



NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF AIR TRAFFIC SPECIALISTS

11303 Amherst Avenue, Suite 4
Wheaton, Maryland 20902

Phone: (301) 933-6228
Fax: (301) 933-3902

June 15, 2005

Ventris C. Gibson
Assistant Administrator for Human Resource Management
Federal Aviation Administration
800 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20591

Ventris
Dear Ms. Gibson:

I am in receipt of your May 25, 2005 letter responding to those issues and concerns raised by Scott Malon and I during our April 29, 2005 meeting with you. There are several issues that I could go back and ask again for clarification, but in the interest of moving forward and making you aware of new problems that have surfaced I will only reiterate one and then move on.

On April 6, 2005, during the NAATS National Membership Meeting, both Nancy Kalinowski and you stated repeatedly that, with regards to Lockheed Martin (LM), a 'job offer' was contingent upon an individual applying for the position. This interpretation was received without argument by both the NAATS and Agency leads on the RIF Negotiations Team. In short, LM is offering only those employees who have applied for a position the opportunity to be selected for employment. Therefore, an individual who has chosen not to apply for LM retains the entitlements of Career Transition hours as provided for in Section(s) 7 and 8 of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), dated April 1, 2005. This issue requires your immediate attention in that field management personnel are not complying with your stated direction.

During a Lockheed Martin visit last week an employee was given a form with his Social Security number on it. That employee had not given Lockheed Martin that information and when he asked where they had gotten it from, they provided no answer. It is our understanding that this is in violation of the Privacy Act. The agency has told our members that the only information given to Lockheed Martin on the ROFR list is their name, position title, series, pay band, facility location, and region. We demand an immediate investigation into this matter.

The following situations have been brought to my attention. Individually, they represent the lack of commitment by the level of management involved. Collectively, they show how pitifully little the Agency is committed to mitigating the separation of this dedicated and talented workforce. If you are personally aware of these events, I would ask you to clarify and explain the circumstances that would allow the agency to dismiss it's obligations towards our bargaining unit.

1. An individual applied for a job as a support specialist in Anchorage Center. This individual not only has Center experience, but Staff experience as well. He was told by an Alaskan Region HR specialist that he is, in fact, entitled to "preferred placement" and could probably not be passed over for selection. However, when Flight Service goes over to Lockheed Martin on October 4th, the individual's detailed assignment would end, as he/she would be separated from the agency. You see, the job was advertised as "not to exceed two years" and this person from HR felt that because Flight Service may be going away in the lower 48 this employee would have no place to go after the two years. Seeing the individual would have moved himself to Alaska and Alaska is staying federal, there should be no problem with the AFSS employee being sent to a facility in Alaska if the agency was making every reasonable effort to place people.
2. It appears that Orlando Tower (ORL Level 7) just picked up 3 center training failures. This, in the face of over 400 eligible and qualified candidates who just recently competed in the ATC-6/7/8 "mega bid", for only a few positions selected. Even though you stated in your letter that you were not aware of any terminal managers in Florida refusing to pick up Flight Service Controllers, doesn't this appear to be the case? Whatever the case, it shows a blatant disregard for the entitlements provided to our workforce within both agency orders and collective negotiated agreements.
3. When the NAATS Board of Directors met with the Administrator and you back on March 8, 2005, the Administrator eloquently spoke on the qualifications and skills of our employees, and that people should not "sell themselves short" when considering all types of positions, within and outside of Air Traffic. While Ms. Blakey's speech sounded heartfelt and good in theory, reality showed that when a couple of our FSDPS members applied for a NAS Specialist position, they were told "Your application did not indicate IT industry certification of A+/Net+ as required at Level III and above." Why am I bringing this up? Well, you and the Administrator seem to think these experienced employees can just slide over into any other job with their current experience. This is not the case, they need to have every opportunity to apply for Air Traffic positions, as this is where their experience lies. The other option is to retrain our members IAW EMP-1.22, what is being done in the retraining arena? Once again all agency directives state every reasonable effort should be made to place people

4. I had the pleasure of speaking to someone from Las Vegas TRACON last week. According to the FAA's staffing standard, the facility is in need of 15 people. A bid was advertised, with 33 Flight Service Controllers applying. Of these, 10 had radar experience and, if allowed, could have been selected if the list was allowed to stand. Here is a facility that used 900 hours of overtime in one month last year. These 10 ATCSs could have assisted in dramatically reducing this fiscal impact. Now, the overtime will apparently continue, in addition to the agency's commitment to severance pay for our ATCSs not selected for these positions. This not only violates all fiscal responsibility, but certainly gives a clear indication that the FAA truly shows no concern for the placement of our workforce.

In closing, there are fair opportunities out there for our people if the agency would stop in its efforts to guarantee a workforce for Lockheed Martin. This is certainly the appearance of our bargaining unit. A simple way to clarify this is to provide the numbers of employees given jobs so far broken down in percentages, management and staff as one and bargaining unit as the other. If this is not the case, please enlighten me.

Sincerely,



Kathleen A. Breen
President

CC: NAATS Board of Directors
Marion Blakey
James H. Washington