

In addition to the proposed increase, the District also proposes to eliminate the longevity steps from the salary schedule but retain the principle of longevity step increases with a reduction of time between three such increases from four to three years. This would permit a private to reach the maximum salary rate in sixteen years rather than in nineteen years as is now the case. The same reduction in the number of years between longevity step increases would apply to all the other officers and members except the Fire Chief and Police Chief who would not receive the benefit of any longevity step increase.

For the improvement of both the police and fire services, the District proposes to provide additional compensation to those officers and members who have served their first year probationary period and who complete or have completed courses of study in law enforcement or fire science subjects at an accredited college or university. The proposed form of compensation would be 8% of their rate of pay (i.e., \$600 in the case of a private) upon completion of thirty hours of such subjects and 16% of their rate of pay (i.e., \$1,200 in the case of a private) upon completion of sixty hours of such subjects. The District considers this approach to recognition of academic attainments to be more feasible than the use of the "Master Patrolman" concept as originally recommended by the Crime Commission and which was included in the proposed bill concerning increase in rates of pay for police and related recruitment benefits submitted by the Board of Commissioners in February 1967 for Congressional consideration. This concept, as proposed, is that a person before being eligible for a rate of pay which is higher than the regular base pay for a police or fire private, should have at least a year of police or firefighting experience in addition to having the required college credits. Also from a morale standpoint of the present forces, the District of Columbia believes it inadvisable to appoint a person as a master patrolman or master firefighter, as the case may be, without his having gone through a period of basic on-the-job training and experience. In addition, the provision of added compensation as proposed for completing thirty credit hours and sixty credit hours provides an incentive to personnel already on the force to achieve such additional education. Also, the District believes the objective of attracting persons with more than a high school education to the police or firefighting forces will be served by having an initial recruiting rate of \$7,500 with the added incentive of \$600 or \$1,200 additional salary at the end of the first year of employment.

The Deputy Chief assigned as Police Executive Officer has also been assigned as one of the Assistant Police Chiefs. In recognition of this dual assignment, the District of Columbia Government believes that this police officer should receive an additional rate of compensation in the amount of \$500.

The District also proposed to include recruitment inducements as previously endorsed in the February 1967 proposal introduced as H.R. 6644 and H.R. 11149. These recruitment inducements include payment of transportation expenses to prospective police privates to come to the District of Columbia for interviews, and resettlement cash allowances not to exceed \$250 and an initial ninety-day per diem allowance of \$7.50 per day to new appointees who have to move into the Washington Metropolitan area.

Additionally, the District proposed the repeal of the provision of P.L. 88-575, approved September 2, 1964, which allows a Deputy Chief to advance to the top step of his class upon completion of thirty years of service. This provision is a benefit applying to Deputy Chiefs only. Should it remain, it is the view of the Departments and Associations and of the members that a similar provision should apply to all members of the forces. As a matter of principle and sound pay administration, it is the opinion of the Government of the District of Columbia that this provision should be deleted from existing law.

And, finally, the District of Columbia proposes an amendment to existing law relating to the probationary year of police privates. A recent District Court decision interpreted existing law as requiring that a police private must be retained for the full probationary year unless formal charges are brought against him before a police trial board. This procedure is inconsistent with that applicable to probationary firemen and all other District employees, who are subject to dismissal for unsatisfactory performance at any time during the probationary year. The requirement that a probationary policeman with unsatisfactory service be retained for the full probationary year reflects unfavorably on the efficiency and economy of the Police Department and is not in the best interest of the District Government in terms of public safety. A provision is therefore included in the attached proposed substitute bill to bring dismissal proceedings for probationary policemen in line with those of all other District employees.