

**From:** Matthew S. Biggs

**Sent:** Friday, March 13, 2009 3:47 PM

**To:** Scolese, Christopher J. (HQ-AI000)

**Cc:** Whitesides, George Thomas. (HQ-AA000); Noble, David Lyman. (HQ-AA000); Ladwig, Alan Michael. (HQ-AA000); 'Lee Stone'

**Subject:** Recommended Distribution of Stimulus Monies

Dear Administrator Scolese,

Thank you very much for your supportive response to President Junemann on February 26th, 2009. IFPTE greatly appreciates the new spirit of cooperation that labor is experiencing in its interaction with the Executive Branch. We are particularly pleased with your stated commitment to "an unprecedented level of transparency and accountability" and "to ensuring openness in the process of identifying the highest priority technical programs, construction projects, and other uses".

In an effort to live up to the noble standards that you set forth in your letter, we hope to continue our participation in the planning process for allocating Stimulus Package funds currently being performed by the relevant Mission Directorates and CASP management. In that light, as part of an open and transparent search for the optimal allocation, IFPTE requests that the preliminary draft plans being forwarded to OMB (today or within the next few days) also be sent to NASA's Unions and to all Center Directors for comment, prior to the Administration's final decision. Perhaps the draft can even be put on the web for public comment?

Below please find our current more detailed concerns:

FOR SMD:

First, SMD appears to have decided that \$325 million of the Science Stimulus funds must be used to support Earth Science Decadal missions. This is an excessive, over-interpretation of the report language. Reducing this number to \$275 million would be more appropriate (still \$25 million more than IFPTE's official recommendation). This would provide an enormous Stimulus to the Decadal missions while also broadening the impact of the Stimulus across the remaining SMD priorities.

Second, SMD appears poised to provide only \$56 million for Earth Science R&A projects. This is inadequate to help re-invigorate Earth Science R&D at NASA Centers. IFPTE strongly urges NASA to provide at least \$4 million in additional Stimulus funds (\$60 million total) with a particular emphasis on saving or creating R&D jobs or infrastructure procurements at Langley, Ames, and Marshall, the Earth Science Centers that cannot leverage infrastructure costs off large missions (these extra funds should be used to cover \$1.33 million to each these three Centers for urgent, currently unmet, Earth Science local R&D infrastructure costs including salaries).

Third, SMD appears to be insisting that the Stimulus monies apply exclusively to Earth Science. This is inconsistent with the legislative text (which assigned the funds to SMD and not specifically to Earth Science) and the associated report does not suggest this extreme position. The Union strongly urges NASA to provide some of the Stimulus funds to Space Science R&A budgets with a particular emphasis on saving or creating R&D jobs or procurements at NASA Centers. Providing at least \$35 million to Space Science R&A accounts would not only enhance science return, but also help revitalize NASA's Space Science intellectual and physical infrastructure at Goddard, Dryden, Ames, Glenn, Langley, and Marshall (this should be used to cover \$2 million to each of these six Centers for urgent, currently unmet, Space Science local R&D infrastructure costs including salaries + \$23 million for new research projects).

Fourth, SMD appears to be contemplating only \$19 million for supercomputing. This is inadequate and contrary to the clear priority given in the report language. IFPTE strongly urges NASA to provide \$11 million in additional Stimulus funds (\$30 million total; half to upgrade *Columbia* and half to support supercomputing R&D across the Agency), consistent with Congressional intent and broad Agency computing needs.

With our suggested changes, the Earth Science Decadal missions will still receive ~70% of the SMD Stimulus funds with 7.5% going to the other explicit Congressional priority (Supercomputing) and ~20% going to general NASA infrastructure supporting Earth and Space Science at NASA Centers. The Union believes that this is truer to Presidential and Congressional intent, and better for NASA than the prioritization currently contemplated by SMD leadership.

We are concerned with transparency and openness for the following:

FOR ESMD:

We are particularly concerned that the allocation to Advanced Capabilities will be inadequate.

FOR ARMD:

We are particularly concerned that the new “green aviation” effort may end up improperly focused on an expensive, one-shot demo project as opposed to a more appropriate focus on developing a broad range of new enabling green-aviation technologies.

FOR CASP:

We continue to recommend that a portion of these funds be used to fund deferred maintenance and repairs across all NASA Centers (especially those that impact employee safety e.g. crane upgrades, elevator upgrades, etc...) and not exclusively for those Center impacted by the 2008 hurricanes. Furthermore, consistent with Presidential direction to make the Stimulus investments have long-term value, NASA should minimize any investment of these funds on Shuttle infrastructure as this will be retired by the end of 2010.

IFPTE looks forward to receiving the requested information and to assisting NASA and OMB in formulating the best possible allocation of Stimulus funds. Finally, as you can see, if also added my legislative colleague, NASA Council of IFPTE Locals Legislative Director, Dr. Lee Stone, to this email.

Sincerely,  
Matt Biggs

---

Matthew S. Biggs,  
Assistant to the President/Legislative Director  
International Federation of Professional  
& Technical Engineers (IFPTE), AFL-CIO, CLC  
501 3rd Street, NW, Suite 701  
Washington, DC 20001