



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-118638
3-18-70

RESTRICTED — Not to be released outside the General Accounting Office except on the basis of specific approval by the Office of Legislative Liaison, a record of which is kept by the Distribution Section, Publications Branch, OAS

B-118638

March 18, 1970

D. G. Gort

Released

RELEASED



LM088922

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Further reference is made to your letter of July 14, 1969, requesting that the General Accounting Office make comparisons of costs and expenditures for certain activities carried out by the District of Columbia Government with the costs and expenditures for these same activities in other cities.

Police + fire activities

We are enclosing reports on the police and fire activities. Other reports will be submitted to you in the near future as they are completed.

We plan to make no further distribution of the reports unless copies are specifically requested, and then only after your agreement has been obtained or public announcement has been made by you concerning the contents of the reports.

Sincerely yours,

(SIGNED) ELMER B. STAATS

Comptroller General
of the United States

Enclosures - 2

The Honorable William Proxmire, Chairman
Subcommittee on the District of Columbia
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate

088922

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
REPORT ON
COMPARISON OF EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOYMENT
FOR THE POLICE ACTIVITY

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT AND SEVEN SELECTED CITIES

The District of Columbia Government's Metropolitan Police Department is responsible for the protection of life and property in the community through the prevention and detection of crime; the enforcement of all local and locally applicable statutes, regulations, and ordinances; the latest techniques of criminology; a police-community relations program; and cooperation with Federal police agencies in the enforcement of Federal laws. Reduction of crime and traffic accident rates are fundamental objectives of police operations.

Each of the seven cities included in our comparison maintained a police department having responsibilities generally similar to those of the Metropolitan Police Department. We adjusted the amounts of expenditures and numbers of employees shown on cities' records to (1) reflect differences in activities being performed by the Metropolitan Police Department and the police departments of the seven cities and (2) reflect activities performed by organizations which appeared to supplement the operations of the cities' police departments.

Our adjustments were based on our review of the police functions in the District and each of the cities as described in written material and/or by city officials. For example, the expenditure and employment data for one police department were reduced to reflect the police protection provided by it to several unincorporated areas. The expenditure data for this city police department were reduced by the amount which the city was reimbursed for providing this protection; the employment data were reduced on the basis of an estimate furnished us by a police department official.

The expenditure and employment data for another police department were increased to reflect police activities performed by a special metropolitan district commission. The adjustments were based on estimates provided to us by a commission official.

There are certain governmental organizations operating in the District which, in effect, supplement the Metropolitan Police Department. These include the United States Park Police; United States Secret Service, including the White House Police; and the United States

We found that there were different methods of funding the various retirement systems for firemen in the other cities. Some cities have retirement funds, either separately for firemen or combined with funds for employees involved in other city functions, to which both the employees and the cities make annual contributions with the total in the fund being available to pay retirement benefits--some of the same cities also make direct payments to certain retired firemen. In one city where the firemen retirement system is merged with that for other city employees, the retirement payments from the fund are not summarized as to departments with which the retirees were previously employed. Thus, extensive effort would be required to identify the payments to retired firemen. Because of the extensive effort that would be required, we excluded all retirement expenditures from the data used in our comparisons.

The expenditures and employment identified with the fire activity in the District and the seven cities are shown in the following table. Because the data furnished by city officials or obtained from cities' records were not audited by us and because certain adjustments to the data were made on the basis of judgment, we believe the data shown in the table should be viewed as indicating an approximate level of expenditures and employment for the fire activity.

POLICE ACTIVITY

EXPENDITURES - FISCAL YEAR 1969

<u>City</u>	<u>Expenditures (note 1)</u>	
	<u>Total</u> <u>(millions)</u>	<u>Per capita</u> <u>(note 2)</u>
District of Columbia:		
-Metropolitan Police Department (note 3)	\$43.6	\$53.50
-United States Park Police, District funding allotment	1.6	2.00
Atlanta	7.4	14.31
Baltimore	37.7	41.63
Boston	28.1	49.24
Cleveland	26.3	34.17
Milwaukee	22.4	29.80
St. Louis	22.9	34.36
San Francisco	24.1	34.24

¹Represents generally amounts expended or obligated in fiscal year 1969, excluding capital outlays, and debt service and retirement costs.

²Based on city population estimates for January 1, 1969, by Rand McNally and Company.

³\$54 million was allotted for the Metropolitan Police Department in fiscal year 1970 (excluding policemen's pension and relief). \$64 million was budgeted for the Metropolitan Police Department for fiscal year 1971 (excluding policemen's pension and relief)--Proposed Budget, fiscal year 1971, Mayor's Recommendations to the City Council of the District of Columbia, January 1970.

POLICE ACTIVITY

EMPLOYMENT -- APRIL 1969

<u>City</u>	<u>Employment (note 1)</u>	
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Per 1,000 population (note 2)</u>
District of Columbia:		
-Metropolitan Police Department (note 3)	3,980	4.9
-United States Park Police, District funding allotment	180	.2
Atlanta	920	1.8
Baltimore	3,880	4.3
Boston	2,990	5.2
Cleveland	2,540	3.3
Milwaukee	2,030	2.7
St. Louis	2,670	4.0
San Francisco	2,030	2.9

¹ Represents generally full-time employment as of April 1969, including part-time employment expressed in terms of full-time equivalents.

² Based on city population estimates for January 1, 1969, by Rand McNally and Company.

³ 5,698 positions were allotted for the Metropolitan Police Department in fiscal year 1970. 6,308 positions were budgeted for the Metropolitan Police Department for fiscal year 1971--Proposed Budget, fiscal year 1971, Mayor's Recommendations to the City Council of the District of Columbia, January 1970.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

REPORT ON

COMPARISON OF EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOYMENT

FOR THE FIRE ACTIVITY

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT AND SEVEN SELECTED CITIES

The District of Columbia Government's Fire Department is responsible for the fire prevention and fire fighting programs, services, and operations of the District of Columbia. Its primary function is to provide protection of life and property through the prevention of fires and the expeditious extinguishment of fires after they occur. The District's Fire Department is also responsible for operating an emergency ambulance service.

Each of the seven cities included in our comparison maintained a fire department having responsibilities generally similar to those of the District's Fire Department. We adjusted the amounts of expenditures and numbers of employees shown on cities' records to (1) reflect differences in activities being performed by the District's Fire Department and the fire departments of the seven cities and (2) reflect activities performed by city departments which appeared to supplement the operations of the fire departments.

Our adjustments were based on our review of the fire functions in the District and each of the cities as described in written material and/or by city officials. For example, the expenditures and employment data for one fire department were reduced to reflect fire protection services provided by it to several areas outside the city's limits. The expenditures for this city fire department were reduced by the amount which the city was reimbursed for providing this protection; the employment was reduced on the basis of information furnished us by fire department officials.

The expenditures and employment data for the fire department in another city were increased to reflect ambulance services performed by another city department. The expenditures were increased on the basis of information in the accounting records of the city; the employment was increased on the basis of budgeted information supplied to us by the city.

The expenditures of the District's Fire Department in fiscal year 1969 included about \$5.9 million for payment to retired personnel or their beneficiaries.

Capitol Police. We regarded the operation of these organizations in the District to be wholly or in large part due to the uniqueness of Washington, D.C., as the Nation's Capital, and except as explained below, did not consider them in making comparisons with other cities.

The responsibilities of the United States Park Police include policing park lands in the District of Columbia which represent small areas in the District used for neighborhood playgrounds and community parks. Since these responsibilities are similar to those of police departments in other cities, we have included as a separate item for police protection in the District, the District's share of funding the United States Park Police in fiscal year 1969.

The expenditures of the Metropolitan Police Department in fiscal year 1969 included about \$14.6 million for pensions to retired police officers of the Metropolitan Police Department, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police; for relief to widows and children of deceased officers of these organizations; for refunds of retirement contributions to officers and members resigning or dismissed from the Metropolitan Police Force; and for medical treatment of Metropolitan Police officers for injuries and diseases contracted in the line of duty.

We found that there were different methods of funding the various retirement systems for police personnel in the other cities. Some cities have retirement funds, either separately for police or combined with funds for employees involved in other city functions, to which both the employees and the cities make annual contributions with the total in the fund being available to pay retirement benefits--some of the same cities also make direct payments to certain retired policemen. In one city where the police retirement system is merged with that for other city employees, the retirement payments from the fund are not summarized as to departments with which the retirees were previously employed. Thus, extensive effort would be required to identify the payments to retired policemen. Because of the extensive effort that would be required, we excluded all retirement expenditures from the data used in our comparisons.

The expenditures and employment identified with the police activity in the District and the seven cities are shown in the following tables. Because the data furnished by city officials or obtained from cities' records were not audited by us and because certain adjustments to the data were made on the basis of judgment, we believe the data shown in the tables should be viewed as indicating an approximate level of expenditures and employment for the police activity.

FIRE ACTIVITY

EXPENDITURES - FISCAL YEAR 1969

EMPLOYMENT - APRIL 1969

<u>City</u>	<u>Expenditures (note 2)</u>		<u>Employment (note 1)</u>	
	<u>Total</u> <u>(millions)</u>	<u>Per capita</u> <u>(note 3)</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Per 1,000</u> <u>population</u> <u>(note 3)</u>
District of Columbia	\$17.5	\$21.49	1,520	1.9
Atlanta	6.6	12.85	840	1.6
Baltimore	22.3	24.64	2,210	2.4
Boston	19.4	34.02	2,040	3.6
Cleveland	14.4	18.74	1,350	1.7
Milwaukee	11.4	15.19	1,180	1.6
St. Louis	10.7	16.14	1,220	1.8
San Francisco	21.5	30.46	1,730	2.5

¹ Represents generally full-time employment as of April 1969, including part-time employment expressed in terms of full-time equivalents.

² Represents generally amounts expended or obligated in fiscal year 1969, excluding capital outlays, and debt service and retirement costs.

³ Based on city population estimates for January 1, 1969, by Rand McNally & Company.



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-118638
3-30-70

B-118638

A. S. Gort

MAR 30 1970

RESTRICTED
Account: _____
by the Office of Management and Enterprise Services, a record of which is kept
by the Distribution Section, Publications Branch, OAS

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Further reference is made to your letter of July 14, 1969, requesting that the General Accounting Office make comparisons of costs and expenditures for certain activities carried out by the District of Columbia Government with the costs and expenditures for these same activities in other cities.

*Sanitary engineering
licenses and inspections
library*

We are enclosing reports on the sanitary engineering, licenses and inspections, and library activities. These reports comply with your request by your letter dated July 14, 1969.

We plan to make no further distribution of the reports unless copies are specifically requested, and then only after your agreement has been obtained or public announcement has been made by you concerning the contents of the reports.

Sincerely yours,

R.F. KELLER

Assistant Comptroller General
of the United States

Enclosures - 3

The Honorable William French, Chairman
Subcommittee on the District of Columbia
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

REPORT ON COMPARISON OF EXPENDITURES

FOR THE SANITARY ENGINEERING ACTIVITY

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT AND SEVEN SELECTED CITIES

The responsibilities of the District of Columbia Government's Department of Sanitary Engineering are to plan, provide, operate, and maintain sanitary services for the District. These services include the (1) distribution of water; (2) control and disposal of storm water; (3) collection, treatment, and disposal of sewage; (4) cleaning of streets and alleys; and (5) collection, processing, and disposal of solid waste.

The responsibility for providing water in the District is shared with the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army. The Corps of Engineers operates and maintains the collection and purification facilities for the supply and transmission of potable water.

Each of the seven cities included in our comparison provide sanitary engineering services generally similar to those provided by the District. We adjusted the expenditure data relating to the sanitary engineering activity in the District and the cities, principally to (1) reflect sanitary engineering services provided to areas outside the cities' limits and (2) reflect activities performed by organizations which supplemented the operations of the cities' sanitary engineering activity.

However, no adjustment was made to the expenditure data relating to the sanitary engineering activity in San Francisco for refuse collection and disposal services. These services in San Francisco are performed by a licensed private organization. An official of the San Francisco city government informed us that the private organization is incurring costs of about \$14 million annually for performing refuse collection and disposal services.

Our adjustments were based on our review of the sanitary engineering activity in the District and each of the cities as described in written material and/or by local officials.

For example, the expenditure data for the District and five of the cities were reduced to reflect sanitary engineering services provided to areas outside the cities' limits. The adjustments were made principally on the basis of either the actual or estimated amounts of revenues

received by the cities for providing such services, generally on the basis of information in the accounting records of the cities. Such adjustments involved amounts ranging from \$2 million to \$14 million.

On the other hand, the expenditure data for the District and two cities were increased to reflect sanitary engineering services performed by organizations which supplemented the operations of the cities' sanitary engineering activity. The expenditure data for the District were increased to reflect the District's costs to fund the Corps of Engineers. The expenditure data for one of the two cities were increased to reflect sewage collection and disposal and water supply activities performed by a special metropolitan district commission--the adjustment being based on the assessments made to the city for such activities by the special commission. The expenditure data for the other city were increased to reflect sewage activities performed by a metropolitan sewer district--the adjustment reflecting the total expenditures for this district since an official of the district requested that we not make an allocation of the district's costs. The district operates and maintains all sanitary and storm sewers within its jurisdiction, which includes the city as well as most of the urban territory of a nearby county.

We were precluded from making a comparison of the employment of the District and the seven cities for the sanitary engineering activity. The uncertainties and imprecision which would have been involved in allocating an appropriate share of employment associated with providing sanitary engineering services to areas outside the cities' limits would have made the resulting figures of doubtful value. Similar obstacles would have been involved in allocating an appropriate share of employment associated with organizations which supplement the operations of the cities' sanitary engineering activity.

The expenditures identified with the sanitary engineering activity in the District and the seven cities are shown in the following table. Because (1) the data furnished by local officials or obtained from records were not audited by us and (2) certain adjustments to the data either could not be made or were made on the basis of judgment, we believe the data shown in the table should be viewed as indicating an approximate level of expenditures for the sanitary engineering activity.

SANITARY ENGINEERING ACTIVITY
EXPENDITURES - FISCAL YEAR 1969

<u>City</u>	<u>Expenditures (note 1)</u>	
	<u>Total (millions)</u>	<u>Per capita (note 2)</u>
District of Columbia	\$31.4	38.56
Atlanta	14.8	28.79
Baltimore	22.3	24.69
Boston	21.2	37.11
Cleveland	28.5	37.01
Milwaukee	27.0	36.06
St. Louis	19.5	29.37
San Francisco	12.9	18.30

¹ Represents generally amounts expended or obligated in fiscal year 1969, excluding capital outlays, and debt service costs.

² Based on city population estimates for January 1, 1969, by Rand McNally and Company.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
REPORT ON
COMPARISON OF EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOYMENT
FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF BUILDING, HOUSING, AND ZONING REGULATIONS;
LICENSES AND INSPECTIONS ACTIVITY
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT AND SIX SELECTED CITIES

The District of Columbia Government's Bureau of Licenses and Inspections, Department of Economic Development, is responsible for ensuring public safety and welfare and the orderly growth of the city by controlling the construction, use, and occupancy of buildings and by the maintenance of housing standards. These responsibilities are carried out through the approval of building plans and the issuance of building permits; the inspection of residential and commercial buildings for compliance with the laws, codes, and regulations covering their construction and repair; and the enforcement of zoning regulations.

The Bureau of Licenses and Inspections is also responsible for certain minor activities relating to the issuance of licenses for the operation of businesses, the enforcement of standard weights and measures regulations, and the supervision of markets. The amounts of expenditures and numbers of employees relating to these activities were not considered by us as being a part of their building, housing, and zoning regulation enforcement activities and are not reflected in the data shown in the table on page 2 for the District of Columbia.

Each of the cities included in our comparison perform the activity of enforcing building, housing, and zoning regulations. The enforcement of such regulations in the cities is the responsibility of one or more city departments which generally have other responsibilities unrelated to the enforcement of building, housing, and zoning regulations.

For example, in one city building and housing inspections and building permit issuances are the responsibility of separate bureaus within one department. The administration of zoning regulations in this city is the responsibility of a different department which has other functions unrelated to zoning activities.

Our determinations of the expenditure and employment data for the District and the cities for the enforcement of building, housing, and zoning regulations were based on written descriptions of these activities and/or discussions with local officials.

The expenditures and employment identified for the District and the cities are shown in the following table. Because the data furnished by local officials or obtained from records were not audited by us and because the data were determined on the basis of judgment, we believe the data shown in the table should be viewed as indicating an approximate level of expenditures and employment for the enforcement of building, housing, and zoning regulations.

ENFORCEMENT OF BUILDING, HOUSING,

AND ZONING REGULATIONS

EXPENDITURES - FISCAL YEAR 1969

EMPLOYMENT - APRIL 1969

<u>City (note 1)</u>	<u>Expenditures (note 2)</u>		<u>Employment (note 3)</u>	
	<u>Total (millions)</u>	<u>Per capita (note 4)</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Per 10,000 population (note 4)</u>
District of Columbia	\$4.0	\$4.86	390	4.8
Atlanta	1.1	2.05	120	2.3
Baltimore	4.1	4.57	410	4.5
Boston	2.5	4.46	240	4.1
Milwaukee	2.2	2.87	240	3.1
St. Louis	1.7	2.51	180	2.7
San Francisco	2.0	2.80	180	2.6

¹Data for Cleveland not obtained.

²Represents generally amounts expended or obligated in fiscal year 1969, excluding capital outlays, and debt service costs.

³Represents generally full-time employment as of April 1969, including part-time employment expressed in terms of full-time equivalents.

⁴Based on city population estimates for January 1, 1969, by Rand McNally and Company.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
REPORT ON
COMPARISON OF EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOYMENT
FOR THE LIBRARY ACTIVITY
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT
AND SEVEN SELECTED CITIES

The District of Columbia Government's Public Library offers services to individuals who live, work, or attend school in the District, and to residents of adjacent counties who pay an annual fee. Library services are provided at the Central Library, at 19 branch libraries, and through an extension department which operates bookmobiles and makes material available directly to schools and other institutions.

The District's library activity maintains a collection of books, documents, periodicals, maps, records, educational films, microtexts, and pamphlets for reference and lending. Advisory, research, reference, and bibliographical assistance is also provided.

Each of the seven cities included in our comparison has a library activity which provides services generally similar to those of the District. Our determinations of the expenditure and employment data were based on our review of the library activity as described in written material and/or by city officials.

We noted that library services provided in the seven cities, as well as in the District of Columbia as described above, are not necessarily restricted to residents or areas within the cities. In Milwaukee, for example, public library services are provided to noncity residents, by such means as a bookmobile, which operates in Milwaukee County outside of the City of Milwaukee. The Public Library in Baltimore supplies materials and reference services to State of Maryland residents through the many county public libraries, in return for payment of funds from the State government.

The expenditures and employment identified with the library activity in the District and the seven cities are shown in the following table. Because the data furnished by city officials or obtained from cities' records were not audited by us and because certain adjustments to the data were made on the basis of judgment, we believe the data shown in the table should be viewed as indicating an approximate level of expenditures and employment for the library activity.

PUBLIC LIBRARY ACTIVITY

EXPENDITURES - FISCAL YEAR 1969

EMPLOYMENT - APRIL 1969

<u>City</u>	<u>Expenditures (note 1)</u>		<u>Employment (note 2)</u>	
	<u>Total</u> <u>(millions)</u>	<u>Per capita</u> <u>(note 3)</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Per 1,000</u> <u>population</u> <u>(note 3)</u>
District of Columbia	\$5.4	\$6.65	570	.7
Atlanta	1.4	2.66	170	.3
Baltimore	5.9	6.48	730	.8
Boston	5.3	9.34	630	1.1
Cleveland	6.6	8.57	870	1.1
Milwaukee	3.3	4.35	460	.6
St. Louis	2.8	4.19	440	.7
San Francisco	3.5	4.99	380	.5

¹ Represents generally amounts expended or obligated in fiscal year 1969, excluding capital outlays, and debt service costs.

² Represents generally full-time employment as of April 1969, including part-time employment expressed in terms of full-time equivalents.

³ Based on city population estimates for January 1, 1969, by Rand McNally and Company.