

I have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS W. FLETCHER,
Assistant to the Commissioner,
 (For Walter E. Washington, Commissioner).

[Attachments]

EXHIBIT A.—ANALYSIS OF H.R. 13980

H.R. 13980 provides for (1) an increase in salaries; (2) deletion of the scheduled longevity steps 7, 8, and 9, with retention of three longevity step increases for Privates through Sergeants and two longevity step increases for Lieutenants through Deputy Chief, with three years between each such increase; (3) payment of \$500 per annum additional to the pay for the Police Executive Officer who is assigned as one of the Assistant Chiefs of Police; (4) payment of \$600 to any officer or member below the rank of Deputy Chief in the Police and Fire Departments who has a minimum of thirty college credit hours in law enforcement or administration or in fire science or administration respectively, and has served one year probation; (5) payment of \$1,200 to any officer or member below the rank of Deputy Chief in the Police and Fire Departments who has 60 or more college credit hours in law enforcement or administration or in fire science or administration respectively, and has served one year probation; (6) advancement of all officers or members except privates to the highest longevity step in their respective class or subclass upon completion of thirty years of continuous service in the police force or in the Fire Department; and (7) salary saving provisions for members of the Police and Fire Departments assigned as Technician I, Technician II, or Station Clerk, as the case may be, who may lose such an assignment only because of the reorganization of the Police or Fire Department. The salary increases provided by the bill average 8.7% and the estimated cost for a full fiscal year is \$4,400,000.

The District Government concurs in the provisions of H.R. 13980 relating to the change in longevity step increases, additional pay for the Police Executive Officer, pay incentive for educational attainment, and salary protection for Technicians and Station Clerks. However, (1) the additional pay for the Police Executive Officer should be subject to insurance benefits in addition to retirement benefits, and (2) rather than to indicate a stated amount of compensation for educational attainment, the District Government believes it more practical to provide for administrative application of such compensation through regulatory issuances according to changes which may occur in basic salary rates.

The District Government does not consider appropriate the provision in H.R. 13980 concerning the advancement of all officers and members except privates to the highest longevity step of their respective class or subclass upon completion of thirty years service. The former Board of Commissioners was strongly opposed to a similar provision which was considered by the Congress in August 1964 for Deputy Chiefs and subsequently enacted into law as a provision of P.L. 88-575, approved September 2, 1964, because of its conflict with the concept of longevity pay for compensatory recognition of long service in the same class or grade. Also, since the basic salary rate is used for retirement pay purposes, this provision which allows attainment to the top rate in a class or subclass after thirty years service might encourage early retirement of those officers and members who had not yet reached the mandatory retirement age. Otherwise such officers and members might continue their employment and the Police and Fire Departments would benefit from their long experience and knowledge. Additionally, no other salary system in the District Government permits an employee to automatically jump to his top rate because of a long period of service.

The District of Columbia must also oppose the provision of section 7 of H.R. 13980 making the legislation effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the first day of October, 1967. As indicated previously, the District cannot support a retroactive increase of this size at this time and therefore recommends the substitution of the attached draft bill (Exhibit C).