

January 2013

Minnesota Local Government Pay Equity Compliance Report

**Submitted to the Minnesota Legislature by
Minnesota Management & Budget**

400 Centennial Office Building
658 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55155

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	1
About This Report	2
Section One Background Information	3
Section Two Tests for Compliance	5
Section Three Summary of Compliance Status of Local Governments	7
Section Four Jurisdictions Not in Compliance	10
Section Five Jurisdictions in Compliance for 2012 Reporting	13

Executive Summary

Minnesota Management & Budget (MMB) is responsible for the enforcement of the Local Government Pay Equity Act (Minnesota Statutes 471.991 - .999 and Minnesota Rules Chapter 3920).

In 2010 MMB completed a major project to upgrade the software local governments use to submit reports. The web-based software was used for the first time in 2011 by 500 local governments. By 2013 all 1,500 local governments will have used the new software to create and submit their reports. The new web-based application has proved to be highly efficient and has greatly reduced the staff time needed at both the local and state level.

The Local Government Pay Equity Act applies to about 1,500 local governments in Minnesota, and affects a total of about 220,000 local government employees. Jurisdictions are scheduled to report on a three-year cycle, meaning that MMB receives approximately 500 reports each year.

Overall, local governments have achieved a high level of compliance - both in meeting reporting requirements and implementing pay equity for their employees. The success of this program is largely attributable to the ongoing assistance and monitoring provided by the MMB Pay Equity Unit and to the commitment on the part of local governments.

In January 2012, 553 local governments were required to submit a report to MMB. As of December 24, 2012, a total of 402 (73%) of the jurisdictions were in compliance, 31 (6%) remain out of compliance and 120 (22%) are in a decision pending status.

While a jurisdiction may have achieved equitable compensation and be in compliance for one reporting cycle, this does not guarantee that all future reports will be in compliance. Therefore, it is important for local governments to continually review their pay structure and submit reports every three years to the State for review and analysis. This on-going requirement to report prevents regression into inequitable compensation practices and reduces sex-based wage disparities in public employment throughout Minnesota.

About This Report

Minnesota Management & Budget (MMB) is responsible for enforcement of the Local Government Pay Equity Act, and is required to submit an annual report to the state legislature regarding local government pay equity compliance. Minnesota Statute (M.S.) 471.999 states:

The report must include a list of the political subdivisions in compliance with section 471.992, subdivision 1, and the estimated cost of compliance. The report must also include a list of political subdivisions found by the commissioner to be not in compliance, the basis for that finding, recommended changes to achieve compliance, estimated cost of compliance, and recommended penalties, if any. The commissioner's report must include a list of subdivisions that did not comply with the reporting requirements of this section. The commissioner may request, and a subdivision shall provide, any additional information needed for the preparation of a report under this subdivision.

The 2013 annual Minnesota Local Government Pay Equity Report was prepared entirely by MMB staff as part of routine work assignments. This report is based on local jurisdiction pay equity reports due to MMB in 2012.

This document can be made available, upon request, in alternate formats such as large print, Braille or audiotape.

Questions regarding this report may be directed to (651) 201-8039.

Section One

Background Information

Requirements of the Law

The Local Government Pay Equity Act (LGPEA) of 1984 (M.S. 471.991 to 471.999) required local governments to “establish equitable compensation relationships” by December 31, 1991. Other common terms for “equitable compensation relationships” are “comparable worth” or “pay equity.” Compliance must be maintained and jurisdictions are periodically evaluated. Jurisdictions are on a three-year reporting cycle with approximately 500 jurisdictions reporting each year.

The purpose of the law is “to eliminate sex-based wage disparities in public employment in this state.” Equitable compensation relationships are achieved when “the compensation for female-dominated classes is not consistently below the compensation for male-dominated classes of comparable work value... within the political subdivision.”

The law requires MMB to determine whether local governments have achieved pay equity, based on implementation reports submitted by local governments.

Responsibilities of Minnesota Management & Budget

A. Pay Equity Rule Adopted

In 1991, the Legislature authorized MMB to adopt rules under the Administrative Procedures Act to assure compliance with the Local Government Pay Equity Act (Laws 1991, chapter 128, section 2).

That same year, MMB asked employer organizations, unions, and women's groups to name representatives to serve on a rulemaking advisory committee. This 30-member group met to discuss and review compliance guidelines and advise the department on the pay equity rule. MMB adopted the rule MCAR 3920, October 1992.

B. Assistance to Local Governments

In 1989, MMB established a full-time pay equity coordinator position. The coordinator has assisted local governments through extensive training, consultation, and analysis of their pay equity reports.

MMB has communicated through various means with the approximately 1,500 local governments required to comply with the law. The department has produced numerous free technical assistance publications available at no cost to the jurisdiction.

MMB has periodically offered training sessions, and thousands of individuals from local governments throughout the state have attended. MMB has also developed videos and DVDs explaining reporting requirements, compliance requirements and job evaluation methodology.

In 2010, MMB developed and launched a new highly efficient web-based software program to help jurisdictions submit reports, determine the underpayment of female job classes and calculate the results for several of the compliance tests. The new software replaces an older downloadable version and local government staff has indicated it is much more user-friendly. Several improvements to the program were made in both 2011 and 2012.

Pay Equity Implementation Activities for 2012

- **Analysis of Pay Equity Reports**

By the end of January 2012, 553 local jurisdictions were required to submit a Pay Equity Report to MMB. As of December 24, 2012, a total of 402 (73%) of the jurisdictions were in compliance, 31 (6%) remain out of compliance and 120 (22%) are in decision pending status. All jurisdictions that are out of compliance or with decision pending may need correction or clarification or other follow-up work. This may involve several preliminary reports and investigations to verify accuracy.

- **2012 Annual Report to Legislature**

Staff prepared the report to the legislature on the status of compliance and non-compliance regarding each local government.

- **Communication Regarding Non-Compliance**

Staff provides ongoing communication to jurisdictions regarding the need to submit updated reports to achieve compliance.

- **Consultation and Technical Assistance**

Provided consultation and technical assistance to jurisdictions that were found out of compliance and developed strategies to achieve compliance and avoid any potential penalties.

- **MMB Web Site**

Continue to maintain and update MMB's pay equity Web page and the State Job Match manual. The web page also includes pay equity reporting instructions, compliance requirements and pay equity analysis software. All are available on the web free of charge.

- **Cost Containment**

Extensive use of electronic communication between MMB and local governments instead of regular mail is part of the ongoing efforts to contain costs. This included the notice to report, notice of compliance, reporting and compliance requirements, and follow up communication regarding incomplete reports, inaccurate reports or reports not in compliance.

Section Two

Tests for Compliance

A. Tests for Compliance

The tests for compliance are summarized below. Complete details for each of the tests can be found in Minnesota Rules Chapter 3920. The “recommended action” after each is a brief overview of the general advice MMB gives to jurisdictions that did not pass a particular test. Reports to each jurisdiction are individualized and identify specific problems and requirements to pass the compliance test(s).

1. **Completeness and accuracy test (CA)** - determines whether jurisdictions have filed reports on time, included correct data and supplied all required information.

Recommended action: *Supply any required information not included in the report, make certain all data is correct and submit report by the required date.*

2. **Statistical analysis test (ST)** - compares salary data to determine if female classes are paid consistently below male classes of comparable work value (job points). Software is used to calculate this test. For smaller jurisdictions, the alternative analysis is used instead of the statistical analysis.

Recommended action: *Adjust salaries to reduce the number of female classes compensated below male classes of comparable value, or reduce the difference between the average compensation for male classes and female classes to the level where it is not statistically significant.*

3. **Alternative analysis test (ALT)** - compares salary data to determine if female classes are paid below male classes even though the female classes have similar or greater work value (job points). Also evaluates the compensation for female classes rated lower than all other classes to see if it is as reasonably proportionate to points as other classes.

Recommended action: *Eliminate the amount of the inequity identified between the salaries for female classes and male classes.*

4. **Salary range test (SR)** - compares the average number of years it takes for individuals in male and female classes to reach the top of a salary range. This test only applies to jurisdictions that have classes where there are an established number of years to move through salary ranges.

Recommended action: *Bring more consistency to the average number of years it takes to move through a salary range for male and female classes to meet the minimum standard for passing the test.*

-
5. **Exceptional service pay test (ESP)** - compares the number of male classes in which individuals receive longevity or performance pay above the maximum of the salary range to the number of female classes where this occurs. This test applies only to jurisdictions that provide exceptional service pay.

Recommended action: *Bring more consistency to the number of male and female classes receiving exceptional service pay to meet the minimum standard for passing the test.*

Section Three

Summary of Compliance Status of Local Governments

2012 Summary of Compliance Status by Jurisdictional Type December 24, 2012 – State Pay Equity Database for Local Jurisdictions

Jurisdiction Type	In Compliance	Out of Compliance	Decision Pending	Total
City	138	14	51	233
County	23	1	4	28
Schools	87	8	34	129
Soil & Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs)	22	0	9	31
Other Districts	34	3	17	54
Housing and Redevelopment Authorities (HRAs)	22	2	4	28
Townships	19	1	0	20
Utilities	14	0	1	15
Health Care Fac.	13	2	0	15
TOTAL	402	31	120*	553

*The State Pay Equity Coordinator retired in 2012. Minnesota Management & Budget is currently in the process of filling the vacancy. Therefore, a compliance determination is still pending for 120 local jurisdictions.

Compliance Status of 2012 Reports

In January 2012, 553 local governments were required to submit a report to MMB. As of December 24, 2012, a total of 402 (73%) of the jurisdictions were in compliance, 31 (6%) remain out of compliance and 120* (22%) are in a decision pending status.

Compliance Status of Reports as of December 24, 2012



*The State Pay Equity Coordinator retired in 2012. Minnesota Management & Budget is currently in the process of filling the vacancy. Therefore, a compliance determination is still pending for 120 local jurisdictions.

Inequities Identified in Pay Equity Reports

For the past several reporting years, MMB has examined the inequities found in jurisdictions that were not in compliance to determine how the wage gap between comparable male and female job classes changed after pay equity wage increases were given. This report includes examples of inequities that were found and corrected in some of the jurisdictions that were found out of compliance.

Inequities were identified in instances where females were paid less than males even though their job evaluation ratings indicated that the females should be paid at least equal to the males. In addition, disparities could not be accounted for by length of service or performance differences. For example, a female in the position of city clerk, rating of 275 points, was paid less than a male in a maintenance position with a rating of 213 points. The dollar amounts of such inequities were calculated and appear below.

Typical inequities in cities were found primarily between city clerks and maintenance workers. In schools, female classes of secretaries, food service workers and teacher aides were paid less than male classes such as custodians.

The examples below show that wages for females were adjusted an average of \$2.49 per hour or 16%. Before the inequities were corrected, the average pay for females in the examples was \$15.89 per hour. After adjustments were made, the average pay for females was \$18.37 per hour. Prior to the adjustments, females were paid 82% of what males were paid, but after the adjustments, the wage gap narrowed and females were paid 93% of what males were paid.

Examples of Inequities Identified in Pay Equity Reports

<i>Position</i>	<i>Hourly Wage "Before"</i>	<i>Hourly Wage "After"</i>	<i>Difference</i>
<i>Admin. Asst.</i>	14.44	22.86	8.42
<i>Bartender</i>	7.82	9.00	1.18
<i>Child Care Teacher</i>	11.07	13.62	2.55
<i>City Clerk/Treas.</i>	19.26	19.76	.50
<i>City Clerk/Treas.</i>	15.34	21.16	5.82
<i>Cook Helpers</i>	12.05	13.54	1.49
<i>Health Asst.</i>	15.47	16.23	.76
<i>Lead Cook</i>	16.63	16.97	.34
<i>Library Director</i>	19.67	22.86	3.19
<i>Media Assistant</i>	15.13	16.23	1.10
<i>Program Head</i>	17.72	18.86	1.14
<i>School Age Child Care</i>	18.84	20.86	2.02
<i>Secretary Elem</i>	23.14	26.98	3.84
Averages	\$15.89	\$18.37	\$2.49

Section Four

Jurisdictions Not in Compliance

A. Jurisdictions Not in Compliance

Based on status reports generated from the Minnesota Pay Equity Database on December 24, 2012, the jurisdictions listed below were out of compliance. This means the report was submitted after the deadline date or required information was missing or inaccurate. Some of the jurisdictions listed below received a “first notice of non-compliance”, but at this time no penalties have been assessed.

Jurisdictions

<p>Cities Arco Bigfork Bovey Clearwater Deerwood Delavan Foreston Gilman Goodridge Hadley Harris Holland Spring Valley Taylors Falls</p> <p>County Houston County</p> <p>Other Brown-Nicollet-Cottonwood Clean Carnelian Marine St. Croix Water. Southern Plains Education Coop</p>	<p>School Districts ISD No. 242 Alden-Conger ISD No. 314 Braham ISD No. 330 Heron Lake-Okaben ISD No. 345 New London-Spicer ISD No. 363 So. Koochiching/Rai ISD No. 403 Ivanhoe ISD No. 707 Nett Lake ISD No. 771 Chokio-Alberta</p> <p>HCF Avera Marshal Regional Med.Ctr Chippewa Co. Montevideo Hosp.</p> <p>HRA Morrison County HRA Redwood Falls HRA</p> <p>Townships Fair Haven Township</p>
--	--

B. Jurisdictions Not in Compliance – Second Notice of Non-Compliance

At this time there are no jurisdictions that have received a second notice of non-compliance with the Local Government Pay Equity Act and a notice that they are subject to a penalty. If there were any jurisdictions in this category, MMB would have specified the reason for non-compliance, recommended actions to achieve compliance and estimated the cost of achieving for compliance for each of these jurisdictions.

Prior to any penalties being assessed, a jurisdiction subject to a penalty would have had several opportunities to avoid such a notice including a first notice of non-compliance and a grace period to make corrections and achieve compliance. In addition, any non-compliant jurisdictions would have been:

- Warned that failure to achieve compliance by the end of the grace period would result in a second notice of non-compliance and a penalty notice. Also, that the penalty would be the greater of a 5% reduction in state aid or \$100 per day assessed from the original deadline for compliance and would continue until compliance was achieved.
- Advised of the reason they were found out of compliance, the results of the tests for compliance and an explanation of the results.
- Encouraged to contact MMB for technical assistance and review of potential salary and other adjustments to see if they would meet compliance requirements.
- Advised to request reconsideration if they wished to explain circumstances and ask for a reversal of MMB's decision, or request an extension of the grace period to achieve compliance.
- Sent a courtesy reminder letter from MMB 30 days prior to the end of their grace period reminding them of the deadline for achieving compliance and submitting a new report.

Any penalized jurisdiction would have had the option to request a suspension of the penalty and/or file a contested case appeal. Penalties may not be imposed while an appeal is pending.

The law allows MMB to consider the following factors when deciding whether to suspend any portion of a penalty: circumstances beyond a jurisdiction's control, severe hardship, non-compliance due to factors unrelated to gender, and steps the jurisdiction has taken to achieve compliance. Jurisdictions also have the option to submit a contested case appeal on the new penalty amounts.

Because penalties continue until compliance is achieved, jurisdictions that do not achieve compliance are subject to additional penalties. No penalties may be imposed until the end of the legislative session in which MMB submits a report listing a jurisdiction as not in compliance. MMB makes compliance decisions on an ongoing basis and updates the legislature annually.

C. Jurisdictions Not in Compliance – Penalties Resolved

A total of 96 penalty cases have been resolved over the past 15 years resulting in \$1,267,851.00 in total restitution paid to approximately 1300 employees for past inequities. A total of \$210,233 has been collected in penalties. The penalties go to the general fund and not to MMB.

Section Five

Jurisdictions in Compliance for 2012 Reporting

Cities

Afton
Aitkin
Albany
Albertville
Alexandria
Altura
Amboy
Argyle
Austin
Balaton
Baxter
Bayport
Beardsley
Belview
Benson
Bertha
Big Lake
Birchwood Village
Bird Island
Biscay
Biwabik
Blue Earth
Boyd
Brandon
Brewster
Brownsdale
Callaway
Calumet
Canton
Carlos
Cass Lake
Chandler
Chanhasen
Chisholm
City of Comfrey
Claremont
Clarissa
Clear Lake
Cloquet
Conger
Corcoran
Crookston
Crosslake
Danube
Dawson
Deephaven
Detroit Lakes
Dodge Center
Donnelly
Eagle Lake
East Bethel
East Grand Forks
Eden Prairie
Elbow Lake
Emily
Emmons
Erhard

Fairfax
Finlayson
Foley
Forest Lake
Franklin
Fulda
Gary
Gaylord
Geneva
Glenville
Gonvick
Goodhue
Goodview
Grand Rapids
Greenfield
Grey Eagle
Grygla
Hallock
Hamburg
Hartland
Hastings
Hayward
Heron Lake
Hilltop
Hoffman
Hokah
Isanti
Janesville
Jasper
Jeffers
Jordan
Kandiyohi
Kellogg
La Prairie
Lewisville
Littlefork
Lonsdale
Luverne
Lynd
Madelia
Madison
Madison Lake
Mahnomon
Maple Grove
Maplewood
Marietta
McGregor
Medina
Menahga
Mendota Heights
Middle River
Milaca
Minneapolis
Minnesota Lake
Minnetrissa
Mound
Northfield

Nowthen
Okabena
Olivia
Osakis
Osseo
Otsego
Ottertail
Palisade
Perham
Pierz
Pillager
Pipestone
Plummer
Plymouth
Proctor
Ramsey
Red Wing
Richfield
Roseau
Rothsay
Royalton
Rushford
Rushmore
Ruthton
Shelly
Shorewood

Silver Lake
South Haven
Spring Lake Park
St. Charles
Stacy
Stephen
Stewartville
Storden
Tracy
Twin Valley
Ulen
Upsala
Vernon Center
Vesta
Waldorf
Walters
Warren
Watertown
Waterville
Watson
Waverly
Welcome
White Bear Lake
Wilmont
Wolf Lake
Wolverton
Worthington
Wyoming

Counties

Blue Earth County
Chisago County
Clay County
Dakota County
Faribault County
Freeborn County
Hubbard County
Jackson County
Kandiyohi County
Kittson County
Koochiching County
Le Sueur County

Mille Lacs County
Pennington County
Ramsey County
Rice County
Roseau County
Stevens County
Swift County
Traverse County
Washington County
Watonwan County
Winona County

Health Care Facilities

Cook-Orr Health Care District
Douglas County Hospital
Heritage Living Center
Lakewood Health System
Norman-Mahnomen Public Health
Ortonville Area Health Service
Paynesville Area Health Care System
Redwood Area Hospital
Rice County District One Hospital
Sleepy Eye Medical Center
Stevens-Traverse-Grant Public
Swift County Benson Hospital
United Hospital District

Housing and Redevelopment Authorities

Austin HRA
Barnesville HRA
Big Stone County HRA
Carver County CDA
Chisholm HRA
Cloquet HRA
Duluth HRA
East Grand Forks EDHA
International Falls HRA
Luverne HRA
Mora HRA
Mountain Lake HRA
North Mankato HRA
Northwest Multi-County HRA
Pequot Lakes HRA
Red Lake Falls HRA
SE Minnesota Multi-County HRA
Sleepy Eye HRA

Tracy HRA
Washington County HRA
Willmar HRA
Worthington HRA

Independent School Districts

ISD No. 108 - Norwood
ISD No. 116 - Pillager
ISD No. 12 - Centennial
ISD No. 138 - North Branch Area Schools
ISD No. 139 - Rush City
ISD No. 15 - St. Francis
ISD No. 162 - Bagley
ISD No. 200 - Hastings
ISD No. 207 - Brandon
ISD No. 2071 - Lake Crystal-W
ISD No. 2125 - Triton
ISD No. 2135 - Maple River
ISD No. 2137 - Kingsland Publi
ISD No. 2149 - Minnewaska
ISD No. 2154 - Eveleth-Gilbert
ISD No. 2164 - Dilworth- Glyndon-F
ISD No. 2165 - Hinckley- Finlayson
ISD No. 2167 - Lakeview
ISD No. 2168 - NRHEG
ISD No. 2169 - Murray County Central
ISD No. 2170 - Staples-Motley
ISD No. 2171 - Kittson Central
ISD No. 22 - Detroit Lakes
ISD No. 2215 - Norman County East
ISD No. 227 - Chatfield
ISD No. 2365 - GFW Gibbon-Fairfax
ISD No. 2527 - Norman Co. West
ISD No. 2580 - East Central
ISD No. 261 - Ashby
ISD No. 264 - Herman-Norcross
ISD No. 2689 - Pipestone- Jasper
ISD No. 270 - Hopkins
ISD No. 273 - Edina
ISD No. 276 - Minnetonka
ISD No. 281 - Robbinsdale
ISD No. 283 - St. Louis Park
ISD No. 2835 - Janesville- Waldorf-
ISD No. 2860 - Blue Earth Area SchoBolluse Earth
ISD No. 2889 - Lake Park- Audubon-Lake Park
ISD No. 2895 - Jackson County Central
ISD No. 2903 - Ortonville
ISD No. 294 - Houston
ISD No. 300 - LaCrescent- Hokah
ISD No. 31 - Bemidji
ISD No. 317 - Deer River
ISD No. 332 - Mora
ISD No. 36 - Kelliher
ISD No. 4 - McGregor
ISD No. 404 - Lake Benton
ISD No. 413 - Marshall
ISD No. 414 - Minneota
ISD No. 432 - Mahnomen
ISD No. 447 - Grygla/Gatzke
ISD No. 463 - Eden Valley- Watkin
ISD No. 482 - Little Falls
ISD No. 484 - Pierz
ISD No. 511 - Adrian
ISD No. 531 - Byron

ISD No. 553 - New York Mills
ISD No. 578 - Pine City
ISD No. 592 - Climax-Shelly
ISD No. 593 - Crookston
ISD No. 599 - Fertile-Beltrami
ISD No. 6 - South St. Paul
ISD No. 600 - Fisher
ISD No. 601 - Fosston
ISD No. 628 - Plummer
ISD No. 630 - Red Lake Falls
ISD No. 659 - Northfield
ISD No. 671 - Hills- Beaver Creek
ISD No. 676 - Badger
ISD No. 682 - Roseau
ISD No. 700 - Hermantown
ISD No. 709 - Duluth
ISD No. 712 - Mountain Iron- Buhl
ISD No. 727 - Big Lake
ISD No. 728 - Elk River
ISD No. 761 - Owatonna
ISD No. 77 - Mankato
ISD No. 787 - Browerville
ISD No. 801 - Browns Valley
ISD No. 820 - Sebeka
ISD No. 834 - Stillwater
ISD No. 837 - Madelia
ISD No. 846 - Breckenridge
ISD No. 850 - Rothsay
ISD No. 99 - Esko

Others

Arrowhead Library System
Arrowhead Regional Development
Bemidji Regional Interdistrict Council
Clear Lake/Clearwater Sewer Authority
Dakota Communications Center
Duluth Entertainment & Convention Center
East Central Regional Development
East Central Solid Waste Commission
Great River Regional Library
Heron Lake Watershed District
Human Services of Faribault and M
Kitchigami Regional Library
Lac Qui Parle-Yellow Bank Watershed District
Metronet
Metropolitan Airports Commission
Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission
Mid-Minnesota Development Commission
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District
Nine Mile Creek Watershed District
North Country Library Cooperative
Northern Lights Library Network
Northwest Hennepin Human Services
Northwest Regional Development Commission
NW Regional Inter-District Council

Okabena-Ocheda Watershed District
Pelican River Watershed District
Pine to Prairie Cooperative Center
Pipestone County Economic Development Authority
Prairieland Joint County Compost
Prior Lake - Spring Lake Watershed District
Public Safety Department of Amboy
Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District
Redwood-Cottonwood Rivers Cont
Two Rivers Watershed District

Soil and Water Conservation Districts

Beltrami SWCD
Benton County SWCD
Blue Earth County SWCD
Clearwater SWCD
Douglas SWCD
Hubbard County SWCD
Lyon County SWCD
Martin SWCD
Mille Lacs SWCD
Nicollet SWCD
Nobles SWCD
Pipestone County SWCD
Red Lake County SWCD
Redwood County SWCD
Root River SWCD
Sherburne SWCD
Sibley County SWCD
Steele County SWCD
Todd SWCD
West Ottertail SWCD
Wilkin SWCD
Winona County SWCD

Towns

Franklin Township
Ideal Township
Joint Powers Board
Krain Township
LaGrande Township
Laketown Township
Linwood Township
Maple Lake Township
Marysville Township
Middleville Township
Northern Township
Oaklawn Township
Pokegama Township
Rockford Township
Shingobee Township
Silver Creek Township
Stanford Township
White Township
York Township

Utilities

Alexandria Light & Power
Austin Utilities
Bagley Public Utilities Commission
Bovey-Coleraine Water & Waste Water Commission
Farwell Kensington Sanitary District
Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission
Madelia Municipal Light & Power
Marshall & Polk Rural Water System
Moorhead Public Service Department
Moose Lake Water and Light Comm
Owatonna Public Utilities
Sauk Centre Public Utilities
Utilities Plus
Wells Public Utilities Department