

**DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND PERA
FY 2015-16 JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE HEARING AGENDA**

**Thursday, December 11, 2014
9:00 am – 12:00 pm**

9:00-9:20 INTRODUCTIONS AND OPENING COMMENTS

9:20-9:50 QUESTIONS COMMON TO ALL DEPARTMENTS

(The following questions require both a written and verbal response.)

1. SMART Government Act:

- a. Please describe how the SMART Government Act is being integrated into the Department's existing processes (both in terms of service delivery and evaluating performance).

Response: DPA has and continues to progressively develop SMART Act goals as part of our strategic planning meetings throughout the year. Our division directors and program managers regularly review the data and ways to measure progress on our goals. They work with their staff to modify business practices as necessary based on trends they can now identify in the data. Additionally, division directors and program managers have their SMART Act goals incorporated into their performance plans and are evaluated on their progress on these goals as part of their mid-year and end-of-year reviews.

- b. How is the data that is gathered for the performance management system used?

Response: Our division directors and program managers regularly review the data and ways to measure progress on our goals. They work with their staff to modify business practices as necessary based on trends they can now identify in the data.

- c. Please describe the value of the Act in the Department.

Response: While the new performance planning process and ability to utilize the CORE Performance Budget module are still relatively new, the Department has found the process and the ability to generate reports helpful in establishing measures, baselines and trends over time, which has enabled us to better manage our programs.

2. Do you have infrastructure needs (roads, real property, information technology) beyond the current infrastructure request? If so, how do these needs fit in with the Department's overall infrastructure priorities that have been submitted to the Capital Development Committee or Joint Technology Committee? If infrastructure should be a higher priority for the Department, how should the Department's list of overall priorities be adjusted to account for it?

Response: The Department is aware of several upcoming infrastructure needs that were identified as a result of the Capitol Complex Master Plan process. The Capitol Complex Master Plan was developed to provide a systematic prioritized approach to address the infrastructure need of the Capitol Complex. The Department plans to prioritize the needs identified within the Capitol Complex Master Plan, which was officially published on December 1, 2014. The Department will seek resources through the capital construction funding request process for prioritized projects or through the controlled maintenance projects levels 1, 2 and 3 process, or through a combination of both.

Initially, the Department has prioritized two projects identified within the Capitol Complex Master Plan and plans to submit two supplemental capital construction funding requests. The two requests will include funding for the design phase to address the total renovation of the Capitol Annex building (1375 Sherman Street) and the Centennial Building (1313 Sherman Street) as these two buildings were rated the number one and number two priorities listed in the Capitol Complex Master Plan (CCMP) issued on December 1, 2014. In general both buildings are listed in poor condition and in urgent need of repairs to address life, safety, and loss of use and reliability issues.

The design phase is intended to identify a plan of action to address the issues identified in the consultant's report for each building. The design phase will develop plans for a total gut and renovation of the building and will update the electrical systems, perform asbestos abatement, upgrade the outdated electrical system, and replace all plumbing and pipes.

Aside from the 1313 and 1375 requests all other building/infrastructure needs at the Capitol Complex are addressed in the Capitol Complex Master Plan to be presented to the General Assembly during the next session.

3. Describe the Department's experience with the implementation of the new CORE accounting system.

a. Was the training adequate?

Response: The CORE trainings that have been and are being offered to DPA staff are accomplishing their intended goals. The earliest trainings provided to staff lacked the context necessary to maximize the effectiveness of the materials presented, but this was largely due to the fact that the trainings were provided in advance of the launch of the CORE system in a training environment that was not as fully implemented as the go-live version of the CORE system. The Department feels that staff did benefit from these early trainings as staff was able to familiarize itself with the general functionality of the system. This familiarity allowed staff to hit the ground running on the first day of CORE implementation. The follow-up trainings that have been presented since implementation were able to incorporate the contextual background of the fully-functional system, which has allowed staff to gain the additional training necessary to become effective users.

b. Has the transition gone smoothly?

Response: The Department believes the transition has gone as smoothly as possible for an implementation of this magnitude. In general, the Department understands that the fundamental processes of the CORE system have been fully implemented and are functioning as anticipated. The Department has experienced some delays in getting reports out of the system that are formatted in such a way that would maximize processing efficiencies. However, the system has been able to produce similar reports that allow it to track its expenses at the macro level, which is sufficient in the short-term. A user group has been convened to work on the quality of the reports and identify additional statewide reporting needs.

c. How has the implementation of CORE affected staff workload during the transition?

Response: As with any implementation of this size, staff workload increased due to the work necessary to transition between two disparate systems. The Department's accounting unit managed the transition of department-specific information between the old COFRS to the new CORE system. Even though the State did as much as it could to automate the transition between the two systems, much of the conversion for the Department required a significant amount of manual work to convert and populate

central billing processes and establish central tables. This level of workload will not be required in the future. CORE requires a higher level of complex review which has elevated the learning curve.

- d. Do you anticipate that CORE will increase the staff workload on an ongoing basis? If so, describe the nature of the workload increase and indicate whether the Department is requesting additional funding for FY 2015-16 to address it.

Response: The Department of Personnel & Administration is the business owner of the CORE financial system. The implementation of CORE has required the Office of the State Controller to adapt its organizational structure and resource needs to a vast array of new business processes and system capabilities. As a result of these structural changes, the Department will be submitting change requests to realign the Office of the State Controller's organizational structure as well as request the resources necessary to leverage the capabilities of the State's new financial system.

For the Department's internal accounting staff, the Department recognizes that the implementation of such a substantial new system will drive additional short-term workload as employees adjust to new ways of doing business. This workload, however, is expected to dissipate as the Department's internal accounting staff acclimate to the workload changes associated with the new CORE system. Any long-term staffing changes resulting from CORE (increase or decrease) will not be known before the system reaches a steady state.

9:50-10:20 DEPARTMENT OVERVIEW

4. Please provide background on the role of the State Personnel Board? What does the Board provide for the state personnel system? What authority does the Board have over the state personnel process? Is there a policy overlap with the General Assembly?

Response: The State Personnel Board is an independent entity established by the Constitution and derives its constitutional authority from Article XII §§ 13(10) and 14(3) and statutory authority from §§ 24-50-101, et seq., C.R.S. 2010.

The State Personnel System was established by statute under Article 50, Title 24, C.R.S. , and is referred to as "State Personnel System Act". The State Personnel Board serves to

adjudicate employment disputes within the State Personnel System and is responsible for promulgating rules to ensure that employment in the State Personnel System is based on merit and fitness. Board appeals involve any action that adversely affects a certified employee's current base pay, status or tenure or loss of other rights to which an employee is entitled by law. Cases appealed to the Board include issues of discrimination, retaliation under the State Employee Protection Act ("Whistleblower"), layoff and retention disputes, wrongful discipline as well as other related issues within the Board's jurisdiction.

The Board consists of five members, three of whom are appointed by the Governor and two who are elected by certified state employees, with all members serving alternating, three-year terms. Public meetings of the State Personnel Board are conducted on the third Tuesday of every month. The Board's staff includes a Director, three part time Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) and two support staff members. The ALJs review cases, make preliminary recommendations for Board consideration, conduct hearings and issue initial decisions. Board staff conducts settlement conferences and facilitates settlement negotiations between State agencies and employees to provide an opportunity for resolution between parties if possible. Board staff also provides training and guidance to agencies to enhance and maintain effective human resource management within the State Personnel System.

5. Please provide an organizational history of the Department within the executive branch? Has statewide personnel policy always been consolidated in this manner? Why do we have one centralized personnel (human resources) system over all departments?

Response: The state personnel system was created in 1971. Article XII, Section 14 of the Colorado Constitution created the Department of Personnel and assigned responsibility to the state personnel director for the administration of the personnel system of the state. In 1995, statutory change occurred "... in an effort to eliminate unnecessary functions, avoid duplication, reduce costs, increase efficiency, and improve services to the state and the public, the rights, powers, duties, functions, obligations, and divisions of the department of administration are transferred to the department of personnel." (C.R.S. 24-30-101). The department of administration was simultaneously abolished.

Thus, the state personnel director is responsible for developing and implementing statewide human resource policy and rule. However, administration of the state personnel system is delegated through decentralized agreements with principal

departments and institutions of higher education. These decentralized agreements allow appointing authorities (i.e. agency executives) discretion within the context of statewide policy and rule to established agency specific human resource policies and procedures.

6. Has there ever been a cost-benefit analysis of the property insurance program in regard to eliminating property insurance? Has an analysis been done to determine whether premiums paid for property insurance are worth what the insurance has provided in claims? Do we have property destruction events happen on a regular enough basis to need insurance? Do individual departments, such as Higher Education, insure their properties independently outside of the property insurance program? Should depreciation of capital assets be part of the property insurance discussion? If we have insurance do we really need depreciation to cover building maintenance? Is property insurance based on replacement value? If not, what is it based on? What is the replacement value of the Capitol? If it was destroyed, what materials could be used to rebuild it? Are there restrictions because it is a historical building? If so, how could we ever rebuild it? Would FEMA replace all our buildings if they were destroyed by a natural disaster? Please explain why or why not.

Response: The Risk Management Property Fund (Fund) insures over 6,000 State buildings with a combined value of just over \$9 billion. The goal of the property program in general is to provide risk mitigation and normalization of possible incurred costs as a result of incidents damaging State buildings over time. The Fund provides property insurance for all State agencies except: University of Colorado, Colorado State University, University of Northern Colorado, Adams State, Western State, Mesa State, and Ft. Lewis College who do not participate in the Risk Management program. The fund provides the coverage through a combination of self-insurance and excess commercial property insurance. The first \$500,000 of each occurrence of a property loss is self-insured through the Fund. Once the \$500,000 deductible has been met the excess commercial property insurance pays the remainder of the claim. The self-insurance and excess commercial insurance reimburses agencies on a replacement cost basis.

Over the last five years the loss ratio (the insurance industry standard of premium cost to claim payouts) for the State commercial insurance policies has been 144%, meaning that for every dollar paid in premiums 144% was paid out in claims. This ratio is high due to the amounts paid for the 2013 flood. The loss ratio without the flood claims is 25%.

Over the last three years each State building valued at a \$1 million or more, including historic buildings, have been appraised to establish replacement cost values. In the instance of historic buildings the replacement cost is based on replacing or restoring the

building as closely as possible to the original condition using materials of like, kind and quality used in the original building.

7. Can Fleet Management sell a portfolio of vehicles in a single sale to one buyer or do they have to have an actual auction of single vehicles? Are auctions conducted by private auction companies or are they conducted by state employees? Explain the auction process. Would it be beneficial to have statutory authority to sell a whole group of vehicles to one buyer as opposed to single vehicles to single buyers? Would that save money? How does Hertz dispose of vehicles?

Response: Response: State Fleet Management (SFM) sells surplus vehicles through Colorado Correctional Industries (CCI). CCI, through their Colorado Surplus Property Agency, Colorado Auto Sales, is authorized to dispose of state surplus property by public auction under the statutory authority of C.R.S. 17-24-106.6 (2) (a) and Colorado Department of Corrections Administrative Regulation 450-03. This includes vehicles determined to be surplus by the Division of Central Services (DCS), and State Fleet Management (SFM). Under the interagency agreement between the two agencies, surplus vehicles that are in better running condition are sold by auction on EBay by Colorado Auto Sales. Inferior surplus vehicles such as accident totals salvage titles, or those that have significant mechanical problems are sold via public "sealed bid" auctions onsite at SFM in collaboration with CCI. SFM pays CCI a seller's fee per vehicle sold on EBay of \$300 for 1-300 vehicles sold and \$250 each for 300+ vehicles. The inferior vehicle fee is \$125 per vehicle for 1-200 vehicles sold, and \$120 per vehicle for 200+ vehicles. SFM conducted a detailed study in February 2009, comparing equivalent law enforcement vehicles, and the prices achieved by SFM were approximately \$850 (34%) better than the wholesale price offered by a private sector vehicle remarketing firm even though the vehicles sold by the private firm were two years newer with lower usage.

It would not be beneficial to sell vehicles to one buyer, as we already have multiple auto dealers, cab companies, and individuals who purchase significant quantities of vehicles by bidding higher on the vehicles than other auction participants. Selling all vehicles to one buyer eliminates the vigorous competitive bidding that assures the highest possible price. The auction process, in SFM's professional opinion determines the fair market value of each vehicle and maximizes our return on sales. This process also ensures that individual citizens and companies have an equal opportunity to purchase state surplus vehicles.

Hertz sells their surplus vehicles at auction, and they also have individual retail outlets located across the country that are like any other used auto dealer. The Hertz fleet

model is very different from that of the state. In the Hertz passenger vehicle model vehicle appearance, condition, and new models are demanded by the consumer. As a result, Hertz replaces vehicles on a very short cycle, buys very large numbers of similar model vehicles at a time and sells very large numbers of similar model vehicles at a time. There is still considerable demand for these newer model vehicles and they are usually purchased by vehicle resellers or sold through their own retail outlets. The state's vehicles are typically very old, high mileage vehicles, are of all different makes and models, are not typically worth much at the time of resale, and are not particularly attractive to purchase for the mass resale market.

10:20-11:15 BRIEFING ISSUES

Fleet Management CNG Break-even Analysis

8. Is the extra cost to drive to CNG fueling stations built into the methodology for the break-even analysis? Would it be better to allocate CNG vehicles based on where fueling stations are located?

Response: No, the extra cost to drive to a CNG fuel site is not built into the methodology. It is the individual agencies responsibility to locate CNG vehicles near CNG fueling stations, and reassign other non-CNG vehicles to other areas until they are replaced. SFM has informed the agencies of where the current CNG fuel sites are located, and to use CNG fuel whenever practicable; however, it is the agencies' decision to determine what is practicable or reasonable.

The proper assignment of CNG vehicles is critical to ensure that state employees are not driving excessive distances for CNG fuel, and being less productive in the process. The purchase of as many CNG vehicles as possible, when considering the statutory guidelines, is a large part of the strategy to address the "demand" side of the supply and demand equation. It is the classic dilemma of no one being willing to invest in fueling infrastructure unless there is a demand that can make it profitable, and no one wants to purchase vehicles if there is no infrastructure in place to ensure that fuel will be available. Combining vehicle demand from the state and private sector companies into a large enough base will help companies feel confident that their investment will generate enough volume to justify the cost of a CNG fuel site.

Purchasing "bi-fuel" capable CNG vehicles, (meaning they can use both regular gasoline and CNG) gives the state more flexibility in the placement of these vehicles, until the CNG infrastructure can catch up. No "potential" CNG replacement vehicles were eliminated

due to the distance from existing or planned CNG fuel sites. If the agency does not think the identified potential CNG vehicle replacement will work, they are required to justify their decision by filling out a form explaining their rationale, with the Executive Director's signature.

The strategy that the state has undertaken, based on statutory direction, is a long term strategy that was intended to help the state develop a viable industry to support the state's CNG resources. Over time as the infrastructure develops, CNG will become a viable industry within the state and the vehicles purchased will begin to generate the cost savings and environmental benefits associated with CNG fuel usage.

9. What is CEO's opinion on this issue brief? What does DNR think of this? Will the departments who are under-utilizing CNG commit to increasing usage? What is the executive branch doing to increase usage of CNG in the vehicles as opposed to just purchasing the vehicles?

Response: Colorado Energy Office

Upon reviewing the issue brief, the Colorado Energy Office (CEO) would like to acknowledge the efforts put forth by the JBC and State Fleet Management to complete an analysis of NGVs based upon various levels of CNG utilization. However, CEO would caution that it is difficult to apply a relatively small sample size of current data to lifecycle CNG usage for the entire fleet over the next 10 years. For example, a state fleet vehicle located in Pueblo and used for travel up and down the I-25 corridor may not have access to consistent CNG fueling at this point in time. However, ground recently broke on a CNG station in Pueblo; another station is being built in Trinidad; a third is being built in Colorado Springs; and additional stations are planned up and down the I-25 corridor. These stations are being built through the ALT Fuels Colorado program, and in total, eight new publicly-accessible CNG stations will be built in the next year. Over the next four years, 20 to 30 publicly-accessible CNG stations will be built, more than doubling the number of stations available statewide. As those stations are built, the utilization rates for state fleet vehicles will increase.

Additionally, CEO would note that it is difficult to assess an entire department's fleet in summary form. For example, extrapolating data for three-quarter-ton trucks in the Office of Information and Technology may require further context before providing a general recommendation for many vehicle models throughout each of the Offices of the Governor.

The CEO would like to clarify a few technical points based on its general knowledge of the market:

1. Many of the CNG vehicles deployed by the state fleet are dedicated NGVs, meaning the vehicles can only use CNG and cannot fuel on gasoline. Among these are the commonly-deployed Honda Civic sedans, as well as the cargo vans mentioned in the "Fleet Management's Life-Cycle Cost Break-Even Analysis" by the JBC Staff Analyst. For these vehicles, 100% of the fuel used will be CNG.
2. The JBC Staff numbers could be updated to show that the 2014 Chevrolet 3500 cargo van has a lower incremental cost (\$1,105) for the CNG option, and the actual combined fuel mileage is 12 mpg for the 2014 model (or 11 mpg for the 2012 model), rather than the 15 mpg used in both sets of analysis. These mpg numbers are available on DOE's Fuel Economy website.

Furthermore, CEO would add that neither gasoline nor CNG prices are stagnant. Gasoline prices are expected to rise significantly faster than CNG prices over the next 10 years, and gasoline's price volatility provides more risk than CNG over the lifecycle of similar vehicles.

State Fleet Management is well versed in the difficult job of managing many different types of vehicles with different usage cases, and CEO does not presume to provide the same level of expertise in this regard as the Department of Personnel and Administration. However, in May 2014, with assistance from State Fleet Management, CEO commissioned an expert contractor to conduct an Opportunity Assessment for the State Fleet. The goal of the Opportunity Assessment is to identify ways for the state fleet to reduce lifecycle costs, reduce emissions and maintain operational feasibility of CNG vehicles. The Assessment will use data-driven models and analyses to identify opportunities that have a positive payback for specific vehicle models in specific use cases, such as those vehicles that use more fuel than average. These vehicles can benefit significantly from the low fuel prices of alternative fuels such as CNG, although other fuels and efficiency options are under consideration as well. The Opportunity Assessment has a projected public release date of Feb. 1, 2015.

Meanwhile, CEO has been focusing station funding outreach (through the ALT Fuels Colorado program) on areas with a large fleet presence, including the state fleet, and has already funded stations in areas such as Commerce City that contain a large state fleet presence.

Response: Department of Natural Resources

During the December 3rd staff briefing on the Department of Personnel and Administration JBC staff raised a number of concerns about the use of CNG vehicles. The Department of Natural Resources shares staff's concern that CNG vehicles be used in a responsible and cost effective manner. The Department of Natural Resources is working through some challenges that have arisen in this early deployment phase of its CNG fleet. In the most recent budget cycles the Department has requested that a number of vehicles added to its fleet be CNG bi-fuel vehicles. This has resulted in the Department being assigned approximately 100 vehicles which are CNG capable. Of these 100 vehicles, approximately half of them were in operational use prior to the beginning of FY 2014-15. The other half of the vehicles have been delivered over the initial months of this fiscal year. One of the challenges the Department faces is the geographically diverse areas that its fleet of vehicles is assigned to. Though the number and location of CNG stations is anticipated to increase, not all areas of the state currently have easy access to a CNG fueling station. The Department of Natural Resources is working with the Department of Personnel and Administration to gather the data on individual vehicle usage. As vehicles are identified that have low usage of CNG, the Department will work with that vehicle's users to identify why CNG is not being used. If CNG is available in that location or is forecast to be available in the near future, education on the availability of CNG and an emphasis on the importance of the program will be provided. If CNG is not available in the general region and is not forecast to be available on a reasonable timeframe, the Department will look to reassign the vehicle to a more appropriate location. The Department is confident that through employee outreach and thoughtful management of its fleet resources, all of its CNG vehicles can be assigned to users and locations which will maximize CNG use.

There are a number of potential benefits associated with CNG vehicle use, including lower fuel costs, lower vehicle maintenance costs, reduced air quality impacts, and helping to create a market for locally produced energy. As such, the Department supports CNG vehicle use and is committed to working with the General Assembly, the Governor's Office, and with its employees and programs to implement CNG vehicle policies and statutes in a way that is both efficient and effective.

Response: Governor's Office of Information Technology

The Office of Information Technology has two fleet vehicles and both are allocated to the Public Safety Communications Network (PSCN - formerly known as the Digital Trunked Radio System). The PSCN requires vehicles with large amounts of storage and transportation capacity due to the equipment transported between tower sites. The CNG adaptations create problems for PSCN vehicles because it significantly impacts the storage capacity of the vehicle due to CNG tanks being larger and requiring more physical spaces for the conversion equipment.

In addition to directly impacting capacity the conversion kit makes it difficult for camper

shells to be placed on the vehicles. Due to the nature of the equipment transported, as well as its cost, PSCN requires locking mechanisms on the vehicles and camper shell to protect equipment from weather and theft.

10. Does lowering of gas prices impact the break-even analysis?

Response: The break even analysis is primarily dependent on the cost difference between regular gasoline and CNG. Any reduction in regular fuel prices that is not offset by similar reductions in the CNG prices will narrow this difference and negatively impact the break-even analysis. Keep in mind the analysis evaluates a 10 year lifecycle cost comparison to the gasoline equivalent and should not be overly sensitive to short term fluctuations. Over the past few years, the cost difference has usually been \$1.00 or greater. If gasoline prices were to remain at historic low levels for a sustained number of years, and if CNG prices remain unchanged or increase, then the break even analysis would produce significantly different results.

Colorado has a substantially higher CNG cost per gallon equivalent than other states. Anything that can be done to improve the cost at the pump for CNG in Colorado would dramatically improve the economics and acceptance of CNG for vehicles. For example, the current Colorado average is about \$2.40 per gge, Nebraska is about \$2.00, Oklahoma is about \$1.75, Utah is about \$1.90, and Wyoming is also about \$1.90. The national average is \$2.21. According to the Colorado Energy Office, Colorado's higher CNG prices can be associated with a few factors: 1) the older technology used in Colorado raises the average cost of CNG by approximately .10 per gge, 2) other states such as Utah subsidize the price of natural gas when sold to CNG stations, and 3) vehicle fleets that commit to long-term fuel contracts are able to secure a lower price compared to the public-facing prices.

11. How does the Department make the decision to request a given proportion of CNG vehicles in the total request? Does the Department take into account the availability of CNG stations in the area where the vehicles will be located? Who makes the policies on how and when a state employee should use CNG versus standard fuel in the alternative fuel vehicles? Why do employees choose not to use CNG in these vehicles? Has the department ever tried to determine this? If not, why not? Would a statutory change help to encourage more usage?

Response: Vehicles to be replaced are selected through the normal replacement model. If there is a CNG vehicle available from an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) then it will be identified as a “potential” CNG acquisition, and included as such in the annual replacement request. When it comes time for the actual purchase of the vehicles, agencies are cautioned not to purchase any “dedicated” CNG vehicles if there is not a CNG station located nearby, and if the vehicle will be used to travel to areas of the state that do not have convenient CNG sites. Vehicles that have dual fuel capability are not eliminated because of distance to the nearest CNG fuel site. For the dual fuel vehicles, SFM has informed the agencies of where the current CNG fuel sites are located, and to use CNG fuel whenever practicable; however, it is the agencies’ decision to determine what is practicable or reasonable.

Monthly reports are available to the agencies on their CNG usage so they can better manage it. However, it would be unfair to impose a statutory requirement to purchase X amount of CNG fuel when there is not enough CNG infrastructure to support any quotas at this time.

It is SFM’s opinion that even under the best situation, CNG vehicles are a minor inconvenience for the driver, if only because they now have to be cognizant of where they get their fuel. This is something they never had to be concerned about in the past. If this means that fueling will be less convenient due to distance or time it will be a factor in acceptance. To summarize, employees may not use CNG because of the time involved to travel to the CNG fuel site locations. A lack of infrastructure is the main problem, and will continue until significantly more stations are added. SFM has not collected specific data from user agencies regarding this issue.

12. What is the Department’s plan to increase CNG usage? What is the Department’s opinion of the staff analysis?

Response: SFM’s statutory obligation is to purchase CNG vehicles if available as long as they meet the 10% lifecycle cost thresholds, and can be used in the field without making it difficult to perform essential duties. Once in the fleet, reports are sent out monthly showing the usage of CNG for each CNG capable vehicle in the fleet. Summary reports are also distributed showing how departments are doing overall and how their usage is trending. These can be used at the executive level to monitor progress and to establish goals for improvement.

DPA also works with the CEO, Clean Cities, Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC), and the private sector to inform CNG suppliers on how many CNG vehicles the state has purchased and where they are to be located. This information combined with that from other public and private entities will assist companies like Clean Energy and Ward Energy as they determine the best locations to build a site.

DPA understands the basis of the JBC analyst's recommendation, that funding be withheld from agencies that do not purchase enough CNG fuel, but by doing so in the manner proposed it would have negative impacts on the CNG initiative/program since DNR and CDOT usually purchase the most CNG vehicles, and are scheduled to purchase the majority going forward. If agencies are resistant to CNG vehicles in their fleet, they could intentionally use less fuel in order to secure funding for non-CNG vehicles in lieu of CNG models. SFM does not think that this action would be consistent with the intent of SB13-070 or SB09-092. Realistically, initiatives like this can take several years or more before significant progress can be made toward significant CNG consumption because of the lagging infrastructure challenges.

13. Are the grants for CNG fueling stations primarily federal? Will they continue in the future or is the money drying up?

Response: The following response was provided by the Colorado Energy Office, and appears in the Office of the Governor's hearing responses dated December 2, 2014.

CEO is on track to meet the program's FY 2014-15 performance goal, which is to increase the number of publicly accessible compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling stations along Colorado's major transportation corridors, through funding 14 stations by June 30, 2015. Upon completion, this will raise the total number of CNG stations statewide to 31.

Program Design: CDOT contracts annually with the Federal Highway Administration through the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) program. CDOT has earmarked \$15 million in Federal CMAQ funds for CEO to incentivize alternative fueling infrastructure over the next four years. CDOT allocates the funds on a yearly basis and contracted with CEO in May 2014 for the first \$7 million for two initial rounds of station funding.

In June 2014, CEO released Request for Applications for the first funding round, and subsequently awarded \$3,902,658 for eight compressed natural gas stations. A little over

\$3 million remains for the second round of funding in January. Additional funds will be allocated to CEO on an annual basis throughout the remainder of the program. CEO's program design is focused on frontloading the station funding (as seen in the allocations below). To date, the 80% incentive level for station equipment (capped at \$500,000) has attracted impressive demand from station developers, resulting in a competitive station grant process that seeks to protect taxpayer investments through ensuring quality business plans, adequate fleet support and innovative station design. Additional funds are also available for co-located electric vehicle charging and propane fueling facilities. While the first round of contracts has been awarded, CMAQ funds are not paid until the grantees have met their contractual match requirement and submit expenditure documentation. Ten percent (10%) of the total award for each station is also retained until the station is online and open to the public.

Program Funding Allocations:

Four Year Total: \$30 million

- CEO: \$15 million for station incentives
 - Goal of 20-30 public CNG stations built statewide
 - 80% of station equipment cost capped at \$500,000
 - Co-located EV fast charging or propane stations eligible for up to an additional \$50,000 each
- Regional Air Quality Council: \$15 million for fleet vehicle incentives
 - Goal of 1,000 alternative fuel vehicles in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas

CEO Station Funding:

- FY 2014-15: \$7 million
 - First Round
 - Awards made in September 2014
 - 8 stations funded - \$3,902,658 in CMAQ funds awarded
- Second Round
 - Awards to be made in February, 2015
 - Anticipate 6 stations funded - approximately \$3 million in CMAQ funds
 - FY15-16: \$3 million (anticipated)
 - FY16-17: \$3 million (anticipated)
 - FY17-18: \$2 million (anticipated)

Cash Funds Excess Uncommitted Reserves Policy

14. If we were to implement the recommended changes would all the issues be resolved or would there still be issues?

Response: The Department agrees that the recommendations will, for the most part, improve management of the State's cash fund revenues in the context of their role in contributing to excess TABOR revenue. The Department has included additional feedback in the response to question 15.

15. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes.

Response: The Department has the following feedback relative to the Joint Budget Committee's Staff's recommendations:

1. The Department agrees with the name changes proposed by JBC staff as it will help clarify that the target is a maximum and not a desired (but not required) target.
2. A capital outlay reserve would help minimize the General Fund impact of replacing capital assets. To avoid any potential conflicts with federal requirements, maintaining the capital outlay reserve within the fund that collected the depreciation would be preferable. Movement of the capital outlay reserve into a separate fund may trigger requests for refunds from the federal government for their portion of the fund balance.
3. An alternative method that accounts for a multi-year cyclical pattern in certain funds would smooth cyclical fluctuations in the excess uncommitted reserves report. It would not, however, mitigate the impact of a fund's contribution to the excess TABOR revenue. The Department would need to develop additional guidelines as to how departments would request the application of a multi-year adjustment to avoid any unintended consequences, if any.
4. The Department would support a simple waiver process for requesting exemption from the excess uncommitted reserves thresholds.
5. Increasing the minimum uncommitted reserves for cash funds considered in the report to \$200,000 would allow the State to focus on those cash funds that have the most significant balances.
6. To the extent that a restriction on spending authority is intended to incentivize action on reducing the fund balance in advance of the restriction, the Department feels as though this may be an effective tool in drawing fund balances down. However, the action of restricting spending authority out of a fund would work against the desired

outcome of reducing the fund balance as departments would likely maintain the same revenue streams but with reduced spending authority. Less spending authority would mean less is spent out of the fund, which would then increase the fund balance and put it further out of compliance.

Total Comp Request Overview

16. What is the status of the total compensation study that was funded last year? Was there a third party study for total compensation?

Response: Based on HB 14-1336 (Long Bill), the Department has established a contract with Milliman Inc. to complete the Annual Total Compensation study, which is due on August 1, 2015. In addition to the Total Compensation Study, the Department has also executed a contract for a PERA Study which is summarized below.

SENATE BILL 14-214: PERA STUDIES CONDUCTED BY ACTUARIAL FIRM

Status: The Department has contracted with Milliman Inc. to complete the independent PERA study and is on target for January 15, 2015 completion.

Background: The bill was a Joint Budget Committee-sponsored bill that created two separate studies:

The first study changes the State's annual total compensation survey process performed by the Department of Personnel & Administration to incorporate retirement benefits by January 15, 2015, and to perform the study again including retirement benefits every eighth year thereafter.

The second study directs the State Auditor's Office, with the concurrence of PERA, to contract with an actuarial firm to perform a comprehensive study of the current PERA plan design compared to other alternative retirement plans and to perform a sensitivity analysis of actuarial assumptions.

17. Please discuss the Total Compensation Request and provide an update on the HLD request.

Response: The FY 2015-16 Total Compensation Request includes the following major components:

- A one percent salary survey increase including targeting adjustments to salary ranges for occupational groups;
- A one percent (weighted average) merit pay increase with a merit matrix designed to incent performance and to move employees quickly to the range midpoint;
- A continuation of the policy to fund Shift Differential at 100 percent of prior year expenditures;
- The statutorily required increases for both Amortization Equalization Disbursement and Supplemental Amortization Equalization Disbursement (4.4 percent and 4.25 percent of revised base salaries);
- A continuation level of funding for Short-Term Disability (.22 percent revised base salaries); and
- A placeholder request amount for Health, Life and Dental.

The Department will submit a Health, Life, and Dental budget amendment to adjust the amounts that are currently included in the HLD request. Preliminary estimates show that premiums will likely increase for FY 2015-16. The majority of the increases can be attributed to: plan migration, increased costs for services, and increased enrollments. DPA continues to target an employer/employee premium cost split that is comparable to the market; for FY 2015-16 this split is approximately 75/25 for the employer and employee.

18. Does the Department have plans to address the issue of narrowed salary ranges in which state employees are bumping up against the maximum, locked in by the maximum, and essentially unable to receive base increases due to this range narrowing? Please provide a brief history of this issue and if possible the cost to address this issue.

Response: In 2005, Milliman Inc. conducted a performance audit on behalf of the Colorado State Auditor of the Department of Personnel & Administration 2005 Annual Total Compensation Survey Report and found that there were too many employees at the bottom of their pay range. In 2005, there was no effort to narrow salary ranges.

Over time the Department has developed several strategies to ensure that ranges are prevailing with the market. The Department has addressed pay progression by implementing two methods with available funds: 1) the Department changed State Personnel Rule to allow for in-range movement and 2) State Constitution (C.O. Const. art. XII, §13) established a merit pay system for employees in the State Personnel System for

the purpose of providing salary increases based on individual employee performance. Awards of merit pay increases are based upon priority groups and are defined in a matrix. The priority groups are determined by an employee’s location within the pay range and performance based on the following three performance levels: Exceptional (level 3), Successful (level 2) and Below Expectations (level 1).

The Department is currently working with a consultant to ensure that the state continues to have technically sound and competitive pay plan. In addition, the Division of Human Resources has pulled data from FY 2011 to FY 2015, and we are seeing fewer employees at, or near the minimum and maximum of their ranges.

| Employee Salary Percent in Range (PIR)by Fiscal Year | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| PIR | FY11 | FY12 | FY13 | FY14 | FY15 |
| <=10% | 32.6% | 34.6% | 35.4% | 33.0% | 21.4% |
| 10-20% | 7.5% | 7.9% | 8.2% | 12.7% | 19.5% |
| 20-30% | 8.2% | 8.1% | 8.5% | 8.2% | 10.1% |
| 30-40% | 6.7% | 6.8% | 6.7% | 8.3% | 8.1% |
| 40-50% | 5.7% | 5.7% | 5.7% | 7.4% | 8.1% |
| 50-60% | 6.7% | 6.7% | 6.7% | 7.2% | 7.7% |
| 60-70% | 7.5% | 7.1% | 7.2% | 5.5% | 7.0% |
| 70-80% | 6.0% | 5.8% | 5.7% | 5.4% | 6.4% |
| 80-90% | 8.2% | 7.5% | 6.8% | 4.3% | 4.2% |
| >=90% | 10.8% | 9.7% | 9.0% | 8.0% | 7.5% |

11:15-11:30 BREAK

11:30-11:40 PERA INTRODUCTION AND OPENING COMMENTS

11:40-12:00 PERA QUESTIONS

19. How does PERA's rate of return/discount rate compare to other STATE public pension plans not including other types of government pension plans? Is unfunded liability going up or down over time? If unfunded liabilities are not going down with a rate of return of 15.6 percent, how will they decline with a rate of return of 7.5 percent? Will GASB 67 and 68 make pension plans more risk-prone?

20. Does PERA have an opinion on how GASB Statement No. 67 may affect the assumed rate of return/discount rate? How might that change impact unfunded liabilities and the funded

status? How soon will PERA need to incorporate GASB Statement No. 67 reporting requirements?

21. Why is the PERA statutory investment portfolio percentage limit for stocks set at 65 percent? Is this a risky level given the benefits that must be paid to retirees? What is the history of investment portfolio mix requirements as they have been defined or provided for in statute or by PERA to address risk? Please describe PERA's investment portfolio strategy as it regards risk and return.
22. Is it true that PERA's is the largest unfunded liability in the state at this point?

ADDENDUM: OTHER QUESTIONS FOR WHICH SOLELY WRITTEN RESPONSES ARE REQUESTED

1. Provide a list of any legislation that the Department has: (a) not implemented or (b) partially implemented. Explain why the Department has not implemented or has partially implemented the legislation on this list.

Response: There is no legislation that the Department has not yet implemented or has partially implemented.

2. What is the turnover rate for staff in the department? Please provide a breakdown by office and/or division, and program.

Response: Please note that for the department-specific information presented electronically to the Joint Budget Committee, the Department of Personnel & Administration worked with departments to make sure that the information being presented is as consistent as possible. As a result, individual departments requested that DPA provide some feedback on assumptions that could change the results.

1. DPA only included classified staff in the reports. This was due to the desire to report turnover by salary quartile. Departments or agencies with a large number of non-classified staff are concerned that this assumption does not allow for reporting on their full complement of employees. Individual agencies may be able to provide additional information regarding non-classified staff turnover that may include distribution amongst any self-defined salary ranges.

2. DPA did not consider internal transfers (from one State agency to another) as turnover. This was done to maintain consistency with several other reports the Department produces that intend to show the State's overall turnover. It is understandable that an individual department would consider a transfer to another agency turnover because they need to go through the hiring and training process again.

3. DPA's methodology looked at separations over the course of the year. Some departments that have produced their own turnover rates have used a snap-shot method of calculating turnover. DPA did not use that method because the Department was looking at the number of separations across an entire year; the snap-shot would not account for seasonality of employment, and a single position could have turnover over more than once in a year.

4. In addition to turnover by Department, DPA also summarized turnover at the Agency level - DPA maintained the same methodology in both analyses. However, because the Department was asked to calculate turnover at the agency level, this additional requirement forces the Department to recalculate headcount because an individual within a single department can occupy multiple positions in different agencies. Therefore, one might notice that the sum of all headcounts among a department's agencies may not equal the sum of the headcount for the department in total. Due to space constraints, the turnover data by department including the agency analysis was transmitted to JBC staff electronically and has not been reproduced here.

| Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Department | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|---|------------|------------|------------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Department | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Department | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| Agriculture | 28 | 306 | 9.2% | 17 | 4 | 7 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Corrections | 741 | 6,736 | 11.0% | 447 | 142 | 152 | 520 | 62 | 51 | 108 |
| Education | 14 | 174 | 8.0% | 5 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| Governor's Office | 59 | 622 | 9.5% | 24 | 3 | 32 | 15 | 14 | 23 | 7 |
| Health Care Policy & Financing | 64 | 492 | 13.0% | 55 | 1 | 8 | 36 | 18 | 8 | 2 |
| Higher Education | 791 | 8,910 | 8.9% | 464 | 135 | 192 | 523 | 118 | 78 | 72 |
| Human Services | 939 | 5,849 | 16.1% | 590 | 184 | 165 | 600 | 152 | 97 | 90 |
| Labor & Employment | 116 | 1,246 | 9.3% | 59 | 20 | 37 | 76 | 11 | 15 | 14 |
| Law | 25 | 190 | 13.2% | 10 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 1 |
| Local Affairs | 12 | 159 | 7.5% | 7 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Military & Veterans Affairs | 22 | 149 | 14.8% | 11 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| Natural Resources | 105 | 1,535 | 6.8% | 49 | 9 | 47 | 28 | 15 | 23 | 39 |
| Personnel & Administration | 43 | 392 | 11.0% | 29 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 8 | 14 | 5 |
| Public Health & Environment | 143 | 1,430 | 10.0% | 93 | 12 | 38 | 36 | 31 | 38 | 38 |
| Public Safety | 101 | 1,724 | 5.9% | 56 | 11 | 34 | 50 | 27 | 14 | 10 |
| Regulatory Agencies | 46 | 597 | 7.7% | 19 | 5 | 22 | 18 | 11 | 7 | 10 |
| Revenue | 139 | 1,323 | 10.5% | 82 | 16 | 41 | 78 | 17 | 19 | 25 |
| State | 15 | 135 | 11.1% | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| State Auditor's Office | 8 | 73 | 11.0% | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Transportation | 255 | 3,216 | 7.9% | 118 | 34 | 103 | 32 | 54 | 80 | 89 |
| Treasury | 2 | 31 | 6.5% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Statewide Total* | 3,668 | 35,289 | 10.4% | 2,157 | 594 | 917 | 2,075 | 580 | 491 | 522 |

3. Please identify the following:

a. The department's most effective program;

Response: The Office of the State Controller is the most effective program within the Department of Personnel & Administration. The Office of the State Controller ensures that the State's financial dealings are recorded and reported accurately and in accordance with State and federal law, as well as generally accepted accounting principles. The

Department's strategic goals include improve customer service, modernize systems, and reinvest in the workforce. The Office of the State Controller furthers the Department's goals by providing the information and assistance necessary for State agencies, the customers of the Office, to more efficiently manage their purchasing and financial transactions.

- b. The department's least effective program (in the context of management and budget);

Response: The Division of Human Resources, the human resource oversight entity within the Department, is not as effective as possible. The Division is charged with establishing human resources programs statewide to ensure compliance with State and federal law; maintaining the statewide classified workforce and benefits datasets; and ensuring the integrity of the State Personnel System by providing training and technical advice to the human resource community and reviewing director's appeals. Currently, the Division is unable to maximize its effectiveness due to the lack of an automated human resource information management system. The decentralized nature of human resource management within the State has allowed for inconsistencies in transactions and application of policies and rules that could be detrimental to the overall workforce and compliance with law. Furthermore, the lack of a comprehensive personnel management system within the State generates inefficiencies where data is needed to analyze legislative requests and hinders management's ability to make sound business and personnel decisions.

- c. Please provide recommendations on what will make this program (2.b.) more effective based on the department's performance measures.

Response: The implementation of a comprehensive, centralized, enterprise-wide human resource system will dramatically improve the effectiveness of the Division of Human Resources, and will further the Department's strategic goals. During the past year, the Department undertook a rigorous due diligence process with the Office of Information Technology, which revealed the critical need for an enterprise system to be used as a single source of human resource information for State employees. Given the age of the State's disparate legacy systems, and numerous data sources that exist within the Executive Branch agencies, the Department believes it is imperative that the implementation of an HRIS begin as soon as possible. The Department envisions a simpler, rational, integrated application portfolio that will encompass automated business processes for critical human resources functions. By providing a central system that can accommodate the critical human resource functions, the need for agency shadow systems will be eliminated, resulting in efficiency gains realized by the agencies.

4. How much capital outlay was expended using either operating funds or capital funds in FY 2013-14? Please break it down between the amount expended from operating and the amount expended from capital.

Response: Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-75-112, in FY 2013-14 the Department spent \$0 capital funds and \$357,471 operating funds for capital outlay.

5. Does Department have any outstanding high priority recommendations as identified in the "Annual Report of Audit Recommendations Not Fully Implemented" that was published by the State Auditor's Office on June 30, 2014? What is the department doing to resolve the outstanding high priority recommendations?

Response: The Department has the following outstanding high priority recommendations: Department of Revenue Tax Processing Performance Audit (#2157)

Recommendation 1C: DPA was originally required to reduce headcount by 15 employees. At this point DPA has reduced 12, and has had the personal service budget reduced for the entire 15. DPA is currently holding the remaining three employees through the remainder of FY 2014-15.

Recommendation 2: The Department of Revenue (DOR) and the DPA have agreed to move the outgoing mail function, Phase IV of Pipeline, to DPA. A tentative date of 7/1/15 has been selected as the transition date. However, this is dependent on two things that need further research. (1) The DOR will not have to incur additional cost during the transition by paying both DPA and the Office of Information Technology, and (2) The implementation date for Phase IV will not impact the implementation date for Phase III.

Cash Funds Uncommitted Reserves Performance Audit (#1344P)

Recommendation 8A (Supplier Database Cash Fund): The Supplier Database Fund and the eProcurement Fund were combined effective July 1, 2014. The Supplier Database Fund was funded by a \$40 fee paid by vendors to access the Bid Information and Distribution System (BIDS). The eProcurement fund was supported by a contractual one percent rebate on state and local government money spent through purchasing contracts under the Western States Contract Alliance, a revenue source over which the Department has little control. Prior to the consolidation of funds, the eProcurement Fund had not appeared on the Excess Reserve Report. The Supplier Database fund has appeared on the Excess Reserve report since FY 2009-10, and each year the Department has presented a proposed compliance plan to eliminate the balance rather than request a waiver. For FY 2011-12, the Department

submitted a budget action to transfer the excess uncommitted reserve balance to the General Fund, but the plan was not fully accepted and therefore failed to eliminate the excess uncommitted reserve balance. The compliance plans utilized several different approaches through the years to eliminate the excess reserves, but ultimately relied on JBC approval of one-time expenditure or transfers to the General Fund.

To address the newly combined fund in part, the Department eliminated the Supplier Database BIDS registration fee on July 1, 2014. In addition, a large portion of the revenue source for the combined fund is based not on fees collected from the public, but from a contractual one percent rebate on state and local government money spent through purchasing contracts under the Western States Contract Alliance. The Department's compliance plan for the combined Supplier Database and eProcurement fund identified the possibility of using this fund as a revenue source to support the ongoing business needs of the State's new CORE financial system, including the Vendor Self Service (VSS) module, which replaced BIDS for vendor solicitations. If requested and authorized, this fund will be incorporated into a methodology that adjusts its fund balance on an annual basis through a common policy. If the Department's plan is approved, this fund is estimated to be in compliance by the end of FY 2015-16 based on current projections. The Department requests a waiver until the fund comes into compliance.

FY 2013-14 Classified Employee Turnover

Employee Turnover By Department

Please note that for the department-specific information presented electronically to the Joint Budget Committee, the Department of Personnel & Administration worked with departments to make sure that the information being presented is as consistent as possible. As a result, individual departments requested that DPA provide some feedback on assumptions that could change the results.

1. DPA only included classified staff in the reports. This was due to the desire to report turnover by salary quartile. Departments or agencies with a large number of non-classified staff are concerned that this assumption does not allow for reporting on their full complement of employees. Individual agencies may be able to provide additional information regarding non-classified staff turnover that may include distribution amongst any self-defined salary ranges.
2. DPA did not consider internal transfers (from one State agency to another) as turnover. This was done to maintain consistency with several other reports the Department produces that intend to show the State's overall turnover. It is understandable that an individual department would consider a transfer to another agency turnover because they need to go through the hiring and training process again.
3. DPA's methodology looked at separations over the course of the year. Some departments that have produced their own turnover rates have used a snap-shot method of calculating turnover. DPA did not use that method because the Department was looking at the number of separations across an entire year, the snap-shot would not account for seasonality of employment, and a single position could have turnover over more than once in a year.
4. In addition to turnover by Department, DPA also summarized turnover at the Agency level - DPA maintained the same methodology in both analyses. However, because the Department was asked to calculate turnover at the agency level, this additional requirement forces the Department to recalculate headcount because an individual within a single department can occupy multiple positions in different agencies. Therefore, one might notice that the sum of all headcounts among a department's agencies may not equal the sum of the headcount for the department in total.

| Department of Agriculture: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| TECHNICIAN II | 6 | 33 | 18.2% | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 6 | 48 | 12.5% | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT II | 3 | 7 | 42.9% | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TECHNICIAN III | 3 | 45 | 6.7% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| PROGRAM ASSISTANT II | 3 | 8 | 37.5% | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 21 | 141 | 14.9% | 14 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Department Total | 28 | 306 | 9.2% | 17 | 4 | 7 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 3 |

| Department of Agriculture: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 6 | 48 | 12.5% | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| TECHNICIAN III | 3 | 45 | 6.7% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| TECHNICIAN II | 6 | 33 | 18.2% | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT III | 1 | 25 | 4.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL VI | 1 | 11 | 9.1% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 17 | 162 | 10.5% | 11 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Department Total | 28 | 306 | 9.2% | 17 | 4 | 7 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 3 |

| Department of Agriculture: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE | 28 | 306 | 9.2% | 17 | 4 | 7 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Department Total* | 28 | 306 | 9.2% | 17 | 4 | 7 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 3 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Corrections: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|---|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| CORR/YTH/CLIN SEC OFF I | 381 | 2,553 | 14.9% | 258 | 99 | 24 | 358 | 6 | 6 | 11 |
| CORR SUPP TRADES SUPV I | 59 | 543 | 10.9% | 28 | 15 | 16 | 40 | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| CORR/YTH/CLIN SEC OFF II | 51 | 764 | 6.7% | 24 | 5 | 22 | 20 | 3 | 5 | 23 |
| NURSE I | 29 | 175 | 16.6% | 23 | 2 | 4 | 18 | 9 | 2 | 0 |
| COMMUNITY PAROLE OFF | 21 | 235 | 8.9% | 17 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Top Classes Total | 541 | 4,270 | 12.7% | 350 | 122 | 69 | 449 | 26 | 17 | 49 |
| Department Total | 741 | 6,736 | 11.0% | 447 | 142 | 152 | 520 | 62 | 51 | 108 |

| Department of Corrections: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|---|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| CORR/YTH/CLIN SEC OFF I | 381 | 2,553 | 14.9% | 258 | 99 | 24 | 358 | 6 | 6 | 11 |
| CORR/YTH/CLIN SEC OFF II | 51 | 764 | 6.7% | 24 | 5 | 22 | 20 | 3 | 5 | 23 |
| CORR SUPP TRADES SUPV I | 59 | 543 | 10.9% | 28 | 15 | 16 | 40 | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| CORR/YTH/CLN SEC SUPV III | 16 | 244 | 6.6% | 7 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| COMMUNITY PAROLE OFF | 21 | 235 | 8.9% | 17 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Top Classes Total | 528 | 4,339 | 12.2% | 334 | 121 | 73 | 437 | 17 | 17 | 57 |
| Department Total | 741 | 6,736 | 11.0% | 447 | 142 | 152 | 520 | 62 | 51 | 108 |

| Department of Corrections: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|---|-----------|-----------|------------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| CANTEEN | 2 | 36 | 5.6% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRIES | 15 | 167 | 9.0% | 5 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| CORRECTIONS ADMINISTRATION | 724 | 6,554 | 11.0% | 442 | 141 | 141 | 516 | 61 | 48 | 99 |
| Department Total* | 741 | 6,757 | 11.0% | 447 | 142 | 152 | 520 | 62 | 51 | 108 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Education: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT III | 3 | 16 | 18.8% | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| IT PROFESSIONAL | 2 | 11 | 18.2% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| PROGRAM ASSISTANT I | 2 | 10 | 20.0% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DATA SPECIALIST | 1 | 2 | 50.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT II | 1 | 5 | 20.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| IT SUPERVISOR | 1 | 4 | 25.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 1 | 13 | 7.7% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 11 | 61 | 18.0% | 5 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Department Total | 14 | 174 | 8.0% | 5 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 |

| Department of Education: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT III | 3 | 16 | 18.8% | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 1 | 13 | 7.7% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| IT PROFESSIONAL | 2 | 11 | 18.2% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| PROGRAM ASSISTANT I | 2 | 10 | 20.0% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT II | 1 | 5 | 20.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 9 | 55 | 16.4% | 3 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| Department Total | 14 | 174 | 8.0% | 5 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 |

| Department of Education: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION | 13 | 69 | 18.8% | 5 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF AND BLIND | 1 | 105 | 1.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Department Total* | 14 | 174 | 8.0% | 5 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Governor's Office: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| IT PROFESSIONAL | 26 | 374 | 7.0% | 14 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 0 |
| IT SUPERVISOR | 11 | 78 | 14.1% | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| CUST SUPPORT COORD II | 4 | 16 | 25.0% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 3 | 11 | 27.3% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| IT TECHNICIAN | 2 | 22 | 9.1% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| TECHNICIAN IV | 2 | 5 | 40.0% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| ELECTRONICS SPEC II | 2 | 5 | 40.0% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ELECTRONICS SPEC IV | 2 | 12 | 16.7% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 52 | 523 | 9.9% | 22 | 2 | 28 | 13 | 13 | 20 | 6 |
| Department Total | 59 | 622 | 9.5% | 24 | 3 | 32 | 15 | 14 | 23 | 7 |

| Governor's Office: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| IT PROFESSIONAL | 26 | 374 | 7.0% | 14 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 0 |
| IT SUPERVISOR | 11 | 78 | 14.1% | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| IT TECHNICIAN | 2 | 22 | 9.1% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| CUST SUPPORT COORD II | 4 | 16 | 25.0% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| ELECTRONICS SPEC IV | 2 | 12 | 16.7% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 45 | 502 | 9.0% | 17 | 2 | 26 | 11 | 13 | 18 | 3 |
| Department Total | 59 | 622 | 9.5% | 24 | 3 | 32 | 15 | 14 | 23 | 7 |

| Governor's Office: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|----------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT | 1 | 2 | 50.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFFICE OF INFORMATION TECH | 58 | 620 | 9.4% | 23 | 3 | 32 | 15 | 14 | 23 | 6 |
| Department Total* | 59 | 622 | 9.5% | 24 | 3 | 32 | 15 | 14 | 23 | 7 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Health Care Policy & Financing: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|-----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 15 | 99 | 15.2% | 10 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 14 | 75 | 18.7% | 14 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL II | 9 | 70 | 12.9% | 9 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT II | 2 | 9 | 22.2% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL V | 2 | 37 | 5.4% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL VI | 2 | 26 | 7.7% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| BUDGET ANALYST I | 2 | 5 | 40.0% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RATE/FINANCIAL ANALYST I | 2 | 6 | 33.3% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| RATE/FINANCIAL ANALYST II | 2 | 7 | 28.6% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 50 | 334 | 15.0% | 43 | 1 | 6 | 26 | 15 | 7 | 2 |
| Department Total | 64 | 492 | 13.0% | 55 | 1 | 8 | 36 | 18 | 8 | 2 |

| Department of Health Care Policy & Financing: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|-----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 15 | 99 | 15.2% | 10 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 14 | 75 | 18.7% | 14 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL II | 9 | 70 | 12.9% | 9 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL V | 2 | 37 | 5.4% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL VI | 2 | 26 | 7.7% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 42 | 307 | 13.7% | 36 | 0 | 6 | 23 | 11 | 6 | 2 |
| Department Total | 64 | 492 | 13.0% | 55 | 1 | 8 | 36 | 18 | 8 | 2 |

| Department of Health Care Policy & Financing: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|-----------|----------|----------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| DEPT OF HLTH CARE POLICY & FIN | 64 | 492 | 13.0% | 55 | 1 | 8 | 36 | 18 | 8 | 2 |
| Department Total* | 64 | 492 | 13.0% | 55 | 1 | 8 | 36 | 18 | 8 | 2 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Higher Education: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|---|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| CUSTODIAN I | 122 | 1,026 | 11.9% | 72 | 35 | 15 | 105 | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT II | 59 | 685 | 8.6% | 35 | 11 | 13 | 44 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT III | 57 | 834 | 6.8% | 39 | 7 | 11 | 44 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| PROGRAM ASSISTANT I | 23 | 400 | 5.8% | 12 | 1 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| IT PROFESSIONAL | 22 | 332 | 6.6% | 15 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 283 | 3,277 | 8.6% | 173 | 57 | 53 | 220 | 34 | 23 | 6 |
| Department Total | 791 | 8,910 | 8.9% | 464 | 135 | 192 | 523 | 118 | 78 | 72 |

| Department of Higher Education: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|---|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| CUSTODIAN I | 122 | 1,026 | 11.9% | 72 | 35 | 15 | 105 | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT III | 57 | 834 | 6.8% | 39 | 7 | 11 | 44 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT II | 59 | 685 | 8.6% | 35 | 11 | 13 | 44 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| PROGRAM ASSISTANT I | 23 | 400 | 5.8% | 12 | 1 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| IT PROFESSIONAL | 22 | 332 | 6.6% | 15 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 283 | 3,277 | 8.6% | 173 | 57 | 53 | 220 | 34 | 23 | 6 |
| Department Total | 791 | 8,910 | 8.9% | 464 | 135 | 192 | 523 | 118 | 78 | 72 |

| Department of Higher Education: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|--------|---|-----|-----|-----|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| ADAMS STATE COLLEGE | 0 | 131 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ARAPAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE | 11 | 43 | 25.6% | 8 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| AURARIA HIGHER EDUCATION CTR | 0 | 265 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CO STATE UNIVERSITY - PUEBLO | 1 | 147 | 0.7% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| COLLEGE ASSIST | 0 | 1 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Department of Higher Education: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency

| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|---|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| COLO COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM | 6 | 52 | 11.5% | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES | 56 | 315 | 17.8% | 43 | 6 | 7 | 40 | 10 | 6 | 0 |
| COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY | 211 | 2,203 | 9.6% | 94 | 39 | 78 | 128 | 31 | 21 | 31 |
| COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF AURORA | 6 | 83 | 7.2% | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF DENVER | 10 | 64 | 15.6% | 9 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| CU - BOULDER | 218 | 2,365 | 9.2% | 134 | 36 | 48 | 142 | 33 | 21 | 22 |
| CU - COLORADO SPRINGS | 20 | 244 | 8.2% | 8 | 7 | 5 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| CU - SYSTEM OFFICES | 1 | 21 | 4.8% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FORT LEWIS COLLEGE | 0 | 112 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FRONT RANGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE | 20 | 228 | 8.8% | 8 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| LAMAR COMMUNITY COLLEGE | 3 | 16 | 18.8% | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| MESA STATE COLLEGE | 11 | 103 | 10.7% | 6 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE | 0 | 271 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MORGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE | 4 | 14 | 28.6% | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NORTHEASTERN JUNIOR COLLEGE | 3 | 27 | 11.1% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NORTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE | 3 | 22 | 13.6% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OTERO JUNIOR COLLEGE | 1 | 22 | 4.5% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PIKES PEAK COMMUNITY COLLEGE | 14 | 241 | 5.8% | 6 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| PRIVATE OCCUPATIONAL SCHOOL DV | 0 | 1 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PUEBLO COMMUNITY COLLEGE | 8 | 94 | 8.5% | 6 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| RED ROCKS COMMUNITY COLLEGE | 9 | 60 | 15.0% | 6 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY | 0 | 5 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TRINIDAD STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE | 0 | 32 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCD- DOWNTOWN | 0 | 144 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO DENVER | 113 | 970 | 11.6% | 69 | 19 | 25 | 71 | 21 | 10 | 11 |
| UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLO | 56 | 571 | 9.8% | 47 | 2 | 7 | 42 | 8 | 5 | 1 |
| WESTERN STATE COLLEGE | 6 | 70 | 8.6% | 4 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Department Total* | 791 | 8,937 | 8.9% | 464 | 135 | 192 | 523 | 118 | 78 | 72 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Human Services: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|---|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| CLIENT CARE AIDE II | 112 | 457 | 24.5% | 82 | 25 | 5 | 52 | 41 | 8 | 11 |
| CORR/YTH/CLIN SEC OFF I | 110 | 563 | 19.5% | 75 | 28 | 7 | 95 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| NURSE I | 79 | 333 | 23.7% | 58 | 13 | 8 | 69 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| HEALTH CARE TECH I | 78 | 458 | 17.0% | 56 | 16 | 6 | 64 | 7 | 2 | 5 |
| CUSTODIAN I | 37 | 176 | 21.0% | 25 | 9 | 3 | 32 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| Top Classes Total | 416 | 1,987 | 20.9% | 296 | 91 | 29 | 312 | 59 | 23 | 22 |
| Department Total | 939 | 5,849 | 16.1% | 590 | 184 | 165 | 600 | 152 | 97 | 90 |

| Department of Human Services: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|---|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| CORR/YTH/CLIN SEC OFF I | 110 | 563 | 19.5% | 75 | 28 | 7 | 95 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| HEALTH CARE TECH I | 78 | 458 | 17.0% | 56 | 16 | 6 | 64 | 7 | 2 | 5 |
| CLIENT CARE AIDE II | 112 | 457 | 24.5% | 82 | 25 | 5 | 52 | 41 | 8 | 11 |
| NURSE I | 79 | 333 | 23.7% | 58 | 13 | 8 | 69 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 30 | 263 | 11.4% | 13 | 4 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 14 |
| Top Classes Total | 409 | 2,074 | 19.7% | 284 | 86 | 39 | 288 | 66 | 21 | 34 |
| Department Total | 939 | 5,849 | 16.1% | 590 | 184 | 165 | 600 | 152 | 97 | 90 |

| Department of Human Services: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|---|------------|-----------|-----------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| COLO. MENT HEALTH INST F LOGAN | 48 | 299 | 16.1% | 27 | 8 | 13 | 27 | 6 | 10 | 5 |
| COLO. MENT HEALTH INST PUEBLO | 215 | 1,216 | 17.7% | 137 | 40 | 38 | 148 | 31 | 23 | 13 |
| DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES | 190 | 1,489 | 12.8% | 95 | 34 | 61 | 102 | 30 | 30 | 28 |
| DIRECTOR OF STATE NURSING HOME | 1 | 11 | 9.1% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DIV OF YOUTH CORRECTIONS | 157 | 1,083 | 14.5% | 105 | 32 | 20 | 115 | 16 | 12 | 14 |
| FITZSIMMONS STATE NURSING HOME | 63 | 316 | 19.9% | 47 | 14 | 2 | 29 | 15 | 9 | 10 |
| GRAND JUNCTION REGIONAL CTR | 55 | 335 | 16.4% | 35 | 12 | 8 | 42 | 8 | 4 | 1 |
| OBH-COMMUNITY BEHAVIORAL HLTH | 5 | 71 | 7.0% | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| PUEBLO REGIONAL CENTER | 26 | 209 | 12.4% | 15 | 10 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| RIDGE REGIONAL CENTER | 99 | 482 | 20.5% | 68 | 22 | 9 | 62 | 24 | 4 | 9 |
| STATE VET CENTER AT HOMELAKE | 16 | 95 | 16.8% | 8 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| VET NURSING HOME AT FLORENCE | 36 | 176 | 20.5% | 28 | 4 | 4 | 18 | 15 | 1 | 2 |
| VET NURSING HOME AT RIFLE | 28 | 121 | 23.1% | 21 | 5 | 2 | 16 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| WALSBURG VET NURSING HOME | 0 | 1 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Department Total* | 939 | 5,904 | 15.9% | 590 | 184 | 165 | 600 | 152 | 97 | 90 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Labor & Employment: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| LABOR/EMPLOYMENT SPEC I | 22 | 195 | 11.3% | 13 | 9 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LABOR/EMPLOYMENT SPEC II | 17 | 266 | 6.4% | 7 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| UNEMP INSURANCE TECH | 7 | 47 | 14.9% | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| LABOR/EMPLOY SPEC INT | 7 | 42 | 16.7% | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT II | 6 | 39 | 15.4% | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| LABOR/EMPLOYMENT SPEC III | 6 | 78 | 7.7% | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Top Classes Total | 65 | 667 | 9.7% | 31 | 16 | 18 | 50 | 5 | 3 | 7 |
| Department Total | 116 | 1,246 | 9.3% | 59 | 20 | 37 | 76 | 11 | 15 | 14 |

| Department of Labor & Employment: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| LABOR/EMPLOYMENT SPEC II | 17 | 266 | 6.4% | 7 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| LABOR/EMPLOYMENT SPEC I | 22 | 195 | 11.3% | 13 | 9 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LABOR/EMPLOYMENT SPEC III | 6 | 78 | 7.7% | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| UNEMP INSURANCE TECH | 7 | 47 | 14.9% | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 5 | 46 | 10.9% | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Top Classes Total | 57 | 632 | 9.0% | 27 | 12 | 18 | 41 | 4 | 5 | 7 |
| Department Total | 116 | 1,246 | 9.3% | 59 | 20 | 37 | 76 | 11 | 15 | 14 |

| Department of Labor & Employment: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| DEPT OF LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT | 116 | 1,246 | 9.3% | 59 | 20 | 37 | 76 | 11 | 15 | 14 |
| Department Total* | 116 | 1,246 | 9.3% | 59 | 20 | 37 | 76 | 11 | 15 | 14 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies

within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Law: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT II | 9 | 31 | 29.0% | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 |
| LEGAL ASSISTANT II | 6 | 46 | 13.0% | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| CRIMINAL INVESTIGATOR II | 2 | 27 | 7.4% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| IT PROFESSIONAL | 2 | 13 | 15.4% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| LEGAL ASSISTANT I | 2 | 5 | 40.0% | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 21 | 122 | 17.2% | 9 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 11 | 5 | 0 |
| Department Total | 25 | 190 | 13.2% | 10 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 1 |

| Department of Law: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| LEGAL ASSISTANT II | 6 | 46 | 13.0% | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT II | 9 | 31 | 29.0% | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 |
| CRIMINAL INVESTIGATOR II | 2 | 27 | 7.4% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| IT PROFESSIONAL | 2 | 13 | 15.4% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| PROGRAM ASSISTANT I | 1 | 10 | 10.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 20 | 127 | 15.7% | 9 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 6 | 0 |
| Department Total | 25 | 190 | 13.2% | 10 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 1 |

| Department of Law: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|----------|----------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| DEPARTMENT OF LAW | 25 | 190 | 13.2% | 10 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 1 |
| Department Total* | 25 | 190 | 13.2% | 10 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 1 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies

within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Local Affairs: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 6 | 30 | 20.0% | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| PROPERTY TAX SPEC II | 3 | 12 | 25.0% | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| TECHNICIAN III | 1 | 4 | 25.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL VII | 1 | 2 | 50.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN III | 1 | 2 | 50.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 12 | 50 | 24.0% | 7 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Department Total | 12 | 159 | 7.5% | 7 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 |

| Department of Local Affairs: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 6 | 30 | 20.0% | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| PROPERTY TAX SPEC II | 3 | 12 | 25.0% | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| TECHNICIAN III | 1 | 4 | 25.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL VII | 1 | 2 | 50.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN III | 1 | 2 | 50.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 12 | 50 | 24.0% | 7 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Department Total | 12 | 159 | 7.5% | 7 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 |

| Department of Local Affairs: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL AFFAIRS | 12 | 159 | 7.5% | 7 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Department Total* | 12 | 159 | 7.5% | 7 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies

within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Military & Veterans Affairs: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| CUSTODIAN I | 4 | 9 | 44.4% | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT II | 3 | 9 | 33.3% | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| PIPE/MECH TRADES II | 2 | 5 | 40.0% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| STRUCTURAL TRADES I | 2 | 9 | 22.2% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| ANG PATROL OFFICER I | 1 | 4 | 25.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| STRUCTURAL TRADES II | 1 | 12 | 8.3% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| EQUIPMENT MECHANIC II | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TRANSPORTATION MTC I | 1 | 6 | 16.7% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| CUSTODIAN III | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LTC OPERATIONS II | 1 | 2 | 50.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AIR TRAFFIC CONTRL II | 1 | 7 | 14.3% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PROGRAM ASSISTANT I | 1 | 4 | 25.0% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PROGRAM ASSISTANT II | 1 | 3 | 33.3% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ACCOUNTANT II | 1 | 2 | 50.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DESIGNER/PLANNER | 1 | 3 | 33.3% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 22 | 77 | 28.6% | 11 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| Department Total | 22 | 149 | 14.8% | 11 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 3 |

| Department of Military & Veterans Affairs: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|--------|---|-----|-----|-----|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| STRUCTURAL TRADES II | 1 | 12 | 8.3% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| STRUCTURAL TRADES I | 2 | 9 | 22.2% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| CUSTODIAN I | 4 | 9 | 44.4% | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT II | 3 | 9 | 33.3% | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| AIR TRAFFIC CONTRL II | 1 | 7 | 14.3% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------|------------|--------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Top Classes Total | 11 | 46 | 23.9% | 5 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Department Total | 22 | 149 | 14.8% | 11 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 3 |

| Department of Military & Veterans Affairs: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| DIVISION OF NATIONAL GUARD | 20 | 130 | 15.4% | 9 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| VETERANS AFFAIRS | 2 | 19 | 10.5% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Department Total* | 22 | 149 | 14.8% | 11 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 3 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

Department of Natural Resources: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations

| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| WILDLIFE MANAGER III | 9 | 183 | 4.9% | 2 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 |
| ENGR/PHYS SCI TECH II | 9 | 88 | 10.2% | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 8 | 52 | 15.4% | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT III | 6 | 72 | 8.3% | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| TECHNICIAN III | 5 | 68 | 7.4% | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 5 | 74 | 6.8% | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| PARK MANAGER II | 5 | 47 | 10.6% | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 47 | 584 | 8.0% | 29 | 4 | 14 | 14 | 7 | 9 | 17 |
| Department Total | 105 | 1,535 | 6.8% | 49 | 9 | 47 | 28 | 15 | 23 | 39 |

Department of Natural Resources: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class

| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| WILDLIFE MANAGER III | 9 | 183 | 4.9% | 2 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 |
| TECHNICIAN IV | 4 | 126 | 3.2% | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| ENGR/PHYS SCI TECH II | 9 | 88 | 10.2% | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 5 | 74 | 6.8% | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT III | 6 | 72 | 8.3% | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 33 | 543 | 6.1% | 17 | 1 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 16 |
| Department Total | 105 | 1,535 | 6.8% | 49 | 9 | 47 | 28 | 15 | 23 | 39 |

Department of Natural Resources: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency

| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| BOARD OF LAND COMMISSIONERS | 3 | 44 | 6.8% | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| DIV RECLAMATION, MINING, SAFETY | 6 | 70 | 8.6% | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES | 19 | 270 | 7.0% | 5 | 2 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| DNR - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR | 1 | 59 | 1.7% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OIL AND GAS CONSERVATION COMM | 13 | 102 | 12.7% | 10 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4 |
| PARKS AND WILDLIFE | 62 | 950 | 6.5% | 31 | 5 | 26 | 21 | 10 | 8 | 23 |
| WATER CONSERVATION BOARD | 1 | 44 | 2.3% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Department Total* | 105 | 1,539 | 6.8% | 49 | 9 | 47 | 28 | 15 | 23 | 39 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Personnel & Administration: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|----------|-----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 8 | 50 | 16.0% | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| PIPE/MECH TRADES II | 3 | 6 | 50.0% | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| CUSTODIAN I | 3 | 10 | 30.0% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CUSTODIAN III | 3 | 6 | 50.0% | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| PROGRAM ASSISTANT I | 3 | 13 | 23.1% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL V | 3 | 20 | 15.0% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| ACCOUNTANT I | 3 | 9 | 33.3% | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 26 | 114 | 22.8% | 20 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 2 |
| Department Total | 43 | 392 | 11.0% | 29 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 8 | 14 | 5 |

| Department of Personnel & Administration: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|----------|-----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 8 | 50 | 16.0% | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL V | 3 | 20 | 15.0% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| ADMIN LAW JUDGE II | 2 | 18 | 11.1% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| PRODUCTION II | 1 | 16 | 6.3% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TECHNICIAN IV | 2 | 14 | 14.3% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 16 | 118 | 13.6% | 10 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 4 |
| Department Total | 43 | 392 | 11.0% | 29 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 8 | 14 | 5 |

Department of Personnel & Administration: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency

| Department of Personnel & Administration: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|----------|-----------|----------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| ADDRESS CONFIDENTIALITY | 0 | 3 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CSEAP | 1 | 17 | 5.9% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DIV OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS | 2 | 41 | 4.9% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| DIV OF FINANCE AND PROCUREMENT | 7 | 69 | 10.1% | 6 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| DIVISION OF CENTRAL SERVICES | 17 | 178 | 9.6% | 9 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| DOP - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR | 2 | 19 | 10.5% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| EMPLOYEE BENEFITS | 1 | 11 | 9.1% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| HUMAN RESOURCE SERVICES | 6 | 18 | 33.3% | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT | 1 | 5 | 20.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| RISK MANAGEMENT SERVICES | 0 | 12 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STATE ARCHIVES | 2 | 10 | 20.0% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| STATE PERSONNEL BOARD | 1 | 6 | 16.7% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| TRAINING PROGRAMS | 3 | 6 | 50.0% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Department Total* | 43 | 395 | 10.9% | 29 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 8 | 14 | 5 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Public Health & Environment: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| HEALTH PROFESSIONAL III | 15 | 109 | 13.8% | 13 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 11 | 155 | 7.1% | 7 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 6 |
| HEALTH PROFESSIONAL IV | 10 | 65 | 15.4% | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| ENVIRON PROTECT SPEC II | 9 | 113 | 8.0% | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| ENVIRON PROTECT SPEC I | 7 | 43 | 16.3% | 5 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Top Classes Total | 52 | 485 | 10.7% | 35 | 3 | 14 | 6 | 9 | 16 | 21 |
| Department Total | 143 | 1,430 | 10.0% | 93 | 12 | 38 | 36 | 31 | 38 | 38 |

| Department of Public Health & Environment: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 11 | 155 | 7.1% | 7 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 6 |
| ENVIRON PROTECT SPEC II | 9 | 113 | 8.0% | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| HEALTH PROFESSIONAL III | 15 | 109 | 13.8% | 13 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4 |
| HEALTH PROFESSIONAL IV | 10 | 65 | 15.4% | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL V | 5 | 61 | 8.2% | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 50 | 503 | 9.9% | 34 | 1 | 15 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 20 |
| Department Total | 143 | 1,430 | 10.0% | 93 | 12 | 38 | 36 | 31 | 38 | 38 |

| Department of Public Health & Environment: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|--------|---|-----|-----|-----|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| DEPT OF PUB HLTH & ENVIRONMENT | 143 | 1,430 | 10.0% | 93 | 12 | 38 | 36 | 31 | 38 | 38 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Department Total* | 143 | 1,430 | 10.0% | 93 | 12 | 38 | 36 | 31 | 38 | 38 |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Public Safety: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| STATE PATROL TROOPER | 15 | 393 | 3.8% | 10 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| STATE PATROL TROOPER III | 8 | 217 | 3.7% | 1 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| POLICE COMMUNICATION TECH | 7 | 118 | 5.9% | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| PORT OF ENTRY I | 7 | 66 | 10.6% | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 6 | 73 | 8.2% | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 6 | 64 | 9.4% | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Top Classes Total | 49 | 931 | 5.3% | 24 | 8 | 17 | 24 | 16 | 2 | 7 |
| Department Total | 101 | 1,724 | 5.9% | 56 | 11 | 34 | 50 | 27 | 14 | 10 |

| Department of Public Safety: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| STATE PATROL TROOPER | 15 | 393 | 3.8% | 10 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| STATE PATROL TROOPER III | 8 | 217 | 3.7% | 1 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| POLICE COMMUNICATION TECH | 7 | 118 | 5.9% | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| STATE PATROL SUPERVISOR | 3 | 100 | 3.0% | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 6 | 73 | 8.2% | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Top Classes Total | 39 | 901 | 4.3% | 20 | 5 | 14 | 17 | 18 | 0 | 4 |
| Department Total | 101 | 1,724 | 5.9% | 56 | 11 | 34 | 50 | 27 | 14 | 10 |

| Department of Public Safety: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY | 101 | 1,724 | 5.9% | 56 | 11 | 34 | 50 | 27 | 14 | 10 |
| Department Total* | 101 | 1,724 | 5.9% | 56 | 11 | 34 | 50 | 27 | 14 | 10 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Regulatory Agencies: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT III | 4 | 69 | 5.8% | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL VI | 4 | 23 | 17.4% | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| FIN/CREDIT EXAMINER II | 4 | 35 | 11.4% | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 3 | 31 | 9.7% | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL V | 3 | 24 | 12.5% | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| FIN/CREDIT EXAMINER I | 3 | 11 | 27.3% | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| FIN/CREDIT EXAMINER III | 3 | 17 | 17.6% | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| RATE/FINANCIAL ANALYST IV | 3 | 26 | 11.5% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Top Classes Total | 27 | 236 | 11.4% | 14 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 4 | 5 |
| Department Total | 46 | 597 | 7.7% | 19 | 5 | 22 | 18 | 11 | 7 | 10 |

| Department of Regulatory Agencies: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT III | 4 | 69 | 5.8% | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III | 2 | 36 | 5.6% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| INSPECTOR III | 2 | 35 | 5.7% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| FIN/CREDIT EXAMINER II | 4 | 35 | 11.4% | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 3 | 31 | 9.7% | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Top Classes Total | 15 | 206 | 7.3% | 7 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Department Total | 46 | 597 | 7.7% | 19 | 5 | 22 | 18 | 11 | 7 | 10 |

Department of Regulatory Agencies: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency

| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|--------|---|-----|-----|-----|
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| ACCOUNTANCY BOARD | 0 | 3 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BARBERS & COSMETOLOGISTS BOARD | 0 | 4 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CHIROPRACTIC BOARD | 1 | 4 | 25.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION | 4 | 28 | 14.3% | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| DENTAL BOARD | 0 | 6 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DIRECTOR OF REGISTRATIONS | 3 | 88 | 3.4% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DIVISION OF BANKING | 10 | 43 | 23.3% | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| DIVISION OF FINANCIAL SERVICES | 0 | 14 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DIVISION OF INSURANCE | 4 | 96 | 4.2% | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| DIVISION OF REAL ESTATE | 5 | 54 | 9.3% | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DIVISION OF SECURITIES | 2 | 25 | 8.0% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| DORA - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR | 2 | 28 | 7.1% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ELECTRICAL BOARD | 2 | 38 | 5.3% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| ENGINEERS & LAND SURVEYORS BD | 0 | 5 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MASSAGE THERAPISTS | 0 | 1 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MEDICAL EXAMINERS BOARD | 1 | 15 | 6.7% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MENTAL HEALTH BOARDS | 0 | 7 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NURSING BOARD | 3 | 20 | 15.0% | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NURSING HOME ADMINISTRATORS BD | 0 | 4 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OFFICE OF BOXING | 0 | 1 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OFFICE OF CONSUMER COUNSEL | 1 | 8 | 12.5% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| OPTOMETRIC BOARD | 0 | 1 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OUTFITTERS BOARD | 0 | 1 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PASSENGER TRAMWAY SAFETY BOARD | 0 | 2 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PHARMACY BOARD | 0 | 8 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| PLUMBERS BOARD | 1 | 15 | 6.7% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION | 7 | 96 | 7.3% | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| VETERINARY MEDICINE BOARD | 0 | 1 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Department Total* | 46 | 616 | 7.5% | 19 | 5 | 22 | 18 | 11 | 7 | 10 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Revenue: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT II | 18 | 164 | 11.0% | 8 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| DRIVER'S LIC EXAM I | 15 | 64 | 23.4% | 14 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DRIVER'S LIC EXAM II | 13 | 92 | 14.1% | 11 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| TAX EXAMINER I | 12 | 110 | 10.9% | 9 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| DRIVER'S LIC EXAM III | 8 | 45 | 17.8% | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Top Classes Total | 66 | 475 | 13.9% | 46 | 8 | 12 | 43 | 7 | 10 | 6 |
| Department Total | 139 | 1,323 | 10.5% | 82 | 16 | 41 | 78 | 17 | 19 | 25 |

| Department of Revenue: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT II | 18 | 164 | 11.0% | 8 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| TAX EXAMINER I | 12 | 110 | 10.9% | 9 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| DRIVER'S LIC EXAM II | 13 | 92 | 14.1% | 11 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| CRIMINAL INVESTIGATOR I | 4 | 68 | 5.9% | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DRIVER'S LIC EXAM I | 15 | 64 | 23.4% | 14 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Top Classes Total | 62 | 498 | 12.4% | 44 | 7 | 11 | 43 | 5 | 10 | 4 |
| Department Total | 139 | 1,323 | 10.5% | 82 | 16 | 41 | 78 | 17 | 19 | 25 |

| Department of Revenue: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|--------|---|-----|-----|-----|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| REVENUE - ADMINISTRATION | 127 | 1,108 | 11.5% | 76 | 16 | 35 | 73 | 16 | 16 | 22 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| REVENUE - GAMING DIVISION | 8 | 91 | 8.8% | 5 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| STATE LOTTERY DIVISION | 4 | 127 | 3.1% | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Department Total* | 139 | 1,326 | 10.5% | 82 | 16 | 41 | 78 | 17 | 19 | 25 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Secretary of State: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL II | 4 | 17 | 23.5% | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| IT PROFESSIONAL | 3 | 30 | 10.0% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 2 | 10 | 20.0% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| ACCOUNTANT II | 2 | 2 | 100.0% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| TECHNICIAN I | 1 | 9 | 11.1% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| TECHNICIAN V | 1 | 2 | 50.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL V | 1 | 6 | 16.7% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BUDGET & POLICY ANLST III | 1 | 2 | 50.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 15 | 78 | 19.2% | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| Department Total | 15 | 135 | 11.1% | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 |

| Secretary of State: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| IT PROFESSIONAL | 3 | 30 | 10.0% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL II | 4 | 17 | 23.5% | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 2 | 10 | 20.0% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| TECHNICIAN I | 1 | 9 | 11.1% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL V | 1 | 6 | 16.7% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 11 | 72 | 15.3% | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Department Total | 15 | 135 | 11.1% | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 |

Secretary of State: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency

| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| DEPARTMENT OF STATE | 15 | 135 | 11.1% | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| Department Total* | 15 | 135 | 11.1% | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

State Auditor's Office: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations

| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR | 6 | 63 | 9.5% | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| IT TECHNICIAN | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Top Classes Total | 8 | 65 | 12.3% | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Department Total | 8 | 73 | 11.0% | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 |

State Auditor's Office: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class

| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR | 6 | 63 | 9.5% | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| IT TECHNICIAN | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Top Classes Total | 8 | 65 | 12.3% | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Department Total | 8 | 73 | 11.0% | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 |

State Auditor's Office: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency

| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| STATE AUDITOR | 8 | 73 | 11.0% | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Department Total* | 8 | 73 | 11.0% | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies

within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Transportation: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| TRANSPORTATION MTC I | 85 | 854 | 10.0% | 49 | 16 | 20 | 5 | 3 | 26 | 51 |
| EQUIPMENT OPERATOR III | 14 | 124 | 11.3% | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| TRANSPORTATION MTC II | 11 | 269 | 4.1% | 2 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT III | 11 | 84 | 13.1% | 5 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 10 | 146 | 6.8% | 7 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 2 |
| PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER I | 10 | 186 | 5.4% | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Top Classes Total | 141 | 1,663 | 8.5% | 75 | 21 | 45 | 14 | 33 | 36 | 58 |
| Department Total | 255 | 3,216 | 7.9% | 118 | 34 | 103 | 32 | 54 | 80 | 89 |

| Department of Transportation: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| TRANSPORTATION MTC I | 85 | 854 | 10.0% | 49 | 16 | 20 | 5 | 3 | 26 | 51 |
| TRANSPORTATION MTC II | 11 | 269 | 4.1% | 2 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 |
| PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER I | 10 | 186 | 5.4% | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV | 10 | 146 | 6.8% | 7 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 2 |
| EQUIPMENT OPERATOR III | 14 | 124 | 11.3% | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| Top Classes Total | 130 | 1,579 | 8.2% | 70 | 19 | 41 | 6 | 31 | 35 | 58 |
| Department Total | 255 | 3,216 | 7.9% | 118 | 34 | 103 | 32 | 54 | 80 | 89 |

| Department of Transportation: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | |
|---|-----------------|---|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | Separation Type | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range |

| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| COLO DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION | 255 | 3,216 | 7.9% | 118 | 34 | 103 | 32 | 54 | 80 | 89 |
| Department Total* | 255 | 3,216 | 7.9% | 118 | 34 | 103 | 32 | 54 | 80 | 89 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

| Department of Treasury: Job Class Turnover Rate by Number of Separations | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT I | 2 | 7 | 28.6% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 2 | 7 | 28.6% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Department Total | 2 | 31 | 6.5% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Department of Treasury: Job Class Turnover Rate by Total Employees in Class | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Class & Separations | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Class Title | Separations | Employees in Class | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| ADMIN ASSISTANT I | 2 | 7 | 28.6% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Top Classes Total | 2 | 7 | 28.6% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Department Total | 2 | 31 | 6.5% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Department of Treasury: Summary of Classified Staff Turnover for FY 2013-14 by Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|---|----------|----------|----------|
| FY 2013-14 Separations By Agency | | | | Separation Type | | | Employees in Quartile of Class Salary Range | | | |
| Agency | Separations | Total Employees | Turnover Rate | Voluntary | Involuntary | Retire | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| TREASURY - ADMINISTRATION | 2 | 31 | 6.5% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Department Total* | 2 | 31 | 6.5% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

*The "Total Employees" count may differ slightly between Department and Agency based reports. This is due to employees who are in multiple agencies within one department. In this scenario, the employee would be counted in each Agency's headcount, but only once in the Department's headcount.

**DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND PERA
FY 2015-16 JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE HEARING AGENDA**

**Thursday, December 11, 2014
9:00 am – 12:00 pm**

9:00-9:20 INTRODUCTIONS AND OPENING COMMENTS

9:20-9:50 QUESTIONS COMMON TO ALL DEPARTMENTS

(The following questions require both a written and verbal response.)

1. SMART Government Act:
 - a. Please describe how the SMART Government Act is being integrated into the Department's existing processes (both in terms of service delivery and evaluating performance).
 - b. How is the data that is gathered for the performance management system used?
 - c. Please describe the value of the Act in the Department.
2. Do you have infrastructure needs (roads, real property, information technology) beyond the current infrastructure request? If so, how do these needs fit in with the Department's overall infrastructure priorities that have been submitted to the Capital Development Committee or Joint Technology Committee? If infrastructure should be a higher priority for the Department, how should the Department's list of overall priorities be adjusted to account for it?
3. Describe the Department's experience with the implementation of the new CORE accounting system.
 - a. Was the training adequate?
 - b. Has the transition gone smoothly?
 - c. How has the implementation of CORE affected staff workload during the transition?
 - d. Do you anticipate that CORE will increase the staff workload on an ongoing basis? If so, describe the nature of the workload increase and indicate whether the Department is requesting additional funding for FY 2015-16 to address it.

9:50-10:20 DEPARTMENT OVERVIEW

4. Please provide background on the role of the State Personnel Board? What does the Board provide for the state personnel system? What authority does the Board have over the state personnel process? Is there a policy overlap with the General Assembly?

5. Please provide an organizational history of the Department within the executive branch? Has statewide personnel policy always been consolidated in this manner? Why do we have one centralized personnel (human resources) system over all departments?
6. Has there ever been a cost-benefit analysis of the property insurance program in regard to eliminating property insurance? Has an analysis been done to determine whether premiums paid for property insurance are worth what the insurance has provided in claims? Do we have property destruction events happen on a regular enough basis to need insurance? Do individual departments, such as Higher Education, insure their properties independently outside of the property insurance program? Should depreciation of capital assets be part of the property insurance discussion? If we have insurance do we really need depreciation to cover building maintenance? Is property insurance based on replacement value? If not, what is it based on? What is the replacement value of the Capitol? If it was destroyed, what materials could be used to rebuild it? Are there restrictions because it is a historical building? If so, how could we ever rebuild it? Would FEMA replace all our buildings if they were destroyed by a natural disaster? Please explain why or why not.
7. Can Fleet Management sell a portfolio of vehicles in a single sale to one buyer or do they have to have an actual auction of single vehicles? Are auctions conducted by private auction companies or are they conducted by state employees? Explain the auction process. Would it be beneficial to have statutory authority to sell a whole group of vehicles to one buyer as opposed to single vehicles to single buyers? Would that save money? How does Hertz dispose of vehicles?

10:20-11:15 BRIEFING ISSUES

Fleet Management CNG Break-even Analysis

8. Is the extra cost to drive to CNG fueling stations built into the methodology for the break-even analysis? Would it be better to allocate CNG vehicles based on where fueling stations are located?
9. What is CEOs opinion on this issue brief? What does DNR think of this? Will the departments who are under-utilizing CNG commit to increasing usage? What is the executive branch doing to increase usage of CNG in the vehicles as opposed to just purchasing the vehicles?
10. Does lowering of gas prices impact the break-even analysis?
11. How does the Department make the decision to request a given proportion of CNG vehicles in the total request? Does the Department take into account the availability of CNG stations in the area where the vehicles will be located? Who makes the policies on how and when a state employee should use CNG versus standard fuel in the alternative fuel vehicles? Why do employees choose not to use CNG in these vehicles? Has the department ever tried to determine this? If not, why not? Would a statutory change help to encourage more usage?

12. What is the Department's plan to increase CNG usage? What is the Department's opinion of the staff analysis?
13. Are the grants for CNG fueling stations primarily federal? Will they continue in the future or is the money drying up?

Cash Funds Excess Uncommitted Reserves Policy

14. If we were to implement the recommended changes would all the issues be resolved or would there still be issues?
15. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes.

Total Comp Request Overview

16. What is the status of the total compensation study that was funded last year? Was there a third party study for total compensation?
17. Please discuss the Total Compensation Request and provide an update on the HLD request.
18. Does the Department have plans to address the issue of narrowed salary ranges in which state employees are bumping up against the maximum, locked in by the maximum, and essentially unable to receive base increases due to this range narrowing? Please provide a brief history of this issue and if possible the cost to address this issue.

11:15-11:30 BREAK

11:30-11:40 PERA INTRODUCTION AND OPENING COMMENTS

11:40-12:00 PERA QUESTIONS

19. How does PERA's rate of return/discount rate compare to other STATE public pension plans not including other types of government pension plans? Is unfunded liability going up or down over time? If unfunded liabilities are not going down with a rate of return of 15.6 percent, how will they decline with a rate of return of 7.5 percent? Will GASB 67 and 68 make pension plans more risk-prone?
20. Does PERA have an opinion on how GASB Statement No. 67 may affect the assumed rate of return/discount rate? How might that change impact unfunded liabilities and the funded status? How soon will PERA need to incorporate GASB Statement No. 67 reporting requirements?
21. Why is the PERA statutory investment portfolio percentage limit for stocks set at 65 percent? Is this a risky level given the benefits that must be paid to retirees? What is the history of

investment portfolio mix requirements as they have been defined or provided for in statute or by PERA to address risk? Please describe PERA's investment portfolio strategy as it regards risk and return.

22. Do current normal yearly contributions – member and state contributions – fully fund the retirement liabilities generated over the year for state employee PERA members? If not, what is the projected percentage of current year liabilities that are being funded by the normal yearly contribution and how much should the normal yearly contribution rate increase to fully fund the liability? If not, why hasn't PERA requested an increase in the normal contribution rates for member and state contributions in order to fully fund current year liabilities? Or why hasn't PERA requested an adjustment to future member benefits that would be fully funded by normal yearly contributions? If not, what percentage of AED and SAED are for the purpose of fully funding liabilities generated due to the shortfall in normal yearly contributions and what percentage are for the purpose of back-filling or paying off the unfunded liabilities that were recognized at the point that AED and SAED were implemented? Are AED and SAED compensation provided to current state employees or are they payments made for underfunding PERA benefits for state employees in the past? If AED and SAED are intended to cover a shortfall in the normal yearly contribution for current state employees, why shouldn't that percentage be included directly in the normal yearly contribution rather than being lumped in with amortization payments intended to cover existing unfunded liabilities?
23. Is it true that PERA's is the largest unfunded liability in the state at this point?

ADDENDUM: OTHER QUESTIONS FOR WHICH SOLELY WRITTEN RESPONSES ARE REQUESTED

1. Provide a list of any legislation that the Department has: (a) not implemented or (b) partially implemented. Explain why the Department has not implemented or has partially implemented the legislation on this list.
2. What is the turnover rate for staff in the department? Please provide a breakdown by office and/or division, and program.
3. Please identify the following:
 - a. The department's most effective program;
 - b. The department's least effective program (in the context of management and budget);
 - c. Please provide recommendations on what will make this program (2.b.) more effective based on the department's performance measures.
4. How much capital outlay was expended using either operating funds or capital funds in FY 2013-14? Please break it down between the amount expended from operating and the amount expended from capital.

5. Does Department have any outstanding high priority recommendations as identified in the "Annual Report of Audit Recommendations Not Fully Implemented" that was published by the State Auditor's Office on June 30, 2014? What is the department doing to resolve the outstanding high priority recommendations?

[http://www.leg.state.co.us/OSA/coauditor1.nsf/All/1FE335CE3162803F87257D7E00550568/\\$FILE/1422S%20-%20ANNUAL%20REPORT%20OF%20AUDIT%20RECOMMENDATIONS%20NOT%20FULLY%20IMPLEMENTED%20AS%20OF%20JUNE%2030,%202014.pdf](http://www.leg.state.co.us/OSA/coauditor1.nsf/All/1FE335CE3162803F87257D7E00550568/$FILE/1422S%20-%20ANNUAL%20REPORT%20OF%20AUDIT%20RECOMMENDATIONS%20NOT%20FULLY%20IMPLEMENTED%20AS%20OF%20JUNE%2030,%202014.pdf)