

## Message

**From:** Vizian, Donna [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=CB2401BF8D4F441DBF27F21E122BE2C5-VIZIAN, DONNA]  
**Sent:** Federal law prohibits disclosure / Ex. 3  
**To:** Federal law prohibits disclosure / Ex. 3  
**Subject:** Fwd: Concerns Re: Draft directive on working conditions for AFGE-represented employees

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Personal Security Detail / Ex. 6 @epa.gov>  
**Date:** July 3, 2019 at 1:46:58 PM EDT  
**To:** "Vizian, Donna" <Vizian.Donna@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Concerns Re: Draft directive on working conditions for AFGE-represented employees

Dear Ms. Vizian,

I have been informed that EPA Labor Employee Relations intends to forcibly impose overly restrictive working conditions on employees represented by the AFGE union, possibly as early as Monday. As the top career official within OMS, I implore you to reconsider this action and return to the table with AFGE to work out a true agreement using the processes and procedures that were intended to govern real collective bargaining agreement development.

As an EPA employee of more than 10 years, I have known EPA to be a place employees are proud to work. A place that prides itself on dedication to our mission to protect human health and the environment, and a place that strives to recognize and support work-life balance. And in return for that, you have in place a dedicated and loyal cadre of employees. Employees who take on increasingly heavy workloads as the responsibilities we have gain in both volume and gravity and the agency has fewer and fewer employees – because we believe protecting people and the environment are some of the most important issues we face. Employees who continue to work hard to advance that mission regardless of who is the head of the Executive Branch or what Congress or the courts impose. We stay and do the work that needs to be done.

You pay lip service to improving employee morale damaged by outside influences, but in the biggest, most crushing way, you are now trying to strip away both our ability to have a voice in our working conditions and our capacity to protect ourselves and our jobs from personal or politically-motivated damage. And this time it's from our own folks. Why? Do you not want to attract and retain good employees? Do you not want employees to participate in the development of workplace standards? This not who EPA is!

How would you feel if you were the one who needed to fight unfair and/or illegal workplace events harming you, yet no union representatives help you because they had no available time, or you couldn't find out who they were because of the restrictions on any forms of communication in EPA physical or electronic workspace? That's what would happen under the draft directive. Do you want to add to area commuting traffic, increase Agency costs to subsidize transit expenses, worsen pollution, and take away supervisor discretion to provide a small amount of flexibility in return for high-quality work from high-performing employees? That's what would happen under the draft directive. Is it worth it to strip parents from one or two more precious hours of the week they could be spending with their kids and volunteer soccer coaching, instead making them spend that time sitting on the train or bus, when their

supervisor has no need for them to be in the office? That's what would happen under the draft directive.

Furthermore, I'd like to rescind my answers to the Employee Viewpoint Survey that indicate that EPA is a good place to work and I'd recommend it, and that managers are supportive of work-life balance. Neither of those are true if this moves forward. While I've been fortunate to have decent and ethical supervisors during my time at EPA, not all are, and I fear the day I could be targeted by one or become afraid to share my true views in a meeting, lest I be admonished and someone decides to push me out. The people of the United States deserve to know the agencies implementing our laws are largely free of employee fear of undue political threats. EPA employees deserve to not have unilateral working conditions imposed, especially regarding things that are supposed to be part of union agreements.

I do believe, deep down, many of the supervisors and managers at EPA want to support their employees and provide a safe work environment. I do not understand this attack on employees, and I believe the majority of supervisors and managers at EPA do not support the draft document. Please do the right thing. Do NOT issue this.

Sincerely,

**Personal Security Detail / Ex. 6**