



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION II  
SAM NUNN ATLANTA FEDERAL CENTER  
61 FORSYTH STREET, SW, SUITE 23T85  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-8931

June 20, 2007

MEMORANDUM TO: James F. McDermott, Director  
Office of Human Resources

FROM: William D. Travers, Regional Administrator

SUBJECT: REQUEST TO ADJUST RELOCATION INCENTIVE FOR TURKEY  
POINT FROM 16% TO 24%


- I. This is to request your approval to adjust the relocation incentive for resident inspectors and senior resident inspectors stationed at Turkey Point from 16% to 24%. The recommended adjustment is based on assignment of Turkey Point to higher categories under both the recruitment difficulty and the geographic economic factors. The "Recommendations Based on Review of Resident Inspector Program Relocation Incentive Algorithm," approved by the Executive Director for Operations on September 23, 2005, indicates that the Office of Human Resources may adjust the relocation incentive amounts for particular sites at any time based on changes in recruitment difficulty, revisions in locality pay, and changes in geographical cost data.
- II. The recommended amount is based on consideration of the following:

Factor	Basis	Current Amount	Proposed Amount
Minimum Incentive	Approved for all sites effective September 23, 2005.	8%	8%
Recruitment Difficulty	<p>The 5% recruitment difficulty category currently assigned represents sites or positions for which it is expected to be <u>difficult</u> to attract suitable candidates (that is, for which candidates are likely to be few) absent the relocation incentive.</p> <p>Region II requests that Turkey Point be assigned instead to the 10% recruitment difficulty factor. This category "represents sites or positions for which it is expected to be <u>particularly difficult</u> to fill positions absent the relocation incentive. For example, several announcements or postings may be necessary to attract a suitable candidate."</p>	5%	10%

C/10

Factor	Basis	Current Amount	Proposed Amount
	<p>In view of the Region's recent experience attempting to fill positions at Turkey Point, this highest level category for recruitment difficulty is a more accurate characterization for Turkey Point, and the higher level relocation incentive that will result is needed to help attract and retain candidates for the site. For example, a recent Turkey point vacancy attracted three qualified staff members, two of whom dropped out of consideration because of the cost of living. The Region eventually persuaded the remaining candidate, who had family in the Miami area, to accept the position. Compared to our recruitment experience at the majority of other RII sites, Turkey Point has fewer acceptable candidates who apply for the resident position, and the experience level of the candidates is generally less. The last two times the Turkey Point resident inspector position was vacant, there was a period of several months where temporary rotations provided site coverage until a suitable candidate was identified and persuaded to accept the position.</p>		
<p>Geographic Economic</p>	<p>The site is properly assigned to the Miami, Florida metropolitan area. According to Cities Ranked and Rated, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition (the newest edition of the reference that was previously used in reviewing and revising relocation incentives in 2005), the cost of living index (COL) for the Miami area grew from 108.8 in 2004 to 130 in 2007 on a scale where 100 represents the average cost of living. In accordance with the COL groupings approved in September 2005, the sharply increased COL results in assignment of 6% rather than 3% for the geographic economic factor.</p>	<p>3%</p>	<p>6%</p>
<p><b>Total</b></p>		<p>16%</p>	<p>24%</p>

III. The Office of Human Resources (HR) has reviewed this request and finds that it  does  does not meet the criteria specified in Management Directive and Handbook 10.44, and the "Recommendations Based on Review of Resident Inspector Program Relocation Incentive Algorithm," approved by the Executive Director for Operations September 23, 2005. I  do  do not agree with the amount recommended. I approve an alternate payment amount of \_\_\_\_\_ based on HR's evaluation. I  approve  disapprove this request with any change noted.

Approved:   
James F. McDermott, Director  
Office of Human Resources

Date: 6-30-07