

# Comment on NSPS Now! American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO

Comments on Proposed NSPS Regulations--RIN 3206-AK76/0790-AH82

Mail original to:

Program Executive Office  
National Security Personnel System, Attn: Bradley B. Bunn  
1400 Key Boulevard, Suite B-200, Arlington, VA 22209-5144

Mail a copy to:

AFGE Attn: MORE, 80 F Street, NW, Washington, DC 20001

FROM

Thomas A Anderson  
3423 S. WATER MILL RD  
MONTGOMERY AL 36116

General: I believe the proposed NSPS will undermine the Civil Service and hurt the mission of the DoD employees.

Subpart C Pay, Sections 9901.301 to 9901.373: The employees in DoD should continue to receive the same annual pay across-the-board adjustment that other GS/FWS workers receive.

The individual pay increases for performance should include guaranteed percentages in the regulations so that employees will understand the pay system and what their pay increase will be depending on their performance.

Subpart D Performance Management - 9901.401 to 9901.409: In order to insure fairness and accuracy, DoD employees should be able to appeal any performance rating to an independent grievance and arbitration process like they can do now.

Subpart F Workforce Shaping - 9901.6012 to 9901.611: DoD should not change the current layoff/RIF rules which give balanced credit to performance and the employees valuable years of committed service to DoD.

Subpart G Adverse Actions - 9901.701 to 9901.810: Due process and fairness demand that the independent body reviewing a major suspension as termination be allowed to alter the proposed penalty if they deem it to be unreasonable. The current standards approved by the courts to guide such bodies should continue to be used.

Subpart I Labor-Management Relations - 9901.901 to 9901.929: The labor management law that has governed the employees' right to organize and engage in collective bargaining has worked well since 1978. There is no compelling reason to take away most of the collective bargaining rights or grievance rights.

DoD should not create a "company dominated dispute board." Any dispute board must be "jointly selected" by management and the Union.

Sincerely,



P-0178

*Thomas A. Anderson*

Comments are due in Washington, DC on March 15.

**Add your comments below.**  
**American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO**

It appears to give "power" to management and as I see it almost no real benefit to employees. It ends fairness and any hope of due process in any adverse action by management. It leaves the DOD employee no real voice just bend over here it comes. Seniority means virtually nothing, long term dedication devoted to duty, responsibility is ended. The "new" employee can impress or "brown-nose" the boss to get ahead.

Note \* To be given 30 days to read, digest, or understand over 50 pages of hard to read, understand (unless you are a lawyer) is quite unacceptable. I fully believe if this is to be fair, we should (employees) should have this plan be fully explained, no hidden clauses, in short all of us need time a more reasonable time period to fully understand and be able to comment.

**Comments are due in Washington, DC on March 15.**