	32748	23184	6	30744	19	5
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	54888	12516	15	23220	37	10
45	WISCONSIN PSC	31034	16806	20	22422	22	7
46	WYOMING PSC	.	.	6	.	.	9

17. Which of the following best describes how the professional staff receives increases in salary: (a) increases are on a merit basis? (b) annual step increases? (c) annual cost of living adjustments (COLA)? (d) partially merit, partially step, partially COLA?

		<u>Response</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	COMBINATION
2	ALASKA PUC	COMBINATION
3	ARIZONA CC	COMBINATION
4	ARKANSAS PSC	COMBINATION
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	COMBINATION
6	COLORADO PUC	COMBINATION
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	UNION
8	DELAWARE PSC	COLA
9	FLORIDA PSC	COMBINATION
10	GEORGIA PSC	COMBINATION
11	HAWAII PUC	UNION
12	IDAHO PUC	COLA
13	ILLINOIS CC	MERIT
14	IOWA SCC	COMBINATION
15	INDIANA PSC	COMBINATION
16	KANSAS SCC	COMBINATION
17	KENTUCKY PSC	COMBINATION
18	LOUISIANA PSC	COMBINATION
19	MAINE PUC	COMBINATION
20	MARYLAND PSC	COMBINATION
21	MICHIGAN PSC	COMBINATION
22	MINNESOTA PUC	COMBINATION
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	COMBINATION
24	MISSOURI PSC	COMBINATION
25	MONTANA PSC	COMBINATION
26	NEBRASKA PSC	COMBINATION
27	NEVADA PSC	COMBINATION
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	COMBINATION
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	STEP
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	COMBINATION
31	NEW YORK PSC	COMBINATION
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	COMBINATION
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	COMBINATION
34	OHIO PUC	COMBINATION
35	OREGON PUC	UNION
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	UNION
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	COMBINATION
38	TENNESSEE PSC	COMBINATION
39	TEXAS PUC	COMBINATION
40	TEXAS RC	COMBINATION
41	UTAH PSC	COMBINATION
42	VIRGINIA SCC	COMBINATION
43	WASHINGTON UTC	COMBINATION
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	COMBINATION
45	WISCONSIN PSC	COMBINATION
46	WYOMING PSC	COMBINATION

18. On the average how often are these increases granted?
annually, semi-annually, other (describe)

		<u>Response</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	OTHER
2	ALASKA PUC	OTHER
3	ARIZONA CC	ANNUALLY
4	ARKANSAS PSC	ANNUALLY
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	ANNUALLY
6	COLORADO PUC	ANNUALLY
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	ANNUALLY
8	DELAWARE PSC	ANNUALLY
9	FLORIDA PSC	ANNUALLY
10	GEORGIA PSC	ANNUALLY
11	HAWAII PUC	ANNUALLY
12	IDAHO PUC	ANNUALLY
13	ILLINOIS CC	ANNUALLY
14	IOWA SCC	ANNUALLY
15	INDIANA PSC	ANNUALLY
16	KANSAS SCC	ANNUALLY
17	KENTUCKY PSC	ANNUALLY
18	LOUISIANA PSC	ANNUALLY
19	MAINE PUC	ANNUALLY
20	MARYLAND PSC	ANNUALLY
21	MICHIGAN PSC	ANNUALLY
22	MINNESOTA PUC	OTHER
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	ANNUALLY
24	MISSOURI PSC	ANNUALLY
25	MONTANA PSC	ANNUALLY
26	NEBRASKA PSC	ANNUALLY
27	NEVADA PSC	ANNUALLY
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	ANNUALLY
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	ANNUALLY
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	ANNUALLY
31	NEW YORK PSC	COMBINATION
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	ANNUALLY
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	ANNUALLY
34	OHIO PUC	ANNUALLY
35	OREGON PUC	COMBINATION
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	ANNUALLY
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	ANNUALLY
38	TENNESSEE PSC	ANNUALLY
39	TEXAS PUC	SEMIANNUALLY
40	TEXAS RC	COMBINATION
41	UTAH PSC	ANNUALLY
42	VIRGINIA SCC	ANNUALLY
43	WASHINGTON UTC	ANNUALLY
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	ANNUALLY
45	WISCONSIN PSC	ANNUALLY
46	WYOMING PSC	ANNUALLY

19. (A) Is the commission restricted from employing former professional staff of the regulated utilities? Yes _____ No _____
 (B) If yes, what is the restriction?

	A	B	
1	ALABAMA PSC	NO	N/R
2	ALASKA PUC	NO	N/R
3	ARIZONA CC	NO	N/R
4	ARKANSAS PSC	NO	N/R
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	NO	N/R
6	COLORADO PUC	NO	N/R
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	NO	N/R
8	DELAWARE PSC	NO	N/R
9	FLORIDA PSC	NO	N/R
10	GEORGIA PSC	NO	N/R
11	HAWAII PUC	NO	N/R
12	IDAHO PUC	NO	N/R
13	ILLINOIS CC	NO	N/R
14	IOWA SCC	NO	N/R
15	INDIANA PSC	NO	N/R
16	KANSAS SCC	NO	N/R
17	KENTUCKY PSC	NO	N/R
18	LOUISIANA PSC	NO	N/R
19	MAINE PUC	YES	CONFLICT OF INTEREST
20	MARYLAND PSC	NO	N/R
21	MICHIGAN PSC	NO	N/R
22	MINNESOTA PUC	NO	N/R
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	NO	N/R
24	MISSOURI PSC	NO	N/R
25	MONTANA PSC	NO	N/R
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO	N/R
27	NEVADA PSC	NO	N/R
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	NO	N/R
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	NO	N/R
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	NO	N/R
31	NEW YORK PSC	NO	N/R
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	NO	N/R
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	NO	N/R
34	OHIO PUC	NO	N/R
35	OREGON PUC	NO	N/R
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	NO	N/R
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	NO	N/R
38	TENNESSEE PSC	NO	N/R
39	TEXAS PUC	NO	N/R
40	TEXAS RC	NO	N/R
41	UTAH PSC	NO	N/R
42	VIRGINIA SCC	NO	N/R
43	WASHINGTON UTC	NO	N/R
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	NO	N/R
45	WISCONSIN PSC	NO	N/R
46	WYOMING PSC	NO	N/R

20. Can the regulated utilities employ former commission professional staff? Yes _____ No _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	YES
2	ALASKA PUC	YES
3	ARIZONA CC	YES
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES
6	COLORADO PUC	YES
7	CONNECTICUT-PUCA	YES
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES
11	HAWAII PUC	YES
12	IDAHO PUC	YES
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES
14	IOWA SCC	YES
15	INDIANA PSC	YES
16	KANSAS SCC	YES
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES
18	LOUISIANA PSC	YES
19	MAINE PUC	YES
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	YES
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES
25	MONTANA PSC	YES
26	NEBRASKA PSC	YES
27	NEVADA PSC	YES
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	NO
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	YES
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES
34	OHIO PUC	YES
35	OREGON PUC	YES
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES
38	TENNESSEE PSC	YES
39	TEXAS PUC	YES
40	TEXAS RC	YES
41	UTAH PSC	YES
42	VIRGINIA SCC	YES
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES
46	WYOMING PSC	YES

21. If the answer to No. 20 is yes, is there a "cooling-off" period or comparable limitation upon that person's professional activity?
 Yes _____ No _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	NO
2	ALASKA PUC	NO
3	ARIZONA CC	NO
4	ARKANSAS PSC	NO
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	NO
6	COLORADO PUC	NO
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	NO
8	DELAWARE PSC	NO
9	FLORIDA PSC	NO
10	GEORGIA PSC	NO
11	HAWAII PUC	YES
12	IDAHO PUC	NO
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES
14	IOWA SCC	NO
15	INDIANA PSC	NO
16	KANSAS SCC	N/R
17	KENTUCKY PSC	NO
18	LOUISIANA PSC	YES
19	MAINE PUC	YES
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES
21	MICHIGAN PSC	NO
22	MINNESOTA PUC	NO
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	NO
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES
25	MONTANA PSC	NO
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO
27	NEVADA PSC	NO
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	N/R
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	NO
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	NO
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES
34	OHIO PUC	YES
35	OREGON PUC	NO
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES
38	TENNESSEE PSC	N/R
39	TEXAS PUC	YES
40	TEXAS RC	NO
41	UTAH PSC	NO
42	VIRGINIA SCC	N/R
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	NO
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES
46	WYOMING PSC	NO

22. What is the average tenure (years in the position) of the incumbents in the following positions: (a) accountant? (b) rate analyst? (c) attorney? (d) economist? (e) auditor/examiner? (f) engineer?

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
1 ALABAMA PSC	3	3	7	N/R	3	7
2 ALASKA PUC	2	2	N/R	N/R	N/R	9
3 ARIZONA CC	N/R	3	N/R	7	4	3
4 ARKANSAS PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
5 CALIFORNIA PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
6 COLORADO PUC	1	6	N/R	1	9	3
7 CONNECTICUT PUCA	12	2	N/R	1	4	12
8 DELAWARE PSC	25	0	5	N/R	1	2
9 FLORIDA PSC	8	6	5	3	7	4
10 GEORGIA PSC	N/R	7	N/R	N/R	2	5
11 HAWAII PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	6	10
12 IDAHO PUC	3	3	2	1	N/R	2
13 ILLINOIS CC	5	N/R	7	4	N/R	8
14 IOWA SCC	3	7	8	7	9	8
15 INDIANA PSC	5	N/R	7	N/R	N/R	6
16 KANSAS SCC	N/R	1	1	2	4	10
17 KENTUCKY PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
18 LOUISIANA PSC	12	10	13	N/R	8	30
19 MAINE PUC	12	2	2	2	N/R	11
20 MARYLAND PSC	3	18	3	N/R	6	12
21 MICHIGAN PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
22 MINNESOTA PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
23 MISSISSIPPI PSC	N/R	10	12	N/R	1	26
24 MISSOURI PSC	3	5	2	5	5	5
25 MONTANA PSC	1	2	2	1	N/R	5
26 NEBRASKA PSC	6	12	12	N/R	6	10
27 NEVADA PSC	N/R	5	2	2	2	10
28 NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	2	4	7
29 NEW JERSEY BPU	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
30 NEW MEXICO PSC	N/R	7	3	1	4	N/R
31 NEW YORK PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
32 NORTH CAROLINA UC	8	N/R	6	4	N/R	10
33 NORTH DAKOTA PSC	23	N/R	5	N/R	30	10
34 OHIO PUC	5	6	5	5	8	5
35 OREGON PUC	5	4	12	N/R	2	9
36 PENNSYLVANIA PUC	0	8	4	3	5	28
37 SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	7	5	3	5	3	7
38 TENNESSEE PSC	3	8	4	N/R	N/R	7
39 TEXAS PUC	2	N/R	2	1	N/R	3
40 TEXAS RC	N/R	2	3	N/R	2	4
41 UTAH PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
42 VIRGINIA SCC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
43 WASHINGTON UTC	11	8	11	2	N/R	7
44 WEST VIRGINIA PCC	8	10	4	N/R	N/R	4
45 WISCONSIN PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
46 WYOMING PSC	10	3	6	1	N/R	5

23. Has the average tenure (years in position) for the following positions increased, declined, or remained the same in the past 5 years? Check the appropriate space for each of the following positions:

(a) accountant (b) rate analyst (c) attorney (d) economist
 (e) auditor/examiner (f) engineer Increased, Decreased, Remained the same

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
1 ALABAMA PSC	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED
2 ALASKA PUC	INCREASED	INCREASED	N/R	INCREASED	N/R	INCREASED
3 ARIZONA CC	N/R	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	REMNAINED SAME	INCREASED	DECREASED
4 ARKANSAS PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
5 CALIFORNIA PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
6 COLORADO PUC	DECREASED	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	DECREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED
7 CONNECTICUT PUCA	REMNAINED SAME					
8 DELAWARE PSC	N/R	INCREASED	INCREASED	N/R	INCREASED	INCREASED
9 FLORIDA PSC	REMNAINED SAME	DECREASED	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	DECREASED	DECREASED
10 GEORGIA PSC	N/R	INCREASED	N/R	N/R	REMNAINED SAME	DECREASED
11 HAWAII PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME
12 IDAHO PUC	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	DECREASED
13 ILLINOIS CC	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	INCREASED	INCREASED	N/R	REMNAINED SAME
14 IOWA SCC	REMNAINED SAME	INCREASED	REMNAINED SAME	INCREASED	REMNAINED SAME	INCREASED
15 INDIANA PSC	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	N/R	INCREASED SAME
16 KANSAS SCC	DECREASED	DECREASED	DECREASED	DECREASED	DECREASED	DECREASED
17 KENTUCKY PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
18 LOUISIANA PSC	INCREASED	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	DECREASED	INCREASED
19 MAINE PUC	INCREASED	REMNAINED SAME	INCREASED	INCREASED	N/R	REMNAINED SAME
20 MARYLAND PSC	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED	N/R	INCREASED	INCREASED
21 MICHIGAN PSC	REMNAINED SAME					
22 MINNESOTA PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
23 MISSISSIPPI PSC	DECREASED	N/R	N/R	REMNAINED SAME	DECREASED	REMNAINED SAME
24 MISSOURI PSC	INCREASED	INCREASED	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	INCREASED
25 MONTANA PSC	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	DECREASED	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	INCREASED
26 NEBRASKA PSC	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	DECREASED	N/R	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME
27 NEVADA PSC	REMNAINED SAME					
28 NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	DECREASED	N/R	INCREASED	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	DECREASED
29 NEW JERSEY BPU	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED
30 NEW MEXICO PSC	DECREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED	DECREASED	N/R	DECREASED
31 NEW YORK PSC	DECREASED	DECREASED	DECREASED	DECREASED	N/R	DECREASED
32 NORTH CAROLINA UC	DECREASED	N/R	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	REMNAINED SAME
33 NORTH DAKOTA PSC	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME
34 OHIO PUC	DECREASED	DECREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED
35 OREGON PUC	REMNAINED SAME	DECREASED	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	DECREASED	REMNAINED SAME
36 PENNSYLVANIA PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
37 SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED	INCREASED
38 TENNESSEE PSC	DECREASED	INCREASED	DECREASED	N/R	N/R	INCREASED
39 TEXAS PUC	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	REMNAINED SAME	DECREASED	N/R	INCREASED
40 TEXAS RC	N/R	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME
41 UTAH PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
42 VIRGINIA SCC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
43 WASHINGTON UTC	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	DECREASED	N/R	REMNAINED SAME
44 WEST VIRGINIA PCC	INCREASED	INCREASED	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	N/R	REMNAINED SAME
45 WISCONSIN PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
46 WYOMING PSC	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	REMNAINED SAME	N/R	REMNAINED SAME

24. What was the approximate number of utility rate filings in 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980?

	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>
1 ALABAMA PSC	14	11	13	10
2 ALASKA PUC	26	22	21	32
3 ARIZONA CC	NO RESPONSE	109	98	98
4 ARKANSAS PSC	12	15	12	25
5 CALIFORNIA PUC	60	57	69	74
6 COLORADO PUC	50	52	54	60
7 CONNECTICUT PUCA	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
8 DELAWARE PSC	31	39	48	48
9 FLORIDA PSC	40	91	81	151
10 GEORGIA PSC	14	10	13	6
11 HAWAII PUC	3	3	3	4
12 IDAHO PUC	12	16	33	35
13 ILLINOIS CC	21	11	15	28
14 IOWA SCC	17	27	27	22
15 INDIANA PSC	365	359	314	322
16 KANSAS SCC	32	24	27	35
17 KENTUCKY PSC	155	104	108	154
18 LOUISIANA PSC	25	32	25	36
19 MAINE PUC	NO RESPONSE	31	38	54
20 MARYLAND PSC	137	149	129	110
21 MICHIGAN PSC	NO RESPONSE	466	366	445
22 MINNESOTA PUC	24	16	7	15
23 MISSISSIPPI PSC	30	37	41	46
24 MISSOURI PSC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
25 MONTANA PSC	53	49	47	80
26 NEBRASKA PSC	0	0	0	0
27 NEVADA PSC	80	50	50	50
28 NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
29 NEW JERSEY BPU	UNCODED	UNCODED	UNCODED	UNCODED
30 NEW MEXICO PSC	75	84	68	73
31 NEW YORK PSC	9	12	16	15
32 NORTH CAROLINA UC	12	12	6	7
33 NORTH DAKOTA PSC	4	2	2	4
34 OHIO PUC	58	34	46	50
35 OREGON PUC	21	10	21	23
36 PENNSYLVANIA PUC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
37 SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	51	24	28	24
38 TENNESSEE PSC	11	8	6	18
39 TEXAS PUC	224	175	176	177
40 TEXAS RC	541	253	375	428
41 UTAH PSC	225	250	275	300
42 VIRGINIA SCC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
43 WASHINGTON UTC	279	347	292	297
44 WEST VIRGINIA PCC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	220	224
45 WISCONSIN PSC	372	423	330	392
46 WYOMING PSC	147	159	179	262

25. What was the approximate number of inquiries from the public and consumer complaints during 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980?

	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>
1 ALABAMA PSC	2938	3910	3746	4397
2 ALASKA PUC	1975	1268	1179	1481
3 ARIZONA CC	NO RESPONSE	2835	3804	9726
4 ARKANSAS PSC	4160	3838	6077	7536
5 CALIFORNIA PUC	36900	40193	33240	53461
6 COLORADO PUC	5403	5795	6659	9690
7 CONNECTICUT PUCA	6399	11305	10894	19116
8 DELAWARE PSC	300	310	373	253
9 FLORIDA PSC	43915	45329	56118	61658
10 GEORGIA PSC	3986	4144	7200	7735
11 HAWAII PUC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
12 IDAHO PUC	1590	1900	2000	2200
13 ILLINOIS CC	6881	7403	14958	17679
14 IOWA SCC	973	789	1003	1277
15 INDIANA PSC	2349	2885	2685	2491
16 KANSAS SCC	520	520	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
17 KENTUCKY PSC	1549	1690	1641	1955
18 LOUISIANA PSC	3810	4100	5210	6181
19 MAINE PUC	2161	2624	2147	3612
20 MARYLAND PSC	2762	3381	3602	3033
21 MICHIGAN PSC	50000	50000	50000	50000
22 MINNESOTA PUC	3155	3189	3065	3850
23 MISSISSIPPI PSC	3710	3603	3744	4462
24 MISSOURI PSC	10266	7924	8247	10923
25 MONTANA PSC	592	809	1023	885
26 NEBRASKA PSC	138	151	143	235
27 NEVADA PSC	1800	2900	4000	4200
28 NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
29 NEW JERSEY BPU	13838	21620	27905	23455
30 NEW MEXICO PSC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
31 NEW YORK PSC	80546	70879	62653	61307
32 NORTH CAROLINA UC	3461	3358	1434	1733
33 NORTH DAKOTA PSC	1358	1422	1476	1542
34 OHIO PUC	17519	19321	15869	16852
35 OREGON PUC	5609	7127	5817	6328
36 PENNSYLVANIA PUC	NO RESPONSE	23190	25183	22466
37 SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	531	1586	1456	1738
38 TENNESSEE PSC	5786	6089	5594	5679
39 TEXAS PUC	4347	5278	6659	7000
40 TEXAS RC	191	729	1170	1272
41 UTAH PSC	75	100	125	150
42 VIRGINIA SCC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
43 WASHINGTON UTC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	2755
44 WEST VIRGINIA PCC	9205	9553	9726	9407
45 WISCONSIN PSC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	6485	7844
46 WYOMING PSC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE

26. Are there statutory requirements for the commission to file an annual (or other regular time period) report? Yes _____ No _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	YES
2	ALASKA PUC	YES
3	ARIZONA CC	YES
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES
6	COLORADO PUC	NO
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES
11	HAWAII PUC	YES
12	IDAHO PUC	YES
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES
14	IOWA SCC	YES
15	INDIANA PSC	NO
16	KANSAS SCC	YES
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES
18	LOUISIANA PSC	NO
19	MAINE PUC	YES
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES
22	MINNESOTA PUC	NO
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	YES
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES
25	MONTANA PSC	YES
26	NEBRASKA PSC	YES
27	NEVADA PSC	NO
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	YES
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES
34	OHIO PUC	YES
35	OREGON PUC	NO
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	NO
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES
38	TENNESSEE PSC	YES
39	TEXAS PUC	YES
40	TEXAS RC	YES
41	UTAH PSC	YES
42	VIRGINIA SCC	N/R
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES
46	WYOMING PSC	YES

27. Approximately what percent of staff time is allocated to preparation and presentation of testimony in any given year?

		<u>Response</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	10
2	ALASKA PUC	N/R
3	ARIZONA CC	40
4	ARKANSAS PSC	95
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	N/R
6	COLORADO PUC	15
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	N/R
8	DELAWARE PSC	20
9	FLORIDA PSC	25
10	GEORGIA PSC	N/R
11	HAWAII PUC	0
12	IDAHO PUC	N/R
13	ILLINOIS CC	25
14	IOWA SCC	75
15	INDIANA PSC	50
16	KANSAS SCC	60
17	KENTUCKY PSC	0
18	LOUISIANA PSC	N/R
19	MAINE PUC	20
20	MARYLAND PSC	2
21	MICHIGAN PSC	N/R
22	MINNESOTA PUC	0
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	8
24	MISSOURI PSC	75
25	MONTANA PSC	0
26	NEBRASKA PSC	15
27	NEVADA PSC	5
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	N/R
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	N/R
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	80
31	NEW YORK PSC	N/R
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	10
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	N/R
34	OHIO PUC	3
35	OREGON PUC	40
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	40
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	35
38	TENNESSEE PSC	70
39	TEXAS PUC	50
40	TEXAS RC	0
41	UTAH PSC	N/R
42	VIRGINIA SCC	N/R
43	WASHINGTON UTC	20
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	20
45	WISCONSIN PSC	2
46	WYOMING PSC	75

28. What was the size of the following support staff for the last full reporting year? (a) secretarial/clerical (b) statistical clerks (c) computer programmers (d) all other support staff

		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
1	ALABAMA PSC	20	0	0	6
2	ALASKA PUC	13	0	1	3
3	ARIZONA CC	4	0	0	28
4	ARKANSAS PSC	11	0	1	13
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	279	4	8	48
6	COLORADO PUC	14	2	1	31
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	33	1	3	29
8	DELAWARE PSC	2	0	0	11
9	FLORIDA PSC	75	1	2	21
10	GEORGIA PSC	9	0	0	0
11	HAWAII PUC	3	N/R	N/R	11
12	IDAHO PUC	12	0	0	3
13	ILLINOIS CC	15	2	N/R	3
14	IOWA SCC	9	1	0	55
15	INDIANA PSC	17	13	N/R	29
16	KANSAS SCC	63	0	2	87
17	KENTUCKY PSC	24	N/R	N/R	13
18	LOUISIANA PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
19	MAINE PUC	28	0	0	42
20	MARYLAND PSC	22	0	0	16
21	MICHIGAN PSC	19	1	2	N/R
22	MINNESOTA PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	13	2	N/R	59
24	MISSOURI PSC	23	N/R	11	143
25	MONTANA PSC	9	N/R	N/R	25
26	NEBRASKA PSC	9	1	0	5
27	NEVADA PSC	15	0	1	4
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	55	0	0	N/R
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	9	0	1	N/R
31	NEW YORK PSC	139	2	7	11
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	6	0	0	5
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	14	0	0	6
34	OHIO PUC	66	5	16	136
35	OREGON PUC	N/R	N/R	1	5
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	171	2	4	42
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	36	0	0	102
38	TENNESSEE PSC	17	11	0	10
39	TEXAS PUC	35	N/R	4	9
40	TEXAS RC	15	6	1	10
41	UTAH PSC	3	N/R	N/R	3
42	VIRGINIA SCC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
43	WASHINGTON UTC	6	N/R	N/R	N/R
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	40	N/R	N/R	49
45	WISCONSIN PSC	33	2	3	19
46	WYOMING PSC	7	N/R	N/R	N/R

29. Does the commission own, lease or regularly have access to a computer? Yes _____ No _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	NO
2	ALASKA PUC	YES
3	ARIZONA CC	YES
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES
6	COLORADO PUC	YES
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES
8	DELAWARE PSC	NO
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES
11	HAWAII PUC	NO
12	IDAHO PUC	YES
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES
14	IOWA SCC	YES
15	INDIANA PSC	NO
16	KANSAS SCC	N/R
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES
18	LOUISIANA PSC	NO
19	MAINE PUC	YES
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES
22	MINNESOTA PUC	NO
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	YES
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES
25	MONTANA PSC	NO
26	NEBRASKA PSC	YES
27	NEVADA PSC	YES
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	N/R
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	NO
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES
34	OHIO PUC	YES
35	OREGON PUC	YES
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES
38	TENNESSEE PSC	YES
39	TEXAS PUC	YES
40	TEXAS RC	YES
41	UTAH PSC	YES
42	VIRGINIA SCC	YES
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES
46	WYOMING PSC	YES

30. Does the commission own, lease or regularly have access to computerized data and information sets used in utility analyses?
 Yes _____ No _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	NO
2	ALASKA PUC	NO
3	ARIZONA CC	YES
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES
6	COLORADO PUC	YES
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES
8	DELAWARE PSC	NO
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES
10	GEORGIA PSC	NO
11	HAWAII PUC	NO
12	IDAHO PUC	YES
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES
14	IOWA SCC	YES
15	INDIANA PSC	NO
16	KANSAS SCC	N/R
17	KENTUCKY PSC	NO
18	LOUISIANA PSC	NO
19	MAINE PUC	NO
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	NO
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES
25	MONTANA PSC	NO
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO
27	NEVADA PSC	YES
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	N/R
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	NO
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	NO
34	OHIO PUC	YES
35	OREGON PUC	YES
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES
38	TENNESSEE PSC	YES
39	TEXAS PUC	YES
40	TEXAS RC	YES
41	UTAH PSC	YES
42	VIRGINIA SCC	N/R
43	WASHINGTON UTC	NO
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES
46	WYOMING PSC	NO

31. (A) Are paid vacations authorized for professional employees?
Yes _____ No _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	YES
2	ALASKA PUC	YES
3	ARIZONA CC	YES
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES
6	COLORADO PUC	YES
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES
11	HAWAII PUC	YES
12	IDAHO PUC	YES
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES
14	IOWA SCC	YES
15	INDIANA PSC	YES
16	KANSAS SCC	YES
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES
18	LOUISIANA PSC	YES
19	MAINE PUC	YES
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	YES
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES
25	MONTANA PSC	YES
26	NEBRASKA PSC	YES
27	NEVADA PSC	YES
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	YES
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES
34	OHIO PUC	YES
35	OREGON PUC	YES
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES
38	TENNESSEE PSC	YES
39	TEXAS PUC	YES
40	TEXAS RC	YES
41	UTAH PSC	YES
42	VIRGINIA SCC	YES
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES
46	WYOMING PSC	YES

31. (continued)

(B) If yes, how are vacations accumulated by years of service?

		<u>No. of Days by Years of Service</u>				
		<u>0-1</u>	<u>2-4</u>	<u>5-9</u>	<u>10-15</u>	<u>Other</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	13	13	16	19	25
2	ALASKA PUC	15	21	24	30	N/R
3	ARIZONA CC	12	15	17	18	N/R
4	ARKANSAS PSC	12	15	18	21	21
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	10	12	15	17	N/R
6	COLORADO PUC	12	12	15	18	21
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	12	12	14	15	N/R
8	DELAWARE PSC	15	15	15	18	21
9	FLORIDA PSC	13	13	16	19	N/R
10	GEORGIA PSC	15	15	18	21	N/R
11	HAWAII PUC	21	21	21	21	21
12	IDAHO PUC	12	12	15	18	N/R
13	ILLINOIS CC	10	17	20	22	25
14	IOWA SCC	10	10	15	20	N/R
15	INDIANA PSC	12	12	12	15	20
16	KANSAS SCC	12	12	13	18	21
17	KENTUCKY PSC	12	12	15	18	21
18	LOUISIANA PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
19	MAINE PUC	12	12	15	18	24
20	MARYLAND PSC	10	10	14	19	25
21	MICHIGAN PSC	13	15	17	19	N/R
22	MINNESOTA PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	15	15	18	18	N/R
24	MISSOURI PSC	15	15	15	18	21
25	MONTANA PSC	15	15	15	18	21
26	NEBRASKA PSC	12	12	15	21	N/R
27	NEVADA PSC	15	15	15	18	21
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	15	15	15	15	N/R
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	12	12	15	20	25
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	15	15	15	15	15
31	NEW YORK PSC	14	16	19	20	N/R
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	10	12	15	18	N/R
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	12	15	18	21	24
34	OHIO PUC	10	10	12	15	20
35	OREGON PUC	12	12	15	18	N/R
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	10	15	15	15	N/R
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	15	15	15	17	N/R
38	TENNESSEE PSC	12	12	18	21	N/R
39	TEXAS PUC	11	12	14	15	18
40	TEXAS RC	11	12	14	15	N/R
41	UTAH PSC	12	12	15	18	N/R
42	VIRGINIA SCC	12	12	15	18	21
43	WASHINGTON UTC	12	14	16	17	21
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	15	18	21	24	N/R
45	WISCONSIN PSC	10	10	15	17	N/R
46	WYOMING PSC	12	12	15	18	N/R

32. May professional employees accumulate unused vacation for more than a year? Yes _____ No _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	YES
2	ALASKA PUC	YES
3	ARIZONA CC	YES
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES
6	COLORADO PUC	YES
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES
11	HAWAII PUC	YES
12	IDAHO PUC	YES
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES
14	IOWA SCC	YES
15	INDIANA PSC	YES
16	KANSAS SCC	YES
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES
18	LOUISIANA PSC	YES
19	MAINE PUC	YES
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	YES
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES
25	MONTANA PSC	YES
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO
27	NEVADA PSC	YES
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	NO
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES
34	OHIO PUC	YES
35	ORECON PUC	YES
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES
38	TENNESSEE PSC	YES
39	TEXAS PUC	YES
40	TEXAS RC	YES
41	UTAH PSC	YES
42	VIRGINIA SCC	YES
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES
45	WISCONSIN PSC	NO
46	WYOMING PSC	YES

33. (A) If yes, how many days of vacation may be carried forward?

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	60 DAYS
2	ALASKA PUC	60 DAYS
3	ARIZONA CC	30 DAYS
4	ARKANSAS PSC	30 DAYS
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	VARIES
6	COLORADO PUC	2 TIMES ANNUAL
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	10 DAYS
8	DELAWARE PSC	ALL
9	FLORIDA PSC	30 DAYS
10	GEORGIA PSC	ALL
11	HAWAII PUC	15 DAYS
12	IDAHO PUC	2 TIMES ANNUAL
13	ILLINOIS CC	2 TIMES ANNUAL
14	IOWA SCC	2 TIMES ANNUAL
15	INDIANA PSC	ALL
16	KANSAS SCC	VARIES
17	KENTUCKY PSC	VARIES
18	LOUISIANA PSC	ALL
19	MAINE PUC	VARIES
20	MARYLAND PSC	35 DAYS
21	MICHIGAN PSC	30 DAYS
22	MINNESOTA PUC	30 DAYS
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	45 DAYS
24	MISSOURI PSC	30 DAYS
25	MONTANA PSC	ALL
26	NEBRASKA PSC	N/R
27	NEVADA PSC	N/R
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	30 DAYS
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	N/R
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	30 DAYS
31	NEW YORK PSC	VARIES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	30 DAYS
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	30 DAYS
34	OHIO PUC	VARIES
35	OREGON PUC	31 DAYS
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	45 DAYS
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	45 DAYS
38	TENNESSEE PSC	N/R
39	TEXAS PUC	21 DAYS
40	TEXAS RC	2 TIMES ANNUAL
41	UTAH PSC	VARIES
42	VIRGINIA SCC	VARIES
43	WASHINGTON UTC	30 DAYS
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	30 DAYS
45	WISCONSIN PSC	NONE
46	WYOMING PSC	30 DAYS

33. (continued)

(B) How many paid holidays are authorized?

		<u>Response</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	13
2	ALASKA PUC	12
3	ARIZONA CC	10
4	ARKANSAS PSC	11
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	12
6	COLORADO PUC	11
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	12
8	DELAWARE PSC	11
9	FLORIDA PSC	9
10	GEORGIA PSC	12
11	HAWAII PUC	13
12	IDAHO PUC	9
13	ILLINOIS CC	13
14	IOWA SCC	11
15	INDIANA PSC	11
16	KANSAS SCC	9
17	KENTUCKY PSC	11
18	LOUISIANA PSC	9
19	MAINE PUC	11
20	MARYLAND PSC	14
21	MICHIGAN PSC	10
22	MINNESOTA PUC	10
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	10
24	MISSOURI PSC	12
25	MONTANA PSC	10
26	NEBRASKA PSC	11
27	NEVADA PSC	N/R
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	12
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	13
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	11
31	NEW YORK PSC	11
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	11
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	10
34	OHIO PUC	10
35	OREGON PUC	10
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	13
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	12
38	TENNESSEE PSC	N/R
39	TEXAS PUC	15
40	TEXAS RC	18
41	UTAH PSC	12
42	VIRGINIA SCC	11
43	WASHINGTON UTC	N/R
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	12
45	WISCONSIN PSC	11
46	WYOMING PSC	8

34. Please indicate which of the following benefits apply to professional employees:

Types of Benefits	Yes	No	Percent Paid By Agency	Premium, or Monthly Cost to Employee	
				Single	Married
(a) Group Hospitalization					
(b) Surgical Plan					
(c) Major Medical					
(d) Group Life					
(e) Group Dental					
(f) Disability Plan					
(g) Prescription Drug Plan					
(h) Eye Care Plan					
(i) Tuition Reimbursement					
(j) Prepaid Legal Service					
(k) Pension Plan					
(l) Other (list)					

		(a)	(b)	(c)	
1	ALABAMA PSC	YES	100	YES	100
2	ALASKA PUC	YES	100	YES	100
3	ARIZONA CC	YES	VARIES	YES	VARIES
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES	N/R	YES	N/R
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES	VARIES	NO	N/R
6	COLORADO PUC	YES	25	YES	25
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES	70	YES	70
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES	VARIES	YES	VARIES
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES	75	NO	N/R
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES	83	YES	83
11	HAWAII PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
12	IDAHO PUC	YES	100	YES	100
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES	100	YES	100
14	IOWA SCC	YES	100	YES	100
15	INDIANA PSC	YES	N/R	YES	N/R
16	KANSAS SCC	YES	100	YES	N/R
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES	100	YES	N/R
18	LOUISIANA PSC	YES	50	YES	50
19	MAINE PUC	YES	100	YES	100
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES	90	YES	90
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES	90	YES	90
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES	100	YES	100
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	YES	100	YES	100
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES	N/R	YES	N/R
25	MONTANA PSC	YES	100	YES	100
26	NEBRASKA PSC	YES	50	YES	N/R
27	NEVADA PSC	YES	100	YES	100
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES	N/R	YES	N/R
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	YES	100	YES	100
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES	50	YES	50
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES	VARIES	YES	VARIES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES	100	YES	100
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES	100	YES	100
34	OHIO PUC	YES	80	NO	N/R
35	OREGON PUC	YES	100	YES	100
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES	100	YES	100
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES	N/R	YES	N/R
38	TENNESSEE PSC	YES	60	YES	60
39	TEXAS PUC	YES	100	YES	100
40	TEXAS RC	YES	100	YES	N/R
41	UTAH PSC	YES	N/R	YES	N/R
42	VIRGINIA SCC	YES	100	YES	100
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES	100	YES	100
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES	100	YES	100
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES	90	YES	90
46	WYOMING PSC	YES	100	N/R	N/R

		(d)	(e)	(f)	
1	ALABAMA PSC	YES	100	NO	N/R
2	ALASKA PUC	YES	100	YES	100
3	ARIZONA CC	YES	100	YES	100
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES	N/R	NO	N/R
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES	100	NO	N/R
6	COLORADO PUC	YES	25	NO	N/R
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES	N/R	YES	70
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES	VARIES	NO	N/R
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES	67	NO	N/R
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES	99	NO	N/R
11	HAWAII PUC	YES	VARIES	YES	VARIES
12	IDAHO PUC	YES	100	NO	N/R
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES	100	NO	N/R
14	IOWA SCC	YES	100	NO	N/R
15	INDIANA PSC	YES	71	N/R	N/R
16	KANSAS SCC	YES	100	NO	N/R
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES	100	YES	0
18	LOUISIANA PSC	YES	50	NO	N/R
19	MAINE PUC	YES	0	NO	N/R
20	MARYLAND PSC	NO	N/R	NO	N/R
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES	100	YES	90
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES	100	YES	100
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	YES	50	NO	N/R
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES	N/R	NO	N/R
25	MONTANA PSC	YES	100	YES	100
26	NEBRASKA PSC	YES	N/R	NO	N/R
27	NEVADA PSC	YES	100	YES	100
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES	N/R	N/R	N/R
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	YES	100	YES	100
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES	0	NO	N/R
31	NEW YORK PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES	100	NO	N/R
34	OHIO PUC	YES	100	YES	100
35	OREGON PUC	YES	0	YES	100
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES	100	YES	100
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES	N/R	NO	N/R
38	TENNESSEE PSC	YES	60	YES	100
39	TEXAS PUC	YES	0	NO	N/R
40	TEXAS RC	YES	N/R	NO	N/R
41	UTAH PSC	YES	N/R	N/R	N/R
42	VIRGINIA SCC	YES	0	NO	N/R
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES	100	YES	100
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES	100	NO	N/R
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES	75	NO	N/R
46	WYOMING PSC	YES	N/R	N/R	N/R

34. (continued)

		(g)	(h)
1	ALABAMA PSC	YES	100
2	ALASKA PUC	YES	100
3	ARIZONA CC	YES	VARIES
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES	N/R
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES	VARIES
6	COLORADO PUC	YES	N/R
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES	70
8	DELAWARE PSC	NO	N/R
9	FLORIDA PSC	NO	N/R
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES	83
11	HAWAII PUC	N/R	N/R
12	IDAHO PUC	NO	N/R
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES	100
14	IOWA SCC	NO	N/R
15	INDIANA PSC	N/R	N/R
16	KANSAS SCC	NO	N/R
17	KENTUCKY PSC	NO	N/R
18	LOUISIANA PSC	YES	50
19	MAINE PUC	NO	N/R
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES	90
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES	N/R
22	MINNESOTA PUC	NO	N/R
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	NO	N/R
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES	N/R
25	MONTANA PSC	YES	100
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO	N/R
27	NEVADA PSC	YES	100
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	N/R	N/R
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	YES	N/R
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES	50
31	NEW YORK PSC	N/R	N/R
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	N/R	N/R
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	NO	N/R
34	OHIO PUC	NO	N/R
35	OREGON PUC	YES	100
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES	N/R
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	NO	N/R
38	TENNESSEE PSC	YES	60
39	TEXAS PUC	YES	100
40	TEXAS RC	YES	N/R
41	UTAH PSC	YES	N/R
42	VIRGINIA SCC	NO	N/R
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES	100
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	NO	N/R
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES	N/R
46	WYOMING PSC	N/R	N/R

	(i)	(j)	(k)
1	ALABAMA PSC	NO	N/R
2	ALASKA PUC	YES	100
3	ARIZONA CC	NO	N/R
4	ARKANSAS PSC	NO	N/R
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES	VARIES
6	COLORADO PUC	NO	N/R
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES	50
8	DELAWARE PSC	NO	N/R
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES	100
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES	N/R
11	HAWAII PUC	N/R	N/R
12	IDAHO PUC	NO	N/R
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES	100
14	IOWA SCC	YES	100
15	INDIANA PSC	NO	N/R
16	KANSAS SCC	YES	100
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES	100
18	LOUISIANA PSC	NO	N/R
19	MAINE PUC	YES	100
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES	100
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES	50
22	MINNESOTA PUC	NO	N/R
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	NO	N/R
24	MISSOURI PSC	NO	N/R
25	MONTANA PSC	NO	N/R
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO	N/R
27	NEVADA PSC	NO	N/R
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	N/R	N/R
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	YES	100
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES	100
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES	N/R
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES	N/R
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	NO	N/R
34	OHIO PUC	YES	100
35	OREGON PUC	YES	100
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES	N/R
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	NO	N/R
38	TENNESSEE PSC	NO	N/R
39	TEXAS PUC	YES	100
40	TEXAS RC	YES	N/R
41	UTAH PSC	YES	50
42	VIRGINIA SCC	YES	100
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES	VARIES
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	NO	N/R
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES	VARIES
46	WYOMING PSC	N/R	N/R

35. What are the number of years required to fully vest the employee in the pension plan? _____ years.

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	15
2	ALASKA PUC	5
3	ARIZONA CC	5
4	ARKANSAS PSC	10
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	5
6	COLORADO PUC	5
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	10
8	DELAWARE PSC	10
9	FLORIDA PSC	10
10	GEORGIA PSC	10
11	HAWAII PUC	5
12	IDAHO PUC	5
13	ILLINOIS CC	8
14	IOWA SCC	4
15	INDIANA PSC	20
16	KANSAS SCC	10
17	KENTUCKY PSC	5
18	LOUISIANA PSC	0
19	MAINE PUC	10
20	MARYLAND PSC	1
21	MICHIGAN PSC	10
22	MINNESOTA PUC	10
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	10
24	MISSOURI PSC	15
25	MONTANA PSC	N/R
26	NEBRASKA PSC	2
27	NEVADA PSC	10
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	10
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	0
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	5
31	NEW YORK PSC	10
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	N/R
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	10
34	OHIO PUC	N/R
35	OREGON PUC	5
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	10
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	5
38	TENNESSEE PSC	10
39	TEXAS PUC	10
40	TEXAS RC	10
41	UTAH PSC	0
42	VIRGINIA SCC	5
43	WASHINGTON UTC	5
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	5
45	WISCONSIN PSC	0
46	WYOMING PSC	4

36. Is personal leave or sick leave granted for the following purposes?

Purpose of Leave	Sick Leave	Personal Leave	None
(a) Family illness			
(b) Jury duty			
(c) Death in family			
(d) Armed forces (military)			
reserve duty			
(e) Other (specify)			

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
1 ALABAMA PSC	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	EDUCATION
2 ALASKA PUC	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	SICK LEAVE
3 ARIZONA CC	N/R	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R	SPECIAL	N/R
4 ARKANSAS PSC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	EDUCATION
5 CALIFORNIA PUC	SICK LEAVE	NONE	SICK LEAVE	NONE	N/R
6 COLORADO PUC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
7 CONNECTICUT PUCA	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
8 DELAWARE PSC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
9 FLORIDA PSC	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	SPECIAL	SPECIAL	N/R
10 GEORGIA PSC	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	N/R
11 HAWAII PUC	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	SICK LEAVE
12 IDAHO PUC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
13 ILLINOIS CC	SICK LEAVE	NONE	SICK LEAVE	NONE	N/R
14 IOWA SCC	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	N/R
15 INDIANA PSC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
16 KANSAS SCC	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
17 KENTUCKY PSC	N/R	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
18 LOUISIANA PSC	SICK LEAVE	NONE	NONE	NONE	N/R
19 MAINE PUC	SICK LEAVE	NONE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
20 MARYLAND PSC	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
21 MICHIGAN PSC	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
22 MINNESOTA PUC	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	N/R
23 MISSISSIPPI PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
24 MISSOURI PSC	SICK LEAVE	NONE	SICK LEAVE	NONE	N/R
25 MONTANA PSC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	N/R	N/R
26 NEBRASKA PSC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
27 NEVADA PSC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
28 NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	N/R	N/R	N/R	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
29 NEW JERSEY BPU	BOTH SICK/PERS	SPECIAL	BOTH SICK/PERS	SPECIAL	N/R
30 NEW MEXICO PSC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R	N/R	N/R
31 NEW YORK PSC	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
32 NORTH CAROLINA UC	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	N/R
33 NORTH DAKOTA PSC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
34 OHIO PUC	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	SPECIAL	SPECIAL	N/R
35 OREGON PUC	N/R	SPECIAL	N/R	SPECIAL	N/R
36 PENNSYLVANIA PUC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE
37 SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	PERSONAL LEAVE	NONE	PERSONAL LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
38 TENNESSEE PSC	SICK LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	N/R
39 TEXAS PUC	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	PERSONAL LEAVE	SPECIAL	N/R
40 TEXAS RC	SICK LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	SPECIAL	N/R
41 UTAH PSC	SICK LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	N/R
42 VIRGINIA SCC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
43 WASHINGTON UTC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R
44 WEST VIRGINIA PCC	SICK LEAVE	NONE	SICK LEAVE	NONE	N/R
45 WISCONSIN PSC	N/R	SPECIAL	N/R	SPECIAL	N/R
46 WYOMING PSC	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	SICK LEAVE	PERSONAL LEAVE	N/R

37. (A) May the employee accumulate unused paid sick leave?
 Yes _____ No _____

		<u>Response</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	YES
2	ALASKA PUC	YES
3	ARIZONA CC	YES
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES
6	COLORADO PUC	YES
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES
11	HAWAII PUC	YES
12	IDAHO PUC	YES
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES
14	IOWA SCC	YES
15	INDIANA PSC	YES
16	KANSAS SCC	YES
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES
18	LOUISIANA PSC	YES
19	MAINE PUC	YES
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	YES
24	MISSOURI PSC	NO
25	MONTANA PSC	YES
26	NEBRASKA PSC	YES
27	NEVADA PSC	YES
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	YES
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	YES
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES
34	OHIO PUC	YES
35	OREGON PUC	YES
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES
38	TENNESSEE PSC	YES
39	TEXAS PUC	YES
40	TEXAS RC	YES
41	UTAH PSC	NO
42	VIRGINIA SCC	YES
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES
46	WYOMING PSC	YES

37. (B) If yes, what is the maximum accumulation in number of days?

		<u>Response</u>
1	ALABAMA PSC	N/R
2	ALASKA PUC	NO LIMIT
3	ARIZONA CC	NO LIMIT
4	ARKANSAS PSC	90
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	NONE
6	COLORADO PUC	NO LIMIT
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	240
8	DELAWARE PSC	NO LIMIT
9	FLORIDA PSC	NO LIMIT
10	GEORGIA PSC	NO LIMIT
11	HAWAII PUC	NO LIMIT
12	IDAHO PUC	NO LIMIT
13	ILLINOIS CC	NO LIMIT
14	IOWA SCC	NO LIMIT
15	INDIANA PSC	NO LIMIT
16	KANSAS SCC	N/R
17	KENTUCKY PSC	NONE
18	LOUISIANA PSC	N/R
19	MAINE PUC	120
20	MARYLAND PSC	NO LIMIT
21	MICHIGAN PSC	N/R
22	MINNESOTA PUC	NO LIMIT
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	120
24	MISSOURI PSC	N/R
25	MONTANA PSC	NO LIMIT
26	NEBRASKA PSC	180
27	NEVADA PSC	N/R
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	N/R
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	NO LIMIT
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	NO LIMIT
31	NEW YORK PSC	N/R
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	NO LIMIT
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	NO LIMIT
34	OHIO PUC	NO LIMIT
35	OREGON PUC	NO LIMIT
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	200
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	90
38	TENNESSEE PSC	NO LIMIT
39	TEXAS PUC	NO LIMIT
40	TEXAS RC	N/R
41	UTAH PSC	N/R
42	VIRGINIA SCC	NO LIMIT
43	WASHINGTON UTC	NONE
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	NO LIMIT
45	WISCONSIN PSC	NO LIMIT
46	WYOMING PSC	NO LIMIT

38. Does your agency regularly use a professional staff performance evaluation and appraisal system? Yes _____ No _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	NO
2	ALASKA PUC	YES
3	ARIZONA CC	YES
4	ARKANSAS PSC	NO
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES
6	COLORADO PUC	YES
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES
11	HAWAII PUC	NO
12	IDAHO PUC	YES
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES
14	IOWA SCC	YES
15	INDIANA PSC	NO
16	KANSAS SCC	YES
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES
18	LOUISIANA PSC	YES
19	MAINE PUC	YES
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	NO
24	MISSOURI PSC	YES
25	MONTANA PSC	NO
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO
27	NEVADA PSC	YES
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	NO
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	YES
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	YES
31	NEW YORK PSC	YES
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	NO
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES
34	OHIO PUC	YES
35	OREGON PUC	YES
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES
38	TENNESSEE PSC	NO
39	TEXAS PUC	YES
40	TEXAS RC	YES
41	UTAH PSC	YES
42	VIRGINIA SCC	YES
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	YES
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES
46	WYOMING PSC	NO

39. Has the state personnel office or the commission completed a salary study within the past 5 years? Yes _____ No _____

Response

1	ALABAMA PSC	YES
2	ALASKA PUC	YES
3	ARIZONA CC	NO
4	ARKANSAS PSC	YES
5	CALIFORNIA PUC	YES
6	COLORADO PUC	YES
7	CONNECTICUT PUCA	YES
8	DELAWARE PSC	YES
9	FLORIDA PSC	YES
10	GEORGIA PSC	YES
11	HAWAII PUC	NO
12	IDAHO PUC	YES
13	ILLINOIS CC	YES
14	IOWA SCC	YES
15	INDIANA PSC	YES
16	KANSAS SCC	NO
17	KENTUCKY PSC	YES
18	LOUISIANA PSC	NO
19	MAINE PUC	YES
20	MARYLAND PSC	YES
21	MICHIGAN PSC	YES
22	MINNESOTA PUC	YES
23	MISSISSIPPI PSC	YES
24	MISSOURI PSC	NO
25	MONTANA PSC	NO
26	NEBRASKA PSC	NO
27	NEVADA PSC	YES
28	NEW HAMPSHIRE PUC	YES
29	NEW JERSEY BPU	YES
30	NEW MEXICO PSC	NO
31	NEW YORK PSC	NO
32	NORTH CAROLINA UC	NO
33	NORTH DAKOTA PSC	YES
34	OHIO PUC	YES
35	OREGON PUC	YES
36	PENNSYLVANIA PUC	YES
37	SOUTH CAROLINA PSC	YES
38	TENNESSEE PSC	YES
39	TEXAS PUC	NO
40	TEXAS RC	NO
41	UTAH PSC	NO
42	VIRGINIA SCC	N/R
43	WASHINGTON UTC	YES
44	WEST VIRGINIA PCC	NO
45	WISCONSIN PSC	YES
46	WYOMING PSC	YES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bassman, Sofen Y. "Headhunters for APPA." Public Power Weekly. (May-June 1981): 54-55.
- Bowman, James S., and Norman, David L. "Attitudes Towards Public Service." Public Personnel Management. (March-April 1975): 113-21.
- College Placement Council, "CPC Salary Survey," Bethlehem, Pa.: College Placement Council, 1981.
- Heneman, Herbert G.; Schwab, Donald P.; Rossum, John A.; and Dyer, Lee D. Personnel/Human Resources Management. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1980.
- Klinger, Donald E. Public Personnel Management: Context and Strategies. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.
- Lawton, Raymond W. Trends in State Regulatory Commission Development and Functioning. Columbus: National Regulatory Research Institute, 1979.
- National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners Bulletin, January 7, 1980 - May 11, 1981.
- National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners. 1977 Annual Report on Utility and Carrier Regulation. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, 1978.
- _____. 1978 Annual Report on Utility and Carrier Regulation. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, 1979.
- _____. 1979 Annual Report on Utility and Carrier Regulation. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, 1980.
- National Regulatory Research Institute. 1981 Catalog of Computer Programs and Data Bases. Columbus: National Regulatory Research Institute, 1981.
- Navarro, Peter. Public Utility Commission Regulation: Performance, Determinants, and Energy Policy Impacts. Cambridge: Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, 1980.
- Public Power Weekly, January 21 - December 22, 1980.
- Public Utilities Fortnightly, July 30, 1979 - July 17, 1980.
- Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act, P.L. 95-617. Statutes at Large, vol. 92 (1978).
- U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Employee Benefits 1977. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 1977.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Handbook of Labor
Statistics Bulletin 2070. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government
Printing Office, 1980.