

M E M O R A N D U M

May 2, 2022

TO: Government Operations and Fiscal Policy Committee

FROM: Craig Howard, Deputy Director

SUBJECT: **FY23 Compensation and Benefits – Follow-up**

PURPOSE: Review and make recommendations for Council consideration

The GO Committee met on April 21 to review and discuss compensation and benefit issues, followed by full Council action on April 26. There are three remaining issues for the Committee to review, two of which were identified at the April 21 worksession and one that was identified as part of the Executive’s April 28 proposed budget amendments.

- FY23 pay adjustments for Police Leadership Service
- FY23 non-merit salary schedules
- Juneteenth Holiday additional expenditures

A. FY23 Pay Adjustments for Police Leadership Service

On April 21, the GO Committee reviewed compensation and benefits for all agencies. At the worksession, Councilmember Katz recommended and the Committee supported a follow-up discussion to review potential changes to the FY23 proposed pay adjustments for Police Leadership Service (PLS) employees.

On April 28th, the County Executive submitted a proposed FY23 budget amendment that would provide PLS employees that same general wage adjustment (GWA) as FOP members (©1-5). If approved, PLS members would receive a 3.5% GWA in July 2022 and a 3.0% GWA in January 2023 instead of a \$4,333 GWA in June of 2023. PLS members would also still be eligible for performance-based pay increases (awarded to MLS and PLS employees in lieu of service increments) which could be as high as 6.0% for an employee who achieves an [exceptional rating](#). The fiscal impact of the Executive’s proposed budget amendment is \$435,468 in FY23 with an annualized cost of \$625,222 in FY24.

Rationale for Revised PLS Pay Adjustment. As detailed below from the staff report for the Public Safety’s Committee’s April 25 worksession on the [FY23 recommended budget for the Police Department](#), retention of PLS employee and the difference between PLS and Police Officer wage scales in an ongoing concern.

The Department has 58 officers in the Police Leadership Service – 38 Lieutenants and 20 Captains. Today, 80% of the Captains and 53% of the Lieutenants are eligible to retire. Maintaining stability in police leadership is critical as the Department faces multiple reform mandates, increased violent crime, and high attrition among the ranks. The FOP’s CBA has a variety of different compensation benefits, including a 5% roll call pay for Sergeants, that compress salaries between ranks. The roll call benefit, along with ample opportunity to earn overtime, act as disincentives for officers to move up into police management. New Lieutenants often make less than Sergeants, creating little incentive to move up in rank where officers have more responsibility but earn less.

Council staff notes that while higher pay adjustments may have a positive impact on these issues, we cannot conclude that providing a higher GWA in FY23 to PLS members will improve retention or will encourage more officers to seek promotion to PLS.

Purpose of PLS and Alignment with MLS. The PLS was created was by Council, at the request of the County Executive, in 2018 via [Expedited Bill 40-17](#). As detailed in the staff report, the PLS was created to address the same issues that are still present today - interest in being promoted to Lieutenant and retention of senior police leadership. Additionally, the PLS was intended to be aligned with MLS and has therefore has a similar salary schedule and has always received the same annual pay adjustments.

Council staff notes that if PLS employees are provided a different GWA than MLS employees, the salary schedules will no longer be aligned. When the PLS was created in 2018, the County Executive’s fiscal impact statement said: “The level of police management responsibility tracks MLS and adopting those salaries and structure would appropriately reflect the salaries paid management ranks in comparable jurisdictions.”

Regardless of the Committee’s decision on GWA’s for PLS employees in FY23, staff recommends that the Committee request that the Executive conduct a review of the PLS program to determine whether it is meeting the intended goals – and if not to provide recommendations on needed adjustments or alternatives.

If the Committee supports the Executive’s recommendation to adjust GWA’s for PLS, it would add \$435,468 in FY23 to be considered as part of the Council’s reconciliation process.

B. New Salary Schedule for Legislative Branch Non-Merit Employees

In 2016, the Council approved [Bill 51-15](#) which requires salary schedules to be developed for all executive and legislative branch non-merit appointees. Two issues delayed implementation of the required salary schedules:

- 1) The Council was dissatisfied with the original executive branch salary schedules submitted by the County Executive in FY17-19. The Council did adopt an Executive Branch salary schedule in [September 2019](#).
- 2) The Council [deferred action on a legislative branch salary schedule](#) in FY20 due to ongoing staffing analysis being conducted by a consultant. This was followed by the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic at the same time as the FY21 budget process began.

For consideration as part of the FY23 budget process, Council staff recommends salary schedules for Legislative Branch non-merit staff as detailed in Table 1 below to take effect July 1, 2022. Any legislative branch schedule will not take effect until after the Council has approved the first schedule, and only applies to employees promoted or hired after the schedule takes effect.

Table 1. Proposed Legislative Branch Non-Merit Salary Schedule: Chiefs of Staff and Directors

Grade	Minimum	Maximum	Positions	Notes
LB3	\$95,251	\$201,315	Chiefs of Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum aligns with the Exec Branch scale for Special Assistants, Deputy Department Directors, etc. • Minimum aligns with M2 in MLS scale to provide flexibility for CM's in determining office staffing
LB2	\$113,017	\$196,059	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hearing Examiners • OLO Director 	Aligns with M1 in MLS scale
LB1	\$143,288	\$243,589	Council Executive Director	Aligns with EXE1 in Exec Branch scale

The Executive's recommended FY23 salary schedule for Executive Branch non-merit staff (©6-7) is unchanged from FY22 is summarized in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Recommended FY23 Executive Branch Non-Merit Schedule

Grade	Minimum	Maximum	Positions
EXE3	\$118,420	\$201,315	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Assistants • Deputy Department Directors • Division/Service Chiefs • Assistant Chiefs of Police • Directors of Non-Principal Offices
EXE2	\$130,262	\$221,446	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Directors • Fire and Police Chiefs • County Attorney
EXE1	\$143,288	\$243,589	Assistant Chief Administrative Officers
EXE0	\$171,946	\$292,308	Chief Administrative Officer

Proposed Inspector General salary schedule. In reviewing the classification structure of the Inspector General position, the Executive Branch has determined that the current structure for the Inspector General is inconsistent with other Executive and Legislative Branch non-merit appointed senior management positions (see ©8-11). In particular:

- **Classification.** Unlike other senior management positions, the Inspector General is currently compensated as part of the General Salary Schedule (GSS) as a Grade 40. The County Code does not specify how the Inspector General position should be classified. The Inspector General historically has received the same general wage adjustments and service increments as received by other non-represented employees classified on the GSS.
- **Leave Structure.** As a position that is classified on the GSS, the Inspector General accrues sick and annual leave. However, all other directors and/or senior management positions in the County accrue paid time off (PTO) instead of separate sick and annual leave. Additionally, the Inspector General now supervises MLS employees who accrue PTO and thus receive more leave than the Inspector General position.

To ensure that the Inspector General position is treated equitably compared to other senior level positions in the Executive and Legislative Branch while maintaining its independence to effectively direct and ensure legal, fiscal, and ethical accountability in the programs and operation of the County, the Executive recommends the following:

- 1) Create a new salary schedule for the Inspector General, aligned with the current Executive Salary Schedule Grade EXE2 (©12). This proposed schedule better aligns the salary schedule with comparable positions in the region. The new salary schedule would not impact the current salary of the Inspector General.
- 2) Provide leave via PTO like is done for all other non-merit appointed senior management positions within the County Government.
- 3) Have the Inspector General continue to receive general wage adjustments and service increments the same as other non-represented employees on the GSS. This ensures that compensation decisions are kept independent from other performance-based pay systems

Table 3. Proposed FY23 Inspector General Salary Schedule

Grade	Minimum	Maximum	Notes
IG	\$130,262	\$221,446	Aligns with EXE2 in Executive Branch non-merit schedule

Council staff recommends approval of:

- **Council staff’s proposed new FY23 legislative branch non-merit salary schedule as detailed in Table 1**
- **The Executive’s recommended FY23 executive branch non-merit salary schedule as detailed in Table 2**
- **The Executive’s proposed new FY23 Inspector General salary schedule as detailed in Table 3**

C. Juneteenth Holiday Additional Expenditures

The Executive's April 28 proposed budget amendments (©1-5) includes adding \$1.0 million to the Compensation and Benefits Non-Departmental Account (NDA) for additional costs related to adding Juneteenth as a County holiday.

On March 15, the Council adopted Executive Regulation 14-21 that formally added Juneteenth as a new official holiday to the County's calendar. The County incurs additional personnel costs on each official County holiday as certain employees that are required to work on that day receive holiday pay. The Fiscal Impact Statement submitted with the Executive Regulation indicated on annual cost of at least \$1.0 million based on recent County experience with personnel costs on holidays.

The Executive's March 15 recommended FY23 operating budget did not assume additional expenditures for the Juneteenth holiday. Executive Branch staff indicate that these costs will be built into the FY24 budget based on actual experience similar to other holidays.

Council staff notes that the Committee has two options related to this proposed amendment:

- **Recommend approval of the Executive's amendment to add \$1.0 million to the Compensation and Benefits NDA in FY23 to be considered as part of the Council's reconciliation process; or**
- **Do not recommend adding \$1.0 million to the NDA at this time, and instead ask the Executive to send a supplemental appropriation in FY23 if needed after actual expenses are incurred. It is possible that natural savings in personnel costs during FY23 via lapse, turnover, etc. would be sufficient to cover any additional holiday costs and a supplemental would not be needed.**



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Marc Elrich
County Executive

MEMORANDUM

April 28, 2022

TO: Gabe Albornoz, President
Montgomery County Council

FROM: Marc Elrich, County Executive *Marc Elrich*

SUBJECT: Amendments to the Recommended FY23 Operating Budget

I indicated in my April 19 budget amendment transmittal memo that additional amendments would be forthcoming. The amendments are described in detail below (including the source of funds), and the attached report contains the necessary information for your analysts to account for them. The amendments submitted are consistent with the County's policy to maintain ten percent of adjusted governmental revenues in reserve.

As previously stated, the recommended FY23 Operating Budget transmitted on March 15 includes an assumption that the County would receive \$58 million in additional income tax revenue related to pass through entities. In actuality, the Maryland Comptroller distributed the correcting distribution on March 25 of \$68 million, an increase of \$10 million over the initial assumption. As a result, this \$10 million of additional revenue will be available for FY22. Consequently, an additional \$11.468 million is forecasted to be available for FY23 due to the higher FY22 revenue base. Since this additional revenue is subject to the County's reserve policy, 90 percent, or \$10.321 million, is available for programmatic uses. The net impact of my April 19 recommended amendments included \$1.917 million in new expenditures, offset by a net \$7.031 million in additional revenue, leaving \$5.114 million to be used for other priorities.

African American Health Program

My FY23 recommended Operating Budget includes an increase of \$2.85 million for the African American Health Program (AAHP), including the Black Physicians Health Network (BPHN) initiative. This vital program works to eliminate health disparities and improve health outcomes for

African Americans and people of African descent in Montgomery County. In particular, this program has been an essential partner in delivering life-saving health and vaccination services to the Black community in Montgomery County during the COVID-19 pandemic. I am, therefore, recommending a \$707,000 increase to the budget of AAHP to ensure that both AAHP and BPHN are sufficiently resourced. While these are two separate initiatives focused on supporting the Black community, the budgets are shown under one line item for this fiscal year. AAHP focuses on primary and secondary prevention and population-based initiatives designed to educate, train, and support improved health outcomes for Black residents of the County. BPHN focuses on primary care and mental health, addressing health care disparities by building a network of Black health care service providers and actively linking the Black residents of the County to those providers. This amendment will be funded with increased tax revenue for FY23.

Juneteenth Holiday Additional Expenditures

On March 15, the County Council adopted proposed Executive Regulation 14-21 that added a new official holiday to the County's calendar – Juneteenth. The Fiscal Impact Statement submitted with the proposed regulation indicated an annual cost of at least \$1,000,000 based on recent County experience with the average additional personnel cost incurred on County holidays. This cost does not reflect the total personnel costs on an official holiday, but rather the additional personnel cost above that of a normal workday. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Office of Human Resources (OHR) will continue to monitor expenditures related to this new holiday and will make adjustments as necessary for FY24 and beyond. The cost of this amendment is \$1,000,000, which will be allocated to the Compensation and Employee Benefit Adjustments Non-Departmental Account and will be funded with increased tax revenue for FY23.

Police Leadership Service Compensation Adjustment

At the Public Safety Committee's April 25 work session to review the Police Department's recommended FY23 Operating Budget, the committee discussed extending the salary compensation adjustments that will be provided to the Police union as agreed during the FY22 collective bargaining reopener to Police Leadership Service (PLS). This would be implemented by providing PLS employees with two general wage adjustments (GWAs) – 3.5% in July 2022 and 3.0% in January 2023. I am, therefore, recommending an amendment to offset the fiscal impact of these GWAs, which in FY23 is \$435,468 (the annualized cost beginning in FY24 would be \$625,222). This amendment will be funded with increased tax revenue for FY23.

The attached report details the budget amendments described above and the ones submitted on April 19. The net impact of the above amendments results in \$2.142 million in new expenditures. When combined with my April 19 amendment package, \$2.972 million remains to be used for other priorities.

Department staff and staff from OMB will be happy to answer any questions you may have about these amendments as we work together to finalize the FY23 operating budget.

Amendments to the Recommended FY23 Operating Budget

April 28, 2022

Page 3 of 3

Amendments to the Recommended FY23 Operating Budget

ME:jw

Enclosure: Details on Recommended FY23 CE Amendments Report

cc: Richard S. Madaleno, Chief Administrative Officer
Fariba Kassiri, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
Marlene Michaelson, Executive Director, County Council
Jennifer R. Bryant, Director, Office of Management and Budget
Michael Coveyou, Director, Department of Finance
Joy Nurmi, Chief of Staff to Council President Albornoz

Detail on Recommended FY23 CE Amendments

Tax Supported

EXPENDITURE AMENDMENTS

Racial Equity and Social Justice

Shift: Funding for Lynching Memorial from Operating Budget to Montgomery County Lynching Memorial CIP Project (P362308) **-50,000**

Fire and Rescue Service

Increase Cost: FY23 Impact of FY22 General Wage Adjustment Supplemental **860,267**

Human Rights

Add: Juneteenth Celebration Expenditures **100,000**

Enhance: Commission on Remembrance and Reconciliation **56,000**

Police

Increase Cost: Police Leadership Services Compensation Adjustment **435,468**

Transit Services

Increase Cost: Six Percent Inflationary Increase to Non-Profit Service Provider Contracts Correction **29,071**

Health and Human Services

Enhance: Increase the FY23 Base Budget for the African American Health Program **707,000**

NDA - Compensation and Employee Benefit Adjustments

Increase Cost: Additional Funding Required for Observance of the New Juneteenth Holiday **1,000,000**

NDA - Incubator Programs - Economic Development Partnership

Increase Cost: Staffing Capacity Expenditure Correction **235,349**

NDA - Police Accountability Board

Add: Police Accountability Board Adjustment **336,031**

NDA - Community Grants

Add: Business District Development Grants Increase **300,000**

Total Tax Supported Expenditures 4,009,186

RESOURCE AMENDMENTS

Detail on Recommended FY23 CE Amendments

Tax Supported

Countywide Generic

FY23 Income Tax Adjustment 11,468,000

Police

Police Protection State Aid -3,290,000

Transit Services

Ride On Fare Revenue Reduction offset by a reduction in CIP Current Revenue expenditures -1,637,505

Total Tax Supported Resources 6,540,495



EXECUTIVE SALARY SCHEDULE

FISCAL YEAR 2023

EFFECTIVE JULY 3, 2022

Executive Salary Schedule

	MINIMUM	MIDPOINT	MAXIMUM
EXE3	\$118,420	\$159,867	\$201,315
EXE2	\$130,262	\$175,854	\$221,446
EXE1	\$143,288	\$193,439	\$243,589
EXE0	\$171,946	\$232,127	\$292,308

As provided for in the Montgomery County Code, Section 1A-104, the County Executive may exceed the salary schedule for an individual employee, subject to Council approval, if the Executive finds that it is necessary to attract or retain a senior leader for a specific position.

Salary Schedule Adjustments

No FY23 GWA

Executive Salary Scales and Positions

EXE0 – EXECUTIVE SALARY SCALE

Position Title

Chief Administrative Officer

EXE1 – EXECUTIVE SALARY SCALE

Position Title

Director Office of Consumer Protection
Director Department of Correction and Rehabilitation
County Attorney
Director Department of Environmental Protection
Director Department of Finance
Fire Chief, Fire/Rescue Service
Director Department of General Services
Director Department of Health and Human Services
Director Department of Housing and Community Affairs
Director Office of Human Resources
Director Office of Intergovernmental Relations
Director Department of Liquor Control
Director Office of Management and Budget
Director Department of Permitting Services
Director Department of Police
Director Office of Procurement
Director Office of Public Information
Director Department of Public Libraries
Director Department of Recreation
Director Department of Technology Services
Director Department of Transportation
Director Office of Racial Equity and Social Justice

EXE2 – EXECUTIVE SALARY SCALE

Position Title

Assistant Chief Administrative Officers

EXE3 – EXECUTIVE SALARY SCALE

Position Title

Special Assistants to County Executive
Special Projects Manager, Office of the CAO
Development Ombudsman, Office of the CAO
Director Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission, Office of the CAO
Division Chief MCFRS Volunteer Services
Chief Aging and Disability Services, HHS
Chief Children Youth and Family Services, HHS
Chief Special Needs Housing, HHS
Chief Behavioral Health and Crisis Services, HHS
Chief Operating Officer, HHS
County Health Officer
Assistant Chiefs of Police, POL
Director Office of Community Partnerships
Director Regional Services Centers
Transportation Policy Officer, DOT
Deputy Director of Operations, DOT
Deputy Director, DGS
Deputy Director, DHCA
Deputy Director, OMB
Chief Broadband Officer, DTS
Chief Data Officer, DTS
Chief Digital Officer, DTS
Chief Labor Relations Officer, OLR

Executive Summary

FY23 Proposed Inspector General Salary Schedule

Background

In reviewing the classification structure of the Inspector General position, it has been determined that the current structure for the Inspector General is inconsistent with other Executive and Legislative Branch non-merit appointed senior management positions. In particular:

- **Classification.** Unlike other senior management positions, the Inspector General is currently compensated as part of the General Salary Schedule (GSS) as a Grade 40. The County Code does not specify how the Inspector General position should be classified. The Inspector General position historically has received the same general wage adjustments and service increments as received by other non-represented employees classified on the GSS.
- **Leave Structure.** As a position that is classified on the GSS, the Inspector General accrues sick and annual leave. However, all other directors and/or senior management positions in the County accrue paid time off (PTO) instead of separate sick and annual leave. Additionally, the Inspector General now supervises MLS employees who accrue PTO and thus receive more leave than the Inspector General position.

The IG is currently compensated in accordance with the General Salary Schedule (GSS) Grade 40, however the current pay increases for the IG are not governed by the Merit System Protection Board as this role is a non-merit designation and oversees an independent agency of the County. The IG receives the same 3.5% service increment and General Wage Adjustment (GWA) as approved by the County Council during the fiscal year budget process for non-represented merit employees. In addition, the IG accrues sick and annual leave as defined in Section 16 and 17 of the Personnel Regulations.

The IG has direct reports from the Management Leadership Service (MLS) merit employee group who are compensated on a pay for performance salary structure and who do not accrue sick or annual leave, but rather receive 140 hours of paid time off (PTO) every July and January. As a result, the MLS employees who are supervised by the IG are currently earning more leave than the IG through the PTO plan. The Executive Branch leadership is appointed by the County Council as non-merit employees and are also compensated on a pay for performance Executive Salary Schedule and receive PTO hours rather than accrue leave.

Per the Montgomery Code Section 2-151, the County Council appoints the IG for a term of 4 years, not to exceed more than 2 full 4-year terms. The Inspector General may, subject to appropriation and all applicable merit system laws and regulations, appoint as a term merit employee one or more deputies and each of the other staff of the Office of the Inspector General as a merit employee, however the IG is a non-merit employee under the Montgomery County Code.

The appointment of the IG acts independent of the Executive Branch and the Council, however, serves as an appointed member of senior management for the County. In addition to the expansion of duties and responsibilities as defined in Bill 11-19, the Inspector General is charged to:

FY23 Proposed Inspector General Pay Schedule
Page 2 of 4

- review the effectiveness and efficiency of programs and operations of County government and independent County agencies,
- prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse in government activities; and
- propose ways to increase the legal, fiscal, and ethical accountability of County government departments and County-funded agencies.

In review of other neighboring jurisdictions, Inspector General positions are typically an appointed member of senior management. Some counties have Internal Auditor roles and do not have an IG that operates in a similar manner as Montgomery County (see attached Other County Details).

Below highlights the counties who have an Office of the Inspector General, which includes Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and the District of Columbia. The Executive Director for the Office of Ethics and Accountability in Prince George’s County handles fraud, waste, and abuse for the County. All other neighboring counties have internal audit functions that are not focused on the work of the IG.

Jurisdiction	Who appoints?	Term of Appointment	Employee Type	Current Salary Schedule Type	Benefits
MCG IG	County Council	(4) year term not to exceed more than 2 full 4-year terms	Non-merit	General Salary Schedule	Accrued sick and annual leave
MCG Executive Leadership	County Council	N/A	Non-merit	Executive Salary Schedule (EXE01, EXE02 & EXE03)	Paid Time Off 140 hours twice per year
District of Columbia IG	Mayor	(6) year term	Non-merit	Executive Salary Schedule (E5)	26 days of universal leave per calendar year
Baltimore County IG	Nominated by the County Executive; Approved by the County Council	The initial term is (5) years; each subsequent term is (4) years	Non-merit	Unknown	Does not seem to differentiate
Baltimore City IG	A quorum of four members of the Advisory Board	(6) year term	Non-merit	Unknown	Does not seem to differentiate
Prince George’s County Executive Director Ethics and Accountability	County Executive and confirmed by the County Council	?	Non-merit	Exempt Service	Does not seem to differentiate
Anne Arundel County County Auditor	County Council	?	Non-merit	Executive and Exempt Service Classes (E-08)	Annual Leave: - >3 years = 13 days - >15 years = 20 days

					- 15 years > = 26 days
Howard County County Auditor	County Council	Indefinite term	Non-merit	General Scale – Grade Q	Annual Leave: - >5 years = 13 days - 6>10 years = 16 days - 11>20 =19 days - 21 > = 21 days
City of Alexandria Chief Internal Auditor	Not appointed position	N/A	?	Executive Pay Scale-Band II	Standard benefits

FY23 Proposed Inspector General Salary Schedule

To ensure that the Inspector General position is treated equitably compared to other senior level positions in the Executive and Legislative Branch while maintaining its independence to effectively direct and ensure legal, fiscal, and ethical accountability in the programs and operation of the County, the following is recommended:

- 1) Create a new salary schedule for the Inspector General, aligned with the current Executive Salary Schedule Grade EXE2. This proposed schedule better aligns the salary schedule with comparable positions in the region. The new salary schedule would not impact the current salary of the Inspector General.
- 2) Provide leave via PTO like is done for all other non-merit appointed senior management positions within the County Government.
- 3) Have the Inspector General continue to receive general wage adjustments and service increments the same as other non-represented employees on the GSS. This ensures that compensation decisions are kept independent from other performance-based pay systems

The proposed salary schedule and the work responsibility of the Montgomery County Government (MCG) Inspector General is more consistently aligned to the executive level leadership in the Counties below that have oversight responsibilities for conducting investigations and complaints of fraud, waste, and abuse.

Jurisdiction	Salary Schedule Comparison				
	Minimum	Mid-Point	Maximum	Current Salary	Salary Schedule
MCG IG Current	\$132,392	\$158,599	\$184,806	\$180,940	GSS 40
MCG IG Proposed	\$130,262	\$175,854	\$221,446	\$180,940	Executive (IG2)
*MCG Executive Leader	\$130,262	\$175,854	\$221,446	\$172,491	Executive (EXE2)
District of Columbia	\$147,399	\$184,945	\$222,489	\$218,126	Executive Service (E5)

FY23 Proposed Inspector General Pay Schedule
Page 4 of 4

Baltimore County	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$145,000	N/A
Baltimore City	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$183,800	N/A
Prince George's County (Ethics and Accountability)	\$89,424	N/A	\$173,979	\$152,000	Exempted Service
Anne Arundel County	\$118,425	N/A	\$208,085	\$131,321	Executive and Exempt Service
Howard County	\$118,101	N/A	\$214,610	\$192,539	General Scale – Grade Q
City of Alexandria	\$106,845	N/A	\$193,631	\$118,425	Executive Pay Scale – Band II

***Notes:** Current Salary reflects the average salary of employees in the EXE2 job classification.



INSPECTOR GENERAL SALARY SCHEDULE

FISCAL YEAR 2023

EFFECTIVE JULY 3, 2022

Inspector General Salary Schedule

	MINIMUM	MIDPOINT	MAXIMUM
IG	\$130,262	\$175,854	\$221,446

Salary Schedule Adjustments

FY23 GWA