



JUDICIAL COMPENSATION COMMISSION

REPORT ON JUDICIAL SALARIES

March 2007

Members:

Sandra Featherman, Chair

Edwin Clift

Horace A. Hildreth, Jr.

Staff:

Lock Kiermaier

JUDICIAL COMPENSATION COMMISSION

(Title 4, chapter 35)

MEMBERSHIP

Sandra Featherman, Chair
University of New England
11 Hill's Beach Rd.
Biddeford, ME 04005

Edwin Clift
194 Hanson Landing Rd.
Ellsworth, ME 04605

Horace A. Hildreth, Jr.
54 Thornhurst Rd.
Falmouth, ME 04105

STAFF

Lock Kiermaier
Office of Fiscal & Program Review
Maine State Legislature
5 State House Station
Augusta, Maine 04333-0005
(207) 287-1635

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS.....	2
MINIMAL RESOURCES	2
WORKLOAD AND PRODUCTIVITY	3
COMPENSATION	3
RECOMMENDATIONS	6
IMPLICATIONS	7

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Survey of Judicial Salaries, National Center for State Courts, July 2006
- Appendix B: Current Chief Justice Salaries in New England States, January 2007

**JUDICIAL COMPENSATION COMMISSION:
2007 REPORT ON JUDICIAL SALARIES**

INTRODUCTION

The Judicial Compensation Commission, established by Title 4, chapter 35, is required to study and make recommendations regarding all aspects of judicial compensation to ensure that the most highly qualified lawyers in this state, drawn from diverse backgrounds, are willing to serve in the State's Judicial Branch of government and to ensure that these judges do not become demoralized during service because of inadequate compensation. The Commission's statutory charge is unchanged since the issuance of its first report in 1996. In preparing this report, the Judicial Compensation Commission was able to build upon the conclusions and recommendations contained in earlier reports issued by the Commission in 1996 and 2000. Current members of the Judicial Compensation Commission, all of whom were newly appointed in 2005, were struck by the relative similarity of the current status of judicial compensation in the state to that of previous years. In brief, the commission has concluded that now, as in the past, members of the Maine judiciary serve the Maine public in an exemplary fashion and do so under a heavy workload with financial resources that compare poorly to other states. Most importantly, despite several past attempts to improve the relative terms of their financial compensation, Maine's judiciary is subject to certain retirement inequities and continues to be significantly underpaid which is the focus of this particular report.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

In its review of the current status of overall judicial compensation, the Commission found that the overall description of Maine's judiciary remains largely unchanged from 1996. Maine's judiciary has continued to maintain a reputation for a tradition of excellence and has done so in spite of an ever increasing workload and a limited set of resources. According to the National Center for State Courts, Maine Judiciary's current case load justifies the creation of 11.6 additional judges across the state. While the Commission commends the improvements in salary and retirement benefits that have been implemented by the Legislature, the Commission also notes an ongoing pattern in which recommendations issued by the Judicial Compensation Commission are significantly reduced in scope prior to final approval by the Legislature. The Commission finds that this pattern of continually reducing the breadth of its past recommendations has resulted in a situation in which, at best, the meager compensation increases for Maine's judiciary have merely preserved the status quo while doing nothing to substantively improve Maine's extremely poor standing when compared both to other New England states and all states overall. For example, the most recent salary survey conducted by the National Center for State Courts (see Appendix A), shows that as of July 1, 2006, Maine ranks 44th among the states for salaries paid to General Jurisdiction Judges.

The Commission has been disappointed to find that the following conclusions from its previous reports going back to 1996 also remain true in the year 2007:

- Minimal Resources: The Judicial Department continues to operate under the constraints of a relatively small support staff along with a budget that is clearly

inadequate to meet the needs of the judiciary as evidenced by reduced court hours, the closing of several courthouses and the lack of overall operational resources. In her State Of the Judiciary report presented to the Legislature on February 1, 2006, Chief Justice Leigh I. Saufley highlighted the Judicial Department's lack of adequate resources by citing the increasing threat of violence inside courthouses, the inability to resolve family court matters in a timely manner, the moratorium on the expansion of specific problem solving courts and the overall lack of enough judges to properly serve the business and consumer communities.

- Workload and Productivity: Maine's judiciary continues to administer a large number of cases, from a large geographic and diverse demographic area, in a reasonably timely fashion under the circumstances. Over the last ten years, there has been an overall 13% increase in civil filings. The Commission notes that the complexity of the caseloads continues to increase. On the District Court level, in the last ten years small claims, which are the simplest cases, requiring less judicial time, declined by 9.6%. On the other hand, protection from abuse cases, which are highly contentious, increased by 9.4%, mental health cases increased by 20.8%, and protection from harassment cases by 69%. Although the number of the more complicated newly filed child protection cases decreased slightly, the number of mandated hearings doubled, and new strict timelines were imposed, adding significant demands to an already overburdened judiciary.
- Compensation: Despite the very modest salary increases that were adopted by the Legislature since 1996, members of Maine's judiciary remain underpaid. Given the crucial importance of the role of Maine's judiciary, salaries for members of Maine's

judiciary remain low when compared to salaries paid to judges in other states (See Appendix A) and to many lawyers practicing in the State of Maine.

The Commission has concluded that the base salary increases established by the Legislature in FY 99 had the effect of maintaining judicial salaries at too low a level, particularly when compared to judicial salaries paid in other states. The Commission also notes that even with the effect of those cost-of-living increases that were actually granted, judicial salaries for fiscal year 2006-07 have only modestly surpassed the base level that the Commission recommended as being appropriate in FY 98. For example, the 1996 Commission originally recommended that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court be paid a salary of \$115,000 for FY 98 and also recommended that the salary should increase over time with cost of living increases. Instead, the Chief Justice salary was established at \$111,000 and has finally reached a figure of \$129,854 for FY 07 which is still the lowest in the New England states (see Appendix B). Had the Commission's original base salary recommendation been accepted with the full payment of all statutorily authorized cost-of-living increases, the Chief Justice's salary would now be \$136,540 which is an amount that the Commission feels is minimally commensurate with the important role and responsibility of the Chief Justice.

When other levels of judicial salaries are compared, the differential is even more compelling. As mentioned previously, according to the latest salary survey conducted by the National Center for State Courts, as of July 1, 2006 (See Appendix A), Maine ranked 44th among all states for salaries paid to General Jurisdiction Judges; the \$105,300 paid to District and Superior Court judges in Maine compares to the median salary of \$120,000 calculated from all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

Upon its review of the current status of judicial compensation, the Commission was shocked to learn that since FY 98, not all statutorily authorized cost of living increases had been granted by the Legislature. 4 MRSA § 4 sub-§2-A states the following:

“2-A. Cost-of-living adjustment. Effective July 1, 1999 and every July 1st thereafter, the State Court Administrator shall adjust the salaries of the State's chief justices, chief judge, deputy chief judge, associate justices and associate judges by any percentage change in the Consumer Price Index from January 1st to December 31st of the previous year, but only to a maximum increase of 4%....” (emphasis added)

The Commission notes that the cost-of-living adjustments authorized by this provision of law were totally ignored by the Legislature for FY 04 and FY 05 as “cost saving measures” used to achieve a balanced General Fund budget. While the Commission is cognizant of the significant budget shortfalls that the Legislature has had to contend with in recent years, in the strongest possible terms, the Commission finds that the detrimental impact of denying of previously authorized salary increases to the judiciary far outweighs the relatively minimal savings that were achieved. The Commission strongly recommends that in future years the legislature discontinue this occasional practice of denying the judiciary these incremental salary increases which are crucial to maintaining any semblance of status quo for the levels of judicial compensation.

Retirement - During its review of the many aspects of compensation which currently affect the members of Maine’s judiciary, the Commission learned of certain inequities concerning the Maine Judicial Retirement System and addresses those issues separately in an accompanying report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For this report and the accompanying report on judicial retirement, the Judicial Compensation Commission has formulated a series of recommendations which reiterate and build upon the recommendations made in its first report back in 1996. As in previous reports, the Commission believes that adoption of these recommendations is a crucial step towards providing a more appropriate compensation level for Maine's judiciary. Providing adequate compensation levels is one sure means of attracting and retaining a high quality judiciary. The Commission is recommending that its recommendations become effective July 1, 2007. The Commission is submitting legislation to the First Regular Session of the 123rd Legislature to statutorily accomplish the recommendations contained in this report:

1. Increase the direct compensation for members of the judiciary.

The Judicial Compensation Commission recommends that, as July 1, 2007, base salaries for the judiciary be increased from the current salaries paid in FY 07 in the following manner:

- Chief Justice, Supreme Court from \$129,854 to \$153,588;
- Associate Justice, Supreme Court from \$112,295 to \$133,555;
- Chief Justice, Superior Court from \$109,954 to \$130,884;
- Associate Justice, Superior Court from \$105,292 to \$125,542;
- Chief Judge, District Court from \$109,954 to \$130,884;
- Deputy Chief Judge, District Court from \$107,593 to \$128,213; and
- Judge, District Court from \$105,292 to \$125,542.

These recommended base salaries reflect what current judicial salaries would be if the original base salary recommendations made by the Commission in its 1996 report had been implemented and if all scheduled cost-of-living increases had been granted since FY 98.

In making these recommendations, we applaud the Legislature's past actions which have increased judicial salaries but believe that the Commission's original base salary level recommendations remain appropriate. The Commission once again notes that previously scheduled judicial salary increases have often been forestalled by budgetary decisions during the past 20 years and the recommended increases contained in this report will finally restore judicial salaries to the intended and proper level. **The Commission wishes to emphasize that any final increase to the base salaries which is less than the recommended levels and any future effort to deny previous commitments to cost-of-living increases will be counterproductive to the goal of achieving adequate compensation levels for members of Maine's judiciary.**

IMPLICATIONS

After more than ten years of reviewing the topic of overall judicial compensation, the Commission remains convinced that the costs of providing needed improvements to judicial salaries is crucial towards insuring the continuance of a high quality judiciary. To insure that the most qualified and highly trained individuals are retained as judges, members of Maine's judiciary must be assured of just and equitable levels of compensation. The negative consequences of failing to adequately compensate members of Maine's judiciary far outweigh the relatively small financial impact of providing long

overdue resources to a crucial sector of Maine State government. In compensation for our judiciary, justice forestalled is justice denied.

APPENDIX A

**SURVEY OF JUDICIAL SALARIES
NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE COURTS**

JULY 1, 2006

GEN JUR. Judges State/Territory	January 1, 2006		July 1, 2006		Changes in Dollars	% Change	Inflation for the last 6 m	
	Salary	Rank	Salary	Rank			In 2006	Inflation Adjusted % raises
Alabama	\$111,973.00	34	\$111,973.00	40	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
Alaska	\$116,076.00	27	\$152,760.00	4	\$36,684.00	31.60%		29.00%
Arizona	\$120,750.00	21	\$120,750.00	25	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
Arkansas	\$123,351.00	17	\$126,111.00	17	\$2,760.00	2.24%		-0.36%
California	\$149,160.00	4	\$150,696.00	5	\$1,536.00	1.03%		-1.57%
Colorado	\$110,255.00	37	\$113,232.00	37	\$2,977.00	2.70%		0.10%
Connecticut	\$139,128.00	8	\$139,128.00	9	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
Delaware	\$163,850.00	2	\$168,100.00	1	\$4,250.00	2.59%		-0.01%
Florida	\$139,497.00	7	\$139,497.00	8	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
Georgia	\$113,470.00	30	\$113,470.00	35	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
Hawaii	\$121,600.00	19	\$125,856.00	19	\$4,256.00	3.50%		0.90%
Idaho	\$97,632.00	47	\$103,600.00	47	\$5,968.00	6.11%		3.51%
Illinois	\$152,930.00	3	\$157,824.00	3	\$4,894.00	3.20%		0.60%
Indiana	\$110,500.00	36	\$115,282.00	32	\$4,782.00	4.33%		1.73%
Iowa	\$117,040.00	25	\$126,020.00	18	\$8,980.00	7.67%		5.07%
Kansas	\$105,813.00	41	\$114,813.00	33	\$9,000.00	8.51%		5.91%
Kentucky	\$121,344.00	20	\$121,744.00	23	\$400.00	0.33%		-2.27%
Louisiana	\$105,780.47	42	\$110,964.00	41	\$5,183.53	4.90%		2.30%
Maine	\$101,731.50	45	\$105,300.00	44	\$3,568.50	3.51%		0.91%
Maryland	\$123,352.00	16	\$128,352.00	15	\$5,000.00	4.05%		1.45%
Massachusetts	\$112,777.00	32	\$112,777.00	38	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
Michigan	\$139,919.00	6	\$139,919.00	7	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
Minnesota	\$119,913.00	23	\$121,712.00	24	\$1,799.00	1.50%		-1.10%
Mississippi	\$104,170.00	43	\$104,170.00	45	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
Missouri	\$108,000.00	39	\$108,000.00	42	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
Montana	\$94,093.00	51	\$94,093.00	51	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
Nebraska	\$113,639.95	29	\$117,333.25	28	\$3,693.30	3.25%		0.65%
Nevada	\$130,000.00	12	\$130,000.00	14	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
New Hampshire	\$120,000.00	22	\$120,000.00	26	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
New Jersey	\$141,000.00	5	\$141,000.00	6	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
New Mexico	\$96,531.00	48	\$96,531.00	49	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
New York	\$136,700.00	10	\$136,700.00	11	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
North Carolina	\$109,279.00	38	\$115,289.00	31	\$6,010.00	5.50%		2.90%
North Dakota	\$94,298.00	50	\$98,070.00	48	\$3,772.00	4.00%		1.40%
Ohio	\$116,100.00	26	\$116,100.00	29	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
Oklahoma	\$102,529.00	44	\$118,450.00	27	\$15,921.00	15.53%		12.93%
Oregon	\$95,799.96	49	\$95,799.96	50	\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
Pennsylvania	\$135,293.00	11	\$149,132.00	12	\$13,839.00	10.23%		7.63%

<i>Rhode Island</i>	\$129,336.00	13	\$133,216.00	13	\$3,880.00	3.00%	0.40%
<i>South Carolina</i>	\$121,617.00	18	\$125,265.00	20	\$3,648.00	3.00%	0.40%
<i>South Dakota</i>	\$101,010.00	46	\$104,040.91	46	\$3,030.91	3.00%	0.40%
<i>Tennessee</i>	\$118,548.00	24	\$122,580.00	22	\$4,032.00	3.40%	0.80%
<i>Texas</i>	\$125,000.00	15	\$125,000.00	21	\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%
<i>Utah</i>	\$111,050.00	35	\$114,400.00	34	\$3,350.00	3.02%	0.42%
<i>Vermont</i>	\$113,369.00	31	\$113,369.00	36	\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%
<i>Virginia</i>	\$138,028.00	9	\$138,028.00	10	\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%
<i>Washington</i>	\$128,143.00	14	\$128,143.00	16	\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%
<i>West Virginia</i>	\$116,000.00	28	\$116,000.00	30	\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%
<i>Wisconsin</i>	\$112,457.00	33	\$112,457.00	39	\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%
<i>Wyoming</i>	\$106,100.00	40	\$106,100.00	43	\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%
<i>District of Columbia</i>	\$165,200.00	1	\$165,200.00	2	\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%
<i>Federal System</i>	\$165,200.00		\$165,200.00				
<i>American Samoa</i>	\$115,000.00		\$0.00				
<i>Guam</i>	\$100,000.00		\$0.00				
<i>Northern Mariana Islands</i>	\$120,000.00		\$120,000.00				
<i>Puerto Rico</i>	\$89,600.00		\$89,600.00				
<i>Virgin Islands</i>	\$135,000.00		\$135,000.00				
Fifty States and Dist. of Columbia							
<i>Median</i>	\$116,100.00		\$120,000.00				
<i>Mean</i>	\$119,630.06		\$122,558.98				
<i>Standard Deviation</i>	\$16,757.38		\$16,932.36				
<i>Mean-->1 Standard Deviation</i>	\$136,387.44		\$139,491.35				
<i>-1 Standard Deviation<-- Mean</i>	\$102,872.68		\$105,626.62				
<i>Maximum Value</i>	\$165,200.00		\$168,100.00				
<i>Minimum Value</i>	\$94,093.00		\$94,093.00				

Average Raise: \$6,277.47

Inflation from Jan to July 2006 was about 2.6%

to adjust for inflation, simply look at the salary changes minus the rate of inflation

26 States gave raises to judges since January, however, most of these raises do not outpace the uncharacteristically high rate of inflation in the last ye

When you adjust for inflation, only 21 states gave general jurisdiction judges real salary increases

Fifty States and Dist. of Columbia		
<i>Median</i>	\$125,000.00	\$129,375.00
<i>Mean</i>	\$128,695.05	\$132,101.75
<i>Standard Deviation</i>	\$17,417.79	\$17,076.87
<i>Mean-->1 Standard Deviation</i>	\$146,112.85	\$149,178.62
<i>-1 Standard Deviation<-Mean</i>	\$111,277.26	\$115,024.88
<i>Maximum Value</i>	\$170,694.00	\$172,452.00
<i>Minimum Value</i>	\$101,612.00	\$101,612.00

Average Raise: \$6,643.06

Inflation from Jan to July 2006 was about 2.6%

to adjust for inflation, simply look at the salary changes minus the rate of inflation

20 States gave raises to judges, however, most of these raises do not outpace the uncharacteristically high rate of inflation in the last year.

When you adjust for inflation, only 16 states gave appellate judges real salary increases

COLR Associates State/Territory	January 1, 2006		July 1, 2006	
	Salary	Rank	Salary	Rank
Alabama	\$152,027.00	11	\$152,027.00	13
Alaska	\$125,520.00	32	\$165,204.00	5
Arizona	\$126,525.00	30	\$126,525.00	34
Arkansas	\$131,509.00	24	\$134,392.00	25
California	\$182,071.00	1	\$183,946.00	2
Colorado	\$119,739.00	39	\$122,972.00	40
Connecticut	\$154,047.00	10	\$154,047.00	12
Delaware	\$179,670.00	2	\$184,300.00	1
Florida	\$160,375.00	6	\$160,375.00	8
Georgia	\$157,779.00	8	\$157,779.00	10
Hawaii	\$135,000.00	21	\$139,725.00	21
Idaho	\$104,168.00	49	\$110,500.00	47
Illinois	\$177,073.00	3	\$182,739.00	3
Indiana	\$133,600.00	22	\$138,844.00	22
Iowa	\$128,000.00	27	\$144,000.00	18
Kansas	\$121,167.00	36	\$123,590.00	38
Kentucky	\$132,012.00	23	\$132,412.00	27
Louisiana	\$118,301.34	41	\$123,625.00	37
Maine	\$108,498.00	45	\$112,300.00	44
Maryland	\$136,852.00	18	\$144,352.00	17
Massachusetts	\$126,943.00	29	\$126,943.00	32
Michigan	\$164,610.00	5	\$164,610.00	6
Minnesota	\$135,567.00	19	\$137,601.00	23
Mississippi	\$112,530.00	43	\$112,530.00	43
Missouri	\$123,000.00	33	\$123,000.00	39
Montana	\$100,884.00	51	\$100,884.00	51
Nebraska	\$122,854.00	34	\$126,846.76	33
Nevada	\$140,000.00	17	\$140,000.00	20
New Hampshire	\$128,000.00	27	\$128,000.00	30
New Jersey	\$158,500.00	7	\$158,500.00	9
New Mexico	\$106,960.00	47	\$106,960.00	49
New York	\$151,200.00	12	\$151,200.00	14
North Carolina	\$120,583.00	38	\$127,215.00	31
North Dakota	\$103,087.00	50	\$107,210.00	48
Ohio	\$135,450.00	20	\$135,450.00	24
Oklahoma	\$113,531.00	42	\$131,100.00	29
Oregon	\$105,199.00	48	\$105,199.00	50
Pennsylvania	\$155,783.00	9	\$155,783.00	11
Rhode Island	\$143,654.00	15	\$147,964.00	16
South Carolina	\$128,018.00	26	\$131,858.00	28
South Dakota	\$108,145.00	46	\$111,389.42	46
Tennessee	\$129,948.00	25	\$134,364.00	26
Texas	\$150,000.00	13	\$150,000.00	15
Utah	\$122,150.00	35	\$125,850.00	36
Vermont	\$119,254.00	40	\$119,254.00	42
Virginia	\$148,682.00	14	\$162,182.00	7
Washington	\$141,394.00	16	\$141,394.00	19

Changes in Doll.	% Change	Inflation for the last 6 months= 0.0262228946041351	
		In 2006	Inflation Adjusted % raises
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$39,684.00	31.62%	29.02%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$2,883.00	2.19%	-0.41%	
\$1,875.00	1.03%	-1.57%	
\$3,233.00	2.70%	0.10%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$4,630.00	2.58%	-0.02%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	(New Salary \$161,200 takes effect 10/1/06)
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$4,725.00	3.50%	0.90%	
\$6,332.00	6.08%	3.48%	
\$5,666.00	3.20%	0.60%	
\$5,244.00	3.93%	1.33%	
\$16,000.00	12.50%	9.90%	
\$2,423.00	2.00%	-0.60%	
\$400.00	0.30%	-2.30%	
\$5,323.66	4.50%	1.90%	
\$3,802.00	3.50%	0.90%	
\$7,500.00	5.48%	2.88%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	(New Salary \$145,984 takes effect 7/23/06)
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$2,034.00	1.50%	-1.10%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$3,992.76	3.25%	0.65%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	(New Salary \$115,040 effective 7/15/06)
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$6,632.00	5.50%	2.90%	
\$4,123.00	4.00%	1.40%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$17,569.00	15.48%	12.88%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$4,310.00	3.00%	0.40%	
\$3,840.00	3.00%	0.40%	
\$3,244.42	3.00%	0.40%	
\$4,416.00	3.40%	0.80%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	
\$3,700.00	3.03%	0.43%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	(New Salary \$124,000 takes effect 7/9/06)
\$13,500.00	9.08%	6.48%	
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%	

West Virginia	\$121,000.00	37	\$121,000.00	41
Wisconsin	\$126,358.00	31	\$126,358.00	35
Wyoming	\$111,400.00	44	\$111,400.00	45
District of Columbia	\$175,100.00	4	\$175,100.00	4
Federal System	\$203,000.00		\$203,000.00	
American Samoa	\$115,000.00		\$118,957.00	
Guam	\$126,000.00		\$126,000.00	
Northern Mariana Islands	\$126,000.00		\$126,000.00	
Puerto Rico	\$120,000.00		\$120,000.00	
Virgin Islands	N/A		N/A	
Fifty States and Dist. of Columbia				
Median	\$128,018.00		\$132,135.00	
Mean	\$133,602.30		\$137,074.49	
Standard Deviation	\$20,791.77		\$21,049.23	
Mean-->1 Standard Deviation	\$154,394.07		\$158,123.73	
-1 Standard Deviation--Mean	\$112,810.53		\$116,025.26	
Maximum Value	\$182,071.00		\$184,300.00	
Minimum Value	\$100,884.00		\$100,884.00	

\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60% (New Salary \$134,389 takes effect 7/14/06)
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60% (New Salary \$115,300 takes effect 9/12/06)
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%

26 of the states and DC got raises since January.

Average Raise: \$6,810.84

Inflation from Jan to July 2006 was about 2.6%

to adjust for inflation, simply look at the salary changes minus the rate of inflation

MANY States gave raises to judges, however, most of these raises do not outpace the uncharacteristically high rate of inflation in the last year.

When you adjust for inflation, only 20 states gave COLR Justices real salary increases

COLR Chiefs		January 1, 2006		July 1, 2006	
State/Territory	Salary	Rank	Salary	Rank	
Alabama	\$153,027.00	15	\$153,027.00	16	
Alaska	\$126,132.00	32	\$165,696.00	7	
Arizona	\$129,150.00	31	\$129,150.00	36	
Arkansas	\$142,140.00	19	\$145,184.00	20	
California	\$198,567.00	1	\$200,613.00	1	
Colorado	\$122,352.00	41	\$125,656.00	40	
Connecticut	\$166,489.00	5	\$166,489.00	6	
Delaware	\$189,240.00	2	\$194,000.00	2	
Florida	\$160,375.00	8	\$160,375.00	12	
Georgia	\$157,779.00	12	\$157,779.00	14	
Hawaii	\$140,000.00	21	\$144,900.00	21	
Idaho	\$105,668.00	50	\$112,000.00	46	
Illinois	\$177,073.00	3	\$182,739.00	3	
Indiana	\$133,600.00	26	\$138,844.00	26	
Iowa	\$132,720.00	27	\$150,110.00	19	
Kansas	\$124,424.00	36	\$126,912.00	38	
Kentucky	\$137,172.00	23	\$137,412.00	28	
Louisiana	\$124,216.47	37	\$129,806.00	35	
Maine	\$125,463.00	34	\$129,854.00	34	
Maryland	\$155,852.00	14	\$163,352.00	10	
Massachusetts	\$131,512.00	29	\$131,512.00	32	
Michigan	\$164,610.00	6	\$164,610.00	8	
Minnesota	\$149,124.00	17	\$151,361.00	18	
Mississippi	\$115,390.00	44	\$115,390.00	44	
Missouri	\$125,500.00	33	\$125,500.00	41	
Montana	\$102,466.00	51	\$102,466.00	51	
Nebraska	\$122,854.00	40	\$126,846.76	39	
Nevada	\$140,000.00	21	\$140,000.00	24	
New Hampshire	\$132,000.00	28	\$132,000.00	31	
New Jersey	\$164,250.00	7	\$164,250.00	9	
New Mexico	\$108,995.00	47	\$108,995.00	49	
New York	\$156,000.00	13	\$156,000.00	15	
North Carolina	\$123,819.00	39	\$130,629.00	33	
North Dakota	\$106,102.00	49	\$110,346.00	48	
Ohio	\$144,300.00	18	\$144,300.00	22	
Oklahoma	\$117,571.00	43	\$140,000.00	24	
Oregon	\$107,600.00	48	\$107,600.00	50	
Pennsylvania	\$160,009.00	9	\$160,009.00	13	
Rhode Island	\$158,020.00	11	\$162,761.00	11	
South Carolina	\$134,418.00	24	\$138,450.00	27	
South Dakota	\$110,145.00	46	\$113,389.42	45	
Tennessee	\$129,948.00	30	\$134,364.00	29	
Texas	\$152,500.00	16	\$152,500.00	17	
Utah	\$124,150.00	38	\$127,850.00	37	
Vermont	\$124,952.00	35	\$124,952.00	42	
Virginia	\$158,514.00	10	\$172,014.00	5	
Washington	\$141,394.00	20	\$141,394.00	23	

Changes in Doll. % Change		Inflation for the last 6 months= 0.0262228946041351	
	In 2006	Inflation Adjusted	% raises
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$39,564.00	31.37%		28.77%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$3,044.00	2.14%		-0.46%
\$2,046.00	1.03%		-1.57%
\$3,304.00	2.70%		0.10%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$4,760.00	2.52%		-0.08%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60% (New Salary \$161,200 takes effect 10/1/06)
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$4,900.00	3.50%		0.90%
\$6,332.00	5.99%		3.39%
\$5,666.00	3.20%		0.60%
\$5,244.00	3.93%		1.33%
\$17,390.00	13.10%		10.50%
\$2,488.00	2.00%		-0.60%
\$240.00	0.17%		-2.43%
\$5,589.53	4.50%		1.90%
\$4,391.00	3.50%		0.90%
\$7,500.00	4.81%		2.21%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60% New Salary \$151,239 effective 7/23/2006
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$2,237.00	1.50%		-1.10%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$3,992.76	3.25%		0.65%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60% (New Salary \$117,040 effective 7/15/06)
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$6,810.00	5.50%		2.90%
\$4,244.00	4.00%		1.40%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$22,429.00	19.08%		16.48%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$4,741.00	3.00%		0.40%
\$4,032.00	3.00%		0.40%
\$3,244.42	2.95%		0.35%
\$4,416.00	3.40%		0.80%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%
\$3,700.00	2.98%		0.38%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60% (New Salary \$129,925 effective 7/9/06)
\$13,500.00	8.52%		5.92%
\$0.00	0.00%		-2.60%

West Virginia	\$121,000.00	42	\$121,000.00	43
Wisconsin	\$134,358.00	25	\$134,358.00	30
Wyoming	\$111,400.00	45	\$111,400.00	47
District of Columbia	\$175,600.00	4	\$175,600.00	4
Federal System	\$212,100.00		\$212,100.00	
American Samoa	\$120,000.00		\$125,212.00	
Guam	\$128,000.00		\$128,000.00	
Northern Mariana Islands	\$130,000.00		\$130,000.00	
Puerto Rico	\$125,000.00		\$125,000.00	
Virgin Islands	\$0.00		\$0.00	
Fifty States and Dist. of Columbia				
Median	\$133,600.00		\$137,931.00	
Mean	\$138,234.13		\$141,877.36	
Standard Deviation	\$22,082.87		\$22,359.40	
Mean->1 Standard Deviation	\$160,316.99		\$164,236.75	
-1 Standard Deviation-Mean	\$116,151.26		\$119,517.96	
Maximum Value	\$198,567.00		\$200,613.00	
Minimum Value	\$102,466.00		\$102,466.00	

\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60% (New Salary \$142,389 takes effect 7/14/06)
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60% (New Salary \$115,300 takes effect 9/12/06)
\$0.00	0.00%	-2.60%

26 of the states and DC got raises since January.

Average Raise: \$7,146.34

Inflation from Jan to July 2006 was about 2.6%

to adjust for inflation, simply look at the salary changes minus the rate of inflation

MANY States gave raises to judges, however, most of these raises do not outpace the uncharacteristically high rate of inflation in the last year.

When you adjust for inflation, only 20 states gave COLR Chief Justices real salary increases

APPENDIX B

**CURRENT CHIEF JUSTICE SALARIES
IN THE NEW ENGLAND STATES**

JANUARY 2007

Current Chief Justice Salaries in the New England States

As of January 2007

Connecticut	\$175,465
Maine	\$129,854
Massachusetts	\$151,239
New Hampshire	\$137,730
Rhode Island	\$163,000
Vermont	\$129,925

Source: compiled by the Judicial Department, State of Maine via telephone survey.