

**WAGE DIFFERENTIALS FOR STATE EMPLOYEES
AND UNIFORM SALARIES FOR LOCAL OFFICERS**

**REPORT OF THE
VIRGINIA ADVISORY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
To
THE GOVERNOR
And
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



Senate Document No. 13

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
Department of Purchases and Supply
Richmond
1976**

MEMBERS

.....

WILLARD J. MOODY, CHAIRMAN
EDWARD E. LANE, VICE-CHAIRMAN
GEORGE E. ALLEN, JR.
VINCENT F. CALLAHAN, JR.
ARCHIBALD A CAMPBELL
JOSEPH V. GARTLAN, JR.
JERRY H. GEISLER
ROBERT R. GWATHMEY, III
C. HARDAWAY MARKS
LEWIS A MCMURRAN, JR.
WILLIAM V. RAWLINGS
JAMES M. THOMSON
LAWRENCE DOUGLAS WILDER
EDWARD E. WILLEY

STAFF

.....

JOHN A. BANKS, JR., DIRECTOR
DIVISION OF LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

E. M. Miller, Jr., Staff Attorney
Jill M. Pope, Legislative Research Associate
Constance D. Sprouse, Legislative Research Associate
Grace C. Horning, Secretary

**WAGE DIFFERENTIALS FOR STATE EMPLOYEES
AND UNIFORM SALARIES FOR LOCAL OFFICERS**

**Report of the
Virginia Advisory Legislative Council**

To

**The Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia
Richmond, Virginia**

December, 1975

To: Honorable Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Governor of Virginia

and

The General Assembly of Virginia

During the 1974 Session of the General Assembly Senate Joint Resolution No. 29¹ was adopted directing the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to study the feasibility of establishing wage differentials for State employees based upon the cost of living requirements within the locality where such employee was working. The Council was also directed to study the possibility of establishing uniform salaries for local boards of supervisors, school boards and city councils. Pursuant to this directive, the Council appointed Willard J. Moody, a member of the Senate, to head a committee and make an indepth study regarding the aforementioned subjects. Along with Mr. Moody, Peter K. Babalas, an attorney and a member of the Senate; John W. Garber, the Director of the Division of State Personnel; Robert J. Hansen, the City Manager, Marion; William L. Heartwell, Jr., the Commissioner, Virginia Employment Commission; Raymond R. Robrecht, an attorney and a member of the House of Delegates; Russell I. Townsend, Jr., an attorney and a member of the Senate; J. Warren White, Jr., a member of the House of Delegates; Chris H. Whiteman, an industrial consultant; and Robert W. Wilson, the County Executive, Fairfax County, served as members of the Committee. Esson M. Miller, Jr. served as counsel to the Committee and Jill M. Pope and Constance D. Sprouse provided research assistance. The Committee wishes to express its special gratitude to John L. Knapp, Director, Economic Studies Center of the Tayloe Murphy Institute, for his assistance to the Committee while conducting this study.

The Committee met numerous times during the period of 1974 and 1975 and conducted public hearings in Richmond, Tidewater (Norfolk), Northern Virginia (Alexandria) and Southwestern Virginia (Roanoke). Since the two directives given to the Committee differed in purpose and direction, the Committee conducted the study in two separate segments. This report will be divided likewise in an effort to avoid confusion.

The Committee concluded its study and made its recommendations to the Council on December 8, 1975. Thereupon the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council adopted the following document as its report.

WAGE DIFFERENTIALS FOR STATE EMPLOYEES

BASED UPON COST OF LIVING CRITERIA

INTRODUCTION:

Discussions over wages during the last several decades indicate that four major criteria have frequently been suggested as bases for wage determinations, but not necessarily in this order: (1) ability to pay, (2) productivity, (3) wage comparability, and (4) cost of living.² While ability to pay may often play an important role in the private sector, the ability of government to pay is limited by its revenues and willingness to tax. Public awareness of the effect of salaries on tax rates has grown with the inflationary trend of the general economy and is now a subject of taxpayer concern. The productivity principal is employed in the private sector largely in assembly line and other measurable production assignments. While much progress has been made in measuring the productivity of government employees, the present situation does not lend itself to total wage determination based solely on productivity measures. Aside from available revenues, comparable wages and cost of living adjustment criteria are generally the factors involved in wage determination in the public sector.

STATE HISTORY AND PRESENT POLICY

ON WAGE DIFFERENTIALS:

The State's first experience with area differentials came during World War II when the concentration of defense activities in the Hampton Roads and Northern Virginia areas created competitive situations which the State could meet only through the establishment of higher rates in these two areas. Area differentials were adopted solely because of the inability to fill State jobs. Administering the differentials caused serious problems, but because they were instituted on a temporary basis, most State personnel were resolved to accept them. Upon termination of the emergency situation brought on by the war, the State abandoned these differentials and returned to common State-wide scales.

During the postwar period, it became apparent that the federal government had created in the Washington Metropolitan area, wage levels which made it difficult for the local governments in Virginia and Maryland to compete for certain skills. By 1950 the legislature had given some recognition to this problem by adopting statutes authorizing the local governments encompassed in the Arlington-Fairfax-Alexandria area to supplement with local funds the salaries paid State employees in the Department of Health. Shortly thereafter, the legislature adopted similar statutes authorizing local government supplements to probation and parole employees.

These supplements from local funds represented the only differentials in the State's pay plan until the advent of the Northern Virginia Institute for Mental Health, which was established with full recognition that the costs of operating in that locality would be substantially above the operating costs for similar institutions throughout the State. Some of the reluctance to establish such an institution in a high cost area were overcome by proposals that the local governments would provide the supplements necessary to make up the difference between the basic State scale and the rates required in that area. After a few years of operation, the local governments notified the State that they would no longer pay supplements to the employees of this institution leaving the State with no choice but to pay this cost out of general funds. The State continues to pay the differential for employees of this institution.

In the mid-sixties, when the State Department of Highways had construction projects in the Fairfax residency (which equaled approximately in value the total of all other construction projects throughout the State), the Highway Department was notified by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads that unless it put more construction inspectors on these projects in the Fairfax residency, federal funds would be withheld from the projects. The Highway Department discussed this problem with the Division of Personnel. The Department was reluctant to implement wage differentials in order to attract workers to the area but concluded that it had no alternative. Since the problem was confined to the single residency of Fairfax, the Department felt that the situation would be tolerable since it was in a position to offer immediate transfer to any qualified employee willing to move to that area. Before final authorization of a differential for the Department of Highways, the Division of Personnel invited all other agency heads with operations in the Northern Virginia area to consider the effect on their agencies of a differential established for the Highway Department and to consider whether they wished to be authorized a similar differential for their employees in the Northern Virginia sector. Without exception, all other departments rejected the idea, being satisfied that it would create more problems for them than it would solve. The Division of Personnel then authorized a differential to be paid to construction inspectors and certain other members of the field services of the Highway Department in the Fairfax residency.

Beginning in 1973, the Virginia Employment Commission, the Division of Motor Vehicles and the Virginia ABC Board asked for and received authorization to pay an area differential in the Arlington-Fairfax-Alexandria area. The amount of the differential varies from 5% to 25% with the most common difference being 15% to 20%. The differential is not based on any measurement of the cost of living but is related directly to the going rate among public and private employers for similar work as determined by periodic wage and salary surveys.

Adjustments to the base State rate are not automatically applied to these differentials. The differentials are adjusted solely on the basis of surveys of prevailing rates in that area. Accordingly, an adjustment to the base State rate may result in a reduction of the amount of differential at a given point in time. Survey time lags,

however, may mean that possible discrepancies take time to be corrected thereby creating further inequities.

In 1971, the consulting firm, Executive Management Services, Inc., was employed by the legislature to make a study of the degree of competitiveness of all rates paid in the State compensation plan. The consultants were specifically charged to measure competitive rates by area or region of the State and to recommend whether area differentials should be paid. The study demonstrates that while there are other regional differences in some parts of the State, only in the Northern Virginia area are the differences of sufficient significance to justify the payment of a differential. Accordingly the consultants recommended that a differential be paid in Northern Virginia, but only in this sector of the State.

FINDINGS OF THE COUNCIL:

As stated earlier, comparable wages and cost of living adjustments are the most important factors involved in wage determination policy keyed to market rates. In theory an employer who pays less than a comparable wage will be unable to recruit and retain competent employees; if he pays more, he is apt to be at a competitive cost disadvantage and may lose business. Such limits are less stringent in the public sector. If a government pays less than a competitive wage, it may lower the quality of employees or simply depend for a long period on the fact that workers do not readily leave their jobs. If a government pays more than the area comparable wage, the only possible limitation is taxpayer concern.

The comparability principle has been used by the federal government in setting salaries for classified employees since 1962.³ The federal government has recently implemented an automatic cost of living adjustment for its employees including military personnel. In those areas of the Commonwealth where there are concentrations of federal and military employees, pressures are placed on local governments to keep pace with these salary increases. The principle of wage comparability is quite simple but the implementation is complex. The policy requires recurring surveys, agreement on reference dates, the minimum size of establishments to be surveyed, industries covered, geographic areas to be included, and the treatment of fringe benefits.

Florida, Georgia, Texas, Oregon, New Jersey and New York are developing or have developed local area price indexes for a determination of cost of living discrepancies in their local jurisdictions. During the public hearings conducted by the committee, statements by witnesses from each of the four areas were to the effect that the cost of living was greater in that particular area than anywhere else in the Commonwealth.

Formal studies of the correlation between wages and price levels have indicated little relationship with only about seven to eight percent of the regional variation in wage rates explained by differences in prices.⁴ Furthermore, the variations in wages for different occupations are not uniform. As shown in Table I relative wages in the Washington, Richmond, and Hampton Roads metropolitan areas vary among occupations.⁵ Thus it would be impossible for relative wages to

vary entirely because of differences in prices unless one assumed a different price index for each occupation.⁶ It is possible to conclude, therefore, that while the cost of living may be a factor in determining wages, it is never the sole determinant thereof.

Local government supplementation of State salaries has been a constant source of discussion since its inception in the early 1950's. Local government in Northern Virginia has continuously expressed their concern that the Commonwealth salaries are too low in that area and further have indicated that the State government should fully pay its employees and take over local supplements. The Council ascertained that there is resistance to local supplementation in Northern Virginia with some thought to discontinuing those currently in existence. It should further be noted that in 1973, the General Assembly extended local supplementation to include salaries of district court judges, clerks, and other personnel of such courts.

TABLE I
INDEX OF AVERAGE WEEKLY OR HOURLY EARNINGS, 1973
(All Metropolitan Areas = 100)

Occupation	washington	Richmond	Hampton Roads
Office clerical (M&W)	104.1	98.0	95.7
Industrial nurses (M&W)	111.3	97.7	NA
Skilled maintenance (M)	105.9	104.4	101.4
Unskilled plant (M)	102.2	97.1	95.3

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Handbook of Labor
 Statistics 1974 (Washington, D.C.: Government
 Printing Office, 1974), pp. 259-66

FLORIDA EXPERIENCE:

In 1972, the Florida legislature provided for a cost of living research study for the purpose of developing a formula "to compensate State and school employees for any significant cost of living differentials."⁷ Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars were appropriated from the General Fund to finance the initial study.⁸ The Florida Department of Administration in cooperation with the Department of Commerce and the Department of Education was directed to study and identify any significant cost of living differentials between and among the counties of the State of Florida.

This study developed price indexes for October, 1972, in each of Florida's sixty-seven counties. The indexes were based on surveys in twelve counties and multiple regression estimates for the remainder. Subsequent studies were conducted in the following two years with the appropriations totaling three hundred thousand dollars for 1973⁹ and four hundred and fifty-four thousand five hundred dollars for 1974.¹⁰ As shown by these expenditures, the Florida Price Level Index has been a costly experience.

Numerous critics of the Index have pointed out fallacies in its basic approach to adjusting wages.¹¹ For example, adjoining localities sharing the same labor market are likely to have different price levels.¹² Also, should there be a large annual downward change in index values, the result would mean a wage reduction which may be politically unacceptable.¹³

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COUNCIL AND THE RATIONALE THEREFOR:

The Council is of the opinion that a policy which sets wage differentials based solely upon the cost of living criteria for employees of the Commonwealth is difficult, if not impossible, to establish equitably on a regional differential basis. The Florida experience in moving into this area has proved extremely costly and the subject of much criticism.

Since 1942, wage and salary rates for State employees have been fixed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Director of Personnel. Any such recommendation, of course, must be made within the limits of funds appropriated for this purpose by the General Assembly. The Council feels that in the broad sense of compensation administration, the present system for establishing wage differentials is reasonably equitable and should be retained by the Commonwealth until a better system can be established. This system places direct control with the executive, permitting the consideration of cost of living adjustments as a factor in wage and salary rates, however, it reserves to the General Assembly indirect control through its power to appropriate funds for the implementation of the compensation plan. It also provides the flexibility necessary to react to changes in the labor market and to deal with emergency situations as they may develop with respect to the State's manpower needs. Internal bickering and lobbying, so frequently observed in other states where legislatures have

undertaken directly to fix compensation rates for some or all of the various occupational classes, is virtually eliminated.

The Council recommends that the Division of Personnel be directed to study continuously all agencies and all classes of personnel within those agencies throughout the Commonwealth in relation to wages paid to personnel and wages paid to similar classes of personnel by the public and private sectors. Likewise, cost of living adjustment criteria should be a matter that is observed and considered in fixing wages and salary rates. The study should be ongoing to insure that inequities in wage standards will be corrected, to the extent possible, before agency initiative indicates that a crisis exists.

The Council feels that a publication of the Statewide Personnel Administration Improvement Project entitled Statewide Salaries and Personnel Practices in Virginia Cities, Counties and Towns is a step in the right direction.

The project is the cooperative undertaking of the Virginia Municipal League, Virginia Association of Counties, Virginia Division of Personnel, U.S. Civil Service Commission and the Virginia Division of State Planning and Community Affairs. The Council endorses and applauds this voluntary effort taken by these organizations and State agencies, but feels that such data should be extended, with the use of Federal, State or local funds, to include an examination of wages in all public and private sectors of the Commonwealth. Geographic boundaries should be drawn accurately reflecting labor markets rather than the utilization of local governmental boundaries. Annual salary and job classification data should be developed showing comparable classifications and wages for Federal, State and local government and private sector employees. Such data would insure that any final determination for a wage differential would be based upon a sound and substantial basis.

The Council further believes that attention must be given by the Commonwealth and the localities to the productivity of public employees and recommends that a VALC Governmental Productivity Study Committee be established to examine productivity programs which are ongoing nationally with a goal to establishing productivity as a continuing factor in the administration of the State government and the governments of the localities. The Council suggests the membership of the VALC Governmental Productivity Study Committee include representatives from the following sectors: local governments, school boards, constitutional officers, State agency heads including specifically, the Director of Personnel and the Director of the Budget and a representative of the Governor's Office.

CONCLUSION:

During the 1974 Session of the General Assembly, Senate Joint Resolution No. 13¹⁴ was adopted requesting the Director of Personnel to annually review wage comparisons between the public and private sectors of the Commonwealth and determine what discrepancies exist. The

Council agrees with this approach but is of the opinion that the review should be broadened to include comparisons within the public sector (i.e., state, federal, local governments) and should be directed by specific resolution. It is recognized by the Council that any such review reflects cost of living adjustment criteria and will continue to do so.

UNIFORM SALARIES FOR CERTAIN LOCAL OFFICIALS

In addition to studying the need for wage differentials for State employees, the Council was directed to study the feasibility of establishing uniform statewide salaries or other compensation by general statute for boards of supervisors, councils of cities and towns, school boards and boards of education.

Presently the salaries for such local officials are either set by statute or by local charter. Section 14.1-46 of the Code of Virginia limits the salaries of boards of supervisors to a range determined by population. This section also sets out certain exceptions allowing specifically designated boards a higher salary range than that established by the population brackets. Section 15.1-778.1 of the Code of Virginia allows urban county boards to establish salaries not to exceed eighteen thousand dollars per annum for each member and provides for the augmentation of such salaries. The salaries of board members of counties having a county manager or county board form of government are limited to fifteen hundred dollars by § 15.1-702 of the Code of Virginia with numerous exceptions also set out within that section.

City council salaries are established pursuant to local charter. Town council salaries are set either by charter or by the council itself.

The salaries for school boards are limited by § 22-67.2 of the Code of Virginia or are provided for by charter.

The affect of uniformity in the salaries of the local officials by providing salary ranges according to population has not been achieved due to the number of exceptions. Further, the fact that some salaries are limited statutorily while others are provided in specific charters does not contribute to the concept of uniformity.

Appendices 1 and 2 show the present salary limits or salaries of boards of supervisors, councils, and school boards of counties and cities within the Commonwealth. As shown by these charts, the supposedly intrinsic uniformity provided by salary ranges according to population is nonexistent. For example, the salary of the school board of Albemarle County (population 37,780) is limited to \$1,200 per member per annum as is the salary of the school board of Amelia County (population 7,592). However, Allegheny County has a population of 12,461 and the salary of its school board is limited to \$600 per member per annum. The salary of the Frederick County (population 28,893) board of supervisors is limited to \$250-\$1,800

per member per annum, while the Cumberland County (population 6,179) board's salary can range from \$1,800 to \$3,600 per member per annum. City Council salaries range from zero to \$4,800 per member per annum.

The idea that uniform salaries are desirable and practical has been questioned for several reasons. The inherent characteristics of the many communities in Virginia are quite diverse. The responsibilities and workloads differ from locality to locality. Thus, there is no uniformity in the demands put upon local officials. Further, communities might be limited financially to pay salaries determined by any proposed statewide standard. The localities are, therefore, in a better position to determine the proper compensation to be paid to their local officials based on the demand of the official and the community's financial capacity.

The present procedure for increasing salary limits of local officials is by the introduction of legislation by a member of the General Assembly, almost always at the request of the local officials concerned. The legislation is normally non-controversial and passes through the committee easily if the amount of increase is not unreasonable and if it is supported by the officials of the locality. This system affords a desirable method of checks and balances on such salaries while not making the procedure cumbersome when salary increases are needed.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the present system of limiting salaries of local officials should be retained as presently provided by statute.

SUMMARY:

The present procedure of placing final authority with the General Assembly for increasing maximum and minimum limitations on local officials' salaries affords a desirable system of checks and balances while at the same time allowing local officials to increase their own salaries within such limitations.

In 1975, twenty-five pieces of legislation were introduced relating to the compensation and salaries of local governing bodies and school boards. In 1974, there were twenty-seven pieces of such legislation introduced. Even though this number of requests appears to place an undue burden on the General Assembly, the bills are of a non-controversial nature and take little time to be considered.

Respectfully submitted,

.....

WILLARD J. MOODY, CHAIRMAN

.....

EDWARD E. LANE, VICE-CHAIRMAN

.....
GEORGE E. ALLEN, JR.
.....
VINCENT F. CALLAHAN, JR.
.....
ARCHIBALD A. CAMPBELL
.....
JOSEPH V. GARTLAN, JR.
.....
JERRY H. GEISLER
.....
ROBERT R. GWATHMEY, III
.....
C. HARDAWAY MARKS
.....
LEWIS A. McMURRAN, JR.
.....
WILLIAM V. RAWLINGS
.....
JAMES M. THOMSON
.....
LAWRENCE DOUGLAS WILDER
.....
EDWARD E. WILLEY

FOOTNOTES

1. SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 29

Directing the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to study the need for wage differentials for State employees in different geographic areas and the feasibility of establishing uniform statewide salaries or other compensation by general statute for boards of supervisors, councils of cities and towns, school boards and boards of education.

Whereas, it must be recognized that the cost of living differs, sometimes greatly, from one geographic area to another; and

Whereas, it has been difficult for State agencies to retain employees in certain geographic areas of the State, especially Northern Virginia and Tidewater, as salaries have not kept pace with the cost of living; and

Whereas, some State agencies have already taken action to allow wage differentials for certain areas of the State; and

Whereas, there is a need to determine the need for such wage differentials; and

Whereas, salaries for certain local officials are set by statute varying from county to county within the Commonwealth; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council is hereby directed to make a study of the need for wage differentials for State employees in the various geographic areas of the State and for a uniform State policy for granting such wage differentials, including the criteria for determining the amount of such wage differentials.

The Council shall also study and make recommendations on the feasibility of establishing uniform statewide salaries or other compensation by general statute for boards of supervisors, councils of cities and towns, school boards and boards of education.

All State agencies shall assist the Council in its study.

The Council shall complete its study and make its report to the Governor and the General Assembly not later than September one, nineteen hundred seventy-five.

2. Thomas W. Gavett, "Comparability Wage Programs", Monthly Labor Review, September, 1971, p. 38.

3. Ibid., p. 42.

4. John L. Knapp, "Use of Local Area Cost of Living Indexes for

Adjusted State Salaries”, remarks to the VALC Committee to Study Wage Differentials for State Employees and Uniform Salaries for Local Officers, April 14, 1975, p. 4.

5. Ibid. , p. 1.

6. Ibid. , p. 3.

7. James C. Simmons, Florida Cost of Living Research Study: Florida Counties Price Level Index (FPLI) (Tallahassee: Florida Department of Administration, 1973), p. 4.

8. Chapter 72-409, Laws of Florida, p. 1447.

9. Chapter 73-335, Laws of Florida, p. 1059.

10. Chapter 74-227, Laws of Florida, p. 629.

11. Knapp, op. cit. , p. 8.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid. , p. 11.

14. SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 13

Establishing the policy of the Commonwealth in regard to its employees.

Whereas, the tradition of good government in the Commonwealth owes much to the quality of its employees; and

Whereas, the effectiveness of State programs and the efficiency of their delivery of services depends on the people who administer them; and

Whereas, the Commonwealth must retain and continue to attract the qualified people needed to administer its programs in the best manner possible; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That it is the policy of the Commonwealth that its employees be compensated at a rate comparable to the rate of compensation for employees in the private sector of the Commonwealth in similar occupations, and that an annual review be conducted by the Director of Personnel to determine where discrepancies in compensation exist as between the public and private sectors of the Commonwealth; the results of such review to be reported each year to the Governor and the General Assembly.

APPENDIX I

Salaries of School Boards

(NOTE: Any county having a county manager form of government may pay chairman an extra \$500/yr.)

<u>Counties</u>	<u>Population (1970)</u>	<u>Salary not to exceed</u>
Accomack	29 004	\$ 1200
Albemarle	37 780	1200
Alleghany	12 461	600
Amelia	7 592	1200
Amherst	26 072	1200
Appomattox	9 784	1200
Arlington	174 284	3000
Augusta	44 220	1600
Bath	5 192	1200
Bedford	26 728	1200
Bland	5 423	720
Botetourt	18 193	600
Brunswick	16 172	1200
Buchanan	32 071	1200
Buckingham	10 597	1200
Campbell	43 319	1200
Caroline	13 925	800
Carroll	23 092	600
Charles City	6 158	240
Charlotte	11 551	1200
Chesterfield	76 855	2400
Clarke	8 102	900
Craig	3 524	480
Culpeper	18 218	1500
Cumberland	6 179	1200
Dickenson	16 077	1220
Dinwiddie	25 046	1200
Essex	7 099	800
Fairfax	455 021	3000
Fauquier	26 375	900
Floyd	9 775	600
Fluvanna	7 621	1200
Franklin	26 858	1200
Frederick	28 893	900
Giles	16 741	1200

Salaries of School Boards

<u>Counties</u>	<u>Population (1970)</u>	<u>Salary not to exceed</u>
Gloucester	14 059	\$ 1000
Goochland	10 069	1200
Grayson	15 439	1200
Greene	5 248	900
Greensville	9 604	1200
Halifax	30 076	1200
Hanover	37 479	1500
Henrico	154 364	3000
Henry	50 901	360
Highland	2 529	1200
Isle of Wight	18 285	1200
James City	17 853	240
King and Queen	5 491	800
King George	8 039	800
King William	7 497	800
Lancaster	9 126	600
Lee	20 321	1260
Loudoun	37 150	3000
Louisa	14 004	1200
Lunenburg	11 687	1200
Madison	8 638	1200
Mathews	7 168	1000
Mecklenburg	29 426	900
Middlesex	6 295	800
Montgomery	47 157	1200
Nelson	11 702	1200
New Kent	5 300	240
Northampton	14 442	1200
Northumberland	9 239	1200
Nottoway	14 260	600
Orange	13 792	1000
Page	16 581	900
Patrick	15 282	1200
Pittsylvania	58 789	1200
Powhatan	7 696	1200
Prince Edward	14 379	1200

Salaries of School Boards

<u>Counties</u>	<u>Population (1970)</u>	<u>Salary not to exceed</u>
Prince George	29 092	\$ 1200
Prince William	111 102	3000
Pulaski	29 564	600
Rappahannock	5 199	600
Richmond	5 841	600
Roanoke	67 339	1200
Rockbridge	16 637	600
Rockingham	47 890	1200
Russell	24 533	1200
Scott	24 376	960
Shenandoah	22 852	900
Smyth	31 349	1200
Southampton	18 582	1200
Spotsylvania	16 424	1200
Stafford	24 587	600
Surry	5 882	1200
Sussex	11 464	1200
Tazewell	39 816	1200
Warren	15 301	900
Washington	40 835	1200
Westmoreland	12 142	1200
Wise	35 947	1200
Wythe	22 139	600
York	33 203	600

<u>Cities</u>	<u>Population</u>	
Alexandria	110 938	\$10 a day (a total of 24 days)
Bedford	6 011	majority vote of city council
Bristol	14 857	(w/o compensation)
Buena Vista	6 425	no provision in charter for compensation
Charlottesville	38 880	fixed by council (not to exceed \$10 a day - total of 24 days) No salary

Salaries of School Boards

<u>Cities</u>	<u>Population (1970)</u>	
Chesapeake	89 580	not to exceed \$ 2000
Clifton Forge	5 501	no provision
Colonial Heights	15 097	set by council
Covington	10 060	no provision
Danville	46 391	not to exceed \$ 600
Emporia	5 300	not to exceed \$ 240
Fairfax City	21 970	not to exceed \$ 300
Falls Church	10 772	no provision
Franklin City	6 880	not to exceed \$ 400
Fredericksburg	14 450	no provision
Galax	6 278	not more than \$ 150
Hampton	120 779	not to exceed \$1800 (actual compensation \$1500)
Harrisonburg	14 605	no provision
Hopewell	23 471	not to exceed \$ 600
Lexington	7 597	fixed by council
Lynchburg	54 083	no provision
Martinsville	19 653	no provision
Newport News	138 177	not to exceed \$1200
Norfolk	307 951	no provision in charter (no salary)
Norton	4 001	no provision
Petersburg	36 103	not to exceed \$ 600
Portsmouth	110 963	no provision in charter (no salary)
Radford	11 596	\$10 a day (total of 24 days)
Richmond	249 621	not to exceed \$3000
Roanoke	92 115	no provision
Salem	21 982	no provision
South Boston	6 889	no provision
Staunton	24 504	no provision
Suffolk	45 024	no provision
Virginia Beach	172 106	no provision
Waynesboro	16 707	not to exceed \$1000
Williamsburg	9 069	not to exceed \$ 600
Winchester	14 643	no provision

Salaries per annum of County Boards of Supervisors

Prince Edward	250-1800
Prince George	250-1800
Prince William	250-5500
Pulaski	250-1800
Rappahannock	250-1800
Richmond	250-1800
Roanoke	250-4800
Rockbridge	250-1800
Rockingham	250-1800
Russell	250-1800
Scott	250-1800
Shenandoah	250-1800
Smyth	250-1800
Southampton	250-1800
Spotsylvania	250-1800
Stafford	250-1800
Surry	250-1800
Sussex	250-1800
Tazewell	250-2400
Warren	250-3000
Washington	250-1800
Westmoreland	250-1800
Wise	250-1800
Wythe	250-3000
York	250-1800

Salaries per annum of City Councils

Alexandria	4800	Covington	150
Bedford	1200	Danville	no greater than 1200
Bristol	300	Emoria	set by council
Buena Vista	0	Fairfax City	2400
Charlottesville	1200	Falls Church	1200
Chesapeake	set by council	Franklin City	600
Clifton Forge	no provision	Frederickshurg	3000 maximum
Colonial Heights	1200	Galax	250

APPENDIX II

Salaries per annum of County Boards of Supervisors

Counties

Accomack	250-4000	Gloucester	250-3000
Albemarle	250-6000	Goochland	250-1800
Alleghany	250-1800	Grayson	250-1800
Amelia	250-1800	Greene	250-1800
Amherst	250-1800	Greensville	250-1800
Appomattox	250-1800	Halifax	250-1800
Arlington	250-7500	Hanover	250-3600
Augusta	250-5000	Henrico	250-7500
Bath	250-1800	Henry	250-5500
Bedford	250-1800	Highland	250-1800
Bland	250-1800	Isle of Wight	250-5000
Botetourt	250-1800	James City	250-1800
Brunswick	250-1800	King and Queen	250-1800
Buchanan	250-2400	King George	250-1800
Buckingham	250-1800	King William	250-1800
Campbell	250-3600	Lancaster	250-1800
Caroline	250-2500	Lee	250-1800
Carroll	250-1800	Loudoun	250-4800
Charles City	250-1800	Louisa	250-1800
Charlotte	250-1800	Lunenburg	250-1800
Chesterfield	250-5000	Madison	250-1800
Clarke	250-1800	Mathews	250-1800
Craig	250-1800	Mecklenburg	250-1800
Culpeper	250-1800	Middlesex	250-1800
Cumberland	1800-3600	Montgomery	250-3000
Dickenson	250-1800	Nelson	250-1800
Dinwiddie	250-1800	New Kent	250-1800
Essex	250-1800	Northampton	250-4000
Fairfax	0-18,000	Northumberland	250-1800
Fauquier	250-1800	Nottoway	250-1800
Floyd	250-1800	Orange	250-2500
Fluvanna	250-1800	Page	250-1800
Franklin	250-3000	Patrick	250-2400
Frederick	250-1800	Pittsylvania	250-3000
Giles	250-1800	Powhatan	250-1800

Salaries of School Boards

<u>Towns</u>	<u>Population</u>	
Poquoson	--	not to exceed \$ 600
Fries	--	not to exceed \$ 240

Salaries per annum of City Councils

Hampton	1200
Harrisonburg	2400 maximum
Hopewell	1200
Lexington	set by council
Lynchburg	1200
Martinsville	80/meeting - 2400 max.
Newport News	2400
Norfolk	4800
Norton ¹	
Petersburg ²	
Portsmouth	3600
Radford	1200
Richmond	4800
Roanoke	4800
Salem	3000
South Boston	set by council - 600 max.
Staunton	no provision
Suffolk	set by council - 3000 max.
Virginia Beach	4800 maximum
Waynesboro	no provision
Williamsburg	set by council
Winchester	no provision

1 Fixed by Commission chosen by judge of circuit court.

2 Set by Commission of five taxpayers of city.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO.....

Requesting the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to study existing productivity programs utilized by government and private management.

WHEREAS, national, State and local revenue shortages are resulting in severe restrictions on the ability to deliver needed services, while at the same time citizens are demanding a higher quality of services for their tax dollars; and

WHEREAS, the federal government recently established the National Commission on Productivity to improve productivity in public employment and to improve skills in work quality; and

WHEREAS, productivity programs have proven extremely successful in private industry by improving the general quality of working life; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interests of the Commonwealth to examine such programs and ascertain whether their establishment would maximize efficiency in government; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council is requested to conduct a study on existing and proposed productivity programs utilized by government and private management and determine whether such programs would benefit the Commonwealth or its political subdivisions. The Council shall, during its study, seek the advice of the National Commission on Productivity, State agency directors, Governor's office, local governing administrators, including constitutional officers and school board members and management of private industry.

The Council shall make an interim report no later than November one, nineteen hundred seventy-six and shall conclude its study and make its final report no later than November one, nineteen hundred seventy-seven, to the Governor and the General Assembly.

#

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO.....

Directing the Director of Personnel to conduct annually certain surveys relating to salaries of employees in the public and private sectors of the economy.

WHEREAS, in nineteen hundred sixty-six the Commonwealth embarked on a policy of establishing salary differentials for the Northern Virginia area because State wages were not comparable with those paid by the federal or local government or the private sector; and

WHEREAS, Senate Joint Resolution No. 13 of the 1973 Session of the General Assembly requested that the Director of Personnel conduct an annual review of salaries of employees in the private sector to determine whether Commonwealth employees are being compensated at a rate comparable to that shown in such surveys; and

WHEREAS, the nineteen hundred seventy-six report of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council Committee Studying Wage Differentials for State Employees recommended that this survey be expanded to include employees of the public sector, including, but not limited to, federal and local salaries, so as to verify that differentials are necessary to provide State employees with comparable wages being paid by all economic sectors; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That the Director of Personnel is hereby directed to expand the annual survey presently being conducted pursuant to Senate Joint Resolution No. 13 of the 1973 Session of the General Assembly to include wages paid in the public sector for comparable State job classifications, including the federal and local governments; the results of such review to be reported each year to the Governor and the General Assembly.

#

