

Supplemental Text 1. Survey Methods

We contacted local managers listed in NACAA's online membership directory three times between October 2016 and January 2017, starting with a recruitment email and physical letter and followed with two rounds of both emails and letters after four weeks. Respondents had the option of responding by filling out a physical survey and returning in a pre-addressed and stamped envelope, or via a Qualtrics survey that was made available through a link embedded in contact emails, with both being identical in survey items and fixed order. Of 118 total members listed and contacted, 78 (66.1%) completed enough of the survey to be usable for this analysis with 26 (33.3% of respondents) responding via mail and 52 (66.7% of respondents) via online survey. Alpha-numeric identifiers were used to match survey responses to agencies, and then, agencies to metropolitan areas.

Respondents are both diverse and representative of NACAA membership regionally and institutionally. NACAA local-level membership represents 26 states, with 50% from the West region, 25.4% from the South, 4.2% from the Northeast, and 20.3% from the Midwest; while survey respondents represent 22 states, with 53.9% from the West, 22.3% from the South, 5.3% from the Northeast, and 21.1% from the Midwest. Although 30.8% of survey respondents are from California, there is no evidence to suggest these respondents are biasing results: 1) chi-squared tests indicated there is no statistically significant difference between California and non-California respondents; 2) a dummy variable for California respondents in ordered probit models was not statistically significant; and, 3) when California respondents were dropped from the data set, there was no substantive change in findings. Additionally, NACAA membership is 21.2% cities, 32.2% counties, and 46.7% regional agencies (i.e., regional planning districts); while survey respondents are 18.4% cities, 38.2% counties, and 43.4% regional agencies. Finally, respondents report a range of sizes for their agencies, with 35.9% less than 10 employees, 20.5%

between 11 and 20, 20.5% between 21 and 40, and 23.1% over 40. In terms of budget, 30.6% report less \$1 million, 30.6% between \$1 and 3 million, 12.5% between \$3 and 5 million, and 25.0% over \$5 million. In all, the survey sample is well-representative of local air agencies.

Nevertheless, the data sample is of a unique local agency population that may not be representative of all local agencies, especially those with different functions or missions. Additionally, local air agencies do not exist in 24 states (due to either preemption or lack of strategic initiative), and are a result of both state- and local-level socio-political, economic, and environmental factors, which affects overall IGM (Woods and Potoski, 2010; Fowler, 2017). While there are no systematic differences between our survey respondents and non-respondents, there are likely systematic differences between states that do have local air agencies and states that do not. While this creates a limitation in generalizing to local governments as a whole, we do not believe our data is biased in generalizations to local air agencies.