This report documents the recommendations the committee made to the Office of Personnel Management in 2022 on the prevailing rate system and other matters pertinent to the establishment of prevailing rates under 5 U.S.C. Chapter 53, Subchapter IV, as amended.
# Table of Contents

## 2022 REPORT

**Part I**................................................................................................................................................ 2
  - Introduction................................................................................................................................ 2

**Part II**............................................................................................................................................... 5
  - Summary of 2022 Recommendations .......................................................................................... 5
  - Issues Resolved by Consensus ...................................................................................................... 5
  - Additional Matters Discussed......................................................................................................... 9

**Part III**............................................................................................................................................ 11
  - Summary of Discussions at 2022 Meetings .................................................................................. 11

**Part IV**............................................................................................................................................ 19
  - Compliance With Statutory Provisions.......................................................................................... 19
  - 2022 Annual Report to the General Services Administration...................................................... 22
Annual Report

2022

Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee

Part I

Introduction

The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee (FPRAC), the national labor-management committee responsible for advising the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) on matters concerning the pay of Federal Wage System (FWS) employees, completed 50 years of operation in 2022. FPRAC is established under section 5347 of title 5, United States Code, and is composed of five representatives from agency management, five representatives from Federal employee labor organizations, and a chair appointed by the Director of OPM.

The Committee membership was changed in 2022 to conform to the practice of rotating the military department representation on the Committee among Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Department of the Navy representative was replaced by the representative from the Department of the Army.

FPRAC meets on a monthly basis. Advance notice of the Committee meeting schedule is published in the Federal Register. In addition, future Committee meeting dates are posted on OPM’s website at www.opm.gov/fprac.

All Committee meetings held in calendar year 2022 were open to the public. The meetings were virtual meetings by Microsoft Teams.

All Committee meetings are recorded. FPRAC meeting transcripts starting with the January 20, 2011, meetings are available at the above website. Archived transcripts of earlier meetings can be obtained by sending an email message to pay-leave-policy@opm.gov.

Annually, the Office of the Chair compiles a report of pay issues discussed and recommendations made to OPM. Beginning with the 2008-2009 summary, FPRAC’s annual summaries are also available on OPM’s website at the above link. Archived annual summaries for earlier years can be obtained by sending an email message to pay-leave-policy@opm.gov.
# Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee Member Roster

## as of December 31, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO</strong></td>
<td>Hon. Janice R. Lachance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Member</td>
<td>Mr. James Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Alternate Member</td>
<td>Mr. Paul O’Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Members</td>
<td>Mr. Craig Norman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Dale Troll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Margareta Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO</strong></td>
<td>Ms. Jacqueline Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Members</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Loeb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Alternate Member</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Members</td>
<td>Mr. Daniel Horowitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Association of Government Employees/SEIU</strong></td>
<td>Mr. David Holway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Member</td>
<td>Ms. Lee Blackmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Alternate Member</td>
<td>Ms. Carisa Carmack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association of Civilian Technicians</strong></td>
<td>Ms. Felicia Neale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Member</td>
<td>Mr. Travis Kielty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Alternate Member</td>
<td>Mr. John Sappington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Members</td>
<td>Mr. Gene Fuerere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of Personnel Management</strong></td>
<td>Ms. Brenda L. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Member</td>
<td>Mr. Mark A. Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Defense</strong></td>
<td>Ms. Nancy Anderson Speight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Member</td>
<td>Mr. Christopher Lynch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Alternate Member</td>
<td>Ms. Rosemary Meriwether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of the Air Force</strong></td>
<td>Ms. Kimberly Eidson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Member</td>
<td>Ms. Nancy Klinitski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Alternate Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of the Army</strong></td>
<td>Ms. Michelle O. Francois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Member</td>
<td>Ms. Mandy Laughlin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternate Member

**Department of the Navy**
Primary Member
Ms. JeeYoung Kang

Primary Alternate Members
Dr. Andrew Jones
Mr. Mathew Philippi
Ms. Sonia Foley

Alternate Member

**Department of Veterans Affairs**
Primary Member
Ms. Ophelia A. Vicks
Ms. Sheila D. Willis
Ms. Alethea Smalls
Ms. Keyonna Butler

Primary Alternate Member

Alternate Member

Alternate Member
Part II

FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Summary of 2022 Recommendations

Issues Resolved by Consensus

(1) 639-MGT-11. Definition of San Mateo County, CA, to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area

The Department of Defense, on behalf of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) requested that OPM define San Mateo County, California, to a nonappropriated fund (NAF) FWS wage area for pay-setting purposes because the Veterans Canteen Service (VCS) employed one NAF FWS employee at VSC #640 at the VA Medical Center – Menlo Park, and the county was not defined in OPM’s regulations.

The management members of FPRAC introduced the issue at the 639th FPRAC meeting on June 16, 2022, in FPRAC document 639-MGT-1, Definition of San Mateo County, California, to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area. The closest NAF wage area to San Mateo County is the Monterey, CA, wage area. In this document, OPM measured road distances from San Mateo County to the host installations in the Monterey, CA, and Solano, CA, NAF FWS wage areas.

The Committee recommended by consensus to define San Mateo County to the area of application of the Monterey NAF FWS wage area. This FPRAC recommendation is going through the regulatory process.

(2) 640-MGT-1. Proposal to Establish a Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee Working Group, 640-MGT-1

At FPRAC’s 637th meeting on April 21, 2022, an American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) representative requested that FPRAC review a Proposal to Limit all Non-Rest of U.S. General Schedule Locality Pay Areas to no more than one Federal Wage System Wage Area and a Proposal to Redefine Monroe County, PA, from the Scranton-Wilkes-}

---

1 Document numbers listed in this report refer to official documents of FPRAC. The first 3-digit number is the meeting number where the document was first introduced. The alpha characters indicate which committee member(s) submitted the documents. “OPM” indicates a document submitted by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. “MGT” indicates that the document was submitted jointly by all the management members. “DOD” indicates a document submitted by the Department of Defense. “LBR” indicates a joint labor document. The number following the alpha characters indicates the chronological order of the document(s) submitted by the organization for that meeting.
Barre, PA, Wage Area to the New York, NY, Wage Area, (FPRAC document 637-AFGE-1).

At FPRAC’s 640th meeting on July 21, 2022, management members of FPRAC introduced FPRAC document 640-MGT-1, *Proposal to Establish a Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee Working Group*.

Public Law 92-392, the Prevailing Rate Systems Act, was enacted on August 19, 1972. This is the law that established the FWS that operates under 5 USC 5341 et seq. The law established FPRAC to provide periodic recommendations to OPM on the administration of the prevailing rate system.

(5 USC 5347(e): The Committee shall study the prevailing rate system and other matters pertinent to the establishment of prevailing rates under this subchapter and, from time to time, advise the Office of Personnel Management thereon.)

Over the 50 years of its existence, FPRAC has discussed every administrative aspect of the FWS. The major areas of focus on how prevailing rate are determined have been how geographic wage areas are established, how individual counties are defined to wage areas, what benchmark jobs are used during wage surveys to compare Federal and private sector work, what private sector industries are included in wage surveys, what criteria determine local wage survey adequacy, and how local wage schedules are established under applicable laws and regulations. FPRAC has studied and provided recommendations to OPM on other areas of the FWS including environmental differentials, pay administration, premium pay entitlements, special rates, and special wage schedules. OPM administers the FWS through regulations found in 5 CFR part 532. Note that there are separate systems under the FWS for employees who are paid from appropriated and nonappropriated funds.

Recognizing that the system has now existed in its current form for 50 years, the management members recommended that FPRAC establish a working group to consider addressing some, or all, of the following questions related to the determination of prevailing wage levels:

- Is current wage survey timing, with full-scale wage surveys required every two years, optimal for determining prevailing wage levels? – Timing related to survey area for optimal collection (E.g.: North Dakota order date is March).
- Should the Department of Defense serve as the lead agency for collecting wage survey data?
- Should wage data be obtained through some other means?
- Do the criteria for establishing wage areas meet the statutory requirements for paying FWS employees according to local prevailing wage levels?
• Do the criteria for defining individual counties to wage areas meet the statutory requirements for paying FWS employees according to local prevailing wage levels?

• Are there too many or too few wage areas? Are there areas that no longer meet the regulatory requirements to be a wage area and if so, should they be abolished? Should any new areas be created?

• Do the laws and regulations governing private industry coverage and establishment size best meet the goal of determining prevailing wage levels?

• Do the current benchmark survey job descriptions used during local wage surveys adequately represent FWS work and allow for comparisons to private sector work levels?

• What obstacles, statutory or regulatory, hinder the government’s ability to pay FWS employees according to local prevailing wage levels and to what degree are employees paid more or less than prevailing wage levels?

• Is local/state minimum wage application appropriate for wage schedule production (e.g.: Seattle-Everett-Tacoma, Washington)?

• Why are there substantial differences in pay levels between FWS and General Schedule positions in the same geographic area?

• Should the pay caps for FWS annual wage schedule adjustments be eliminated?

The Committee established by consensus a Federal Wage System Working Group (Working Group) to study the questions above and the proposal submitted by AFGE.

(3) 641-MGT-1. Redefinition Shenandoah National Park

AFGE requested that OPM introduce a proposal to recommend that the portions of the Shenandoah National Park defined to the Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg, MD, Richmond, VA, and Roanoke, VA, wage areas be moved to the Washington, DC, wage area.

The management members of FPRAC introduced the issue at the 641st meeting on July 21, 2022, in FPRAC document 641-MGT-1, Redefinition Shenandoah National Park.

Since 1972, OPM—and its predecessor, the Civil Service Commission—has been responsible for overseeing the administration of FWS. The FWS is designed to provide common policies, practices, and job-grading standards for uniform application by all Federal agencies. While most FWS employees are paid according to their grade level from the regular wage schedule for their wage area, certain agency policies and practices, including the special wage schedules for National Park Service (NPS) positions in overlap areas, continued as “set-aside” special schedules under the FWS.
Another common term for this practice is “grandfathering” of a pay practice. The policies of these special schedules were to be frozen in place until such time as the policies could be reviewed by FPRAC. These NPS overlap areas special schedules were reviewed by FPRAC and codified in regulation in 1976. They are currently located in 5 CFR 532.271. In some cases, FWS wage area boundaries have been defined so they may accommodate the organizational boundaries of National Park boundaries so as to avoid recruitment and retention difficulties at parks. This is not the case for all National Parks.

These special schedules apply only to NPS employees whose duty station is located in one of the following NPS jurisdictions Blue Ridge Parkway, Natchez Trace Parkway, and Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

The overlap schedules (as a pre-FWS agency practice) existed for these three jurisdictions because they covered areas of land that crossed State/county lines and overlapped two or more FWS wage area boundaries.

The Shenandoah National Park (approximately 105 miles long) was never included in NPS’s agency “set-aside” pay practice. When the FWS was first established, most of Shenandoah National Park was in the Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg wage area. Over time, as a result of changes in Office of Management and Budget defined metropolitan statistical areas, the wage area definitions for some counties have been changed by OPM based on recommendations of FPRAC.

The Committee recommended by consensus to redefine the Shenandoah National Park portion of Albemarle, Augusta, Greene, Page, Rockingham Counties, VA, to the Washington, DC, area of application. This change places the entire Shenandoah National Park in the Washington, DC, wage area. Madison, Rappahannock, and Warren Counties continue to be defined to the Washington, DC, wage area. The remaining portion of Albemarle and Green Counties continue to be defined to the Richmond wage area; the remaining portion of Augusta County continue to be defined to the Roanoke wage area; and the remaining portion of Page and Rockingham Counties continue to be defined to the Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg wage area. This FPRAC recommendation is going through the regulatory process.

(4) 642-OC-1. Update on FPRAC Working Group Discussions: Recommendation to Eliminate Annual Limitation on Prevailing Rate System Wage Schedule Adjustments, 642-OC-1

Each year since fiscal year 1979, appropriations legislation has limited FWS pay adjustments so as not to exceed average General Schedule (GS) pay adjustments. For FY 2022, the FWS pay limitation of 2.90 percent was in Section 737 of Division E of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022. The Government originally imposed limits on FWS pay adjustments during the high inflation era of the late 1970’s for budget
purposes and to ensure that FWS pay rates did not increase more rapidly than GS pay rates. In certain high cost of labor areas, GS employees were leaving white-collar positions to take higher paying blue-collar positions. Federal employee organizations have strongly opposed FWS pay limitations since they were first imposed, but agencies were concerned about the budget impact lifting the cap system-wide in any one fiscal year.

At the October 6th, 2022, Working Group meeting, the Committee members concluded that the cost of lifting the cap is outweighed by the negative impact the cap has on the ability of agencies to recruit and retain FWS employees.

At the October 20th, 2022, FPRAC public meeting, the Committee recommended by consensus that OPM should seek elimination of an annual provision placed in the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act that establishes a statutory limitation each year on the maximum allowable FWS wage schedule adjustment.
Additional Matters Discussed

- Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee Annual Summary, 2020, 637-OC-1
- Fiscal Year 2022 Prevailing Rate Pay Adjustments, 637-OPM-1
- Achieving a $15 Per Hour Minimum Pay Rate for Federal Employees Memo, 637-OPM-2
- Review of Labor Membership on the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, 638-OPM-1
- Proposal to Establish a Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee Working Group, 640-MGT-1
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FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Summary of Discussions at 2022 Meetings

Meeting 637 – April 21, 2022

- Letters from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated September 6, 2018, and March 22, 2022, 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
  - Estimated 5-Year Cost Projection of Application of FPRAC Request
  - Paper Pay Disparity at Tobyhanna Army Depot by Joseph P. Lynott Sr.
  - Email Message from Steven R. Kester in Support of the Proposal to Move Monroe County, PA, to the New York, NY, Wage Area
  - Letters from Steven R. Kester Regarding the Pay Disparity Between FWS and GS Employees at Tobyhanna Army Depot
  - Employment Distribution at Tobyhanna Army Depot, 634-OPM-1, and 2022 Update to GS and FWS Employment Distribution at Tobyhanna Army Depot
  - Market Rates vs Schedule Rates for Electronics Mechanics (Series 2604) Tobyhanna Army Depot

- 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
  - Review of San Joaquin County, California

- 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
  - Review of the Salinas-Monterey, California, Federal Wage System Wage Area

- 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 Area
  - 2016 Study by NOAA Describing the Ocean Economies of the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico
  - Review of the Puerto Rico Federal Wage System Wage Area
  - Puerto Rico Wage Grade Adjustment 2020
  - Letter from the Association of Civilian Technicians Requesting FPRAC Delay the Vote on the ACT Puerto Rico Proposal until April/May 2021

- Draft, Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee Annual Summary, 2020
Meeting 638 – May 19, 2022

- Letters from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated September 6, 2018 and March 22, 2022, 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
  - Estimated 5-Year Cost Projection of Application of FPRAC Request
  - Paper Pay Disparity at Tobyhanna Army Depot by Joseph P. Lynott Sr.
  - Email Message from Steven R. Kester in Support of the Proposal to Move Monroe County, PA, to the New York, NY, Wage Area
  - Letters from Steven R. Kester Regarding the Pay Disparity Between FWS and GS Employees at Tobyhanna Army Depot
  - Employment Distribution at Tobyhanna Army Depot, 634-OPM-1, and 2022 Update to GS and FWS Employment Distribution at Tobyhanna Army Depot
  - Market Rates vs Schedule Rates for Electronics Mechanics (Series 2604)
    - Tobyhanna Army Depot
- 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
  - Review of San Joaquin County, California
- 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
  - Review of the Salinas-Monterey, California, Federal Wage System Wage Area
- 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 Area
  - 2016 Study by NOAA Describing the Ocean Economies of the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico
  - Review of the Puerto Rico Federal Wage System Wage Area
  - Puerto Rico Wage Grade Adjustment 2020
  - Letter from the Association of Civilian Technicians Requesting FPRAC Delay the Vote on the ACT Puerto Rico Proposal until April/May 2021
- Review of Labor Membership on the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee

Meeting 639 – June 16, 2022

- Letters from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated September 6, 2018 and March 22, 2022, 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
Letter from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated March 22, 2022, Requesting FPRAC Review a Proposal to Limit all Non-Rest of U.S. General Schedule Locality Pay Areas to no more than one Federal Wage System Wage Area and a Proposal to Redefine Monroe County, PA, from the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA, Wage Area to the New York, NY, Wage Area

2022 Update to Review of Monroe County, Pennsylvania

Estimated 5-Year Cost Projection of Application of FPRAC Request

Paper Pay Disparity at Tobyhanna Army Depot by Joseph P. Lynott Sr.

Email Message from Steven R. Kester in Support of the Proposal to Move Monroe County, PA, to the New York, NY, Wage Area

Letters from Steven R. Kester Regarding the Pay Disparity Between FWS and GS Employees at Tobyhanna Army Depot

Employment Distribution at Tobyhanna Army Depot

Market Rates vs Schedule Rates for Electronics Mechanics (Series 2604)

Tobyhanna Army Depot

• 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

• Review of San Joaquin County, California

• 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

• Review of the Salinas-Monterey, California, Federal Wage System Wage Area

• 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 Area

• 2016 Study by NOAA Describing the Ocean Economies of the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico

• Review of the Puerto Rico Federal Wage System Wage Area

• Puerto Rico Wage Grade Adjustment 2020

• Letter from the Association of Civilian Technicians Requesting FPRAC Delay the Vote on the ACT Puerto Rico Proposal until April/May 2021

• Definition of San Mateo County, CA, to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area

• Email from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated May 23, 2022, Requesting FPRAC Review a Proposal to Unify the WG schedules at the Federal Correctional Complex Butner

• Southeastern North Carolina (RUS) Wage Schedule

• Central North Carolina Wage Schedule

• Fiscal Year 2020 Prevailing Rate Pay Adjustments

• Central North Carolina Special Wage Schedule A099

• Richmond, VA (RCH) Wage Schedule
Meeting 640 – July 21, 2022

- Letters from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated September 6, 2018 and March 22, 2022, 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
- Letter from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated March 22, 2022, Requesting FPRAC Review a Proposal to Limit all Non-Rest of U.S. General Schedule Locality Pay Areas to no more than one Federal Wage System Wage Area and a Proposal to Redefine Monroe County, PA, from the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA, Wage Area to the New York, NY, Wage Area
- 2022 Update to Review of Monroe County, Pennsylvania
- Estimated 5-Year Cost Projection of Application of FPRAC Request
- Paper Pay Disparity at Tobyhanna Army Depot by Joseph P. Lynott Sr.
- Email Message from Steven R. Kester in Support of the Proposal to Move Monroe County, PA, to the New York, NY, Wage Area
- Letters from Steven R. Kester Regarding the Pay Disparity Between FWS and GS Employees at Tobyhanna Army Depot
- Employment Distribution at Tobyhanna Army Depot
- Market Rates vs Schedule Rates for Electronics Mechanics (Series 2604) Tobyhanna Army Depot
- 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
- Review of San Joaquin County, California
- 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
- Review of the Salinas-Monterey, California, Federal Wage System Wage Area
- 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 Area
- 2016 Study by NOAA Describing the Ocean Economies of the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico
- Review of the Puerto Rico Federal Wage System Wage Area
- Puerto Rico Wage Grade Adjustment 2020
- Letter from the Association of Civilian Technicians Requesting FPRAC Delay the Vote on the ACT Puerto Rico Proposal until April/May 2021
• Email from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated May 23, 2022, Requesting FPRAC Review a Proposal to Unify the WG schedules at the Federal Correctional Complex Butner
  o Southeastern North Carolina (RUS) Wage Schedule
  o Central North Carolina Wage Schedule
  o Fiscal Year 2020 Prevailing Rate Pay Adjustments
  o Central North Carolina Special Wage Schedule A099
  o Richmond, VA (RCH) Wage Schedule
  o AK78 Final Rule General Schedule Locality Pay Areas published at 70 Federal Register 74996 on December 19, 2005
• Proposal Establish a Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee Working Group
• Email from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated July 5, 2022, Requesting FPRAC Review a Proposal to Consolidate Shenandoah National Park under Washington, District of Columbia (DCB) Wage Schedule

Meeting 641 – September 15, 2022

• Letters from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated September 6, 2018 and March 22, 2022, 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
  o Letter from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated March 22, 2022, Requesting FPRAC Review a Proposal to Limit all Non-Rest of U.S. General Schedule Locality Pay Areas to no more than one Federal Wage System Wage Area and a Proposal to Redefine Monroe County, PA, from the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA, Wage Area to the New York, NY, Wage Area
  o 2022 Update to Review of Monroe County, Pennsylvania
  o Estimated 5-Year Cost Projection of Application of FPRAC Request
  o Paper Pay Disparity at Tobyhanna Army Depot by Joseph P. Lynott Sr.
  o Email Message from Steven R. Kester in Support of the Proposal to Move Monroe County, PA, to the New York, NY, Wage Area
  o Letters from Steven R. Kester Regarding the Pay Disparity Between FWS and GS Employees at Tobyhanna Army Depot
  o Employment Distribution at Tobyhanna Army Depot
  o Market Rates vs Schedule Rates for Electronics Mechanics (Series 2604) Tobyhanna Army Depot
• 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
  o Review of San Joaquin County, California
• 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
  o Review of the Salinas-Monterey, California, Federal Wage System Wage Area
  o Request for the abolishment of the Monterey/Salinas wage survey area
  o Remarks on NAGE’s Proposal to Abolish the Salinas-Monterey, CA, Wage Area and Redefine Monterey County, CA, to the San Francisco, CA, Wage Area by guest speaker Peter Wahon

• 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 Area
  o 2016 Study by NOAA Describing the Ocean Economies of the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico
  o Review of the Puerto Rico Federal Wage System Wage Area
  o Puerto Rico Wage Grade Adjustment 2020
  o Letter from the Association of Civilian Technicians Requesting FPRAC Delay the Vote on the ACT Puerto Rico Proposal until April/May 2021

• Email from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated May 23, 2022, Requesting FPRAC Review a Proposal to Unify the WG schedules at the Federal Correctional Complex Butner
  o Southeastern North Carolina (RUS) Wage Schedule
  o Central North Carolina Wage Schedule
  o Fiscal Year 2020 Prevailing Rate Pay Adjustments
  o Central North Carolina Special Wage Schedule A099
  o Richmond, VA (RCH) Wage Schedule
  o AK78 Final Rule General Schedule Locality Pay Areas published at 70 Federal Register 74996 on December 19, 2005

• Email from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated July 5, 2022, Requesting FPRAC Review a Proposal to Consolidate Shenandoah National Park under Washington, District of Columbia (DCB) Wage Schedule

• Redefinition of Shenandoah National Park

Meeting 642 – October 20, 2022

• Letters from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated September 6, 2018 and March 22, 2022, 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
  o Letter from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated March 22, 2022, Requesting FPRAC Review a Proposal to Limit all Non-Rest of U.S. General Schedule Locality Pay Areas to no more than one Federal Wage System Wage Area and
a Proposal to Redefine Monroe County, PA, from the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA, Wage Area to the New York, NY, Wage Area
- 2022 Update to Review of Monroe County, Pennsylvania
- Estimated 5-Year Cost Projection of Application of FPRAC Request
- Paper *Pay Disparity at Tobyhanna Army Depot* by Joseph P. Lynott Sr.
- Email Message from Steven R. Kester in Support of the Proposal to Move Monroe County, PA, to the New York, NY, Wage Area
- Letters from Steven R. Kester Regarding the Pay Disparity Between FWS and GS Employees at Tobyhanna Army Depot
- Employment Distribution at Tobyhanna Army Depot
- Market Rates vs Schedule Rates for Electronics Mechanics (Series 2604) Tobyhanna Army Depot
- 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
  - Review of San Joaquin County, California
- 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
  - Review of the Salinas-Monterey, California, Federal Wage System Wage Area
  - Request for the abolishment of the Monterey/Salinas wage survey area
  - Remarks on NAGE’s Proposal to Abolish the Salinas-Monterey, CA, Wage Area and Redefine Monterey County, CA, to the San Francisco, CA, Wage Area by guest speaker Peter Wahon
- 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 Area
  - 2016 Study by NOAA Describing the Ocean Economies of the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico
  - Review of the Puerto Rico Federal Wage System Wage Area
  - Puerto Rico Wage Grade Adjustment 2020
  - Letter from the Association of Civilian Technicians Requesting FPRAC Delay the Vote on the ACT Puerto Rico Proposal until April/May 2021
- Email from the American Federation of Government Employees, Dated May 23, 2022, Requesting FPRAC Review a Proposal to Unify the WG schedules at the Federal Correctional Complex Butner
  - Southeastern North Carolina (RUS) Wage Schedule
  - Central North Carolina Wage Schedule
  - Fiscal Year 2020 Prevailing Rate Pay Adjustments
  - Central North Carolina Special Wage Schedule A099
  - Richmond, VA (RCH) Wage Schedule
• AK78 Final Rule General Schedule Locality Pay Areas published at 70 Federal Register 74996 on December 19, 2005
• Update on FPRAC Working Group Discussions: Recommendation to Eliminate Annual Limitation on Prevailing Rate System Wage Schedule Adjustments
1. OFFICIAL DESIGNATION: Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee.

2. AUTHORITY: The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee is established under section 5347 of title 5, United States Code, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), as amended, 5 U.S.C., App. 2.

3. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES: The Committee studies the prevailing rate system and other matters pertinent to the establishment of prevailing rates under 5 U.S.C. Chapter 53, Subchapter IV, as amended.

4. DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES: The Committee makes recommendations to the Director of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management on the prevailing rate system for Federal blue-collar workers, including:

   (1) Definitions of local wage areas;

   (2) Coverage of local wage surveys, including the occupations, establishment sizes, and industries to be surveyed and how surveys are conducted; and

   (3) Policies on basic and premium pay administration.

5. AGENCY OR OFFICIAL TO WHOM THE COMMITTEE REPORTS: The Chairman of the Committee reports to the Director of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

6. SUPPORT: As provided by 5 U.S.C. 5347, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management provides such clerical and professional personnel as the Chairman of the Committee considers appropriate and necessary to carry out the functions of the Committee.

7. ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS IN DOLLARS AND STAFF YEARS: The estimated annual operating expenses of the Committee are $269,063. Its estimated staff years are 1.7 full-time equivalents (FTEs).

8. DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICER: The Deputy Associate Director, Pay and Leave, Employee Services, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, serves as the Designated Federal Officer (DFO) to the Committee. The Committee will meet at the call of the Chairman, Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, in consultation with the DFO or his/her designee. The Chairman, in consultation with the DFO or his/her designee, will prepare and approve all meeting agendas. The DFO or his/her designee will attend all meetings and adjourn any meeting when he/she determines adjournment to be in the public interest.
9. ESTIMATED NUMBER AND FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS: The meeting schedule contemplated for the Committee is one meeting per month throughout a calendar year; more frequent meetings will be scheduled when deemed necessary.

10. DURATION: There is no statutory termination date. The mandate of the Committee is one of a continuing nature until amended or revoked by act of Congress.

11. TERMINATION: The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee is permanently established by Public Law 92-392, and its charter is renewed every 2 years under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-463).

12. MEMBERSHIP AND DESIGNATION: The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee has five Regular Government Employee (management) members, five Representative (labor) members, and one Chairman appointed by the Director of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. The Chairman of the Committee serves for a 4-year term, as set forth in 5 U.S.C. 5347(a)(1). Labor members of the Committee serve at the pleasure of the Director of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. Labor membership is reviewed every 2 years to assure entitlement under the criteria set forth in 5 U.S.C. 5347(b).

13. SUBCOMMITTEES: The Chairman of the Committee may, with U.S. Office of Personnel Management approval, form Working Groups to study specific technical issues and report back to the full Committee. Working Groups do not provide advice or work products directly to the Director of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

14. RECORDKEEPING: The records of the Committee, formally and informally established subcommittees, or other subgroups of the Committee, will be handled in accordance with General Records Schedule 6.2 and policies and procedures of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. The Committee’s records are available for public inspection and copying at the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, subject to the Freedom of Information Act of 1966, (5 U.S.C. § 552, as amended).

15. FILING DATE:

APPROVED:

__________________________ ____1/12/2022_____
Kiran A. Ahuja Date
Director
U.S. Office of Personnel Management
2022 Annual Report to the General Services Administration

As required by section 7(a) of Public Law 92-463, the Federal Advisory Committee Act, an Internet report was submitted to the designated Advisory Committee Management Officer of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management for transmission to the General Services Administration.