

~~191~~
910
sally fule

DEC 17 1974

RECOMMENDED
SALARY AND EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT
FOR
LEGISLATORS
OF
THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OF MINNESOTA

Submitted By
The Personnel Board
of
The State of Minnesota

Consultant: The Galles Resource

November 14, 1974

P/L60.40

STATE PERSONNEL BOARD

Board Members

William D. Watters, Chairman
Attorney, Hammer, Halverson, Watters & Bye, Ltd.

Cornell L. Moore, Vice Chairman
Attorney, Robins, Davis & Lyons

Edward J. LaFave, Jr.
Executive Vice President, Citizens Bank of Morris

Mrs. Marie Larson
Personnel Supervisor, Kahler Corporation

William B. Flaherty, Sr.
President, Flaherty Equipment Company

Mrs. Marcella Page
Asst. Corporate Secretary and Administrative Assistant,
Economics Laboratory, Inc.

Miss Edna Schwartz

Consultant

Glen F. Galles, President
The Galles Resource

November 14, 1974

Legislator Salary Recommendation

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OF MINNESOTA

Index

	Page
1. Requirements to Submit Recommendation	1
2. Recommendation	2
A. Salary	2
B. Updating to 1977	3
C. Expense Reimbursement	4
3. Introduction to Report	5
4. Premises Underlying Recommendation	8
5. Purpose of Salary for Legislators	10
6. Time Demands on Legislator	11
7. Per Diem	14
8. Supplemental Benefits	16
9. Comparison with Other States	18
10. Comparison with Local Officials	22
11. Salary Trends	24

Appendices

A. Job Description of Legislator	26
B. Legislators 1974 Compensation	28
C. History of Salary & Per Diem	30
D. History of Supplemental Benefits	31
E. Survey of Local Officials Salary	32
F. Survey of Legislators	35
G. Salary Differentials for Legislative Leaders	56
H. Per Diem Analysis	60
I. Legislative Compensation in 50 states	62

Requirement to Submit Recommendation Regarding Legislators' Salaries

The following excerpts from Chapter 43 of the Minnesota Statutes 1974 provide as follows:

A. "The Personnel Board shall on or before November 15 of each numbered year submit to the Commissioner of Personnel a listing of salaries....for members of the legislature...."

B. "Before submitting the salary listing....the Personnel Board shall consult with the Governor, the Commissioner of Administration, the Commissioner of Finance and the Commissioner of Personnel concerning the salary listing and shall give due consideration to the advice of these officers."

C. "...the salary listing shall contain a specific salary for.... the position...."

D. "When determining or recommending salary for any position, the Personnel Board and the Commissioner of Personnel shall assure that....salaries for state positions bear equitable relationships to salaries for similar positions outside state service. Salaries bear equitable relationships to one another within the meaning of this section if salaries for positions which require comparable knowledge, abilities, duties, responsibilities and accountabilities are comparable...."

E. "...legislative branch means all legislators...."

F. "...in no event may the Commissioner (of Personnel) make any changes in the recommendations of the Personnel Board concerning positions in the legislative....branches."

G. "...in January of each odd-numbered year, the Governor shall also transmit for legislative consideration the Commissioner's proposals as recommended by the Commissioner or as modified by the Governor, but the Governor shall not modify any recommendations concerning positions in the legislative....branches."

Recommendation

Based on all information available, and in consideration of sound principles of compensation, the Personnel Board presents the following three-part recommendation, all parts of which constitute the recommendation in total. The parts of the recommendation can not be separated without altering other parts. Should any one part not be accepted, the Board would request the opportunity to reconsider its total recommendation.

The recommendations are as follows:

- A. That the salary of members of the legislature, other than certain legislative leaders, be established at \$13,500 per year and that certain leaders be provided higher salaries as listed below, provided that
- B. Provision be made to increase the salaries recommended in Paragraph A above by the same percentage as awarded to professional and managerial employees in the state classified service due to cost of living plan adjustments which are determined in 1975 and 1976, provided that
- C. Expense reimbursement be changed to a modified vouchered basis for actual expenses for lodging and related expenses when an additional residence is required, up to a maximum established by the legislature,

Plus

A non-vouchered per diem allowance for session and non-session official business which provides

- (1) \$10 a day when duties are performed in the legislator's home area, or
- (2) \$17.50 a day when duties are performed away from the legislator's home area.

No variation would be provided for in-session versus out-of-session allowances. Allowance for out-of-state travel would remain as at present.

The major considerations underlying the above recommendation include the following:

- A. As to the salary level,
 - (1) Time demands on legislators appear to require approximately 60% of all working hours, both legislative and personal occupation, during the biennium.
 - (2) Salaries paid to municipal and county lawmakers in the four large governments who have full or half-time aldermen, councilmen or commissioners are, on the average, approximate 35% more than salary (alone) paid to legislators.
 - (3) The relationship to salaries of other Minnesota State officials and employees is significantly lower than considered appropriate.
 - (4) The relationship of salaries paid to legislators in other states indicates the salary paid to Minnesota legislators is lagging a number of other states, even when consideration is given to the 60% time demands.

B. As to leadership differentials,

The practice of providing leadership differentials is prevalent in most other states on a variety of bases. The provision has considerable merit because of the level of responsibility and the additional time demands placed on the leaders. The Board feels that at least the top six leaders should receive higher salaries.

In Minnesota we provide an extra \$5.00 a day per diem for the House Speaker and the Senate President, a device which in the judgment of the Personnel Board is not consistent with the concept of per diem. Consequently, it is recommended that a salary differential be provided as follows:

House Speaker & Senate President	25% additional salary
Senate Majority Leader & House Majority Leader	20% additional salary
Senate Minority Leader & House Minority Leader	15% additional salary

C. As to a provision for projecting salaries to 1977,

Inasmuch as the law prohibits the legislature from raising the salaries of the members during the biennium of the House of Representatives term, it is necessary that it establish salaries for legislators in the biennium prior to that in which it can become effective. Translated this means that any decision made in 1975 or 1976 can not become effective until 1977.

This presents a dilemma inasmuch as the recommendations presented in this report by the Personnel Board reflect conditions existing at this time and does not involve predictions as to conditions that could exist two years from now. Considering the historical inflationary trends that have existed recently and the inflation that can be anticipated in 1975 and 1976, it is extremely important that some means of updating be provided so that compensation can be equitable and appropriate in the year in which it will take effect.

The Board recommends that the legislature determine salaries which are appropriate at the time of its deliberations guided by the specific recommendation of the Personnel Board, and to add a provision to adjust for rising salary levels that have occurred since this report. As a suggestion any figure established by this process could have attached to it a clause whereby the amount will be automatically increased by the percentage awarded to state employees. For example, if the legislature adjusts the salaries of such employees by X% in the 1975 session, the recommendations of the Personnel Board should be automatically adjusted by the same X%. If another adjustment for state employees is made in 1976, a similar adjustment would be made to the salary of the legislators in arriving at the proper figure to become effective in 1977.

D. As to the change in expense reimbursement,

The principle of reimbursing legislators and other State employees for extra expenditures incurred in the performance of duties is well established and valid. However, legislators should not receive income equivalent to salary through unexpended per diem allowances.

Therefore, the totally unvouchered per diem payment should be abolished and a two-part provision be made:

- (1) \$10 per day when meetings are in the legislator's home area, whether in or out of session, to provide for local mileage, extra incurred items, and more costly expenditures, or
\$17.50 a day when meetings are away from the legislator's home area, to cover the even greater miscellaneous or more expensive expenditures,
plus
- (2) Reimbursement for actually incurred and vouchered expenditures for lodging and related expenses (such as laundry), up to a stated maximum, when such arise out of the establishment of a temporary second residence in the performance of duties. Such items and limits should permit the legislators to reside respectfully when away from home without requiring personal expenditures.

Introduction to Report

A number of issues arose during the conduct of the study and the formulation of the recommendation which the Personnel Board feels is appropriate to note in the introduction of this report inasmuch as they bear upon conclusions and could influence the understanding of the report.

1. Lack of policy base for determining salary

The requirement placed upon the Personnel Board to recommend salaries for legislators was incorporated in the same law that specified the obligations to recommend and/or formulate salaries for other people in the State service. As such, some of the specific statements dealing with legislators were interwoven with those of other personnel, and it is possible that some of the references in the law were intended primarily for other personnel rather than to legislators. This is illustrated by the following excerpts. "When determining or recommending salary for any position, the Personnel Board and the Commissioner of Personnel shall assure that. . . salaries for state positions bear equitable relationships to salaries for similar positions outside state service. Salaries bear equitable relationships to another within the meaning of this section if salaries for positions which require comparable knowledge, abilities, duties, responsibilities and accountabilities are comparable. . . ." It is believed that these statements were intended to apply to personnel other than legislators.

Consequently, there does not exist, to the knowledge of the Personnel Board, any written statements of policy or guidance which can serve as a basis for determining legislators' salaries. Whereas the Personnel Board accepts the responsibility for fulfilling its obligations under the law, it does not feel that the establishment of policy is the responsibility or prerogative of the Board. The issue involved therein is far too fundamental and should be established by the legislature itself who are in the best position to reflect the wishes of the voters. Should establishing such policy appear to be too involved or be judged to be a conflict of interest if done by the legislature, then a charge to the Personnel Board to recommend policy would be more directly approached by means different from those involved in this study.

2. There exists today, as probably there has in the past, a high degree of controversy regarding the role, function, the size, of the legislature, and consequently of the role of legislators themselves. Considerable attention is being given by special study committees and others, including legislators themselves, to this issue. In some cases, it is approached in terms of "legislative reform" and in other situations it is approached in terms of the time and work demands placed upon the legislators. The observations of the Personnel Board are that
 - a. The issue is far from being clear or settled.
 - b. Any major alterations from the present role could well affect the qualifications and compensation of legislators.
 - c. It is not the function of the Personnel Board to involve itself in this issue beyond the point of understanding the existence of the issue.

The Personnel Board, in formulating this recommendation, has accepted as fact the current and existing status of the legislature and the present role of the legislator.

3. There is today, in terms of time demands, an increase of the requirements upon the legislators as compared to previous years. Some take the position that the increased demands are transitory due to the new scheduling resulting from flexible sessions or due to circumstances linked to a change in the power within the legislature. Others observe that it is a pronounced trend which results from the increased demands of voters and from the tendency to thrust certain legislative issues down from the federal level to the state level. The increase in time demands is quoted by several as reasons for deciding not to seek re-election and often such statements are linked with the inadequacy of salary to compensate for the additional time demands.

The Personnel Board has not involved itself in the justification of such time demands, but has accepted its existence. It has attempted to determine the degree of existence by survey of legislators and use such information to formulate its recommendation.

4. The function of salary in the compensation package is not clear nor has it been clearly defined by the legislature or by others. The issue becomes somewhat confused because of the conflicts and disagreements as to why legislators seek or leave office. Some argue that compensation ought to be based on a replacement of primary occupation loss in earnings due to the time requirements. Others disagree strongly with this being a function of salary. It is accepted that the personal income from primary occupation earnings varies widely with legislators, ranging from those who are independently wealthy to those who have acknowledged that the income earned as a legislator is far above that that they earned otherwise. In industry and in government employment, salary quite often is considered as a market function designed to attract and retain competent employees. It appears that this can not be considered singularly a function of salary for legislators.
5. The legislator, as a single entity, does not exist in terms of traits, functions, activities or talents. He is a composite of many different possessed qualifications and engages in a wide variety of practices in the performance of his responsibilities and the meeting of his time commitments. In other situations, this would suggest a variation in salaries due to a variation in duties or contribution. Traditional, as well as political reasons prohibit this and consequently a single salary for the rank and file legislator seems most appropriate even though it is recognized that it does not reflect the individual differences that might exist.
6. Observed public opinion as to legislators' salary is often an expression of small segments of the voters and does not appear to be expressive of the majority. Unfortunately, it is seldom that a majority view can be secured and the opportunities for small groups of voters, who have positions against salary increases, are more vocal and probably more influential. It is the opinion of the Personnel Board that the majority of the citizens of Minnesota respect the role and contribution of legislators. Furthermore, the majority of citizens accept the general principle that a legislator should be compensated equitably in relation to equals in and out of state service. No longer should the legislator be required to consider loss in regular earnings as a form of contribution to the state. Consequently, the question is what specifically constitutes a fair salary, not whether or not a fair salary should be paid.

Premises Underlying the Recommendation

A number of fundamental decisions were made by the Personnel Board prior to proceeding on its study of legislators' salaries which had the effect of establishing a foundation upon which the recommendation could be presented. Included in these considerations are the following:

1. That the voters respect the principle of equity in considering legislators' salaries and equity can be judged by considering salaries paid to
 - a. state officials and employees
 - b. local officials at county and municipal levels
 - c. legislators in other states.
2. That the preservation of real income in the face of rising costs is a minimum that should be provided legislators to the same extent that it is provided to others in state service.
3. The principle underlying reimbursement of expenses incurred in the performance of duties as a legislator is and should be to
 - a. reimburse only for actual expenses incurred in the performance of required duties including items such as duplicate housing and living expenses, postage, telephone and transportation.
 - b. Not provide added "earned income" by awarding amounts over and above such expenses.
 - c. Be as equitable as possible amongst all the legislators and not favor or disfavor any because of home location or other individual factors.
 - d. Not reimburse for expenses which are expended clearly for political purposes.

Consequently, both salary and per diem were considered by the Personnel Board as legitimate considerations rather than limiting the recommendation to salary only.

4. Supplemental benefits beyond salary and per diem represent a part of the total compensation package provided to legislators. To avoid consideration of the provisions for pension, medical insurance, life insurance and other such benefits would not respond to the intent of the law. On the other hand, the legislation did not specify that the Personnel Board present any opinion or recommendation as to the existing level of benefits or as to changes in the features of the benefit program.

Consequently, the Personnel Board determined that it would study and understand generally the provisions of such benefits, would determine whether or not salaries should be higher or lower in consideration of the benefit package itself, but would not deal with any recommendation as regards change in the benefit package.

5. That a recommendation appropriate for November 15, 1974 based upon current conditons would constitute a proper recommendation even though any change in salaries could not be effected before January 1, 1977, provided that a means for updating the salary figure for economic conditions is incorporated in the recommendation.

Furthermore, should conditions change as to increased or decreased time demands upon legislators, such changes should be incorporated so that the salaries determined appropriate for 1977 can reflect conditions existing at that time.

Purpose of Salary

To provide an income which will attract and retain competent legislators from various backgrounds and economic areas.

To reasonably offset loss of personal occupational earnings for individuals elected as legislators considering a typical cross-section of occupations of those elected.

To provide a recognition reflecting respect and dignity due to individuals who are selected to represent citizens in State government.

To eliminate any deterrant of economic disadvantage to individuals who would otherwise be attracted to serve as legislators.

Time Demands on Legislator

Conclusion: It appears that over a two year term the typical legislator spends 60% of his extended work weeks in the performance of legislative responsibilities.

Analysis

Although today there is considerable discussion, study, investigation and contemplation as to what demands should be placed upon a legislator over the two year term as regards time and attention to legislative duties, this report addresses itself to the situation that exists at the present time.

- A. Throughout this study a number of suggestions and recommendations were made by interested individuals which related to the amount of time that should be required of legislators with many of the suggestions being linked to a different role from that which presently exists.
- B. Some argue that the position should be considered a full time position which the incumbent would consider as his career, at least for the moment, and he would not continue the practice of any other employment outside of the position of legislator.
- C. Others argue that the amount of time that is presently being devoted to legislative duties is not only unnecessary but also detrimental in that it tends to erode the historical posture of the legislator as being an individual who devotes a relatively small portion of his occupational hours over the biennium to perform the duties of a legislator.

In approaching the question of time demands, the Personnel Board very clearly and very specifically is avoiding any posture on this issue. It feels that it does not have, nor should it involve itself in such an issue, and that such issue should be resolved either by the legislature itself or by the citizens of the State of Minnesota. Certain arguments have been presented that a decision regarding salary, regardless of whether it was liberal or conservative decision, would have effect upon this issue. The Personnel Board recognizes that compensation can not be divorced from such an issue, but nevertheless by interpretation of the law, the Board is to remain apart from this question.

In order, however, to fulfill its responsibilities, the Personnel Board necessarily does have to make a determination regarding time requirements. Therefore, it accepts the best indicators of present time requirements as being those which actually exist regardless of why. Should significant changes occur either way, then a reconsideration of the compensation recommended would be essential.

Survey of Time Demand

In order to secure the best information available at a reasonable cost, the Personnel Board conducted a survey of Legislators. All 201 legislators were mailed a questionnaire and asked as to time demands and expense reimbursement. A copy of the survey, the correspondence, and the tabulations are contained in Appendix F.

Approximately 56% of the legislators serving in 1974 replied, even though a second request was directed to non-respondents. Undoubtedly some were not candidates for re-election, some were enmeshed in the process of electioneering and some probably were disinterested or chose not to become associated with the subject in any way. A few expressed strong disagreement with the Board's involvement, even though the law requires a recommendation.

Nevertheless, the Board feels that the number of responses are sufficient to reflect the situation experienced by all. Furthermore, although the answers reflect only opinions and recollections of the respondents, they can be accepted as generalizations for this study.

Conclusions from the survey responses are necessarily generalized and represent a "composite" or "typical" legislator. Actual experiences vary widely for individuals and consequently the conclusions require considerable interpretation.

Interviews and other informal information sources seem to collaborate these conclusions and therefore suggest that the interpretations are reasonable.

Highlights of Survey

The legislator is an extremely active individual who devotes extensive time to his combined duties of legislator and personal occupation. He reports that he devotes 50-70 hours a week to these combined duties when the legislature is not in session and even more, over 70 hours a week when in session.

During session he is consumed with his legislative duties, including research and meeting with constituents and other interested parties, with 85% of his 70 hour week required for such activities.

During recess he reports typically 30-35% of his time required to attend to legislative duties, involving committee meetings, research and time with constituents.

To arrive at a composite of time demands over the two year period, the Personnel Board involved the following considerations:

- A. The extensive time of 60-70 hours a week is typical of a large number of professional, administrative and managerial people, and as such was accepted as a basis of comparison.
- B. 85% of in-session and 35% of recess days would result in an equivalent of 60% of full time of an extensive work week. Consequently, this was considered as the time demands arising out of legislative duties.

Per Diem

Conclusion: The present arrangement for paying per diem is

- (1) inequitable amongst local and outstate legislators,
- (2) is inconsistent in providing different amounts to local legislators when out of session compared to when in-session, and
- (3) appears to produce an added income to some legislators and thereby confuses the total issue of compensation.

Analysis

The function of per diem allowances usually is to reimburse individuals for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in the performance of duties, which expenses are typically over and above those considered as normal living expenses. In providing per diem to legislators, it reflects the historical view of the legislator as one whose residence is located where his primary occupation is located, and that to serve as a legislator requires extra out-of-pocket expenditures when attending sessions or meetings. This is further supported by the provision of other kinds of allowances such as auto mileage, postage and telephone charges incurred in the performance of legislative duties.

The adaptation of the per diem concept to legislators has moved from the pure reimbursement concept, although in some cases it may even fall short of paying for actual incurred expenses.

1. No evidence of actual expenditures for per diem items is required.
2. When in session, legislators who do not establish away-from-home residence are paid \$25.00 a day for all calendar days that they are "in-session". Legislators who certify a change in residence are paid \$33.00 a day. Against this allowance, the local legislator probably can claim daily mileage and meals in preparing his income tax return, while the outstate legislators probably can claim all food, lodging and miscellaneous expenditures.
3. When the legislature is not in session, a legislator can draw per diem when he attends a meeting in St. Paul, or some other designated place in the State, or performs some official duties that may fall outside the definition of a "meeting". The amount of per diem paid in these circumstances is \$33.00 for all legislators, regardless of whether the residence is in the city where the event occurs or else-

where. Mileage from a distant location is also paid. In this situation, the outstate legislator may or may not incur housing or other expenses different from those incurred by the local legislator; depending upon whether overnight lodging is required, or chosen.

Consequently, the out-of-pocket expenses could range from local mileage (not reimbursed) and meals of a local legislator to housing, meals, local mileage and miscellaneous expenses if an outstate legislator secures overnight lodging.

4. Whereas information is not available as to how much added income is provided by per diem payments, the Personnel Board concludes that it can range from zero to several hundred dollars a year.

Legislators' Supplemental Benefits

Conclusion: Inasmuch as supplemental benefits such as group insurance, pension plans, deferred compensation and other economic items relate to total compensation, it is concluded that the benefit package for State legislators is strongly on the plus size, both in design and in consideration of the fact that the legislator secures full benefits even though a part-time employee. It would appear therefore that no consideration is necessary or required when dealing with the issue of salary to off-set any voids or inadequacies in the benefit program. As a matter of fact, if there were to be any balancing off of the supplemental benefits in the total package, it would have to be concluded that they represent additional income over and above that provided to state employees, municipal or county employees, or people in private industry. This report however does not direct itself to any quantification of that conclusion and consequently the consideration of salary and per diem will be made on their own merits.

Analysis

A rather prevalent practice has developed amongst various governments whereby lawmakers are being provided a large number of supplemental benefits such as group insurance and pension plans. Usually these are the same as those provided to employees of that particular government, but in some cases they are uniquely different or significantly different in degree. Whereas this practice is not prevalent when the lawmaker is required to devote only a very small portion of his time, it is observed that most governments do extend these benefits when approximately half of the individual's time is required to fulfill lawmakers' duties.

When such benefits are extended to part-time lawmakers, it does permit or create a possible duplication of benefits, particularly if the individual has similar benefits extended to him in his regular course of employment. In certain circumstances, such as in medical insurance, the insurance industry has developed non-duplication provisions, but this would not be so for retirement plans or life insurance plans. To the extent that the State legislator receives such benefits, it is considered a definite plus in his compensation, particularly if the benefits are likewise available through his regular employment.

In addition, it is observed that the Minnesota State Legislator has additional privileges not normally extended to employees which for some legislators must represent an even greater plus factor.

1. Medical insurance is the same as provided to state employees. However, it can be purchased by a legislator at group rates for the rest of his life even though he no longer serves as a legislator. To the self-employed individual who would have to purchase group insurance at individual rates, this should be very attractive.
2. Life insurance is the same as provided to State employees, with a portion free and additional amounts available at group rates.
3. Retirement Plan - The retirement plan designed for legislators is a very liberal plan when compared to that provided to other state employees, to other lawmakers at the county and municipal level and to a major portion of employees in private industry even though the contribution rate is higher. The major features of the plan are outlined as follows:

Retirement Age	60
Minimum Service	8 years
Per cent of Average Salary	
8 years service	40% of updated salary
12 years service	50% of updated salary
20 years service	70% of updated salary
Basis of Average Salary	Average - Salary after 1/1/73
Surviving Spouse Benefit	50% of retired benefit
1st child	25% of retired benefit
Additional children, each	12-1/2% " "
Family Maximum 100%	
Eligibility for Survivor Benefit	2 years service
Contribution by Legislator	8% of salary
Contribution by State	General Funds

LEGISLATIVE SERVICES LIBRARY
STATE OF MINNESOTA

Comparison with Legislators in Other States

Conclusion: Whereas data on Minnesota legislators indicated they were paid in the upper 35% when compared to legislators of other states, salary levels are changing and an increase of 15% to 20% could be made without exceeding the top earners.

Analysis

One of the sources studied by the Personnel Board is the compensation paid to legislators in other states. Whereas it is recognized that we do not have a "supply and demand" consideration here as we normally assume for classified and unclassified employees, nevertheless a comparison with other states' legislators' compensation is considered valid. It suggests or indicates a value placed by citizens of other states as regards the contribution of their legislators.

To attempt to arrive at any conclusion from such data, the Personnel Board assumed that the citizens of the State of Minnesota would conclude that Minnesota legislators should be paid comparable to the top paid legislators in other states with allowances made when comparing to states requiring full time legislators.

The issues involved and surrounding the establishment of pay of legislators in the State of Minnesota are reported to be somewhat typical of those experienced in other states. Some, as a matter of fact, have historical and constitutional restrictions which prohibit the increasing of salary over a very nominal figure such as \$600 a year and it could be only assumed that this has had its influence on either the amount of effort and time provided or on other ways by which compensation has been awarded. The political pressures of public opinion and the ever present problem of lawmakers raising their own salaries have seemed to influence the results in a number of states.

However, a positive trend is developing whereby compensation commissions of some form or other are being established to deal with the issue of compensation, sometimes only for legislators and sometimes for the total salaried group within the state service. It is reported that these are proving to be very effective in bringing the issues into a more objective consideration. Also, it is not clear whether it is cause or effect, but for the approximate 18 to 20 states where commissions are in existence, the average salary (salary only) for the biennium runs approximately 30% higher in those states when compared

to the average salary for the biennium paid to the balance of the states who do not have commissions. Where commissions are established interesting developments are being observed, such as a trend towards identifying salary for the purpose it is to serve and expense reimbursement being provided for on a vouchered basis, thereby eliminating the tendency to provide additional salary through the per diem route.

Unfortunately, the published data that is available is somewhat confused by the mixture of situations wherein per diem is provided on an unvouchered basis for either or both the in-session time and the interim time. Consequently, the true income over and above expenses is not easily identifiable. Also tucked away in some states' laws are provisions for additional allowances, sometimes generally applied to take care of legislative responsibilities outside the Capitol and typically in the legislator's home district.

This confusion prohibits the most popular source of information, namely the Citizens Conference on State Legislators, from drawing specific conclusions that are complete and comprehensive as regards true income of legislators. They did however calculate what they call "total compensation biennial" which consisted of salary and unvouchered per diem or other allowances paid during the regular sessions. They did not include salary or expenses for special sessions if those are specifically provided for, or for per diem while on legislative business in the interim. Furthermore, they did not give consideration to vouchered expenses which they did not consider as income. This obviously produces some inconsistencies in making comparisons because if a state provided vouchered expenses and another state paying the same salary also provided per diem, all of which could have been vouchered, the showing of the per diem state as providing a higher income to the legislator is incorrect. It becomes further confused when, in a state like Minnesota, a metropolitan legislator probably ends up with more income out of per diem than the outstate legislator.

Another complication is reflected in the fact that in some of the states, particularly those paying the highest salaries, require the legislator to consider his legislative position as his primary occupation and devote practically all time to such duties. This is true in the top paying states of California, New York and Massachusetts where the Citizens Conference calculates the 1972 annual income as \$24,210 for California, \$20,000 for New York and \$15,296 for Massachusetts, as compared to the \$10,000 provided to the Minnesota legislator (which reflects the raise in salary to \$700 a month but does not reflect the most recent increase in per diem).

Many states are reporting the increased demand upon legislators and some have documented their conclusion in the past couple of years such as Florida concluding that 50% to 60% of the time over a biennium is required and Wisconsin reporting that approximately 65% of the time is required.

Using the data for its face value, in 1972 Minnesota is reported as in rank 14 amongst the 50 states with the range for all states being from \$100 a year in New Hampshire to \$24,210 in California (using November 1972 figures). Information available indicates that a number of states have raised either per diem or salary and the best indications are that the average has been rising at the rate of about 10% a year in the last four years and 15% a year in the ten year period prior to that. A number of observations suggest that the citizens view of his legislator is strongly shifting both as to his role and as to the time demands placed upon him. As a result, the rise in compensation can be considered primarily as a correction factor from the figures set two or three decades ago when the individual legislator spent a small amount of time as a recess from his normal occupation and drew very little compensation therefrom.

If Minnesota chooses to view an appropriate position being comparable to the average or high average state, then the present compensation can be considered adequate. On the other hand, a comparison with the top 20% of states who require approximately 60% of the legislator's time could result in conclusions that Minnesota could justify a 10% to 15% increase.

Out of all of this diverse information, a few observations appear clear.

1. The movement of compensation for legislators is continuing and that unless Minnesota raises its compensation proportionately, the relative position of 14th in 1972 will be eroded and will continue to fall until such change occurs.
2. The top three states are reported to be paying approximately \$21,000 a year for full time duties. The Minnesota legislator reports that he typically devotes 60% of his biennium time to legislative duties and if compensation should be viewed as being proportionate to those legislators in the top three paying states, then Minnesota's present compensation is approximately 15% to 20% below that figure. In other words, an increase of 15% to 20% would result in pay level which would place the Minnesota legislator proportionate to the top income legislators throughout the 50 states.

3. An increase of 15-20% would place the Minnesota legislator in the top group of states who require 55-60% of a legislator's time.
4. Because the Personnel Board has no information as to where citizens of Minnesota view the values of their legislators, no conclusion is arrived at by the Board to change salary because of pay levels in other states. As stated above, the best that it can conclude is that should other factors indicate and justify a salary increase, then such an increase could occur up to 15% to 20% without placing Minnesota above the highest states requiring either full time or part-time service.

Note: The information used in this study was the best information available from published sources. Changes are occurring in a number of states, and as new information is received, it will be forwarded to the legislature.

Salary Comparison with Local Lawmakers

Conclusion: Salary and assumed income from per diem for legislators falls considerably below the equivalent salary of lawmakers in the two large metropolitan cities and the two large counties. The lag ranges up to 65%, and on the average is 34%.

Inquiry was made of the three large cities of Minneapolis, St. Paul and Duluth, and of four counties; Hennepin, Ramsey, St. Louis and Olmsted. The information secured included time demands, salary, allowances and benefits.

In all such cases, work is performed in the city of residence and consequently no provision is made for per diem or mileage. Variations occurred as regards incurred expenses, but predominantly these were related to out of town trips. Where an auto allowance was provided, such was noted and it was assumed that the allowance was consumed by the miles driven in performance of duties.

Analysis

Only the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul and the County of Hennepin require full time services of its lawmakers. The Consultant's conclusion regarding Ramsey County is that approximately 50% time is required. Duluth, St. Louis County, Rochester and Olmsted County have limited requirements ranging up to 25% time requirements, and are compensated on a limited basis, often per meeting.

Considering those local governments which require full time of the lawmaker, the following observations are noted:

- A. The job requirements of lawmakers at the county and municipal level tend to incorporate more administrative and operational monitoring and control, in addition to lawmaking. Members are on a large number of committees which deal with actual operations of government services.
- B. The numbers of lawmakers in a unit are considerably less, ranging from 5 to 13, and consequently each individual has proportionately greater impact and accountability than the State Legislator. No effort was made to draw any conclusion as to relative "weight" of the various positions.

C. All lawmakers are provided a package of supplemental benefits which are somewhat similar to those provided State Legislators, with the following notable observations:

1. Being full time, the only coverage for such local officials is their government employment, whereas State Legislators, usually otherwise employed, are likely eligible for additional benefits in a few benefits such as life insurance and retirement plan. Obviously vacations and holidays are not subject to "doubling up" and medical insurance has non-duplication conditions.
2. For state legislators who are self-employed or who would have to purchase their own medical insurance, being eligible year round for a good medical plan at group rates is a strong advantage. The retirement plan for state legislators has features which make this benefit a strong plus when compared to local officials.
3. As a general conclusion the benefits package in all four local governments are so similar that the package would not alter a direct comparison of salaries.

Salary Trends

Conclusion: It is not feasible to draw any conclusions on how well legislators' salaries kept pace with comparable positions.

Analysis

One consideration that is traditionally involved in considering compensation recommendations is that of the history of changes in salaries which is often referred to as "trend". This examination is justified by an assumption that a salary level which existed at one time has historically been tested as to adequacy or inadequacy and therefore unless it has been challenged, it can represent a reasonable basis for determining whether such salaries have remained current. For example, (1) if an appropriate salary is established for a position and (2) if comparable salary levels rise considerably, (3) the salary under consideration should rise by the same amount in order to be considered to have maintained its relative position.

As we examine history we find that in 1967 the monthly salary of legislators was raised from \$200 to \$400, a figure which remained for six years until it was increased in 1973 to \$700 a month. This \$700 a month coincided with the change to flexible sessions and was primarily argued on the basis of additional work requirements.

Because the Personnel Board is not in a position to evaluate the extent to which the \$700 salary was a reflection of increased work demands, it can not draw any conclusion as to whether the salary of a legislator has risen higher than the same or less than those of other comparable positions when the influence of change and duties and responsibilities has been extracted from the figure.

Another factor tending to complicate any comparison has been the changes that have been provided to constitutional officers starting in 1967 when salaries were increased approximately 20% to 25% from the levels existing in 1966 which in turn have been further increased resulting in levels 50 to 100% higher than those that existed in 1966. These changes undoubtedly influenced by the existence of citizens committee recommendations urging correction of salary levels for such officials. The legislature and the citizens of the State seemed to recognize the need for significant correction as seen by the changes which occurred.

1. State employees, other than Constitutional officers, (primarily classified employees) have or will have received compounded increases of approximately 21-1/2% over the level existing in early 1972, given as separate increases on the following dates:

July 1972	4%
July 1973	6%
July 1974, cost-of-living	6%
Anticipated January 1975, cost-of-living	4%

2. Private Industry Middle Management

Whereas published figures are not completely available at this point, it appears that salary levels for middle managers in private industry similar to those contained in published surveys could approximate 13 to 15% over the two year period of 1974-75 with a number of experts anticipating that the annual rate may rise to 8% or 16% in a two year period.

Attempts to compare the rise in income of legislators again is confused by the existence of per diem allowances which appear to provide some income over and above expenses. In 1973 the per diem was increased \$9 for all legislators. It is not known, however, whether or not this was adequate to meet rising living costs or whether it exceeded it or fell below it.

Whereas the information available is not adequate to draw a firm conclusion regarding how well the salaries of legislators have kept pace with comparable positions, it is pointed out that the 1973 salary of \$700 a month has and will remain in effect until 1979 and by that time the equivalent value of the \$700 will be considerably reduced.

JOB DESCRIPTION

LEGISLATOR - STATE OF MINNESOTA

Prepares and legislates for a program derived from a variety of sources, including his district, the committees on which he serves, his party, friends and interest groups.

Conceives the need for new legislation through study of the problems of his district and the state.

Initiates research through the staff and committees and requests preparation of bills and amendments.

Develops support for his proposals and lends support or opposes programs of other legislators.

Reviews the daily calendar, journals and weekly status to keep informed on bills scheduled for hearings and floor action.

Attends sessions, takes part in debate and votes on business before the chamber.

Exercises legislative oversight over the administrative branch of government and the state budget through committee hearings, personal contacts, review of reports and investigation of complaints.

Replies to correspondence and telephone calls, supervises the work of a secretary and committee aides, if available, when acting as a committee chairman.

Keeps constituents informed on the progress of legislation and his position on specific bills and, in turn, keeps himself informed on the opinions of his constituents, political party and interest groups.

Attends committee meetings and hearings throughout the state to inform himself on the details of proposals, the arguments for and against them, and to vote on their submission to the Legislature.

Acts as liaison between his district, state and federal agencies, providing personal assistance to constituents in handling their problems.

STATE OF MINNESOTA
LEGISLATORS
1974 COMPENSATION PROGRAM

Salary	\$700/month - \$8,400/year
Per Diem	Non-vouchered In Session \$25 day for Metro Legislators \$33 day for others Out of Session \$33 day for all
Retirement Plan	Benefit payable at age 60 - if "retired" Eight (8) years service to qualify (not continuous) Contribution 8% of salary 40% of average salary since 1-1-73 Plus 2-1/2 for each year service over 8 Benefit payable for life - plus If death after 2 years service, or Retires after 8 years service Benefit 50% to spouse - lifetime unless 20% to first dependent child 12-1/2% to each additional child Total 100% or Contribution returned to estate Benefits <u>not</u> subject to Minnesota Income Tax
Travel Expenses	14¢ mile during Sessions (One a week) (Metro Senators - none)
Life Insurance	\$5000 State paid Up to \$40,000 optional - cost .20 to 2.08/mo. per \$1000 Dependents at \$2000 each - cost .56 to 4.38/mo. total. AD&D Double
Phone-Postage-Office	Postage \$200 year member \$250 Chairmen \$300 Minority Leader - Assistant Majority Whip Phone \$30 month - Long Distance in Session if arise

Medical Insurance

Full Semi-Private R&B - 365 days
Unlimited Hospital Extras - 365 days
Extended care facilities
Surgical schedule (full to 80%)
Major Medical - \$50 deductible
80% co-insurance
\$50,000 maximum
All former legislators eligible to continue
\$34.35 month
Cost employee -0- dependent

STATE OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATOR
HISTORY OF SALARY AND PER DIEM

	<u>Salary</u>	<u>Per Diem</u>		
		<u>Metro</u>	<u>In Session</u> Outstate	<u>Interim</u> Both
1965	\$200	\$14.00	\$21.00	
1966	\$200			\$25.00
1967	\$400	\$14.00	\$21.00	
1968	\$400			-0-
1969	\$400	\$16.00	\$24.00	
1970	\$400			-0-
1971	\$400	\$16.00	\$24.00	\$25.00
1972	\$400			\$25.00
1973	\$700	\$25.00	\$33.00	\$33.00
1974	\$700			\$33.00

LEGISLATORS SALARY

HISTORY OF SUPPLEMENTAL BENEFITS

1965	Retirement Plan Instituted Ten year service at age 65
January 1966	Life insurance - paid by legislator Medical insurance
January 1, 1969	Life and medical insurance - \$10.00 paid by State Retirement service - 8 years age 65
January 1, 1972	Continuation of medical insurance after term of office Some increase in benefits
1973 Law	Retirement Service eight years at age 60 Last salary as base

Salaries of Local Lawmakers

A survey was conducted of salaries, benefits and time requirements of several county and municipal lawmakers. Only those listed below were considered by the Personnel Board to be comparable to a sufficient degree.

This does not imply that citizens who serve on the many city and county councils or boards are devoting minimum time to their duties. To the contrary, it is well known that many devote several hours each week to their assignments.

The four reported on were selected because they represent situations wherein a majority of hours of extended work weeks are required, and wherein compensation is believed to be designed to provide all or a significant portion of earned income.

The information reports both

- (1) the stated salary, recorded in the 1975 column...and
- (2) the Personnel Board's calculation of a portion of the salary that coincides with the stated portion of time actually required.

(For example, the Minneapolis Aldermen will be paid \$20,929 a year in 1975. To identify a 60% portion to give a reference that can be used to compare with a legislator's time demand, the figure of \$12,557 was produced. Ramsey County salary was increased because the Board believes the time demands represent 50%.)

	<u>1975 Stated Salary</u>	<u>Time Requirements</u>	<u>Converted to 60% equivalent</u>
Minneapolis	\$20,929	100%	\$12,557
St. Paul	17,000	100%	10,200
Hennepin	24,492	100%	14,695
Ramsey	13,847	50%	<u>16,616</u>
		Average	\$13,517

SALARY AND BENEFITS STUDY
STATE - COUNTY - MUNICIPAL
LEGISLATIVE OFFICIALS

Appendix E-2
September 1974

	State Legislators	City of Minneapolis	City of St. Paul
Time Demands	60%	100%	100%
Salary	\$8,400 year	\$19,166 - 1/2/74 \$20,124 - 11/1/74 \$20,929 - 9/1/75	\$16,723 - 1974 \$17,000 - 1975
Expenses	In session - per diem \$25.00 - Metro \$33.00 - Rural Interim - per diem \$33.00 - All	Some as incurred	Some as incurred
Mileage	14¢ outstate only - One trip week while in session	\$125.00 month non-vouchered	Incurred up to \$75 month
Medical Insurance	SP R&B - 365 days Unlimited Extras Surgical 100%-80% MM - \$50.00 deduct 80% co-in \$50,000 max. Depend: \$34.35 mo.	R&B - \$55.00 day 70 days Extras-\$900 max. Surgical MM-\$100 deduct 80%-90% Depend: \$16.00 mo.	Similar to State
Life Insurance	\$5000 no cost Supplemental up to \$40,000 20¢ to \$2.08 mo/m Depend: \$2000 56¢ to \$4.38 mo total	\$5000 no cost Supplemental 1x or 2x annual 10¢ to \$1.04 mo/m Depend: \$1000 @ 44¢ mo.	Similar to State
Sick Leave	On annual salary	On annual salary	On annual salary
LTD	None	None	None
Vacation	On annual salary	On annual salary	On annual salary
Vacations	Nine	Nine	Nine stated-two floating PERA
Retirement	8 years service Age 60 normal 40% - up benefit Survivor benefit Es. pays 8%	10 years service Age 60 normal 10 yrs. -20% benefit 30 yrs. -70% benefit Es. pays 8%	10 years service Age 65 normal Combined with SS 10 yrs. -10% + SS 30 yrs. -40% + SS Es. pays 4% + SS

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OF MINNESOTA

SALARY AND BENEFITS STUDY
STATE - COUNTY - MUNICIPAL
LEGISLATIVE OFFICIALS

	Hennepin County	Ramsey County	City of Duluth
Time Demands	100%	50%	25-35%
Salary	\$24,492	\$13,847 as of 1/1/74	\$25 meeting up to \$3000 year
Expenses	Some as incurred	Some as incurred	Some as incurred
Mileage	\$100 month non-vouchered	Parking at office	Not available
Medical Insurance		SP R&B - 365 days Unlimited Extras Surgical - 1st \$200 + 80%. MM-\$50 deduc. 50% co, \$25,000 max. Depend: No cost	Not eligible
Life Insurance	\$5000 no cost supplemental 150% salary up to \$40,000 - 32¢ to \$1.04 mo.	\$5000 with AD&D \$5000, supplemental up to \$15,000 - 30¢ to \$2.40 mo/m. Depend: \$1000 - 40¢ to \$2.50 mo/m	Not eligible
Sick Leave	On Annual Salary	On Annual Salary	None
LTD	None	None	None
Vacation	On Annual Salary	On Annual Salary	None
Holidays	Ten	Nine fixed-two floating	Not applicable
Retirement	PERA 10 years service Age 65 normal Combined with SS 10 yrs. -10% + SS 30 yrs. -40% + SS Es. pays 4% + SS	PERA 10 years service Age 65 normal Combined with SS 10 yrs. -10% +SS 30 yrs. -40% + SS Es. pays 4% + SS	Not eligible

State of Minnesota



PERSONNEL BOARD

215 State Administration Building

St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

(612) 296-6221

August 19, 1974

TO EACH MEMBER OF THE 1974 LEGISLATURE:

Subject: Legislators' Salaries

As required by the present law, the Personnel Board of the State of Minnesota is conducting research and preparing to present a recommendation pertaining to legislators' salaries (reference Laws of 1974, Chapter 511, Sec. 1, et seq.). In order to fulfill all of the requirements of the act and to approach the issue on a comprehensive and professional basis, we have engaged Glen F. Galles of the management consulting firm The Galles Resource to provide the Board with research and analysis capability.

On his recommendation, we are contacting each legislator who served in the year 1974 to secure information pertinent to these deliberations. Enclosed is a questionnaire which we hope you will complete and return immediately so that we can have good information for our deliberations. You will observe that the questionnaire deals with the issue of time demands upon you in the performance of your obligations as a legislator. We realize that some of these answers may be approximations rather than the product of records in your files, but nevertheless they will benefit the deliberations.

The Board has concluded that salary, per diem and reimbursement for expenses such as travel, telephone and office will be a part of the total consideration. Consequently, the questionnaire deals with these items.

As with all questionnaires, they often are not completely comprehensive and, therefore, we welcome any comments that you would care to add.

No publication or identification of the responses will be made and we have directed Mr. Galles to receive the replies and present only summary information to the Board. All identification as to who submitted which response will remain in the files of the consultant.

We wish to thank you for your cooperation and its assistance in helping the Personnel Board develop a rational basis and a sound conclusion that can be presented to the legislature for its deliberations in 1975.

Sincerely,

William D. Watters
Chairman

QUESTIONNAIRE
LEGISLATORS SALARIES
1973-74

The following information is sought by the Personnel Board of the State of Minnesota to assist in its deliberations regarding salaries for members of the legislature. We invite factual responses, hopefully based upon records, but in many instances may be approximations recalled from memory. The information that you provide will remain confidential within the files of the private consultant engaged to conduct this study.

Please mail the completed questionnaire to The Galles Resource in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. At the same time, please complete the post card and mail it to the Personnel Board secretary. This will permit us to follow up on missing questionnaires, inasmuch as there will be no identification on the questionnaires themselves.

We would appreciate it if you could complete this questionnaire and return it by September 3.

1. About what percent of your average working time during legislative sessions is spent on each of the following legislative and non-legislative activities?

Over Period January 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974
Please be sure distribution totals 100%

	None	1 to 19%	20 to 39%	40 to 59%	60 to 79%	80 to 99%	100%
a. Percent of Average Working Time Spent on... Legislative business on floor (in session)	-0-	42%	47%	8%	1%	-0-	2%
b. Percent of Average Working Time Spent on... Committee meetings, hearings, caucuses (in session)	-0-	8%	55%	32%	4%	-0-	1%
c. Percent of Average Working Time Spent on... Research & Preparation (in session)	-0-	59%	37%	3%	-0-	-0-	1%
d. Percent of Average Working Time Spent on... Communication with constituents (in session)	-0-	59%	36%	3%	1%	-0-	1%
e. % of Average Working Time Spent on... Other duties or offices related to legislative position (in session)	6%	82%	10%	1%	-0-	-0-	1%
f. % of Average Working Time Spent on... Outside occupational activities <u>not</u> related to legislative position (in session)	45%	45%	7%	3%	-0-	-0-	-0-
2. About what percent (of your average working time is spent on each of the following legislative and non-legislative activities) when the legislature is <u>not</u> in session?							
a. % of Average Working Time Spent on... Committee meetings, hearings, caucuses (not in session)	1%	77%	19%	3%	-0-	-0-	-0-
b. % of Average Working Time Spent on... Research & preparation (not in session)	1%	77%	18%	3%	1%	-0-	-0-
c. % of Average Working Time Spent on... Communication with constituents (not in session)	1%	59%	30%	8%	2%	-0-	-0-

Over Period January 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974

Please be sure distribution totals 100%

	None	1 to 19%	20 to 39%	40 to 59%	60 to 79%	80 to 99%	100%
d. % of Average Working Time Spent on... Other duties or offices related to <u>legislative position (not in session)</u>	5%	64%	20%	5%	5%	-0-	1%
e. % of Average Working Time Spent on... Outside occupational activities <u>not</u> related to legislative position (not in <u>session)</u>	5%	11%	15%	32%	22%	14%	1%

Please indicate the number of HOURS in answering the following:

	None	1 to 9	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70 +
3. About how many hours a week do you spend on legislative business during legislative sessions?	-0-	-0-	-0-	1%	2%	8%	15%	44%	30%
4. About how many hours a week do you spend on legislative business when the legislature is not in session?	1%	14%	21%	26%	26%	9%	1%	2%	-0-
5. About how many hours a week do you spend on your own business or non-legislative job when the legislature is in session?	34%	40%	15%	4%	7%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
6. About how many hours a week do you spend on your own business or non-legislative job when the legislature is not in session?	6%	7%	7%	15%	20%	31%	13%	-0-	1%
a. Total Number Hours a Week Spent on Legislative Business & in Personal Occupa- tion When Legislature is in Session.	1%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	2%	11%	23%	63%
b. Total Number Hours a Week Spent on Legislative Business & in Personal Occupa- tion When Legislature is Not in Session.	-0-	-0-	-0-	1%	1%	16%	40%	22%	20%

38

	Percent Extra Compensation	Member of Committee?	Name of Committee
7. Some legislative committee assignments require more working time than others. If you think service on these committees deserves extra compensation, write in the name of each committee and the percent extra compensation over base pay which you believe is deserved. Also, indicate if you have been a member of this com- mittee in Column 2.	See Comments	See Comments	

Please indicate the PERCENTAGE in answering the following:

	None	1-19%	20-39%	40-59%	60-79%	80-99%	100%	Total
8. About what percent of your actual expenses of <u>each type listed below</u> incurred in legislative duties are reimbursed by the State?								
a. % of Actual Expenses Reimbursed... Food & Lodging While at Capitol (in session)	10%	-0-	1%	1%	5%	17%	65%	
b. % of Actual Expenses Reimbursed... Food & Lodging While at Capitol (out of session)	11%	3%	6%	10%	10%	10%	50%	
c. % of Actual Expenses Reimbursed... Mileage (in session)	14%	15%	6%	5%	15%	12%	33%	
d. % of Actual Expenses Reimbursed... Mileage (out of session)	12%	17%	14%	10%	7%	7%	33%	
e. % of Actual Expenses Reimbursed... District, Non-Session Expenses	56%	14%	7%	6%	4%	2%	11%	
f. % of Actual Expenses Reimbursed... Actual Expenses for Non-Session Meetings	22%	5%	10%	7%	4%	16%	36%	
9. Would you favor additional compensation (over & above allowable expenses) to legislators on a per meeting basis for attendance at <u>interim study committees</u> when the Legislature is not in session?	Yes		No		Qualified Answer			
	35%		33%		32%			
a. How many dollars per meeting additional?	None	\$1-\$4	\$5-\$9	\$10-\$14	\$15-\$19	\$20-\$24	\$25 or more	
	26%	2%	6%	13%	2%	7%	44%	
10. How many sessions have you served in <u>each</u> House of the Legislature?	None	One	Two	Three	Four or more		Total	
a. House of Representatives (# Sessions Served)	9%	33%	22%	14%	22%			
b. Senate (# Sessions Served)	60%	9%	13%	5%	13%			
11. In which House are you now serving?	House of Representatives			70%	Senate			30%
12. How old are you?	Under 40		40-61	62 or older				
	41%		55%	4%				

Tabular Results of "Check Answer" Questions: Legislature

The maximum possible number of responses to this questionnaire is 201 (134 Representatives and 67 State Senators). The following tabulations are based on a total of 97 completed questionnaires (73 from Representatives and 28 from Senators). The overall legislative response rate, therefore, is 55.7% to date. The response rate for Representatives is 54.4%, while that for State Senators is 41.8%.

Summary of Results

Percent Distribution

- | | All | Representative | Senate |
|--|-----|----------------|--------|
| 1. About what percent of your average working time <u>during legislative sessions</u> is spent on each of the following <u>legislative and non-legislative activities?</u> | | | |

Percent of Average Working Time Spent
on... Legislative business on floor (in session)

None	-%	-%	-%
One to 19%	42	37	54
20 to 39%	47	47	42
40 to 59%	8	11	0
60 to 79%	1	0	4
80 to 99%	0	0	0
100%	2	5	0
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	5	3	2

Percent of Average Working Time Spent
on... Committee meetings, hearings,
caucuses (in session)

None	-%	-%	-%
One to 19%	8	10	5
20 to 39%	55	53	55
40 to 59%	32	30	36
60 to 79%	4	5	4
80 to 99%	0	0	0
100%	1	2	0
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	6	4	2

Percent of Average Working Time Spent
on... Research & Preparation (in session)

None	-%	-%	-%
One to 19%	59	54	65
20 to 39%	37	39	32
40 to 59%	3	5	3
60 to 79%	0	0	0
80 to 99%	0	0	0
100%	1	2	0
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	10	6	4

Percent of Average Working Time Spent on... Communication with constituents (in session)	Percent Distribution		
	All	Representative	Senate
None	-%	-%	-%
One to 19%	59	59	58
20 to 39%	36	36	42
40 to 59%	3	3	0
60 to 79%	1	1	0
80 to 99%	0	0	0
100%	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	8	4	4
Percent of Average Working Time Spent on... Other duties or offices related to legislative position (in session)			
None	6%	6%	12%
One to 19%	82	82	68
20 to 39%	10	10	16
40 to 59%	1	0	4
60 to 79%	0	0	0
80 to 99%	0	0	0
100%	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	11	8	3
Percent of Average Working Time Spent on... Outside occupational activities <u>not</u> related to legislative position (in session)			
None	45%	44%	46%
One to 19%	45	41	54
20 to 39%	7	10	0
40 to 59%	3	5	0
60 to 79%	0	0	0
80 to 99%	0	0	0
100%	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	10	8	2

	Percent Distribution		
	All	Representative	Senate
2. About what percent (of your average working time is spent on each of the following legislative <u>and</u> non-legislative activities) when the legislature is <u>not</u> in session?			
Percent of Average Working Time Spent on... <u>Committee meetings, hearings, caucuses (not in session)</u>			
None	1%	2%	-%
One to 19%	77	75	81
20 to 39%	19	18	19
40 to 59%	3	5	0
60 to 79%	0	0	0
80 to 99%	0	0	0
100%	0	0	0
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	6	4	2
Percent of Average Working Time Spent on... <u>Research & preparation (not in session)</u>			
None	1%	2%	-%
One to 19%	77	76	83
20 to 39%	18	18	13
40 to 59%	3	4	0
60 to 79%	1	0	4
80 to 99%	0	0	0
100%	0	0	0
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	7	3	4
Percent of Average Working Time Spent on... <u>Communication with constituents (not in session)</u>			
None	1%	2%	-%
One to 19%	59	56	65
20 to 39%	30	30	31
40 to 59%	8	9	4
60 to 79%	2	3	0
80 to 99%	0	0	0
100%	0	0	0
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	6	3	3

Percent of Average Working Time Spent on...Other duties or offices related to legislative position (not in session)	Percent Distribution		
	All	Representative	Senate
None	5%	6%	-%
One to 19%	64	64	65
20 to 39%	20	15	35
40 to 59%	5	7	0
60 to 79%	5	7	0
80 to 99%	0	0	0
100%	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	10	8	2

Percent of Average Working Time Spent on...Outside occupational activities <u>not</u> related to legislative position (not in session)	Percent Distribution		
	All	Representative	Senate
None	5%	3%	8%
One to 19%	11	15	4
20 to 39%	15	13	19
40 to 59%	32	28	42
60 to 79%	22	23	19
80 to 99%	14	16	8
100%	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	10	8	2

3. About how many hours a week do you spend on legislative business during legislative sessions?

	All	Representative	Senate
None	-%	-%	-%
One to 9 hours	0	0	0
10 - 19 hours	0	0	0
20 - 29 hours	1	0	2
30 - 39 hours	2	3	0
40 - 49 hours	8	5	12
50 - 59 hours	15	21	4
60 - 69 hours	44	41	50
70 hours or more	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>32</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	13	11	2

	Percent Distribution		
	All	Representative	Senate
4. About how many hours a week do you spend on legislative business when the legislature is not in session?			
None	1%	2%	-%
One to 9 hours	14	14	15
10 - 19 hours	21	22	15
20 - 29 hours	26	28	22
30 - 39 hours	26	22	30
40 - 49 hours	9	10	7
50 - 59 hours	1	0	4
60 - 69 hours	2	2	7
70 hours or more	0	0	0
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	12	11	1
5. About how many hours a week do you spend on your own business or non-legislative job when the legislature is in session?			
None	34%	39%	23%
One to 9 hours	40	37	45
10 - 19 hours	15	12	27
20 - 29 hours	4	5	0
30 - 39 hours	7	7	5
40 - 49 hours	0	0	0
50 - 59 hours	0	0	0
60 - 69 hours	0	0	0
70 hours or more	0	0	0
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	14	12	2
6. About how many hours a week do you spend on your own business or non-legislative job when the legislature is not in session?			
None	6%	6%	7%
One to 9 hours	7	10	4
10 - 19 hours	7	10	4
20 - 29 hours	15	3	26
30 - 39 hours	20	19	26
40 - 49 hours	31	34	26
50 - 59 hours	13	15	7
60 - 69 hours	0	0	0
70 hours or more	1	3	0
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	14	13	1

Total Number Hours a Week Spent on Legislative Business and in Personal Occupation When Legislature is in Session	Percent Distribution		
	All	Representative	Senate
None	1%	2%	-%
One to 9 hours	0	0	0
10 - 19 hours	0	0	0
20 - 29 hours	0	0	0
30 - 39 hours	0	0	0
40 - 49 hours	2	0	8
50 - 59 hours	11	12	8
60 - 69 hours	23	25	19
70 hours or more	63	61	65
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	14	13	1
Total Number Hours a Week Spent on Legislative Business & in Personal Occupation When Legislature is Not in Session			
None	0%	0%	0%
One to 9 hours	0	0	0
10 - 19 hours	0	0	0
20 - 29 hours	1	1	0
30 - 39 hours	1	1	0
40 - 49 hours	16	16	15
50 - 59 hours	40	40	40
60 - 69 hours	22	26	15
70 hours or more	20	16	30
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	12	11	1

7. Some legislative committee assignments require more working time than others. If you think service on these committees deserves extra compensation, write in the name of each committee and the percent extra compensation over base pay which you believe is deserved. Also, indicate if you have been a member of this committee in Column 2.

	Percent Distribution		
	All	Representative	Senate
8. About what percent of your actual expenses of <u>each type</u> listed below incurred in legislative duties are <u>reimbursed</u> by the State?			
<u>Percent of Actual Expenses Reimbursed... Food & Lodging While at Capitol (in session)</u>			
None	10%	11%	8%
One to 19%	0	0	0
20 to 39%	1	0	4
40 to 59%	1	0	4
60 to 79%	5	3	8
80 to 99%	17	14	24
100% or more	<u>65</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>52</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	11	8	3
<u>Percent of Actual Expenses Reimbursed... Food & Lodging While at Capitol (out of session)</u>			
None	11%	13%	8%
One to 19%	3	3	4
20 to 39%	6	8	0
40 to 59%	10	10	8
60 to 79%	10	10	8
80 to 99%	10	6	22
100% or more	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	11	7	4
<u>Percent of Actual Expenses Reimbursed... Mileage (in session)</u>			
None	14%	17%	8%
One to 19%	15	17	12
20 to 39%	6	8	0
40 to 59%	5	5	4
60 to 79%	15	15	16
80 to 99%	12	7	24
100% or more	<u>33</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>36</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	13	9	4

Percent of Actual Expenses Reim- bursed... <u>Mileage (out of session)</u>	Percent Distribution		
	<u>All</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Senate</u>
None	12%	13%	4%
One to 19%	17	15	21
20 to 39%	14	21	4
40 to 59%	10	7	17
60 to 79%	7	7	8
80 to 99%	7	3	17
100% or more	<u>33</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>29</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	15	10	5
Percent of Actual Expenses Reim- bursed... <u>District, Non-Session</u> <u>Expenses</u>			
None	56%	59%	50%
One to 19%	14	13	17
20 to 39%	7	10	0
40 to 59%	6	3	13
60 to 79%	4	3	4
80 to 99%	2	0	8
100% or more	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	13	9	4
Percent of Actual Expenses Reim- bursed... <u>Actual Expenses for Non-</u> <u>Session Meetings</u>			
None	22%	24%	18%
One to 19%	5	5	5
20 to 39%	10	12	5
40 to 59%	7	5	13
60 to 79%	4	3	5
80 to 99%	16	12	27
100% or more	<u>36</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>27</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained			

	Percent Distribution		
	All	Representative	Senate
9. Would you favor additional compensation (over & above allowable expenses) to legislators on a per meeting basis for attendance at <u>interim study committees</u> when the Legislature is not in session?			
Yes	35%	36%	32%
No	33	33	32
Qualified answer	<u>32</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>36</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	13	7	6
<u>How many dollars per meeting additional?</u>			
No increase	26%	24%	28%
One to \$4	2	3	0
\$5 to \$9	6	3	11
\$10 to \$14	13	12	11
\$15 to \$19	2	3	0
\$20 to \$24	7	9	11
\$25 or more	<u>44</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>39</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	46	36	10
10. How many sessions have you served in <u>each House of the Legislature?</u>			
<u>HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (# Sessions Served)</u>			
None	9%	-%	46%
One	33	38	7
Two	22	24	7
Three	14	11	20
Four or more	<u>22</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>20</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not ascertained	18	6	13
<u>SENATE (# Sessions Served)</u>			
None	60%	97%	-%
One	9	0	27
Two	13	0	32
Three	5	3	9
Four or More	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>32</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not Ascertained	40	34	6
11. In which House are you now serving?			
Representatives	70%	100%	-%
Senate	<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>100</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not Ascertained	10	8	2

	Percent Distribution		
	All	Representative	Senate
<u>12. How old are you?</u>			
Under 40 years old	41%	44%	35%
40 - 61 years old	55	51	61
62 years old or older	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%
# Not Ascertained	7	5	2

Legislature Survey

Question #7. of the Survey read "Some legislative committee assignments require more working time than others. If you think service on these committees deserves extra compensation, write in the name of each committee and the percent extra compensation over base pay which you believe is deserved. Also, indicate if you have been a member of this committee in Column 2.

Of the 73 Representatives who responded to the Legislature Survey, 32 did not answer this question and 7 replied no or none. Comments included the following:

- "I don't believe in extra compensation."
- "I would not favor any plan that would give one member more compensation than another member, except in leadership...."
- "No, under any circumstances."
- "None, do not believe in that type of system."
- "I have served on Appropriations, the most time consuming committee all eight terms. Under present circumstances I do not think there should be extra compensation."
- "Too hard to evaluate."
- "No extra pay! Don't like the job--quit!"
- "Don't believe this would be a good idea!!!"
- "No committee should have their members paid any more than other committees' members."
- "None, in general these are committees everyone wants to be on."
- "I do not agree with the concept of different pay for legislators, unless it is strictly reimbursement for expenses."
- "NONE - but committee chairmen, Speaker, etc. - should be paid more."
- "Only the speaker and the majority and minority leaders deserve extra compensation."
- "Any assignments deserve an increase in current salary."
- "Prefer per diem for extra duty."
- "Privilege to serve."
- "Speaker, Majority and Minority Leaders and perhaps appropriations should receive extra."
- "I think committee chairmen, leaders and the speaker should receive more money."
- "Disagree with this - would cause inequities and morale problems."
- "Number committee assignments and chairmen ... should be considered for more compensation."
- "Would prefer to see these differences handled by reduction in number of committees assigned."
- "I could support increased pay for the Speaker, Majority and Minority Leaders and Committee Chairmen."
- "... Believe Speaker, Majority Leader and Minority Leader should receive more compensation. I have not served in any of these positions."

Those Representatives who responded with the percent of extra compensation and the names of the committees are as follows:

Percent Extra Compensation (Range)	Member of Committee?	Name of Committee
? to 25%	Yes	Appropriations
? to 35%	No	Appropriations
? to 35%	Yes	Government Operations
? to 10%	No	Government Operations
5%	Yes	Education
? to 10%	No	Taxes
5%	No	Health & Welfare
5%	No	Transportation
5%	Yes	Judiciary
?	?	Majority Leader
?	?	Minority Leader
?	?	Speaker

Of the 28 Senators who responded to the Legislature Survey, 12 did not answer this question and three replied none. Comments included the following:

"...every policy committee requires more time than most are able and willing to spend."

"Pay for meetings attended, then this would be automatic."

"No, do not think so."

An add-on to a Senator who suggested a 25% extra compensation and serves as a member of the Appropriations Committee: "This assumes member serves on 3-4 other committees having reasonably active schedules. Particular members of the Education Division. I suppose the only fair way would be to weight the committees so that a member would not get extra compensation for serving on appropriations unless his other committee assignments represented an average load."

Those Senators who responded with the percent of extra compensation and the names of the committees are as follows:

Percent Extra Compensation (Range)	Member of Committee?	Name of Committee
10%	Yes	Metro, Urban Affairs
10%	Yes	Health, Welfare & Corrections
20 to 50%	Yes	Finance
5 to 200%	No	Finance
20 to 300%	Yes	Education, Chairman
		Education, School Aids Sub-Committee Chairman
150%	Yes	Taxes
25%	Yes	Appropriations
25%	Yes	Government Operations
20%	No	Majority & Minority Leaders

Question #9. of the Survey read "Would you favor additional compensation (over and above allowable expenses) to legislators on a per meeting basis for attendance at interim study committees when the Legislature is not in session?"

Of the 73 Representatives who responded to the Survey, 36% answered yes, 33% answered no and 31% qualified their answer. Comments included the following:

"Meetings should be curtailed - a lot of time is wasted during interim."

"No, became many lame ducks - look at your question! When I miss a day of employment it costs me \$70.00. This is off-set by per diem and salary. I would rather see salary increased than all are treated alike and can afford to be present and represent constituents."

"The amount should be the same as per diem. Not per meeting. Could have more than one meeting per day?"

"We presently receive adequate "per diem" for these."

"This is presently done. I do not favor it."

"Yes? - Not the problem - other expenses as involving work with constituents or time spent in research should receive per diem expense allowance."

"Depends upon salary. If salary large enough, no. If it is not, then yes."

"Yes - Including meetings of which the legislator is not a member of the Committee."

"No, not for Metro area legislators - perhaps for outstaters."

"Additional compensation is needed for in-district expenses when legislature is not in session."

"Yes, we lose money not working at home yet must carry on a residence in both places."

"Yes, but need to be careful that useful work is done."

"No, depending upon "salary" level."

"Possibly if there were excess number of meetings."

Of the 28 Senators who responded to the Survey, 32% answered yes, 32% answered no and 36% qualified their answer. Comments included the following:

"Yes, with a ceiling, those who work should get compensation. "\$25 or more plus travel, attendance at a half day meeting takes a 12 hour day for many rural legislators."

"No - Too much opportunity to schedule meetings to increase the pay for certain people's purposes."

"Yes, if the salary was not considered to cover that type of extra obligation. Higher for outstate."

"Yes, we now have mileage and \$33 per diem."

"No, we already receive a per diem for such meetings."

"No, too easy to create a full time legislator."

"If member loses pay from regular job. However, members receive \$700 per month on 12 month basis. Salary should be increased - not pay for meetings."

General comments from Representatives included:

"Strongly favor salary set by referendum, reimbursement of actual expenses up to set maximum. "

"My most accurate time computation says that I spent 2,700 hours (approximately) in legislative work from January 1, 1973 through March 30, 1974. "

"Some members are worth \$5000 per ins., others about \$400 per mo. Raising the pay won't keep the good ones, it'll only attract more poor ones. "

"I feel very strongly that the salaries should NOT be increased. "

"Gentlemen - this should not be "What is" but "What ought to be" - otherwise your questionnaire is a self-fulfilling one leading to full time legislators. You must consider what should and can be done to reduce the time demands on legislators. "

General comments from Senators included:

"It is impossible to give an equivalent to the COST of legislative service. Per diem has become an income supplement for Metro legislators. Eating hotdogs at the Capitol saves food money but adds to medical bills. "

"Salary ought to be no less than \$12,000 per year plus expenses incurred during and between sessions. "

"I believe Chairman of Committees should receive some compensation beyond regular committee member. Reasons: (1) more time required, easily 20%. (2) More responsibility. (3) More experience necessary - senior member of legislature. (4) Called on for more speeches, etc. (5) Leadership role. (6) Encourage more senior, experienced and capable to stay. "

"When one is 250 miles from home while in St. Paul he or (she) is full time except for brief phone calls. However, something will be lost if salary or legislative income is increased in any substantial way. "

"In past years it has cost me \$1000 a year out of pocket. This does not include help replacement on farm. The cash out of pocket includes those items which a legislator is expected to take part in because of his position. It is a free choice and perhaps it should not be a factor for consideration. "

"You've missed the whole point! The question is NOT how much time is spent NOW. It's how much time SHOULD and WOULD be spent (if the compensation were greater) on meeting the needs of the state. The question is how much money is lost by some legislators during the off-session periods because they can't get a job, clients, customers, etc. during the session. "

"My working day is 7:30 a.m. to 12:00 midnight. During the session, a great deal of my time at my other job is evenings, Saturdays, Sundays, holidays, early morning hours and late afternoon hours. The amount of time spent on my regular job varies of course, increasing as the session nears completion. Moreover, campaigning every other year is 3-1/2

months seven hours a day, seven days a week - all after 4:40 p.m. weekdays and all day Saturday and Sunday. Therefore the percentage is difficult to allocate. "

"I do not intend to complete this questionnaire. I do not believe the information it seeks is relevant in any significant way to setting appropriate salary levels for legislators. Further, I am certain you will get a distorted sample by self elimination of legislators like myself who combine other careers with legislative service. " (Signed)

Leadership Differentials
Practice in Other States

- I. The following states provide no differential for leaders:
- | | | |
|----------|------------|--------------|
| Arizona | California | Delaware |
| Hawaii | Missouri | Montana |
| Nebraska | New Mexico | South Dakota |
| Texas | Utah | Washington |
- II. The following provide differentials for the top one and two leaders usually the House Speaker and the Senate President:
- | | | |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Alabama | Alaska | Arkansas |
| Florida | Georgia | Idaho |
| Kentucky | Louisiana | Maine |
| Michigan | Mississippi | Nevada |
| New Hampshire | New Jersey | North Carolina |
| Oregon | Rhode Island | South Carolina |
| Tennessee | Vermont | West Virginia |
| Wisconsin | Wyoming | |
- III. The following provide differentials for the top two leaders and Majority and Minority leaders:
- | | |
|------|----------|
| Iowa | Oklahoma |
|------|----------|
- IV. The following provide differentials for the top two leaders, Majority and Minority leaders and either assistants or committee chairmen:
- | | | |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Colorado | Connecticut | Illinois |
| Indiana | Kansas | Maryland |
| Massachusetts | New York | North Dakota |
| Ohio | Pennsylvania | |

COMPENSATION DIFFERENTIALS FOR LEGISLATIVE LEADERS

STATE	LEADER	AMOUNT OF DIFFERENTIAL (Additional Salary or Expenses)
ALABAMA	House Speaker	\$2/diem salary in session
	Senate President (Lieutenant Governor)	\$2/diem salary in session
ALASKA	House Speaker	\$500/yr. salary
	Senate President	\$500/yr. salary
ARIZONA		No Differential
ARKANSAS	House Speaker	\$150/yr. salary
CALIFORNIA		No Differential
COLORADO	House Speaker	\$35/diem on legislative business in interim, \$840/yr. (max.)
	House & Senate Majority & Minority Leaders	\$35/diem on legislative business in interim, \$840/yr. (max.)
	Joint Budget Committee Members	\$35/diem on committee meetings in interim, \$3500/yr. (max.)
CONNECTICUT	House Speaker	\$4000/biennium salary
	Senate President Pro Tem	\$4000/biennium salary
	House Deputy Speaker	\$3000/biennium salary
	House & Senate Majority & Minority Leaders	\$3000/biennium salary
	House & Senate Deputy Majority & Minority Leaders	\$2000/biennium salary
	House & Senate Assistant Majority & Minority Leaders	\$1000/biennium salary
DELAWARE		No Differential
FLORIDA	House Speaker	\$3000/yr. salary + \$5000/yr. contingency fund (vouchered)
	Senate President	\$3000/yr. salary + \$5000/yr. contingency fund (vouchered)
GEORGIA	House Speaker	\$17,800/yr. salary
	Senate President Pro Tem	\$2800/yr. salary
	House Speaker Pro Tem	\$2800/yr. salary
HAWAII		No Differential
IDAHO	House Speaker	\$5/diem salary in session
	Senate President Pro Tem	\$5/diem salary in session
ILLINOIS	House Speaker	\$6000/yr. salary
	Senate President	\$6000/yr. salary
	House Majority & House & Senate Minority Leaders	\$5000/yr. salary
	Senate Assistant Majority Leaders (2) & Assistant Minority Leaders (2)	\$4500/yr. salary
	House Assistant Majority Leaders (2) & Assistant Minority Leaders (2)	\$4000/yr. salary
	House Majority Whips (2) & Minority Leaders (2)	\$3500/yr. salary
INDIANA	House Speaker	\$2500/yr. expense allowance
	Senate President Pro Tem	\$2500/yr. expense allowance
	House & Senate Minority Floor Leaders	\$1500/yr. expense allowance
	House Majority Floor Leader	\$1000/yr. expense allowance
	Senate Assistant Majority Floor Leader	\$1000/yr. expense allowance
	House & Senate Majority & Minority Caucus Chairmen	\$1000/yr. expense allowance
	House & Senate Assistant Minority Floor Leaders	\$1000/yr. expense allowance
IOWA	House Speaker	\$5500/yr. salary
	Senate President (Lieutenant Governor)	\$5500/yr. salary
	House & Senate Majority & Minority Floor Leaders	\$1000/yr. salary
KANSAS	House Speaker	\$2400/yr. expense allowance
	Senate President Pro Tem	\$2400/yr. expense allowance
	House Speaker Pro Tem	\$1800/yr. expense allowance
	House & Senate Majority & Minority Leaders	\$1800/yr. expense allowance
	House & Senate Chairmen, Committee on Ways & Means	\$1800/yr. expense allowance
KENTUCKY	House Speaker	\$5/diem salary in session
	Senate President (Lieutenant Governor)	\$5/diem salary in session

Source: Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, July 1974.

STATE	LEADER	AMOUNT OF DIFFERENTIAL (Additional Salary or Expense)
NEW YORK (continued)	Assembly & Senate Chairmen, Standing Committees	\$5000-18,000/yr. expense allowance
	Assembly & Senate Ranking Members, Standing Committees	\$3500-9500/yr. expense allowance
NEW MEXICO		No differential
NORTH CAROLINA	House Speaker	\$1600/yr. salary; \$50/month expenses year-round; \$20/diem in session
NORTH DAKOTA	House Speaker	\$5/diem in session
	House & Senate Majority & Minority Floor Leaders	\$5/diem in session
	Chairmen of Standing Substantive Committees	\$3/diem in session
	Chairman, Legislative Council	\$35/diem (\$5 extra)-interim committee meetings
	Chairmen, Interim Committees	\$33/diem (\$3 extra)-interim committee meetings
OHIO	House Speaker	\$4000/yr. salary
	Senate President Pro Tem	\$4000/yr. salary
	House Speaker Pro Tem	\$2000/yr. salary
	House Majority Floor Leader & Senate Majority Whip	\$2000/yr. salary
	House & Senate Minority Leaders	\$2000/yr. salary
	House Assistant Minority Leader	\$1000/yr. salary
OKLAHOMA	House Speaker	\$4200/yr.
	Senate President Pro Tem	\$4200/yr.
	House & Senate Majority & Minority Floor Leaders	\$240/month in session
	House Speaker	1-1/3 regular salary (\$1600/yr. more)
OREGON	Senate President	1-1/3 regular salary (\$1600/yr. more)
	House Speaker	\$10,500/yr. salary
PENNSYLVANIA	Senate President Pro Tem	\$10,500/yr. salary
	House & Senate Majority & Minority Floor Leaders	\$8500/yr. salary
	House & Senate Majority & Minority Whips	\$4000/yr. salary
	House & Senate Majority & Minority Caucus Chairmen	\$3500/yr. salary
	House & Senate Majority & Minority Caucus Secretary	\$2000/yr. salary
	House & Senate Policy Committee Chmn.	\$2000/yr. salary
	House Speaker	\$5/diem in session
	House Speaker	\$4075/yr. salary
SOUTH CAROLINA	Senate President (Lieutenant Governor)	\$1575/yr. salary
	House Speaker Pro Tem & Senate President Pro Tem	\$1200/yr. salary
SOUTH DAKOTA		No differential
TENNESSEE	House Speaker	\$2757.50/yr. expense allowance plus \$750/regular session; \$2400/yr. allowance for office, \$3000 for secretarial help in home district, \$300 for incidentals and supplies
	Senate President	\$2757.50/yr. expense allowance plus \$750/regular session; \$2400/yr. allowance for office, \$3000 for secretarial help in home district, \$300 for incidentals and supplies
TEXAS		No differential
UTAH		No differential
VERMONT	House Speaker	\$100/wk. salary plus actual expenses (no limit)
VIRGINIA	House Speaker	\$5050/yr. salary
	Senate President (Lieutenant Governor)	\$10,525/yr. salary (total)
WASHINGTON		No differential
WEST VIRGINIA	House Speaker	\$15/diem salary in session
	Senate President	\$15/diem salary in session
WISCONSIN	House Speaker	\$25/mo. salary year-round
WYOMING	House Speaker	\$3/diem in session
	Senate President	\$3/diem in session

Source: Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, July 1974.

STATE	LEADER	AMOUNT OF DIFFERENTIAL (Additional Salary or Expenses)	
LOUISIANA	House Speaker	\$25,000/yr. in lieu of per diem in session, interim committee per diem and monthly expense allowance; plus \$6000/yr. (maximum) vouchered expense allowance	
	Senate President (Lieutenant Governor)	\$6000/yr. (maximum) vouchered expense allowance	
MAINE	House Speaker	\$1500/regular session plus \$5 per diem/special session	
	Senate President	\$1500/regular session plus \$5 per diem/special session	
MARYLAND	House Speaker	\$2000/yr salary plus \$3000 interim expense allowance	
	House Majority & Minority Leaders	\$2500 interim expense allowance	
	Speaker Pro-Tem & other leaders	\$2000 interim expense allowance	
	Chairmen of Major House Committees	\$1500 interim expense allowance	
	Senate President	\$2000/ yr. salary plus \$700 interim expense allowance	
	Senate Leaders & Chairmen of Major Committees	\$200 interim expense allowance	
MASSACHUSETTS	House Speaker	2-3/4 times regular salary (\$22,204/yr. more)	
	Senate President	2-3/4 times regular salary (\$22,204/yr. more)	
	House & Senate Majority & Minority Leaders	1-3/4 times regular salary (\$9,516/yr. more)	
	House & Senate Ways & Means Cte. Chmn.	1-3/4 times regular salary (\$9,516/yr. more)	
	House & Senate Assistant Majority & Minority Floor Leaders	1½ times regular salary (\$6,344/yr. more)	
	House & Senate Post Audit & Oversight Committee Chairmen	1½ times regular salary (\$6,344/yr. more)	
	House & Senate Ways & Means Committee Vice Chairmen	1½ times regular salary (\$6,344/yr. more)	
	Senate Second Asst. Majority & Minority Floor Leaders & House Second & Third Assistant Minority Floor Leaders	1½ times regular salary (\$6,344/yr. more)	
	House & Senate Chairmen of joint standing committees not listed above	1-1/3 times regular salary (\$4,187/yr. more)	
	House & Senate Chairmen of Committees of Bills in Third Reading	1-1/3 times regular salary (\$4,187/yr. more)	
	House Vice Chairman of Committee on Post Audit and Oversight	1-1/3 times regular salary (\$4,187/yr. more)	
	House Assistant Vice Chairman of Committee on Ways & Means	1-1/3 times regular salary (\$4,187/yr. more)	
	Senate Third Assistant Minority Floor Leader	1-1/3 times regular salary (\$4,187/yr. more)	
	MICHIGAN	House Speaker	\$5000/yr. salary
	MINNESOTA	House Speaker	\$5/diem in session
		Senate President (Lieutenant Governor)	2 times salary of Senator (\$9,600/biennium more)
MISSISSIPPI	House Speaker	\$3500 salary/regular session	
	Senate President (Lieutenant Governor)	\$3500/session plus \$10,000/yr expenses	
MISSOURI		No differential	
MONTANA		No differential	
NEBRASKA		No differential	
NEVADA	House Speaker	\$2/diem salary in session	
	Senate President (Lieutenant Governor)	\$2/diem salary in session	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	House Speaker	\$50/biennium salary plus \$500/bn. expenses	
	Senate President	\$50/biennium salary plus \$500/bn. expenses	
NEW JERSEY	House Speaker	1-1/3 regular salary (\$3,333/yr. more)	
	Senate President	1-1/3 regular salary (\$3,333/yr. more)	
NEW YORK	Senate President (Lieutenant Governor)	\$30,000/yr. salary plus \$15,000/yr. expenses	
	Assembly Speaker & Senate President Pro Tem	\$21,000/yr. expense allowance	
	Assembly Majority & Minority Leaders	\$18,500/yr. expense allowance	
	Senate Deputy Majority Leader and Senate Minority Leader	\$18,000/yr. expense allowance	
	Assembly Deputy Majority Leader	\$10,000/yr. expense allowance	
	Assembly Majority Whip	\$9,000/yr. expense allowance	
	Assembly Majority & Minority Coordinators of Joint Legis. Committees	\$7500/yr. expense allowance	
	Assembly Deputy Minority Leader	\$6500/yr. expense allowance	
	Assembly Minority Whip	\$5000/yr. expense allowance	

Source: Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, July 1974.

Per Diem Analysis

I. Data Source

Information was secured from the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate regarding the actual per diem payments made to Representatives and Senators in 1973.

This information covered payments for both session and interim per diem, and was issued to each legislator.

1974 information reported the 74 day per diem payments for the sessions. Only an estimate could be arrived at for interim per diem because reports are not prepared until after December 31, 1974. The Board assumed six days which is subject to verification.

Table A reports the information secured or assumed.

II. Interpretation

To arrive at an estimated income over and above actually incurred expenses, the Personnel Board made certain assumptions. As such, the assumptions are generalized and wide variations occur in individual cases.

1. Some local legislators live at home and work in downtown St. Paul. They probably incur very little additional expense in attending meetings.
2. Outstate legislators experience different living costs in food and lodging. Based on numerous conditions, some variations occur due to personal choice as to style of living.
3. Requirements to attend and not attend meetings while in and out of session are such that a wide variation in attendance often occurs. This translates itself into income implications.
4. Some legislators perform legislative duties over and above committee meetings, and as such draw per diem far in excess of the average.

Even though any general conclusion would not be applicable to a large number of legislators, being too conservative or too liberal, the Personnel Board could not ignore the conclusion that some income was received.

TABLE A

<u>All Legislators</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>Oustate</u>
1973 Session	140	\$3500	\$4620
1974 Session	<u>74</u>	<u>1850</u>	<u>2442</u>
Combined	214	\$5350	\$7062
1973 Recess	25.5	\$ 830	\$ 830
1974 Recess Estimated	<u>6.0</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>200</u>
Combined	31.5	\$1030	\$1030
1973-74 Total	245-1/2 days	\$6380	\$8092
Average per year	122-3/4 days	\$3190	\$4046

	Annual Salary*	Unvouchered Expenses				Vouchered Expenses				Mileage -per miles	Credit cards
		Session & Interim	Session	Interim (L)	Interim-Other	Session & Interim	Session	Interim (L)	Interim-Other		
South Carolina	4,000		25/dm (L)	25/dm						12¢	
Washington	3,800		40/dm (C)	40/dm							
West Virginia	3,300			35/dm (11)			25/dm (C)	25/dm		10¢	telephone
South Dakota	2,500			25/dm (4)			16.50/dm (12)			10¢	
North Carolina	2,400	50/mo.	25/dm (C)	25/dm						11¢	telephone (9)
Louisiana	2,250	6000/yr. (13)		50/dm (4)						10¢	
Vermont	2,250		30-10/dm(L) (2)							11¢	
Nevada	1,800		30/dm (C)				Actual			14¢	Rent-a-car telephone
Maine	1,750		8/dm (L)				40/dm (14)			10¢	telephone
Arkansas	1,200		20/dm (15)				25/dm			10¢	
Montana	1,200		33/dm (C)				Actual			12¢	
Utah	1,000		15/dm (C)	25/dm (4)						13¢	
Kentucky	925		25/dm (L)		400/mo. (13)		Actual			15¢ (16)	
Kansas	765		35/dm (C)	35/dm						10¢	telephone (6)
Alabama	680		20/dm	30/dm (17)						10¢	
Idaho	600		25/dm (C)	25/dm	3.50/dm		10/dm (14)	Actual		10¢	telephone
Wyoming	450		26/dm (C)	41/dm (18)				Actual (19)		10¢	telephone
Rhode Island	300									8¢	
North Dakota	150		50/dm (C)	30/dm (4)				18/dm (20)		10¢	
New Hampshire	100									25-6¢ (21)	telephone (6)
New Mexico	0		36/dm (C)	36/dm (4)						10¢	telephone (22)

* Average over biennium

All allowances for office, staff, printing, postage and supplies have been excluded.

1. Car & gas credit card provided.
2. Depending on residence.
3. 20 day maximum, Legislative Council meetings only.
4. Committee meetings only.
5. Maximum - \$1050/year
Special session-30/dm; \$600 maximum Leadership only.
6. Six days a week, when General Assembly is not in session.
7. Vouchered first 5 days of recess.
8. Legislative Council only.
9. House travel and expense allowance.
Senate: Actual
10. For meetings of Joint Committees on Government Finance and Interstate Cooperation; \$1050 maximum.
11. In-state travel; for out-of-state travel, 32.50/diem.
12. For office, staff and communications as well as travel & expenses.
13. For lodging or travel.
14. For House members; Senate authorized payment of \$1800/session for its members, declared unconstitutional, being appealed.
15. In session - 15¢/mile; Interim - 10¢/mile
16. Includes \$10 salary for interim days on legislative business.
17. Salary - \$15/dm plus expenses - \$26/dm
18. Amount over per diem.
19. For in-state travel.
20. Out-of-state: Actual plus \$8/dm for meals
21. Sliding scale, based on distance.
22. Interim committee members only.

C = Calendar Days
L = Legislative Working Days
dm = diem
Actual = Actual and Necessary Expenses

Source: Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, July 1974.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Report on Salaries, Expenses In 50 State Legislatures

1. From 1950 to November, 1972, legislative compensation has increased 541.9 percent. The increase has been more dramatic in the last 12 years than in the first 10 years of the period.
2. Average biennial compensation in November, 1972, was \$15,785; median biennial compensation was \$13,223. (See TABLE 4 for a summary of legislative compensation.) The higher average compensation results from the relatively high compensation of a few states as opposed to the large number of states which have relatively low compensation levels.
3. During 1972, legislative compensation was increased in 15 states. Nine of these states have had an increase in interim expense allowances.
4. Most states pay a biennial or annual salary. Ten states pay a per diem salary for each calendar or legislative day of the regular session.
5. Expenses are paid to legislators on a vouchered or unvouchered basis, and are paid for the session, the interim or for both the session and interim. Many states have increased expense allowances, particularly unvouchered allowances, to compensate for low salary levels.
6. Few states pay session expenses on a vouchered basis, but about one-third of the states pay interim or year-round expenses on a vouchered basis. The number doing so has increased in recent years.
7. There also seems to be a trend toward paying allowances for official legislative business in the interim other than interim committee meetings alone.
8. A major category of obstacles to adequate compensation is the constitutional restriction. The average biennial compensation in states where the constitution restricts legislative pay is \$6,159; average biennial compensation in all other states is \$18,500. Since 1968, the number of states with constitutional restrictions has fallen from 22 to 11.
9. Public opinion is seen as another major obstacle to change in compensation. Many states hope to retain the concept of a citizen-legislator who derives most of his income from a job in his home district. At the same time, many are recognizing the need for greater attention to legislative affairs and a more competent or professional approach. The effect of compensation on the issue of competence is undeniable.
10. Given the reluctance of many state legislators to increase their own salaries, a number of means of increasing overall compensation have been pursued: raising expense allowances and/or retirement benefits; free transportation; and extra compensation for leaders. The creation of compensation commissions can also be viewed as a way to deal favorably with public opinion.
11. The average biennial compensation of the 20 states with compensation commissions is \$18,742, compared to \$13,814 for all states without commissions. The existence of a compensation commission in a state may be indicative of a prior concern about legislative compensation in that state.
12. The average biennial compensation of state legislators remains low compared to the salaries of comparable professionals in the public and private sectors. There is, however, a clear upward trend.

TABLE 4

SUMMARY TABLE: LEGISLATOR INCOME IN THE
50 STATE LEGISLATURES, NOVEMBER 1972

RANK	STATE	SALARY	FIXED EXPENSES	TOTAL COMPENSATION BIENNIAL
1	CALIFORNIA	\$19,200/year	\$30/diem in session	\$48,420
2	NEW YORK	15,000/year	5,000/year	40,000
3	ALASKA	9,000/year	35/diem in session; 4,000/year	35,345
4	ILLINOIS	17,500/year	50/session	35,100
5	MICHIGAN	17,000/year	None	34,000
6	PENNSYLVANIA	15,600/year	None	31,200
7	MASSACHUSETTS	12,027/year	2-32/diem in session; 1,200/year	30,592
8	HAWAII	12,000/year	20/diem in session; 750/year	29,480
9	FLORIDA	12,000/year	25/diem in session	27,000
10	OHIO	12,750/year	None	25,500
11	MARYLAND	11,000/year	None	22,000
12	WISCONSIN	8,900/year	20/diem in session; 25-40/mo. interim	21,230
13	INDIANA	6,000/year	25/diem in session; 60/wk. interim	21,065
14	MINNESOTA	16,800/biennium	24/diem in session	20,160
15	NEW JERSEY	10,000/year	None	20,000
16	OKLAHOMA	9,480/year	None	18,960
17	MISSOURI	8,400/year	10/diem in session	18,360
18	OREGON	4,800/year	30/diem in session; 150/mo.	17,730
19	ARIZONA	6,000/year	20/diem in session	16,900
20	LOUISIANA	50/diem in session	500/month	16,500
21	TENNESSEE	5,000/year	40/diem in session; 100/mo. interim	16,100
22	COLORADO	7,600/year	None	15,200
23	MISSISSIPPI	5,000/session	20/diem in session; 100/mo. interim	14,400
24	VIRGINIA	5,475/year	31.50/diem in session	13,785
25	IOWA	5,500/year	15/diem in session	13,445
26	CONNECTICUT	11,000/biennium	1,000/year	13,000
26	SOUTH CAROLINA	4,000/year	25/diem in session	13,000
28	KENTUCKY	25/diem in session	25/diem in session; 50/session; 400/mo. interim	12,350
29	DELAWARE	6,000/year	25/year	12,050
30	KANSAS	10/diem in session	35/diem in session; 200/mo. interim	11,655
31	ALABAMA	10/diem in session	20/diem in session; 300/mo.	11,460
32	TEXAS	4,800/year	12/diem first 120 session days	11,040
33	WASHINGTON	3,600/year	40/diem in session; 50/mo.	10,800
34	GEORGIA	4,200/year	25/diem in session	10,525
35	NORTH CAROLINA	2,400/year	25/diem in session; 50/mo.	10,125
36	NEBRASKA	4,800/year	160/year	9,920
37	WEST VIRGINIA	3,300/year	10/diem in session	7,800
38	IDAHO	600/session (max.)	35/diem in session; 3.50/diem interim	7,661
39	NEVADA	3,600/session (max.)	30/diem in session; 370/session	6,940
40	VERMONT	4,500/biennium (max.)	8/diem in session	5,484
41	MONTANA	20/diem in session	25/diem in session	5,400
42	MAINE	3,500/biennium	18/diem in session	5,318
43	SOUTH DAKOTA	5,000/biennium	None	5,000
44	NORTH DAKOTA	5/diem in session	40/diem in session; 50/mo.	4,340
45	ARKANSAS	1,200/year	20/diem in session; 300/mo. Senate in session	4,040
46	NEW MEXICO	None	36/diem in session	3,240
47	UTAH	25/diem in session	15/diem in session	3,200
48	WYOMING	15/diem in session	26/diem in session	1,640
49	RHODE ISLAND	5/diem in session, 60 legislative days (max.)	None	600
50	NEW HAMPSHIRE	200/biennium	None	200

Research Memorandum #16, Citizens Conference on State Legislatures,
December, 1972.