FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

608th FPRAC

SHELDON FRIEDMAN, Chairperson, Presiding

Thursday, October 15, 2015

Room 5526 Office of Personnel Management Washington, D.C. 20415

ATTENDANCE:

Members/Alternates:

Management Members:

Mark Allen, OPM Jim Davey, DoD David Pedersen, Navy Arleen Romba, VA (via phone)

Labor Members:

Randy Erwin, MTD/NFFE J. David Cox, AFGE Jacque Simon, AFGE Robert Shore, NAGE Steven Landis, ACT

Staff Specialists and Visitors:

Brenda Roberts, Designated Federal Officer, OPM Madeline Gonzalez, OPM Steve Driscoll, OPM Kevin Franklin, OPM Jim Brady, DoD Rebecca Chaves, DoD Rosemary Meriwether, Navy Brian Kokotajlo, AFGE Rod Koeppa, AFGE Ryan O'Leary, NAGE Robert Jentsch, ACT Chris Golden, ACT

Recording Secretaries:

Mike Eicher, OPM Ana Paunoiu, OPM

[Transcript prepared from digital audio produced by FPRAC.]

Page

I.	Opening/Announcements	
	٠	Introductions
	•	Announcements
II.	Re	view of the Minutes of the 607th Meeting5
III.		l Business
	a.	Review of Lee County, Virginia, 557-MGT-2
		- 2013 Update to Review of Lee County, Virginia, 586-MGT-1
	b.	Definition of South Bend-Mishawaka, IN-MI Metropolitan Statistical
		Area, 562-MGT-2
		- 2013 Update to Definition of South Bend-Mishawaka, IN-MI
		Metropolitan Statistical Area, 586-MGT-2
	c.	Letter from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated
		June 6, 2011, Requesting FPRAC Review a Proposal to Redefine
		Monroe County, PA, from the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA, Wage Area
	Ŀ	to the New York, NY, Wage Area, 564-AFGE-1
	a.	Definition of Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton, NC Metropolitan Statistical
		Area, 575-MGT-1
		 2013 Update to Definition of Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton, NC Metropolitan Statistical Area, 588-MGT-1
	0	Proposal to Move a Portion of Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst from
	C.	the Philadelphia, PA, Wage Area to the New York, NY, Wage Area,
		599-ACT-1
		 Review of Burlington and Ocean Counties, New Jersey,
		602-OPM-1
		- Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst GS and FWS Employment as of
		October 2014, 603-OC-2
		- Transcript of 556 th Meeting – includes remarks by Colonel Gina M.
		Grosso, Former Commander at Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst
		on pages 8 to 20 [REPRINT]
		- 2011 letter from 15 New Jersey Congressmen in support of AFGE's
		proposal to consolidate FWS wage areas, or portions of wage areas
		that lie within non-RUS GS locality pay areas, 565-OC-3
		[REPRINT]
		- Director John Berry's response to 2011 letter from the 15 New
		Jersey Congressmen in support of AFGE's proposal, 566-OC-2
		[REPRINT]
		- Burlington and Ocean Counties, NJ: Summary of FPRAC
		Discussions, 606-OC-2
		- Counties Redefined/Not Redefined or Split Due to Organizational
		Relationships among Closely Related or Closely Located Federal
	ſГ	Activities (1994-2014),607-OPM-2
	1. F	Review of Greene County, Missouri, 607-OPM-3

PROCEEDING

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Welcome, everyone, to our 608th meeting of the

Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee. My name is Sheldon Friedman, Chair of the Committee, and as we always do, let's please go around the room and introduce ourselves. Let's start today with you, Randy.

MR. ERWIN: Randy Erwin with the National Federation of Federal Employees representing Metal Trades Department.

MR. COX: J. David Cox with AFGE.

MS. SIMON: Jacque Simon, AFGE.

MR. SHORE: Robert Shore with NAGE.

MR. LANDIS: Steve Landis with ACT.

MR. ALLEN: Mark Allen with OPM.

MR. DAVEY: Jim Davey with DoD.

MR. PEDERSEN: David Pedersen, Navy.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: And I believe we have a person on the phone with us.

Would you introduce yourself?

MS. ROMBA: Arleen Romba with VA.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Arleen.

And I would ask the people also around the sides of the room to please introduce

themselves loudly.

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

MS. MERIWETHER: Rosemary Meriwether, Navy.

MR. FRANKLIN Kevin Franklin, OPM.

MR. DRISCOLL: Steve Driscoll, OPM.

MR. BRADY: Jim Brady, DoD.

MS. CHAVES: Becky Chaves, DoD.

MS. GONZALEZ: Madeline Gonzalez with OPM.

MR. EICHER: Mike Eicher, OPM.

MS. PAUNOIU: Ana Paunoiu with OPM.

MR. JENTSCH: Robert Jentsch, ACT, Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst.

MR. GOLDEN: Chris Golden, ACT, Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst.

MR. KOKOTAJLO: Brian Kokotajlo, AFGE Local 2001, Fort Dix.

MR. KOEPPA: Rod Koeppa, AFGE Local 2001, Fort Dix.

MR. O'LEARY: Ryan O'Leary with NAGE.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you, everyone.

A couple of quick announcements. The first one is the e-mail that we sent you about the earthquake drill. Actually, that drill has been canceled. If the building starts shaking, it's not a drill.

[Laughter.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So the other announcement that I made a little earlier, and will now repeat, is that we found that our new equipment for recording produces a lot of feedback if everybody's mic is on at the same time. You'll see there's a little light in the upper right-hand corner of your mic. If it's green, it's on; if it's red, it's off. If there's no light at all, that means you haven't turned the thing on. There's a switch at the back to do that. So what I would ask people is please keep their mics turned off unless they are speaking, and that button in the center of the mic is how you turn it on and off, okay? And that concludes my announcements. That brings up the review of the transcript of our last meeting. Are there any changes or corrections that people want to bring to our attention beyond those that you have already told us about?

[No audible response.]

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

MR. ERWIN: Move to adopt.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Seconded. All right. I read my Robert's Rules of Order, and what I found in there is you actually don't need motions to adopt transcripts of meetings. I could be wrong about that, but that's what I read. It's sufficient for the Chair just to ask if there are any objections to adopting it. So in the interest of expediting our overly long meetings, I have decided to do it that way.

So hearing no objection, the transcript is adopted. All right.

That brings up Old Business. We have a number of items on our Old Business agenda, and I know, Steve, you have asked to bring something up. Are you still interested in doing that?

MR. LANDIS: About letter (e)?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Yes.

MR. LANDIS: Yes, I guess if we're ready to discuss that now, I believe that AFGE has something with that, with letter (e).

MS. SIMON: You go ahead and make the motion.

MR. LANDIS: Oh, okay. I will make the motion to discuss, with the potential of bringing to a vote, letter (e), the proposal to move the remaining portion of Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst into the New York wage area.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. So going back to your original motion from our 599th meeting—let me read it back to you, and tell me if this is what you are saying. It says you propose moving the areas of Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst that are currently in the Philadelphia wage area into the New York wage area.

MR. LANDIS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: And that's your motion?

MR. LANDIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Is there a second?

MR. COX: I will second the motion.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: And it has been seconded.

Well, we're open for discussion. Typically, we would give you a chance, Steve, to say a few words in favor of your motion.

MR. LANDIS: Okay. It's interesting that this happens to be the actual sixth anniversary of the creation of the Joint Base. It was created in October of 2009. We've discussed this at length for the last 4 or 5 years I've been on the Committee. I know that we've had a lot of discussion here, especially back in the spring, and we had Colonel Kelm that came up to basically testify to the actual closely-related nature of the Joint Base. I think that he did an excellent job of doing that.

We've had some other questions in the past. I know that Mr. Davey had an issue with moving a larger portion into New York as opposed to moving a smaller portion from New York into Philly. I think that part of our issues with that are that when they created the Joint Base, the government moved the larger portion of McGuire and Dix for the GS workers into the smaller portion.

Also, moving the smaller portion of Lakehurst, which is in Ocean County, would then move a portion of the New York metropolitan statistical area out of the New York wage area, so I think either one of those, moving that would be an incorrect maneuver.

I just don't think there's really much left to discuss on this. I think we've hit this from every possible direction. I think that the majority of people, whether they're able to vote in that direction or not, I think that we all know that this is the right thing to do, and I just think it's time to take care of it.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Any other discussion?

Jim?

MR. DAVEY: If I may. Thank you, Mr. Landis.

You've mentioned that moving the GS—the way it happened, well, it did move part of the MSA from New York, from the Philadelphia area to the New York MSA, so there was a movement of MSA occurring there. Normally, we don't split an MSA.

What we're doing in this instance is we are splitting an MSA, so it's anti the concept that we have, where a metropolitan statistical area stays together, so I would propose that we keep the Philadelphia statistical area together, which would be Burlington stays over there. Dix-McGuire stays over there.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Any other discussion?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I would note, just for background information,

among the many documents we have listed on this issue under Old Business (e) on the agenda is 607-OPM-2, "Counties Redefined/Not Redefined or Split Due to Organizational Relationships among Closely Related or Closely Located Federal Activities, 1994-2014." This document summarizes how FPRAC has dealt in the past with cases where federal installations straddle wage area lines.

Does somebody else want to speak on the motion? Jacque.

MS. SIMON: I have a question, Mr. Davey. Are you prepared to support this proposal?

MR. DAVEY: No. We believe that the locality areas should be FWS locality areas as opposed to GS locality areas.

MR. ALLEN: One thing that OPM staff has done here is provide an analysis of the regulatory criteria that are normally used for defining Federal Wage System wage areas. Based on our regulations, distance is the first criterion OPM looks at. As such, we would find that Burlington County is closer to Philadelphia than it is to New York, and also that the Lakehurst portion of the Joint Base is marginally closer to Philadelphia. But there's more commuting from Ocean County, NJ, into New York than there is into the Philadelphia survey area.

To me, it really is a tough decision on what to do with the Joint Base because it is split in two parts. It used to be all part of the Philadelphia wage area up until around 1998. In 1998, OPM defined the Lakehurst portion of what is now the Joint Base to the New York wage area based primarily on the metropolitan statistical area changes in that area.

Nothing has really changed for Burlington County, however, which is the location

where the majority of the Federal Wage System workers at the Joint Base continue to work, and it's not very persuasive to say that, under the Federal Wage System's criteria, the dominant federal employer in Burlington County should be moved to the New York wage area when it's so close to the Philadelphia survey area, and is indeed part of the Philadelphia survey area.

So, I can't agree with the idea to move the McGuire Air Force Base-Fort Dix portions out of the Philadelphia wage area and into the New York wage area, but that's just based on distance.

I understand fully the rationale that it is one Joint Base, and it certainly makes sense; the employees at the Joint Base should be treated the same under the Federal Wage System. They should be paid from one wage schedule. However, I'm not prepared to say that the employees in the Lakehurst portion should be moved out of the New York wage area and into the Philadelphia wage area because that would create a problem at that set of installations at Lakehurst.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Anyone else?

Jacque.

MS. SIMON: The Joint Base is a somewhat unique situation, and we all know that, but having listened to you just now, the establishment of the Joint Base doesn't seem to override for you any kind of equity concerns about treating the salaried and the hourly workforces differently when it comes to defining their locality.

The notion that these federal workers are working in the exact same location for the exact same employer and the employer is going to discriminate and treat some of them as if they are in one location and others as if they are in another location and that discrimination has adverse implications for the hourly workforce, it's so inequitable, and that issue isn't even being addressed.

Instead, we're denying the jointness of the base, and I don't know how many years—it's going on 10 years that this has been established as a Joint Base, and here you are saying, "Well, they may have done that on paper, but we're going to still treat it as if they are separate employers." It's the same employer. It's the Joint Base. You got to stop calling it "Fort Dix," "Fort McGuire." They're not separate anymore. It's one base. It's unified. That's what the BRAC did.

So you've got inequity on top of inequity. You've got the inequity between the salaried and hourly workers, which is outrageous in itself, and a further inequity that denies the existence of the Joint Base. And we're just at a loss to understand how even the Department of Defense that unified the base, that created the Joint Base, wants to pretend that it's not a Joint Base. I don't get it.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Anyone else?

Jim.

MR. DAVEY: I asked a question a couple meetings ago, and I don't recollect an answer. We have new locality areas being created for GS, and I was trying to determine the impact those new locality pay areas might have on this kind of a discussion. Does anybody recollect any review or any outcome of that?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I've been pressing for information on that, but I haven't gotten it myself yet.

MS. SIMON: It would not affect the Joint Base.

MR. DAVEY: Are there any crossover people? Are there any bases in two counties or partly in one area and partly in another?

MR. ALLEN: Under OPM's proposed regulations that would establish the new locality pay areas, which are based on metropolitan areas, like Albany, Colorado Springs, etc, there is no joint base that would be affected by these proposed regulations for the General Schedule locality pay areas.

And, in fact, Madeline, do you remember if there are any counties that would be moved from one wage area to another? Or that could be moved from one wage area to another?

MS. GONZALEZ: I don't recall that, but I do recall that DoD will have to prepare two schedules in several instances where there is just one now.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I'd like to make a procedural suggestion, if I might. I think this is an important question, but somewhat separate from the one at hand. I think that we ought to have a separate conversation about the implications of the new GS locality pay areas for FWS, but keep in mind that is somewhat separate from Steve's motion.

MR. ALLEN: I totally agree. It would not have any impact on the Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So, in that case, let us return to the motion and see if there's any other discussion of the motion.

MS. SIMON: My colleague who works in the prison on the Joint Base has just reminded me that even the Postal Service has recognized the Joint Base, one ZIP code, one town. It's now called "Joint Base MDL," McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst, NJ. It's one place.

Every county that's on a border, you could make an argument that it has a closer distance to some other wage area. That's the nature of borders. Just the idea that these counties are on borders doesn't disqualify them from being unified.

MR. ALLEN: OPM does have a longstanding practice of taking single

organizational entities into account somewhat informally. FPRAC has recommended over the years that if one installation is split between wage areas, then it should be defined to one wage area because otherwise it causes obvious management problems to get employees to work in all parts of the installation.

It's not really a new issue. It's something that we've talked about over the years, but we've never put something in regulation that says if there is something like a Joint Base that it should not be split between wage areas.

If we were just relying on current regulatory criteria, the majority of the employees who are stationed at what used to be the McGuire Air Force Base and Fort Dix portions of the Joint Base would appropriately continue to be defined to the Philadelphia wage area.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: If I could just interject real quickly. Mark, you're not saying that we should delay a decision on this just because we don't have that sort of regulation in place, are you? I'm curious. As I mentioned earlier, one of the documents we have circulated on this is 607-OPM-2, which lists, I think, more than a dozen cases. Now, obviously, the facts differ from case to case. They're not all identical, but the document provides the general idea of what FPRAC has done in cases where a single federal installation or a group of closely-related installations straddles two wage areas, and so it's not as if FPRAC has been impeded from making recommendations in such situations by lack of any specific regulation. I think the regulations in fact have some language in them about closely-related activities.

MR. ALLEN: Not for the Appropriated Fund employment sites. They may have something in there for the Non-Appropriated Fund.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: How has FPRAC been doing this all these years,

other than the application of common sense?

MR. ALLEN: Over the years, it's been based on an analysis of the Federal Wage System's regulatory criteria, and then decisions are derived from that. There has been some flexibility applied with places like National Parks that are split between wage areas. There's nowell, there's no Joint Base. The joint basing is kind of a relatively new concept, and I think Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst is the only Joint Base that is currently split between wage areas.

But I'm not necessarily saying that OPM needs a regulation in order to take the Joint Base into account for defining wage areas. What I'm saying is that the only thing I've heard so far is that OPM should change the definitions of wage areas because General Schedule locality pay areas are defined in a different way. That seems to be the main argument that members are considering at this point, not how to operate within the Federal Wage System regulations and operating procedures.

MS. SIMON: Mark, I don't think that's a fair characterization. Everybody who has talked about the Joint Base has talked about the uniqueness of the Joint Base as well as the inequity between the salaried and the hourly workforce, not only the inequity between the salaried and hourly workforce. We have also talked about the fact that this unique situation of a Joint Base should be unified to New York.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Let me give you my observation, for what it's worth. I hope you're not saying, Mark, now that the Joint Base issue has been kicking around for 5 or 6 years, that we need further delay, pending some discussion of a potential regulation.

MR. ALLEN: I don't think we're going to get any more information, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate everybody coming down and explaining their points of view from the Joint Base. It is very helpful to understand the local concerns from everybody. CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So if you want us to look into potential regulation, we can do that separately. Unless there's some new point about the motion that someone wants to make—Steve?

MR. LANDIS: I just wanted to say a couple of things. We have mentioned, like Jacque said—I have mentioned repeatedly the fact that the Joint Base has—it's not just the difference between GS and FWS. You have FWS workers on one side of the base making a higher rate than FWS workers on the other side of the base.

I brought up as well one of the documents that was handed out in a work group meeting. It says right in there that it's general practice for OPM to not divide a closely-related federal activity between two different wage areas.

Also, in response to your mention that your main concern is the distances, the distances between the McGuire and Dix portion of the base from Philly to New York, it's a few miles. It's not like it's like 20 or 30 miles. Most of the people that I work with on the Joint Base commute from that more northeasterly area.

There are people who live in Burlington County, but there are a lot of people, for example, who live in Ocean County and live even further north than that.

So I think if the distance is what we're talking about, the distance is so negligible, and in some cases, the majority of the people are still commuting from the northeastern area, I don't think that should be a negatively deciding factor on this.

MR. SHORE: Correct me if I am misremembering, but I thought we heard testimony that the splitting of the base was actually hindering the operations with assignments of overtime and things of that matter.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: From not one but two successive base commanders.

MR. SHORE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Anything else?

MR. DAVEY: I think we replied that that's an option that they can overcome simply by assigning people the way that they could assign them before it was a Joint Base.

I would like to remind everybody that there is a motion that's within OPM's consideration already, the GS locality pay becomes the FWS locality pay, that this item is already under consideration within OPM, and there's apparently a legislative item that we're seeing in front of us that will be introduced—or is already introduced that performs the same thing that we're talking about. So why would we not let that work its way through?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Anybody else want to—J. David?

MR. COX: Part of it, though we allow many things to work through, I am reminded very much of the movie that was very popular about 2 years ago, when Lyndon Johnson said to Dr. King, "No, no. Right now is just not a good time to go for voter rights. Let me keep working the process," and Dr. King said, "Not no, but you've got to do it now. We've got to have voting rights. The injustice has been carried on long enough.

This base, I believe, was put together about 10 years ago? Am I correct?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: 2009.

MR. COX: Okay. That's 6 or soon to be 7 years. That is a long period of time to join people together. Yes, you've got people working here, and it's nice, "Well, don't assign this person overtime there," but sometimes that's the person that can go do it. People cross over various sections, apply for many jobs. It's one facility, I think. We had something like this similar at the prison down in Butner, North Carolina, at one time that finally had to get situated because the county line ran down through the middle of the prison, one guy stuck in one locality area and one in the other.

It's time to deal with it, and to count on Congress to move any type of legislation, I don't think that they are going to do that. They don't do much of anything up there nowadays, so they're not going to move in Congress, and I think it's time to just move forward.

MR. ALLEN: Yes, I would agree. This issue has been problematic for probably 30 years. It's because it's such a large military installation that straddles two counties.

The last time Management members considered and voted on this issue, there was actually a labor motion to move the entire Fort Dix-McGuire Air Force Base portions into the New York wage area, as well. If we're voting on this, I don't think that I am hearing the Management position has changed.

But having said that, if we're ready to vote—

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Any further discussion?

MR. DAVEY: Well, I think it's unfortunate that our Air Force member is not here today, who would be providing input on the Air Force position of this.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: We're sorry he's not here too. I'm not sure where he is.

MR. LANDIS: I think we got a pretty strong Air Force position when the base

command sent their representation down to explain the problems they were suffering there.

MR. DAVEY: There are different levels of Air Force input.

MR. LANDIS: I understand.

MR. DAVEY: And that was one of the many levels.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Any further discussion?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: We have a motion on the floor. It appears there's no consensus on it. Unless there is further discussion, then I guess we need to vote.

Steve?

MR. LANDIS: They have four members, so-

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Somebody, yes, on the Labor side will need to recuse themselves from voting. They have four, including the VA representative on the phone on the Management side, so somebody needs to sit out and not vote on the Labor side.

MR. SHORE: I'll sit out.

MS. GONZALEZ: Who will not vote? NAGE?

MR. ALLEN: NAGE.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So, Madeline, would you please conduct the vote.

MS. GONZALEZ: Mr. Chairman, can you read the motion one more time,

please?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Yes. The motion is the first sentence of 599-ACT-1:

We propose moving the areas of Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst that are currently in the

Philadelphia wage area into the New York wage area.

MR. ALLEN: Is that moved and seconded?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: That has been moved and seconded earlier on, yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: I need a "yes" or "no" answer. OPM?

MR. ALLEN: No.

MS. GONZALEZ: DoD?

MR. DAVEY: No.

MS. GONZALEZ: Navy?

MR. PEDERSEN: No.

MS. GONZALEZ: VA?

MS. ROMBA: No.

MS. GONZALEZ: Metal Trades?

MR. ERWIN: Yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: AFGE, Mr. Cox?

MR. COX: Yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: AFGE, Jacque?

MS. SIMON: Yes.

MS. GONZALEZ: ACT?

MR. LANDIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: It's a tie, Mr. Chairman, 4 to 4.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I am pleased to vote yes, so we will recommend this to the Director.

I forgot to mention at the outset under Announcements, I did see early this morning an article from the Pocono Record about the situation at Tobyhanna Army Depot. I asked Madeline to circulate the article—please see 608-OC-1.

We have a number of other Old Business items. Are there any that people want to bring up—J. David?

MR. COX: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that we bring up under Old Business, (c), redefine the Tobyhanna Army Depot to the New York wage area also.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So the proposal is to redefine—what exactly then? Just Tobyhanna or the county? MR. COX: No, the county. It's Monroe County in the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre wage area to the New York wage area. The GS pay schedule covers that same area. I think what we have pending in OPM is a definition that there not be a split of GS and wage grade areas. I think that's the exact thing that we voted on years ago that's been going through the process.

What I'm saying today, I would move to take this one forward because we've been waiting forever on that other decision, so I'm just saying this is one that continues to create lots of problems.

I was up there recently, difficulty continues in recruiting, hiring, training, all those type of things, so I would move to move it forward.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: So it's moved to redefine Monroe County, Pennsylvania, from the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre wage area to the New York wage area. Did I state that correctly?

It's been moved. Is there a second?

MS. SIMON: I second.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to note that we don't actually currently have any analysis for Monroe County where we look at the Federal Wage System regulatory criteria such as we've done for the Newburgh wage area or the Joint Base issue before the Committee. OPM staff will be happy to put something together on that, so we could take a look at Monroe County and see where it is situated. There most likely have been some changes in commuting patterns in the region, but I don't think the Committee has ever looked at it before. But if the Committee would like, we can put something together. It may help clarify the issues we're looking at with Monroe County.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Any further discussion on that?

MR. COX: I think we'd be amenable to that, Mark, because we believe the commuting patterns and all are there, and I know we've had some statistical data on this in the past. You may not all have written it down, but this is one we've talked to death about 7 or 8 years, maybe longer than that.

MR. ALLEN: Ten. At least 10.

MR. COX: Ten. So I think that there's probably—and I know the issue before was we were trying to do a nationwide fix, so that one is still out there in the black hole too. But I think this one may be easier to try to fix as an individual one.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Just so I am clear, you are open to deferring this discussion?

MR. COX: Yeah, yeah. I think we would be willing to defer. How long do you think that would take? Do you think we could have it on at the next meeting?

MR. ALLEN: If not the next meeting, in December? Right, Madeline?MS. GONZALEZ: Not before December. I will try for December.MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MS. SIMON: On a slightly different note, do you have any kind of information about the timing of the proposed rule for Newburgh?

MR. ALLEN: For Newburgh, our proposed regulation is undergoing internal clearance. From start to finish, these changes typically take around 6 months. Actually, most of the rules defining Federal Wage System wage area boundaries do not require OMB review, so that tends to move forward faster than most other types of regulations that OPM would do.

It should be 6 months from when the recommendation was made.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. Is there any other Old Business item that

people want to bring up this morning?

MR. COX: Well, I wasn't here, and I haven't been here several meetings, but I'm actually very familiar with North Carolina simply because I lived there for a long time. This number (d), could somebody give me a quick background again on what that is?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Do you happen to have it, Mark?

MR. ALLEN: It's been so long, I don't think I am carrying that one around with me anymore.

MR. COX: I mean, there's the Charlotte wage area. There's the Asheville wage area, and this is trying to move it from one to the other or—

MR. ALLEN: No.

MR. COX: This is sort of out there in between both of them?

MR. ALLEN: I believe it was three counties in the Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton,

North Carolina metropolitan statistical area and one of the more—the less populated county had been added by OMB to the metropolitan area, and we were trying to decide what to do with that county at that time.

Do you remember, Madeline?

MS. GONZALEZ: There are four counties. There are two in one wage area and two in another.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MR. COX: Two probably in Charlotte. Two probably in Asheville because I think there's two wage areas there.

MS. GONZALEZ: Yes. There are two in Asheville and two in Charlotte.

MR. ALLEN: If I remember correctly, I think the Management proposal would

have affected no employees, but there were a few employees who would have been moved to the Charlotte wage area.

MS. GONZALEZ: No employees would have been moved under the management proposal.

MR. ALLEN: But if the MSA was defined to the other wage area, there would have been an impact on a few employees?

MS. GONZALEZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Do we want to take another look at this, perhaps?

MR. COX: Let us go back and take a look at that one to see what that is. Now that Charlotte is fixing to become a new GS locality, there may be other factors that's going on there, not to confuse with the other, but that's one that may be changing.

MR. ALLEN: We don't need to reintroduce it since it's still active on the agenda, but we can discuss it at the next meeting in more detail.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: We will remind people to take another look at that one prior to next meeting.

Anything else? Any other Old Business item that people want to talk about this morning?

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: If not, I'm not aware of any New Business, but maybe there's something I don't know about. Are there any New Business items people want to bring up?

Steve.

MR. LANDIS: I just wanted to ask. After the June meeting, there was something

we were discussing earlier. Mr. Davey—actually back in June, I think it was, how there was no criteria in the regulation, and I did a little research and found the regulation talks about splitting MSAs only under unusual circumstances. I think we've discussed that a few times.

I thought, leading up to this, that that would be enough, and apparently, the majority that voted did as well. But do you think it would help in the future if we were to regulate how to treat closely-related single large federal institutions that spread out across the MSA lines, something to that effect, for future reference to keep things like this from happening, drawn out for such long periods of time?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Do we think maybe a working group discussion would be useful on this issue?

MR. LANDIS: Yeah. I just thought that would be something we could discuss there or anywhere really, wherever you guys would think would be best.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Does that sound like—to me, that's certainly a fine idea. Is there any objection to referring this topic to the working group?

MR. ALLEN: No objection from me, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: All right. We'll do it.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, I did want to point out something in the article that was handed out this morning from the "Pocono Record." It's the third paragraph where it says that although a number of government agencies have previously stated that they were in agreement, a spokesman for Senator Casey said that the administration still hasn't budged. So I wanted to correct the record on that to indicate that no federal agencies have actually agreed with the October 2010 FPRAC majority recommendation, but we are starting to work through some of the ones that would have been affected by that recommendation on a case-by-case basis. CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Well, as long as you're correcting the record, let me also say, as far as I know, while the recommendation that was adopted in 2010 and confirmed in 2012, hasn't been implemented, neither has it been turned down. Am I correct about that?

MR. ALLEN: That's correct.

MS. SIMON: And I'd add that we had verbal assurances from a couple of OPM

Directors and other agency heads that they would support implementation.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Okay. All right. Well, unless there's some other New Business I'm not aware of, it would be entirely in order for us to adjourn. Is there any objection to adjourning? Something else I learned from Robert's Rules of Order.

[No audible response.]

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: If there's no objection to adjourning—going once, going twice, three times, we are adjourned—see you all next month. Thank you.