

FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

625th FPRAC

JILL L. NELSON, Chair, Presiding

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Room 5526
Office of Personnel Management
Washington, D.C. 20415**ATTENDANCE:****Members/Alternates:**Management Members:Mark Allen, OPM
Christopher Lynch, DoD
Gary Buck, Army
Karen Hannah, VALabor Members:Jacque Simon, AFGE
Richard Loeb, AFGE
Timothy Traylor, NAGE (via phone)
Steven Landis, ACT**Staff Specialists and Visitors:**Jeanne D. Jacobson, Designated Federal Officer, OPM
Madeline Gonzalez, OPM
Karl Fendt, DoD
Brian Bauer, DoD
Leticia DavidQuintero, Navy
Shannon Moss Scott, Navy
Carl Biscontini, AFGE Local 1647
Bob Donahue, AFGE Local 1647
Ned George, AFGE Local 1647**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
– Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee Annual Summaries, 2017-2018, 625-OC-1	
II. Review of the Minutes of the 624th 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
- d. Definition of Johnson County, Indiana, to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area, 624-MGT-1

IV. New Business.....16

- a) Remarks by Employees of Tobyhanna Army Depot on AFGE’s Proposal to Redefine Monroe County, PA, from the New York, NY, Wage Area to the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA, Wage Area
- b) Comparison of Federal Wage System Employment and Weighted Average Pay Gaps, 625-OPM-1
- c) Definition of Columbia, MO Metropolitan Statistical Area, 625-MGT-1

P R O C E E D I N G

CHAIR NELSON: Good morning. Thank you for braving the heat. It's kind of yucky and gross out there.

This meeting will now come to order. This is the 625th meeting of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee. It is now 10:05. This meeting is being recorded. A transcript will be provided to all members.

My name is Jill Nelson, Chair of this Committee. We will start with introductions. You know what? We'll start with the Union and work our way around, and we'll get all the way around the room that way.

MR. LANDIS: Steve Landis, ACT.

MR. LOEB: Richard Loeb, AFGE.

MS. SIMON: Jacque Simon, AFGE.

MR. ALLEN: Mark Allen with OPM.

MR. LYNCH: Christopher Lynch, Department of Defense.

MR. BUCK: Gary Buck, Department of Army.

MS. HANNAH: Karen Hannah, VA.

MS. DAVIDQUINTERO: Leticia DavidQuintero, Department of Navy.

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

MS. JACOBSON: Jeanne Jacobson, OPM, Designated Federal Officer.

MR. FENDT: Karl Fendt, DoD.

MR. BAUER: Brian Bauer, DoD.

MR. EICHER: Mike Eicher, OPM.

MS. PAUNOIU: Ana Paunoiu, OPM.

MS. GONZALEZ: Madeline Gonzalez, OPM.

MR. GEORGE: Ned George, AFGE Local 1647, Tobyhanna Army Depot.

MR. BISCONTINI: Carl Biscontini, Local 1647, Tobyhanna Army Depot.

MR. DONAHUE: Bob Donahue, AFGE 167, Tobyhanna Army Depot.

CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

Now, do we have anyone on the phone? No one on the phone today. Okay, thanks.

MR. ALLEN: I would note that there is a lack of a quorum for voting, if we did have to vote on anything. Not expecting to vote on anything today, though.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Got that noted.

Let's start with Opening Announcements. The only announcement today is that we've got the Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee's Annual Summaries in here. It's summaries of 2017-2018, and it's Doc 625-OC-1.

The members approved these summaries at the May meeting. MTD and ACT approved by email because they did not attend the meeting.

We have included a copy in the record here, just in your folders for your own records.

So that is basically the only announcement.

So Review of the Minutes of the 624th Meeting, which was held on May 16th. OPM received no edits for this transcript. Are there any edits being offered today?

[No audible response.]

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Seeing and hearing none, the Chair will entertain a motion to accept the minutes of the 624th meeting.

MS. SIMON: So moved.

MR. ALLEN: Second.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. So the minutes of the 624th meeting have been moved and seconded. Thank you.

We are going to move on to Old Business. I am thinking we have three visitors here to speak to address item (c) on the agenda. If the members have no objection, we'll go ahead and address it first, so that we can listen to these people. Is that okay with everyone?

[No audible response.]

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Item (c) is the letter from AFGE dated September 6th, 2018, requesting review of a proposal to not allow Federal Wage System 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.

I would like to make sure that we're going to have each of you speak, but I'd like to make sure that you introduce yourself first so that it's easier for the transcription service to have some idea of who's talking.

MS. SIMON: Should they come to the table?

CHAIR NELSON: Yeah. If you'd like to come up to the table. If you're comfortable there—it's not a huge room. So whatever is easiest for you, and we want to get the mics turned on.

MR. BISCONTINI: So I'll get started. Well, good morning, everyone. Thanks for having us here today.

CHAIR NELSON: Good morning. Thank you for being here.

MR. BISCONTINI: I'm Carl Biscontini. I didn't mention it, but I am the president

of Local 1647 at Tobyhanna Army Depot. And I represent the bargaining unit employees at Tobyhanna Army Depot.

I feel like the longstanding pay disparity that we're all aware of would be better relayed by the technicians accompanying me here today. These are the guys that show up daily, stay home when we're furloughed, travel the continental United States, volunteer to enter war zones, and continually support the warfighter. These are the guys that have been left behind, and I would like to introduce them.

I've got Robert Donahue and Edward George. We call him "Ned." And I'm sure Bob is going to have a few words to say, so I'll let Bob speak.

MR. DONAHUE: Good morning. I wanted to thank everyone for listening to us this morning, taking the time to hear our concerns.

The pay disparity, of course, is not new at our depot. It has been going on for a while. We've been here many times before, but hopefully, this will be the last time.

The strikingly unfair compensation structure has driven a wedge between our working GS men and women and the WG. We talk about wage surveys and economies of scale, but do we actually accomplish that?

The area we live in has very little industry to compare with. These industries for the overwhelming instance do not require secret clearances. They do not require travel up to 25 percent and more around the country, leaving family at home. They do not require that employees maintain high standards of integrity, concern for the public interest, as our MSPB does.

Where the significant impact of a life-changing event can cost the loss of our ability to support our family—for example, divorce, unpaid medical bills, credit difficulties—it

can and has caused loss of clearance and loss of position.

As you enter the work areas of our depot, you hear the heartbeat of Tobyhanna and the sound of the drills, the rhythm of the spray guns, and the alert sounds of the automated test equipment.

Harder to hear is the murmur of detachment caused by the pay disparity, but it's there. Just as Tobyhanna is a living, breathing beehive of activity, this legacy of disparity is a drain on its vitality also.

We can't fool ourselves into thinking we should mirror the private sector because, in our business, quality means lives. We do not build or maintain commercial products. Our quality products being Class 3 have to work first time and every time they are needed. We need to keep a highly skilled workforce we have today. Commercial-type products couldn't stand up to the constant vibration and shock of vessels under way for an active, quick-strike mobile force.

A mobile force or vessel has no room for spares. Durability and reliability is the key. This is what we do at Tobyhanna Army Depot— maintain, repair, and manufacture durable quality products for our warfighters.

Our organic industrial base has to be maintained, we all know, for the security of America's defenders and their families. By defenders, I include everyone in this room that's responsible for getting assets to our warfighters.

Americans are known for making easy decisions because we're not afraid to make the right decisions. Thanks for your time.

[Technical interruption.]

MR. BUCK: May I ask a question?

MR. DONAHUE: Yes, sir.

MR. BUCK: How many members do you represent?

MR. DONAHUE: Altogether, we have around 1,400 WG workers and around 1,200 to 1,250 GS workers. Now, that's not a solid number. It's fluid at this point.

MR. BUCK: Thanks.

MR. DONAHUE: You're welcome.

MR. ALLEN: Is there a big contractor presence still at the depot?

MR. DONAHUE: We have a significant contractor there. I don't know the exact number of the contractors.

MR. GEORGE: Approximately around 300 right now, give or take a few either way. That also goes up and down almost at a daily rate.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. Yeah, I had heard, but I hadn't really heard anything definite in the past about total numbers of people working. I was there a long time ago. It's a very impressive place.

MR. GEORGE: They've hired quite a few in the last—they did quite a few hiring fairs with the upgrade in workload. We've hired about 400 employees in the last year. It's mostly in the WG workforce where they have been hired. I think the 2020 projected hiring numbers was 2,250 is where they wanted to be at. That's total employees. That was just briefed out this week.

My name is Ned George. I've been working at Tobyhanna Army Depot since 2004. I'm a 3-year Army veteran before I came there. I had 14 years in the International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades. I did their apprenticeship program to be a painter. My whole career, I've been a WG worker at the depot. I was there when the GS employees were first given the upgrade of locality pay, and the reason that they were giving it, as we all know, is because of the influx from the people from the city and stuff like that. I live right close to

Tobyhanna. Ninety percent of my neighbors are people from New York City and New Jersey that just come in for the weekends.

When I go to the store, I pay a lot more money for my groceries because of that. I pay more money for my gas. I pay more money for my taxes, but I've been there for 20 years painting. And I have a secretary that does clerical work, which is very important, but they make more money than our senior WG employees.

As a painter—I just became a finish inspector there. As a painter, I travel up to 50 percent of the time to anywhere that we had a flight line in the world. Remote islands. I've been 300 miles off the coast of Russia. I've been in Spain. I've been in Hawaii. I've been in Boise, Idaho, all the "remote places," they like to call them.

It's kind of discouraging that when the guys left and right of you and the ladies left and right of you have been given something and you're basically looked down upon, it's a constant struggle left and right.

I actually was vice president of the local at one time, chief steward. I actually stepped down, did not run for reelection. That was because of the pay disparity and the constant struggle every day for our stewards. Pretty much, it's looked upon that it's almost like the Union's fault that the WGs don't have it. It's a very big divide. You read the wage surveys and the surveys of our employees, and it's the number one thing that we always talk about. And it's just discouraging that you're not treated fairly and equally as the people left and right of you.

Me as a painter, I could go out and work in the painters union and make a lot more money doing a lot less, but I've been a soldier. And the assets that I work every day, I know what they do. I know they keep our country safe.

I have a 9-year-old boy that I hope someday could come in and do the same kind

of things that I got a chance to do. It would be nice to be treated fairly.

I would like to thank everyone here for the chance to come down and speak. It would be nice to finally get this thing pushed through. Of all the 625 meetings of the FPRAC, I don't know how many positive recommendations you have, but it's pretty discouraging to our employees that the only—the two things that we were positive from this board for this to happen, that I believe we're the only two positive recommendations that have never been written into law. So, I mean, that's kind of discouraging when you look across the—everything else that goes on. You wonder if it's a farce in the end and who's holding us back.

I thank you for all your time and hope this can be fixed someday.

CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

MR. BUCK: Yeah. Thank you.

CHAIR NELSON: Do you have anything else for us today?

MR. BISCONTINI: I don't have anything else.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Thank you for joining us. We appreciate it.

MR. ALLEN: I would just like to point out, for your local members, it is certainly not the fault of the union local that this issue has not been addressed. It's something that I think your union and the national headquarters people have been pushing very strongly over the years.

MR. GEORGE: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: And it's to your credit that that's happened.

MR. GEORGE: It's just disheartening, sir. You know, it's very disheartening to work there for almost 20 years and this to still be going on left and right.

How many positive recommendations have not been? How come we're the only two?

MR. ALLEN: There was one recommendation that was not adopted back in the early 1990s that would have required a change in statute.

MR. GEORGE: The last one that we went through, that I actually testified then as well, sat on people's desks, we were told, forever.

MR. ALLEN: There was a recommendation in October 2010 which required further study. So that one was not outright rejected.

MR. GEORGE: I don't have the pay, sir, so it was rejected.

MR. ALLEN: Well, they were not adopted. Nobody actually said, "No, we're not doing this." So they're still hanging out there. That's why we're discussing them, continuing to discuss the issues on the merits here. That's probably the best place to deal with this type of thing and come up with a solution, any recruitment or retention problems that there may be existing at the base or at the depot.

MS. SIMON: I think that it's probably time to try to put together a new cost estimate for this proposal, specifically Monroe County as well as dealing with the issue nationally.

The last time OPM put together a really careful cost estimate, I think the numbers were quite different, the employment numbers, certainly at Tobyhanna. I think there are fewer employees since the cost estimate was last put together, and I was wondering if you all would be willing to undertake that project.

MR. ALLEN: Madeline, did we do one recently?

MS. GONZALEZ: Yes, we did.

MS. SIMON: When was the last time?

MS. GONZALEZ: It was 622-OPM-1.

MR. ALLEN: Fall last year.

MS. GONZALEZ: It was December 2018.

MS. SIMON: I'm talking about the cost nationally with explicit assumptions about pay raises for addressing this inequity in every location that would be affected as well as in particular for Monroe County, with the new numbers on current wages and current employment levels.

MR. ALLEN: Since it would be the OPM staff doing that type of analysis, what I'd recommend is that you look at the last estimate that we provided to the Committee and any member provide us with suggestions—

MS. SIMON: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: —on a more expansive approach to that or—

MS. SIMON: Okay. I can put the request in writing. I'll do that.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

CHAIR NELSON: Maybe even put comparisons to prior ones that you want it to be broke out to.

MS. SIMON: Yeah. The last time you guys did the big study was several years ago, and I know that the employment numbers are substantially lower today than they were when you did the big study, certainly at Tobyhanna, but also at Tracy and other places. And I've recently heard from the folks at Tracy where we also have a local, and they got the same issue, same morale issue, same level of outrage at the inequity. That certainly affects everything that the depot tries to accomplish.

CHAIR NELSON: Thank you. And we will push getting the documents. At least the staff has something to work from. That will be helpful.

MS. SIMON: Sure, sure.

CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

Shall we return to agenda item (a)?

First off, I want to say I think somebody just came on to the phone. Would you like to identify yourself?

MR. TRAYLOR: [via phone] Yes. Good morning. This is Tim Traylor with NAGE.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Thank you.

So we are going to return to agenda item (a) which is NAGE's March 9th, 2016, request to reexamine placement of Wage Grade employees working in Shawnee County.

Tim, do you have any kind of an update on this?

MR. TRAYLOR: [via phone] Can we come back to that? I'm getting updated by Rob Shore.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: This agenda item, I believe, is still tied up with the broader recommendation.

CHAIR NELSON: Yeah, I think it is too, especially if there's going to be a bigger study done. So we'll probably just move on from this one today.

We have the definition of Pitt County to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System. Do we have any updates on Pitt County?

Jacque?

MS. SIMON: No. Like I said earlier, I know that President Cox wants to come and address FPRAC on this matter, and he wasn't able to be here today.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. We're moving on to item (d). We've kind of done them out of order, just so that we realize now that we're on item (d). Item (d) is something that was raised at the last meeting, and Mark was asked to do some historical information on that.

What item (d) is, it's a definition of Johnson County, Indiana, to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area. 624-MGT-1 is the document.

Would you like to address that?

MR. ALLEN: Sure. We went back and looked to see if there is anything precedent-setting in previous definitions of how Nonappropriated Fund wage areas had been dealt with, if there was a county that was contiguous to another area of application county. I don't really see anything definitive about how those are handled.

What I was saying at the last meeting was that Johnson County was adjacent to an FWS area of application county, but the regulatory criteria point towards having that county added to the Hardin–Jefferson Nonappropriated Fund wage area. There is only one NAF employee in Johnson County and that employee would get a higher pay rate going to Hardin–Jefferson rather than to the other alternative.

That's not the basis that we used for making the recommendation to FPRAC from the Management side. We did look at the regulatory criteria, and it was really based on proximity. We think that Johnson County should be added to the Hardin–Jefferson NAF wage area.

CHAIR NELSON: I can add my thoughts a little bit. I did look down through there and realized that it was basically higher pay by going to the Hardin–Jefferson wage area.

MS. SIMON: So are you opposed to change?

MR. ALLEN: No.

CHAIR NELSON: It gives the higher—what is proposed would give the person a higher salary.

MS. SIMON: I understand. Are we going to vote on it?

MR. ALLEN: Not if we have consensus.

MS. SIMON: Okay. I mean, I guess since we've got NAGE on the phone, I think we can vote.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

MS. SIMON: Right? Oh, okay.

CHAIR NELSON: Yeah, yeah. Sure.

I mean, before, I think the assumption was there was a lower wage, and there was concern about that, whereas going back through, I think they've pointed out that—and I looked through, and I went, "It's all higher wage."

So do we want to take a vote on this, then? Is there consensus?

MS. SIMON: That's fine with me.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. We have a consensus? I'll do that.

MR. ALLEN: Yes. We'll move forward with the proposed regulation on this one and a final regulation to follow on after that.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Thank you.

And New Business, we also have the comparison of Federal Wage System employment and weighted average pay gaps, 625-OPM-1.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

CHAIR NELSON: Do you want to tell us a little bit about that, Mark?

MR. ALLEN: Yes. Under 625-OPM-1, this is a kind of document that the OPM

staff used to provide to FPRAC prior to the 3-year pay freeze. The first page, this is for Federal Wage System wage schedules adjusted as of the close of Fiscal Year 2018. We're still working on the 2019 information that's still, of course, going to come into the end of the fiscal year. Once we have all of that information compiled, we'll run another weighted average pay gap. So we probably would get that to the Committee maybe October-November time.

What this is showing is the employment level is about 172,000 for just the WG, WL, WS, WD, and WN plans which are the schedules that are shown on regular wage schedules. They're around another 20- to 30,000 employees who are covered by other special wage schedules.

So for these regular wage schedules, what we're seeing here is a weighted average pay gap as of close of Fiscal Year 2018 of around 5.04 percent, and this is at Step 2.

MS. SIMON: You've got two Scranton–Wilkes-Barre, one with 1,492 employment and one with 277 employment.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. There's a reason for that.

Moving on to page 2, you will see a wage schedule like Anniston–Gadsden, Alabama, which has wage area codes 001 with total employment of 2,072 people. Average pay gap is 2.34 percent, and the scheduled effective date for that wage schedule is 24th of June 2018.

Because of the floor increase provision that's been in appropriations law since 2004, some wage areas have more than one wage schedule. Anniston–Gadsden is one of those. So if you look down to the wage area code 201, that is for the Anniston–Gadsden, Alabama, wage schedule that covers—I believe it's just one county that coincides with Huntsville, Alabama, locality pay area. There are two people in that county, and because of the grade levels, there is actually a slight overpayment of 0.39 percent. Where you see negative numbers that

means there's a pay surplus rather than a pay gap.

MR. LYNCH: I'm sorry. So they're leading the market versus—

MR. ALLEN: That's right, yeah.

One measure in Step 2, the average step for wage grade employees is around 3.5, which means that in reality, people are paid about 6 percent on average above market, above the Step 2 rates, but—

MS. SIMON: But you've measured these gaps using data from the wage surveys, not—

MR. ALLEN: That's right.

MS. SIMON: So that data excludes all unionized skill trades and the building trades?

MR. ALLEN: The wage schedules would not include the construction industry. I think that's what you're—

MS. SIMON: That's what I mean. The unionized skill trades in the construction industry.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. There's no exclusion generally of unionized or non-unionized workers. It's just what type of industry they're included in.

MS. SIMON: Okay. But in the building trades, in the union building trades for the skilled trades, their contract pay scale is excluded?

MR. ALLEN: Those are not included in the Federal Wage System surveys.

MS. SIMON: Okay. I just want that noted.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. Any questions about this?

MS. SIMON: I'd just like to say that I understand why you did it the way you did

it because that's the data we have, and we don't want to ignore the data collected in the wage surveys. And the actual pay adjustments have been—occur sort of on a separate track from the process described in Title 5 for prevailing rates, data from the wage surveys.

This is not very high-quality data, and it's certainly very, very dissimilar from the data used to measure the pay gap for GS employees. So no one should ever take a look at this pay gap and the pay gap that the Federal Salary Council used and say, "Okay. Look at this. It's so much smaller for blue collar than it is for white collar," because they're two entirely different measurements taken from entirely different datasets. One is of much higher quality than the other.

So while this might be interesting, it's certainly not—should never be spoken of in the same way as the pay gap measurement that the Federal Salary Council uses for GS employment.

CHAIR NELSON: Any further comments?

[No audible response.]

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Shall we go on to item (c) under New Business?

Item (c) is the definition of Columbia, Missouri, Metropolitan Statistical Area, and that's 625-MGT-1 in your folder.

Mark, would you like to address this one?

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. This one is coming to the table because of changes in metropolitan area definitions made by OMB.

The recommendation here is to move Cooper and Howard Counties, Missouri, out of the Kansas City wage area and into the St. Louis wage area. Boone County is the location where the State Capitol is, Columbia, Missouri. Cooper and Howard are pretty small population

counties that I believe are only attached to Boone County or the Columbia MSA because of the commuting relationship from those two counties into Columbia.

Over the course of time, OMB has added and dropped those counties from the Metropolitan Area definition, but the definitions we're working from now under OMB Bulletin No. 18-04 do have them included in the Columbia MSA. So it's an issue that we need to address under OPM's regulations.

There are no FWS employees in Howard County, and only one employee works in Cooper County, Missouri. It is our practice to measure distances, as a primary criterion. For Boone County, which is the core county of the MSA and it's where most of the FWS employees are, we see that distance would favor neither wage area, neither Kansas City nor St. Louis if you're measuring to the nearest city. I believe the distance is about 125 miles, one way or the other.

For the host installation, the distance criterion would favor St. Louis wage area.

Geographic features, not really any to speak of. It's really flat terrain, no real obstacles.

Commuting patterns don't favor either Kansas City or St. Louis, and likewise, Columbia, Missouri, is not really similar in population size or industry patterns to either Kansas City or to St. Louis.

So the Management recommendation here is to keep the metropolitan area whole as the regulations say that we should, and the best solution is to have Cooper and Howard Counties both added to the St. Louis wage area.

MS. SIMON: Well, I'll counter that with adding those two counties to Kansas City, since it's a toss-up on all the criteria, and AFGE represents the unionized workers who

would be affected. I'd like to move that the counties be added to Kansas City.

CHAIR NELSON: If I understand this right, there's one worker involved that we're discussing?

MR. ALLEN: Yes. Well, there's one worker for—

CHAIR NELSON: For Cooper.

MR. ALLEN: For Cooper. There are 152 employees in Boone County.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

MS. SIMON: Boone County, we represent 129.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

MS. SIMON: At the Department of Veterans Affairs.

MR. ALLEN: I believe we do not have consensus on the AFGE suggestion.

CHAIR NELSON: No, we do not.

MR. ALLEN: No.

MS. SIMON: And no consensus on the Management one either.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. So we do have a quorum for voting today if there's a desire to hold a vote on this one.

CHAIR NELSON: Do we want to hold a vote or just kind of don't know at this point where we're headed?

MS. SIMON: No, no. I just really would ask that you guys give it a little more thought.

As you described, Mark, there's not a strong argument in one direction or another. It's really a 50-50 toss of the coin, and we ask that you give more consideration for the possibility of Kansas City.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Thank you.

That covers all of the New Business, and we have future meeting dates are set forth in the documents before you. You've got those.

I believe we've now covered all the items in the agenda for today.

Before I take a motion for adjournment—

MR. TRAYLOR: [via telephone] I just had one question. I apologize.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Feel free.

MR. TRAYLOR: [via telephone] This is again Tim Traylor with NAGE.

In the past meetings, we were unable to reach consensus regarding Shawnee County, and it's his understanding we're up for a vote.

So I was curious. Someone mentioned a study earlier. So I was curious where that came from and exactly what study is being done.

MS. SIMON: Oh, it's not having to do with Shawnee County, if that's what you're asking.

MR. TRAYLOR: [via telephone] Oh, yeah. So Rob is under the impression that we just were not able to reach consensus. We even had a document from management to support our position, so he's ready to move it for a vote.

MR. ALLEN: I believe the position of the Management members is that because the issue really is that Shawnee County is covered by the Kansas City locality pay area and GS employees in that county are paid Kansas City rates that should be extended to the wage system as well. That, I believe, would be part of the bigger study for whether it's appropriate to use GS locality pay areas to define Federal Wage System wage areas.

But having said that, if NAGE wants to make a motion today to vote on that issue

for Shawnee County and the Chair is in agreement to do that, we could do that.

CHAIR NELSON: NAGE?

MR. TRAYLOR: [via telephone] Yeah. Specifically regarding the pay discrepancy between Shawnee County and Leavenworth County, I think that's the heart of this.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. I think what is going on is Rob left notes that the issue for Shawnee County is ready for a vote, but I don't get the sense that the other members on the Committee are ready for that.

MS. SIMON: And the proposal is to move Shawnee County to Kansas City?

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MS. SIMON: And that's what NAGE is supporting?

MR. ALLEN: Right.

MS. SIMON: Is there consensus on that?

MR. ALLEN: No.

MS. SIMON: Then I think we need to wait.

CHAIR NELSON: Yeah. I think that's probably the better idea to not vote on this one yet today.

MS. SIMON: Okay.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay?

MS. SIMON: Mm-hmm.

CHAIR NELSON: Mr. Traylor, did you understand, then, that there really isn't support from the Union to take a vote on this today?

MR. TRAYLOR: [via telephone] That's fine. I'm just relaying a message from Rob. I'll update him later.

CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Thank you.

Before we adjourn, I really want to make sure that the three of you that have spoken with us today realize that we appreciate you coming in and taking the time, even in—sorry we've got so much heat for you guys. I feel bad. You're coming from mountain areas. But we do appreciate the time you've taken, and thank you very much for all of us.

So I guess we're at a point now where we can—is there a motion for adjournment?

MS. SIMON: So moved.

CHAIR NELSON: So moved. Is there a second?

MR. ALLEN: And second.

CHAIR NELSON: We have a second. All in favor of adjourning?

[No audible response.]

CHAIR NELSON: I guess that's everyone.

Any opposition?

[No audible response.]

CHAIR NELSON: May you all have a great afternoon and enjoy the extra hour of sun tomorrow, longest day of the year, maybe the hottest day of the year. I don't know.