

Cases 13-E-0030, 13-G-0031 and 13-S-0032

Index of Caitlyn E. Edmundson Exhibits

Item	PDF Page(s)
Cover Sheet/Index	1
CEE-1	2-39
CEE-2	40-40
CEE-3	41-46
CEE-4	47-57
CEE-5	58-59
CEE-6	60-60

Company Name: Con Edison  
Case Description: Con Edison Electric, Gas & Steam Rate Cases  
Case: 13-E-0030, 13-G-0031, 13-S-0032

Response to DPS Interrogatories – Set DPS-3  
Date of Response: 03/06/2013  
Responding Witness: Compensation and Benefits Panel

Question No. :0013.5

Subject: Management Benefit Programs and Compensation - Regarding the description of the prior employers of recent hires on p. 38, line 14 – p. 39, line 12 of the testimony, for each of the two time periods analyzed, provide a list of the specific companies from which all of these recent hires came as well as the number of employees that came from those companies. The testimony indicates that “the largest single source of employees was Con Edison contractors” and “the second largest employer cluster was eight percent from various municipal and state employers.” Why weren’t any Con Edison contractors or municipal/state agencies included in the peer groups, as it appears as though Con Edison competes with these companies for employees?

Response:

Please see attachments for a listing of prior employers, sorted by prior employer name.

Please refer to the Panel’s testimony on pages 19- 21, in which the Company described its selection of the peer group for benefits and compensation consistent with the guidance of the Public Service Commission.





Fidelity Investments  
Firmenich  
First Commercial Bank  
FLTS Search  
General Physics Corp  
Gleacher & Company Securities Inc.  
Grant Thornton LLP  
GridNavigator, Inc.  
Guy Carpenter & Co., LLC  
HDR Engineering  
HRA  
Imagine 247 Foundation/Learning  
Spring School  
Imaginova  
Intelligent Product Solutions  
Israel, Israel & Purdy, LLP  
Jacksonville Electric Authority  
Jateks Inc.  
JP Morgan Chase  
JP Morgan Chase  
JS Asset Management  
Keyspan  
KPMG LLP  
KPMG LLP  
Lake Success Liquors  
Lee's Toyota  
Lehigh Technical Services  
LIPA/National Grid  
Lycee Francais de New York  
Macquarie  
Macquarie Securities  
Malcolm Pirnie the Water Division of  
ARCADIS  
Marks, Paneth & Shron  
Marsh USA  
Maxum Petroleum Inc.  
MBF Investigations  
Medidata Solutions  
Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer  
Center  
Merck  
Merrill Lynch  
Montefiore Medical Center  
Motorola Solutions  
MTA  
MTA  
MTA  
MTA  
MTV  
MWBE Partners  
National Grid  
National Grid  
National Grid  
National Grid  
National Grid  
National Grid  
National Grid  
Neotecra Inc. NY  
New York State  
NY Affordable Reliable Electricity  
Alliance  
NY Police Dept.  
NYC Dept. of Buildings  
NYC Dept. of Correction  
NYC Dept. of Education  
NYC Dept. of Investigation  
NYC Environmental Protection  
NYC Housing Authority  
NYC Police Dept  
NYC Police Dept  
NYCEDC  
NYISO  
Off. Of the Special Commisioner of  
Investigation

Office of Congressman Welch  
Pall Corp.  
Pfizer  
Picador/St. Martin's Press  
Pitney Bowes Inc.  
Power Survey Co.  
Practising Law Institute  
PricewaterhouseCoopers  
PricewaterhouseCoopers  
PricewaterhouseCoopers  
PSEG  
PSEG Nuclear  
Public Service Electric & Gas  
Public Service Enterprise Group  
Ram Tech Systems, Inc.  
RCM Technologies  
Sairam Consultants, Inc.  
Sargent Mfg.  
Seedco Financial Inc.  
Self-Employed  
Self-Employed  
Severn Trent Environment Services  
Shaw Power Group  
Sikorsky Aircraft  
Southampton Hospital  
Southern Wine & Spirits of NY  
Spence-Chapin Services to Families  
St. Vincents  
Staten Island Advance  
Staten Island Economic Development  
Corp.  
Structuretone

Suffolk County Dept. of Public Works  
Sunoco Refinery  
Syska Hennessy Group  
Technisource/ConEdison: Construction  
Quality Assurance  
TekSystems  
The Aldan Troy Group  
The Boeing Co.  
The Penthouse Group  
Time Warner Cable  
TRC Solutions  
U.S. Army  
U.S. Peace Corps - Panama  
Union Pacific  
United Parcel Service  
United Water  
URS Corp  
USAID  
Verizon  
Verizon  
Verizon  
Verizon  
Verizon  
Vital Network Services  
WDA Group  
Welkin Mechanical  
William H. Rosvally, Esq  
Wilson Elser  
Winston Staffing  
Winston Staffing  
WSP Flack & Kurtz  
WSP Flack & Kurtz  
WSP-Cantor Seinuk  
Wyndham Worldwide  
Yorkson Legal, Inc.

**Last Employer (based on available data) - 1/2007 through 6/2011**

2020 Companies

Accretech USA, Inc.

Air Products & Chemicals, Inc.

Alcoa-Howmet Casting & Services

Alcrest Transportation

Alliance Bernstein

ALSTOM Power

AMEC Earth & Environmental

Angel Body Products

Aon Insurance

Arvind Narayanaswamy Research Group

BAE Systems

Ball Baker Leake LLP

Bear Stearns

Benenson Strategy Group

BNY Mellon

Boeing

Bowne Management Systems

Brickman Group

Brooklyn Educational Opportunity Center

Cablevision

Central Hudson Gas & Electric

CH2M Hill

Chatsworth Securities LLC

Citigroup

Clean Diesel Technologies, Inc.

CLSA

CNY Builders

Cobb County Schools

College of Staten Island

Community Energy, Inc.

Community Environmental Center

Comsys

Comverge/Public Energy Solutions

ConEd Contractor

ConEd Contractor

ConEd Contractor

ConEd Contractor

ConEd Contractor

ConEd Contractor

ConEd Contractor

ConEd Contractor

ConEd Contractor

ConEd Contractor

ConEd Contractor

ConEd Contractor

ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
ConEd Contractor  
Congressman Michael E. McMahon  
Constellation Energy  
Control Solutions Int'l  
Cooper Union Computer Center  
Covanta Energy  
CSA Group  
DC Power Systems, Inc.  
DCAS  
Deloitte Tax, LLP  
Dent Wizard  
Dept. of Energy Solor Decathlon  
Dept. of Mechanical Engineering  
Donnelly & Moore  
DSG Development  
EIC Associates, Inc.  
Eisner LLP  
Emory University Law School  
Enterprise Rent-A-Car  
Enviowash  
Ernst & Young LLP  
Ernst & Young LLP  
Express  
Federal Bureau of Investigation  
FedEx Express  
Fein, Such, Khan, & Shepard, P.C.  
First Funds LLC  
Florida Power & Light  
Forest Laboratories, Inc.  
Fox TV  
French Institute Alliance Francaise



Gas Turbine Controls  
Georgia Transmission Corp.  
Gerdau Ameristeel  
Grant Thornton  
Gravitas Technology  
Groundwork, Inc.  
Group Financial  
Hardesty & Hanover  
HBO/Time Warner  
Highwood-USA  
Hubbell Inc., Wiring Devices-Kellems  
IBM  
IBM  
IBM  
Infinity Electrical Contractor Inc.  
International Council of Shopping Centers  
International Power PLC  
Jacques Whitford Co., Inc.  
Jetblue Airways  
Johnson & Johnson  
Johnson Controls, Inc.  
KPMG  
Laboratory for Laser Energetics  
Larsen Brown Staffing  
Lehigh Technical Service G.I.T  
Leviton Manufacturing Co.  
Lincus Energy  
Long Island Railroad  
LVI Services  
Macy's  
Mahoney Cohen & Co.  
Marist College  
Marlborough Gallery  
Mars Inc.  
Mary Immaculate Hospital  
Massmutual Financial Group  
McGraw-Hill Professional  
Microsoft  
Montauk Financial Group  
Morgenstern, Svoboda & Baer CPAs  
Morris Discount  
MTA  
MTA  
MTA - Audit Dept.  
National Grid  
National Grid  
National Grid

National Grid  
National Grid  
National Grid  
National Hanover  
NBC Universal  
Nexant  
NFS LLC  
NJ Office of Attorney General, Div. of Law  
NY Magic  
NY Power Authority  
NY Presbyterian Hospital  
NYC Council  
NYC DDC  
NYC DEP  
NYC Dept. of Parks & Recreation  
NYC Health & Hospitals Corp.  
NYPD  
NYPD  
NYPD  
NYPD  
NYSERDA  
NYU College of Arts & Sciences Advising Center  
O&R  
PA Army Nat'l Guard  
Pacific Gas & Electric  
Pacific Gas & Electric  
PB America  
Polytechnic Institute of NYU  
Precision Pipeline Solutions  
RDA International  
Robert Bosch LLC  
RPG Consultants  
RSM McGladrey  
Safety Kleen Systems  
Sairam Consulting  
Saks Fifth Ave.  
Schindler Elevator Corp.  
Schindler Elevator Corp.  
ScienceFirst  
Sciences Inc.  
Screenvision  
Self-Employed  
SIEMENS - Morgan Stanley  
Skadden Arps  
SL Green Realty Corp  
Sleepy Hollow Country Club  
Sleepy's

Software Guidance & Assistance @ BNP  
Solar Resources  
State Street Bank  
Staten Island Advance  
Stephen Einstein & Associates  
Strauss Paper  
Tech Analyst Inc.  
Texas Engineering Extension Service  
TGR, Inc.  
Thacher Associates  
The Dannon Co.  
The Hertz Corp.  
The Jack Parker Corp.  
The Louis Berger Group  
The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.  
Thomson Reuters  
Tiaa-Cref  
Town Sports International, Inc.  
Toys R Us  
Trane  
TSR Consulting  
UBS  
Univar USA Inc.  
US Army  
US Powergen  
Ventyx (Global) Energy Co.  
Verizon  
Verizon  
Verizon  
Verizon  
Verizon  
Verizon  
Verizon  
Verizon  
Verizon  
Verizon  
Ward Investigations LLC  
Wesleyan University-Economics Dept.  
Westchester County Police Dept.  
Winston Support Staffing  
WSP Flack & Kurtz  
XM Los Expertos En Mercados  
YU & Associates  
Zempleo  
Zemplo/Winston/ConEd

Company Name: Con Edison  
Case Description: Con Edison Electric Rate Case  
Case: 13-E-0030

Response to DPS Interrogatories – Set DPS-3  
Date of Response: 03/05/2013  
Responding Witness: Compensation and Benefits Panel

Question No. :0013.6

Subject: Management Benefit Programs and Compensation - Regarding the list of benchmarked positions, as shown in Exhibit AH C/BP – 3a and 3b. Provide a list of the positions that weren't benchmarked in this particular analysis. Also according to p. 35, lines 12-19 of the testimony of the Compensation/Benefits Panel, only 30% of Con Edison's non-officer management positions were benchmarked. Why weren't all/more of Con Edison's non-officer management positions benchmarked? Explain why it is sufficient to benchmark only 30% of positions.

Response:

Studies of this nature do not require the review of all company positions. As discussed in the Panel's testimony (p.34), the Company was able to obtain positional information from survey data for about 30 percent of management employees at Con Edison which provided a representative cross section of positions as described on page 35 line 20 to page 37 line 2 of the Panel's testimony:

- The positions held by these management employees covered several functional areas: Central Operations, Electric Operations, Finance, Accounting, Customer Operations, Human Resources, Engineering, Gas Operations, and Legal, among others. Please note that often the same positions are in multiple departments. In some of those instances, positions were benchmarked for some but not all departments. For example, there are Section Managers at Con Edison in multiple departments. Section Managers were included in the analysis for many departments, but not for all departments.;
- The positions included all of the non-officer management salary bands at Con Edison (1L/1H, 2L/2H, 3L/3H, and 4L/4H);
- Across the band levels, the lowest sample size covered 25 percent of the employees in the band (i.e., for bands 1H and 3L), and the highest sample size was 80 percent of the employees in the band (i.e., for band 1L); and

- The average base salary for the total non-officer management employee population is \$109,836 (at the time of the study) and the average for the nearly 1,400 employees included in the Expanded Utility Peer Group analysis is \$111,901.

The results of the analysis, therefore, are representative of Con Edison's pay positioning across the entire employee population and the non-officer management employees included in the study are compensated similarly to the entire Con Edison non-officer management population, which further substantiates the validity of the analysis and the conclusions drawn from the findings.

The Review included 58 of the Company's 192 titles or approximately 30 percent of non-officer management titles. Attached is a list of positions excluded from the Review.



## **MANAGEMENT TITLES EXCLUDED FROM THE REVIEW**

### **MANAGEMENT BANDS and TITLES**

#### **ASSISTANT - SL**

- 1 DEPARTMENTAL ASSISTANT
- 2 ASSISTANT

#### **ASSISTANT - SH**

- 3 LEGAL ASSISTANT
- 4 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT

#### **ENTRY PROFESSIONAL BAND**

- 5 COMPUTER INTERN
- 6 MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATE

#### **BAND 1L**

- 7 ASSOCIATE ACCOUNTANT
- 8 ASSOCIATE ANALYST
- 9 ASSOCIATE INDUSTRIAL HYGIENIST
- 10 ASSOCIATE QA EXAMINER
- 11 ASSOCIATE TAX ACCOUNTANT
- 12 CHIEF COORDINATOR
- 13 CLERICAL SUPERVISOR
- 14 COMPUTER ANALYST
- 15 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT
- 16 EXPEDITER
- 17 GRAPHIC DESIGNER
- 18 INVESTIGATOR
- 19 LIBRARIAN
- 20 PARALEGAL

#### **BAND 1H**

- 22 ACCOUNT EXECUTIVE - D
- 23 ACCOUNTANT
- 24 ASSOCIATE GAS SYSTEM OPERATOR
- 25 ASSOCIATE ARCHITECT
- 26 ASSOCIATE SCIENTIST
- 27 AUDITOR
- 28 CONSTRUCTION SUPERVISOR
- 29 CUSTOMER OUTREACH ADVOCATE
- 30 CUSTOMER PROJECT MANAGER B
- 31 CUSTOMER SERVICE CENTER MANAGER
- 32 DISTRICT MANAGER
- 33 FIELD ENGINEERING REPRESENTATIVE
- 34 INSTRUCTOR
- 35 LAW LIBRARIAN
- 36 MAJOR ACCOUNT REPRESENTATIVE
- 37 PLANT INDUSTRIAL HYGIENIST
- 38 QUALITY ASSURANCE EXAMINER
- 39 SENIOR ENGINEERING ASSISTANT
- 40 SENIOR GRAPHIC DESIGNER
- 41 STAFF INVESTIGATOR
- 42 TAX ACCOUNTANT
- 43 TECHNICAL MARKETING REPRESENTATIVE

#### **BAND 2L**

- 44 ACCOUNT EXECUTIVE -C
- 45 ARCHITECT
- 46 CHIEF SURVEYOR
- 47 CONTROL ROOM SUPERVISOR
- 48 DISTRICT OPERATOR
- 49 ENERGY SERVICES MANAGER
- 50 FIELD OPERATIONS PLANNER
- 51 GAS SYSTEM OPERATOR
- 52 GENERAL SUPERVISOR
- 53 INDUSTRIAL HYGIENIST
- 54 OPERATIONS TRAINER
- 55 PROGRAM PLANNER
- 56 PROJECT PLANNER
- 57 PUBLIC AFFAIRS MANAGER
- 58 SCIENTIST
- 59 SCHEDULER
- 60 SENIOR CHEMIST
- 61 SENIOR EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT
- 62 SENIOR INSTRUCTOR
- 63 SENIOR SYSTEM ANALYST
- 64 SENIOR WRITER & PRODUCER
- 65 STEAM DISPATCHER
- 66 SUPERVISING DESIGNER
- 67 WORK ORGANIZER

#### **BAND 2H**

- 68 ACCOUNT EXECUTIVE -B
- 69 CHIEF ENERGY DISPATCHER
- 70 GENERATION OPERATOR
- 71 PRINCIPAL ENGINEER
- 72 PROJECT AUDITOR
- 73 SENIOR ARCHITECT
- 74 SENIOR DISTRICT OPERATOR
- 75 SENIOR ENGINEER
- 76 SENIOR ENGINEERING SCHEDULER
- 77 SENIOR GAS SYSTEM OPERATOR
- 78 SENIOR INDUSTRIAL HYGIENIST
- 79 SENIOR PLANNING ANALYST
- 80 SENIOR QA EXAMINER
- 81 SENIOR RATE ANALYST
- 82 SENIOR REAL ESTATE REPRESENTATIVE
- 83 SENIOR SCIENTIST
- 84 SENIOR STAFF WRITER
- 85 SENIOR SUPERVISING DESIGNER
- 86 SENIOR TAX ACCOUNTANT
- 87 SENIOR WATCH SUPERVISOR
- 88 SUB SECTION MANAGER
- 89 SUPERINTENDENT
- 90 TRANSMISSION OPERATOR

#### **BAND 3L**

- 91 ACCOUNT EXECUTIVE -A
- 92 AREA MANAGER
- 93 ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
- 94 ASSISTANT TO PRESIDENT
- 95 ASSOCIATE CHIEF DISTRICT OPERATOR
- 96 ASSOCIATE CHIEF SYSTEM OPERATOR
- 97 CONSTRUCTION SUPERINTENDENT
- 98 ENERGY MANAGER
- 99 GAS TURBINE SUPERINTENDENT
- 100 MAINTENANCE MANAGER
- 101 MGR. ENVIRONMENT, HEALTH & SAFETY
- 102 OPERATIONS MANAGER - FOSSIL
- 103 OUTAGE MANAGER
- 104 PROGRAM MANAGER
- 105 SENIOR SYSTEM OPERATOR
- 106 SUPERVISING ENGINEER
- 107 SYSTEM OPERATOR
- 108 TECHNICAL MANAGER

#### **BAND 3H**

- 109 CHIEF AUTOMOTIVE ENGINEER
- 110 CHIEF DISTRICT OPERATOR
- 111 CHIEF SYSTEM OPERATOR
- 112 DIRECTOR - OPERATIONS COMMUNICATIONS
- 113 DIRECTOR MEDIA RELATIONS
- 114 DIRECTOR MINORITY BUSINESS PROGRAM
- 115 OPERATIONS MANAGER

#### **BAND 4L**

- 116 ASSISTANT TO THE CHAIRMAN
- 117 CHIEF GAS ENGINEER

#### **BAND 4H**

- 118 DIRECTOR - CORPORATE PLANNING
- 119 DIRECTOR - ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS
- 120 DIRECTOR - ENERGY MANAGEMENT
- 121 DIRECTOR - INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
- 122 DIRECTOR - INFORMATION RESOURCES
- 123 DIRECTOR - RATE ENGINEERING
- 124 DIRECTOR - TAXES
- 125 GENERAL MANAGER - CENTRAL ENERGY SERVICES.
- 126 GENERAL MANAGER - CONSTRUCTIONS
- 127 GENERAL MANAGER - CENTRAL OPERATIONS
- 128 GENERAL MANAGER - ELECTRIC OPS.
- 129 GENERAL MANAGER - ISO
- 130 PLANT MANAGER

#### **LAWYERS / PHYSICIANS**

##### **BAND 60**

- 131 ATTORNEY

##### **BAND 64**

- 132 ADMINISTRATIVE PHYSICIAN

##### **BAND 65**

- 133 MEDICAL DIRECTOR

##### **BAND 66**

- 134 GENERAL TAX COUNSEL

Company Name: Con Edison  
Case Description: Con Edison Electric Rate Case  
Case: 13-E-0030

Response to DPS Interrogatories – Set DPS-14  
Date of Response: 03/28/2013  
Responding Witness: Compensation/Benefits Panel

Question No. :E0144

Subject: Management Benefits and Compensation Package - 1. Regarding progress toward Con Edison's performance goals as described on p. 73, lines 5-20 of the testimony provided by the Compensation/Benefits Panel, provide all information that was reviewed and approved by the Company's senior management and Board of Directors. Also provide, in a usable electronic file, the Company's tracking of performance against its targeted objectives and metrics, as described on p. 68, line 12 – p. 71, line 8 of the testimony and in Exhibits C/BP – 2, 3, 4. 2. Regarding the variable component of management pay as described on p. 9, lines 18-20, p. 15, line 17 – p. 16, line 2, and p. 61, Elines 19-22 of the testimony, when did variable pay become a part of Con Edison's direct compensation package? Provide compensation data that shows that base salary decreased at this point in time and thus variable pay is not extra or bonus pay. 3. Regarding the BLS information referenced on p. 4, lines 10-11 of the testimony, has Con Edison, in the last ten years, provided data, for union and/or management positions, to the Bureau of Labor Statistics for use in their National Compensation Survey? If so, indicate how the duties and responsibilities of the job titles for which the Company provided the BLS data correspond to the Standard Occupational Classifications (SOC) listed in Appendix B of the BLS bulletin titled "National Compensation Survey: Occupational Earnings in the United States, 2010" (<http://www.bls.gov/ncs/ncswage2010.htm>). Also indicate how the duties and responsibilities of the job titles shown in Exhibits AH C/BP – 3a, b correspond to the SOCs listed in Appendix B of the BLS bulletin. 4. Regarding the Benefit Index results as discussed on p. 24, line 11 – p. 26, line 2 of the testimony, provide the underlying computations used to produce the Benefit Index results. In other words provide "the total value a representative population of employees would derive from Con Edison's benefits program and the benefits programs of each of the peer companies" as determined by the actuarial techniques used by Aon Hewitt. What is the composition of this "representative population of employees"? How is it determined? What assumptions are used when measuring the value of each benefits program? How are they determined? Was the Benefit Index model tested for sensitivity to changes in these assumptions? 5. Regarding the Summary of Total Benefits and Compensation Review – Post Benefit and Variable Pay Changes table presented in Exhibit AH C/BP – 6. Provide, in a usable electronic file, the underlying data used to produce the table, similar to the information provided in Exhibits AH C/BP – 3a, b. 6. Regarding the lack of adjustment for geography of the survey data from the Expanded Utility Peer Group, as discussed on p. 35, lines 3-11 of the testimony. Elaborate on the brief explanation provided in the testimony as to why the positional data used in the benchmarking analysis was not adjusted for cost differences associated with the geographical locations of the corresponding companies. Quantify metropolitan New York's "significantly higher than national cost of labor."



Response:

1. Regarding progress toward Con Edison's performance goals as described on p.73, lines 5-20 of the testimony provided by the Compensation/Benefits Panel, provide all information that was reviewed and approved by the Company's senior management and Board of Directors. Also provide, in a usable electronic file, the Company's tracking of performance against its targeted objectives and metrics, as described on p.68, lines 12-p.71, line 8 of the testimony and in Exhibits C/BP-2, 3, 4.

**Response:**

The Company's variable pay component of management compensation aligns performance at all levels of management with the overall Company's performance. The corporate level indicators shown on the Compensation/Benefits Panel Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (C/BP-4) are used to determine the amount of funds awarded for variable pay. This is based on the year end performance results for these key indicators. The status of the key indicators shown on Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (C/BP-4) is provided to the Board at each meeting during the year. Please refer to the attachment for the material provided to the Board in December 2012 and January 2013.

All management employees have access to the Company's intranet site to view the status of the Company's performance, which is reviewed and updated each month. Please see below screen prints from the Company's intranet site. This information cannot be easily transferred into a "usable electronic file." Please see the attached file for the 2012 results for the items listed on the Compensation/Benefits Panel Exhibits \_\_\_\_ (C/BP-2 and -3). The Company also would note that in response to the Liberty Audit the Company provided a demonstration to Mr. Stockholm and three members of the DPS Staff in July 2011 to explain how this information is maintained, updated, and made available to Company employees.

CECONY Performance Indicators is a drop down site on the Company's intranet.

**CECONY performance indicators**

Select Date: **December 2012**

Overall Status: as of December 2012

Overall Status is comprised of CECONY Performance Indicators, Capital Budget, O&M Budget, and Net Income. See categories below for details.

Category	Indicator	Status
CECONY Performance Indicators	<b>SAFETY/ENVIRONMENTAL</b>	
	Environmental Index	On Target
	Safety Index	On Target
	<b>EMPLOYEES</b>	
	Employee Development Index	On Target
	<b>CUSTOMERS</b>	
	Representative Calls (Answered within 30-seconds)	On Target
	PSC Complaints	On Target
	Customer Satisfaction Surveys	On Target
	Meters Read on Cycle	On Target
<b>ELECTRIC</b>		
Electric Reliability Performance Measure	On Target	
Electric Non-Network Availability	On Target	
Electric Network System Availability	On Target	
<b>GAS</b>		
Gas Leaks - Workable and Total Backlog	On Target	
Respond to Gas Odor Complaints within 30 minutes	On Target	
<b>STEAM</b>		
Steam System - Normal Pressure Operations	On Target	
Generation Station - Forced Outages	On Target	
<b>Net Income</b>	On Target	
<b>Capital Details</b>	On Target	
<b>Modifiers</b>	On Target	
<b>Budgets</b>	On Target	
<b>O &amp; M Details</b>	On Target	
<b>Modifiers</b>	On Target	
<b>Budgets</b>	On Target	
<b>Major Groups</b>		
Ce Electric Operations	Budget	
Ce Customer Operations	On Target	
Uncollectibles	On Target	
Ce Gas Operations	On Target	
Ce Central Operations	On Target	
Interference	Off Target	
Ce Environ Health & Safety	On Target	
Ce Business Shared Services	Off Target	
Ce Enterprise Shared Services	Off Target	
Ce Human Resources	On Target	
Ce Public Affairs	On Target	
Ce Finance	On Target	
Insurance Premiums	On Target	
Ce Law	Off Target	
Ce Auditing	Off Target	
Ce Chair Of The Board & Ceo	On Target	
Ce Office Of President	On Target	

2. Regarding the variable component of management pay as described on p.9, lines 18-20, p.15, line 17-p.16.line 2, and p.61, lines 19-22 of the testimony, when did variable pay become a part of Con Edison's direct compensation package? Provide compensation data that shows that base salary decreased at this point in time and thus variable pay is not extra or bonus pay.

**Response:**

Since 1999, rather than continuing to compensate each employee in a single form of a payment via base salary, Con Edison carved out a portion of employees' base salaries to link it directly with Company performance. The annual merit budget was reduced to two percent in 1999 and 2000 in order to fund lump sum variable pay awards and transition the Company's base compensation plan to include a pay-for-performance component. The average industry merit increase in 1999 and 2000 ranged from a low of 4.0 percent to a high of 4.4 percent based on survey data from American Compensation Association, Compensation Resources, Conference Board, Hewitt Associates, Mercer, Buck Consultants, and Price Waterhouse Coopers. The Company used the 2.0 percent difference to fund management variable pay. The reasoning behind Con Edison's decision to have a variable pay plan is plain – putting a portion of an employee's base salary at risk serves to align pay with performance. By reducing the annual merit budget at the introduction of the variable pay plan, the Company shifted a portion of total management base salary to pay-for-performance which must be re-earned each year. Tying a portion of employees' base compensation (base salary and variable pay) to performance is commonplace both in American business generally and for public utilities.

3. Regarding the BLS information referenced on p.41, lines 10-11 of the testimony, has Con Edison, in the last ten years, provided data, for union and/or management positions, to the Bureau of Labor Statistics for use in their National Compensation Survey? If so, indicate how the duties and responsibilities of the job titles for which the Company provided the BLS data correspond to the Standard Occupational Classifications (SOC) listed in Appendix B of the BLS bulletin titled "National Compensation Survey: Occupational Earnings in the United States, 2010" (<http://www.bls.gov/ncs/ncswage2010.htm>). Also indicate how the duties and responsibilities of the job titles shown in Exhibits AH C/BP-3a, b corresponds to the SOCs listed in Appendix B of the BLS bulletin.

**Response:**

The Company provides certain information regarding union positions to the Bureau of Labor Statistics ("BLS"). It is unclear to the Company what use, if any, the BLS may have made of data that the Company submitted to the BLS over the last 10 years. As noted in the Panel's testimony, the Panel's position is that it is inappropriate to use BLS information for purposes of evaluating the Company's benefits and compensation. The Company does not have the information requested by the remainder of this question. The Company objects to responding to the remainder of this question as it would require the Company to perform a detailed study.

4. Regarding the Benefit Index results as discussed on p. 24, line 11 – p. 26, line 2 of the testimony, provide the underlying computations used to produce the Benefit Index results. In

other words provide “the total value a representative population of employees would derive from Con Edison’s benefits program and the benefits programs of each of the peer companies” as determined by the actuarial techniques used by Aon Hewitt.

**Response:**

The total value of the representative population of employees that would be derived from Con Edison’s benefits programs including the changes implemented effective January 1, 2013, is 92.6 percent of the value of the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile of the Utility Peer Group and was 95.8 percent of Utility Peer Group in 2011 prior to the changes. See Exhibit \_\_ (AH C/BP-2). Benefit comparisons in aggregate were measured by the Benefit Index. Please refer to Attachment 1 which shows the Company’s Benefit’s Index and the Benefit Index for each of the 16 Utility Peer Companies. The peer company names are not shown on the attachment to keep each company’s results confidential.

What is the composition of this “representative population of employees”? How is it determined? What assumptions are used when measuring the value of each benefits program? How are they determined? Was the Benefit Index model tested for sensitivity to changes in these assumptions?

**Response:**

The Benefit Index portion of the Company’s Review was done with the objective of focusing on benefit program design. The Benefit Index is a series of calculations which provides a relative value of each of the Company’s benefits and the aggregate compared with the peer companies. Please refer to Attachment 2 which shows the Benefit Index and the ranking of each of the Company’s benefits relative to the Utility Peer group. This method provides a comparison of the value of the overall program.

The following is a general description of the categories shown on Attachment 2.

- Retirement Benefits: –Includes post-retirement benefits such as pensions, retiree health, retiree life insurance, and benefits provided under the Company’s defined contribution program. Preretirement death benefits and the portion of any disability pension prior to age 65 are not included (these benefits are reflected in the Death and Disability indexes).
- Matched Savings: Includes 401(k)-type savings plans with an employer subsidy. Only the employer-provided benefit is used to determine the value of the savings plans. Any assumed payment due to death prior to retirement are reflected in the Death indexes. Payments that occur upon disability are retirement benefits.
- Death: The preretirement portion includes all lump sum payments and annuity or periodic payments resulting from preretirement death, including those that are insured, self-insured, or payable from the defined benefit and defined contribution plans. Group life benefits have been shown in a separate index. The post retirement death benefits include lump sum benefits from a pension plan. They do not include postretirement benefits.
- Disability: Has been split into short-term and long-term by defining short-term benefits as those payable in the first six months, without regard to source. That is, the

Short-Term Disability index includes long-term disability plan benefits if they are payable in the first six months of disability. Similarly, the Long-Term Disability index includes salary continuation benefits payable after six months.

- **Health Care:** Includes the traditional medical benefits such as hospital, surgical, doctor visits, prescription drugs, dental, and vision. The index for preretirement health care benefits is developed with and without dental, vision, accounts, and credits to allow for analysis of medical plans. The Postretirement Health Care index includes the package available to retirees. The payment by the employer of the employee's share of Medicare premiums is included in this index.
- **Time Off with Pay:** Includes holidays and vacations, which are shown combined as well as separately, recognizing that planning decisions on number of holidays are sometimes influenced by the amount of vacation provided and by the flexibility of an employee has in scheduling vacation.

To facilitate comparisons the Benefit Index applies economic and actuarial assumptions to a common population to determine relative values. This population has the characteristics of a full-time salaried industrial/utility workforce and includes both lower and higher paid employees but excludes part-time employees. The development of this population involved collecting data from a number of major U.S. industrial corporations.

The values are summed up for all the employees in the population recognizing that the value of the various benefits varies by the individual's circumstances—age, service, gender, compensation level. The relative value in any benefit area then recognizes, on a composite basis, the value to an entire employee group—using a mix of employees who have a variety of individual circumstances. The overall benefit program indexes are not based on an arbitrary weighting of the individual program indexes; instead, the composite indexes reflect the relative value calculated for each program for each peer group company. For example, the Health Care index has a greater weighting and more impact than the Post-retirement Death index in determining the overall Benefits Index. The composite indexes are determined by first adding together the Company's benefit plan values for the benefit areas included, and then comparing the result with the average for the base companies.

The Company is reviewing the release of the assumptions with Aon Hewitt and will [supplement this response in the near future.](#)

5. Regarding the Summary of Total Benefits and Compensation Review – Post Benefit and Variable Pay Changes table presented in Exhibit AH C/BP – 6. Provide, in a usable electronic file, the underlying data used to produce the table, similar to the information provided in Exhibits AH C/BP – 3a,b.

**Response:**

Please see attached Excel file for the underlying data used to produce Exhibit \_\_ (AH C/BP – 6).

6. Regarding the lack of adjustment for geography of the survey data from the Expanded Utility Peer Group, as discussed on p.35, lines 3-11 of the testimony. Elaborate on the brief explanation provided in the testimony as to why the positional data used in the benchmarking analysis was not adjusted for cost differences associated with the geographical locations of the corresponding companies. Quantify metropolitan New York’s “significantly higher than national cost of labor.”

**Response:**

Please refer to the Company’s response to NYECC1-E028.

The definition of "significant" is over 20 percent. Please see the table below for the cost of labor geographic differentials for New York City versus the United States average, based upon ERI’s Geographic Assessor.

<u>U.S. Average Annual Salary Level</u>	<u>Salary Structure Percentages</u>
\$50,000	121.0
\$75,000	123.5
\$90,000	124.0
\$100,000	124.2
\$110,000	124.3
\$125,000	123.8
\$150,000	123.3
\$200,000	122.8

Data as of January 1, 2013.

Company Name: Con Edison  
Case Description: Con Edison Electric Rate Case  
Case: 13-E-0030

Response to DPS Interrogatories – Set DPS-18  
Date of Response: 03/27/2013  
Responding Witness: Customer Operations Panel

Question No. :E0235

Subject: KEMA Mandatory Hourly Pricing Program Evaluation Report - Regarding the KEMA Mandatory Hourly Pricing Program Evaluation Report that was filed with the Commission on May 1, 2012 in Case 08-E-0539 and referred to on p. 88-93 of the testimony provided by the Electric Customer Operations Panel. 1. Provide all input data files (in ".txt" or ".csv" format), SAS program files (".sas" files) and SAS results files (".lst" files) that were used to a. estimate the Cobb-Douglas demand model equations discussed in Section 6 of the report; b. calculate the alternative rate summarized in Table 6 on p. 3-6 of the report; and c. produce the "Modeled kWh with MHP" and "Modeled kWh without MHP" demands for each customer as shown on p. E-16 through E-23 of the appendices to the report. 2. Provide all model estimation results and summary statistics associated with each demand model estimated. 3. Confirm that the hourly demand equations discussed in Section 6 of the report only included prices during the contemporaneous hour. Explain why those demand models did not also include prices for other hours of the day or a variable which reflects the ratio of the price in the contemporaneous hour to the peak hour price for each day. 4. Discuss and provide the results of any multicollinearity tests or analyses performed related to possible correlation of the price and weather variables included in the demand models discussed in Section 6 of the report. 5. Discuss and provide the results of any endogeneity tests or analyses performed related to the possible correlation of the customer demands and the price variable included in the demand models discussed in Section 6 of the report. 6. For each Customer ID listed on p. E-16 through E-23 (Tables 8, 9, and 30 – Customer Price Elasticity Results Full Service Customers) of the appendices to the report, provide any survey response information associated with that customer. 7. Indicate if customer IDs are consistent throughout the appendices to the report. 8. Provide electronic versions of the data in the all the tables in the appendices to the report. 9. For Table 5/40 on p. E-6 to E-13 – Customer Metrics Full Service Customers and Table 12/33 – Max Demand and Coincident Peak for Surveyed Customers, identify the tier of each customer. For Tier I customers that were studied in the 2009 MHP Two Year Evaluation, provide the 2006-2008 data for Tables 5/40 and 12/33 of the 2012 report from Table 21 (Customer Metrics Full Service Customers) and Table 27 (Max Demand and Coincident Peak for Surveyed MHP Customers) of the 2009 evaluation. 10. The 2009 MHP Two Year Evaluation provided recommendations to address customers' desire for more information about the MHP program and energy management software. To what extent has Con Edison implemented the recommendations of Section 5.5 of the 2009 MHP Two Year Evaluation? 11. How many customers attended the Customer Forums on March 18 and 22, 2010 and March 11, 2011, mentioned on p. 4-2 of the report and in Table 11 on p. 4-3?

Response:

Regarding the KEMA Mandatory Hourly Pricing Program Evaluation Report that was filed with the Commission on May 1, 2012 in Case 08-E-0539 and referred to on p. 88-93 of the testimony provided by the Electric Customer Operations Panel

1. Provide all input data files (in ".txt" or ".csv" format), SAS program files (".sas" files) and SAS results files (".lst" files) that were used to

All files referred to in this response were previously sent to Staff on July 6 2012. Per Staff's instruction, this information is not being provided.

- a. estimate the Cobb-Douglas demand model equations discussed in Section 6 of the report;

Refer to the 837,163 KB file 'PSC REQUEST Item 1a .zip.'

- b. calculate the alternative rate summarized in Table 6 on p. 3-6 of the report

Refer to the 51,383 KB file 'PSC REQUEST Item 1b .zip'

- c. produce the "Modeled kWh with MHP" and "Modeled kWh without MHP" demands for each customer as shown on p. E-16 through E-23 of the appendices to the report.

Refer to the 382,402 KB file 'PSC REQUEST Item 1c .zip.'

2. Provide all model estimation results and summary statistics associated with each demand model estimated.

All information available regarding the models is in the 837,163 KB file 'PSC REQUEST Item 1a .zip.'

3. Confirm that the hourly demand equations discussed in Section 6 of the report only included prices during the contemporaneous hour. Explain why those demand models did not also include prices for other hours of the day or a variable which reflects the ratio of the price in the contemporaneous hour to the peak hour price for each day.

The hourly demand model discussed in section 6 of the report only included prices during the contemporaneous hour.

The model specification used in the 2012 analysis is the same as the final model specification presented in the analysis conducted for 2006-2008 data (MHP Final Report dated February 27, 2009). The 2012 analysis was conducted under a compressed schedule. Therefore it was not practical to replicate the 2009 report's model building exercise for the 2012 analysis. The model building process utilized in the 2009 report ultimately concluded that price had little influence on customer demand. The price variable, as defined, was considered to be consistent with the Cobb-Douglass approach.



Variables that transformed or were derivatives of weighted averages of the hourly price were not considered during the model building process of the 2009 analysis. As this analysis was built on the 2009 template, the 2012 analysis also did not consider these alternative variables.

4. Discuss and provide the results of any multicollinearity tests or analyses performed related to possible correlation of the price and weather variables included in the demand models discussed in Section 6 of the report.

After reviewing the correlation of temperature vs. price, by season, day of the week and time, the results show that for the 336 relationships (2 seasons, 7 days of week, and 24 hours a day) the R2 range from 0% to 44%, with 95% having an R2 of less than 31%.

Based on the analysis, price is not highly correlated to dry bulb temperature. Among other factors, hourly energy prices are driven by outages, availability of supply, time of day, day of the week, and time of year. The approach of developing individual models by customer, by season, by day of the week and by time of day was designed to control these factors.

5. Discuss and provide the results of any endogeneity tests or analyses performed related to the possible correlation of the customer demands and the price variable included in the demand models discussed in Section 6 of the report.

No endogeneity tests were performed.

Consider the linear model:  $\text{demand} = f(\text{price}, \text{temperature})$

When this model is estimated for each customer, by season, by day of the week, by hour (approximately 576,000 models), 60% of the models feature estimated coefficients for the price variable that are not statistically different from zero (i.e., p value of greater than 10%). Furthermore, only 35% of the models had a coefficient that were statistically different than zero, and had the “correct” sign (positive).

When the analysis is limited to just the relationship of price vs. demand [i.e.,  $\text{demand} = f(\text{price})$ ], 52% of the models would have a price coefficient with the right sign and significant. The models have a median R2 of 36%.

6. For each Customer ID listed on p. E-16 through E-23 (Tables 8, 9, and 30 – Customer

Price Elasticity Results Full Service Customers) of the appendices to the report, provide any survey response information associated with that customer.

Refer to the 6,081 KB file ‘PSC REQUEST Item 7 .xlsx.’ Note: 93 of 107 surveys had complete interval data.

7. Indicate if customer IDs are consistent throughout the appendices to the report.

Yes. Customer ID’s are consistent throughout the Appendix.

8. Provide electronic versions of the data in the all the tables in the appendices to the report.

Refer to the 393 KB file 'PSC REQUEST Item 9 .xlsx.'

9. For Table 5/40 on p. E-6 to E-13 – Customer Metrics Full Service Customers and Table 12/33 – Max Demand and Coincident Peak for Surveyed Customers,

- identify the tier of each customer.

Refer to the 67 KB file 'PSC REQUEST Item 10a.lst.' Note: The load factor presented in the report was incorrectly calculated. The corrected load factor provided in 'PSC REQUEST Item 10a.lst' is based on the individual customer annual peak demand (i.e., the annual non-coincident demand). This correction does not impact the ultimate conclusions found in the report.

- For Tier I customers that were studied in the 2009 MHP Two Year Evaluation, provide the 2006-2008 data for Tables 5/40 and 12/33 of the 2012 report from Table 21 (Customer Metrics Full Service Customers) and Table 27 (Max Demand and Coincident Peak for Surveyed MHP Customers) of the 2009 evaluation.

Refer to the 37 KB file 'PSC REQUEST Item 10b.lst' that was sent to staff on July 6th, 2012.

Note:

- 41 account numbers from the 2009 analysis, matched the 2012 account numbers.
- Of the 41 matched accounts, 21 remain full service customers
- The 2009 computer programs that generated Tables 21 and 27 of the 2009 Report could not be located. For consistency sake, the recapitulation of the 2009 results provided in 'PSC REQUEST Item 10b.lst' was produced using the 2012 computer programs. Slight variations between the 2009 report and the data contained in 'PSC REQUEST Item 10b.lst' may occur. These variations are not material.

10. The 2009 MHP Two Year Evaluation provided recommendations to address customers' desire for more information about the MHP program and energy management software. To what extent has Con Edison implemented the recommendations of Section 5.5 of the 2009 MHP Two Year Evaluation?

Refer to the 26 KB file 'PSC REQUEST Item 11.xls' with a matrix of 2009 recommendations to actions as part of this evaluation.

11. How many customers attended the Customer Forums on March 18 and 22, 2010 and March 11, 2011, mentioned on p. 4-2 of the report and in Table 11 on p. 4-3?

Each of the three customer forums held on the above dates had approximately 75 attendees.

Company Name: Con Edison  
Case Description: Con Edison Electric, Gas & Steam Rate Cases  
Case: 13-E-0030, 13-G-0031, 13-S-0032

Response to DPS Interrogatories – Set DPS-38  
Date of Response: 04/15/2013  
Responding Witness: Compensation / Benefits Panel

Question No. :0498

Subject: Management Benefits and Compensation Package – Position Matching - Regarding the positional analysis mentioned on p.30-44 of the testimony provided by the Compensation and Benefits Panel: 1. Provide a detailed explanation of how the “position matching” was performed between managers at Con Edison and managers at the Expanded Utility Peer Group companies, as well as between managers at the Company and managers at the New York Metropolitan Peer Group companies. Specifically address the weight or level of consideration given to the following possible factors: (a) number of employees managed; (b) level of education or training required; (c) specific duties and responsibilities; (d) other (specify). Explain how criteria were used to determine whether a position was or was not a “match” for a position at Con Edison. What level of similarity was required to declare a position a match? Was the required similarity level the same or different for the New York Metropolitan Peer Group as compared to the Expanded Utility Peer Group? If it was different, explain how. 2. For each category, indicate what source or sources were used to furnish data or information for the position matching. Provide, in a usable electronic format, the data that was used to perform the position matching benchmark analysis. 3. How many management employees are employed by Con Edison as compared to the total number of employees employed by the Company? What is the ratio of management employees to total employees at the peer companies with which Con Edison is compared? Provide management and non-management employee counts, and the ratios of managers to total employees for Con Edison and for each company populating the Expanded Utility Peer Group and the New York Metropolitan Peer Group.

Response:

1. Provide a detailed explanation of how the “position matching” was performed between managers at Con Edison and managers at the Expanded Utility Peer Group companies, as well as between managers at the Company and managers at the New York Metropolitan Peer Group companies. Specifically address the weight or level of consideration given to the following possible factors: (a) number of employees managed; (b) level of education or training required; (c) specific duties and responsibilities; (d) other (specify). Explain how criteria were used to determine whether a position was or was not a “match” for a position at Con Edison. What level of similarity was required to declare a position a match? Was the required similarity level the same or different for the New York Metropolitan Peer Group as compared to the Expanded Utility Peer Group? If it was different, explain how.

**Response:** The approach used to match managers at Con Edison to comparable positions within the Expanded Utility Peer Group and New York Metropolitan Peer Group was the same and done according to standard industry practice. Per *The WorldatWork Handbook of Compensation, Benefits & Total Rewards* (copyright 2007), a benchmark job is defined as “*a job that is commonly found and defined, used to make pay comparisons, either within the organization or to comparable jobs outside the organization.*” In addition, benchmark job description typically cites the functional responsibility (e.g., Finance, Human Resources, Engineering), general job duties and level (e.g., manager, supervisor), but usually does not specify items such as the number of employees managed nor level education or training required. The predominant consideration is the general duties and responsibilities of the position. While there are no standard industry guidelines, in Aon Hewitt’s experience, a role is generally considered comparable to a survey benchmark if 75 percent of the incumbent’s duties and responsibilities match the benchmark job description duties and responsibilities. The 75 percent guidelines ensure that the essence or essential functions of the job are similar and comparable although there may be some minor duties and responsibilities which are different.

For the Company’s analysis, a position at Con Edison was first evaluated based on the functional responsibility. Second, the job duties and level were reviewed relative to the survey benchmark job description. If the level of the Con Edison role was comparable to the benchmark job level, and if at least 75 percent of the Con Edison incumbent’s duties and responsibilities were the same as the benchmark job’s duties and responsibilities, then the Con Edison role was considered to be comparable to the benchmark job.

2. For each category, indicate what source or sources were used to furnish data or information for the position matching. Provide, in a usable electronic format, the data that was used to perform the position matching benchmark analysis.

**Response:** Please see Exhibits AH C/BP-3a and AH C/BP-3b attached to the Compensation/Benefit Panel’s testimony. These exhibits provide the Con Edison position, the survey benchmark and source used, and the comparison of pay elements between Con Edison and the survey data.

3. How many management employees are employed by Con Edison as compared to the total number of employees employed by the Company? What is the ratio of management employees to total employees at the peer companies with which Con Edison is compared? Provide management and non-management employee counts, and the ratios of managers to total employees for Con Edison and for each company populating the Expanded Utility Peer Group and the New York Metropolitan Peer Group.

**Response:**

Management employees at Con Edison represent approximately one third of the total employee base. Please see Accounting Panel Exhibit \_\_ (AP-5), Schedule 3.

Similar information for the companies in the Expanded Utility Peer Group and the New York Metropolitan Peer Group is not available. Available data is limited to data submitted by these companies to the Aon Hewitt and/or Towers Watson databases, and do not represent their entire organization. Full employee census data would be needed to provide this information for the peer companies which are not available because it is not submitted to the Aon Hewitt or the Towers Watson databases.

As provided in the Company's response to section 1 of this Question, the primary considerations used in matching Con Edison positions were the general duties and responsibilities relative to the benchmark jobs.

Company Name: Con Edison  
Case Description: Con Edison Electric, Gas & Steam Rate Cases  
Case: 13-E-0030, 13-G-0031, 13-S-0032

Response to DPS Interrogatories – Set DPS-56  
Date of Response: 05/17/2013  
Responding Witness: Compensation / Benefits Panel

Question No. :0668

Subject: Positional Benchmarking - 1. Page 37, lines 12-16 of the Compensation and Benefits Panel testimony states, “A minimum of five peer companies must match a position in order for the market data to be reportable.” Did the Company include in its compensation analysis of both the Expanded Utility Peer Group and the New York Metropolitan Peer Group all of Con Edison’s non-officer management positions for which there was data from at least five peer companies? If no, list the Con Edison positions that were not included in each peer group analysis and explain why each position was not included. 2. In response to DPS-498, question 1, the Company states that in Aon Hewitt’s experience, a position is generally considered comparable to a survey benchmark if 75 percent of the incumbent’s duties and responsibilities match the benchmark job description duties and responsibilities. Provide a list of all of Con Edison’s non-officer management positions that were considered comparable to a survey benchmark (by way of having 75 percent of duties and responsibilities match the benchmark job description) and the survey benchmark they are considered comparable to. 3. Provide copies of all compensation and benefits information that Con Edison provided to Aon Hewitt, Towers Watson, and Mercer in response to the surveys that were used as the source of data for the benchmarking analyses performed in the Compensation and Benefits Panel testimony. What was the process used by Con Edison to compare its positions to a survey benchmark? Who was responsible for completing the surveys? 4. Page 36, lines 9-11 of the testimony states, “The results of the analysis, therefore, are representative of Con Edison’s pay positioning across the entire employee population.” The summary table at the end of Exhibit AH C/BP – 3a indicates what percentage of each salary band was included in the compensation analysis. There is a wide range in the percentages of employees per salary band that are represented in the analysis. Explain how this is a good representation of Con Edison’s employee population as a whole and why some bands are better represented than others. To the extent that Con Edison positions were not included in the peer group analysis even though data may have been available, discuss how the benchmarked positions relate to a statistically valid random sample of positions.

Response:

1. Page 37, lines 12-16 of the Compensation and Benefits Panel testimony states, “A minimum of five peer companies must match a position in order for the market data to be reportable.” Did the Company include in its compensation analysis of both the Expanded Utility Peer Group and the New York Metropolitan Peer Group all of Con Edison’s non-officer management positions for which there was data from at least five peer companies? If no, list

the Con Edison positions that were not included in each peer group analysis and explain why each position was not included.

The market data for each benchmark job supplied for the Company's analysis consisted of at least five data points from five different peer companies. This market data was used only after the following criteria, as stated in our response to DPS-498, was met. A non-officer management position at Con Edison was first evaluated based on the functional responsibility. Second, the job duties and level were reviewed relative to the survey benchmark job description. If the level of the Con Edison position was comparable to the responsibilities outlined in the benchmark job description level, and if at least 75% of the Con Edison incumbent's functional duties and responsibilities matched this description, then the Con Edison position was considered to be comparable to the benchmark job and was included in the compensation analysis.

2. In response to DPS-498, question 1, the Company states that in Aon Hewitt's experience, a position is generally considered comparable to a survey benchmark if 75% of the incumbent's duties and responsibilities match the benchmark job description duties and responsibilities. Provide a list of all of Con Edison's non-officer management positions that were considered comparable to a survey benchmark (by way of having 75% of duties and responsibilities match the benchmark job description) and the survey benchmark they are considered comparable to.

Please see the exhibits (i.e., Exhibit AH C/BP – 3a) submitted with the original testimony. These exhibits provide all the job titles at the Company included in the analysis, the benchmark job used, and the survey source.

3. Provide copies of all compensation and benefits information that Con Edison provided to Aon Hewitt, Towers Watson, and Mercer in response to the surveys that were used as the source of data for the benchmarking analyses performed in the Compensation and Benefits Panel testimony. What was the process used by Con Edison to compare its positions to a survey benchmark? Who was responsible for completing the surveys?

This answer will be provided early next week.

4. Page 36, lines 9-11 of the testimony states, “The results of the analysis, therefore, are representative of Con Edison’s pay positioning across the entire employee population.” The summary table at the end of Exhibit AH C/BP – 3a indicates what percentage of each salary band was included in the compensation analysis. There is a wide range in the percentages of employees per salary band that are represented in the analysis. Explain how this is a good representation of Con Edison’s employee population as a whole and why some bands are better represented than others. To the extent that Con Edison positions were not included in the peer group analysis even though data may have been available, discuss how the benchmarked positions relate to a statistically valid random sample of positions.

The testimony immediately preceding that statement reads:

*The positions included in the analysis covered several functional areas: Central Operations, Electric Operations, Finance, Accounting, Customer Operations, Human Resources, Engineering, Gas Operations, and Legal, among others, and all of the non-officer management salary bands at Con Edison: 1L/1H, 2L/2H, 3L/3H, and 4L/4H. Across the band levels, the lowest sample size covered 25% of the employees in the band (i.e., for bands 1H and 3L), and the highest sample size was 80% of the employees in the band (i.e., for band 1L).*

Some bands are better represented because more job titles/positions within the band are comparable to the survey benchmark jobs based on the position matching process described in the Panel’s testimony and summarized in the Company’s response to Question 1 above.

Also, at the higher band levels, it is common to find roles that have only one or just a few employees in the same job. At the lower band levels, it is common to find roles that have many employees in the same job (e.g., there are many Customer Operations Supervisors in Band 1L). Therefore, including one job at the higher band levels typically covers fewer employees than including one job at the lower band levels. This partially explains why the percentage of employees per salary band that are represented in the analysis differ across the salary bands.

The Panel’s testimony (page 36, line 16 through page 37, line 2) also compares the average base salary of the job titles/positions included in the analysis to the average base salary of the entire non-officer management employee population:

*The average base salary for the total non-officer management employee population is \$109,836 (at the time of the study) and the average for the nearly 1,400 employees included in the Expanded Utility Peer Group analysis is \$111,901. This indicates that the non-officer management employees included in the study are compensated similarly to the entire Con Edison non-officer management population, which further substantiates the validity of the analysis and the conclusions drawn from the findings.*

In fact, the average base salary of the entire non-officer management employee population is lower than the average base salary of the employees included in the study. Therefore, the study results are likely conservative. In other words, the employees in the study are likely



more competitively paid than the population at large because the average salary of the employees included in the study is higher than the average base salary of the entire non-officer management employee population.

5. Regarding the matching of positions for benchmarking discussed on pages 36-38 of the testimony, and related to the file “NYECC19-07 - 2010 TW US CDB ESM FunctionDiscipline\_Descriptions\_(Word\_File).pdf” provided in the confidential response to NYECC-1, E019, explain in detail how career ladders and spans of control were used in matching position titles between Con Edison and the peer companies. Also, explain why so many seemingly more generic titles (i.e., Associate Accountant) were included on the “Management Titles Excluded from the Review” list provided in response to DPS-013, question 6 and thus, not included in the benchmarking analysis.

The career ladders and spans of control were not used in matching positions between Con Edison and the peer companies. The process followed is described above in the Company’s response to Question 1 above.

Seemingly, generic titles like Associate Accountant were excluded from the review because the incumbent’s duties and responsibilities did not overlap with the survey benchmark job duties and responsibilities by at least 75%, or the job level was not equivalent between the incumbent’s job and the benchmark job description, or there were not at least five datapoints from five different peer companies available in order to include the Con Edison job in the study results. Other roles within each function (e.g., accounting) were included in the study. The analysis covered several functional areas: Central Operations, Electric Operations, Finance, Accounting, Customer Operations, Human Resources, Engineering, Gas Operations, and Legal, among others, and all of the non-officer management salary bands at Con Edison.

The overarching objective of any competitive analysis, based on typical industry practice, including the analysis conducted for Con Edison, is to cover all functional areas without overweighting any particular one and to cover jobs at all salary band levels. Based on the percentage of the Con Edison population included in the analysis (nearly 30%), the breadth and depth of the positions included across functions and across salary bands, and the average salary of the entire Con Edison non-officer employee management population as compared to the average salary of the employees included in the analysis, the analysis is both valid and reliable.

6. Indicate whether the same Aon Hewitt and Towers Watson survey data were used to benchmark Con Edison’s positions in this case as were used to benchmark positions in O&R Case 11-E-0408. If so, indicate if any of the positions benchmarked in the O&R case were excluded from the Con Edison analysis in this case. Include a list of those positions that were excluded from the benchmarking analysis in the case and the reason for doing so.

While the same survey providers (i.e., Aon Hewitt and Towers Watson) were used to benchmark positions at Con Edison’s positions in this case and in O&R’s Case 11-E-0408, the actual survey data used was different. While many of the job titles are similar across these two studies, given that O&R is a subsidiary of Con Edison, Inc. and represents a small

portion of Con Edison, Inc.'s overall operating size in terms of organization scope and annual revenue, data was drawn from smaller survey cuts in terms of annual revenue of the peers as compared to the peers cuts used for the Con Edison study. For reference, please see Exhibit 10a, attached to this response, for details regarding which job titles from the O&R Case overlap with the analysis in this proceeding. There were 45 job titles benchmarked in the O&R study:

- Twenty-six of the O&R job titles were included in the Con Edison study.
- Eight of the O&R job titles did not exist at Con Edison and, therefore, were not benchmarked in the Con Edison study.
- Two of the O&R job titles did not exist at Con Edison, but similar job titles do exist at Con Edison and were benchmarked in Con Edison study.
- Four of the O&R job titles did exist at Con Edison, but were not benchmarked due to lack of available survey data or because of level differences between the survey benchmark and the Con Edison job title, but similar job titles were benchmarked instead.
- Five of the O&R job titles did exist at Con Edison, but were not benchmarked due to lack of available survey data or differences in level between the survey benchmark and the Con Edison job title.

Company Name: Con Edison  
Case Description: Con Edison Electric Rate Case  
Case: 13-E-0030

Response to NYECC Interrogatories – Set NYECC-1  
Date of Response: 02/27/2013  
Responding Witness: Compensation and Benefits Panel

Question No. :E019

Referencing Exhibit (AH-C/BP-1), a. provide a complete copy of the Towers Watson Survey referenced therein and the period of time covered by the survey; b. identify all utilities in the Towers Watson Survey that were excluded from your analysis for CECONY and the reason for their exclusion as to each; c. Identify which of the sixteen utilities added from the Towers Watson Survey are of comparable size and scope to the Company and which are publicly-traded utility companies. b. Provide the specific details of the size and scope for each of the publicly-traded utility companies which are comparable to the Company. Identify the specific factors used as the basis of comparison for size and scope. c. Specifically which of the sixteen utilities added from the Towers Watson Survey are subject to regulation from a state public service commission. d. Which of the sixteen utilities added from the Towers Watson Survey are publicly regulated by a state public service commission and have the identical elements of management, officer and Board compensation as are sought by CECONY in their rate case filings? e. Which of the sixteen utilities added from the Towers Watson Survey, which are publicly regulated by a state public service commission, and have the identical elements of management, officer and Board compensation as are sought by CECONY in their rate case filings, are paid for exclusively from ratepayer funding? f. Which of the sixteen utilities added from the Towers Watson Survey, which are publicly regulated by a state public service commission, and have the identical elements of management, officer and Board compensation as are sought by CECONY in their rate case filings, are paid for exclusively by shareholder funding? g. Which of the sixteen utilities added from the Towers Watson Survey, which are publicly regulated by a state public service commission, and have the identical elements of management, officer and Board compensation as are sought by CECONY in their rate case filings, are paid for by both shareholder funding and ratepayer funding? If applicable, identify how the cost is attributed to each form of funding and exactly how the funding for such costs is apportioned or split?

Response:

- a. The results of this survey are confidential but will be made available for review at Con Edison's offices at 4 Irving Place to parties that have executed the Protective Agreement for these Rate Cases. The data from this survey is effective March 1, 2010.
- b. The Towers Watson 2010 Energy Services Survey is comprised of 124 companies (see attached exhibit - Towers Watson 2010 Energy Services Survey Participants). From this survey, the primary data used were from utility companies with annual revenues greater

than \$6 billion. There are 36 companies in the greater than \$6 billion revenue group and all 36 were used in the Company's analysis.

- c. The average of all the companies in the greater than \$6 billion cut from the Towers Watson 2010 Energy Services Survey is comparable in size and scope to Con Edison. That group is included in the exhibit for 19(b) under ">\$6 billion." All of these companies are publicly traded except for Energy Future Holdings, Tennessee Valley Authority, and EPCO.
- d. Please refer to the response in subpart (b) above.
- e. Of the 36 companies the Company used from the Towers Watson 2010 Energy Services Survey participants, 32 are subject to regulatory review and the Company understands that three (EPCO, McDermott, and SAIC) are not. The Tennessee Valley Authority is subject to limited FERC jurisdiction.
- f. Please see response to subpart (e) above. The Company seeks rate recovery for the base salary and the variable component of management compensation for non-officer management employees, base salary for officers, and the annual retainers and meetings fees for its Board of Trustees which are reasonable business expenses. The Company is not in a position to confirm that companies in the Towers Watson 2010 Energy Services Survey provide "identical" elements of management, officer, and Board compensation as those sought in these Rate Cases. No two companies have identically designed elements of management, officer, and Board compensation. The purpose of the Review as described in the Panel's testimony was to compare the aggregate value of the compensation and benefit plans sponsored by the Company to competitive market practice for other companies of similar size and scope. Notwithstanding this, the elements for which Con Edison is seeking recovery are typical in the market, as evidenced by the analysis provided in the Panel's testimony.
- g. Please refer to the Company's response to subpart (f) above. The Company does not know specifically how many participants in the Towers Watson 2010 Energy Services Survey have compensation paid exclusively from ratepayers, exclusively by shareholders, or some combination of the two. However, the Company would note that among utility companies participating in the Aon Hewitt Database, 75 percent provided information stating that they recover all or some portion of management variable pay from ratepayers.
- h. Please refer to the response to subparts (f) and (g) above.
- i. Please refer to the response to subpart (f) and (g) above.

Company Name: Con Edison  
Case Description: Con Edison Steam Rate Case  
Case: 13-S-0032

Response to DPS Interrogatories – Set DPS-56  
Date of Response: 05/24/2013  
Responding Witness:

Question No.: S0668 – Supp

Subject: Positional Benchmarking - 1. Page 37, lines 12-16 of the Compensation and Benefits Panel testimony states, “A minimum of five peer companies must match a position in order for the market data to be reportable.” Did the Company include in its compensation analysis of both the Expanded Utility Peer Group and the New York Metropolitan Peer Group all of Con Edison’s non-officer management positions for which there was data from at least five peer companies? If no, list the Con Edison positions that were not included in each peer group analysis and explain why each position was not included. 2. In response to DPS-498, question 1, the Company states that in Aon Hewitt’s experience, a position is generally considered comparable to a survey benchmark if 75 percent of the incumbent’s duties and responsibilities match the benchmark job description duties and responsibilities. Provide a list of all of Con Edison’s non-officer management positions that were considered comparable to a survey benchmark (by way of having 75 percent of duties and responsibilities match the benchmark job description) and the survey benchmark they are considered comparable to. 3. Provide copies of all compensation and benefits information that Con Edison provided to Aon Hewitt, Towers Watson, and Mercer in response to the surveys that were used as the source of data for the benchmarking analyses performed in the Compensation and Benefits Panel testimony. What was the process used by Con Edison to compare its positions to a survey benchmark? Who was responsible for completing the surveys? 4. Page 36, lines 9-11 of the testimony states, “The results of the analysis, therefore, are representative of Con Edison’s pay positioning across the entire employee population.” The summary table at the end of Exhibit AH C/BP – 3a indicates what percentage of each salary band was included in the compensation analysis. There is a wide range in the percentages of employees per salary band that are represented in the analysis. Explain how this is a good representation of Con Edison’s employee population as a whole and why some bands are better represented than others. To the extent that Con Edison positions were not included in the peer group analysis even though data may have been available, discuss how the benchmarked positions relate to a statistically valid random sample of positions.

Response:

3. Provide copies of all compensation and benefits information that Con Edison provided to Aon Hewitt, Towers Watson, and Mercer in response to the surveys that were used as the source of data for the benchmarking analyses performed in the Compensation and

Benefits Panel testimony. What was the process used by Con Edison to compare its positions to a survey benchmark? Who was responsible for completing the surveys?

**Response:** Please see attachment A for the source data provided to Tower Watson. The Company information provided to Aon Hewitt is shown in Attachment A under the following columns: Band/Grade, CECONY Job Title, CECONY Direct Pay Levels, including Base Salary, Total Cash Comp. and Total Direct Comp. Please see attachment B for the source data provided to Aon Hewitt. In addition to providing this information, the Compensation Department worked directly with Aon Hewitt to review survey descriptions and to match Company positions with Aon Hewitt survey positions. Company employee identifying information was redacted from the attachments. Please also see Exhibit AH C/BP – 3a and 3b. With respect to Mercer, please also refer to Exhibits \_\_\_ (C/BP-5 through 8).

The Con Edison Compensation Department reviews the benchmark job descriptions provided by the compensation consulting firm requesting the compensation data for their surveys. To the extent possible, the Compensation Department matches positions within the Company to the descriptions provided. The Compensation Department is responsible for completing the surveys.



**COMPARISON OF TOTAL COMPENSATION STUDIES**

	<b>Pacific Gas and Electric Company [1]</b>	<b>Southern California Gas Company [2]</b>	<b>National Grid [3]</b>	<b>Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.</b>	<b>Industry Practice/Commission Precedent</b>
<b>year</b>	2009	2010	2012		
<b>HR consulting firm</b>	Towers Perrin	Towers Watson	Towers Watson	Aon Hewitt	
<b>peer groups</b>	utility and general industry peer groups	utility and general industry peer groups (each consisting of 31 companies)	38 utility and general industry peer companies	utility (16 companies) and general industry (15 companies) peer groups	utility and general industry peer groups (NYS PSC O&R Case 11-E-0408)
<b>competitive range</b>	plus/minus 10% of market	plus/minus 10% of market	plus/minus 10% of market	plus/minus 10% of market	plus/minus 10% of market
<b>% of employees represented by benchmark positions</b>	55% employees	68% employees	81% positions	30% (Utility Peer Group); 3% (New York Metropolitan Peer Group)	50% (according to the World at Work Handbook)
<b>number of companies matching a benchmark job needed to yield data for a study</b>	5 data points are needed (according to an article by Hewitt Associates included in the exhibits)	5 companies	N/A	5 peer companies	5 (pursuant to Statement 6A from the September 1994 Statements of Antitrust Enforcement Policies issued by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission)
<b>conditions for a survey position to be deemed a match for a benchmark job</b>	20% or less deviation in scope of job duties or function (i.e., at least 80% match between survey job and benchmark job)	composition (e.g., scope, duties, or function) of a survey job reflects 80% of the benchmark composition	N/A	75% (according to the response to DPS-498)	70% (according to the World at Work Handbook)

**Sources:**

[1] Case 09-12-020 before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, <http://delaps1.cpuc.ca.gov/CPUCProceedingLookup/f?p=401:57:1272745672967101::NO>

[2] Case 10-12-006 before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, <http://delaps1.cpuc.ca.gov/CPUCProceedingLookup/f?p=401:57:1272745672967101::NO>

[3] Case 12-E-0201 before the New York State Public Service Commission, <http://documents.dps.ny.gov/public/MatterManagement/CaseMaster.aspx?MatterCaseNo=12-e-0201&submit=Search+by+Case+Number>





For release 10:00 a.m. (EDT) Wednesday, May 25, 2011

USDL-11-0761

Technical information: (202) 691-6199 • NCSinfo@bls.gov • www.bls.gov/ncs  
Media contact: (202) 691-5902 • PressOffice@bls.gov

## OCCUPATIONAL PAY COMPARISONS AMONG METROPOLITAN AREAS, 2010

Average pay for civilian workers in the San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA metropolitan area was 20 percent above the national average in 2010, one of 77 metropolitan areas studied by the National Compensation Survey (NCS), the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. The Brownsville-Harlingen, TX metropolitan area had a pay relative of 80, meaning workers earned an average of 80 cents for every dollar earned by workers nationwide. Using data from the NCS, pay relatives—a means of assessing pay differences—are available for each of the nine major occupational groups within surveyed metropolitan areas, as well as averaged across all occupations for each area. The average pay relative nationally for all occupations and for each occupational group equals 100. (See table 1.)

A pay relative is a calculation of pay—wages, salaries, commissions, and production bonuses—for a given metropolitan area relative to the nation as a whole. The calculation controls for differences among areas in occupational composition, establishment and occupational characteristics, and the fact that data are collected for areas at different times during the year. Simple pay comparisons calculating the ratio of the average pay for an area to the entire United States in percentage terms would not control for interarea differences in occupational composition and other factors, which may impact pay relatives.

**Chart 1. Pay relatives in selected metropolitan areas, National Compensation Survey, July 2010**

Pay Relative (United States = 100)



Chart 1 above lists selected metropolitan area pay relatives compared to average pay nationally among those studied in the NCS. Table A provides selected metropolitan area pay relatives for each of five major occupational groups. In addition, area-to-area comparisons have been calculated for all 77 metropolitan areas and are available on the BLS website at <http://www.bls.gov/ncs/ocs/payrel.htm>.

**Table A. Selected metropolitan area-to-national pay relatives and major occupational groups, July 2010 (of 77 metropolitan areas surveyed)**

Major Occupational Group	Metropolitan Area	Pay Relative
Management, business, and financial	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	120
	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside, CA	108
	Reno-Sparks, NV	108
	Salinas, CA	108
	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	108
Office and administrative support	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	120
	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	115
	Boston-Worcester-Manchester, MA-NH	114
	Hartford-West Hartford-Willimantic, CT	114
	Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-WV	112
Service	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	126
	Salinas, CA	123
	Seattle-Tacoma-Olympia, WA	123
	Hartford-West Hartford-Willimantic, CT	119
	Minneapolis-St. Paul-St. Cloud, MN-WI	115
	San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	115
Production	Detroit-Warren-Flint, MI	117
	Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Truckee, CA-NV	117
	Bloomington-Normal, IL	116
	Seattle-Tacoma-Olympia, WA	115
	Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	113
Transportation and material moving	Seattle-Tacoma-Olympia, WA	117
	Minneapolis-St. Paul-St. Cloud, MN-WI	114
	Boston-Worcester-Manchester, MA-NH	111
	Kansas City, MO-KS	110
	Salinas, CA	109
	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	109

The pay relative for production occupations in the Detroit-Warren-Flint, MI and Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Truckee, CA-NV areas was 117, meaning the pay in these two metropolitan areas averaged 17 percent more than the national average pay for that occupational group. By contrast, the pay relative for production workers in the Brownsville-Harlingen, Texas area was 80, meaning pay for workers in those occupations averaged 20 percent less than the national average. (See table 1.)

Statistical significance measures are not available for news release and area-to-area comparison tables.

**NOTICE OF FINAL NEWS RELEASE**

This is the final Occupational Pay Comparisons Among Metropolitan Areas news release. Funding for the Locality Pay Survey program is ending. However, the other programs of the National Compensation Survey, such as the Employment Cost Index, Employer Costs for Employee Compensation, and benefit publications will continue to be produced.

## TECHNICAL NOTE

### Pay relative controls and calculations

Pay relatives control for differences among areas in occupational composition as well as establishment and occupational characteristics. Metropolitan areas often differ greatly in the composition of establishments and occupations that are available to the local workforce. For example, in Brownsville-Harlingen, Texas, the ratio of workers in the high-paying management, business, and financial occupational group to the number of workers in all occupations is under 6 percent, whereas nationally this ratio is nearly 10 percent.<sup>1</sup> In addition to these factors, the NCS collects compensation data for metropolitan areas at different times during the year. Payroll reference dates differ between areas, which makes direct comparisons between areas difficult.

The pay relative approach controls for these differences to isolate the geographic effect on wages. To illustrate the importance of controlling for these effects, consider the following example. The average pay for construction and extraction workers in the New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA metropolitan area in 2010 was \$32.54 and in the United States, \$21.18.<sup>2</sup> A simple pay comparison can be calculated from the ratio of the two average pay levels, multiplied by 100 to express the comparison as a percentage. The pay comparison in the example is calculated as:

$$(\$32.54 \div \$21.18) * 100 \cong 154$$

This comparison does not control for differences between New York and the nation in the mix of occupations, industries, and other factors. A more accurate estimate of the geographic effect of wages in New York can be obtained by taking these differences into account. Controlling for differences in occupational composition, establishment and occupational characteristics, and the payroll reference date in New York relative to the nation as a whole, the pay relative for construction and extraction occupations in New York is 129.

### Survey methodology

Pay relatives were estimated using a multivariate regression technique designed to control for interarea differences. This technique controls for the following ten characteristics:

- Occupational type
- Industry type
- Work level
- Full-time / part-time status
- Time / incentive status
- Union / nonunion status
- Ownership type
- Profit / non-profit status
- Establishment employment
- Payroll reference date

Even accounting for the characteristics used in the current regression analysis, there is still wage variation across the areas. The variation is due to differences in wage determinants that were not included in the model. Examples of these determinants include price levels, environmental amenities such as a pleasant climate, and cultural amenities.

Historical pay relatives data are available for the survey years 1992-1996, 1998, 2002, 2004-2009. There are several differences between the recent pay relatives and the pay relatives for earlier years, including different industry and occupation classification systems, varying methodology, and different survey designs. These differences limit comparability. The pay relatives since 2004 have been calculated using the same industry and occupation classification systems, methodology, and survey design. Nonetheless, comparisons between the estimates for these years should be made only with caution.

For more details on survey design, methodology, classification systems, recent changes in the survey, and appropriate uses and limitations of the data, see *BLS Handbook of Methods*, Chapter 8, “National Compensation Measures,” available on the Internet at [http://www.bls.gov/opub/hom/homch8\\_a.htm](http://www.bls.gov/opub/hom/homch8_a.htm), especially the major section “Area-to-Nation and Area-to-Area Pay Comparisons.”

### Obtaining information

Articles, bulletins, and other information from the National Compensation Survey may be obtained by calling (202) 691-6199, sending email to [NCSinfo@bls.gov](mailto:NCSinfo@bls.gov), or visiting the Internet site <http://www.bls.gov/ncs>. Information in this release will be made available to sensory impaired individuals upon request. Voice phone: (202) 691-5200; Federal Relay Service Number: 1-800-877-8339.

<sup>1</sup>Data for this example are based on the May 2010 Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Area Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates, on the Internet at <http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oessrcma.htm>.

<sup>2</sup> Average pay for construction and extraction workers in New York and for the United States are based on wage estimates published in *New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA National Compensation Survey, May 2010* and *National Compensation Survey: Occupational Earnings in the United States, 2010*, on the Internet at <http://www.bls.gov/ncs/ocs/compub.htm>.

Table 1. Pay relatives for major occupational groups in metropolitan areas, National Compensation Survey, July 2010

(Average pay nationally for all occupations and for each occupational group shown = 100.)

Metropolitan Area <sup>1</sup>	All occupations	Management, business, and financial	Professional and related	Service	Sales and related	Office and administrative support	Construction and extraction	Installation, maintenance, and repair	Production	Transportation and material moving
United States .....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Amarillo, TX .....	88	94	79	90	96	90	88	97	88	92
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Gainesville, GA-AL .....	98	101	101	94	95	101	86	94	97	105
Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, TX .....	94	92	92	91	102	95	84	108	90	97
Birmingham-Hoover, AL .....	94	93	98	98	89	97	80	97	94	99
Bloomington, IN .....	91	94	88	86	86	92	83	93	104	100
Bloomington-Normal, IL .....	100	91	103	99	103	97	118	86	116	100
Boston-Worcester-Manchester, MA-NH .....	111	102	111	112	107	114	115	113	108	111
Brownsville-Harlingen, TX .....	80	84	88	88	71	80	68	79	80	77
Buffalo-Niagara-Cattaraugus, NY .....	97	95	90	101	92	94	107	97	110	101
Charleston-North Charleston-Summerville, SC .....	94	91	98	88	105	92	83	95	108	98
Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC .....	99	101	97	98	103	101	87	104	100	95
Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City, IL-IN-WI .....	106	105	107	106	103	107	129	109	103	104
Cincinnati-Middletown-Wilmington, OH-KY-IN .....	100	103	97	99	110	100	80	100	102	105
Cleveland-Akron-Elyria, OH .....	100	102	98	99	98	102	109	112	101	101
Columbus-Marion-Chillicothe, OH .....	100	96	96	102	104	102	108	102	104	99
Corpus Christi, TX .....	90	80	91	88	90	87	96	108	96	91
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX .....	98	98	100	93	102	99	89	98	93	100
Dayton-Springfield-Greenville, OH .....	96	99	92	101	95	92	92	98	99	99
Denver-Aurora-Boulder, CO .....	102	97	101	106	106	104	94	111	100	101
Detroit-Warren-Flint, MI .....	102	98	105	95	99	100	103	98	117	104
Elkhart-Goshen, IN .....	93	97	90	100	95	94	103	86	93	100
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO .....	101	96	98	102	98	97	100	133	107	107
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI .....	100	90	98	101	114	101	104	91	102	96
Great Falls, MT .....	91	96	77	103	92	83	96	95	83	100
Greensboro-High Point, NC .....	95	100	98	92	93	96	87	91	99	103
Greenville-Mauldin-Easley, SC .....	95	99	93	96	93	95	77	82	110	98
Hartford-West Hartford-Willimantic, CT .....	111	107	109	119	107	114	112	112	109	107
Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton, NC .....	95	93	84	94	91	91	95	93	104	102
Honolulu, HI .....	105	104	101	114	104	98	115	109	112	95
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville, TX .....	99	101	105	91	102	101	90	97	98	95
Huntsville-Decatur, AL .....	98	104	102	93	99	95	91	94	99	96
Indianapolis-Anderson-Columbus, IN .....	95	86	96	94	82	97	98	103	104	97
Iowa City, IA .....	98	98	94	99	98	103	118	93	98	105
Johnstown, PA .....	88	86	85	94	91	90	95	78	88	86
Kansas City, MO-KS .....	99	93	100	96	101	97	95	101	106	110
Kennebec-Pasco-Richland, WA .....	105	103	99	109	107	104	107	102	96	108
Knoxville, TN .....	90	97	98	78	94	90	86	92	91	94
Lincoln, NE .....	87	78	84	91	82	90	82	88	92	94
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside, CA .....	108	108	107	111	108	107	108	109	100	105
Louisville/Jefferson County-Elizabethtown-Scottsburg, KY-IN .....	96	89	96	99	101	98	100	92	103	89

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 1. Pay relatives for major occupational groups in metropolitan areas, National Compensation Survey, July 2010 — Continued

(Average pay nationally for all occupations and for each occupational group shown = 100.)

Metropolitan Area <sup>1</sup>	All occupations	Management, business, and financial	Professional and related	Service	Sales and related	Office and administrative support	Construction and extraction	Installation, maintenance, and repair	Production	Transportation and material moving
Memphis, TN-MS-AR .....	95	96	95	88	99	97	92	96	93	92
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL ...	97	104	89	98	99	99	96	98	96	100
Milwaukee-Racine-Waukesha, WI .....	102	99	96	99	109	100	115	100	108	104
Minneapolis-St. Paul-St. Cloud, MN-WI .....	107	102	102	115	107	105	111	108	109	114
Mobile, AL .....	90	98	91	90	87	92	102	82	96	103
New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA .....	98	94	103	90	102	99	90	106	111	104
New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA ..	114	120	114	114	108	115	129	110	106	103
Ocala, FL .....	87	84	85	88	89	95	81	91	85	93
Oklahoma City, OK .....	92	97	90	95	99	87	115	84	81	104
Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL .....	91	89	84	93	94	92	95	95	100	105
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL .....	92	81	87	94	96	89	97	95	98	102
Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland, PA-NJ-DE-MD .....	104	103	104	101	98	109	108	107	99	105
Phoenix-Mesa-Glendale, AZ .....	99	105	103	98	101	99	86	98	95	99
Pittsburgh-New Castle, PA .....	95	88	95	93	94	95	95	96	101	97
Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA .....	105	101	103	110	106	106	106	114	104	101
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA .....	104	95	105	105	103	107	114	110	113	104
Reading, PA .....	101	104	106	97	102	102	101	96	102	100
Reno-Sparks, NV .....	101	108	98	99	103	102	98	104	102	101
Richmond, VA .....	98	96	96	94	97	102	90	102	100	98
Rochester, NY .....	101	103	101	103	105	100	101	96	106	107
Rockford, IL .....	98	88	93	101	100	97	116	95	99	104
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Truckee, CA-NV ...	108	104	110	111	109	103	117	110	117	108
Salinas, CA .....	113	108	115	123	124	107	116	119	93	109
San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX .....	92	91	96	92	90	94	97	97	90	91
San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA .....	107	105	106	115	108	104	106	107	101	102
San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA .....	120	108	120	126	124	120	128	124	109	109
Seattle-Tacoma-Olympia, WA .....	112	105	109	123	109	108	115	103	115	117
Springfield, MA .....	107	97	110	111	99	106	114	97	105	106
Springfield, MO .....	89	93	85	89	92	88	83	86	97	92
St. Louis, MO-IL .....	100	96	101	97	99	102	107	111	98	97
Tallahassee, FL .....	88	78	82	92	92	90	97	90	85	92
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL .....	93	95	88	96	92	96	93	90	89	93
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC .....	92	88	92	90	93	95	87	97	91	89
Visalia-Porterville, CA .....	99	87	105	107	102	93	95	99	103	99
Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-WV .....	109	105	111	106	109	112	106	112	107	105
York-Hanover, PA .....	97	101	100	96	98	95	101	93	103	102
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA .....	91	98	89	90	92	92	90	96	100	87

<sup>1</sup> A metropolitan area can be a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) or Combined Statistical Area (CSA) as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, December 2003.

## PAY RELATIVES

Company	Headquarters	(Nearest) MSA	Management, Business,	Office and Administrative		Average
			and Financial	Professional and Related	Support	
Center Point Energy	Houston, TX	Houston-Baytown-Huntsville, TX	101	105	101	102.3
Constellation Energy	Baltimore, MD	Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-WV	105	111	112	109.3
Dominion Resources, Inc.	Richmond, VA	Richmond, VA	96	96	102	98.0
DTE Energy Company	Detroit, MI	Detroit-Warren-Flint, MI	98	105	100	101.0
Duke Energy Corporation	Charlotte, NC	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC	101	97	101	99.7
Edison International	Rosemead, CA	San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	108	107	107	107.3
Entergy	New Orleans, LA	New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	94	103	99	98.7
Exelon	Chicago, IL	Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City, IL-IN-WI	105	107	107	106.3
FirstEnergy Corp.	Akron, OH	Cleveland-Akron-Elyria, OH	102	98	102	100.7
NextEra Energy	Juno Beach, FL	Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL	104	89	99	97.3
NiSource	Merrillville, IN	Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City, IL-IN-WI	105	107	107	106.3
Northeast Utilities	Berlin, CT	Hartford-West Hartford-Willimantic, CT	107	109	114	110.0
PG&E Corporation	San Francisco, CA	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	108	120	120	116.0
PSEG	Newark, NJ	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	120	114	115	116.3
Southern Company	Atlanta, GA	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Gainesville, GA-AL	101	101	101	101.0
Allegheny Energy	Greensburg, PA	Pittsburgh-New Castle, PA	88	95	95	92.7
Ameren Corporation	St. Louis, MO	St. Louis, MO-IL	96	101	102	99.7
American Electric Power	Columbus, OH	Columbus-Marion-Chillicothe, OH	96	96	102	98.0
PPL Corporation	Allentown, PA	York-Hanover, PA	101	100	95	98.7
Progress Energy	Raleigh, NC	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC	101	97	101	99.7
Sempra Energy	San Diego, CA	San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	105	106	104	105.0
XcelEnergy	Minneapolis, MN	Minneapolis-St. Paul-St. Cloud, MN-WI	102	102	105	103.0
AEI Services	Houston, TX	Houston-Baytown-Huntsville, TX	101	105	101	102.3
Calpine	San Jose, CA	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	108	120	120	116.0
CMS Energy	Jackson, MI	Detroit-Warren-Flint, MI	98	105	100	101.0
DCP Midstream	Denver, CO	Denver-Aurora-Boulder, CO	97	101	104	100.7
Energy Future Holdings	Dallas, TX	Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	98	100	99	99.0
EPCO	Houston, TX	Houston-Baytown-Huntsville, TX	101	105	101	102.3
FPL Group	Juno Beach, FL	Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL	104	89	99	97.3
Integrus Energy Group	Chicago, IL	Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City, IL-IN-WI	105	107	107	106.3
Kinder Morgan	Houston, TX	Houston-Baytown-Huntsville, TX	101	105	101	102.3
McDermott	Houston, TX	Houston-Baytown-Huntsville, TX	101	105	101	102.3
NRG Energy	Houston, TX	Houston-Baytown-Huntsville, TX	101	105	101	102.3
ONEOK	Tulsa, OK	Oklahoma City, OK	97	90	87	91.3
Pepco Holdings	Washington, DC	Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-WV	105	111	112	109.3
SAIC	Oklahoma City, OK	Oklahoma City, OK	97	90	87	91.3
Tennessee Valley Authority	Knoxville, TN	Knoxville, TN	97	98	90	95.0
Williams Companies	Tulsa, OK	Oklahoma City, OK	97	90	87	91.3
<b>Average:</b>						<b>102.0</b>
Con Edison	New York, NY	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	120	114	115	<b>116.3</b>

GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT

Table with columns: GRADE, SOURCE, BENCHMARK, COUNTRY, REGION, and various performance metrics (Base Salary, Total Compensation, etc.).









571	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	884	881	888	884	888	884	1102	1100	1099	1097	80.83%	1113	1111	1109	1107	76.37%	79.81%	1113	1111	1109	1107	76.37%	79.81%	826	822	832	832	831	831	70.20%	72.95%	1024	1027	1045	1042	1040	1038	76.70%	77.4%	
572	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	884	881	888	884	888	884	1102	1100	1099	1097	80.83%	1113	1111	1109	1107	76.37%	79.81%	1113	1111	1109	1107	76.37%	79.81%	826	822	832	832	831	831	70.20%	72.95%	1024	1027	1045	1042	1040	1038	76.70%	77.4%	
573	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.9%	78.76%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.7%	74.7%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.7%	74.7%	824	821	832	832	831	831	66.16%	68.16%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
574	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	1102	1096	1108	1101	1108	1101	1102	1100	1099	1097	81.23%	80.4%	1111	1111	1109	1107	82.56%	82.2%	1113	1111	1109	1107	82.56%	82.2%	829	824	832	832	831	831	75.0%	78.4%	1114	1110	1142	1140	1138	1136	80.1%	83.7%
575	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.9%	78.76%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.7%	74.7%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.7%	74.7%	824	821	832	832	831	831	66.16%	68.16%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
576	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	885	881	889	885	889	885	1102	1100	1099	1097	81.4%	84.3%	1111	1111	1109	1107	76.0%	79.4%	1113	1111	1109	1107	76.0%	79.4%	828	822	832	832	831	831	70.20%	72.95%	1024	1027	1045	1042	1040	1038	76.70%	77.4%
577	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	887	875	881	878	881	878	1102	1100	1099	1097	78.1%	81.1%	1111	1111	1109	1107	77.6%	80.6%	1113	1111	1109	1107	77.6%	80.6%	826	822	832	832	831	831	71.4%	73.9%	1024	1027	1045	1042	1040	1038	76.70%	77.4%
578	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	893	880	887	884	887	884	1102	1100	1099	1097	80.4%	82.9%	1113	1111	1109	1107	75.6%	79.1%	1113	1111	1109	1107	75.6%	79.1%	826	822	832	832	831	831	69.5%	71.4%	1023	1026	1045	1042	1040	1038	75.8%	78.7%
579	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	886	882	890	886	890	886	1102	1100	1099	1097	80.2%	82.6%	1111	1111	1109	1107	77.6%	80.6%	1113	1111	1109	1107	77.6%	80.6%	826	822	832	832	831	831	71.4%	73.9%	1024	1027	1045	1042	1040	1038	76.70%	77.4%
580	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	889	876	883	880	883	880	1102	1100	1099	1097	76.1%	78.0%	1113	1111	1109	1107	74.3%	77.3%	1113	1111	1109	1107	74.3%	77.3%	824	821	832	832	831	831	67.2%	69.2%	1117	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
581	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Design Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	881	870	885	879	885	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	84.6%	86.0%	1113	1111	1109	1107	89.4%	92.2%	1113	1111	1109	1107	89.4%	92.2%	830	826	832	832	831	831	82.2%	84.6%	1148	1127	1145	1142	1140	1138	80.3%	82.3%
582	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Design Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	884	879	886	883	886	883	1102	1100	1099	1097	74.9%	76.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	72.9%	75.9%	1113	1111	1109	1107	72.9%	75.9%	822	820	832	832	831	831	68.8%	70.7%	1112	1106	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
583	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Design Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	1100	1094	1114	1108	1114	1108	1102	1100	1099	1097	80.73%	80.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	88.3%	91.2%	1113	1111	1109	1107	88.3%	91.2%	830	826	832	832	831	831	81.1%	83.9%	1144	1123	1145	1142	1140	1138	80.8%	82.6%
584	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Design Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	879	887	884	887	884	1102	1100	1099	1097	76.5%	78.3%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	824	821	832	832	831	831	65.7%	67.7%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
585	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.6%	78.4%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	824	821	832	832	831	831	65.7%	67.7%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
586	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.6%	78.4%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	824	821	832	832	831	831	65.7%	67.7%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
587	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.6%	78.4%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	824	821	832	832	831	831	65.7%	67.7%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
588	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.6%	78.4%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	824	821	832	832	831	831	65.7%	67.7%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
589	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.6%	78.4%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	824	821	832	832	831	831	65.7%	67.7%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
590	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.6%	78.4%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	824	821	832	832	831	831	65.7%	67.7%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
591	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.6%	78.4%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	824	821	832	832	831	831	65.7%	67.7%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
592	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.6%	78.4%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	824	821	832	832	831	831	65.7%	67.7%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
593	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.6%	78.4%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	824	821	832	832	831	831	65.7%	67.7%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
594	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.6%	78.4%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	824	821	832	832	831	831	65.7%	67.7%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
595	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.6%	78.4%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	824	821	832	832	831	831	65.7%	67.7%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
596	21	61	Engineer (Civil Eng. - Civil Eng. - Earthquake Eng)	Ann Hewitt, TCM: Engineer - Senior (All Disciplines)	888	876	882	879	882	879	1102	1100	1099	1097	75.6%	78.4%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	1113	1111	1109	1107	71.8%	74.8%	824	821	832	832	831	831	65.7%	67.7%	1116	1100	1142	1140	1138	1136	70.0%	72.7%
597	21	61	Analyst (FI - Corp Acct - Corp Acct)	Towers Watson, Financial Analysis, Audit and Tax - AT700 FI Any/Audit/Tax Multi - Career	889	874	883	877	883	877	878	1102	1100	1099	1097	87.1%	82.1%	886	884	885	883	76.8%	77.0%	886	884	885	883																	















# Top-Level Results

2012  
 39th annual  
 2013

Below is a high-level look at results from the 2012-2013 survey, which closed in May 2012. This year, the “WorldatWork 2012-2013 Salary Budget Survey” received a total of 4,299 submissions. Additional industry and geographic breakout information that can be customized in countless ways for the U.S. and Canada is included in the “Online Reporting Tool,”

which will be available with the full survey results for purchase in early August. If you participated in this survey, you will receive a complimentary subscription.

The information is for your organizational use only. No portion of this communication may be reproduced or redistributed in any form without written permission from WorldatWork.

## Total Salary Budget Increases, by Country and Employee Category

	Employee Category	Actual 2012		Projected 2013	
		Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Australia	NHN	3.8%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
	NS	4.1%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
	MS	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
	OE	4.0%	4.0%	4.1%	4.0%
	All	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
Brazil	NHN	7.8%	8.0%	7.1%	7.8%
	NS	7.6%	7.5%	7.2%	7.5%
	MS	7.5%	7.5%	7.1%	7.5%
	OE	8.0%	7.4%	7.6%	8.0%
	All	7.7%	7.5%	7.2%	7.5%
Canada	NHN	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
	NS	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
	MS	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
	OE	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
	All	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
China	NHN	10.1%	9.4%	9.9%	9.0%
	NS	9.1%	9.0%	8.6%	8.6%
	MS	8.7%	8.8%	8.4%	8.5%
	OE	8.7%	9.0%	8.5%	9.0%
	All	9.1%	9.0%	8.8%	8.7%
France	NHN	2.8%	3.0%	2.9%	3.0%
	NS	2.9%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	MS	3.2%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	OE	2.9%	3.0%	2.9%	3.0%
	All	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Germany	NHN	2.9%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	NS	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
	MS	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
	OE	3.2%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
	All	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%

Total Salary Budget Increases, by Country and Employee Category (continued)

	Employee Category	Actual 2012		Projected 2013	
		Mean	Median	Mean	Median
India	NHN	11.2%	12.0%	11.1%	12.0%
	NS	11.3%	12.0%	10.6%	11.5%
	MS	11.1%	11.8%	10.6%	11.5%
	OE	11.3%	12.0%	10.7%	12.0%
	All	11.2%	12.0%	10.7%	11.9%
Japan	NHN	2.5%	2.5%	2.6%	2.5%
	NS	2.7%	2.5%	2.8%	2.7%
	MS	2.6%	2.5%	2.8%	2.7%
	OE	2.5%	2.5%	2.7%	2.5%
	All	2.6%	2.5%	2.7%	2.6%
Netherlands	NHN	3.1%	3.0%	2.8%	3.0%
	NS	3.1%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	MS	3.1%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	OE	3.3%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	All	3.1%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Singapore	NHN	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.5%
	NS	4.3%	4.5%	4.3%	4.5%
	MS	4.3%	4.4%	4.3%	4.5%
	OE	4.5%	4.5%	4.8%	4.5%
	All	4.3%	4.5%	4.3%	4.5%
Spain	NHN	2.8%	2.9%	2.9%	3.0%
	NS	2.8%	3.0%	2.9%	3.0%
	MS	2.8%	3.0%	2.9%	3.0%
	OE	2.8%	2.9%	2.7%	3.0%
	All	2.8%	3.0%	2.9%	3.0%
U.K.	NHN	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	NS	3.1%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
	MS	3.1%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
	OE	3.3%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
	All	3.1%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
United States	NHN	2.8%	3.0%	2.9%	3.0%
	NS	2.9%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	ES	2.9%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	OE	2.8%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	All	2.8%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%

Non-U.S. Countries	
NHN	Nonmanagement Hourly Nonunion
NS	Nonmanagement Salaried
MS	Management Salaried
OE	Officers/Executives
U.S.	
NHN	Nonmanagement Hourly Nonunion
NS	Nonexempt Salaried
ES	Exempt Salaried
OE	Officers/Executives

Please direct any questions or comments to [surveypanel@worldatwork.org](mailto:surveypanel@worldatwork.org)

WorldatWork | 14040 N. Northsight Blvd. | Scottsdale, AZ 85260 USA  
Customer Relationship Services: 877-951-9191 (toll-free); 480-922-2020

©2012 WorldatWork. All rights reserved. No portion of this communication may be reproduced or redistributed in any form without written permission from WorldatWork.



### List of Hourly Pricing Studies Reviewed

- Boisvert, Richard, Peter Cappers, Bernie Neenan, and Bryan Scott. *Industrial and Commercial Customer Reponse to Real Time Electricity Prices*. Report. Neenan Associates, Dec. 2004.
- Faruqui, Ahmad and Sanem Sergici. "Dynamic Pricing of Electricity in the Mid-Atlantic Region: Econometric Results from the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company Experiment." *Journal of Regulatory Economics* 40.1 (2011): 82-109.
- Faruqui, Ahmad and Sanem Sergici. "Household Response to Dynamic Pricing of Electricity: A Survey of 15 Experiments." *Journal of Regulatory Economics* 38.2 (2010): 193-225.
- Goldman, C., N. Hopper, and R. Bharvirkar. *Customer Strategies for Responding to Day-Ahead Market Hourly Electricity Prices*. Report. Demand Response Research Center, Aug. 2005.
- Goldman, C., N. Hopper, O. Sezgen, M. Moezzi, and R. Bharvirkar. *Customer Response to Day-Ahead Wholesale Market Electricity Prices: Case Study of RTP Program Experience in New York*. Report. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Jun. 2004.
- Impact Evaluation of the California Statewide Pricing Pilot*. Report. Charles River Associates, Mar. 2005.
- Price Elasticity Model for Steam Customers, Case 07-S-1315. See Ex. FWB-1 of Staff Witness Frederick Barney's testimony in this proceeding.