# REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF FRANK JOHNSON 

 BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ON BEHALF OF SOUTHERN STATES UTILITIES, INC. DOCKET NO. 950495-WSDOCTMET NMER-DATE
Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
A. My name is Frank Johnson and my business address is 2100 RiverEdge Parkway, Atlanta, Georgia 30328.
Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
A. My employer is Hewitt Associates, LLC. I am a principal in the firm and responsible for the Direct Pay Practice in the Southeastern Region. My primary responsibilities are to work with clients on compensation issues and develop our practice in the region.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE NATURE OF THE BUSINESS IN WHICH HEWITT ASSOCIATES IS ENGAGED.
A. Hewitt Associates is a global human resource consulting firm. Our primary activities are to assist our clients in improving their business results through people. Specific areas of focus include all forms of employee compensation, employee benefits, and a broad range of human resource consulting activities, including comprehensive compensation and benefits analyses.

Hewitt Associates has 62 offices world-wide and employs approximately 5,000 associates.
Q. COULD YOU NAME SOME OF THE MAJOR NATIONAL AND FLORIDA FIRMS FOR WHICH HEWITT ASSOCIATES HAS PERFORMED COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS ANALYSES?
A. Hewitt Associates performs compensation and benefits work for a broad cross-section of the Fortune 500 . These would include organizations such as AlliedSignal Inc., Amoco Corporation, The Clorox Company, Delta Air Lines, Inc., Eastman Kodak Company, First Union Corporation, General Electric Company, General Motors Corporation, GTE, Levi Strauss \& Company, Motorola Inc., Nike Inc., RJR Nabisco Inc., Sears Roebuck, Shell Oil Company, and Whirlpool Corporation.

Hewitt Associates also has worked with a number of major Florida-based organizations including American Automobile Organization, AvMed-SanteFe, Barnett Banks, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Florida, Cordis Corporation, Brevard County School Board, Burger King Corporation, Darden Restaurants Inc., Eckerd Corporation, Florida Progress Corporation, Florida Steel Corporation, Independent Life \& Accident Ins. Co., Interim Services Inc., Office Depot Inc., Orlando Regional Healthcare System, Scotty's Inc., Tropicana Products Inc., Tupperware Worldwide, Universal Studios Florida, and The Walt Disney Company.
Q. FOR WHAT OTHER UTILITIES HAS HEWITT ASSOCIATES PERFORMED COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS ANALYSIS?
A. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company, Carolina Power and Light, Consumers' Power Company, The Dayton Power \& Light Company, The Detroit Edison Company, Duke Power Company, Florida Power Corporation, Louisville Gas and Electric Company, Minnesota Power, Nashville Electric Service, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Potomac Electric Power Company, Public Service Enterprise Group Inc., SCANA, Sonat, The Southern Company (Gulf Power, Georgia Power, Alabama Power, Savannah Power, etc.), Tacoma Public Utilities, Unicom Corporaton, Washington Energy Company, and Wisconsin Power and Light Company.
Q. AS A PROFESSIONAL IN THE FIELD OF COMPENSATION, HAVE YOU PERSONALLY CONDUCTED COMPENSATION OR COMPETITIVE MARKET ANALYSES FOR OTHER FIRMS AND UTILITIES? IF SO, PLEASE NAME SOME OF THEM.
A. Yes. I have conducted and/or supervised numerous market studies for a wide variety of organizations. Some examples in the utility industry are: The Southern Company, Carolina Power and Light, Sonat, SCANA (South Carolina Electric and Gas), Florida Power Corporation, Nashville Electric Service, and Duke Power Company.

Some other organizations I have conducted and/or supervised market studies for include AvMed

Sante Fe, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Georgia, Bowater Incorporated, Burger King Corporation, Burlington Industries Incorporated, Caterpillar Incorporated, Coca-Cola Bottling Company-Consolidated, Coulter Corporation, DiMwtal Equipment Corporation, Exxon Chemical Company, First Union Corporation, General Electric Appliance Division, Interim Services Inc., International Paper Company, Jacksonville Port Authority, Lykes Brothers, The Mayo Clinic, Milton Roy Company, National Gypsum Company, Oxford Industries, Prison Rehabilitative Industries and Diversified Enterprises, Inc. (PRIDE), Racal-Datacom Inc., St. Joseph Hospital (Tampa), Springs Industries, and Wachovia Corporation. Most of the clients I have worked with have included some level of market-based pay analysis. Most recent examples include:

- A Washington D.C.-based financial services organization where data was developed on a broad cross-section of 50 jobs;
- A Charlotte, North Carolina-based financial services organization where market data was developed on 80 jobs in the information systems area;
- A Florida organization where data was
developed on almost a 100 jobs throughout the state;
- A Florida hospital where data was developed on 75 jobs;
- An Atlanta organization where market data was developed on almost a 100 jobs; and
- A South Carolina organization where data was developed on 150 jobs.

Because of the extensive nature of the market data analyses Hewitt Associates conducts, we have access to a broad range of compensation surveys. We also have developed detailed processes for ensuring the accuracy of the data.
Q. FOR HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN EMPLOYED WITH HEWITT ASSOCIATES?
A. Seven and a half years.
Q. WHAT IS YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND?
A. I received a Bachelor of Business Administration from Georgia State University with a major in general management in 1967, and I received a Masters of Business Administration from Georgia State University with a specialty focus on human resources management in 1971.
Q. WHAT CERTIFICATES AND PROFESSIONAL TRAINING IN THE FIELD OF COMPENSATION DO YOU HAVE?
A. I have held membership in the American Compensation Association, the Atlanta Area Compensation Association, and the Society for Human Resource Management. Through those organizations, other professional organizations, and internal opportunities with my employers, I have attended dozens of training courses related to compensation and benefits.
Q. HAVE YOU CONDUCTED TRAINING FOR PROFESSIONALS IN THE FIELD OF EMPLOYEE BENEFITS AND COMPENSATION?
A. Yes. I have conducted numerous training courses for managers and supervisors covering both the philosophical aspects of compensation and benefits, as well as the administrative details of how those programs should be managed within our company. Additionally, I served as an Assistant Professor at Central Piedmont Community College.

In over 20 years of consulting, I have conducted many training courses and seminars for clients and professional organizations. I have addressed American Compensation Association groups in New York; Philadelphia; Washington, D.C.; Atlanta; Miami; Tampa; Orlando; Jacksonville; Columbia, South Carolina; Greenville, South Carolina; Greensboro, North Carolina; Charlotte,

North Carolina; Raleigh, North Carolina; Knoxville, Tennessee; Nashville, Tennessee; Memphis, Tennessee; and Richmond, Virginia.

Client services will also include some training and instruction for the client. Having served over 250 clients, it is difficult for me to enumerate which specific clients required some form of supplementary training and which did not; however, at least $25 \%$ of my client assignments involved some level of training. Additionally, as part of the normal services provided, we perform a form of training for our clients. We explain new concepts and ideas to executives and work with them to establish a strategy for the organization. We then apply those concepts and ideas with the compensation professionals in the organization, and as a part of the application, we are sharing our knowledge and experiences in a way that could be considered ongoing training. Essentially, we are hired by our clients because they believe the breadth of our experience and the knowledge we bring to the assignment will add value to their enterprises.
Q. COULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR BACKGROUND IN THE FIELD OF COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS?
A. My entire business experience has been aligned with human resource activities and has included some level of compensation and/or employee benefits activities. I began working for Equifax (called Retail Credit Company at the time) in 1963. While with Equifax, my duties consisted of working with the group medical insurance program, paying claims, analyzing data, working with carriers during renewal activities, compensation analytical work, and special projects. Approximately half my time was spent on compensation issues and included conducting survey data analysis, job evaluations, pay system design and ongoing administration.

I spent an additional seven years as a corporate compensation and employee benefit manager with Belk Store Services and Rollins Incorporated. My duties for both these employers included the full range of design, administration, and funding for compensation and employee benefit programs. I worked with trustees, money managers, and carriers to refine existing employee benefit programs and monitor financial results. I also designed compensation programs for a broad range of employee groups, including retail sales clerks, white-collar administrative employees, management and executive
employees, lawn care specialists, exterminators, customer representatives, home protection equipment installers, and outside sales representatives.

I began consulting approximately twenty years ago. My entire consulting career has been focused on compensation related activities. As I mentioned, I have worked with more than 250 clients during this time, and the myriad projects I have worked on has included market pricing, job evaluations, salary structure design and development (including different forms of traditional structures, as well as alternative approaches to broadbanding), base pay design (including traditional approaches, as well as competency-based, skill-based, and team-based pay), short-term incentive design, long-term incentive design, performance management design, and sales compensation. Also, because of my background, some of these projects included employee benefits and some broader human resources issues; however, my concentration has been on compensation.
Q. PLEASE STATE THE DUTIES OF YOUR CURRENT POSITION WITH HEWITT ASSOCIATES.
A. My duties include:

- Provide high quality advice and design assistance to clients throughout Hewitt

Associates' Southeastern region;

- Market Hewitt Associates, services to prospective clients;
- Develop the direction for the Direct Pay Practice in the Southeastern region, in conjunction with the firm's overall business direction.
Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED ON ISSUES REGARDING COMPENSATION FOR UTILITY CLIENTS?
A. No. In working with some of our utility clients, the possibility has been raised, and we have discussed the potential need. However, none of our other utility clients have had the need for me to testify.
Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?
A. The purpose of my testimony is to rebut the testimony of Office of Public Counsel witness Mr . Paul A. Katz concerning the basis for SSU's proposed market salary adjustment.
Q. DID HEWITT ASSOCIATES PERFORM A COMPENSATION STUDY FOR SSU TITLED "COMPETITIVE PAY DATA AND ANALYSIS FOR SELECTED POSITIONS" DATED APRIL 1995?
A. Yes. Exhibit__ (DGL-3) is a copy of that study:
Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THE COMPENSATION STUDY

HEWITT ASSOCIATES PERFORMED FOR SSU WAS A VALID SURVEY THAT WAS MARKET BASED WITH THE SPECIFIC MARKETS BEING THE LOCALITIES IN WHICH SSU OPERATES? If SO, PLEASE TELL US WHY.
A. Yes, $I$ believe the market data analysis is valid. We employ a rigorous process to ensure the relevance and validity of the data, and this process was followed for the SSU study. The process includes: - A careful review of sSU's jobs. This included an examination of job descriptions, organization charts, and discussions with management to clarify questions about actual job content.

- A clear understanding of the appropriate competitive market places. When developing competitive survey data, it is important to understand where employees are most likely to be recruited and where they are most likely to go if they are offered other employment. Some key findings from this analysis are:
- Higher level jobs and jobs requiring specific or unique technical skills and competencies are recruited from a much wider market place than lower level jobs or jobs requiring skills and competencies
that are more easily obtained. For example, a search for a Chief Financial Officer likely will be on at least a regional basis and could be national. It is also possible that this search could include utility and non-utility organizations. The search for a clerical position is much more likely to be conducted on a local basis, and the comparable organizations are likely to include all employers.
- Many "staff" positions (e.g., Human Resources, Accounting, Information Systems, etc.) may be recruited or lost from a variety of industries; they are not confined to the utility industry.
- Some jobs (e.g., Engineers) will have different market places depending on the level of the job. For example, an Entry Level Engineer likely has the option of going into almost any industry. As the Engineer gains experience in a specific industry, however, they will tend to focus future job searches on that specific industry. Likewise, companies
in the industry will tend to look for senior level people who have specific experience to their industry.
- The competitive market place for some jobs is relatively narrowly defined. For example, an experienced Water Plant Operator is most likely to be attracted to other water plants. SSU's experience is that their primary competition for this job in Florida is in plants operated by local governments that are in proximity to SSU's water plants.
- Using a variety of surveys that captures data on the relative markets. This step actually has two components:
- Market specificity: We want to ensure that data is reflective of the appropriate market place. Different surveys contain different jobs and different locations; therefore, we do not rely on a single survey source to provide all data. We actually referenced 19 different surveys in the course of our data analysis for SSU.
- Control bias: It is possible for any one
survey to contain some element of data bias. This can be caused by the way companies match the jobs to their survey descriptions, the size or types of companies in the survey, etc. Therefore, we attempt to use multiple survey sources for each job match whenever possible as a control mechanism. If we get closely comparable data from two different sources, it helps establish the credibility of each source.

However, in some cases, a single survey source provides the most directly relevant data, and no other valid data source exists. In these cases, we use this survey as the sole input. Our clients also are encouraged to review their own recruiting experience to provide further validation of the single source.

- Carefully matching sSU's jobs with surveyed jobs. The data analysis is not conducted by looking at job titles. Rather we take the information we have gathered concerning the content of SSU's jobs and compare it with job
descriptions contained in the survey sources. We make every effort to ensure that the descriptions and the information contained in the survey are comparable to the content of the SSU job. Once this is established, we then use that data in the survey analysis.

Adjusting survey data to be effective at a constant date. Because the effective dates of the data will vary in different surveys, all data is adjusted to a common date; in this case, it was projected to July 1, 1995.

Weighting survey data. We carefully analyze each survey, the closeness of the job match, the timeliness of the survey, and the appropriateness of the market place. Based on this analysis, we use our experience and judgment to assign a weighting to each survey input. This helps to ensure that the most relevant data is given the highest weight in the overall calculation.

- Establishing an Estimated Market Value. We compile all the survey data and develop a weighted average. The weighted average provides SSU with a close approximation of the market value of each particular job under
study. The Estimated Market Values ("EMV's") were established to reflect an approximation of the market average or going rate for each job in the study.

As you can see, extreme care is taken to ensure the relevance, accuracy, validity and proper comparison of all data included in the study. We believe the findings provide SSU with an accurate representation of market values for the benchmark jobs that were analyzed.
Q. WHY DID YOU USE THE MARKET AVERAGES AS THE EMVS FOR THE ANALYSIS FOR SSU?
A. SSU's compensation strategy is designed to target pay levels for all jobs included in this study at approximately market average levels.
Q. IN YOUR OPINION, IS THIS STRATEGY APPROPRIATE AND CONSISTENT WITH TYPICAL PRACTICE?
A. Yes. While some organizations will purposely target pay levels to be above competitive market levels in an effort to help ensure their ability to attract and retain qualified employees, most organizations target pay levels at market average rates. Interestingly, in the past, it was not unusual for utilities to have aggressive pay policies targeted at 75 th percentile or higher levels. However, in
the past few years, our experience has shown that virtually all the utilities we work with in the Southeast have modified their strategies to reflect more of a market average direction. Concurrently, they often develop incentive programs which provide the opportunity for total compensation to be above market averages, but only when specific performance objectives are achieved.
Q. WERE THE METHODS HEWITT ASSOCIATES USED TO EVALUATE SSU'S LABOR MARKET COMPETITIVENESS THE SAME AS THOSE YOU HAVE USED FOR OTHER MAJOR COMPANIES AND REGULATED UTILITIES IN FLORIDA AND ELSEWHERE IN THE UNITED STATES?
A. Yes. We have found the process I just outlined to be extremely effective in developing pay levels.
Q. WERE THE METHODS HEWITT ASSOCIATES USED TO EVALUATE SSU'S LABOR MARKET COMPETITIVENESS THE SAME AS YOU HAVE USED FOR OTHER UTILITIES AND BUSINESSES WHICH HAVE EMPLOYEES DISPERSED IN A MIX OF RURAL AND METROPOLITAN AREAS THROUGHOUT ONE STATE OR REGION?
A. Yes.
Q. WOULD YOU SAY THAT THE METHODS HEWITT ASSOCIATES USED ARE CONSIDERED STATE OF THE ART AS USED BY MAJOR HUMAN RESOURCES COMPENSATION PROFESSIONALS IN THE UNITED STATES?
A. Yes. While we believe we have refined the market pricing process more than many companies and have developed more rigorous documentation than some do, the basic approach is used by most major organizations in the country, both utility and non-utility, when developing competitive pay data on their jobs.
Q. FOR WHAT PURPOSE DO YOUR OTHER CLIENTS USE THE COMPETITIVE PAY DATA YOU PROVIDE?
A. Competitive pay data is used by our clients to assist them in making a number of decisions. Some examples are:

- Assign jobs to salary grades and ranges. Many companies now take the approach that market data is the most appropriate information to use when creating salary structures and assigning jobs to the salary grades. They, or we, collect the competitive pay data as I previously described. They then use the Estimated Market Value to determine which salary grade a job should be placed in. Typically, jobs are placed into the grade with a midpoint or target pay level that is closest to the market value.
- Updating existing salary structure. The
competitive pay data often is compared with existing midpoints or target pay levels in a salary structure. This information is then used to adjust the salary structure so that it better reflects the competitive realities of the market place. This is necessary because most organizations use the salary structure to help them manage and control their salary expenses. If the structure is too low, they run the risk of underpaying employees; if the structure is too high, they run the risk of overpaying employees.
- Determining the appropriateness of current pay levels. This concept is similar to the previous one; however, in this analysis actual salary levels, rather than midpoints, are compared with competitive pay levels. Again, the purpose of this analysis is for the organization to determine whether or not current pay levels are high or low relative to the market place.
- Determining salary increase budgets. Depending on the outcome of the analysis I just described. Many companies use the competitive information to assist them with
developing their salary increase budgets. For example, if salaries, on average, are well above the competitive levels, the company may decide its salary increase budget could be less than budgets being developed by other organizations. Conversely, if salaries are relatively low compared to the competition, the company may desire a salary increase budget that is high enough to provide some level of "catch-up." Alternatively, the company may simply develop a special budget for giving adjustments that will allow the catch-up to occur.
Q. COULD YOU PLEASE DESCRIBE THE APPROACH FOR DEVELOPING MARKET INFORMATION WHICH YOU USED WHEN CONDUCTING YOUR ANALYSIS FOR SSU?
A. We essentially broke the project into four steps. The first step was to define carefully the scope of our project activities in a project planning meeting. During this meeting, we discussed appropriate criteria for selecting benchmark jobs, the number of jobs, potential jobs for inclusion as benchmarks, and the likely survey sources we would be using for developing data. During this same meeting, we conducted a step
we labeled "direction setting." We discussed specific issues regarding the appropriate groups against which SSU should compare themselves to and the level at which pay should be compared.

We highlighted the importance of job matching and established a detailed process for ensuring that SSU's jobs are matched appropriately to the survey jobs. I described this process in an answer to a previous question.

The final step was to develop the competitive market information. We called this step "market pricing." The process we agreed upon and ultimately used is the same process I described in an answer to a previous question.
Q. PLEASE INDICATE THE METHODS USED BY HEWITT ASSOCIATES TO SELECT THE WAGE SURVEYS FOR THE SSU COMPETITIVE MARKET ANALYSIS?
A. We have used the same methods for SSU's study that we have used for hundreds of other clients in that we selected surveys with the following characteristics:

- Those containing jobs that could be compared directly to SSU jobs.
- Those containing organizations that compete with SSU for similar talent.
- Those covering the appropriate geographic areas in which SSU is most likely to recruit talent and/or lose people.
- Those conducted by reputable organizations.
- Those which were timely enough for the data to be considered up-to-date.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE MEASURES HEWITT ASSOCIATES USED TO ENSURE THAT THE COMPARISON PAX DATA USED IN THE COMPETITIVE MARKET SURVEY WAS RELEVANT TO THE GEOGRAPHIC MARKETS IN WHICH SSU RECRUITS EMPLOYEES.
A. Again, we used the same methods used for hundreds of other clients. We reviewed each job to determine where employees are most likely to be hired and where they are most likely to go if they leave. We made an independent assessment based on our experience with various types of jobs, and then discussed this assessment with SSU management to ensure the reasonableness of conclusions. We then selected published salary surveys which contained data from these geographic areas.
Q. WAS THE PROCESS USED TO WEIGHT THE SURVEY DATA IN CALCULATING THE ESTIMATED BASE MARKET VALUE FOR THE SSU STUDY THE SAME AS THAT USED FOR YOUR OTHER CLIENTS?
A. Yes.
Q. DID SSU PROVIDE HEWITT ASSOCIATES WITH DETAILED FORMAL POSITION DESCRIPTIONS FOR ALL THE JOBS WHICH IT EMPLOYS ALONG WITH A COPY OF ITS ENTIRE PAY STRUCTURE?
A. Yes.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS USED BY HEWITY ASSOCIATES TO MATCH JOB DESCRIPTIONS SUPPLIED BY SSU TO THE JOB DESCRIPTIONS SUPPLIED IN THE VARIOUS SURVEYS USED.
A. We carefully matched SSU's job descriptions to survey descriptions contained in the published salary surveys we used.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE STATISTICAL ANALYSES USED TO COMPARE SSU'S AVERAGE INCUMBENT PAY TO THAT OF THE SURVEYED COMPANIES.
A. We conducted several sets of analyses for SSU. The actual reports are included in Exhibit $\qquad$ (DGL-
3). I will reference the exhibit numbers in describing each of these.
- Actual Pay and Midpoint Compared to Market (Exhibit $\qquad$ (DGL-3), page 7 of 81): This analysis lists the benchmark jobs and shows a comparison of SSU's actual pay level and midpoint to the Estimated Market Value developed during our analysis. This exhibit
provides several significant findings:
- On average, SSU's midpoints and its actual pay levels, the latter being the key indicator Mr. Katz would presumably focus on, are both below competitive market levels.
- On average, midpoint values are further behind competitive market values than are actual pay levels. This supports the fact that $\operatorname{SSU}$ has attempted to keep pace with pay movement despite having a salary structure that is well below competitive levels.
- There is a wide dispersion of SSU's actual pay levels and midpoint values around the market value. As can be seen, generally speaking, the correlation between SSU's midpoint values and its actual pay levels is high. Thus, if the midpoint is above market levels the actual pay level tends to be above market levels, and conversely if the midpoint is below market levels, the actual pay levels tend to be below market levels.

This particular analysis is important from another
perspective. It indicates that the previous system being used by SSU to value its jobs was not doing an effective job of predicting external market values. Because the system apparently had a strong internal focus, there was some disconnection from what was happening in the external market place. This exhibit highlights the fact that if $S S U$ wants its actual pay levels to more closely approximate competitive pay levels, it will need to change its job valuing procedures as well as bring pay to competitive levels.

- Comparison of SSU Salaries and Midpoints with Market Averages (Exhibit ____ (DGL-3), page 12 of 81): This analysis displays graphically how SSU's actual average salary levels and midpoints compare with the market values, using salary grades as a variable.

This analysis provides a pictorial example that SSU's actual average salaries are below market averages at all levels, and SSU midpoints are below market averages at almost all levels. However, it is also instructive to note that for higher graded jobs, the differential increases. In other words, lower level jobs are paid closer to the market place
than higher level jobs.
Again, this is important if SSU wants to make its pay structure more reflective of competitive practice. SSU will either have to design a new salary structure or adjust its current salary structure by differing amounts (e.g., grade 1 would be increased by a relatively small amount and grade 22 would be increased by a relatively large amount).

In developing this graphic, we also conducted a statistical analysis of the data. This statistical analysis verifies that in general SSU's actual pay levels and midpoints move in a consistent pattern with the market, but they are consistently low.

- Market Ratio and Comparatio Comparisons (Exhibit $\qquad$ (DGL-3), page 13 and 14 of 81):

These two bar graphs provide a different display of the data outlined in the previous analysis. By grade, this graph shows the percentage relationship of SSU's midpoint and average salary level compared to the market values.

- Cost to Bring Actual Pay to Market (Exhibit (DGL-3), page 15 of 81 ): Using the
information outlined in Exhibit $\qquad$ (DGL-3), page 8 of 81 , we calculated the amount of salary increase needed, on average, to bring the current pay level to the competitive level. For example, the Data Entry Operator I is shown as having a base pay level of $\$ 16,000$ and an estimated market value of $\$ 17,500$. By increasing the $\$ 16,000$ by $9.4 \%$, you get $\$ 17,500$. In the aggregate, this exhibit shows that it would take $17.3 \%$ to bring all SSU pay levels to the market values developed.
Q. ACCORDING TO YOUR REPORT, ONE OF THE SURVEYS HEWITT ASSOCIATES RELIED ON WAS THE FLORIDA LEAGUE OF CITIES SURVEY, PLEASE GENERALLY DESCRIBE THE PARTICIPATING EMPLOYERS IN THE FLORIDA LEAGUE OF CITIES SURVEY AND THEIR GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS.
A. The Florida League of Cities Survey actually is broken into two separate volumes. One volume covers municipalities with populations in excess of 50,000 people, and the other volume covers municipalities with populations between 10,000 and 50,000 people. The municipalities include both city and county government. Some examples of the municipalities included are as follows:

1

City or County Name

Lake City

Niceville
Holly Hill
St. Augustine
Stuart

Vero Beach

Plant City

Ormond Beach

Bradenton

North Miami

Martin County

St. Lucie County

Collier County

Leon County

Manatee County

Jacksonville
Broward County
This listing is simply a brief sample of the
municipalities covered by the surveys. There are 120 municipalities covered by these two volumes.
Q. DO YOU THINK THE FLORIDA LEAGUE OF CITIES SURVEY ABOVE IS A VALID COMPARISON FOR SSU TO USE IN EVALUATING THE LABOR MARKET POSITION OF ITS LICENSED OPERATORS AND OTHER WATER AND WASTEWATER PLANT PERSONIEL?
A. Yes. Plant operators are highly trained, but in a very narrow specialty. Therefore, their most likely path of movement is to another water or wastewater plant treatment operator. We determined, and SSU's experience confirmed, the most likely competition for plant operators is found in city and county government water and wastewater operations.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE OTHER SURVEYS THAT WERE IN THE SSU MARKET COMPARISONS AND INDICATE WHY THEY WERE SELECTED FOR COMPARISON AGAINST THE SSU BENCHMARK JOBS IN THE HEWITT ASSOCIATES ANALYSIS.
A. Descriptions of the actual surveys used are contained in Exhibit ___ (DGL-3), pages 22 through 25 of 81 .

As discussed in an answer to a previous question, we selected these surveys because they provided information on the appropriate jobs, from the appropriate labor markets, with data that is
timely.
Q. WHY DO YOU THINK THE OTHER SURVEYS USED FOR MARKET COMPARISONS WERE VALID AND RELEVANT TO SSU'S LABOR MARKET?
A. As described previously, there are two primary reasons for using multiple survey sources:

- Multiple market places. Different surveys examine different job categories and labor markets. Therefore, it is important to use surveys that most directly reflect the pay practices of the relevant external market places.
- Data bias. To the extent possible, we encourage the use of multiple survey sources when examining any particular job. This helps to mitigate the potential for a single survey containing data error.
Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR CONCLUSIONS AND GENERAL OBSERVATIONS REGARDING SSU'S CURRENT ACTUAL COMPENSATION AND SALARY STRUCTURE AS COMPARED TO THE RELEVANT COMPETITIVE LABOR MARKETS.
A. In general, SSU's actual pay levels and midpoint values (salary structure) are below competitive market levels.
Q. ON PAGE 11 OF THE STUDY, HEWITT ASSOCIATES SHOWS AN

AVERAGE OF 17.3\% AS THE "COSTS TO BRING (SSU'S) ACTUAL PAY TO MARKET." PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE 17.3\% WAS CALCULATED.
A. A calculation was made to determine the size of increase that would be needed to raise the average pay level for each job to the Estimated Market Value. In the example mentioned previously, it would require a $9.4 \%$ increase to raise the Data Entry Operator I from $\$ 16,000$ to $\$ 17,500$. The 17.3\% was calculated in the same manner using the aggregated actual base salary levels and Estimated Market Values.
Q. IN VIEW OF THE AVERAGE COST OF $17.3 \%$ NECESSARY TO BRING SSU'S PAY UP TO MARKET LEVELS, DO YOU THINK THAT IT WAS JUSTIFIED AND REASONABLE FOR SSU TO BUDGET 4.765\% OF ITS 1996 LABOR BUDGET TO IMPLEMENT COMPETITIVE MARKET ADJUSTMENTS IN 1996 ?
A. Our analysis clearly indicates that SSU's pay levels are below competitive pay levels. We found in our initial benchmark comparison that it would take $17.3 \%$ on average to raise SSU's pay to competitive market levels.

We now have conducted a more in depth analysis of each individual employee's rate of pay in SSU's Operations and Maintenance and Customer Service
areas. This analysis looked at current individual incumbent rates of pay and compared them to the external market. We found overall for Operations and Maintenance that it would require an increase of $11.3 \%$ of that department's payroll to raise actual pay level to market and $15.1 \%$ to raise Customer Service employees pay to market levels. These two departments represent $60 \%$ of all SSU jobs.

Typically when pay is this far below market our clients will allocate some percentage of payroll and adjust pay levels. The percentage would not be enough to bring pay levels up to market levels immediately, but it should be enough to begin to close the gap.

Based on this detailed analysis of each incumbent's actual pay, it seems to us that 4.765\% is a reasonable starting point to begin to address these below market labor rates. Many organizations in these circumstances will develop separate budgets to be used for granting market adjustments, and it is important to have the money available to make adjustments to employees in jobs viewed as being critical to an organization's success. So, in summary, I believe it is reasonable for SSU to have requested funds needed to make market related pay
adjustments.
Q. DO YOU BELIEVE BASED ON THE RESULTS OF YOUR 1995 STUDY OF SSU'S ACTUAL BASE PAY AND PAY GRADE STRUCTURE THAT SSU'S PAY IS REASONABLY COMPETITIVE IN THE LABOR MARKETS WHEREIN SSU RECRUITS ITS EMPLOYEES?
A. No. SSU's pay levels, on average, are below competitive pay levels.
Q. WHAT TYPICALLY ARE THE EFFECTS ON RECRUITMENT, RETENTION AND QUALITY OF SERVICE FOR ORGANIZATIONS THAT DO NOT PAY COMPETITIVE LABOR RATES?
A. This question can be more complex than simply looking at competitive pay levels. However, most organizations believe, and experience supports, that if actual pay levels or the ability to pay, fall below competitive rates, it will be much harder to recruit individuals into the organization and the organization will be much more likely to lose individuals to other organizations who are willing to pay more.

The extent of the difficulties in recruiting and retention will be influenced by how far below competitive pay levels the organization's pay practice is. Obviously, an organization that offers pay levels $20 \%$ below the competition is likely to
have a much harder time recruiting and retaining employees than an organization that has pay levels only $5 \%$ below the competition. Further, if an organization's pay level causes it to have difficulty hiring qualified employees, the long-term effect is that the quality of service will no doubt suffer. In this case, since SSU's pay levels are below competitive market levels, I consider it likely that its pay levels will have a negative effect.
Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH OPC WITNESS MR. KATZ THAT "THE SALARY STRUCTURE IS IRRELEVANT TO A COMPANY'S ABILITY TO COMPETE IN THE MARKET" AND THAT "THE FACT THAT SSU DID NOT RAISE ITS SALARY STRUCTURE HAS NO BEARING WHATSOEVER ON (A) ITS ACTUAL RATES, OR (B) ITS ABILITY TO FAIRLY COMPETE IN THE LABOR MARKET."?
A. I believe there is a theoretical answer and a realistic answer to this question. Briefly, the theoretical answer is that what Mr . Katz says is true. In theory, a company could completely ignore its salary structure and pay employees any amount they want to. However, this raises the question of why they would even spend the time to develop the structures in the first place. The realistic answer is that virtually all
companies develop salary structures to help them manage and control their salary levels. Mr. Katz is correct in stating that most salary ranges are typically set to be $50 \%$ from minimum to maximum. However, most organizations establish a rate within the range (typically the midpoint) that they consider to be the target or the control rate of pay for jobs in that salary range. By policy and practice, most organizations want the pay levels of employees in that range to "cluster" around this control point, and pay administrative guidelines are designed to ensure that this occurs. Most programs provide larger increases or more frequent increases for employees whose pay falls below the control point and smaller increases or less frequent increases to employees whose pay is above the control point.

It is easy to see that using this approach tends to force pay levels for most employees toward the control point. The extremes of the range typically are reserved for new hires and for employees who perform at the extremes. For example, a consistently high performing employee may well be paid above the control point; however, the number of these employees should be relatively limited.

Likewise, a consistently low performing employee should be paid below the control point, and again, there should be relatively few of these.

This concept has been an accepted compensation principle for years. The intent is to establish the control point at a level where the organization is reasonably confident it can attract and retain qualified employees. Therefore, if the control point is being used to manage pay, and most companies use it this way, and it is allowed to fall well below or move well above competitive pay levels, it will have a direct and adverse impact on an individual organization's pay levels.

Mr. Katz states, "So, salary structure increases and salary increases can be two completely different things." The important point here is that while it is true that these "can be" two different things, in reality, they are closely integrated in virtually all organizations, and the salary structure has a direct impact on pay practices and pay levels.
Q. ACCORDING TO MR. KATZ TESTIMONY, IT IS HIS OPINION THAT NONE OR VIRTUALLY NONE OF SSU WITNESS LOCK'S CONCLUSIONS WHICH ALSO INCLUDE THE ENTIRE HEWITT ASSOCIATES STUDY BE GIVEN ANY WEIGHT BECAUSE:
(A) THE FOUNDATION SALARY SURVEYS USED ARE NON-COMPARABLE TO SSU'S INDIVIDUAL ESTABLISHMENTS AND (B) THE SURVEY DATA ITSELF HAS BEEN MISUSED. DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. KATZ'S STATED OPINION?
A. No. As I have already testified, the methodology employed in this study is rigorously applied to ensure comparability of job matches, comparability of labor market definitions (including geographic consideration), and validity of the data analysis itself. Therefore, I believe the survey information is comparable to SSU's situation and the data has been applied to provide an accurate representation of SSU's actual pay levels compared to the external market place.
Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT MR. KATZ DEMONSTRATED ANY UNDERSTANDING OF THE HEWITT ASSOCIATES STUDY CONDUCTED FOR SSU?
A. No. Since I had no direct contact with Mr. Katz, I cannot unequivacably provide an opinion on his qualifications. However, based on Mr. Katz's experience and testimony, I do not believe he has the requisite level of knowledge or expertise necessary to properly evaluate the Hewitt study. Mr. Katz spent 25 years in a variety of compensation positions for the federal government.

It has been a given in the private sector that the compensation program in the federal government is probably the most ineffective compensation program in the country. Therefore, that experience does little to expand the overall knowledge of best practices in compensation:

During the past seven years, much of Mr . Katz's experience has been as an expert witness and/or working with public sector clients. Again, public sector compensation programs are viewed as not being reflective of best practices.

It is obvious from his resume that Mr . Katz has significant educational and theoretical background. However, I question whether or not that background has been used to apply sound compensation principals in a practical manner in a corporate setting.

Also, most of Mr. Katz's education and hands-on experience occurred in the 1980's or before. It is important to point out that most of the true innovations in compensation management have occurred in the last ten years, with some of the most significant changes being made in the last five years. For example, when Mr . Katz retired from the government, the most prevalent way to establish job
values was to use a quantitative job evaluation process. These processes tended to focus more on internal value than external value. As a result, many practitioners of that time were unaware of some of the refined approaches used to analyze and apply market data to manage pay levels. Today, the most prevalent job evaluation approach is to use the external market as the primary method for establishing job values.

Finally, based on Mr. Katz's testimony, it does not appear that he read the entire Hewitt Study at issue in this case. In that document, we clearly described the activities taken to ensure comparability of job matches, labor market, etc., but he seems to ignore that. Also, he seems to have pulled data selectively from some of the exhibits without indicating a balanced view of all the exhibits. Therefore, I must conclude that he read at least at some of the data, but chose to ignore or did not review other parts of the report.

## Q. DOES THAT CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.

