

FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

628th FPRAC

JILL L. NELSON, Chair, Presiding

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Room 5526
Office of Personnel Management
Washington, D.C. 20415**ATTENDANCE:****Members/Alternates:**Management Members:Mark Allen, OPM
Melissa Lalonde, DoD
Virginia Reynolds, Air Force
Gary Buck, Army
Sheila Willis, VALabor Members:Dale Troll, NFFE/MTD
Jacqueline Simon, AFGE
Richard Loeb, AFGE
Robert Shore, NAGE
Travis Kielty, ACT**Staff Specialists and Visitors:**Brenda Roberts, Designated Federal Officer, OPM
Madeline Gonzalez, OPM
Brian Bauer, DoD
Christopher Quesenberry, DoD
Mandy Laughlin, Army
Shannon Moss Scott, Navy
Alethea Smalls, VA
Douglas Fehrer
Timothy Traylor, NAGE**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.....	4
• Announcements.....	5
II. Review of the Minutes of the 627th Meeting.....	5
III. Old Business.....	6
a. 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	
– Additional Information on Shawnee County, Kansas, 614-OPM-1	
– Supporting Documentation from Topeka WG Employees, 614-NAGE-1 through 614-NAGE-7	
– Additional Information on the Topeka, Kansas, Wage Area, 615-OPM-1	
– Additional Request from the National Association of Government Employees and Replies to Questions, 618-NAGE-1	
– 2018 Update to Review of Shawnee County, Kansas, 620-MGT-1	
– Regulatory Criteria Analysis for the Topeka, Kansas, Wage Area, 620-OPM-1	
– Memorandum from Director, VAMC in the Eastern Kansas Healthcare System, concerning the pay discrepancy between the VAMCs located in Shawnee County, KS, and Leavenworth County, KS, 622-VA-1	
– Additional Supporting Documentation Submitted by Topeka WG Employees, 622-NAGE-1 through 622-NAGE-3	
b. Definition of Pitt County, North Carolina, to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area, 614-MGT-2	
– Additional Information on Pitt County, North Carolina, 616-OPM-2 and 617-OPM-1	
– 2018 Update to Definition of Pitt County, North Carolina, to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area, 620-MGT-2	
c. Letter from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated September 6, 2018, Requesting FPRAC Review a Proposal to Not Allow Federal Wage System Wage Area Boundaries to Split General Schedule Locality Pay Areas and a Proposal to Redefine Monroe County, PA, from the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA, Wage Area to the New York, NY, Wage Area, 620-AFGE-1	
– Estimated 5-Year Cost Projection of Application of FPRAC Document 620-AFGE-1, 622-OPM-1	
– Paper Pay Disparity at Tobyhanna Army Depot by Joseph P. Lynott Sr., 623-OC-2	
– Email Message from Steven R. Kester in Support of the Proposal to Move Monroe County, PA, to the New York, NY, Wage Area, 623-OC-3	

- Letter from Steven R. Kester Regarding the Pay Disparity Between FWS and GS Employees at Tobyhanna Army Depot, 627-OC-1
- d. Definition of Columbia, MO Metropolitan Statistical Area, 625-MGT-1
- e. Definition of Fort Smith, AR-OK Metropolitan Statistical Area, 626-MGT-1
- f. Letter from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated September 3, 2019, Requesting FPRAC Recommend Redefining San Joaquin County, CA, from the Stockton, CA, Wage Area to the San Francisco, CA, Wage Area, 627-AFGE-1

IV. New Business.....24

- a) Letter from the National Association of Government Employees, Dated September 25, 2019, Requesting FPRAC Reexamine the Placement of Wage Grade Employees Working in the Salinas-Monterey, CA, Wage Area, 628-NAGE-1

P R O C E E D I N G

CHAIR NELSON: Good morning. This meeting will now come to order.

This is the 628th meeting of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee. It is now almost 10:15. This meeting is being recorded, and a transcript will be provided to all members.

My name is Jill Nelson, Chair of the Committee. We'll start with introductions. I have to think this one through now because we are going in a different rotation here. So we'll go around the room and have everybody introduce themselves. Let's start down there.

MR. KIELTY: My name is Travis Kielty with the Association of Civilian Technicians.

MR. SHORE: Robert Shore with NAGE.

MR. LOEB: Rich Loeb at AFGE.

MS. SIMON: Jacque Simon, AFGE.

MR. TROLL: Dale Troll, Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO.

MR. ALLEN: Mark Allen with OPM.

MS. LALONDE: Melissa Lalonde with Department of Defense.

MS. REYNOLDS: Virginia Reynolds, Department of Air Force.

MR. BUCK: Gary Buck, Department of Army.

MS. WILLIS: Sheila Willis, VA.

MR. BAUER: Brian Bauer, DoD.

MR. QUESENBERRY: Chris Quesenberry, DoD.

MS. SMALLS: Alethea Smalls, VA.

MS. LAUGHLIN: Mandy Laughlin, Department of Army.

MR. EICHER: Mike Eicher, OPM.

MS. PAUNOIU: Ana Paunoiu, OPM.

MS. GONZALEZ: Madeline Gonzalez, OPM.

MS. ROBERTS: Brenda Roberts, OPM, Designated Federal Officer.

MS. MOSS SCOTT: Shannon Moss Scott, Department of Navy.

CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

There's nobody on the phone today, correct?

MS. GONZALEZ: Correct.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Let's move on to the announcements.

I don't have any announcements this morning. Does anyone else have an announcement they would like to make?

MR. ALLEN: No announcements. I would just note that we are in this room because the Executive Conference Room has broken recording equipment. I'm not sure how long we're going to be in this space, but if we need to caucus, we can use Brenda's office.

MS. SIMON: We can have a moment of silence for Elijah Cummings, who was a great friend to many of us, especially including wage grade employees.

MR. ALLEN: That's a very good point.

[Moment of silence.]

CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Jacque. That was definitely appropriate.

We will review the minutes of the 627th meeting held on September 19th. OPM has received no edits. Are there any edits suggested today?

[No audible response.]

CHAIR NELSON: Seeing and hearing none, the Chair will entertain a motion to

accept the minutes of the 627th meeting.

MR. KIELTY: I motion to accept the minutes.

MR. LOEB: Second.

CHAIR NELSON: Thank you. Minutes are approved.

Let's move on to Old Business, starting with (a) on the agenda, which is the March 9, 2016, request from NAGE to reexamine placement of wage grade employees working in Shawnee County.

NAGE has been asking for a vote on this particular one; however, the agenda item is still waiting for a new cost analysis study that has been requested.

Mark and Jacque, can you enlighten us on that one?

MR. ALLEN: I believe we are still waiting for AFGE to let us know if there is some type of additional information that we need.

MS. SIMON: Are you talking about North Carolina?

CHAIR NELSON: What we found is that looking at the NAGE one, it's very much tied up with the request you put in under—

MS. SIMON: Monroe County?

CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

MS. SIMON: And the same with San Joaquin County?

CHAIR NELSON: Mm-hmm. And we've been waiting on it. Mark has been waiting for—you were going to submit some written comments or suggestions for changes.

MS. SIMON: I believe that the employees who asked for a recommendation from California would like to come to Washington and make a presentation to FPRAC. They were going to come this summer. I had told them that I was not going to be able to be present at the

last couple of meetings because I was on work travel, and so they are planning to come this fall. So they'd like to come and make a presentation to FPRAC regarding their circumstances.

These are people from Tracy Army Depot.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Yes. We have another one for Monterey.

MR. SHORE: Could I just ask at what point did we decide that we were tying all of them back together?

MS. SIMON: Now, I didn't know that the Shawnee one was—

CHAIR NELSON: A couple of meetings ago, it kind of got pointed out what it was part of the big picture.

MS. SIMON: I didn't understand that the Shawnee one was connected to the issue of—

MR. ALLEN: Yes. It may not be.

MS. SIMON: —limiting GS areas to one—

MR. ALLEN: They don't necessarily have to be. It depends on what everybody wants to do, but where we left off on the big-picture issue was that AFGE was going to send Madeline a document saying what they would like to see for costing.

We provided costing information earlier this year or maybe towards the end of last year.

MS. GONZALEZ: It was in December.

MR. ALLEN: December?

MS. SIMON: December of?

MS. GONZALEZ: 2018.

MS. SIMON: Okay, all right.

MR. ALLEN: Sort of in the form of a big spreadsheet type of thing, where we went through what would happen with any county that would be affected by the broader AFGE proposal to use GS locality pay areas to define Federal Wage System wage areas. So we had that cost information there, and a few meetings ago, you had mentioned, Jacque, that you were going to send us something to ask us for additional costing information. We haven't seen what that is yet.

MS. SIMON: Okay. I'm sorry. I'll go back over my notes.

MS. GONZALEZ: Make sure you speak up. Remember the recordings are—

CHAIR NELSON: Yeah. I believe they're working with microphones at—

MS. SIMON: Where are they?

MS. GONZALEZ: On the top shelf of that cabinet. The recorders are very small, so please speak up.

MS. SIMON: Okay.

MS. GONZALEZ: Thank you.

MS. SIMON: I'll get back to you.

CHAIR NELSON: Thank you because that's kind of been some time ago—

MS. SIMON: But I don't think that should delay a vote on Shawnee County.

MR. SHORE: Yeah.

MS. SIMON: I think NAGE would like a vote on Shawnee County.

MR. SHORE: Yeah. I mean, I think NAGE would like a vote on it, and we heard from some of the supervisors, I think, at the last meeting. They explained why this is important

to them. In some regard, whatever the outcome of the vote is, they're trying to find out what's going on. It's been 3 years since they originally—the request was submitted. So we would like a vote.

I don't think there's anything outstanding. The additional—the original study was done, and additional information was submitted after some discussion. So as far as I'm aware, I don't think there's anything that we're waiting for.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. We had provided a document a couple years ago now, which said what would happen if the Topeka wage area was abolished, which Management members didn't agree with, but we did provide that information, anyway.

So I guess the next step, unless anybody has something more to say about this one, is to have a motion put forward.

CHAIR NELSON: We've had so many people switch in and out. Would you kind of give us a rundown, just a quick synopsis of this before it's put to a vote? Because I'm seeing that we've got different faces than—

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. Actually, it would be NAGE's proposal, so I think NAGE should be saying what they want.

So the Management proposal is clear. We don't think there's call for any change in the Topeka wage area.

MR. SHORE: The proposal was to abolish the Topeka wage area, which would realign based on the study that OPM did, some of these employees to the Kansas City wage area, others, I believe, were to be reassigned or realigned to other wage areas. Based on what we've put forth, I believe everybody—there was no loss of pay for anybody, and there were increases in pay for those in Shawnee County.

I don't have the study that was done with me. I think it was—I don't even know if it's listed here actually.

MS. GONZALEZ: Yes, it is. 620-OPM-1.

MR. SHORE: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. Is this 620-MGT-1? Is that is?

MS. GONZALEZ: The analysis of the entire wage area is 620-OPM-1.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. So under 620-OPM-1, OPM did put together a further review of all the counties. Under 620-MGT-1, we provided an update to a previous study done under 612-MGT-1, the *Review of Shawnee County, Kansas*. The Management recommendation on this was that the Topeka wage area continue to be a separate wage area, and Shawnee County continue to be defined to the Topeka wage area.

There is information in the study about the viability of the wage area, which still meets all of OPM's regulatory criteria to remain separate from any other wage area, including Kansas City.

At the time this study was done, there were around 723 workers in the Topeka wage area: a combination of Department of the Air Force, which had 131 in Shawnee County, Department of the Army with 89, Department of the Interior with 2, and the Department of Veterans Affairs with 113. I think to date, we've only heard from employees at the VA Medical Center in Topeka about their concerns.

It mainly seemed to be the type of losses that people were going to work in a neighboring wage area. Personally, I don't think that's a reason to abolish a wage area because, to me, that happens all the time, when somebody chooses to go work somewhere else.

We had a statement from the Department of Veterans Affairs that was included in

that document. I understand there was further discussion during the testimony. That's what the local people provided. That would be in the record, though.

So that's basically what the Management position was. Maintain the wage schedule at prevailing wage levels in Topeka and continue doing wage surveys in Topeka instead of abandoning that practice and pay people from a Kansas City wage schedule, which is 60 or 70 miles away.

MR. SHORE: So there were two points that were made. One was that the employees—that they were having employees go to the Leavenworth facility. The other point that was made, somewhat extensively, was that they were working interchangeably. If you recall, we heard from bus drivers who talked about driving to the other facilities. They were going to Leavenworth, making stops there, but they were based out of Topeka and therefore would be employees of Topeka, at the Topeka hospital, despite going to the other hospitals. We heard testimony from painters and builders and different types of, you know, manual—people doing—

MS. SIMON: [Inaudible.]

MR. SHORE: Yeah. That were building furniture that was then going to the other facility. They were painting in the other facility, hanging up pictures. So it was more than just a couple people leaving, and I believe at the last meeting, we resubmitted the letter from the hospital director, which appeared to be in support of changing the wage area—or abolishing the wage area and move Shawnee County to Kansas City.

CHAIR NELSON: Now, they had the special rates there that they've been able to utilize?

MR. SHORE: I don't think so.

MR. ALLEN: No, I don't think that we received any request for pay flexibilities

for the VA Medical Center there. That's one of the reasons I asked one of the local people at our last meeting if he knew of anybody who left to go work in the private sector, and the answer to that was no, which may or may not be an indicator that the wage levels there are appropriate for the workforce that's there.

So I don't really have anything more to add. Does the VA have anything you'd like to say about that?

MS. WILLIS: So, yes. Thank you. Further exploring the possibility of the use of special rates for the different occupations to be able to look at—to see the market comparability within those occupations and to see if there is an opportunity for us to use that to set levels.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

My office also reviews special rate requests that would go through DoD because DoD is the lead agency. So we would, of course, review any request that would come in to us, to use pay flexibilities. Another option is to use recruitment and retention incentives if you are likely to leave for a non-government job.

CHAIR NELSON: So, Rob, what would you like to do with this at this point? Do you want to—

MR. SHORE: I think we vote for it, if we can. We have people.

MS. GONZALEZ: I need a motion in writing on a piece of paper.

MR. ALLEN: It could be some—I'm not making your motion for you, of course.

MR. SHORE: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: But it could be something as simple as "The Labor members recommend that the Topeka, Kansas, wage area be abolished"—

MR. SHORE: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: —"and its counties be defined by"—well, I don't want to speak for others if we're all—

MS. SIMON: Yeah, that's fine.

MR. ALLEN: And that those counties be defined to appropriate wage areas.

So once the motion is on the table, I think the Management members would like to have a quick caucus in Brenda's office.

MR. SHORE: I'll do my best to try to print. It's hard. I can't do both.

MS. GONZALEZ: Okay, this is NAGE's motion. I need a second.

MS. SIMON: Second.

MS. GONZALEZ: Before the vote, the Chair will read the motion.

CHAIR NELSON: Now we'll see if I can read his writing.

The motion is that the Labor members recommend that the Topeka, Kansas, wage area be abolished and the counties redefined to appropriate wage areas.

MR. SHORE: Yeah.

CHAIR NELSON: Is there a second on that?

MS. SIMON: Second.

MS. GONZALEZ: Do the Management members want to caucus now?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

[Management members go into caucus off the record.]

MR. ALLEN: Okay. So reporting back from the Management members' caucus, we did discuss this a little bit further, and we believe that it's not appropriate to abolish the Topeka wage area. But OPM is willing to work with the Department of Veterans Affairs to investigate whether pay flexibilities should be deployed to address any business needs when they

exist at the Medical Center, and we could also work with DoD if they're having difficulty with the Army and Air National Guard units in that wage area.

CHAIR NELSON: We're now going to take a vote on the NAGE request for March 9th, 2016. The vote will be on this recommendation or request—Labor members recommend that the Topeka, Kansas, wage area be abolished and counties redefined to appropriate wage areas.

MS. GONZALEZ: Are you ready to vote?

MR. ALLEN: We're all ready to vote.

MS. GONZALEZ: OPM?

MR. ALLEN: OPM votes no.

MS. GONZALEZ: DoD?

MS. LALONDE: DoD votes no.

MS. GONZALEZ: The Air Force?

MS. REYNOLDS: No.

MS. GONZALEZ: Army?

MR. BUCK: No.

MS. GONZALEZ: VA?

MS. WILLIS: No.

MS. GONZALEZ: Metal Trades?

MR. TROLL: Yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: AFGE, Jacque?

MS. SIMON: Yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: AFGE, Richard?

MR. LOEB: Yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: NAGE?

MR. SHORE: Yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: ACT?

MR KIELTY: Yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: It's a tie, Madam Chair.

CHAIR NELSON: Cool. I figured it would be that.

And while I am very sympathetic with all of the people who have come forward, I will have to vote no, just because I feel that the rules need to be followed, and the other options need to be implemented and faced first. And when that comes out, and no headway has been made, I can then consider supporting the other way. But for now, I have to vote no.

Shall we—

MS. GONZALEZ: Can I have the motion back please?

CHAIR NELSON: Yes, you can have the motion.

MR. ALLEN: We have another visitor with us today.

CHAIR NELSON: Would you give us your name?

MR. FEHRER: Yes. Douglas Fehrer.

CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Welcome, Douglas.

MR. TRAYLOR: Madam Chair, Tim—

MR. ALLEN: The other guest—

MR. TRAYLOR: Good morning. Tim Traylor representing NAGE.

CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

Sorry about the parking issue, Tim.

Shall we move on to (b), definition of Pitt County? We have deferred Pitt County the last several meetings at Jacque's request due to the fact that President Cox would like to speak on this, and he was unable to attend.

MS. SIMON: You can have a vote today.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. I guess we have time for some kind of a motion.

MS. SIMON: Well, this is an OPM initiative.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. So the—do I need to write this down for you, Madeline?

MS. GONZALEZ: Yes, please.

MR. ALLEN: OPM moves that the recommendation contained in 620-MGT-2 regarding Pitt County, North Carolina, be adopted as a recommendation from the Committee to OPM.

I can give a summary of this one since it's been on the agenda for quite a while.

Pitt County is in North Carolina, and probably the easiest way to look at this is to look at the map.

There was, I believe, one person at the VA Canteen Service facility in Greenville, North Carolina, and what had happened with that was that the local activity had started paying the employee from what was an incorrect wage schedule. It would have jumped over the Wayne, North Carolina, wage area to apply—is it the Cumberland wage schedule, Madeline?

MS. GONZALEZ: Right.

MR. ALLEN: Right.

If you look at the map in Attachment 1, you'll see that Wayne County, which is Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, is right smack in the middle between Pitt County and

Cumberland County, and based on the regulatory criteria, primarily looking at distance to a survey area, Wayne County is the closest.

MS. SIMON: By?

MR. ALLEN: This was—it would have been 43 miles to Seymour Johnson. It would have been 63 miles to Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station, which is actually not in the Cumberland wage area. It's the—Craven?—Craven wage area. Now, Pitt County is adjacent to Craven County, but the closest county measuring from the host installation to Pitt County is Wayne. So that's the basis for the Management recommendation.

MS. SIMON: That's a very small difference in terms of distance.

MR. ALLEN: It's 20 miles.

MS. SIMON: Twenty-mile difference, yeah.

MR. ALLEN: Forty-three compared to 63.

CHAIR NELSON: This impacts one individual, you said?

MS. SIMON: Right. And it would—

CHAIR NELSON: Is there pay retention, though?

MR. ALLEN: I believe we went through this with VA before. It had been a temporary position, which would not have been eligible for pay retention, but the position was converted to permanent and pay retention now would apply.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Do we need any more summary?

[No audible response.]

CHAIR NELSON: Would either party, either side like to caucus on this one?

MR. ALLEN: I don't see a need to caucus on this one.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

MS. GONZALEZ: I need a second.

MS. LALONDE: Second.

CHAIR NELSON: So we're ready to call for a vote?

MS. GONZALEZ: Can the Chair read the motion please?

CHAIR NELSON: OPM moves that the position in 620-MGT-2 be adopted as the Committee's recommendation.

MS. GONZALEZ: Metal Trades?

MR. TROLL: No.

MS. GONZALEZ: AFGE, Jacque?

MS. SIMON: No.

MS. GONZALEZ: AFGE, Richard?

MR. LOEB: No.

MS. GONZALEZ: NAGE?

MR. SHORE: No.

MS. GONZALEZ: ACT?

MR. KIELTY: No.

MS. GONZALEZ: OPM?

MR. ALLEN: OPM is yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: DoD?

MS. LALONDE: Yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: Air Force?

MS. REYNOLDS: Yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: Army?

MR. BUCK: Yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: VA?

MS. WILLIS: Yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: Five to five. It's a tie.

CHAIR NELSON: I'm going to have to go yes on this one.

So we move on to letter (c) on the agenda. It addresses a letter from AFGE dated September 6, 2018, requesting FPRAC to review a proposal to not allow Federal Wage System boundaries to split General Schedule locality pay areas and a proposal to redefine Monroe County, Pennsylvania, from Scranton-Wilkes-Barr, PA, wage area to New York, New York, wage area, 620-AFGE-1.

MS. SIMON: We're not ready to vote on this.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. This relates to the AFGE request for additional costing information.

CHAIR NELSON: That's what my comments are. I was going to ask. So we're going to defer this to the next meeting?

MR. ALLEN: I'm okay with that.

CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

Letter (d)—Definition of Columbia, Missouri, Metropolitan Statistical Area 625-MGT-1.

At our June meeting, Mark discussed, as I understand, that Management's recommendation is to keep the metropolitan area whole as stated in the regulations, and that the best solution is to have Cooper and Howard Counties both added to the St. Louis wage area.

Jacque moved that counties be added to Kansas City.

But at the September meeting, we discussed whether this item should be tabled because this was taken up several years ago, and the Committee could not reach a consensus on it. And Management finds no really good rationale for redefining two counties into a different wage area in this case.

There's no consensus. We did not have a quorum. So the Committee agreed to defer this agenda item.

Mark, would you like to provide us with an update on this?

MR. ALLEN: I think that's a very good summary of the previous discussions on this. Basically, what I was talking about at the last meeting was we had at this Committee considered this issue before. There is a regulation that OPM has. It's a longstanding rule that metropolitan areas should not be split between two wage areas, but when we previously looked at this one in particular, we couldn't find a good rationale to define all three counties to either wage area because they're right in the middle. There's like 1 or 2 miles difference for Columbia.

And previously, this had been tabled. I would not have an issue if we tabled this one again.

MS. SIMON: Plus, we're getting new data for MSAs.

MR. ALLEN: We are. That would be under OMB Bulletin 18-04.

This one is 18-04, isn't it?

MS. GONZALEZ: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. This one—actually, I guess that's one of the reasons why this one was brought back to the table is we were looking at the updated definitions.

So the real issue here is that Columbia is in Boone County. Most of the city is

there. When OMB revisited their definitions of metropolitan statistical areas, they determined that both Howard and Cooper Counties would be part of the Columbia, Missouri, MSA, but when somebody would take a look at Howard and Cooper Counties separately, they appear to be fairly rural counties. And just by themselves, they would be appropriately defined, I think, to the Kansas City wage area, where they are now. That's how the original definition of a wage area is set up. The issue, I believe, is Boone County, and the Management position is that Boone County is correctly defined to the St. Louis wage area.

I can't speak for everybody, but I think we'd be willing to table this one, as we did before.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Is there a motion on the floor to table this?

MR. ALLEN: Unless we're voting, we don't really need a motion.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Is there a consensus at least on tabling it, since there will be new data coming too?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Excellent. Thank you.

Let's move on to (e), definition of Fort Smith, Arkansas-Oklahoma metropolitan statistical area.

My notes are reflecting that this is where there are three Wage Grade 9 affected employees, and once they get past Step 2, there's a definite increase in pay for them. This is a split installation. It does not make sense to have people working at the same military base paid from separate wage schedules, and the employees are getting more money with this one.

So, you guys, that's my summary of it.

MR. ALLEN: That's a perfect summary.

MS. GONZALEZ: Grade 9 is higher at all steps in Tulsa.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. So what we're really looking at with this one, as the Chairman has said, the Management members don't believe it's a good business practice to split an individual installation between separate wage areas. In this case, it would be Fort Chaffee. So what we have recommended is that Crawford, Sebastian, Sequoyah County continue to be defined to the Tulsa wage area, but Franklin County continue to be defined to the Little Rock wage area to avoid splitting employees who work at the Ozark National Forest between two wage areas. But we recommend that the Fort Chaffee portion of Franklin County be defined to the Tulsa wage area.

MS. SIMON: I haven't looked at that in a while, so I don't know which way you're going. But are you consolidating them in the lower-paying areas?

MR. ALLEN: No. Higher. Tulsa has a pretty high wage schedule.

MS. SIMON: But the—

ATTENDEE: I had [inaudible].

MS. SIMON: Okay.

At Fort Chaffee, there's three employees, and that's what you're consolidating?

MR. ALLEN: That's right, yeah.

CHAIR NELSON: And they're going into a higher paying wage area.

MR. ALLEN: From Little Rock to Tulsa.

MS. SIMON: And what about Sebastian County? They're in Tulsa. Are they staying in Tulsa?

CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

MS. SIMON: Sequoyah County is in Tulsa. The only ones moving are these three

employees from Franklin County?

MR. ALLEN: That's right.

If I remember correctly, what happened with this is that we—OPM and FPRAC did work on this many years ago and moved Fort Chaffee out of Little Rock and to the Tulsa wage area. So we did not at that time see any employees in Franklin County. Now there are, so we're trying—attempting to address that.

MS. SIMON: Okay.

CHAIR NELSON: And these are—they're already Grade 9?

MR. SHORE: Yeah. They're Grade 9. I'm just saying they look—the only part that's—

CHAIR NELSON: We have consensus on this one?

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

CHAIR NELSON: Great.

MS. SIMON: Who says government can't—

MR. ALLEN: We're rolling. Can we add some more things to the agenda?

CHAIR NELSON: No.

[Laughter.]

CHAIR NELSON: We're pushing our luck here.

MR. ALLEN: Was that it?

CHAIR NELSON: No. We're now on (f).

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

CHAIR NELSON: Which is what I think I missed last time.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: So, yeah, this relates to what Jacque was saying earlier in the meeting, which is employees from—

MS. SIMON: California.

MR. ALLEN: —California. San Joaquin County—

MS. SIMON: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: —are interested in having their county defined to the San Francisco wage area.

MS. SIMON: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: And we don't have a study of that developed for this meeting, but we'll have one for the next meeting, after we get it cleared with the other Management members and develop a Management consensus on that issue.

MS. SIMON: You don't have to have a Management consensus. Maybe the Department of the Army wants to do something with the employees on the Tracy Army Depot.

MR. ALLEN: There is also one for Monterey. Do we need to put something together for that as well?

MR. SHORE: Yes. That's—

CHAIR NELSON: That's the New Business. Okay. So we're going to go ahead and defer this item (f), defer that. Management is going to put together a study.

Let's go ahead and go on to the New Business, which is addressing Monterey.

MR. SHORE: Yeah. So NAGE submitted a request to reexamine the placement of the Monterey-Salinas, California, wage area, and it's my understanding they're doing a survey there now. But the request is to do—reexamine the placement.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. Yeah, this issue has come up in the past. We'll be happy to take another look at it, and I'm not sure if we'd have something for the next meeting or not, but we will definitely take a look at it, what the current status is there.

CHAIR NELSON: So we'll defer this until the next meeting and see where we're at, at that point.

MR. ALLEN: When is the next meeting? November?

CHAIR NELSON: November 21st.

MR. ALLEN: Is that the day the Continuing Resolution runs out?

CHAIR NELSON: Well, see you guys in January, right?

[Laughter.]

MR. KIELTY: December, it's Mr. Buck's birthday, the December meeting.

CHAIR NELSON: That's right?

MR. BUCK: No. It's November.

MR. KIELTY: November meeting is your birthday. I may be off that day.

[Laughter.]

CHAIR NELSON: Your birthday present.

MR. BUCK: Yeah.

CHAIR NELSON: Thanksgiving is very late. It's the 28th this year.

I believe we've now covered all the items in our agenda for today, and boy, we made some progress. Is there a motion for adjournment?

MR. KIELTY: Motion to adjourn.

MR. LOEB: Second.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. All in favor of adjourning?

[Chorus of ayes.]

CHAIR NELSON: This meeting is now adjourned.

[End of recorded session.]