

EXHIBIT F

August 6, 2009

VIA E-MAIL AND FIRST CLASS MAIL

Jeffrey Pash, Esq.
National Football League
280 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10017



NFL PLAYERS
ASSOCIATION

LEGAL DEPARTMENT

Dear Jeff:

Before responding to your letter of July 10, 2009 regarding our request for certain information relevant to collective bargaining, I took some time to research our past dealings regarding the NFLPA's right to review television contracts. As I had recalled, we requested copies of the television contracts in preparation for bargaining back in 1981, and when the league refused to provide them, we filed an unfair labor practice charge in Region 2 of the National Labor Relations Board. That charge resulted in the filing of a Complaint by the NLRB against the NFL Management Council on April 19, 1982, saying that the league's refusal to allow the NFLPA to review television contracts was a violation of Section 8(a)(1) and (5) of the National Labor Relations Act.

After an evidentiary hearing on the Complaint, Judge Julius Cohn ruled in favor of the NFLPA on September 27, 1982, and ordered the NFL, among other things, to cease and desist from failing and refusing to furnish the non-monetary terms of the TV contracts to the union. That NLRB case was settled as part of an NLRB Settlement Agreement signed on December 11, 1982. That Agreement provided in Paragraph 1.a. (7) and (8) that the NFL was to make available for the NFLPA's inspection the non-financial terms of all media contracts. A copy of the Agreement is enclosed for your review.

Against this backdrop, it would seem that your current failure or refusal to share at least the non-financial terms of the television contracts with us violates legal precedent. It makes no difference, as you state on page 3 of your letter, that "The new television agreements, which you request in your letter, cover seasons not included within the current agreement." The contracts we sought in 1982 also covered seasons subsequent to the term of the then current CBA, and the same was true of the TV contracts we requested to see when we returned to bargaining in 1987.

Accordingly, I trust that you will reconsider your refusal to provide the NFLPA with copies of the new television contracts with CBS, NBC, and Direct TV. The League and the Clubs committed long ago to provide non-financial terms, and in view of the obvious relevance of financial terms, and the stated willingness in your letter to share the "expected revenues from those contracts when the negotiations focus on overall revenue," it seems the financial terms should be provided as well.

In addition, I remind you of our request for the audited financials of the clubs which DeMaurice made in his May 18, 2009 letter to Roger. Although you declined to provide that information in your letter of June 1, 2009, you did say at the end of our first bargaining session

Mr. Jeff Pash
August 6, 2009
Page 2

on June 3 in New York that we deserved to have "more specifics" on why the clubs needed concessions from the NFLPA in the economic area. That view was essentially repeated near the end of our July 14 session in Washington when Greg Levy stated that your side realized that you needed to give us more information on the "specific areas" in which clubs have experienced increased costs in recent years. This was after we stated that we needed to see club financials in order to be persuaded that there is a financial problem before we can begin discussing any solutions. As of this date, however, no financial information has been provided.

As a further matter, you and other members of your committee have told us that not all of the owners' objections to the current CBA are "data driven" or for that matter, rational. For example, we were told at the June 3 meeting that our side "should not assume that the owners' decision to terminate was "all rational or numbers-based," and that "each owner has his own reasons."

To make any real progress, we therefore believe that we need to know more about the owners' reasons for terminating, whether they be rational or not. We need to see specific economic information which we can use to evaluate the need for change, and we need to understand, to the best of our ability, what each owner's reasons are for discontinuing the partnership which has performed so well for both of us since its inception in 1993. None of that information has been forthcoming so far, but we trust that will not remain the case as we prepare for our next round of talks.

In that respect, DeMaurice has asked me to discuss with you possible dates in either the second or third weeks in August. Please let us know if that time frame fits your committee's schedule. Meanwhile, you will also recall that you agreed that the next meeting will be most productive if you are ready to begin presenting whatever proposals you wish to make on behalf of the owners for changing our current agreement. Since the owners were the parties terminating the existing deal, it is incumbent upon them to come forward and propose what specific changes they are seeking. Frankly, since the termination by the owners was so long ago, we are surprised and cannot understand why we have not yet received any proposal from the owners' side. We hope and trust that this situation will shortly change, as the uncapped year is coming closer, and we urge you to come to the next meeting with some specific proposals that we can evaluate.

Sincerely,



Richard Berthelsen

cc: DeMaurice Smith