

FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

563rd FPRAC

SHELDON FRIEDMAN, Chairperson, Presiding

Thursday, May 19, 2011

Room 5526
Office of Personnel Management
Washington, D.C.

ATTENDANCE:

Members/Alternates:

Management Members**MARK ALLEN**, Office of Personnel Management
STEVEN RUMBLE, Department of Defense
CARLOS SAAVEDRA, Department of Navy
BARBARA WALKER, Department of Army
THURSTAN HUNTER, Department of Veterans AffairsLabor Members**WILLIAM FENAUGHTY**, Metals Trade Department
EDWARD ELDER, NAGE
JACQUELINE SIMON, AFGE
STEVE FISHER, ACT

Staff Specialists and Visitors:

MADELINE GONZALEZ, Office of Personnel Management
TERRI AVONDET, Office of Personnel Management
JEROME MIKOWICZ, Office of Personnel Management
CHRIS WALLACE, Office of Personnel Management
KATIE PENNELL, Office of Personnel Management
JIM BRADY, Department of Defense
CRAIG JERABEK, Department of Defense
H.L. "Hank" ROVAN, Department of Defense
DAWNA POWELL, Department of Defense
SETH SHULMAN, Department of Defense
KARL FENDT, Department of Defense
DIANA WILLIAMS, AF
MARY AUGSBURGER, AF
TAMMY VANKEUREN, AF
ANRIKA CORBIN, Department of Veterans Affairs
JENNIFER McCLOSKEY, Senator Bob Casey's OfficeRecording Secretary: **VANNESSA BROWN**

[Transcript prepared from digital audio produced by FPRAC.]

C O N T E N T S

I. Opening/Announcements

- Introductions.....3
- Guest Speaker: Jennifer McCloskey, representing Office of Senator Bob Casey.....5
- Announcements
 - Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee Annual Summary, 2010, 563-OC-1.....9
 - 563-OC-3.....25
 - Newspaper Article about Tobyhanna Army Depot from the Pocono Record, 563-OC-2.....29
 - Status Report on FPRAC Recommendation on 557-AFGE-1.....29

II. Review of the Minutes of the 562nd Meeting.....29

III. Old Business

- Review of Lee County, Virginia, 557-MGT-2.....30
- Discussion of Survey Issues/Concerns
 - FPRAC's Chairman's Memorandum to Members on Survey Issues Work Group, 561-OC-1.....30
- Special Wage Schedule Pay Practice for Federal Wage System Lock and Dam Employees, 562-MGT-1.....30
- Definition of South Bend-Mishawaka, IN-MI Metropolitan Statistical Area, 562-MGT-2.....30

•-•-•

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Good morning, everyone. I think everybody maybe who is going to be here is here. So welcome, everyone, to this 563rd meeting of FPRAC. Why don't we go around and introduce ourselves, as always. My name is Sheldon Friedman. I'm the Chairman of FPRAC.

MR. ALLEN: Mark Allen with OPM.

MR. RUMBLE: Steven Rumble with Department of Defense.

MR. SAAVEDRA: Carlos Saavedra, Department of the Navy.

MS. WALKER: Barbara Walker, Army.

MR. HUNTER: Thurstan Hunter, Department of Veterans Affairs.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Bill? We got to make you a new name tag.

MR. FENAUGHTY: Ah, yes. Bill Fenaughty. I'm with NFFE. I'm going to be replacing Dennis on this committee. We sent a letter to Berry -- rather Ronald Ault did send a letter to Berry. I don't know if you people will get a copy. I don't know if Sheldon did or not, but it's in the mix, so at least don't call me "Dennis."

[Laughter.]

MS. SIMON: Jackie Simon, AFGE.

MR. ELDER: Edward Elder, NAGE.

MR. FISHER: Steve Fisher, ACT.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you all, and then let's go around the rest of the room as well.

MR. MIKOWICZ: Jerry Mikowicz, OPM.

MS. GONZALEZ: Madeline Gonzalez with OPM.

MS. AVONDET: Terri Avondet, OPM.

MS. AUGSBURGER: Mary Augsburger, Air Force.

MS. CORBIN: Anrika Corbin, Department of Veterans Affairs.

MR. FENDT: Karl Fendt, Department of Defense.

MR. ROVAN: Hank Rován, Department of Defense.

MR. SHULMAN: Seth Shulman, Department of Defense.

MS. POWELL: Donna Powell, Department of Defense.

MR. BRADY: Jim Brady, Department of Defense.

MR. JERABEK: Craig Jerabek, DOD.

MS. VANKEUREN: Tammy Vankeuren, Air Force.

MS. WILLIAMS: Diana Williams, Air Force.

MS. BROWN: Vannessa Brown, OPM.

MR. WALLACE: Chris Wallace, OPM.

MS. PENNELL: Katie Pennell, OPM.

MS. McCLOSKEY: Jennifer McCloskey, Office of Senator Bob Casey.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. Welcome, everyone.

We have a guest speaker this morning, not on the agenda I'm sorry to say, rather a late addition.

Katie, why don't I ask you to introduce our guest speaker.

MS. PENNELL: Jennifer McCloskey of Senator Casey's office, and I believe she has a letter from the Senator that she would like to read this morning.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So the floor is yours.

MS. McCLOSKEY: Thank you very much. Well, thank you all for having me. As Katie said, my name is Jennifer. I work for Senator Casey. The Senator is sorry that he wasn't able to be here himself to give some comments, but he asked me to come and read this letter on his behalf, so without further ado.

Dear Chairman Friedman: Today the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee (FPRAC) will discuss a recent recommendation from the Office of Personnel Management to delay the final decision on the October 21st, 2011,

recommendation regarding changes to the Federal Wage System wage area boundaries.

As FPRAC evaluates this recommendation, I would like to communicate the concerns I have with OPM's position on this issue and encourage the committee to move forward quickly and with the understanding that thousands of workers' livelihoods are tied to your decisions. I was encouraged by the October 21st, 2010, recommendation issued by FPRAC, which reflected a passage of a motion to disallow Federal Wage System wage areas to split General Schedule locality pay areas.

The consequence of this recommendation would mean the end of a pay disparity at Tobyhanna Army Depot between the General Schedule employees who are included in the more generous New York labor market locality pay system and the Federal Wage System employees who are not. As you know, this scenario has produced instability in the workforce by dampening morale among affected employees who feel that they are being treated unequally with no justification.

I was further encouraged by correspondence I received from you in November 2010 which explained that the proposal was

accepted and transmitted to the OPM Director John Berry for final approval. Six months later, no such decision has been reached. Instead, OPM has determined that further study is required.

While I can appreciate the need to examine the impact of a change that impacts the Federal Wage System, I cannot understand the six months it has taken OPM to initiate a reexamination with your committee. This delay is made even worse by the additional delay that OPM has suggested by tying implementation to the Federal pay freeze. OPM is not required to hold off implementation until 2013. It has chosen to do so. While it does, thousands of Pennsylvanians await fair pay.

If FPRAC agrees that further study is necessary, I ask that you move quickly to answer the outstanding questions, so that OPM can make a final decision and move quickly to implement the recommendations. In addition, I ask that your committee provide clear guidance on the process of review and timeline to add greater transparency to this issue.

Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Robert P. Casey Jr.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Ms. McCloskey. We'll make sure that the members of the committee get copies of this letter, which I was just given.

Any questions or comments?

MS. SIMON: Yes. Hi. I'm Jackie Simon from AFGE.

MS. McCLOSKEY: Hi.

MS. SIMON: I actually had an opportunity to talk to the Senator last night about this letter --

MS. McCLOSKEY: Okay.

MS. SIMON: -- and we appreciate it greatly. I think it accurately reflects the views of AFGE members in Pennsylvania particularly and Monroe County and Tobyhanna, and when the committee begins to discuss Director Berry's proposed way of dealing with this issue, we'll make some proposals that are consistent with what Senator Casey has suggested.

And we very, very much appreciate your support on this issue, and we're certainly not going to let OPM get away with this. Thanks.

MS. McCLOSKEY: Anything else?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your time.

MS. McCLOSKEY: Thank you for your attention, and we really appreciate having the opportunity, and you were very gracious to extend the invitation to us, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: We're glad to have you.

So moving on in our agenda, we have several documents that were e-mailed to the members but after the agenda, three pieces; in fact, one which I guess you only got this morning, a letter from Congressman Runyan, two previous ones from OPM, one dealing with the Director's resolution of the recommendation that we made back in October by majority vote that was also just discussed by the representative from Senator Casey's office, another on operating procedures for FPRAC going forward during the period of the current pay freeze.

I trust in the case of the two pieces that were sent to people ahead of time, you had a chance to review them. Is that correct?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: And is there any discussion, questions?

MS. SIMON: We're discussing now the operating principles and/or the statement from the --

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: We can take them in -- I guess it would make sense to take them in order, so why don't we start with 563-OPM-1.

MS. SIMON: Okay. I think we need to have a Labor caucus.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. I believe we have the small Pendleton Room.

MS. SIMON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: See you when you get back.

[Labor caucus held off the record.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. We are back in session, everyone. We were discussing 563-OPM-1. Are there any questions or discussion about that?

MS. SIMON: What we talked about just now is that we'd like to have -- we'd like to have more involvement in this analysis, and just as important as our involvement, we would actually like the Chairman as a neutral to be extremely involved in directing and participating in the analysis.

And I think we had a -- when the proposal was passed, we had a very detailed statement of dissent from DOD. I think the OPM staff person who is probably going to be charged with

this certainly never was shy about his bias and objections to the proposal, and so just in order that the analysis reflect, I think, sort of the hand of a neutral and make sure that it really is an objective analysis, we'd like to be involved.

We understand that the analysis would come to FPRAC prior to its going to the Director, but we'd like to be more involved in the actual formulation of the report of the analysis -- and the analysis than merely sort of seeing it, you know, prior to the Director receiving it.

So, you know, we'd also prefer something earlier than the end of 2011, but, you know, be that as it may, the more important part is not to leave this important work only to one side because it's clearly -- I don't think there's any question that there's bias on both sides and probably extremely valuable for our taxpayers and public to have a neutral overseeing the work.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Well, I guess we could communicate that to the Director, we can pass that suggestion on to him. I guess the only observation I would have is it does seem to be desirable rather than to -- if you assume that trying to find some Labor/Management consensus is a good idea on this issue, if

that can be done in the course of the actual report --

MS. SIMON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: -- writing, it seems to me that's a good thing, rather than to --

MS. SIMON: I mean, it can also even --

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: -- wait for a report that is debated again here.

MS. SIMON: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: But all we could do is suggest that. I don't know if anyone on Management side is in kind of --

MR. ALLEN: What I would say is that the committee will continue to meet on a monthly basis. We have working group meetings that will continue to take place, generally following the full FPRAC meetings, and those working group meetings could serve as an opportunity for any member on the committee to inform OPM staff about what they believe should go into the report, so that there's really some pre-decisional involvement before something comes back to the committee. , At this point, the Director is asking for an idea of everything that would happen under AFGE's proposal.

If there are unintended consequences that might occur

that nobody has thought about yet, then we really do have to take a look at how the AFGE proposal could be implemented, and he needs to get every viewpoint in a kind of cohesive written statement.

The OPM staff has already started to consider the framework for a study like this, but we don't have anything concrete yet, so I think it's a good idea that you've raised your opinion now.

MS. SIMON: Yeah. I think that, you know, what you just said is exactly consistent with what I'm saying, except perhaps in the details.

I don't believe that a report written exclusively by OPM will have every viewpoint, and in order to ensure that, I think that people from both sides of the table need to be involved. And I think the process needs to be overseen by a neutral.

Like I said, we can't pretend in this room that there isn't a strong bias in favor of the proposal on this side of the table and an equally strong bias in opposition to the proposal on that side of the table, and to have only one side of the table preparing the analysis for the ultimate decision-maker just

doesn't seem fair or right to me.

And, you know, we have a neutral. We have a neutral. I don't know. I mean, I can't give you assignments. I'm just proposing this, that the participation of the Chair in this analysis because, you know, I'm not sure any of the unions here, given what's going on in Congress right now, have the resources to devote to this over the next many months the way OPM does.

So, out of necessity, we would rely upon OPM to do a lot of the work, but we want to be involved. We want to be involved in the writing of the analysis, and we want not merely so-called "pre-decisional input," which is "Thank you so much for your views. We've already been instructed here, and we'll keep on going," if we wanted something more substantial than that.

MR. RUMBLE: I appreciate the opinion, but it appears that the Director has directed OPM staff to conduct this stuff.

MS. SIMON: You're absolutely right.

MR. RUMBLE: And saying that -- and I get -- and again, I appreciate the neutrality of the Chairperson, but serving in a neutral way and directing the group, I don't see that the Chairperson would be in a position to direct or to try to influence the outcome in any way other than just to ensure that

everyone perhaps is able to speak their mind. And the final outcome is still OPM's in the way the report, the analysis, whatever the outcome is, is a frank result of the analysis, and it doesn't -- I guess what I'm saying is I don't want to go into this thinking that the Chairperson will have some influence in swaying the outcome of the analysis.

The analysis will be what it is. It may serve --

MS. SIMON: Well, I don't want the Chair to influence the analysis either.

I also think OPM is clearly not objective in this, on this issue. You know, the staff of OPM has been a very, very, very fierce and active agent trying to kill this proposal, and so it's like, "Okay, fine. You know, we get that. You know, everybody's got a perspective." I don't like to pretend. You know, I don't want to participate in a pretense that OPM is somehow neutral. OPM is not a neutral.

MR. RUMBLE: But again --

MS. SIMON: And -- well, I hear what you say about the fact that this is already an assignment, but, you know, I mean, it's not the word of God. It's something that we could go back to Director Berry.

MR. RUMBLE: Because, again, the Director is not directing FPRAC to do this.

MS. SIMON: No. Right now --

MR. RUMBLE: I mean, the Director is directing OPM --

MS. SIMON: -- we're looking at --

MR. RUMBLE: -- to do this.

MS. SIMON: -- something where the director has -- has asked his staff to do this, which is, you know, certainly his business, but we'd like to go back to the Director and propose that he revise his assignment and ask for a more comprehensive --

MR. RUMBLE: And I'm not speaking against a collaborative effort, but I just hope that the expectation is not that the Chairperson is going to somehow push OPM in one direction or the other.

MS. SIMON: I just think that, you know, as far as I know, you know, here we are talking about the Chairman, and he's standing right here.

[Laughter.]

MS. SIMON: My knowledge of the Chairman's background is that he's a highly accomplished researcher and very experienced in labor economics, and we'll have a better report

for his involvement, and he brings a lot to the table in terms of knowledge and experience in this field. And you know, why not?

MR. ELDER: And to build on what you were saying, Jackie, I mean, to the extent that the Director wants to address a lot of these things, elements that he lists here, including preventing unintended consequences and working out exactly how we're going to implement the new wage areas in terms of surveys and the like, I would think that labor could provide some useful input and useful proposals as far as addressing a lot of these issues, and we could help spot any unintended consequences or complications that might arise as a result of these changes.

And as far as the Chairman's being -- his role in all of this, it would help to have someone help coordinate that, that effort or participation.

So I think both of those elements, both of those facts would argue in favor of our proposal.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Well, since this is, of course, the Director's call, it seems to me there are two ways we could proceed. If there's a third way I haven't thought of, I'm sure someone will point it out to me.

One is, Jackie, we could try to communicate your and

the other Labor representatives' desire to have full participation not just in reviewing the results of this report when it's brought back to FPRAC, but to be fully part of the process of its research and writing in some way. We could communicate that request to the Director, or perhaps the Labor representatives would want to contact the Director about that themselves and communicate that. We could do it either way, it seems to me.

MS. SIMON: How about both?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Well, both. We could certainly report that this was the conversation we had at the FPRAC meeting, this is what the Labor folks requested, and would he accept that as a friendly amendment to his decision on this matter, and then see what he says. Does that seem like a reasonable way to leave this for the moment?

MS. SIMON: Yeah.

MR. RUMBLE: Would you anticipate that that would be phrased as the Labor members represent recommendation for the FPRAC's recommendation?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Actually, I guess hearing from the Management side -- I don't want to misstate it, so let me know if

I get it right -- is that in general, the Management side would welcome Labor's participation at an earlier stage than when the report comes back to FPRAC. Is that correct?

Maybe we need to reduce this to writing and make sure we're all comfortable with it before we send it to the Director or --

MR. FENAUGHTY: That's a good idea.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay.

MS. SIMON: Are you -- what is Management saying? Mark is okay with that idea?

MR. ALLEN: I guess what I'm saying is that we sort of already have a framework of committee meetings and work group meetings at which we could receive input from every member of the committee on this review. I don't think that it would be a good idea for us just to cloister ourselves away on the OPM staff and seven months from now put a big binder on the table for everybody to look at. So I think we are probably in agreement that everybody should be involved in some way in the process.

But on the other hand -- and we've seen this from other working groups that we've had -- somebody needs to take the first step, and generally that's to take a first step that involves

looking at technical information that only OPM staff would have access to and only the DOD technical staff on the Wage and Salary Division would have access to. That would be kind of a starting point for developing --

MS. SIMON: I understand all --

MR. ALLEN: -- a bigger document.

MS. SIMON: -- of that. I'm thinking just frankly, you know, when we're looking at some of these items on the list, and of course, the devil is in the detail, so what kinds of assumptions are made in terms of what, you know -- who would go where and what they'd be paid, you know, after are going to be crucial.

And at a minimum, we'll have to run numbers under different sets of assumptions. I think that that's the kind of input I want to have.

I don't want to only create worst-case-scenario, you know, assumptions, and I think that, you know, an opponent of this proposal, I'd be very tempted to create what I would consider worst-case scenarios. And so that's the kind of thing I want to watch out for. That's the kind of -- you know, that's what you can anticipate from my participation, would be an

insistence that, you know, something other than the most costly and most illogical and most damaging assumptions are made to make the thing look as if it were, you know, the end of western civilization. I don't want that.

MR. ALLEN: I think --

MS. SIMON: And I know that there will be a temptation to present the proposal in the worst-possible light, and I don't want it only presented to the Director in the worst-possible light.

MR. ALLEN: I think we owe -- as OPM staff, we owe the Director the whole picture of how something could be implemented --

MS. SIMON: I agree.

MR. ALLEN: If the Director eventually does agree with implementing a change in how the Federal Wage System operates, and in order to develop that big picture, we have to have everybody involved at some point in how the thing is developed.

But somebody needs to get the thing started, and generally it's the OPM staff who do that.

MS. SIMON: No question about that. I just -- I think I've explained my interest. I want a really fair assessment of

the multiple possible ways this could be implemented and a range of costs that could be associated with it, not just a worst-possible scenario.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Why don't I attempt a short memo to the Director, we'll run it by everyone, and take it from there. Is that a reasonable way that reflects this conversation?

MS. SIMON: I'm okay with that.

MR. ALLEN: I would view this as more of a clarification of what the Director intended in his statement to the committee rather than developing a new policy that might differ from what he put in his statement.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Right.

MS. SIMON: Up to the Director.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. Any other discussion on 563-OPM-1?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: We will move on to 563-OPM-2, which is how the pay freeze in general will affect the timing of implementation of recommendations from FPRAC.

MR. ALLEN: I think this one is actually good news in that FPRAC had made several consensus recommendations to make

changes under OPM's existing regulatory criteria for defining wage areas and of abolishing wage areas when they had fallen too low in employment to be sustained. We have the okay to go ahead through the regulatory process with de minimis changes as long as they're not changing the general way that the Federal Wage System operates under its existing rules.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Any discussion of this one?

MS. SIMON: Well, needless to say, there's a lot to say about this, but FPRAC doesn't have the ability to affect anything associated with this. It's shameful. You know, we'll have to deal with it in a different realm.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. We have a late piece of paper. I guess it's 563-OC-3, the letter to Director Berry from Congressman Runyan of New Jersey. He has requested that we actually read it into the record.

What I thought I would do to save the time of the committee is, with everyone's permission, we will have the transcriptionist, if that's a word, type it into the transcript, but we wouldn't need to have it read aloud right now. Is that all right?

MS. SIMON: I'd like to have it read aloud.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Well, would you like to -- who would like to be the reader?

MS. SIMON: I'll be the reader.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Go for it.

MS. SIMON: Where is the date on this letter?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Well, Katie, when did we receive it?

MS. PENNELL: Yesterday afternoon.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Yesterday.

MS. SIMON: So what was yesterday, the 18th of May?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Yeah.

MS. SIMON: 2011?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Right.

MS. SIMON: Addressed to John Berry, Director, United States Office of Personnel Management.

Dear Director Berry: I'm writing to express my disappointment with your recent statement to the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, which defers "making a decision on the FPRAC recommendation until further fact-finding and potential impact is completed." As you are aware, the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure

process, consolidated McGuire Air Force Base, Fort Dix, and Lakehurst Naval Air Station into Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst. The Joint Base, now with the United States Air Force, is the lead operating service. It's the first of its kind, and all military service branches represented are now represented as one facility.

Additionally, Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst is home to Fort Dix Federal Correctional Institution as well as other Federal non-DoD agency presence. JB MDL employs over 40,000 men and women and is one of the largest employers in New Jersey.

While joint basing at McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst has largely been a resounding success, one area which remains a critical issue is wage parity for wage grade employees working at the base. Before the three installations were combined, employees at McGuire and Fort Dix were paid at the Philadelphia wage rate while Lakehurst employees were paid at the New York City rate. After consolidation, this discrepancy remained, resulting in employees doing the same job on different ends of the Joint Base being paid different wages.

My office has been told that approximately 600 Federal employees could be affected by this discrepancy. In 2010, the FPRAC and OPM recognized this problem and recommended that no (non-RUS) General Schedule locality pay area would be subdivided between more than one Federal Wage System wage area. However, since this recommendation was made, OPM has failed to implement the recommendation.

This week, your staff briefed my office about your statement on the FPRAC recommendation and concerns about the implementation of their recommendation. It is our understanding that OPM is trying to reconcile the FPRAC recommendation with President Obama's pay freeze.

Additionally OPM wants to better understand how the FPRAC recommendation should be implemented based on the scale of federal workers that would be impacted. While I appreciate your concerns and deliberation, it's troubling that nearly one year after the initial FPRAC recommendation, OPM has decided to continue to postpone the recommendation with an estimated 2013 implementation date- nearly a decade after the 2005 BRAC.

Last week, the House Armed Services Committee passed the

Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Act, which included report language that I added, which seeks to address this issue. Specifically the report language states the committee directs the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to make a timely determination on the FPRAC recommendation of October 2010 with respect to Department of Defense Federal Wage System employees employed at joint military institutions constituted on or before the date of enactment whose constituent installations are not all located within the same pay locality.

The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall provide a briefing to the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on the actions being taken to address the FPRAC recommendation by November 15th, 2011. It's my hope based on this report language that OPM will implement in a timely (well before 2013) manner the FPRAC recommendation, fixing this pay inequity for wage grade DOD employees at the Joint Base.

Additionally, I have introduced legislation that seeks to address the broader population of all wage grade employees (DOD or otherwise) employed at the Joint Base. We look forward to working with OPM on perfecting that legislation as it moves forward in the committee process. Your staff may contact Joe Heaton at 225-4765 if we can be of additional assistance. Sincerely, Jon Runyan, Member of Congress.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So that mostly wraps up our announcements section of the agenda. We have final copies of our annual report, which everybody has. There's yet another newspaper article about Tobyhanna Army Depot being circulated. We've already covered that, the discussion of the Director's decision regarding 557-AFGE-1.

So that brings up the review of the minutes of our last meeting, which I believe everyone has. Are there any further edits to the minutes of our last meeting?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Is there a consensus to adopt the minutes of our last meeting?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: It appears there is consensus, so the minutes are adopted. Thank you.

Old business. I believe the first and third of these -- well, is there any discussion of any of these four items now that anyone wants to have? I'll start with Lee County.

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Nothing right now.

The work group, we have a meeting shortly after this meeting.

Is there any discussion of the lock and dam Army Corps of Engineers pay practice at this time?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Continue to defer that.

I believe we decided on the South Bend-Mishawaka, we could defer that one, too.

So, unless there's any other business item, is there anything else?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: A motion to adjourn would be welcome.

ATTENDEE: Motion to adjourn.

MR. ALLEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Second that. We'll adjourn. Thank
you.

•-•-•