



MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

REPORT #78-1

October 25, 1977

TITLE

An Evaluation of the Uniform Policies and Practices of County Government Departments, Other Public Agencies in the County and the Bi-County Agencies.

CONTENTS

	Page
I. Summary and Major Conclusions.....	2
II. Authority and Scope.....	3
III. Background, Facts and Discussion.....	3
County Government Departments.....	4
Other Public Agencies in the County.....	15
Bi-County Agencies.....	18
IV. Conclusions.....	23
V. Recommendations.....	27
VI. Agency/Departments Comments and Office Responses.....	30
Exhibits	44
A Uniform & Clothing Expenditures - All County and Bi-County Agencies	
B. Uniform Items Purchased on A. Jacobs & Sons, Inc., Contract	
C. Uniform/Clothing Allowance for Selected Police and Sheriff's Departments	
D. Sampling of Uniform Rental Service - County Government	
E. Sampling of Uniform Rental Service - Montgomery College	

I. SUMMARY AND MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

In FY 77 \$914,397 of County funds were expended to purchase, rent and maintain uniforms for approximately 6,700 public employees, and to compensate some employees who wear civilian clothes in lieu of a uniform. The FY 78 budget for approximately the same level of service is \$968,773. These costs provide uniforms for the purpose of identification or protection of personal clothing; not included is any cost for clothing for personal safety or protection.

The overall conclusion of this evaluation by the Office of Legislative Oversight is that a requirement exists to furnish uniforms to some public employees; however, some of the current uniform programs are overly generous and costly, ineffectively managed and exceed practical requirements.

The major conclusions of this evaluation are:

1. County Government;

--Some currently uniformed County government employees in desk assignments and similar positions where the public is met only occasionally could perform their duties without wearing a uniform with no reduction in the level of service.

--The County government's current uniform rental contract provides for service significantly in excess of employee needs and use.

--The practice of paying an annual cash allowance to some employees in County government as compensation for wearing civilian attire should be reevaluated in that justification for the program is weak and the program is unequally administered and overly generous to a select group of employees.

--The policy within County government of providing gratis laundering and dry cleaning services for County purchased uniforms, and for civilian clothing worn in lieu of a uniform, is unique, unnecessary and should be terminated except for those instances when such services are necessitated by a line of duty altercation.

2. Other Public and Bi-County Agencies;

--With the exceptions of a cash allowance to Park Police officers for uniform maintenance and replacement and a uniform rental program at the College which exceeds employee needs and use, MCPS, the College, M-NCPPC and WSSC appear to have well managed uniform programs.

II. AUTHORITY AND SCOPE

1. Authority: County Council Resolution No. 8-1418, subject: FY 78 Work Program of the Office of Legislative Oversight, adopted June 28, 1977, directed that the Office evaluate policies concerning the issue and maintenance of uniforms and clothing to personnel of County government, other public agencies in the County and the bi-County agencies.

2. Scope: To coordinate the development of data by County government, other public agencies in the County and the bi-County agencies; examine the justification for the various uniform programs (new and replacement uniforms, cash clothing allowance, uniform rental service, and laundering and dry cleaning service); review contracts and fiscal accountability; and evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of program management and resource utilization.

III. BACKGROUND, FACTS AND DISCUSSION

1. During the FY 78 Budget worksessions before the County Council, the Sheriff's Department identified a discrepancy between the annual cash clothing allowance paid Sheriff's deputies and that paid plainclothes officers of the Police Department. Discussions concerning that discrepancy led to questions by Councilmembers concerning County uniform policies and practices. As a result, Council decided to postpone a decision on equalizing the cash clothing allowance until a detailed evaluation of County uniform policies and procedures could be made by the Office of Legislative Oversight. This report presents that detailed evaluation.

2. The Office of Legislative Oversight (herein referred to as the Office) conducted this evaluation of uniform costs during the 1st Quarter FY 78, using actual FY 77 and FY 78 budget data. Information was collected from County government departments, Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS), Montgomery College, the Sheriff's Department, the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) and the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC). Cost data as submitted by the departments and agencies were used in this report as it appeared to be the most accurate data. This evaluator attempted to obtain independent data from the various County government department's Monthly Operating Statements. However, the discovery of an overcharge in the Uniform Object Code of over \$1.4 million confirmed that department reported data would be the most accurate

3. Uniforms are provided employees for three basic purposes: (a) identification, (b) protection of the employee's personal clothing and (c) personal safety. Under personal safety are included such items as safety helmets, hard-toe safety shoes, x-ray aprons and turn-out gear worn by fire fighters. This report addresses in detail policies concerning uniforms which are furnished employees for identification and protection of personal clothing, and not for personal safety.

4. The uniform programs currently in effect in the County can be divided into four categories:

a) Category I: New and replacement uniforms purchased with County funds. Under this program, County funds are expended for the purchase of uniforms (and in the case of some departments, equipment and accouterments) which are worn by employees while performing official duties. Included in this category is the gratis issue of replacement articles due to loss, damage or normal wear and tear.

b) Category II: Uniform rental service. Under this program, County funds are expended for a rental/laundrying service for uniforms which are worn by employees while performing official duties.

c) Category III: Cash clothing allowance. Under this program, the County pays a non-taxable cash clothing allowance to employees who wear civilian clothing in lieu of a uniform while performing official duties.

d) Category IV: County purchased laundrying, cleaning and other services. Under this program, County funds are expended for laundrying, dry cleaning and leather repair service for County purchased uniforms and for articles of personal clothing which are worn by an employee in lieu of a uniform when performing official duties.

5. A detailed discussion of each of the four uniform program categories is presented in subsequent paragraphs, divided into County government, other public agencies in the County and the two bi-County agencies. At Exhibit A is a comprehensive table displaying FY 77 expenditures and FY 78 budget for all departments and agencies within each of the four categories. Portions of that comprehensive table are expanded upon in other tables within the body of this report.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

6. Category I: New uniform purchase and replacement.

a) Eight departments of County government purchase uniforms which are furnished to employees at no cost. Six of the agencies are included on a single contract with A. Jacobs and Sons, Inc., Baltimore, Maryland, for basic uniforms, items of equipment and accouterments (such as emblems, patches, insignia, chevrons) and alterations. The seventh department, Social Services annually spends approximately \$300 for smocks for homemakers and is not included in this report. The eighth department, Health, has a separate contract which is discussed in paragraph 6j below.

b) The A. Jacobs and Sons' contract is for complete uniform sets and replacement items for the various County government departments. At Exhibit B is a list of uniform items available through the contract, organized by department. The cost to equip an employee in each of the six agencies of the County government, together with the FY 77 actual and the FY 78 budget for new and replacement uniforms from all sources are outlined in the following table:

Department/Agency	No. of Employees	Cost to Equip One Employee	FY 77 Actual	FY 78 Budget
Police - Sworn	778	\$1,200 ^a)	\$175,103	\$237,250
- Uniformed Non-sworn	99	334)		
- Crossing Guard	247	563)		
Corrections/Rehabilitation				
- Male	38	725)	28,662	17,902
- Female	9	532)		
- Food Service	2	312)		
- Cooks	10	98)		
DOT - Parking & Mass Transit	72	357	18,500	13,000
DEP - Inspectors	17	635	1,828	3,600 ^b
FM&S - Security Guards				
- (full-time)	11	638	1,500	1,500
- (part-time)	3	455		
Fire/Rescue	<u>100</u>	<u>600^c</u>	<u>17,420</u>	<u>14,225</u>
TOTALS	1,386	---	\$243,013	\$287,477

Notes: a) Included in this \$1,200 are equipment items estimated by the Police Department to cost \$300 and include such items as a revolver and holster, handcuffs and case, blackjack, riot control equipment, etc.

b) DEP acknowledges the FY 78 budget of \$3,600 is high and must be adjusted.

c) Does not include any turn-out (protective) gear.

c) The Police Department has the largest uniform expenditure in County government. An examination of the Police Department's uniform program reveals a past history of extravagance and a current pattern of costly uniform changes and specious accountability.

(1) In the recent past, costly uniform changes have included widening the width of the trouser stripe, substituting two jackets for the winter coat (reefer) and replacing the poplin summer and winter uniform shirts with wash-and-wear shirts, which the department has specified will be dry cleaned for longer wear. In the case of the winter coat and poplin shirts, the department apparently did not utilize a change-over, wear-out period to gain the maximum wear utilization of the discontinued articles. The results were a high change over cost and hundreds of excess, serviceable uniform items currently on hand in the department's supply room.

(2) In the case of the poplin shirts, each uniformed sworn officer is receiving eight winter and eight summer wash-and-wear shirts as replacements for 16 poplin shirts at a cost of \$12.75 for the long sleeve winter shirt and \$11.65 for the short sleeve summer shirt. The change-over was to improve appearance and comfort for the force. The eventual cost to change shirts for the approximate 620 sworn uniformed officers will be over \$120,000. Although there are no current plants to re-sell the poplin shirts, approximately 700-900 poplin shirts will be released to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to be dyed and issued to inmates

d) Examples of currently costly practices and specious accountability in the Police Department's uniform program include:

(1) The initial cost to equip a sworn police officer is approximately \$1,200, which includes uniform clothing items (approximately \$900) and personal equipment (revolver, handcuffs, accouterments, etc--approximately \$300). This sum is significantly higher than the cost to outfit a sworn officer in the four adjacent Washington area police departments of Arlington, Prince George's, Fairfax and Washington, D.C. The average cost to provide a sworn officer in these four jurisdictions with a uniform and comparable personal equipment is approximately \$760 (See Exhibit C for details). The disproportionately higher cost for Montgomery County is due mainly to the larger variety and quality of clothing articles issued. It is noted that many uniform items are issued from recycled clothing.

(2) The green, dress blouse* and jackets illustrate the large variety of items issued. Each sworn officer is issued a blouse (summer or winter weight) which costs about \$100; however, its wear is very limited, such as for ceremonies or appearances before the County Executive or County Council. The uniformed sworn officers is also issued two all-weathered duty jackets. Further, the officer can request issue of the winter coat (reefer). In the opinion of this evaluator, the occasions when the dress blouse may be worn are too limited to justify its purchase and issue.

*uniform coat

(3) Each sworn and non-sworn officer and Crossing Guard receives up to two pair of leather dress shoes (or combination of dress shoes and boots). No other police department in this area, to include the U.S. and M-NCPPC Park Police, are issued dress shoes. The Police Department justifies the issue of shoes on the basis of maintaining uniformity in foot gear; to quote: "If personnel were required to purchase their own shoes it is difficult to imagine the variety of styles that would be exhibited as a result, which would certainly demean our officer's appearance."

(4) As for the excessive quantity of articles issued, a uniformed sworn police officer receives an initial issue of 16 shirts, (8 winter and 8 summer), 12 pair of trousers (6 winter and 6 summer), six neckties and two pair of dress shoes. A comparison with the same four adjacent police jurisdictions reveals that the average issue of those items is considerably less: 12 shirts, six pair of trousers, one tie, and no dress shoes. Within the County, the M-NCPPC Park Police are issued six shirts and six pair trousers and no dress shoes.

(5) The sworn and non-sworn personnel who are on desk assignments and in positions where they are not required to meet the public on a regular basis are also issued uniforms. It is the opinion of this evaluator that there is little need to provide uniforms to employees in assignments such as the EOC, supply, personnel and similar administrative assignments. Removing the uniform requirement from these positions would not reduce the level of service performed.

(6) The Police Department uniform supply room in the Public Service Training Academy was visited on September 16, 1977. The supply room was neat and well stocked. The supply personnel were highly cooperative; however, they had no accurate knowledge of stocks on hand as there was no inventory. Their estimate of "approximately 500 pair of trousers" turned out to be over 1,000 pair. A random inspection of individual clothing records revealed many incomplete and erroneous entries. As an example, a record of an officer who wears a uniform daily reflected that he had turned in more shirts and trousers than he had been issued.

e) The sum of past decisions and current practices concerning uniforms in the Police Department have been and are costly. Although FY 78 will see a decline in the authorized strength of uniformed sworn police officers, the FY 78 budget for the purchase of new and replacement uniforms is 35% higher than the FY 77 actual (\$175,103 vs \$237,250) and the FY 78 budget for cleaning and laundering is 45% higher than the FY 78 actual (\$46,050 vs \$67,000). The new and replacement uniform budget is especially high when one considers that there is a large supply of basic uniform items currently on hand in the Police Department supply room at the PSTA.

f) The practice of issuing an excessive number of shirts and trousers (or blouses and skirts for female employees) and of furnishing leather dress shoes is repeated in other departments of County government, as reflected in the following table:

Department		Shirts/ Blouses	Trousers/ Skirts	Shoes/ Boots
Corrections/Rehabilitation	male	15	10	2
	female	14	8	2
DOT - Meter Enforcement	male	16	10	2
	female	16	10	2
Meter Collection	male	20	7	2
Mass Transit	male	10	6	0
DEP - Inspectors	male	20	8	2
	female	17	8	2
FM&S - Security Guard	male	12	12	1
Fire & Rescue	male	18	6	1

g) The Department of Corrections/Rehabilitation defends the issue of shoes on the dual bases of uniformity and safety, the latter necessitating a non-skid sole and rubber heel to prevent falls and electrical shock.

h) All six of the above County government departments which furnish uniforms provide replacement items for loss, damage or normal wear and tear.

i) The uniform policy for approximately 17 inspectors of the Department of Environmental Protection requires special comment. The cost of outfitting a male employee is \$640 and a female employee is \$632. In addition, replacement, gratis laundering and dry cleaning is also provided by the County. However, current DEP policy does not require inspectors to wear the uniform. In the opinion of this evaluator, there is little justification for having a uniform program if wearing the uniform is at the discretion of the employee.

j) The Health Department has a different and considerably less expensive uniform purchase and replacement program. The Health Department, by contract with the Hopkins Uniform Co., Baltimore, Maryland, authorizes a newly employed Health Aid or Health Technician to visit the Hopkins' showroom and select an initial issue of uniforms at an approximate average cost of \$60 per employee. Hopkins bills the County directly. Annually, each Health Aid and Health Technician may visit the showroom and select replacement uniforms. The replacement allowance is equal to the original allowance. However, many employees have not selected a full replacement set of uniforms each year, which has tended to reduce the Health Department's replacement costs.

7. Category II: Rented uniforms and service.

a) Five County government departments utilize a uniform rental service which provides employees with basic "off-the-shelf" shirt and trouser uniforms together with a laundering and repair/replacement service. Four of the departments are serviced by a single two-year contract with Rentex Services, Inc., Baltimore, Maryland. The fifth department, Health, has a slightly different contract for medical smocks and linen with Linens of the Week, Washington, D.C.

b) The following table outlines the department's FY 77 actual and FY 78 budget data for rental uniform service:

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Approx. No. of Employees</u>	<u>FY 77 Actual</u>	<u>FY 78 Budget</u>
Department of Transportation	580	\$ 96,150	\$105,900
Department of Environmental Protection	65	19,265	11,492
Facilities Management and Services	150	17,774	21,975
Department of Liquor Control	130	23,439	27,000
Department of Health	<u>100</u>	<u>2,060</u>	<u>2,500</u>
TOTALS	1,025	\$158,688	\$168,867

c) The Rentex contract provides that employees receive an initial issue of basic uniforms consisting of a shirt and trousers (or pants for females), with the shirt sleeve length changed seasonally. The contract specifies a specific number of basic uniform changes per week, at a cost to the County of 68¢ per change. The number of basic uniform changes per week varies both between and within departments, with the department director specifying the number of changes a week which the activity requires. The County is billed weekly and pays on the basis of the number of changes specified in the contract, not on the basis of the number of uniforms actually laundered by the contractor in any given week. For those employees who are furnished a jacket in addition to the basic shirt/trousers uniform a flat rate of 60¢ per jacket change is charged the County. The contractor is responsible for putting County emblems and patches on the uniform shirts. The standard patches are the first or last name over one shirt pocket and "Montgomery County" over the other pocket.

d) The following table outlines the current Rentex contract costs:

No. of Changes Per Week	No. of Uniform Sets Issued to an Employee	Contract Cost/ Employee/ Week	Additional Cost Per Jacket Change
5	11 shirts; 11 trousers/ slacks	\$3.40	.60
3	7 " ; 7 "	2.04	.60
2	5 " ; 5 "	1.36	.60

e) As part of this evaluation, the Office sampled the paid vouchers for six subdivisions of the four departments serviced by Rentex to determine the efficiency of contract execution. The sample covered a two week period in the summer and a two week period in the winter of FY 77. The sample revealed that for the total four-week period the County paid a contracted price of \$2,984.80. However, by counting the actual number of shirts, trousers and jackets picked up, the sample revealed that only 25% of the uniforms which should be serviced were actually turned in. (See Exhibit D).

f) There appear to be several reasons why employee participation is at a frequency less than that contracted for. Some employees do not wear the uniform or wear only portions of the uniform; others launder their own uniforms; while still others simply change less frequently than the contracted number of times per week. Although supervisors at the operating level should monitor employee usage of the service, the current Rentex billing procedure does not provide sufficient information to the operating level. Presently, Rentex sends the Original Invoice to the operating element served. This 12-column invoice lists each employee by name and the pre-billed cost of the contracted service. Rentex sends the Finance Department's Accounts Payable Section a Statement and a copy of the Original Invoice. However, on Finance's copy of the Original Invoice are six additional columns, one of which indicates the actual number of soiled uniform items picked up for each employee. Finance should send that copy of the Original Invoice to each operating activity to enable supervisors to evaluate employee participation in the program.

8. Category III: Cash clothing allowance.

a) Four departments of County government pay an annual cash clothing allowance to employees to either purchase uniforms or as compensation for wearing civilian clothes when performing official duties. These departments are Police, Corrections/Rehabilitation, Fire and Rescue Services and Health.

b) The following table outlines the uniform program for each of these four departments together with the FY 77 actual and FY 78 budget data:

Department	No. of Employees	FY 77 Actual	FY 78 Budget	Type Allowance
Police	145 (full) 19 (partial)	67,937	65,440	\$420 per year full or \$360 per year partial; paid semi-annually to plainclothes officers or those required to occasionally wear civilian clothes in the performance of duty. The County pays for the laundering/cleaning of the civilian clothes purchased with this allowance.
Corrections/ Rehabilitation	7	-0-	840	Beginning in FY 78, payment of \$120 per year will be made to seven medical personnel to purchase uniforms. Laundering and cleaning is at the employee's expense.
Fire/Rescue	4	1,680	1,680	\$420 per year for four investigators.
Health	13	2,530	1,560	\$120 per year to medical and dental personnel to purchase uniforms. Laundering and cleaning is at the employee's expense.
TOTAL	188	72,147	69,520	

c) The paying of a cash allowance for the purchase of uniforms, as practiced by the Departments of Corrections/Rehabilitation and Health is not uncommon. The justification for this procedure is that it is simpler and less costly to the County than purchasing or renting uniforms.

d) The practice of paying a cash clothing allowance to plainclothes police officers is found in the other police departments of the Washington Metropolitan area. (See Exhibit C for details). However, the cash clothing allowance policy of the Police Department has two unique and generous characteristics. The first concerns the free laundering, cleaning and shoe repair service for the civilian articles. No other Washington Metropolitan area police department provides laundering, cleaning or shoe repair service to either plainclothes or uniformed police officers. The second unique characteristic is the payment of a full or partial cash clothing allowance to officers who occasionally wear civilian clothes for duty which is essentially neither investigative nor operations-oriented. Examples of current duty positions in which the incumbent received a full or partial cash semi-annual clothing allowance for the period January-June 1977 are: The Department Director (\$150); an officer assigned to the Office of the Director (\$150); and officers assigned to Media Services (\$210); Community Relations (\$150); and Crime Prevention (\$150).

e) Two basic reasons are cited by the police in justifying full or partial cash clothing allowances for officers. First, that carrying a weapon, handcuffs and other equipment is hard on civilian clothes, wearing them out sooner than normal in work that's more demanding than that performed by other employees.

The second justification is that, "The furnishing of allowance for purchase of clothing is in keeping with the agreement to provide clothing and equipment. In addition, a measure of control is assured to maintain the desired appearance of personnel." Or as stated in a memorandum to this Office by the Chief, Department of Police: "It [cash clothing allowance to plainclothes officers] is a fringe benefit the same as providing uniforms to other police officers and as such is a condition of employment;" and "Since the Department requires certain officers to wear civilian attire when it would be more appropriate than uniform dress, the partial clothing allowance is justified." Both of these reasons are, in the opinion of this evaluator, insufficient to justify the expense. Paying a cash clothing allowance is predicated on the fact that identification of the employee as a police officer is not desirable. Thus, the plainclothes officer essentially has the same dress requirement as the majority of County employees, that is, to maintain a neat appearance. However, since the plainclothes officer faces the constant possibility of having his clothes damaged or soiled in an altercation, the officer should be eligible for a cash reimbursement when personal clothing is lost, damaged or soiled in line of duty altercations or accidents.

9. Category IV: Laundering and cleaning and other services.

a) By contract with Eddie's Cleaners & Launderers, Frederick, Maryland, the County provides laundering and dry cleaning service for County purchased uniforms and personal items of civilian clothing which are worn in lieu of a uniform when performing official duties. The County also has contracts with two shoe repair and two tailoring shops.

b) Five County government departments provide free laundering, dry cleaning, shoe repair and uniform repair and alterations. The following table outlines FY 77 actual and FY 78 budget data concerning those services:

Department	Approx. # of Personnel	FY 77 Actual	FY 78 Budget	Employees Served
Police	1,124	\$46,050	\$67,000	Uniformed officers (sworn & non-sworn) Crossing Guards & plainclothes officers.
Corrections/ Rehabilitation	70	4,759	6,660	Correctional officers.
DOT	72	7,230	16,200	Mass Transit and Parking District.
DEP	17	(Incl. in CAT I data)		Uniformed inspectors
FM&S	14	1,500	1,500	Security guards
Fire/Rescue	100	4,545	5,023	Uniformed employees & plainclothes investigators.
TOTAL	1,397	\$64,084	\$96,383	

c) Within the Washington Metropolitan area, the practice of providing laundering, cleaning and shoe repair service is unique to Montgomery County. A survey of the same four adjacent police departments indicated no comparable service for employees (See Exhibit C). It might also be noted that one of the largest organizations which use uniforms, the Armed Services, does not provide gratis laundry and shoe repair service for personal duty or work uniforms.

d) The Montgomery County Police department's justification for providing such service is:

"The amount allocated per individual is much lower than the amount the service would require if each individual provided his own on the open market. The contractual price has been such that personnel are required to be dressed in neat and clean clothing at all times. This could well become a serious problem if the service were discontinued and each officer was required to provide his own."

e) The Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation vigorously defends these services because of the adverse working conditions in which the employees work; and because "termination of these services would be construed by the officers to be an erosion of fringe benefits."

f) In the opinion of this evaluator, the current laundering, cleaning and shoe repair service is a fringe benefit provided to a select group. Except for laundering and dry cleaning resulting from a line of duty altercation or accident, these services should be terminated. To minimize the cost to the employee for these services, the same contract rates now paid for by the County could be paid by the employee through payroll deduction or similar arrangement.

10. Summary of County government uniform programs.

a) Although a requirement exists to provide uniforms for certain County government employees for identification or protection of personal clothing, the current uniform programs are overly generous and costly, ineffectively managed and exceed practical requirements. The County government buys a wide variety of expensive uniforms, issues new and replacement articles in quantities excessive to normal requirements, and provides uniforms to employees who are not required to meet the public on a regular basis. The most generous and unique aspect of this program is providing leather dress footwear.

b) County government provides uniforms to other employees under a two-year rental/laundrying service contract. The Procurement Division was able to negotiate a contract at 16% less cost per uniform change than either the MCPS or College uniform rental contracts. However, the program requires stronger program management in that the County has contracted and pays for a level of service in excess of that actually used by the employees.

c) The procedure whereby a generous cash clothing allowance is paid to a select group of employees for not wearing a uniform needs reevaluating. Once the requirement for identification of the employee is removed, the requirement to provide a uniform or a cash payment in lieu of a uniform is likewise removed. County employees who receive a cash clothing allowance have no requirement to present a higher standard of appearance than do the majority of the other County employees. Where damage to clothing occurs in a line of duty altercation or accident, individual compensation should be paid by the County.

d) Finally, providing gratis laundering, dry cleaning and shoe repair services for normal wear to employees wearing County purchased uniforms and those receiving a cash clothing allowance is overly generous and amounts to a special fringe benefit for approximately 1,400 employees. Except in those cases where clothing is soiled in a line of duty altercation or accident, free laundering and dry cleaning services should be terminated. The cost to the employee can be greatly reduced by maintaining the same contract but with employees paying by payroll deduction.

OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WITHIN THE COUNTY

(MCPS, Montgomery College, Sheriff's Dept.)

11. Category I: Uniform purchase and replacement.

a) Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) and Montgomery College purchase uniforms for support service employees. In the case of MCPS, uniforms are purchased by contract from Angelica Uniform Group, Inc., St. Louis, Mo., for 500 cafeteria employees. After a six-month probationary period, cafeteria employees are issued either five dresses or three pants suits (at a total cost of approximately \$30). Replacement items are provided as needed; however, laundering is the employees' responsibility.

b) In FY 77, Montgomery College purchased long sleeve work shirts for male custodial and maintenance employees as an augmentation to the short sleeve shirts furnished in a uniform rental service contract. Eleven shirts were issued each employee with an additional five shirts per employee purchased as replacements. No funds are budgeted in FY 78 for uniform purchase.

c) The Sheriff's Department has not purchased uniforms in over four years when ten uniforms were purchased and worn by Deputies performing security duty in the Circuit Courthouse and District Courts. These security patrols no longer function and Deputies are no longer issued uniforms.

12. Category II: Rented uniforms and service.

a) MCPS and the College utilize a uniform rental service for support service employees. MCPS has a contract with Baltimore Uniform Rental, Inc., to supply a basic shirt/trouser (pants for females) uniform for approximately 1,500 employees in school plant operations, maintenance, transportation, supply management, processing services, office services, and print shop. Of the 1,500, only 150 employees engaged in fuel delivery and heavy maintenance are authorized five uniform changes per week. The remaining 1,350 or 90%, mostly light maintenance custodial and service employees, are authorized only two changes per week. The policy of fewer

changes per week is in contrast to those departments of County government and Montgomery College (see below) utilizing the uniform rental service where the majority of employees are authorized five changes a week. Many County government and Montgomery College employees have similar job classifications as the MCPS employees. Like the County government contract with Rentex, the Baltimore Uniform Rental contract is for a specified number of uniform changes per week. MCPS is billed weekly and also pays on the basis of the number of contracted changes and not for the number of uniforms actually laundered by the contractor. In the past, the billing system of the Baltimore Uniform Rental had not indicated the number of uniforms actually serviced. Consequently, this Office was unable to evaluate the usage rate by employees. MCPS staff has reported that future invoices will specify the number of uniforms laundered.

b) Montgomery College has a similar contract with Baltimore Uniform Rental, Inc., as does MCPS for approximately 125 maintenance and custodial employees. The College pays a contracted price to supply a basic shirt and trouser uniform (or dresses/pantsuits for females). The contracted price is \$3.95 per male employee per week for five uniform changes per week (or 79¢ per change). and \$3.00 per female employee per week for five uniform changes per week (or 60¢ per change). The five changes per week for College custodial and maintenance employees contrasts with the two changes per week for MCPS custodial and maintenance employees. The College selected five changes per week for hygienic reasons. However, a sampling of vouchers paid Baltimore Uniform Rental, Inc., for two, two-week periods in FY 77 revealed that for the total four-week period, the College paid a contracted price of \$390.40; however, by counting the actual number of shirts/trousers picked-up, the sample revealed that approximately 32% of the uniforms which should be serviced were actually being turned in. (See Exhibit E). As in the case of County government rental uniform usage, there appears to be several reasons why employee participation is less than that contracted for (see paragraph 7f above). The College also has a uniform rental contract with Carter Industrial Laundry, Landover, Maryland, for a blazer/shirt/trouser uniform (blazer/blouse/skirt for females) for approximately 20 security employees.

c) The Sheriff's Department does not utilize a rental uniform service.

13. Category III: Cash clothing allowance.

a) Of the three agencies evaluated, MCPS, the College and the Sheriff's Department, only the latter gives a cash clothing allowance. Each deputy is authorized up to \$200 per year, paid semi-annually as a tax-free supplement, as reimbursement for the cost of civilian clothes which are worn in lieu of a uniform when

performing official duties. The Sheriff's Department's justification for, this allowance is basically the same as the Police Departments, namely the requirement to always present a neat appearance while performing such duties as process serving and escorting prisoners where altercations are not uncommon; and the requirement to wear equipment such as a revolver, black jack, badge and handcuffs which damage civilian clothes.

b) The annual cash clothing allowance paid Sheriff's deputies is less than half the amount paid plainclothes officers (\$200 vs \$420), and is considerably less than the annual cash clothing allowance paid deputies in other Sheriff's departments in the immediate area: Arlington County - \$598; and Prince George's County - \$400. (See Exhibit C).

c) Another inconsistency between plainclothes police officers and Sheriff's deputies concerns clothing maintenance. Plainclothes police officers are provided free laundering, cleaning and shoe repair service while Sheriff's deputies are responsible for these services. Although no exact value can be placed on this service, the FY 78 Police Department budget allots \$70 per sworn officer to cover these services.

d) As stated earlier in this report, the practice of paying a cash clothing allowance as compensation for purchasing civilian dress to wear when performing duties is a costly fringe benefit. As in the case of plainclothes police officers, Sheriff's deputies should be compensated when personal clothing is lost, damaged or soiled in the line of duty.

14. Category IV: County purchased laundering, cleaning and other services. Neither the MCPS nor the Sheriff's department pays for laundering, cleaning or other services for County purchased uniforms or personal clothing. The College has contracted with the rental uniform vendor to launder the College owned long sleeve shirts at the rate of 30¢ per shirt (See paragraph 11b above).

15. Summary of the uniform programs of other public agencies in the County.

a) A review of the programs of two other public agencies in the County which purchase uniforms for employees reveals less generous, and in the case of MCPS, more closely managed programs. Within MCPS purchased uniforms are basic and are issued in reasonable amounts. No footwear is provided and uniform maintenance is the employee's responsibility. However, the College has purchased shirts to augment a uniform rental contract when the same shirts could be included in the rental contract.

b) The contracted uniform rental programs of MCPS and the College are comparable to the County government's program with

the exceptions that County government contracted for less cost per change and MCPS has contracted for a more realistic level of service. The College, on the other hand, has contracted and pays for a level of service in excess to that actually used by the employees.

c) Currently, the Sheriff's deputies receive a significantly smaller annual cash clothing allowance than do plainclothes police officers who perform similar duties. This evaluator questions the policy and practice of paying a cash clothing allowance. However, if the policy and practice are retained, Sheriff's deputies should receive an allowance equal to that paid plainclothes police officers.

BI-COUNTY AGENCIES

(M-NCPPC AND WSSC)

16. Category I: Uniform purchase and replacement.

a) The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) provides uniforms to four groups of employees: Park Police Officers, Park Managers and Naturalists and full and part-time (seasonal) Maintenance Workers. The following table outlines FY 77 actual and FY 78 budget for uniform purchase and replacements for these four groups:

Employee Group		FY 77 Actual	FY 78 Budget	Replacement Items Provided	Laundering Cleaning Provided	Remarks
Park Police		32,197	35,250	Note a	Note a	Initial cost/officer \$690 (does not include cost of weapon) for dispatcher & clerk: \$146; (Ave. issue, 6 shirts & 6 trousers.
Officers	51					
Disp/clks	7					
Park Mngrs & Naturalists	17	2,334	1,200	yes	no	Cost of initial issue/employee: \$180.
Maint. Workers (Full time)	307	27,996	12,000	yes	no	Note b
Maint. Workers (seasonal)	175	1,300	1,300	yes	no	Issued three "tee" shirts at \$2.50 ea.
TOTAL	557	63,827	49,750			

Note a: Park Police officers receive a monthly allowance of \$40 (\$480 annually)

for cleaning, laundering and replacement for normal wear and tear. For loss/damage in line of duty, MNCPPC replaces item. Dispatchers and station clerks are provided replacement articles, but are responsible for laundering and cleaning.

Note b: In FY 77, the Department of Parks changed from a rental uniform service for maintenance personnel to purchased uniforms. Under the previous rental/laundry service, the Commission and the maintenance workers shared the cost of the rental system on a 50-50 basis. The FY 77 figure of \$27,996 reflects the purchase of a basic issue of clothing. Full time maintenance workers are now issued five sets of trousers/shirts plus a cold weather jacket. The initial cost to purchase the five trousers and shirts was \$76.35 and the cold weather jacket, \$23.50, for a total purchase price per employee of \$99.85. The wear-life of the trousers and shirts is expected to be two years. Under the previous rental uniform plan, the annual cost to the employee and the Commission was \$49.40 each or \$98.80 total. Thus, the Commission will relieve the employee from paying \$99 over a two-year period and will be breaking even on its cost over the same two year period.

b) The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) purchases uniforms for security guards and field employees of the Maintenance and Operations Division. The FY 77 actual and FY 78 budget data for these two employee groups are outlined in the following table:

Employee Group	Approx # of Employees	FY 77 Actual	FY 78 Budget	Replacement Items Provided	Laundering Cleaning Provided	Remarks
Security Guards	18	4,100	-0-	yes	no	Initial cost for male officer: \$203 for female: \$235 (Ave. issue 6 shirts 2 trousers).
Maintenance	900	52,731	-0-	no	no	Note a.
TOTAL	918	56,831	-0-			

Note a: In FY 77, WSSC purchased and issued to 900 field and plant employees of the Maintenance and Operations Department, through Grade 13, four sets of coveralls with replacement and laundering at the employee's expense. New employees hired in FY 78 will be issued four sets of coveralls from stocks purchased in FY 77.

17. Category II: Uniform rental service.

a) For most of FY 77, M-NCPPC provided rental uniform service to 307 full time maintenance workers at a cost of \$17,172. In late FY 77, M-NCPPC purchased uniforms (see paragraph 16a - Note b). No funds are allocated in FY 78 for uniform rental service.

b) WSSC contracts for uniform rental service for approximately 120 employees. The program is similar to the service provided County government and MCPS employees, with a higher cost per change. The FY 77 cost for the uniform rental service was \$24,104, with a similar amount budgeted for FY 78.

18. Category III: Cash clothing allowance. Neither M-NCPPC nor WSSC provides a cash clothing allowance to employees.

19. Category IV: County purchased laundering, cleaning and other services. Neither M-NCPPC nor WSSC furnishes a gratis laundering or dry cleaning service. As noted above, 51 Park Police Officers receive an annual allowance of \$480 for cleaning, laundering and replacement of uniform items.

20. Summary of the uniform programs of the bi-County agencies.

a) The uniform purchase programs of both M-NCPPC and WSSC appear to be reasonable attempts to provide necessary service at the least cost to the employee and the agency. It is especially noted that: management has maintained control over the program and made improvements to the program; the uniform program is not overly generous to the employee (no leather footwear is provided); and, with the exception of the cash allowance to 51 Park Police officers for laundering, cleaning and replacement, all employees are responsible for the maintenance of their uniforms.

b) Concerning the cash allowance for Park Police officers, M-NCPPC justification is that the initial uniform issue is minimal, resulting in a faster wear-out period and sooner replacement, or the requirement to immediately purchase additional shirts and trousers. In addition, the high cost of dry cleaning was cited, especially with the frequency of such service necessitated by the requirement to maintain a neat appearance under adverse weather and working conditions.

OTHER MATTERS

21. County Council Resolution No. 8-1418, subject, FY 78 Work Program of the Office of Legislative Oversight, includes a general work project to evaluate County agency policies, procedures and attitudes. Outlined below are pertinent observations on agency policies, procedures and attitudes and on other matters related to uniform programs.

a) Cooperation, coordination and communication:

(1) This first formal effort of the Office of Legislative Oversight met some hesitancy and apprehension on the part of some department personnel, primarily in connection with Office requests for uniform data and justification. However, the reaction was temporary and all departments and agencies furnished the necessary information in a cooperative and open manner.

(2) Of special note was the high degree of cooperation, responsiveness and professionalism displayed by the Division of Purchasing and the Accounts Payable Section of the Department of Finance. Both activities devoted many hours of assistance and opened their files to this evaluator. To service the uniform needs of eight County government departments is no small operation. For example, the Purchasing Division services over twenty separate uniform contracts.

(3) The four agencies which use a rental uniform service, County government, WSSC, MCPS and the College, contract with three different firms. The contracts provide similar service, but at different costs per uniform change, which suggests that a single coordinated contract to serve approximately 3,000 County employees could result in cost saving to all four agencies.

b) Self-evaluation procedures. The degree of underutilization of the uniform rental service by County government and Montgomery College employees indicates that management either is unaware of this underutilization or has accepted a level of service less than specified in the contract. Periodic internal evaluation of the uniform rental service by department supervisors was possible in that weekly invoices sent to the Finance Department from the contractors indicated by name of each employee the paid contract charge and the lesser actual service performed.

c) Uniform alterations and repair. In addition to providing laundering, dry cleaning and shoe repair service, employees in the Department of Police, Corrections, DOT, DEP, Fire and Rescue Services and Facilities Management and Services, are also provided uniform alterations and repairs. This Office was not able to determine complete cost data for uniform alterations and repairs and for shoe repair. Most of those expenditures were included within purchasing and replacement data. However, a sampling of vouchers for the month of June 1977, for Sam's Tailoring Shop indicated the County paid \$214 for alterations and repair of uniform items. This is in addition to \$688 paid in May 1977, to A. Jacobs & Sons for alterations as part of that contract.

Further, a review of the FY 77 vouchers for one of the shoe repair contractors, Stern's Shoe Repair, indicated the following cost data by department: Police - \$1,776.41; Transportation - \$280.15; Fire/Rescue Services - \$57.00; Environmental Protection - \$127.50 and Corrections/Rehabilitation - \$17.42; for a total of \$2,258.48. Costs for alterations and repairs for uniforms provided under the uniform rental service contract are included in the contract cost.

d) Patches and Emblems. The County purchases a large variety of uniform patches and emblems. An example of the costs associated with patches are three Police Department invoices dated December 1, 1976: 133 emblems sewn on EOC shirts; \$66.17; 304 MCP emblems sewn on EOC shirts: \$151.24; and purchase of 500 dispatcher, 500 desk clerk and 100 crossing guard emblems: \$1,293.50. The rental uniform contract specifies sewing the employee's name and "Montgomery County" patches above the shirt pockets. This evaluator has observed numerous County employees who have removed these patches. Another observation is that many departments and some sub-activities within departments have their own special patch. The entire program of departmental "personalized" patches appears to have proliferated to the point where a considerable expenditure of County funds are involved.

e) Safety clothing. As indicated earlier, this report does not include an evaluation of safety clothing. However, in examining the uniform policies and procedures within County government it was apparent that there is a need to reevaluate the requirement for uniforms for safety as contrasted with uniforms for identification and appearance. Within County government, the Safety and Insurance Office of the Department of Finance is working to increase the overall awareness for safety clothing. Records confirm that County funds expended in the safety shoe and safety eye glasses programs have been more than compensated for in reduced foot and eye injuries. There is, however, an apparent need to expand the safety clothing program into such areas as safety shoes for more employees, protective light weight vests and helmets for police officers and fire proof garments to be worn by fire fighters under their turn-out coat and trousers.

f) All-seasons uniform. Currently, both summer and winter weight shirts and trousers and seasonal coats are purchased. Information from two large users of uniforms, the military and the airlines, indicates that they are moving toward an all-seasons uniform. The County should examine this trend when considering future acquisitions.

g) Availability of performance data. This comment concerns the Department of Fire and Rescue Services and the 16 fire departments and two rescue squads. This report contains

detailed uniform data for the approximate 100 employees of the Department of Fire and Rescue Services. However, only gross FY 77 actual and FY 78 budget data is presented for the 16 various fire departments and two rescue squads. (See Exhibit A, Note c). To have presented a more detailed evaluation of these departments, squads would have required an effort beyond the scope of this work project. There appears to be little standardization between these departments/squads. As an example, there is a system of standardization and bulk purchase of some protective (turn-out) clothing such as pants, coats and boots; but there is no standardization or bulk purchase of helmets. To further complicate matters, dress and work uniforms and accouterments are purchased from a non-specific and inconsistent mix of County and volunteer funds. Accordingly, one of the recommendations of this report is to include an evaluation of the funding of the 16 fire departments and two rescue squads as a future work project for the Office of Legislative Oversight.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

1. Conclusion #1:

a) General: The FY 77 actual and FY 78 budget cost of providing new and replacement uniforms, a uniform rental service, cash clothing allowances, and clothing maintenance service for County government (less 16 fire departments and two rescue squads), other public agencies in the County and the two bi-County agencies was \$914,397 in FY 77 and \$968,773 FY 78 budget.

b) Specific:

	<u>FY 77 Actual</u>	<u>FY 78 Budget</u>
County Government	\$545,082	\$629,737
MCPS	156,054	218,844
College	39,577	33,338
Sheriff	11,750	13,000
M-NCPPC	80,999	49,750
WSSC	<u>80,935</u>	<u>24,104</u>
TOTAL	\$914,397	\$968,773

2. Conclusion #2:

a) General: There is a valid requirement for a uniform program within the County government whereby public funds are used to purchase new and replacement uniforms for employees to be worn for identification and protection of personal clothing; however, the current program is overly generous and costly, ineffectively managed and exceeds practical requirements.

b) Specifics:

1. Uniformed County government employees in desk assignments and similar positions where there is only an occasional requirement to meet the public could perform their duties without wearing a uniform with no reduction in the level of service.

2. An excessive quantity of shirts and trousers (blouses/skirts) are provided employees in the Departments of Police, Corrections and Rehabilitation, Fire and Rescue Services, Environmental Protection (Inspectors), Transportation (Parking and Mass Transit) and Facilities Management and Services (Security).

3. Leather dress shoes and shoe repair service are provided employees in the Departments of Police, Corrections and Rehabilitation, Fire and Rescue Services, Environmental Protection (Inspectors), Transportation (Parking and Mass Transit) and Facilities Management and Services (Security).

4. In the case of the Department of Environmental Protection, a considerable sum is expended to provide uniforms for inspectors (male: \$640.80; female: \$632.00). Not only is the uniform elaborate for identification purposes, the justification for wearing the uniform is questionable in that its wear is at the discretion of the employee.

5. In the case of the Police Department, the cost of an initial issue of uniforms and equipment is excessive when compared to the cost to outfit a police officer in four adjacent Washington Metropolitan area police departments.

6. In the case of the Police Department, the FY 78 budget for the purchase of new and replacement uniforms is 35% higher than the FY 77 actual, although there will be a reduction in uniformed police personnel in FY 78.

3. Conclusion #3:

a) General: A lack of management of the uniform rental service program which provides uniforms and laundering service to approximately 1,000 County government employees and 145 Montgomery College employees has resulted in the County government and the College contracting and paying for services which are in excess of employee needs and use.

b) Specifics:

1. Service has been requested by certain departments of County government and the College which, by sampling and observation, is in excess to the needs and actual utilization of the employees. A sampling of activities of four County government departments and the College participating in a uniform rental service revealed that the frequency of actual uniform changes per week averaged significantly less than the changes contracted and paid for.

2. A reexamination of the County government and College uniform rental programs is needed to confirm which employees should participate in the program and the frequency of uniform changes for those employees.

4. Conclusion #4:

a) General: The practice of paying an annual cash allowance to some employees as compensation for wearing civilian attire should be reevaluated in that justification of the program is weak and the current program is unequally administered and overly generous to a select group of employees.

b) Specifics:

1. The current rationale for paying a cash clothing allowance is that an officer who normally wears a uniform for identification purposes now requires anonymity and must wear civilian clothes in lieu of a uniform; the equipment an officer must carry wears out civilian clothing faster; and, its a fringe benefit.

2. A comparison of the full cash clothing allowance paid plainclothes police officers with four Washington Metropolitan area police departments reveals that Montgomery County pays about the same average as paid by those four departments.

3. A comparison of the cash clothing allowance paid Sheriff's deputies with two adjacent county Sheriff's departments reveals that Montgomery County deputies receive a considerably lesser annual allowance (\$200 vs \$598 and \$400).

5. The Police Department has an overly generous policy of paying a partial cash clothing allowance of up to \$360 annually to sworn, uniformed police officers in supervisory non-investigative and non-operations oriented positions who, on occasion, wear civilian attire.

5. Conclusion #5:

a) General: The policy within County government of providing gratis laundering and dry cleaning services for County purchased uniforms and civilian clothing worn in lieu of a uniform is unique, unnecessary and should be terminated except for those instances when such services are the result of line of duty altercations or accidents.

b) Specifics:

1. Approximately 1,400 employees in the Departments of Police (1124); Corrections and Rehabilitation (70); Transportation (72); Environmental Protection (17); Facilities Management and Services (14) and Fire and Rescue Services (100) are provided gratis laundering and dry cleaning services for County purchased uniforms. In addition, included in the above Police Department total are approximately 164 officers who, in addition to a cash clothing allowance, are provided the gratis laundry and dry cleaning service for civilian clothes worn while on duty.

2. The FY 77 actual cost for gratis laundry, dry cleaning and shoe repair services for approximately 1,400 County government employees was \$64,084 or \$44 per employee; the FY 78 budgeted amount is \$96,383 or \$66 per employee--a 50% increase.

6. Conclusion #6:

a) General: With one exception, the two bi-County agencies, M-NCPPC and WSSC, appear to have well managed uniform programs which serve the requirements and needs of those agencies.

b) Specific:

1. The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission practice of providing Park Police officers an annual cash clothing allowance of \$480 for uniform replacement, laundering and dry cleaning appears overly generous.

7. Conclusion #7:

a) General: To make a detailed assessment of the various sources of funds and the total expenditures for uniforms, clothing and related services by the 16 fire departments and two rescue squads, a separate evaluation by the Office of Legislative Oversight is required.

b) Specifics:

1. Standardization and central purchase is accomplished for only some of the protective (turn-out) clothing.
2. There is no evidence of standardization or central purchase of work and dress uniforms.
3. Dress uniforms and work clothes are purchased from a non-specific, non-standard and inconsistent mix of County and volunteer funds.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS.

1. That employees in desk assignments and similar positions where there is only an occasional need to meet the public not be required to wear a uniform. (Based on FY 78 data, estimated annual savings: To be determined).
2. That the number of shirts and trousers (blouses/skirts) currently issued uniformed employees in the Departments of Police, Corrections and Rehabilitation, Fire and Rescue Services, Transportation (Parking and Mass Transit) and Facilities Management and Services (Security) be reduced; and that a moratorium on the replacement of those items be imposed until the amount of those items in the possession of employees is reduced to a reasonable level. e.g. a total of 12 shirts (blouses) and 8 trousers (skirts). (Based on FY 78 data, estimated annual savings from not issuing one summer and one winter shirt/trouser combination: \$97,000).
3. That the practice of furnishing leather dress shoes and shoe repair service to employees in the Departments of Police, Corrections and Rehabilitation, Fire and Rescue Services, Transportation (Parking and Mass Transit) and Facilities Management and Services (Security) be terminated. (Based on FY 78 data, estimated annual savings: \$17,500).
4. That the issue and replacement of uniforms to inspectors in the Department of Environmental Protection be terminated; and that all uniform items on hand be collected and reissued to other employees using similar items. Further, either the requirement that Department of Environmental Protection inspectors wear a uniform be rescinded or a less costly uniform be provided. (Based on FY 78 data, estimated annual savings: \$1,500).
5. That a reevaluation of the articles issued uniformed members of the Police Department be made with the goal of reducing their quantity and variety. (Based on FY 78 data, annual savings: To be determined).

6. That a reevaluation of the Police Department's FY 78 budget for the purchase of new and replacement uniforms be made and the 35% increase over FY 77 actual expenditures be completely justified, with special emphasis placed on reevaluating the change over from poplin to wash-and-wear shirts without allowing for a concomitant wear-out period. (Based on FY 78 data, estimated annual savings: To be determined).

7. That the uniform rental program of County government and the College should be reexamined to determine:

(a) Those employees who must wear a uniform; and

(b) The minimum frequency of changes commensurate with position requirements and the personal preference of the employees. (Based on FY 78 data, estimated annual savings: To be determined).

(c) In the case of County government, supervisors should be provided information on the frequency of employee participation in the service.

8. That the practice of paying an annual cash clothing allowance to some employees as compensation for wearing civilian attire should be reevaluated and rejustified. (Based on FY 78 data, estimated annual savings: To be determined).

9. That the current practice of paying a full or partial cash clothing allowance to sworn, uniformed police officers in supervisory, non-investigative and or non-operations oriented assignments who occasionally wear civilian clothes should be terminated. (Based on FY 78 data, estimated annual savings: \$11,000).

10. That, if the practice of paying a cash clothing allowance is retained, the allowance paid to Sheriff's deputies in operations oriented positions be equal to that paid to full time plainclothes officers. (Based on FY 78 data, annual increase to provide 63 deputies the same allowance as plainclothes police officers: \$13,460).

11. That practice of providing gratis laundering and dry cleaning services to uniformed and plainclothes personnel of the Departments of Police, Corrections and Rehabilitation; Fire and Rescue Services, Environmental Protection (Inspectors), Transportation (Parking and Mass Transit) and Facilities Management and Services (Security) be terminated except for those instances when such service is the result of line of duty altercations or accidents. (Based on FY 78 data, estimated annual savings: \$70,000).

12. That the Chairman, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission be requested to reevaluate the apparent generous policy of paying Park Police officers an annual cash clothing allowance of \$480 for uniform laundering, dry cleaning and replacement. (Based on FY 78, data, estimated annual savings: To be determined).

13. That the Office of Legislative Oversight be directed as a future work project to evaluate the purchasing and funding policies and practices of the 16 fire departments and two rescue squads.

VI. AGENCY/DEPARTMENT COMMENTS AND OFFICE RESPONSES

(Turn to page 30)

VI. AGENCY/DEPARTMENT COMMENTS AND OFFICE RESPONSES

General: Before submitting this report to the Council, a draft copy was sent to the seventeen County agencies/departments included in the report. Replies were received from ten agencies/departments. Those comments which corrected basic data or provided additional clarification and justification have been included in this final report. New agency/department data, judgments and justifications are presented in subsequent paragraphs, organized by report recommendation (See pages 27-29 above), together with an Office response. It should be noted that comments agreeing with or complimentary to the report are not included.

Recommendation 1: Eliminate uniforms from employees in desk assignments.

a) Police:

"The Department of Police has seriously considered discontinuing the purchase of uniforms for some non-sworn personnel (e.g., civilian radio dispatchers) and has discontinued the purchase of those type uniforms for new employees. This action is based on the rationale as stated in the report."

b) Fire and Rescue:

"... the military nature of the job as well as the discipline required are aided by the wearing of a common uniform. It ties all of the various elements of the fire and rescue services together into one operating unit.

"In addition, the only personnel employed by the Department of Fire and Rescue Services who do not meet the public are our dispatchers. They are, however, classified as fire fighters. It is therefore important for identification purposes and to ensure a continuous link to the field personnel that they continue to wear uniforms. They also can be transferred to the field where they are required to meet the public.

"The personnel assigned as dispatchers are part of the career development program and take all of the promotional examinations for sergeant, lieutenant, and captain along with all of the other career personnel. They are therefore defined in the career development program as uniform personnel.

"Another consideration is that the communications personnel go in to the field to conduct training classes as part of our in-service program. In addition, they also conduct classes for new personnel as part of our Firefighter I and II classes. During these times it is essential that the image of the total organization be projected so that the communication function appears as part of the overall program."

c) Budget and Research:

"Disagree... Present employees remain in uniform."

d) Office response:

None

Recommendation 2: Reduce initial issue of shirts/trousers and impose a moratorium on replacements until a reasonable level is obtained:

a) Police:

"In 1971 Colonel Watkins inventoried the uniform allocation per officer. He then established the limitations from which the present authorized issued was evolved. The excess quantities were returned to Supply thus creating the present system of recycling clothing. Additional issuance from 1975 to the present has been limited to replacement based on verified need. This total authorized issue has been reduced further and is continuously being scrutinized by management.

"In terms of excessiveness in the present quantity authorized, the duties and working conditions of the patrol officer should dictate this level, and not an unsupported opinion.

"Who determines what is reasonable? The annual savings indicated in the report would be for one year only, then replacement demands would begin."

b) Fire and Rescue:

"... the need for nine long sleeve and nine short sleeve shirts was explained by the nature of the job and the need to frequently change during the day. In addition, the need for replacement is reduced as evidenced by the total uniform expenditure."

c) Corrections/Rehabilitation:

"Do not interpose an objection to a realistic reduction of the initial issue of shirts and trousers (blouses/skirts) to correctional officers.

"A recommended minimum issue would be:

Summer - 7 shirts (blouses); 7 trousers (skirts/pants)
Winter - 5 shirts (blouses); 3 trousers (skirts/pants)"

d) Budget and Research:

"Agree with conclusion, disagree with savings estimated. Should be definition of reasonable."

e) Office response:

The recommended issue of the Department of Corrections/Rehabilitation is a reasonable starting minimum.

Recommendation 3: Do not furnish shoes.

a) Police:

"The statement that no other area departments issue shoes to their sworn or non-sworn personnel is not true. Additionally, if the department is to maintain uniformity in appearance and at the same time maintain high morale, no better way is available than to provide the entire uniform. If personnel were required to purchase their own shoes it is difficult to imagine the variety of styles that would be exhibited as a result, which would certainly demean our officers' appearance.

"... the park [MNCPPC Park Police] officers purchase their shoes out of their \$480.00 annual allowance. The Maryland State Police are given \$50.00 annually for shoes. The Prince George's County Police are given \$400.00 annually for the purchase of replacement uniforms and shoes."

b) Corrections/Rehabilitation:

"Disagree vigorously. Uniforms imply uniformity and this report recommends initial and replacement issue of uniforms. Shoes are an important and essential part of the uniform. There should be a "standard" shoe to achieve uniformity. Can an employee be required to purchase this standard shoe or can the choice of shoe be the prerogative of the employee?

"The correctional officer needs a special shoe to perform the required duties. The officer stands and walks on a hard surface eight hours a day. Shoe must be made for comfort and safety. Present issued shoe has soft inner sole and arch support designed for comfort and has a non-skid sole and rubber heel to prevent a serious fall when the floor may be watered down during an inmate disorder. Shoe must grip the floor when an officer is restraining an intractable inmate. Shoe must have rubber heel and sole to eliminate the possibility of an electrical shock. We owe it to the officer to issue and repair a safe and comfortable shoe on a non-reimbursable basis. The proper shoe is a definite factor in preventing injuries and reducing officer fatigue on the job. To insure longer life of the shoe, County should maintain the cost of repair."

c) Budget and Research:

"Disagree. I would modify but not terminate. Shoe purchase and repair be limited to Police patrolmen and Correction officers only."

d) Office response:

The smooth toe, black oxford is a fairly standard item. If special shoes are required for safety it should be defended on that basis, not on the basis of uniformity or appearance.

Recommendation 4: Terminate uniforms for DEP inspectors.

a) DEP:

I [Mrs. Abrams] shall be addressing the issues [pertaining to uniforms] in the FY 79 budget request for this department. I am appointing a departmental task force of DEP employees who will attempt to determine whether there are any specific operational needs for uniforms, e.g. for identification or protection of personal clothing, that justify continuation of a modified uniform policy."

b) Budget and Research:

"Disagree: No point in putting in storage to rot. No one else can use. Savings only \$1,500.

c) Office response:

None

Recommendation 5: Reduce quantity and variety of uniforms issued police.

a) Police:

"The list on Exhibit B indicates 61 items. A sworn patrol officer is issued fourteen of these items. A reduction here could only be accomplished by eliminating the summer/winter trousers and going to a year round fabric. As mentioned previously, this is under consideration."

b) Budget and Research:

"Agree. Should be specific. Suggest Chief establish new procedures.

"The Police Department standardize its uniform and use all surplus before new purchases, since the color of uniform has not changed."

c) Office response:

Police clothing issue levels, (Source: Police Department General Order 75-22).

	Issue Exec. Off.	Issue. Patrol/ Service	Issue Mtr. Off.	Issue Sctr. Off.	Issue Pln Clo Off.	Issue Cadet
Belt, trousers	1	1	1	1	1	1
Blouse, green, summer	1					
Blouse, green, winter	1	1	1	1	1	1
Boots, slicker, pr.		1	1	1		1
Britches, summer			6			
Britches, winter			6			
Cap, summer	1	1	1	1		
Cap, winter	1	1	1	1	1	

	Issue Exec. Off.	Issue Patrol/ Service	Issue Mtr. Off.	Issue Sctr. Off.	Issue Pln Clo Off.	Issue Cadet
Cap, fur trooper		1	1	1		1
Cap, cadet						1
Gloves, black leather	1	1	1	1	1	1
Gloves, motormn, summer			1	1		
Galoshes, pr.	1				1	
Jacket, duty		2	2	2		1
Maincoat, tan	1				* 1	
Motor dicky			2	2		
Motor reefer			1	1		
Necktie, black	6	6	6	6	1	6
Raincoat, yellow		1	1	1	*	1
Raincap, yellow, w/cape		1	1	1	*	1
Raincap, clear	1				*	
Rubbers, pr.	1	1	1	1	1	1
Shirt, long sleeve	8	8	8	8	1	8
Shirt, short sleeve	8	8	8	8	1	8
Shoes, low quarter, pr.	1	1			1	1
Shoes, buckle, pr.	1	1				1
Shoes, high top, pr.			2	2		
Sweater, motormn			1	1		
Trousers, summer	6	6		6		6
Trousers, winter	6	6		6	1	6
Undervest, green	1	1	1	1		
Utility suit					1	
Utility cap					1	
Total # items by type	18	19	22	22	14	18

* Depends upon rank

Crossing Guard clothing issue levels (Source: Police Department Manual for Crossing Guards).

1 badge
2 skirts (summer)
4 skirts (winter)
4 slacks (winter)
8 shirts
1 overcoat
1 raincoat
1 raincap
1 cap

1 hood (women's winter)
4 neckties
1 whistle & chain
1 pair of boots
2 pairs gloves (white)
1 pair gloves (red)
2 pairs of shoes
1 vest (red fluorescent)
1 belt (male)

Recommendation 6: Reevalue Police Department FY 78 budget for purchase and replace uniforms.

a) Police:

"Cost analysis of past decisions and current practices concerning uniforms in the Police Department does not support the report conclusion that they are too costly. The report compares budgets with expenditures when it seems more appropriate to compare budgets and expenditures from year-to-year separately.

"The budget appropriations and actual expenditures for the past three fiscal years will support the fact the police do attempt to efficiently manage the budget items pertaining to "Clothing and Uniforms" and "Laundry and Dry Cleaning." Budget requests will be brought in line with expenditure experience.

	<u>FY 75</u>		<u>FY 76</u>		<u>FY 77</u>	
	<u>Approp.</u>	<u>Expend.</u>	<u>Approp.</u>	<u>Expend.</u>	<u>Approp.</u>	<u>Expend.</u>
Clothing & Uniforms (\$)	334,190	270,829	352,962	119,873	302,310	136,979
Laundry & Dry Cleaning(\$)	87,870	56,803	65,000	58,087	77,150	56,738
Annual Savings (\$)		94,428		240,002		185,743
Three (3) Yr. Savings:		\$520,173				

Annual costs per individual for FY 77

	<u>Clothing & Uniforms</u>	<u>Laundry & Dry Cleaning</u>
Sworn Officers -	\$135.00	\$49.00
Non-Sworn Full Time -	\$138.00	\$57.00
Non-Sworn Part Time -	\$133.00	\$48.00

"These figures are averages based on the percent of employees in each group. Actual expenditure per group would vary if an indepth study were conducted.

"Considering the savings to Montgomery County it is difficult to imagine how the police program can be labelled overly generous and costly, ineffectively managed and exceeds practical requirements."

b) Budget and Research:

"Agree with recommendation."

c) Office response:

(1) The figures in the report were submitted by the Department of Police in a memorandum dated August 15, 1977.

(2) Regarding the FY 75 savings of \$94,428 and FY 76 savings of \$240,002, the Annual Financial Report for FY 75 records on page 21 an Unencumbered Balance for Other Operating Expenses for the Department of Police of \$4,386; and the Annual Financial Report for FY 76 records on page 21 an Unencumbered Balance for Other Operating Expenses of \$87,495. These balances could have been developed in part from savings in the Uniforms account.

Recommendation 7: Reevaluate uniform rental program.

a) College:

"... the rental price [of uniforms was]... to include cleaning, repairs, and replacement if necessary. There were no provisions made for those employees who prefer to be responsible for laundering and/or repairing uniforms which have been assigned to them. Therefore, the investigator has raised a very interesting question in regard to how the College should be billed when rented uniforms are not laundered and/or repaired by the vendor from whom the uniforms are rented. This question is presently under study by the staff of the College.

"In addition, the staff is presently conducting a pilot program to examine the cost savings, if any, that would be realized if the College were to purchase uniforms and provide gratis laundry on an "actual use" basis."

b) Budget and Research:

" The number of changes in work clothes be reduced.

"Disagree with recommendation."

c) Office response:

None

Recommendation 8: Reevaluate and rejustify the paying of cash clothing allowances.

a) Police:

"The provision of cash clothing allowance for police officers assigned to plain clothes duty is equated to the provision of uniform clothing and replacement for uniformed personnel. The allowance is not overly generous when compared with other departments on Exhibit C and even lower than one department.

"Since the Department requires certain officers to wear civilian attire when it would be more appropriate than uniform dress, the partial clothing allowance is justified.

"The police officer required to wear plain clothes is subject to contact with the public daily. Thus the need for maintaining a desired appearance. By providing the employee with an allowance and laundry/dry cleaning, the department has insured its ability to insist upon a neat, presentable appearance."

b) Fire/Rescue:

"There are four fire investigators within the Department of Fire and Rescue Services. These individuals are trained officers who investigate the cause of a fire, determine if the crime of arson has been committed, question and interview suspects, as well as make arrests. Because of the investigative nature of their job they must wear civilian clothes. Since civilian clothes are a job requirement, it is important that a minimum level of dress standards be maintained. I therefore feel it is an obligation of the County to provide plain clothes to ensure that the minimum level is maintained."

c) Budget and Research:

"Agree. Savings small."

"Clothing allowances be reduced to \$200/year for detectives and Deputy Sheriffs."

d) Office response:

None

Recommendation 9: Terminate paying full or partial cash clothing allowance for Police personnel in supervisory and non-investigative positions.

a) Police:

"The majority of those employees who receive a partial allowance of \$360.00 annually are in operational positions (Crime Prevention) and subject to the same types of demands of patrol officers."

b) Budget and Research:

"Disagree. Should be reduced but not terminated."

c) Office response:

None

Recommendation 10: Sheriff Deputies receive a cash clothing allowance equal to plainclothes police officers.

a) Police:

"Concerning the issue about the Sheriff's Department, one can take the position that there does not necessarily have to be parity among the various departments of the County Government, depending upon whether they can justify their operational needs for uniforms or the amount of uniform allowance they provide their employees. The daily working conditions need to be considered in this instance."

b) Sheriff:

The Sheriff commented orally that he wished to emphasize that compensation for Sheriff's deputies should be equal to that of the Police Department.

c) Budget and Research:

"Disagree. Have some difficulty with this as positions are not comparable in my opinion."

d) Office response:

None

Recommendation 11: Terminate gratis laundering and dry cleaning services.

a) Police:

"The provision of gratis laundry and dry cleaning for certain police personnel is not a gift when considering it was an incentive for recruiting the best qualified applicants to this department. The removal of this benefit is tantamount to a reduction in salary. What now costs the county an estimated fifty-one dollars annually per employee would cost the employee approximately \$450.00 were he to maintain the same standards.

"The statement that this practice is unique to Montgomery County has been disqualified previously. The allowance paid by the MNCPPC Police had this item included with the uniform replacement costs. The Maryland State Police receive an annual allowance of approximately \$150.00 for maintenance of uniforms. Both of these departments and perhaps others that provide allowance for clothing replacement have found this to be totally inadequate to cover such costs."

b) Fire and Rescue:

"By its very nature, work in the fire and rescue services entails a great deal of dirty type work. Not only does this occur during working fires, but perspiration from wearing the heavy protective equipment requires frequent changes of clothes.

"To this must be added the dirt and damage to clothing during ambulance calls. Victims are found in all locations from fields to automobiles. In addition, there is the problem of damage to the clothing from the injured patient's wounds.

"Investigators and fire inspectors spend a great deal of time on new construction sights, in attics and basements as well as many out-of-the-way places. Uniforms become extremely dirty in the performance of their duty."

c) Corrections/Rehabilitation:

"Vigorously oppose... In the performance of duties, the officer frequently is on the receiving end of physical abuse from the inmates and must physically restrain intractable inmates. The smell of cigarette smoke permeates the uniform. Inmates often hurl objects at the officers to include such things as food and even urine. Within the past two years, in an effort to economize, laundry and dry cleaning services were withdrawn for the treatment staff.

"Termination of these services would be construed by the officers to be an erosion of fringe benefits. To the present time, County had made an effort to retain existing benefits for the present employee as currently demonstrated by the proposed retirement legislation before Council which purposely does not reduce the level of benefits for the present employee.

"Can we really expect an officer to pay for dry cleaning required as a result of the overall working environment?"

"The recommendation of the report indicates that services would continue in those instances resulting from a line of duty altercation. This would be burdensome and would require paper work and could foster manipulation and dishonesty. Those who wanted to could get around the system at the expense of the ethical employee.

"Recommend services be continued. Discontinuance would have an adverse morale impact. New officers obviously should also receive these services."

d) Budget and Research:

"Disagree. Will encourage dirty, unsightly appearance. In my opinion, it is worth the cost. Believe it should be administered better, based on report."

e) Office response:

The current County contract could be continued at the same rate with employees paying for personal services through payroll deduction.

Recommendation 12: Request M-NCPPC reevaluate annual cash clothing allowance to Park Police for laundry, dry cleaning and replacement:

a) M-NCPPC:

"The Commission believes that the payment of \$40.00 per month is not excessive and not beyond the requirements needed by the Office to adequately maintain the cleaning of the various uniform items and to permit the timely replacement of worn items.

"Significantly, since the initial uniform issue quantity is minimal, this results in faster wear-out and replacement; or as many Officers do, the immediate purchase of additional shirts and trousers.

"It is most important that the Officers maintain a presentable and neat appearance. Because the Officers are often exposed to all types of weather and sometimes adverse conditions, regular and frequent cleaning is necessary."

b) Budget and Research:

"Agree with recommendation."

c) Office response:

None

Recommendation 13: Direct Office to evaluate purchasing and funding policies of fire departments/rescue squads.

a) Fire and Rescue:

"First, two of these organizations accept no tax funds and therefore are not subject to the control of the County Council. Second, the Fire Board has begun to develop its centralized purchasing system in conjunction with the County Purchasing Department. Since this is just in the development stages, I would suggest that any work project be postponed until the new procedures are developed.

b) Budget and Research:

"Agree with recommendation."

c) Office response:

None

GENERAL AND SUMMARY COMMENTS BY AGENCIES/DEPARTMENTS:

a) Police:

"The report addresses the overly generous and costly programs of providing gratis uniforms, replacements, cash allowances and maintenance for certain employees. It also states the present programs are ineffectively managed and the practical requirements are excessive. Whether the issue of the replacement and maintenance of uniforms to some employees and the payment of cash clothing allowances to others is equitable is only a part of the entire question. The fact remains that the desirable outcomes of this type of benefit, along with the demonstrated commitment to minimizing the attendant costs, clearly indicates that continuing this practice is a worthwhile investment for the county and the Department of Police.

"In regard to fringe benefits in general, any change in the current uniform policy should be evaluated in light of the department's total compensation package as it relates to other jurisdictions in the Metropolitan area... Unfortunately, the report chose to compare clothing allowance as an isolated issue.

"My final comment concerns the impact any modification to the existing fringe benefits may have on employee morale and productivity. The present cost to the county may be well spent to retain the employee's confidence in government, present public image and prevent the possibility of employees becoming involved in compromising situations resulting from acceptance of gratuities for laundry, dry cleaning and clothing purchases. The consideration of the economic impact on the employee of any reduction in the program can not be lost in this process."

b) Fire and Rescue:

"In summary, I feel that (1) the cleaning allowance should be continued, (2) that the amount of clothing issued initially remain the same, (3) that the fire and rescue communications personnel continue to wear uniforms, and (4) that the fire investigators continue to receive a clothing allowance, and, (5) that the Department of Fire and Rescue Services continue to maintain its own distinctive patch."

c) Corrections/Rehabilitation:

"Erosion of clearly justified and established fringe benefits creates disharmony, adverse morale, and dissatisfied employees. We agree that the uniform allowance may be generous and needs to be studied."

d) DEP:

"In closing, I would like to point out that appears to be a recommendation that could be added to your draft report. I would suggest that the County's uniform rental contract be bid and awarded on the basis of cost per uniform changed. Thus, the frequency of changes due to position requirements or personal preferences of the employees may be accommodated and the County would no longer pay for uniform changes which are not used."

e) Budget and Research:

"While the report does mention the philosophy behind certain uniform assignments, I do not believe the subject has been adequately addressed.

"This County has established certain norms as far as the standard of service it provides. The public has come to expect to see Police Officers, for example, in a neat, fresh uniform. This has many benefits for the public as well as the employee. With other employees, it provides reassurance to the public that the employee is a representative of the Government, which cannot be overemphasized.

"The Policeman, for example, stands out in the public view. This is especially true with the clothing styles which have recently become the public norm. Thus, the uniformed County employee is very visible in the performance of his or her duty. This visibility often results in a task being performed in a safe and expeditious manner.

"Historically, the County Council has left the details of uniform allotments and styles to the various department heads to administer. Generally, this procedure has worked effectively. This report appears designed as a device to take that prerogative away from the various departments and establish a policy followed by all County departments and agencies on a uniform basis, which I would contend does not necessarily follow as proper.

"While this office is as concerned as any office about economy in government service, I think that these economies must be weighed against the benefits which are accruing to the public. In the past several years, many new duties have been absorbed by groups of employees who previously did not meet the public, for example, the leash law enforcement, fire inspections performed by firemen, and many other, combined with the need for proper sight identification. The net effect has been that the public is assured that the employee is officially representing the government.

"While one might quarrel with specific quantities or styles of uniforms, the basic question remains - how discretionary are these expenditures? It should be pointed out that there are two primary factors which should be considered: public service and employee morale versus any unnecessary expenditures. It is important to realize out of \$515 million, we are talking about less than \$1 million or .2 of 1% if all could be eliminated. Therefore, since it is assumed the uniformed services will remain so, the discretionary amount would appear to be less than \$100,000."

f) Office response:

DEP's recommendation was presented to the uniform rental vendor, who commented that he knows of no vendor offering such an arrangement. Nonetheless, DEP's recommendation was passed to the Purchasing Office.

The Council annually appropriates or approves close to \$1 million for uniforms and uniform related services for almost 7,000 public employees. Admittedly, this but .2 of 1% of the annual budget; and the annual savings recommended in this report is only \$180,000. Notwithstanding these exiguous amounts, the uniform programs, like all programs funded with public monies, must be conceived, funded and managed with the necessary goals of effectiveness, efficiency and necessity.

This report does not conclude that the County uniform programs should be terminated. Rather, the report recommends eliminating extravagances, correcting inequities and strengthening program management.

<u>EXHIBITS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
A. Uniform & Clothing Expenditures - All County and Bi-County Agencies	1-A
B. Uniform Items Purchased on A. Jacobs & Sons, Inc., Contract	1-B
C. Uniform/Clothing Allowance for Selected Police and Sheriff's Departments	1-C
D. Sampling of Uniform Rental Service - County Government	1-D
E. Sampling of Uniform Rental Service - Montgomery College	1-E

UNIFORM & CLOTHING EXPENDITURES
ALL COUNTY/BI-COUNTY AGENCIES
FY 77 ACTUAL/FY 78 BUDGET

AS OF AUGUST 1977

DEPARTMENT/AGENCY	CAT I Uniforms: New/Repl			CAT II Rental Uniform Service			CAT III Cash Clothing Allowance			CAT IV Cleaning & Laundering Service			Total All Categories	
	Approx. # Personnel	FY 77 Actual	FY 78 Budget	Approx. # Personnel	FY 77 Actual	FY 78 Budget	Approx. # Personnel	FY 77 Actual	FY 78 Budget	Approx. # Personnel	FY 77 Actual	FY 78 Budget	FY 77 Actual	FY 78 Budget
County Government (See Note a)														
Police	960	175,103	237,250	-----none-----			164	67,937	65,440	1,124	46,050	67,000	289,090	369,690
Correct/Rehab.	70	28,662	17,902	-----none-----			7	-0-	840	70	4,759	6,660	33,421	25,402
DOT	72	18,500	13,000	580	96,150	105,900	-----none-----			72	7,230	16,200	121,880	135,100
DEP	17	1,828	3,600	Note b 65	19,265	11,492	-----none-----			17 - (Incl. in CAT I)-			21,093	15,092
Facilities Mngmt. & Ser.	14	1,500	1,500	150	17,774	21,975	-----none-----			14	1,500	1,500	20,774	24,975
Dept. Liquor Control	-----none-----			130	23,439	27,000	-----none-----			-----none-----			23,439	27,000
Health	116	7,150	7,490	100	2,060	2,500	13	2,530	1,560	-----none-----			11,740	11,550
Fire/Rescue 16 depart. & 2 squads (See Note c)	100 (1,450)	17,420 (122,030)	14,225 (137,050)	-----none-----			4	1,680	1,680	100	4,545	5,023	23,645	20,928
				-----none-----			-----none-----			----- (Incl. in CAT I) -----			(122,030)	137,050
Total County Government	1,349	250,163	294,967	1,025	158,688	168,867	188	72,147	69,520	1,397	64,084	96,383	545,082	629,737
<u>Other Public Agencies</u> in the County.														
MCPS	500	16,763	18,750	1,525	139,291	200,094	-----none-----			-----none-----			156,054	218,844
Montgomery College	68	5,031	-0-	Note d 145	34,546	33,338	-----none-----			-----none-----			39,577	33,338
Sheriff	-----none-----			-----none-----			63	11,750	13,000	-----none-----			11,750	13,000
Total Other Co. Agencies	568	21,794	18,750	1,670	173,837	233,432	63	11,750	13,000	-0-	-0-	-0-	207,381	265,182
EXHIBIT A														

V-1

DEPARTMENT/AGENCY	CAT I			CAT II			CAT III			CAT IV			Total	
	Uniforms: New/Repl			Rented Uniforms & Service			Cash Clothing Allowance			Cleaning & Laundering Service			All Categories	
	Approx. #	FY 77	FY 78	Approx. #	FY 77	FY 78	Approx. #	FY 77	FY 78	Approx. #	FY 77	FY 78	FY 77	FY 78
	Personnel	Actual	Budget	Personnel	Actual	Budget	Personnel	Actual	Budget	Personnel	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget
Bi-County			Note											
M-NCPPC	557	63,827 ^e	49,750	307	17,172	-0-	-----	none-----	-----	----(Incl. in CAT I)-----			80,999	49,750
WSSC	918	56,831 ^f	-0-	120	24,104	24,104	-----	none-----	-----	-----	none-----		80,935	24,104
Total Bi-County Agencies	1,475	120,658	49,750	427	41,276	24,104	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	161,934	73,854
Grand Total County:	3,392	392,615	363,467	3,122	373,801	426,403	251	83,897	82,520	1,397	64,084	96,383	914,397	968,773

Notes:

- V-2
- For all departments and agencies, the approximate number of personnel is an average of FY 77 and FY 78 strengths and includes female and male, full and part time employees. Not all personnel within an agency receive the same items and number of article of clothing.
 - DEP acknowledges the FY 78 budget of \$3,600 is high and must be adjusted.
 - Data for the 16 Fire Departments and 2 Rescue Squads are not included in any totals. The Fire Departments/Rescue Squads cost data includes a mixture of uniforms and protective (turn-out) clothing from County and volunteer funds.
 - MC - In FY 77, MC purchased long sleeve shirts for approximately 68 male custodial/maintenance personnel on the basis of 11 shirts issued and five as replacements. These shirts are laundered by the rental uniform service contractor.
 - MNCPPC - FY 77 expenditures for CAT I: In FY 77, the Department of Parks changes from a rental/laundry service for work uniforms to an outright purchase. Under the previous rental/laundry system, the Commission and employees shared the cost on a 50-50 basis.
 - WSSC - FY 77 expenditures for CAT I: In FY 77, WSSC purchased and issued to 900 field and plant employees of the Maintenance and Operations Department through Grade 13, four sets of coveralls with replacement and laundering at the employee's expense. In FY 78, any new employees will be issued four sets from stocks purchased with FY 77 funds.

Uniform Items Provided Six
County Government Departments by
Contract with A. Jacobs and Sons, Inc.

GROUP I - DEPARTMENT OF POLICE

1. Caps - Summer
2. Caps - Winter
3. Caps - Crossing Guards - Male
4. Caps - Policewoman.
5. Caps - Crossing Guards - Female
6. Caps - Police Cadets.
7. Hat - Montana Peak.
8. Hat - Montana Peak - Milan Straw.
9. Caps - Fur.
10. Caps - Air Force Style - Winter
11. Caps - Air Force Style - Summer
12. Cap Cover
13. Cap Cover
14. Cap Cover - Female Police Officer & Crossing Guards
15. Cap Cover - Montana Peak Hat.
16. Helmet - Knitted - Crossing Guard
17. Coat - Uniform (Blouse)
18. Coat - Uniform (Blouse) Summer Tropical
19. Coats - Cadets.
20. Jacket - Uniform - Crossing Guard - Male.
21. Jacket - Uniform - Crossing Guard - Female.
22. All-Weather Raincoat/Overcoat - Executive Officers.
23. Overcoats - Crossing Guards

24. Jacket - Duty
25. Raincoats - Policemen, Policewomen, Crossing Guards
26. Gloves.
27. White Cotton Gloves
28. Neckties.
29. Neckties - Civilian Radio Dispatchers & Civilian Desk
Clerks - Female
30. Winter Shirts - Police Officers.
31. Summer (Short Sleeves) Shirts - Police Officer
32. Winter Shirts - Cadet.
33. Summer (Short Sleeves) Shirts - Cadet.
34. Winter Shirts - Desk Clerks & Civilian Radio Dispatchers -
Grade I.
35. Summer (Short Sleeves) Shirts - Desk Clerks & Civilian
Radio Dispatchers - Grade I.
36. Winter Shirts - Civilian Radio Dispatchers II.
37. Summer (Short Sleeves) Shirts - Civilian Radio Dispatchers II
38. Winter Shirts - Civilian Desk Clerks & Civilian Radio
Dispatchers - Female
39. Summer (Short Sleeves) Shirts - Civilian Desk Clerks &
Civilian Radio Dispatchers - Female.
40. Shirtwaist, Winter (Long Sleeves) - Crossing Guards - Female
41. Winter Shirt - Policewomen
42. Summer (Short Sleeves) Shirts - Policewomen.
43. Skirts - Civilian Desk Clerks & Civilian Radio Dispatchers -
Female
44. Skirts - Crossing Guards
45. Undervest - Police Officers.

- 46. Sweaters - Desk Clerks & Civilian Radio Dispatchers.
- 47. Sweaters - Motorcycle Men.
- 48. Winter Trousers - Police Officers, Cadets, & Crossing
Guards - Male.
- 48A. (OPTIONAL)
- 49. Summer Trousers - Police Officers - Male
- 49A. (OPTIONAL)
- 50. Summer Trousers - Desk Clerks & Radio Dispatchers.
- 51. Winter Trousers - Desk Clerks & Radio Dispatchers.
- 52. Breeches - Winter.
- 53. Breeches - Summer.
- 54. Winter Slacks - Policewomen.
- 55. Summer Slacks - Policewomen.
- 56. Insignia - Desk Clerks & Civilian Radio Dispatchers.
- 57. Insignia for School Patrol
- 58. Unit Patch, Traffic.
- 59. Chevrons - P.F.C., Cpl., and Sgt.
- 60. Motorcycle Officers Dickey
- 61. Reefer - Motorcycle Officers

GROUP II - DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION - MALE INSPECTORS

- 1. Belt
- 2. Cap.
- 3. Rain Hat Cover
- 4. Coats.
- 5. Coats, Green, Outer.
- 6. Shirts, Summer

7. Shirts, Winter
8. Insignia, Uniform.
9. Trousers, Winter Uniform
10. Trousers, Summer Uniform

GROUP III - DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION - FEMALE INSPECTORS

1. Hat.
2. Rain Hat Cover
3. Shirts, Winter
4. Shirts, Summer
5. Skirts, Winter
6. Skirts, Summer
7. Coats.
8. Coats, Green, Outer.
9. Insignia

GROUP IV - CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS (also FM&S - Security)

1. Uniform Coats.
2. Trousers, Winter
3. Shirts, Winter
4. Trousers, Summer
5. Shirts, Summer
6. Belts.
7. Chevrons (Corporal).
8. Chevrons (Sergeant).
9. Chevrons (Private First Class)

10. Insignia
11. Ties
12. Raincoats.
13. Nylon Jackets.

GROUP V - FIRE PERSONNEL

1. Body Coat - Winter.
2. Body Coat - Summer.
3. Trousers - Winter
4. Trousers - Summer
5. Trousers - Wash & Wear.
6. Shirts - White Long Sleeves
7. Shirts - Blue Long Sleeves.
8. Shirts - White Short Sleeves.
9. Shirts - Blue Short Sleeves
10. Caps (Winter)
11. Caps (Summer)
12. Sweaters.
13. Belts
14. Scarves
15. Gloves.
16. Raincoats
17. Ties.
18. Ties.

GROUP VI - DIVISION OF PARKING

1. Belt.
2. Caps.
3. Winter Coats.
4. Summer Jackets.
5. summer Trousers.
6. Winter Trousers.
7. Winter Shirts.
8. Summer Shirts.
9. Ties

UNIFORM/CLOTHING ALLOWANCE FOR SELECTED
METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AREA POLICE
AND SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENTS

AS OF AUGUST 1977

Police Dept.	County Furnished Uniforms			Uniform Replacement		Cash Clothing Allowance		Gratis Cleaning/Laundry	
	Gratis Initial Issue	Cost (Incl. Gun & Equip)	Leather Footwear Issued	For Lost/Dam In Line of Duty	For Normal Wear & Tear	Annual Cash Allow.	Annual Cash Allow. for Plain-clothes Officers	For Uniformed & Plainclothes	Cash Allow.
Montgomery Co.	yes	\$1,200	yes	yes	yes	no	\$420	yes	no
Arlington Co.	yes	\$ 690 ^a	no ^b	yes	yes	no	\$598 (plus an initial payment of \$500)	no	no
Fairfax Co.	yes	\$ 950	no	yes	yes	no	\$390	no	no
Prince George's Co.	yes	\$ 600	no	yes	no	\$400	\$400	no	no
Wash., D.C.	yes	\$ 800	no	yes	yes	no	\$350/yr.	no	no

Notes:

- a) Motorcycle officers received an additional \$250 for two pair boots.
- b) Except for two pair boots for motorcycle officers.
- c) Issued "civilian-type" uniforms (blazer, trousers, shirt, tie) valued at \$270 plus replacement.

Sheriff's Department		Annual Cash Allow. for Plain clothes Deputies	Cleaning/Laundry	
Montgomery County		\$200	no	no
Arlington County		\$598	no	no
Fairfax County		None ^c	no	no
Prince George's County		\$400	no	no

EXHIBIT C

A SAMPLING OF RENTAL UNIFORM SERVICE BY
RENTEX SERVICES, INC., IN FY 77

Agency	Weekly Invoice Date	Cost of Contract Service Paid to Rentex	Cost to Ser. Items Actually Picked Up	% Utilization
DOT - Traffic Engineering	8/12/76	\$71.40	\$36.04	
	8/19/76	71.40	34.00	
Account #465195	1/24/77	78.20	34.00	
	1/31/77	78.20	44.88	
	TOTAL	\$299.20	\$148.92	50%
DOT - Street Cleaning	8/16/76	\$156.40	\$ 48.28	
	8/23/76	156.40	36.04	
Account #465013	1/24/77	89.76	15.64	
	1/31/77	89.76	16.32	
	TOTAL	\$492.32	\$116.26	24%
Facilities Management & Services - Building Maintenance	7/07/76	\$ 29.88	\$ 3.40	
	7/14/76	29.88	5.44	
	1/24/77	26.52	2.04	
	1/31/77	26.52	6.12	
Account #465179	TOTAL	\$112.80	\$ 17.00	15%
Facilities Management & Services - Central Duplicating	8/16/76	\$ 12.24	\$ 6.12	
	8/23/76	12.24	5.44	
	1/24/77	17.00	4.76	
	1/31/77	17.00	0	
Account #465088	TOTAL	\$ 58.48	16.32	28%
DEP - Solid Waste	7/07/76	\$287.20	\$ 40.12	
	7/14/76	287.20	53.04	
Account #465096	1/24/77	238.00	43.52	
	1/31/77	238.00	19.04	
	TOTAL	\$990.40	\$155.72	16%
Departemtn of Liquor Control - Beer Div.	8/16/76	\$227.80	\$ 47.60	
	8/23/76	227.80	56.44	
	1/24/77	288.00	69.36	
Account #463885	1/31/77	288.00	29.92	
	TOTAL	\$1,031.60	\$203.32	20%
Total for Sample Period		\$2,984.80	\$657.54	22%

A SAMPLING OF RENTAL UNIFORM SERVICE BY
BALTIMORE UNIFORM RENTAL INC., IN
FY 77 FOR MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

Agency	Weekly Invoice Date	Cost of Contract Service Paid to Contractor	Cost to Ser. Items Actually Picked Up	% Utilization
Stop 353	11/03/76	\$ 94.80	\$ 26.07	
	11/10/76	103.80	26.86	
	4/20/77	95.90	37.92	
	4/27/77	95.90	34.76	
	TOTAL	\$390.40	\$125.61	32%

Note a: Contracted at the rate of \$3.95/week/employee receiving 5 changes per week or 79¢/change.

