Proposed Rules

Federal Register

Vol. 79, No. 211

Friday, October 31, 2014

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

5 CFR Part 532

RIN 3206–AN10

Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of Certain Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas

AGENCY: U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Proposed rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is issuing a proposed rule that would redefine the geographic boundaries of several appropriated fund Federal Wage System (FWS) wage areas for pay-setting purposes. Based on recent reviews of Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) boundaries in a number of wage areas, OPM proposes redefinitions affecting the following wage areas: Washington, DC; Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg, MD; Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN; Charlotte, NC; Columbia, SC, and Southwestern Wisconsin. In addition, this proposed rule would make three minor corrections to the Miami, FL; Columbus, GA, and Kansas City, MO, wage areas.

DATES: We must receive comments on or before December 1, 2014.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by ''RIN 3206–AN10,'' using any of the following methods:

Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Mail: Brenda L. Roberts, Acting Deputy Associate Director for Pay and Leave, Employee Services, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, Room 7H31, 1900 E Street NW., Washington, DC 20415–8200.

Email: pay-leave-policy@opm.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Madeline Gonzalez, by telephone at (202) 606–2838 or by email at *pay-leave-policy@opm.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: OPM is issuing a proposed rule to redefine the geographic boundaries of several appropriated fund FWS wage areas. These changes are based on recommendations of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee (FPRAC), the statutory national labor-management committee responsible for advising OPM on matters affecting the pay of FWS employees. From time to time, FPRAC reviews the boundaries of wage areas and provides OPM with recommendations for changes if the Committee finds that changes are warranted.

OPM considers the following regulatory criteria under 5 CFR 532.211 when defining FWS wage area boundaries:

(i) Distance, transportation facilities, and geographic features;

(ii) Commuting patterns; and

(iii) Similarities in overall population, employment, and the kinds and sizes of private industrial establishments.

In addition, OPM regulations at 5 CFR 532.211 do not permit splitting MSAs for the purpose of defining a wage area, except in very unusual circumstances.

The Office of Management and Budget defines MSAs and maintains and updates the definitions of MSA boundaries following each decennial census. MSAs are composed of counties and are defined on the basis of a central urbanized area—a contiguous area of relatively high population density. Additional surrounding counties are included in MSAs if they have strong social and economic ties to central counties.

When the boundaries of wage areas were first established in the 1960s, there were fewer MSAs than there are today and the boundaries of the then existing MSAs were much smaller. Most MSAs were contained within the boundaries of a wage area. MSAs have expanded each decade and in some cases now extend beyond the boundaries of the wage area.

FPRAC recently reviewed several wage areas where boundaries subdivide certain MSAs and concurred by consensus with the changes described in this proposed rule. These changes would be effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after 30 days following publication of the final regulations.

Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC–MD–VA–WV MSA

Washington, DC; Calvert, Charles, Frederick, Montgomery, and Prince George's Counties, MD; Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Fredericksburg, Manassas, and Manassas Park Cities, VA; Arlington, Clarke, Culpeper, Fairfax, Fauquier, Loudoun, Prince William, Rappahannock, Spotsylvania, Stafford, and Warren Counties, VA; and Jefferson County, WV, comprise the Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC–MD–VA–WV MSA. The Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC–MD–VA–WV MSA is split between the Washington, DC, wage area and the Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg, MD, wage area. Washington, DC; Charles, Frederick, Montgomery, and Prince George's Counties, MD; Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Manassas, and Manassas Park Cities, VA; and Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William Counties, VA, are part of the Washington, DC, survey area. Calvert and St. Mary's Counties, MD; Fredericksburg City, VA; Clarke, Fauquier, King George, Spotsylvania, Stafford, and Warren Counties, VA; and Jefferson County, WV, are part of the Washington, DC, area of application. Culpeper and Rappahannock Counties, VA, are part of the Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg area of application.

OPM proposes to redefine Culpeper and Rappahannock Counties to the Washington, DC, area of application so that the entire Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC–MD–VA–WV MSA is in one wage area. There are seven FWS employees working in Culpeper County and one FWS employee working in Rappahannock County.

Rochester, MN MSA

Dodge, Fillmore, Olmsted, and Wabasha Counties, MN, comprise the Rochester, MN MSA. The Rochester, MN MSA is split between the Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN, wage area and the Southwestern Wisconsin wage area. Dodge, Olmsted, and Wabasha Counties are part of the Minneapolis-St. Paul area of application and Fillmore County is part of the Southwestern Wisconsin area of application.

OPM proposes to redefine Fillmore County to the Minneapolis-St. Paul area of application so that the entire Rochester, MN MSA is in one wage area.

There are currently no FWS employees working in Fillmore County.

Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC MSA

Cabarrus, Gaston, Iredell, Lincoln, Mecklenburg, Rowan, and Union Counties, NC, and Chester, Lancaster, and York Counties, SC; comprise the Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC–SC MSA. The Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia MSA is split between the Charlotte, NC, wage area and the Columbia, SC, wage area. Cabarrus, Gaston, Mecklenburg, Rowan, and Union Counties, NC, are part of the Charlotte survey area; Iredell and Lincoln Counties, NC, and Lancaster and York Counties, SC, are part of the Charlotte area of application; and Chester County, SC, is part of the Columbia area of application.

OPM proposes to redefine Chester County to the Charlotte area of application so that the entire Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC–SC MSA is in one wage area. There are currently no FWS employees working in Chester County.

Miscellaneous Corrections

In addition, this proposed rule would make the following minor corrections:

- Update the name of the Columbus Consolidated Government in the Columbus, GA, FWS wage area because Columbus is the official name of the entity resulting from the consolidation of the City of Columbus and Muscogee County in 1971.
- Update the name of Dade County in the Miami, FL, FWS wage area because the name of Dade County was officially changed to Miami-Dade County in 1997.
- Delete the name of the St. Louis, MO, wage area from the list of area of application counties in the Kansas City, MO, wage area because, due to a formatting error, the name of the St. Louis wage area was incorrectly printed as if it was an area of application county in the Kansas City wage area.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

I certify that these regulations would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because they would affect only Federal agencies and employees.

List of Subjects in 5 CFR Part 532

Administrative practice and procedure, Freedom of information, Government employees, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Wages.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

Katherine Archuleta,

Director.

Accordingly, OPM is proposing to amend 5 CFR part 532 as follows:

PART 532—PREVAILING RATE SYSTEMS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 532 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 5343, 5346; § 532.707 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 552.

■ 2. Appendix C to subpart B is amended by revising the wage area listings in paragraph (3), under the undesignated center heading Definitions of Wage and Wage Survey Areas, for the Washington, DC; Miami, FL; Columbus, GA; Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg, MD; Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN; Kansas City, MO; Charlotte, NC; Columbia, SC, and Southwestern Wisconsin wage areas to read as follows:

Appendix C to Subpart B of Part 532—Appropriated Fund Wage and Survey Areas

* * * * *

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Washington, DC

Survey Area

District of Columbia:
  Washington, DC
Maryland:
  Charles
  Frederick
  Montgomery
  Prince George's
Virginia (cities):
  Alexandria
  Fairfax
  Falls Church
  Manassas
  Manassas Park
Virginia (counties):
  Arlington
  Fairfax
  Loudoun
  Prince William

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Maryland:
  Calvert
  St. Mary's
Virginia (city):
  Fredericksburg
Virginia (counties):
  Clarke
  Culpeper
  Fauquier
  King George
  Rappahannock
  Spotsylvania
  Stafford
  Warren
West Virginia
  Jefferson

* * * * *

FLORIDA

* * * * *

Miami

Survey Area

Florida:
  Miami-Dade

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Florida:
  Broward
  Collier
  Glades
  Hendry
  Highlands
  Martín
  Monroe
  Okeechobee
  Palm Beach
  St. Lucie

* * * * *

GEORGIA

* * * * *

Columbus

Survey Area

Alabama:
  Autauga
  Elmore
  Lee
  Macon
  Montgomery
  Russell
Georgia:
  Chattahoochee
  Columbus

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Alabama:
  Bullock
  Butler
  Chambers
  Coosa
  Crenshaw
  Dallas
  Lowndes
  Pike
  Tallapoosa
  Wilcox
Georgia:
  Harris
  Marion
  Quitman
  Schley
  Stewart
  Talbot
  Taylor
  Troup
  Webster

* * * * *

MARYLAND

* * * * *

Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg

Survey Area

Maryland:
  Washington
Pennsylvania:
  Franklin
West Virginia:
  Berkeley

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Maryland:
  Allegany
  Garrett
Pennsylvania:
  Fulton
Virginia (cities):
  Harrisonburg
  Winchester
Virginia (counties):
  Frederick
  Greene
  Madison

Page
Rockingham
Shenandoah
West Virginia:
Hampshire
Hardy
Mineral
Morgan

* * * * *

MINNESOTA

* * * * *

Minneapolis-St. Paul

Survey Area

Minnesota:
Anoka
Carver
Chisago
Dakota
Hennepin
Ramsey
Scott
Washington
Wright
Wisconsin:
St. Croix

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Minnesota:
Benton
Big Stone
Blue Earth
Brown
Chippewa
Cottonwood
Dodge
Douglas
Faribault
Fillmore
Freeborn
Goodhue
Grant
Isanti
Kanabec
Kandiyohi
Lac Qui Parle
Le Sueur
McLeod
Martin
Meeker
Mille Lacs
Morrison
Mower
Nicollet
Olmsted
Pope
Redwood
Renville
Rice
Sherburne
Sibley
Stearns
Steele
Stevens
Swift
Todd
Traverse
Wabasha
Wadena
Waseca
Watonwan
Yellow Medicine
Wisconsin:
Pierce
Polk

* * * * *

Missouri

Kansas City

Survey Area

Kansas:
Johnson
Leavenworth
Wyandotte
Missouri:
Cass
Clay
Jackson
Platte
Ray

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Kansas:
Allen
Anderson
Atchison
Bourbon
Doniphan
Douglas
Franklin
Linn
Miami
Missouri:
Adair
Andrew
Atchison
Bates
Buchanan
Caldwell
Carroll
Chariton
Clinton
Cooper
Daviess
De Kalb
Gentry
Grundy
Harrison
Henry
Holt
Howard
Johnson
Lafayette
Linn
Livingston
Macon
Mercer
Nodaway
Pettis
Putnam
Saline
Schuyler
Sullivan
Worth

* * * * *

NORTH CAROLINA

* * * * *

Charlotte

Survey Area

North Carolina:
Cabarrus
Gaston
Mecklenburg
Rowan
Union

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

North Carolina:
Alexander
Anson
Catawba
Cleveland
Iredell
Lincoln
Stanly
Wilkes
South Carolina:
Chester
Chesterfield
Lancaster
York

* * * * *

SOUTH CAROLINA

* * * * *

Columbia

Survey Area

South Carolina:
Darlington
Florence
Kershaw
Lee
Lexington
Richland
Sumter

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

South Carolina:
Abbeville
Anderson
Calhoun
Cherokee
Clarendon
Fairfield
Greenville
Greenwood
Laurens
Newberry
Oconee
Orangeburg
Pickens
Saluda
Spartanburg
Union

* * * * *

WISCONSIN

* * * * *

Southwestern Wisconsin

Survey Area

Wisconsin:
Chippewa
Eau Claire
La Crosse
Monroe
Trempealeau

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Minnesota:
Houston
Winona
Wisconsin:
Barron
Buffalo
Clark
Crawford
Dunn
Florence
Forest
Jackson
Juneau
Langlade
Lincoln
Marathon
Marinette
Menominee

Oneida
Pepin
Portage
Price
Richland
Rusk
Shawano
Taylor
Vernon
Vilas
Waupaca
Wood

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2014–25903 Filed 10–30–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–39–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

5 CFR Part 9501

RIN 3206–AL02

Office of Personnel Management Criteria for Internal Revenue Service Broadbanding Systems

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) hereby withdraws a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) regarding the criteria governing the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) broadbanding systems, published in the **Federal Register** April 17, 2007. OPM has determined withdrawal of the NPRM is appropriate as it would be impractical to issue this rule at this time.

DATES: *Effective Date:* The proposed rule, published on April 17, 2007, in the **Federal Register** (72 FR 19126), is withdrawn as of October 31, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Melvin, Senior Human Resources Specialist, Office of Personnel Management, Employee Services, Pay and Leave, Room 7H31, 1900 E Street NW., Washington, DC 20415. *Email: jennifer.melvin@opm.gov; Telephone:* (202) 606–2858; or *Facsimile:* (202) 606–0824.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under 5 U.S.C. 9509, the Secretary of the Treasury may, under criteria prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), establish one or more broadbanding systems covering all or any portion of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) workforce that would otherwise be covered by the General Schedule (GS) pay and classification system. OPM published its criteria for IRS broadbanding systems as a final notice in the **Federal Register** on December 19, 2000 (65 FR 79433) and the criteria in that notice are still in effect.

On April 17, 2007, OPM issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) in the **Federal Register** (72 FR 19126) to amend title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, to establish a new chapter XCV and part 9501 providing revised criteria for IRS broadbanding systems. The proposed regulations would have provided the Department of the Treasury with the flexibility, in coordination with OPM, to establish broader bands for covered IRS employees and would have established a more direct relationship between pay and performance. The proposed regulations would have also revised the criteria consistent with changes in the GS pay administration rules made by the Federal Workforce Flexibility Act of 2004 and OPM implementing regulations.

The comment period for the NPRM closed on June 18, 2007. OPM received and considered all five written comments in response to the NPRM. Comments were received from one Federal agency, one labor organization, two professional associations, and one individual. The following is a general overview of the comments OPM received during the public comment period raised in connection with the merits of the proposed rule.

The comments received were varied. The main items of concern included the role of labor organizations in applying the IRS broadbanding system authority and OPM criteria, the maximum number of grades that may be combined into a band, the requirements and flexibilities for providing various within-band pay adjustments, performance ratings and the IRS performance management system, limitations on the maximum rates of pay for bands, and the flexibility to establish control points that limit salary progression within bands. Several commenters also asked for clarification regarding the language used in various parts of the proposed rule.

Office of Personnel Management.

Katherine Archuleta,

Director.

[FR Doc. 2014–25902 Filed 10–30–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–39–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

9 CFR Part 94

[Docket No. APHIS–2014–0032]

Importation of Beef From a Region in Argentina

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed rule; reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: We are reopening the comment period for our proposed rule that would allow, under certain conditions, the importation of fresh (chilled or frozen) beef from a region in Argentina located north of Patagonia South and Patagonia North B, referred to as Northern Argentina. This action will allow interested persons additional time to prepare and submit comments.

DATES: The comment period for the proposed rule published on August 29, 2014 (79 FR 51508) is reopened. We will consider all comments that we receive on or before December 29, 2014.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by either of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov/#!docket Detail;D=APHIS–2014–0032.*
- *Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery:* Send your comment to Docket No. APHIS–2014–0032, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3A–03.8, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737–1238.

Supporting documents and any comments we receive on this docket may be viewed at *http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail; D=APHIS–2014–0032* or in our reading room, which is located in room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 799–7039 before coming.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Silvia Kreindel, Senior Staff Veterinarian, Regionalization Evaluation Services, National Import Export Services, Veterinary Services, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 38, Riverdale, MD 20737–1231; (301) 851–3313.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 29, 2014, we published in the **Federal Register** (79 FR 51508–51514, Docket No. APHIS–2014–0032) a proposal to allow, under certain conditions, the