

Y4
. P 84/10
F 51/
PT. 3

1022

89 Y4
P 84/10
F 51/
PT. 3

REDUCE STANDBY STATUS OF FIREFIGHTING PERSONNEL IN U.S. GOVERNMENT

GOVERNMENT

Storage

(Part III)

506662 739905 ✓
A11600 00911T



HEARING

BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 10294 and Similar Bills

A BILL TO REDUCE THE TIME IN STANDBY STATUS OF FIRE-
FIGHTING PERSONNEL OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, AND
FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MAY 27, 1966

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1966

CONTENTS

Statements of—		
Cahill, Hon. William T., a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey-----		Page 22
Gisvold, Paul A., Deputy Chief of Industrial Relations, Department of the Navy; accompanied by Larry Duhrkoop, Fire Protection Coordinator, U.S. Navy; John M. Wolverson, Chief, Fire Prevention and Protection Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army; Leo A. Simms, Air Systems Command, Department of the Navy; and G. T. Cook, Fire Protection Group, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force-----		3, 18
Walters, Thomas G., special assistant for legislation, American Federation of Government Employees; accompanied by Al Davis, legislative representative, International Association of Firefighters-----		12
Additional material submitted—		
Amendments to H.R. 10294-----		2
Letter from Capt. Paul A. Gisvold, Deputy Chief of Industrial Relations, U.S. Navy, to Hon. Lindley Beckworth, dated June 8, 1966-----		11

REDUCE STANDBY STATUS OF FIREFIGHTING PERSONNEL IN U.S. GOVERNMENT

FRIDAY, MAY 27, 1966

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m. in room 346, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Lindley Beckworth (chairman) presiding.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The committee will come to order.
(H.R. 10294 follows:)

[H.R. 10294, 89th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To reduce the time in standby status of firefighting personnel of the Federal Government, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 401 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 926), is amended—

- (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 401.";
- (2) by striking out "(1) any officer or employee in a position" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) any officer or employee (other than an officer or employee to whom subsection (b) of this section applies) in a position"; and
- (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:
“(b)(1) The head of any department, independent establishment, or agency, including a Government-owned or controlled corporation, shall provide that any firefighter in a position requiring him regularly to remain at, or within the confines of, his station during longer than the ordinary period of duty established for full-time officers and employees generally under section 604(a) of this Act, a substantial part of which consists of remaining in a standby status rather than performing work, shall—

“(A) be placed on such duty for a period of eight hours in excess of forty hours a week, and

“(B) be entitled to receive premium compensation for such duty on an annual basis, in lieu of premium compensation provided under any other provisions of this Act, in an amount equal to 20 per centum of such part of the rate of basic compensation of his position as does not exceed the minimum scheduled rate of basic compensation provided for grade GS-10 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

“(2) For all time worked in excess of forty-eight hours a week, such firefighter shall be entitled to receive compensation in accordance with applicable provisions of law relating to overtime, night, and holiday pay.

“(3) As used in this subsection, the term ‘firefighter’ means an officer or employee whose principal duty is to supervise or perform work in the prevention, control, and extinguishment of fires, in the driving or operation of fire protection vehicles and equipment, in the operation of fire alarm equipment, or in the dispatching of firefighting staff and equipment.”

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in any amendment made by this Act shall be construed to decrease the existing aggregate rate of compensation of any employee on the rolls on the effective date of such amendment, but, when the position of such employee becomes vacant, any subsequent appointee thereto shall receive compensation provided for such position in accordance with such amendment.

SEC. 3. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the expiration of one hundred eighty days following the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The Subcommittee on Civil Service is meeting this morning to conduct the third—and, it is hoped, the last in this Congress—public hearing on H.R. 10294 and similar bills to reduce standby time for Federal civilian firefighters.

The first hearing was held on August 18, 1965, and the second was held a month ago, on April 28, 1966. The specific subject matter before the subcommittee this morning is a draft of proposed amendments to H.R. 10294. The amendment to the text strikes out all after the enacting clause and substitutes in lieu thereof new language to establish more favorable tours of duty for firefighters. The amendment to the title merely conforms the title and the new policy stated in the text. Copies of the proposed amendments have been furnished representatives of the Department of Defense, and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the record at this point.

(The amendments are as follows:)

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 10294

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: That (a) there shall be for each firefighter a basic workweek of not to exceed sixty hours within a workweek cycle established by the head of the Department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation concerned. The hours of duty of each workshift under such workweek shall be consecutive. Such workweek shall be effective beginning on the first day of the first pay period commencing on or after the first day of the second month following the date of enactment of this Act and shall continue in effect until the close of the first workweek cycle which begins in the first year following the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) Effective beginning immediately after the close of the first workweek cycle which begins in the first year following the date of enactment of this Act, there shall be for each firefighter a basic workweek of not to exceed fifty-six hours within a workweek cycle established by the head of the department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation concerned. The hours of duty of each workshift under such workweek shall be consecutive.

(c) For the regular hours of work of each workweek established by subsection (a) or (b) of this section, each firefighter shall be paid compensation at an aggregate rate consisting of his rate of basic compensation and an amount equal to twenty per centum of his rate of basic compensation. Such aggregate rate of compensation shall be held and considered to be the basic compensation or basic salary of such firefighter for the purposes of retirement, insurance, overtime, night, and holiday pay, employees' compensation, and all other rights, benefits, and privileges of employees of the Federal Government.

(d) For all time worked by a firefighter in excess of the regular hours of work under any workweek established by subsection (a) or (b) of this section, such firefighter shall be paid compensation in accordance with applicable provisions of law relating to overtime, night, and holiday pay.

(e) Section 401 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 926), is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 401."; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to firefighters."

(f) (1) The foregoing provisions of this section, including the amendments made by subsection (e), shall not govern, change, or otherwise affect any basic workweek of forty hours (including the compensation therefor) of any firefighter which is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; but any change in such basic workweek made by appropriate administrative authority on or after such date shall be made in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section and such amendments; and such provisions and amendments shall apply with respect to such new workweek.

(2) The aggregate rate of compensation paid to any firefighter under a basic workweek of forty hours referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be

held and considered to be the basic compensation or basic salary of such firefighter for the purposes of retirement, insurance, employees' compensation, and all other rights, benefits, and privileges of employees of the Federal Government.

(g) As used in this section and the applicable amendment made by this section, the term "firefighter" means a civilian officer or employee of any department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, including a Government-owned or controlled corporation, whose principal duty is to supervise or perform work in the prevention, control, and extinguishment of fires, in the driving or operation of fire protection vehicles and equipment, in the operation of fire alarm equipment, or in the dispatching of firefighting staff and equipment.

(h) The provisions under the heading "Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064 Public Law 85-844), shall not apply with respect to retirement benefits resulting from the enactment of this section.

(i) The foregoing provisions of this section shall become effective (except as otherwise provided therein) on the first day of the second month following the date of enactment of this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to correct certain employment inequities for firefighters of the Federal Government, and for other purposes."

Mr. BECKWORTH. Our chief witness this morning is Capt. Paul A. Gisvold, Deputy Chief of Industrial Relations, Department of the Navy. Captain Gisvold, would you kindly identify your associates for the record and then proceed as you see fit?

STATEMENT OF CAPT. PAUL A. GISVOLD, DEPUTY CHIEF OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY; ACCOMPANIED BY LARRY DUHRKOOP, FIRE PROTECTION COORDINATOR, U.S. NAVY

Captain GISVOLD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am accompanied today by Mr. Larry Duhrkoop, Fire Protection Coordinator, U.S. Navy, Office of Naval Material. Mr. Edward Sompayrac, who was scheduled to be here this morning, is ill.

We also have representatives from the branches of the service, Mr. John Wolverton, representing the Army, and Mr. Simms, representing the Navy, and Mr. Cooke representing the Air Force.

In the event there are technical or detailed questions I am unable to answer we can ask them for answers.

I have a prepared statement reflecting the position of the Department of Defense on H.R. 10294 with the proposed amendment which I should like to present at this point.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the Navy appreciates this opportunity to appear before members of the subcommittee, as the representative of the Department of Defense, with respect to H.R. 10294 and the proposed amendment thereto.

I appeared before you on the basic provisions of H.R. 10294, on August 18, 1965, representing the Department of Defense. After that hearing the subcommittee asked the Civil Service Commission to conduct a study on the hours of work and premium pay of Federal firefighters which Mr. Macy, Chairman of the Commission, transmitted to the committee in connection with the April 28 hearing.

I am appearing today in response to your request for Defense Department views on the proposed amendment to H.R. 10294 prepared by the International Association of Firefighters, a draft of which was furnished by the subcommittee staff.

At the outset, I believe it would be desirable to briefly describe the background and circumstances of the firefighting function within the Defense Establishment. Where military installations are adjacent to cities or municipalities which have fire departments, we generally rely upon them at least in part for fire protection. We maintain our own fire departments primarily for two situations: Military crash firefighting crews to respond to the demands at air bases in support of tactical operations, and civilian firefighting crews at installations which are isolated or otherwise not adequately protected by adjacent municipalities. Firefighting departments exist at more than 300 installations worldwide. They are manned by some 10,000 U.S. civil service Classification Act employee firefighters who serve on shifts of 24 hours on, and 24 hours off, with three shifts or 72 hours on station each workweek. They spend about one-third of this time (24 or 25 hours per week) in scheduled duty assignments, and average about 3 percent of their time (2 hours per week) responding to and returning from actual fire calls. Most of these fire departments are comparatively small, with a low incidence of fire and severity of fires when compared to municipality figures.

With this background, I should like to address the substantive features of the proposed amendment of the bill.

REDUCTION IN WORKWEEKS

The bill would require a reduction in basic workweeks from 72 hours to 60 hours, and 1 year later to 56 hours. While we could, with proper funds and resources, adjust to a 60-hour workweek with some scheduling difficulties, there is no apparent purpose in logic or equity for doing so. There is no apparent inordinate demand on individuals whose workweek entails less than 30 hours of actual work assignments and who are left with 4 days free off duty out of 7 days.

In terms of size, and of incidence and severity of fires, our fire departments compare most nearly with municipal fire departments serving communities from 10,000 to 25,000. As shown in the study previously furnished by the Civil Service Commission, the most common weekly tour of duty in such communities is 72 hours, the next most prevalent is in excess of 72 hours, and the median is 67 hours. The fact that larger cities are trending toward a workweek of 60 hours or less must be considered in light of the fact that the incidence and severity of their fires are substantially greater than ours. We have a good fire prevention program.

PREMIUM COMPENSATION

The proposed bill would require firefighters to be paid 20 percent more than the basic rates for their grade levels, even though their workweeks had been reduced from 72 to 60 hours or less. The practical effect of this would be an increase in compensation far in excess of the President's noninflationary guidelines. Combined with the proposed reduction in workweeks, we could not maintain current levels of fire protection without substantial increases in staffing, and in fiscal obligations exceeding \$30 million per year. These increases have not been budgeted for, and I would expect that searching reviews would be made with a view toward elimination or severe reductions in fire departments before committing ourselves to such a substantial

increase. Not only are Federal salary rates for firefighters already significantly above those paid by municipalities of comparable character, but this bill would otherwise establish privileged class legislation for firefighters as compared to other Federal employees required to perform standby duty (nurses, doctors, personnel engaged in communications, protective, and research work, etc.), who would continue to be compensated for such duty at rates substantially less than this bill would provide for firefighters. Under current Federal-wide rules, 60-hour standby tours call for only 10 percent in additional premium compensation when they perform 25 or more hours of actual work and 5 percent additional premium compensation for 24 hours, or less, of actual work.

CONVERTING PREMIUM COMPENSATION TO BASIC COMPENSATION

The proposed bill would require that the 20-percent premium compensation previously discussed be regarded as basic compensation and that firefighters be excluded from the portion of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, which provides for additional annual compensation in lieu of normal overtime, holiday and related pay benefits. Such an arrangement would further aggravate the proposed privileged status of firefighters, as compared to all other Federal employees who earn retirement, insurance, overtime, holiday pay, and other fringe benefits only on the basis of earnings during a 40-hour workweek. In addition to the views previously furnished by Chairman Macy of the Civil Service Commission on this subject, this provision raises serious questions of interpretation and administration. For example, we do not know what legal construction might be given to the phrase "shall be paid compensation at an aggregate rate consisting of his rate of basic compensation and an amount equal to 20 percent of his rate of basic compensation" if the total aggregate is also basic compensation. We would anticipate serious questions or problems as related to benefits provided by current laws, as well as such new legislative proposals as H.R. 14122 providing for 25-percent premium compensation for work performed on Sundays.

Because equity is not considered to require or permit our firefighters to be paid at rates and in a manner substantially exceeding those available to other Federal employees and firefighters in comparable municipal fire departments, and because of the substantially increased costs involved, the Department of Defense is opposed to the enactment of the proposed amended form of H.R. 10294.

Thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of Defense. I hope I have answered the questions which were brought up by the hearing on April 28, and I will be glad to attempt to answer any questions you may have today.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Matsunaga, any questions?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Captain, what is the present level of compensation for firefighters?

Captain GISVOLD. Approximately 8,000 of the Federal firefighters are at the GS-4, GS-5, GS-6 levels. A firefighter generally enters the service at a GS-4 level at step one and the current representative rate of compensation of a GS-4 level is \$5,109. With 20 percent of

this basic compensation added for premium pay, plus a uniform allowance of \$125, a median salary for Federal firefighters is \$6,256.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. How does this compare to firefighters employed by municipalities?

Captain GISVOLD. Federal firefighters' minimum salary compares favorably with the median salary of municipal firemen serving in areas with populations of over 500,000. They are at \$5,830.

If we compare it to the 10,000 to 25,000 group which we indicated initially, they start at \$4,500, with a maximum median rate of \$5,040. You see we are over the salary of municipalities in the 10,000 to 25,000 category and we compare favorably with even the larger groups.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. What about the hours of work as compared to municipalities?

Captain GISVOLD. In the 10,000 to 25,000 population category the median is 67 hours. Most prevalent is 72 hours and a good number are over 72 hours. It is about comparable.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. So our Federal firefighters compare favorably both in salary and hours worked?

Captain GISVOLD. That is right.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. What about the shifts? Are they the same, 24 hours on and 24 hours off?

Captain GISVOLD. Normally that is right; just about comparable.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. This would permit moonlighting on the part of many of the firefighters, would it not?

Captain GISVOLD. It does; yes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Have you any statistics as to how many do practice moonlighting?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. I have no experience on that. I recently left Honolulu where I was fire protection coordinator for the Armed Forces, Pacific, and based on my observations there in the Hawaiian Islands, the Philippines, and in Japan, I would say that better than 50 percent are on other jobs in their off time. They have lengthy periods they are not on duty. Every 2 weeks they have 3 days off, and through the 2 weeks they have every other day off.

You will find two men will take one job, work for a contractor, one man working today and the other then switches the next day.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Have you any idea as to the average income of those who do moonlight; the average they earn per week or month?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. This depends a lot on the area they are in. I would say very nearly doubling their income in some cases.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Have you made any study as to the effects of moonlighting on the efficiency of these men as firefighters?

Captain GISVOLD. I know of none.

Mr. DUHRKOOP. We have not made a study but we have a very firm requirement that as long as the other job does not interfere with their primary duty as a firefighter we have not taken exception to it. They cannot let it interfere with their firefighting job. However, it has not bothered their efficiency that I know of. I cannot think of an instance where we have run into any problem.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. When you speak of availability 24 hours on and 24 hours off, while your men are off for 24 hours are they subject to call or not?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. Not firmly so; no. If we have a major fire we try to call them but there is no definite hard-and-fast rule on it at all.

Generally you find a firefighter is a rather peculiar breed of cat.

He will come back, anyway. I have seen this happen often without his being called.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Voluntarily?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. That is the kind of spirit we want.

Mr. DUHRKOOP. That is right.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am glad to hear that.

And you feel that if we should decrease the number of hours and at the same time allow for premium pay that the firefighter would be enjoying a tremendous boost over and above the comparable workers in the Federal service. Is that it?

Captain GISVOLD. Yes, sir. He gets the same pay increases as all Classification Act employees right now.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. What about sick leave? Has the record of the firefighter been about average, over the average, or below the average in the use of sick leave?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. Our experience to date is that their sick leave rate is far better than that of the average Federal employee.

For example, let us take the Philippines—they were running at about 6 percent sick leave. We were able to get the firefighters to the point where they are now running about two and a half percent. This is right at what we are doing in most of the fire departments throughout the military today.

We have some cases where there is job dissatisfaction, where the primary thought is for high sick leave rate, which has brought it up to 4 percent, but we have pulled that back by adjusting working conditions.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. What is the average for Federal service?

Mr. DICK. The Commission study of leave used for 1961 cites an average of 8.3 days per year. The rate for ungraded employees is slightly higher than that for Classification Act employees.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. What is the average of the firefighters? How about converting the percentage figure?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. The study of the figures I made in about January of this year is that the Classification Act employees were about 3.75 or 4 percent. It varies with the time of the year. The firefighters were holding steady at two and a half to 2.75 percent.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Captain, you discussed this matter several times with representatives of the firefighters, no doubt. What do you regard as the real fallacy in the argument that they present to you in your personal discussions? Certainly there is no doubt that they are trying to present the facts as they see them, and I know you would be that type of man, too. I find it a little difficult to see how two parties can be so far apart.

Captain GISVOLD. I am not sure what the real basis for the request for reduction from 72 to 60 hours is. From all indications to me it merely entails an increase in pay.

From what I have been able to gather in checking with the people that I know within the firefighter family and in checking with these people I have with me there does not seem to be any discontent among the firefighters. We are not losing anybody because of lack of pay. We have no problems in recruitment of firefighters.

It seems to me they are at a pay level which is comparable to that of outside organizations, so I really don't know why we should be

changing it and I do not know what the background for the organization request for increased pay is.

I think their indication is a desire to meet a trend. I think you will have to admit the trend is for a shorter workweek. I think this is reflected mostly in the municipalities because of the increased incidence of fires and severity of fires. Firefighters are working more than they were several years ago. Why this is I am not sure but this is an actual fact.

I do not think this increased incidence or severity has been reflected in our firefighting picture. As a matter of fact, I think our severity incidence has been going down over a period of years.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Do you know what the average age of the present firefighter is?

Captain GISVOLD. No.

Mr. DUHRKOOP. I do not have a figure but——

Captain GISVOLD. Fairly high, I think.

Mr. DUHRKOOP. Around 38 years.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Do you know the average number of years a Federal firefighter has been in the service?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. No; but predominantly over the 15-year level.

Mr. BECKWORTH. And you do make the statement that you have no difficulty so far as concerns resignations and that kind of thing?

Captain GISVOLD. That is right.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. If we were to reduce the number of hours to 60 would this mean the need for hiring additional personnel?

Captain GISVOLD. Yes, sir. This reflects something on the order of 3,360 additional civilian personnel.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. You stated earlier that the average workweek with municipal firefighters averaged about 67 hours?

Captain GISVOLD. For the 10,000 to 25,000, 67; yes, sir.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. But the average workweek for the Federal firefighters today is 72 hours.

Captain GISVOLD. That is right.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Suppose we were to reduce it to 67, making it comparable to——

Captain GISVOLD. Using that average of 67 you get into problems of scheduling. Normally it should be on 24- or 12-hour schedules. You cannot break 67 up into that.

The predominant hours of work in the 10,000 to 25,000 population cities is 72 hours. There are some that go to 60 and some that go to 80 and 84. I believe 84 is the next step, so when you average these out that is where you get the 67.

I do not think it would be practical at all to go to an in-between step between 60 and 72. Sixty-seven would be an unmanageable number, really. We try to schedule them 24 hours or 12 hours.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Would it be preferable to reduce the number of hours to 60 in the workweek and hire additional personnel or to leave the hours as they are and increase the pay of the present firefighters? Which would be preferable in your view?

Captain GISVOLD. Do I have to make a choice?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Cutting down the number of hours would really mean an increase in pay per hour.

Captain GISVOLD. I see no justification for an increase in pay either way. Either way, if you ask which will cost less, I don't know. I

would have to figure this one out. I haven't given much thought to this.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Were the firefighters included in the recent pay raise for all Federal workers?

Captain GISVOLD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. And they would be again if the present bill pending in the Senate is approved?

Captain GISVOLD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. So they enjoy the automatic pay increases given all Federal employees?

Captain GISVOLD. Yes, sir; and they also will benefit when the 25 percent Sunday differential comes up. How this works I don't know, but if a man works 24 hours on Sunday where he will get 25 percent for 24 hours worked has not yet been decided. This may come up in the discussions.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. So that presently they are not given overtime pay for any work in excess of 8 hours per day or anything over 48 hours?

Captain GISVOLD. They are given 20 percent additional in lieu of overtime.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Twenty-percent premium pay?

Captain GISVOLD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. How is this figured out? Is it a weekly average? Do you figure it per day, also, or is it just an overall monthly salary?

Captain GISVOLD. Overall monthly salary.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Duhrkoop, you say you recently returned from Honolulu?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. Yes; my office is at Pearl Harbor. I was fire marshal for the Navy and the fire protection coordinator of the Armed Forces, Pacific. I have been out there 20 years.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. We have been receiving complaints from firefighters out in Honolulu, at Pearl Harbor as well as Hickam, but particularly at Hickam. You have nothing to do with Hickam?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. Not now, no; but I have a fairly good background to discuss it with you.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The complaint has been that the number of firefighters that you do have out there is wholly insufficient to handle any real emergency which might arise, that you are depending too much upon the municipal firefighting units.

Is there any truth in this?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. No, sir; I do not feel there is. The military answer about 300 to 400 calls a year in municipal areas as opposed to about 10 or 12 that the city and county answer into the military installations. I think the Navy alone provides some 300 or 400 responses to the areas out around Wahiwa, Nanakuli, Wai'anai, and those areas where the city is not set up well and in good shape. I do not feel that Hickam is one bit short on personnel.

The thing is that with that new international airport complex Hickam has extended itself and put two fire companies down in that area and actually provides protection for civilian enterprise.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. You have at all times an emergency unit for the airplanes, do you not?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. If you do this do you still have units available for fire calls off the base?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. Yes, sir. In the normal scheme of things you have your fire companies placed in accordance with the National Board of Fire Underwriters rules. The crash fire organization takes on the aircraft if they are in trouble. The so-called structural fire crews, which remain in place, will back up the crash fire groups. I think they are adequate.

Just stop and think for a moment that in the Pearl Harbor area we have five fire companies operated by the Navy and three by Hickam. That is the structural fire-type. I am not sure of the number of structural firetrucks but it is adequate for the problem they have.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Have you increased or decreased the number of personnel in the last 15 years?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. It has been decreased.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Yet I am informed that the area to be covered has increased.

Mr. DUHRKOOP. No. The only really new development there, which is primarily a responsibility of the city and county, and I went over this quite extensively with the late William Blaisdell before he passed away, he agreed it was their responsibility. That is the new industrial park in that area. That has provided quite a drain but this is basically a city responsibility. They are trying to get the resources to put about two fire companies in there.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. What about housing for Federal personnel?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. That has increased in the Iroquois Point area, at Barbers Point. The city's area increased, too, so they increased their firefighting complement. We increased ours at the Westlock Ammunition Depot and we feel that area is adequately covered.

Actually the increase in housing, and there has been a substantial increase on the Winward side and on the Kaneohe side, does not increase the real burden on the fire department except by inspection. It does increase the fire incidence experience and rate. As far as putting an additional drain, no, unless you get a housing area too far away where you must establish another fire company.

You see, we operate out there, and it is the only place in the world where we do this, three armed forces operating in a single fire department.

Then the three services acting as a single party entered into a mutual aid agreement with the city and county of Honolulu and we operate the three services, and it is a joint effort. They answer into some of our military installations and our companies answer into the civilian communities. This is done as a matter of course. It is really a wonderful organization.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Then in your considered opinion, there is adequate coverage as it is now without the need for increasing personnel or units?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. Yes, sir; with one exception: Where it is a city responsibility such as Damon Tract. They need to increase. However, the Federal Government does not need to increase.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Thank you very much.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Thank you very much.

At this point in the record, without objection, we shall include certain tables with reference to Federal firefighters and civil service employment and cost facts with reference to this legislation.

(The material follows:)

JUNE 8, 1966.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
 Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil Service, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your request for cost documentation from the Department of Defense on H.R. 10294, 89th Congress, a bill "To reduce the time in standby status of firefighting personnel of the Federal Government, and for other purposes."

On May 27, 1966, I testified for the Department of Defense before your subcommittee in an open hearing in opposition to a proposed amendment to H.R. 10294, prepared by the International Association of Firefighters. During the course, of the testimony, I indicated that I would supply cost data to your subcommittee that would indicate the estimated additional cost of reducing the workweek of Federal firefighters in the Department of Defense.

Enclosure (1) is the data submitted to your subcommittee for the record.

The total annual cost estimate of \$31 million consists of (1) \$14 million for additional civilian personnel required if the workweek for civilian firefighters were reduced from 72 hours to 60 hours and (2) \$17 million for additional Air Force and civilian personnel to allow a similar reduction in the workweek for Air Force military firefighter personnel.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

P. A. GISVOLD,
 Captain, U.S. Navy,
 Acting Chief of Industrial Relations.

ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL COSTS OF A 60-HOUR WORKWEEK FOR CIVILIAN FIREFIGHTERS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

If the proposed 60-hour workweek is effected for civilian firefighters, the estimated annual increased costs would be as follows:

Number of additional civilian firefighters.....	2, 106
Basic salaries (at GS-4, step 4, \$5,109).....	\$10, 759, 554
8 percent for supplemental benefits, i.e., retirement, FEGLI, health insurance, etc.....	860, 764
Uniforms (at \$125 for each employee).....	263, 250
20 percent of basic compensation for premium pay.....	2, 151, 911
Subtotal.....	14, 035, 479
Additional Air Force costs for civilian firefighters due to reduction of workweek for Air Force military firefighters to 60 hours.....	16, 981, 776
Total estimated additional cost.....	31, 017, 255

ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL COSTS OF A 60-HOUR WORKWEEK FOR CIVILIAN FIREFIGHTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

If the proposed 60-hour workweek is effected for civilian firefighters, the estimated annual increased costs would be as follows:

Number of additional civilian firefighters.....	540
Basic salaries (at GS-4, step 4, \$5,109).....	\$2, 758, 860
8 percent for supplemental benefits, i.e., retirement, FEGLI, health insurance, etc.....	220, 709
Uniforms (at \$125 for each employee).....	67, 500
20 percent of basic compensation for premium pay.....	551, 772
Total additional cost.....	3, 598, 841

12 **REDUCE STANDBY STATUS OF FIREFIGHTING PERSONNEL**

ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL COSTS OF A 60-HOUR WORKWEEK FOR CIVILIAN FIREFIGHTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

If the proposed 60-hour workweek is effected for civilian firefighters, the estimated annual increased costs would be as follows:

Number of additional civilian firefighters.....	756
Basic salaries (at GS-4, step 4, \$5,109).....	\$3, 862, 404
8-percent for supplemental benefits, i.e., retirement, FEGLI, health insurance, etc.....	308, 992
Uniforms (at \$125 for each employee).....	94, 500
20 percent of basic compensation for premium pay.....	772, 481
Total additional cost.....	5, 038, 377

ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL COSTS OF A 60-HOUR WORKWEEK FOR CIVILIAN FIREFIGHTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

If the proposed 60-hour workweek is effected for civilian firefighters, the estimated annual increased costs would be as follows:

Number of additional civilian firefighters.....	810
Basic salaries (at GS-4, step 4, \$5,109).....	\$4, 138, 290
8 percent for supplemental benefits, i.e., retirement, FEGLI, health insurance, etc.....	331, 063
Uniforms (at \$125 for each employee).....	101, 250
20 percent of basic compensation for premium pay.....	827, 658
Total additional cost.....	5, 398, 261

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL COSTS OF A 60-HOUR WORKWEEK FOR AIR FORCE CIVILIAN FIREFIGHTERS DUE TO REDUCTION IN WORKWEEK FOR AIR FORCE MILITARY FIREFIGHTERS TO 60 HOURS

If the proposed 60-hour workweek is effected for civilian firefighters, the estimated annual increased costs would be as follows:

Number of additional Air Force firefighters.....	2, 550
Basic salaries (GS-4, step 4, \$5,109).....	\$13, 027, 950
8 percent for supplemental benefits, i.e., retirement, FEGLI, health insurance, etc.....	1, 042, 236
Uniforms (at \$125 for each employee).....	306, 000
20 percent of basic compensation for premium pay.....	2, 605, 590
Total additional cost.....	16, 981, 776

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Walters, do you care to be heard?

STATEMENT OF THOMAS G. WALTERS, SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR LEGISLATION, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES; ACCOMPANIED BY AL DAVIS, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIREFIGHTERS

Mr. WALTERS. My name is Thomas G. Walters, special assistant for legislation to the president of the American Federation of Government Employees. I am accompanied by Mr. Al Davis, the legislative representative of the International Association of Firefighters.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will let Mr. Davis speak for the record, and then if there are any questions he or I will attempt to answer them.

Mr. BECKWORTH. You may proceed, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, my first remark was made previously. However, after listening to the statement of my friend, Captain

Gisvold of the Navy, I think it quite important to put this in the record again.

A study was made after the first hearing on this bill by the Civil Service Commission and from the final civil service draft, I will read to you the Navy's recommendation as it appears in the civil service final draft. The Navy says, and I quote:

The most feasible tour, if a reduced tour were adopted, would be a 56-hour week. Such tours are relatively easy to establish and administer. Such a schedule would also require a minimum of additional personnel, give more continuity to each fire company and provide more efficiency.

So, I am therefore a little confused by some of the previous statements.

I may jump around a little in my remarks relative to the testimony by Captain Gisvold, representing the Department of Defense.

We try to keep our statistics up to date, and the figures of our organization show that the average workweek nationwide, of firemen in municipalities of 10,000 or more, as of January 1966, is 56 hours per week.

I am rather astounded at some of the answers relating to moonlighting of the Federal firefighters. I feel sure that any man in this room, whose first job required him to work 72 hours a week would not work additional hours unless there was a very urgent reason. We heard previously that GS-4's make up approximately 80 percent of the total number of Federal firefighters, take-home pay, including the 20 percent is less than \$5,200. I do not think we need justify further why these men are in some cases moonlighting. They have to maintain their homes and families.

I do not remember the exact figures recently released for the mere existence of a family of four. However, I believe it was in excess of \$5,700.

I was very pleased to hear Captain Gisvold or one of his assistants state that sick leave used by Federal firefighters is even less than those of other Federal employees who work as clerks or guards and are never exposed to the rigors of a firefighter.

National Airport Fire Department in the last 9 months has lost four men due to heart attacks, two of which have since died, one 48 years old and the other slightly over 50.

The question was raised relative to recruitment difficulty. In the early months of 1965 we went over the qualification standards of Federal firefighters very carefully with the Civil Service Commission. At that time men were being appointed to the Federal fire service at 45 and 50 years of age, and in some cases, believe it or not, retired from other jobs for physical disability. We thought this was very wrong.

We feel that to give the Federal Government the type of fire service it deserves, men appointed should be required to comply with no less than the present physical standards including an age maximum. The present law prohibits the Civil Service from setting a maximum age.

Mr. Chairman, believe it or not, in a recent study we found that some installations were hiring firefighters with no regard to the present civil service requirements insofar as physical standards are concerned. They were still using the old physical standards previous to the 1963 upgrading. Therefore we can readily understand why some installations are not having trouble recruiting. However, I know that does not hold true in all areas.

I believe it is very important, for the record to show that over a period of years the Congress has reduced the hours of many employees in the Federal Government and, they have never correspondingly reduced salaries.

The subject was touched on and a question was asked concerning the average age of the Federal firefighter. We made a very extensive study within the past 6 months of the average age of Federal firefighters, and found them to be 45-plus years.

Mr. Chairman, may I at this point state that this bill would rectify a longstanding injustice to a small minority of Federal employees, in fact the only employees who neither have standard hours of work or a standard salary.

The Federal firefighters serving at St. Elizabeths Hospital here in the District of Columbia work a 40-hour week with premium pay when they work between the hours of 6 p.m. and 6 a.m.

The Federal firefighters serving at National Airport just across the river in Virginia, work a 72-hour week (National being one of the busiest airports in this country) with premium pay of 20 percent in lieu of the 32 hours per week over 40, Sundays, holidays, night differential, and so forth.

Some Federal firefighters work 40 hours per week, some work as much as 84 hours per week. We think their hours as well as their salary should be set by action of the Congress as is the case in almost 2 million of their associate employees.

Anticipating the 2.9 percent Federal pay raise and assuming our proposal of existing base plus 20 percent as the aggregate salary of a Federal firefighter, the new salary of a GS-4 beginner firefighter would be approximately \$5,676 per annum.

We are informed that the cost to the Federal Government of each military man is in excess of \$7,000 per annum.

Therefore, we are somewhat at a loss to understand the opposition insofar as costs are concerned.

We know that the Defense Department alone uses almost 15,000 military men as firefighters. It would, therefore, appear that by hiring civilians as firefighters they would effect a saving of approximately \$18 million.

Our cost figures of approximately \$11 million were arrived at by simply multiplying the present number of civilian firefighters, 9,437, that would be affected by this legislation by one-sixth (present work-week 72 hours, proposed 60 hours, a reduction of 12 hours per week or one-sixth) so, we find that we need 1,573 additional men to maintain the present coverage, not 3,360 additional men.

By multiplying the additional number of firefighters needed by the starting salary, the result is as follows: $1,573 \times \$5,676 = \$8,928,348$.

This figure does not include fringe benefits, we used the round percentage figure of 23 percent which is the cost of fringe benefits to the District of Columbia for firefighters and policemen and we now find the total cost as follows: $\$8,928,348 \times 23 \text{ percent} = \$10,981,868$, and not 30 million.

Mr. Chairman, section (f)(2) relating to aggregate salary to count on retirement, insurance, employee's compensation, and so forth, is of urgent necessity to all Federal firefighters.

At the present time these men receive no credit on retirement for that part of their pay called premium or 20 percent. This is a part of their regular take-home pay, each pay period, each year; however,

upon retiring, their retirement income then becomes not a percentage of what they have been taking home but a percentage of take-home less 20 percent.

Readily we can see that this is far from continued reasonable income, only a meager amount. May we further point out that thousands of military men working as firefighters side by side with civilian Federal firefighters, are eligible to retire after 20 years of service and their retirement pay is computed on their gross pay.

To refute a previous reference, Federal firefighters do not spend as much time in actually fighting as do municipal firefighters and the severity of their fires are substantially greater than those encountered by Federal firefighters, we offer the following statistics: The total value of all buildings and equipment in the United States, excluding Federal-owned, is approximately \$1.6 trillion, last year the total fire loss was approximately \$1.3 billion or a ratio of .08 percent.

The total value of all buildings and equipment owned or occupied by the Federal Government is approximately \$324 billion, last year the fire loss was approximately \$221 million, or a ratio of .07 percent.

We find that this \$221 million fire loss figure to Federal property is not too realistic in that it does not include losses, example: an airplane falls and burns just outside the fence at Andrews Air Force Base, the firefighter's fight the plane fire for hours at great risk to their lives, although a total loss, this loss does not reflect in this \$221 million figure (records of the Federal Fire Council).

So, we then find that statistics do not support the opposition in their statement that Federal firefighters do not spend as much time in actual firefighting as do municipal firefighters and the severity of their (municipal cities) fires are substantially greater than those encountered by Federal firefighters.

To complete my remarks, may we very simply offer the following: in view of the tremendous strides in the past 21 years that have been made in hours and salary of every American who works for a living, we offer you the plight of the Federal firefighter who was then and who still is working the same hours as was granted him by the Congress more than 21 years ago; should any other justification be necessary?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Davis, sometimes we are not talking about the same things when we hold our hearings. I want to read from the statement of Captain Gisvold this sentence:

Combined with the proposed reduction in workweeks, we could not maintain current levels of fire protection without substantial increases in staffing and in fiscal obligations exceeding \$30 million per year.

You have his statement there before you, have you not?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not have the statement, but I did hear his testimony.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That varies considerably from your figure of around \$11 million.

Mr. DAVIS. This is true, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Are you talking about different situations? How do you reconcile the two statements? Certainly they are not in harmony.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I would be at a complete loss to reconcile the \$30 million figure because, as I previously stated, simple arithmetic tells us that this is a reduction of one-sixth. We take the total strength, and one-sixth of the existing 10,600 multiplied by the starting

salary of GS-4 plus the fringe benefits. We used the figure of 23 percent for the fringe benefits, which we feel is far in excess of what the cost would be for Federal firefighters.

Mr. WALTERS. In other words, Mr. Chairman, it appears to us that our figures are a little high. I would just like to say that in order to conserve the time of the committee, Mr. Davis and I representing our two organizations agree on what has been said this morning previously, and I concur in what Mr. Davis has just stated.

I would like to add this. There has been much said or inferred that this would give the present firefighters an increase in pay. If a man is going to work 72 hours or 60 hours or any other number of hours and receives the same amount of money that he is now receiving, he is not going to take any more money home with him. It is not an increase for those people who are on the rolls, in my opinion. If it is, I wish somebody would so instruct me. If a man does not take any more money home for his family to live on, then I certainly do not concur that there has been an increase in pay for that individual.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Coming back to the question put by the chairman, if you were to reduce the number of hours from 72 to 60 per week, that, to me, comes out to about a 20-percent reduction. To replace the reduced number of hours with additional personnel would mean an additional 20 percent; would it not? I do not see how you get your one-sixth.

Mr. DAVIS. They are working 72 hours.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Sixty is about 80 percent of 72.

Mr. WALTERS. All of these people do not work 72 hours now, Congressman.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. So, it would average out about one-sixth?

Mr. DAVIS. It is not exactly that, Congressman. Some are now working 72 hours and we are reducing their hours by 12. Twelve is one-sixth of 72, their hours would be reduced by one-sixth.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. You are reducing 12 hours out of 72. Yes, that is one-sixth.

Mr. WALTERS. About 9,500 employees are affected by this reduction in hours.

Mr. DAVIS. We think that figure is high Mr. Matsunaga, we have no way of knowing except by using the latest figures that were put out by the Civil Service Commission a couple of years ago which show the number who work for the different agencies.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. You stated, Mr. Davis, that you have civilians working side by side with military personnel.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. What rank do the military personnel hold?

Mr. DAVIS. To my knowledge, it is whoever is available or whoever the Government sees fit to give fire training.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Would it be privates, PFC's?

Mr. DAVIS. I would say yes, all grades up to that of commissioned officer.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Would it not be demoralizing to the military personnel to serve alongside and do the same work as civilians who earn two or three times or maybe four times more than they are earning?

Mr. WALTERS. I am wondering if the civilians are making that much more, counting the living quarters and other types of fringe benefits of the military. Don't misunderstand me. I think the military are

entitled to every penny they receive. In fact, in practically all cases I think they should have an increase. If you consider the other things pertaining to his living conditions, there may not be as much difference in the actual total income at the end of a given period as might appear on the surface.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. But there is a substantial difference, whatever the difference is.

Mr. WALTERS. We think so, the overall cost to the Government being greater to maintain military as firefighters.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. What is the ratio of civilian workers to military personnel at a given installation?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Matsunaga, I wish we could answer that question. I have been trying to get that information for the past year and a half. It seems the information is not available at Civil Service or DOD. To my personal knowledge, some bases have 50 percent or more. At other bases they may have just a crash crew.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. As I see it, this may present a rather hazardous situation. Military personnel are constantly changing, are they not? You do require trained personnel for firefighting?

Mr. DAVIS. The civil service requirements, as I remember them, are in general, to enter the Federal Fire Service as a GS-4 would require one to have had served and/or had training in a paid or volunteer fire department, plus meeting physical requirements. So, the answer to your question is definitely yes.

Mr. WALTERS. We are on your side, Congressman. We would like to see this thing all civilian civil service in the fire department. We do not subscribe to the idea of bringing in green people and assigning them as firefighters without their having to take the same training, also meet the same requirements as civilian firefighters.

Mr. DAVIS. Congressman, we do recognize one fact on this subject, it is necessary for the military to train some firefighters to serve as such, in areas of the world where we may be involved. Other than that, we are in total agreement with what Mr. Walters has just said.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I fail to see any area where the civilian firefighters are called to work that the military firefighters would work.

Mr. DAVIS. We agree with that 100 percent.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I would think it would be a bad thing for the morale of the military man to be working side by side along with a civilian who makes substantially more in pay. This may be a matter of policy we need to look into, Mr. Chairman. Maybe we ought to recall the captain and find out just what percentage of military personnel we have working alongside civilian firefighters.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, we certainly agree with the President and Secretary McNamara's program to replace military personnel now serving in nonessential, noncombatant positions. Just recently we were in communication with the Honorable Robert McNamara protesting the fact that, according to a recent civil service publication, there is a continuing uptrend of military in the Federal Fire Service instead of what we believe should be a downtrend.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Would you care to comment on the comparative efficiency of civilian firefighters as compared with military firefighters?

Mr. DAVIS. The only way that I would comment on your question is that civilian firefighters have to train military firefighters, and we find that only career employees make efficient firefighters.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. No further questions.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Since we do want to clarify the record as much as we can before going into executive session on this legislation, I believe it would be well if we recalled Captain Gisvold so he might discuss the figure of \$30 million versus the \$11 million, and also the subject matter that Congressman Matsunaga has been discussing relating to military firefighters.

**FURTHER STATEMENT OF CAPT. PAUL A. GISVOLD AND
LAURENCE DUHRKOOP, U.S. NAVY**

Captain GISVOLD. Actually, I would like to take the opportunity to comment on a couple of other items, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Surely, and speak a little louder, please.

Captain GISVOLD. There was mention made about 56 hours in our statement. If you take the statement exactly as it reads, it implies it is easier to schedule a 56-hour workweek than a 60-hour workweek. With two 24-hour periods it is easier to schedule 56, and that is why we made that statement. It is easier to schedule a 56-hour workweek.

With reference to the average workweek for 10,000 or more population, of course this brings into play all of the people in the various categories of population, and as a result you bring down your average hours of the workweek. We categorize ours as 10,000 to 25,000, which is the way the statistics categorize them. The categories are 10,000 to 25,000, 25,000 to 50,000, 50,000 to 100,000, and 200,000 and above. We put ourselves in the category of 10,000 to 25,000, which personally I think is a little high anyway, but it is the lowest category they have, and indicates the population and data on frequency of fires and the hours of work.

We have categorized ourselves in the 10,000 to 25,000, and the predominant workweek in that category is 72 hours.

With regard to moonlighting, I think we can verify by asking any one of the three services whether it is the predominant factor that there is moonlighting in the firefighting profession in the Federal Government. I think we would get a concurrence among them. I know it existed when I was on duty in Boston at the naval shipyard. The firefighters predominantly had jobs outside. I think it is the general trend. I would like to get a verification from the three services, if we can. Do you agree on this, gentlemen?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will you identify yourselves?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am John M. Wolverson, Chief, Fire Prevention and Protection Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army.

Yes, sir; a substantial number of our firefighters do moonlight.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Who is the next gentleman?

Mr. SIMMS. I am Leo A. Simms, Air Systems Command, Department of the Navy.

I have traveled in and about the country inspecting fire departments for the last 18 years, and over the last 10-year period I would say that about 50 percent of our Federal firefighters do have other jobs on days off.

Mr. COOK. I am G. T. Cook, Fire Protection Group, Directorate of Civil Engineering, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force.

We have never made any attempt to make a survey and get statistical facts and figures. I think to do so might be treading on thin ice. It is general knowledge that it is a common and possibly a preponderant practice to have outside employment among the firefighters on their alternate 24 hours and, once every 2 weeks, 48 hours continuous off duty.

Captain GISVOLD. With regard to physical standards, everybody who enters Government employment has to pass a physical examination. I do not think there is any question that the people who are brought on board are capable of meeting the physical standards. I do not think there is any question that these people are physically qualified.

There may be the employment of people who are older. There are some cases where we have hired people retired from the military with good backgrounds, and they are qualified. I think an average age of 45 years is probably a more accurate figure than the 38 we gave before. We can get these figures for you if you are interested. I would guess around 45.

Getting down to the \$8 million reference, or \$10 million, as the case may be, I have a detailed breakdown of where these costs come from. The \$11 million that Mr. Davis indicated is comparable with the \$12 million figure which we have which called for the additional costs of a 60-hour workweek for civilian firefighters. This is just taking into account the civilian component of the firefighters in the Navy. This comes out to be \$9.5 million basic salary for the 2,000 people involved in this particular area. For the supplemental, including benefits, retirement, and so forth, we use an 8-percent figure, which gives us \$750,000 additional. The uniform allowance of \$125 per person comes to a quarter of a million dollars. The 20 percent basic compensation for premium pay is another \$1.8 million. It comes up to \$12.3 million, which is fairly close to the figure Mr. Davis gave.

I have that broken down and can give you the figures by Army, Navy, and Air Force.

When you take into account the fact that we have military personnel in this family and theoretically they are working alongside the civilians, you would have to hire additional civilians to take up that slack in the military. The total package when you get through involves 3,360 additional firefighters. The salary we are talking about is \$15 million; and the 8 percent, \$1.2 million; uniforms, about half a million dollars; 20 percent differential, \$3 million. So, it adds up to \$20 million.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I might say at this point, Captain, you may place all the documentation you have in the record, to be used by us. That is true of you, too, Mr. Davis, with reference to any clarifying information after you have studied what is in the record. I think it would be good for the committee to have a prepared statement from each of you in order to arrive at the true facts.

Captain GISVOLD. I have another figure which is a composite of these two. I have to add the two figures together. I have one for civilian firefighters and one for the military component. The two come to about \$32 million. I can give you these figures.

This is where the difference comes in, in fulfilling the requirements on the military and expansion of the military but not hiring military, hiring civilians to replace these people, not to replace people we have but to expand the service we have.

I do not know whether I have covered all this. Have you any comments you want to make?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. The one comment I would like to make to clarify the issue, so to speak, is the matter of the 20-percent increase in personnel. The reason this happens is because the leave which is granted personnel now remains constant, but the working hours are cut. So, the ratio brings the 20-percent increase in personnel into play.

Captain GISVOLD. That refers to the one-sixth that you are interested in. It is not really a true one-sixth. You cannot work it that way. You have to schedule these additional people in the same time period with the leave requirements. It adds up to a little more than that.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I realize that. It is not as simple as the arithmetic would indicate.

As to the employment of military personnel to work alongside civilian firefighters, what is the percentage of military personnel as compared to civilians?

Mr. DUHRKOOP. I have figures for the Air Force. They are utilizing 9,950 military personnel. The Navy is using about 4,400 military personnel. The Army has about 540 military personnel.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. What accounts for the difference? There is a substantial difference between the Army and the Air Force.

Mr. DUHRKOOP. The Army is using military personnel to augment their forces here and there, but they do not have the same input of military for overseas bases. Mr. Wolverton can explain that situation better than I can, and I would like to have him answer the question, if I may.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Go ahead, Mr. Wolverton.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I think the answer to this is that we have a completely different requirement. Both the Air Force and the Navy, for instance, have a very much different airfield problem from the Army. They both have large, high-performance-type aircraft and their airfield requirements are far greater than ours.

I would like to correct the figure of 540. Actually we have 554 military. Virtually all these military are being used at military airfields; 332 are being used within the continental United States. Those that are being used within the continental United States are being used on Army airfields.

Our problem is tied into places like Fort Rucker, the Army aviation field. We have 19 major airfields and we have some 50 airstrips. We cannot support all this activity with civilian personnel. We cannot get the money to do it, for one thing, and we could not get the personnel to do it if we had the money, so we are using 90-odd military at Fort Rucker.

Captain GISVOLD. The Air Force and Navy, the Air Force particularly, moves as a unit. It has its firetrucks and everything there and when they move the whole group moves in an entity. The Navy is like this in some respects, also, in that we have firefighters designated aboard ships and when we bring them back on rotation we have to give them some place to live on shore and to work in their trade, and their trade is firefighting. We use our military firefighters

mostly on our purely military bases. So there is a requirement to have a certain number of military firefighters on shore for rotation and training potential.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I can understand where you have no civilians available from the community, because of your requirements being away from such a community, but how many of these could readily be replaced by civilian firefighters? This is the question I would like to have answered if you would have an answer.

Captain GISVOLD. If you will discount the need for training and rotation requirements, of course, the only area you would say you need military firefighters, I think, are isolated areas where you cannot get civilians to do the job.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Disregarding that, how many could readily be replaced by civilian firefighters, presuming civilian firefighters are available or could be made available through a civilian training program.

Captain GISVOLD. I do not have that number. I do not know. I think to make any comment on that we would have to tie it in with the civilian program. Qualificationwise I think you could qualify civilian firefighters as well as military firefighters.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am concerned about the morale problem, too, because I, and I am sure other Members of Congress, have been receiving letters from military personnel saying they are being paid only a private's pay and they do the same work as civilians, and work side by side with them, while the civilians receive much more.

Furthermore, talking about costs, Mr. Wolverton, our Manpower Subcommittee has come up with figures to show it is much more costly to have a soldier doing civilian work than to hire civilian personnel. Besides, if you can show a need for additional personnel for security or safety reasons, Congress will provide the funds. If you do not present it in an acceptable fashion, that is a fault of the administration in not being forceful enough in making the presentation to Congress, but Congress is definitely sympathetic toward meeting the needs of the military. I think Congress has been more lenient in making appropriations for the military than for any other department or agency of the Government.

Captain GISVOLD. I think the \$30 million figure we gave you reflects the fact we would reduce the military man's tour of duty; we would not bring in any additional military, and we would fill all these holes with civilians.

I think it is important to remember that the military billets used in firefighting are to fill the needs for rotation overseas and for those on shore duty. I agree with you that if you put the military man overseas, bring him back on rotation, and put him in an environment where he is working with civilians who are making more money, that is the quickest way to lose the military because they will say, "Why military?"

I think the number we have now of firefighters reflects the need for rotation and for training.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. So you do recognize a morale problem?

Captain GISVOLD. Absolutely.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. And do you have any objection to replacing military personnel in areas where civilians are available, as a matter of policy?

Captain GISVOLD. Only up to the point of allowing rotation capability. We have to have spaces for people, in the Navy particularly, who rotate back to the States.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. You are speaking of military personnel now?

Captain GISVOLD. Yes. We have to have some billets here in the States to take care of rotation, but outside of that, less than half of our total firefighting family worldwide in the Department of Defense are civilians, and I do not think there are many areas where we have mixes. I think at Andrews and places like that they do, but in general I do not think there are any mixes in the Navy. I may be wrong.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I can understand why you would keep a minimum for rotation purposes, but over and above that, would you favor a policy of using civilians over military?

Mr. WOLVERTON. If I may, we have that same problem. The number I gave you includes our strike activities. For instance, when we took out in a hurry for the Dominican Republic a firefighting platoon went with them. So it is necessary to have some military in the Army.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. How much training does a military man get before he becomes a firefighter?

Mr. WOLVERTON. In the Army we have no schools for them. We assign them to the base fire department and they get their training in this fashion. Also, for our crash training we send them to Air Force schools.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BECKWORTH. We do appreciate your coming here, each of you, and I do want to emphasize our request that you study carefully the testimony of the different witnesses and bring out anything that you feel would tend to clarify the situation, because the subcommittee as well as the full committee wishes to do the right thing.

Without objection, I will insert in the record a statement from Hon. William T. Cahill, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey.

(The statement follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to express my vigorous support of H. R. 10294, a bill whose primary purpose is to reduce the time which firefighting personnel of the Federal Government must spend in standby status.

At the present time most Federal firefighters are operating under a 72-hour workweek arrangement. Such a schedule is years behind the times and is wholly out of step with current practices now followed by fire departments in the major cities of this country.

The basic objective of this measure is to shorten the present workweek for Government firefighters while at the same time protecting their incomes. Such a change can be thoroughly justified in the interests of equity and fairness by examining for comparative purposes any body of statistical or other factual data relating to other firemen and fire departments throughout the country.

Federal firefighters, in terms of total numbers, constitute only a tiny proportion of the entire Federal work force. Perhaps it is for this reason that the much needed change in their status, as incorporated in this bill, has for so long been overlooked.

Though their numbers may be small, it is almost impossible to exaggerate the vital nature of their work or the hazards that are inevitably associated with it.

Under the best of circumstances firefighting personnel cannot follow anything approaching the normal, well-regulated schedule enjoyed by the rest of the civil service. The least that Congress can do is to reduce to a minimum the disruptive and unconventional elements that are inherent in the nature of their work.

By passing H.R. 10294 we shall be taking a significant step in this direction.

The subcommittee stands adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

(Thereupon, at 11:45 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.)



CHAPTER I
THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES
FROM 1492 TO 1776

The first European to set foot on the North American continent was Christopher Columbus in 1492. He discovered the island of San Salvador in the Bahamas. In 1498, Vasco da Gama reached the eastern coast of South America. In 1500, Pedro Álvares Cabral discovered Brazil. In 1577, Francis Drake sailed around the world. In 1607, the first permanent English settlement was established in Jamestown, Virginia. In 1620, the Pilgrims landed in Plymouth, Massachusetts. In 1776, the United States Declaration of Independence was signed.