

This material is part of a collection that documents the harassment, discrimination, and retaliation perpetrated against Alaska's women research scientists by their supervisor, with full knowledge (and arguably, "tacit approval") of their federal employer, the USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS)

Cynthia Bower
Appeals Hearing (Docket # B 10 2533)
October 2010

Exhibit 5

List of Potential Witnesses

USDA Agricultural Research Service scientists who also experienced unlawful discrimination and/or retaliation by Alberto Pantoja while employed by ARS:

1. Loretta Winton [REDACTED]

2. Nancy Robertson [REDACTED]

3. Jeff Conn [REDACTED]

ARS administrators and other personnel who were aware of unlawful discrimination and retaliation in Alaska's ARS unit (but will be unwilling to testify to the unlawful activities that they observed and/or participated in):

4. Andrew Hammond (Pacific West Area Director; [REDACTED])

5. Robert Matteri (Pacific West Area Associate Director; [REDACTED])

6. Maureen Whalen (Pacific West Area Assistant Director; [REDACTED])

7. Donald McLellan (EEO Director; [REDACTED])

8. Edward Knipling (ARS Administrator, [REDACTED])

9. Peter Bechtel [REDACTED]

10. Janis Contento (Location Administrative Officer; [REDACTED])

29 C.F.R §1614.102 (a) requires the ARS to identify and eliminate discriminatory practices and policies. However, the aforementioned ARS personnel knowingly allowed discrimination against women scientists to occur (and persist!) at the Subarctic Agricultural Research Unit in Alaska.

- a.) Andrew Hammond is currently PWA Director. Dr. Hammond performs matrix management functions at PWA and therefore may (or may not) be my second line supervisor. He is named was a respondent in my EEO complaints and he has the following knowledge:
- On 27 December 2007 he was sent my timely grievance (containing complaints of discrimination against women), but he delegated the matter and ignored the situation
 - He received (and delegated without acting on) my Request for RPES reevaluation (sent 7 January 2008) in which I noted that the RL had established a hostile environment for women scientists in Alaska
 - He received my 7 February 2008 "Notification of Formal Grievance", which listed examples of discrimination against women, but he chose to allow the discrimination to continue
 - On June 2nd 2008 he was sent a formal grievance listing the ARS Directive (#461.5 Misconduct, Discipline, and Adverse Action) that he could use to stop the discriminatory treatment of Alaska's female research scientists (but instead he allowed the discrimination to continue)
- b.) Robert Matteri is currently Associate PWA Director. Dr. Matteri performs matrix management functions at PWA and therefore may (or may not) be my second line supervisor. He is named was a respondent in my EEO complaints and he has the following knowledge:
- On 24 January 2008 he responded to my timely grievance by ignoring my complaints of discrimination against women at SARU
 - On 31 January 2008 he responded to my Request for RPES reevaluation (sent 7 January 2008 in which I noted that the RL had established a hostile environment for women scientists in Alaska) by doing nothing to alleviate the situation
 - He also required (1/31/08) that my complaints about my supervisor be submitted to the Area Director "through supervisory channels" including my supervisor's concurring "Through" signature
 - He did not recuse himself as the Reviewing Official, (despite being named as a respondent in my formal EEO complaint) and instead participated in reprisal discrimination, which resulted in my lower-than-warranted annual performance appraisal on November 5th 2008
- c.) Edward Knipling is the Administrator for ARS. Dr. Knipling is named as a respondent in my EEOC complaint and he has the following knowledge:
- On 27 December 2007 he was cc'd on my timely grievance, which described discrimination against women at SARU, but he did nothing to stop the illegal discrimination
 - On May 23rd 2008 he fully and carefully considered my grievance and exhibits, (which clearly described discrimination against the women scientists at SARU), then issued a Final Agency Decision condoning the discriminatory treatment and dismissing my claims