



Office of Command Counsel Newsletter

February 2001, Volume 2001-1

CLE 2001

The CLE Planning Committee held its first couple of meetings to discuss and design the plenary sessions, elective topics, the enrichment session and possible conference activities. **Steve Klatsky** is the chair of the committee. Members are **Vera Meza, Cassandra Johnson, Ed Stolarun, Bob Lingo, Mike Lassman** and **Mike Wentink**. CLE 2001 is 21-25 May at the Grosvenor Hotel, Lake Buena Vista, Florida.

We thank you for the solid and thoughtful suggestions and topics that you sub-

mitted—all will be seriously considered by the Committee. We have a variety of topics in all of the legal disciplines we practice that will make for an interesting and educational experience.

In the next few weeks you may be called upon to participate as speakers on these topics, or to contribute to the Legal Focus sessions that will be conducted. There are four Legal Focus Sessions: Acquisition, Environmental, Employment and Intellectual Property.

We hope you share the belief that active participation

with your colleagues makes for a successful CLE Program.

If you have any further ideas or thoughts on the contents of the programs, or any other CLE-related question please contact **Steve Klatsky** DSN 767-2304. sklatsky@hqamc.army.mil.

In This Issue:

<i>Verbon Black Dies</i>	2
<i>The Economy Act</i>	3
<i>New Tech Transfer Statute</i>	4
<i>Proprietary Tech Data</i>	5
<i>Whistleblower Rules Amended</i>	7
<i>Weingarten Rule Explained</i>	8
<i>Removing Law Enforcement Personnel</i>	9
<i>Selling/Privatizing Mil Utilities</i>	10
<i>XO: Protecting Migratory Birds</i>	11
<i>DA Travel policy</i>	12
<i>Telemarketing Scams</i>	13
<i>No Workplace Solicitation</i>	13
<i>Faces in the Firm</i>	14

TEDDY ROOSEVELT: On America...in 1901

“We belong to a young nation, already of giant strength, yet whose present strength is but a forecast of the power that is to come. We stand supreme in the continent, in the hemisphere. East and west we look across the two great oceans toward the larger

world-life in which, whether we will or not, we must take an ever-increasing share. As, keen-eyed, we gaze into the coming years, duties new and old rise thick and fast to confront us from within and without.”

Theodore Roosevelt on the American spirit in 1901

Verbon Black Dies

Retired MICOM Chief Counsel

W. Verbon Black, 69, former Chief Counsel at the U.S. Army Missile Command (MICOM--predecessor of AMCOM) died Sunday December 31, 2000 in Huntsville, Alabama.

Mr. Black graduated from Birmingham Southern College and the University of Alabama Law School and received a master's degree in public administration from the Harvard University School of Public Administration.

He was a Korean War veteran and practiced law in Birmingham before becoming chief counsel to the Army Missile Command in Huntsville.

Recognized with the Presidential Award in the Senior Executive Service in 1994, Mr. Black was also named Attorney of the Year by

the Army Materiel Command in 1986.

He was an active supporter of the Huntsville Museum of Art, WLRH Public Radio, the Alabama Public Television Network and the Huntsville Literary Association and was a member of the board of directors of the Historic Huntsville Foundation.

Survivors include his wife, Delia Wells Black of Huntsville; two brothers, Lehmon Ray Black of Arab and John Hugh Black of Huntsville; two sisters, Linda Lou Black Glenn and Glenda Sue Black Ponder, both of Arab; and several nieces and nephews.

Memorials may be made to the American Heart Association, WLRH Public Radio or the Huntsville-Madison County Public Library.

Newsletter Details

Staff

Command Counsel
Edward J. Korte

Editor
Stephen A. Klatsky

Layout & Design
Holly Saunders

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

The Economy Act

SBCCOM Chief Counsel **Pat Sheldon**, DSN 256-3724 provides an excellent article on The Economy Act (Encl 1).

The Economy Act provides agencies the authority we use to provide services to or secure the services of another Executive agency for in house performance or performance by contract where there is no other statutory authority

The Act had its genesis during the great depression. Congress was looking for ways to curtail the expenses of government.

It passed the Economy Act in 1932 to obtain economies by deleting duplicating and overlapping activities.

Interestingly the legislative history reflects Congress belief that private industry should not be called upon to perform “what Government Agencies can do more cheaply for each other,” and that Government Agencies “especially equipped to perform the work” should be available whenever work can be performed “as expeditiously and for less money” than elsewhere.

Some DOD agencies abused their authority under the Act in the early nineties by offloading to circumvent funding restrictions or limitations. Agencies became unwitting partners in violations of the Antideficiency Act. This practice was called to a halt by a directive signed by the Secretary of Defense. Now we have extensive regulation of our use of the Economy Act.

The paper provides an overview of the applicable FAR regulations and describes the requirements for Determination & Findings.

Last, it addresses The Economy Act Order, the document you send or receive that initiates the transaction. It is a written agreement between the requiring and servicing agencies. The elements of that agreement required by the FAR are:

- a. a description of the supplies or services required;
- b. delivery requirements;
- c. a funds citation;
- d. a payment provision;
- e. appropriate acquisition authority; and
- f. a dispute resolution provision

List of Enclosures

1. The Economy Act
2. Technology Transfer Commercialization Act
3. Explaining Proprietary Technical Data
4. Distribution Statements on Technical Data
5. Financing Base Operations & Support Functions
6. Weingarten Rule Explained
7. Mandatory Removal: Law Enforcement Personnel
8. Selling & Privatizing Military Utility Systems
9. EO: Protection for Migratory Birds
10. Going After Polluters on Army Lands
11. DA Travel Policy-- Spouse Travel Approval
12. Telemarketing Scams
13. No Workplace Solicitation

YEAR 2000 FAIR ACT LISTS AVAILABLE

The Year 2000 FAIR Act Commercial Activities Inventories are available for the public's review, the Office of Management and Budget has announced. Inventories from nearly 40 departments and agencies can now be viewed, including those from the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Education. Under the FAIR Act, agencies are required to submit to OMB a list of commercial activities that are not "inherently governmental," are currently being performed by federal employees, and could be contracted out to the private sector. Click on <http://www.whitehouse.gov/OMB/procurement/fair2agencycontact.html> to access the most recent list of inventories.

AGENCIES MUST PAY INTEREST ON LATE PAYMENTS

Under an interim rule recently released by the Office of Management and Budget, federal agencies will have to pay service contractors interest if they fail to make a payment to the contractor within 30 days of receiving a proper invoice. The rule went into effect on December 15, 2000, and applies to payment requests received under cost-reimbursement service contracts awarded on or after December 15th. The new rule was issued to implement Section 1010 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2001, which requires agencies to pay an interest penalty whenever they fail to make a timely payment on a service contract. Comments on the interim rule must be submitted by February 13, 2001.

New Tech Transfer Statute

Congress recently passed the Technology Transfer Commercialization Act of 2000. The Act's goals are to make the technology transfer process more "industry-friendly", as well as to simplify technology licensing.

Among other things, the Act permits licensing certain pre-existing patents related to Cooperative Research and Development Agreements ("CRADAs").

While this has always been permitted, it was sometimes procedurally difficult because the license and CRADA were in two separate agreements. POC is HQ AMC Counsel, **Lisa Simon**, DSN 767-2552 (Encl 2).

Explaining Proprietary Technical Data

TACOM-ARDEC Intellectual property Team Leader **John Moran**, DSN 880-6590, provides a preventive law item written for clients, explaining for them the term proprietary technical data (Encl 3).

Initially it should be understood that proprietary data is not limited to data as usually used in our parlance of government terminology. Generally speaking, it is any information developed and possessed by one party that provides a competitive advantage over others. So it can take on various different forms. Outside the government, it is often just referred to as proprietary information. Some examples would be a list of customers that are specific to a company or a specific product/market. Usually this information was compiled by a study involving an investment or the expenditure of some effort or other resources resulting in specialized and valuable informa-

tion creating an ownership stake. Such information must not be in the public domain so that it is not generally known. When such information is owned or developed by corporations, they may refer to it as a trade secret. It could take the form of technical or test data, specifications (TDPs), or other types of design information but it would not be limited to any of these as long as it complies with the general characteristics of not being known by others and having some value that provides a competitive advantage.

The paper describes the procedures applicable for maintaining the proprietary status of the information.

Additionally, it cautions employees regarding our obligation to safeguard such information, especially in an era when we are working more closely with contractor personnel.

Legal Considerations in Designing and Implementing Electronic Processes:

From DOJ's web page: "This guide addresses legal issues that agencies are likely to face in converting to electronic processes and provides suggestions on how to address these issues. The rise of electronic commerce offers departments and agencies exciting opportunities to convert or redesign existing processes. At the same time, creating a more accessible and efficient government requires us to maintain public confidence in the security and reliability of the Government's electronic transactions, processes, and systems. Thus, in designing electronic systems, departments and agencies should ensure that essential data are available when need and that the data and the underlying processes are legally sufficient, reliable and in compliance with all applicable legal requirements."

Accessible from our site at:

<http://www.contracts.ogc.doc.gov/cld/othernews.html>

Distribution Statements on Technical Data

AMCOM IP Counsel **Anne Lanteigne**, DSN 746-5109, provides a paper on the growing importance of distribution statements on technical data packages (Encl 4).

Distribution Statements are markings that appear on technical data to indicate the scope of distribution, release and disclosure that the technical data can be subjected to. Distribution Statements comprise a set of codes "A" through "F", and "X", each of which affords to the technical data that is marked with it, a different level of protection from distribution.

The requirements to affix proper Distribution Statements to technical data produced by or for the Department of Defense are not new but have been around for a long time. They are contained in DoD Directive 5230.24. The low profile of this Directive in the general landscape of Government business in the past is understandable. Prior to the advent and wide use of the Internet, documents did not travel with such alarming

ease and at such a hair-raising speed as they do now.

However, because of the recent boom in electronic commerce and the Department of Defense's increasing participation therein, among other reasons, the need for marking technical data with proper Distribution Statement codes has become more acute than ever. A proper Distribution Statement code affixed to technical data controls the release of the data. An example of DoD's participation in electronic commerce is using the web to issue solicitations and the technical data, if available, that is associated with the acquisition. To ensure adequate level of protection for the data, web solicitation normally can release only technical data that is marked with Distribution Statement code "A" which is authorization for unlimited distribution. Another reason to ensure tightened enforcement of the requirements of DoDD 5230.24 is increased Foreign Military Sales and international partnerships.

Financing Base Operations and Support Services

TACOM Counsel **Mike Walby**, DSN 786-8591 provides a legal opinion he rendered to a client addressing the issue of the appropriateness of changing the method of financing base operations and support functions (Encl 5).

The paper addresses AR 37-49, DFAS-IN-Manual 37-100-XX, Chapter 340, various DA policy memoranda, as well as the January 1999 AMC Policy for Base Support and Support Agreement Formulation.

The opinion addresses the possibility of a blanket or percentage assessment for base operations services.

In addition to the substance of the article the style used in responding is one that a client appreciates: each question is separately recited and addressed. This makes it easier on the reader.

MSPB Amends Whistleblower Rules

The Merit Systems Protection Board recently amended its procedural rules concerning whistleblower appeals to assist in providing the information the Board needs to process these appeals, according to a press release.

Under the Whistleblower Protection Act (and court rulings interpreting the Act), a person who files a complaint with the Special Counsel alleging that a personnel action was taken or threatened because of whistleblowing must exhaust Office of Special Counsel (OSC) procedures before filing an appeal with MSPB. The Board may consider only those matters the person raised before the Special Counsel.

“This change in our rules is the result of a cooperative effort with OSC to help whistleblowers provide

both of our offices with the information we need to process their cases,” said Acting Board Chairman **Beth S. Slavet**.

“OSC revised its complaint form in August to include a new Part 2, Reprisal for Whistleblowing, in which a complainant describes each whistleblowing disclosure, identifies when and to whom the disclosure was made, describes the personnel action that was taken or threatened because of the disclosure, and provides the date of any such action or threat. This is the information the Board needs to determine whether the appellant has satisfied the WPA’s requirement to exhaust OSC procedures before filing with MSPB.”

The revised complaint form is available on the OSC web site at

www.osc.gov.

FLRA GC on Meetings

The General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority (FLRA), **Joseph Swerdzewski**, issued guidance yesterday to the FLRA Regional Directors regarding Meetings under the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statute (Statute).

The Guidance discusses the General Counsel’s policy on the rights and obligations of unions and agencies in meetings with employees under the Statute. The memorandum provides guidance on the types of situations where employees have a right to union representation and where unions have a right to be represented when agency representatives meet with bargaining unit employees. The Guidance also provides checklists for supervisors, union stewards, and employees to utilize to determine whether a particular situation gives rise to a right to representation.

A copy of the guidance and an executive summary is available on the Authority’s web page. The executive summary is at

http://www.flra.gov/gc/guidance/gc_meet_exs.html

DOJ Issues ADR Report

On January 17, 2001 Attorney General **Janet Reno** today released a report on the successes and current state of alternative dispute resolution programs in the federal government to help agencies develop and maintain their programs in the new presidential administration, according to Department of Justice officials.

Jeff Senger, deputy senior counsel in DOJ's Office of Dispute Resolution, told ADRWorld.com that the Report of the Interagency Alternative Dispute Resolution Working Group (IADRWG) "highlights the value of ADR" in the federal government and lays out the "accomplishments of IADRWG, federal government agencies and administrative agencies in implementing the Alternative Dispute Resolution Act of 1998."

According to Senger, Reno is particularly pleased that one key goal — that every agency implement at least one new ADR program or significantly enhance a

current ADR program — was met by "every cabinet level agency and most administrative agencies." The attorney general believes that the work and accomplishments of federal agencies over the past two years will provide a "foundation for future administrations to build on," he added.

The report also outlines agencies' plans for establishing new ADR programs in the future. For example, the IADRWG will establish a voluntary arbitration pilot program for resolving low-dollar claims against the federal government such as simple tort claims. The pilot program would be made available to all agencies that process claims against the government, and they could process cases involving as much as their statutory settlement authority, which is generally about \$25,000. The claims could only be for monetary relief, and the agency would have the discretion to choose which disputes it believes are appropriate for arbitration.

Weingarten Rule Explained

Briefly, this statutory right provides that when an agency representative questions a bargaining unit employee, and the employee reasonably believes the questioning may result in disciplinary action against that employee and the employee requests union representation, the employee is generally entitled to representation if the investigation continues.

Upon a valid request for union representation from the employee, management has three options:

- 1) grant the request and notify the union that a meeting to examine a bargaining unit employee is going to take place and that the employee has requested union representation;
- 2) continue the investigation without interviewing the employee; or
- 3) offer the employee a clear choice to either continue the interview without representation, or have no interview.

Enclosed is a paper on Weingarten provided by HQDA's Labor Advisor **David Helmer** (Encl 6).

Employment Law Focus

Mandatory Removal For Law Enforcement Personnel-When Convicted Of Felony

Attached, for your information, is an info paper from OPM concerning Section 639 of P.L. 106-554, which add section 7371 to 5 USC Chapter 73 (Encl 7).

The new section is titled, "Mandatory removal from employment of law enforcement officers convicted of felonies." The new law requires that any law enforcement officer who is convicted of a felony shall be removed from employment as a law enforcement officer on the last day of the first applicable pay period following the conviction notice date. (The conviction notice date is the date the agency has notice that the officer has been convicted of a felony.) The specific legislation is included at the end of the OPM guidance.

The legislation provides for a shortened notice period and identifies the areas of appeal for actions taken under this section. The employee must still be given specific notice of the proposed re-

moval, an opportunity to respond, and a final decision with appeal rights. The requirement is effective January 20, 2001, and it is not retroactive - only new convictions after that date apply. Where convictions are subsequently overturned, the employee is entitled to be returned to his/her position with back pay.

It is important to note that the law only requires that the employee be removed from a law enforcement position. It does not require that the employee be removed from the Federal service. That is, if management elects to reassign the employee out of the law enforcement position based upon his/her felony conviction, such action would be in compliance with section 7371.

Activities must read the law carefully and begin its implementation. A key aspect of the implementation is meeting your labor relations obligations.

Time off for Health Screening

Federal employees with limited available sick leave will be able to take up to four hours of additional paid time off each year for health screenings like mammography, pap smears, and blood pressure and cholesterol checks, according to an announcement by President Clinton.

The Federal Employees Health Benefits Program <../insure/health/index.htm>, the health insurance plan for federal employees, covers a wide range of preventive health services, including screening for prostate, cervical, colo-rectal and breast cancer and screening for sickle cell and blood lead levels.

The President's memorandum also wants agencies to step up health screenings by:

Providing preventive services through in-house health units.

Providing preventive services through on-site fitness centers

Encourage employee organizations to sponsor health activities.

Selling or Privatizing Military Utility Systems

OSC Counsel **Geraldine Lowery**, DSN 793-5932, has provided an outstanding article on a growing issue of concern to the contracting, environmental and real estate communities (Encl 8).

The authority for the military to sell or privatize its utilities was granted by Congress through the passage of Public Law 105-85. Sec 2688 of that law reads as follows:

“Utility systems: conveyance authority (a) Conveyance Authority.—The Secretary of a military department may convey a utility system, or part of a utility system, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary to a municipal, private, regional, district, or cooperative utility company or other entity. The conveyance may consist of all right, title, and interest of the United States in the utility system or such lesser estate as the Secretary considers appropriate to serve the interests of the United States”.

The goal of the Department of Defense is to avoid the immediate expense of upgrading aging infrastructure by selling the systems to private entities. The costs of capital improvements will then be reimbursed to the utility company through utility rates over a period of time. The feasibility of privatization of each system is to be determined only after a full assessment of the system, evaluation of the market for all potential purchasers, and a careful comparison of costs associated with each alternative, including the alternative of keeping the system where there are no cost benefits or no willing purchasers. See Policies And Procedures For Privatization Of Army Owned Utility Systems At Active Installations.

The paper also addresses newly minted provisions of the Defense Authorization Act for FY 2001, applicable provisions of title 10 USC Sec 2304 (c), case law and legislative history.

Restoration Activities: DOD Issues Final Policy on Land Use Controls

On 17 January 2001, DoD issued the Final Policy on Land Use Controls Associated with Environmental Restoration Activities.

This policy provides an overall framework for implementing, documenting, and managing land use controls for active and transferring installations.

The policy establishes a **72-hour DoD and other Service review requirement** for all land use control agreements. A copy of the DoD Policy is available at - https://www.denix.osd.mil/denix/Public/Library/CleanUp/luc_policyguidance.pdf.

If you have any questions, please call **Stan Citron**, DSN 767-8043.

President Orders Protection for Migratory Birds

On 10 January 2001 President Clinton signed Executive Order 13186, Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds, 66 Fed. Reg. 3853, January 17, 2001 (Encl 9).

Each Federal Agency taking actions that have, or are likely to have, a measurable negative effect on Migratory bird populations is directed to develop and implement, within two years, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Fish and Wildlife Service that shall

promote the conservation of migratory bird populations.

Some of the provisions of the Order do not go into effect until Agencies have entered into such MOUs with the Service. However, it would be prudent to ensure that environmental analyses of Federal actions required by NEPA or other established environmental review processes evaluate the effects of actions and agency plans on migratory birds, with emphasis of concern, as defined by the Order.

Going After the Polluters of Our Army Lands

Since February 1998, the Department of Defense has had a policy to identify and pursue all opportunities for the potential recovery or sharing of environmental restoration costs from DoD contractors and other parties, public and private, that may have contributed to environmental contamination of DoD properties.

The DoD Defense Environmental Restoration Program Management Guidance states that Services should pursue recovery of response costs of \$50,000 or more.

Recently, the Corps of Engineers has awarded two indefinite delivery contracts for services to assess the potential recovery opportunities against such parties.

Our installations may avail themselves of this service, by contacting the Corps of Engineers as set forth in the enclosed letter (Encl 10).

Environmental Law Bulletins--JAGCNet

The Environmental Law Division Bulletin for December and all future editions are now available electronically on the JAGCNet Envi-

ronmental Forum, and we urge all interested in Environmental Law to become registered for access to that restricted Forum.

Ethics Summary for AMC for Calendar Year 2000

Financial Disclosure:

Total Public Filers: 154
- Disqualifications: 42

Total Confidential
Filers: 15,105

- Written notices of disqualification issued: 707
- Divestitures: 7
- Reassignments: 10

Ethics Training:

Total Employees Trained:
14,600

Disciplinary Actions

Disciplinary Actions:
153

- Misuse of position, resources, info: 135
- Indebtedness: 4
- Compensation from non-Federal sources: 6
- Impartiality in performing official duties: 1

Travel Alert: Secretary of the Army Travel Policy Changes

There have been significant developments in the Travel policy applicable to Department of Army personnel.

AMC Ethics Counsel **Mike Wentink**, DSN 767-8003, provides a copy of the Secretary of Army memorandum (Encl 11).

As one of the major changes, note that the AMC CG is now the approval authority for all USAMC accompanying spouse travel on MILAIR.

The policy sets forth the documentation that must be included in all requests for approval.

You should also note what has not changed: we still fly coach, and the rules for upgrading have not changed. The rules concerning frequent flyers remain the same. Further, travelers still may not use their "official" miles to upgrade their

seat on TDY unless certain exceptions are present.

Department of Defense (DOD) and Department of the Army (DA) transportation resources are to be vigorously managed to prevent both the misuse and the perception of misuse. Travel must be directly and clearly related to mission achievement.

This document supersedes the Secretary of the Army memorandum subject: Policy for Travel by Department of the Army Officials, dated 8 April 1999. It implements specified policies and procedures provided by DOD Directive 4500.56, DOD Policy on the Use of Government Aircraft and Air Travel (1997). It also serves to reduce the cost of travel and prevent the inappropriate and perceived inappropriate use of DA travel resources by the implementation of these policies and procedures.

Ethics Focus

Spouse Travel: What You Must Submit for Approval

- a. Request signed by the sponsor;
- b. Name, grade, and position/title of sponsor;
- c. Purpose of spouse's travel;
- d. Travel date and destination;
- e. Type of conveyance, to include cost if a commercial flight;
- f. Policy and/or fiscal determination by appropriate MACOM official;
- g. Agenda or itinerary for spouse that indicates either actual participation or a diplomatic or public relations benefit to the United States.

Legal Assistance Preventive Law Item: Telemarketing Scams

CECOM's **Pamela McArthur**, DSN 992-4371, provides an excellent legal assistance preventive law note on Telemarketing Scams (Encl 12).

The paper is written in an easy-to-read manner for the client. For example:

Most people would be surprised to know that there are an estimated 14,000 illegal telemarketing operations bilking U.S. citizens of at least \$40 billion annually.

All consumers, and seniors in particular, need to understand that these aren't just aggressive or "sleazy" salespeople trying to make a living — fraudulent telemarketers are hardened criminals willing to take their victims' life savings.

They're so good at what they do, they can even persuade people to mortgage their homes in order to claim their sweepstakes winnings or make investments.

Studies by various agencies show that most fraud victims don't make the connection between illegal telemarketing and criminal activity. They simply don't associate the voice on the phone with someone who could be trying to steal their money.

Once they understand that illegal telemarketing is a serious crime — punishable by heavy fines and long prison sentences — people are more likely to hang up and report calls to the authorities.

* * * * NO SOLICITATION * * * *

In this Ethics Advisory reissue **Mike Wentink** describes the rules and exceptions regarding workplace solicitation (Encl 13)

The general rule is that employees may not solicit the sale of magazine subscriptions, cosmetics, household products, hair replacement systems, vitamins, candy, cookies, insur-

ance, weight loss programs, etc. while on the job or in their offices. Even if off the job and outside the workplace, they may not knowingly solicit DoD employees who are junior to them.

Faces In The Firm

HELLO & GOODBYE...TO YOU

Arrivals

AMCOM

CPT Anthony C. Adolph is the new Legal Assistance Officer. He is a graduate of New York Law School. His last assignment was in Bamberg, Germany, where he was a military intelligence officer.

Gary J. Suttles joined Adversary Proceedings Division in December. He came to us from Social Security Administration in Savannah, and brings experience from both federal and state government service as well as private practice. He is a graduate of the Cumberland School of Law, Birmingham, AL.

Laura F. Owens is brand new to the federal government. She has been working as an Assistant City Attorney in Decatur, Alabama for the past five years before joining the Acquisition Law Division in January. She is a graduate of University of Alabama School of Law.

Wade L. Brown joined the Acquisition Law Division and farewell to MAJ Wade L. Brown as a "green suiter" with ten years of experience in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, of which the last 1 1/2 years have been in the AMCOM Legal Office.

HQ AMC

Sam Shelton has joined the General Law Division and will practice employment law, something he has done successfully at Ft. Belvoir, and most recently at ARL. You will know Sam as a leader in the design and implementation of the REDS ADR Program.

Retirement

AMCOM

Howard G. Garner retired from the Intellectual Property Law Division on 3 January 2001 after almost 25 years of government service as a patent attorney. He and his wife plan to remain in the Huntsville, Alabama area.

Promotions

AMCOM

Congratulations to **David C. Points, Jr.**, who was recently promoted to GS-0905-14, General Attorney in the General Law/Intellectual Property Law Division.

HQAMC

Cherell Lonon-Gerald has been promoted to GS-8 Legal Assistant in the Protest Litigation Branch.

Elaine Timberlake has been promoted to GS-8 Legal Assistant in the Business Operations Law Division.

Billy Mayhew has been promoted to GS-7 Legal Assistant in the Administrative Office.