

FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

613th FPRAC

SHELDON FRIEDMAN, Chairperson, Presiding

Thursday, June 16, 2016

Room 5526
Office of Personnel Management
Washington, D.C. 20415**ATTENDANCE:****Members/Alternates:**Management Members:Mark Allen, OPM
Jim Davey, DoD
Jason Munro, Air Force
Gary Buck, Army
Carmen Montgomery, VALabor Members:Randy Erwin, MTD
Jacque Simon, AFGE
Candace Archer, AFGE
Robert Shore, NAGE
Lamar Elliott, ACT**Staff Specialists and Visitors:**Brenda Roberts, Designated Federal Officer, OPM
Madeline Gonzalez, OPM
Jim Brady, DoD
Emily Carter, DoD
Richard Rohr, Navy
Rosemary Meriwether, Navy
David Pedersen, Navy
Arleen Romba, VA (via phone)**Recording Secretaries:**Mike Eicher, OPM
Ana Paunoiu, OPM

[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.....	3
• Announcements.....	4
II. Review of the Minutes of the 612th Meeting.....	4
III. Old Business.....	4
a. Review of Greene County, Missouri, 607-OPM-3	
b. Letter from the National Association of Government Employees, Dated March 9, 2016, Requesting FPRAC Reexamine the Placement of Wage Grade Employees Working in Shawnee County, KS, 611-NAGE-1 – Review of Shawnee County, Kansas, 612-MGT-1	
IV. New Business.....	6
a. Definition of Cameron County, Texas, to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area, 613-MGT-1	
b. Definition of Lane County, Oregon, to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area, 613-MGT-2	
c. Definition of Kent County, Michigan, to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area, 613-MGT-3	

P R O C E E D I N G

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to our 613th meeting of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee. My name is Sheldon Friedman, Chair of the Committee, and as always, I would appreciate it if members of the Committee will introduce themselves for the recorder. Why don't we start with you today, Mark.

MR. ALLEN: Mark Allen with OPM.

MR. DAVEY: Jim Davey with DoD.

MR. MUNRO: Jason Munro with Air Force.

MR. BUCK: Gary Buck, Army.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Carmen Montgomery, Veterans Administration.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you, and we're very pleased to have you here today, Carmen.

And, Randy?

MR. ERWIN: Randy Erwin with NFFE representing Metal Trades Department.

MS. ARCHER: Candace Archer, AFGE.

MS. SIMON: Jacque Simon, AFGE.

MR. SHORE: Rob Shore with NAGE.

MR. ELLIOTT: Lamar Elliott, ACT.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: All right. And I'd appreciate it if folks around the edge of the room could also please introduce themselves. Brenda, let's start with you, please.

MS. ROBERTS: Sure. Brenda Roberts, OPM, designated Federal Officer.

MR. ROHR: Richard Rohr, Navy.

MS. MERIWETHER: Rosemary Meriwether, Navy.

MR. PEDERSEN: David Petersen, Navy.

MR. BRADY: Jim Brady, DoD.

MS. CARTER: Emily Carter, DoD.

MR. EICHER: Mike Eicher, OPM.

MS. GONZALEZ: Madeline Gonzalez, OPM.

MS. PAUNOIU: Ana Paunoiu, OPM.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Do we have anybody on the phone?

MS. ROMBA: [via telephone] Good morning. This is Arlene Romba with VA.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Good morning, Arlene.

I have no announcements this morning. If anyone else does, the floor is yours.

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: No? All right. We will move on to review of the transcript of our last meeting. Are there any changes that people want to bring to our attention beyond those we have already heard from you about?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: If not, is there any objection to adopting the transcript of our last meeting?

MR. ALLEN: No objections.

MR. ERWIN: No objections.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: No objections. All right. Hearing no objections, the transcript is adopted.

That brings up Old Business. At our last meeting, we talked about wanting to table item (a) if there is no objection to doing that. This would be the review of Greene County,

Missouri, 607-OPM-3. It's been on our agenda for quite a while. If we were to table it, we can bring it back. Is there any objection to tabling it?

MR. ALLEN: No objection from Management.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Any objection on the Labor side?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. Let's table it. If we want to bring it back, if we need to bring it back, we can do so in the future.

Item (b) under Old Business, Rob, I believe you indicated you don't have your local folks ready yet; is that correct?

MR. SHORE: Yeah. The plan is at next month's meeting or the next meeting we have to have two or three of the employees available to answer questions and then give their, I guess, further explanation of what basically is going on at the VA there. So once I have confirmation of the number, I will obviously let everybody know and get it on the agenda for next time.

I did have some questions about the 612-MGT-1, and I was hoping maybe we could get a little bit more information as well for the next meeting, if that was possible.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Do you want to raise those now, or do you want to send them in?

MR. SHORE: I can send them in, if that's easier, and we can go about it that way.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. If they're technical, it may make more sense to send questions to OPM staff, and we will do our best to answer them.

MR. SHORE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay, that's great. All right. If there's nothing else on

that issue, we will save that for the next meeting and move on to New Business, where we have three items, the first being the definition of Cameron County, Texas, to a non-appropriated fund Federal Wage System wage area, and that's Document No. 613-MGT-1.

Mark, would you please summarize that one for us?

MR. ALLEN: Sure. Just to give an idea of the bigger picture, OPM has received actually several requests from the Department of Veterans Affairs to define VA Canteen Service employees who work in counties that are not currently defined to an appropriate non-appropriated wage area.

We have three packages today. These packages all deal with small numbers of employees, 2, 2, and 1. They work for the VA Canteen Service.

The 613-MGT-1 proposal deals with defining Cameron County, Texas, to a NAF wage area. The two employees who are in Harlingen, Texas, have actually been paid from the Nueces, Texas, non-appropriated fund wage schedule for some time. What we're trying to do is just put in regulation that they are in a county that's defined to a NAF wage area.

So what we're recommending is that Cameron County, Texas, be defined as an area of application to the Nueces, Texas, non-appropriated fund wage area.

If you look at the map, which is the first attachment, you will see that Cameron County is down in the very southeastern corner of Texas. The closest survey area is Nueces, which I think is probably Corpus Christi, although the distance is 148 miles. That is 148 miles to Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi. That is the closest survey area for Cameron County. There would be no pay changes for these two employees if FPRAC recommends we move forward with this and OPM issues the regulations.

MS. SIMON: Can I ask a question?

MR. ALLEN: Sure.

MS. SIMON: Is Webb County also part of this Nueces area?

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. Everything you see there—

MS. SIMON: The area of application?

MR. ALLEN: —it's sort of in the purple color.

MS. SIMON: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: That is all part of the Nueces area of application.

MS. SIMON: And Bexar is the next one?

MR. ALLEN: I think that's Austin, where Austin is.

MS. SIMON: But that's—

MR. ALLEN: San Antonio? Okay.

MS. SIMON: That's the next closest one.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MS. SIMON: Okay. So the whole southern part of the state is part of Nueces.

MR. ALLEN: Pretty much.

In the interest of time, I could probably go through the other two before we come up with a recommendation.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Are there any more questions on this one?

MR. ALLEN: The other two are pretty much similar.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Actually, is there a consensus to do this one?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: All right. So we have adopted 613-MGT-1. Thank you.

So now move on to 613-MGT-2.

MR. ALLEN: FPRAC document 613-MGT-2 is a similar situation. We have two VA Canteen Service employees in Eugene, Oregon, who are paid from the Pierce, Washington, non-appropriated fund wage schedule, and if we look at Lane County on the map, we'll see that it's in not quite the north, northern part of Oregon, but—

MS. SIMON: It's in the southern part of Oregon.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah, close to the southern part of Oregon.

There are currently two other area of application counties in the Pierce, Washington, wage area, Coos and Douglas, which are to the south of Lane, so what this proposal recommends is that Lane County be defined along with those two, and several other counties to the Pierce, Washington, area of application.

MS. SIMON: You didn't compare it to Sacramento?

MR. ALLEN: We took a look at it, but I think Sacramento is actually much further away.

MS. SIMON: Well, the Sacramento wage area or an area of application of the Sacramento wage area shares a border. In Klamath County, Oregon, right?

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. And—

MS. SIMON: Klamath County is still Oregon.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. And Jackson.

MS. SIMON: And so did you even do a—you didn't do a comparison to see which one made more sense according to the criteria?

MR. ALLEN: Did we measure the mileage?

MS. GONZALEZ: We did not measure the mileage to the host activity in

Sacramento because Coos and Douglas are part of Pierce, not Sacramento, and Lane County is right above Douglas.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Do the Labor folks want to see a comparison or analysis that includes Sacramento?

MS. SIMON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: All right. Why don't we defer this one?

MR. GONZALEZ: Coos and Douglas would have to be moved to Sacramento too.

MS. SIMON: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Maybe I can look at my road atlas here and see what the distances are.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Yeah. Although there's no harm in doing a more complete analysis, then, is there?

MR. ALLEN: No, there's just no real harm in doing that, other than the delay. So is it Eugene, Oregon, we're looking at?

MS. SIMON: Right. The host activity is—oh, my God.

MR. ALLEN: It's 141 miles to Giant's Pass, another 176 miles to Redding, and 165 miles to Sacramento, so that's—

MS. SIMON: Yeah, it's 240 miles from Joint Base McChord.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. But it's—if I was doing the math in my head—three, four—almost 500 miles from Sacramento, it looks like.

MS. SIMON: Yeah, but that's not the—the thing is how far away it is from the host activity, right?

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MS. SIMON: Well, it's 240 miles from the host activity. The host activity is all the way in Washington.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah, but it's further to Sacramento.

MS. SIMON: What's the host activity in Sacramento?

MR. ALLEN: That, I don't have.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Why don't we just extend the analysis to include Sacramento and take a look at that, unless somebody has another idea.

MS. SIMON: No. Just, I mean, I've been to Joint Base McChord. It's far from Eugene.

MR. ALLEN: Well, I find with a lot of the NAF wage areas that don't have very many employees in them, especially out West, the area of application can get very large, but, yeah, I don't have a problem with measuring the mileage to whatever the host installation is for the wage area to the south. But I'm pretty sure it's going to be much further than it is to the Pierce survey area—and OPM at some point already decided to define Coos and Douglas Counties in Oregon to the Pierce area of application.

MS. GONZALEZ: In addition, Mark, the outpatient clinic in Lane County is a satellite of the Roseburg VA Medical Center, which is located in Douglas County.

MS. SIMON: I think, Madeline, what you're saying—what you initially said is the right thing, which is that maybe Coos and Douglas County are in the wrong—

MS. GONZALEZ: I am not saying they are wrongly defined. I am saying they are already defined to Pierce.

MS. SIMON: Well, they all need to be together. I get the idea that they should be

together.

MS. GONZALEZ: And there is no way of defining Lane County with Sacramento without defining the other two.

MS. SIMON: That's what I meant. They should all be together.

MR. ERWIN: Mark, did you give a pay impact on the employees for the last one? You didn't give a pay impact for this one.

MR. ALLEN: They will be paid from the schedule they're currently paid from, so there would be no impact.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So—

MR. ALLEN: We can defer that one.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: —we are going to defer that, pending a little bit more analysis that includes Sacramento, right? Okay.

That moves us on to the third New Business item, 613-MGT-3.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. This is for Kent County, Michigan, with a recommendation to be defined to the Macomb, Michigan, non-appropriated fund wage area, which is basically recommending that Wyoming, Michigan, be defined to the area of application of the Detroit metropolitan area. And when we look at the map at the first attachment, you will see that it looks like every county in the lower peninsula of Michigan that's defined to a NAF wage area is defined to the Macomb, Michigan, NAF wage area.

So I know it's 175 miles to the Selfridge Air National Guard Base. That would be the closest NAF survey area, so that's why we're recommending this outcome for that county.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Any questions or discussion?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Is there a consensus to adopt this one?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Yes? All right. We have consensus to adopt 613-MGT-3.

Is there any other new business?

MR. ALLEN: As I mentioned, we will most likely have a few more of these at next month's meeting. We're just doing the analyses for them.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. Any other new business?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: If not, it would be in order for us to adjourn.

MR. ERWIN: Move to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: All right. Okay. I hear no objection to adjourning.

See everybody next month. Thank you very much. Enjoy the summer.