

# Affirmative Action Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement, and Retention of Persons with Disabilities

DOI U.S. Geological Survey - FY 2025

To capture agencies' affirmative action plan for persons with disabilities (PWD) and persons with targeted disabilities (PWTD), EEOC regulations (29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(e)) and MD-715 require agencies to describe how their affirmative action plan will improve the recruitment, hiring, advancement, and retention of applicants and employees with disabilities.

## Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

*EEOC regulations (29 CFR §1614.203(d)(7)) require agencies to establish specific numerical goals for increasing the participation of persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities in the federal government.*

1. Using the goal of 12% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce?  
If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD)

Answer: No

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD)

Answer: Yes

In FY2025, the percentage of PWD in the GS-11 to SES cluster was 8.02 Percent, which is below the established goal of 12 Percent.

\* For GS employees, please use two clusters: GS-1 to GS-10 and GS-11 to SES, as set forth in 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(7). For all other pay plans, please use the approximate grade clusters that are above or below GS-11 Step 1 in the Washington, DC metropolitan region.

2. Using the goal of 2% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce?  
If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD)

Answer: No

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

In FY2025, the percentage of PWTD in GS-11 to SES cluster was 1.52 Percent, which is below the established goal of 2 Percent.

| Grade Level Cluster<br>(GS or Alternate Pay Planb) | Total | Reportable<br>Disability Total | Reportable Disability<br>Percentage<br>(Numerical Goal<br>12 Percent) | Targeted Disability Total | Targeted Disability<br>Percentage<br>(Numerical Goal<br>2 Percent) |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Grades GS-11 to SES                                | 4280  | 347                            | 8.11                                                                  | 66                        | 1.54                                                               |
| Grades GS-1 to GS-10                               | 1336  | 213                            | 15.94                                                                 | 59                        | 4.42                                                               |

3. Describe how the agency has communicated the numerical goals to the hiring managers and/or recruiters.

The Office of Human Resources provides training to supervisors and managers on the various hiring authorities and flexibilities throughout the year, emphasizing the importance of managers' involvement in all aspects of hiring. This includes considering non-competitive hiring authorities to meet DOI's goals for increasing the participation of persons with disabilities and veterans in the federal government. As part of the USGS Supervisory Challenge, the initial supervisory training course for new supervisors offered three times a year, these hiring flexibilities are introduced, including best practices and dispelling myths regarding special appointment authorities to meet DOI's goals for increasing the participation of persons with disabilities and veterans in the federal government. As part of the USGS Supervisory Challenge, the initial supervisory training course for new supervisors offered three times a year, these hiring flexibilities are introduced, including best practices and dispelling these myths regarding special appointment authorities. We also have several resources and contacts to obtain qualified candidates. These resources comprise the Workforce Recruitment Program, State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies, disability offices at local colleges and universities, VA Vocational & Rehabilitation Employment Coordinators, and more. Additionally, as part of the pre-recruitment consultation, HR and the hiring manager collaborate on the recruitment process to discuss various hiring avenues and tools for competitive hiring authorities and their benefits, advancing the goals of hiring people with disabilities and veterans.

## Section II: Model Disability Program

*Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(1), agencies must ensure sufficient staff, training and resources to recruit and hire persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities, administer the reasonable accommodation program and special emphasis program, and oversee any other disability hiring and advancement program the agency has in place.*

### A. PLAN TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT & COMPETENT STAFFING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

1. Has the agency designated sufficient qualified personnel to implement its disability program during the reporting period? If "no", describe the agency's plan to improve the staffing for the upcoming year.

Answer: Yes

2. Identify all staff responsible for implementing the agency's disability employment program by the office, staff employment status, and responsible official.

| Disability Program Task                                                                        | Total Full Time | Total Part Time | Total Collateral Duty | Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees                     | 4               | 0               | 0                     | Cathleen Smith, Chief ER, LR, Benefits, Office of Human Resources, cmsmith@usgs.gov |
| Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD                                                      | 0               | 0               | 0                     | Vacant                                                                              |
| Architectural Barriers Act Compliance                                                          | 1               | 0               | 0                     | Bethany Girardi Acting Chief, Office of Management Services bgirardi@usgs.gov       |
| Processing applications from PWD and PWTD                                                      | 1               | 0               | 0                     | Audrey Audrey Tsujita Office of Human Resources, Staff/Class atsujita@usgs.gov      |
| Section 508 Compliance                                                                         | 0               | 0               | 1                     | Sharma Siddhartha, 508 Coordinator siddhartha_sharma@ios.doi.gov                    |
| Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account | 1               | 0               | 0                     | Audrey Tsujita, Staff/Class, Office of Human Resources, atsujita@usgs.gov           |

3. Has the agency provided disability program staff with sufficient training to carry out their responsibilities during the reporting period? If "yes", describe the training that disability program staff have received. If "no", describe the training planned for the upcoming year.

Answer: Yes

The Office of Human Resources staff members participate in annual refresher training for various hiring authorities for veterans. The staff also attends different OPM/DOI-sponsored events centered on hiring veterans and individuals with disabilities. For example, each year, when the list of candidates is released for the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP), the Human Resources staff receives training on this recruitment and referral program to support the hiring of college students and recent graduates with disabilities. As part of the training, this includes a demonstration on how to search the WRP database to find qualified candidates, an overview of the Schedule A hiring authorities for individuals with disabilities, and roles and responsibilities in advising on the use of this program to enhance the hiring of veterans and individuals with disabilities. These sessions are valuable in providing advisory services to our customers regarding these different hiring authorities for veterans and individuals with disabilities.

### B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

Has the agency provided sufficient funding and other resources to successfully implement the disability program during the reporting period? If "no", describe the agency's plan to ensure all aspects of the disability program have sufficient funding and other resources.

Answer: Yes

## **Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program**

## Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

*Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(i) and (ii), agencies must establish a plan to increase the recruitment and hiring of individuals with disabilities. The questions below are designed to identify outcomes of the agency's recruitment program plan for PWD and PWTD.*

### A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

1. Describe the programs and resources the agency uses to identify job applicants with disabilities, including individuals with targeted disabilities.

USGS utilizes special hiring authorities to hire and recruit applicants with disabilities, include Schedule A hiring authority for people with disabilities, Veterans Recruitment Appointments (VRA); and 30 Percent or More Disabled Veterans Authority. Job announcements posted on USAJOBS.gov are advertised and promote applicants with disabilities to open through non-competitive hiring authorities and provide application instructions to receive consideration under these hiring authorities. All our job announcements include information on reasonable accommodations and how to request if you need assistance in applying. USGS also has a designated Selective Placement Program Coordinator who assists individuals with disabilities on the application process, recruitment and hiring. Both Human Resources and our hiring managers have established partnerships with Vocational Rehabilitation Services, Veteran and Disability Organizations. These partnerships help to identify qualified candidates.

2. Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(a)(3), describe the agency's use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A) to recruit PWD and PWTD for positions in the permanent workforce.

The Office of Human Resources collaborates with hiring managers to discuss the different hiring authorities available, including Schedule A and veteran hiring authorities, to support the hiring of veterans and individuals with disabilities. As part of the pre-recruitment consultation, Human Resources also advises on various options for recruiting and reaching candidates eligible under these non-competitive appointing authorities. Additionally, USGS considers non-competitive applicants for Merit Promotion announcements, and the hiring manager has the flexibility to include them in Delegated Examining announcements. When non-competitive candidates apply, they are referred on a non-competitive certificate, and hiring managers receive additional information on utilizing these non-competitive hiring authorities.

3. When individuals apply for a position under a hiring authority that takes disability into account (e.g., Schedule A), explain how the agency (1) determines if the individual is eligible for appointment under such authority; and, (2) forwards the individual's application to the relevant hiring officials with an explanation of how and when the individual may be appointed.

The applications are reviewed against OPM basic qualifications. If an applicant meets the minimum qualification requirements and provides supporting documentation, such as a Schedule A letter, the applicant is referred on a non-competitive certificate. The HR specialist uses these opportunities to educate our managers on special hiring flexibilities.

4. Has the agency provided training to all hiring managers on the use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A)? If "yes", describe the type(s) of training and frequency. If "no", describe the agency's plan to provide this training.

Answer: Yes

The Office of Human Resources actively provides training for supervisors and managers on Schedule A and veteran hiring authorities. These training sessions aim to enhance awareness and understanding of these special hiring authorities. The training is delivered in various formats, including webinars, individual consultations, and our Human Capital SharePoint site, which contains information on each of the hiring pathways and the benefits for the hiring manager. Additionally, as part of the USGS Supervisor Challenge, the HR office conducts refresher sessions for supervisors who have completed the program to reinforce these concepts, as well as hiring authorities and flexibility. These refresher courses are offered several times a year.

### B. PLAN TO ESTABLISH CONTACTS WITH DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Describe the agency's efforts to establish and maintain contacts with organizations that assist PWD, including PWTD, in securing and maintaining employment.

The Office of Human Resources, along with many hiring officials, has established and maintained relationships with VA Employment Coordinators, local veteran and disability offices, and veteran and disability offices at nearby colleges. These connections have helped target veterans and individuals with disabilities. In many instances, before advertising job opportunities on USAJOBS, hiring managers reach out to these talent pools to find eligible candidates, resulting in faster hires. The Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) is also a valuable resource and is frequently utilized by hiring managers to recruit and hire students and recent graduates. The USGS also has several recruiters within our science centers who assist the program during informational interviews, which helps promote the program and hiring authority throughout the organization.

**C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)**

1. Using the goals of 12% for PWD and 2% for PWTD as the benchmarks, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires in the permanent workforce? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) below.

a. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWD) Answer: No

b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD) Answer: No

| New Hires                 | Total<br>(Number) | Reportable Disability<br>Permanent<br>Workforce<br>(Percentage) | Reportable Disability<br>Temporary<br>Workforce<br>(Percentage) | Targeted Disability<br>Permanent Workforce<br>(Percentage) | Targeted Disability<br>Temporary<br>Workforce<br>(Percentage) |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| % of Total Applicants     | 0                 | 0.00                                                            | 0.00                                                            | 0.00                                                       | 0.00                                                          |
| % of Qualified Applicants | 0                 | 0.00                                                            | 0.00                                                            | 0.00                                                       | 0.00                                                          |
| % of New Hires            | 473               | 9.94                                                            | 2.75                                                            | 2.54                                                       | 0.00                                                          |

2. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If "yes", please describe the triggers below. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer: Yes

b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer: Yes

Compared to established benchmarks, a trigger was identified for PWD in the following Mission Critical Occupations for FY2025: 0404 Biological Science Technician (0.00 Percent), 0408 Ecology (0.00 Percent), 0482 Fish Biology (0.00 Percent), 0486 Wildlife Biology (0.00 Percent), 1320 Chemistry (0.00 Percent), 1370 Cartography (0.00 Percent) and 1399 Physical Science Student Trainee (0.00 Percent).

Compared to established benchmarks, a trigger was identified for PWTD in the following Mission Critical Occupations for FY2025: 0150 Geography (0.00 Percent), 0301 Miscellaneous Administration & Program (0.00 Percent), 0303 Miscellaneous Clerk & Assistant (0.00 Percent) 0404 Biological Science Technician (0.00 Percent), 0408 Ecology (0.00 Percent), 0482 Fish Biology (0.00 Percent), 0486 Wildlife Biology (0.00 Percent), 1311 Physical Science Technician (0.00 Percent), 1313 Geography (0.00 Percent), 1320 Chemistry (0.00 Percent), 1370 Cartography (0.00 Percent) and 1399 Physical Science Student Trainee (0.00 Percent).

| New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations     | Total<br>(Number) | Reportable Disability<br>New Hires<br>(Percentage) | Targetable Disability<br>New Hires<br>(Percentage) |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Numerical Goal</b>                         | --                | 12%                                                | 2%                                                 |
| 0150 GEOGRAPHY                                | 7                 | 28.57                                              | 0.00                                               |
| 0301 MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM | 2                 | 50.00                                              | 0.00                                               |
| 0303 MISCELLANEOUS CLERK AND ASSISTANT        | 17                | 17.65                                              | 0.00                                               |
| 0343 MANAGEMENT AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS          | 12                | 75.00                                              | 16.67                                              |
| 0401 GEN NATURAL RESOURCES MGMT& BIO SCIENCES | 21                | 19.05                                              | 4.76                                               |
| 0408 ECOLOGY                                  | 5                 | 0.00                                               | 0.00                                               |
| 0482 FISH BIOLOGY                             | 1                 | 0.00                                               | 0.00                                               |
| 0486 WILDLIFE BIOLOGY                         | 1                 | 0.00                                               | 0.00                                               |
| 1301 GENERAL PHYSICAL SCIENCE                 | 52                | 7.69                                               | 3.85                                               |
| 1311 PHYSICAL SCIENCE TECHNICIAN              | 13                | 15.38                                              | 0.00                                               |
| 1313 GEOPHYSICS                               | 14                | 7.14                                               | 0.00                                               |
| 1315 HYDROLOGY                                | 20                | 15.00                                              | 5.00                                               |
| 1316 HYDROLOGIC TECHNICIAN                    | 82                | 12.20                                              | 3.66                                               |
| 1320 CHEMISTRY                                | 5                 | 0.00                                               | 0.00                                               |
| 1350 GEOLOGY                                  | 26                | 11.54                                              | 3.85                                               |
| 1399 STUDENT TRAINEE- PHYSICAL SCIENCE        | 10                | 0.00                                               | 0.00                                               |
| 2210 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT        | 19                | 26.32                                              | 10.53                                              |

3. Using the relevant applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the qualified internal applicants for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If "yes", please describe the triggers below. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD)

Answer: Yes

b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

Using the relevant applicant pool as the benchmark, triggers were identified for PWD and PWTD across multiple MCO in FY2025. Although qualified internal applicants with disabilities were available, no selections of PWD or PWTD were made, resulting in a selection rate of 0.00 Percent for both groups in the following occupational series: 0150 Geography, 0301 Miscellaneous Administration and Programs, 0303 Miscellaneous Clerk and Assistant, 0343 Management and Program Analysis, 0401 General Natural Resources Management and Biological Science, 0408 Ecology, 0482 Fish Biology, 0486 Wildlife Biology, 1301 General Physical Science, 1311 Physical Science Technician, 1313 Geophysics, 1320 Chemistry, 1350 Geology, 1370 Cartography, and 1399 Physical Science Student Trainee.

A trigger identified for PWTD in the 1316 Hydrologic Technician occupational series, as no PWTD selections were made, resulting in a selection rate of 0.00 Percent. No trigger was identified for PWD in this series, as PWD selection rate was 100 Percent and met or exceeded availability. Accordingly, no barrier was identified for PWTD in this occupation. In the 2210 Information Technology Management occupational series, no trigger was identified for PWTD, as the selection rate of 11.11 Percent met availability. A trigger identified for PWD (11.11 Percent 22.76 Percent) in this series was identified.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among employees promoted to any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If "yes", please describe the triggers below. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your

agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Promotions for MCO (PWD)

Answer: No

b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD)

Answer: No

## Section V: Plan to Ensure Advancement Opportunities for Employees with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(iii), agencies are required to provide sufficient advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities. Such activities might include specialized training and mentoring programs, career development opportunities, awards programs, promotions, and similar programs that address advancement. In this section, agencies should identify, and provide data on programs designed to ensure advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities.

### A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

Describe the agency's plan to ensure PWD, including PWTD, have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

Consistent with the Department of the Interior requirement, all USGS employees to complete an Individual Development Plan with their supervisor, which is used to identify training needs necessary to be successful in their current position, and in possible future advancement opportunities. Our merit promotion plan also promotes internal advancement opportunities for PWD and disabled veterans, through various non-competitive hiring authorities. In addition, many occupations within USGS have established career ladders requiring on the job and classroom training as well as mentoring to ensure success and opportunity for advancement.

### B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

- Please describe the career development opportunities that the agency provides to its employees.

Leadership Intensive  
Leadership 101  
Leadership 201  
Mentoring Program  
Supervisory Challenge

- In the table below, please provide the data for career development opportunities that require competition and/or supervisory recommendation/approval to participate.

| Career Development Opportunities  | Total Participants Applicants (Percentage) | Total Participants Selectees (Percentage) | PWD Applicants (Percentage) | PWD Selectees (Percentage) | PWTD Applicants (Percentage) | PWTD Selectees (Percentage) |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Mentoring Programs                | 0                                          | 78                                        | 0                           | 4.68                       | 0                            | 1.56                        |
| Training Programs                 | 0                                          | 139                                       | 0                           | 21                         | 0                            | 1.43                        |
| Internship Programs               | 0                                          | 0                                         | 0                           | 0                          | 0                            | 0                           |
| Fellowship Programs               | 0                                          | 0                                         | 0                           | 0                          | 0                            | 0                           |
| Coaching Programs                 | 0                                          | 0                                         | 0                           | 0                          | 0                            | 0                           |
| Detail Programs                   | 0                                          | 0                                         | 0                           | 0                          | 0                            | 0                           |
| Other Career Development Programs | 0                                          | 0                                         | 0                           | 0                          | 0                            | 0                           |

- Do triggers exist for PWD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Applicants (PWD)

Answer: No

b. Selections (PWD)

Answer: No

Triggers for PWD and PWTD in Career Development programs could not be determined for this reporting period because applicant status data was not collected.

Triggers for PWD/PWTD among selectees could not be determined for this reporting period because applicant data identifying were not collected. As a result, USGS was unable to establish the relevant applicant pool or compare the representation of PWD/PWTD applicants to those selected for career development opportunities.

4. Do triggers exist for PWD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Applicants (PWTD)

Answer: No

b. Selections (PWTD)

Answer: No

Triggers for PWD and PWTD in Career Development programs could not be determined for this reporting period because applicant status data was not collected.

Triggers for PWD/PWTD among selectees could not be determined for this reporting period because applicant data identifying were not collected. As a result, USGS was unable to establish the relevant applicant pool or compare the representation of PWD/PWTD applicants to those selected for career development opportunities.

## C. AWARDS

1. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for any level of the time-off awards, bonuses, or other incentives? If "yes", please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD)

Answer: Yes

b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

A trigger was identified for PWD in the distribution of time-off awards (11-20 hours). The participation rate for PWD in this award category was 8.37 Percent, which is below the PWD workforce participation rate of 11.55 Percent. This disparity suggests that employees with disabilities may be underrepresented among recipients of time-off awards within this range and warrants additional review to determine whether barriers or other factors may be influencing award distribution. A trigger was also identified for PWD in several cash award categories. The participation rates for PWD were 10.57 Percent for awards of \$2000-\$2999, 7.57 Percent for \$3000-\$3999, 8.52 Percent for \$4000-\$4999, and 7.81 Percent for awards of \$5000 or more. Each of these rates is below the PWD workforce participation rate of 11.55 Percent, indicating potential underrepresentation of PWD in higher-value categories. These disparities will be reviewed to determine whether barriers or other factors may be affecting equitable distribution of awards.

Triggers were observed for PWTD in the distribution of time-off awards, with participation rates of 2.38 Percent for awards of 1-10 hours, 1.90 Percent for 31-40 hours, and 0 Percent for 41 or more hours. Requires review to determine if barriers are affecting equitable distribution of awards. A trigger was also identified for PWTD in several higher-value cash award categories. The participation rates for PWTD were 1.63 Percent for awards of \$3,000- \$3,999, 1.42 Percent for \$4,000-\$4,999, and 1.56 Percent for \$5,000 or more. Each of these rates falls below the PWTD workforce participation rate of 2.71 Percent, indicating potential underrepresentation of PWTD in these award categories.

| <b>Time-Off Awards</b>                          | <b>Total<br/>(Number)</b> | <b>Reportable<br/>Disability<br/>(Percentage)</b> | <b>Without<br/>Reportable<br/>Disability<br/>(Percentage)</b> | <b>Targeted Disability<br/>(Percentage)</b> | <b>Without Targeted<br/>Disability<br/>(Percentage)</b> |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given      | 294.00                    | 13.27                                             | 86.73                                                         | 2.38                                        | 97.62                                                   |
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours       | 2279.00                   | 13.43                                             | 86.57                                                         | 1.93                                        | 98.07                                                   |
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours     | 7.75                      | 7.85                                              | 7.74                                                          | 6.29                                        | 7.79                                                    |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given     | 203.00                    | 8.37                                              | 91.63                                                         | 2.96                                        | 97.04                                                   |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours      | 3363.00                   | 7.82                                              | 92.18                                                         | 2.71                                        | 97.29                                                   |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours    | 16.57                     | 15.47                                             | 16.67                                                         | 15.17                                       | 16.61                                                   |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given     | 185.00                    | 13.51                                             | 86.49                                                         | 3.24                                        | 96.76                                                   |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours      | 4580.00                   | 13.91                                             | 86.09                                                         | 3.14                                        | 96.86                                                   |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours    | 24.76                     | 25.48                                             | 24.64                                                         | 24.00                                       | 24.78                                                   |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given     | 369.00                    | 13.55                                             | 86.45                                                         | 1.90                                        | 98.10                                                   |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours      | 13994.00                  | 13.46                                             | 86.54                                                         | 1.89                                        | 98.11                                                   |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours    | 37.92                     | 37.66                                             | 37.97                                                         | 37.71                                       | 37.93                                                   |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given  | 0.00                      | 0.00                                              | 0.00                                                          | 0.00                                        | 0.00                                                    |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours   | 0.00                      | 0.00                                              | 0.00                                                          | 0.00                                        | 0.00                                                    |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours | 0.00                      | 0.00                                              | 0.00                                                          | 0.00                                        | 0.00                                                    |

| Cash Awards                                     | Total<br>(Number) | Reportable<br>Disability<br>(Percentage) | Without<br>Reportable<br>Disability<br>(Percentage) | Targeted Disability<br>(Percentage) | Without Targeted<br>Disability<br>(Percentage) |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Cash Awards \$500 and Under:<br>Awards Given    | 2084.00           | 12.57                                    | 87.43                                               | 2.78                                | 97.22                                          |
| Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Total<br>Amount    | 825027.00         | 12.34                                    | 87.66                                               | 2.72                                | 97.28                                          |
| Cash Awards \$500 and Under:<br>Average Amount  | 395.89            | 388.66                                   | 396.93                                              | 386.24                              | 396.16                                         |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Awards<br>Given     | 800.00            | 12.25                                    | 87.75                                               | 3.63                                | 96.38                                          |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total<br>Amount     | 599370.00         | 12.50                                    | 87.50                                               | 3.59                                | 96.41                                          |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average<br>Amount   | 749.21            | 764.31                                   | 747.11                                              | 741.59                              | 749.50                                         |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999:<br>Awards Given   | 2293.00           | 12.82                                    | 87.18                                               | 3.36                                | 96.64                                          |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total<br>Amount   | 3113094.00        | 13.20                                    | 86.80                                               | 3.30                                | 96.70                                          |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999:<br>Average Amount | 1357.65           | 1397.55                                  | 1351.78                                             | 1335.66                             | 1358.42                                        |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999:<br>Awards Given   | 1589.00           | 10.57                                    | 89.43                                               | 2.96                                | 97.04                                          |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total<br>Amount   | 3818167.00        | 10.61                                    | 89.39                                               | 2.98                                | 97.02                                          |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999:<br>Average Amount | 2402.87           | 2410.56                                  | 2401.97                                             | 2423.68                             | 2402.24                                        |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999:<br>Awards Given   | 859.00            | 7.57                                     | 92.43                                               | 1.63                                | 98.37                                          |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total<br>Amount   | 2891286.00        | 7.84                                     | 92.17                                               | 1.71                                | 98.29                                          |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999:<br>Average Amount | 3365.87           | 3485.11                                  | 3356.11                                             | 3534.93                             | 3363.07                                        |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999:<br>Awards Given   | 493.00            | 8.52                                     | 91.48                                               | 1.42                                | 98.58                                          |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total<br>Amount   | 2191461.00        | 8.63                                     | 91.37                                               | 1.49                                | 98.51                                          |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999:<br>Average Amount | 4445.15           | 4505.40                                  | 4439.54                                             | 4671.14                             | 4441.90                                        |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more:<br>Awards Given    | 768.00            | 7.81                                     | 92.19                                               | 1.56                                | 98.44                                          |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total<br>Amount    | 5732730.00        | 7.78                                     | 92.22                                               | 2.24                                | 97.76                                          |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more:<br>Average Amount  | 7464.49           | 7432.67                                  | 7467.19                                             | 10702.92                            | 7413.09                                        |

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTB for quality step increases or performance-based pay increases? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) below.

a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTB)

Answer: Yes

b. Pay Increases (PWTB)

Answer: Yes

A trigger was identified for PWD in the distribution of step increases and performance-based pay awards. The participation rate for PWD receiving step increases was 9.76 Percent, and performance-based pay was 1.85 Percent, both of which are below the PWD workforce participation rate of 11.55 Percent. These disparities suggest potential underrepresentation of PWD in these award categories and warrant further review to determine whether barriers or other factors may be affecting equitable access to recognition and warrant further review to determine whether barriers or other factors may be affecting equitable access to recognition and compensation opportunities.

A trigger was identified for PWTD in the distribution of step increases and performance-based pay awards. The participation rate for PWTD receiving step increases was 1.76 Percent, and for performance-based pay was 0 Percent, both below the PWTD workforce participation rate of 2.71 Percent. These disparities indicate potential underrepresentation of PWTD in these award categories and warrant further review to assess whether barriers or other factors are affecting equitable access to recognition and compensation opportunities.

| Other Awards                                     | Total<br>(Number) | Reportable<br>Disability<br>(Percentage) | Without<br>Reportable<br>Disability<br>(Percentage) | Targeted Disability<br>(Percentage) | Without Targeted<br>Disability<br>(Percentage) |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Total Performance Based Pay Increases<br>Awarded | 54.00             | 1.85                                     | 98.15                                               | 0.00                                | 100.00                                         |

3. If the agency has other types of employee recognition programs, are PWD and/or PWTD recognized disproportionately less than employees without disabilities? (The appropriate benchmark is the inclusion rate.) If "yes", describe the employee recognition program and relevant data in the text box.

a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD)

Answer: N/A

b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD)

Answer: N/A

## D. PROMOTIONS

1. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. SES

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)

Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

b. Grade GS-15

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)

Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

c. Grade GS-14

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)

Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)

Answer: No

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)

Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

aii. No internal selection (0 Percent) , therefore RAP rate for PWD reflects a trigger 0 Percent < 5.14 Percent.

1bii. The PWD selection rate is 2.41 Percent above the PWD Relevant Applicant Pool (RAP) rate there is no trigger.

1cii. A trigger was identified for PWD in GS-14 internal selections. The participation rate for PWD was 4.35 Percent, which is below the relevant applicant pool (RAP) rate of 7.86 Percent, resulting in a difference of 3.51 Percent.

1dii. A trigger was identified for PWD in GS-13 internal selections. The participation rate for PWD was 10 Percent, which is below the RAP rate of 11.07 Percent, resulting in a difference of 1.07 Percent.

2. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

## a. SES

- |                                         |             |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer: No  |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)          | Answer: Yes |

## b. Grade GS-15

- |                                         |             |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer: No  |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)          | Answer: Yes |

## c. Grade GS-14

- |                                         |            |
|-----------------------------------------|------------|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer: No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)          | Answer: No |

## d. Grade GS-13

- |                                         |            |
|-----------------------------------------|------------|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer: No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)          | Answer: No |

2a. A trigger was identified for PWTD in SES internal selections. The participation rate for PWTD was 0 Percent, which is 1.07 Percent below the RAP rate, resulting in a difference of 1.07 Percent.

2b. A trigger was identified for PWTD in GS-15 internal selections. The participation rate for PWTD was 0 Percent, which is 1.18 Percent below the RAP rate of 1.18 Percent, resulting in a disparity of 1.18 Percent

2c. The PWTD selection rate 2.80 Percent above the PWTD RAP rate, there is no trigger.

2d. A trigger was identified for PWTD in GS-13 internal selections. The participation rate for PWTD was 0 Percent, which is below the RAP rate of 2.58 Percent, resulting in a difference of 2.58 Percent.

3. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- |                             |             |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| a. New Hires to SES (PWD)   | Answer: No  |
| b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD) | Answer: No  |
| c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD) | Answer: No  |
| d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD) | Answer: Yes |

A trigger was identified for PWD in GS-13 new hires. The participation rate for PWD new hires was 7.14 Percent, which is 2.80 Percent below the RAP rate, resulting in a difference of 2.80 Percent.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- |                              |             |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| a. New Hires to SES (PWTD)   | Answer: No  |
| b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD) | Answer: Yes |
| c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD) | Answer: No  |
| d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD) | Answer: Yes |

4b. A trigger was identified for PWD in GS-15 new hires. The participation rate for PWD new hires was 0 Percent, which is below the 7.59 Percent RAP rate.

4d. GS-13 PWD new hires at 7.14 Percent, which is below the 11.07 Percent RAP rate.

5. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory

positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Executives

- |                                        |            |
|----------------------------------------|------------|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) | Answer: No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWD)          | Answer: No |

b. Managers

- |                                        |             |
|----------------------------------------|-------------|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) | Answer: No  |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWD)          | Answer: Yes |

c. Supervisors

- |                                        |             |
|----------------------------------------|-------------|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) | Answer: No  |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWD)          | Answer: Yes |

5bii. A trigger was identified with PWD managers at 4.35 Percent, which is below the RAP rate of 8.52 Percent.

5cii. A trigger was identified with PWD supervisors internal selections at 7.61 Percent, which is below the 8.52 Percent RAP rate.

6. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTB among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Executives

- |                                         |             |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) | Answer: No  |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTB)          | Answer: Yes |

b. Managers

- |                                         |            |
|-----------------------------------------|------------|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) | Answer: No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTB)          | Answer: No |

c. Supervisors

- |                                         |             |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) | Answer: No  |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTB)          | Answer: Yes |

aii. A trigger was identified with Executives PWTB at 0 Percent internal selections, which is below the 6.69 Percent RAP rate.

cii. A trigger was identified with PWTB supervisors' internal selection at 0 Percent, which is below the 5.10 Percent RAP rate.

7. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- |                                    |            |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| a. New Hires for Executives (PWD)  | Answer: No |
| b. New Hires for Managers (PWD)    | Answer: No |
| c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) | Answer: No |

8. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTB among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- |                                     |            |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD)  | Answer: No |
| b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD)    | Answer: No |
| c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) | Answer: No |

## Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To be model employer for persons with disabilities, agencies must have policies and programs in place to retain employees with disabilities. In this section, agencies should: (1) analyze workforce separation data to identify barriers retaining employees with disabilities; (2) describe efforts to ensure accessibility of technology and facilities; and (3) provide information on the reasonable accommodation program and workplace assistance services.

### A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

1. In this reporting period, did the agency convert all eligible Schedule A employees with a disability into the competitive service after two years of satisfactory service (5 C.F.R. § 213.3102(u)(6)(i))? If "no", please explain why the agency did not convert all eligible Schedule A employees.

Answer: No

The Federal regulations do not require conversion to the competitive service and that employees could stay on the excepted appointment indefinitely.

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without disabilities? If "yes", describe the trigger below.

a. Voluntary Separations (PWD)

Answer: Yes

b. Involuntary Separations (PWD)

Answer: Yes

At 1.20 Percent PWD employees separated voluntarily at about 20 Percent higher than their workforce representation, which may suggest a retention disparity and could warrant further barrier analysis.

PWD employees comprised 10.1 Percent of the workforce but accounted for 40 Percent of involuntary removals, resulting in an inclusion rate of 3.96. This significant over-representation suggests a potential barriers and warrants further review of disciplinary and removal practices.

| Separations                             | Total<br>(Number) | Reportable<br>Disabilities<br>(Percentage) | Without Reportable<br>Disabilities<br>(Percentage) |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force | 0                 | 0.00                                       | 0.00                                               |
| Permanent Workforce: Removal            | 21                | 1.34                                       | 0.20                                               |
| Permanent Workforce: Resignation        | 424               | 10.40                                      | 5.91                                               |
| Permanent Workforce: Retirement         | 293               | 3.12                                       | 4.54                                               |
| Permanent Workforce: Other Separations  | 756               | 26.89                                      | 9.60                                               |
| Permanent Workforce: Total Separations  | 1494              | 41.75                                      | 20.25                                              |

3. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWTD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without targeted disabilities? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Voluntary Separations (PWTD)

Answer: No

b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

PWTD employees represented 2.19 Percent of the workforce but accounted for 2.80 Percent of voluntary separations, resulting in an inclusion rate of 1.28. This indicates modest over-representation. Trends should be monitored to determine whether a barrier may exist.

PWTD employees comprised 2.19 Percent of the workforce but accounted for 12.0 Percent of involuntary removals, resulting in an inclusion rate of 5.48. This significant over-representation suggests a potential barrier and warrants further review of removal practices and decision-making processes.

| Separations                             | Total<br>(Number) | Targeted<br>Disabilities<br>(Percentage) | Without<br>Targeted Disabilities<br>(Percentage) |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force | 0                 | 0.00                                     | 0.00                                             |
| Permanent Workforce: Removal            | 21                | 1.37                                     | 0.29                                             |
| Permanent Workforce: Resignation        | 424               | 12.33                                    | 6.23                                             |
| Permanent Workforce: Retirement         | 293               | 4.11                                     | 4.40                                             |
| Permanent Workforce: Other Separations  | 756               | 31.51                                    | 10.89                                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Total Separations  | 1494              | 49.32                                    | 21.82                                            |

4. If a trigger exists involving the separation rate of PWD and/or PWTD, please explain why they left the agency using exit interview results and other data sources.

No triggers were identified within the exit survey reports.

## B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(4), federal agencies are required to inform applicants and employees of their rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 794(b)), concerning the accessibility of agency technology, and the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 4151-4157), concerning the accessibility of agency facilities. In addition, agencies are required to inform individuals where to file complaints if other agencies are responsible for a violation.

1. Please provide the internet address on the agency's public website for its notice explaining employees' and applicants' rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

<https://www.doi.gov/ocio/section508>

2. Please provide the internet address on the agency's public website for its notice explaining employees' and applicants' rights under the Architectural Barriers Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

<https://www.usgs.gov/accessibility>

3. Describe any programs, policies, or practices that the agency has undertaken, or plans on undertaking over the next fiscal year, designed to improve accessibility of agency facilities and/or technology.

Improve the level of accessible work produced by USGS employees by building leadership awareness and commitment. Our goal is to make ALL USGS content accessible, regardless of its recipient. Support USGS business objectives by providing tools that apply the highest level of cost-effective accessible work products available when embraced and accepted- Incorporate Information Architecture (science of identifying what users want to do in a document and organizing the functionally into a structure that users can understand, navigate, and use to complete the work) to become more responsive to employee needs.

## C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(3), agencies must adopt, post on their public website, and make available to all job applicants and employees, reasonable accommodation procedures.

1. Please provide the average time frame for processing initial requests for reasonable accommodations during the reporting period. (Please do not include previously approved requests with repetitive accommodations, such as interpreting services.)

89 days from initiation, engaging in the interactive process and final decision.

2. Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the agency's reasonable accommodation program. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests, timely providing approved accommodations, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring accommodation requests for trends.

RA procedures remain effective due to timely acknowledgement of requests, prompt implementation of interim accommodation, and regular communication with employees and supervisors. There is a dedicated RA inbox and responses to request occur within the same day. The

program continues to monitor trends, track requests, and provide guidance to supervisors. Employees and managers are educated on the RA process as outlined in PB 21-03 so that all parties understand the process.

#### **D. PERSONAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES ALLOWING EMPLOYEES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKPLACE**

Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(5), federal agencies, as an aspect of affirmative action, are required to provide personal assistance services (PAS) to employees who need them because of a targeted disability, unless doing so would impose an undue hardship on the agency.

1. Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the PAS requirement. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests for PAS, timely providing approved services, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring PAS requests for trends.

USGS provides interpretive services, personal assistants when needed in the workplace or outside the workplace, such as for travel.

## Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

### A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT

1. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging harassment, as compared to the governmentwide average?

Answer: No

2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging harassment based on disability status result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?

Answer: No

3. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

### B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

1. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging failure to provide a reasonable accommodation as compared to the government-wide average?

Answer: No

2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging failure to provide reasonable accommodation result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?

Answer: No

3. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination involving the failure to provide a reasonable accommodation during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

## Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

*Element D of MD-715 requires agencies to conduct a barrier analysis when a trigger suggests that a policy, procedure, or practice may be impeding the employment opportunities of a protected EEO group.*

1. Has the agency identified any barriers (policies, procedures, and/or practices) that affect employment opportunities for PWD and/or PWTD?

Answer: No

2. Has the agency established a plan to correct the barrier(s) involving PWD and/or PWTD?

Answer: N/A

3. Identify each trigger and plan to remove the barrier(s), including the identified barrier(s), objective(s), responsible official(s), planned activities, and, where applicable, accomplishments

4. Please explain the factor(s) that prevented the agency from timely completing any of the planned activities. Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.

N/A

5. For the planned activities that were completed, please describe the actual impact of those activities toward eliminating the barrier(s).

N/A

6. If the planned activities did not correct the trigger(s) and/or barrier(s), please describe how the agency intends to improve the plan for the next fiscal year.

N/A