## March 31, 2023

The Honorable Melissa Hortman

Speaker of the House of Representatives
The Honorable Bobby Joe Champion
President of the Senate

## Re: Compensation Council Recommendations

Dear Madam Speaker and Mr. President:
In accordance with the duties assigned to it by Minnesota Statutes, section 15A. 082 (currently in force), to make recommendations to the Legislature on the appropriate levels of salaries for Minnesota's top governmental officials, the Minnesota Compensation Council (Council) held 4 hearings, received oral testimony and written submissions from interested parties, and engaged in extended deliberations. The Council requests that you strongly consider the recommendations in the report and would welcome the opportunity to present the report before the legislative committees with jurisdiction over the budgets for constitutional officers, agency heads, and the courts.

In addition to providing the statutorily-required recommendations, and given the unique history of compensation of Constitutional Officers in Minnesota, this report also provides some additional background and further recommendations for consideration and possible legislative action.

## Background

The Compensation Council, which is convened every odd-numbered year, recommends salaries for Minnesota's Constitutional Officers and all Justices and Judges in Minnesota's court system. The Council also recommends salary limits for the Commissioners of state departments and the heads of certain Metropolitan agencies appointed by the Governor.

By law, the Compensation Council is a bipartisan committee composed of members appointed by both the Governor and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The Council has a long tradition of working collaboratively and reaching consensus in focused deliberations.

The statute that establishes the Compensation Council specifically provides that we consider "the amount of compensation paid in government service and the private sector to persons with similar qualifications, the amount of compensation needed to attract and retain experienced and competent persons, and the ability of the state to pay the recommended compensation." As we demonstrate in our report, we carefully considered these elements in making our findings and recommendations set forth below.

Our Constitutional Officers, Judges, and the Agency Heads lead our government in Minnesota. It is important that the individuals who serve in these roles be of the highest caliber. This Council, like
others before it, believes that a fair and adequate compensation system is an important element in ensuring that good candidates will seek and serve in these offices.

## Findings

## Constitutional Officers

The 2021 Legislature did not act on the recommendation of the 2021 Council to increase the salary for Minnesota's governor, or to increase the salaries of our other Constitutional Officers. In fact, numerous Compensation Councils that have met since 2001 have recommended modest increases to the salaries of Minnesota's Constitutional Officers to satisfy the statutory criteria of attracting and retaining competent persons and keeping pace with comparable private-sector positions. Despite those repeated recommendations, the Governor and other Constitutional Officer's salaries have been increased in only one biennium (2015-2016) since 2003. As a result, those salaries have lagged behind cost of living increases by over $50 \%$ for that period.

## Governor

The Governor is responsible for managing the Executive Branch with approximately 55,000 employees and overseeing a biennial state budget of over $\$ 55$ billion from the General Fund. According to a 2022 survey by the Council of State Governments, the salary of Minnesota's governor was ranked $37^{\text {th }}$ nationally, compared to $13^{\text {th }}$ in 2003, the last time substantial action was taken on Constitutional Officer salaries.

While Minnesota does not compete nationally for governor candidates, our decreased ranking indicates that other states have taken action to recognize that governors and other elected officials should be paid salaries commensurate with their responsibilities. Three of the four states surrounding Minnesota pay higher salaries to their governors. See attachment 2.

The Council recognizes that there are certainly non-monetary considerations that motivate candidates to run for the highest executive offices in the state. However, the natural consequence of the increasing compensation gap is that candidates who have greater personal financial constraints will likely not run for office.

## Attorney General

The Attorney General is the State's chief legal officer; plays a key role in litigation defending challenges against the State and seeking to enforce the State's interests; provides legal advice affecting all parts of State and local government; handles criminal prosecutions across the State on behalf of counties; and is often involved in constitutional and other legal dealings with other states and the federal government. The Attorney General oversees legal work for one hundred state agencies and boards and handles over 7,000 open legal files per year. The Attorney General manages an operating budget of approximately $\$ 46$ million and an office of over 335 employees. The Attorney General serves on the State Executive Council.

These salaries have been used for comparisons:

| Chief Judge, MN Supreme Court | $\$ 210,497$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Hennepin County Attorney | $\$ 195,065$ |
| Ramsey County Attorney | $\$ 185,004$ |
| Stearns County Attorney | $\$ 200,872$ |
| Minnesota State General Counsel | $\$ 195,000$ |
| U.S. Attorney (2021 data) | $\$ 172,394$ |
| Minnesota Attorney General | $\$ 121,248$ |

In 2021, the Attorney General's Office reported that he is compensated less than 37 managerial and supervisory attorneys in their own office. In 2023, the Office reports that there are 28 managers and 51 attorneys who earn salaries higher than the Attorney General.

## State Auditor

The Office of the State Auditor oversees local government financial activity in Minnesota by performing audits of local government financial statements and by reviewing documents, data, reports, and complaints reported to the Office. This Office is responsible for overseeing the finances of approximately 3,300 local units of government. The State Auditor manages an operating budget of approximately $\$ 13$ million and employs 72 staff.

The responsibilities of the Office include:

- Providing oversight of over $\$ 60$ billion in spending by local governments in Minnesota.
- Performing financial, compliance and petition audits; and, review and compare reporting forms to financial statements.
- Investigating allegations of misuse of public funds.
- Serving as a resource for local governments.
- Providing oversight of approximately 600 local firefighter pension plans.

In addition, the State Auditor serves on the State Executive Council, the State Board of Investment, Land Exchange Board, Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, Public Employees Retirement Association, and the Rural Finance Authority Board.

In comparison, the Office of the Legislative Auditor, in the Legislative Branch, is responsible for conducting financial audits of the Executive Branch and preparing extensive evaluations of state agency programs. That Office has approximately 65 staff, and an operating budget of approximately $\$ 8$ million. The Legislative Auditor's salary is approximately $\$ 183,264$ which is $\$ 74,779$ greater than the State Auditor's salary.

## Secretary of State

The Secretary of State deals extensively with the administration of critical election laws and with business and corporate filing involving many important parts of the state's economy, relied on by citizens and businesses throughout the State. This Office has an operating budget of about \$17 million, and 94 staff. The Secretary of State serves on the State Executive Council.

The scope of the Office of the Secretary of State is broad:

- The Business Office processes over 485,000 business filings each year.
- The Office is a net revenue generator, contributing $\$ 27$ million in revenue to the state's General Fund each year.
- The Secretary manages the state elections system. In the last presidential election, over 3.3 million citizens voted, representing a nation-leading $79 \%$ turnout. In 2022, over 2.5 million voters voted in Minnesota with a $61 \%$ voter turnout, representing the third highest voter turnout in the nation.
- The Secretary and staff provide oversight of increasingly complex and serious security threats to our state's election systems.
- The Office implements the Safe at Home program, which permits Minnesotans who need to protect the location of their home to receive mail through the Office.

The scope of the Office has increased substantially:

- Since 2002, the biennial general fund operating budget has increased from $\$ 14.4$ million to $\$ 17$ million, an increase of $18 \%$.
- Over the same period, the revenue generated by the Office, returned to the General Fund, has increased from $\$ 9$ million to $\$ 27$ million, an increase of $200 \%$.
- The number of registered voters has increased from 2.9 million to 3.9 million, an increase of 35\%.
- Starting in 2004, the Office took on the federally mandated task of developing and maintaining the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS). The SVRS began as a basic system to house registration information on 2.9 million voters and has now grown into an indispensable tool for election administrators and the public where 3.9 million voters are able to:
- look up their voter registration information;
- find polling places and precincts;
- apply for absentee ballots to be mailed and track their ballots status; and
- have ballots emailed if they were living overseas or serving in the military.
- Business filings have more than doubled in the past two decades, increasing from about 250,000 business services filings in 2003 to 600,000 in 2021.

While the size of the Secretary of State's office and budget and the scope of responsibilities are comparable to that of the State Auditor, the salary of the Secretary of State is $\$ 13,123$ less than that of the State Auditor and $\$ 87,542$ less than that of the Legislative Auditor.

## Lieutenant Governor

The Lieutenant Governor handles a variety of functions assigned by the Governor and would become the State's chief executive should the Office of the Governor become vacant.

The Lieutenant Governor serves several capacities:

- Member of the State Executive Council
- Vice-chair of the State Capitol Preservation Commission
- Chair of the Capitol Area Architectural Planning Board

The Lieutenant Governor in many ways operates as chief deputies of state agencies do, convening meetings on behalf of the Governor, assisting the Governor with policy development and implementation, and representing the Governor at meetings and events.

The Council also reviewed salaries paid to Constitutional Officers in other states. See Attachment 3 for a comparison with these officials in neighboring states.

## Judicial Branch

The 2021 Legislature increased the salaries of the judiciary by $2.5 \%$ in July 2021, which was substantially less than the amount recommended by the 2021 Council.

Our Council reviewed extensive written material and heard testimony from the Minnesota District Judges Association (MDJA) concerning compensation, pension, and other benefits. Data collected by the Council indicate:

- While Minnesota does not compete with other states for its judges, it is relevant to examine the ranking of the salaries paid to Minnesota's judiciary compared to other states. Salaries
of district court judges have slipped to the bottom half when compared nationally. District court judges now rank $26^{\text {th }}$, compared to $24^{\text {th }}$ in 2021 and 2018. A copy of the national survey is included as Attachment 4.
- Numerous county and assistant attorneys earn higher salaries than the salary of District Court judges (\$169,264):


## County attorneys ${ }^{1}$

| Carver | $\$ 192,982$ | Beltrami | $\$ 129,084$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Chisago | $\$ 146,142$ | Kanabec | $\$ 136,115$ |
| Dakota | $\$ 220,775$ | Mower | $\$ 149,000$ |
| Hennepin | $\$ 195,065$ | Olmsted | $\$ 188,859$ |
| Ramsey | $\$ 185,004$ | St. Louis | $\$ 174,117$ |
| Scott | $\$ 194,378$ | Stearns | $\$ 200,872$ |

## Assistant County attorneys ${ }^{1}$

| Carver | $\$ 158,475$ | Beltrami | $\$ 118,373$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Chisago | $\$ 96,424$ | Kanabec | $\$ 96,990$ |
| Dakota | $\$ 197,120$ | Mower | $\$ 105,942$ |
| Hennepin | $\$ 192,144$ | Olmsted | $\$ 171,240$ |
| Ramsey | $\$ 175,331$ | St. Louis | $\$ 149,094$ |
| Scott | $\$ 169,979$ | Stearns | $\$ 182,997$ |

- Private sector attorneys regularly earn more than judges (the $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile reflects the median):


## Private sector attorneys

|  | 25 th percentile | $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile | $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lawyer, 10+ years' experience | $\$ 141,240$ | $\$ 171,468$ | $\$ 197,950$ |
| Lawyer, 4-9 years' experience | $\$ 107,268$ | $\$ 136,960$ | $\$ 169,595$ |
| Lawyer, 2-3 years' experience | $\$ 96,835$ | $\$ 121,980$ | $\$ 149,800$ |
| First year Lawyer | $\$ 80,518$ | $\$ 98,975$ | $\$ 128,400$ |

In their testimony on behalf of MDJA, Judge Lois Conroy and Paul Peterson, President of the Minnesota State Bar Association, expressed a concern that if judicial salaries continue to stagnate, it will be difficult to attract a diverse and high-quality pool of candidates from both the public and private sectors. They further noted that in certain judicial districts the number of well-qualified candidates for judicial openings has been very limited. Judge Conroy testified that one search process for a District County Judge vacancy in Greater Minnesota yielded only six candidates. The judges contend salaries are one of the significant reasons for the limited number of applicants.

Testimony by the judges indicated that more candidates come from the public sector, with declining numbers from the private sector, likely due to the limited compensation opportunities for judges. The 2021 MDJA consultants' report indicated that while median salaries for ten-year private

[^0]sector attorneys are comparable, private sector attorneys have significantly more opportunity for income growth: the $95 \%$ percentile for attorneys is $\$ 250,000$. An attorney on the Council stated that starting salaries for new attorneys at larger law firms are higher than salaries for Minnesota's judges, which do not increase based on years of experience. The Compensation Council shares the view that the judiciary should reflect a broad range of experience and perspectives, and that a small pool of candidates from only one part of the legal community should be a serious concern for the future of the state's judiciary.

The MDJA conducted a survey of its members, which resulted in numerous important findings:

- $33 \%$ of judges reported that when they were appointed, there were ten or fewer applicants. A judge reported that when appointed in 2008, there were 55 applicants.
- $23 \%$ of judges reported they were exploring other jobs outside of the Judicial Branch, while $42 \%$ reported they had been recruited for jobs outside the Judicial Branch.

The Council also heard testimony from Jeff Shorba, State Court Administrator, who explained the Judicial Council's work in developing the Courts' biennial budget proposal. This proposal is premised on all members of the judiciary and staff receiving salary increases of $9 \%$ in FY 24, and then judges receiving a $6 \%$ salary increase and staff receiving a $6 \%$ compensation pool in FY 25 . The Judicial Council consists of 19 judges and six administrators from throughout the Court system. Thirteen of the judges are district court judges.

## Agency Head Salary Limits

While the 2021 Council made no recommendations regarding agency head salaries, the 2017 and 2019 Councils recommended that the agency head salary limits be de-coupled from the salary of the Governor. The 2019 Council recommended an evaluation of the salary relationships of heads of state agencies. No action has been taken by the Legislature on any of these recommendations.

Currently, salary ranges continue to be adjusted for inflation by Minnesota Management and Budget, as provided in the statute. The maximum of the range for most agencies is $\$ 212,466$, while the highest salary level paid in that range is $\$ 154,992$. As a result, there is a gap of over $\$ 57,474$, so that the Governor could propose significant salary increases without adjusting the ranges.

Agency head salary ranges are assigned to three groups. Previous Councils have pointed out that there are only limited differences in salaries for agency heads in Group I, where most state agency heads are assigned. However, there are substantial differences in sizes of these agencies in terms of budgets and staff size, and the complexity of programs administered. Some Commissioners head agencies with less than 100 employees and are paid $\$ 145,000$. Other Commissioners have 4,000 to 7,000 employees and are paid a salary of only $\$ 10,000$ more. There are similar incongruities when reviewing agency budgets for these same Commissioners, which range from almost $\$ 26$ billion to under $\$ 550$ million.

In testimony, MMB Commissioner Schowalter recommends that the Council consider:

- Decouple agency head salary ranges from the Governor's salary.
- Increase agency head salaries to the level they would have been had they received the same across the board increases received by state employees since 2015, approximately $17 \%$. These increases can be supported within the existing salary ranges.
- Increase agency head salaries each July by the same across the board increases received by state employees.
- Increase the salary of the Metropolitan Airports Commission chair to $\$ 60,000$.
- Align the salary of the Commissioner of MNIT and the Commissioner of the State Lottery with those of other state agencies.

Attachment 5 shows the current salary limits and salaries for heads of state agencies.

## Budget considerations

MMB's February forecast estimates a surplus of $\$ 17.5$ billion for the 2024-2025 biennium. The Council considered several elements regarding the forecast during its deliberations:

- The forecast has been amended to include the impact of inflation on the cost of Stateprovided services.
- MMB has indicated that due to a number of variables, such as the recession and the war in Ukraine, the state of the economy is difficult to predict.


## Recommendations

In accordance with Minnesota Statutes, section 15A. 082 as currently in effect, the Compensation Council makes the following recommendations:

1. Salaries for the Judiciary. We recommend that salaries of judges be increased by:
a) $9.0 \%$ effective July 1,2023
b) $6.0 \%$ effective July 1,2024

In reaching this conclusion, the Council notes that:

- The 2021 Legislature enacted only a single increase of $2.5 \%$, not keeping judges whole with respect to inflation, and less than across the board increases received by state employees.
- Salaries of judges are now less than the median salary of private sector attorneys with ten years of experience. A 2021 study shows that at higher salary percentiles, private sector attorneys pay is over two times what judges may earn, since all judges are paid the same amount.
- Many county attorneys earn more than District Court Judges before whom they regularly appear. There are now numerous assistant county attorneys around the State whose pay is higher than District Court Judges.
- Salaries of Minnesota's District Court Judges ranked $26^{\text {th }}$ nationally in 2022, a decline from 2018, when Minnesota ranked $19^{\text {th }}$.


## 2. Salaries of Constitutional Officers.

A. We recommend that the salaries of the Attorney General, Secretary of State, State Auditor and Lieutenant Governor be de-coupled from that of the Governor. Each officer is separately elected by the people of Minnesota. We also recommend that the salaries of the other Constitutional Officers not exceed that of the Governor. This limit should be established in state statute.
B. We recommend that salaries of Constitutional Officers:

1. Be increased by $9.0 \%$ effective July 1,2023 ;
2. Be increased by $7.5 \%$ effective July 1,2024 ; and
3. The salary of the Secretary of State be increased to the same salary as the State Auditor, effective July 1, 2023.

In making these recommendations, the Council notes that:

- Salaries of Constitutional Officers have increased only once in nearly two decades. Since salaries were set as a percentage of the salary of the Governor in 2003, only in one biennium have salaries increased, when modest cost of living adjustments were implemented in 2015 and 2016.
- The Legislature generally has made no adjustments to these salaries, despite the Council's consistent recommendations to increase them. The Governor and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court appoint the bipartisan group of citizens who constitute this Compensation Council to carefully evaluate data and hear testimony from a variety of witnesses. The Council's recommendations reflect the majority of the group. (The Council did not meet in 2003, 2011 and 2015.)
- If the salaries of these officers had just kept pace with inflation since 2003, they would be almost $61 \%$ higher than they are today.
- While there are certainly non-monetary considerations that motivate candidates to run for the highest executive offices in the state, the natural consequence of this increasing compensation gap is that candidates who have greater personal financial constraints will not run for office.
- The duties of the Office of the Secretary of State are comparable to those of the State Auditor. Both have extensive and complex relationships with local units of government: one auditing those units of government to ensure financial accountability, the other working with local elections officials to manage the state's voter registration system and elections processes. As a result, these two salaries should be the same.

3. Agency head salary ranges. The Council makes no recommendation regarding agency head salary ranges or the salaries paid to each agency head.

In reaching this conclusion, the Council notes that:

- The Commissioner of Minnesota Management and Budget, representing the Governor, made no recommendation to the Council regarding needed changes to the salary ranges limits. (The Commissioner did recommend that all agency heads be consolidated into one grouping.)
- The current salary ranges have been adjusted by the Consumer Price Index since 2013. The salary range limit for most agency heads is $\$ 212,466,66 \%$ higher than the salary of the Governor.
- The highest current salary of a Commissioner is $\$ 154,992$. The Governor has current authority to increase Commissioner salaries by $\$ 57,000$ within the existing salary ranges. Under current law, the proposed increases would need to be submitted to the Subcommittee on Employee Relations and the full Legislature for approval. The Commissioner also suggested that the Council make recommendations regarding salary increases for heads of state agencies, to increase those salaries by $17 \%$ to reflect the rate of state employee compensation increases since agency head salaries were last increased.

The salaries of the Constitutional Officers and for Judges that result from implementation of these recommendations are shown in Attachment 6.
4. Proposed legislation restructuring the Council. The Council reviewed legislation that would restructure the Council, so that it would determine salaries of members of the Judiciary, Constitutional Officers and heads of state agencies.

The Council supports creation of an entity that fixes the salaries of Constitutional Officers and Judges without action of the Legislature. The Council recommends that the terms of members of this entity be four years.

This Council, and numerous others previously, have recommended reasonable salary increases for our highest state officials. Those recommended increases have been based on extensive testimony and review of compensation data. Such recommendations have had bipartisan support of members appointed by the Governor and Chief Justice. However, except for two sets of increases approved by the Legislature over almost twenty years, the recommendations for reasonable, modest increase have been ignored. As a result of this long history of inaction by the Legislature, this Council concludes that a new entity, with authority independent of the Legislature, similar to the Legislative Salary Council, should determine these salaries.

During its discussions, the Council noted that its proposed new responsibilities, especially related to the possible setting of salaries of individual agency heads, would require more time than provided in its current statute. A restructured Council might need to be appointed sooner, as having a later due date for its determinations may make it difficult to plan for the budget implications associated with the recommendations made.

## Conclusion

The Compensation Council adopted these recommendations at its meeting on March 23, 2023. Minutes and audio/video recordings of the meetings are available on the Council's website.

We have included a list of the members of the Council as Attachment 1. The members worked diligently and thoughtfully to develop these recommendations for consideration by the Legislature. Council members are committed to working with you to encourage the Legislature's adoption of the Council's recommendations. We extend a sincere thank you to the staff of the Legislative Coordinating Commission for their excellent work and tireless efforts during a limited timeframe. We all believe appropriate compensation for our government officials is vital to our State's future and that these recommendations should be implemented.

Respectfully submitted,

## Samuel L.Kaplan

Samuel Kaplan
Chair, Compensation Council
cc:
Governor Tim Walz
Lt. Governor Peggy Flanagan
Attorney General Keith Ellison
State Auditor Julie Blaha
Secretary of State Steve Simon


Nick Zerwas
Vice Chair, Compensation Council

Chief Justice Lorie S. Gilda
Senator Kari Dziedzic, Majority Leader
Senator Mark Johnson, Minority Leader
Representative Jamie Long, Majority Leader
Representative Lisa Demuth, Minority Leader

## Attachment 1

## Compensation Council Members

The Compensation Council consists of 16 members: eight nonjudges appointed by the chief justice of the Supreme Court, of whom no more than four may belong to the same political party; and one member from each congressional district appointed by the governor, of whom no more than four may belong to the same political party.

| Member | Appointing Authority |
| :--- | :--- |
| David Asp | Supreme Court |
| Richard Cohen | Supreme Court |
| Devin Driscoll | Supreme Court |
| Peter Gregory | Supreme Court |
| Susan Holden | Supreme Court |
| Noah Hobbs | Governor |
| Samuel Kaplan | Governor |
| Amy Koch | Governor |
| Amanda Matchett | Governor |
| Robert Meyerson | Supreme Court |
| Nicholas Morgan | Supreme Court |
| Amber Naqvi | Governor |
| Jason Resseman | Governor |
| Scott Van Binsbergen | Governor |
| Charles Weaver | Governor |
| Nicholas Zerwas | Supreme Court |

Salary Increase Comparisons Compensation Council - 3/6/2023

Table 1: State of Minnesota \% Change 2017-2022

|  | 7/1/2017 | 7/1/2018 | 7/1/2019 | 7/1/2020 | 7/1/2021 | 7/1/2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constitutional officers | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Minnesota judges | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 0.00\% |
| Agency heads | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| State employees ${ }^{1}$ | 2.00\% | 2.25\% | 2.25\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% |
| Minnesota state legislators | 44.50\% | - | 3.30\% | - | 3.80\% | - |

Table 2: Constitutional Officers Salaries

| State | Population | Governor | Lt. Governor | Attorney General | Secretary of State | State Auditor |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minnesota | $5,706,494$ | $\$ 127,629$ | $\$ 82,959$ | $\$ 121,248$ | $\$ 95,722$ | $\$ 108,485$ |
| North Dakota | 779,094 | $\$ 138,748$ | $\$ 107,917$ | $\$ 163,394$ | $\$ 110,582$ | $\$ 110,582$ |
| South Dakota | 886,667 | $\$ 118,728$ | $\$ 104,000$ | $\$ 118,603$ | $\$ 94,906$ | $\$ 94,906$ |
| lowa | $3,190,369$ | $\$ 130,000$ | $\$ 103,312$ | $\$ 123,669$ | $\$ 103,312$ | $\$ 103,212$ |
| Wisconsin | $5,893,718$ | $\$ 152,756$ | $\$ 80,684$ | $\$ 148,242$ | $\$ 72,551$ | $\$ 140,254$ |

Table 3: Judicial Salaries

| Judicial Salaries | Population | Supreme Ct Judge | Appeals Ct Judge | District Ct Judge |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minnesota | $5,706,494$ | $\$ 191,359$ | $\$ 180,313$ | $\$ 169,264$ |
| North Dakota | 779,094 | $\$ 169,162$ | - | $\$ 155,219$ |
| South Dakota | 886,667 | $\$ 174,551$ | - | $\$ 163,036$ |
| lowa | $3,190,369$ | $\$ 187,326$ | $\$ 169,765$ | $\$ 158,056$ |
| Wisconsin | $5,893,718$ | $\$ 184,829$ | $\$ 174,366$ | $\$ 164,487$ |

Table 4: Inflation and Other Major Indicators 2017-2022

|  | December | December | December | December | December | December |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ |  |
| Inflation (CPI-U) | - | $1.91 \%$ | $2.29 \%$ | $1.36 \%$ | $7.04 \%$ | $6.45 \%$ |
| Social Security rate increase | $2.00 \%$ | $2.80 \%$ | $1.60 \%$ | $1.30 \%$ | $5.90 \%$ | $8.70 \%$ |
| Private sector ${ }^{2}$ | $2.80 \%$ | $3.10 \%$ | $3.00 \%$ | $2.80 \%$ | $5.00 \%$ | $5.10 \%$ |

[^1]
## EXECUTIVE BRANCH

TABLE 4.11
Selected State Administrative Officials: Annual Salaries

| State or other jurisdiction | Governor | Lieutenant governor <br> (a-1) | Secretary of state (a-2) | Attorney general (a-3) | Treasurer (a-4) | Adjutant general (a-5) | Admin. <br> (a-6) | Agriculture <br> (a-7) | Auditor <br> (a-8) | Banking $(a-9)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | \$124,563 | \$69,998 | \$94,453 | \$171,726 | \$89,665 | \$149,454 | \$216,204 | \$96,855 | \$88,405 | \$183,083 |
| Alaska | 145,000 | 114,991 | (a-1) | 169,708 | 163,780 | 141,160 | 147,088 | 114,426 | 174,836 | 110,311 |
| Arizona | 95,000 | (a-2) | 70,000 | 90,000 | 70,000 | 146,000 | 195,000 | 132,000 | 130,000 | N/A |
| Arkansas | 154,115 | 45,344 | 98,371 | 142,092 | 92,906 | 185,655 | 159,034 | 134,640 | 92,906 | 149,861 |
| California | 209,747 | 157,310 | 157,310 | 182,189 | 167,796 | 197,802 | N.O. | 217,292 | 217,292 | 197,798 |
| Colorado | 92,700 | 164,009 | 93,360 | 107,672 | 93,360 | 165,000 | 169,956 | 159,660 | 188,808 | 136,584 |
| Connecticut | 150,000 (d) | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 165,000 | 175,000 | 140,000 | 197,050 | 149,625 |
| Delaware | 171,000 | 82,239 | 132,011 | 149,893 | 117,582 | 126,156 | (c) | 123,333 | 112,667 | 115,595 |
| Florida | 134,181 | 128,597 | 146,260 | 132,841 | (a-24) | 190,107 | 146,260 | 132,841 | N/A | (a-24) |
| Georgia | 175,000 | 91,609 | 123,637 | 139,169 | 185,000 | 195,998 | 160,000 | 123,987 | 175,008 | 132,558 |
| Hawaii | 165,048 | 162,552 | N.O. | 162,552 | 162,552 | 245,838 | (c) | 154,812 | 154,812 | 125,400 |
| Idaho | 138,302 | 48,406 | 117,557 | 134,000 | 117,557 | 147,659 | 123,614 | 149,386 | 153,462 | (a-24) |
| Illinois | 181,670 (d) | 139,200 | 160,800 | 160,800 | 139,200 | 135,600 | 168,000 | 157,200 | 175,200 | 159,600 |
| Indiana | 134,051 | 103,076 | 89,514 | 107,686 | 89,514 | 155,530 | 164,904 | 158,568 | 89,514 | 139,074 |
| lowa | 130,000 | 103,212 | 103,212 | 123,669 | 103,212 | 229,217 | 154,300 | 103,212 | 103,212 | 128,890 |
| Kansas | 110,707 | 154,313 | 86,003 | 98,901 | 86,003 | 145,183 | 191,800 | 123,000 | N/A | 126,075 |
| Kentucky | 152,181 | 129,375 | 129,375 | 129,375 | 129,375 | 136,000 | N.O. | 129,375 | 129,375 | 128,553 |
| Louisiana | 130,000 | 115,003 | 115,000 | 115,000 | 115,000 | 197,953 | 237,500 | 115,000 | 145,891 | 150,800 |
| Maine | 70,000 | (e) | 81,910 | 114,441 | 94,577 | 143,936 | 143,936 | 143,936 | 101,192 | 118,726 |
| Maryland | 180,000 | 149,500 | 105,500 | 149,500 | 149,500 | 152,100(b) | 175,959 (b) | 156,080 (b) | N.O. | 112,489 (b) |
| Massachusetts | 185,000 | 165,000 | 178,695 | 185,378 | 189,560 | 180,072 | 170,406 | 146,350 | 190,989 | 143,820 |
| Michigan | 159,300 | 111,510 | 112,410 | 112,410 | 182,070 | 191,434 | (a-10) | 173,400 | 183,772 | 173,400 |
| Minnesota | 127,629 | 82,959 | 95,722 | 121,248 | (a-24) | 165,495 | 144,991 | 144,991 | 108,485 | 140,627 |
| Mississippi | 122,160 | 60,000 | 90,000 | 108,960 | 90,000 | 141,105 | 150,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 156,900 |
| Missouri | 133,821 | 86,484 | 107,746 | 116,437 | 107,746 | 114,450 | 133,394 | 129,142 | 107,746 | 125,616 |
| Montana | 118,397 | 90,140 | 98,104 | 141,023 | (a-6) | 130,000 | 145,000 | 130,000 | 97,412 | 112,934 |
| Nebraska | 105,000 | 75,000 | 85,000 | 95,000 | 85,000 | 116,411 | 166,381 | 122,158 | 82,925 | 138,001 |
| Nevada | 163,474 (d) | 69,563 | 112,462 | 154,198 | 112,462 | 131,743 | 143,779 | 131,743 | N.O. | 110,211 |
| New Hampshire | 143,704 | (e) | 105,930 | 144,354 | 82,456 | 125,712 | 144,354 | 110,196 | N.O. | 129,371 |
| New Jersey | 175,000 | 175,000 | 175,000 | 175,000 | 175,000 | 175,000 | N.O. | 175,000 | 151,952 | 175,000 |
| New Mexico | 110,000 | 85,000 | 85,000 | 95,000 | 85,000 | 223,620 | 156,000 | 82,980 | 85,000 | 93,600 |
| New York | 225,000 | 210,000 | 160,000 | 210,000 | 190,000 | 160,000 | 195,145 | 160,000 | 210,000 | 210,000 |
| North Carolina | 154,743 | 136,699 | 136,699 | 136,699 | 136,699 | 155,074 | N/A | 136,699 | 136,699 | 137,770 |
| North Dakota | 138,748 (d) | 107,917 | 110,582 | 163,394 | 110,582 | 207,624 | N.O. | 119,757 | 110,582 | 145,964 |
| Ohio | 164,590 | 174,449 | 121,576 | 121,576 | 121,576 | 142,251 | 157,497 | 142,230 | 121,576 | 132,620 |
| Oklahoma | 147,000 | 114,713 | 140,000 | 132,825 | 114,713 | 190,289 | 125,000 | 126,508 | 114,713 | 196,721 |
| Oregon | 98,600 | (a-2) | 77,000 | 82,220 | 77,000 | 182,100 | 221,400 | 182,100 | 192,048 | N.O. |
| Pennsylvania | 201,729 | 169,451 | 145,244 | 167,838 | 167,838 | 182,063 | 161,390 | 145,244 | 167,838 | 145,244 |
| Rhode Island (g) | 145,755 | 122,740 | 117,637 | 124,991 | 117,637 | 141,259 | 136,510 | (a-23) | 159,248 | 135,000 |
| South Carolina | 106,078 | 46,545 | 92,007 | 92,007 | 92,007 | 163,257 | 217,643 | 92,007 | 165,872 | 126,615 |
| South Dakota | 118,728 | 104,000 | 94,906 | 118,603 | 94,906 | 126,622 | 119,216 | 131,687 | 94,906 | 115,658 |
| Tennessee | 198,780 | 72,948 (e) | 209,520 | 196,968 | 209,520 | 161,904 | 209,520 | 161,904 | (a-14) | 161,904 |
| Texas | 153,750 | 7,200 | 197,415 | 153,750 | (a-14) | 191,357 | N.O. | 140,938 | 181,128 | 242,925 |
| Utah | 165,600 | 149,040 | (a-1) | 157,320 | 149,040 | 145,018 | 156,000 | N/A | 149,040 | 156,000 |
| Vermont | 184,100 | 78,146 | 116,730 | 139,755 | 116,730 | 131,331 | 148,304 | 148,013 | 116,730 | 129,043 |
| Virginia | 175,000 | 36,321 | 176,730 | 150,000 | 177,172 | 161,360 | 176,730 | 176,730 | 198,179 | 179,950 |
| Washington | 187,353 | 117,300 | 134,640 | 172,259 | 153,615 | 195,998 | 173,856 | 173,856 | 132,212 | 137,808 |
| West Virginia | 150,000 | 20,000 (e) | 95,000 | 95,000 | 95,000 | 125,000 | 95,000 | 95,000 | 95,000 | 75,000 |
| Wisconsin | 152,756 | 80,684 | 72,551 | 148,242 | 72,551 | 150,000 | 152,755 | 132,600 | 140,254 | 140,483 |
| Wyoming | 105,000 | (a-2) | 92,000 | 177,000 | 92,000 | 142,816 | 167,000 | 126,378 | 92,000 | 109,184 |
| Guam | 130,000 | 85,000 | N.O. | 105,286 | 52,492 | 68,152 | 88,915 | 60,850 | 100,000 | 88,915 |
| CNMI* | 70,000 | 65,000 | N.O. | 80,000 | 40,800 (b) | N.O. | 54,000 | 40,800 (b) | 80,000 | 40,800 (b) |
| Puerto Rico | 70,000 | N.O. | 125,000 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 150,000 | 125,000 | (a-1) | 76,500 | 76,500 | 100,000 | 76,500 | 76,500 | 76,500 | (a-1) |

[^2]ncsc.org/salarytracker
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These graphics depict the rankings of judicial salaries, with the highest salary for each position having a rank of "1."

Data is reported by each jurisdiction to NCSC.

General Jurisdiction


Intermediate Appellate Court


- States without an intermediate appellate court.

$\times$ C2ER does not provide cost of living index for U.S. Territories.

Judicial Salaries at a Glance

|  | Mean | Median | Range |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Chief, Court of Last Resort | $\$ 201,762$ | $\$ 197,823$ | $\$ 125,000$ | to | $\$ 295,908$ |
| Associate Justice, Court of Last Resort | $\$ 194,549$ | $\$ 187,914$ | $\$ 120,000$ | to | $\$ 282,177$ |
| Judge, Intermediate Appellate Court | $\$ 187,419$ | $\$ 186,542$ | $\$ 105,000$ | to | $\$ 264,542$ |
| Judge, General Jurisdiction Trial Courts | $\$ 174,267$ | $\$ 168,761$ | $\$ 89,600$ | to | $\$ 232,600$ |

## Salaries and Rankings - Listed Alphabetically by Jurisdiction Name

The table below lists the salaries and rankings for associate justices of the courts of last resort, associate judges of intermediate appellate courts and judges of general jurisdiction trial courts (actual salaries and cost- of- living- adjusted salaries as of January 1, 2023). Salaries are ranked from highest to lowest, with the highest salary for each position having a rank of "1." The lowest salary has a rank of 55 , except for the intermediate appellate courts, which exist in only 42 jurisdictions, and adjusted general jurisdiction, for which the adjustment factor is only available for 51 of the jurisdictions.

|  | Court of Last Resort |  |  | Intermediate Appellate Court |  |  | GeneralJurisdiction Court |  | General-Jurisdiction Court <br> Adjusted for Cost-of-Living Index |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Salary | Rank |  | Salary | Rank |  | Salary | Rank | Factor | Salary | Rank |
| Alabama | \$185,640 | 30 |  | \$184,579 | 22 |  | \$148,512 | 47 | 93.0 | \$159,646 | 33 |
| Alaska | \$215,436 | 14 |  | \$203,522 | 11 |  | \$199,193 | 13 | 131.9 | \$151,059 | 38 |
| American Samoa | No Respo |  |  | No Respon |  |  | No Respo |  | Not Ava | lable |  |
| Arizona | \$205,000 | 20 |  | \$190,000 | 20 |  | \$164,700 | 31 | 102.3 | \$160,925 | 30 |
| Arkansas | \$203,625 | 22 |  | \$197,596 | 14 |  | \$192,919 | 16 | 90.6 | \$212,908 | 2 |
| California | \$282,177 | 1 |  | \$264,542 | 1 |  | \$231,174 | 2 | 135.2 | \$170,993 | 19 |
| Colorado | \$199,632 | 23 |  | \$191,724 | 19 |  | \$183,816 | 21 | 111.1 | \$165,481 | 23 |
| Connecticut | \$209,770 | 17 |  | \$197,046 | 15 |  | \$189,483 | 18 | 127.0 | \$149,216 | 39 |
| Delaware | \$212,315 | 16 |  | Not Applic |  |  | \$199,612 | 12 | 110.1 | \$181,347 | 11 |
| District of Columbia | \$246,600 | 3 |  | Not Applic |  |  | \$232,600 | 1 | 160.0 | \$145,351 | 41 |
| Florida | \$239,442 | 5 |  | \$202,440 | 12 |  | \$182,060 | 23 | 101.3 | \$179,771 | 13 |
| Georgia* | \$184,112 | 35 |  | \$182,990 | 23 |  | \$180,915 | 24 | 93.4 | \$193,773 | 6 |
| Guam | \$160,454 | 48 |  | Not Applic |  |  | \$144,110 | 50 | Not Ava | lable |  |
| Hawaii | \$235,680 | 6 |  | \$218,796 | 5 |  | \$213,096 | 5 | 150.2 | \$141,840 | 46 |
| Idaho | \$160,400 | 49 |  | \$150,400 | 39 |  | \$144,400 | 49 | 99.6 | \$145,045 | 42 |
| Illinois | \$258,456 | 2 |  | \$243,256 | 2 |  | \$223,219 | 3 | 100.0 | \$223,212 | 1 |
| Indiana | \$199,059 | 24 |  | \$193,501 | 18 |  | \$165,276 | 30 | 95.6 | \$172,922 | 18 |
| lowa | \$187,326 | 29 |  | \$169,765 | 33 |  | \$158,056 | 40 | 97.7 | \$161,711 | 29 |
| Kansas | \$168,598 | 46 |  | \$163,156 | 37 |  | \$148,912 | 46 | 98.1 | \$151,799 | 37 |
| Kentucky | \$153,751 | 52 |  | \$147,562 | 40 |  | \$141,401 | 52 | 92.2 | \$153,322 | 35 |
| Louisiana | \$187,914 | 28 |  | \$175,797 | 27 |  | \$168,949 | 27 | 97.2 | \$173,795 | 17 |
| Maine | \$155,397 | 51 |  | Not Applic |  |  | \$145,642 | 48 | 116.9 | \$124,554 | 51 |
| Maryland | \$206,433 | 19 |  | \$193,633 | 17 |  | \$184,433 | 20 | 126.7 | \$145,563 | 40 |
| Massachusetts | \$226,187 | 9 |  | \$213,924 | 6 |  | \$207,855 | 8 | 133.0 | \$156,307 | 34 |
| Michigan | \$181,483 | 36 |  | \$182,656 | 24 |  | \$168,759 | 29 | 91.4 | \$184,703 | 9 |
| Minnesota | \$191,359 | 26 |  | \$180,313 | 25 |  | \$169,264 | 26 | 102.6 | \$164,957 | 24 |
| Mississippi | \$173,800 | 42 |  | \$168,467 | 34 |  | \$158,000 | 41 | 88.4 | \$178,722 | 15 |
| Missouri | \$189,198 | 27 |  | \$172,937 | 30 |  | \$163,082 | 35 | 90.5 | \$180,285 | 12 |
| Montana | \$155,920 | 50 |  | Not Applic |  |  | \$142,683 | 51 | 103.9 | \$137,376 | 49 |
| Nebraska | \$198,427 | 25 |  | \$188,505 | 21 |  | \$183,545 | 22 | 100.8 | \$182,128 | 10 |
| Nevada | \$170,000 | 44 |  | \$165,000 | 35 |  | \$160,000 | 37 | 112.4 | \$142,369 | 45 |
| New Hampshire | \$179,942 | 38 |  | Not Applic |  |  | \$168,761 | 28 | 120.9 | \$139,576 | 47 |
| New Jersey | \$221,855 | 13 |  | \$211,319 | 8 |  | \$200,163 | 11 | 121.7 | \$164,452 | 25 |
| New Mexico | \$180,748 | 37 |  | \$171,710 | 32 |  | \$163,125 | 34 | 100.1 | \$162,943 | 28 |
| New York | \$233,400 | 7 |  | \$222,200 | 4 |  | \$210,900 | 7 | 112.4 | \$187,708 | 8 |
| North Carolina | \$167,807 | 47 |  | \$160,866 | 38 |  | \$152,188 | 45 | 95.2 | \$159,788 | 31 |
| North Dakota | \$169,162 | 45 |  | Not Applic |  |  | \$155,219 | 43 | 107.8 | \$143,958 | 44 |
| Northern Mariana Islands | \$126,000 | 54 |  | Not Applic |  |  | \$120,000 | 54 | Not Ava | lable |  |
| Ohio | \$184,575 | 34 |  | \$172,034 | 31 |  | \$158,206 | 39 | 92.6 | \$170,870 | 20 |
| Oklahoma | \$173,469 | 43 |  | \$164,339 | 36 |  | \$156,732 | 42 | 93.3 | \$168,026 | 22 |
| Oregon | \$176,724 | 39 |  | \$173,316 | 29 |  | \$163,476 | 33 | 119.1 | \$137,275 | 50 |
| Pennsylvania | \$244,793 | 4 |  | \$230,974 | 3 |  | \$212,495 | 6 | 102.3 | \$207,689 | 4 |
| Puerto Rico | \$120,000 | 55 |  | \$105,000 | 42 |  | \$89,600 | 55 | Not Ava | ilable |  |
| Rhode Island | \$225,804 | 10 |  | Not Applic |  |  | \$217,637 | 4 | 128.6 | \$169,296 | 21 |
| South Carolina | \$213,321 | 15 |  | \$207,987 | 9 |  | \$202,654 | 10 | 98.8 | \$205,125 | 5 |
| South Dakota | \$174,551 | 41 |  | Not Applic |  |  | \$163,036 | 36 | 99.5 | \$163,865 | 27 |
| Tennessee | \$208,704 | 18 |  | \$201,768 | 13 |  | \$194,808 | 14 | 92.3 | \$211,019 | 3 |
| Texas | \$184,800 | 32 |  | \$178,400 | 26 |  | \$154,000 | 44 | 96.4 | \$159,670 | 32 |
| Utah | \$203,700 | 21 |  | \$194,450 | 16 |  | \$185,200 | 19 | 103.2 | \$179,471 | 14 |
| Vermont | \$184,771 | 33 |  | Not Applic |  |  | \$175,654 | 25 | 121.2 | \$144,939 | 43 |
| Virgin Islands | \$226,564 | 8 |  | Not Applic |  |  | \$191,360 | 17 | Not Ava | lable |  |
| Virginia | \$222,308 | 12 |  | \$204,868 | 10 |  | \$193,848 | 15 | 102.4 | \$189,305 | 7 |
| Washington | \$224,176 | 11 |  | \$213,400 | 7 |  | \$203,169 | 9 | 114.9 | \$176,846 | 16 |
| West Virginia | \$149,600 | 53 |  | \$142,500 | 41 |  | \$132,300 | 53 | 95.5 | \$138,489 | 48 |
| Wisconsin | \$184,829 | 31 |  | \$174,366 | 28 |  | \$164,487 | 32 | 100.4 | \$163,909 | 26 |
| Wyoming | \$175,000 | 40 |  | Not Applic |  |  | \$160,000 | 37 | 105.3 | \$151,876 | 36 |
| Mean | \$194,549 |  |  | \$187,419 |  |  | \$174,267 |  | *Georgia | rovided weigh | ed salari |
| Median | \$187,914 |  |  | \$186,542 |  |  | \$168,761 |  |  |  |  |
| Range \$120,000 to | \$282,177 |  | \$105,000 to | \$264,542 |  | \$89,600 to | \$232,600 |  |  |  |  |

The adjusted figures presented use the C2ER Cost- of- Living Index. The Council for Community and Economic Research- C2ER is the most widely accepted U.S. source for cost- of- living indices, with nearly 400 reporting jurisdictions across America. C2ER does not provide cost of living index for U.S. Territories. Due to the rounding of C2ER factors to the nearest hundredth for publication purposes, user calculations of our adjusted salary figures may not equate to the published totals. More detailed information can be found at www.c2er.org.

## AGENCY HEAD SALARIES <br> LCC Subcommittee on Employee Relations

3/6/2023


## Compensation Council

March 28, 2023

| 2016 <br> January 1 <br> Current salaries | 2021 <br> July 1 | 2022 <br> July 1 | 2023 <br> July 1 | 2024 <br> July 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Compensation Council recommendation |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Minnesota County Attorneys Association Survey. If the survey provided a range for a position, we showed the high end of the range.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ State employees received across the board increases that average these amounts. In addition, employees not at the top of their salary ranges are eligible for merit increases. These annual increases generally vary from $2.75 \%$ to $3.5 \%$, depending on the contract. About $50 \%$ of state employees are eligible for these increases.
    ${ }^{2}$ Bureau of Labor Statistics: Economic News Release: Employment Cost Index Sum. US. Private industry, Table 1. https://www.bls.gov/regions/midwest/newsrelease/pdf/employmentcostindex minneapolis.pdf

[^2]:    See footnotes at end of table

