

FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

634th FPRAC

DOUGLAS FEHRER, Chairman, Presiding

Thursday, August 20, 2020

Virtual Meeting by Teleconference
Office of Personnel Management
Washington, D.C. 20415**ATTENDANCE:****Members/Alternates:**Management Members:Mark Allen, OPM
Christopher Lynch, DoD
Gary Buck, Army
Kendra Atiz, Navy
Keyonna Butler, VALabor Members:Paul O'Conner, MTD
Jacqueline Simon, AFGE
Richard Loeb, AFGE**Staff Specialists and Visitors:**Brenda Roberts, Designated Federal Officer, OPM
Jeanne Jacobson, OPM
Madeline Gonzalez, OPM
Michael Cogar, OPM
Karl Fendt, DoD
Erica Abiera, DoD
Mandy Laughlin, Army
Kimberly Eidson, Air Force
Julie Davidson, Cyber FEDS
Steve Connelly, OPM HI**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.....	7
II. Review of the Minutes of the 633rd Meeting.....	7
III. Old Business.....	8
a. 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 and 633-OC-1	
b. 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	
– Review of San Joaquin County, California, 629-MGT-1	
c. 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	
– Review of the Salinas-Monterey, California, Federal Wage System Wage Area, 629-MGT-2	
– Request for the abolishment of the Monterey/Salinas wage survey area, 632-NAGE-1	
d. Letter from the Association of Civilian Technicians, Dated November 9, 2019, Requesting FPRAC Consider Moving the Puerto Rico Wage Area into the Special Appropriated Fund Schedule for U.S. Insular Areas, 629-ACT-1	
– 2016 Study by NOAA Describing the Ocean Economies of the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, 629-ACT-2	
– Review of the Puerto Rico Federal Wage System Wage Area, 631-MGT-1	
– Puerto Rico Wage Grade Adjustment 2020, 631-ACT-1	
e. Amendments to 5 CFR 532.201, 532.207, 532.235, and 532.247, 633-MGT-2	

IV. New Business.....20

- a. Employment Distribution at Tobyhanna Army Depot, 634-OPM-1
- b. Market Rates vs Schedule Rates for Electronics Mechanics (Series 2604)
Tobyhanna Army Depot, 634-OPM-2

P R O C E E D I N G

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Good morning, everyone. This is Doug Fehrer, the Chairman of FPRAC. I'm now going to call this meeting to order, and I want to do a roll call to see who we have with us. I'm going to start with our members, then our official visitors and then the public. So let's start with Mark Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Mark Allen is here for OPM.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: And then DoD, Chris Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Chris Lynch is here.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Navy? Kendra Atiz?

MS. ATIZ: Kendra is here.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Army. Gary Buck?

MR. BUCK: Good morning, sir. I'm here.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Good. From VA, Keyonna?

MS. BUTLER: Yep, I'm here.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: And then on the Labor side from MTD, Dale Troll?

MR. O'CONNOR: Dale Troll is not here today. Paul O'Conner is here.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Thank you, Paul.

AFGE, Jacque?

MS. SIMON: Hi. This is Jacque. I'm here.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: And Richard as well?

MR. LOEB: Present, sir.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Thank you, Richard.

Is anyone on the line with NAGE? I don't think Lee was going to be able to join

us.

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: So no one from NAGE. And then ACT, Steve?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Steve, are you with us today?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Maybe Steve might be able to join us later.

And then from OPM, Brenda Roberts, Designated Federal Officer?

MS. ROBERTS: Good morning. I'm here.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Jeanne Jacobson?

MS. JACOBSON: Good morning. I'm here.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Madeline?

MS. GONZALEZ: Yes, I'm here.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Ana?

MS. PAUNOIU: Good morning. I'm here.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Mike?

MR. EICHER: I'm here.

MR. COGAR: Here, Doug.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Was that Michael Cogar as well?

MR. COGAR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Oh, sorry. And then from DoD, Karl?

MR. FENDT: Yes, sir, I'm on.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Gary?

MR. FENDT: Gary will not be able to join us today, and then we also had a last-minute cancellation. Jerry Dollente will not be on today either.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: How about Erica?

MS. ABIERA: I'm here. Good morning.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Anyone else from Navy?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: And then Army, we have Mandy?

MS. LAUGHLIN: Yes, sir. I'm here.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: And anyone else from VA?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: And then from Air Force, Kimberly?

MS. EIDSON: Yes. Kimberly is here. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Very good. And then on the public side, Julie Davidson?

MS. DAVIDSON: Good morning. I'm here.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: And Steve Connelly?

MR. CONNELLY: Steve is here.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Thank you.

All right. Is there anyone else on the line that I did not call?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: If not, let's move on. This is the 634th meeting of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee. It's now 10:04, and based on our roll call, Mark, do we have a quorum?

MR. ALLEN: We have a quorum to meet. I think we only have three of the Labor

members represented on the phone today. I don't think we were necessarily planning on voting on anything, but if we have consensus on anything, I think we just go ahead and move forward with that. Normally, we would just contact the members who are not able to attend the meeting if there's otherwise consensus on an issue.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Very good. Also, I just want to remind everyone that we are recording this meeting. As always, the minutes will be provided to all the members, and I would like to ask that members of the press or those from the general public curtail your participation to listening only, and if you do have questions, comments, or issues that you would like to have addressed, please put them in writing and submit them to our office. And any press questions or inquiries should be addressed through Michael Cogar in the Office of Communications. We'll respond to others in writing or at our next meeting, if that's appropriate.

Announcement wise - I want to thank everyone for participating in the meeting today, and that's really it. But are there any other announcements?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Hearing none, let's move on to the approval of the minutes, the minutes of the 633rd meeting which we held by teleconference last month on Thursday, July 16th, 2020. OPM received no edits to the transcripts. Are there any final edits offered today?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Hearing none, do we have a motion to accept the minutes?

MR. ALLEN: Move to accept the minutes.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: All those in favor of accepting the minutes?

[Chorus of ayes.]

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: I guess perhaps I should say, "Any opposition?" given that we're trying to do this on the phone.

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Hearing no opposition, let the record show that the minutes of the 633rd meeting of the Committee have been approved.

That takes us to our Old Business. We continue to carry over items (a), (b), (c), and (d) from past meetings, and at our last meeting, we had some direct input on item (a), the Tobyhanna pay issue, from some of their current and former depot members. And when we get to new business today, we're going to look at the employment distribution and pay rate data that OPM's Pay and Leave staff has assembled. So let's hold on that.

But before we move on, Jacque, is there anything else on this item before we continue?

MS. SIMON: Which item are you referring to?

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Item (a), the Tobyhanna pay issue.

MS. SIMON: You mean in addition to what we've already discussed, or are you proposing that we not discuss the tables supplied by OPM?

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Oh, no, no, no. I had said we were going to discuss the tables when we get to New Business. I just wanted to check and see if you had any additional information or updates for us before we moved on

MS. SIMON: No, I don't have any more updates.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Then also, while you're on, on item (b), any updates on the San Joaquin County presentation or additional information on that?

MS. SIMON: No. No, we do not have any new information on that. No.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: All right. Well, keep us posted on the—

MS. SIMON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: —presentation on that one.

And then item (c), the Salinas-Monterey issue was brought to us through NAGE, and we'll continue to hold that since Lee can't be with us again today. They have informed us that they are still interested in making a presentation. So we'll continue to carry that on the agenda as well.

On item (d), the Puerto Rico wage area issue, do we have anything new on this? As I recall, Travis was going to follow up with his colleagues at the local again and then with NAGE leadership to inquire if any recruitment and retention incentives as well as special pay rates are being used and what their impact was thus far. Are there any updates on that?

[No audible response.]

MR. ALLEN: With ACT absent from the Committee today, I don't think we can get any further information on that. It's my understanding that what we were doing with this was leaving it on the agenda, but that ACT was going to check on the possibility of pay flexibilities to recruit and retain employees in Puerto Rico.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: With Steve not being able to be on the line today, we'll go ahead and continue to carry that over as well.

Finally, we have item (e) which we carried over from our last meeting. These are the proposed amendments to revise the wage grade survey process, which would allow for greater flexibility in the collection of data, and this is a really time-sensitive issue.

Mark, do you want to take a minute to summarize this again for us?

MR. ALLEN: Sure.

It's always been the case, under the Federal Wage System, that the actual collection of wage data during a full-scale wage survey and the comparison of Federal benchmark jobs to what private-sector employees are actually doing and what they're getting paid has to be done by in-person visits to private industrial establishments.

The changes in technology over the last decades have brought forward an idea of possibly using technology to collect information when it's possible by email or just by telephone calls or many other kind of electronic means. But the reason this is on the agenda now is that, because of the pandemic, DoD's data collectors for wage surveys are not allowed to travel, so that prevents in-person visits to private industrial establishments to collect data. Also, it's very likely that even if DoD staff were present in each wage area, that the private-sector compensation managers would be kind of leery in letting somebody into their establishment for the purpose of collecting wage data.

What this proposal does is give DoD the option of collecting information using electronic means, which has not been available before. When the pandemic is over and even during the pandemic, it would be up to a local wage survey committee to decide on what terms contacts with private industrial establishments would be made, either in person or just by collecting information through electronic means. It would not be a blanket procedure where all contacts would be made other than in person. I think it's a commonsense proposal. It would require a change in regulation, and that's why there's some time sensitivity to this, because we need to—if we're going to implement this, we need to put this into effect as soon as possible so DoD can start gathering wage data to the best of their ability, just through in-person visits or by gathering data on what's going on in the private sector remotely.

That's about all I have to cover on that. Does anybody have any questions or concerns about this one?

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Jacque, I know you had mentioned last month that you wanted to touch base with some of your locals to see what they think.

MS. SIMON: Yeah. I mean, I did. There's certainly some reluctance to leave this effectively to Management making contact with employers and receiving the data electronically, where you don't have the experience of actually seeing the operation or getting a sense of its appropriateness. It's clearly an inferior means of data collection, and so we have reservations about it.

Obviously, the pandemic is extraordinary, but we don't want it to become the default method.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Are there any other comments or anyone else want to—

MR. LYNCH: I just want to confirm with Mark.

This would be—when we do collect the data electronically, it would still be in the manner that we collect it now—that's it, if we were going in person, correct, it would still be both the Management and the Labor members participating? So it wouldn't just be a Management member collecting the data? It would be both? Yes, we would be at the disadvantage of not going to the facility itself and not seeing it.

Being a former data collector, yes, it does help being in the facility. But it would still involve the Labor member as well, correct?

MR. ALLEN: I think that's the correct interpretation of the intent behind this. There's no intent at all of not including Labor representatives in every aspect of the wage survey process, so—

MS. SIMON: Mark, I understand that there's no intent of that. In practical terms, however, we believe that that would be the effect. Even if it weren't intentional or that's not the way anybody would want to do it, it only takes one person to do this kind of collection of data in this way.

I mean, we're all acknowledging that it is an inferior method that should only be used in exceptional circumstances like the pandemic. It's inferior because you have much less of a chance of determining—

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MS. SIMON: —the appropriateness of the comparison between Federal and private sector jobs.

MR. ALLEN: I understand those concerns, as Chris was mentioning, and I also did the wage data collection process myself a long, long time ago. I think the gold standard will remain gathering information in person in teams of Labor and Management members going to a private establishment and sitting down with a compensation manager—that's always going to be the best way of getting accurate information.

I understand, Jacque, your saying you have reservations, yet the actual implementation would still be up to the local wage survey committees and through the DoD wage committee as well.

MS. SIMON: Well, this is in my mind, you know, the exercise of discretion about when it's appropriate to use this method as opposed to the traditional in-person method, and we would be much—we would support having this as an option for exceptional circumstances such as a pandemic, but only in exceptional circumstances.

MR. LYNCH: Would this be one of the issues that would be discussed at the

hearing before the survey starts with the local wage survey committee, make that determination ahead of time whether or not the electronic data collection would be allowed, or how would that be handled?

MR. ALLEN: The regulations we're proposing to change don't say specifically that anything has to be done just one way. What we would intend to do with the change in regulations would be to leave it up to the local wage survey committee to decide how they wanted to proceed. There may be different approaches in different parts of the country, depending on the degree to which Management and Labor data collectors are available to collect the information during the pandemic period. It could also be that for companies where there have been contacts for, say, the last 20 years and it's known that the company had certain matches to jobs—it could be just a phone call or a joint phone call by the Labor and Management member to that establishment, and then they could email updated pay rates or just update—send in a rate sheet from a union contract. If it's something relatively simple like that, then it would not take up the time for the compensation staff and the private-sector establishment would reduce risk for everybody involved in the process and provide also, I think, still secure, accurate information.

But from my personal perspective, if a private industry establishment has not been contacted previously for a wage survey and it was unknown if they had any matches to any of the survey jobs or whether the industry they were involved in was actually within the scope of the Federal Wage System's survey practices, then it's a good idea just to have the Labor and Management data collectors go to the place and talk to somebody in person, maybe even take a walk around the production floor to see what the people are doing. I know I used to do that in the past.

Basically, what we're saying in this proposal is OPM does not know in advance

what means of good data collections are going to be appropriate in every circumstance. So what we're saying here is that it should be up to the local wage survey committee to make that determination. There needs to be a degree of flexibility in the process here.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you, Mark.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: The local committee would review the data. It's not a one-sided data collection at the end of the day, correct?

MR. ALLEN: That's correct. It would still be the—and it should still be the fact that any collection of data would still be a Management data collector and a Labor data collector working together to collect the information. The data collectors don't make any final determinations on the suitability of the information that's collected. That would be sent to the local wage survey committee, and then it would also be reviewed later by the Department of Defense wage committee before a wage schedule would be issued based on those data.

So what we're faced with now, if we don't have this policy put into place, is that the wage schedules still have to be issued, but the only pay adjustments that go into effect are the floor increases because there's no other basis for determining what the wage schedules could be without the ability to collect the wage data.

MS. SIMON: Well, Mark, you're saying it's what you've written or nothing. It could also be adjusted to say, you know, you deviate only in cases, emergency situations such as a pandemic. I mean, it's not this or nothing.

MR. ALLEN: So are you proposing something different? Are you suggesting that there be something else added with the regulation changes that we're proposing?

MS. SIMON: Yes, to say that the requirement to do a physical inspection—I guess "inspection" is the right word—can be waived in the event of a public health emergency

such as a pandemic, not just at the discretion of the committee when they want to do it, when they don't want to do it.

MR. ALLEN: I think what we mean to see is a specific change that you're suggesting, Jacque, in 633-MGT-2. We have the changes that the Management members are proposing in the regulation, where we are adding—I'm just taking a look at 532.201 definitions for the purposes of this part, "Full-scale survey means a survey conducted at least every 2 years in the private sector by personal visit of data collectors, telephone, mail, or electronic means."

I think what you're saying is that the data could only be collected by telephone, mail, or electronic means if there was an emergency situation. You know, that emergency situation may not just be a pandemic. It could be any other emergency situation, like a hurricane, tropical storm, or, I guess, in Iowa recently, it was the derecho storm that went through there. So that may be another circumstance.

MR. O'CONNOR: We've had hurricanes before, we've had all kinds of weather before. About the wage survey, you can just postpone an on-site visit. That's not a big deal. I think the new regulation should only be for this specific pandemic and not all these arbitrary emergencies. If we don't require on-site inspections doing a full survey, we effectively in probably many areas of the country—because it's easier—we turn the entire wage survey program into a phone call survey, and that's unacceptable.

It would be easy to do a phone call—even a Zoom survey if you want. Without the ability to actually go on the site and compare jobs, it would be—obviously, unmatched jobs may filter through, and that is a disservice to a national workforce.

I don't agree that we should turn it into a phone survey for anything but this specific pandemic.

MR. ALLEN: And I understand that perspective.

MS. SIMON: Well, Mark, your memorandum cites the pandemic.

MR. ALLEN: Right.

MR. LOEB: Yeah, I was just going to say, Mark, under your—on page 2 of the thing, current situation, your first paragraph is devoted essentially to the pandemic. It seems to me the basis for offering up this proposal.

MR. ALLEN: The thing that's driving this forward at this point really is the pandemic, but this is an issue that's been raised—well, at least, I guess, since we had email available. It is possible to collect information using electronic means. It's not really a new idea, but it's something that's just been brought to the table because of the pandemic and the inability to gather information through personal visits, current times, was likely to be going on for the next few months, unfortunately.

Do the other Management members have anything they'd like to add at this time?

MR. BUCK: What have we done in the past? I'm just thinking, for example, what have we done in the past for natural disasters, such items as that?

MR. ALLEN: What we did—or OPM did some years ago when there were—I believe it was Hurricane Andrew that went through Miami. What we did in that case was DoD put together a request to move, I guess, mainly, not exclusively, the nonappropriated fund wage surveys along the Gulf Coast out of hurricane season.

But what we're faced with now is a nationwide emergency. There's really nothing we can do to change the wage survey schedule to such a degree. It's really an unprecedented situation.

MR. BUCK: I understand. I appreciate it. I know most of the natural disasters and

such for specific areas—yeah, you're absolutely right that this is a global situation. I was just asking for the record what we have—if we have some sort of a precedent set in the past.

Thank you, Mark.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Just a thought on this as well, because it does seem to me—I mean, from everything that I read of it and what I've heard in this discussion, it does sound like the local committee would have to agree on this, and would it be possible, if we're talking about making changes in the language, to just say that there would have to be a unanimous consent of that local committee? I may be off base on this, and please speak up if I am. But would that help you folks on the Labor side if it was something—or instances of emergency need? And it would be by unanimous consent of the local committee members.

MR. ALLEN: The way of putting that into effect would be if we're taking a look again at 532.201. So instead of having "in the private sector by personal visit of data collectors," then comma, it would just be "in the private sector by personal visit of data collectors," period, and then follow that with another sentence, "With the consensus agreement of a local wage survey committee, telephone, mail, or electronic means may also be used."

And I think what the unions would say in that case, it should be "With the consensus agreement of a local wage survey committee, telephone, mail, or electronic means may be used in emergency situations," not that I want to put words into anybody's mouth with that. But that's what I'm hearing at this point.

MS. SIMON: Well, I appreciate the notion of requiring consensus at the local level, but there's a lot of ways that that can go wrong. I appreciate that, you know, it seems like a fail-safe way, but I think, as Mark wrote in his memo, the rationale was the coronavirus and the pandemic. And I think that should be the—and a public health emergency that prohibits personal

visits should be the only grounds on which the decision is made to forego visits.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Mark, do you have any final thoughts on that?

MR. ALLEN: I'd like to hear what the other Management members have to say about any possible changes.

MR. LYNCH: What I would like to see is, not to delay it too much further, but I think we have to see the revised language and then run it by our leadership again to get the buy-in before getting the approval.

MR. ALLEN: We can put together that. I think what we'll do is put together two versions. One would be a version which would be what the Chairman suggested as a means to move forward, which would be using electronic means with the consensus of the local wage survey committee, and then what Jacque was saying which would be by the consensus of the local wage survey committee but only during a national health emergency.

Jacque, would you also be okay with any kind of local emergency, or is it you're just interested in covering the pandemic or a pandemic?

MS. SIMON: I suppose a local emergency would qualify, the idea being that you physically can't go. It would be unsafe.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MS. SIMON: And the recognition, you know, as someone said, if someplace is under 10 feet of water, obviously.

MR. ALLEN: Right. Yes. So like Hurricane Katrina would be one circumstance.

MS. SIMON: Right.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MS. SIMON: Yeah. We're talking about public health emergency such as, you

know, the unprecedented one we're experiencing.

MR. BUCK: Army concurs with that.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Mark, as our parliamentarian, I'll toss this to you too.

Given that this is time-sensitive and we're now several months into this, so we've seen an impact on data collection, could we propose those changes and circulate them and potentially get approval as soon as possible rather than waiting until our next scheduled meeting? Or would we need to schedule a special meeting? What would be our option on helping to make this happen for data collection purposes sooner rather than later?

MR. ALLEN: It's actually part of the Federal Advisory Committee Act that any decisions on recommendations would need to be made in a public meeting. I think it's probably going to take a little while to circulate everything among agency leadership anyway. At least from my perspective, it's probably best to wait until the next public meeting, which is next month. We don't really have enough time to get another public meeting notice out to have an earlier meeting than that.

OPM staff will develop the two options to modify the initial recommendations that the Management members put forward, and we'll circulate both of those. I think we should circulate those to all the Committee members and then receive any further comments back from anybody and see what the positions are at the next public meeting and then hopefully come to agreement on what the best way to move forward is on this one.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Is everyone good with that?

MR. BUCK: Army, yes.

MS. SIMON: I am.

MR. LYNCH: I'm okay with that.

MS. ATIZ: I'm good with that.

And I would just like to offer one comment because I do understand, Jacque, your perspective and the concern for the employees and the fair evaluation during the survey period, but the longer that we delay in being able to have this flexibility, the employees' pay is not being really calculated based on the local area, other than for that minimum.

And I do attend and I am a member of the wage committee meeting, and I do notice the difference, the difference in the pay from being able to collect data versus now we can't and we're applying the minimum. So this is just perhaps widening the gap a little bit, and it may contribute to some pay errors—not pay errors, but pay challenges later in retaining, at the least, because they are looking where outside those folks that we're collecting from—they're continuing to receive pay increases, but we're not capturing that. So I do want to add that. We do have challenges in the Department of Navy retaining wage employees because of the private-sector data.

But I'm in agreement with everything. Thank you.

MS. SIMON: Thank you. I appreciate that very much, and far be it from us to do anything that would interfere with our members getting the pay increases that they deserve. I just want to make sure that that happens into the future, and I think the proposal as it was offered put that in jeopardy. But I think we've come up with a good compromise.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Well, if there's nothing else on this item at this time, let's move on to New Business, and we do have two items, as I've mentioned before, regarding the Tobyhanna Army Depot. And that is the employment distribution and then the market rates versus schedule rates.

Mark, if I can ask you again to walk us through these?

MR. ALLEN: I don't think we've provided information on the General Schedule workforce at Tobyhanna Army Depot to FPRAC before. This is kind of interesting information. It's under 634-OPM-1.

What we do here is provide a breakdown by job series code and series name and number of employees, and if we go down the list of job series and how many people are in them, we'll see here it's a reflection of a major Federal industrial location. You'll see things like 27 Fire Protection and Prevention employees, 22 Police Officers, 15 Security Guards who are on the Federal payroll, 41 Human Resources Management people.

The major groups, though, on the General Schedule workforce are related to sort of general management, so 55 Management and Program Analysis employees, 87 people involved with Logistics Management, and then we also have a substantial number of employees who are involved in doing the Electronic Engineering work, 99 people there, 89 Electronics Technicians, and 134 Production Control employees.

In the distant past, there was a fairly substantial number of employees in the shipyards who were involved in sort of scheduling projects for maintenance work on ships, and those employees would have been under the WD and WN pay plan code. At some point, there may have been a switchover based on the nature of the work involved at the depot where they may have moved some WD employees into this Production Control occupation, but that's where those people are now, 134 people in Production Control and 105 people in Information Technology Management.

We also have the list of the Federal Wage System occupational series, series name, number of employees, and as you see there, by far the largest number of people are involved in job series code 2605, which is Electronic Mechanics. Most of the work is done on

the wage side. The depot is sort of hands-on work with the rebuilding and maintenance of electronics equipment that comes in from DoD units. There 868 Electronics Mechanics, 64 Electronics Integrated Systems Mechanics, 58 Electricians, 59 Sheet Metal Mechanics, and 60 people involved in Painting, 62 Miscellaneous General Maintenance and Operations Work. That's a multi-trade occupation that's used pretty widely, both in the private sector and Federal sector now.

The next largest group there down the list is Warehousing and Stock Handling, which would be under 6901 series, with 101 employees, with a further —5 Tools and Parts Attending employees, and 38 Materials Handlers.

This is basic information on the workforce.

The next document broke down the Electronics Mechanic series. 634-OPM-2— broke this down by grade level and step, so that everybody can see what the pay levels are in relation to the local labor market, and what we see here is that the depot is able to recruit people at WG-5 and WG-8. The reason I say that the depot is able to recruit people is because they have significant numbers in those grades at the entry level, step 1 and step 2. To get to step 2, it only requires 6 months of service in the job.

In the column where it says FY 2020 unrestricted rates, that step 2 rate is the market rate that would be on the wage schedule if there was no pay cap and on floor increase. The market rate at step 2 for WG-5 is \$19.21 an hour for the Scranton wage area. The schedule rate would show that, for all steps of WG-5, the pay is above the unrestricted rate, and that's a result of the floor increase over the years. At WG-8, you can see that step 1 is below the unrestricted rate, but if you take a look at the grade levels where you have a WG-10 and up, most of the employees are going to be at step 5 for WG-10, WG-11, -12, and -13. And if we take a

look at Wage Grade 10, where most of the employees are, it's step 5. There are 182 employees in step 5, where the pay level is \$27.93 an hour—which is a couple dollars an hour above the market pay level.

This is an interesting way of looking at that one occupation which is the largest occupational series at the depot as a way of background information for everybody.

Anybody have any questions about that?

MR. LYNCH: None, Mark. We do appreciate you putting the information together.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. Anybody else?

MS. ATIZ: Hi, Mark. This is the Navy. I have nothing. Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MR. BUCK: Army has nothing.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: And if there is nothing else at this time, again, Mark, thank you very much for pulling this together and for walking us through it. We will certainly add this to our overall file as we continue to look at this issue.

I would be very interested at some point to be able to get up to the depot and actually see firsthand the work being done there. It sounds very interesting and certainly very important, and it sounds like they do a tremendous amount of really great work.

MR. ALLEN: I haven't been to the depot myself for a very long time, but I have been there in the past. And it's very large and a very impressive installation. They do a lot of important work there.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Absolutely. Okay. If nothing else on this, last but not least, our future meeting dates. As always they are listed in the agenda and they're published in

the Federal Register.

And with that, God willing, our next meeting will be held on Thursday, September 17th, at 10 a.m., and hopefully, it will be in the Executive Conference Room at OPM, but if not, we'll be having it by teleconference again.

Other than that, I believe this covers all of our agenda items for today. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

MS. SIMON: So moved.

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Okay. Is there anyone—for the sake of doing this on the phone, is there anyone who does not want to adjourn at this time?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FEHRER: Okay. Hearing none, this meeting is now adjourned. Stay well, everyone, and again, thank you all, especially OPM staff for their great work in support of the Committee.

[End of recorded session.]