

FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

581st FPRAC

SHELDON FRIEDMAN, Chairperson, Presiding

Thursday, December 13, 2012

ROOM 7517

Office of Personnel Management
Washington, D.C. 20415**ATTENDANCE:****Members/Alternates:**Management Members:Mark Allen, OPM
Steven Rumble, DoD
Darlene Freeman, AF
R. Lamar Williams, NAVY
Sian Fisher, VALabor Members:Eugene Hudson, AFGE
Jacque Simon, AFGE
Sarah Suszczyk, NAGE
Steve Landis, ACT**Staff Specialists and Visitors:**Jerry Mikowicz, Designated Federal Official, OPM
Madeline Gonzalez, OPM
Mike Eicher, OPM
Terri Avondet, OPM
Jennifer Dorsey, OPM
Nate Somers, OPM-CLA
Jim Brady, DoD
Hank Rovin, DoD
Karl Fendt, DoD
Melissa Arroyo, NAVY
Stephanie Boyd, VA
Yvonne Wheeler, AFGE**Recording Secretaries:** Mike Eicher and Terri Avondet

[Transcript prepared from digital audio produced by FPRAC.]

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
I. <u>Opening/Announcements</u>	
• Introductions.....	4
• Announcements.....	6
- FPRAC's FY 2012 Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) Report, 581-OC-1	
- 2012 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey Results: Report by Demographics Question 70-Pay Satisfaction Reponses, 581-OC-2	
II. Review of the Minutes of 580th Meeting.....	7
III. <u>Old Business</u>	8
a. Review of Lee County, Virginia, 557-MGT-2	
- Total Employment in the Eastern Tennessee Wages Area by County, 566-OPM-1	
- List of FWS Wage Areas with Fewer than 500 Employees, 566-OPM-2	
- Review of Criteria for Defining Appropriated Fund Wage Areas, 545-OC-1 [REPRINT]	
b. Discussion of Survey Issues/Concerns	
- FPRAC's Chairman's Memorandum to Members on Survey Issues Work Group, 560-OC-1	
c. Special Wage Schedule Pay Practice for Federal Wage System Lock and Dam Employees, 562-MGT-1	
d. Definition of South Bend-Mishawaka, IN-MI Metropolitan Statistical Area, 562-MGT-2	
e. Letter from the American Federation of Government Employees, dated June 6, 2011, requesting FPRAC review a proposal to redefine Monroe County, PA from the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA wage area to the New York, NY wage area, 564-AFGE-1	
f. Definition of Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton, NC Metropolitan Statistical Area, 575-MGT-1	
g. Proposal for FPRAC review of the Federal Wage System Appropriated Fund and Non-Appropriated Fund Operating Manuals, 575-AFGE-1	
h. Suggestion for a research paper on the history of the Federal Government's prevailing rate system	
i. Review of the Augusta and Portland, ME Federal Wage System Wage Areas, 578-MGT-1	

C O N T E N T S (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
j. Alternate Analysis of the Portland, ME Federal Wage Area, 580-MGT-1	
k. Definition of Vanderburgh County, Indiana, to a Non-Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area, 580-MGT-2	

P R O C E E D I N G

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to this, our 581st, meeting of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee. My name is Sheldon Friedman, Chair of the Committee.

As we usually do, why don't we go around and introduce ourselves? Start with you today, Mark.

MR. ALLEN: Mark Allen with OPM.

MR. RUMBLE: Steven Rumble, Department of Defense.

MR. WILLIAMS: Lamar Williams, Department of the Navy.

MS. FISHER: Sian Fisher, Department of Veterans Affairs.

MS. FREEMAN: Darlene Freeman, Department of Air Force.

MR. LANDIS: Steven Landis, Association of Civilian Technicians.

MS. SUSZCZYK: Sarah Suszczyk, National Association of Government Employees.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. And we know some more folks are on their way, stuck in traffic but will be here shortly.

Why don't we also go around the room?

MR. ROVAN: Hank Rován, DoD.

MR. BRADY: Jim Brady, DoD.

MR. FENDT: Karl Fendt, DoD.

MS. ARROYO: Melissa Arroyo, Navy.

MS. BOYD: Stephanie Boyd, Department of Veterans
Affairs.

MS. GONZALEZ: Madeline Gonzalez with OPM.

MS. AVONDET: Terri Avondet, OPM.

MR. EICHER: Mike Eicher, OPM.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So why don't we take a minute and review the meeting dates for next year? I trust everybody has already checked their calendar and let us know if you have a problem with any of these dates, but if you haven't checked, please do so now.

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: All right. We'll have really good attendance. That's terrific.

[Laughter.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Except for the people who are not here right now. They'll be here in a minute, though, I think.

A couple of announcements. Just kind of a housekeeping matter, as a Federal advisory committee, FPRAC has to file -- or I guess OPM on our behalf has to file a report

with the General Services Administration about our committee. I think this is an annual requirement, Madeline; is that correct?

MS. GONZALEZ: Correct, yes.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Yeah. So I've given you a copy, it's totally fascinating reading.

And then a little bit more interesting, I think, is the second handout, 581-OC-2, which is the response from the latest employee viewpoint survey about satisfaction with pay, and there is actually a breakout in there of FWS. I don't know whether that includes the nonappropriated fund folks. Does anybody know whether they are surveyed? Could we perhaps find out?

MR. ALLEN: We can ask the people who administer the survey if they include the nonappropriated fund employees in the scope of the survey. I believe it's around 740,000 employees who were included, total, in the survey this year.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Yeah. It's a much bigger sample this year and much higher response and actually pretty substantial group of FWS folks, as you'll see more than 40,000 responses.

MR. ALLEN: Well, that would be 40,000 out of around 230,000 total Federal Wage System employees.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Right. Well, if in fact the nonappropriated fund employees are part of the group that's surveyed, which I guess we're not quite sure of. Please let me know if you find out about that, Mark.

Any questions about this?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: If not, can we review the minutes of our previous meeting? Are there changes beyond those that people have already notified us about? Any corrections?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: If there's no objection -- going once, going twice, going three times?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Hearing no objection, the transcript from our last meeting is adopted.

And that brings up old business. I guess we're a little bit caught in a bind. On the one hand, some folks have to leave early, I know. Others are in traffic, and should be here momentarily. We are waiting for our new member from AFGE, Eugene Hudson. He's taking J. David Cox's seat at our table but apparently there is some pretty bad traffic this morning and he is on his way.

Jacque waited for him in their office, and so they're going to be here momentarily.

We could dive into old business, but I think what I'd rather do is just wait for a few more minutes, since they should be here momentarily. Maybe we can start our party while we wait.

MR. MIKOWICZ: We have been looking for the meeting.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Oh, okay. You found us. Good.

Why don't the new arrivals introduce themselves? Go ahead, Jerry.

MR. MIKOWICZ: I am Jerry Mikowicz, OPM Designated Federal Officer for this meeting.

MR. SOMERS: Nate Somers, Major, United States Air Force, legislative fellow assigned to OPM.

ATTENDEE: I'm Jennifer; I work in the Office of Communications at OPM.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So unless there's some violent objection, we'll take a short break and have some refreshments, pending our AFGE folks' arrival. They are on their way but stuck in traffic.

[Recess.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Welcome again. Some new folks have arrived. -

Welcome, Mr. Hudson. I'm Sheldon Friedman, Chairman of FPRAC. The FPRAC meetings are recorded. For the benefit of the recorder, please introduce yourselves. MR. HUDSON: My name is Eugene Hudson, Jr. I am the National Secretary/Treasurer for the American Federation of Government Employees.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Welcome.

MS. SIMON: Jacque Simon, AFGE.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Someone else came and joined us.

MS. WHEELER: Yvonne Wheeler, AFGE.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

We have gotten through the adoption of our transcript from the last meeting, and that brings up old business.

Towards the end, we have three items that we might actually be able to deal with today, now that we have a quorum.

The previous items (a) through (h) are all in our working group, but if anybody wants to bring them up, you have one quick minute to do it.

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Then why don't we move on to (i), (j), and (k). Items (i) and (j) are really the same issue. This relates to what to do with the Portland, Maine, FWS wage

area, which is no longer going to have an activity capable of conducting a survey and has fallen very low in FWS employment. We have two alternate approaches for what to do with the counties in that wage area.

Do people need a refresher on this issue? Shall we ask Mark to walk us through the alternatives that have been prepared?

MS. SIMON: I think that would be useful.

I mean, I've reviewed both the initial analysis that proposed moving the whole thing to Portland as well as the --

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: You mean Augusta.

MS. SIMON: Or moving Portland to Augusta -- excuse me -- as well as the alternative analysis that would split the various counties of the Portland wage area, but I think it would be useful to have a review.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. Mark, the floor is yours.

MR. ALLEN: In 578-MGT-1, which was introduced to the Committee back in September, the Management members had taken a look at the Portland, Maine, wage area.

As the Chairman has stated, the Federal Wage System employment levels have decreased to such a degree in the Portland Wage Area that it's no longer feasible to maintain

Portland as a separate wage area. There's no host activity capable of supporting local wage surveys, as there had been in the past.

In 578-MGT-1, the Management members took a look at Portland and recommended that the Portland wage area be abolished and its counties be redefined to the Augusta wage area.

Based on a previous FPRAC recommendation that the Portsmouth, NH, wage area be abolished and its counties be redefined to the Boston wage area, the Management members took a look at the Portland wage area only as it would compare with the Augusta wage area.

The Labor members requested that we do an alternate analysis as if the Portsmouth, NH, wage area continued as a separate wage area, and that was introduced as 580-MGT-1.

In this analysis, we took a look at individual counties within the current Portland wage area, and based on an analysis of the regulatory criteria, including distance and commuting patterns and metropolitan statistical area definitions, the Management members would recommend that Cumberland and Sagadahoc Counties, Maine, be redefined to the Portsmouth wage area, and that Androscoggin, Franklin, and

Oxford Counties, Maine, and Coos County, New Hampshire, be defined to the Augusta, Maine, wage area.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Can I just ask a clarifying question before we go to discussion? Are the Management folks at this point equally amenable to either approach, or are they --

MR. ALLEN: I believe we are in favor of 580-MGT-1.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Oh, you're in favor now of the second.

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Oh.

MS. SIMON: Wait. You are in favor of 580-MGT-1?

MR. ALLEN: The alternate analysis.

MS. SIMON: You are?

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MS. SIMON: Oh. Well, then we may have -- you know, we may be able to do something today.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Is there any discussion?

MS. SIMON: Do you want to discuss? Do you want to caucus? Do you want to vote?

MR. LANDIS: I guess we can talk about it for just a minute.

MS. SIMON: I'm sure we can. Do we have a place we can go to caucus?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Madeline? Is there a caucus room?

MS. GONZALEZ: Jerry's office.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Somebody show folks the way.

[Caucus held by Labor members off the record.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. Welcome back from your caucus, Labor members. Is there any discussion of this issue?

MS. SIMON: Yeah. I mean, the one sticking point, the one problematic county is Coos County. That, you know, it's less than 30 miles difference on the distance criterion. As far as everything else, you know, distribution of private sector employment favors Portsmouth. It has 12 employees, and, you know, we would move to amend 580-MGT-1 to place Coos County, New Hampshire, in the Portsmouth wage area. If we could agree on that, then I think we could move forward.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Any discussion of that?

MR. ALLEN: We are showing for Coos County to be on page 2 of Attachment 2.

MS. SIMON: Which document are you on, Mark?

MR. ALLEN: This is 580-MGT-1, Attachment 2. This is where you listed distance, was showing distances 90 miles from

Coos County to Augusta and 96 miles to the host activity, which is the VA Medical Center, Togus, and 117 miles to Portsmouth and 119 miles to the host activity, which is the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard.

Other things that we would look at would be commuting patterns, and in this case, there's not much of a linkage between Coos County and either survey area. The overall examination of the similarities in overall population, employment, and the kinds and sizes of private industrial establishments criterion for Coos County does not favor one wage area more than another.

The only thing we really have to go on is distance, and in this case, although it's not strongly favoring either, I think we do have to stick with the idea that the county should be defined to which survey area is closest under the regulatory criterion.

MS. SIMON: Well, I think that there -- you know, you've got -- we've got our methods for measuring distance that are -- you know, sometimes are very close calls. This is a really close call.

Coos County has been part of the same wage area as all these other counties in Maine for a very long period of time,

and, you know, this proposal sort of singles them out as the one county going to Augusta, rather than going to Portsmouth, along with the other Maine counties. The small difference in distance doesn't seem to warrant such a big change, and so like I said, we would move to amend 580-MGT-1 to move Coos County into Portsmouth, along with all the other recommendations.

MR. ALLEN: That would present us with a problem when we would try to write a regulation to implement something like that if we say that we are ignoring the distance criterion. We need a definitive reason why.

MS. GONZALEZ: May I say something? Coos County is not the only county being redefined to the Augusta wage area.

MS. SIMON: No, I know.

MS. GONZALEZ: And if you look at the map --

MS. SIMON: The map on --

MR. LANDIS: The map is difficult to read.

MS. GONZALEZ: It's not possible to move Coos County without moving Oxford County too.

MS. SIMON: I can't see the map.

MR. ALLEN: There's a better map in 578-MGT-1.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I have a question on the distance. Coos County, is that measuring from an activity or from a city?

MR. ALLEN: Our practice is to measure from an activity, if there is an activity in a county, to the survey area and to the host installation.

MS. SIMON: Yeah. I mean, just looking at this map, Coos County looks a whole lot closer to Portsmouth than Augusta, obviously closer to Portland, but --

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So was the distance measured from the largest FWS employer in the county or from the largest city if no FWS employees?

MR. ALLEN: From the largest FWS employer in the county. There is a Federal prison in Coos County.

MS. GONZALEZ: We are measuring from Berlin, the Town of Berlin, where FWS employees are working.

MS. SIMON: And they're at a prison, and is that like in the far reaches of Coos County?

MR. ALLEN: I'm not sure where exactly it is in the county.

What Madeline is pointing out is that to define Coos County to the Portsmouth wage area would result in having the Portsmouth wage area being split apart. Oxford County would be in between it and Coos County.

MS. SIMON: Okay. Well, we can certainly amend our

proposal to include Oxford County in Portsmouth, as well.

MR. ALLEN: I think that would further compound the problem. Oxford County is 49 miles from Augusta, Maine, and 96 miles to Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: What about the other regulatory criteria? Do they point the same way or do they point in a different way?

MS. SIMON: I think they don't -- they don't point one way or another.

MR. ALLEN: On page 4 of 580-MGT-1, commuting patterns and similarities in overall population, total private sector employment, and the kinds and sizes of private industrial establishments indicate that a couple of the counties are closer in those regards to Augusta than to the Portsmouth wage area.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Any further discussion of this?

MS. SIMON: Well, you do have -- on page 7, you've got the distribution of private sector employment analysis favoring the Portsmouth wage area; in other words, they're more part of the labor market of Portsmouth. They're more similar in labor market.

MR. ALLEN: Where is this?

MS. SIMON: I'm on page 7 of 580-MGT-1.

MR. ALLEN: I'm not seeing in one of these analyses where we say that Coos County is more similar to the Portsmouth wage area than the Augusta wage area.

MS. SIMON: Well, want me to show you where?

MR. ALLEN: Only one portion of the overall analysis for this criterion -- the distribution of private sector employment analysis favors the Portsmouth wage area. Overall, when you look at the overall population and employment, and the kinds and sizes of private industrial establishments, it doesn't indicate that it favored one wage area more than the other.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: One clarifying question. What's our witching hour to make a final decision on this one? Jim, can you enlighten us?

MR. BRADY: I don't know that there is a witching hour, per se. There's not much capability in the wage area, but the staff has conducted surveys before, so if need be, we can certainly do that again --

MS. SIMON: Okay.

MR. BRADY: -- and keep it as a wage area till it can be decided.

MS. SIMON: Okay.

MR. BRADY: Mark, do you know? It would have to be

published in the Federal Register. That's why I'm not familiar totally, exactly how much time you would have.

MR. ALLEN: At this point, OPM would need to issue an interim final regulation after we receive an FPRAC recommendation. The Director would need to decide on whether to adopt the FPRAC recommendation or not, and then to proceed with issuing a regulation.

The chances of that happening at this point, it's possible. It's difficult administratively to do that, but it is possible to do it. If we wait until January, it's not possible to do it then.

MS. SIMON: Okay. I guess we're not ready to vote then.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Pardon me?

MS. SIMON: We are not ready to vote.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Not ready to vote? So you're not ready to adopt the proposal. So we just postpone this?

MS. SIMON: I guess.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. I was hoping we could get this one resolved. I hope a lot of things. Peace on earth.

[Laughter.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Well, let's see if we can deal

with that other old business item (k), definition of Vanderburgh County, Indiana, to a nonappropriated fund Federal Wage System wage area, 580-MGT-2. Do we need a refresher on that issue? Are we ready to discuss it? Refresher good or --

MR. HUDSON: Sure.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Mark, refresh us, please.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. This is a very brief one.

Vanderburgh County, Indiana, is not currently defined to a nonappropriated fund wage area. There are now two nonappropriated fund employees under the Federal Wage System working at the outpatient clinic for the Department of Veterans Affairs in Evansville.

The Management members have taken a look at the regulatory criteria, and based on distance to the nearest survey area, the Management members have recommended that Vanderburgh County be defined as an area of application to the Christian, Kentucky/Montgomery, Tennessee, nonappropriated fund wage area. If you look all the way to the back at Attachment 3, we have a chart that compares road distances from the VA Evansville Outpatient Clinic in Vanderburgh County to host activities in neighboring wage areas. It's 100 miles to the host activity in the Christian/Montgomery wage area, and 149 miles to the next

closest host activity, which is in the St. Clair wage area. The other criteria that we look at, such as commuting patterns and transportation facilities, don't indicate a linkage favoring one wage area more than the other.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: A clarification question before you move to discussion. In this same document, closer to the front, there's quite different distance numbers, and I was kind of curious, so I kind of googled it myself. And it looked more like the ones you had earlier to me, so why on page 2-2, do you have different distance numbers?

MR. ALLEN: I believe you are looking at Attachment 1, which was a Department of Defense analysis, and somebody can correct me if I'm wrong. But the distance measurements, it says in the chart on 2-2, that the distances are based on the Department of Defense's Table of Official Distances, by road, between the installations or cities where FWS employees are stationed, and OPM staff have a practice of presenting studies to FPRAC that have distance based on Google. We use Google Maps to cover distances between locations, basically so anybody can go and double-check and see what Google is saying.

MS. SIMON: Yeah. No, I mean, I looked into it also. I mean, if you look at the distance between the major cities,

Evansville/Louisville, Evansville/Clarksville, it's more like a 10-mile difference. And, you know, just because of the differences in highways in those two areas, it's actually either identical driving times or slightly favoring Louisville for driving times, because there's major highways connecting Evansville and Louisville and not so with Clarksville.

So we've got negligible distance differences and certainly possibly commuting patterns and a driving distance that favors Louisville, but I think the other thing that's really rather telling and more important, if you look at the criteria for the combination for NAF areas, you know, very strong similarities between Evansville and Louisville economically, certainly in terms of their labor markets, mean and hourly wages in Evansville, 15.69 an hour, and -- wait. Evansville is 15.16 an hour. Louisville is 15.69 an hour, and then Clarksville is 13.90 an hour. Median family income in Evansville, 62.9. Louisville is virtually identical, and then Clarksville is 53,500. Economically, in terms of the labor market in particular, Evansville and Louisville are practically twins, and Clarksville is substantially different. And distance is either negligible or favors Louisville in terms of driving times and commuting.

So I think that -- I think there's a strong case to be made that the county belongs in the Louisville area rather than the Clarksville area.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Any further discussion?

MS. SIMON: Hardin/Jefferson rather than Christian/Montgomery.

MR. ALLEN: I'm actually somewhat familiar with Evansville and Louisville. I can't really say that, at least in my mind, that Evansville is similar to Louisville.

MS. SIMON: Well --

MR. ALLEN: Louisville is -- they're both river cities, but Louisville is considerably bigger than Evansville.

MS. SIMON: I'm talking about economic data, not, you know -- not anything else.

MR. ALLEN: To look at the economic data in isolation from the regulatory criteria --

MS. SIMON: I wasn't looking at them in isolation from the regulatory criteria. You know, one of the items in the regulatory criteria is similarities in the counties in terms of overall population, private employment, you know, kinds and sizes of private industrial establishments, transportation facilities, commuting patterns. The commuting pattern is

relevant.

You know, its proximity. It doesn't say absolutely we must be dictated by the number of miles on, you know, Google. It says proximity of largest activity, and, you know, we have used economic data, economic similarities between these counties as an important criterion. And here we have practically identical economic statistics between Louisville and Evansville and substantially different economic statistics in the Clarksville area, to have median family household income and average hourly earnings be that much different is a very strong indication of a very different labor market, a very, very different local economy. And then you've got identical standards in Louisville and Evansville.

So I just think it's a clear-cut case that this county belongs with Louisville.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So I think I hear the Labor side saying that the distance between activities might point to Christian/Montgomery, but the other regulatory criteria point the other way.

MS. SIMON: Well, I'm not even saying that I would concede the first part. I don't think that the distance is a clear-cut indicator one way or another, given the road system

and, proximity of the major cities.

MR. BRADY: What does the regulatory criteria actually state? Does it state that there's an order?

MS. SIMON: Proximity of largest activities in each county.

MR. BRADY: Does it state that there is an order in consideration?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: It states that, generally, they're considered in order, but I think it leaves -- Mark or anyone who actually knows the answer to this can correct me, but I think it leaves rather vague what happens if the criteria point in different directions.

MS. SIMON: It says -- I mean, it's got the word "generally," which is a qualifier.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: "Generally," but that's not absolutely.

I mean, if it was automatic procedure, why would we need FPRAC for that?

MR. ALLEN: There is some room for discretion, but the regulatory criteria, since we are dealing with a local prevailing rate system, has distance listed as the first criterion that's reviewed, and they are generally reviewed in

the order listed.

MS. SIMON: Well, I think you just hit the nail on the head, Mark. Prevailing rates are what matters, and prevailing rates in Louisville are essentially identical to Evansville, and prevailing rates are much lower in Clarksville.

MR. ALLEN: What economic statistics are you pointing to?

MS. SIMON: Median hourly wages and median household income from Bureau of Labor Statistics.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. I would suggest that those be introduced to the Committee --

MS. SIMON: Sure.

MR. ALLEN: -- formally, so that we can all take a look at --

MS. SIMON: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: -- what they say and do an analysis of those.

MS. SIMON: Happy to do it.

MR. ALLEN: Then if we take a look at those, I think that might put everybody in a better position to --

MS. SIMON: Sounds like a plan.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Should we then defer this until

the Labor folks present --

MS. SIMON: Sure.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: -- their data on this issue?

MS. SIMON: Sure.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. We didn't get this one done, either. Oh, well.

MS. SIMON: We made progress. I think we made progress.

MR. ALLEN: Sometimes it's slow.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: We get there eventually.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. Well, is there any other item of business that needs to come before us today?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I hope people can stay for the holiday party. I want to wish everybody a very Happy Hanukah and Merry Christmas, Happy New Year. Did I forget anybody?

MS. SIMON: Oh, we have all kinds of things to celebrate this month.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Yeah.

MS. SIMON: Our former colleague, J. David Cox, is about to become a grandfather this morning, so there's that,

too.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So if there's no other business, we do have a work group meeting for those who can stay.

MS. SIMON: Oh, just for the record, Steve -- I think I heard, but I just want to clarify, we're going to postpone our briefing on locks and dams until --

MR. ALLEN: The January meeting, I believe.

MR. RUMBLE: I believe we will have a presentation in January.

MS. SIMON: January?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Yes. For that, it really would be helpful if people can prepare, and I've asked Madeline to recirculate her analysis that was done quite some time ago, and there will be somebody who can answer questions-- will they be making a presentation, Steve, or just answering questions? A presentation would be delightful. Do you --

MR. RUMBLE: Yes, I believe we will be making a presentation.

MS. SIMON: Do you know what we're talking about?

MR. RUMBLE: I understand what you're talking about, but I don't know the current status.

MS. SIMON: That we've been talking about, okay.

MR. RUMBLE: Yes, because I've been a participant in the past, but I haven't been updated recently.

MS. SIMON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: The agenda for today's working group meeting is the OPM FWS appropriated fund, and nonappropriated fund operating manuals.

So does anyone know where the working group meeting will be?

MS. GONZALEZ: Right here.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Right here.

And unless there is some objection, we could adjourn. Going once? Going twice?

MS. SIMON: Move to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay, thank you. We will see everyone in the New Year.