

**Reinventing Government and Federal Downsizing --or Whose Ox is being Gored**

by G. Ross Stephens  
Political Science Department  
University of Missouri-Kansas City

and

Nelson Wikstrom  
Political Science and Public Administration  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
Richmond

**Panel:**

**National Government “Reinvention”: Yesterday and Today**

Thursday, November 9, 2000

2:45-4:15 PM

WP 2000-19

Annual Conference of the Southern Political Science Association  
Sheraton Colony Square Hotel  
Atlanta, Georgia  
November 8-11, 2000

***Working Papers*** published by the Institute of Governmental Studies provide quick dissemination of draft reports and papers, preliminary analysis, and papers with a limited audience. The objective is to assist authors in refining their ideas by circulating results and to stimulate discussion about public policy. *Working Papers* are reproduced unedited directly from the author’s page.

**Abstract:**

There are a number of aspects of reinventing government and federal downsizing that have received little or no attention by scholars or other interested parties. First, it should be emphasized, not all federal executive agencies have experienced reductions in personnel; and where downsizing has occurred, the degree of personnel reduction has varied widely from one agency to the next. In addition, between 1990 and 1997, some agencies have increased their civil service personnel, others have apparently hired additional workers on contract, or both. Third, both the judicial branch and the Justice Department have dramatically increased their civil service personnel. The outgoing tide has not lowered all boats. Moreover, in the aggregate, all of the positions eliminated due to downsizing, for this seven-year period, were situated in the lower pay grades; conversely, the number of individuals in the highest ranks of the General Schedule and the Senior/Executive positions increased substantially. Finally, it appears that some of the agencies which have experienced the most severe reductions in personnel no longer have the capacity to fully provide the services for which they were created or to provide a range of vital information to the business, academic, and professional communities. The latter, obviously, has important public policy implications.

Vice-President Gore leads the Administration's efforts to reinvent government, making it work better, cost less, and get results that Americans care about. Under his leadership, the size of the federal [civilian] workforce has been reduced by about 350,000 people, and common sense changes have been made in the way government works that have saved the taxpayers \$ 137 billion.

--Reinventing Government web site<sup>1</sup>

All of this sounds like 'the good, the true, and the beautiful', but is it on the mark? To a considerable degree, the movement for federal downsizing is the result of bureaucrat bashing, primarily denigrating federal bureaucrats, that started in the 1980s, continued into the 1990s, and continues to the present day. And, there is little doubt, we will be subjected to much more of this kind of political rhetoric throughout the 2000 presidential election campaign season. Needless to say, this sort of political grousing is neither new or novel to our time. Writing in *Scribner's Magazine* in 1933, Charles A. Beard and William Beard describe a similar situation, "Among the latest deliriums is that of waging war on the bureaucracy, full of noise and promise. Some of our very best people are doing it, usually without discrimination, for discrimination takes the edge off propaganda."<sup>2</sup> In the the same spirit, substantial misinformation is conveyed as fact concerning both personnel downsizing and the general state of the public bureaucracy in the United States. As Charles Goodsell (1994) so aptly advanced many years later, "Roughly 20 million Americans work for government. We all recognize that this huge slice of the population does not consist solely of lazy bums, incompetents, or the psychologically malformed."

Many of the critics of the bureaucracy stridently contend that these civil servants are doing little or nothing for their compensation, and in a parallel vein, claim the size of the federal bureaucracy has ‘mushroomed out of control’. Yet, we need to bear in mind that nearly all of the growth of government personnel since the 1950s has been at the state and local levels, partially stimulated by the increase in federal grants-in-aid. However, a more important basic factor accounting for the dramatic increase in state and local personnel is increasing challenges and demands associated with the approximately 100 million increase in the population of the United States over the last half century. In a more specific sense, the dramatic increase in state and local personnel is a result of the 150 percent increase in the population of metropolitan areas with 70 percent of this growth (105 million) in suburban and fringe areas. Between 1950 and the 1990s, the population of metropolitan areas increased from 85 to 213 million which meant 128 million new city and suburban residents requiring services primarily provided by local and state governments (Stephens and Wikstrom, 2000).

Most partisan critics of the federal bureaucracy fail to recognize that over the last half-century, federal civilian and military employment declined 28 percent. More specifically, personnel associated with defense related agencies declined by about 44 percent, while that for non-defense agencies increased 47 percent. Nevertheless, defense agencies still account for over 55 percent of all fulltime military and civilian personnel and over 64 percent if a fulltime equivalent (FTE) is included for military ready reserve personnel (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1998, 1999).<sup>3</sup> It seems appropriate to include an FTE equivalent for the military reserves given the enhanced role for the ready reserves over the last few decades. Most tabulations of the federal bureaucracy fail to include military personnel or assign workers to defense and non-defense agencies. Growth of the federal bureaucracy has been greatly exaggerated.

### **Reductions by Pay System and Pay Scale**

In an aggregate sense, a disproportionate share of the federal personnel downsizing that occurred between 1990 and 1997 took place at the lower levels of the General Schedule (GS) positions and the wage payroll system. Between 1990 and 1997, a net of 320,059 civilian non-postal positions were eliminated, but the decline in GS 1-12 and wage payroll jobs totaled 366,522 employees. As Table 1 indicates, wage payroll workers declined by nearly one-third, while those ranked GS 1-4 dropped by over 50 percent; that is, 111,341 and 107,309 respectively. GS 5-8 ranks declined by 79,005 or 16 percent; GS 9-12 by 67,767 workers or 11 percent. Overall civilian non-postal employment dropped 15 percent. At the same time, GS 13-15 workers increased 15 percent while senior/executive jobs rose nearly half, up by over 49 percent. Over 44,600 highly compensated civil service jobs were created, somewhat ironically, during this era of federal reduction in the number of employees. And, again somewhat ironically, notwithstanding all of the political ‘noise’ and rhetoric given to providing more opportunities for minorities in the federal government, nearly all of these reductions-in-force were African-American (-15 percent) and white ( -17 percent) personnel. In the scheme of things, other minorities fared much better; the number of Hispanic employees succumbing to downsizing totaled a scant 470 workers (-0.4 percent). Only employees classified as Native American, Asian, and Pacific Islander increased in number and then by only a little over 3,400 for an increase of 3.0 percent.

(Table 1 about here)

One would expect some concentration of personnel reduction in the lower pay grades, but for the period under consideration these changes seem excessive:

	<u>1990 Percent of Personnel<sup>4</sup></u>	<u>1990-97 Percent of Personnel Reduction</u>
Wage Pay	16.0 %	- 30.4 %
GS 1-4	9.9	- 29.2
GS 5-8	22.4	- 21.6
GS 9-12	28.2	- 18.8

One reason may well be the fact that personnel in the lower pay grades may be easier to replace under contract.

### **Procurement Contracts**

There is substantial evidence to support the perspective that the often stated and popularized reduction in federal employees is severely misleading, since many of these workers have been replaced by contract employees through the utilization of procurement contracts. We might well characterize this phenomenon as the ‘smoke and mirrors’ effect of downsizing. To start with, between 1989 and 1998 defense agency contract procurement declined by 4 percent, non-defense agency procurement contracts increased over 81 percent (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1989 and 1998). In a more specific sense, a well-placed source, employed by a regional office of the General Services Administration (GSA), indicated that thirty of the sixty positions in her office have been eliminated, but that all thirty positions had been replaced by contract workers. As will be shown in a later section of this paper, GSA is among that group of federal agencies that has experienced both a large reduction in personnel since 1990 and a rather massive increase in dollars expended for procurement contracts.

A number of executive agencies have employed personnel on contract for a very long time (John Maggs, 1999)<sup>5</sup>, but there is considerable circumstantial evidence that the use of contract employment has increased for at least some agencies since the reinventing government program went into effect. Along these lines, Paul C. Light in his recently released book titled *The True Size of*

*Government* has estimated the number of workers employed under federal procurement contracts for 1984, 1990, and 1996. His data lends support to the belief that several non-defense agencies are replacing some of the civil servants downsized with contract workers (Table 2). Between 1990 and 1996, while the overall estimated number of contract workers declined 712,000 (-11 percent) and those employed by defense agencies went down 808,000 (-16 percent), non-defense agency contract personnel increased 96,000 (+ 7.4 percent). It is of interest that, contract workers employed in the purchase of products declined 798,000 (-33 percent); those employed in the purchase of services increased by 87,000 (+2 percent).

(Table 2 about here)

It should be emphasized that these are aggregate figures for the entire federal government. A somewhat different pattern, and a better way to understand the effects of federal downsizing, is to examine the data on an agency by agency basis. A difficulty we should mention here is the problem of the availability of data on an agency by agency basis. At this writing, personnel data are available for the entire 1990 to 1997 period for all federal agencies. On the other hand, comparable information for procurement contracts is readily available only for 17 agencies for the period from 1995 to 1998 from the *Consolidated Federal Funds Reports*. As a result, we chose to compare the reductions in personnel for these agencies from 1994 to 1997 with the increase in procurement contracts in millions of dollars and in some cases dollars per civil servant released, with a one year lag time, for 1995-1998. For these periods, both the Justice Department and the Postal Service increased civil service personnel and contract procurement with sufficient latitude to have hired additional personnel under contract.

Ten agencies reduced personnel and increased procurement contracts. It is unlikely that the departments of Agriculture and Veterans hired many replacement workers under contract, although this is a reasonable conjecture for the Treasury, Commerce, Labor, and the State departments with

increases in contracting from \$ 49,000 to \$ 116,000 per worker downsized. It is almost certain that GSA, EPA, and the departments of Education, Transportation, and Health and Human Services (the latter includes the Social Security Administration)<sup>6</sup> have increased contract personnel with increases in procurement contracts of from \$ 418,000 to over \$ 829,000 per civil servant downsized. For these agencies, it is quite possible that the number of workers hired under contract exceeded the number released through downsizing. The remaining four agencies experienced reductions in both personnel and procurement contracting during these time periods, therefore it is highly unlikely that many, if any, of their downsized workers were replaced by contract personnel.

(Table 3 about here)

### **Personnel Changes by Branch and Agency, 1990 to 1997**

Overall between 1990 and 1997, including both civilian and military personnel, federal employment declined by over one million positions for a reduction of 18 percent. The reduction for Congressional employees was 16 percent while that for the executive branch of government declined 18 percent. Executive branch civilian employees went down 11 percent while military personnel declined 27 percent. The fourteen line departments lost 17 percent of their civilian positions, while the so-called independent agencies, as a group, remained largely unchanged.<sup>7</sup>

What is striking about all of this is when one takes into account the many vacancies in federal judgeships, the judicial branch increased employment ranks by nearly 30 percent in this seven year period (see Table 4). While the data for judicial branch procurement contracts are not available, there appears to have been a proliferation of service personnel and law clerks over the last few years. In addition, the judicial branch has hired more security guards<sup>8</sup> and constructed new, state-of-the-art courthouses that require more workers to operate. In these new facilities every judge has his or her own, very expensive, law library, and in all probability, a law librarian to go along with the personal library.<sup>9</sup> A 30 percent increase in personnel seems excessive.

(Table 4 about here)

The 40 percent increase in Justice Department personnel over this seven-year period also seems out-of-line. Some of this expansion of personnel could be accounted for by the appointment of several special prosecutors and their staff, but these personnel were hired under contract. Another contributing factor would appear to be the policy emphasis on 'law and order' and the accompanying growth of federal law enforcement entities [Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Secret Service, the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF) unit, the Border Patrol, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), U.S. Marshals Service, Bureau of Prisons, *etcetera*]. Policies that have contributed include the so-called 'war on drugs', countering the prospect of terrorist activity, and attempts to stop illegal immigration. According to one source at the Justice Department, each time they have a task force to study an issue, such as terrorism, they end up hiring additional workers to deal with the problem.<sup>10</sup> This source also indicated that the process of computerizing criminal justice data, case data, and other necessary information, as well as the increase in case loads are contributing factors. Mandatory sentencing also appears to be a contributing factor. Very troubling is the enormous increase in prosecutorial discretion in recent years and the nationalization of nearly all crimes. Justice Department personnel increased by over 33,000 employees during this seven-year period. Perhaps the large increases in judicial branch and Justice Department personnel is just a full-employment program for the myriads of attorneys being turned out by the nation's law schools.

Analysis of the results of other federal downsizing of specific bureaucratic components of the national government provides a set of interesting and informative results. Viewed from this perspective, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) experienced the largest increase in personnel of almost 56 percent, but this appears to have been a response to various emergencies confronted between 1990 and 1997. To be precise, however, it should be noted that for the 1990-1996 period the increase was 109 percent, then FEMA terminated over one-fourth of its employees

between 1996 and 1997. The Federal Reserve system (FRS) and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) added about one-fourth to their work force. Growth of personnel at the Panama Canal Commission seems to have been the result of training Panamanians to take over when the canal was transferred to Panama.

In contrast, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (NASA), the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), Railroad Retirement Board (RRB), the Department of Defense (DOD), and the General Services Administration (GSA) lost between 20 and 30 percent of their civilian personnel over seven years, while the International Development and Cooperation Agency declined 37 percent. The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) declined 47 and 49 percent respectively. The 49 percent reduction in personnel at the TVA seems excessive for a profit making entity that has shared its profits with state and local governments in the region in the form of payments-in-lieu of taxes. Have the privately owned utilities finally managed to achieve their goal of destroying the TVA because it provides cheaper power to the region?

Troubling to the authors is the decline by half or more for the Commerce Department and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC). In a specific sense, the loss of trained and highly competent personnel at the Census Bureau, located in the Commerce Department, has drastically reduced and in other cases delayed the amount of information they collect and disseminate on all sorts of matters like agriculture, manufacturing, transportation, housing, government, etc.-- information utilized by the academic community, business, and government that is vital to the formulation and analysis of public policy. The Census Bureau has lost such a large proportion of its experienced personnel they can no longer conduct the special projects they once did for other federal agencies and Congress.<sup>11</sup> This situation, an organizational deficit, greatly reduces our ability to analyze and critique whatever is going on in both the government and the economy.

In an analogous manner, the downsizing of personnel at the FDIC is even more troubling than that which occurred at the Commerce Department, when we consider the Federal Savings and Loan Deposit Insurance Corporation (FSLIC) debacle that accompanied deregulation in the 1980s and the fact that Congress has recently passed broad legislation further deregulating our financial institutions. From 1990 and 1997, the FDIC experienced a 53 percent reduction in personnel, but this portrays only part of the problem at hand. Between 1985 and 1990, the number of employees increased from 6,723 to 17,641 as the result of the assumption of the duties of the FSLIC and the charge to 'clear up the bad debts' of the savings and loan institutions throughout the country. Reflecting this increased workload, in 1992 the number of FDIC employees totaled 22,467. However, by 1997, the number of FDIC workers had dropped to 8,265 for a 63 percent reduction of personnel in five years. This development raises a very real question as to whether the FDIC can do its job with a reduced work force of some 8,000 employees in a period when there is a blurring of organizational and business lines between banks, saving and loans, insurance companies, brokerage firms, and other financial institutions?

### **Conclusion**

As pointed out earlier, the growth of the federal bureaucracy over time has been grossly exaggerated. Concerning federal downsizing, the evidence strongly indicates that 'an outgoing tide does not lower all boats'. Nor has the seemingly popular 'reinventing government' approach solved the problems that some critics attribute to the federal bureaucracy; indeed, and somewhat ironically, this approach has simply ushered in new problems. For example, are contract workers more or less expensive than civil servants? Are they as competent when you consider the fact that they inhabit the lower rungs of the employment hierarchy and in the past civil servants could receive retirement and other benefits that are not always available to contract workers? Has the dollar cost savings been worth the service costs that result from losing experienced personnel?

The judicial branch, the Justice Department, and some other agencies have prospered under this project. By tradition Congress does not scrutinize the budget of the judicial branch in the same way or to the same degree the budgets of most executive agencies are examined. Have the courts and the Justice Department, heavily populated by lawyers, become our new legal bureaucratic aristocracy? To what degree have the courts and the lawyers usurped the policy functions of the other agencies and branches of government? Growth in these areas certainly reflects the currently popular 'Rambo' and 'law and order' public policy emphasis with the growth of federal law enforcement entities. At all levels of government prisons are the new growth industry. Though not critical at this point in time, how many steps have we taken in the direction of what is sometimes called the 'police state'?

In the aggregate, the elimination of civil service positions has been inordinately confined to the lower pay grades and pay systems, while the numbers of highly paid personnel have increased significantly. Part of this increase may be due to the 1993 change in party affiliation of the President from Republican to Democrat. Increased need for highly trained and specialized technical personnel throughout the federal bureaucracy may also have played a role. In a corollary fashion, it should be noted that African-Americans and white personnel have experienced an era of 'equal opportunity downsizing.' It appears that Hispanic co-workers have been largely unaffected, while Native Americans-Asians-Pacific Islanders have modestly increased their ranks..

Severe reductions at the Commerce Department have significantly reduced the amount of information available to other federal agencies, including Congress, state and local governments, business, and scholars. Is this becoming the new age of the 'know nothings' who say 'don't bother me with the facts, we want to do what we want to do' even though this is supposed to be the 'information age'. With reductions of personnel at the FDIC and deregulation of virtually all financial institutions, can we prevent an even bigger problem than that experienced with the savings

and loan banks in the 1980s? To what degree has the “reinventing government program” restricted the ability of the federal government to function in the 21st Century? It should be remembered that when the national government in a federal system abdicates the funding or provision of a public service, it may well force state and/or local units to fill in the gap.

Denigrating bureaucracy seems to be standard fare of recent presidential campaigns. As we go into the year 2000 campaign season, it is well to remember the concerns of Larry Lane and James Wolf (1990) that presidential campaign attacks on bureaucracy have contributed to a “tangible sense of federal institutional breakdown and declining morale.” For Lane and Wolf, “America has squandered one of its most critical resources--a fine civil service.”

**Table 1.** Change in Number of Federal (Non-Postal) Employees by Pay Scale and Pay System, 1990-1997

	Number of Employees		Percentage Change	Change in Number of Employees
	Year			
	1990	1997		
Wage Payroll	343,922	232,581	- 32.4%	- 111,341
GS Pay Rates				
1-4	212,843	105,534	- 50.4%	- 107,309
5-8	481,173	402,168	- 16.4	- 79,005
9-12	616,861	548,094	- 11.1	- 68,767
13-15	263,186	303,003	+15.1	+ 39,817
GS Sub-total	1,574,063	1,358,799	- 13.7%	- 215,264
Senior/Executive	9,970	14,876	+ 49.2%	+ 4,816
Other Pay Systems <sup>1</sup>	106,928	105,143	- 1.7%	- 1,785
Other, nec <sup>2</sup>	115,476	118,901	+ 3.0%	+ 3,425
Total Civilian Employees	2,150,359	1,830,300	- 14.9%	- 320,059

<sup>1</sup>Mostly made up of federal court and Congressional employees, along with some from the Justice Department and some of the independent agencies. It appears that of this group only Congressional employees declined.

<sup>2</sup>This category consists of American Indian, Alaskan Natives, Asians, and Pacific Islanders that are not included in the above data in the Table 561 from the 1998 *Statistical Abstract of the United States*.

**Table 2.** Estimated Federal Contract Work Force, 1984-1996<sup>1</sup>

<u>Estimated Contract Work Force</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>Year</u>		<u>1984-1996 Percentage Change</u>
		<u>1990</u>	<u>1996</u>	
<u>Work Force in 000</u>	6,790	6,347	5,635	- 17.1%
Defense Agencies	5,824	5,049	4,241	- 27.2%
Non-defense Agencies	966	1,298	1,394	+ 44.3%
<u>Work Force for Purchase of:</u>				
Products	3,298	2,435	1,637	- 50.4%
Services	3,492	3,912	3,999	+ 14.5%
<u>Contract Expenditure in 1994 \$ Constant</u>	\$235.4	\$204.2	\$173.2	- 26.4%

---

<sup>1</sup>This table is adapted from Table 2-2 in Paul C. Light, *The True Size of Government*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1999, pp. 22-23. The separation of defense and non-defense agency contract employment is accomplished by estimates of the division of defense and non-defense activities of the Energy Department and NASA which are included with Light's estimate for the Defense Department.

**Table 3.** Change in Number of Federal Employees (1994-1997) and Change in Procurement Contract Expenditures (1995 to 1998) for Selected Non-Defense Federal Agencies<sup>1</sup>

<u>Agency</u>	<u>1994-97 Change in Agency Employees</u>		<u>1995-98 Change in Procurement Contracts</u>		<u>\$Increase in Contracts Per Worker Downsized</u>
	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Increase/Decrease Numbers</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>\$ millions</u>	
<i>Increase in both personnel and procurement:</i>					
Justice	+ 25.7 %	+ 19,351	+ 38.5 %	+\$ 715.3	
Postal Service	+ 3.7	+ 30,599	+ 38.5	+ 3,391.1	
<i>Decrease in personnel with increase in procurement:</i>					
GSA	- 25.7 %	- 4,948	+ 38.7 %	+\$ 2,069.4	\$418,230
Agriculture	- 10.9	- 13,019	+ 4.6	+ 113.5	8,718
Treasury	- 10.2	- 16,004	+ 44.5	+ 795.7	49,719
Commerce	- 7.6	- 2,850	+ 32.3	+ 257.8	90,456
Veterans	- 7.3	- 19,121	+ 8.8	+ 227.9	11,919
State	- 5.8	- 1,488	+ 13.0	+ 73.3	49,261
Labor	- 5.6	- 945	+ 13.8	+ 110.3	116,720
Education	- 3.6	- 173	+ 37.0	+ 143.5	829,480
HHS & Social Security <sup>2</sup>	- 1.3	- 1,721	+ 41.4	+ 1,219.3	708,483
Transportation	- 1.1	- 717	+ 13.9	+ 479.7	669,038
EPA	- 0.3	- 47	+ 2.5	+ 23.4	497,872
<i>Decrease in both personnel and procurement:</i>					
FEMA	- 6.4 %	- 333	- 12.6 %	- \$ 31.7	
Energy	- 14.2	- 2,821	- 10.5	- 1,779.4	
NASA	- 15.0	- 3,494	- 5.6	- 646.8	
Interior	- 15.9	- 12,839	- 25.1	- 373.9	

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1995-1998 *Consolidated Federal Funds Reports* and 1997 and 1998 *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

<sup>1</sup>Changes for procurement contracts by time period are lagged one year from changes in numbers of employees. Procurement contracts data by agency are only erratically available from the *Consolidated Federal Funds Reports*.

<sup>2</sup>Social Security was separated from Health and Human Services in April 1995 so the two agencies are combined for this presentation.

**Table 4.** Change in Federal Civilian and Military Employment, 1990 to 1997

	<u>Years</u>		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
	<u>1990</u>	<u>1997</u>		
Total Civilian	3,128,267	2,783,704	- 344,563	- 11.0%
<u>Branch:</u>				
Legislative	37,495	31,355	- 6,140	- 16.4%
Judicial	23,605	30,641	+ 7,036	+ 29.8
Executive	3,067,167	2,721,708	- 345,459	- 11.3
Executive, incl. Military	5,521,436	4,506,339	- 1,014,897	- 18.4%
<u>Departments:</u>	2,065,532	1,722,821	- 342,711	- 16.6%
State	25,288	24,108	- 1,180	- 4.7%
Treasury	158,655	140,369	- 18,286	- 11.5
Defense	1,034,152	749,461	- 284,691	- 27.5
Justice	83,932	117,261	+ 33,329	+ 39.7
Interior	77,679	67,865	- 9,814	- 12.6
Agriculture	122,594	106,539	- 16,055	- 13.1%
Commerce	69,920	34,792	- 35,128	- 50.2
Labor	17,727	15,787	- 1,940	- 10.9
Health & Human Serv. <sup>1</sup>	123,959	126,523	+ 2,564	+ 2.1
HUD	13,596	10,908	- 2,688	- 19.3
Transportation	67,364	64,179	- 3,185	- 4.7%
Energy	17,731	17,078	- 653	- 3.7
Education	4,771	4,640	- 131	- 2.7
Veterans	248,174	243,311	- 4,863	- 2.0

---

<sup>1</sup>Includes Social Security Administration even though it was separated April 1995.

**Table 4** continued:

	<u>1990</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
<u>Independent Agencies:</u> <sup>2</sup>	1,001,634	998,887	- 2,747	- 0.3%
Federal Reserve	1,525	1,716	+ 391	+ 25.6%
EPA	17,123	18,045	+ 922	+ 5.4
EEOC	2,880	2,631	- 249	- 8.6
FCC	1,778	2,069	+ 291	+ 16.4
FDIC	17,641	8,265	- 9,376	- 53.1
FEMA	3,137	4,888	+ 1,751	+ 55.9%
GSA	20,277	14,309	- 5,968	- 29.4
National Archives	3,120	2,832	- 288	- 9.2
NASA	24,872	19,844	- 5,028	- 20.2
Labor Relations Board	2,283	1,992	- 291	- 12.7
Nuclear Regulatory Comm.	3,353	3,081	- 272	- 8.1%
OPMgt.	6,636	3,603	- 3,033	- 45.7
Panama Canal Comm.	8,240	9,777	+ 1,537	+18.7
RRRetirement	1,772	1,327	- 445	- 25.1
SEC	2,302	2,861	+ 559	+ 24.3
SBA	5,128	4,380	- 748	- 14.6%
Smithsonian	5,092	5,188	+ 96	+ 1.9
TVA	28,392	14,810	-13,882	- 48.9
Information Agency	8,558	6,534	- 2,021	- 23.6
International Development	4,698	2,968	- 1,730	- 36.8
Postal Service	816,886	853,298	+36,412	+ 4.5%
<u>Military:</u>	2,454,069e.	1,784,631e.	-669,438e.	- 27.3%
Active Duty	2,043,700	1,425,200	-618,500	- 30.3
Ready Reserves (est.FTE)	410,369	359,431.	- 50,938	- 12.4
<u>Total Government,</u>				
<u>Civilian and Military:</u>	5,582,336	4,568,335	-1,014,001	- 18.2%

---

<sup>2</sup>Only agencies with at least 1,500 employees in 1990 are listed.

## REFERENCES:

- Beard, Charles A. And William Beard, "The Case for Bureaucracy," *Scribner's Magazine*, republished in the *Public Administration Review*, 46:2, 209 (March-April, 1986).
- Goodsell, Charles T. *The Case for Bureaucracy: A Public Administration Polemic*, Chatham NJ: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1994, p. 167.
- Light, Paul C. *The True Size of Government*, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1999, pp. 22-23.
- Lane, Larry M. and James F. Wolf, *The Human Resource Crisis in the Public Sector*, New York, NY: Quorum, 1990, p. i.
- Maggs, John "'At AID, Two Kinds of Workers,'" *National Journal*, 31:41, pp. 2902-2903, October 9, 1999.
- Ross, John P. Presentation to a panel at the 1999 American Political Science Association conference In Atlanta, GA, "Roundtable on Regional Connections and Federal Urban Policy: A HUD Policy Initiative."
- Stephens, G. Ross and Nelson Wikstrom, *Metropolitan Government and Governance: Theoretical Perspectives, Empirical Analysis, and the Future*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. 3, 22-23.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Consolidated Federal Funds Reports*, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1989-1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1990-1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *U.S. Government Organization Manual*, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1998-1999, pp. 328-366.

## ENDNOTES:

1. Taken from the White House web site 12/27/99, [wysiwyg//39http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/EOP/OVP/initiatives\\_bottom.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/EOP/OVP/initiatives_bottom.html).
2. This is from a 1933 article reprinted in the *Public Administration Review*, 46:2 (March-April 1986) 209.
3. These data are for 1997. The FTE equivalent used is one-fourth of the 892,000 National Guard and military reserves. Including the reserves seems particularly appropriate today given its enhanced role in both war and peace-keeping operations. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1998 and 1999 *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
4. These pay systems constituted 76.5 percent of civilian personnel in 1990.
5. This is particularly true for the State and Defense departments.
6. Social Security was separated from HHS during this period, therefore it was necessary to combine the data for these two agencies..
7. The independent agencies were tabulated as a group, but only those agencies with 1,500 or more employees in 1990 are listed in Table 4.
8. If the judicial branch follows the pattern for most executive agencies, security guards are hired on contract.
9. Interview, February 10, 2000 with David N. Atkinson, Curators Professor of Political Science and Law, University of Missouri-Kansas City.
10. This source is an attorney and long-time employee of the a regional office of the Justice Department. In fact, this person seemed surprised the delartment had not grown faster than the 40 percent indicated. See *U.S. Government Manual-1998/1999*, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 328-366.
11. In a presentation to a panel at the annual 1999 conference of the American Political Science Association in Atlanta, John P. Ross described his attempt to contract with the Governments Division of the Census Bureau for a special study on the layering of taxes in metropolitan areas to be fully funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). At the time, 1997-98, Dr. Ross was Director of Economic Development and Public Finance at HUD. The response of the Governments Division at Census was that even though HUD would pay the full cost, they could no longer do this type of research as they had lost too many experienced personnel through federal downsizing.