Proposed Rules

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–AN40

Prevailing Rate Systems; Definition of Kent County, Michigan, and Cameron County, Texas, to Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas


ACTION: Proposed rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is issuing a proposed rule that would define Kent County, Michigan, as an area of application county to the Macomb, MI, NAF FWS wage area and Cameron County, TX, as an area of application county to the Nueces, TX, NAF FWS wage area. The Veterans Canteen Service (VCS) now employs one NAF FWS employee at VCS #315 in the Wyoming Health Care Center in Kent County and two NAF FWS employees at VCS #740 in the Veterans Affairs Health Care Center at Harlingen in Cameron County.

Under § 532.219 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, each NAF wage area “shall consist of one or more survey areas, along with nonsurvey areas, if any, having nonappropriated fund employees.” Kent and Cameron Counties do not meet the regulatory criteria under 5 CFR 532.219 to be established as separate NAF wage areas; however, nonsurvey counties may be combined with a survey area to form a wage area. Section 532.219 lists the regulatory criteria that OPM considers when defining FWS wage area boundaries.

OPM recently completed reviews of the definitions of Kent and Cameron Counties and is proposing the changes described below. The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, the national labor-management committee responsible for advising OPM on matters concerning the pay of FWS employees, recommended these changes by consensus. These changes would apply on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after 30 days following publication of the final regulations.

Kent County, MI

Kent County would be defined as an area of application county to the Macomb, MI, NAF FWS wage area. The closest NAF wage area to Kent County is the Macomb wage area. There are no other NAF wage areas in the immediate vicinity of Kent County. VCS #315 is located approximately 175 miles from Selfridge Air National Guard Base, the Macomb wage area’s host activity.

With the definition of Kent County to the Macomb NAF wage area, the Macomb wage area would consist of 1 survey county, Macomb County, MI, and 13 area of application counties: Alpena, Calhoun, Crawford, Grand Traverse, Huron, Iosco, Kent, Leelanau, Ottawa, Saginaw, Washtenaw, and Wayne Counties, MI; and Ottawa County, OH.

Cameron County, TX

Cameron County would be defined as an area of application county to the Nueces, TX, NAF FWS wage area. The closest NAF wage area to Cameron County is the Nueces wage area. There are no other NAF wage areas in the immediate vicinity of Cameron County. VCS #740 is located approximately 148 miles from Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, the Nueces wage area’s host activity.

With the definition of Cameron County to the Nueces NAF wage area, the Nueces wage area would consist of one survey county, Nueces County, TX, and six area of application counties: Bee, Calhoun, Cameron, Kleberg, San Patricio, and Webb Counties, TX.

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.


Beth F. Cobert,
Acting 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 D to subpart B is amended by revising the wage area listing for the Macomb, MI, and Nueces, TX, wage areas to read as follows:

Appendix D to Subpart B of Part 532—Nonappropriated Fund Wage and Survey Areas

Michigan

Macomb

Survey Area

* * * * *
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This action proposes special conditions for the Pilatus Aircraft, Ltd., Model PC–12, PC–12/45, and PC–12/47 airplanes. Therefore, the FAA is proposing this special condition to address (1) all characteristics of the rechargeable lithium batteries and their installation that could affect safe operation of the modified Model PC–12, PC–12/45, and PC–12/47 airplanes, and (2) appropriate Instructions for Continued Airworthiness (ICAW) that include maintenance requirements to ensure the availability of electrical power from the batteries when needed.

Type Certification Basis

Under the provisions of § 21.101, Finnoff Aviation must show that the Model PC–12, PC–12/45, and PC–12/47, as changed, continue to meet the applicable provisions of the regulations incorporated by reference in Type Certificate No. A78EU1 or the applicable regulations in effect on the date of application for the change. The Administrator finds that the applicable airworthiness regulations (i.e., 14 CFR part 23) do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for the Model PC–12, PC–12/45, and PC–12/47 airplanes. 

Type Certification Basis

Under the provisions of § 21.101, Finnoff Aviation must show that the Model PC–12, PC–12/45, and PC–12/47, as changed, continue to meet the applicable provisions of the regulations incorporated by reference in Type Certificate No. A78EU1 or the applicable regulations in effect on the date of application for the change. The Administrator finds that the applicable airworthiness regulations (i.e., 14 CFR part 23) do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for the Model PC–12, PC–12/45, and PC–12/47 airplanes.

Type Certification Basis

Under the provisions of § 21.101, Finnoff Aviation must show that the Model PC–12, PC–12/45, and PC–12/47, as changed, continue to meet the applicable provisions of the regulations incorporated by reference in Type Certificate No. A78EU1 or the applicable regulations in effect on the date of application for the change.

If the Administrator finds that the applicable airworthiness regulations (i.e., 14 CFR part 23) do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for the Model PC–12, PC–12/45, and PC–12/47 airplanes, the Administrator will adopt the special conditions contained in this proposed rulemaking as final, unless commenters provide significant new data, comments, or information showing that the special conditions are unnecessary for the continued airworthiness of these airplanes.

Type Certification Basis

Under the provisions of § 21.101, Finnoff Aviation must show that the Model PC–12, PC–12/45, and PC–12/47, as changed, continue to meet the applicable provisions of the regulations incorporated by reference in Type Certificate No. A78EU1 or the applicable regulations in effect on the date of application for the change. The Administrator finds that the applicable airworthiness regulations (i.e., 14 CFR part 23) do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for the Model PC–12, PC–12/45, and PC–12/47 airplanes, the Administrator will adopt the special conditions contained in this proposed rulemaking as final, unless commenters provide significant new data, comments, or information showing that the special conditions are unnecessary for the continued airworthiness of these airplanes.