

Work and Pay

in State and Local Air Pollution Control Agencies

Results of a Survey of
Salaries and Benefits

Prepared by the
State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators
and the
Association of Local Air Pollution Control Officials
July 1999

Acknowledgments

The State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators (STAPPA) and the Association of local Air Pollution Control Officials (ALAPCO) are pleased to provide *Work and Pay in State and Local Air Pollution Control Agencies*. STAPPA and ALAPCO wish to thank Darryl Tyler (Delaware) and Bruce Andersen (Kansas City, KS), the Chairs of the STAPPA and ALAPCO Program Funding Committees, respectively, under whose guidance this document was prepared. The associations also gratefully acknowledge the efforts of Dr. Kristine Kelly (New York), who provided valuable

assistance in the evaluation of the survey responses. Finally, this report would not have been possible without the continued cooperation of the state and local air pollution control agency members across the country who responded to the questionnaire. Both their willingness to participate and their candor helped to make this report a success.

The survey and this report were overseen and prepared by STAPPA/ALAPCO staff, including S. William Becker (Executive Director) and Mary Sullivan Douglas (Senior Staff Associate).

About STAPPA and ALAPCO

The State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators (STAPPA) and the Association of Local Air Pollution Control Officials (ALAPCO) are the national associations of air quality officials in the states and territories and over 165 major metropolitan areas throughout the country. The members of STAPPA and ALAPCO have primary responsibility for implementing our nation's air pollution control laws and regulations. The associations serve to encourage the exchange of information and experience among air pollution control

officials; enhance communication and cooperation among federal, state and local regulatory agencies; and facilitate air pollution control activities that will result in clean, healthful air across the country. STAPPA and ALAPCO share joint headquarters in Washington, DC.

For further information, contact STAPPA and ALAPCO at 444 North Capitol Street, NW, Suite 307, Washington, DC 20001 (telephone: 202/624-7864; fax: 202/624-7863; web site: www.4cleanair.org; e-mail: 4clnair@sso.org).

Contents

<i>Page</i>	
1	INTRODUCTION
	SECTION I – SUMMARIES OF AGENCY RESPONSES
5	Summary of State Air Pollution Control Agency Responses
9	Summary of Local Air Pollution Control Agency Responses
13	Endnotes and References
	SECTION II – SALARY TABLES
17	State Agency Salary Table by Position and Region
21	Local Agency Salary Table by Position and Region
	APPENDICES
A3	Appendix A – STAPPA and ALAPCO Salary Survey (blank)
B1	Appendix B – Position Descriptions

Introduction

Human resources are state and local governments' most significant asset. Personnel-related costs generally make up between 50 and 70 percent of an agency's operating budget.¹ During the past decade all levels of government experienced a combination of both growth and retrenchment. Increasingly, public service demands a workforce that is highly trained, technically skilled, knowledgeable, and accountable. The attraction and retention of qualified personnel in government is one of the critical problems facing all agencies. Additionally, reductions in budgets, early retirements, new technologies, a diversified workforce and privatization are some of the major human resource issues that state and local governments are facing as they approach the new millennium.

To examine the impact of these issues on state and local governments, and assess workforce needs, STAPPA and ALAPCO distributed questionnaires on January 31, 1997 and September 11, 1997 to state and local air pollution control agencies intended to collect employment information about state and local air pollution control agencies across the United States (i.e., salaries, benefits and staff resources).

Responses were returned to STAPPA/ALAPCO several months later. Eighty-two percent or 41 states answered the survey. Nine states did not respond – Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island,

South Dakota, and Wyoming. Forty-three local air pollution control agencies responded to the questionnaire.

This report represents a compilation of responses from air pollution control agency representatives about the benefits and compensation offered to their workforces, and it examines some of the issues currently facing state and local regulatory administrators as they approach the 21st century. The results of this study show that air pollution regulatory agencies face the same concerns that have been expressed throughout government.

This report focuses first on compensation and benefit packages for state air pollution control agency employees, and then provides similar information for local air agencies. At the end of this report is a copy of the blank questionnaire that was distributed to collect the information for this survey (see Appendix A). Also included are detailed descriptions of the various job titles used throughout this report (see Appendix B).

SECTION I

Summaries of Agency Responses

Summary of State Air Pollution Control Agency Responses

Salaries in State Air Agencies

The survey respondents provided salary information for most top-, mid- and entry-level positions. Beginning on page 17 is a table containing the detailed salary information provided by state air agencies (including national and regional averages for each position). Based on the survey results, the following observations may be made:

- there are considerable differences in salaries within agencies and among regions. Within each agency, salaries generally increase as position levels rise;
- agency directors earn the highest average salary, followed in descending order by deputy directors, unit supervisors, attorneys, engineers, modellers/meteorologists, planners/rule writers, accounting/financial managers, chemists, public information specialists, environmental scientists/inspectors, data entry/information services staff, administrative staff and clerical personnel; and
- the highest-paying region overall is Region 2, followed in descending order by Regions 10, 5, 9, 7, 8, 3, 4, 6, 1. This ranking was determined by comparing how often each region placed in rankings by individual position. Rankings of regions by individual position vary.

Education Requirements

The survey requested information about education and experience requirements. Some agencies noted that education can substitute for years of experience and some noted that experience can substitute for educational requirements. Other agencies merely require knowledge, skills and abilities and do not stipulate minimum education or experience requirements. Just over one-half of the responding agencies indicated specifically that the agency director must have at least a bachelor's degree.

Characteristics of State Agency Staff Resources

State agencies cover a wide range of geographical territory and vary enormously in the number of air pollution sources that they are responsible for regulating. Consequently, their staff sizes and budgets are also quite different.

- over 60 percent of the state-agency respondents have budgets between \$1 million and \$10 million;
- two agencies reported budgets over \$55 million; and
- 35 percent of the responding agencies employ between 101-200 people; only 20 percent employ over 200 people; and the remaining agencies – 45 percent – have fewer than 100 staff members.

Contract Employees in State Government

Privatization or contracting for employment services continues to be regarded by the public as a way to increase productivity or enable government to complete work that they do not have the resources or expertise to handle in-house. Agency staff resources are supplemented or replaced through the use of contract employees who either work on long-term projects or are hired for very specific short-term programs. Although the debate still continues about the usefulness of privatizing certain government functions, this survey finds that contract employees continue to play a role in the conduct of government business:

- 65 percent of the agencies employ either temporary workers or consultants;
- agencies contract with firms for engineering, technical and scientific advice, and clerical or secretarial support; and
- slightly more than 50 percent of the agencies said that the hourly salaries paid to contract workers were more than salaries paid to comparable state staff.

Retirement Plans in State Government

Among the perceived benefits of public service are the pension plans offered by state and local governments. Most government pension plans are defined benefit plans where the benefit paid at retirement is either a fixed amount or is determined by formula. Recent trends in government also include the addition of deferred compensation plans that allow employees to contribute to specific plans in order to temporarily defer tax payments. The results of the survey regarding retirement plans follow:

- 100 percent of agencies had a retirement plan for their employees;
- 100 percent of the agencies also offered a deferred compensation plan; and
- only 6 percent of the agencies contribute less than 1 percent of an employee's salary to a retirement fund – 58 percent of the agencies contribute more than 5 percent of an employees' salary to a retirement fund.

State Government Health, Life, Dental Insurance

Health care concerns continue to occupy government agendas. The benefits provided to government employees at all levels are often a major factor that employees consider in their employment choices. A review of the responses on health, dental care and life insurance demonstrates that state air regulatory agencies provide significant benefits in these areas.

- 93 percent of the agencies contribute to Social Security and Medicare;

- 95 percent of the agencies have a health insurance plan and 83 percent of them provide their employees with a dental insurance plan;
- 60 percent of the agencies contribute between 25 to 99 percent to an employee's health and dental plan; and 24 percent of the agencies contribute 100 percent;
- 47 percent of the agencies provide their employees with a life insurance policy that equates to a specific dollar amount – the dollar amounts range from a low of \$1,250 to a high of \$50,000; and
- 36 percent of the agencies tie the life insurance policy amount to a multiple of an employee's salary ranging from one to four times the employee's annual salary.

State Employee Vacation Leave

Fringe benefits certainly increase the attractiveness of a particular employer. The questionnaire included a series of questions examining the amount of vacation granted to first-, fifth-, tenth- and fifteenth-year employees. The results are as follows:

- 47.5 percent of the state agencies grant their first-year employees one to three weeks vacation;
- after employees have been with an agency five years, 60 percent of the agencies allow them one to three weeks vacation leave; and by the tenth year of employment, over 87 percent of the agencies grant their employees between one and five weeks vacation leave; and
- 15 percent of the agencies allow employees to earn between five and eight weeks of vacation leave by their fifteenth year of service.

Survey respondents were also asked about vacation buy-outs and annual vacation payments, if any, that might be given to an employee of the state agency:

- 97 percent of the agencies indicated that they pay employees for unused vacation leave when they leave the agency;
- most agencies indicated that they pay for between 30 and 60 days of unused vacation. For those who pay more, the responses varied from up to two years worth – two respondents – to no restrictions on the amount of leave – five agencies; and
- when agencies were asked if they paid an employee for unused vacation leave on an annual basis (as opposed to upon retirement or termination), the majority of agencies – 90 percent – responded *no*.

The following table compares leave benefits reported by the private sector and state and local governments in general and the information reported by state and local air pollution control state and local agencies in this survey.

Percentage of Employees Covered by Paid Leave Benefits and Number of Days of Paid Leave (not including Sick Leave)²

Benefit	Private Sector		State and Local Employees		State and Local Air Agencies	
	Percent Covered	Average Days Provided	Percent Covered	Average Days Provided	Percent Covered	Average Days Provided
1 year of service	97%	9	100%	12	100%	5-15
20 years of service	98%	21.1	100%	21	100%	25-40

State Agency Sick Leave

Agencies were also asked about the extent of sick time that their employees were allowed during their tenure. Their responses were as follows:

- 63 percent of the agencies responded that their employees earn an average of over two weeks of sick time each year;
- when an employee leaves state service, 54 percent of the agencies will pay for unused sick leave to that employee. However, most of the unused sick leave payment was limited to employees who left state government because of retirement. Employees in this category could cash in up to 300 days or a certain percentage of their sick leave – 25 to 40 percent – upon retirement; and
- an overwhelming majority of agencies – 94 percent – do not pay an employee for unused sick leave on an annual basis.

State Agency Flexible Work Schedules

Flexible work schedules have become an important part of government’s efforts to recruit and retain a diverse workforce. Government agencies together with private industry are now providing their employees with many options to accommodate the increasing diversity of the workforce. These options can include employees setting their own work schedules as long as they work a specified number of hours each day; employees taking their work home and communicating with the office through the use of computers or telecommuting; or employees taking temporary and voluntary reductions in work and salary in exchange for more leave time. The state agencies responded as follows:

- 95 percent allow flexible working schedules for their employees; and
- 43 percent allow their employees to only “flex” their hours (i.e., they have flexible beginning and ending times to their workdays); the remaining 57 percent of the agencies provide their employees with telecommuting, flexible start and stop times, shorter workweeks with longer workdays or some combination.

Attrition Rate and Why Employees Leave State Government

A study by the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) determined that the reasons that influenced a federal government employee’s decision to leave government service were so diverse that different rankings of reasons were cited by different groups of federal employees varying by age, civil service grade level, sex, location and performance rating. Most federal employees cited multiple reasons for leaving, although compensation and advancement were top ranked.³ An examination of the survey responses regarding the attrition or turnover rate and the reasons state air agency employees leave state service showed:

- 50 percent of the agencies reported an annual attrition rate, averaged over the last three years, of 1 to 5 percent; of the remaining agencies that responded, only one reported a turnover rate of less than 1 percent. The majority of those agencies that had a higher rate – 32 percent of respondents – reported their turnover rates to be between 6-10 percent;
- state air pollution control agency employees leave government for a variety of reasons, the more common of which are: career change, education, retirement, transfer or relocation and higher pay; and
- 30 percent of the agencies stated that the main reason employees left state service was to take a higher paying position with industry.

Reduction in Force or Decreasing State Payrolls

Over the past several years state governments have coped with fiscal difficulties by trimming budgets, instituting pay and benefit constraints, hiring contractors and reducing the size of the workforce. The survey included a set of questions examining the extent of reductions-in-force, and the impact that they have had on the ability of state air pollution control programs to continue to implement state and federal regulatory requirements. The results are as follows:

- 28 percent of the agencies responded that they had experienced a decrease in staff over the past three years;
- of those that had experienced decreases, 50 percent had staffing reductions of less than five percent;
- states experienced staff reductions for many reasons: overall decrease in the state budget, reductions in the Section 105 federal air grant and the state's resources allocated to air pollution control and program consolidation. One state agency mentioned that, although its budget had remained stable, cost increases had resulted in staff reductions;
- the impact of these decreases on programs varied with each state. In general, those agencies that experienced staffing reductions mentioned the following impacts: program consolidation, increased permitting backlogs, reduction in the thoroughness and number of inspections, reduced enforcement effort and a lowering of the number of complaints that were actively investigated;
- although the types of jobs that were eliminated – management, inspectors, clerical staff, engineers, scientists, chemists, etc. – varied from agency to agency, in general, most of the positions that were terminated were engineering ones; and
- only 15 percent of the agencies foresaw additional staff reductions in the future.

State Agency Staffing Increases

The good news is that state air pollution control agencies have also increased their staff numbers over the past several years. This finding must, however, be balanced against the increased workload that states have experienced under the Title V permitting requirements in the federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. Specifically, the respondents indicated the following:

- 66 percent of the agencies responded that they had experienced an increase in staff over the past three years;
- two-thirds of those who gained staff estimated that the annual rate of increase in staff size was over 5 percent; and 25 percent of those agencies added staff at a rate of between 11 and 15 percent;

- 44 percent of the agencies noted that the single major reason for these staff increases was the addition of Title V revenues; the remaining agencies indicated that increases in their state budgets and/or new non-Title V regulatory fees had contributed to the staff expansion;
- 74 percent of the agencies indicated that the impact of the new Title V revenues was to add new Title V staff resources; and
- the new positions were filled with engineers, environmental scientists, planners, data entry and computer personnel, administrators, public information specialists, accountants, attorneys and clerical staff.

State Agency Salary Increases

One of the most powerful rewards that an organization can provide its employees is pay. The questionnaire collected data on the amount and frequency of salary increases, the findings of which are as follows:

- 68 percent of the agencies indicated that salary raises are considered annually;
- 88 percent of the agencies reported that their staffs had received a raise in the past year;
- the vast majority of agencies – 87 percent – stated that the raises received by their employees in the past year ranged from 1 to 5 percent;
- 89 percent of the agencies reported that the typical annual increase over the past three years ranged from 1 to 5 percent;
- agencies' responses about how raises were determined varied greatly. Eighteen percent stated that raises were based on legislative mandates, 13 percent indicated that raises were based on performance or merit, 8 percent stated that they were based on collective bargaining and 8 percent said raises were simply cost of living adjustments;
- 64 percent of the agencies whose personnel did not receive a raise indicated that the major reason raises were not granted was that either the governor or the legislature did not approve one; and
- 58 percent of the agencies stated that it took, on average, 10-15 years for employees to reach the highest salary levels within the agency.

Summary of Local Air Pollution Control Agency Responses

Salaries in Local Air Agencies

Beginning on page 21 is a table containing the detailed salary information provided by local air agencies (including national and regional averages for each position). Based on the survey results, the following observations may be made:

- there are considerable differences in salaries within agencies and among regions. Within each agency, salaries generally increase as position levels rise;
- agency attorneys earn the highest average salary, followed in descending order by directors, deputy directors, unit supervisors, accounting/financial managers, planners/rule writers, modellers/meteorologists, engineers, public information specialists, data entry/information services staff, chemists, environmental scientists/inspectors, administrative staff and clerical personnel; and
- the highest-paying region overall is Region 9, followed in descending order by Regions 10, 5, 4, 7 and 3 (other regions either did not respond or do not have local agencies). This ranking was determined by comparing how often each region placed in rankings by individual position. Rankings of regions by individual position vary.

Education Requirements

As with the state agencies, some local agencies indicated that education can substitute for experience and vice versa. Some agencies merely require knowledge, skills and abilities and did not stipulate minimum education or experience requirements. Thirty-six of the 43 responding agencies indicated specifically that the agency director must have at least a bachelor's degree.

Characteristics of Local Agency Staff Resources

Local government agencies vary in scope, geographical responsibility and staffing. Key characteristics gleaned from the survey are:

- 55 percent of the local agencies have budgets between \$1 million and \$10 million;
- 38 percent have an air pollution budget of less than \$1 million;
- 52 percent employ fewer than 20 people;
- 31 percent of the agencies employ between 20-60 people; and
- only one agency – the South Coast Air Quality Management District in California – employs over 400 people.

Contract Employees in Local Government

Local governments appear to face the same forces to privatize their workforce as state air pollution control agencies. However, unlike the state agencies that responded to this survey, only about one-fourth of the local agencies hired temporary workers or consultants. The survey results were as follows:

- only 26 percent of local air pollution control agencies employ either consultants or temporary staff, compared to 65 percent of state agencies;
- 29 of them use consultants in the computer field with the remaining agencies using contract employees in engineering, public relations, impact modeling and legal work; and
- 80 percent of those agencies that use contract workers indicated that the salaries paid to them were comparable to those paid to government employees.

Retirement Plans in Local Government

The responses to the questions regarding retirement and deferred compensation plans for local government air pollution control employees are as follows:

- 100 percent of local agencies have retirement plans for their staffs;
- 93 percent of the agencies also offer a deferred compensation plan; and
- 43 percent of the agencies contribute between 5 and 10 percent of an employee's salary to a pension plan.

Local Government Health, Life and Dental Insurance

The benefits provided to staff are often a major factor that employees consider in their employment choices. The survey included a series of questions regarding the health, life and dental benefits that are available to employees of local air pollution control government agencies. The responses indicate the following:

- 76 percent of the local government agencies contribute to both Social Security and Medicare;
- 7 percent of the agencies contribute only to Medicare;
- 53 percent of the agencies provide a life insurance benefit to their employees that is a specific dollar amount, usually equal to their salaries or one and one-half to two times the employees' annual salaries;
- 91 percent of the agencies provide a dental insurance plan for their workers and all of the responding agencies cover their employees with a health insurance plan; and

- 43 percent of the agencies contribute 100 percent to an employee's health and dental plans, while 40 percent contribute at least 25 percent to these plans.

Local Employee Vacation Leave

Vacation leave information for the local air pollution control agencies, based upon the survey results, follow:

- 43 percent of the agencies give first-year employees one to two weeks vacation while 10 percent of the agencies provide first-year employees with no vacation;
- in 50 percent of the agencies, employees who have been with their agencies for five years receive one to three weeks vacation;
- by the tenth year of employment, employees in 62 percent of the local agencies receive vacation leave of three to five weeks; and
- by their fifteenth year of public service, employees in only 2 percent of the agencies receive less than three weeks vacation.

Local agencies were questioned about payment for unused vacation and their responses follow:

- 95 percent indicated that they paid an employee for unused vacation leave when that person left the employment of the local agency;
- the amount of unused vacation leave for which an agency would pay varied widely. A few paid up to 30 days – seven agencies – and some paid for all vacation leave available to their employees; and
- 82 percent of the agencies reported that they do not pay for unused vacation leave on an annual basis.

Local Agency Sick Leave

Sick leave is an important benefit for public-sector employees. This series of questions examined the amount of sick leave that employees receive throughout their tenures.

- 50 percent of the agencies allow their employees between one and two weeks of sick leave each year; another 35 percent of the agencies provide their staffs with over two weeks of annual sick leave;
- 61 percent of the agencies reported that they paid an employee for unused sick leave when the employee left the agency; the number of days of sick leave for which an agency would actually pay varied widely. Most agencies set a maximum of between 25 and 75 days; and
- 88 percent of the agencies revealed that they did not pay an employee for unused sick leave on an annual basis.

Local Agency Flexible Work Schedules

The changing complexion of the workforce and the fierce competition for highly qualified workers has resulted in various combinations of work schedules being offered to employees.

- 80 percent of agencies have a flexible or alternative work schedule in place for their employees; and
- the majority of these agencies – 94 percent – permitted a shorter workweek with a longer workday or flexible beginning/ending times to the workday or some combination of the above. Only 6 percent of the agencies combined this with a telecommuting option.

Attrition Rate and Why Employees Leave Local Government

Local agency reports on the attrition rates of their employees and their reasons for leaving the public sector varied. The results of the survey are as follows:

- 39 percent of the agencies reported an annual attrition rate, averaged over the last three years, of between 1 and 5 percent. Of the remaining agencies that responded, 34 percent had an attrition rate of between 6 and 10 percent, 10 percent lost less than 1 percent per year, and only 3 agencies reported attrition rates of over 20 percent;
- local government employees left for a variety of reasons: higher pay in either the public or private sector, retirement, career changes, educational leave, and family obligations; and
- 10 percent of the agencies responded that the main reason their employees left local government service was for a higher-paying job in another government sector; while 13 percent of the agencies indicated that the main reason their employees left was for a higher paying position with the private sector. Other responses included a combination of factors.

Reduction in Force or Decreasing Local Payrolls

Local air pollution control officials were asked if their agencies had experienced any reduction in the workforce over the past three years. Their responses were as follows:

- only 29 percent indicated that they had staff decreases over the past three years;
- of those agencies that had reductions, 50 percent experienced staff decreases of less than 5 percent, while 25 percent had decreases between 5 and 10 percent;
- local agencies experienced decreases for many reasons, but the primary ones were program consolidation (25 percent); reduced revenues from fees (17 percent);

and reduced municipal budgets for air pollution control work (7 percent). The rest of the agencies cited a combination of factors – overall municipal budget reductions coupled with decreased fee revenues and program consolidation and/or reorganization (51 percent);

- the impact of these reductions was, naturally, different for each locality. Generally, those agencies that experienced staffing decreases reported program consolidation and reorganizations and combinations of reductions in permitting and enforcement work. However, 33 percent indicated that there was little impact for them;
- those agencies that lost staff mostly experienced reductions in clerical and environmental scientists/field inspection staff; and
- only 33 percent of the agencies expected additional staffing reductions in the future, and 67 percent of these predicted reductions of less than five percent.

Local Agency Staffing Increases

Local air pollution control agencies were also asked to examine any staffing increases that they had experienced over the past three years. Their responses follow:

- 48 percent of local agencies had increased their workforces over the past three years;
- the annual rate of increase in staff averaged over the last three years was less than 5 percent for 53 percent of the agencies, and between 5 and 10 percent for 29 percent of the agencies;
- although there were numerous reasons cited for this increase, 50 percent of the agencies that responded to this question indicated that additional revenues from the Title V fee program helped to support new staff. The remaining agencies listed additional revenues from non-specific fees (22 percent); increases to the municipal budget for air pollution work (6 percent) and combinations of the above;
- the programmatic impact of the additional staff to individual agencies varied widely, including improving source evaluations, spreading the work more evenly among staff and allowing them to begin to address air pollution mandates; and
- the types of positions that were added to the workforce were mainly engineering (44 percent of the responding agencies); and environmental scientists and inspection staff (28 percent of the agencies).

Local Agency Salary Increases

Compensation is clearly an issue that is important to all government workers. The questionnaire collected data on the amount and frequency of salary increases. The results of the survey on questions concerning this topic were:

- 74 percent of the local agencies indicated that salary raises are considered annually;
- 93 percent of the agencies responded that their staffs had received raises in the past year;
- the overwhelming majority of agencies – 90 percent – said that their employees had received raises ranging from 1 to 5 percent;
- 90 percent of the agencies reported that the typical raise that their staffs received over the past three years was 1 to 5 percent;
- agencies responded that their pay raises were determined in many different ways: collective bargaining agreements (13 percent); automatic cost of living adjustments (10 percent); merit, based upon performance (10 percent), seniority or some combination of the above (67 percent);
- agencies that had personnel who did not receive a raise in pay responded that the major reason was that the government did not approve one (27 percent of respondents); and
- in response to a question on how long it would take employees to reach the highest salary levels within the agency, 44 percent indicated that it would take five to ten years; 14 percent reported fewer than five years and the remaining agencies said over ten years.

Endnotes and References

Endnotes

1. J. Shafritz, N. Ricucci, D. Rosenbloom, and A. Hyde, *Personnel Management in Government*, (New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1992), 10 1.
2. The first four columns of data are from a comprehensive survey of benefit plans in state and local governments conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1987. This information was presented in *Public Personnel Management*, Vol.20, No.4 (Winter 1991). The last two columns are based on information regarding paid leave (not including sick leave) collected in STAPPA/ALAPCO's salary survey (1997).
3. "Why Are Employees Leaving the Federal Government?" *U.S. Merit System Protection Board*, 1990, p. 15.

References

- Shafritz, J. Ricucci, N., Rosenbloom, D., Hyde, A. *Personnel Management in Government*. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1992.
- Moore, P. "Comparison of State and Local Employee Benefits and Private Employee Benefits." *Public Personnel Management*, 20 (1991), 4:429-437.
- U.S. Merit System Protection Board. "Why are Employees Leaving the Federal Government?" Washington, D.C., 1990.

SECTION II

Salary Tables

STAPPA/ALAPCO Salary Survey
State Agency Salaries (1997)

(page 1)

State Agencies	Region	Agency Budget (in millions)	Size of Staff	Director	Deputy Director	Unit Supervisor	Entry-Level Engineer	Mid-Level Engineer	Top-Level Engineer
New Hampshire	1	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$57,500	\$41,000 - \$49,000	\$41,500	\$26,000	\$33,000	\$39,500
Vermont	1	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$52,000	\$43,000	\$36,000	\$22,000	\$30,000	\$34,000
REGION 1 AVERAGE				\$54,750	\$44,000	\$38,750	\$24,000	\$31,500	\$36,750
New York	2	\$33-\$43	201-300	\$82,700	\$84,700	\$70,000	\$38,500	\$58,400	\$60,000
REGION 2 AVERAGE				\$82,700	\$84,700	\$70,000	\$38,500	\$58,400	\$60,000
Delaware	3	\$1-\$10	61-100	\$83,100		\$60,500	\$28,400	\$36,600	\$45,800
Maryland	3	\$1-\$10	101-200	\$61,000 - \$75,000	\$52,000 - \$64,000	\$48,183	\$29,306	\$39,516	\$42,675
Pennsylvania	3	\$22-\$32	301-400	\$59,000 - \$82,000	\$46,000 - \$70,000	\$55,169	\$27,130	\$39,032	\$44,538
Virginia	3	\$1-\$10	101-200	\$52,000 - \$81,000	\$44,000 - \$68,000	\$53,353	\$37,358	\$40,839	\$44,645
West Virginia	3	\$1-\$10	61-100	\$55,176	\$46,000	\$40,431	\$32,934	\$36,668	\$39,978
REGION 3 AVERAGE				\$69,138	\$54,523	\$51,527	\$31,026	\$38,531	\$43,527
Alabama	4	\$1-\$10	61-100	\$104,000	\$100,000		\$41,288	\$49,101	\$72,735
Florida	4	\$11-\$21	101-200	\$86,300	\$68,100	\$41,600	\$27,190	\$37,373	\$39,827
Georgia	4	\$11-\$21	101-200	\$74,800		\$64,800	\$30,000	\$50,000	\$70,000
Kentucky	4	\$1-\$10	101-200	\$78,300	\$56,400	\$41,814	\$24,057	\$32,545	\$55,115
Mississippi	4	\$1-\$10	61-100	\$56,200	\$50,300	\$43,392	\$27,154	\$37,359	\$43,391
South Carolina	4	\$11-\$21	101-200	\$47,000 - \$78,000	\$46,000 - \$78,000	\$60,995	\$35,384	\$43,703	\$51,604
Tennessee	4	\$1-\$10	101-200	\$38,000 - \$62,000	\$37,000 - \$60,000	\$44,412	\$24,348	\$31,224	\$54,696
REGION 4 AVERAGE				\$79,947	\$64,236	\$49,502	\$29,917	\$40,186	\$55,338
Illinois	5	over \$55	301-400	\$52,000 - \$96,000	\$42,000 - \$96,000	\$60,200	\$35,050	\$40,650	\$45,950
Indiana	5	\$11-\$21	101-200	\$49,000 - \$75,000	\$43,000 - \$65,000	\$50,141	\$33,761	\$37,674	\$48,386
Michigan	5	\$11-\$21	201-300	\$91,800	\$80,200	\$57,483	\$33,199	\$47,063	\$50,425
Minnesota	5	\$11-\$21	61-100	\$82,000	\$88,000	\$52,000	\$42,000	\$54,000	\$63,000
Ohio	5	\$11-\$21	201-300	\$50,000 - \$66,000	\$46,000 - \$60,000	\$51,000		\$40,000	\$44,000
Wisconsin	5	\$11-\$21	101-200	\$74,000			\$29,971	\$35,243	\$44,232
REGION 5 AVERAGE				\$82,624	\$68,832	\$54,165	\$34,796	\$42,438	\$49,332

When an agency provided salary ranges, the means of the ranges were used in calculating the regional averages. For the Director and Deputy Director salaries, actual ranges are identified (if provided) in the table. For other positions, just the means of the ranges are identified.

STAPPA/LAPCO Salary Survey
State Agency Salaries (1997)

(page 2)

State Agencies	Region	Agency Budget (in millions)	Size of Staff	Director	Deputy Director	Unit Supervisor	Entry-Level Engineer	Mid-Level Engineer	Top-Level Engineer
Arkansas	6	\$1-\$10	61-100	\$51,900		\$32,500	\$36,428	\$42,271	\$46,727
Louisiana	6	\$11-\$21	201-300	\$43,000 - \$68,000	\$38,000 - \$59,000	\$42,500	\$32,000	\$37,000	\$39,500
Oklahoma	6	\$1-\$10	101-200	\$51,000 - \$67,000	\$40,000 - \$53,000	\$43,510	\$31,561	\$37,050	\$42,528
Texas	6	\$22-\$32	over 400	\$75,000 - \$85,000		\$58,000	\$27,500	\$32,500	\$40,500
REGION 6 AVERAGE				\$51,916	\$47,571	\$44,128	\$31,872	\$37,205	\$42,314
Iowa	7	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$61,000 - \$77,000	\$53,000 - \$67,000	\$49,556	\$36,088		\$45,843
Kansas	7	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$66,000		\$55,192	\$36,454	\$43,763	\$66,778
Missouri	7	\$1-\$10	61-100	\$38,000 - \$57,000	\$35,000 - \$52,000	\$43,608	\$36,792		\$41,760
Nebraska	7	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$84,400	\$59,600	\$45,400	\$31,450	\$35,200	\$42,500
REGION 7 AVERAGE				\$75,220	\$54,326	\$48,439	\$35,196	\$39,482	\$49,220
Colorado	8	\$11-\$21	101-200	\$81,700	\$78,300	\$67,423	\$43,766	\$54,506	\$81,792
Montana	8	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$37,000		\$31,500	\$23,000	\$25,000	\$27,000
North Dakota	8	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$39,000 - \$60,000	\$33,000 - \$53,000	\$39,162	\$21,600	\$28,956	\$38,352
South Dakota	8	\$1-\$10		\$47,000 - \$78,000					
Utah	8	\$1-\$10	101-200	\$47,000 - \$79,000		\$42,741	\$39,379	\$50,279	\$62,472
REGION 8 AVERAGE				\$59,396	\$60,684	\$45,207	\$31,936	\$39,685	\$52,404
Arizona	9	\$11-\$21	101-200	\$51,000 - \$78,000	\$47,900	\$39,843	\$27,197	\$35,143	\$36,839
California	9	over \$55	over 400	\$103,100	\$92,900	\$71,316	\$31,248	\$47,856	\$56,400
Hawaii	9	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$65,000		\$45,000	\$38,000	\$43,000	\$48,000
Nevada	9	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$46,000 - \$63,000		\$50,000	\$39,950		\$45,650
REGION 9 AVERAGE				\$84,088	\$70,443	\$51,540	\$34,099	\$42,000	\$46,722
Alaska	10	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$70,000 - \$97,000	\$59,000 - \$81,000	\$57,000	\$35,500	\$48,000	\$55,500
Idaho	10	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$61,100	\$56,200	\$45,698	\$32,302	\$38,002	\$47,507
Washington	10		101-200	\$662,000		\$49,272	\$29,424	\$53,100	\$58,584
REGION 10 AVERAGE				\$63,699	\$63,111	\$50,657	\$32,409	\$46,367	\$53,864
NATIONAL AVERAGE				\$72,491	\$60,930	\$49,531	\$32,171	\$40,584	\$48,968
NATIONAL HIGH				\$104,000	\$100,000	\$71,316	\$43,766	\$58,400	\$81,792
NATIONAL LOW				\$37,000	\$43,000	\$31,500	\$21,600	\$25,000	\$27,000

STAPPA/LAPCO Salary Survey
State Agency Salaries (1997)

(page 3)

State Agencies	Entry-Level Environmental Scientist/ Inspector/ Field Staff	Mid-Level Environmental Scientist/ Inspector/ Field Staff	Top-Level Environmental Scientist/ Inspector/ Field Staff	Modeller Meteorologist	Chemist	Attorney	Planner Rule Writer	Public Information Specialist	Data Entry Information Services	Accounting Financial Manager	Administrative	Clerical
New Hampshire	\$23,000	\$25,000	\$30,500	\$35,000		\$43,000	\$33,000		\$11,000		\$22,000	\$18,500
Vermont	\$22,000	\$30,000	\$34,000								\$27,000	\$20,000
REGION 1 AVERAGE	\$22,500	\$27,500	\$32,250	\$35,000		\$43,000	\$33,000		\$11,000		\$24,500	\$19,250
New York	\$26,200	\$40,000	\$43,200	\$40,000	\$34,700	\$50,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$34,700	\$40,000	\$25,000
REGION 2 AVERAGE	\$26,200	\$40,000	\$43,200	\$40,000	\$34,700	\$50,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$34,700	\$40,000	\$25,000
Delaware	\$25,700	\$30,800					\$30,700		\$36,100		\$24,800	\$21,000
Maryland	\$23,565	\$31,536	\$39,516	\$27,899	\$28,150	\$50,444	\$34,247	\$33,464	\$29,712	\$34,247	\$25,674	\$20,818
Pennsylvania	\$23,981	\$34,191	\$44,538	\$40,431	\$39,032	\$58,866		\$39,032		\$37,106	\$32,617	\$26,426
Virginia	\$28,596	\$34,174	\$37,358	\$38,139	\$34,174		\$40,839	\$37,358		\$44,645	\$23,929	\$21,889
West Virginia	\$24,332	\$28,378	\$37,509	\$33,156	\$30,170	\$45,000				\$32,862	\$28,476	\$18,046
REGION 3 AVERAGE	\$25,235	\$31,816	\$39,730	\$34,906	\$32,881	\$51,437	\$35,262	\$36,618	\$32,906	\$37,215	\$27,099	\$21,636
Alabama	\$26,683	\$32,530	\$45,578	\$42,614	\$28,713	\$45,578	\$31,408				\$18,658	\$16,055
Florida	\$24,116	\$32,831	\$37,373	\$35,031		\$31,199	\$25,611		\$32,831		\$22,677	\$16,248
Georgia	\$20,000	\$35,000	\$50,000	\$40,000	\$30,000			\$30,000		\$30,000	\$35,000	\$23,500
Kentucky	\$21,840	\$30,727	\$54,660	\$34,524			\$33,084	\$23,665	\$21,173	\$31,161	\$26,988	\$25,188
Mississippi	\$22,249	\$26,340	\$30,138			\$31,537			\$25,067	\$35,356	\$17,323	\$15,696
South Carolina	\$27,444	\$35,384	\$50,132		\$40,084						\$34,350	\$25,730
Tennessee	\$18,204	\$25,452	\$47,928	\$31,422						\$21,244	\$26,770	\$17,828
REGION 4 AVERAGE	\$22,934	\$31,181	\$45,116	\$36,718	\$32,932	\$36,105	\$30,034	\$26,832	\$26,357	\$29,440	\$25,967	\$20,035
Illinois	\$28,800	\$35,150	\$45,950	\$33,950		\$40,200	\$51,800	\$35,600	\$41,550	\$32,600	\$33,450	\$23,400
Indiana	\$34,450	\$39,052	\$44,200		\$36,036	\$36,738	\$39,052	\$28,665	\$34,454		\$25,350	\$18,447
Michigan	\$30,881	\$44,140	\$47,982	\$44,140	\$44,140		\$47,982	\$47,982	\$46,186	\$39,588	\$41,342	\$30,845
Minnesota	\$31,500	\$34,000	\$37,500	\$67,000	\$48,000	\$75,500	\$34,000	\$49,000				\$31,500
Ohio	\$35,500	\$40,000	\$44,000	\$40,000		\$41,000	\$40,000	\$32,500	\$40,000	\$53,000	\$33,000	\$25,000
Wisconsin	\$24,705	\$28,864	\$36,508	\$36,508	\$30,553		\$33,050	\$30,539	\$22,051	\$33,712	\$39,843	\$21,209
REGION 5 AVERAGE	\$30,973	\$36,868	\$42,690	\$44,320	\$39,682	\$48,360	\$40,981	\$37,381	\$36,848	\$39,725	\$34,597	\$25,067

STAPPA/LAPCO Salary Survey
 State Agency Salaries (1997) (page 4)

State Agencies	Entry-Level Environmental Scientist/ Inspector/ Field Staff	Mid-Level Environmental Scientist/ Inspector/ Field Staff	Top-Level Environmental Scientist/ Inspector/ Field Staff	Modeller Meteorologist	Chemist	Attorney	Planner Rule Writer	Public Information Specialist	Data Entry Information Services	Accounting Financial Manager	Administrative	Clerical
Arkansas	\$33,533	\$38,005	\$38,005	\$33,533	\$33,810	\$45,124	\$39,735	\$24,440	\$21,556	\$43,111	\$32,135	\$25,563
Louisiana	\$24,500	\$26,000	\$30,000	\$42,000					\$26,500			\$19,500
Oklahoma	\$25,134	\$28,164	\$31,560	\$30,150	\$31,944	\$40,620	\$34,578	\$34,578	\$38,796	\$30,090	\$28,968	\$18,108
Texas		\$41,500	\$41,500	\$33,000	\$34,000	\$34,000	\$37,000	\$37,000	\$43,000	\$32,500	\$21,000	
REGION 6 AVERAGE	\$27,722	\$27,082	\$33,188	\$36,796	\$32,918	\$42,872	\$36,104	\$29,509	\$30,963	\$38,734	\$31,201	\$21,043
Iowa	\$33,197	\$39,697	\$39,697		\$46,592				\$20,290		\$26,227	\$19,406
Kansas	\$36,140	\$48,802	\$64,992			\$43,924				\$44,468	\$27,378	\$25,610
Missouri	\$29,928	\$33,822	\$38,370	\$32,304	\$33,822		\$33,822	\$27,612	\$32,574	\$38,370	\$30,684	\$19,446
Nebraska	\$27,500	\$33,250	\$38,900	\$30,000	\$47,000		\$37,250					\$17,500
REGION 7 AVERAGE	\$31,691	\$38,625	\$45,490	\$31,152	\$33,822	\$46,796	\$38,332	\$27,612	\$26,432	\$41,419	\$28,096	\$20,491
Colorado	\$30,904	\$51,018	\$67,697	\$50,429		\$61,392	\$46,058	\$40,662	\$47,172	\$35,680	\$32,109	\$24,401
Montana	\$21,000	\$23,000	\$25,000	\$26,000		\$35,000	\$27,000		\$19,000		\$18,000	\$15,000
North Dakota	\$21,600	\$27,564	\$32,808					\$32,478				
South Dakota												
Utah	\$35,349	\$43,910	\$53,097			\$37,312				\$25,536		\$15,263
REGION 8 AVERAGE	\$27,213	\$36,373	\$44,651	\$38,215	\$44,568	\$44,568	\$36,529	\$36,570	\$33,086	\$30,608	\$25,055	\$18,221
Arizona	\$24,740	\$28,780	\$31,993	\$31,993			\$27,901	\$26,844	\$19,824	\$25,787	\$19,640	\$17,094
California	\$45,684	\$53,820	\$61,944	\$52,044	\$83,628			\$54,756	\$52,152	\$57,300	\$37,020	\$27,576
Hawaii	\$30,000	\$34,000	\$38,000	\$55,000	\$34,000	\$55,000	\$34,000		\$34,000	\$30,000		\$20,000
Nevada	\$36,700		\$39,950						\$36,700	\$45,650	\$38,250	\$25,400
REGION 8 AVERAGE	\$34,281	\$38,867	\$42,972	\$46,346	\$34,000	\$69,314	\$30,951	\$40,800	\$35,669	\$39,684	\$31,637	\$22,518
Alaska	\$43,000	\$49,500		\$57,000			\$50,000		\$39,000			\$25,500
Idaho	\$32,302	\$38,002	\$47,507	\$38,002			\$38,002	\$32,198	\$29,578	\$52,000	\$26,312	\$20,925
Washington	\$27,897	\$39,456	\$51,780	\$45,522			\$46,896	\$48,072			\$27,132	\$20,280
REGION 10 AVERAGE	\$34,400	\$42,319	\$49,644	\$41,762	\$57,000		\$44,966	\$40,135	\$34,289	\$52,000	\$26,722	\$22,235
NATIONAL AVERAGE	\$28,278	\$34,795	\$42,429	\$38,907	\$35,963	\$47,654	\$37,331	\$35,688	\$32,087	\$37,248	\$28,958	\$21,536
NATIONAL HIGH	\$45,684	\$53,820	\$67,697	\$67,000	\$57,000	\$83,628	\$51,800	\$54,756	\$52,152	\$57,300	\$41,342	\$31,500
NATIONAL LOW	\$18,204	\$23,000	\$25,000	\$26,000	\$28,150	\$31,199	\$25,611	\$23,665	\$11,000	\$21,244	\$17,323	\$15,000

STAPPA/LAPCO Salary Survey
Local Agency Salaries (1997)

(page 1)

Local Agencies	Region	Agency Budget (in millions)	Size of Staff	Director	Deputy Director	Unit Supervisor	Entry-Level Engineer	Mid-Level Engineer	Top-Level Engineer
Allegheny Co., PA	3	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$42,400				\$29,580	\$33,600
REGION 3 AVERAGE				\$42,444				\$29,580	\$33,600
Huntsville, AL	4	under \$1	under 20	\$51,000 - \$76,000	\$42,000 - \$60,000				
Birmingham, AL	4	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$60,000 - \$80,000	\$44,000 - \$60,000	\$46,686	\$36,608	\$42,390	\$49,026
Hillsborough Co., FL	4	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$80,000	\$40,000 - \$62,000	\$29,500	\$27,000	\$34,000	\$44,000
Pinellas Co., FL	4	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$40,000 - \$64,000		\$42,853			
Jefferson Co., KY	4	\$1-\$10	61-100	\$70,000	\$67,500	\$54,759	\$31,876	\$41,194	\$65,791
Forsyth Co., NC	4	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$73,100		\$46,000	\$30,000	\$33,000	\$39,000
Chattanooga, TN	4	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$70,100	\$48,100	\$56,000	\$33,843	\$36,381	\$38,811
Memphis, TN	4	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$54,200	\$48,100	\$41,522	\$32,208	\$37,800	\$43,392
Nashville, TN	4	\$1-\$10	under 20	\$79,600		\$47,301	\$38,084	\$41,843	\$59,632
REGION 4 AVERAGE				\$71,201	\$45,331	\$45,577	\$32,803	\$38,087	\$48,522
Cook Co., IL	5	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$74,400	\$65,500	\$49,000	\$38,000	\$45,000	\$49,500
Anderson, IN	5	under \$1	under 20	\$38,000				\$30,678	
Evansville, IN	5	under \$1	under 20	\$42,000					
Wayne Co., MI	5	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$83,300	\$55,700	\$49,159	\$33,456	\$36,211	\$50,251
Hamilton Co., OH	5	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$52,000 - \$78,000		\$60,152	\$37,149		\$50,523
Dayton, OH	5	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$47,000 - \$67,000		\$50,700			
Toledo, OH	5			\$64,000		\$47,000	\$37,000	\$42,000	\$45,000
REGION 5 AVERAGE				\$60,373	\$60,665	\$51,202	\$36,401	\$38,472	\$48,819
Linn Co., IA	7	under \$1	under 20	\$40,000			\$31,970	\$35,402	\$39,354
Polk Co., IA	7	under \$1	under 20	\$87,100	\$69,700	\$61,312		\$48,965	
Wyandotte Co., KS	7	under \$1	under 20	\$50,000 - \$80,000	\$42,000 - \$60,000		\$28,900	\$34,800	\$38,650
Lincoln, NE	7	under \$1	under 20	\$34,000 - \$51,000			\$33,500		
Omaha, NE	7	under \$1	under 20	\$48,000			\$38,000		\$44,000
REGION 7 AVERAGE				\$58,375	\$60,388	\$61,312	\$33,093	\$39,722	\$40,668

When an agency provided salary ranges, the means of the ranges were used in calculating the regional averages. For the Director and Deputy Director salaries, actual ranges are identified (if provided) in the table. For other positions, just the means of the ranges are identified.

STAPPA/LAPCO Salary Survey
Local Agency Salaries (1997)

(page 2)

Local Agencies	Region	Agency Budget (in millions)	Size of Staff	Director	Deputy Director	Unit Supervisor	Entry-Level Engineer	Mid-Level Engineer	Top-Level Engineer
Boulder, CO	8	under \$1	under 20	\$42,000 - \$55,000		\$40,500			
Denver, CO	8	under \$1	under 20	\$65,000 - \$85,000	\$55,000 - \$70,000			\$45,000	
Yellowstone, MT	8	under \$1	under 20	\$38,800					
REGION 8 AVERAGE				\$38,868	\$62,500	\$40,500		\$45,000	
Pinal Co., AZ	9	under \$1	under 20	\$56,400			\$41,225		\$44,428
Feather River, CA	9	under \$1	under 20	\$42,000 - \$51,000					\$40,550
Lake Co., CA	9	under \$1	under 20	\$50,000	\$45,000				
No. Coast, CA	9	under \$1	under 20	\$70,800					\$58,044
Sacramento, CA	9	\$1-\$10	61-100	\$88,800	\$56,000 - \$68,000	\$56,070		\$48,396	\$56,298
San Diego, CA	9	\$11-\$21	101-200	\$49,000 - \$102,000	\$42,000 - \$89,000	\$59,831	\$40,404	\$46,936	\$54,309
San Joaquin, CA	9	\$22-\$32	201-300	\$107,700	\$78,000 - \$95,000	\$47,988	\$37,584	\$45,702	\$50,394
South Coast, CA	9	over \$55	over 400	\$137,800	\$102,700	\$77,148	\$51,469	\$57,286	\$63,761
Tuolumne Co., CA	9	under \$1	under 20	\$65,700	\$41,500				
Ventura, CA	9	\$1-\$10	61-100	\$63,900 - \$90,000	\$48,000 - \$69,000	\$43,406	\$43,976	\$48,845	\$52,465
Yolo-Solano, CA	9	\$1-\$10	under 20	\$59,400		\$47,100	\$34,080	\$39,564	
Clark Co., NV	9	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$85,400	\$52,500	\$46,945	\$42,817	\$51,212	\$59,738
Washoe Co., NV	9	\$1-\$10	under 20	\$61,700		\$52,853	\$38,896	\$45,386	\$51,875
REGION 9 AVERAGE				\$78,401	\$64,278	\$52,927	\$41,306	\$47,916	\$53,186
Lane Co., OR	10	\$1-\$10	20-60	\$65,700		\$49,044	\$30,000	\$39,000	\$45,000
Mt. Vernon, WA	10	\$1-\$10	under 20	\$55,700					\$48,662
Puget Sound, WA	10	\$1-\$10	61-100	\$89,000 - \$103,000	\$65,000 - \$87,000	\$69,114	\$47,970	\$54,282	\$62,832
Vancouver, WA	10	\$1-\$10	under 20	\$65,000		\$55,000	\$33,000	\$37,000	\$43,000
Spokane, WA	10	\$1-\$10	under 20	\$74,100	\$60,500	\$50,500	\$40,560	\$49,300	\$54,600
REGION 10 AVERAGE				\$68,291	\$61,585	\$55,915	\$37,883	\$44,896	\$50,819
NATIONAL AVERAGE				\$68,082	\$58,137	\$50,801	\$36,651	\$42,041	\$49,216
NATIONAL HIGH				\$137,813	\$102,778	\$77,148	\$51,469	\$57,286	\$65,791
NATIONAL LOW				\$38,000	\$5,100	\$29,500	\$27,000	\$29,580	\$33,600

STAPPA/LAPCO Salary Survey
 Local Agency Salaries (1997) (page 3)

Local Agencies	Entry-Level Environmental Scientist/ Inspector/ Field Staff	Mid-Level Environmental Scientist/ Inspector/ Field Staff	Top-Level Environmental Scientist/ Inspector/ Field Staff	Chemist	Attorney	Planner Rule Writer	Public Information Specialist	Data Entry Information Services	Accounting Financial Manager	Administrative	Clerical
Allegheny Co., PA		\$22,520	\$27,228	\$27,924	\$29,000	\$45,500	\$34,000			\$31,200	\$21,600
REGION 3 AVERAGE	\$22,520	\$27,228	\$27,924	\$29,000	\$45,500	\$34,000				\$31,200	\$21,600
Huntsville, AL	\$31,500	\$36,000	\$42,000								\$25,000
Birmingham, AL	\$27,331	\$36,608	\$42,390	\$38,834		\$47,195		\$33,561		\$22,745	\$19,646
Hillsborough Co., FL	\$23,000	\$29,000	\$34,000							\$26,000	\$23,000
Pinellas Co. FL	\$29,919	\$34,928	\$38,753	\$34,928						\$25,640	\$21,001
Jefferson Co., KY	\$23,691	\$29,851	\$39,132		\$53,320		\$33,283	\$41,537	\$34,586	\$23,629	\$18,387
Forsyth Co., NC	\$30,000	\$33,000	\$39,000			\$36,000				\$26,000	\$18,000
Chattanooga, TN	\$22,921	\$24,525	\$31,315	\$36,005		\$46,934	\$29,887		\$43,580	\$30,533	\$20,756
Memphis, TN	\$27,048	\$34,902	\$42,756			\$44,256		\$34,704			\$18,036
Nashville, TN	\$28,269	\$31,307	\$38,084	\$39,153							\$23,532
REGION 4 AVERAGE	\$27,075	\$32,236	\$38,603	\$37,230	\$53,320	\$43,596	\$31,585	\$36,601	\$39,083	\$25,758	\$20,818
Cook Co., IL	\$31,000		\$38,500	\$39,000				\$29,000	\$49,500	\$24,349	\$23,500
Anderson, IN	\$18,000	\$24,570	\$28,000								
Evansville, IN											
Wayne Co., MI	\$38,357	\$37,106	\$27,263	\$31,419	\$72,041		\$37,017		\$28,260	\$29,245	\$24,281
Hamilton Co., OH	\$29,723		\$40,414	\$37,149		\$37,149		\$29,723	\$37,149	\$44,804	\$24,804
Dayton, OH	\$29,432	\$33,301	\$39,437			\$41,236				\$44,804	\$24,711
Toledo, OH	\$37,087	\$39,104		\$44,000					\$34,000		\$32,402
REGION 5 AVERAGE	\$30,600	\$33,520	\$34,723	\$37,892	\$72,041	\$39,192	\$37,083	\$29,362	\$36,250	\$31,665	\$25,940
Linn Co., IA	\$25,147	\$27,872	\$30,971								\$20,946
Polk Co., IA	\$32,049	\$35,195	\$38,660								\$22,130
Wyandotte Co., KS	\$24,500	\$28,900					\$30,250				\$21,250
Lincoln, NE			\$31,750								\$20,750
Omaha, NE	\$26,000		\$33,000	\$27,000							\$22,000
REGION 7 AVERAGE	\$26,924	\$30,656	\$33,595	\$27,000			\$30,250				\$21,415

STAPPA/LAPCO Salary Survey
Local Agency Salaries (1997) (page 4)

Local Agencies	Entry-Level Environmental Scientist/ Inspector/ Field Staff	Mid-Level Environmental Scientist/ Inspector/ Field Staff	Top-Level Environmental Scientist/ Inspector/ Field Staff	Modeller Meteorologist	Chemist	Attorney	Planner Rule Writer	Public Information Specialist	Data Entry Information Services	Accounting Financial Manager	Administrative	Clerical
Boulder, CO	\$26,000	\$32,000	\$42,000	\$51,500	\$35,772		\$40,000	\$40,500			\$25,000	\$22,000
Denver, CO												\$15,732
Yellowstone, MT												\$18,866
REGION 8 AVERAGE	\$26,000	\$32,000	\$42,000	\$51,500	\$35,772		\$40,000	\$40,500			\$25,000	\$18,866
Pinal Co., AZ	\$26,313		\$32,947									\$16,058
Feather River, CA	\$29,250		\$33,250				\$33,250					
Lake Co., CA		\$45,238			\$35,000	\$40,000						\$38,000
No. Coast, CA		\$45,760	\$53,700	\$48,708			\$38,952					\$29,754
Sacramento, CA	\$34,809	\$39,312	\$45,209	\$44,034	\$41,496	\$82,800	\$46,392	\$46,986	\$45,480	\$41,736	\$29,731	\$25,536
San Diego, CA	\$33,264	\$38,514	\$42,468	\$47,988	\$38,514	\$97,864	\$52,978	\$35,506	\$46,456	\$34,736	\$23,826	\$19,334
San Joaquin, CA	\$42,443	\$47,241	\$52,580	\$62,822	\$56,403	\$79,517	\$36,144	\$36,144	\$37,200	\$51,642	\$28,038	\$21,312
South Coast, CA	\$29,300	\$32,400	\$35,700				\$63,761	\$47,479		\$87,456	\$42,951	\$30,901
Tuolumne Co., CA	\$33,138	\$36,410	\$39,084	\$43,306	\$45,011				\$45,071	\$43,902	\$26,189	\$20,400
Ventura, CA	\$29,352	\$34,080					\$40,272			\$37,644	\$28,200	\$18,834
Yolo-Solano, CA	\$29,935	\$35,834	\$41,760									\$26,352
Clark Co., NV	\$36,337	\$42,442	\$48,547	\$48,547					\$31,616	\$34,382	\$25,646	
Washoe Co., NV							\$48,547	\$46,259				
REGION 9 AVERAGE	\$32,414	\$39,723	\$42,525	\$49,234	\$43,285	\$73,916	\$45,037	\$43,482	\$41,165	\$49,519	\$30,783	\$24,612
Lane Co., OR	\$31,380	\$39,000	\$45,000	\$45,000			\$35,000	\$40,344	\$35,000	\$45,600		\$26,000
Mt. Vernon, WA	\$42,468	\$38,137	\$42,041								\$37,743	\$20,213
Puget Sound, WA	\$29,000	\$47,970	\$54,282		\$45,618	\$76,014	\$54,282	\$47,970	\$54,282	\$69,114	\$33,660	
Vancouver, WA	\$29,470	\$34,000	\$38,000								\$26,000	\$23,000
Spokane, WA	\$33,080	\$34,100	\$41,350	\$45,000	\$31,900		\$39,000	\$39,000	\$37,900	\$37,100	\$32,468	\$23,360
REGION 10 AVERAGE	\$33,080	\$38,641	\$44,135	\$45,000	\$38,759	\$76,014	\$44,641	\$42,438	\$42,394	\$50,605	\$32,468	\$23,143
NATIONAL AVERAGE	\$29,924	\$35,186	\$39,159	\$42,895	\$38,122	\$68,495	\$43,667	\$39,393	\$38,579	\$44,806	\$29,612	\$22,931
NATIONAL HIGH	\$42,468	\$47,970	\$54,282	\$62,822	\$56,403	\$97,864	\$63,761	\$48,520	\$54,282	\$87,456	\$44,804	\$38,000
NATIONAL LOW	\$18,000	\$22,520	\$27,228	\$27,924	\$27,000	\$40,000	\$33,250	\$29,887	\$29,000	\$24,349	\$22,745	\$15,732

Appendices

Appendix A

STAPPA AND ALAPCO SALARY SURVEY

Attached is a survey designed to gather information about state and local air pollution control agency salaries, benefits and other employment information. Once the data have been collected, compiled and analyzed, it may be used by air agencies interested in comparing their salary structures with the national averages.

Please complete the questionnaire and return it no later than **September 26, 1997** to:

STAPPA/ALAPCO Secretariat
444 North Capitol Street, NW,
Suite 307
Washington, DC 20001
fax: (202) 624-7863

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact the Secretariat at (202) 624-7864.

Please provide the following information:

Agency _____

Contact Person _____

Telephone Number _____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

September 11, 1997

STAPPA AND ALAPCO SALARY SURVEY

Instructions — Please provide the following information for each category of employee:

Annual Salary — Indicate the average or typical salary for each category. It is acceptable to indicate the salary range for a position, where appropriate.

Education/Experience Requirements — Indicate the academic degree and/or the number of years experience necessary for each position.

How Does Salary Compare — Rate the salaries relative to private firms or industry in the area by indicating plus or minus approximate percentages (e.g., -10% indicates that the agency salary is 10 percent lower than industry salaries in the area).

Number of Employees — Indicate the number of employees in each category (do not include contract workers).

Average Length of Employment — Indicate the average number of years personnel in each category remain employed by the air agency.

Job Descriptions — Since state and local agencies often use different titles to describe the same positions, we have included general descriptions in Appendix B (see the end of the questionnaire) as guidelines to identify jobs within your agency. It is possible that some or many of the positions in your agency will not match these descriptions exactly; therefore, we suggest you choose the description that is most similar. If some members of your staff perform a combination of tasks, either split their information accordingly (e.g., attribute 1/2 time to one position and 1/2 time to another) or classify them in the position in which they spend most of their time.

POSITION	Annual Salary	Education/Experience Requirements Degree &/or Years	How Does Salary Compare with Local Industry (plus or minus percentage)	Number of Employees	Average Length of Employment
Director	\$ _____ &/or _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Deputy Director	\$ _____ &/or _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Unit Supervisor (e.g., enforcement, permitting)	\$ _____ &/or _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____

POSITION	Annual Salary	Education/Experience Requirements Degree &/or Years	How Does Salary Compare with Local Industry (plus or minus percentage)	Number of Employees	Average Length of Employment
Engineer					
Entry Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Mid Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Top Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Environmental Scientist/Inspector/Field Staff					
Entry Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Mid Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Top Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Modeller/Meteorologist					
Entry Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Mid Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Top Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Chemist					
Entry Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Mid Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Top Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Attorney					
Entry Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Mid Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Top Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Planner/Rule Writer					
Entry Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Mid Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Top Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Public Information Specialist					
Entry Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Mid Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Top Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Data Entry/Information Services					
Entry Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Mid Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Top Level	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____

POSITION	Annual Salary	Education/Experience Requirements Degree &/or Years	How Does Salary Compare with Local Industry (plus or minus percentage)	Number of Employees	Average Length of Employment
Public Information Specialist	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Accounting/Financial Manager	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Administrative	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Clerical	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
Other (please describe) _____	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (please describe) _____	\$ _____	_____ &/or _____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.**A. ABOUT YOUR AGENCY/PROGRAM**

1. What is the size of your air pollution control budget? (Round to nearest million and include all sources of funds.)

 Under \$1 million
 \$1 to \$10 million
 \$11 to \$21 million
 \$22 to \$32 million
 \$33 to \$43 million
 \$44 to \$54 million
 Over \$55 million

2. How many employees are on the staff of your air pollution control agency? (Round to nearest whole number.)

 Fewer than 20 people
 20 to 60 people
 61 to 100 people
 101 to 200 people
 201 to 300 people
 301 to 400 people
 Over 400 people

3. What is the average length of employment for your staff?

 Less than 1 year
 1-5 years
 6-10 years
 11-20 years
 Over 20 years

4. How many hours are in the standard workweek at your agency?

 Less than 30 hours
 Between 30 and 35 hours
 Between 35 and 40 hours
 Over 40 hours

B. STAFFING INCREASES AND DECREASES

1. What is the annual turnover or attrition rate within your program, averaged over the last three years? (Round to nearest whole number.)

 Less than 1 percent
 1 to 5 percent
 6 to 10 percent

- 11 to 15 percent
- 16 to 20 percent
- Greater than 20 percent

2. What are the reasons that personnel leave your program? (Check as many as apply.)

- Career change
- Return to school
- Higher paying jobs (government)
- Higher paying jobs (private industry)
- Other (Please specify: _____)

3. Has your program experienced a DECREASE in staff in the last three years?

- No (PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 11)
- Yes

4. What is the annual rate of decrease in staff size (averaged over the last three years)?

- Less than 5 percent
- 5 to 10 percent
- 11 to 15 percent
- 16 to 20 percent
- More than 20 percent (Please specify: _____)

5. What were the major reasons for this staff reduction? (Check all that apply.)

- Reduced state budget for air pollution control work
- Reduced overall state budget
- Reduced municipal budget for air pollution control work
- Reduced overall municipal budget
- Reduced federal Section 105 grant
- Reduced revenues from fees
- Reduced revenues from Title V facility fees
- Program consolidation/reorganization
- Other (Please specify: _____)

6. What has been the impact of these reductions on your program? (Check all that apply.)

- Little Impact
- Program consolidation (Please specify: _____)
- Elimination/reduction of ambient air quality monitoring sites/monitors
- Increased permit review time/backlogs of permits
- Elimination/reduction of complaint handling (e.g., less timely response, etc.)
- Reduction in enforcement effort
- Reduction in inspections (e.g., in number or thoroughness)
- Adverse impact on air quality
- Other (Please specify: _____)

7. What types of positions have been eliminated? (Check all that apply. If possible, use percentages to indicate how many positions have been eliminated.)

- Deputy Director
- Unit Supervisor (e.g., enforcement, permitting)
- Engineer
- Environmental Scientist/Inspector/Field Staff
- Modeller/Meteorologist
- Chemist
- Attorney
- Planner/Rule Writer
- Data Entry/Information Services
- Public Information Specialist
- Accounting/Financial Manager
- Administrative
- Clerical
- Other (Please specify: _____)

8. Do you foresee additional staff reductions during the current year?

- Yes
- No (PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 11)

9. What percentage staff decrease do you foresee?

- Less than 5 percent
- 5 to 10 percent
- 11 to 15 percent
- 16 to 20 percent
- More than 20 percent (Please specify: _____)

10. What impact(s) do you foresee that these reductions will have on your program?

Please specify: _____

11. Has your program experienced an INCREASE in staff over the last three years ?

- Yes
- No (PLEASE SKIP TO SECTION C, QUESTION 1)

12. What is the annual rate of increase in staff size (averaged over the last three years)?

- Less than 5 percent
- 5 to 10 percent
- 11 to 15 percent
- 16 to 20 percent
- More than 20 percent (Please specify: _____)

13. What were the major reasons for this staff increase? (Check all that apply.)

- Increased state budget for air pollution control work
- Increased overall state budget
- Increased municipal budget for air pollution control work
- Increased overall municipal budget
- Increased federal Section 105 grant
- Increased/addition of revenues from fees
- Increased/addition of revenues from Title V facility fees
- Other (Please specify: _____)

14. What has been the impact on your program of these additional resources?

Please specify: _____

15. What types of positions have been added? (Check all that apply. If possible, use percentages to indicate how many positions have been added in each category.)

- Deputy Director
- Unit Supervisor (e.g., enforcement, permitting)
- Engineer
- Environmental Scientist/Inspector/Field Staff
- Modeller/Meteorologist
- Chemist
- Attorney
- Planner/Rule Writer
- Data Entry/Information Services
- Public Information Specialist
- Accounting/Financial Manager
- Administrative
- Clerical
- Other (Please specify: _____)

C. CONTRACT EMPLOYEES IN YOUR AGENCY

1. Does your program employ contract workers (temps or consultants)?

- Yes
- No (SKIP TO SECTION D)

2. How many contractual employees does your program currently employ? (Also, please specify positions: (e.g. 10% of contract employees are engineers, 25% are planners)

3. Are contract workers salaries comparable with regular salaried employees?

- Yes (SKIP TO SECTION D, QUESTION 1)
- No

4. What is the difference in contract workers' salaries when compared to regular salaried employees?

- Contract workers are paid less per hour.
 Contract workers are paid more per hour.
 Other (Please specify: _____)

D. SALARIES

1. In general, how often are raises considered?

- Annually
 1 to 2 years
 3 to 5 years
 Over 5 years
 Other (Please specify: _____)

2. Have you/your employees received a raise in the past year?

- Yes
 No (SKIP TO QUESTION 6)

3. What was the percentage raise that your program employees received in the past year?

- Less than 1 percent
 1 to 5 percent
 6 to 10 percent
 Over 10 percent (Please specify: _____)
 Other (Please specify: e.g., no raises last year, but \$200 bonus the previous two years, etc. _____)

4. What has been the typical annual increase over the last three years?

- Less than 1 percent
 1 to 5 percent
 6 to 10 percent
 Over 10 percent (Please specify: _____)
 Other (Please specify: e.g. no raises, but \$200 bonuses given, etc.) _____)

5. How are raises determined in your program? (Check all that apply.)

- Cost of Living Adjustments (automatic)
 Collective bargaining
 Legislative mandate
 Merit (Based on performance rating system)
 Seniority (Based on years of service)
 Year-end Bonus
 Other (Please specify: _____)

6. What was the main reason that your program's employees did not get a raise in the past year?

- Budget Cuts
- Contract stipulated flat rate
- No contract in place
- Legislature/Governor/County did not approve pay raise
- Other (Please specify: _____)

7. On average, how long would it take an employee to reach the highest salary level within the agency?

- Less than 5 years
- 5 to 10 years
- 10 to 15 years
- Over 15 years
- Other (Please specify: _____)

E. RETIREMENT FUNDING

1. Does your agency have a retirement fund?

- Yes
- No (SKIP TO SECTION F, QUESTION 1)

2. What percentage of an employee's salary does the agency contribute to an employee's retirement fund? (Round to nearest whole number.)

- Less than 1%
- 1 to 5 percent
- 5 to 10 percent
- 11 to 25 percent
- More than 25 percent
- Match employee's contribution (Please specify percentage of match, e.g., agency contributes amount equal to 50 percent of employee contribution, etc. _____)
- Other (Please specify: e.g., varies according to salary or bargaining unit, etc. _____)

3. Does the agency offer a tax sheltered or deferred compensation plan to which employees may contribute?

- Yes
- No
- Other (Please specify: _____)

F. HEALTH/LIFE BENEFITS

1. Does the agency contribute to Medicare/Social Security?

- Yes
- No

2. What is the “typical” life insurance policy provided to program employees? (Please specify:

_____)

3. Does your agency have a dental plan for employees?

No

Yes

4. Does your agency have a health insurance plan for employees?

No

Yes. If yes, what portion of the premium does your agency contribute for health and dental insurance (combined)?

Less than 5 percent

5 to 25 percent

25 to 99 percent

100 percent

G. VACATION AND SICK LEAVE

1. How many vacation days do first-year employees receive?

None

Fewer than 5 days (1 week)

1 to 2 weeks

2 to 3 Weeks

3 to 5 Weeks

5 to 8 Weeks

Other (Please specify: _____)

2. How many vacation days do fifth-year employees receive?

Less than 1 Week

1 to 3 Weeks

3 to 5 Weeks

5 to 8 Weeks

Other (Please specify: _____)

3. How many vacation days do tenth-year employees receive?

1 to 3 Weeks

3 to 5 Weeks

5 to 8 Weeks

8 to 12 Weeks

Other (Please specify: _____)

4. How many vacation days do employees with over fifteen years of service receive?
- 1 to 3 Weeks
 - 3 to 5 Weeks
 - 5 to 8 Weeks
 - 8 to 12 Weeks
 - Other (Please specify: _____)
5. Does your agency pay for unused vacation leave when an employee leaves?
- No
 - Yes (Please specify: e.g., up to a maximum of x days, or only if the employee retires, etc. _____)
6. Does your agency pay for unused vacation leave on an annual basis?
- No
 - Yes (Please specify: e.g., up to a maximum of x days, a fraction of unused leave, etc. _____)
7. How many sick leave days does an average employee receive each year?
- No sick leave is earned
 - Less than 1 week per year
 - 1 to 2 weeks per year
 - Over 2 weeks per year
 - Varies depending upon length of service
(Please specify: _____)
8. Does your agency pay for unused sick leave when an employee leaves?
- No
 - Yes (Please specify: e.g., up to a maximum of x days, or only if the employee retires, etc. _____)
9. Does your agency pay for unused sick leave on an annual basis?
- No
 - Yes (Please specify: e.g., up to a maximum of x days, a fraction of unused leave, etc. _____)

H. FLEXIBLE TIME

1. Does your agency currently allow “flexible” working schedules?
- No (SKIP TO SECTION I.)
 - Yes

2. Please describe the “flexibility” in your agency. (Check all that apply.)

- Telecommuting
- Staggered or flexible beginning/ending times for workday
- Shorter workweek
- Shorter workweek/longer workday
- Other (Please specify: _____
_____)

I. COMMENTS (Use additional paper if necessary.) _____

Appendix B

Salary Survey Job Descriptions

Since state and local agencies often use different titles to describe the same positions, we have included the following general descriptions as guidelines to identify jobs within your agency. It is possible that some or many of the positions in your agency will not match these descriptions exactly; therefore, we suggest you choose the description that is most similar. If some members of your staff perform a combination of tasks, either split their information accordingly (e.g., attribute 1/2 time to one position and 1/2 time to another) or classify them in the position in which they spend most of their time.

Director

Serves as top air official within the agency. Carries out substantive, technical and complex administrative work in connection with the total operation of the agency. Has responsibility for developing and implementing the program, as well as supervising, planning, organizing and coordinating agency activities. Responsibilities also include preparing and executing workplans and budgets, as well as promoting cooperation and understanding of agency activities among appropriate persons and agencies. This position usually provides considerable latitude for independent judgment and initiative.

Deputy Director

Serves as immediate assistant to Director. Responsibilities could include directing program management, overseeing resources, supervising staff and representing the agency or director at meetings. Duties may also include supervision of specific programs within the agency.

Unit Supervisor (e.g., enforcement, permitting)

Supervises, coordinates and plans the activities of a program unit. Responsibilities extend to supervising and scheduling unit staff, reviewing reports and documents, assigning work and assisting in the highly technical and/or special problems that may arise.

Engineer

Carries out engineering work as applied to air pollution prevention and control. This could involve reviewing applications and writing and issuing permits to construct new sources or for the Title V Operating Permits program (including evaluation of emissions of regulated contaminants, analysis of process design, review of stack test protocols, etc.), source inspections, complaint investigations, enforcement of air pollution regulations, special investigations and projects and policy and regulatory development. Requires knowledge of engineering principles and practices as applied to air pollution control. Graduation from an accredited four-year college or university in an approved engineering or appropriate scientific curriculum is likely to be required. At higher levels, work involves supervising the activities of subordinate environmental engineers and others.

Environmental Scientist/Inspector/Field Staff

May perform basic research involving the formulation, execution, analysis, interpretation and reporting of scientific investigations of phenomena or problems with applications in the field of air pollution control. Undertakes a wide variety of duties, including source inspections; operation and maintenance of a sophisticated ambient air monitoring network (including collection of routine or special samples, calibrating and adjusting instrumentation, etc.); complaint investigation; enforcement of air pollution regulations; and communication with the public, industry and public officials. Carries out advanced inspections of commercial and industrial facilities. Performs calculations of allowable and actual pollution emissions to determine the compliance status of inspected facilities. Evaluates various types of control equipment, writes technical reports of inspection and

investigations and prepares enforcement correspondence. Graduation from an accredited two- or four-year college or university may be required. At higher levels, work involves supervising the activities of subordinate inspection and field staff and others.

Modeller/Meteorologist

Conducts computerized air quality modeling and analyzes results. Plans, conducts and supervises meteorological studies relating to air pollution and its control. Makes forecasts and evaluates meteorological data to examine air quality conditions.

Chemist

Performs analytical analysis of air samples for toxics, ozone precursors and other pollutants. Implements field collection and laboratory methods for sample collection. Uses computer analysis for data handling and is responsible for reporting analytical results and evaluating data validity, calibration and quality assurance.

Attorney

Advises agency on a wide variety of legal matters, including those pertaining to regulations, legislation, permits, etc. This position refers to attorneys on the air agency staff itself and does not include attorneys within a central state, local or departmental office of general counsel assigned to review matters pertaining to the air agency.

Planner/Rule Writer

Focuses on the development of rules, budgets and workplans; planning; program evaluation; legislative coordination; interpretation of federal, state and local requirements; and oversight of implementation of specialized programs.

Data Entry/Information Services

Develops or tailors computer software and small computer systems, conducts analytical work and maintains efficient computer services for the agency and links to larger computers. May have responsibility for the electronic data processing equipment, systems and programs and for validating, analyzing and transmitting required data to appropriate federal and state agencies.

Public Information Specialist

Serves as liaison for or assists other agency staff in interacting with the general public, the media, other governmental entities and other interested parties. May develop public information, communication and education campaigns; prepare documents describing agency activities for consumption outside of the agency; write an agency newsletter; and provide agency management and staff with public relations advice.

Accounting/Financial Manager

Conducts bookkeeping, accounting and other financial recordkeeping. Responsibilities may include payroll, reimbursement for travel and other expenses, cost projections, monitoring of expenditures to track budget, etc. Job may also include tracking fees, grants and other income, as well as apportioning expenses to appropriate accounts.

Administrative

Carries out standard administrative and secretarial duties, such as management of office, procurement of office equipment, preparation of correspondence, meeting planning, arrangement of travel, etc. Includes more sophisticated duties than those of clerical staff. Requires little direct supervision and may oversee clerical staff.

Clerical

Performs standard clerical secretarial duties, including answering and directing telephone calls, typing letters and documents, scheduling meetings, receiving visitors, filing, etc. No or limited supervisory duties.