



FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 326, Lewisberry, PA 17339

(717) 938-2300 • FAX (717) 932-2262 • www.fleoa.org

Representing Members Of:

AGENCY for INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT - OIG
AGRICULTURE - OIG & FOREST SERVICE
COMMERCE

Export Enforcement, OIG
& National Marine Fisheries

DEFENSE

Air Force - OSI
Army - Criminal Investigation Command
Defense Criminal Investigative Service
Naval Criminal Investigative Service
OIG

EDUCATION - OIG

ENERGY - OIG

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY - CID & OIG

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION - OIG

GENERAL SERVICES ADMIN. - OIG

HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES - OIG

Food & Drug Administration & OIG

HOMELAND SECURITY

Border Patrol
Coast Guard Investigative Service
Customs Service
Federal Air Marshal
Federal Emergency Management Agency - OIG
Federal Protective Service
Immigration & Naturalization Service
OIG

Secret Service
Transportation Security Administration

HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT - OIG

INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs
Bureau of Land Management
Fish & Wildlife Services
National Park Service
OIG

U.S. Park Police

JUSTICE

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms & Explosives
Drug Enforcement Administration
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Marshals Service
OIG

U.S. Attorney's Office - CI

LABOR - OIG & LABOR RACKETEERING

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS & SPACE ADMIN. - OIG

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION - OIG

POSTAL SERVICE - OIG & INSPECTION SERVICE

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD - OIG

SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION - OIG

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION - OIG

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION - OIG

STATE DEPARTMENT

Bureau of Diplomatic Security & OIG

TRANSPORTATION - OIG

TREASURY

FINCEN & OIG

Internal Revenue Service - CI

TIGTA

U.S. COURTS (JUDICIAL) - Probation &

Pretrial Services

VETERAN AFFAIRS - OIG

NATIONAL OFFICERS

President

TIMOTHY J. DANAHEY

Executive Vice President

ART GORDON

First Vice President

JOHN AMAT

Second Vice President

CHARLES HYACINTHE

Legislative Vice President

MATTHEWISSMAN

Treasurer

JOSEPH D'ORSANEO

Secretary

JON ADLER

National Awards Director

CHRISTINE A. KUSIAK-TAYLOR

National Chapters Director

BRIAN K. CORNELL

Immediate Past President

RICHARD J. GALLO

General Counsel

LAWRENCE BERGER

Legislative Counsel

JAMES & HOFFMAN

EDGAR N. JAMES

MARIE CHOPRA

TESTIMONY OF

RICHARD J. GALLO
IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT

WITH

TIMOTHY DANAHEY
NATIONAL PRESIDENT

OF THE

**FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT
OFFICERS ASSOCIATION**

BEFORE THE

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

SUBCOMMITTEES ON

CIVIL SERVICE AND AGENCY REORGANIZATION

&

CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY and
HUMAN RESOURCES

CONCERNING

**PERSONNEL ISSUES AFFECTING FEDERAL LAW
ENFORCEMENT
& PAY REFORM**

ON

JULY 23, 2003

Chairwoman Davis, Chairman Souder, Ranking Members Davis and Cummings, Members of the Subcommittees, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My name is Richard J. Gallo and I am with the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (otherwise known as FLEOA). I currently serve as the Immediate Past President, having served as President from September 1996 until I completed my second term in March 2003. I am here with Timothy Danahey, the current President of FLEOA to discuss the issues of pay disparity and the need for pay reform for federal law enforcement agents.

We are here representing over 20,000 federal agents from over 50 different agencies, including the following: Drug Enforcement Administration, US Marshals Service, US Customs Service (now part of BICE – the Bureau of Customs and Immigration Enforcement), the IRS’s Criminal Investigations Division, Postal Inspectors from the US Postal Inspection Service, agents from the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Secret Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Services and Border Patrol (both now part of BICE), from the Department of State’s Bureau of Diplomatic Security, from the Department of Defense’s Naval Criminal Investigative Service, the Defense Criminal Investigative Service, the Army’s Criminal Investigative Division, the Air Force’s Office of Special Investigation, from the Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Fish and Wildlife Service, US Park Police and National Park Service, the Food and Drug Administration, the US Attorney’s offices, FINCEN, Labor’s Office of Labor Racketeering, US Probation Officers, and the criminal investigators employed by over 30 different Inspector General offices, including the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Education, Energy, Interior, Justice, Labor, Treasury, Postal Service, SEC, Library of Congress, Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, FDIC, AID, EPA, TSA, FEMA, GAO, SSA, Transportation, SBA, NASA, GSA, RRB, VA, NRC, – all Federal law enforcement officers who are working under what is commonly referred to as “6c” covered positions (i.e., eligible to retire if you have over 20 years of service and the age of 50).

FLEOA’s President Danahey is an agent with the Naval Criminal Investigative Service, while I am a Senior Special Agent with the USDA Office of Inspector General. Other National Officers here today are Executive Vice President Art Gordon with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives and Legislative Vice President Matt Issman, with BICE (formerly the US Customs Service).

FLEOA is a non-partisan, professional association, representing exclusively federal law enforcement officers. On behalf of our members we wish to thank you for your leadership on holding these hearings on this important topic.

We have been actively involved in the issue of Pay Reform for Federal Agents for over sixteen years. During the 1980’s, FLEOA worked closely with Senator Denis DeConcini, who earned the nickname “Guardian Angel of the Treasury Agents”. In 1987, a bill, introduced by Senator DeConcini, was passed that established the National Advisory Commission on Law Enforcement, commonly referred to as the NACLE Commission. This Commission was tasked to study (what was common knowledge to members of FLEOA and a few elected officials) the huge recruitment and retention problem in federal law enforcement ranks.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

The NACLE Commission was created in 1988, and FLEOA was a commissioner along with three US Senators, five Members of the House of Representatives, the US Attorney General, the Treasury Secretary, the Directors of OPM and FBI, the Administrator of DEA, two Inspectors Generals and several others.

NACLE held hearings documenting the horror stories about the recruitment and retention problems in federal law enforcement. They heard how, even though federal agents needed a college degree and several years of investigative experience to apply for their jobs, state and local law enforcement paid more and gave greater benefits. They read presented stories showing how criminals were looking for the agents teetering on the edge of bankruptcy in order to offer bribes, and, they also read the stories of the federal agents, from agencies including the FBI, DEA Customs, and the Border Patrol, who succumbed to those temptations as a result. They read about the pay of federal law enforcement officers in California being ranked 25th lowest overall. They read about the senior agents in federal law enforcement who had plans to leave federal law enforcement as early as possible, because in the exact words of Herb Hawkins, Special Agent in Charge of the FBI's Phoenix office in the late 1980's: "I am not paid what I am worth, and I need to retire to make some money."

The NACLE staff made its draft recommendations on October 4, 1989. On January 30, 1990, the Commissioners approved the final findings and recommendations, two of which were:

Federal Pay was too low for the law enforcement occupations and needed to be increased at all levels.

The only long term solution to Federal Law Enforcement's pay and benefit malaise lay in a separate Federal Law Enforcement Pay System.

The NACLE Commission made a number of significant recommendations addressing longstanding pay and benefits issues for the government's law enforcement workforce, which were turned into legislative proposals, and introduced as companion bills introduced in both chambers in March 1990. In the House of Representatives, HR 4224 was introduced by Representative Don Edwards, along with Representatives George Gekas, William Hughes and Michael Oxley. Senator DeConcini introduced S.2250 in the Senate.

On March 28, 1990, FLEOA, along with many of the same representative people here today, testified in front of the House of Representative's Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits explaining the immediate need for sweeping adjustments of the pay scale for Federal law enforcement officers.

In October 1990, as a result of those hearings, and subsequent work by the Representatives, Senators and their staffs, the recommendations of the NACLE Commission passed into law. President George H. Bush signed Public Law 101-509 on November 5, 1990, the first major government-wide pay reform in almost 30 years.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

In summary and in part, this law did the following:

- Granted special emergency pay adjustments to certain pay districts (only 8, instead of the 23 originally recommended by NACLE);
- Called for a nine-year phase-in of locality pay adjustments starting in 1994 (to bring federal employees within 5% of the pay disparity gap, set by the President's Pay Council in each individual pay district).
- Required OPM to provide to Congress, no later than January 1, 1993, a plan to establish a separate pay and classification system for federal law enforcement officers.

So why, with such a rich history in how Congress, back in 1987 to 1990, reviewed, studied, debated, and eventually solved the problems, are we here today?

It would appear that something has gone dreadfully wrong for Federal law enforcement and federal law enforcement officers to be in the same predicament as they were in the 1980's.

- ◆ We should not be able to tell you that there are first year federal law enforcement officers who qualify for public assistance.
- ◆ We should not be able to tell you that there are federal law enforcement officers who commute before dawn to the city in which they work in, then sleep in their cars (to catch up on their sleep) before reporting to work (they live so far away – to afford a house for their family– they have no other alternative).
- ◆ We should not be able to tell you that after we hire and train people for the federal law enforcement occupation, that there are federal agents who leave in order to work for a state or local law enforcement agency – so they can make a better salary and get better benefits.

We should not be able to tell you these things but we must – they are happening every day in the real world. The only question left to ask is: **WHY?**

The answer is because the law passed by Congress and signed by President George H. Bush in 1990 has been ignored! For more than thirteen years!

It is incomprehensible, however, we the enforcers of the laws of the United States, are not receiving the benefits of the law. But yet if a criminal is arrested for breaking the law and does not receive due process, the case is dismissed. A classic case of: “Do as I say, not as I do!”

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

A point-in-fact:

- P.L 101-509 has been the law for over thirteen years, yet there is still no separate pay and classification system set up for federal law enforcement officers.
- The special emergency pay adjustments granted in P.L. 101-509 [based on 1990 dollar values] have eroded away, and are in dire need of readjustment.

The original special emergency pay adjustments, written during the September/October 1990 timeframe, while part of a viable solution then, are at the least, comical now. The following examples show why:

The Boston area was granted a 16% pay adjustment. The pay adjustment is still the same after 13 years! (NOTE: The FBI moved their offices from Concord, NH to Manchester, NH in order to transfer their agents from the RUS Pay District to the higher Boston Pay District – but what about the law enforcement response time for upstate New Hampshire?). (Note: RUS stands for “Rest of the United States”).

- In NYC, the original pay adjustment was 16%. Now it is 16.83%. This only occurred in January 2003! Thirteen years and the area only got a whopping 0.83% increase!

- In San Francisco, the original 1990 pay adjustment was also set at 16%. By 2002, the pay adjustment had only risen 3.4% to 19.04% even though the OPM set pay disparity gap was listed at 52.08%!

- In Los Angeles, the original 1990 pay adjustment was 16%. This was because pay disparity gap for LA at the time was approximately 22%. Today, the LA pay district receives a pay adjustment of 17.71%; a whole 1.71% increase in 13 years, while the area pay disparity gap has more than doubled. The gap is currently set at 45.06%.

But, big cities are not the only place where federal law enforcement is suffering. The Southwest border, from McAllen, Texas to San Diego, California has seen its share of recruitment and retention problems over the years as well, as has the Northern Border. Cities like Seattle, Sacramento, Denver, Miami and dozens of other areas have also seen problems in the recruitment and retention of federal law enforcement officers.

Other districts that the NACLE Commission recommended to receive special emergency pay adjustments, such as Atlanta, Miami and Sacramento, were not on the final list within P.L. 101-509 – however these areas (along with others) were to participate in the nine-year phase-in of pay adjustments starting in 1994.

Here's the kicker: The “phase-in” never was accomplished, due to some valid concerns over the formulas used to calculate the pay disparity gap in each area (NOTE: pay disparity gap is separate and distinct from cost of living gaps. A pay disparity gap can be more “employer friendly” while a cost of living gap can be more “employee friendly”). However, FLEOA believes that whatever the concerns were about the formula computations, it should never have gotten to the point where the law was completely ignored.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Starting in 1998, FLEOA began working on trying to get the attention of anyone who would listen regarding what we saw as a potential problem. Our efforts included participating in a meeting on January 25, 1999, at the offices of the General Counsel of the Senior Executives Association (Shaw, Bransford, Veilleux and Roth, located here in Washington, DC, (also present was the then National President and Executive Director of the FBI Agents Association). At this meeting there was expressed unanimity about this problem and it was resolved that something must be done.

A paper was put together by FLEOA members in ATF in the San Francisco and delivered to the ATF Director – asking for some type of relief because the quality of life in the Bay Area was such that agents were fleeing the office as soon as they could transfer out. In fact there was testimony in front of Congress which stated that approximately 65% of the FBI agents in San Francisco, Los Angeles and New York had less than five years on the job – because the senior agents were transferring out of these cities as soon as they got enough seniority.

Two years later, in February 2001, FLEOA presented to the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, co-chaired by two true friends of law enforcement, Representatives Jim Ramstad and Bart Stupak, a paper entitled: “FLEOA Calls For Changes In Locality Pay - Crisis Coming In Recruitment and Retention”. We orally presented our paper before this Caucus, and FLEOA’s first words were:

“WAKE UP – DOES ANYONE SEE THE CRISIS THAT IS COMING?”

At this meeting of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, FLEOA detailed the problem and reviewed the potential disaster we saw coming. What was amazing to us was that it seemed no one else appeared to understand or realize that federal law enforcement was entering into a gunfight without any bullets.

At the February 2001 meeting of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, a staffer of Representative Peter King approached FLEOA and told us how their office was receiving calls about this very same issue, and wanted us to meet with his boss to discuss whatever our draft proposals were addressing these problems.

Over the next months, work on this issue was conducted between FLEOA and Representative King – work that straddled the disaster of September 11, 2001 – and as a New Yorker who lost family and friends on 9-11, I can tell you without apology that completing work on this issue did take a backseat during those trying times. We also worked with the Senate during this time – particularly Senator Joseph Biden and his staff.

The result of this collaborative work effort was HR 3794, introduced into the House of Representatives during the 107th Congress in 2002, which called for **partial** increases in the locality pay adjustment paid to federal agents. The bill, HR 3794, covered 18 pay districts (note: there are a total of 32 pay districts).

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Of the 18 pay districts covered by HR 3794, they included the eight pay districts originally covered by the special emergency pay adjustments granted in P.L. 101-509, plus any other pay district that had a higher pay disparity gap (as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and published by OPM's Presidents Pay Agent) than the lowest pay gap within the original eight districts (ten districts had such – therefore the total pay districts on HR 3794 was 18).

Originally, we did not include a section written up by Senator Biden's staff for FLEOA – a section that addressed fencing off LEAP (Law Enforcement Availability Pay) from the pay cap. However this section surfaced in a bill introduced later by Representative Michael Rogers, as well as in the bill introduced this year by Representative King.

By the end of the 107th Congress, HR 3794 had 162 co-sponsors. A companion bill in the Senate (S.2770) was also introduced, and almost made it as an amendment to the legislation creating the Department of Homeland Security – however a huge obstacle emerged in the Senate.

The obstacle that emerged in the Senate centered around the fact that HR 3794 covered 18 metropolitan pay districts – leaving certain Senators feeling that federal law enforcement in the districts in their state (not among the 18) may be compromised by an exodus of agents to pay districts with a high locality pay adjustment (remember the FBI leaving Concord, NH for “greener” pastures in Manchester, NH?).

Certain Senators (from both sides of the aisle) informed us they were hesitant to support, other Senators (again, from both sides of the aisle) said flat out that they would make sure the bill would be tabled – because they did not want to see senior federal law enforcement officers transfer from their state to another state in order to receive a higher pay adjustment (note: a federal law enforcement officer's retirement annuity is based on an employee's “high three” – which is usually the last three years of a person's career).

Thus the choice was either to: 1) add the remaining pay districts to a bill, or: 2) call their bluff (about making sure they would table the bill).

The lame duck session of the 107th Congress ended with HR 3794 and S. 2770 (also SA 4839) pending in their respective committees.

This year, we met with the staffs of Representatives King and Rogers to discuss the particulars of this issue, armed with the knowledge that certain members of the other chamber wanted a bill that would not trigger a mass exodus from their areas by agents in search of a higher pay adjustment. Mindful of the fact that this has an impact (however slight) on the budget, we discussed refining the proposal; by decreasing the partial pay adjustments in some areas in order to enable inclusion of a partial pay adjustment for all pay districts. FLEOA thinks it is rather sophomoric to ignore concerns of either chamber – especially when both sides of the aisle expressed those concerns.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

We also agreed that the section calling for a revisit of the study completed in 1993 by OPM relative to creating a separate pay and classification system for federal agents should be included.

However, due to differences regarding how many pay districts should be included, a single bill was not introduced. In January of this year, the work completed was introduced by Representative Peter King as HR 466. We truly appreciate Representative King's leadership and support on this issue.

HR 466 includes **partial** pay adjustments in the locality pay adjustments for all 32 pay districts and a section (originally written by Senator Biden's staff for FLEOA) to fence off LEAP pay from counting towards the pay cap, thereby enabling supervisors to earn overtime pay – overtime which they currently work, but do not get paid for.

We are pleased to see that both Chairs, both Vice Chairs, and both Ranking Members of the Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Reorganization and the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources are co-sponsoring HR 466. We are pleased to note that a majority of Members on both of these Subcommittees are co-sponsoring HR 466. We are pleased to note that majorities of Republicans and of Democrats on the full Committee are co-sponsoring HR 466. And, lastly, we are pleased to note that a majority of Representatives in Congress have already co-sponsored HR 466.

In the Senate, a bill (S.985) has been introduced that is a companion to HR 466 in its entirety, however also contains the provision calling for a revisit of the 1993 study by OPM relative to creating a separate pay and classification system for federal agents.

FLEOA strongly supports HR 466 – however if the committee, during markup attaches the provision calling for the 1993 OPM study to be revisited, we would not object in the least. In addition, if the Committee would want to address problems that have arisen in the States of Alaska and Hawaii - the pay adjustment in these two states are in the form of a "COLA" (Cost of Living Allowance) and thus unlike a locality pay adjustment, they do not count towards a retirement annuity – by converting the COLA into a straight (dollar for dollar) locality pay adjustment for purposes of calculating a retirement annuity, FLEOA would support such a change. This change was proposed to us by FLEOA's Hawaii and Alaska Chapter President (Hawaii Chapter President: Roger Grinley, an agent with the FBI; and, Alaska Chapter President: Marvin Goffena, a Deputy with the US Marshals Service).

FLEOA wishes to sound the clarion here in this Congress - as we did in our meeting with the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus in February 2001. This issue is adversely affecting federal law enforcement – the recruitment and retention of the individuals tasked with investigating many of the federal crimes that this body passes. Federal agents only make up about 5% of this nation's law enforcement – hence the saying:

“You can't make a federal case out of everything”.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

The requirements to become a Federal agent are generally tougher than any other law enforcement agency – state, local or municipal. The usual requirements include a four-year degree plus investigative experience in a state or local police or investigative agency. Federal agents are usually recruited and selected from many of the other law enforcement agency – state, local and municipal.

Many who jump to the federal law enforcement ranks [because federal law enforcement is considered the epitome of law enforcement] lost time in grade [seniority] they had in their previous state or local agency. This time is usually measured in years, some transferees lose more than ten years. The job of federal law enforcement officer is not for the faint hearted. The job comes with last minute travel, long hours, training, and extended surveillances, just to name a few things. It can be very frustrating. Many strive and yearn to be federal law enforcement officers; but only the best are selected. Many highly qualified people don't act on their desire to be one of the best because, **they can't afford it!**

Yet, many state and local police departments pay more and have better benefits, for instance, compare the pay for some local Police Detectives versus an agent starting with the DEA or Secret Service, in the following cities:

Chicago:	\$ 37,700	Starting salary for a Chicago Detective:	\$ 64,000
Cincinnati:	\$ 36,888	Starting salary for a Cincinnati Detective:	\$ 54,000
Denver:	\$ 37,291	Starting salary for a Denver Detective:	\$ 62,000
Las Vegas:	\$ 36,075	Starting salary for a Henderson Detective:	\$ 56,140
Los Angeles:	\$ 38,191	Starting salary for a LAPD Detective:	\$ 68,000
Minneapolis:	\$ 36,713	Starting salary for Minneapolis Detective:	\$ 58,000
New York:	\$ 38,174	Starting salary for a NYPD Detective:	\$ 68,000
Portland, OR:	\$ 36,739	Starting salary for a Portland Detective:	\$ 59,000
Seattle:	\$ 36,782	Starting salary for a Seattle/Tacoma Detective:	\$ 57,000
San Francisco:	\$ 39,175	Starting salary for a SFPD Detective:	\$ 76,000
Santa Clara:	\$ 39,175	Starting salary for a Santa Clara Detective:	\$ 65,000
Tampa:	\$ 36,075	Starting salary for a Tampa PD Detective:	\$ 54,000

The salaries listed above are without overtime – both on the federal salaries as well as the local PD salaries. It has to be noted that federal agents receive overtime in the form of “LEAP” (stands for: Law Enforcement Availability Pay) Pay, which is restricted to 25% of their base salary. In addition, anyone earning over the pay cap automatically has his or her salary reduced to the pay cap (note: this occurs frequently at the GS-15 level and infrequently at the GS-14 level). The overtime pay of local Police Department Detectives are not automatically restricted – and the media continually issues reports regarding the huge amounts of overtime worked by local Police Department detectives, especially needed in these days of Orange Alerts being issued by the US Department of Homeland Security.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

As a result of this pay disparity what potential applicants find on our job vacancy web sites is: “Applicants are solicited numerous job vacancies in various cities”. And, instead of closing dates on our job announcements, you see:

“OPEN CONTINUOUSLY” -or- “OPEN UNTIL FILLED”

Another federal agency, instead of using the two above captions, used the following:

“December 31, 2999”

What does this mean? Why do we have to continuously solicit applicants? Why do we have job announcements with a closing date of 97 years into the future?

The answer is:

We are not able to recruit the best and brightest from the detective ranks of Police Departments, because they pay substantially more than federal law enforcement.

As the premiere law enforcement agencies, this situation begs the following important questions:

Who are we getting as applicants? Those who are unable to get their detective badges in their local PD? If the applicants can't get their detective badges in their local PD, do we really want them as Federal law enforcement officers? Why should Federal law enforcement be forced to do with second best? If Federal law enforcement is the premiere law enforcement, why should we lose our best and brightest because they can't afford to take care of their families?

It should be noted that some state and local Police Departments are now recruiting from the ranks of federal law enforcement. So in effect what is happening is: **we pay to train qualified candidates only to see these individuals leave federal service to go to a better paying law enforcement job at the local level** (where, besides the pay, the health and retirement benefits are better). **We are bleeding this hidden cost through our training budgets.**

Recently there have been published reports indicating that, since 9-11-01, the FBI has hired 900 agents and among these new hires, over 100 have left the agency (note: the FBI hires at a GS-10 level, not the GS-7 level other agencies pay new hires – this is an approximate \$5,000 increase in pay). This is without precedent. If the Human Resources Division of IBM was hiring engineers, and over time many of them left to go to other companies, the people staffing the Human Resources of IBM would be fired for being incompetent. The taxpayer monies used to train these law enforcement officers is slipping through “**below the radar**” while we debate spending some of what is already wasted to recruit and retain.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Just this past month, IRS Criminal Investigations office in New York City has transferred 11 agents out of their New York City office, in response to hardship requests from all 11. Again, this triggers “below the radar” spending, since those 11 positions have to be filled – and will be filled with new agents straight out of the academy. The alternative to allowing these agents’ hardship transfers was to watch some of them resign from service. Thus not only would their positions have to be filled, but also the positions they transferred into. The bottom line is that our agencies are already utilizing funding to deal with the locality pay crisis in which we find ourselves. FLEOA believes that HR 466, granting **partial** locality pay adjustments will help with recruitment and retention, and thus assist in stemming some of this “below the radar” bleeding

How would this help management retention? HR 466 would allow mid and high level supervisors to earn 25% of their salaries in overtime. This will resolve the problem of pay compression in our ranks. Currently some mid and high-level supervisors do not earn more than their subordinates. A street level agent with 20 years on the job may be the top candidate for a managerial position but why take on added responsibilities for no additional pay?

A top-level street agent with over 20 years on the job closely earns not only what his/her direct supervisor earns, but also what his/her second level supervisor earns! This is why Federal law enforcement agencies have not been able to attract candidates for managerial positions in high cost of living areas. This disincentive has resulted in Federal law enforcement agencies getting **ZERO** applicants for supervisory positions in high cost of living cities – but since there are street level agents working in these areas, you do need supervisors, so what is the agencies answer?

MORE CURRENT HIDDEN COSTS: With a squad of criminal investigators in the field working, and with zero applicants for supervisor positions, the agencies have to TDY (Temporary Duty Assignment) someone from another area. This person is detailed to the city in question for anywhere from a 30 to 90 day assignment. Agencies put these TDY supervisors in a hotel near the office (usually in the downtown area) pay for their meals and provide expense monies. Agencies rotate supervisors from several cities to make sure that there is supervision of the criminal investigators working in the field.

This problem in retaining managers who are at the pay cap is compounded by virtue of our retirement system (federal criminal investigators can retire at the age of 50 if they have 20 years of service). Since most agents with over 20 years on the job find themselves at, or near this pay cap, and are working hours in which they are not getting paid for, most have no incentive to remain -- but huge incentives to retire and seek employment in the private sector. Since 9/11 many companies have a newfound respect for their security personnel – which has translated into better pay and benefits. **We hemorrhage our best and brightest into the private sector while we are unable to complete for the best and brightest among the youngest.** Section Two of H.R. 466 will abate this bleeding.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

In 1990, Congress saw fit to surgically address the problems in federal law enforcement and, this proposal updates the solution chosen by Congress at that time. The proposal adjusts the 13 year-old special emergency pay adjustments percentages paid to federal agents (and this time includes the US Capitol Police) easing the pay disparities by **partially increasing** the locality pay adjustments paid to them. Since 1990, the current pay adjustments have either NOT been increased at all, or, have had negligible increases. **The cost of the adjustments in HR 466 will ZERO OUT**, since these adjustments remain stagnant in the coming years.

We must be able to draw dedicated, focused and talented professionals to perform the difficult work that America wants its federal agents to perform - to keep America safe and secure.

Seeing federal law enforcement agencies get zero applicants for supervisory positions in high cost of living cities should give us pause. Seeing job announcements with no closing date, just the caption "Open Until Filled" should give us pause. Seeing over ½ of major metropolitan areas staffed with federal criminal investigators with less then five years on the job, should give us pause.

Today we briefly covered two very serious issues affecting the recruitment and retention of federal law enforcement officers -- pay disparity and pay reform. As we in FLEOA discussed these issues we sincerely believe they must be addressed immediately to stem the debilitating outflow of highly qualified federal law enforcement officers as well as our inability to recruit. The solution to this problem is H.R. 466.

The answer:

**America's Federal Agents Need H.R. 466 –
Pay Reform For Federal Agents -**

* * * * *

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION