



United States Government
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
Office of the Regional Director
Region 5
103 South Gay Street, 8th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21202-4061

December 2007

Dear former TVS employees:

In June of this year, I sent you a letter about the pending case involving the NLRB, CNN, Team Video Services and the National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians (NABET) Locals 11 and 31. As I told you in my letter of November 30, the June letter contained incorrect information about an issue in this case.

My June letter said that for many years the terms and conditions of employment of Team Video employees were governed by collective bargaining agreements between CNN and NABET. As I told you in my November letter, that statement is incorrect. The collective-bargaining agreements I referenced in the June letter were actually between Team Video Services and NABET. The implication of the misstatement in the June letter that CNN was an employer of Team Video Service employees remains in dispute in this case. CNN and Team Video Services vigorously deny that they were joint employers and that CNN had any role in determining the terms and conditions of your employment. The NLRB continues to assert that a joint employer relationship exists. This is an issue to be determined in litigation.

Accordingly, you should not rely on my misstatement in the June letter regarding the relationship between CNN and Team Video Services in so far as it involves NABET. Some of you may have seen my June letter when it was sent, or have seen it since then on the website of NABET Local 31 and perhaps in other ways. As I said above, you should disregard the implication of the June letter insofar as it concerns the relationship between CNN and Team Video Services vis-à-vis NABET.

I also wish to clarify that my prior letter did not imply that CNN or Team Video Services had done anything to interfere with the processes of the Board in this case. To the best of my knowledge, CNN and Team Video Services have not done anything to threaten, intimidate, or coerce any witnesses in this case. If you understood my letters to imply the contrary, you should disregard this implication as well.

Thank you for the time you have taken to read this letter.

Very truly yours,

Wayne R. Gold,
Regional Director
NLRB Region 5