

## FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

639th FPRAC

**JANICE R. LACHANCE**, Chair, Presiding

Thursday, June 16, 2022

Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams  
Office of Personnel Management  
Washington, D.C. 20415**ATTENDANCE:****Members/Alternates:****Management Members:**Mark Allen, OPM  
Nancy Speight, DoD  
Mandy Laughlin, Army  
Nancy Klinitzki, Air Force  
Ophelia A. Vicks, VA**Labor Members:**Paul O'Connor, MTD  
Jacqueline Simon, AFGE  
Richard Loeb, AFGE  
Carisa Carmack, NAGE  
Felicia Neale, ACT**Staff Specialists and Visitors:**Brenda Roberts, Designated Federal Officer, OPM  
Ana Paunoiu, OPM  
Samantha Bono, OPM  
Christopher Lynch, DoD  
Gary Kistner, DoD  
Erica Abiera, DoD  
Chrissy Wlezien, DoD  
Roy Poorker, DoD  
Kieu Nguyen, DoD  
Charles Arnold, DoD  
JeeYoung Kang, Army  
Sheila Willis, VA  
Keyonna Butler, VA  
Arlene Romba, VA  
Peggy Cleveland, Navy  
Simone Griffin, Navy  
Dale Troll, MTD  
Gene Fuerere, ACT

**Recording Secretary:**  
Mike Eicher, OPM

[Transcript prepared from digital audio produced by FPRAC.]

## C O N T E N T S

	Page
I. Opening/Announcements	
• Introductions.....	5
• Announcements.....	8
II. Review of the Minutes of the 638th Meeting.....	8
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	
– 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, 637-AFGE-1	
– 2022 Update to Review of Monroe County, Pennsylvania, 638-OPM-2	
– 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	
– Letters from Steven R. Kester Regarding the Pay Disparity Between FWS and GS Employees at Tobyhanna Army Depot, 627-OC-1 and 633-OC-1, 637-OC-2 and 637-OC-3	
– Employment Distribution at Tobyhanna Army Depot, 634-OPM-1, and 2022 Update to GS and FWS Employment Distribution at Tobyhanna Army Depot, 638-OPM-3	
– Market Rates vs Schedule Rates for Electronics Mechanics (Series 2604) Tobyhanna Army Depot, 634-OPM-2, and 2022 to Market Rates vs Schedule Rates, 637-OPM-4	
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 and 636-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
    - Letter from the Association of Civilian Technicians Requesting FPRAC Delay the Vote on the ACT Puerto Rico Proposal until April/May 2021, 636-ACT-1
- IV. New Business.....12
- a. Definition of San Mateo County, CA, to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area, 639-MGT-1
  - b. 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, 639-AFGE-1
    - Southeastern North Carolina (RUS) Wage Schedule, 639-AFGE-2
    - Central North Carolina Wage Schedule, 639-AFGE-3
    - Fiscal Year 2020 Prevailing Rate Pay Adjustments, 639-AFGE-4
    - Central North Carolina Special Wage Schedule A099, 639-AFGE-5
    - Richmond, North Carolina Special Wage Schedule A099, 639-AFGE-5
    - AK78 Final Rule General Schedule Locality Pay Areas published at 70 *Federal Register* 74996 on December 19, 2005, 639-AFGE-7

## P R O C E E D I N G

CHAIR LACHANCE: I want to welcome everyone to the 639th meeting of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee. It's exactly 10, so we can get started.

This meeting is being held virtually and recorded, as usual. A verbatim transcript will be provided to all the members for your review by the next meeting.

My name is Janice Lachance. I've met most of you, at least on this screen by now, and I have the privilege of chairing the Committee.

We usually start with introductions, so we can get them on the record and in our transcript. We will start with the Management members. Mark, do you want to go ahead?

MR. ALLEN: Yes. This is Mark Allen for the OPM staff.

CHAIR LACHANCE: DoD?

MS. SPEIGHT: Hi. This is Nancy Speight. I'm the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civilian Personnel Policy.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Thank you. Army?

MS. LAUGHLIN: Hi. Good morning. This is Mandy Laughlin with Army.

MS. KANG: Good morning. This is Jee Young Kang

CHAIR LACHANCE: Air Force?

[No response.]

CHAIR LACHANCE: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Air Force had trouble connecting.

MS. KLINITSKI: Sorry. This is Nancy Klinitski from the Air Force. Over.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Terrific. Glad to have you, Nancy. We were worried about you.

VA?

MS. VICKS: Good morning. This is O. Ann Vicks, one of the Executive Directors in the Office of the Chief Human Capital Office there.

MS. WILLIS: Hi. Good morning. From VA, this is Sheila Willis.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Go ahead.

MS. WILLIS: This is Sheila Willis, and I am the director for Compensation and Classification Service, and I work for Ann Vicks, and we also have Keyonna Butler with us as well.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Terrific. Good. Is anyone here from the Metal Trades Department

MR. O'CONNOR: Good morning. Paul O'Connor. Metal Trades.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Great. AFGE? I know we have Jacque on the road.

MS. SIMON: Yeah. I'm on, and I just got a text from Richard Loeb who said he's having difficulty getting on. He'll probably eventually get on. He's trying.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Okay, good. We will look for him when he gets here.

MR. LOEB: I am now on. It took a few minutes to get into the server. Thank you.

CHAIR LACHANCE: That's good. Thanks.

Is anyone here from NAGE?

MS. CARMACK: Carisa Carmack from NAGE.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Okay. And ACT?

MS. NEALE: Good morning. This is Felicia Neale here, representing ACT.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Great. Good to have everyone.

We also have with us Branda Roberts, slightly outside the shot of the camera here,

but she's here at OPM as the Designated Federal Office under the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Can we get the staff to introduce themselves?

MS. PAUNOIU: Hi. This is Ana Paunoiu with OPM.

MR. EICHER: Mike Eicher, OPM.

MS. BONO: Samantha Bono, OPM.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Great. And do we have any guests attending today?

MS. CLEVELAND: This is Peggy Cleveland with Department of Navy on the call.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Great. Thank you.

MR. ARNOLD: Charles Arnold from DCPAS.

CHAIR LACHANCE: I'm sorry. You broke up a bit. Could you repeat that?

MR. ARNOLD: Yeah. Charles Arnold from DCPAS.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Great. Thank you.

MR. KISTNER: Gary Kistner, DCPAS.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Gary, thank you.

MS. WLEZIEN: Chrissy Wlezien, DCPAS.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Okay. Chrissy, two of you talked at once. Can you repeat?

MS. WLEZIEN: Yes. Chrissy Wlezien with DCPAS.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Great.

MR. POORKER: Roy Poorker, DCPAS.

MS. ROMBA: This is Arlene Romba with VHA, Workforce Management and Consulting.

MS. NGUYEN: Kieu Nguyen with DCPAS.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Anyone else?

MR. TROLL: This is Dale Troll also here for Metal Trades.

MS. GRIFFIN: This is Simone Griffin with Department of Navy.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Anyone else?

[No response.]

CHAIR LACHANCE: Welcome, everybody. It's great to have such a big group on the call.

We don't have any announcements this morning, so we can move right to review the transcript of the last meeting, which was held on May 19th. Are there any changes anyone would like to bring to our attention?

[No response.]

CHAIR LACHANCE: I see people looking it over now. So, if not, is there any objection to adopting the transcript as it is written?

MR. ALLEN: No objection.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Great. Hearing no objection, the transcript is adopted.

Thank you, everyone.

As we pointed out at the last meeting, there are a few items under Old Business which we do need to tackle. Let's start with item (a), the letter from the American Federation of Government Employees requesting FPRAC review of the proposal to not allow Federal Wage System wage area boundaries to split General Schedule locality pay areas and a proposal to redefine Monroe County, Pennsylvania, from the Scranton–Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, wage area to the New York, New York, wage area.



AFGE submitted another letter this March requesting Monroe County, Pennsylvania, be redefined to the New York wage area and also requesting FPRAC to 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.

We also have Document 638-OPM-2, a 2022 update to review Monroe County, Pennsylvania, that OPM staff has prepared.

Then there's also Document 638-OPM-3, an updated employment distribution at Tobyhanna, and 638-OPM-4, an updated wage schedule rate versus wage survey rate.

Finally, Document 638-OPM-5 is a map of the New York locality pay area.

Mark, do you want to talk about these documents and present them to the Committee?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. SIMON: Can I interrupt? This is Jacque.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Yeah.

MS. SIMON: This issue is of great importance to AFGE, but because of the circumstances surrounding today's meeting, that it's coinciding with AFGE's national convention and it's just very difficult for us to participate fully, can I ask that this presentation be deferred until next month when I'm not driving to the convention and I can give it my undivided attention, which it really requires?

MR. ALLEN: That's fine with me.

CHAIR LACHANCE: I think that's fine. Are there any objections from other Committee members to defer this until the July meeting?

[No response.]

CHAIR LACHANCE: Hearing none, seeing none, Jacque, I think that's just fine.

MS. SIMON: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Sure.

MR. ALLEN: In connection with that, we would like to also discuss at the next meeting establishing a working group to delve further into these persistent questions that OPM has been receiving over the years. They seem to be picking up speed. There are other things we also need to look at, but we tend to broach that issue at the next meeting in more detail.

MS. SIMON: Yes. With everything associated with it, this issue at the next meeting.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Okay. I think that's fine with everyone. I'm not hearing any concerns about that. That's great.

All right. So, let's now move to item (b) under Old Business, letter from the American Federation of Government Employees requesting FPRAC recommend redefining San Joaquin County, California, from the Stockton, California, wage area to the San Francisco, California, wage area and review of San Joaquin County, California.

Jacque or Richard, do you have any updates on this item, or do you want to include this in whatever action might be taken at the July meeting?

MS. SIMON: Yeah. This is a very similar issue. So, I think it will be taken care of when we talk about the other issue in July.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Okay. Are there any concerns from other members of the Committee about postponing consideration of this until July?

[No response.]

CHAIR LACHANCE: Okay. Hearing none, we can do that.

The next item under Old Business is item (c), and that is a letter from the National Association of Government Employees requesting FPRAC reexamine the placement of wage grade employees working in the Salinas–Monterey area, a review of the Salinas–Monterey, California, wage area, and a request for abolishment of the Monterey–Salinas wage survey area.

Since this request was introduced by NAGE, do you have any updates on this item, or do you think it could also be included in our consideration in July? Entirely up to you.

MS. CARMACK: I think it might be up for what we're going to discuss in July.

I reached out to the locals over there, and I haven't heard back yet. I am continuing to reach out to them, but I think it might be something that would be able to be discussed in July as well, if everyone is okay with that.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Okay. Any concerns about that?

MR. ALLEN: No concerns from my perspective. I believe all three of those areas are really tracking back to the same issue of concern.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Great. Alright. The last item under Old Business is item (d). It's a letter from the Association of Civilian Technicians requesting FPRAC consider moving the Puerto Rico wage area into the Special Appropriated Fund Schedule for U.S. Insular Areas.

Does ACT have any updates on this item? It's not exactly related to the issue of using GS locality pay areas in the Federal Wage System. So, do you have any updates for us on this?

MS. NEALE: Good morning. No, I don't have any further updates, other than the last correspondence that was done.

MR. ALLEN: I'll note also with this one that it may be a good subject to bring up for a working group discussion. This one has to deal not with GS locality pay areas but how

wage rates are actually established in Puerto Rico. The concern expressed here was the National Guard was having difficulty recruiting, retraining National Guard technicians. Again, that's work we'll get into further.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Does that make sense to you, ACT, as a way to proceed?

MS. NEALE: Yes, it does.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Okay. Any concerns or discussion about that?

MS. NEALE: My only concern is this has been an ongoing topic of discussion, and it's been a concern for guys in Puerto Rico for a long time. So whatever method would be useful in moving it forward, I'm all for that.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Great. Thank you very much, and I think that, hopefully, if we can move ahead with this working group, we can tackle a lot of these concerns that have been dogging the Committee really for years. So, hopefully, we can make that happen soon and get to work on it.

MS. NEALE: That would be great.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Going now to New Business, item (a) is the definition of the San Mateo County, California, wage area to a non-appropriated fund Federal Wage system wage area for pay setting purposes.

Mark, do you want to present this package to the members?

MR. ALLEN: Yes. Thank you.

The Department of Defense on behalf of the Department of Veterans Affairs initiated a request that OPM define San Mateo County, California, to a non-appropriated fund wage area under the Federal Wage System. The thing drawing this to our attention here is that there are now three non-appropriated fund employees under Federal Wage System at the VA

Medical Center in Menlo Park, California.

I should also note that San Mateo County was assigned to a non-appropriated fund wage area, but it was removed some years ago because neither DoD nor VA had Federal Wage System non-appropriated employees in that county, but that changed very recently.

The fact is that VA has employees there now. They're being paid from the Monterey, California, non-appropriated fund wage schedule. What we are seeking here is FPRAC take a look at this and see if we have a recommendation. I hope we've got consensus that San Mateo County should be appropriately defined in regulation to the Monterey, California, non-appropriated fund wage area.

On page 3, we have a summary of the regulatory criteria, and the only criterion really that's somewhat definitive is the proximity. Transportation facilities or the geographic features, don't favor any wage area more than another. Basically, if you take a look further through this package, you'll see there were only two options to define San Mateo County. One would be for the Solano wage area, which would be Travis Air Force Base, but that's a little bit further away than Monterey is.

There's also another factor that is not part of the regulations, but we as a committee sometimes consider as well, and that's organizational relationships, and VA may want to speak to this in more detail. But I understand that the Menlo Park VA Medical Center is part of the same health care network as Palo Alto, which is in Santa Clara County, and Santa Clara County is part of the Monterey wage area.

Does anybody have anything to add to that?

MS. VICKS: Arlene, the lead in this one directly. Anything you want to speak to?

MS. ROMBA: No. Thank you for the opportunity.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Is there any further discussion about this?

MR. ALLEN: There will be no changes for the people here.

MS. SIMON: I have a question. This is Jacque. I have a question. If this request comes from VA because they didn't—they weren't assigned to any non-appropriated fund schedule, and they needed to figure out how to pay the employees? Are these like canteen employees?

MR. ALLEN: That's right. I think usually these are very newly established positions, and I think they tend to be coffee bars that are newly established inside the VA medical centers. They're associated with the VA canteen service. Yes.

MS. SIMON: Okay. And which county has higher wages?

MR. ALLEN: Sorry. Which—

MS. SIMON: Was it Santa Clara or San Mateo that has higher wages?

MR. ALLEN: They would be the same. The Santa Clara County and San Mateo County would be under the Monterey wage schedule.

MS. SIMON: And that's what the VA is proposing?

MR. ALLEN: Yes, that's right. They're already paying the employees. They have been for some time paying the employees from—

MS. SIMON: Okay. They just want to make it official? They just want to make it official?

MR. ALLEN: That's right, yes.

MS. SIMON: Okay.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Correct.

MS. SIMON: Got it.

CHAIR LACHANCE: So can we move forward by consensus on this? Are there any concerns or further discussion or questions?

[No response.]

CHAIR LACHANCE: Okay. It's official. Thank you all very much.

The last item under New Business is item (b), and that's a letter from employees and a few attachments that were received from AFGE requesting to unify the Wage Grade Schedule at FCC Butner in North Carolina.

Jacque, are you in a position to present this to the members?

MS. SIMON: I am not. This will have to get this for [inaudible], but I do have a question for Mark. I know this issue came up for the GS employees at that complex several years ago, and it was unified. Do we have precedence for trying to unify? I know we did at the Joint Base McGuire. Do we have other precedence for unifying one sort of joint employer?

MR. ALLEN: Yes. That's typically what the Federal Wage System also considers, but we took a look at this case, and it appears that the Federal Correctional Complex Butner is actually covered currently under one wage schedule. There are two wage schedules for that area. One coincides with the Raleigh–Durham locality pay area. The other would be the part that would be rest of U.S. Federal Correctional Complex Butner is actually covered under the Raleigh–Durham wage schedule.

I believe for a number of years now, both counties that have parts of FCC Butner in them have it under the same wage schedule that's somewhat higher.

I think what the employees there are actually asking about is why other prisons like Petersburg in the Richmond wage area, why the wage rates there are about \$3 an hour higher

for wage supervisor employees. My suggestion also on this one, since it's not entirely clear what they're asking for, is to delve into this one in a little more detail.

MS. SIMON: Okay. I thought you were going to say something else because we also have an inquiry from the National Park Service where—Richard could talk about this some more—where people whose duty station is in one section of the park pay wages from a different schedule from a different part of the park, and they get different pay increase that's based on whether their duty stations, the GS, rest of U.S., or another GS locality. Now, are you saying that is not happening at Butner?

MR. ALLEN: We took a look at the geographic definitions of both the GS and for the FWS areas, and both counties that have parts of FCC Butner in them are in the same wage area and under the same wage schedule.

MS. SIMON: But are they in the same GS locality?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. SIMON: Okay. So, they're really concerned with Butner as compared to Petersburg rather than Butner compared with Butner.

MR. ALLEN: I believe so, and it seems to be their primary concern is the level of rates of pay that are received, that their installation compared with other Bureau of Prison facilities that are in different wage areas, and that, in my mind, that's another thing that we can talk about in the working group.

MS. SIMON: All right. I mean, there's a lot of problems in Butner, starting with physical plant. I just wanted to be clear on that.

It was reported to me they were telling me that different sections of the complex got different pay rates. So, you're saying that's not the case?



MR. ALLEN: I would say if they are, they shouldn't be. It should be under the same wage schedule.

MS. SIMON: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: But the only thing that I could think of, and this didn't seem to be reflected in what they were saying, is that there's a newly established satellite camp that is not in either of those two counties, but I have not seen that that's the case. I guess just those two counties that have parts of FCC Butner in them, and they should be under the same wage schedule.

MS. SIMON: Okay. I'm moving on to another issue on those, but it really kind of came up at the same time. And, Richard, you may want to talk about it, but we have National Park Service employees whose duty stations are in different locations within the same National Park, and they're different GS locality. So they're getting different pay increases, and we just wanted to know if there was—[audio distortion]—assigned a National Park.

MR. LOEB: They're basically, in most cases—the park, which is Shenandoah, is in three, possibly four different counties in Virginia. Some of the counties are in the D.C. locality area. Others are assigned to—well, to Hagerstown for WG purpose—WG purposes, rest of U.S. for GS purposes, and in some cases, the differences between the duty stations, which they [unclear] define as these work areas that are frequently like, you know, sort of—I'll use the term they're where they keep the heavy equipment. The differences among them are sometimes a mile or two apart, but whereas, the work assignments for any given duty station can cross anywhere in the park. So you can have a few miles apart duty station crossing over back and forth and constantly working, you know, in the other duty station, so to speak, but they're being paid at the lower-rate duty station. We have a request from them, and we will handle it and probably send it

over to you.

What they're seeking is sort of a unified wage rate for the Shenandoah National Park, regardless of where the assigned duty station is. Interestingly, the 80 employees in the park were just reassigned recently because they did a geo-location of their—I'll use the term. It's a workstation. It's a duty station. Many of these look a bit like heavy equipment garages, and they found that they were actually in another county, not the county they were assigned originally, given as a duty station. Looks like a number of them went down, and a few even went up, but it's crazy because they're all like eating lunch together every day, and they're like seeing significant differences in pay, as much as \$3 an hour.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah, Richard. If you send that over to the OPM staff, we'll take a look at it.

MR. LOEB: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: We're somewhat familiar with that issue already because of employees writing in to us.

MR. LOEB: I'm not surprised.

MR. ALLEN: Yes, what you're looking at there is definitely the Shenandoah National Park is in more than one wage area.

MR. LOEB: Right.

MR. ALLEN: Part of that is because of how the metropolitan areas are defined. The D.C. metropolitan area extends out pretty far, and I don't think that this one would have anything to do with the GS locality pay areas. This is a straight consideration of the wage areas and how those are defined, without taking into consideration, I think, the boundaries of that park. So we're happy to take a look at it.

MR. LOEB: Right. You're correct, but the park is in several different wage areas or at least two, right?

MR. ALLEN: Yes. We'll take a look at that and get the maps. I know you all love maps.

MR. LOEB: Thank you.

CHAIR LACHANCE: We will bring out the maps. Great. Thank you. I think that will be on the agenda for an upcoming meeting for sure.

There are no other items under New Business. Does anybody have anything else they want to raise or comment on? Otherwise, we are ready to adjourn this meeting and get ready to roll up our sleeves in July.

MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah. This is Paul O'Connor, Metal Trades.

Can we jump back to item (a) under New Business just for a moment? I was looking through the notes that I wrote, and I just wanted context for a couple comments that were made. What I wrote down was they're already being paid this rate and just wanted to make it official. What does that mean?

MR. ALLEN: What happens often when VA establishes a new coffee bar in a medical center, some of these counties are not defined to a wage area in OPM's regulations because the non-appropriated fund areas are just specifically defined where their employee is located, and that's the function of the law that covers non-appropriated fund system.

On the appropriated fund side, every county is defined to a wage area. So, when we get a case where a new facility has opened up, VA has to figure out what schedule they're going to pay people from, and then we have to play catch up essentially. So, we do regulations on that once we get a recommendation from FPRAC. Since now we have a consensus

recommendation on that one, we'll go ahead and do the proposed regulation and final regulations. It will have no effect on the employees themselves. It's just a paperwork exercise for us.

MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. So, if I understand this, it's a new location, and it's not in a specific wage area. But now that there's a business there, they will be absorbed into this wage area?

MR. ALLEN: That's right.

MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. All right. That makes sense. Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Paul, these things come up every now and then, not all that frequently. I think we usually see about one a year. I'm not entirely clear about how many coffee bars VA sets up in their medical centers, if they're new or if they had them before. They had to shut them down during the pandemic, and now they're hiring people back again.

MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Definitely need coffee bars.

Any other comment or question?

MR. FUERERE: Hey, this is Gene Fuerere, ACT. I just wanted to let the record know I was in attendance, just listening.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Thank you very much for telling us that.

Is there anyone else who may have had connectivity issues who came on after we did the roll call?

MR. LYNCH: Yes. This is Chris Lynch with DoD.

CHAIR LACHANCE: Thank you, Chris. Glad we resolved your tech issues.

MR. LYNCH: You're welcome.

MR. ALLEN: I think we managed to get everybody on this meeting who wanted to be here, so I'm very pleased.

CHAIR LACHANCE: We're going to declare victory.

Should we adjourn while we're on this upbeat note? Is there a motion from one of you to adjourn and a second?

MR. ALLEN: I'll make the motion to—

MS. SIMON: This is Jacque. I—[audio distortion].

CHAIR LACHANCE: Great. Thank you. Thank you, AFGE.

Mark, you'll second.

And is there anyone opposed to adjourning the meeting?

[No response.]

CHAIR LACHANCE: If not, we will be officially adjourned, and we'll look forward to July when we can get to work on some of these longstanding issues.

Thank you, everyone.

[End of recorded session.]