The original documents are located in Box 12, folder "Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee" of the Norman Ross Files, 1974-75 at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

ANNUAL REPORT 1974

FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20415

COMMISSIONER

July 29, 1975

The President of the United States

Sir:

We have the honor to submit the second Annual Report of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee as prescribed by section 5347, title 5, United States Code.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Hampton
Robert E. Hampton

J. B. Spain
Jayne B. Spain

L. J. Andolsek

Commissioners

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20415

July 21, 1975

TO: The Commissioners of the United
States Civil Service Commission

In accordance with the provisions of section 5347 of title 5, United States Code, there is attached for your consideration and transmittal to the President and the Congress, the second Annual Report - 1974 of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee.

For the Committee:

David T. Roadley
David T. Roadley
Chairman

Attachment

90
1883-1973
MERIT PRINCIPLES ASSURE QUALITY AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

ANNUAL REPORT

1974

FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CONTENTS

FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, created by Public Law 92-392, continued to carry out its mandate successfully in its second year of operation. This mandate was set forth in the Law to provide that the Committee "shall study the prevailing rate system and other matters pertinent to the establishment of prevailing rates . . . and, from time to time, advise the Civil Service Commission thereon." [1]

The composition of the Committee remained essentially the same as in 1973, the only difference being the replacement, on the management side of the table, of the Department of the Navy representation by representation from the Department of the Army. Committee staff support remained the same as in the previous year. Rules and procedures were also unchanged in 1974.

The Committee held a total of 35 meetings in calendar year 1974. All of these meetings were closed to the public on the basis of a determination made by Civil Service Commission Chairman Robert E. Hampton under section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-463) and 5 U.S.C., section 552(b)(2). This decision

[1] Sec. 5347(e), 5 U.S.C.

was rendered in order to provide the members with the opportunity to advance proposals and counterproposals in meaningful debate on issues related solely to the Federal Wage System with the view toward ultimately formulating advisory policy recommendations for the consideration of the Civil Service Commission. It was determined that if sessions were open, debate in a bilateral context would be seriously inhibited, thereby jeopardizing the Committee's ability to function.

COMMITTEE ACTION IN 1974

CONTINUING WORK ON THE NAF WAGE SYSTEM

In its first year of operation, the Committee spent the major portion of its efforts in helping to develop a Federal wage system for nonappropriated fund (NAF) employees, as provided for in the Law. The end result was full implementation by the Commission's Bureau of Policies and Standards of the Federal Wage System (Nonappropriated Fund Employees) (FWS (NAF)). This kind of concentrated and accelerated activity was therefore not required of the Committee on NAF matters during 1974. However, from time to time specific issues concerning the FWS (NAF) had to come to the Committee for resolution. Some of these were resolved by mutual agreement, while others became formal recommendations made to the Civil Service Commission by majority vote.

ISSUES RESOLVED BY FORMAL RECOMMENDATION

In the course of its 1974 deliberations, the Committee made three formal recommendations concerning aspects of the FWS (NAF), which were presented to the Commission for decision. One of these included a minority report, submitted by management. All concerned the definition of wage areas.

Defining Wage Areas in Metropolitan Washington, D.C.

The Committee's very first formal recommendation, approved by the Commission on February 13, 1973, established the criteria for defining NAF wage areas; these criteria formed the basis of many subsequent Committee actions.

These criteria provide that a wage area may consist of two parts, a survey area and an area of application. A survey area is defined as a geographic area of one or more counties where there is sufficient private employment in wholesale, retail, service, and recreational establishments to provide adequate survey data. An area of application consists of one or more counties, including a survey area, plus those counties having NAF employment, but which do not meet the requirements for treatment as a survey area. The wage schedules established from data obtained in a survey area are applied uniformly to NAF wage employees in the area of application.

Two or more counties may be combined to constitute a single wage or wage survey area through consideration of the following factors:

-- Proximity of largest activity in each county.

-- Transportation facilities for employees.

-- Commuting patterns of private and NAF employees.

Usually, wage area definitions are worked out at the staff level. However, under mutually agreed-upon procedures, any differences which cannot be resolved by the labor and management staff members are referred to the full Committee for consideration and action. Staff disagreement on how to define the Washington, D.C., metropolitan region brought the matter before the Committee.

Basically, the issue was over the number and size of wage areas to be defined. In the course of debate, labor and management came to agreement on the disposition of several neighboring Virginia and Maryland counties. This reduced the final issue to the question of whether to define the D.C. metropolitan area as three separate wage survey areas, consisting of: (a) Washington, D.C.; (b) Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland; and (c) Alexandria City, Arlington County, and Fairfax County in Virginia; or, to define all of the above as forming a single wage survey area.

Management members supported the establishment of the three separate wage areas for the D.C. metoropolitan region. Their views were based on the special provisions in the Law requiring that NAF wage schedules be drawn from rates paid in private industry in the immediate locality. Since each one of the three areas meets the criteria for separate wage areas, that is, each has sufficient private employment and sufficient NAF employment, the management members maintained that there was no rationale for combining them into a single wage survey area.

They also felt that the characteristics of NAF employees cause them to seek employment in installations close to where they reside, and that they do not work generally in NAF establishments throughout the metropolitan area. Therefore, management contended that commuting patterns support the establishment of three separate areas.

The management members went on to argue that Washington, D.C. presents a unique situation. The higher minimum wage rates in the District establish a distinct labor market for wholesale, retail, service, and recreational businesses as compared with the nearby Maryland counties and the nearby Virginia counties.

Further, they contended that the weight of the higher D.C. rates, if combined with the rates of the surrounding counties would be disproportionate because D.C. has double the amount of private industry but only one-third the number of NAF employees. This, management asserted, would be contrary to the established criteria for paying NAF employees wages based on a survey of private industry rates in the immediate locality.

On the other hand, labor strongly argued that Washington, D.C., and the surrounding counties that fall within the Washington Beltway should be combined into a single wage survey area. Union members made reference to the policy set forth in the Law to the effect that there will be equal pay for substantially equal work in all agencies within the same local wage area, a policy they contended would be violated by the management proposal.

They further argued that since the individual agencies previously had combined wage data on Washington, D.C., rates with data on wages paid in the surrounding counties to establish NAF wage schedules, what was formerly treated as a unified wage area by the agencies would now be fragmented into several wage areas. This would result in different rates of pay for the same jobs in the same general area, and would defeat the intent of the Law, they contended.

After thoroughly debating the issue, it became clear that no accord could be reached. A vote was taken in which the majority voted in favor of recommending the establishment of three NAF wage areas in

Metropolitan Washington, D.C., as set forth in the management proposal. The Commission approved the recommendation.

A Proposal to Redefine a Wage Area

Union and management staff specialists had reached agreement on the definition of Clark County, Indiana; Hardin County, Kentucky; and Jefferson County, Kentucky, as a NAF survey area. They also agreed to make Jefferson County, Indiana, an area of application to this survey area. The principal installation in this wage area is Fort Knox, located in Hardin County, Kentucky.

A large number of NAF wage employees are employed at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, which is 164 miles from Fort Knox. Based on information available when the Clark-Hardin-Jefferson NAF wage area was established, it was thought that the NAF wage employees in Fort Campbell were located in Christian County, Kentucky. Since both labor and management staffs agreed that there was insufficient private industry employment in Christian County upon which to base a NAF wage schedule for Fort Campbell, Christian County was made an area of application to the Clark-Hardin-Jefferson area. The Civil Service Commission announced this decision on July 19, 1973, and set the survey to begin in February 1974.

However, it was subsequently learned that a sizable group of the Fort Campbell NAF wage employees are actually located in Montgomery County, Tennessee. If Christian and Montgomery Counties were combined, there would be a strong likelihood that adequate private industry data for the construction of a NAF wage schedule could be obtained. If these two rather rural counties were combined to form a survey area, wage rates based on a local survey would probably be lower than NAF wage rates established for Fort Knox, Kentucky, which are influenced by private establishment rates in Louisville, Kentucky.

Management representatives maintained that because of the provision in the Law to pay NAF employees rates based on those prevailing in the immediate locality, the area of application concept should be used only where the immediate locality does not provide adequate wage data. Since an error had been made with regard to the actual location of certain Fort Campbell NAF employees, management contended that the time to correct the error was before the wage survey is made and improper wage rates applied. The management proposal for correcting the situation was to define Christian and Montgomery Counties as comprising a separate survey area.

This was strongly opposed by labor. Union representatives pointed out that these employees had been informed many months previously, by the Civil Service Commission decision, that they were to be paid

Fort Knox NAF wage rates, and they strongly argued that the employees have every right to expect management to carry out the decision.

There are many other large military installations that cover several counties, the union representatives stated, and contended that the management proposal opens the door to seek redefinition of other agreed-upon wage areas. They argued that the only reasonable action is to complete the full 2-year survey cycle and then consider needed wage area revisions throughout the system. They believed that it would be unfair to the NAF employees at Fort Campbell to single them out now for a change.

As the debate proceeded, management representatives urged conducting a survey of the proposed Christian-Montgomery area concurrently with the scheduled survey in the Clark-Hardin-Jefferson area. If the data still proved inadequate, the management members offered to stay with the status quo, that is, retaining Christian County as an area of application. Labor found this suggestion unacceptable, asserting that this constituted a change in the rules, and that existing NAF wage area definitions should remain as they are for a full 2 years.

Since no agreement was possible, the Committee recommended by majority vote that Christian County be an area of application of the Clark-Hardin-Jefferson wage area.

The management members submitted a minority report detailing their objections to the majority recommendation. The report reiterated the management position that the Committee recommendation violates the provision in the Law limiting NAF wage areas to the immediate locality. It also cited specific examples of NAF wage areas which were redefined, in the light of updated NAF employment data, before the start of the first survey. According to the report, these show that the Civil Service Commission has established precedents for redefining wage areas, and the management view that errors should be corrected before the survey was again expressed. The report further asserted that the management proposal fully met both the requirements of the Law and the Civil Service Commission regulations.

The Commission subsequently adopted the majority recommendation.

Redefinition of Two Wage Areas

Two additional NAF wage area definitions came into contention at the staff level in 1974. Since no agreement as to how to redefine them could be reached by the staff members, the matter was brought before the Committee for resolution.

The information that was available at the time the Jackson, Missouri, NAF wage area was originally defined indicated that Richards Gebaur Air Force Base was located in Jackson County, Missouri. More recent information showed that the Base is actually located in Cass and Jackson Counties, Missouri, and that headquarters is located in Cass County. All of the NAF wage employees working at Richards Gebaur are working in Cass County.

When the Douglas, Nebraska, NAF wage area was originally defined, the information showed Offutt Air Force Base was located in Douglas County. However, it was subsequently learned that the Base is located in Sarpy County.

In the case of Jackson, Missouri, there were not enough NAF employees in Jackson County for it to qualify as a survey area. Cass County met the minimum private industry and NAF employment requirements to qualify as a survey area. However, the private industry was marginal and it was not felt that an adequate survey could be conducted. Management members proposed to solve the problem by combining Jackson and Cass Counties into a single wage survey area.

Very much the same situation obtained in the Douglas, Nebraska, case. Douglas County did not have enough NAF wage employees to qualify. Sarpy County qualified according to the minimum criteria, but here also private industry employment was so marginal that it did not seem likely to produce adequate survey data. As in the first situation, management members proposed combining counties, Douglas and Sarpy, to form one wage survey area.

Management's position was that when an area only marginally meets the criteria, and when the addition of a contiguous county would virtually assure adequacy, then this combining procedure should be followed. Other established wage areas were cited as precedents by management members, who contended that their proposal would provide the most adequate locality rates.

Union members strongly disagreed with this view, asserting that it would be a departure from the rules. They maintained that inadequate areas should be made areas of application to the nearest adequate area. They also argued that the examples brought up by management had been mutually agreed upon with the understanding that they would not serve as precedents. Past practice supported the labor view, they contended.

As debate continued, management members emphasized the flexibility of the criteria, and that both the management and the labor proposals are permissible under the rules. However, it was management's view that the labor approach was less desirable, because it would mean the importing of distant rates, whereas the management proposal adhered much more closely to the immediate locality principle. Union members could not agree to what they viewed as a unilateral change in the rules.

There being no agreement, the Committee moved to a vote. A majority voted to recommend that the Commission approve the combining of Jackson and Cass Counties, Missouri, into one wage survey area, and the combining of Douglas and Sarpy Counties, Nebraska, into another single wage survey area.

The recommendation was approved by the Commission.

ISSUES RESOLVED BY MUTUAL AGREEMENT

Two matters concerning the FWS (NAF) were resolved by mutual agreement in 1974. One item was a wage area definition, and the other involved pay-setting practices for U.S. citizen NAF wage employees in Guam.

Wage Area Definition

The Committee studied a proposal for defining the St. Louis, Missouri, NAF wage area. After careful review the members agreed that St. Louis City was clearly inadequate to be a survey area. Instead, the Committee recommended that adjacent St. Clair County, Illinois, be identified as the survey area. The Commission approved the recommendation.

Pay-Setting Practices in Guam

Union members expressed concern over the possibility in a survey of picking up rates below the Guamanian minimum wage, which is higher than the Federal minimum wage. They felt that this was an issue of far larger significance than Guam, and that it raised other basic questions concerning minimum wage rates. The debates and recommendations on these matters are dealt with elsewhere in this report. However, after labor was assured that in Guam, the local minimum wage rate applies to all industries and employees, it was agreed to define Guam as a NAF wage survey area and that a full-scale survey be scheduled for September 1974. The Commission approved the agreement.

REVIEWING THE FEDERAL WAGE SYSTEM

ISSUES RESOLVED BY FORMAL RECOMMENDATION

During the period covered by this report, three issues concerning the FWS had to be brought to a vote. Two of the resulting formal recommendations included a minority report, each submitted by labor. One of these issues related to the disposition of certain special schedules, while the other two concerned environmental pay.

Motion Picture Special Schedules and Their Application

There are currently in existence many special schedules which continue to be adjusted administratively under policies and practices of the establishing agency. As an interim measure these pay practices are continued under the Federal Wage System (FWS) until each special schedule has been submitted to the Committee, reviewed, and a decision made on the Committee recommendation. Special schedules may be paid only in exceptional circumstances, as described in FPM Supplement 532-1, subchapter S4-3b. The general policy stated therein is that special schedules may be established when prevailing rates for specialized types of jobs in individual wage areas are so far above the maximum rates of regular wage schedules that agencies are seriously handicapped in recruiting and retaining qualified employees at the regular rates.

The information which was presented to the Committee concerning motion picture production schedules showed that there were at that time two discrete pay systems for these jobs. One, utilized by Navy in the Washington, D.C., area, adopts pay rates for printing and lithographic jobs in the area. The other was developed by Air Force for the west coast area, and was based on contract rates in the motion picture industry. However, most of the job duties and tasks in the west coast schedule were grouped differently than in the motion picture industry: tasks from several separate industry classifications were found in a single Air Force job. The special schedule was developed by determining the percentage of time spent on each task, prorating the industry contract rate for each task, and then determining the weighted average rate for the job as a whole.

Management advocated grading the motion picture jobs in the Washington, D.C. area by Civil Service Commission job grading standards and converting the jobs to the regular schedule. They based their view on the fact that the rates of the regular wage schedule encompassed or were better than the industry rates, thereby removing the justification for a special schedule. This was not the case in the west coast, however, where the motion picture industry rates were well above the rates of the regular wage schedule. Management therefore proposed retaining the existing special schedule plan.

Opposing both of these proposals, union representatives originally felt that if the Washington, D.C., motion picture employees were converted to the regular schedule, then a majority of them would have to go on pay retention. This was unacceptable to labor. With regard to the west coast situation, the union representatives contended that the Air Force practice was inconsistent with the Civil Service Commission's evaluation policy for mixed jobs, whereby a mixed job is to be evaluated to the grade level of the highest level duty. In general, they strongly felt that the two groups of motion picture employees should not be treated differently. They advocated a single special schedule that would treat all motion picture production employees in the same way, and that would also apply automatically to any new units that might be created.

Subsequently, management clarified the impact of its proposal for the Washington, D.C., area, by stating that if the employees were converted at the time of the next schedule adjustment, only two would require pay savings protection. In view of this, labor withdrew its objections to converting these employees to the regular schedule.

The issue of constructing special schedules by prorating industry contract rates on a time-percentage basis continued to divide the parties. Labor insisted that it could not agree to paying less than the rate for the highest skill level, and held to the view that the averaging method was wrong. Management reiterated its view that the prorating method was consistent in principle with the practices in the motion picture industry. The management members also argued against any nationwide schedule, maintaining that the whole premise for establishing special schedules is based on local situations. Further, they contended that for these employees, the highest rates of pay do not necessarily relate to the highest skills required. Since no further agreement could be reached, the Committee recommended by majority vote to adopt the current Air Force special schedule plan for the west coast motion picture production employees.

The union members submitted a minority report, in which they reiterated their objection to the prorating concept. They strongly felt that it would violate a basic principle of the FWS, which is, in the case of a mixed job, to pay according to the highest skill level. Also, they argued that this would mean that the west coast employees would be treated differently from those in Washington, D.C., since any employees in the latter group with mixed duties would be paid according to the highest skill.

The Committee's majority recommendation was approved by the Commission.

Establishing a New Environmental Differential: Asbestos

The Law provides that the Civil Service Commission may establish environmental differentials for Federal wage employees whose duties involve exposure to either unusually severe working conditions, or unusually severe hazards, or both.

Some time ago, a proposal to establish a differential for exposure to fiberglass resulted in a recommendation from an agency to include asbestos in the proposal. The whole package was submitted to the predecessor National Wage Policy Committee, but action was not completed by the time of the passage of Public Law 92-392. When the matter was brought before the present Committee, the members agreed to consider asbestos separately from fiberglass.

Four expert witnesses, invited by the labor members, provided extensive technical information on the consequences of exposure to airborne asbestos fibers. The testimony, and the discussion which followed, led the labor and the management members to agree that such exposure would meet the criteria for payment of an environmental differential for duty involving an unusually severe hazard. Both sides also were in agreement that a differential payment of

8 percent was warranted for all hours in a pay status on each day of exposure. The parties did not agree, however, on whether the differential should be paid for as an additional example of a substance under the category for poisons (toxic chemicals) high degree, or as a separate category covering only asbestos.

Labor took the position that asbestos exposure should be placed under the high degree poison category, because this category has been in effect since November 1, 1970. The union representatives felt that it would be unfair to establish a new category for asbestos with a prospective effective date and thus deny employees the retroactive pay. To support their argument, they cited two Navy shipyards in which local agreements had been negotiated to recognize asbestos as a poison, but payments had been discontinued by order from Navy headquarters.

In opposition to this view, the management representatives pointed out that the high degree poison category was established to cover chemical warfare agents. They further cited the accepted definition of a poison as a substance which acts chemically on bodily tissues. Thus, they contended that while asbestos is a hazardous material, it is not a poison and does not belong under that category. In addition, they maintained that the Navy decision to stop payment for asbestos was correct, because it was pending before the Committee and the Commission had not authorized such a category.

After considerable further discussion, it became apparent that the issue was at impasse. A vote was taken, and the majority of the Committee recommended that asbestos exposure be made a separate category, to be applied prospectively.

A labor minority report urged the rejection of the majority recommendation and the approval of the labor approach. After detailing the history of the experience at the shipyards, the report strongly contended that the locally negotiated agreements were proper. According to labor, the basis of the Navy decision to stop payment for asbestos was improper because the subject never was officially an item for consideration before the predecessor Committee. The report also charged that a negative arbitration decision on the matter was unduly affected by the management assertion that asbestos was pending before the National Wage Policy Committee. Further, the report argued that the policy of local negotiations to determine coverage of additional local situations under appropriate categories [2] had been vitiated by these management actions. The report reiterated the labor arguments supporting its case that asbestos should be an example under high degree poisons, emphasizing the contention that employees are rightfully entitled to retroactivity.

After careful consideration, the Commission approved the majority recommendation.

[2]FPM Supplement 532-1, subchapter S8-7, section g(3).

A Differential for Exposure to Fibrous Glass Material

When the Committee proceeded to the fiberglass question, labor invited three expert witnesses who testified about the consequences of exposure to fibrous glass material. In the course of the discussion, it became apparent that both management and labor representatives could agree that such exposure would meet the criteria for payment of an environmental differential for duty involving an unusually severe working condition. Both sides were also in agreement that the differential should be paid for the actual hours of exposure. The two sides could not agree, however, on the amount of the differential.

The union representatives were of the opinion that a differential rate of 6 percent was warranted. While current medical evidence indicates that fiberglass and related materials are irritants, rather than hazards, the union representatives expressed concern that in the long run, they may turn out to be as harmful as asbestos. For the present, the union representatives' concerns were that the protective equipment was only partially effective. They also contended that working with fibrous glass material was worse than dirty work, which is paid at a rate of 4 percent. Fibrous glass material involves exposure not only to soil but also to an irritant, and for this reason they advocated a differential rate of 6 percent.

On the other side of the table, the management representatives were of the opinion that a differential rate of 4 percent was appropriate. They contended that the irritation caused by fibrous glass material was no worse than the soil resulting from dirty work, and therefore should be paid at the same rate. The management representatives also expressed their alarm about the bad precedent that would be set by deviating from the current pattern of 4 and 8 percent for high and low degree types of differentials, and by what they viewed as a pyramiding of conditions on the part of the union representatives.

The matter was thoroughly discussed, but no agreement was possible. Consequently, the Committee recommended by majority vote the addition of an environmental differential category for fibrous glass material, to be paid at a rate of 6 percent. The recommendation was approved by the Commission.

ISSUES RESOLVED BY MUTUAL AGREEMENT

Missile Propulsion Tests

A proposal for a new environmental differential category for missile propulsion tests had been submitted to the predecessor Committee, but was not considered at that time. When it was brought before the present Committee, it was debated at great length, and eventually several agreements resulted.

The first agreement to be reached was on the wording of the proposed new category for participating in missile liquid propulsion or solid propulsion tests. The members also agreed at that time that payment should be on the basis of hours in pay status.

Since the subject of explosives had come up throughout the missile propulsion discussions, the members were able to agree on the wording of two proposed new examples to be added under existing categories. It was agreed to add handling or engaging in destruction operations on an armed (or potentially armed) warhead, as an example under the category for explosives and incendiary material, high degree hazard. The members also agreed on the need for and the wording of an example dealing with propulsion systems that are part of aerospace vehicle egress and jettison systems.

Finally, the Committee reached agreement on the percentage amount of the differentials. The separate missile propulsion category was recommended to be paid at a rate of 8 percent. The new example proposed to be added to the high degree hazard category of explosives would also be paid at 8 percent. It was also recommended that the other example concerning aircraft ejection systems be placed under the category for explosives, low degree hazard, which carries a 4 percent rate. All of these items are payable for all hours in pay status. The Commission subsequently approved the category and examples as recommended.

Termination of Economic Controls: The Effect on Federal Wages

In the Committee's First Annual Report, the effect of the Economic Stabilization Program on Federal wages was discussed. Also included was a brief reference to the fact that subsequent to the close of the period of that Report, controls were lifted, and Federal wages were established at full parity with local prevailing rates.

However, the Committee had before it several alternative ways of returning wage schedules to the prevailing rate line, and the members devoted considerable time and attention over several meetings to these possibilities. Out of this thorough examination came an agreement on a resolution "that each Federal wage schedule shall be adjusted to its prevailing rate line on the first day of the first pay period following the termination of wage controls based on the Economic Stabilization Act (Public Law 91-379, as amended), as applied to the Federal Wage System schedules." The Commission approved the resolution, and instructions were furnished to lead agencies to implement this policy.

Wage Employees Overseas

The basis for establishing rates of pay for U.S. citizen wage employees overseas has been a special schedule derived from the 23 U.S. wage areas considered to be the major recruitment sources for overseas positions. When this special schedule was reviewed by the Committee an accord was reached after considerable discussion.

This accord was basically to retain the 23-area schedule, but with a few alterations. It was agreed to switch from the use of certain key grades as peg points to grade-by-grade averaging for the determination of rates. The effective date of the new schedule would be advanced from July 1 to January 1, since that is more in accord with the survey schedules of a majority of the 23 areas. Further, the agreement included dropping the geodetic survey team schedule because it is redundant, and it was also understood that no action would be taken at that time on the special printing and lithographic schedule for overseas areas except to advance the effective date. The Commission approved the agreement.

Pay Practices for Wage Employees in Guam

After thorough debate, the Committee came to mutual agreement on pay practices for Federal wage employees in Guam. The agreement was to establish a special schedule based on the 23-area schedule used for setting the pay of U.S. employees in foreign areas. All covered wage employees in Guam will be paid from the same wage schedule. However, those employees recruited outside of Guam who meet the same provisions as those specified for General Schedule (GS) employees [3] will receive

[3] FPM Supplement 990-1, section 591.204.

the same differential as GS employees as a part of base pay for re-cruitment and retention purposes. These recommended pay practices were approved by the Commission.

National Guard Technicians in Puerto Rico

The Committee's discussion of conditions affecting pay practices for National Guard technicians in Puerto Rico revealed a number of important questions that need answering before a final decision can be made. Consequently, the members were in accord to invest the technical staff of the Department of Defense Wage Fixing Authority with the responsibility for developing a presurvey study outline for Puerto Rico, in consultation with appropriate agencies and labor unions.

In the meantime, it was agreed that the existing special schedule for technicians engaged in aircraft communications and electronics, and munitions maintenance operations would be continued. The Commission approved this approach.

Special Schedules for Midway and Samoa

Since the special schedules for employees in American Samoa and Midway follow the same pattern as that already agreed to for Guam, an accord was reached to continue the current practice for these two areas. The Commission approved the continuation of these special schedules.

POLICIES ON MINIMUM WAGE RATES

ISSUES RESOLVED BY FORMAL RECOMMENDATION

A number of policy questions arose in the Committee's meetings in 1974 concerning the ways in which minimum wage rates, Federal and local, relate to Federal wage schedules. As a part of these general debates, an issue concerning wage data from firms having discriminatory rate-setting practices was also dealt with. The Committee made two formal recommendations and one report resulting from a majority vote to the Civil Service Commission on these issues. Two of these three items were accompanied by minority reports.

Extending the Policy on Discriminatory Wage Rates

There had been FPM instructions concerning data used in fixing rates for both FWS and FWS (NAF) schedules which provided for exclusion of discriminatory rates. These instructions were very specific as to which rates were to be excluded: the exclusion covered rates which were apparently set in consideration of religious or political affiliations, marital status, race, color, national origin, age or sex, or of a physical handicap if the job duties could be performed efficiently by a person with that handicap. The instructions did not require the exclusion of other, nondiscriminatory, rates paid by the same firm.

On the union side, it was felt that wherever discriminatory rates are found, it has to be assumed that the entire firm is not a quality firm, and therefore, all wage data from that firm must be excluded. The union spokesmen contended that previous practice, in cases where discriminatory rates were found, had been to exclude all wage data from the entire firm. They asserted that the FPM supplements should be revised to provide for this clarification.

On the other side of the table, management viewed the existing instructions as being clear and appropriate. The instructions had a flexibility which the management representatives wished to retain, in that the burden of decision in the identification of discriminatory rates was on the local wage survey committee and on the agency wage committee. It was the responsibility of these two bodies to recommend to the lead agency the extent to which any or all wage rates should be excluded.

After further discussion, it became apparent that the issue could not be resolved by mutual agreement. Consequently, the Committee voted to recommend adding to the two FPM Supplements [4] wording that provides for the exclusion of all data from a firm if it is found that the firm has discriminatory hiring or other discriminatory rate-setting practices.

The recommended provision was approved by the Commission.

Multiple State or Local Minimum Wage Rates

Since Federal wage rates are established in consideration of the Federal minimum wage rate, or of state or municipal minimum rates when they are higher, the question was raised about the proper policy to be followed in cases where there are several different state or local minimum rates. The policy that was in existence at that time was basically discretionary. Labor felt that it was much too flexible, and that the instructions should be changed to provide for the use of the highest state or local minimum rate in all cases.

At first, management advocated the use of the lowest minimum rate as a floor, but after study, came to the view that use of either the highest or the lowest would be too inflexible. Consequently,

[4] FPM Supplement 532-1, S5-10a(1)(d) and FPM Supplement 532-2, S5-10a(1)(d).

the management representatives presented an alternative proposal. In this concept, the dominant Federal activity in an area would be determined, and the state or local minimum wage rate for that type of activity would be applied to the entire area wage schedule. In actual fact, the Washington, D.C., area was the only area at the time with multiple minimum rates higher than the Federal minimum, and these were mainly for NAF-type occupations. The management members felt that if this type of situation should arise in other areas, each case should be examined and decided on its own merits.

Labor strongly objected to the use of any but the highest applicable minimum rate. The alternate concept presented by management was unacceptable to the union representatives, because they contended that it would lead to inequities for those employees not working in the dominant Federal activity. They insisted that equal pay for equal work had always been the principle, and that employees in the same grade had always had the same minimum rate applied regardless of occupation. They also opposed the case-by-case approach favored by management, contending that this was a general policy matter which would set a precedent. They felt that the policy should be to apply the highest minimum to all equally in all cases.

As the discussion proceeded, the management representatives held to their view that their proposal would be in the best interests of the employees, while labor continued to argue that use of the highest rate would be fair. Since neither side could come to an agreement, a vote was taken. The majority of the Committee recommended adding to FPM Supplements 532-1 and 532-2, S5-11g(2), wording reflecting the management concept.

In their minority report, the union spokesmen expressed their concern over the specific problem of the Washington, D.C., wage area. However, they emphasized their continuing concern over the long term application of the management concept. Reiterating the principle of equal pay for equal work, the union representatives asserted that the rule has always been that all employees in the same grade and paid from the same schedule, other things being equal, receive the same benefits. Under the management proposal, they contended, those employees not in the dominant occupation would be denied the minimum wage to which they would otherwise be entitled.

The Commission subsequently approved the majority recommendation.

<u>Survey Data Below State or Local Minimum Rates</u>

Under current instructions, no wage schedules are established for Federal wage employees that have rates below the Federal minimum rate. Private industry wage data below the Federal minimum are excluded. These instructions also provide that in areas where the state or local minimum rates are higher than the Federal minimum, private industry wage rates at or above the Federal minimum will be collected and used in the computation of the prevailing rate payline. If any rate thus produced is below the appropriate state or local minimum rate, then such rate is increased so that the lowest rate on the schedule is equal to the state or local minimum.

The union representatives were of the opinion that the existing instructions should be changed so that all rates below the appropriate state or local minimum would be excluded. They believed that higher-grade employees are unfairly penalized by including these rates between the Federal minimum and the higher state or local minimum, because it lowers the average payline. It is unfair, they contended, to have employees at the lower grades deriving the sole benefits from a local minimum higher than the Federal. The union spokesmen asserted that to adjust rates upward at the lower end of the wage scale is artificial. They felt that the Law is flexible enough to permit such a change in the instructions.

While the management representatives recognized that the use of a higher local minimum wage as a floor could produce some artificiality, they maintained that exclusion of all wage rates below the local minimum would extend this artificiality from the lower grades throughout the schedule as a whole. They contended that this would be a drastic departure from the principles of wage-fixing based on locality rates, and that there was no basis for this in the Law. They further held that minimum wage rates were never intended to benefit all employees, but only those whose pay is marginal.

After it became clear that no accord could be reached, the majority of the Committee voted to oppose the exclusion of wage data which is below the state or local minimum wage rate in the computation of local prevailing rates. Because labor desired to file a minority report, a Committee report on this action was forwarded to the Commission for either confirmation or disapproval.

In their minority report, the union representatives expressed their view that the labor side has always supported consistent and equitable pay treatment for Federal employees. They reiterated their position that there should be one minimum wage treatment for application of both Federal and state or local minimum rates. The management approach, they contended, creates artifical compression and fails to recognize that where local economic conditions justify a higher minimum rate, these same conditions impact on all employees, not just those at the lower grades.

Subsequently, the Commission sustained the Committee action.

ISSUES RESOLVED BY MUTUAL AGREEMENT

FEDERAL WAGE SCHEDULES AND THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

When the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) was amended, effective May 1, 1974, a question came before the Committee about the effects of the amendments on constructing Federal wage schedules. Specifically, the point at issue was how to utilize wage data collected prior to May 1, 1974, in the construction of wage schedules which would be effective after May 1, 1974. Concern was expressed on whether or not it was proper to include any data or any scheduled wage rates below the new Federal minimum rate established at that time under the FLSA amendments. After illustrations of the results of various options were presented to the Committee, the members were able to agree on what they felt was the best course of action. This was to use the data as collected and make the necessary adjustments to the lower grade rates to comply with instructions for constructing minimum rate wage schedules. [5]

[5] FPM Supplements 532-1 and 532-2, S5-11g.

Planning for the Future: FLSA and Wage Schedules

In view of the fact that the Federal minimum rate was due to go up again on January 1, 1975, the Committee recognized the need for planning ahead on how to utilize wage data for areas with schedules effective on or after that date. Both sides agreed that there should be a cutoff point, in order to avoid collecting in the same survey some data prior to January 1, 1975, and some after.

Accordingly, the Committee agreed to propose that those surveys scheduled for November and early December be ordered with the expectation that all data collection would be completed before the end of December. All rates below the then-existing Federal minimum would be excluded. For those surveys scheduled for late December, no establishment visits would be made prior to January 1, 1975, and all rates below the new Federal minimum would be excluded. The Commission approved this approach.

OTHER ISSUES CONSIDERED

Working With Inmates of Federal Prisons

One of the two other issues considered by the Committee was a proposal developed by an agency in consultation with a union to establish a new environmental differential. The differential was proposed for wage employees who supervise or work in close proximity to inmates of Federal prisons, at a rate of 8 percent for all hours in a pay status.

A witness was called, who gave expert testimony about the Federal prison system. The Committee also examined written documentation, and thoroughly debated all aspects of the issue.

The management view was that the day-to-day duties of Federal wage employees who supervise or work in close proximity to inmates of Federal prisons do not face unusually severe hazards in their work, and thus do not meet the criteria for an environmental differential. The management spokesmen pointed out that the evidence showed that it was correctional officers rather than wage employees who are the principal victims of assaults by prisoners. Further, since the wage employees were considered supervisors, and were classified at one grade higher than usual for the duties performed because they work with prisoners, the management representatives maintained that they were already adequately compensated. The management representatives expressed their strong opposition to establishing an additional environmental differential category which would be paid for essentially all of the duties regularly assigned to these employees.

On the other side, the union spokesmen held that the evidence presented was sufficient to convince a reasonable person that the work in question constituted exposure to unusually severe hazards. They contended that a serious injury to even one employee showed that there existed a potential for serious injury to all other employees. Because this proposal was the result of collective bargaining between labor and management in the field, they strongly argued that failure to approve it would be a disservice to collective bargaining in the Federal Service.

In the course of the Committee's discussion, management expressed a willingness to recommend a restricted category whereby wage employees would be entitled to an 8 percent differential for only those days when they were assigned to organized searches for escaped prisoners or participated in the suppression of assaults by prisoners on Federal workers, assaults by prisoners on other prisoners, or other altercations. Labor could not agree to these restrictions.

Since no accord was possible, the Committee, by majority vote, recommended against adoption of the proposed category. Because of labor's expressed wish to submit a minority report, a Committee report on this action was forwarded to the Commission for either confirmation or disapproval.

The labor minority report reiterated the contention that Federal wage employees work in an environment in which they daily risk intimidation, harassment, or the possibility of injury or death. The union representatives asserted that actual injury experience had been sufficiently documented to show that an actual hazard exists which cannot be practically eliminated, and that therefore a differential was warranted. They also reemphasized their concern about the majority's unwillingness to recognize that the proposal had been jointly worked out between the agency concerned, which is the agency with the knowledge and expertise in these matters, and the recognized labor organization representing these employees.

The Commission subsequently sustained the majority action.

Deadline for Indefinite Pay Retention

The Committee was informed of a Commission staff paper alerting agencies to the deadline for indefinite pay retention. This was in line with a Comptroller General decision which upheld the Commission's instructions concerning indefinite pay savings when a reduction in grade is a result of the initial application of standards. [6] The Commission's General Counsel interpreted the decision to mean that the termination date of October 1, 1974, was a firm deadline.

[6] FPM Supplement 532-1, S10-8 and 9.

In line with this, the staff paper had two purposes: to establish clearly the rights of employees to this type of pay retention, and to alert agencies to apply the standards before the termination date to assure protection of employee rights. It also spelled out in more specific detail how the termination date was to be applied. First, job-grading standards issued before April 1, 1974, were required to be applied prior to October 1, 1974. Second, standards issued between April 1, 1974, and October 1, 1974, would carry a deadline date for application 6 months after the actual distribution date. This was to insure that printing delays would not deprive entitled employees of their right to indefinite pay retention. Third, the initial application of the FWS job-grading system to all wage positions not covered by standards issued prior to October 1, 1974, had to be completed no later than 6 months after the actual distribution date of the last standard issued. This was also to protect the rights of entitled employees to indefinite pay retention provisions.

* * * * * * * *

SUMMING UP

In 1974, as in its first year of operation, the Committee maintained a viable bilateral atmosphere. Labor and management continued talking to each other, respecting each other's views, and frequently reaching mutual agreement on a variety of issues. The Committee continued its mission of taking needed action on matters concerning both the ongoing wage system, and the fledgling NAF wage system. The expectation for the future is that the Committee will continue to operate in this fruitful way.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHARTER

A. The Committee's Official Designation:

- The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee.

B. Objectives and Scope:

- The Committee shall study the prevailing rate system and other matters pertinent to the establishment of prevailing rates under this subchapter (subchapter IV, ch. 53, 5 U.S.C., as amended).

C. Duration:

- There is no time limit set forth in the Act (P.L. 92-392). It is expected that the mandate of the Committee is one of a continuing nature, until amended or revoked by appropriate act of Congress.

D. Responsible Agency and Official:

- Recommendations of the Committee are made to the Civil Service Commission.

- The Chairman of the Committee reports to the Chairman, Civil Service Commission.

E. Agency Providing Support:

- United States Civil Service Commission.

F. Committee Responsibilities:

- The Committee is advisory. Its primary responsibility is to study the prevailing rate system and from time to time advise the Civil Service Commission thereon.

- The Committee shall submit an annual report to the Commission and the President, for transmittal to Congress, as required by section 5347(e) of the Act (P.L. 92-392).

G. Estimated Annual Operating Costs in Dollars and Manyears:

- Using current salary schedules, $121,000 and four manyears.

H. Estimated Number and Frequency of Meetings:

- The meeting schedule contemplated for the Committee is one meeting each week throughout a calendar year; more frequent meetings shall be scheduled when deemed necessary.

I. The Committee's Termination Date:

- There is no statutory termination date. The Chairman of the Committee serves for a 4-year term, as set forth in section 5347(a)(1) of the Act (P.L. 92-392). Management members serve at the pleasure of the designating authority. Labor membership is reviewed every 2 years to assure entitlement under the criteria set forth in section 5347(b) of the Act (P.L. 92-392).

J. Date Filed: December 9, 1974

Approved: Robert Hampton　　　　Date: December 9, 1974

ORGANIZATION OF

THE FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN: David T. Roadley

MANAGEMENT MEMBERS:

W. J. Abernethy, Director, Civilian Personnel, Department of the Air Force.

Ben B Beeson, Director of Civilian Personnel, Department of the Army.

Carl W. Clewlow, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense.

Raymond Jacobson, Director, Bureau of Policies and Standards, U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Martin Wish, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Personnel, Veterans Administration.

LABOR MEMBERS:

Paul J. Burnsky, President, Metal Trades Department, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

George Knaly, Director, Government Operations, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Theodore A. Vanderzyde, Grand Lodge Representative, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Clyde M. Webber, National President, American Federation of Government Employees, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Alan J. Whitney, National Executive Director, National Association of Government Employees (Ind.).

DESIGNATED MANAGEMENT ALTERNATES:

Edward L. Farrell, Veterans Administration.

William M. Frailey, Department of the Army.

Frederick A. Kistler, U.S. Civil Service Commission.

James P. Madigan, Department of the Air Force.

William Marks, Department of Defense.

Joseph Meick, Department of the Army.

Pascale A. Petosa, Department of Defense.

Ogden Reed, Department of the Army.

Donald K. Schimmel, Veterans Administration.

William C. Valdes, Department of Defense.

Raymond C. Weissenborn, U.S. Civil Service Commission.

DESIGNATED LABOR ALTERNATES:

Gary Altman, National Association of Government Employees (Ind.).

Gilbert G. Bateman, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers/AFL-CIO.

Robert Crum, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers/AFL-CIO.

Robert W. Fauntleroy, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers/AFL-CIO.

Dennis Garrison, American Federation of Government Employees/AFL-CIO.

George Hobt, American Federation of Government Employees/AFL-CIO.

Paul Hutchings, Metal Trades Department/AFL-CIO.

James O'Dea, National Association of Government Employees (Ind.).

Saul S. Stein, Metal Trades Department/AFL-CIO.

COMMITTEE STAFF:

Everett M. DeHanas, Secretary.

S. Jean Stewart, Wage Policy Specialist.

Mary G. Reifsnÿder, Secretary to the Chairman.

TYPICAL FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE [7]

Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee

Notice of Committee Meetings

Pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of Public Law 92-463, effective January 5, 1973, notice is hereby given that meetings of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee will be held on:

Thursday, October 3, 1974

Thursday, October 10, 1974

Thursday, October 17, 1974

Thursday, October 31, 1974

The meetings will convene at 10 a.m. and will be held in Room 5A06A, Civil Service Commission Building, 1900 E Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

The committee's primary responsibility is to study the prevailing rate system and from time to time advise the Civil Service Commission thereon.

At these scheduled meetings, the committee will consider proposed plans for implementation of Public Law 92-392, which law establishes pay systems for Federal prevailing rate employees.

[7] Submitted on a monthly basis, as meeting schedules are established by Committee consensus.

The meetings will be closed to the public on the basis of a determination under section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-463) and 5 U.S.C., section 552(b)(2), that the closing is necessary in order to provide the members with the opportunity to advance proposals and counter-proposals in meaningful debate on issues related solely to the Federal Wage System with the view toward ultimately formulating advisory policy recommendations for the consideration of the Civil Service Commission.

However, members of the public who wish to do so, are invited to submit material in writing to the Chairman concerning matters felt to be deserving of the committee's attention. Additional information concerning these meetings may be obtained by contacting the Chairman, Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, Room 5451, 1900 E Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20415.

DAVID T. ROADLEY
Chairman, Federal Prevailing Rate
Advisory Committee

September 13, 1974

ANNUAL REPORT TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

As required by Section 7(a) of Public Law 92-463, the Federal Advisory Committee Act, a summary report of the 1974 operations of the Committee was submitted to the designated Advisory Committee Management Officer of the Civil Service Commission for transmission to the Office of Management and Budget.

The report covered such items as Committee establishment authority, membership, functions of the Committee, meeting dates, advisory recommendations to the Civil Service Commission, and the estimated total aggregate annual cost to fund, service, supply, and maintain the Committee.

The details of these activities are covered elsewhere in this Report, with the exception of cost data. Available resources were reported to be $121,000 for Committee staff maintenance for 1974, utilizing 4 manyears for staff support to the Committee. None of the Committee members or alternates receive compensation or other emoluments for their service on the Committee.

APPENDIX I

CALENDAR OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS IN 1974

Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee meeting dates for calendar year 1974:

January 17, 1974

January 24, 1974

January 31, 1974

February 7, 1974

February 14, 1974

February 21, 1974

February 28, 1974

March 7, 1974

March 14, 1974

April 4, 1974

April 18, 1974

May 2, 1974

May 9, 1974

May 16, 1974

May 23, 1974

June 6, 1974

June 13, 1974

June 20, 1974, 1st Session

June 26, 1974, 2nd Session

June 27, 1974

July 18, 1974

July 25, 1974

August 1, 1974

August 8, 1974

August 15, 1974

September 5, 1974

September 12, 1974

September 19, 1974

September 26, 1974

October 3, 1974

October 10, 1974

October 31, 1974

November 14, 1974

November 21, 1974

December 5, 1974

December 19, 1974

APPENDIX II

PRINCIPAL ISSUES DISCUSSED AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS IN 1974

MEETING NUMBER AND SUBJECT MATTER DISCUSSION

51	- Environmental Differential Proposal for Work on Missile Propulsion Tests.
52	- Environmental Differential Proposal for Work on Missile Propulsion Tests.
	- Application of the 5.5 Percent Limit on Wage Increases.
53	- Definition of the Washington, D.C. NAF Wage Area.
	- Application of the 5.5 Percent Limit on Wage Increases.
54	- Definition of the Washington, D.C. NAF Wage Area.
	- Environmental Differential Proposal for Work on Missile Propulsion Tests.
55	- Environmental Differential Proposal for Work on Missile Propulsion Tests.
	- Redefinition of the Clark, Indiana - Hardin, Kentucky - Jefferson, Kentucky NAF Wage Area.
56 and 57	- Application of the 5.5 Percent Limit on Wage Increases.
58	- Definition of the St. Louis, Missouri NAF Wage Area.
	- Environmental Differential Proposal for Work With Inmates of Federal Prisons.
59	- Environmental Differential Proposal for Work With Inmates of Federal Prisons.
60	- Special Wage Schedules for U.S. Citizens Overseas.

61	-	Deadline for Indefinite Pay Retention.
	-	Special Wage Schedules for U.S. Citizens Overseas.
62	-	Effects of FLSA Amendments of 1974 on Wage Schedule Construction.
63	-	Special Wage Schedules for Motion Picture Production.
64	-	Special Wage Schedules for Motion Picture Production.
	-	Special Wage Schedules for Lock and Dam Employees.
65	-	Special Wage Schedules for Motion Picture Production.
66	-	Special Wage Schedules for Lock and Dam Employees.
	-	Discussion of the Final Draft of the Committee's Annual Report.
67	-	Special Wage Schedules for Lock and Dam Employees.
68	-	Special Wage Schedules for Guam.
69 and 70	-	Special Wage Schedules for Motion Picture Production.
71	-	Special Wage Schedules for Lock and Dam Employees.
72	-	Special Wage Schedules for NAF Employees in Guam.
73	-	Special Wage Schedules for NAF Employees in Guam.
	-	Special Wage Schedules for Lock and Dam Employees.
	-	Redefinition of Jackson County, Missouri and Douglas County, Nebraska NAF Wage Areas.
74	-	Special Wage Schedules for Lock and Dam Employees.
75	-	Special Wage Schedules for National Guard Technicians in Puerto Rico.

76 - Use of Minimum Wage Rates in the Construction of Federal Wage Schedules.

77 - Pay Problems of Employees in NAF Warehouses.

-- Environmental Differential Proposals for Work With Asbestos and Fiberglass.

78 - Environmental Differential Proposals for Work With Asbestos and Fiberglass.

79 - Policy on Constructing Federal Wage Schedules in Localities With Multiple Minimum Wage Rates.

- Policy on Use of Wage Data Which Is Below State or Local Minimums.

- Policy on Use of Wage Data Which Is Discriminatory.

80 - Environmental Differential Proposal for Work With Asbestos.

81 - Policy on Constructing Federal Wage Schedules in Localities With Multiple Wage Rates.

- Policy on Use of Wage Data Which Is Below State or Local Minimums.

- Policy on Use of Wage Data Which Is Discriminatory.

82 - Environmental Differential Proposal for Work With Fiberglass.

83 - Environmental Differential Proposal for Work With Fiberglass.

- Special Wage Schedules for Possessions and Territories (except the Virgin Islands).

- Relationships of the Special Wage Schedule for Hill Air Force Range, Utah to the Remote Worksite Allowance.

84 - Relationships of the Special Wage Schedule for Hill Air Force Range, Utah to the Remote Worksite Allowance.

85 - Proposed Revisions in the NAF Wage System.