



Office of Command Counsel Newsletter

February 2000, Volume 2000-1

CLE 2000: We Are Planning

The AMC Command Counsel Continuing Legal Education (CLE) Program will be held at the Grosvenor Hotel 22-26 May 2000.

The theme of this year's CLE is "**AMC ATTORNEYS: Providing Solutions to Support the Army's Vision**".

The Planning Committee for CLE 2000 has solicited the input from the AMC Chief Counsels and the AMC legal community. The design of the program is proceeding and we expect to have an educational and interesting workshop. Thanks to **Mike Futch** (TYAD), **George Worman** (ANAD), **Bob Lingo** (HQ AMC), **Verlyn Richards** (TACOM-W), **Will Rathbun** (AMCOM), and **Kay Krewer** (TACOM-Rock Island) for their suggestions.

We are very pleased that the AMC Commander, **General John Coburn** has agreed to participate with an address to the AMC attorneys.

Additionally, we are pleased that the General Counsel of the Army **Charles A. Blanchard** will speak to us. Likewise, we are happy to announce that **BG Bob Barnes**, the Assistant Judge Advocate General for Civil Law & Litigation will address the legal community.

We will have approximately 15 electives, and legal focus sessions on acquisition, employment, environmental and intellectual property.

We are also planning to tour NASA at Cape Canaveral, which will be an unforgettable experience for all attendees.

If our plans work out the Friday morning enrichment program will focus on dealing with our clients.

The planning committee is chaired by **Steve Klatsky** and includes **Nick Femino**, **COL Demmon Canner**, **Bill Medsger**, **Vera Meza**, **Cassandra Johnson**, **Ed**

Stolarun, **Bob Lingo**, and **Holly Saunders**.

Members of the Planning Committee and coordinators of the legal focus sessions will be contacting AMC counsel to seek their active participation in the CLE. With your assistance CLE 2000 is sure to be a success.

In This Issue:

<i>CLE Around the Corner</i>	1
<i>AMCCC Top 10</i>	2
<i>Qui Tam Suit</i>	3
<i>Defending Protests</i>	5
<i>Market Research Conundrum</i>	6
<i>FLRA ULP Practice Manual</i>	7
<i>ADR-Confidentiality</i>	7
<i>REDS-Mandatory Elements</i>	8
<i>ADR & Environmental Disputes</i>	9
<i>Misuse of Gov't Resources</i>	10
<i>ARL Legal Office Profile</i>	11
<i>Faces in the Firm</i>	12

OFFICE OF COMMAND COUNSEL PRIORITIES 2nd Quarter FY 2000

The Office of Command Counsel adopts a list of projects, programs or issues as a focus of attention. We do this on a quarterly fiscal year basis and the list is posted in our front office. We use the list in a variety of ways: as part of orientation briefings conducted for senior officials from DA, HQ AMC and AMC field organizations. We also use the list in our periodic update sessions with our senior leadership.

Our Top 10 priorities for second quarter FY 2000:

CLE 2000 AGENDA

DOD ETHICS TRAINING

MAV ACQUISITION

CEO SESSION

MANAGEMENT OFF-SITE

PROTOCOL PROGRAM 2000

PARTNERING MEETING

ETHICS HANDBOOK FOR
SUPPORT KTRS

WATERVLIT SOLUTIONS

AUTOMATION 2000

**You are invited to submit your
similar "Top" Priorities for
publication in future Newsletters**

Newsletter Details

Staff

Command Counsel
Edward J. Korte

Editor

Stephen A. Klatsky

Layout & Design

Holly Saunders

Administrative Assistant

Fran Gudely

Webmaster

Joshua Kranzberg

The AMC Command Counsel Newsletter is published bi-monthly, 6 times per year (Feb, Apr, Jun, Aug, Oct and Dec)

Back Issues are available by contacting the Editor at (703) 617-2304.

Contributions are encouraged. Please send them electronically as a Microsoft® Word® file to sklatsky@hqamc.army.mil

Check out the Newsletter on the Web at http://www.amc.army.mil/amc/command_counsel/

Letters to the Editor are accepted. Length must be no longer than 250 words. All submissions may be edited for clarity.

Acquisition Law Focus

QUI TAM Case Reported

United States of America ex rel. Roby v. The Boeing Company, USDC, SD Ohio, NO. C-1-95-375 dated November 2, 1999.

In a nutshell the case, brought under the False Claims Act, involves the delivery aircraft transmission gears which Boeing knew had problems. As part of its claim for damages, the United States is seeking the cost of a helicopter that crashed and was totally destroyed and about \$1,000,000 in damages to another helicopter that crashed.

One of Boeing's defenses to this claim is that the "Limitation of Liability—High Value Items" clause, FAR 52.246-34 (HVIC), precludes liability for these damages under the Act.

The HVIC provides that the contractor is not liable for loss or damage to Government property, including the supplies delivered under the contract, that occurs after Government acceptance and results from defects or deficiencies in the supplies. This limitation of liability does not apply when the defect or deficiency in the supplies or the Government's acceptance results from the willful misconduct or lack of good faith on the part of the contractor's

managerial personnel. Another exception to this limitation of liability is if the contractor purchased insurance or established a reserve for self-insurance covering this type of loss.

The Government's position was that the HVIC, a product of regulation, cannot be construed to preclude liability, limit damages, or be permitted to engraft additional elements or requirements on to an Act of Congress, the False Claims Act.

The court held as a matter of law that the HVIC provides no defense to the Government's and Relator's claims against Boeing for violations of the False Claims Act. The court held that the clause's application extends to contractual remedies.

Even though the HVIC has existed since 1971, this was an issue of first impression. Boeing places great import on this decision and wants the issue certified to allow it to file an interlocutory appeal to the 6th Circuit.

Procurement Fraud Advisors, in particular, should read this case. The decision is somewhat lengthy, 37 pages.

POC is AMCOM's **Bob Gafield**, DSN 897-2820. Call Bob for a copy.

List of Enclosures

1. **GAO Protest: Sole Source--Lessons Learned**
2. **Take the Money... and Keep It!**
3. **Practice Pointers: Successfully Defending Protests**
4. **The Market Research Conundrum**
5. **ADR: ASBCA Contract Claim--Mini-Trial**
6. **ADR--Confidential? More or Less**
7. **Environmental Law Bulletin: Nov 99**
8. **Environmental Law Bulletin: Dec 99**
9. **Ethics Advisory #00-01: Misuse of Govt Resources**
10. **ABA Ethics Publication: Ethical Standards in the Public Sector.**

Protest Report: Sole Source Decision & Lessons

TACOM-Rock Island counsel **Joe Picchiotti**, DSN 793-8435, reports on a recent GAO protest decision concerning sole source. HQ AMC counsel **Jeff Kessler**, DSN 767-8045 worked with Joe on the defense of the protest.

On December 20, 1999 the GAO denied Parmatic Filter Corporation's protest of TACOM-Rock Island's award to Hunter Manufacturing Company for 1,800 each 200 CFM Gas Particulate filters for \$1.2 million. The award was made under a sole-source urgency justification and was added on to Hunter's existing production contract. Parmatic alleged that it had the ability to meet the Government requirements.

The GAO found that the Contracting Officer reasonably determined that the sole source award was necessary to meet urgent requirements where Parmatic would have had to pass first article testing requirements and establish a production line under severe time constraints. The GAO also noted that the Contracting Officer reasonably considered Parmatic's pro-

duction problems on a similar item.

There was concern that the protest might be sustained for several reasons:

First, there was a concern that a statement in the J&A that "no other sources had expressed an interest in writing," would be perceived as disingenuous or misleading since the PCO was aware of Parmatic's general interest in producing the item at the time the J&A was executed.

Second, there was a concern that urgent delivery schedule agreed to under contract was greater than the delivery schedule contemplated in the J&A, which Parmatic claimed refuted the urgent requirement.

Third, there was a concern that the procurement activity could not adequately identify the genesis of the urgent requirement and demonstrate that the requirement was not the result of a lack of planning.

The full report is provided. It contains discussion and lessons learned on each of these three issue areas (Encl 1).

Take the Money...and Keep it!

These days numerous AMC organizations are studying ways to bring in more dollars, realizing that growth is the only alternative to the death-of-a-thousand-cuts management style. However, even if you find an organization willing to fund your work, you may find it difficult to keep the money with which it pays you. The intent of this note is to point out some pitfalls as well as some of the ways these pitfalls may be avoided.

The Problem

The difficulty in the use of outside funds stems the conjunction of two Congressional statutes with a legal doctrine promulgated by the Comptroller General. The **Purpose Statute** (31 USC 1301(a)) and the **Miscellaneous Receipts Statute** (31 USC 3302(b))

ARL's **Robert Chase**, DSN 290-1599, provides an article that addresses the interface between the two statutes, and suggests solutions might be found through an analysis of the Economy Act, 31 USC 1535, the law of warranties, testing services under 15 USC 3710a(d)(1), patent license agreements, CRADAs or other transactions (Encl 2).

Practice Pointers: Successfully Defending Protests

IOC A-76 Studies "Down Scoped" & Proceeding Smoothly

The "down scoping" of the IOC depot A76 studies has resulted in a reduction to three remaining studies. The removal of the ammunition demilitarization mission as part of those studies leaves only base operations type activities for review. The result places these A76 studies on more familiar ground. Base operations have long been subjects of such studies and appear more clearly to be the type of activity envisioned for A-76 study.

After commencing the depot studies, it soon became apparent that the ammunition demilitarization mission presented particular problems. Workload was less than predictable; often what was predictable was not adequate to support offering to a private contractor. Because of the workload problems, demilitarization personnel at the depots often wear more than one hat; demilitarization is only one of several jobs performed. The possibility of privatization also endangered

the requirement to maintain in-house safety demilitarization skills.

IOC is currently in the process of putting the depot A76 packages on the street. There is no reason to anticipate that these studies will not proceed smoothly. Similarly, the IOC arsenal A76 studies are being modified to limit them to base operations activities, as well. Much the same difficulties have been found with regard to arsenal manufacturing operations. Projecting workload for purposes of bidding is very problematic. It is expected now that the Arsenal studies are in fact modified to include only base operations activities, they will proceed with equal speed and smoothness.

Questions regarding the above may be addressed to **Samuel J. Walker**, Attorney/Advisor, Industrial Operations Command at DSN 793-8421/ commercial (309) 782-8421 or email walkers@ioc.army.mil.

The AMC Protest VTC of 1 February 200, conducted by the AMCCC Protest Litigation Branch, included an outstanding presentation by **Rick Castiglia**, from McKenna & Cuneo. The subject: Practice Pointers for Successfully Defending Protests: The Perspective of Intervenor's Counsel.

The outline used is presented for your information (Encl 3).

The paper highlights that a Debriefing is an excellent means for preventing protests. It identifies the minimum amount of information that may be disclosed, as well as additional information that may be disclosed. There is a section "Do not disclose..."

There is also a paragraph on strategy tips concerning debriefings.

Lastly there is a section entitled "Preparing the Agency Report."

The Market Research Conundrum

Since the advent of Acquisition Reform as legislated by Public Law (PL) 103-355, The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (FASA) and PL 104-106, The Federal Acquisition Reform Act/Information Technology Management Reform Act (FARA/ITMRA) of 1996 (also known as the Clinger-Cohen Act), the Federal acquisition workforce has become increasingly familiar with the term "market research."

This workforce has received extensive amounts of literature and instruction describing what market research is, why and when it is required, who should be doing the research, the various methods of data collection and the techniques that can be used to conduct market research.

A case can be made that given the breadth of personnel who continuously remain involved in some form of market research in order to effectively perform their assigned job responsibilities, a significant portion of

the Acquisition workforce can claim expertise in particular market sectors.

Given the legislation, literature, training and experience over the last 6 years, can there be any more mysteries associated with performing market research?

The heightened awareness of the need to learn which firms are capable of meeting the Government's requirements for a particular acquisition had its roots in PL 98-369, The Competition in Contracting Act of 1984 (CICA).

As the justification format to certify that only one firm has the capability to meet the Government's requirements evolved, it became clear that it was necessary to corroborate that conclusion. Waiting until the solicitation synopsis to advertise a sole source requirement was not a viable method of corroboration.

Therefore, the then newly devised Justification and Approval (J&A) document contained a section on

Market Surveys (now titled Market Research), essentially to affirm industry's agreement that there was, in fact, only one responsible source.

The POCs in the CECOM Legal Office are **Theodore F. Chupein**, CECOM Special Advocate for Competition, DSN 992-5056 and **Garrett E. Nee**, DSN 992-1361. The full paper is provided (Encl 4).

ADR on ASBCA Claim

RRAD counsel **Garland Yarber**, DSN 829-3258, reports on the use of a mini-trial as an ADR process before the ASBCA, in a case in which the contractor sought to recover \$103,494 for an alleged 4,429 labor hours in excess of its estimate for the project, and also sought a refund of liquidated damages collected by the Government for nine days of delay in completing the contract.

The contractor alleged that the government caused the delay by imposing an escort requirement (Encl 5).

FLRA Issues ULP Case Confidential?: Handling Manual-- More or Comprehensive Less Guidance

The General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority has issued a new Unfair Labor Practice Case Handling Manual (Manual) which provides comprehensive guidance to Regional Agents in processing, resolving, and investigating unfair labor practice charges.

The Manual incorporates and references the changes to the General Counsel's regulations set forth at Subpart A of Part 2423 of the FLRA's Regulations. See 63 Fed. Reg. 65638-65645 (Nov. 30, 1998), which includes the codification of the Office of the General Counsel's (OGC) policies on Facilitation, Intervention, Training and Education (FITE); Quality; Scope; Injunctions; Prosecutorial Discretion; Settlement; and Ap-

peals. Where appropriate, the Manual references relevant case law.

As it pertains to various case processing matters, the Manual provides for uniformity and best practices among the Regions; provides criteria and principles that govern Regional discretion and judgment; and also provides Model and Sample Forms and Letters.

The Manual is available in PDF format on the FLRA Web Site, www.flra.gov

<<http://www.flra.gov/index.html>> or at

<<http://www.flra.gov/gc/manuals/ulp/ch-manual.html>>. The Manual is also offered for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office.

"The ADR field has a tendency to make large claims in many things, an inevitable result of mixing a great deal of social commitment, a dash of professional insecurity, and lots of lawyers whose ebullience would be worthy of Teddy Roosevelt.

One of those claims is to keep what parties say in confidence. Does this particular claim measure up, in logic, practice or the reasonable expectations of the parties and the public? "

This article by **Christopher Honeyman**, first appeared in the January 1999 ABA Dispute Resolution Magazine, and addresses a very important issue in ADR: the scope and limits of the confidentiality of ADR proceedings, such as mediation.

ADR proceedings are impacted by how the parties to the dispute view the statements/comments on confidentiality that a third-party neutral makes.

The entire article is provided for your information (Encl 6).

REDS: What's Required--Mandatory Elements (Flexibility the Key)

There have been several questions raised from AMC REDS Team members regarding the scope of flexibility they have in designing their local REDS program.

REDS was created consistent with the philosophy that governs ADR: be flexible, let the parties design their own program.

Accordingly, REDS has very few "mandatory" components. And, even when described as mandatory, there is flexibility within.

Steve Klatsky, DSN 767-2304, prepared a list of mandatory items, which was forwarded to each REDS Team Chief through the HQ AMC Office of Equal Opportunity.

1. Decision to offer REDS

The decision to offer REDS must be the product of the REDS team (EEO, Legal, CPAC) and not a decision by one organizational element or by an EEO Counselor (the specific process used to reach that decision is a flexible item for you to design).

2. REDS Voluntary for Employees

Use of REDS, when offered, for employees is voluntary. Once the REDS team, acting for management, makes the REDS offer, participation by managers is mandatory (the specific process to identify those management officials who will be involved is a flexible item for you to design).

3. REDS Intake Form

A REDS Intake Form (a model is at Appendix A of the AMC REDS Action Plan -- or you may create your own).

4. ADR Agreement Form

ADR Agreement Forms (models are at Appendices B, C, D of the AMC REDS Action Plan -- or you may create your own). A separate form may be needed for each ADR process you adopt.

5. Evaluation Form

An Evaluation Form (a model is at Appendix I of the REDS Action Plan--or you may create your own).

6. Reporting Form

Use of the Reporting Form at Tab 8 of your REDS Training Deskbook (use as is please). This reporting form does not add a burden to the field, in that it adds a column or two to the existing EEO reporting requirements.

7. Union: Obligations & Role

Involve your Union(s)--the specifics depend on your local collective bargaining unit and local labor-management environment.

MSPB Chair Steps Down

Ben L. Erdreich, MSPB Chair since 1993 is departing for the private practice of law in Alabama. Vice Chair **Beth Slavet**, will be taking over as acting chair.

ADR: Helping to Resolve Environmental Disputes

AMC & Environmental Partnering

Alternate dispute resolution (ADR) can be a valuable tool to avoid or resolve environmental disputes. AMC has used facilitated partnering to improve the environmental cleanups at several installations and used mediation to assist us in resolving at two environmental enforcement actions.

The Federal Facilities Environmental Journal (Autumn 1999) has a good article outlining the basic principles of ADR and how it can be used to resolve environmental disputes.

One very interesting section of the article addresses the issue:

When to consider ADR.

A number of factors come into play in making this determination. Generally, the more of the following factors that exist, the more likely it is that the collaborative approach of ADR could yield benefits:

1. It's not all about money.

2. The likely outcome of litigation is or could be undesirable.

3. There are one or more identifiable issues.

4. Parties have worked together in the past.

5. Parties are identifiable and limited in number.

6. Reaching a mutually agreeable solution is better for all parties than not reaching one.

7. All parties accept the ADR process.

8. Parties seek a solution that can not be court-ordered.

9. Sufficient time, money, and other resources are available to support the process.

10. Parties have the ability to either help or hurt one another.

11. Parties will work together in the future.

You can obtain a copy of the article at the following website: available at: http://www.denix.osd.mil/denix/DOD/News/Pubs/FFEJ/Autumn99/10_heath.html or by contacting Stan Citron (DSN 767-8043).

The Army Central Regional Environmental Office (CREO) Newsletter (Winter 2000) includes an article prepared by IOC Attorney, **Bill Bradley**, DSN 793-8418, on a successful partnering effort in New Mexico.

This program involves a partnership between the State EPA and various federal agencies located in New Mexico. One of the main goals of the partnership is developing the best, most cost effective means of protecting the environmental.

The article (including a photograph of Bill Bradley addressing the partnership) will be available at the CREO website - <http://aec.army.mil>.

ELD Bulletins

Environmental Law Division Bulletins for November 1999 (Encl 7) and December 1999 (Encl 8) are provided) for those who have not received an electronic version from ELD or who have a general interest in Environmental Law.

Misuse of Government Resources

The HQ AMC Ethics Team, chaired by **Mike Wentink**, DSN 767-8003, recently issued Ethics Advisory #00-01, titled Misuse of Government Resources (Encl 9).

The "Standards of Ethical Conduct" requires employees to "protect and conserve Government property" and "not use such property, or allow its use, for other than authorized purposes." (5 C.F.R. Sec. 2635.704).

The DoD "Joint Ethics Regulation (JER)," DoD 5500.7-R, helps to define "authorized purposes." (JER 2-301). In addition to official use, "authorized purposes" can include some occasional, incidental, and intermittent personal use of reasonable duration if it does not interfere with mission or official duties and does not result in significant additional cost, when authorized by the "agency designee."

Personal Use

The CG has authorized AMC employees some occasional, incidental, and intermittent personal use of reasonable duration of their

computers, communications systems and other resources.

This authorization, and its limitations and restrictions, are set out in AMCIO-T Policy Memorandum #97-08, dated 4 Sep 97, as revised in Change 1, dated 23 Feb 99 (attached to this Advisory).

Misuse Case

In "The Washington Post" business section of January 3, 2000, there is a report about five Army employees of the Military District of Washington (MDW) caught allegedly misusing their Government computers, e-mail accounts and internet access. According to the report, they used their Government computers and internet access to download software from a commercial website (AllAdvantage) and install it on their computers.

Apparently, one of the MDW employees being solicited to join by a fellow employee, talked to a reporter. When the reporter contacted MDW, the spokesman knew nothing about this scheme. However, it was quickly uncovered, and five Army employees are implicated.

Authorized use of the telephone, computers, e-mail, etc., will never include use for commercial purposes. In addition, we need to be extremely careful about business dealings with fellow-employees. The general rule is "no solicitation" in the office. Previous Ethics Advisories related to this issue are:

ETHICS ADVISORY 98-03 - Appropriate Use of E-Mail.
ETHICS ADVISORY 98-14 - Solicitations in the Federal Workplace

ABA Ethics Pub

Enclosed is an announcement of a recent ABA publication: Ethical Standards in the Public Sector A Guide for Government Lawyers, Clients and Public Officials

This new book is a compilation of essays, articles, and research intended to help government lawyers, their clients, and other public officials focus on some of the ethical considerations that arise in the practice of law in the public sector (Encl 10).

AMC Legal Office Profile

Army Research Laboratory, Adelphi, Maryland

The U.S. Army Research Laboratory (ARL) is the Army's primary source of fundamental and applied research. Its mission is to provide the Army with the key technologies and analytical support necessary to ensure supremacy in future land warfare. ARL—with its state-of-the-art facilities and workforce—constitutes the largest source of integrated science and technology services in the Army.

The lab occupies two major sites, both in Maryland: the Adelphi Laboratory Center (ALC) and the Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG). It operates unique outdoor facilities at the White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) in New Mexico.

The lab also has two research elements that are co-located with National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) activities in Cleveland, OH, and Hampton, VA.

ARL also receives considerable benefit from its newly realigned site in Research Triangle Park, NC (formerly the Army Research Office).

OFFICE STRUCTURE

The ARL Office of Chief Counsel is composed of three branches and a satellite office under the leadership of Chief Counsel, **COL Steven B. Lundberg**. The satellite office is located at the Research Triangle Park, NC, site.

Business Law Branch

In addition to reviewing traditional FAR-controlled contract actions, advises on matters such as cooperative agreements, international transactions, the sale of services to industry and other transactions.

Employees

Robert R. Chase, Deputy Chief Counsel and Team Leader; **Alvin E. Prather** and **Patrick J. Emery**, attorneys.

Administrative Law/ Litigation Branch

Handles a wide variety of issues, from personnel law and contract litigation to information and environmental law.

Employees

Timothy W. Connolly, Team Leader; **Sam W. Shelton, III**, and **Kenneth J. Spitz**, attorneys; **Angee K. Acton**, Paralegal; and **Tina D. Shaner**, Legal Assistant.

Intellectual Property Law Branch

Supports technology transfer under cooperative research and development agreements (CRDAs), deals directly with ARL's scientists and engineers in patenting inventions, and advises on issues relating to copyright and trademark law.

Employees

Paul S. Clohan, Jr., Team Leader; **Mark D. Kelly** and **U. John Biffoni**, attorneys; and **Carolyn P. Bourget**, Patent Technician.

SATELLITE OFFICE

Mark Rutter serves as counsel to employees at the Research Triangle Park, NC, site. The site awards the preponderance of research grants for the AMC community, and has a high level of expertise in this area.

Faces In The Firm

Longevity

HQ AMC

Mike Wentink completed 30 years of Federal service on January 9, 2000.

Steve Klatsky completed his 25th year (consecutive) at HQ AMC on 18 December.

Promotions & Awards

Phil Hunter, SBCCOM, was recently promoted to GS-15.

Peter Taucher, Chief Intellectual Property Law Division at TACOM-Wrn and

Kay Krewer, Chief, TACOM-Rock Island Legal Group received special recognition from the TACOM CG at the Town Hall Briefing held on 5 Jan 00. Both individuals were recognized for their diligent work and significant contributions in their respective areas. Pete for his legal advice and counsel on several international agreements and Kay for writing a user friendly guide on workloading the depots and arsenals.

Hello/Goodbye

WSMR

MAJ Brad Byrnes, Deputy SJA PCSd to The JAG School Graduate Course. His replacement is **CPT Justin Tade** coming from the Trial Defense Service, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.

CPT Van Hardenberg, Legal Assistance Attorney, PCSd to Ft. Lee, Virginia. His replacement is **1LT Brent Robinson** coming from The Judge Advocate General's Basic Course. 1LT Robinson will be promoted to Captain in February 2000.

Stephen Phillips, Contract Law Attorney, White Sands Missile Range retired in January 2000 after 30 years of federal service.

AMCOM

1LT John L. Faris, III has joined the Office of Staff Judge Advocate after completing the Officer Basic Course.

IOC

Mary Lou Massa, Legal Assistant, General Law/Installation Support, will be retiring the end of February. Mary Lou has been a delight and a true asset to our office. We're gonna miss her! She'll have all that time for gardening, grandkids, the piano . . . everything and anything! Our best wishes to you, Mary Lou!

Birth

IOC

Captain Marc Howze and Gma celebrated the birth of their new daughter, Nia Marie, on 6 December 1999. Nia weighed in at 7 pounds, 11 ounces. What a beautiful sunny day it was! Her proud parents brought Nia home to a brother and two sisters. Congratulations to the entire family - she's a keeper!