



Report of the Judicial Compensation Commission

Annapolis, Maryland
May 2022

Contributing Staff

Writers

Jennifer K. Botts
Caleb E. Weiss

Reviewers

Amy A. Devadas

Other Staff Who Contributed to This Report

Claudette Sherman

For further information concerning this document contact

Library and Information Services
Office of Policy Analysis
Department of Legislative Services
90 State Circle
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Baltimore Area: 410-946-5400 • Washington Area: 301-970-5400

Other Areas: 1-800-492-7122, Extension 5400

TTY: 410-946-5401 • 301-970-5401

Maryland Relay Service: 1-800-735-2258

Email: libr@mlis.state.md.us

Home Page: <http://dls.maryland.gov>

The Department of Legislative Services does not discriminate on the basis of age, ancestry, color, creed, marital status, national origin, race, religion, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, or disability in the admission or access to its programs, services, or activities. The Department's Information Officer has been designated to coordinate compliance with the nondiscrimination requirements contained in Section 35.107 of the Department of Justice Regulations. Requests for assistance should be directed to the Information Officer at the telephone numbers shown above.



THE MARYLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401-1991

JUDICIAL COMPENSATION COMMISSION

May 5, 2022

The Honorable Lawrence J. Hogan, Jr.
Governor of Maryland

The Honorable Bill Ferguson
President of the Senate

The Honorable Adrienne A. Jones
Speaker of the House of Delegates

Dear Governor Hogan, President Ferguson, and Speaker Jones:

Herewith, the Judicial Compensation Commission transmits to you a summary of the commission's 2021 activities and subsequent action by the General Assembly regarding judicial compensation in Maryland.

The commission commenced its work for this meeting cycle by examining the judicial salaries that were implemented following the enactment of an amended resolution, as passed by the General Assembly during the 2018 legislative session. The 2018 resolution, which reflected a \$15,000 reduction from the salary increases originally proposed by this commission, established a phased-in increase of \$20,000 per judge from fiscal 2019 through 2022. The commission learned that even with those increases, there has been a decline in the number of applicants for judicial vacancies. Furthermore, the Judiciary indicated that although the overall credentials of individuals appointed to judgeships remain impressive, a diversity of experience has been lacking among recent appointments. The commission has long recognized that individuals may pursue judgeships for a variety of reasons; however, it also maintains that salary is still an important element of attracting qualified applicants. Accordingly, the commission members unanimously agreed that there remains a compelling need to further increase judicial salaries in order to assure that qualified individuals will continue to be attracted to serve as judges. Specifically, the commission recommended a phased-in increase of \$40,000 per judge for all courts from fiscal 2023 through 2026, as shown in the following table. Pursuant to statute, judges will not receive any general salary increases proposed by the Governor for State employees in any year in which a judge's salary is increased in accordance with a resolution. Resolutions to implement the recommendations were introduced during the 2022 session as Senate Joint Resolution 4 and House Joint Resolution 3.

Because the General Assembly did not adopt or amend either resolution, the resolutions were enacted 50 days after introduction as Joint Resolution 3 and Joint Resolution 2, respectively, establishing the salaries shown below for fiscal 2023 through 2026.

	<u>Current Salary</u>	<u>Effective 7/1/2022</u>	<u>Effective 7/1/2023</u>	<u>Effective 7/1/2024</u>	<u>Effective 7/1/2025</u>	<u>Phase-in</u>
Court of Appeals						
Chief Judge	\$215,433	\$225,433	\$235,433	\$245,433	\$255,433	\$40,000
Judge	196,433	206,433	216,433	226,433	236,433	40,000
Court of Special Appeals						
Chief Judge	186,633	196,633	206,633	216,633	226,633	40,000
Judge	183,633	193,633	203,633	213,633	223,633	40,000
Circuit Court	174,433	184,433	194,433	204,433	214,433	40,000
District Court						
Chief Judge	183,633	193,633	203,633	213,633	223,633	40,000
Judge	161,333	171,333	181,333	191,333	201,333	40,000

During its presentation to the commission, the Judiciary emphasized the additional work required by individuals who serve as administrative judges for county circuit courts or the District Court and asked the commission to consider recommending supplemental compensation for those judges. Because members desired additional time to examine this request and obtain relevant information, the commission did not recommend additional compensation for those judges in its recommendations. However, although the commission is not scheduled to convene again until 2025, pursuant to the timeframe set forth in statute, the members also voted unanimously to recommend that it be authorized to meet again prior to 2025 to further consider the issue of providing additional compensation to administrative judges.

May 5, 2022
Page 3

On behalf of each commission member, I thank you for the privilege of serving you and the State of Maryland.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'EJG', with a horizontal line extending to the right and a small flourish at the end.

Edward J. Gilliss
Chairman

EJG/JKB/ero/cgs

cc: Hon. Matthew J. Fader, Chief Judge
Secretary David R. Brinkley
Ms. Victoria L. Gruber
Mr. Ryan Bishop

Maryland Judicial Compensation Commission 2021 Membership Roster

Edward J. Gilliss
Chair

Members

Meghan K. Casey

Victoria K. Fretwell

Alice G. Pinderhughes

John M. Suit II

John M. Wasilisin

Carlos D. Williams

Committee Staff

Jennifer K. Botts

Caleb E. Weiss

Contents

Transmittal Letter.....	iii
Executive Summary.....	xi
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
Statutory Provisions and Reporting Requirements.....	1
Activities to Date	2
Chapter 2. Compensation Principles and Data.....	9
Compensation Principles	9
Comparability	9
Judicial Pensions.....	12
The Economy	12
Recruitment of Qualified Candidates.....	13
Workplace Conditions	13
The Future.....	14
Chapter 3. Fiscal 2023-2026 Salary Recommendations	15
Appendix 1. Annotated Code of Maryland.....	19
Appendix 2. National and Regional Judicial Salary Rankings.....	23
Appendix 3. Federal Court Judicial Salaries.....	35
Appendix 4. Salaries of Selected Maryland Officials.....	37
Appendix 5. Salaries of Maryland Cabinet Secretaries	39
Appendix 6. Senate Joint Resolution 4.....	41
Appendix 7. House Joint Resolution 3	45
Appendix 8. Maryland Judiciary Special Committee on Judicial Compensation Report	49

Executive Summary

The Judicial Compensation Commission examined salaries paid to State and local officials, federal judges, judges in all other states, and numerous other members of the legal profession, such as attorneys in private practice, and received presentations from the Department of Legislative Services and the Judiciary. Based on a review of this information, the commission continues to believe that further salary increases are merited and necessary in order to assure that

qualified individuals from diverse backgrounds will be attracted to serve as judges without unreasonable economic hardship. The commission voted unanimously to recommend the salaries listed below for the next four fiscal years. The recommendations reflect a total salary increase per judge of \$40,000, to be implemented as follows over the next four fiscal years:

Fiscal 2023 Salary Effective July 1, 2022	Fiscal 2024 Salary Effective July 1, 2023																																																						
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td colspan="2">Court of Appeals</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Chief Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">\$225,433</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">206,433</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">Court of Special Appeals</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Chief Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">196,633</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Associate Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">193,633</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">Circuit Court Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">184,433</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">District Court</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Chief Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">193,633</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Associate Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">171,333</td></tr> </table>	Court of Appeals		Chief Judge	\$225,433	Judge	206,433			Court of Special Appeals		Chief Judge	196,633	Associate Judge	193,633			Circuit Court Judge		184,433			District Court		Chief Judge	193,633	Associate Judge	171,333	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td colspan="2">Court of Appeals</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Chief Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">\$235,433</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">216,433</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">Court of Special Appeals</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Chief Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">206,633</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Associate Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">203,633</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">Circuit Court Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">194,433</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">District Court</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Chief Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">203,633</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Associate Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">181,333</td></tr> </table>	Court of Appeals		Chief Judge	\$235,433	Judge	216,433			Court of Special Appeals		Chief Judge	206,633	Associate Judge	203,633			Circuit Court Judge		194,433			District Court		Chief Judge	203,633	Associate Judge	181,333
Court of Appeals																																																							
Chief Judge	\$225,433																																																						
Judge	206,433																																																						
Court of Special Appeals																																																							
Chief Judge	196,633																																																						
Associate Judge	193,633																																																						
Circuit Court Judge		184,433																																																					
District Court																																																							
Chief Judge	193,633																																																						
Associate Judge	171,333																																																						
Court of Appeals																																																							
Chief Judge	\$235,433																																																						
Judge	216,433																																																						
Court of Special Appeals																																																							
Chief Judge	206,633																																																						
Associate Judge	203,633																																																						
Circuit Court Judge		194,433																																																					
District Court																																																							
Chief Judge	203,633																																																						
Associate Judge	181,333																																																						
Fiscal 2025 Salary Effective July 1, 2024	Fiscal 2026 Salary Effective July 1, 2025																																																						
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td colspan="2">Court of Appeals</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Chief Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">\$245,433</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">226,433</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">Court of Special Appeals</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Chief Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">216,633</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Associate Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">213,633</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">Circuit Court Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">204,433</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">District Court</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Chief Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">213,633</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Associate Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">191,333</td></tr> </table>	Court of Appeals		Chief Judge	\$245,433	Judge	226,433			Court of Special Appeals		Chief Judge	216,633	Associate Judge	213,633			Circuit Court Judge		204,433			District Court		Chief Judge	213,633	Associate Judge	191,333	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td colspan="2">Court of Appeals</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Chief Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">\$255,433</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">236,433</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">Court of Special Appeals</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Chief Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">226,633</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Associate Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">223,633</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">Circuit Court Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">214,433</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">District Court</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Chief Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">223,633</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Associate Judge</td><td style="text-align: right;">201,333</td></tr> </table>	Court of Appeals		Chief Judge	\$255,433	Judge	236,433			Court of Special Appeals		Chief Judge	226,633	Associate Judge	223,633			Circuit Court Judge		214,433			District Court		Chief Judge	223,633	Associate Judge	201,333
Court of Appeals																																																							
Chief Judge	\$245,433																																																						
Judge	226,433																																																						
Court of Special Appeals																																																							
Chief Judge	216,633																																																						
Associate Judge	213,633																																																						
Circuit Court Judge		204,433																																																					
District Court																																																							
Chief Judge	213,633																																																						
Associate Judge	191,333																																																						
Court of Appeals																																																							
Chief Judge	\$255,433																																																						
Judge	236,433																																																						
Court of Special Appeals																																																							
Chief Judge	226,633																																																						
Associate Judge	223,633																																																						
Circuit Court Judge		214,433																																																					
District Court																																																							
Chief Judge	223,633																																																						
Associate Judge	201,333																																																						

Consistent with statutory requirements, the commission's salary recommendations to the General Assembly for the 2022 session were introduced as a joint resolution in each house of the General Assembly by the fifteenth day of the session.

Because the General Assembly neither adopted nor amended the joint resolution to reduce the proposal within 50 days after its introduction, the salaries recommended by the commission have been enacted and will be implemented for fiscal 2023 on July 1, 2022, and on July 1 each subsequent year through July 1, 2025. Had the General Assembly rejected any or all of the commission's salary recommendations, the salaries of the judges would have remained unchanged, unless, pursuant to § 1-703(b) of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article, the judges' salaries were increased by the same percentage awarded to State employees.

As set forth in statute, the commission meets every four years and is not scheduled to convene again until 2025. However, the members voted unanimously to recommend that it be authorized to meet before that time to further examine recommending additional compensation to individuals who, in addition to their regular duties as judges, serve as administrative judges for the county circuit courts or the District Court. While the commission received preliminary information, its members agreed that more time and information is needed in order to make an informed recommendation regarding this matter.

Finally, the commission did not have any recommendations regarding judicial pensions.

Chapter 1. Introduction

In 1980, the General Assembly created the Judicial Compensation Commission by adding § 1-708 to the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

Statutory Provisions and Reporting Requirements

The commission includes seven members, all appointed to six-year terms by the Governor and nominated as follows: two by the President of the Senate; two by the Speaker of the House of Delegates; one by the Maryland State Bar Association; and two at large. The commission elects a chairman from among its membership. Appointees are eligible for reappointment. Members of the General Assembly, State and local employees or officers, and judges or former judges are not eligible for appointment to the commission.

When established, the commission was required to review judicial salaries and pensions every two years and make recommendations every four years; however, the commission could review and make recommendations more often. In recent years, the meeting schedule and reporting requirements have changed numerous times, as discussed in further detail later in this chapter. Current statutory provisions require that on or after September 1, 2011; September 1, 2013; and every four years thereafter, the commission must review salaries and pensions and make recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly.

Section 1-708, which appears in **Appendix 1**, establishes the following:

- A joint resolution incorporating the commission's salary recommendations must be introduced in each house of the General Assembly by the fifteenth day of the session following the commission's proposals.
- The General Assembly may amend the joint resolution to decrease, but not increase, any of the commission salary recommendations. The General Assembly may not reduce the salary of a judge below current levels. Failure to adopt or amend the joint resolution within 50 calendar days after its introduction results in adoption of the salaries recommended by the commission. If the General Assembly rejects any of the commission's recommendations, the salaries of the judges remain unchanged, unless modified under other provisions of law.
- Commission pension recommendations must be introduced as legislation by the Presiding Officers of the Senate and the House of Delegates. These recommendations shall become effective only if passed by both houses.

Judicial salaries are also adjusted in accordance with §§ 1-702 and 1-703 of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article. Pursuant to § 1-703 (as amended by Chapter 444 of 2005), general State employee salary increases apply to judges only in years in which judges' salaries are not increased in accordance with a resolution from the commission's recommendations. Section 1-702 specifies that the Chief Judge of the District Court must receive a salary equivalent to the salary paid to an Associate Judge of the Court of Special Appeals.

Activities to Date

Activities Prior to 2005

Since it began its deliberations in late 1980, the commission has made numerous salary proposals, the first of which applied to fiscal 1983. **Exhibit 1.1** summarizes the commission's previous salary proposals and subsequent General Assembly action from fiscal 1983 through 2022. Exhibit 1.1 also shows general employee salary increases, as prior to the 2005 legislative session, judges typically received the benefit of salary increases both from any joint resolutions that were adopted as well as any general employee salary increase.

Exhibit 1.1 Salary Proposals

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Judicial Compensation Commission Proposal</u>	<u>Assembly Action</u>	<u>General Salary Increase</u>
2019	Phase-in of \$35,000 over fiscal 2019-2022	Phase-in of \$20,000 over fiscal 2019-2022	2%; 0.5% ⁽¹⁾
2017	None for fiscal 2017-2018	None	None
2013	None for fiscal 2013; phase-in of \$29,006 over fiscal 2014-2016	Phase-in of \$14,081 over fiscal 2014-2016	2% ⁽²⁾
2011	Phase-in of \$39,858 over fiscal 2011-2014	Reject	None ⁽³⁾
2010	Phase-in of \$39,858 over fiscal 2010-2013	None ⁽⁴⁾	None ⁽³⁾
2006	Phase-in of \$15,000-\$30,000 over 2006-2009	None ⁽⁵⁾	2% ⁽⁶⁾
2005	Phase-in of \$15,000-\$30,000 over fiscal 2005-2008	Reject	\$752
2004	None	None	None
2003	5% increase	Reject	None

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Judicial Compensation Commission Proposal</u>	<u>Assembly Action</u>	<u>General Salary Increase</u>
2002	None	None	4% ⁽⁷⁾
2001	\$10,000	Reject	4% ⁽⁸⁾
2000	None	None	\$1,275 ⁽⁹⁾
1999	\$11,275	None ⁽¹⁰⁾	\$1,275 ⁽⁹⁾
1998	\$9,000	Reject	None
1997	2.9%, 9.5%-10%	2.9%-3.0% ⁽¹¹⁾	None
1996	None	None	2%
1995	3%-8.1%	Reject	3%
1994	None	None	None ⁽¹²⁾
1993	None	None	None ⁽¹³⁾
1992	None	None	None ⁽¹³⁾⁽¹⁴⁾
1991	4%	4-25% ⁽¹⁵⁾	4%
1990	None	None	4%
1989	10.5%-14.3%	10.5%-14.3%	4%
1988	13.0%-22.7%	6.4%-11.8%	2.5%
1987	None	None	3.5%
1986	6.3%-8.9%	Reject	4%
1985	11.2%-13.9%	9%	6%
1984	None	None	None
1983	10.5%-12.1%	10.5%-12.1%	9%

⁽¹⁾ In fiscal 2019, a 2% cost-of-living (COLA) increase took effect January 1, 2019, and a 0.5% COLA took effect April 1, 2019. The April salary increase, as well as a \$500 bonus effective at the same time, were contingent on fiscal 2018 general fund revenues exceeding the December 2017 estimate by at least \$75 million, which they did. In fiscal 2020, a 3% COLA took effect July 1, 2019, and most employees received a 1% increase on January 1, 2020. In fiscal 2021, a 2% COLA took effect January 1, 2021, and all State employees received a \$1,000 one-time bonus in April 2021. In fiscal 2022, most employees received a 1% COLA and a \$1,500 bonus on January 1, 2022. In fiscal 2023, most employees will receive a 3% COLA on July 1, 2022.

⁽²⁾ The General Assembly also approved the following COLA increases: (1) 3% in fiscal 2014; (2) 2% in fiscal 2015; and (3) 2% in fiscal 2016. Because judges did not have a scheduled salary increase in fiscal 2013, they were eligible for the 2.0% COLA.

⁽³⁾ There were no COLAs for State employees in fiscal 2010 or 2011. Instead, State employees were subject to furloughs in both years, resulting in an average salary reduction of 2.6% in each fiscal year.

- (4) Chapter 2 of 2009, an emergency measure, established, for the 2009 session only, that the failure of the General Assembly to act on a joint resolution by the fiftieth day of session would not allow the recommended salary increases to become effective.
- (5) The Judicial Compensation Commission's recommended increases took effect because the General Assembly failed to act on the resolution within the required 50-day timeframe.
- (6) In addition, fiscal 2007 increases were \$900 for employees making less than \$45,000 at the end of fiscal 2006, \$1,400 for employees making \$70,000 or more, and 2% for those remaining. The General Assembly approved a 2% COLA for fiscal 2008. Although a 2% COLA was included in the fiscal 2009 budget, a furlough for State employees effective December 16, 2008, reduced employee salaries by an average of approximately 1.5%.
- (7) For fiscal 2002, the General Assembly approved a 4% cost-of-living (COLA) effective January 1, 2002. By statute, members of the Judiciary received the same percentage COLA.
- (8) The General Assembly approved a 4% COLA effective November 15, 2000.
- (9) For fiscal 1999 and 2000, the General Assembly approved a COLA in the dollar amount of \$1,275 for all State employees. By statute, members of the Judiciary received the same percentage COLA.
- (10) The Judicial Compensation Commission's recommended increase took effect because the General Assembly failed to act on the resolution within the required 50-day timeframe.
- (11) For fiscal 1997, the General Assembly approved the 2.9% increase recommended for the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals. All others were amended to a 3.0% increase. All salary adjustments were delayed until October 1, 1996.
- (12) In fiscal 1994, Executive and Judicial branch employees (except judges) received in-grade increments, but no general salary increase. Legislative Branch employees received a uniform 3% increase but no increments.
- (13) Employees in all three branches of government did not receive in-grade increments in fiscal 1992 and 1993.
- (14) All employees of the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial branches, except judges and elected officials, were required to take one to five days leave without pay in fiscal 1992.
- (15) The Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals received a 25% salary increase.

Source: Department of Legislative Services

The commission made no formal recommendations other than to endorse the general salary increase for fiscal 1984, 1987, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2002, and 2004. The commission made formal recommendations in 1983 and 1989, which were adopted by the General Assembly; the commission's proposal in fiscal 1999 was also adopted when the General Assembly failed to act on the resolution within the required 50 days. The commission made formal recommendations in 1986, 1995, 1998, 2001, 2003, and 2005 that were rejected. Finally, in 1985, 1988, 1991, and 1997, the commission's recommendations were adopted with modifications by the General Assembly.

Activities Since 2005

During the 2005 legislative session, the commission resubmitted the salary recommendations that were not adopted during the 2004 session. The *Supplement to the 2004 Report of the Judicial Compensation Commission* advised that, if the salaries were increased as proposed, the commission did not intend to make another salary recommendation until fiscal 2010. When the General Assembly failed to act on the legislation within the required time period, the proposal was implemented by operation of law, rendering the salary structure effective.

The 2005 session also marked the beginning of two significant changes regarding the work of the commission. First, Chapter 444 of 2005 limited the frequency of review of judicial compensation and recommendations by the commission by establishing a schedule of once every four years, instead of the prior requirements that the commission review judicial compensation every two years and make recommendations at least every four years. In addition, Chapter 444 provided that general employee salary increases do not apply to judges in years in which salaries are increased in accordance with a resolution from the commission's recommendations.

The commission met in 2008 and made recommendations for a four-year phased-in salary plan for fiscal 2010 through 2013 that was introduced by Senate Joint Resolution 4/House Joint Resolution 2 of the 2009 session; however, no further action was taken on the joint resolutions. Instead, Chapter 2 of 2009, an emergency measure, established, for the 2009 session only, that the failure of the General Assembly to act on a joint resolution by the fiftieth day of session would not allow the recommended salary increases to become effective.

In recognition of the failure to take salary action for the Judiciary, the time period for the commission's meeting schedule was statutorily altered to allow another meeting in fall 2009. This action aligned the schedule of the commission with the meeting schedules of the Governor's and General Assembly's compensation commissions. Although the commission did not hold a formal meeting in 2009, the members participated in a telephone poll and voted to resubmit the same salary recommendations that were submitted in the prior session. The recommendations would have increased judicial salaries by approximately \$40,000 over a four-year period.

The recommendations were again rejected by the General Assembly during the 2010 session. However, Chapter 484 of 2010 (the Budget Reconciliation and Financing Act) altered the meeting schedule of the commission again to allow for a review of salaries in 2011 and 2013, then every four years thereafter.

In 2011, the commission met twice and voted to submit recommendations increasing judicial salaries through fiscal 2016. However, the commission did not recommend a salary increase in the first year (fiscal 2013). Instead, the commission recommended a salary increase of \$29,006 over a three-year period.

The General Assembly amended the resolution submitted by the commission so that the annual salaries for all judges increased by \$14,081 over the three years as follows: (1) \$4,556

beginning July 1, 2013 (fiscal 2014); (2) \$4,692 beginning July 1, 2014 (fiscal 2015); and (3) \$4,833 beginning July 1, 2015 (fiscal 2016).

The commission also made recommendations in its 2011 report on appropriate retirement benefits and member contribution levels, which took into account the sustainability of pension systems, based on instructions included in Chapter 397 of 2011. The commission voted to include in its report a recommendation that the contribution rate for judges appointed after July 1, 2012, increase from 6% to 8%. Chapter 485 of 2012 increased the member contribution rate from 6% to 8% of earnable compensation for *all* members of the Judges' Retirement System, and further added a five-year vesting requirement for individuals who become members of the Judges' Retirement System on or after July 1, 2012.

Although the commission also met in fall 2013, it did not propose additional salary increases at that time. Because salaries were not increased in accordance with any resolution, judges would have been eligible for any general salary increases awarded to State employees in fiscal 2017 and 2018. However, State employees were not provided a salary increase in either of those fiscal years.

In 2017, the commission met twice to discuss salary recommendations for fiscal 2019 through 2022. Recognizing that judicial salaries had been stagnant since fiscal 2016, the commission recommended a \$35,000 increase in judicial salaries over a four-year period, as shown in **Exhibit 1.2**.

Exhibit 1.2
2017 Judicial Compensation Commission Salary Recommendations
Fiscal 2019-2022

	<u>Prior Salary</u>	<u>Proposed 2019</u>	<u>Proposed 2020</u>	<u>Proposed 2021</u>	<u>Proposed 2022</u>	<u>Phase-in</u>
Court of Appeals						
Chief Judge	\$195,433	\$205,433	\$215,433	\$222,933	\$230,433	\$35,000
Judge	176,433	\$186,433	196,433	203,933	211,433	35,000
Court of Special Appeals						
Chief Judge	166,633	176,633	186,633	194,133	201,633	35,000
Judge	163,633	173,633	183,633	191,133	198,633	35,000
Circuit Court						
	154,433	\$164,433	174,433	181,933	189,433	35,000
District Court						
Chief Judge	163,633	\$173,633	183,633	191,133	198,633	35,000
Judge	141,333	\$151,333	161,333	168,833	176,333	35,000

Source: Department of Legislative Services

The General Assembly amended the resolution to instead increase salaries for all judges by \$5,000 per year from fiscal 2019 through 2022, as shown in **Exhibit 1.3**.

Exhibit 1.3
Judicial Salaries (Implemented) – Joint Resolution 3 of 2018
Fiscal 2019-2022

	<u>Prior Salary</u>	<u>Implemented 2019</u>	<u>Implemented 2020</u>	<u>Implemented 2021</u>	<u>Implemented 2022</u>	<u>Phase-in</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>
Court of Appeals							
Chief Judge	\$195,433	\$200,433	\$205,433	\$210,433	\$215,433	\$20,000	10.23%
Judge	176,433	181,433	186,433	191,433	196,433	20,000	11.34%
Court of Special Appeals							
Chief Judge	166,633	171,633	176,633	181,633	186,633	20,000	12.00%
Judge	163,633	168,633	173,633	178,633	183,633	20,000	12.22%
Circuit Court	154,433	159,433	164,433	169,433	174,433	20,000	12.95%
District Court							
Chief Judge	163,633	168,633	173,633	178,633	183,633	20,000	12.22%
Judge	141,333	146,333	151,333	156,333	161,333	20,000	14.15%

Source: Department of Legislative Services

Chapter 2. Compensation Principles and Data

Since its inception, certain compensation principles have guided the commission's judicial salary recommendations. This chapter discusses the compensation principles and summarizes salary data reviewed by the commission.

Compensation Principles

The commission has traditionally considered many compensation principles and variables when developing its recommendations. The commission members have identified these themes through independent research and from the testimony of jurists who have appeared before the commission throughout the years. Among the topics that have been discussed in the commission's meetings are:

- salary levels compared to other states' judges, federal judges, and other State and local officials;
- economic and fiscal conditions;
- the ability to attract and retain qualified individuals from diverse backgrounds; and
- workplace conditions and accomplishments of the Judiciary.

The commission continues to regard these factors as applicable and relevant in formulating its recommendations concerning judicial salaries. It also recognizes that all of the issues need to be collectively considered. For example, achieving parity with the private sector would very likely attract more individuals with diverse legal experiences, yet it would also place Maryland's judicial salaries significantly higher than cabinet secretaries, other states' judges, and federal judges, as well as necessitate a substantial expenditure increase. Conversely, relying only on salary levels in other states could result in a recommendation too low to attract qualified individuals, particularly when considering the higher cost of living in the State. Additional details about these factors are provided in the following pages and in the appendices.

Comparability

The commission studies how salaries paid to Maryland judges compare to salaries for judges in other states and the federal judiciary as well as other important elected and appointed officials in Maryland State and local government. Some of the categories that the commission considers worthy of comparison when considering the salaries of Maryland judges are discussed below.

Judges in Other States

The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) routinely surveys all states to compare salaries at each judicial level. The commission uses this data to study the salary rankings of Maryland judges compared to judges at similar levels in other states. These national and regional rankings are shown in **Appendix 2** of this report. However, in some cases, direct comparisons could not be made from state to state. NCSC no longer tracks salary data for the Chief Judge of the Intermediate Appellate Court (the equivalent of the Court of Special Appeals in Maryland), so no comparison is made under this category. Likewise, because not all states have comparable courts of limited jurisdiction (the equivalent of the District Court in Maryland), NCSC no longer tracks this salary data.

The available data indicates that almost all states have provided salary increases since the commission met in 2017. Average national salaries increased by between 9.92% to 10.26%, while Maryland judicial salaries increased by between 10.23% to 12.95%, as shown in **Exhibit 2.1**. While recognizing that the State's salaries are still above the national average, the commission has routinely accounted for the high cost of living in the State when considering recommendations. NCSC also provides rankings for general jurisdiction court compensation (circuit courts) that is adjusted for a cost-of-living index. When factoring in this index, Maryland slips to the bottom quarter of the rankings (43rd) among the states. When the commission met in 2017, Maryland was ranked 36th. Even with the salary gains made as a result of the implemented resolution applicable for fiscal 2019 through 2022, the high cost of living in the State continues to diminish the impact of the salary increases.

Exhibit 2.1 Maryland's Comparison with Average National Salaries January 1, 2017, and July 1, 2021

<u>Position</u>	<u>Average National Salaries as of January 1, 2017</u>	<u>Average National Salaries as of July 1, 2021</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>	<u>Maryland Salaries as of January 1, 2017⁽¹⁾</u>	<u>Maryland Salaries as of July 1, 2021</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>
Highest Court- Chief Judge	\$174,379	\$192,277	10.26%	\$195,433	\$215,433	10.23%
Highest Court- Associate Judge	168,360	185,435	10.14%	176,433	196,433	11.34%
Intermediate Appellate Court Judge	163,319	179,998	10.21%	163,633	183,633	12.22%
General Jurisdiction Court Judge	151,474	166,501	9.92%	154,433	174,433	12.95%

⁽¹⁾ Although January 1, 2017 salaries are shown to align with available national data from the National Center for State Courts, the amounts also reflect Maryland salaries as of July 1, 2017, since there was no increase in fiscal 2018.

Source: Department of Legislative Services; National Center for State Courts

Federal Judges

Comparisons between the salaries of Maryland judges and federal judges have routinely been considered, particularly due to the State's proximity to Washington, DC. Though the two jobs differ, the high compensation, regular salary increases, and lifetime tenure make a federal judicial appointment very attractive. A listing of federal judges' salaries reviewed by the commission appears in **Appendix 3**.

Salaries of Maryland and Local Officials

Salaries for the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Comptroller, Treasurer, and Secretary of State are generally established every four years by the Governor's Salary Commission. As required by the Maryland Constitution, the commission develops salary recommendations and submits them to the General Assembly for approval. Salaries for these constitutional officers were last increased over the 2015 through 2018 term; the commission did not recommend salary increases when it met in 2017. The current salaries of constitutional officers are shown in **Appendix 4**. However, the Governor's Salary Commission also met in 2021 and recommended the following salary increases over the next four-year term: (1) \$15,000 for the Governor; (2) \$25,500 for the Lieutenant Governor, Comptroller, Treasurer, and Attorney General; and (3) \$14,500 for the Secretary of State. Recommendations regarding the salaries for the Governor and Lieutenant Governor were enacted as Joint Resolutions 4 and 5 during the 2022 session. The General Assembly also passed legislation (HB 424 of 2022) codifying the commission's recommendations regarding the salaries of the other constitutional officers.

The General Assembly Compensation Commission similarly submits salary recommendations for the members of the General Assembly. The commission's last implemented recommendations to increase salaries, which phased in a 15.7% increase over four years for members and the Presiding Officers, were submitted in the 2014 session and implemented over the 2015 through-2018 term. The General Assembly Compensation Commission did not recommend salary increases when it met in 2017; current salaries for General Assembly members and officers are shown in Appendix 4. However, pursuant to the 2022 recommendations of the General Assembly Compensation Commission, the following increases will be phased in over the next four years: (1) \$6,306 for members; and (2) \$8,191 for the presiding officers.

The commission also reviewed the salaries of cabinet secretaries. In fiscal 2022, the salaries for incumbent cabinet secretaries range from \$122,165 to \$275,000. This represents an increase from a range of \$114,555 to \$236,000 in fiscal 2018, the applicable fiscal year when this commission met in 2017. More information regarding salaries for these individuals can be found in **Appendix 5**.

Judicial Pensions

Comparisons between the pension systems for Maryland judges and those for judges in other states and federal judges were thoroughly reviewed and considered by the Judicial Compensation Commission in 2011. Maryland's State Employee Pension Systems underwent significant changes during the 2011 legislative session, and the commission was charged by the General Assembly with making specific recommendations concerning appropriate benefit and member contribution levels for the Maryland Judges' Retirement System. The number of members of the Maryland Judges' Retirement System is only a fraction of the membership of the various State Employee Pension Systems; however, the members of the Maryland Judges' Retirement System receive a considerable retirement salary benefit. Prior to fiscal 2013, Maryland judges contributed 6% of their annual salary for the first 16 years of service toward a full retirement benefit of two-thirds of the salary of an active judge in a comparable position to the retired member. The benefit accrues at a fraction of this rate for each year of service prior to 16 years. No contribution is required after 16 years of service. Maryland judges may retire at the age of 60 and are required to retire at the age of 70. In addition to the annual retirement salary benefit, Maryland judges are also entitled to survivor benefits, disability benefits, and retiree health benefits. As previously noted, pursuant to Chapter 485 of 2012, all judges now contribute 8% of their annual salary for the first 16 years of service toward their pension plan. Further, judges appointed after July 1, 2012, must remain a judge for five years before they become vested in the pension system.

While acknowledging the substantial retirement benefit afforded to judges, the commission has previously discussed how increased contributions such as the ones enacted in 2012 have the practical effect of negatively impacting judicial salaries by offsetting any salary increases. The commission did not propose any changes to judicial benefits in its recommendations.

The Economy

The recommendations of the commission were considered during a time in which the State budget is experiencing a historic surplus due to both COVID-19 related federal aid and higher than expected tax returns. The Department of Legislative Services briefed the commission on recent developments in the economic and financial climate that have impacted the general fund balance. The State's budget is in much better condition than when the commission met in 2017, and the structural balance forecast indicates that this position is likely to continue over the next several years. However, the commission also noted that the high inflation currently being seen nationwide exacerbates the ongoing issue of judicial salaries historically not keeping pace with inflation. The commission's charge of recommending appropriate salaries is particularly critical since judges do not receive the benefit of general salary increases (*i.e.* cost-of-living adjustments) in any year during which judges are also receiving an increase in accordance with the resolutions.

Recruitment of Qualified Candidates

As required by its statutory mandate, the commission considers the judicial salary structure's ability to attract highly qualified attorneys to the bench. In its presentation to the commission, the Judiciary noted that in recent years, the number of individuals applying to be a judge has decreased. For example, recent vacancies in Howard and Washington counties only attracted five and four applicants, respectively. The Judiciary advised that despite the prevailing belief that there are always numerous people who apply to be judges, it has had to readvertise vacancies on several occasions in an attempt to elicit even a modest number of applicants. Low salaries for judges in comparison to the overall legal profession also contribute to a lack of diversity among applicants and eventual appointees. Individuals appointed are often government attorneys (*e.g.*, prosecutors, assistant Attorneys General, etc.), for whom a judicial salary represents a higher or somewhat comparable salary. The Judiciary stressed that it was not denigrating recently appointed judges but rather emphasizing that a lack of diversity in experience has been lacking. The reality of low judicial salaries is that many qualified attorneys, such as those with a family law practice or who have worked in complex civil litigation, are not applying for judgeships. The Judiciary is essentially competing with law firms and other entities for the best legal talent. While acknowledging that salary is only one of many factors potential applicants consider, the commission has continuously asserted that a more competitive salary will help ensure that qualified individuals are interested in judgeships.

Workplace Conditions

The commission continues to be mindful of the increased demands placed on the State's judges, particularly in the trial courts. The Judiciary briefed the commission on the numerous types of cases heard in the circuit courts on a daily basis and the widespread responsibilities of these judges, which include everything from deciding on the most appropriate placement for a child in a custody-related matter to signing warrants to execute an individual's arrest. The Chief Judge of the District Court remarked on the high volume of cases handled in that court, which has historically included over 650,000 landlord-tenant cases, 44,000 peace and protective orders, and 1,000,000 traffic cases annually, just to cite a few examples. The challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic were also discussed, as the courts had to ensure the continued handling of critical matters under safe conditions.

For the first time, the commission was asked to consider a recommendation to provide a modest stipend for individuals who serve as administrative judges in either the circuit courts or the District Court. As the commission learned, additional duties assigned to administrative judges include (1) overseeing personnel and human resources issues; (2) managing courthouse security; (3) facilitating case flow through the court system; (4) orientation for new staff; (5) for circuit court judges, coordinating with the local jurisdiction on budgetary issues and ensuring that the resources for the physical courthouse facility are adequate; and (6) monitoring motions filed through the Maryland Electronic Court system (MDEC) to ensure that matters are handled

expeditiously when a judge who would typically respond to such motions is on leave. These judges were also tasked with oversight of unique issues that arose due to the COVID-19 pandemic, such as determining how to implement appropriate social distancing requirements within the courthouses.

The Future

The commission believes that the salaries of Maryland's judges should keep pace with the projected earnings of judges in other states, especially those in the mid-Atlantic region. The commission is acutely aware that the quality of the State's Judiciary depends on its ability to attract competent and diverse individuals with a range of experience and believes that the implemented recommendations will ensure the Judiciary's continuing ability to serve the citizens of the State. Because the commission's members were not fully appointed until December 2021, its work had to be accomplished in a truncated period without adequate time to fully consider appropriate recommendations regarding stipends for administrative judges. Therefore, while the commission is pleased that its recommendations were adopted by the General Assembly and will be implemented over the next four years, it respectfully requests the opportunity to meet prior to its next statutorily scheduled meeting in 2025 in order to fully consider compensation for administrative judges.

Chapter 3. Fiscal 2023-2026 Salaries

The commission met two times in 2021 to consider salary recommendations. The Department of Legislative Services (DLS) provided information on the State's economic condition, available national and regional salary rankings for different levels of courts, and salary information for various Executive and Legislative branch officials. The commission also heard presentations and received information from the Maryland Judiciary on the workload of the courts and its concerns regarding judicial salaries. In its presentation, the Maryland Judiciary's Special Committee on Judicial Compensation expressed a preference for any recommendations to include a dollar, rather than percentage, increase that was the same for all levels of judges. This ensures that trial court judges (*i.e.* circuit court and District court judges) receive a higher percentage increase than higher paid appellate court judges. The Judiciary notes that these trial court judges are the ones who most interact with the public on a daily basis. The commission considered this position and believed it to be a reasonable strategy to ensure that salary increases do not increase the compensation gap between judges at different levels.

In December 2021, the commission, by a unanimous vote of its members, finalized its recommendation to increase the salaries of all Maryland judges by \$40,000 over the next four years. Joint resolutions introduced and ultimately enacted during the 2022 session establish the following annual salary increases for all judges at each of the seven levels: (1) \$10,000 beginning July 1, 2022; (2) \$10,000 beginning July 1, 2023; (3) \$10,000 beginning July 1, 2024; and (4) \$10,000 beginning July 1, 2025. These changes, as well as current salary levels, are presented in **Exhibit 3.1**.

Exhibit 3.1
Judicial Compensation Commission Salary Recommendations
Fiscal 2023-2026

	<u>Total Judgeships</u>	<u>Current Salary</u>	<u>2023</u>	<u>2024</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2026</u>
Court of Appeals						
Chief Judge	1	\$215,433	\$225,433	\$235,433	\$245,433	\$255,433
Associate Judge	6	196,433	206,433	216,433	226,433	236,433
Court of Special Appeals						
Chief Judge	1	186,633	196,633	206,633	216,633	226,633
Associate Judge	14	183,633	193,633	203,633	213,633	223,633
Circuit Court	174	174,433	184,433	194,433	204,433	214,433
District Court						
Chief Judge	1	183,633	193,633	203,633	213,633	223,633
Associate Judge	123	161,333	171,333	181,333	191,333	201,333
Magistrate	77	145,200	154,200	163,200	172,200	181,200
Incremental Salaries ⁽¹⁾			4,013,000	4,013,000	4,013,000	4,013,000
Incremental Medicare at 1.45%			58,189	58,189	58,189	58,189
Incremental Pensions for Non-Judge Employees			168,128	160,568	152,925	144,877
Incremental Pensions – Judges ⁽²⁾			670,000	7,120,000	810,000	710,000
Incremental Compensation for Senior/Recalled Judges ⁽³⁾			981,049	981,049	981,049	981,049
Incremental Annual Fiscal Impact			\$5,890,366	\$12,332,805	\$6,015,163	\$5,907,114
Total Annual Fiscal Impact			\$5,890,366	\$18,215,610	\$24,215,488	\$30,098,456

⁽¹⁾ Includes salary increases for the Public Defender, State Prosecutor, and members of the Workers' Compensation Commission, whose salaries are tied by statute to judicial salaries. Does not include costs for any local officials whose salaries are tied to judicial salaries but are funded locally. Also includes salary increases for magistrates, whose compensation is not under the purview of the Judicial Compensation Commission but have salaries tied to the salary of a District Court judge based on Judiciary policy.

⁽²⁾ Impact on judicial pensions is based on an actuarial estimate prepared based on the recommended salary increases.

⁽³⁾ Compensation for senior/recalled judges is tied to judicial salaries by statute.

Source: Bolton Partners, Inc.; Maryland Judiciary; Department of Legislative Services

As shown in the exhibit, overall expenditures associated with the implemented plan are approximately \$5.9 million in fiscal 2023 (which has been included in the fiscal 2023 budget); in the final year of the plan, the cost to the State will be \$30.1 million. While the exhibit presents a comprehensive overview, select details regarding some of the fiscal impacts are discussed below.

Although the commission is only specifically charged with making recommendations for judicial salaries, its recommendations also impact other State employees whose salaries are tied to judicial salaries by statute or internal judicial policy. For example, the Judiciary compensates magistrates at a salary equal to 90% of that of a District Court judge. The Public Defender and State Prosecutor have salaries that correspond to circuit court judges; the 10 members of the Workers' Compensation Commission have salaries that correspond to that of a District Court judge.

The commission's proposal affects the retirement benefit paid to retired judges. As previously mentioned, after 16 years of service, a member of the Judges' Retirement System becomes eligible for the maximum retirement allowance of two-thirds of the annual salary of an active judge in a similar position. Exhibit 3.1 indicates that although the approximate increase in pension costs as a result of the recommendations is only \$670,000 in fiscal 2023, the meaningful impact of this effect (\$7.1 million) first occurs in fiscal 2024, the first year in which contribution rates for the judicial retirement system will be recalibrated to reflect the new compensation plan. This estimate is based on the contribution rates determined by the DLS actuary under the recommended salary scale. The impact of increased pension contributions to the regular employee system for magistrates, the Public Defender, the State Prosecutor, and Commissioners of the Workers' Compensation Commission are shown separately in the exhibit.

The Judiciary consistently relies on using senior judges (judges who have retired) to supplement current resources. The commission's proposal also impacts the cost of using these senior judges, whose compensation is based on current judicial salaries under Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article, § 1-302. Based on the Judiciary's current and projected utilization of such judges, the proposal is expected to incrementally increase costs for senior judge compensation by approximately \$981,000 annually.

The recommended flat dollar increase impacts each judge differently, depending on which level of court they serve. As **Exhibit 3.2** outlines, the percent salary growth at each level of court increases as salary decreases. This is because a flat dollar hike in pay is of greater benefit to those at lower salaries. By fiscal 2026, the highest paid judge will have received a 18.57% increase, while the lowest paid judges will have received 24.79%. Over the four-year period, however, the actual salary gap between the highest and lowest paid judges is maintained at \$54,100.

Exhibit 3.2
Judicial Compensation Commission Salary Recommendations
Fiscal 2023-2026

	<u>Current Salary</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
Court of Appeals		
Chief Judge	\$215,433	18.57%
Judge	196,433	20.36%
Court of Special Appeals		
Chief Judge	186,633	21.43%
Judge	183,633	21.78%
Circuit Court	174,433	22.93%
District Court		
Chief Judge	183,633	21.78%
Judge	161,333	24.79%
Average		21.66%

Source: Department of Legislative Services

Appendix 1

Annotated Code of Maryland

Article – Courts and Judicial Proceedings

Title 1. Court Structure and Organization

Subtitle 7. Judicial Salaries and Allowances

§ 1-708. Judicial Compensation Commission

(a) Salaries and pensions of judges - The salaries and pensions of the judges of the Court of Appeals, the Court of Special Appeals, the circuit courts of the counties, and the District Court shall be established as provided by this section, §§ 1-701 through 1-707 of this subtitle, and Title 27 of the State Personnel and Pensions Article.

(b) Established.

(1) There is a Judicial Compensation Commission. The Commission shall study and make recommendations with respect to all aspects of judicial compensation, to the end that the judicial compensation structure shall be adequate to assure that highly qualified persons will be attracted to the bench and will continue to serve there without unreasonable economic hardship.

(2) The Commission consists of seven members appointed by the Governor. No more than three members of the Commission may be individuals admitted to practice law in this State. In nominating and appointing members, special consideration shall be given to individuals who have knowledge of compensation practices and financial matters. The Governor shall appoint:

(i) Two members from a list of the names of at least five nominees submitted by the President of the Senate;

(ii) Two from a list of the names of at least five nominees submitted by the Speaker of the House of Delegates;

(iii) One from a list of the names of at least three nominees submitted by the Maryland State Bar Association, Inc.; and

(iv) Two at large.

(3) A member of the General Assembly, officer or employee of the State or a political subdivision of the State, or judge or former judge is not eligible for appointment to the Commission.

(4) The term of a member is six years, commencing July 1, 1980, and until the member's successor is appointed. However, of the members first appointed to the Commission, the Governor shall designate one of the members nominated by the President of the Senate to serve for three years and one for six years; one of the members nominated by the Speaker to serve for four years and one for five years; the member nominated by the Maryland State Bar Association, Inc., to serve for three years; and one of the members at large to serve for two years, and one for six years. A member is eligible for reappointment.

(5) Members of the Commission serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for reasonable expenses incurred in carrying out their responsibilities under this section.

(6) The members of the Commission shall elect a member as chairman of the Commission.

(7) The concurrence of at least five members is required for any formal Commission action.

(8) The Commission may request and receive assistance and information from any unit of State government.

(c) Written recommendations and funding - On or after September 1, 2011, September 1, 2013, and every four years thereafter, the Commission shall review the salaries and pensions of the judges of the courts listed in subsection (a) of this section and make written recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly on or before the next ensuing regular session of the General Assembly. The Governor shall include in the budget for the next ensuing fiscal year the funding necessary to implement those recommendations, contingent on action by the General Assembly under subsections (d) and (e) of this section.

(d) Recommendation as house joint resolution.

(1) The salary recommendations made by the Commission shall be introduced as a joint resolution in each House of the General Assembly not later than the fifteenth day of the session. The General Assembly may amend the joint resolution to decrease any of the Commission salary recommendations, but no reduction may diminish the salary of a judge during his continuance in office. The General Assembly may not amend the joint resolution to increase the recommended salaries. If the General Assembly fails to adopt or amend the joint resolution within 50 days after its introduction, the salaries recommended by the Commission shall apply. If the joint resolution is adopted or amended in accordance with this section within 50 days after its introduction, the salaries so provided shall apply. If the General Assembly rejects any or all of the Commission's salary recommendations, the salaries of the judges affected remain unchanged, unless modified under other provisions of law.

(2) The Governor or the General Assembly may not increase the recommended salaries, except as provided under § 1-703(b) of this subtitle.

(e) Legislation - The recommendation of the Commission as to pensions shall be introduced by the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Delegates in the form of legislation, and shall become effective only if passed by both Houses.

(f) Changes in salaries and pensions - Any change in salaries or pensions adopted by the General Assembly under this section takes effect as of the July 1 of the year next following the year in which the Commission makes its recommendations.

(g) Sections unaffected - This section does not affect § 1-702(b), § 1-703(b), or §§ 1-705 through 1-707 of this subtitle, or Title 27 of the State Personnel and Pensions Article.

[1980, ch. 717; 1982, ch. 820, § 3; 1992, ch. 131, § 12; 1994, ch. 468; 1997, ch. 14, § 1; 1998, ch. 21, § 2; 2005, ch. 25, § 13; ch. 444, § 1; 2006, ch. 44, § 6; 2009, ch. 2; 2010, ch. 72; ch. 484, § 2.]

Appendix 2

National and Regional Judicial Salary Rankings

Appendix 2.1A

National Judicial Salary Rankings

Highest Appellate Court – Chief Judge

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
1	California	\$274,695
2	Illinois	250,442
3	New York	240,800
4	Hawaii	238,104
5	Florida	227,218
6	Virginia	225,517
7	Washington	223,499
8	Pennsylvania	221,295
9	New Jersey	220,684
10	South Carolina	217,464
11	Connecticut	215,915
12	Maryland	215,433
13	Texas	214,830
14	Delaware	214,394
15	Minnesota	210,496
16	Rhode Island	208,368
17	Massachusetts	206,239
18	Alaska	205,776
19	Tennessee	204,336
20	Arkansas	199,344
21	Colorado	198,036
22	Utah	195,100
23	Missouri	193,545
24	Nebraska	192,647
25	Indiana	192,644
26	Iowa	192,261
27	Louisiana	191,268
28	Ohio	189,927
29	Vermont	184,557
30	New Hampshire	181,290

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
31	Georgia	179,112
32	Wyoming	175,000
33	Maine	174,437
34	Oklahoma	172,049
35	North Dakota	170,535
36	Oregon	170,412
37	Nevada	170,000
38	Alabama	167,072
39	Wisconsin	165,772
40	Arizona	164,836
41	Michigan	164,610
42	Idaho	163,400
43	North Carolina	160,838
44	Mississippi	159,000
45	Montana	157,784
46	South Dakota	157,350
47	Kansas	156,755
48	New Mexico	155,394
49	Kentucky	147,362
50	West Virginia	136,000
	Average	\$192,277
	District of Columbia	\$232,300

Source: National Center for State Courts

Appendix 2.1B
Regional Judicial Salary Rankings
Highest Appellate Court – Chief Judge

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
1	New York	\$240,800
2	District of Columbia	232,300
3	Virginia	225,517
4	Pennsylvania	221,295
5	New Jersey	220,684
6	Connecticut	215,915
7	Maryland	215,433
8	Delaware	214,394
9	Rhode Island	208,368
10	North Carolina	160,838
11	West Virginia	136,000

Source: National Center for State Courts

Appendix 2.2A
National Judicial Salary Rankings
Highest Appellate Court – Associate Judge

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
1	California	\$261,949
2	Illinois	250,442
3	New York	233,400
4	Hawaii	229,668
5	Florida	227,218
6	Washington	220,320
7	Pennsylvania	215,037
8	New Jersey	213,240
9	Virginia	212,365
10	South Carolina	207,108
11	Alaska	205,176
12	Delaware	205,135
13	Massachusetts	200,984
14	Connecticut	199,781
15	Tennessee	199,332
16	Maryland	196,433
17	Colorado	193,812
18	Utah	193,100
19	Nebraska	192,647
20	Indiana	192,644
21	Minnesota	191,359
22	Rhode Island	189,424
23	Missouri	185,127
24	Texas	184,800
25	Arkansas	184,588
26	Iowa	183,653
27	Louisiana	182,160
28	Georgia	179,112
29	Ohio	178,280
30	Vermont	176,140
31	New Hampshire	175,837
32	Wyoming	175,000
33	Nevada	170,000
34	Oregon	167,232
35	Alabama	166,072

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
36	North Dakota	165,845
37	Wisconsin	165,772
38	Michigan	164,610
39	Oklahoma	161,112
40	Idaho	160,400
41	Arizona	159,685
42	North Carolina	156,664
43	Montana	155,920
44	South Dakota	155,350
45	New Mexico	153,394
46	Kansas	152,923
47	Mississippi	152,250
48	Maine	150,870
49	Kentucky	142,362
50	West Virginia	136,000
	Average	\$185,435
	District of Columbia	\$231,800

Source: National Center for State Courts

Appendix 2.2B
Regional Judicial Salary Rankings
Highest Appellate Court – Associate Judge

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
1	New York	\$233,400
2	District of Columbia	231,800
3	Pennsylvania	215,037
4	New Jersey	213,240
5	Virginia	212,365
6	Delaware	205,135
7	Connecticut	199,781
8	Maryland	196,433
9	Rhode Island	189,424
10	North Carolina	156,664
11	West Virginia	136,000

Source: National Center for State Courts

Appendix 2.3A
National Judicial Salary Rankings
Intermediate Appellate Court – Associate Judge

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
1	California	\$245,578
2	Illinois	235,713
3	New York	222,200
4	Hawaii	212,784
5	Washington	209,730
6	New Jersey	203,114
7	Pennsylvania	202,898
8	South Carolina	201,930
9	Virginia	195,422
10	Alaska	193,836
11	Tennessee	192,708
12	Florida	192,105
13	Massachusetts	190,087
14	Connecticut	187,663
15	Indiana	187,265
16	Colorado	186,132
17	Utah	184,300
18	Maryland	183,633
19	Nebraska	183,015
20	Minnesota	180,313
21	Arkansas	179,123
22	Texas	178,400
23	Georgia	177,990
24	Louisiana	170,339
25	Missouri	169,214
26	Michigan	168,436
27	Iowa	166,436
28	Ohio	166,167
29	Alabama	165,072
30	Nevada	165,000
31	Oregon	164,004
32	Wisconsin	156,388

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
33	Arizona	154,534
34	Oklahoma	152,632
35	Idaho	150,400
36	North Carolina	150,184
37	Kansas	147,987
38	New Mexico	145,725
39	Mississippi	144,827
40	Kentucky	136,632
	Average	\$179,998

Source: National Center for State Courts

Appendix 2.3B
Regional Judicial Salary Rankings
Intermediate Appellate Court – Associate Judge

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
1	New York	\$222,200
2	New Jersey	203,114
3	Pennsylvania	202,898
4	Massachusetts	190,087
5	Connecticut	187,663
6	Maryland	183,633
7	North Carolina	150,184

Source: National Center for State Courts

Appendix 2.4A
National Judicial Salary Rankings
General Jurisdiction Court – Associate Judges

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
1	Illinois	\$216,297
2	California	214,601
3	New York	210,900
4	Hawaii	207,084
5	Washington	199,165
6	South Carolina	196,753
7	Delaware	192,862
8	New Jersey	192,391
9	Alaska	189,720
10	Pennsylvania	186,665
11	Tennessee	186,060
12	Massachusetts	184,694
13	Virginia	184,617
14	Rhode Island	182,367
15	Connecticut	180,460
16	Colorado	178,452
17	Nebraska	178,199
18	Utah	175,550
19	Arkansas	174,883
20	Maryland	174,433
21	Georgia	173,714
22	Minnesota	169,264
23	Vermont	167,449
24	Florida	165,509
25	New Hampshire	164,911
26	Louisiana	163,658
27	Nevada	160,000
28	Wyoming	160,000
29	Indiana	159,950
30	Missouri	159,578
31	Michigan	155,621
32	Iowa	154,957
33	Oregon	154,692
34	Texas	154,000
35	Ohio	152,811
36	North Dakota	152,175
37	Arizona	149,383
38	Wisconsin	147,535

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
39	Oklahoma	145,567
40	South Dakota	145,101
41	Idaho	144,400
42	Montana	142,683
43	North Carolina	142,082
44	Maine	141,404
45	New Mexico	138,438
46	Mississippi	136,000
47	Kansas	135,068
48	Kentucky	130,926
49	Alabama	126,018
50	West Virginia	126,000
	Average	\$166,501
	District of Columbia	\$218,600

Note: The National Center for State Courts also publishes rankings for associate judges of general jurisdiction courts that have been adjusted using a cost-of-living index. After salaries are adjusted for cost-of-living, Maryland's rank is 43.

Source: National Center for State Courts

Appendix 2.4B
Regional Judicial Salary Rankings
General Jurisdiction Court – Associate Judges

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
1	District of Columbia	\$218,600
2	New York	210,900
3	Delaware	192,862
4	Pennsylvania	186,665
5	Connecticut	180,460
6	Virginia	184,617
7	New Jersey	192,391
8	Rhode Island	182,367
9	Maryland	174,433
10	North Carolina	142,082
11	West Virginia	126,000

Source: National Center for State Courts

Appendix 3

Federal Court Judicial Salaries

	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Supreme Court					
Chief Justice	\$263,300	\$267,000	\$270,700	\$277,700	\$280,500
Associate Justice	251,800	255,300	258,900	265,600	268,300
 Court of Appeals					
Judges	217,600	220,600	223,700	229,500	231,800
 Trial Courts					
District Court Judges, International Trade Court Judges, and Claims Court Judges	205,100	208,000	210,900	216,400	218,600

Note: Pursuant to federal law, salaries for bankruptcy judges and magistrate judges are set at 92% and up to 92%, respectively, of a district judge's pay.

Source: United States Courts

Appendix 4

Salaries of Selected Maryland Officials¹

Salaries of Selected Maryland Officials Calendar 2018 and 2022

Constitutional Officers	Annual Salary <u>2018</u>	Annual Salary <u>2022</u>
Governor	\$180,000	\$180,000
Lieutenant Governor	149,500	149,500
Attorney General	149,500	149,500
Comptroller	149,500	149,500
Treasurer	149,500	149,500
Secretary of State	105,500	105,500
General Assembly		
Members	\$50,330	\$50,330
President of the Senate	65,371	65,371
Speaker of the House	65,371	65,371

¹ Neither the Governor’s Salary Commission nor the General Assembly Compensation Commission recommended salary increases when it met in 2017; therefore, salaries considered by these commissions remained unchanged between calendar 2018 and 2022.

Source: Maryland Budget Bills; Department of Legislative Services

Appendix 5

Salaries of Maryland Cabinet Secretaries

Salaries of Maryland Cabinet Secretaries Fiscal 2018 and 2022

<u>Cabinet Secretaries</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2022</u>	<u>Increase</u>
Superintendent of Schools	\$236,000	\$275,000	16.5%
State Police	171,015	220,601	29.0%
Health	174,417	189,798	8.8%
Budget and Management	177,906	189,731	6.6%
Transportation	174,419	189,726	8.8%
Commerce	175,462	187,124	6.6%
Information Technology	170,782	182,571	6.9%
Human Services	170,818	182,171	6.6%
Juvenile Services	169,059	180,295	6.6%
Environment	155,599	176,606	13.5%
Labor	165,215	176,196	6.6%
Natural Resources	162,499	173,299	6.6%
Public Safety and Correctional Services	162,254	173,038	6.6%
Higher Education	160,710	171,391	6.6%
Housing and Community Development	156,245	166,630	6.6%
General Services	149,678	156,496	4.6%
Agriculture	143,488	153,019	6.6%
Disabilities	140,526	149,866	6.6%
Aging	137,749	146,904	6.6%
Planning	137,749	139,753	1.5%
Veterans Affairs	114,555	122,165	6.6%

Source: Maryland Budget Books

Appendix 6
Senate Joint Resolution 4 (Joint Resolution 3)

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 4

D1

2lr2019
CF 2lr2018

By: **The President (By Request)**

Introduced and read first time: January 21, 2022

Assigned to: Budget and Taxation

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION

1 A Senate Joint Resolution concerning

2 **Judicial Compensation Commission – Recommendations**

3 FOR the purpose of establishing the compensation of the members of the Judiciary in this
4 State in accordance with Section 1–708 of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings
5 Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

6 WHEREAS, Section 1–708(b)(2) of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article of the
7 Annotated Code of Maryland establishes a seven–member Judicial Compensation
8 Commission appointed by the Governor with two members appointed on nomination of the
9 President of the Senate, two members appointed on nomination of the Speaker of the House
10 of Delegates, one member appointed on nomination of the Maryland State Bar Association,
11 and two members appointed at large. The Judicial Compensation Commission is
12 constituted as follows: appointments made on the nomination of the President of the
13 Senate: Meghan Casey and Carlos Williams; appointments made on the nomination of the
14 Speaker of the House of Delegates: Victoria Fretwell and John Wasilisin; appointment
15 made on the nomination of the Maryland State Bar Association: Edward Gilliss; and
16 appointments at large: John Suit II and Alice Pinderhughes. The Commission members
17 elected Edward Gilliss to serve as the chair of the Commission. The Commission is charged
18 with reviewing the salaries and pensions of the judges of the Judiciary of Maryland and
19 making written recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly on or after
20 September 1, 2011, September 1, 2013, and every 4 years thereafter; and

21 WHEREAS, Section 1–708(d) of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article of the
22 Annotated Code of Maryland provides as follows: the General Assembly may amend this
23 Joint Resolution to decrease any of the Commission’s salary recommendations, but no
24 reduction may diminish the salary of a judge during the judge’s continuance in office. The
25 General Assembly may not amend this Joint Resolution to increase these recommended
26 salaries. Should the General Assembly not adopt or amend this Joint Resolution within 50
27 days after its introduction, the salaries recommended herein shall apply during fiscal years
28 2023 through 2026. Should the General Assembly reject any or all of the salaries herein
29 recommended, the salaries of the judges so affected shall remain unchanged during fiscal
30 years 2023 through 2026 unless modified under other provisions of the law; and



SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 4

1 WHEREAS, The Judicial Compensation Commission held two meetings in 2021 and
 2 considered many aspects and facets of judicial compensation. The Commission, by a vote of
 3 five or more of its members as required by § 1-708(b)(7) of the Courts and Judicial
 4 Proceedings Article, has recommended an increase in judicial salaries for fiscal years 2023
 5 through 2026; now, therefore, be it

6 RESOLVED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MARYLAND, That after
 7 considering the recommendations of the Judicial Compensation Commission, beginning
 8 July 1, 2022, judicial salaries shall be as follows:

9	Position	Current Salary	Proposed Salary
10	Court of Appeals		
11	Chief Judge	215,433	225,433
12	Associate Judge	196,433	206,433
13	Court of Special		
14	Appeals		
15	Chief Judge	186,633	196,633
16	Associate Judge	183,633	193,633
17	Circuit Courts		
18	Judge	174,433	184,433
19	District Court		
20	Chief Judge	183,633	193,633
21	Associate Judge	161,333	171,333;

22 and be it further

23 RESOLVED, That beginning July 1, 2023, judicial salaries shall be as follows:

24	Position	Proposed Salary
25	Court of Appeals	
26	Chief Judge	235,433
27	Associate Judge	216,433
28	Court of Special	
29	Appeals	
30	Chief Judge	206,633
31	Associate Judge	203,633
32	Circuit Courts	
33	Judge	194,433
34	District Court	
35	Chief Judge	203,633
36	Associate Judge	181,333;

37 and be it further

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 4

1 RESOLVED, That beginning July 1, 2024, judicial salaries shall be as follows:

2	Position	Proposed Salary
3	Court of Appeals	
4	Chief Judge	245,433
5	Associate Judge	226,433
6	Court of Special	
7	Appeals	
8	Chief Judge	216,633
9	Associate Judge	213,633
10	Circuit Courts	
11	Judge	204,433
12	District Court	
13	Chief Judge	213,633
14	Associate Judge	191,333;

15 and be it further

16 RESOLVED, That beginning July 1, 2025, judicial salaries shall be as follows:

17	Position	Proposed Salary
18	Court of Appeals	
19	Chief Judge	255,433
20	Associate Judge	236,433
21	Court of Special	
22	Appeals	
23	Chief Judge	226,633
24	Associate Judge	223,633
25	Circuit Courts	
26	Judge	214,433
27	District Court	
28	Chief Judge	223,633
29	Associate Judge	201,333;

30 and be it further

31 RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded by the Department of
32 Legislative Services to the Honorable Lawrence J. Hogan, Jr., Governor of Maryland; the
33 Honorable William C. Ferguson, IV, President of the Senate of Maryland; and the
34 Honorable Adrienne A. Jones, Speaker of the House of Delegates.

Appendix 7
House Joint Resolution 3 (Joint Resolution 2)

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

D1

2lr2018
CF SJ 4

By: **The Speaker (By Request)**

Introduced and read first time: January 19, 2022

Assigned to: Appropriations

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION

1 A House Joint Resolution concerning

2 **Judicial Compensation Commission – Recommendations**

3 FOR the purpose of establishing the compensation of the members of the Judiciary in this
4 State in accordance with Section 1–708 of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings
5 Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

6 WHEREAS, Section 1–708(b)(2) of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article of the
7 Annotated Code of Maryland establishes a seven–member Judicial Compensation
8 Commission appointed by the Governor with two members appointed on nomination of the
9 President of the Senate, two members appointed on nomination of the Speaker of the House
10 of Delegates, one member appointed on nomination of the Maryland State Bar Association,
11 and two members appointed at large. The Judicial Compensation Commission is
12 constituted as follows: appointments made on the nomination of the President of the
13 Senate: Meghan Casey and Carlos Williams; appointments made on the nomination of the
14 Speaker of the House of Delegates: Victoria Fretwell and John Wasilisin; appointment
15 made on the nomination of the Maryland State Bar Association: Edward Gilliss; and
16 appointments at large: John Suit II and Alice Pinderhughes. The Commission members
17 elected Edward Gilliss to serve as the chair of the Commission. The Commission is charged
18 with reviewing the salaries and pensions of the judges of the Judiciary of Maryland and
19 making written recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly on or after
20 September 1, 2011, September 1, 2013, and every 4 years thereafter; and

21 WHEREAS, Section 1–708(d) of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article of the
22 Annotated Code of Maryland provides as follows: the General Assembly may amend this
23 Joint Resolution to decrease any of the Commission’s salary recommendations, but no
24 reduction may diminish the salary of a judge during the judge’s continuance in office. The
25 General Assembly may not amend this Joint Resolution to increase these recommended
26 salaries. Should the General Assembly not adopt or amend this Joint Resolution within 50
27 days after its introduction, the salaries recommended herein shall apply during fiscal years
28 2023 through 2026. Should the General Assembly reject any or all of the salaries herein
29 recommended, the salaries of the judges so affected shall remain unchanged during fiscal
30 years 2023 through 2026 unless modified under other provisions of the law; and



HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

1 WHEREAS, The Judicial Compensation Commission held two meetings in 2021 and
 2 considered many aspects and facets of judicial compensation. The Commission, by a vote of
 3 five or more of its members as required by § 1-708(b)(7) of the Courts and Judicial
 4 Proceedings Article, has recommended an increase in judicial salaries for fiscal years 2023
 5 through 2026; now, therefore, be it

6 RESOLVED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MARYLAND, That after
 7 considering the recommendations of the Judicial Compensation Commission, beginning
 8 July 1, 2022, judicial salaries shall be as follows:

9	Position	Current Salary	Proposed Salary
10	Court of Appeals		
11	Chief Judge	215,433	225,433
12	Associate Judge	196,433	206,433
13	Court of Special		
14	Appeals		
15	Chief Judge	186,633	196,633
16	Associate Judge	183,633	193,633
17	Circuit Courts		
18	Judge	174,433	184,433
19	District Court		
20	Chief Judge	183,633	193,633
21	Associate Judge	161,333	171,333;

22 and be it further

23 RESOLVED, That beginning July 1, 2023, judicial salaries shall be as follows:

24	Position	Proposed Salary
25	Court of Appeals	
26	Chief Judge	235,433
27	Associate Judge	216,433
28	Court of Special	
29	Appeals	
30	Chief Judge	206,633
31	Associate Judge	203,633
32	Circuit Courts	
33	Judge	194,433
34	District Court	
35	Chief Judge	203,633
36	Associate Judge	181,333;

37 and be it further

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

1 RESOLVED, That beginning July 1, 2024, judicial salaries shall be as follows:

2	Position	Proposed Salary
3	Court of Appeals	
4	Chief Judge	245,433
5	Associate Judge	226,433
6	Court of Special	
7	Appeals	
8	Chief Judge	216,633
9	Associate Judge	213,633
10	Circuit Courts	
11	Judge	204,433
12	District Court	
13	Chief Judge	213,633
14	Associate Judge	191,333;

15 and be it further

16 RESOLVED, That beginning July 1, 2025, judicial salaries shall be as follows:

17	Position	Proposed Salary
18	Court of Appeals	
19	Chief Judge	255,433
20	Associate Judge	236,433
21	Court of Special	
22	Appeals	
23	Chief Judge	226,633
24	Associate Judge	223,633
25	Circuit Courts	
26	Judge	214,433
27	District Court	
28	Chief Judge	223,633
29	Associate Judge	201,333;

30 and be it further

31 RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded by the Department of
32 Legislative Services to the Honorable Lawrence J. Hogan, Jr., Governor of Maryland; the
33 Honorable William C. Ferguson, IV, President of the Senate of Maryland; and the
34 Honorable Adrienne A. Jones, Speaker of the House of Delegates.

Appendix 8
Maryland Judiciary
Special Committee on Judicial Compensation Report

Report to the Maryland Judicial Compensation Commission

September 16, 2021

Revised 11-24-2021

Maryland Judiciary Special Committee on Judicial Compensation

The Honorable Jonathan Biran, Court of Appeals, Chair

The Honorable Mary Ellen Barbera, Chief Judge Court of Appeals (retired)

The Honorable Matthew J. Fader, Chief Judge Court of Special Appeals

The Honorable Keith A. Baynes, Chair, Conference of Circuit Court Judges

The Honorable John P. Morrissey, Chief Judge, District Court

The Honorable Angela M. Eaves

The Honorable Stacy A. Mayer

The Honorable Scott M. Carrington

Pamela Harris, State Court Administrator

Kelley O'Connor, Government Relations, Administrative Office of the Courts

Jennifer Boswell, Human Resources, Administrative Office of the Courts

Lee Robinson, Human Resources, Administrative Office of the Courts (retired)



September 16, 2021

This report was prepared by the Maryland Judiciary as part of the briefing for the statutory Judicial Compensation Commission at their organizational meeting prior to the 2022 legislative session of the Maryland General Assembly.

Statutory Provisions for the Judicial Compensation Process in Maryland

The Judicial Compensation Commission was created by statute in 1980 with the legislative purpose to ensure that the Maryland Judiciary attracts highly qualified applicants to the bench in Maryland without economic hardship to the judicial nominees (Chapter 717, Acts of 1980). The statutory provisions are codified at Maryland Code, Courts & Judicial Proceedings Article, § 1-708 (see Tab 1).

The statute was amended in 2009 to provide for quadrennial review of judicial salaries by the Commission. Under the statute, the Commission prepares a report that is submitted to the Governor and the Maryland General Assembly prior to the start of the next regular session (Courts & Judicial Proceedings Article, § 1-708). A Joint Resolution, which encompasses the Commission's proposals, is then introduced in each house of the General Assembly by the 15th day of the session.

The General Assembly may amend the Joint Resolution to decrease, but not increase, any of the Commission's salary recommendations. Failure to amend or reject the Joint Resolution within 50 calendar days after its introduction results in the adoption of the salaries recommended by the Commission.

If the General Assembly rejects any of the Commission's recommendations, the salaries of the judges remain unchanged, unless modified under other state personnel provisions of the law.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Structure of the Maryland Judiciary	3
Report of the Special Committee.....	4
Statutory Authority.....	22
State Courts Judicial Salary Survey.....	25
Federal Court Salaries	30
Judicial Salaries versus Inflation	32
National Center for State Courts (NCSC) Survey of Judicial Salaries.....	47
Comparative Salary Data.....	50

Structure of the Maryland Judiciary

The District Court of Maryland

Most Maryland residents who come into contact with the legal system do so through the District Court. The District Court is a statewide court headquartered in Annapolis, with 33 locations in 12 districts throughout the state. It has a staff of over 1,700 individuals, including 124 judges. As one of the two trial courts in Maryland, more than 1.7 million cases are filed in the District Court each year. These cases include domestic violence and peace orders; landlord-tenant disputes; motor vehicle violations ranging from parking tickets to driving under the influence; civil lawsuits for up to \$30,000; criminal misdemeanors and certain felonies; and pretrial release and preliminary hearings for all defendants charged in Maryland. The mission of the District Court is “to provide equal and exact justice for all who are involved in litigation before the Court.” As most individuals appearing before the District Court represent themselves, the District Court judges are presented with a unique challenge in an adversarial system.

The Circuit Courts

The Circuit Courts are the trial courts of general jurisdiction in Maryland. They have exclusive jurisdiction over most matters of equity, civil cases exceeding \$30,000, and most felony criminal cases. The Circuit Courts also preside over divorce and other family law matters. They are the only state courts in Maryland empowered to conduct jury trials (in both civil and criminal cases). In addition to their role as trial courts, the Circuit Courts also hear appeals from the District Court and administrative agencies. There are 24 Circuit Courts in Maryland: one in each of the 23 counties plus Baltimore City. The number of judges on each Circuit Court is set by statute and varies by county: Baltimore City has the most Circuit Court judges with 35, while Caroline, Dorchester, Garrett, Kent, Queen Anne’s, Somerset, and Talbot Counties have only one Circuit Court judge each. These judges are tasked with resolving the more serious and more complicated criminal and civil cases in the Maryland trial courts.

The Court of Special Appeals

The Court of Special Appeals is the intermediate appellate court in Maryland, located in Annapolis. The Court was created in 1966 in response to the rapidly growing caseload in the Court of Appeals. Originally, the Court of Special Appeals could hear appeals only in criminal cases. In 1974, its jurisdiction was expanded to include any reviewable judgment in the Circuit Courts. Today, the Court of Special Appeals resolves over 2,100 appeals per year. The Court consists of 15 judges—one from each of the seven geographically determined appellate judicial circuits and eight “at large” judges who can reside anywhere in the state. In most cases, the Court hears and decides cases in panels of three.

The Court of Appeals

The Court of Appeals is the highest court in Maryland (what most states would call their “Supreme Court”), also located in Annapolis. Since the expansion of the Court of Special Appeals’ jurisdiction in 1974, the Court of Appeals has heard cases on an almost exclusively discretionary basis. Parties can file a “petition for writ of certiorari” in any case pending in or decided by the Court of Special Appeals. The Court of Appeals then reviews the petition and determines whether further review of the case is desirable or in the public interest. This includes cases that raise constitutional issues, unsettled questions of law, and issues related to emerging technologies. If the case meets this standard for further review, the Court grants the petition and allows the parties to argue their case. With few exceptions, decisions of the Court of Appeals are final and cannot be appealed to another court. The Court of Appeals is composed of seven judges—one from each of the seven appellate judicial circuits—all of whom sit on each case. Currently, the Court’s seven members include three female judges and two African-American judges, making it one of the most diverse panels on a state supreme court in the country. This year marks the eighth consecutive term in which all of the Court’s opinions were released in the same term (year) in which they were heard.

Report of the Special Committee

Introduction

This report has been prepared by the Maryland Judiciary in advance of the statutory Judicial Compensation Commission (Commission) review of judicial salaries prior to the 2022 legislative session of the Maryland General Assembly. As has been past practice, the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals appointed a Special Committee on Judicial Compensation (Committee) consisting of incumbent judges and support staff from the Judiciary. This Committee has met several times over the last six months to consider the issues associated with judicial compensation in order to prepare this report, which consists of comparative data and an analysis of judicial salaries in states similar to Maryland in their geography, economy and judicial structure for presentation to the Commission.

Findings

As a result of this study, the Committee noted several areas of concern:

- **Judicial Salaries Versus Inflation:** Over the past 20 years (2001 – 2021) Maryland judicial salaries have not kept pace with inflation. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index (CPI-U), the cost of living for all urban consumers in the Northeast United States increased by 72.52% over the most recent 20 years. Judicial salaries increased by 45% to 48% during that same time. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the cost-of-living for all urban consumers in the Baltimore/Washington Region also increased by 68.78% over the most recent 20 years.
- **Regional Ranking:** Of the nine regional states with which Maryland is most comparable geographically and economically, the salaries of Maryland judges currently rank in the bottom third: Circuit Court – ninth (last); Court of Special Appeals – sixth; Court of Appeals – eighth; Chief Judge, Court of Appeals – seventh. Moreover, Maryland’s judicial salaries have remained stagnant in the rankings over the past four years: Circuit Court – remained at ninth; Court of Special Appeals – remained at sixth; Court of Appeals – remained at eighth; Chief Judge, Court of Appeals – remained at seventh. Of the seven states (including Maryland) having limited jurisdiction courts comparable to the District Court, Rhode Island is the only state in our region. Maryland ranks behind Rhode Island.
- **National Ranking:** Of the fifty states and the District of Columbia ¹ in a national ranking, the salaries of Maryland judges also generally dropped in their competitive positions especially when a cost of living factor is applied. Without the cost of living factor, the ranking is: Circuit Court – 21st; Court of Special Appeals – 18th; Court of Appeals – 17th; Chief Judge, Court of Appeals – 13th. With the cost of living factor, the ranking is: Circuit Court – 43rd; Court of Special Appeals – 37th; Court of Appeals – 37th; Chief Judge, Court of Appeals – 29th.

¹ The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) Survey of Judicial Salaries includes U.S. Territories that are not included in this summary.

- **Federal Judicial Salaries:** A prior Committee recommended keeping pace with federal judicial salaries to maintain Maryland’s competitive standing, which it believed was critical, given Maryland’s proximity to the District of Columbia. However, it appears the gap between Maryland judicial salaries and federal judicial salaries continues to widen, for example, a judge on the federal intermediate appellate court earns a salary of \$231,800 while a judge on the Court of Special Appeals – Maryland’s intermediate court – earns a salary of \$183,633, a difference of \$48,167.
- **Legal Associate Salaries:** According to Law Crossing (2018), a Baltimore Law Firm 1st year Associate makes \$179,678, which is \$18,345 more than our Judge, District Court and \$5,245 more than our Judge, Circuit Court. A Baltimore Law Firm 2nd year Associate makes \$193,045, which is \$9,412 more than our Chief Judge, District Court and Judge, Court of Special Appeals and \$6,412 more than our Chief Judge, Court of Special Appeals. A Baltimore Law Firm 3rd year Associate makes \$212,110, which is \$15,677 more than our Judge, Court of Appeals and only \$3,323 less than our Chief Judge, Court of Appeals. A Baltimore Law Firm 4th year Associate makes \$245,089, which is \$29,656 more than our Chief Judge, Court of Appeals.

According to Law Crossing (2018), a District of Columbia Law Firm 1st year Associate makes \$181,570, which is \$20,237 more than our Judge, District Court and \$7,137 more than our Judge, Circuit Court. A District of Columbia Law Firm 2nd year Associate makes \$195,077, which is \$11,444 more than our Chief Judge, District Court and Judge, Court of Special Appeals and \$8,444 more than our Chief Judge, Court of Special Appeals. A District of Columbia Law Firm 3rd year Associate makes \$214,343, which is \$17,910 more than our Judge, Court of Appeals and only \$1,090 less than our Chief Judge, Court of Appeals. A District of Columbia Law Firm 4th year Associate makes \$247,669, which is \$32,236 more than our Chief Judge, Court of Appeals.

- **Law Professor Salaries:** According to University of Baltimore Compensation Analyst, a University of Baltimore Law School Professor salary average is \$177,371, which is \$16,038 more than our Judge, District Court and \$2,938 more than our Judge, Circuit Court. According to University of Maryland Compensation Manager, a University of Maryland Law School Professor salary average is \$177,371, which is \$16,038 more than our Judge, District Court and \$2,938 more than our Judge, Circuit Court.

Current Maryland Judicial Salaries

In January 2018, the Judicial Compensation Commission submitted to the Maryland Legislature a recommendation to increase the salaries of all Maryland judges by \$35,000 over four years (\$10,000 each in years 1 and 2; \$7,500 each in years 3 and 4). The legislature reduced the Commission’s recommendation to \$5,000 each year and it was awarded in phases in fiscal years 2019 to 2022. The increases were as follows for each level of judgeship: \$5,000 (FY19); \$5,000 (FY20), \$5,000 (FY21); and \$5,000 (FY22). The total cumulative, average increase amount was an approximate 12.16% increase in salary.

Title	Salary Prior to Increases	07/01/2018 Salary	07/01/2019 Salary	07/01/2020 Salary	07/01/2021 Salary
Judge, District Court	\$141,333	\$146,333	\$151,333	\$156,333	\$161,333
Chief Judge, District Court	\$163,633	\$168,633	\$173,633	\$178,633	\$183,633
Judge, Circuit Court	\$154,433	\$159,433	\$164,433	\$169,433	\$174,433
Judge, Court of Special Appeals	\$163,633	\$168,633	\$173,633	\$178,633	\$183,633
Chief Judge, Court of Special Appeals	\$166,633	\$171,633	\$176,633	\$181,633	\$186,633
Judge, Court of Appeals	\$176,433	\$181,433	\$186,433	\$191,433	\$196,433
Chief Judge, Court of Appeals	\$195,433	\$200,433	\$205,433	\$210,433	\$215,433

Judicial Salary Survey as of July 2021

In July 2021, the Judiciary Human Resources Department obtained current judicial salary data from the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to compare Maryland judicial salaries with judicial salaries in states within the region and nationally. The Committee compiled the judicial salary data and presents its findings here for the consideration of the Commission. Tab 2 provides the most recent judicial salary data report by each state for each judicial classification. It should be noted the NCSC no longer tracks salary data for the Intermediate Appellate Court Chief Judge and Courts of Limited Jurisdiction due to jurisdictional differences from state to state. The data is listed in order of national rank (highest to lowest). Regional rankings are also provided as are salaries adjusted for cost of living. What follows is a synopsis of the reported data for state courts.

Regional Comparison:

Although the Committee believes it is important to examine the salaries of Maryland judges compared to the nation as a whole, it considers it particularly important to examine how Maryland judges stand when compared to other states in the Mid-Atlantic geographical area. The states that traditionally have been included in this regional comparison with Maryland are:

Connecticut	New York
Delaware	Pennsylvania
District of Columbia	Rhode Island
New Jersey	Virginia

The chart below shows the current regional rankings vs. those reported in our last survey, with 1 being highest and 9, lowest.

Regional, No Cost-of-Living Factor				
Date	Chief Judge, Highest Appellate	Judge, Highest Appellate	Judge, Intermediate Appellate	General Jurisdiction Judge
01/01/2017	7	8	6	9
07/01/2021	7	8	6	9
Variance	0	0	0	0

As indicated above, Maryland remained stagnant in all four (4) judicial classifications. At each level, Maryland judicial salaries are near or at the bottom of the regional rankings.

The chart below shows the cost-of-living factor being applied to the regional rankings vs. those reported in our last survey, with 1 being highest and 9, lowest.

Regional, Cost-of-Living Factor				
Date	Chief Judge, Highest Appellate	Judge, Highest Appellate	Judge, Intermediate Appellate	General Jurisdiction Judge
01/01/2017	4	6	5	7
07/01/2021	7	7	6	8
Variance	-3	-1	-1	-1

As indicated above, when the cost-of-living factor is applied, Maryland lost ground in all judicial classifications. At each level, Maryland judicial salaries are now near the bottom of the regional rankings.

As noted previously, the NCSC no longer tracks salary data for courts of limited jurisdiction, *e.g.* the District Court of Maryland. Within the region, Rhode Island is the only state that has a court of limited jurisdiction comparable to Maryland’s District Court. Therefore, the Committee had to research other states to find comparable courts. As a result of the research and utilizing the NCSC list serve, the Committee obtained salary data for six (6) states that have a court of limited jurisdiction that is comparable to Maryland: Alaska, Colorado, Kentucky, Nebraska, Rhode Island, and Washington. The average of judicial salaries for courts of limited jurisdiction in those states is \$164,643. This is a difference of \$3,310 when compared to current judicial salaries in the District Court, as of 07/01/2021. A comparison of the average cost of living in these jurisdictions indicates Maryland has a cost of living adjustment index of 126.8 while the other states average 113.27, a difference of 13.53. Maryland District Court judges make less than the average salary of their counterparts in the above states, yet also have a higher cost of living.

National Comparison:

The chart below highlights how Maryland’s current national rankings have changed vs. those that were reported in the 2017 survey with 1 being highest and 51 lowest.

National, No Cost-of-Living Factor				
Date	Chief Judge, Highest Appellate	Judge, Highest Appellate	Judge, Intermediate Appellate	General Jurisdiction Judge
01/01/2017	11	14	19	22
07/01/2021	13	17	18	21
Variance	-2	-3	+1	+1

As indicated above, Maryland lost ground in two (2) of the four (4) judicial classifications and gained ground in two (2) of the four (4) judicial classifications.

National, Cost-of-Living Factor				
Date	Chief Judge, Highest Appellate	Judge, Highest Appellate	Judge, Intermediate Appellate	General Jurisdiction Judge
01/01/2017	21	32	32	37
07/01/2021	29	37	37	43
Variance	-8	-5	-5	-6

As indicated above, when the cost-of-living factor is applied, Maryland lost ground in all four (4) of the judicial classifications. The Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals is paid in the bottom half of highest appellate court chief judges nationally. The other national classifications for Maryland judges range from the bottom twenty-eight percent to the bottom eight percent.

A Maryland General Jurisdiction Judge, the lowest nationally ranked judge classification in Maryland, when adjusted for cost-of-living, dropped six (6) rankings and now ranks 43rd when compared to other states and the District of Columbia:

State	National Rank	COLF	Salary w/ COLF
Illinois	1	100	\$216,297
Tennessee	2	92.2	\$201,759
South Carolina	3	98.6	\$199,554
Arkansas	4	90.4	\$193,387
New York	5	112.4	\$187,674
Georgia	6	93.4	\$186,047
Pennsylvania	7	102.2	\$182,669

Virginia	8	102.4	\$180,353
Missouri	9	90.3	\$176,695
Nebraska	10	101.1	\$176,232
Delaware	11	109.9	\$175,463
Washington	12	115	\$173,117
Michigan	13	91.6	\$169,849
Utah	14	103.5	\$169,687
Louisiana	15	97.1	\$168,486
Indiana	16	95.2	\$168,083
Ohio	17	92.4	\$165,451
Minnesota	18	102.9	\$164,538
Florida	19	101.1	\$163,672
Colorado	20	111.1	\$160,615
Texas	21	96.6	\$159,487
California	22	135.2	\$158,717
Iowa	23	97.8	\$158,384
New Jersey	24	121.9	\$157,764
Oklahoma	25	93.2	\$156,195
Mississippi	26	88.6	\$153,520
Wyoming	27	104.9	\$152,511
North Carolina	28	95.6	\$148,698
Wisconsin	29	100.3	\$147,151
Arizona	30	101.8	\$146,712
Idaho	31	99.1	\$145,755
South Dakota	32	99.7	\$145,588
Alaska	33	131.3	\$144,502
Connecticut	34	126.7	\$142,483
Nevada	35	112.6	\$142,101
Kentucky	36	92.4	\$141,733
Rhode Island	37	128.7	\$141,670
North Dakota	38	108	\$140,871
Massachusetts	39	132.3	\$139,621
Vermont	40	121.2	\$138,162
New Mexico	41	100.3	\$138,011
Hawaii	42	150.4	\$137,691
Maryland	43	126.8	\$137,608
Kansas	44	98.2	\$137,546
Montana	45	104.1	\$137,065
District of Columbia	46	159.5	\$137,016
New Hampshire	47	120.5	\$136,853
Alabama	48	93.1	\$135,313
West Virginia	49	95	\$132,596
Oregon	50	119.2	\$129,772
Maine	51	116.7	\$121,125

A Maryland Intermediate Appellate Court Judge, when adjusted for cost-of-living, dropped five (5) rankings and now ranks 37th when compared to 39 other states:

State	National Rank	COLF	Salary w/ COLF
Illinois	1	100	\$235,713
Tennessee	2	92.2	\$209,011
South Carolina	3	98.6	\$204,797
Pennsylvania	4	102.2	\$198,530
Arkansas	5	90.4	\$198,145
New York	6	112.4	\$197,687
Indiana	7	95.2	\$196,707
Virginia	8	102.4	\$190,842
Georgia	9	93.4	\$190,567
Florida	10	101.1	\$190,015
Missouri	11	90.3	\$187,391
Texas	12	96.6	\$184,679
Michigan	13	91.6	\$183,882
Washington	14	115	\$182,374
California	15	135.2	\$181,641
Nebraska	16	101.1	\$181,024
Ohio	17	92.4	\$179,834
Utah	18	103.5	\$178,068
Alabama	19	93.1	\$177,306
Louisiana	20	97.1	\$175,426
Minnesota	21	102.9	\$175,231
Iowa	22	97.8	\$170,180
Colorado	23	111.1	\$167,536
New Jersey	24	121.9	\$166,623
Oklahoma	25	93.2	\$163,768
Mississippi	26	88.6	\$163,462
North Carolina	27	95.6	\$157,096
Wisconsin	28	100.3	\$155,920
Arizona	29	101.8	\$151,802
Idaho	30	99.1	\$151,766
Kansas	31	98.2	\$150,700
Connecticut	32	126.7	\$148,116
Kentucky	33	92.4	\$147,870
Alaska	34	131.3	\$147,628
Nevada	35	112.6	\$146,536
New Mexico	36	100.3	\$145,289
Maryland	37	126.8	\$144,821
Massachusetts	38	132.3	\$143,679
Hawaii	39	150.4	\$141,479
Oregon	40	119.2	\$137,587

A Maryland Highest Appellate Court Judge, when adjusted for cost-of-living, dropped five (5) rankings and now ranks 37th when compared to other states and the District of Columbia:

State	National Rank	COLF	Salary w/ COLF
Illinois	1	100	\$250,442
Florida	2	101.1	\$224,746
Tennessee	3	92.2	\$216,195

Pennsylvania	4	102.2	\$210,408
South Carolina	5	98.6	\$210,049
New York	6	112.4	\$207,651
Virginia	7	102.4	\$207,388
Missouri	8	90.3	\$205,013
Arkansas	9	90.4	\$204,190
Indiana	10	95.2	\$202,357
California	11	135.2	\$193,749
Ohio	12	92.4	\$192,944
Georgia	13	93.4	\$191,769
Washington	14	115	\$191,583
Texas	15	96.6	\$191,304
Nebraska	16	101.1	\$190,551
Iowa	17	97.8	\$187,784
Louisiana	18	97.1	\$187,600
Delaware	19	109.9	\$186,656
Utah	20	103.5	\$186,570
Minnesota	21	102.9	\$185,966
Michigan	22	91.6	\$179,705
Alabama	23	93.1	\$178,380
New Jersey	24	121.9	\$174,930
Colorado	25	111.1	\$174,448
Oklahoma	26	93.2	\$172,867
Mississippi	27	88.6	\$171,840
Wyoming	28	104.9	\$166,826
Wisconsin	29	100.3	\$165,276
North Carolina	30	95.6	\$163,874
Idaho	31	99.1	\$161,857
Connecticut	32	126.7	\$157,680
Arizona	33	101.8	\$156,861
Alaska	34	131.3	\$156,265
South Dakota	35	99.7	\$155,817
Kansas	36	98.2	\$155,726
Maryland	37	126.8	\$154,916
Kentucky	38	92.4	\$154,071
North Dakota	39	108	\$153,560
New Mexico	40	100.3	\$152,935
Hawaii	41	150.4	\$152,705
Massachusetts	42	132.3	\$151,915
Nevada	43	112.6	\$150,977
Montana	44	104.1	\$149,779
Rhode Island	45	128.7	\$147,183
New Hampshire	46	120.5	\$145,923
Vermont	47	121.2	\$145,330
District of Columbia	48	159.5	\$145,329
West Virginia	49	95	\$143,158
Oregon	50	119.2	\$140,295
Maine	51	116.7	\$129,280

A Maryland Highest Appellate Court Chief Judge, when adjusted for cost-of-living, dropped eight (8) rankings and now ranks 29th when compared to other states and the District of Columbia:

State	National Rank	COLF	Salary w/ COLF
Illinois	1	100	\$250,442
Florida	2	101.1	\$224,746
Texas	3	96.6	\$ 222,391
Tennessee	4	92.2	\$221,623
South Carolina	5	98.6	\$220,552
Arkansas	6	90.4	\$220,513
Virginia	7	102.4	\$220,231
Pennsylvania	8	102.2	\$216,531
Missouri	9	90.3	\$214,336
New York	10	112.4	\$214,235
Ohio	11	92.4	\$205,549
Minnesota	12	102.9	\$204,564
California	13	135.2	\$203,177
Indiana	14	95.2	\$202,357
Louisiana	15	97.1	\$196,981
Iowa	16	97.8	\$196,586
Delaware	17	109.9	\$195,081
Washington	18	115	\$194,347
Georgia	19	93.4	\$191,769
Nebraska	20	101.1	\$190,551
Utah	21	103.5	\$188,502
Oklahoma	22	93.2	\$184,602
New Jersey	23	121.9	\$181,037
Michigan	24	91.6	\$179,705
Mississippi	25	88.6	\$179,458
Alabama	26	93.1	\$179,454
Colorado	27	111.1	\$178,250
Connecticut	28	126.7	\$170,414
Maryland	29	126.8	\$169,900
North Carolina	30	95.6	\$168,241
Wyoming	31	104.9	\$166,826
Wisconsin	32	100.3	\$165,276
Idaho	33	99.1	\$164,884
Arizona	34	101.8	\$161,921
Rhode Island	35	128.7	\$161,902
Kansas	36	98.2	\$159,628
Kentucky	37	92.4	\$159,483
Hawaii	38	150.4	\$158,314
North Dakota	39	108	\$157,903
South Dakota	40	99.7	\$157,823
Alaska	41	131.3	\$156,722
Massachusetts	42	132.3	\$155,887
New Mexico	43	100.3	\$154,930
Vermont	44	121.2	\$152,275
Montana	45	104.1	\$151,570

Nevada	46	112.6	\$150,977
New Hampshire	47	120.5	\$150,448
Maine	48	116.7	\$149,475
District of Columbia	49	159.5	\$145,643
West Virginia	50	95	\$143,158
Oregon	51	119.2	\$142,963

Federal Judicial Salaries:

Due to Maryland’s proximity to the nation’s capital, it is important to be mindful of the variance between Maryland judicial salaries and those of the federal court system. To maintain a competitive standing in the region, the prior Committee’s goal was to achieve full parity with federal judicial compensation. Tab 3 shows the current federal judicial salary structure. Below is a comparison of the federal and Maryland judicial salaries and increases.

Federal Court Salaries	2017	2021
Chief Justice, Supreme Court	\$263,300	\$280,500
Associate Justice, Supreme Court	\$251,800	\$268,300
Judge, Court of Appeals	\$217,600	\$231,800
Trial Courts - District Court Judges	\$205,100	\$218,600
Bankruptcy & Magistrate Judges	\$189,000	\$202,000

Maryland State Court Salaries	07/01/2017	07/01/2021
Chief Judge, Court of Appeals	\$195,433	\$215,433
Judge, Court of Appeals	\$176,433	\$196,433
Chief Judge, Court of Special Appeals	\$166,633	\$186,633
Judge, Court of Special Appeals	\$163,633	\$183,633
Judge, Circuit Court	\$154,433	\$174,433
Chief Judge, District Court	\$163,633	\$183,633
Judge, District Court	\$141,333	\$161,333

Recommendations

In view of the above findings, the Committee respectfully urges the Judicial Compensation Commission to consider the recommendation of a significant salary increase for each classification of judge to be effective July 1, 2022.

In order to maintain the current gaps in salaries between classifications, the Committee recommends that any salary increase be the same dollar amount for each judicial classification. An across-the-board percentage increase would serve only to widen the gap between each classification, which the Committee does not recommend.

The Committee also asks that any proposed salary increase be implemented in total on July 1, 2022, rather than incrementally over several years. Incremental increases would further delay the necessary immediate correction to judicial salaries, causing salaries to continue to lag behind the market. It also would diminish the positive effects of the total increase because a likely rise in the cost-of-living or employee-paid benefits each year would noticeably reduce the value of smaller yearly increases.

Accomplishments of the Maryland Judiciary Since the Judicial Compensation Report of 2017

The Maryland Judiciary's mission is to provide fair, efficient, and effective justice for all. As such, the Maryland Judiciary advances justice for all who come to Maryland's courts. All judges serve to support the Judiciary's vision of an efficient, innovative, and accessible court system that works collaboratively with justice partners to serve the people with integrity and transparency.

Our judges collectively handle more than 2 million cases per year; every case represents a crucial juncture in peoples' lives. These include approximately 3,000 cases per year at the appellate level, close to 300,000 cases annually at the circuit court level, and the remaining 1.7 million cases per year are handled by the District Court.

Every day, Maryland judges are called upon to make decisions that have a profound impact on people's lives. Our judges hear cases that run the gamut from traffic violations to first degree murder, from landlord-tenant disputes to civil cases involving medical malpractice and complex commercial and technology matters. They hear difficult cases involving divorce, child custody, domestic violence, and human trafficking. They decide juvenile matters and are given the authority to terminate parental rights and remove children from their homes to protect them from imminent harm. And, they have the authority to sentence a criminal defendant in the appropriate case to spend the rest of his or her life in prison.

In recent years, the Maryland Judiciary has expanded the role of its trial court judges, increasing their interactions with litigants through innovative programs such as drug courts, veterans' courts, and mental health courts. Our judges are also supporting expanded services for children and families, juveniles, human trafficking victims, the elderly, the unrepresented, and the limited English-speaking population. At the same time, judges are adapting to significant changes as the Judiciary phases in the Maryland Electronic Courts (MDEC) initiative, works to modernize its overall operations, and strives for increased transparency by making more information publicly accessible.

Some of the recent accomplishments by the Maryland Judiciary and its judges include:

Modernization and System Improvements

- MDEC is fully operational in 21 of 24 jurisdictions in the state representing 87.5 percent of courts. Montgomery county will "go live" with the MDEC system in October 2021. The remaining two jurisdictions, Prince George's County and Baltimore City, are on pace for full statewide implementation by 2023.
- Trial courts are developing and implementing new case management plans statewide to improve overall efficiency, enhance service delivery, and make case management information more accessible.
- Courts throughout the state are held accountable with established case-time standards. For example, the Court of Appeals has met its standard of issuing rulings on all cases during

the same term in which the cases were heard for the past eight consecutive terms since it established the standard.

Responding to Needs in the Community

- The Judiciary operates 60 active problem-solving courts statewide, including some exclusively designed to meet the needs of our veteran population, families in recovery, drug addiction, juveniles, and those with acute mental health needs. A first of its kind Re-Entry Program has been launched in Baltimore City. Judges spend many hours in the community and with participants engaged with these problem-solving initiatives. These courts often convene during evening hours following a full day of dockets.
- The Maryland Judiciary has been acknowledged by the Justice Index as a national leader in access to justice, ranking fourth, nationally, for overall performance. The Maryland Judiciary Help Centers have walk-in centers and statewide call-in locations that are staffed by trained attorneys and have helped over 100,000 people over the past year seeking assistance in civil legal matters, particularly those related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Full-time walk-in centers are available in courthouse locations in Baltimore, Rockville, Catonsville, Upper Marlboro, Glen Burnie, Salisbury, and Frederick. Part-time walk-in services are available in Cambridge and Hagerstown. Individuals can also receive help from 8:30 am to 8:00 pm Monday through Friday by calling 410-260-1392 to talk with an attorney for free.
- Judges are collaborating actively with Executive Branch departments to implement the Maryland Justice Reinvestment Act and to deal with pandemic-related issues.
- Judges increasingly are using e-warrants to support law enforcement more efficiently when emergency search warrants are needed after hours, on weekends, and on holidays. This requires judges, as scheduled, to be on-call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year in every county and in Baltimore City.
- Judges are implementing a Judiciary resolution against the presumptive shackling of juveniles in the courtroom. Research indicates that children are hindered in their access to justice when restraints cause emotional restrictions, preventing communication with counsel, or when shackling results in an undue perception of guilt.
- The Judiciary has expanded access to court resources for people with limited English proficiency through new website portals that offer the most requested resources in Spanish, French, Russian, Chinese, and Korean, including court forms and requests for interpreter services. Remote virtual language assistance is being piloted throughout the state in the upcoming months.

Judicial Achievements During the Pandemic Emergency

- On March 13, 2020, Chief Judge Mary Ellen Barbera issued a set of Administrative Orders to adjust Judiciary operations in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. The orders clearly delineated that, regardless of conditions, the Judiciary needed to maintain operations to provide service to the most vulnerable populations that it serves. Those

services included bail reviews, protective orders, peace orders, extreme risk protective orders, juvenile detention hearings, family law emergencies, and quarantine and isolation cases.

- Throughout these challenging times, Maryland state courts have remained open to address matters to the extent allowed by the pandemic, providing due process and protecting constitutional rights. Chief Judge Barbera issued the first two administrative orders responding to changing conditions and capacities, authorizing Administrative Judges in trial courts to take appropriate measures to protect the safety of the public, justice partners, and court personnel. For Administrative Judges, these responsibilities were in addition to hearing cases, managing trial calendars and overseeing the administration of the court.
- In addition, since the onset of the pandemic, Administrative Judges have been responsible for enacting and adapting to over 80 Administrative Orders to ensure that the courts remained operational during this unprecedented pandemic. Collectively, they managed their courts through the pivot to remote proceedings, retrofitted their courtrooms with Plexiglas shields, distributed PPE and adjusted to each and every phase of the phased reopening thereby maintaining public safety while still remaining operational. No additional compensation is provided for these pandemic-related duties.
- During this initial period, the Judiciary procured truckloads of plexiglass, sanitizers, contactless thermometers, decals for social distancing, masks and other PPE. The first courthouse screening protocols were developed, the judiciary started to pivot to Skype video dockets and administrative procedures were developed to deal with the positive test results in courthouses.
- In the initial response to the pandemic, the Judiciary faced issues ranging from ensuring continuity of the drug and mental health courts to pausing electronic feeds to the MVA and CCU. By June 2020, the Judiciary fully embraced remote proceedings moving from Skype to Teams and Zoom for Government. In managing this remarkable pivot from all in-person proceedings to remote hearings, the Judiciary resolved security issues inherent in remote proceedings, effectively incorporated interpreters into these remote proceedings, and developed integrations with our recording systems. During the same time, the Administrative Office of the Courts and District Court Headquarters provisioned hundreds of laptops, webcams and microphones, and resolved issues with noticing of hearings and the text messaging notice of trial date program.
- Since June of 2020 through July of 2021, the Judiciary conducted more than 147,145 Zoom sessions, that involved 1,079,741 participants, and used over 49,001,723 Zoom minutes. In addition, the Judiciary's Help Centers remained operational remotely throughout the pandemic, developing a knowledge base of resources, which include local rental assistance programs. Maryland Court Help Centers provided more than 150,000 instances of service to individuals without counsel between March of 2020 and August of 2021. More than 32,000 instances of service were for landlord-tenant matters. Town Hall meetings with the local bar associations were initiated to update changes to operations.

The Judiciary hosted regular meetings with the Department of Public Safety, the Department of Health, and the Department of Housing at the state level, and with all of the justice partners at the local level, to ensure that operations continued collaboratively as safely as possible.

- Notwithstanding what appeared to be never-ending obstacles and challenges, the courts continued to function effectively and efficiently due to the diligence and initiative of Maryland judges. If not for these judges, with the assistance of equally diligent and motivated Judiciary staff, the courts would have ceased to function during a time when, perhaps, their presence was of the greatest importance to our society.

Education and Professional Development

- Judges regularly volunteer their subject matter expertise to educate their colleagues and to plan important future educational initiatives.
- Judges are engaged in a newly created New Trial Judges Mentor Program, a year-long formal, structured, and guided process that supports the preparation and ongoing education of new trial judges. Experienced judges who have exhibited the highest ethical standards and have demonstrated a commitment to judicial education serve as mentors for new trial judges during their first year.
- Judges routinely work, on many occasions after hours, in concert with local bar associations, schools, and community-based organizations to lead civics education events, make presentations, preside over mock trials, and host court visits, all to help educate the public, including our next generation of leaders, about the legal system, how government works, and the roles that individuals play in a civil society.

Policy and Governance

- Judges are involved in judicial governance through participation on the Maryland Judicial Council and its eleven working committees, devoting significant “after hours” time and expertise developing policy recommendations with regard to (1) Alternative Dispute Resolution, (2) Court Access and Community Relations, (3) Court Operations, (4) Court Technology, (5) District Court, (6) Domestic Law, (7) Education, (8) Juvenile Law, (9) Legislation, (10) Senior Judges, (11) Specialty Courts and Dockets and (12) Equal Justice.

*Appendix 1***The Judicial Compensation Commission**

The Judicial Compensation Commission was created by statute in 1980 with the legislative purpose to ensure that the Maryland Judiciary attracts highly qualified applicants to the bench in Maryland without economic hardship to the judicial nominees (Chapter 717, Acts of 1980). The statutory provisions are codified at Maryland Code, Courts & Judicial Proceedings Article, sec 1-708.

The statute was amended in 2009 to provide for quadrennial review of judicial salaries by the Commission. Under the statute, the Commission prepares a report that is submitted to the Governor and the Maryland General Assembly prior to the start of the next regular session (Courts & Judicial Proceedings Article, sec 1-708). A Joint Resolution, which encompasses the Commission's proposals, is then introduced in each house of the General Assembly by the 15th day of the session.

The General Assembly may amend the Joint Resolution to decrease, but not increase, any of the Commission's salary recommendations. Failure to amend or reject the Joint Resolution within 50 calendar days after its introduction results in the adoption of the salaries recommended by the Commission.

If the General Assembly rejects any of the Commission's recommendations, the salaries of the judges remain unchanged, unless modified under other state personnel provisions of the law.

*Appendix 2***Structure of the Maryland Judiciary****The District Court of Maryland**

Most Maryland residents who come into contact with the legal system do so through the District Court. The District Court is a statewide court headquartered in Annapolis, with 33 locations in 12 districts throughout the state. It has a staff of over 1,700 individuals, including 124 judges. As one of the two trial courts in Maryland, more than 1.7 million cases are filed in the District Court each year. These cases include domestic violence and peace orders; landlord-tenant disputes; motor vehicle violations ranging from parking tickets to driving under the influence; civil lawsuits for up to \$30,000; criminal misdemeanors and certain felonies; and pretrial release and preliminary hearings for all defendants charged in Maryland. The mission of the District Court is “to provide equal and exact justice for all who are involved in litigation before the Court.” As most individuals appearing before the District Court represent themselves, the District Court judges are presented with a unique challenge in an adversarial system.

Administrative Judges of the District Court have significant responsibilities for which they are not compensated. These duties include providing supervision over the associate judges on their courts, management of the bailiffs and other courthouse safety concerns, docket management, and facilities oversight. They regularly meet with justice partners on issues and programs vital to court operations and case adjudication. Some Administrative Judges supervise multiple courthouse locations and multiple counties. Essentially, the Administrative Judges are on-call 24/7.

The Circuit Courts

The Circuit Courts are the trial courts of general jurisdiction in Maryland. They have exclusive jurisdiction over most matters of equity, civil cases exceeding \$30,000, and most felony criminal cases. The Circuit Courts also preside over divorce and other family law matters. They are the only state courts in Maryland empowered to conduct jury trials (in both civil and criminal cases). In addition to their role as trial courts, the Circuit Courts also hear appeals from the District Court and administrative agencies. There are 24 Circuit Courts in Maryland: one in each of the 23 counties plus Baltimore City. The number of judges on each Circuit Court is set by statute and varies by county: Baltimore City has the most Circuit Court judges with 35, while Caroline, Dorchester, Garrett, Kent, Queen Anne’s, Somerset, and Talbot Counties have only one Circuit Court judge each. These judges are tasked with resolving the more serious and more complicated criminal and civil cases in the Maryland trial courts.

Like the District Court Administrative Judges, the Administrative Judges of the circuit courts not only hear cases, but they also have significant responsibilities for which they are not compensated. Although not exhaustive, these duties include providing supervision over the associate judges on their courts, management of sheriff and bailiff concerns, human resources issue resolution, docket management, facilities oversight and security issues, and working with local executive and legislative officials on budgets for maintaining and improving the physical structure of the local courthouses, and regularly meeting with many justice partners on issues and programs vital to court operations and case adjudication. Some Administrative Judges are not only charged with the day to day operations of their respective courts, but also have limited

oversight of other court locations within their judicial geographical circuits to coordinate inter-court transfer of matters. Essentially, the Administrative Judges are on-call 24/7.

The Court of Special Appeals

The Court of Special Appeals is the intermediate appellate court in Maryland, located in Annapolis. The Court was created in 1966 in response to the rapidly growing caseload in the Court of Appeals. Originally, the Court of Special Appeals could hear appeals only in criminal cases. In 1974, its jurisdiction was expanded to include any reviewable judgment in the Circuit Courts. Today, the Court of Special Appeals resolves over 2,100 appeals per year. The Court consists of 15 judges—one from each of the seven geographically determined appellate judicial circuits and eight “at large” judges who can reside anywhere in the state. In most cases, the Court hears and decides cases in panels of three.

The Court of Appeals

The Court of Appeals is the highest court in Maryland (what most states would call their “Supreme Court”), also located in Annapolis. Since the expansion of the Court of Special Appeals’ jurisdiction in 1974, the Court of Appeals has heard cases on an almost exclusively discretionary basis. Parties can file a “petition for writ of certiorari” in any case pending in or decided by the Court of Special Appeals. The Court of Appeals then reviews the petition and determines whether further review of the case is desirable or in the public interest. This includes cases that raise constitutional issues, unsettled questions of law, and issues related to emerging technologies. If the case meets this standard for further review, the Court grants the petition and allows the parties to argue their case. With few exceptions, decisions of the Court of Appeals are final and cannot be appealed to another court. The Court of Appeals is composed of seven judges—one from each of the seven appellate judicial circuits—all of whom sit on each case. Currently, the Court’s seven members include three female judges and two African-American judges, making it one of the most diverse panels on a state supreme court in the country. This year marks the eighth consecutive term in which all of the Court’s opinions were released in the same term (year) in which they were heard.

Tab 1

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY – MD COURTS & JUDICIAL
PROCEEDINGS ARTICLE § 1-708**

This section is the Md. COURTS & JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS Code Ann. § 1-708
COURTS & JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS
TITLE 1. COURT STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION
SUBTITLE 7. JUDICIAL SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES

Md. COURTS AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS Code Ann. § 1-708
COURTS AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS
TITLE 1. COURT STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION SUBTITLE
7. JUDICIAL SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES
Md. COURTS AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS Code Ann. § 1-708 (2016)

§ 1-708. Judicial Compensation Commission

(a) Salaries and pensions of judges. — The salaries and pensions of the judges of the Court of Appeals, the Court of Special Appeals, the circuit courts of the counties, and the District Court shall be established as provided by this section, §§ 1-701 through 1-707 of this subtitle, and Title 27 of the State Personnel and Pensions Article.

(b) Established. —

(1) There is a Judicial Compensation Commission. The Commission shall study and make recommendations with respect to all aspects of judicial compensation, to the end that the judicial compensation structure shall be adequate to assure that highly qualified persons will be attracted to the bench and will continue to serve there without unreasonable economic hardship.

(2) The Commission consists of seven members appointed by the Governor. No more than three members of the Commission may be individuals admitted to practice law in this State. In nominating and appointing members, special consideration shall be given to individuals who have knowledge of compensation practices and financial matters. The Governor shall appoint:

(i) Two members from a list of the names of at least five nominees submitted by the President of the Senate;

(ii) Two from a list of the names of at least five nominees submitted by the Speaker of the House of Delegates;

(iii) One from a list of the names of at least three nominees submitted by the Maryland State Bar Association, Inc.; and

(iv) Two at large.

(3) A member of the General Assembly, officer or employee of the State or a political subdivision of the State, or judge or former judge is not eligible for appointment to the Commission.

(4) The term of a member is 6 years, commencing July 1, 1980, and until the member's successor is appointed. However, of the members first appointed to the Commission, the Governor shall designate one of the members nominated by the President of the Senate to serve for 3 years and one for 6 years; one of the members nominated by the Speaker to serve for 4 years and one for 5 years; the member nominated by the Maryland State Bar Association, Inc., to serve for 3 years; and one of the members at large to serve for 2 years, and one for 6 years. A member is eligible for reappointment.

(5) Members of the Commission serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for reasonable expenses incurred in carrying out their responsibilities under this section.

(6) The members of the Commission shall elect a member as chairman of the Commission.

(7) The concurrence of at least five members is required for any formal Commission action.

(8) The Commission may request and receive assistance and information from any unit of State government.

(c) Written recommendations and funding. — On or after September 1, 2011, September 1, 2013, and every 4 years thereafter, the Commission shall review the salaries and pensions of the judges of the courts listed in subsection (a) of this section and make written recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly on or before the next ensuing

regular session of the General Assembly. The Governor shall include in the budget for the next ensuing fiscal year the funding necessary to implement those recommendations, contingent on action by the General Assembly under subsections (d) and (e) of this section.

(d) Recommendation as house joint resolution. —

(1) The salary recommendations made by the Commission shall be introduced as a joint resolution in each House of the General Assembly not later than the fifteenth day of the session. The General Assembly may amend the joint resolution to decrease any of the Commission salary recommendations, but no reduction may diminish the salary of a judge during his continuance in office. The General Assembly may not amend the joint resolution to increase the recommended salaries. If the General Assembly fails to adopt or amend the joint resolution within 50 days after its introduction, the salaries recommended by the

Commission shall apply. If the joint resolution is adopted or amended in accordance with this section within 50 days after its introduction, the salaries so provided shall apply. If the General Assembly rejects any or all of the Commission's salary recommendations, the salaries of the judges affected remain unchanged, unless modified under other provisions of law.

(2) The Governor or the General Assembly may not increase the recommended salaries, except as provided under § 1-703(b) of this subtitle.

(e) Legislation. — The recommendation of the Commission as to pensions shall be introduced by the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Delegates in the form of legislation, and shall become effective only if passed by both Houses.

(f) Changes in salaries and pensions. — Any change in salaries or pensions adopted by the General Assembly under this section takes effect as of the July 1 of the year next following the year in which the Commission makes its recommendations.

(g) Sections unaffected. — This section does not affect § 1-702(b), § 1-703(b), or §§ 1-705 through 1-707 of this subtitle, or Title 27 of the State Personnel and Pensions Article.

HISTORY: 1980, ch. 717; 1982, ch. 820, § 3; 1992, ch. 131, § 12; 1994, ch. 468; 1997, ch. 14, § 1; 1998, ch. 21, § 2; 2005, ch. 25, § 13; ch. 444, § 1; 2006, ch. 44, § 6; 2009, ch. 2; 2010, ch. 72; ch. 484, § 2.

Copyright © 2016 LexisNexis, a division of Reed Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved. Statutes current through October 1, 2016 and all chapters of the 2016 Regular Session of the Maryland General Assembly. Annotated Code of Maryland Copyright 2016 by Matthew Bender and Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group. All rights reserved.

Tab 2

STATE COURTS JUDICIAL SALARY SURVEY

This section includes the salary and ranking data for:

Limited Jurisdiction, Judge
General Jurisdiction, Judge
Intermediate Appellate, Court Judge
Intermediate Appellate Court, Chief Judge
Highest Appellate Court, Judge
Highest Appellate Court, Chief Judge

MARYLAND JUDICIARY | SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL COMPENSATION

Limited Jurisdiction Judge										
State	No Cost of Living Factor			Includes Cost of Living Factor				1/1/2017 Salary	% Chng from 1/1/2017 to 7/1/2021	Date of Last Salary Change
	National Rank 7/1/2021	Regional Rank 7/1/2021	7/1/2021 Salary*	National Rank 7/1/2021	COLF 7/1/2021	Regional Rank 7/1/2021	Salary 7/1/2021			
Alaska	6		\$160,856	7	131.3		\$122,510	\$160,848	0.00%	07/01/2020
Colorado	2		\$178,462	3	111.1		\$160,632	\$145,631	22.54%	07/01/2021
Kentucky	7		\$118,372	5	92.4		\$128,108	\$112,668	5.06%	07/01/2019
Maryland	5	2	\$161,333	6	126.8	2	\$127,234	\$141,333	14.15%	07/01/2021
Nebraska	3		\$178,199	1	101.1		\$176,260	\$160,677	10.91%	07/01/2021
Rhode Island	4	1	\$165,158	4	128.7	1	\$128,328	\$165,733	-0.35%	12/29/2019
Washington	1		\$190,120	2	115		\$165,322	\$137,536	38.23%	07/01/2020

Source: Independent outreach to individual courts.

Regional states

General Jurisdiction Judge										
State	No Cost of Living Factor			Includes Cost of Living Factor				1/1/2017 Salary	% Chng from 1/1/2017 to 7/1/2021	Date of Last Salary Change
	National Rank 7/1/2021	Regional Rank 7/1/2021	7/1/2021 Salary*	National Rank 7/1/2021	COLF 7/1/2021	Regional Rank 7/1/2021	Salary 7/1/2021			
Alabama	50		\$126,018	48	93.1		\$135,313	\$134,943	-6.61%	10/01/2019
Alaska	10		\$189,720	33	131.3		\$144,502	\$189,720	0.00%	07/01/2020
Arizona	38		\$149,383	30	101.8		\$146,712	\$147,175	1.50%	01/01/2018
Arkansas	20		\$174,883	4	90.4		\$193,387	\$160,000	9.30%	11/29/2020
California	3		\$214,601	22	135.2		\$158,717	\$191,612	12.00%	07/01/2019
Colorado	17		\$178,452	20	111.1		\$160,615	\$159,320	12.01%	07/01/2021
Connecticut	16	8	\$180,460	34	126.7	6	\$142,483	\$167,634	7.65%	07/01/2021
Delaware	8	3	\$192,862	11	109.9	4	\$175,463	\$183,444	5.13%	07/04/2021
District of Columbia	1	1	\$218,600	46	159.5	9	\$137,016	\$205,100	6.58%	01/03/2021
Florida	25		\$165,509	19	101.1		\$163,672	\$146,080	13.30%	10/01/2020
Georgia	22		\$173,714	6	93.4		\$186,047	\$162,442	6.94%	07/19/2021
Hawaii	5		\$207,084	42	150.4		\$137,691	\$197,112	5.06%	07/01/2019
Idaho	42		\$144,400	31	99.1		\$145,755	\$128,500	12.37%	07/01/2021
Illinois	2		\$216,297	1	100		\$216,297	\$194,001	11.49%	07/01/2021
Indiana	30		\$159,950	16	95.2		\$168,083	\$141,311	13.19%	07/01/2021
Iowa	33		\$154,957	23	97.8		\$158,384	\$143,897	7.69%	07/01/2021
Kansas	48		\$135,068	44	98.2		\$137,546	\$120,037	12.52%	06/13/2021
Kentucky	49		\$130,926	36	92.4		\$141,733	\$124,620	5.06%	07/01/2019
Louisiana	27		\$163,658	15	97.1		\$168,486	\$151,218	8.23%	07/01/2021
Maine	45		\$141,404	51	116.7		\$121,125	\$121,968	15.94%	07/01/2021
Maryland	21	9	\$174,433	43	126.8	8	\$137,608	\$154,433	12.95%	07/01/2021
Massachusetts	13		\$184,694	39	132.3		\$139,621	\$159,694	15.65%	07/01/2018
Michigan	32		\$155,621	13	91.6		\$169,849	\$141,318	10.12%	01/01/2002
Minnesota	23		\$169,264	18	102.9		\$164,538	\$149,605	13.14%	07/01/2021
Mississippi	47		\$136,000	26	88.6		\$153,520	\$136,000	0.00%	01/01/2021
Missouri	31		\$159,578	9	90.3		\$176,695	\$148,263	7.63%	07/01/2021
Montana	43		\$142,683	45	104.1		\$137,065	\$126,131	13.12%	07/01/2021
Nebraska	18		\$178,199	10	101.1		\$176,232	\$159,077	12.02%	07/01/2021
Nevada	28		\$160,000	35	112.6		\$142,101	\$160,000	0.00%	01/01/2009
New Hampshire	26		\$164,911	47	120.5		\$136,853	\$152,159	8.38%	01/04/2019
New Jersey	9	4	\$192,391	24	121.9	5	\$157,764	\$165,000	16.60%	01/01/2021
New Mexico	46		\$138,438	41	100.3		\$138,011	\$118,384	16.94%	07/01/2021
New York	4	2	\$210,900	5	112.4	1	\$187,674	\$193,000	9.27%	04/01/2019
North Carolina	44		\$142,082	28	95.6		\$148,698	\$132,584	7.16%	07/01/2021
North Dakota	37		\$152,175	38	108		\$140,871	\$143,869	5.77%	07/01/2021
Ohio	36		\$152,811	17	92.4		\$165,451	\$133,850	14.17%	01/01/2021
Oklahoma	40		\$145,567	25	93.2		\$156,195	\$131,835	10.42%	07/01/2020
Oregon	34		\$154,692	50	119.2		\$129,772	\$135,775	13.93%	10/01/2020
Pennsylvania	11	5	\$186,665	7	102.2	2	\$182,669	\$178,868	4.36%	01/01/2020
Rhode Island	15	7	\$182,367	37	128.7	7	\$141,670	\$158,340	15.17%	12/22/2019
South Carolina	7		\$196,753	3	98.6		\$199,554	\$141,354	39.19%	06/02/2021
South Dakota	41		\$145,101	32	99.7		\$145,588	\$126,346	14.84%	07/01/2021
Tennessee	12		\$186,060	2	92.2		\$201,759	\$170,520	9.11%	07/01/2021
Texas	35		\$154,000	21	96.6		\$159,487	\$149,000	3.36%	09/01/2019
Utah	19		\$175,550	14	103.5		\$169,687	\$159,050	10.37%	07/01/2021
Vermont	24		\$167,449	40	121.2		\$138,162	\$145,011	15.47%	07/05/2021
Virginia	14	6	\$184,617	8	102.4	3	\$180,353	\$166,136	11.12%	06/10/2021
Washington	6		\$199,165	12	115		\$173,117	\$165,870	20.07%	07/01/2020
West Virginia	51		\$126,000	49	95		\$132,596	\$126,000	0.00%	N/A
Wisconsin	39		\$147,535	29	100.3		\$147,151	\$131,187	12.46%	01/03/2021
Wyoming	29		\$160,000	27	104.9		\$152,511	\$150,000	6.67%	07/08/2019

Source: National Center for State Courts (ncsc.org)

Regional states

MARYLAND JUDICIARY | SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL COMPENSATION

Judge, Intermediate Appellate Court										
State	No Cost of Living Factor			Includes Cost of Living Factor				1/1/2017 Salary	% Chng from 1/1/2017 to 7/1/2021	Date of Last Salary Change
	National Rank 7/1/2021	Regional Rank 7/1/2021	7/1/2021 Salary*	National Rank 7/1/2021	COLF 7/1/2021	Regional Rank 7/1/2021	Salary 7/1/2021			
Alabama	29		\$165,072	19	93.1		\$177,306	\$178,878	-7.72%	10/01/2019
Alaska	10		\$193,836	34	131.3		\$147,628	\$193,836	0.00%	07/01/2020
Arizona	33		\$154,534	29	101.8		\$151,802	\$152,250	1.50%	01/01/2018
Arkansas	21		\$179,123	5	90.4		\$198,145	\$161,500	10.91%	11/29/2020
California	1		\$245,578	15	135.2		\$181,641	\$219,272	12.00%	07/01/2019
Colorado	16		\$186,132	23	111.1		\$167,536	\$166,170	12.01%	07/01/2021
Connecticut	14	5	\$187,663	32	126.7	5	\$148,116	\$174,323	7.65%	07/01/2021
Florida	12		\$192,105	10	101.1		\$190,015	\$154,140	24.63%	10/01/2020
Georgia	23		\$177,990	9	93.4		\$190,567	\$174,500	2.00%	07/19/2021
Hawaii	4		\$212,784	39	150.4		\$141,479	\$202,596	5.03%	07/01/2019
Idaho	35		\$150,400	30	99.1		\$151,766	\$130,000	15.69%	07/01/2021
Illinois	2		\$235,713	1	100		\$235,713	\$211,416	11.49%	07/01/2021
Indiana	15		\$187,265	7	95.2		\$196,707	\$165,443	13.19%	07/01/2021
Iowa	27		\$166,436	22	97.8		\$170,180	\$154,556	7.69%	07/01/2021
Kansas	37		\$147,987	31	98.2		\$150,700	\$131,518	12.52%	06/13/2021
Kentucky	40		\$136,632	33	92.4		\$147,870	\$130,044	5.07%	07/01/2019
Louisiana	24		\$170,339	20	97.1		\$175,426	\$157,294	8.29%	07/01/2021
Maryland	18	6	\$183,633	37	126.8	6	\$144,821	\$163,633	12.22%	07/01/2021
Massachusetts	13		\$190,087	38	132.3		\$143,679	\$165,087	15.14%	07/01/2018
Michigan	26		\$168,436	13	91.6		\$183,882	\$152,955	10.12%	01/01/2002
Minnesota	20		\$180,313	21	102.9		\$175,231	\$159,370	13.14%	07/01/2021
Mississippi	39		\$144,827	26	88.6		\$163,462	\$144,827	0.00%	01/01/2021
Missouri	25		\$169,214	11	90.3		\$187,391	\$157,242	7.61%	07/01/2021
Nebraska	19		\$183,015	16	101.1		\$181,024	\$163,476	11.95%	07/01/2021
Nevada	30		\$165,000	35	112.6		\$146,536	\$165,000	0.00%	01/01/2009
New Jersey	6	2	\$203,114	24	121.9	4	\$166,623	\$175,534	15.71%	01/01/2021
New Mexico	38		\$145,725	36	100.3		\$145,289	\$124,616	16.94%	07/01/2021
New York	3	1	\$222,200	6	112.4	2	\$197,687	\$203,400	9.24%	04/01/2019
North Carolina	36		\$150,184	27	95.6		\$157,096	\$140,144	7.16%	07/01/2021
Ohio	28		\$166,167	17	92.4		\$179,834	\$145,550	14.16%	01/01/2021
Oklahoma	34		\$152,632	25	93.2		\$163,768	\$138,235	10.41%	07/01/2020
Oregon	31		\$164,004	40	119.2		\$137,587	\$144,535	13.47%	10/01/2020
Pennsylvania	7	3	\$202,898	4	102.2	1	\$198,530	\$194,442	4.35%	01/01/2020
South Carolina	8		\$201,930	3	98.6		\$204,797	\$145,074	39.19%	06/02/2021
Tennessee	11		\$192,708	2	92.2		\$209,011	\$176,616	9.11%	07/01/2021
Texas	22		\$178,400	12	96.6		\$184,679	\$158,500	12.56%	09/01/2019
Utah	17		\$184,300	18	103.5		\$178,068	\$167,000	10.36%	07/01/2021
Virginia	9	4	\$195,422	8	102.4	3	\$190,842	\$176,510	10.71%	06/10/2021
Washington	5		\$209,730	14	115		\$182,374	\$174,224	20.38%	07/01/2020
Wisconsin	32		\$156,388	28	100.3		\$155,920	\$139,059	12.46%	01/03/2021

Source: National Center for State Courts (ncsc.org)

Regional states

The following states do not have comparable Intermediate Appellate Courts:

1. Delaware (regional state)
2. District of Columbia (regional state)
3. Maine
4. Montana
5. New Hampshire
6. North Dakota
7. Rhode Island (regional state)
8. South Dakota
9. Vermont
10. West Virginia
11. Wyoming

Chief Judge, Intermediate Appellate Court										
State	No Cost of Living Factor			Includes Cost of Living Factor				1/1/2017 Salary	% Chng from 1/1/2017 to 7/1/2021	Date of Last Salary Change
	National Rank 7/1/2021	Regional Rank 7/1/2021	7/1/2021 Salary*	National Rank 7/1/2021	COLF 7/1/2021	Regional Rank 7/1/2021	Salary 7/1/2021			
Maryland	5	5	\$186,633	5	126.8	5	\$147,187	\$166,633	12.00%	07/01/2021
New Jersey	3	3	\$203,114	4	121.9	4	\$166,623	\$175,534	15.71%	01/01/2021
New York	1	1	\$227,800	2	112.4	2	\$202,669	\$208,500	9.26%	04/01/2019
Pennsylvania	2	2	\$209,153	1	102.2	1	\$204,651	\$200,416	4.36%	01/01/2020
Virginia	4	4	\$198,422	3	102.4	3	\$193,771	\$176,510	12.41%	06/10/2021

Source: Independent outreach to individual courts.

Regional states

MARYLAND JUDICIARY | SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL COMPENSATION

Judge, Highest Appellate Court										
State	No Cost of Living Factor			Includes Cost of Living Factor			Salary 7/1/2021	1/1/2017 Salary	% Chng from 1/1/2017 to 7/1/2021	Date of Last Salary Change
	National Rank 7/1/2021	Regional Rank 7/1/2021	7/1/2021 Salary*	National Rank 7/1/2021	COLF 7/1/2021	Regional Rank 7/1/2021				
Alabama	36		\$166,072	23	93.1		\$178,380	\$167,685	-0.96%	10/01/2019
Alaska	12		\$205,176	34	131.3		\$156,265	\$205,176	0.00%	07/01/2020
Arizona	42		\$159,685	33	101.8		\$156,861	\$157,325	1.50%	01/01/2018
Arkansas	26		\$184,588	9	90.4		\$204,190	\$166,500	10.86%	11/29/2020
California	1		\$261,949	11	135.2		\$193,749	\$233,888	12.00%	07/01/2019
Colorado	18		\$193,812	25	111.1		\$174,448	\$173,024	12.01%	07/01/2021
Connecticut	15	7	\$199,781	32	126.7	6	\$157,680	\$185,610	7.63%	07/01/2021
Delaware	13	6	\$205,135	19	109.9	4	\$186,656	\$195,245	5.07%	07/04/2021
District of Columbia	4	2	\$231,800	48	159.5	9	\$145,329	\$217,600	6.53%	01/03/2021
Florida	6		\$227,218	2	101.1		\$224,746	\$162,200	40.09%	10/01/2020
Georgia	29		\$179,112	13	93.4		\$191,769	\$175,600	2.00%	07/19/2021
Hawaii	5		\$229,668	41	150.4		\$152,705	\$218,820	4.96%	07/01/2019
Idaho	41		\$160,400	31	99.1		\$161,857	\$140,000	14.57%	07/01/2021
Illinois	2		\$250,442	1	100		\$250,442	\$224,628	11.49%	07/01/2021
Indiana	21		\$192,644	10	95.2		\$202,357	\$170,195	13.19%	07/01/2021
Iowa	27		\$183,653	17	97.8		\$187,784	\$170,544	7.69%	07/01/2021
Kansas	47		\$152,923	36	98.2		\$155,726	\$135,905	12.52%	06/13/2021
Kentucky	50		\$142,362	38	92.4		\$154,071	\$135,504	5.06%	07/01/2019
Louisiana	28		\$182,160	18	97.1		\$187,600	\$168,045	8.40%	07/01/2021
Maine	49		\$150,870	51	116.7		\$129,280	\$130,136	15.93%	07/01/2021
Maryland	17	8	\$196,433	37	126.8	7	\$154,916	\$176,433	11.34%	07/01/2021
Massachusetts	14		\$200,984	42	132.3		\$151,915	\$175,984	14.21%	07/01/2018
Michigan	39		\$164,610	22	91.6		\$179,705	\$164,610	0.00%	01/01/2002
Minnesota	22		\$191,359	21	102.9		\$185,966	\$169,135	13.14%	07/01/2021
Mississippi	48		\$152,250	27	88.6		\$171,840	\$152,250	0.00%	01/01/2021
Missouri	24		\$185,127	8	90.3		\$205,013	\$172,017	7.62%	07/01/2021
Montana	44		\$155,920	44	104.1		\$149,779	\$136,177	14.50%	07/01/2021
Nebraska	20		\$192,647	16	101.1		\$190,551	\$171,975	12.02%	07/01/2021
Nevada	34		\$170,000	43	112.6		\$150,977	\$170,000	0.00%	01/01/2009
New Hampshire	32		\$175,837	46	120.5		\$145,923	\$162,240	8.38%	01/04/2019
New Jersey	9	4	\$213,240	24	121.9	5	\$174,930	\$185,482	14.97%	01/01/2021
New Mexico	46		\$153,394	40	100.3		\$152,935	\$131,174	16.94%	07/01/2021
New York	3	1	\$233,400	6	112.4	2	\$207,651	\$213,600	9.27%	04/01/2019
North Carolina	43		\$156,664	30	95.6		\$163,874	\$146,191	7.16%	07/01/2021
North Dakota	37		\$165,845	39	108		\$153,560	\$157,009	5.63%	07/01/2021
Ohio	30		\$178,280	12	92.4		\$192,944	\$156,150	14.17%	01/01/2021
Oklahoma	40		\$161,112	26	93.2		\$172,867	\$145,914	10.42%	07/01/2020
Oregon	35		\$167,232	50	119.2		\$140,295	\$147,559	13.33%	10/01/2020
Pennsylvania	8	3	\$215,037	4	102.2	1	\$210,408	\$206,054	4.36%	01/01/2020
Rhode Island	23	9	\$189,424	45	128.7	8	\$147,183	\$175,870	7.71%	12/22/2019
South Carolina	11		\$207,108	5	98.6		\$210,049	\$148,794	39.19%	06/02/2021
South Dakota	45		\$155,350	35	99.7		\$155,817	\$135,270	14.84%	07/01/2021
Tennessee	16		\$199,332	3	92.2		\$216,195	\$182,688	9.11%	07/01/2021
Texas	25		\$184,800	15	96.6		\$191,304	\$168,000	10.00%	09/01/2019
Utah	19		\$193,100	20	103.5		\$186,570	\$174,950	10.37%	07/01/2021
Vermont	31		\$176,140	47	121.2		\$145,330	\$152,538	15.47%	07/05/2021
Virginia	10	5	\$212,365	7	102.4	3	\$207,388	\$192,458	10.34%	06/10/2021
Washington	7		\$220,320	14	115		\$191,583	\$183,021	20.38%	07/01/2020
West Virginia	51		\$136,000	49	95		\$143,158	\$136,000	0.00%	N/A
Wisconsin	38		\$165,772	29	100.3		\$165,276	\$147,403	12.46%	01/03/2021
Wyoming	33		\$175,000	28	104.9		\$166,826	\$165,000	6.06%	07/08/2019

Source: National Center for State Courts (ncsc.org)

Regional states

MARYLAND JUDICIARY | SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL COMPENSATION

Chief Judge, Highest Appellate Court										
State	No Cost of Living Factor			Includes Cost of Living Factor				1/1/2017 Salary	% Chng from 1/1/2017 to 7/1/2021	Date of Last Salary Change
	National Rank 7/1/2021	Regional Rank 7/1/2021	7/1/2021 Salary*	National Rank 7/1/2021	COLF 7/1/2021	Regional Rank 7/1/2021	Salary 7/1/2021			
Alabama	39		\$167,072	26	93.1		\$179,454	\$181,127	-7.76%	10/01/2019
Alaska	19		\$205,776	41	131.3		\$156,722	\$205,776	0.00%	07/01/2020
Arizona	41		\$164,836	34	101.8		\$161,921	\$162,400	1.50%	01/01/2018
Arkansas	21		\$199,344	6	90.4		\$220,513	\$180,000	10.75%	11/29/2020
California	1		\$274,695	13	135.2		\$203,177	\$245,269	12.00%	07/01/2019
Colorado	22		\$198,036	27	111.1		\$178,250	\$176,799	12.01%	07/01/2021
Connecticut	12	6	\$215,915	28	126.7	6	\$170,414	\$200,599	7.64%	07/01/2021
Delaware	15	8	\$214,394	17	109.9	4	\$195,081	\$204,148	5.02%	07/04/2021
District of Columbia	5	2	\$232,300	49	159.5	9	\$145,643	\$218,100	6.51%	01/03/2021
Florida	6		\$227,218	2	101.1		\$224,746	\$162,200	40.09%	10/01/2020
Georgia	32		\$179,112	19	93.4		\$191,769	\$175,600	2.00%	07/19/2021
Hawaii	4		\$238,104	38	150.4		\$158,314	\$226,962	4.91%	07/01/2019
Idaho	43		\$163,400	33	99.1		\$164,884	\$142,000	15.07%	07/01/2021
Illinois	2		\$250,442	1	100		\$250,442	\$224,628	11.49%	07/01/2021
Indiana	26		\$192,644	14	95.2		\$202,357	\$170,195	13.19%	07/01/2021
Iowa	27		\$192,261	16	97.8		\$196,586	\$178,538	7.69%	07/01/2021
Kansas	48		\$156,755	36	98.2		\$159,628	\$139,310	12.52%	06/13/2021
Kentucky	50		\$147,362	37	92.4		\$159,483	\$140,504	4.88%	07/01/2019
Louisiana	28		\$191,268	15	97.1		\$196,981	\$176,448	8.40%	07/01/2021
Maine	34		\$174,437	48	116.7		\$149,475	\$150,454	15.94%	07/01/2021
Maryland	13	7	\$215,433	29	126.8	7	\$169,900	\$195,433	10.23%	07/01/2021
Massachusetts	18		\$206,239	42	132.3		\$155,887	\$181,239	13.79%	07/01/2018
Michigan	42		\$164,610	24	91.6		\$179,705	\$164,610	0.00%	01/01/2002
Minnesota	16		\$210,496	12	102.9		\$204,564	\$186,048	13.14%	07/01/2021
Mississippi	45		\$159,000	25	88.6		\$179,458	\$159,000	0.00%	01/01/2021
Missouri	24		\$193,545	9	90.3		\$214,336	\$179,883	7.59%	07/01/2021
Montana	46		\$157,784	45	104.1		\$151,570	\$137,571	14.69%	07/01/2021
Nebraska	25		\$192,647	20	101.1		\$190,551	\$171,975	12.02%	07/01/2021
Nevada	38		\$170,000	46	112.6		\$150,977	\$170,000	0.00%	01/01/2009
New Hampshire	31		\$181,290	47	120.5		\$150,448	\$167,271	8.38%	01/04/2019
New Jersey	10	5	\$220,684	23	121.9	5	\$181,037	\$192,795	14.47%	01/01/2021
New Mexico	49		\$155,394	43	100.3		\$154,930	\$133,174	16.68%	07/01/2021
New York	3	1	\$240,800	10	112.4	3	\$214,235	\$220,300	9.31%	04/01/2019
North Carolina	44		\$160,838	30	95.6		\$168,241	\$150,086	7.16%	07/01/2021
North Dakota	36		\$170,535	39	108		\$157,903	\$161,517	5.58%	07/01/2021
Ohio	29		\$189,927	11	92.4		\$205,549	\$166,350	14.17%	01/01/2021
Oklahoma	35		\$172,049	22	93.2		\$184,602	\$155,820	10.42%	07/01/2020
Oregon	37		\$170,412	51	119.2		\$142,963	\$150,572	13.18%	10/01/2020
Pennsylvania	9	4	\$221,295	8	102.2	2	\$216,531	\$212,051	4.36%	01/01/2020
Rhode Island	17	9	\$208,368	35	128.7	8	\$161,902	\$193,458	7.71%	12/22/2019
South Carolina	11		\$217,464	5	98.6		\$220,552	\$156,234	39.19%	06/02/2021
South Dakota	47		\$157,350	40	99.7		\$157,823	\$137,270	14.63%	07/01/2021
Tennessee	20		\$204,336	4	92.2		\$221,623	\$187,692	8.87%	07/01/2021
Texas	14		\$214,830	3	96.6		\$222,391	\$170,500	26.00%	09/01/2019
Utah	23		\$195,100	21	103.5		\$188,502	\$176,950	10.26%	07/01/2021
Vermont	30		\$184,557	44	121.2		\$152,275	\$159,827	15.47%	07/05/2021
Virginia	7	3	\$225,517	7	102.4	1	\$220,231	\$204,293	10.39%	06/10/2021
Washington	8		\$223,499	18	115		\$194,347	\$185,661	20.38%	07/01/2020
West Virginia	51		\$136,000	50	95		\$143,158	\$136,000	0.00%	N/A
Wisconsin	40		\$165,772	32	100.3		\$165,276	\$147,403	12.46%	01/03/2021
Wyoming	33		\$175,000	31	104.9		\$166,826	\$165,000	6.06%	07/08/2019

Source: National Center for State Courts (ncsc.org)

Regional states

Tab 3

FEDERAL COURT SALARIES

Salary data from 2016-2021 for:

Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, Trial Courts, and Federal Court Judges

Federal Court Salaries				
	2016	2017	2020	2021
Supreme Court				
Chief Justice	\$260,700	\$263,300	\$277,700	\$280,500
Associate Justice	\$249,300	\$251,800	\$265,600	\$268,300
Court of Appeals				
Judges	\$215,400	\$217,600	\$229,500	\$231,800
Trial Courts				
District Court, International Trade, and Claims Judges	\$203,100	\$205,100	\$216,400	\$218,600
Bankruptcy & Magistrate Judges*	\$187,000	\$189,000	\$200,000	\$202,000

*Salaries for bankruptcy judges and Magistrate judges who are judicial officers of the U.S. District courts are set at 92% of a district judge's pay.

Federal Court Salaries	2017	2021
Chief Justice, Supreme Court	\$263,300	\$280,500
Associate Justice Supreme Court	\$251,800	\$268,300
Judge, Court of Appeals	\$217,600	\$231,800
Trial Courts - District Court Judges	\$205,100	\$218,600
Bankruptcy & Magistrate Judges*	\$189,000	\$202,000

Source: United States Courts; Administrative Office of the Courts


**Effective January 1, 2014, federal judicial salaries were adjusted as a result of two court decisions (*Beer v United States* and *Barker v United States*) as well as a one percent cost of living adjustment.


Tab 4


JUDICIAL SALARIES versus INFLATION


This section tracks how Maryland’s judicial salaries have grown versus inflation and includes charts comparing the Maryland to the Northeast Consumer Price Index and the Baltimore/Washington Region Consumer Price Index from 2001-2021 for:


District Court Judge
District Court Chief Judge
Circuit Court Judge
Court of Special Appeals Judge
Court of Special Appeals Chief Judge
Court of Appeals Judge
Court of Appeals Chief Judge






































Tab 5


**NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE COURTS (NCSC)
SURVEY OF JUDICIAL SALARIES**

Survey of Judicial Salaries from the National Center for State Courts

SURVEY OF Judicial Salaries

Published July 2021, Vol. 46 No. 2
Data and Rankings as of July 1, 2021

This graphic depicts 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.



Judicial Salaries at a Glance

	Mean	Median	Range
Chief, Highest Court	\$190,460	\$192,261	\$125,000 to \$274,695
Associate Justice, COLR	\$183,939	\$183,653	\$120,000 to \$261,949
Judge, Intermediate Appellate Court	\$177,633	\$178,762	\$105,000 to \$245,578
Judge, General Jurisdiction Trial Courts	\$163,110	\$161,829	\$64,365 to \$218,600
State Court Administrators	\$167,195	\$160,341	\$77,000 to \$299,004

© Copyright 2021 National Center for State Courts.
Contents of this publication may be copied and reprinted without permission from the National Center for State Courts.
Proper attribution is requested.



www.ncsc.org/salarytracker

Headquarters
300 Newport Avenue, Williamsburg, VA 23185

Denver Office
707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2900, Denver, CO 80202

Arlington Office
2425 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 350, Arlington, VA 22201

Washington, D.C. Office
111 Second Street NE, Washington, D.C. 20002

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 July 1, 2021). 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 56, 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		General-Jurisdiction Court		General-Jurisdiction Court <i>Adjusted for Cost-of-Living Index</i>		
	Salary	Rank	Salary	Rank	Salary	Rank	Factor	Salary	Rank
Alabama	\$166,072	37	\$165,072	29	\$126,018	52	93.1	\$135,213	48
Alaska	\$205,176	13	\$193,836	10	\$189,720	10	131.3	\$144,502	33
American Samoa	<i>Not Applicable</i>		<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$ 64,365	56	<i>Not Applicable</i>		
Arizona	\$159,685	43	\$154,534	34	\$149,383	39	101.8	\$146,712	30
Arkansas	\$184,588	27	\$179,123	21	\$174,883	21	90.4	\$199,387	4
California	\$261,949	1	\$245,578	1	\$214,601	3	135.2	\$158,717	22
Colorado	\$199,812	19	\$186,132	16	\$178,452	17	111.1	\$160,615	20
Connecticut	\$199,781	16	\$187,662	14	\$180,460	16	126.7	\$142,483	34
Delaware	\$205,135	14	<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$192,862	8	109.9	\$175,463	11
District of Columbia	\$231,800	4	<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$218,600	1	159.5	\$137,016	46
Florida	\$227,218	6	\$192,105	12	\$165,509	26	101.1	\$163,672	19
Georgia	\$179,112	30	\$177,990	23	\$173,714	23	93.4	\$186,047	6
Guam	\$155,660	46	\$155,660	33	\$138,324	48	<i>Not Applicable</i>		
Hawaii	\$229,668	5	\$212,784	4	\$207,084	5	150.4	\$137,691	42
Idaho	\$160,400	42	\$150,400	36	\$144,400	43	99.1	\$145,755	31
Illinois	\$250,442	2	\$235,713	2	\$216,297	2	100.0	\$216,297	1
Indiana	\$192,644	22	\$187,265	15	\$159,950	31	95.2	\$168,083	16
Iowa	\$183,653	28	\$166,436	27	\$154,957	34	97.8	\$158,384	23
Kansas	\$152,923	49	\$147,987	38	\$135,068	50	98.2	\$137,546	44
Kentucky	\$142,262	52	\$136,632	41	\$130,926	51	92.4	\$141,733	36
Louisiana	\$182,160	29	\$170,339	24	\$162,658	28	97.1	\$168,486	15
Maine	\$150,870	51	<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$141,404	46	116.7	\$121,125	61
Maryland	\$196,433	18	\$183,632	18	\$174,433	22	126.8	\$137,608	43
Massachusetts	\$200,984	15	\$190,087	13	\$184,694	13	132.3	\$139,621	39
Michigan	\$164,610	40	\$168,436	26	\$155,621	33	91.6	\$169,849	13
Minnesota	\$191,359	23	\$180,313	20	\$169,264	24	102.9	\$164,538	18
Mississippi	\$152,250	50	\$144,827	40	\$136,000	49	88.6	\$153,520	26
Missouri	\$185,127	25	\$169,214	25	\$159,578	32	90.3	\$176,695	9
Montana	\$155,920	45	<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$142,683	44	104.1	\$137,065	45
Nebraska	\$192,647	21	\$183,015	19	\$178,199	19	101.1	\$176,232	10
Nevada	\$170,000	35	\$165,000	30	\$160,000	29	112.6	\$142,101	35
New Hampshire	\$175,837	33	<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$164,911	27	120.5	\$136,853	47
New Jersey	\$213,240	9	\$209,114	6	\$192,391	9	121.9	\$157,764	24
New Mexico	\$153,294	48	\$145,725	39	\$138,438	47	100.3	\$138,011	41
New York	\$233,400	3	\$222,200	3	\$210,900	4	112.4	\$187,674	6
North Carolina	\$156,664	44	\$150,184	37	\$142,082	45	95.6	\$148,698	28
North Dakota	\$165,845	38	<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$152,175	38	108.0	\$140,871	38
Northern Mariana Islands	\$126,000	54	<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$120,000	54	<i>Not Applicable</i>		
Ohio	\$178,280	31	\$166,167	28	\$152,811	37	92.4	\$165,451	17
Oklahoma	\$161,112	41	\$152,632	35	\$145,567	41	93.2	\$156,195	25
Oregon	\$167,232	36	\$164,004	31	\$154,692	35	119.2	\$129,772	50
Pennsylvania	\$215,037	8	\$202,898	7	\$186,665	11	102.2	\$182,669	7
Puerto Rico	\$120,000	55	\$105,000	42	\$89,600	55	<i>Not Applicable</i>		
Rhode Island	\$189,424	24	<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$182,367	15	128.7	\$141,670	37
South Carolina	\$207,108	12	\$201,930	8	\$196,753	7	98.6	\$199,554	3
South Dakota	\$155,350	47	<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$145,101	42	99.7	\$145,588	32
Tennessee	\$199,332	17	\$192,708	11	\$186,060	12	92.2	\$201,759	2
Texas	\$184,800	26	\$178,400	22	\$154,000	36	96.6	\$159,487	21
Utah	\$193,100	20	\$184,300	17	\$175,550	20	103.5	\$169,687	14
Vermont	\$176,140	32	<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$167,449	25	121.2	\$138,162	40
Virgin Islands	\$211,476	11	<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$178,240	18	<i>Not Applicable</i>		
Virginia	\$212,265	10	\$195,422	9	\$184,617	14	102.4	\$180,353	8
Washington	\$220,320	7	\$209,730	5	\$199,165	6	115.0	\$173,117	12
West Virginia	\$136,000	53	<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$126,000	53	95.0	\$132,596	49
Wisconsin	\$165,772	39	\$156,388	32	\$147,535	40	100.3	\$147,151	29
Wyoming	\$175,000	34	<i>Not Applicable</i>		\$160,000	29	104.9	\$152,511	27
Mean	\$183,939		\$177,633		\$163,110				
Median	\$183,663		\$178,762		\$161,829				
Range	\$120,000 to \$261,949		\$106,000 to \$245,578		\$64,365 to \$218,600				

The 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.

Tab 6

COMPARATIVE SALARY DATA

This section offers comparative executive salary data for:

- Legal Salaries- Corporate In-House from 2015 & 2020
- Legal Salaries- Law Firms from 2016 & 2018
- Partner Salaries from 2018 & 2020
- Local Law School Professors from 2016 & 2021
- Salaries of States Attorneys of Large Maryland Counties from 2017 & 2020
- Salaries of State of Maryland Executives from 2014 & 2019
- Salaries of State of Maryland Superintendent of Schools from 2019 & 2021
- Salaries of County Executives of Large Maryland Counties from 2017 & 2020
- Salaries of Maryland Cabinet Secretaries from 2014 & 2018
- Salaries of State of Maryland Police Chiefs from 2017 & 2019
- Salaries of State of Maryland Sheriffs from 2017 & 2020
- State of Maryland 2021 Executive Pay Plan
- State of Maryland 2021 Physician Salary Schedule
- State/Local Government and Legal Salary Ranking

Legal Salaries - Corporate In-House Salary Averages				
Years of Experience	2020	2015	Salary Change	% Change
0-3 Years	\$115,125	\$80,700	\$34,425	29.90%
4-9 Years	\$135,188	\$114,000	\$21,188	15.67%
10+ Years	\$178,813	\$143,375	\$35,438	19.82%

Source: Robert Half Legal 2021 Salary Guide

Legal Salaries - Baltimore/Washington Law Firm Salary Averages				
Baltimore Law Firm	2018*	2016	Salary Change	% Change
1st Year Associate	\$179,678	\$154,961	\$24,717	13.76%
2nd Year Associate	\$193,045	\$166,128	\$26,917	13.94%
3rd Year Associate	\$212,110	\$180,622	\$31,488	14.85%
4th Year Associate	\$245,089	\$204,615	\$40,474	16.51%
5th Year Associate	\$268,590	\$224,103	\$44,487	16.56%
6th Year Associate	\$292,439	\$243,458	\$48,981	16.75%
7th Year Associate	\$311,377	\$258,476	\$52,901	16.99%
8th Year Associate	\$329,542	\$271,359	\$58,183	17.66%
Washington D.C. Law Firm	2018*	2016	Salary Change	% Change
1st Year Associate	\$181,570	\$156,592	\$24,978	13.76%
2nd Year Associate	\$195,077	\$167,877	\$27,200	13.94%
3rd Year Associate	\$214,343	\$182,523	\$31,820	14.85%
4th Year Associate	\$247,669	\$206,769	\$40,900	16.51%
5th Year Associate	\$271,417	\$226,462	\$44,955	16.56%
6th Year Associate	\$295,518	\$246,021	\$49,497	16.75%
7th Year Associate	\$314,655	\$261,197	\$53,458	16.99%
8th Year Associate	\$333,011	\$274,215	\$58,796	17.66%

Source: Law Crossing

Salaries of Law Partners				
Location	Average Total Compensation - 2020*	Average Total Compensation - 2018	Difference	% Change
Nationwide	\$1,054,000	\$885,000	\$169,000	16.03%
Washington, DC/ Northern Virginia	\$1,252,000	\$1,133,000	\$119,000	9.50%
Years As Partner (Nationwide)	Average Total Compensation - 2020*	Average Total Compensation - 2018	Difference	% Change
1-5 Years	\$529,000	\$487,000	\$42,000	7.94%
6-10 Years	\$958,000	\$781,000	\$177,000	18.48%
Size of Firm (Nationwide)	Average Total Compensation - 2020*	Average Total Compensation - 2018	Difference	% Change
51-200	\$738,000	\$510,000	\$228,000	30.89%
201-500	\$840,000	\$634,000	\$206,000	24.52%
501-1000	\$883,000	\$1,065,000	-\$182,000	-20.61%

Source: Major, Lindsey and Africa 2020 Partner Compensation Survey

MARYLAND JUDICIARY | SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL COMPENSATION

Local Law School Professor Salaries										
University	2021 High	2021 Median	2021 Low	2021 Average	2016 High	2016 Median	2016 Low	2016 Average	Salary Change (Averages)	% Change (Averages)
University of Baltimore	\$260,419	\$155,323	\$111,100	\$177,371	\$241,781	\$146,926	\$110,000	\$154,945	\$22,426	12.64%
University of Maryland	\$264,535	N/A	\$164,670	\$216,750	\$261,454	N/A	\$152,135	\$198,243	\$18,507	8.54%

Local Law School Deans Salaries				
University	2021 Salary	2016 Salary	Salary Change	% Change
University of Baltimore	\$426,266	\$395,760	\$30,506	7.16%
University of Maryland	\$411,020	\$381,607	\$29,413	7.16%

Sources:
 University of Baltimore: Erin Gleeson, Compensation Analyst
 University of Maryland: Emily Runser, Compensation Manager

Salaries of State of Maryland States Attorneys (Largest Counties)				
County	2020 Salary*	2017 Salary	Salary Change	% Change
Baltimore City	\$238,772	\$238,772	\$0	0.00%
Baltimore County	\$212,478	\$204,187	\$8,291	3.90%
Montgomery County	\$208,686	\$206,476	\$2,210	1.06%
Prince George's County	\$199,000	\$199,000	\$0	0.00%
Anne Arundel County	\$191,919	\$170,518	\$21,401	11.15%

Source: Salary Survey of MD County Government

Salaries of State of Maryland Executives				
	January 2019*	January 2014	Salary Change	% Change
Executive Department				
Governor State Of Maryland	\$180,000	\$175,000	\$5,000	2.78%
Lieutenant Governor	\$149,500	\$145,500	\$4,000	2.68%
Chief of Staff	\$205,000	\$172,000	\$33,000	16.10%
Deputy Chief of Staff	\$135,000	\$161,000	(\$26,000)	-19.26%
Chief Legal Counsel	\$165,000	\$154,000	\$11,000	6.67%
Secretary of Appointments	\$159,000	\$167,000	(\$8,000)	-5.03%
Director, External Affairs and Intragency Initiatives	\$215,000	n/a	n/a	n/a
Attorney General's Office				
Attorney General	\$149,500	\$145,500	\$4,000	2.68%
Comptroller of Maryland				
Comptroller	\$149,500	\$145,500	\$4,000	2.68%
Deputy Comptroller	\$181,000	\$145,000	\$36,000	19.89%
Chief of Staff	\$181,000	\$162,000	\$19,000	10.50%
Legal Counsel	\$127,000	\$108,000	\$19,000	14.96%
Maryland State Treasurer's Office				
Treasurer	\$149,500	\$145,500	\$4,000	2.68%
Chief Deputy Treasurer	\$159,000	\$153,000	\$6,000	3.77%
Legal Division Director	\$140,000	\$127,000	\$13,000	9.29%
Office of the Secretary of State				
Secretary of State	\$105,500	\$102,500	\$3,000	2.84%
Deputy Secretary of State	\$101,000	\$90,000	\$11,000	10.89%
Assistant Secretary of State	\$101,000	\$90,000	\$11,000	10.89%

Source: Governor's Salary Commission and Baltimore Sun

Salaries of State of Maryland Superintendent* of Schools				
Jurisdiction	2021	2019	Salary Change	% Change
Maryland State	\$310,000	\$275,000	\$35,000	12.73%
Jurisdiction	2019/2020 Salary**	2015/2016 Salary	Salary Change	% Change
Prince George's	\$302,000	\$290,000	\$12,000	4.14%
Baltimore	\$298,000	\$275,000	\$23,000	8.36%
Baltimore City	\$290,000	\$290,000	\$0	0.00%
Montgomery	\$290,000	\$240,000	\$50,000	20.83%
Howard	\$286,425	\$267,904	\$18,521	6.91%
Anne Arundel	\$279,868	\$245,000	\$34,868	14.23%
Washington	\$247,500	\$217,041	\$30,459	14.03%
Frederick	\$246,467	\$200,356	\$46,111	23.01%
St. Mary's	\$225,000	\$188,200	\$36,800	19.55%
Carroll	\$219,937	\$189,625	\$30,312	15.99%
Harford	\$217,315	\$210,388	\$6,927	3.29%
Charles	\$217,000	\$200,000	\$17,000	8.50%
Calvert	\$205,000	\$180,000	\$25,000	13.89%
Cecil	\$200,984	\$198,134	\$2,850	1.44%
Wicomico	\$194,013	\$177,004	\$17,009	9.61%
Allegany	\$190,418	\$180,316	\$10,102	5.60%
Talbot	\$189,000	\$160,000	\$29,000	18.13%
Worcester	\$182,085	\$172,500	\$9,585	5.56%
Queen Anne's	\$176,286	\$166,369	\$9,917	5.96%
Caroline	\$172,224	\$150,000	\$22,224	14.82%
Somerset	\$170,000	\$155,000	\$15,000	9.68%
Kent	\$155,488	\$152,400	\$3,088	2.03%
Garrett	\$141,000	\$159,630	-\$18,630	-11.67%
Dorchester	\$137,000	\$142,280	-\$5,280	-3.71%

Source: Maryland State Department of Education

*Salaries are determined through negotiations with the local boards of educations.

Salaries of State of Maryland County Executives (Large Counties)				
County	2020 Salary*	2017 Salary	Salary Change	% Change
Prince George's County	\$215,998	\$206,998	\$9,000	4.17%
Montgomery County	\$192,769	\$190,728	\$2,041	1.06%
Baltimore City	\$180,324	\$171,635	\$8,689	4.82%
Baltimore County	\$175,000	\$175,000	\$0	0.00%
Anne Arundel County	\$142,000	\$136,000	\$6,000	4.23%

Source: Salary Survey of MD County Government

Salaries of State of Maryland Cabinet Secretaries				
Position	January 2018*	January 2014	Salary Change	% Change
Superintendent of Schools	\$236,000	\$210,000	\$26,000	12.38%
Transportation	\$177,908	\$169,404	\$8,504	5.02%
Budget & Management	\$177,906	\$169,404	\$8,502	5.02%
Commerce	\$175,462	\$158,100	\$17,362	10.98%
Health & Mental Hygiene	\$174,417	\$169,404	\$5,013	2.96%
State Police	\$171,015	\$158,100	\$12,915	8.17%
Human Services	\$170,818	\$157,917	\$12,901	8.17%
Juvenile Services	\$169,059	\$153,166	\$15,893	10.38%
Labor, Licensing, and Regulation	\$165,215	\$153,000	\$12,215	7.98%
Natural Resources	\$162,499	\$151,754	\$10,745	7.08%
Public Safety	\$162,254	\$169,404	-\$7,150	-4.22%
Higher Education Commission	\$160,710	\$145,530	\$15,180	10.43%
Housing	\$156,245	\$151,754	\$4,491	2.96%
Environment	\$155,599	\$143,847	\$11,752	8.17%
General Services	\$149,678	\$141,142	\$8,536	6.05%
Agriculture	\$143,488	\$132,651	\$10,837	8.17%
Aging	\$137,749	\$127,345	\$10,404	8.17%
Planning	\$137,749	\$127,345	\$10,404	8.17%
Veterans	\$114,555	\$106,174	\$8,381	7.89%

Source: Governor's Salary Commission

Salaries of State of Maryland Police Chiefs				
Jurisdiction	2019 Salary*	2017 Salary	Salary Change	% Change
Baltimore	\$270,966	\$254,214	\$16,752	6.18%
Montgomery	\$239,566	\$239,566	\$0	0.00%
Baltimore City	\$217,300	\$212,000	\$5,300	2.44%
Howard	\$205,010	\$191,298	\$13,712	6.69%
Anne Arundel	\$189,825	\$170,327	\$19,498	10.27%
Prince George's	\$167,656	\$162,767	\$4,889	2.92%
Frederick	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$0	0.00%
Harford	\$122,619	\$117,645	\$4,974	4.06%
St. Mary's	\$106,120	\$54,704	\$51,416	48.45%
Washington	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0	0.00%
Wicomico	\$95,000	\$95,000	\$0	0.00%
Calvert	\$90,480	\$90,480	\$0	0.00%
Carroll	\$90,001	\$90,001	\$0	0.00%
Worcester	\$88,888	\$88,888	\$0	0.00%
Kent	\$85,000	\$85,000	\$0	0.00%
Allegany	\$74,263	\$70,000	\$4,263	5.74%
Garrett	unavailable	\$75,486	n/a	n/a
Caroline	N/A	N/A	n/a	n/a
Cecil	N/A	N/A	n/a	n/a
Charles	N/A	N/A	n/a	n/a
Dorchester	N/A	N/A	n/a	n/a
Queen Anne's	N/A	N/A	n/a	n/a
Somerset	N/A	N/A	n/a	n/a
Talbot	N/A	N/A	n/a	n/a

Source: Salary Survey of MD County Government

Salaries of State of Maryland Sheriffs				
Jurisdiction	2020 Salary*	2017 Salary	Salary Change	% Change
Prince George's	\$169,433	\$154,333	\$15,100	8.91%
Montgomery	\$161,495	\$159,786	\$1,709	1.06%
Charles	\$152,324	\$124,387	\$27,937	18.34%
Queen Anne's	\$151,333	\$132,000	\$19,333	12.78%
St. Mary's	\$139,391	\$102,000	\$37,391	26.82%
Calvert	\$139,391	\$90,480	\$48,911	35.09%
Baltimore City	\$138,006	\$132,600	\$5,406	3.92%
Anne Arundel	\$132,999	\$132,999	\$0	0.00%
Frederick	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$0	0.00%
Harford	\$122,619	\$117,645	\$4,974	4.06%
Cecil	\$117,843	\$75,075	\$42,768	36.29%
Washington	\$110,011	\$88,000	\$22,011	20.01%
Carroll	\$110,000	\$90,001	\$19,999	18.18%
Howard	\$101,000	\$91,000	\$10,000	9.90%
Caroline	\$100,053	\$80,000	\$20,053	20.04%
Dorchester	\$96,853	\$89,500	\$7,353	7.59%
Kent	\$96,853	\$85,000	\$11,853	12.24%
Wicomico	\$95,000	\$95,000	\$0	0.00%
Talbot	\$91,620	\$79,567	\$12,053	13.16%
Baltimore	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$0	0.00%
Allegany	\$90,000	\$70,000	\$20,000	22.22%
Worcester	\$88,000	\$88,000	\$0	0.00%
Garrett	\$85,000	\$85,000	\$0	0.00%
Somerset	\$75,000	\$60,000	\$15,000	20.00%

Source: Salary Survey of MD County Government

STATE OF MARYLAND					
Executive Pay Plan - Salary Schedule					
Annual Rates Effective January 1, 2021					
Grade Profile	Scale		Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum
EPP 0001	ES4	9904	\$86,971	\$101,463	\$115,960
EPP 0002	ES5	9905	\$93,443	\$109,052	\$124,658
EPP 0003	ES6	9906	\$100,436	\$117,244	\$134,051
EPP 0004	ES7	9907	\$107,989	\$126,097	\$144,203
EPP 0005	ES8	9908	\$116,144	\$135,656	\$155,164
EPP 0006	ES9	9909	\$124,955	\$145,982	\$167,006
EPP 0007	ES10	9910	\$134,467	\$157,128	\$179,785
EPP 0008	ES11	9911	\$144,748	\$169,171	\$193,595
EPP 0009	EX91	9991	\$166,456	\$222,931	\$279,407

STATE OF MARYLAND PHYSICIAN SALARY SCHEDULE Annual Rates Effective January 1, 2021															
Grade Profile	SCALE	BASE	STEP 1	STEP 2	STEP 3	STEP 4	STEP 5	STEP 6	MID POINT STEP 7	STEP 8	STEP 9	THIRD QUARTILE STEP 10	STEP 11	STEP 12	STEP 13
PHY 0001	0031	\$91,751	\$95,381	\$99,013	\$102,941	\$106,869	\$111,116	\$115,364	\$119,960	\$124,552	\$129,521	\$134,490	\$139,862	\$145,235	\$150,819
PHY 0002	0032	\$98,880	\$102,802	\$106,724	\$110,966	\$115,208	\$119,795	\$124,383	\$129,346	\$134,306	\$139,672	\$145,036	\$150,842	\$156,645	\$162,677
PHY 0003	0033	\$106,580	\$110,817	\$115,051	\$119,633	\$124,214	\$129,168	\$134,121	\$139,481	\$144,840	\$150,635	\$156,429	\$162,696	\$168,967	\$175,478
PHY 0004	0034	\$114,896	\$119,471	\$124,044	\$128,994	\$133,940	\$139,294	\$144,645	\$150,428	\$156,216	\$162,476	\$168,735	\$175,503	\$182,272	\$189,306
PHY 0005	0035	\$123,874	\$128,818	\$133,759	\$139,102	\$144,446	\$150,225	\$156,004	\$162,253	\$168,503	\$175,264	\$182,023	\$189,332	\$196,640	\$204,237
PHY 0006	0036	\$133,576	\$138,914	\$144,250	\$150,020	\$155,790	\$162,032	\$168,273	\$175,023	\$181,774	\$189,075	\$196,373	\$204,269	\$212,163	\$220,366
PHY 0007	0037	\$144,051	\$149,815	\$155,581	\$161,811	\$168,043	\$174,784	\$181,526	\$188,815	\$196,102	\$203,990	\$211,874	\$220,400	\$228,925	\$237,781
PHY 0008	0038	\$155,366	\$161,590	\$167,813	\$174,547	\$181,278	\$188,556	\$195,835	\$203,710	\$211,582	\$220,096	\$228,613	\$237,821	\$247,028	\$256,598
PHY 0009	0039	\$159,642	\$166,040	\$172,439	\$179,358	\$186,280	\$193,763	\$201,243	\$209,340	\$217,432	\$226,185	\$234,940	\$244,406	\$253,871	\$263,705
PHY 0010	0040	\$167,583	\$174,307	\$181,031	\$188,299	\$195,568	\$203,430	\$211,291	\$219,797	\$228,301	\$237,494	\$246,689	\$256,637	\$266,581	\$276,915

"Step increases are not guaranteed and are contingent on funding in the State budget."

State/Local Government and Legal Salary Ranking

Rank	Title	Salary
1	Partners Washington, DC/ Northern Virginia	\$1,252,000
2	Partner Salaries Nationwide	\$1,054,000
3	Nationwide Partners with 6-10 Years	\$958,000
4	Nationwide Partners with 501-1000 employees	\$883,000
5	Nationwide Partners with 201-500 employees	\$840,000
6	Nationwide Partners with 51-200 employees	\$738,000
7	Nationwide Partners with 1-5 Years	\$529,000
8	University of Baltimore Law School Dean	\$426,266
9	University of Maryland Law School Dean	\$411,020
10	Washington D.C. Law Firm 8th Year Associate	\$333,011
11	Baltimore Law Firm 8th Year Associate	\$329,542
12	Washington D.C. Law Firm 7th Year Associate	\$314,655
13	Baltimore Law Firm 7th Year Associate	\$311,377
14	Maryland State Superintendent	\$310,000
15	Prince George's Superintendent	\$302,000
16	Baltimore Superintendent	\$298,000
17	Washington D.C. Law Firm 6th Year Associate	\$295,518
18	Baltimore Law Firm 6th Year Associate	\$292,439
19	Baltimore City Superintendent	\$290,000
20	Montgomery Superintendent	\$290,000
21	Howard Superintendent	\$286,425
22	Anne Arundel Superintendent	\$279,868
23	Physician Salary 010	\$276,915
24	Washington D.C. Law Firm 5th Year Associate	\$271,417
25	Baltimore Police Chief	\$270,966
26	Baltimore Law Firm 5th Year Associate	\$268,590
27	Physician Salary 009	\$263,705
28	Physician Salary 008	\$256,598
29	Washington D.C. Law Firm 4th Year Associate	\$247,669
30	Washington Superintendent	\$247,500
31	Frederick Superintendent	\$246,467
32	Baltimore Law Firm 4th Year Associate	\$245,089
33	Montgomery Police Chief	\$239,566
34	Baltimore City States Attorney	\$238,772
35	Physician Salary 007	\$237,781
36	Superintendent of Schools	\$236,000
37	St. Mary's Superintendent	\$225,000
38	Physician Salary 006	\$220,366
39	Carroll Superintendent	\$219,937
40	Harford Superintendent	\$217,315
41	Baltimore City Police Chief	\$217,300
42	Charles Superintendent	\$217,000
43	University of Maryland Law School Professor (Average)	\$216,750
44	Prince George's County Executive	\$215,998
45	Chief Judge, Court of Appeals	\$215,433
46	Washington D.C. Law Firm 3rd Year Associate	\$214,343
47	Baltimore County States Attorney	\$212,478
48	Baltimore Law Firm 3rd Year Associate	\$212,110
49	Montgomery County States Attorney	\$208,686
50	Howard Police Chief	\$205,010
51	Calvert Superintendent	\$205,000

State/Local Government and Legal Salary Ranking

Rank	Title	Salary
52	Physician Salary 005	\$204,237
53	Cecil Superintendent	\$200,984
54	Prince George's County State's Attorney	\$199,000
55	Judge, Court of Appeals	\$196,433
56	Washington D.C. Law Firm 2nd Year Associate	\$195,077
57	Wicomico Superintendent	\$194,013
58	Baltimore Law Firm 2nd Year Associate	\$193,045
59	Montgomery County Executive	\$192,769
60	Anne Arundel County States Attorney	\$191,919
61	Prince George's County States Attorney	\$191,919
62	Allegany Superintendent	\$190,418
63	Anne Arundel Police Chief	\$189,825
64	Physician Salary 004	\$189,306
65	Talbot Superintendent	\$189,000
66	Chief Judge, Court of Special Appeals	\$186,633
67	Chief Judge, District Court	\$183,633
68	Judge, Court of Special Appeals	\$183,633
69	Worcester Superintendent	\$182,085
70	Washington D.C. Law Firm 1st Year Associate	\$181,570
71	Baltimore City Executive	\$180,324
72	Governor State Of Maryland	\$180,000
73	Baltimore Law Firm 1st Year Associate	\$179,678
74	In-House Counsel (10+ Years of Experience)	\$178,813
75	Transportation	\$177,908
76	Budget & Management	\$177,906
77	University of Baltimore Law School Professor (Average)	\$177,371
78	Queen Anne's Superintendent	\$176,286
79	Physician Salary 003	\$175,478
80	Commerce	\$175,462
81	Baltimore County Executive	\$175,000
82	Judge, Circuit Court	\$174,433
83	Health & Mental Hygiene	\$174,417
84	Caroline Superintendent	\$172,224
85	State Police	\$171,015
86	Human Services	\$170,818
87	Somerset Superintendent	\$170,000
88	Prince George's Sheriff	\$169,433
89	Juvenile Services	\$169,059
90	Prince George's Police Chief	\$167,656
91	Labor, Licensing, & Regulation	\$165,215
92	Physician Salary 002	\$162,677
93	Natural Resources	\$162,499
94	Public Safety	\$162,254
95	Montgomery Sheriff	\$161,495
96	Judge, District Court	\$161,333
97	Higher Education Commission	\$160,710
98	Housing	\$156,245
99	Environment	\$155,599
100	Kent Superintendent	\$155,488
101	Charles Sheriff	\$152,324
102	Queen Anne's Sheriff	\$151,333

State/Local Government and Legal Salary Ranking

Rank	Title	Salary
103	Physician Salary 001	\$150,819
104	General Services	\$149,678
105	Attorney General	\$149,500
106	Comptroller State Of MD	\$149,500
107	Lieutenant Governor	\$149,500
108	Treasurer State Of Maryland	\$149,500
109	Agriculture	\$143,488
110	Anne Arundel County Executive	\$142,000
111	Garrett Superintendent	\$141,000
112	Calvert Sheriff	\$139,391
113	St. Mary's Sheriff	\$139,391
114	Baltimore City Sheriff	\$138,006
115	Aging	\$137,749
116	Planning	\$137,749
117	Dorchester Superintendent	\$137,000
118	In-House Counsel (4-9 Years of Experience)	\$135,188
119	Anne Arundel Sheriff	\$132,999
120	Frederick Police Chief	\$125,000
121	Frederick Sheriff	\$125,000
122	Harford Police Chief	\$122,619
123	Harford Sheriff	\$122,619
124	Cecil Sheriff	\$117,843
125	In-House Counsel (0-3 Years of Experience)	\$115,125
126	Veterans	\$114,555
127	Washington Sheriff	\$110,011
128	Carroll Sheriff	\$110,000
129	St. Mary's Police Chief	\$106,120
130	Secretary of State	\$105,500
131	Howard Sheriff	\$101,000
132	Caroline Sheriff	\$100,053
133	Washington Police Chief	\$100,000
134	Dorchester Sheriff	\$96,853
135	Kent Sheriff	\$96,853
136	Wicomico Police Chief	\$95,000
137	Wicomico Sheriff	\$95,000
138	Talbot Sheriff	\$91,620
139	Calvert Police Chief	\$90,480
140	Carroll Police Chief	\$90,001
141	Allegany Sheriff	\$90,000
142	Baltimore Sheriff	\$90,000
143	Worcester Police Chief	\$88,888
144	Worcester Sheriff	\$88,000
145	Garrett Sheriff	\$85,000
146	Kent Police Chief	\$85,000
147	Somerset Sheriff	\$75,000
148	Allegany Police Chief	\$74,263