



Society of Professionals, Scientists, and Engineers, Affiliated with University Professional and Technical Employees (UPTE), Communications Workers of America (CWA) Local 9119, AFL-CIO
Kurt Glaesemann, President ♦ Jayne Tonowski, President-elect

SENTINEL

News For LLNL
Professionals, Scientists, and Engineers

Page 1

Special RFP Edition

DOE Labs Up For Bid

By Manny Trujillo (LANL) and Jeff Colvin (LLNL)

The Congress included a provision in the FY04 Appropriations bill that requires the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) to put up for bid all three Laboratories currently managed for DOE by the University of California (UC) when the current contracts expire. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) and Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) are up for competitive bidding this year, while Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) received a two-year extension until 2007.

The focus of SPSE and University Professional and Technical Employees (UPTE) lobbying activity over the past year has been to make sure language was put into the Requests for Proposal (RFP) that would protect employee pay, benefits, rights, and the working conditions we currently enjoy as UC employees. You can see the details in our Fact Sheet on the SPSE website, www.spse.org (click on Issues/Activities).

Meanwhile, disaster struck LANL at the worst possible time. Two classified computer discs allegedly turned up missing last summer, and a laser accident happened, seriously injuring a student. The LANL Director ordered the shutdown of all work at LANL, and 23 people were originally suspended over the missing discs case. The FBI was called in to investigate, and employee morale hit an all-time low. LANL was on complete or partial shutdown status for several months. One result is that a number of Work for Others contracts have been canceled, and some DOE programmatic money is being redirected elsewhere.

To make matters worse, LANL Director Pete Nanos, as part of LANL's plan for resumption of work at LANL, ordered that managers conduct an assessment of employee "competence and commitment." Each manager and supervisor has conducted interviews with all his or her employees in order to make this assessment. UPTE did not oppose the assessment process, but did insist that it be fair and objective. UPTE's concern was that, without strict guidelines and controls in place, managers would abuse their authority in this assessment process to get rid of employees they do not like. This is not an unjustified fear, since there remains a highly poisonous work environment at LANL.

Why should UC employees at LLNL be concerned with what happens to LANL? The answer to this is simple. Whatever happens to LANL in the competitive bidding process will set the template for what happens with LLNL. If UC competes for LANL and loses they may decide not to compete for LLNL in two years. Alternatively, they may decide not to compete for LANL, and thereby clear the way for a new Contractor to come in under conditions in which employee rights and benefits are seriously eroded. This is the time when employees at both Labs need to come together in solidarity to stand up for the preservation of the rights and benefits we currently enjoy as UC employees.

The Draft RFP

Both the draft and the final RFP for LBNL has already been issued, and the deadline for bidders to submit proposals was February 9. The draft RFP for LANL has also been issued, and the comment period expired on March 4. The good news is that many of the provisions we called for did indeed make it into the draft RFP. The bad news is that several others did not. Concern has focused on what has looked like a threat of a corporate raid on the UC pension fund. Where we called for a successor pension plan that would be "substantially equivalent" to UC's, the draft RFP simply specified that it should be "comparable" to industry standard, which, it turns out, is much less than what UC offers.

continued next page

Response by UPTE to draft RFP at LANL

UPTE members worked with legal consultants to write a response to the draft RFP. The union emphasized these three concerns:

- (1) Serious deficiencies in the proposed Evaluation Criteria that would undermine the Laboratory's long-standing science and technology leadership. This includes evaluating prospective Contractors on their past performance over only 5 years instead of 20 years.
- (2) The need for maintenance of salary and benefit levels. The Lab's mission, UPTE noted, will be preserved only "though the hiring and retention of top-rate scientists and technical staff. The connection between employee salary, pensions and other benefits in recruitment and retention of a highly skilled workforce" is critical.
- (3) The importance of recognition and preservation of UPTE-CWA Local 1663, the only independent employee organization at LANL, which has "played a crucial role in representing employees."

SPSE and UPTE have been hard at work to pressure DOE to change their language concerning the pension benefit. It seems they have heard us. In a recent OpEd piece in the Albuquerque Journal, the head of the contract bid process at DOE wrote that Lab employees should not worry; DOE's intention is to require any successor Contractor to provide a "substantially equivalent" pension plan, exactly the language we proposed. That's the good news. The bad news is that the current language of the RFP seems to allow the new Contractor, even if it is UC, to have a two-tier system, in which "carry-over" employees would still stay on a plan substantially equivalent to UCRP (but maybe only for 6 months!), but new employees could go on a different, much-less-generous, plan.

University of Texas Pulls Out of Los Alamos Bidding

Another big area of concern is the requirement in the draft RFP for LANL that any University bidder must partner with industry.

While the University of Texas has publicly announced that it will not bid to run the Los Alamos National Lab, rumors have begun to surface that UC is close to agreeing to a partnership with several private corporations to prepare its bid.

If there is such a partnership, it is unclear at this time who would actually be the employer and what would happen to the employees participating in the UC retirement fund. One of the private partners could become the employer, or the partnership could set up its own private umbrella corporation. The union's concern is that employees, all of whom are currently UC employees, will eventually be "divided up", with some working for UC and others working for one or another of the industrial partners. This kind of management arrangement can have an adverse impact on the quality of the science, as well as open the door to an eventual erosion of employee rights and benefits.

The University's last experiment with such a partnership occurred when it privatized the entire UC San Francisco hospital in a merger with Stanford. That venture ended in an unmitigated disaster for employees and the University.

During the transition, UC forced employees to resign their UC positions in order to be eligible for jobs with the new company. Many dedicated, long-term employees decided to leave. After 18 months, the enterprise collapsed and employees were funneled back to UC. Throughout the process, UPTE and other unions fought to save jobs, compensation and benefits. It took an act of Congress to restore UC employees' lost service credit.

UPTE Continues Its Lobbying

SPSE and UPTE continue to work ceaselessly to guarantee the best possible outcome for employees at all three Labs in this contract bidding process. Nothing less than our working lives and careers are at stake. UPTE members continue to press DOE to make the changes we want to the final RFP, and lobbied members of Congress on our issues. The UPTE members who attended the CWA Legislative Conference in Washington, D.C. earlier this month made numerous visits to individual members of Congress educating them about our issues and enlisted their support in the cause of protecting employee rights and benefits in the contract bid process. ■

Lobbying on Your Behalf in Washington D.C.

By Kurt Glaesemann, SPSE President

SPSE President Kurt Glaesemann attended the Communications Workers of America Legislative Conference March 6 – 8. The group representing the interests of LANL, LBNL, and LLNL employees included: Kurt Glaesemann, Manuel Trujillo (LANL Representative to UPTE), Susan Martin (LANL UPTE Member), Rodney Orr (UPTE System-wide Legislative Chair), Jelger Kalmijn (UPTE System-wide President), and Lindey Cloud (UPTE System-wide Treasurer). This group spent several days in Washington D.C. lobbying the Legislative branch about what the DOE is doing with the RFP process. A copy of the fact sheet is available on the UPTE web site: <http://www.upte.org/doefacts.htm>. The system-wide support that we received, made me proud of our affiliation with UPTE.

Offices talked to included both California Senators, twelve California members of Congress, one New Mexico Senator, two New Mexico members of Congress, and Congressman P. J. Visclosky (D - IN) who is the director of the Appropriations Committee. We were warmly welcomed at all the offices we visited and the legislative staff members kept copies of the fact sheet. The different offices political leanings aimed the conversation in different directions: increased cost of new contract, reduced workers rights, loss of knowledgeable employees, environmental protection, and security. By carefully directing the conversation, we were always able to reach agreement on at least one issue.

While in Washington, members met separately with Michael Telson PhD., the Director of National Laboratory Affairs, Federal Government Relations and Tyler Przybylek J.D. the chair of the Source Evaluation Board (SEB). The SEB is in charge of writing the RFP and then evaluating the resulting proposals and finally picking a winner.

Here are some of the highlights of the discussion with Przybylek. The SEB plans to announce the winner of the LANL contract on 30 July 2005 and to have the new contractor on board effective 1 Oct 2005. Employees transferring to new Contractor will be extended a 6-month window under University California Retirement Plan (UCRP) to decide whether or not to stay. Employees might become employees of the Partners (Sub-Contractors) after 6 months and see their benefits/pension package reduced. New employees' benefits would be less than current employees transferring to the new contractor would. Even if UC wins the contract, UC is expected to establish an independent Limited Liability Corporation (LLC) to manage the laboratory with its own pension plan. Przybylek mentioned that the UPTE letter on the draft RFP stirred much debate on the SEB, so SPSE can be proud of our influence on the process. ■

Regression In The RFP Process

By Bill O'Connell

The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Source Evaluation Board for the Los Alamos contract procurement has issued four white papers on February 18 on how they are proposing to amend the draft Request for Proposals. See <http://www.doeal.gov/LANLContractRecompete/DraftRFP.htm>. Comments were due March 4 and UPTE submitted comments together with the UPTE locals at LANL and LBNL.

How the LANL contract is structured by NNSA is a harbinger of how the LLNL contract will be handled two years later. The SEB stated it is interested in "leveling the playing field" for all potential bidders. The results have some ominous impacts on the employees. Some highlights of the SEB's latest thinking for the LANL contract are:

1. There will be no cap on liability for the winning Contractor. The SEB feels that the increased fee they are proposing compensates the Contractor for taking on additional liability. The proposed fee for the operation of LANL is doubled from that in the draft RFP, to 3% of the LANL budget. That makes it 7 times the current fee to UC. This certainly does not level the playing field between non-profit and for-profit potential Contractors. An uncapped liability is not feasible for a non-profit, especially a state university (be it Texas or California). It is all the more surprising because DOE ran a procurement process for management of the Idaho National Laboratory in 2004 which allowed a liability cap if the winner were to be a non-profit. The contract was awarded to Battelle Energy Alliance, a non-profit and a Limited Liability Corporation (LLC), wholly owned by Battelle Memorial Institute, also a non-profit. The liability cap is there in the new Idaho contract. Because the contract is with the LLC and not the main corporation (which has assets), the unlimited liability is largely meaningless.
2. Los Alamos will have a new site-specific pension plan, even if UC were to bid and win. University California Retirement Plan (UCRP) will definitely be gone for continuing employees. The final RFP, yet to be issued, will require the winning Contractor, even if it is UC, to establish a separate site-specific pension plan, distinct from any corporate or other pension plan, and a benefits package substantially equivalent to what current employees receive under the contract. By the way, if a new pension plan takes on the accrued pension liabilities and the assets adequate to fund them from UCRP, any present over funding in the UCRP attributable to the transferring LANL-UC employees will be taken back by DOE and passed through to the US Treasury.
3. The winning Contractor may establish a two-tier system of pension and other benefits, different for new staff hired after the transition. This has the potential to create divisions among the staff. The SEB's words are: "The Contractor shall exercise appropriate managerial judgment regarding the establishment of a new total compensation package for employees hired after the date the Contractor assumes responsibility for management and operation of the Laboratory." (I am not sure how this is consistent with point 2 above, or which takes precedence).
4. For all employees transferring from the predecessor Contractor to this [new] Contract, the Contractor shall provide a total compensation with respect to salaries, health/welfare benefits, pensions substantially equivalent to that provided by the predecessor Contractor as of the date the Contractor assumes responsibility for management and operation of the Laboratory. The Contractor shall maintain the base salaries of the transferring workforce.
5. The new Contractor will take in all continuing employees (except for current key management), if they agree to roll over their pension accruals to date to the new site-specific pension plan. If they do not agree, they do not have to be rehired. THIS IS COERCION. To lock in their status with UCRP, they would have to resign or retire. Then they could be hired on a case-by-case decision as a new employee.
6. The employment of current employees may not endure beyond a modest transition time. The SEB states "SEB proposes revising the Section H Workforce Transition clause (which requires the Contractor to offer employment to all employees except Senior Management) to specify that DOE expects the Contractor to subsequently exercise appropriate managerial judgment regarding employee retention and job assignments."
7. The employees' benefits package "benefits/value" cap at 1.05 times the averages of a comparator group stays in the new contract, and a corrective action plan is required. The SEB adds a time period for bringing benefits into line with national averages. Their words are: "When net benefit value and/or per capita cost exceed the comparator group by more than 5 percent, submit corrective action plans, when requested by the Contracting Officer, to achieve a net benefit value and per capita cost not to exceed the comparator group by more than 5 percent. The plan shall include a timeline as to when the Contractor can bring the benefits to within 5% of the

continued next column

continued next page

comparator group without impacting the substantially equivalent defined benefits for employees who transferred from the predecessor Contractor.” [Underlining in original] Thus DOE as steward of the taxpayers’ dollars limits the Labs’ base salaries to survey averages of other high-tech work, and now limits fringe benefits to averages also. For benefits cost, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (CoC) Annual Employee Benefits Cost Survey may be used, or other broad based national survey as approved by the DOE Contracting Officer. DOE has posted a benefits value survey comparison on the NNSA procurement web site for LANL. The survey used twenty major industrial corporations representing twenty different industries. Actually there may be a good business case for a higher-than-average benefits package. The NNSA is precluding the winning Contractor from trying to make such a case.

continued next column

8. Retired LANL employees health benefits will be addressed specifically. They will get them from the new Contractor, even if they are getting their pension from UCRP. The SEB’s words are: “Accordingly, the SEB will include language in the final RFP that will require the Contractor to provide LANL employees and retired LANL employees with health and welfare (including dental) benefits substantially equivalent to those in effect under the current contract. Substantial equivalency will be determined solely by the Contracting Officer, who will be advised by a Benefits Advisory Panel to be established by NNSA. An opportunity for input to the Contracting Officer from a representative group of retired LANL employees will be provided prior to the Contracting Officer’s determination.” ■

Problems with the Draft RFP Produce Responses and Comments

By D.B. Clarke

SPSE Executive Board members have been in touch with their colleagues at LBNL and Los Alamos over issues raised by the two draft Requests for Proposals for Contractors to manage and operate the two Laboratories. Clearly, decisions made in the process of finalizing the RFPs and the award of the contracts are likely to set precedents which will affect SPSE members here at LLNL.

Comments on Draft Request for Proposals

In particular, we are aware of two documents, which were sent to HQDOE as comments on the draft RFP for Los Alamos National Laboratory. The first, dated January 6, 2005 was signed by Manny Trujillo on behalf of UPTE’s local at LANL. This comment was addressed to Mr. Tyler Przybylek, Chairman Source Evaluation Board, USDOE. UPTE’s document expresses concerns of the employees at LANL regarding the draft RFP in three areas.

Serious Deficiencies in the Proposed Evaluation Criteria

The first concern to be addressed is “serious deficiencies in the proposed Evaluation Criteria” to be used by the Selection Board. UPTE is concerned that the deficiencies “will undermine the outcome of the contract competition.”

The UPTE comment expresses concern that “the current Evaluation Criteria would result in a decline in the Laboratory’s long-standing science and technology leadership.” The Evaluation Criteria use a scoring system in which such items as “Science and Technology Approach & Transition Plan,” “Laboratory Organization and Key Personnel,” and “Oral Presentation” (!) will be given a weighted point score and combined with other items reflecting past performance -- the last five years only! -- to determine a total score. They say that the draft RFP doesn’t properly weight the past performance of a Contractor in the science and technology area “The current draft RFP would allow a ‘slick presentation’ of a new approach to science and technology more than 4 times more weight than the past performance of a Contractor.” The UPTE comment suggests an improved scoring system that separates the business and operations area from science and technology.

The UPTE comment also highlights “an inappropriate statement of the goals of the solicitation and evaluation criterion.” In the evaluation DOE is to “give substantial weight to [b]alancing and integrating the performance

continued next page

of world-class science and technology with laboratory operations, business practices, and laboratory management.” UPTE’s comment urges using “the superior language (from an earlier DOE document) ‘integrating excellence in laboratory operations and business operations with the performance of world-class science and technology.’ This preferred language makes clear that strong science should not be balanced against and possibly weakened by improved laboratory and business operations. Instead, Laboratory operations and business practices should be improved without damaging world-class science and technology.”

Perhaps of more importance to SPSE members are two other areas of concern:

The “Need for maintenance of salary and benefit levels” And

“Draft RFP does not sufficiently protect the incumbent labor organization” -- meaning UPTE, Local 1663 CWA. They ask for specific language in the final RFP mentioning them by name and protecting their rights including (for example) access to workers and participation in the grievance/arbitration process. What exactly UPTE rights are or should be in relation to the applicable labor law is a topic for another time. They consider that they have a special position at present. Since drafting the RFP is partly a political process it may be that the best approach is to observe, “If you don’t ask for it, you won’t get it.”

The second item is really about issues with the pension benefits, as will be discussed below.

Coalition for LANL Excellence

We have also received a document from a group calling itself, “Coalition for LANL Excellence (CLE).” It is signed by Dr. Joseph S. Ladish, a retired LANL physicist. CLE is said to include representatives of LANL retiree groups, the Democratic and Republican parties of Los Alamos County, UPTE, and retired or active LANL employees as individuals. Dated January 21, 2005, most of the CLE document addresses issues and problems with the proposed pension benefits, and questions about handling the transition to a new Contractor if there is one.

Apparently in mid-January, 2005, a public meeting at LANL featured a question-and-answer session led by Tyler Przybylek and others from HQDOE. The comments in the document are pursuant to the questions answered at the meeting.

The draft RFP contains a paragraph which has created massive heartburn for many current and former Los Alamos employees.

“Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph (e), the Parties further agree to consider the desirability of covering pensioners, survivors, UCRP disability recipients, and terminated vested and non-vested members under a successor plan.”

It’s not hard to understand why we all would be upset that such a proposal was even being considered. The good news, it appears, is that CLE asserts that Tyler Przybylek agreed at the January 16th meeting in Los Alamos to remove the offending paragraph (H-37-(e)-2-iii) and asks “to be assured this paragraph will be removed.”

With that paragraph removed the status of the pensions for already retired employees will be clarified. They would continue as members of UCRP.

Allowing Employees to Freeze their UCRP Pension Benefits

The CLE document asks that all employees, with the exception of key management personnel, would “automatically become part of the workforce of the successor Contractor, regardless of whether they choose to freeze their UCRP pension benefits by terminating with UC and becoming inactive members of UCRP.”

If a new Contractor takes over the operation of the LANL, a current employee has three options: (1) *Retire*, if eligible, taking whatever UC pension they will get. (2) *Transfer* automatically to the new Contractor, accepting whatever pension benefits are provided by the new Contractor, or (3) *Terminate* from LANL just before the

continued next page

transition date, “freezing” their UC pension and then apply for a job at LANL with the new Contractor. If successful the third option would work pretty well -- but only if the new Contractor finds your skills, knowledge and ability satisfactory for their new operation. The CLE request would make the third option more attractive for every employee, not just for the valuable (and overwhelmingly white male) members of the technical staff. Appropriate transition rules for accrued vacation and sick leave would have to be developed.

Removal of the 105% Cap on Benefits

The CLE document calls for removal from draft RFP of “the 105% cap on overall benefits.” The cap originates in a process in which the Contractor in the first year of the contract would have to reduce their benefits (e.g. pension) so as to not exceed 105% of the levels derived from a Benefits-Value (Ben-Val) study. Such a study has been done for LANL and LLNL, using benefit data from twenty large industrial companies. No non-profits or universities were included.

The results of the study, available on the DOE web site, are not surprising, given the cost-cutting tendencies in today’s workplace. Our UC pension benefits are quite generous compared to industry. According to this report, UCRP provides 298% of the corporate average value in Defined Benefit pensions, and 166% of that provided by the top company included in the comparison. UC also provides postretirement health insurance significantly more valuable than the corporate average.

“This benefit cap phrase, perhaps more than any other item in the present draft of the RFP, could produce a widespread exodus of key personnel from the Laboratory and almost assuredly will make it difficult to attract and retain the ‘best and the brightest’ required to complete our mission. The UCRP benefits programs have been a major contributor to the recruitment and retention of a highly-qualified and respected staff who have devoted their lives to the safety and security of the nation and to the advancement of many technologies important to its growth, often at the expense of making their own scientific careers subordinate to the requirements of classification. We believe that a superior benefits package is vital to the continued recruitment and retention of such people.”

Taking the draft RFP at face value means that either UC or the new Contractor would be required to make large decreases in the pension benefits for their employees. Reminding DOE that the “UCRP has been particularly noteworthy in managing its assets without requiring excessive costs from DOE,” the document asks the DOE to consider limits on benefits based on the costs of providing them rather than considering the benefits themselves, if (as the document says) “any wording must be present regarding limits on the benefits.”

Possible Legal Challenge

As CLE says, present contract with UC states in H.008: Pension Plan

(f) Contract termination and selection of a successor Contractor

(4) DOE agrees to require that, in the event of a termination of work under the contract, a successor Contractor shall permanently maintain the benefit accrual terms and conditions of UCRP for the Contractor employees transferred to the successor Contractor insofar as UCRP is consistent with the provisions of applicable law.

CLE states, “We do not believe the cap is consistent with this statement in our present contract and could form a basis for a legal challenge to any contract awarded with this provision.”

Provide a 60 Day Window for Benefit Comparison

CLE requested a provision in the RFP providing a 60 day window during which present employees will be able to compare their present pension benefit under UCRP with the pension benefit that they would receive from the successor contract if they transferred directly over to the successor Contractor with their present pension benefit accrual under UCRP.

The CLE document also asks the DOE to “provide a statement within the RFP that will assure that substantially equivalent retiree healthcare will be continued under the successor contract.”

continued next page

Political Support for LANL Employees

E-mail from Betty Gunther and other at Los Alamos indicates that political support is developing for improvement in the RPF. If so, that is good news. In December, Senator Jeff Bingaman, (D - NM) released a statement saying in part, "... I am disappointed that the RFP does not make benefits and pension plans, as well as community support, part of what will be factored into who will win the next contract. I will express my concerns to DOE, and it's my hope that the final RFP will address these important issues."

Other comments have been made by Senator Domenici (R - NM) and Governor Richardson (D - NM), who stated, "My office will be watching closely to ensure that the Department's requirement that comparable salary and benefits be maintained under the terms of the new contract is maintained throughout the process." ■



Letter to the Editor about LANL RFP

It seems as if DOE (or NNSA) is intent on destroying the Los Alamos/Livermore Labs and forcing UC out of the contracts at all cost. Also, why is DOE getting away with treating the LBNL contract different - I have heard no mention of a stand-alone retirement plan for the LBNL contract; is not NNSA's justification for LANL/LLNL also applicable to LBNL?

I really hope SPSE takes a very hard look at this issue and DOE's underlying motives, which in my opinion is to get a "yes man" operator for the Labs - who will not be so independent as UC. And I fear that a less independent operator will be more likely to unquestioningly adopt DOE's bureaucratic approach to management as the way to manage the Labs and keep DOE happy. Unfortunately, future Lab employees will become no different from federal employees, and scientific freedom and the right to provide unbiased research or dissenting viewpoints a thing of the past.

No one in Congress seems to appreciate that these Labs were here long before DOE, and now DOE feels it has a right to do whatever it wants including damaging the internal fabric and relationship with UC that has made the Labs so successful. It's too bad LLNL was not transferred to the Department of Homeland Security or another agency that has a better appreciation for overseeing Federally Funded Research and Development Centers. ■

Did You Know? Stories Being Told At LANL

SPSE does endorse free speech and the power of numbers in getting a message across. SPSE has not reviewed and neither endorsed or not endorsed the LANL blog, we think it provides useful insight into LANL.

The following excerpts are taken from an uncensored LANL forum. <http://lanl-the-real-story.blogspot.com/>

"LANL Director George P. Nanos shut down the entire Laboratory in July, 2004, citing "egregious" security and safety violations. The results of the shutdown include a cost to the taxpayer of approximately \$850 million, an exodus of highly talented staff members, and the loss of untold millions of dollars of funding from customers who have taken their business elsewhere." From Anonymous

"I would like to correct one misconception presented in a previous comment: when you shout here, you are not shouting into the wind. You are shouting in front of an audience that now comprises approximately 26,000 visitors. Some of those visitors come from DOE. Some come from the US Senate. Some from the House of Representatives. Some come from the Office of the President of the University of California. Some sit on the 4th floor of the AD building. Some are reporters for the Associated Press, Physics Today, Nature, the Albuquerque Journal, the Oakland Tribune, and, yes, the Los Alamos Monitor. Starting to get the picture?" Name Withheld

Editor's note: The word blog comes from the removal of "we" from weblog, which might explain why most blogs are so self-centered. ■

JOIN SPSE

Membership is open to 100, 200, 300, 500 series employees:

To join SPSE, complete and return this form. The form below authorizes payment of \$25.00 per month dues to be paid by payroll deduction to SPSE. Be sure to sign on *6. If you do not wish to have automatic deduction do not fill out the * items and you will be billed quarterly.

Name (please print) _____ Employee Number _____

Job code _____ L-Code _____ Extension _____ E-mail _____

Home Address _____ Home Telephone _____

Signature _____ Date _____



**EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP
PAYROLL DEDUCTION AUTHORIZATION**
UPAY 669 (10/80)

**PLEASE
PRINT
OR
TYPE**

CAMPUS LLNL	LOC	EMPLOYEE I.D. *1 Must be entered	DATE *2
ACTION ON THIS FORM TO BECOME EFFECTIVE ON THE PAY PERIOD BEGINNING:			DATE ASAP
MONTHLY DEDUCTION			
LAST NAME, *3	FIRST, *3	MIDDLE INITIAL *3	ENROLL AMOUNT
DEPARTMENT EMPLOYED AT U.C. *4			REGULAR DUES RATE: \$25.00 X
TITLE AT U.C. *5			MAXIMUM DUES: \$25.00 per month
ORGANIZATION NAME (INCLUDING LOCAL NAME AND NUMBER) Society of Professionals, Scientists, and Engineers			TOTAL

I authorize The Regents of the University of California to withhold monthly or cease withholding from my earnings as an employee, membership dues, initiation fees and general assessments as indicated above.

I understand and agree to the arrangement whereby one total monthly deduction will be made by the University based upon the current rate of dues, initiation fees, and general assessments. I ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT CHANGES IN THE RATE OF DUES, INITIATION FEES AND GENERAL ASSESSMENTS MAY BE MADE AFTER NOTICE TO THAT EFFECT IS GIVEN TO THE UNIVERSITY BY THE ORGANIZATION TO WHICH SUCH AUTHORIZED DEDUCTIONS ARE ASSIGNED AND I HEREBY EXPRESSLY AGREE THAT PURSUANT TO SUCH NOTICE THE UNIVERSITY MAY WITHHOLD FROM MY EARNINGS AMOUNTS EITHER GREATER THAN OR LESS THAN THOSE SHOWN ABOVE WITHOUT OBLIGATION TO INFORM ME BEFORE DOING SO OR TO SEEK ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FROM ME FOR SUCH WITHHOLDINGS.

The University will remit the amount deducted to the official designated by the organization.

This authorization shall remain in effect until revoked by me - allowing up to 30 days time to change the payroll records in order to make effective this assignment or revocation thereof - or until another employee organization becomes my exclusive representative.

It is understood that this authorization shall become void in the event the employee organization's eligibility for payroll deduction terminates for any reason. Upon termination of my employment with the University, this authorization will no longer be in effect.

This authorization does not include dues, initiation fees and general assessments to cover any time prior to the payroll period in which the initial deduction is made.

Payroll deductions, including those legally required and those authorized by an employee are assigned priorities. In the event there are insufficient earnings to cover all required and authorized deductions it is understood that deductions will be taken in the order assigned by the University and no adjustment will be made in a subsequent pay period for membership dues, initiation fees and general assessments.

EMPLOYEE SIGNATURE *6	DATE
--------------------------	------

FOR UNIVERSITY USE ONLY

TRAN CODE	EMPLOYEE ID NO.	DATE	ELEMENT NO.	BAL CD	AMOUNT
1 2 4	12	13 18	19 22	23	24 30
X1		MO DY YR	6	G
X1			6	G
X1			6	G

RETENTION: 1 YEAR AFTER INACTIVE - ACCOUNTING OFFICE