

-----Original Message-----

From: David

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 12:02 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Hanford

The Department of Energy is seeking public comment regarding the funding of pension and health care benefits for workers on DOE sites. Why is DOE only now concerned with this?

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here for fifteen years. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was negotiated with the union and the contractors. Prior to this, there were multiple pension plans due to the multiple contractors performing work for DOE. The multi-employer plan was designed to save money for DOE. A detailed cost analysis was conveyed to DOE-Headquarters that showed what the plan would cost to fund through 2012. DOE-Headquarters approved the plan and, although the workers suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time, the plan was accepted by the unions and the workforce. It appears now that DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the workforce through pension benefit payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan altogether.

DOE wants to introduce a "market-based" plan because the DOE site workers receive higher benefits to those in the private sector. Does DOE even know what type of work is performed at Hanford? The Hanford site is not building "widgets" or cleaning up oil spills. We are engaged in and exposed to one of the most contaminated and hazardous environments in the world. The workforce have dedicated their lives to cleaning up the federal governments environmental legacy. Each day, they put themselves in harms way performing a critical service to the United States of America. Their dedication should not go unnoticed. They should expect from their government the same type of commitment and dedication in return for their service.

If DOE is so worried about how to fund benefits plans, they need to start within their own ranks. Their pension and medical plans are significantly higher than the very workforce they want to eliminate. For the workforce at Hanford, the pension multiplier is 1.6 x high 5 wages X years of service. For DOE, the multiplier is 2.2 X high 3 wages X years of service. They don't seem to be worried about how to fund themselves. In fact, by eliminating the workers pension plan, the DOE could enrich their own. That appears to be the case.

In closing, I adamantly oppose this new directive. It's time the federal government honor their commitments to the workforce and abandon any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode worker benefits.

Thank you,

David W. Reeve

-----Original Message-----

From:
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 11:32 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Pension and Medical Funding

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here for twenty five years. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was negotiated with the union and contractors. Prior to this, there were multiple pension plans due to the multiple contractors performing work for DOE. This multi-employer plan was designed to save money for DOE. A detailed cost analysis was conveyed to DOE-Headquarters that showed what the plan would cost to fund through 2012. DOE-Headquarters approved the plan and, although the workers suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time, the plan was accepted by the unions and the workforce. It appears now, since DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the workforce through pension benefit payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan altogether.

DoE wants to introduce a 'market based' plan because the DOE site workers receive higher benefits than those in the private sector. The Hanford site is not just cleaning up oil spills. We are engaged in and exposed to one of the most contaminated and hazardous environments in the world. Our workforce has been cleaning up the federal governments' environmental legacy. Each day we put ourselves in harms way performing a critical service to the United States of America. Our dedication should not go unnoticed. We respectfully expect the same type of commitment from our government in return for our service and dedication.

I strongly oppose this new directive, it is time for the federal government to honor their commitments to the workforce and abandon any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode worker benefits.

Thank you,

Eduardo Cervantes, Millwright

-----Original Message-----

From: BRAD EKSTROM
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 10:35 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject:

I have worked on the Hanford site for 14 years. I do not feel that it is fair to change the rules in the middle of the game in sports, or when you are planning for retirement on a benefit that you have earned. You can save money elsewhere than making your last dollar on the people that serve in cleaning up the mess that you have created in our hometown. The people here on site deserve to be treated fairly for the hazardous work that we do and not have to worry about you bureaucrats thinking we are trying to get something we don't deserve and picking

our pockets while we concentrate on staying safe in the Tank farms. It would be nice to be appreciated for what we have accomplished thus far and not be nickel and dimed to death by people always reaching for our wallets. Stop the insanity. Brad Ekstrom

-----Original Message-----

From: Becky Phillips

Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 8:46 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here for 3.5 years. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was negotiated with the union and the contractors. Prior to this, there were multiple pension plans due to the multiple contractors performing work for DOE. The multi-employer plan was designed to save money for DOE. A detailed cost analysis was conveyed to DOE-Headquarters that showed what the plan would cost through 2012. DOE-Headquarters approved the plan and, although the workers suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time, the plan was accepted by the unions and the workforce. It appears now that DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the workforce through pension benefits payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan altogether.

DOE wants to introduce a "market-based" plan because the DOE site workers receive higher benefits to those in the private sector. Does DOE even know what type of work is performed at Hanford? The Hanford site is not building "widgets" or cleaning up oil spills. We are engaged in and exposed to one of the most contaminated and hazardous environments in the world. The workforce have dedicated their lives to cleaning up the federal governments environmental legacy. Each day, they put themselves in harms way performing a critical service to the United States of America. Their dedication should not go unnoticed. They should expect from their government the same type of commitment and dedication in return for their service.

If DOE is so worried about how to fund benefits plans, they need to start within their own ranks. Their pension and medical plans are significantly higher than the very workforce they want to eliminate. For the workforce at Hanford, the pension multiplier is 1.6 x high 5 wages x years of service. For DOE, the multiplier is 2.2 x high 3 wages x years of service. They don't seem to be worried about how to fund themselves. In fact, by eliminating the workers pension plan, the DOE could enrich their own. That appears to be the case.

In closing, I adamantly oppose this new directive. It's time the federal government honor their commitments to the workforce and abandon any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode worker benefits.

Thank you,

Brian Phillips

-----Original Message-----

From: Kubler, Diane
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 4:16 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: FW: suggestion (& disclaimer)

To Whom it may concern:

Any and all of the following views implied and/or expressed reflect my personal beliefs as a U.S. tax payer and private citizen and are in no way intended to reflect or constitute an expression of the U.S. Air Force/Army/Navy/Marines, Department of Defense, or any and all other government/private agencies, laboratories, or policies.

I realize this may be an obvious suggestion combined with a question.

DoE has centralized and combined resources; in this how many contract contractor's employees (under the scenario of the Washington Post article) were equally affected? Has a study (similar to the old A-76 Cost Study) been accomplished on the contract contractor provided services, pensions, or fringes? The old system (started in the 1940s) of the government absorbing contract costs for contractor provided employees benefits strongly appears to have out lived the motivation needed six decades ago. Currently it appears greed is the motivation and not to "attract scientists to work on secret projects in remote locations, and continued through the Cold War." The remote locations are becoming less and less. One of the first atomic bomb tests was in a U.S. western state - it is not remote anymore. Suggest - A SERIOUS COMPLETE LIFE CYCLE COST OF DOING BUSINESS COST STUDY.

As a tax payer most of us know that no matter how well written a contract (to include agreements or memorandum of understanding) they can be changed, modified, or terminated. A Simple Law, an Act (congress), a tax change (I'll discuss later) can change everything. If the solution is between the government (referenced as the old system started in the 1940') and the contractor parties, then look into bringing it into the current century. A "Life Cycle Cost" analysis, cost study, or what ever title is used, a serious study is obviously needed. It does not take a genius to see the 1940's scenario has outlived it's usefulness decades ago. Suggest - CHANGE THE CONTRACTS, A NEW LAW, OR ACT NEEDS TO BE PASSED.

The *pass-through of contractor employee benefits for the federal government to pay for is absurd. By the very nature of this plan; the contractor has little to zero incentive to keep the pass-through costs down! (*Pass-through meaning the benefits, etc. the government pays for which in turn the contractor dangles as the golden carrot to get said employees.) Suggestion - COULD POSSIBLY BECOME ANTI-DEFFICIENT. CAN'T BE CONTINUED BY THE VERY NATURE OF THE PLAN (IN A SENCE BECOMING NOT LEGAL TO CONTINUE TO OFFER)

As for the TAX referenced above. Perhaps there could be a tax levied to contractors (both Prime and Sub) still operating under this old 1940's scenario. At least that way some of the taxes would go back into the system. Perhaps a tax can be levied against the employees AND the contractor's operating off this old system. If not a federal tax, then perhaps a state tax to put revenue back into the system. Call it a luxury or usage tax - Something that only applies to employees/contractors utilizing the 1940's scenario. A tax that would incentivize the contractors/employees to stop using this method. This way it would not be denying it...just making it much less attractive & hopefully more expensive to utilize. Suggestion- TAX IT. TAX THE HECK OUT OF IT TO MAKE IT NOT COST EFFECTIVE TO USE FOR ALL PARTIES GAINING FROM IT.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Respectfully.

Diane E. Kubler

-----Original Message-----

From: Kubler, Diane

Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 5:02 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: RE: One time buy-out

To Whom it may concern:

1. Offer a one time buy out with the incentive of \$25K . After that time the employees must rely upon their employers (i.e. contractor that they work for).
2. An early retirement incentive (but with reduced benefits).
3. A reduced retirement and relocation costs paid for 1 move within a one year period of time from retirement.
4. Offering 401K type incentive with the government reducing their cost share by 25% each year for 4 years. After that it's up to the contractor.

Usually Cash \$\$ is one of the best incentives of all.

The scenario the 1940's 'motivation' provided could realistically be in it's 3rd generation (or more) within families working for such companies and drawing benefits/retirement. Allowing it to continue is not the answer and lump sum incentives can motivate.

(Lump sum before taxes...of course)

Thank you.

Diane Kubler

-----Original Message-----

From: larry weingarten
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 5:30 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Contractor benefits

These benefits were promised to us.

A retired Sandian

Larry Weingarten

-----Original Message-----

From: Hempfling, William F
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2007 8:18 AM
To: contractor pensions
Cc: DiMeglio, Denise J; Aronson, Samuel (BNL)
Subject: Pension/Medical Challenges in DOE

I am, William Hempfling, the HR Director at Brookhaven National Laboratory and would like to submit the following comments in response to the aforementioned notice in the Federal Register. Brookhaven National Laboratory is also going to submit a paper regarding our view of the issues that are associated with DOE's requirement for contractors to do semi-annual Benefits-Value studies and Cost Studies. A number of other contractors share our view that these one-size-fits-all approaches are flawed and I do not want to repeat the same arguments that my peers have already made. There are, however, two other points that I would like to address. The first concerns my view of how Human Resources operates in the DOE contractor system and the key role we play in managing costs while attempting to remain competitive. The second point I'd like to cover is the effectiveness of the oversight role played by the DOE-Site Office management.

Managing Human Resources functions in today's environment is an incredibly complex task. The competition for talent is fierce. Our nation does not produce a sufficient number of bright, young Scientists and Engineers to meet the country's needs. The Labs are competing with each other, universities, and high technology industries to recruit the best and brightest to meet the country's challenges. At the same time, the laboratories have been operating under flat-flat or declining budget for many years. We've reduced staff, found more innovative ways to accomplish our tasks, and looked for every possible way to save money.

Most laboratories have acknowledged the key role that is played by Human Resources in the management of their operations. We HR Directors sit at the table with senior level managers in our institutions and we

grapple with the competing dilemma of keeping costs at a reasonable level in order to avoid layoffs while maintaining sufficiently attractive benefit/salary plans to compete for talent. Of course, retention of highly qualified staff in such a competitive marketplace for talent is also part of this equation. I've been HR Director at Brookhaven since October of 2000. Since that time, our laboratory has shrunk by almost 500 FTE's to our present level of ~2,600 FTE's. But more to the point of this memo, I've overseen significant cuts in the overall benefits packages that we offer to employees. None of the aforementioned cuts were done in response to DOE Order 350.1. Rather, they were done because we, as responsible managers, realized that our choices were to either cut costs or have crippling staff reductions.

We've made substantial changes to our medical, retirement, and other employee welfare plans since 1999 and have, as a consequence, reduced our costs by more than \$21,000,000. (A summary of those changes follows this paper) Interestingly enough, some of the changes we made had the effect of increasing our ben-val index, despite the fact that they resulted in significant dollar savings. I am concerned that an overly-proscriptive approach regarding how benefits should be administered in the DOE contractor system does not take into account the fact that HR Directors are, by and large, proactive members of management teams. We are making some very difficult decisions, at the ground level. We are all trying to maintain the very delicate balance that exists between holding down costs, avoiding layoffs, and maintaining competitive salary and benefit plans. I maintain that we perform our jobs despite the requirements of 350.1 or the shelved 351.1.

That said, I'm not suggesting that there should be no oversight by the Department of Energy. I believe that the HR community understands the need for oversight and clearly accepts the role that DOE plays in terms of being stewards for the taxpayer. This leads to my second point about the role played by the DOE Site Offices. I would point to my relationship with our Site Contracting Officer as a good model for the entire system.

We meet regularly and are very open with one another about what is going on in our respective worlds. As a consequence, we've developed a good understanding and a healthy working relationship. That's not to say that tension doesn't arise from time to time over our (at times) competing needs or demands. But by and large, we both operate from the basis of mutual understanding. Because of our open relationship, he fully understands that I am making decisions that affect the balance between cost and recruitment. He also understands that I'm making those decisions even when not required to do so by DOE Order 350.1. In my view, the Site Contracting Officer is the individual who should be serving as HQ's "legs on the ground." The Site Contracting Officer has

a good picture of our total compensation picture, how our salaries stack up, and local pressures (such as taxes, cost of medical delivery in the community, local costs of living, etc.).

I believe that some form of benefits/compensation metric is necessary for DOE to be able to say that they are performing their role as stewards. But that metric should be viewed merely as a tool. A re-worked approach to viewing benefits, as part of total compensation, across the complex should not be proscriptive. Rather, in my view, the Site Contracting Officers should be given a fair amount of latitude and should be brought into discussions about these issues with the people in headquarters. There are many factors at play in the various locales and the people in HQ cannot be expected to have a full understanding of what is occurring at each site.

What follows is a full description of the proactive steps taken by Brookhaven National Laboratory in an effort to manage our costs while maintaining plans that are attractive enough to enable us to compete for the world-class staff that would be worthy of a DOE National Laboratory.

SUMMARY OF BENEFIT PLAN MODIFICATIONS AND OTHER COST SAVINGS 1999 - 2007

1/1/99 Benefit Modifications

* Replaced CIGNA indemnity medical plan with PPO plan for employees and non-Medicare retirees

ANNUAL ESTIMATED SAVINGS: \$4,600,000

1/1/01 Benefit Modifications

* Eligibility for retiree medical coverage was modified for employees who were hired on or after 1/1/01 to a minimum age of 55 with 10 or more years of service. Age plus service must equal 70 or more. Previously the service requirement was 5 years.

* The long-term disability plan benefit was modified from 50% of base pay to 60% of base pay.

* 401(a) retirement plan eligibility was modified to exclude age 30 and 3 months of service. The new requirement is age 21 and 2 years of service.

ANNUAL ESTIMATED SAVINGS:

Unable
to Estimate

1/1/02 Benefit Modifications

* The medical contribution structure was modified to go from 3 to 4 pay categories.

* Co-payments for the medical programs were increased from \$5 to \$15 for non-IBEW employees and retirees.

* Coverage for prescription drugs was modified from a 2-tier structure to a 3-tier structure for non-IBEW employees and retirees.

* Employees who retired on or after 1/1/02 are now required to make whatever contribution the Laboratory may require. It is no longer frozen at the time of retirement.

* Dual coverage for medical and dental plans was discontinued prospectively.

* The Cigna dental PPO plan was added as an option for non-IBEW employees.

ANNUAL ESTIMATED SAVINGS: \$2,600,000

* 1/1/03 Benefit Modifications

* The medical contribution structure was modified and is now based

on both pay and plan cost for non-IBEW union employees.

* The medical contribution structure was modified for employees who retired on or after 1/1/02 to be 20% of plan cost.

* The Cigna medical plan deductible was increased from \$250 per person (\$500 per family) to \$500 per person (\$1500 per family).

* The Cigna medical plan out-of-pocket maximum was increased from \$1200 per person (\$2400 per family) to \$2500 per person (\$7500 per family).

* The availability of out-of-network pharmacies was eliminated for the Cigna medical plan.

* A \$100 per person prescription drug deductible was implemented for the Cigna and Vytra medical plans.

* Medical and dental benefits were offered to same-sex domestic partners for non-IBEW and non-SCSPA employees and retirees.

* The severance plan was modified to reduce the benefit for voluntary reductions-in-force for non-IBEW employees.

ANNUAL ESTIMATED SAVINGS: \$5,913,000

1/1/04 Salary Action

* Delayed annual salary increase plan by 3-months.

ONE-TIME SAVINGS: \$2,000,000

1/1/04 Benefit Modifications

* The medical contribution structure was modified and is now based on pay for IBEW union employees.

* The Cigna dental PPO plan was offered to IBEW employees.

* Medical and dental benefits were offered to same-sex domestic partners for IBEW employees.

ANNUAL ESTIMATED SAVINGS:

Cost neutral

* Modified severance pay plan so that maximum amount of severance payable to any employee is \$45,000. Savings mentioned below were for fiscal year 2005. Future annual savings would be based upon the number of layoffs.

ANNUAL ESTIMATED SAVINGS:

\$1,200,000

* Reduced the number of vacation days that could be carried over from one fiscal year to the next from a maximum of 24 to 20.

ONE-TIME SAVINGS: \$1,100,000

1/1/05 Benefit Modifications

* The life, long-term disability, and accidental death and dismemberment insurances were moved from Cigna to Prudential, thus reducing the cost of coverage.

* The Cigna medical plan was moved from a minimum premium insurance arrangement to a self-insured arrangement, thus reducing the administrative costs of coverage.

* The Cigna PPO medical plan was moved to an OAP medical plan for non-IBEW employees to access deeper discounts with providers.

* The Cigna prescription program was modified to use an alliance with Aon to access deeper discounts on prescription drugs.

* The Vytra medical plan was moved from a fully-insured HMO

medical plan to a self-insured PPO medical plan for non-IBEW employees to access deeper discounts with providers.

* Stop loss insurance was implemented for the self-insured medical plans with Cigna and Vytra, thus providing a cap on extraordinary claims.

ANNUAL ESTIMATED SAVINGS: \$2,425,000

1/1/06 Benefit Modifications

* Office visit co-payments were increased from \$15 to \$20 for a primary care physician and \$30 for a specialist

* The co-payment for a 30-day supply of prescription drugs increased from \$5/\$15/\$30 (generic, brand-name formulary, brand-name non-formulary) to \$10/\$25/\$40. It is double of the above amounts for a 90-day mail-order supply.

* The age limit for dependent children attending full-time school was set at 23. Previously, there was no age limit. (medical and dental plans)

* Dual coverage was eliminated (medical and dental plans)

* The benefit credit was eliminated from the CIGNA medical plan.

* Retirees who previously had a \$100 per person (\$300 per family) deductible were moved to a \$500 per person (\$1500 per family) deductible. Their out-of-pocket maximum was also increased from \$900 per person to \$2500 per person (\$7500 per family)

* A vacation buy plan was added. This encourages the use of leave without pay but spreads the impact to the employee over the entire calendar year (versus just the paycheck in which the time is taken).

ANNUAL ESTIMATED SAVINGS: \$1,501,000

8/1/06 Benefit Modifications

* Required IBEW employees who retired after 7/31/06 to go into non-union medical plans and pay 20% of plan cost savings not determined

1/1/07 Benefit Modifications

* For SCSPA:

Current Plan

1-1-07 Plan

Medical office visit co-payments

\$15

\$20 PCP/ \$30 specialist

Prescription drug deductible

\$0

\$100/person

\$300/family

Prescription drug co-payments

Range \$5/\$10/\$25 to

\$5/\$12/\$35 based on plan

Range \$10/\$25/\$40 to \$15/\$30/\$50 based on plan

Out-of-network deductible

(CIGNA)

\$250/person

\$500/family

\$500/person

\$1500/family

Out-of-pocket maximum

\$1200/person

\$2400/family

\$2500/person

\$7500/family

Dual Coverage & Benefit Credit

Included

Eliminated

Age for dependent children in F/T school (Medical)

Unlimited for CIGNA.

Other plans: 23-25

Age 23 for all Plans

Type of Medical Plan

CIGNA PPO

CIGNA OAP PPO with additional discounts for BNL

Medical Plan Contributions

Base salary: weekly cost

<\$30K: \$5.22/7.98/10.73

\$30-40K: \$7.43/11/14.85

\$40-60K: \$9.63/14.30/19.25

\$60-80K: \$12.67/19.03/25.37

\$80K+: \$16.48/24.74/32.98

Employee/EE+1/Family

Base salary: weekly cost

<\$40K: \$7.25-31.96

\$40-70K: \$10.87-47.94

\$70-100K: \$13.77-60.73

\$100K+: \$17.40-76.71

Employee/EE+1/Family

Range based on plan selected

Dental Plan Dual Coverage

Included

Eliminated

Age for dependent children in F/T school (Dental)

Unlimited for EBS.

Other plans: 23-25

Age 23 for all plans

* For IBEW:

o Moved the IBEW group from the Cigna OAP to PPO medical plan. This would result in additional savings due to the network change

o Moved the IBEW group from the Vytra fully-insured HMO to self-insured PPO.
savings not determined

TOTAL SAVINGS FROM ABOVE ACTIONS:
\$21,300,000

-----Original Message amended to add disclaimer-----

From: Jan Tweed
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2007 12:27 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Contractor Pensions

While I understand the financial impacts of continuing to fund the pensions and medical benefits of M&O contractor employees, I think it would be a disservice to our nation to eliminate or significantly reduce these benefits. Highly qualified workers seek out the laboratories for many reasons, and these benefits are key to recruiting and retaining this excellent work force. The price is small when compared to the more than 60 years of commitment by these outstanding workers. The Federal government has tremendously benefited from the accomplishments and scientific excellence of these workers.

The views expressed in these comments reflect my personal beliefs as a private citizen and are not intended to reflect or constitute an expression of Agency [or laboratory or company] policy.

-----Original Message-----

From: Huddleston, Stevan J

Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 3:59 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: FW: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

Importance: High

The Department of Energy is seeking public comment regarding the funding of pension and health care benefits for workers on DOE sites. Why is DOE only now concerned with this?

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here for thirteen years . In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was negotiated with the union and the contractors. Prior to this, there were multiple pension plans due to the multiple contractors performing work for DOE. The multi-employer plan was designed to save money for DOE. A detailed cost analysis was conveyed to DOE-Headquarters that showed what the plan would cost to fund through 2012. DOE-Headquarters approved the plan and, although the workers suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time, the plan was accepted by the unions and the workforce. It appears now that DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the workforce through pension benefit payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan altogether.

DOE wants to introduce a "market-based" plan because the DOE site workers receive higher benefits to those in the private sector. Does DOE even know what type of work is performed at Hanford? The Hanford site is not building "widgets" or cleaning up oil spills. We are engaged in and exposed to one of the most contaminated and hazardous environments in the world. The workforce have dedicated their lives to cleaning up the federal governments environmental legacy. Each day, they put themselves in harms way performing a critical service to the United States of America. Their dedication should not go unnoticed. They should expect from their government the same type of commitment and dedication in return for their service.

If DOE is so worried about how to fund benefits plans, they need to start within their own ranks. Their pension and medical plans are significantly higher than the very workforce they want to eliminate. For the workforce at Hanford, the pension multiplier is 1.6 x high 5 wages X years of service. For DOE, the multiplier is 2.2 X high 3 wages X years of service. They don't seem to be worried about how to fund themselves. In fact, by eliminating the workers pension plan, the DOE could enrich their own. That appears to be the case.

In closing, I adamantly oppose this new directive. It's time the federal government honor their commitments to the workforce and abandon

any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode worker benefits.

Thank you,

Stevan J Huddleston

-----Original Message-----

From: Cox, Gordon L
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 3:37 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: RE: PENSION AND POST-RETIREMENT BENEFITS

The views expressed in these comments reflect my personal beliefs as a private citizen and are not intended to reflect or constitute an expression of Agency [or laboratory or company] policy.

I have been employed by DOE contractors at Hanford for 30 years. My decision to do this was based largely on the promise that if I continued to be employed until retirement age, that my pension would be calculated on a expressed formula. Also, that I would be eligible for continued health care benefits at a specified cost to me. I was also promised that at retirement I would be entitled to an expressed amount of life insurance. You have already reneged on that commitment.

The cost of keeping your promise was predictable 30 years ago, and the implication that these costs are somehow a big surprise, is not at all credible.

DOE represents more than just a business. It is the United States government, and even under the current administration, must keep it's commitments. Especially when those commitments are to the very people who have invested their entire working life in the goals and missions of the DOE.

Gordon L. Cox

-----Original Message-----

From: Wingfield, Michael C
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 3:35 PM
To: contractor pensions

Subject: RE: Comment

Mike Wingfield

The views expressed in these comments reflect my personal beliefs as a private citizen and are not intended to reflect or constitute an expression of Agency [or laboratory or company] policy.

I am a 3rd generation Hanford worker. My father just passed away last May of asbestosis. His father passed for an undetermined lung problem. When the 3 of us took on a life's commitment to work at one of the most dangerous places on the planet it was with the understanding our government would take care of us. Now, at the dusk of my career you are considering abandoning me. We had a deal. My working life for a commitment from you to make my retirement somewhat comfortable. Please don't abandon those people that have given so much for their country in cold war and clean-up efforts. Keep our pensions and medical benefits the same. That was the deal.

-----Original Message-----

From: Steven A Eide

Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 2:44 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: RE: Comments on DOE Contractor Pensions and Medical Coverage

I think all DOE contractors and DOE employees should receive the same level of benefits. That level should be similar to other government and private organizations.

"The views expressed in these comments reflect my personal beliefs as a private citizen and are not intended to reflect or constitute an expression of Agency [or laboratory or company] policy."

-----Original Message-----

From: Steven A Eide

Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2007 9:38 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Comments on DOE Contractor Pensions and Medical Coverage

I think all DOE contractors and DOE employees should receive the same level of benefits. That level should be similar to other government and private organizations.

Steven A. Eide

-----Original Message-----

From: Taylor, Crystal J
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 11:21 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: FW: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding
Importance: High

The Department of Energy is seeking public comment regarding the funding of pension and health care benefits for workers on DOE sites. Why is DOE only now concerned with this?

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been working here for a total of 10 years. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was negotiated with the union and the contractors. Prior to this, there were multiple pension plans due to the multiple contractors performing work for DOE. The multi-employer plan was designed to save money for DOE. A detailed cost analysis was conveyed to DOE-Headquarters that showed what the plan would cost to fund through 2012. DOE-Headquarters approved the plan and, although the workers suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time, the plan was accepted by the unions and the workforce. It appears now that DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the workforce through pension benefit payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan altogether.

DOE wants to introduce a "market-based" plan because the DOE site workers receive higher benefits to those in the private sector. Does DOE even know what type of work is performed at Hanford? The Hanford site is not building "widgets" or cleaning up oil spills. We are engaged in and exposed to one of the most contaminated and hazardous environments in the world. The workforce have dedicated their lives to cleaning up the federal governments environmental legacy. Each day, they put themselves in harms way performing a critical service to the United States of America. Their dedication should not go unnoticed. They should expect from their government the same type of commitment and dedication in return for their service.

If DOE is so worried about how to fund benefits plans, they need to start within their own ranks. Their pension and medical plans are significantly higher than the very workforce they want to eliminate. For the workforce at Hanford, the pension multiplier is 1.6 x high 5 wages X years of service. For DOE, the multiplier is 2.2 X high 3 wages X years of service. They don't seem to be worried about how to fund themselves. In fact, by eliminating the workers pension plan, the DOE could enrich their own. That appears to be the case.

In closing, I adamantly oppose this new directive. It's time the federal government honor their commitments to the workforce and abandon any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode worker benefits.

Thank you,

Crystal J. Taylor

-----Original Message-----

From: Craig E Hall
Sent: Monday, April 09, 2007 11:08 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject:

Adjust D.O.E.'s pensions and benefits before the contractors. This at least would show you really want to reduce the benefits costs even for your own people.

-----Original Message-----

From: Hendricksphoto
Sent: Monday, April 09, 2007 9:38 PM
To: contractor pensions; Senator Murray) Murray
Subject: Funding of pension and health care benefits for workers on DOE sites.

The Department of Energy is seeking public comment regarding the funding of pension and health care benefits for workers on DOE sites. Why is DOE only now concerned with this?

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State . I've been here for nineteen years. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was negotiated with the union and the contractors. Prior to this, there were multiple pension plans due to the multiple contractors performing work for DOE. The multi-employer plan was designed to save money for DOE. A detailed cost analysis was conveyed to DOE-Headquarters that showed what the plan would cost to fund through 2012. DOE-Headquarters approved the plan and, although the workers suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time, the plan was accepted by the unions and the workforce. It appears now that DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the workforce through pension benefit payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan altogether.

DOE wants to introduce a "market-based" plan because the DOE site workers receive higher benefits to those in the private sector. Does DOE even know what type of work is performed at Hanford ? The Hanford site is not building "widgets" or cleaning up oil spills. We are engaged in and exposed to one of the most contaminated and hazardous environments in the world. The workforce have dedicated their lives to cleaning up the federal governments environmental legacy. Each day, they put themselves in harms way performing a critical service to the United States of America . Their dedication should not go unnoticed. They should expect from their government the same type of commitment and dedication in return for their service.

If DOE is so worried about how to fund benefits plans, they need to start within their own ranks. Their pension and medical plans are significantly higher than the very workforce they want to eliminate. For the workforce at Hanford , the pension multiplier is 1.6 x high 5 wages X years of service. For DOE, the multiplier is 2.2 X high 3 wages X years of service. They don't seem to be worried about how

to fund themselves. In fact, by eliminating the workers pension plan, the DOE could enrich their own. That appears to be the case.

In closing, I adamantly oppose this new directive. It's time the federal government honor their commitments to the workforce and abandon any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode worker benefits.

Thank you,
Tim Hendricks

-----Original Message-----

From: CLAY GOSNEY

Sent: Monday, April 09, 2007 6:16 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Fw: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

Citrus Punch

The Department of Energy is seeking public comment regarding the funding of pension and health care benefits for workers on DOE sites. Why is DOE only now concerned with this?

I worked at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I retired after 40 years of service. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was negotiated with the union and the contractors. Prior to this, there were multiple pension plans due to the multiple contractors performing work for DOE. The multi-employer plan was designed to save money for DOE. A detailed cost analysis was conveyed to DOE-Headquarters that showed what the plan would cost to fund through 2012. DOE-Headquarters approved the plan and, although the workers suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time, the plan was accepted by the unions and the workforce. It appears now that DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the workforce through pension benefit payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan altogether.

DOE wants to introduce a "market-based" plan because the DOE site workers receive higher benefits to those in the private sector. Does DOE even know what type of work is performed at Hanford? The Hanford

site is not building "widgets" or cleaning up oil spills. We are engaged in and exposed to one of the most contaminated and hazardous environments in the world. The workforce have dedicated their lives to cleaning up the federal governments environmental legacy. Each day, they put themselves in harms way performing a critical service to the United States of America. Their dedication should not go unnoticed. They should expect from their government the same type of commitment and dedication in return for their service.

If DOE is so worried about how to fund benefits plans, they need to start within their own ranks. Their pension and medical plans are significantly higher than the very workforce they want to eliminate. For the workforce at Hanford, the pension multiplier is 1.6 x high 5 wages X years of service. For DOE, the multiplier is 2.2 X high 3 wages X years of service. They don't seem to be worried about how to fund themselves. In fact, by eliminating the workers pension plan, the DOE could enrich their own. That appears to be the case.

In closing, I adamantly oppose this new directive. It's time the federal government honor their commitments to the workforce and abandon any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode current and retired persons worker benefits.

Thank you,

Clay Gosney

-----Original Message-----

From: courtland smith

Sent: Monday, April 09, 2007 5:58 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Fw: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

Citrus Punch

The Department of Energy is seeking public comment regarding the funding of pension and health care benefits for workers on DOE sites. Why is DOE only now concerned with this?

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here off and on since 1985, right now I have 15 years. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was negotiated with the union and the contractors. Prior to this, there were multiple pension plans due to the multiple contractors performing work for DOE. The multi-employer plan was designed to save money for DOE. A detailed cost analysis was conveyed to DOE-Headquarters that showed what the plan would cost to fund through 2012. DOE-Headquarters approved the plan and, although the workers suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time, the plan was accepted by the unions and the workforce. It appears now that DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the workforce through pension benefit payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan altogether.

DOE wants to introduce a "market-based" plan because the DOE site workers receive higher benefits to those in the private sector. Does DOE even know what type of work is performed at Hanford? The Hanford site is not building "widgets" or cleaning up oil spills. We are engaged in and exposed to one of the most contaminated and hazardous environments in the world. The workforce have dedicated their lives to cleaning up the federal governments environmental legacy. Each day, they put themselves in harms way performing a critical service to the United States of America. Their dedication should not go unnoticed. They should expect from their government the same type of commitment and dedication in return for their service.

If DOE is so worried about how to fund benefits plans, they need to start within their own ranks. Their pension and medical plans are significantly higher than the very workforce they want to eliminate. For the workforce at Hanford, the pension multiplier is 1.6 x high 5 wages X years of service. For DOE, the multiplier is 2.2 X high 3 wages X years of service. They don't seem to be worried about how to fund themselves. In fact, by eliminating the workers pension plan, the DOE could enrich their own. That appears to be the case.

In closing, I adamantly oppose this new directive. It's time the federal government honor their commitments to the workforce and abandon any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode worker benefits.

Thank you,

-----Original Message-----

From: Sara Jordan

Sent: Monday, April 09, 2007 2:53 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Re: DOE's request for comments on DOE Notice 351.1

Concern re DOE Notice 351.1 - Contractor Pensions for Retirees in Oak Ridge

Please do not further degrade DOE's already unfair practices for Oak Ridge contractor retirees. Instead, we need to grant OR retirees the pension improvements that current employees have received, and to institute at least of modicum of adjustment to reflect the increases in cost of living that have occurred since we retired.

DOE communications always stress the alarming costs of unfunded liabilities across the Weapons Complex. But that is not the case with Oak Ridge retiree pensions! Our Oak Ridge pension fund has been plentiful for decades, currently having around \$600 Million beyond projected needs, and we are very frustrated with being mistreated (denied regular cost-of-living adjustments) in spite of these available funds. Since 1984 (over 20 years!) there has been no contribution from DOE's budget into the Oak Ridge main pension fund. All employee benefits and enhancements have been paid for by fund investment returns, including for new employees. Our fund is not in financial trouble; it is simply being hoarded while retirees suffer continual erosion of their financial security.

Furthermore, retirees are not even being granted pension improvements that current employees receive. In 2004, the pension multiplier factor was improved from 1.2 to 1.4, and the surviving spouse option reduction was reduced from 10% to just 2%-a very nice improvement, but only for current employees, not for the retirees who are languishing with pensions of ever-diminishing purchasing power. We need these improvements plus COLAs, and the funds are already available.

Finally-in virtually all its communications, DOE inappropriately quotes financial numbers that mix up pension costs with medical costs. True, medical costs are a worry for all of us, but at least in Oak Ridge, those medical funds come from a different source from our pensions. The continued insistence on mixing the two issues serves only to increase the anger and frustration at DOE's dishonesty and bad faith in dealing with thousands of loyal employees who served for decades during the Cold War and until recent years.

Please help us. We cannot believe that it would be the intent of Congress or the citizens of this country to follow a policy that is so blatantly biased against seniors who defended this country through years of effort and contribution to DOE programs. We urge your prompt attention to the benefits of retirees in Oak Ridge and hope that you will get others to assist you in obtaining an equitable policy. We will be grateful for your strong support of the need for pension relief in Oak Ridge.

Thank you,
Sara R. Jordan

-----Original Message-----

From: ROD BERRY

Sent: Sunday, April 08, 2007 10:56 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Public Comment for Pension & Medical Funding

The Department of Energy is seeking public comment regarding the funding of pension and health care benefits for workers on DOE sites. Why is DOE only now concerned with this?

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here for 31 years. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was negotiated with the union and the contractors. Prior to this, there were multiple pension plans due to the multiple contractors performing work for DOE. The multi-employer plan was designed to save money for DOE. A detailed cost analysis was conveyed to DOE-Headquarters that showed what the plan would cost to fund through 2012. DOE-Headquarters approved the plan, and although the workers suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time, the plan was accepted by the unions and the work force. It appears now that DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the work force through pension benefit payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan all together.

DOE wants to introduce a "market-based" plan because the DOE site workers receive higher benefits to those in the private sector. Does DOE even know what type of work is performed at Hanford? The Hanford site is not building "widgets" or cleaning up oil spills. We are engaged in and exposed to one of the most contaminated and hazardous environments in the world. The work force have dedicated their lives to cleaning up the government's environmental legacy. Each day, they put themselves in harms way performing a critical service to the United States of America. Their dedication should not go unnoticed. They should expect from their government the same type of commitment and dedication in return for their service.

If DOE is so worried about how to fund benefit plans, they need to start with their own ranks. Their pension and medical plans are significant higher than the very work force they want to eliminate for the work force at Hanford, the pension multiplier is 1.6 X high 5 wages X years of service. For DOE the multiplier is 2.2 X high 3 wages X years of service. They don't seem to be worried about how to fund themselves. In fact, by eliminated the worker's pension plan, the DOE could enrich their own. That appears to be the case.

In closing, I adamantly oppose this new directive. It's time the federal government honors their commitments to the work force and abandon any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode worker benefits.

Thank You,

Rod J. Berry

-----Original Message-----

From: Cherri DeFigh-Price

Sent: Sunday, April 08, 2007 1:59 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: omments on DOE Contractor Pension programs

Thank you for extending the time for commenting on the DOE contractor pension program.

I have worked at the DOE Hanford site for 33 years and have seen many changes. Contrary to the local press, I believe that the Department of Energy should require the contractors to establish portable, 401-K (or similar) programs for all new DOE contractor staff hired. I do not think it is 'unfair' since the people hiring on will know what they are getting.

The argument of a strong site-specific pension program has been the need to retain the right technical staff. Given where DOE is with it's programs (where there is very little production -- tritium - going on), it would be both in the DOE best interest and in future employees if their retirement funds were both PORTABLE and within their own control.

Right now, the DOE site specific pension programs are like mini golden parachuits for the employees, discouraging them to go where their talents can best serve them in disposing and treating the Department of Energy legacy wastes. As we shut down sites (hopefully continuing that endeavor) would it not be best for the employees to be encouraged to go to the 'next DOE cleanup site' on the list, rather than fighting to keep jobs at sites (like Hanford) where there is little work.

We are not running large speciality processing facilities at most places. The training needs to be repeated every few years. If the employer is treating the workers well and the work is meaningful, they will come (and stay) regardless of whether the pension is site specific or more portable.

I know that most of the press feedback you have gotten has been to continue the very expensive, non portable pension programs. Please recognize we do not all believe that.

I encourage you to establish (via your contracting process) a more portable, industry based retirement program.

Thank you.

Cherri DeFigh-Price

-----Original Message-----

From: TheMatrix

Sent: Saturday, April 07, 2007 3:34 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Comment on Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

Hello;

I am an employee of Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque, New Mexico. I have the following comments regarding the referenced challenge.

1. Our management has always told us that our benefits for Medical and Retirement are based on market surveys of similar organizations both commercial and government. They indicated that our retirement plan is within an acceptable range of the market survey. In fact on a number of occasions, management indicated that they would not enhance or improve our retirement plan because it was comparable to that market survey. Now the DOE is proposing that our pension is too costly. In fact Sandia has not had to contribute toward the retirement plan for more than 20 years and is not likely to have to contribute for at least another 5 to 10 years. Sandia's plan is not out of line with similar plans offered by those companies in our market survey. No changes are warranted!
2. A similar point can be made about Sandia's medical benefits. We as employees have been contributing toward the plan premium for a number of years and paying copays for services. Each year our premium share and copays change based on medical costs. Sandia's plan is fair to employees and the taxpayer.
3. The real issue with DOE's pension and medical benefit budget problems is the rapid rise in medical costs not retirement plans. Cutting medical benefits is not the solution. Improve the way medical services are managed and delivered. For example, when I go to the doctor, medical records are not available from one office to another or to the patient. There is far too much paperwork associated with medical services. Every time I visit a doctor's office a copy of my insurance card is made and a receptionist checks me in. Why can't I just scan my card and automatically be authenticated for insurance coverage and the appointment? DOE staff should be working with members of Congress to pass legislation that changes the way medicine is administered and medical information is sequestered rather than trying to reduce employee benefits.
4. If DOE reduces employee benefits there is going to be an effect on hiring the best and

brightest scientists to work on national security problems. We are told that Sandia's budgets will be reduced in the future as our work shifts from nuclear weapons to other national security problems. Sandia is going to have trouble hiring the necessary talent to meet these challenges if they can't continue to offer competitive employee benefits.

Thanks You.

-----Original Message-----

From: Scott Klekar

Sent: Friday, April 06, 2007 5:56 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Pension Plan

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here for thirteen years. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was negotiated with the union and the contractors. Prior to this, there were multiple pension plans due to the multiple contractors performing work for DOE. The multi-employer plan was designed to save money for DOE. A detailed cost analysis was conveyed to DOE-Headquarters that showed what the plan would cost to fund through 2012. DOE-Headquarters approved the plan and, although the workers suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time, the plan was accepted by the unions and the workforce. It appears now that DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the workforce through pension benefit payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan altogether.

DOE wants to introduce a "market-based" plan because the DOE site workers receive higher benefits to those in the private sector. Does DOE even know what type of work is performed at Hanford? The Hanford site is not building "widgets" or cleaning up oil spills. We are engaged in and exposed to one of the most contaminated and hazardous environments in the world. The workforce have dedicated their lives to cleaning up the federal governments environmental legacy. Each day, they put themselves in harms way performing a critical service to the United States of America. Their dedication should not go unnoticed. They should expect from their government the same type of commitment and dedication in return for their service.

If DOE is so worried about how to fund benefits plans, they need to start within their own ranks. Their pension and medical plans are significantly higher than the very workforce they want to eliminate. For the workforce at Hanford, the pension multiplier is 1.6 x high 5 wages X years of service. For DOE, the multiplier is 2.2 X high 3 wages X years of service. They don't seem to be worried about how to fund themselves. In fact, by eliminating the workers pension plan, the DOE could enrich their own. That appears to be the case.

In closing, I adamantly oppose this new directive. It's time the federal government honor their commitments to the workforce and abandon any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode worker benefits.

Thank you,

Scott B. Klekar

-----Original Message-----

From: Gail Sewell
Sent: Friday, April 06, 2007 9:07 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Pension Benefits

I find it unconscionable that DOE would continue to deny its contractor workers the same benefits that it and Congress enjoys; i.e., increases in retirement benefits associated with off-setting inflation. After all, it is neither Congress nor DOE employees who are actually working on site and being exposed, inadvertently or not, to hazardous materials.

I will be contacting my representatives in Congress to urge them to correct this inequity and urging members of AARP to join in our battle. I would hope that DOE would see its way clear to encourage this change.

Sincerely,

Gail Sewell

-----Original Message-----

From: Donald Miller
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2007 4:44 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: DOE Notice 351.1 concerning pension plans and health

Sirs:

Although the official information being provided to retirees about protecting the pension fund seems well founded, the critical problem we retirees face is the silence we heard from our employers about the retiree payments being fixed before retirement.

It seems the decision to stop funding the retirement reserve from contractor payments was ill conceived. A modest contractor payment into the fund each year would permit the introduction of a modest CPI related annual increase in payments to retirees.

We do not expect a 100% correlation, nor do we expect to live in poverty after giving 35 to 40 years to the nation's defense and scientific leadership.

My 1994 retirement monthly check is now worth about half what it was then. My wife receives a small increase in her teachers retirement from Tennessee each year which helps.

The national retirement fund situation is a poor example for this great country to set. DOE is in a position to take a positive step and set the example for others as well as being fair to its contractor retirees.

Thank you

Donald R. Miller

-----Original Message-----

From: Jerry Smith
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2007 3:46 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Public Comment on Contractor Pension and Health Plan Reimbursement

It seems to me as taxpayer that DOE should take the lowest responsible bid for fixed terms or jobs. I am against any open-ended agreements to fund employee benefits for employees of the contractors. If the contractors can't do that, why do we need them? We might as well hire the employees directly.

Jerry Smith

-----Original Message-----

From: Hamtcpres . . .
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2007 12:33 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Pension and Medical Benefit Public Comment

The Department of Energy is seeking public comments regarding the costs associated with the pension and medical plans on DOE sites.

I have been a worker at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State for twenty-eight years. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension plan was introduced and negotiated with the union and the contractors. Prior to 1987, there were multiple pension plans at Hanford due to the multiple contractors performing various job activities for DOE. The multiple pension plans were at a significant cost to the federal government. The new pension plan was designed to save the federal government and the taxpayers a significant amount of money. The parameters of the new pension plan required approval from DOE-Headquarters, who were given the opportunity to review the plan, the cost savings and the projected funding that would be required to administer the plan up to 2012. After considerable review, DOE-Headquarters approved the plan and the associated funding. Although the workforce suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time,

all interested parties approved the new pension plan.

Now that DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the workforce through pension benefit payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan altogether. Why is DOE so concerned about this now? They were fully cognizant of the funding that would be required to administer the plan. DOE is only concerned about how to fund the workforce pension plans. Why is the same concern not directed to within their own offices? The DOE pension plans are enriched with retirement benefits, significantly higher than the workforce, and at a significantly higher associated cost. If DOE wants to reduce retirement costs, they can start by eliminating unnecessary and non-productive workers that reside within the Forestall Building. Eliminating DOE headcount would save the federal government and the taxpayers money, money that could be forwarded to the personnel that actually perform a critical service to the United States of America.

The Department's new policy for pension and medical benefits is going to be a serious detriment to the interests of the Local, State, and Federal agencies that are committed to the clean-up mission at Hanford. The Department's continuing efforts to restructure the benefit programs will have an adverse impact on the retirement security of the workforce that are dedicated in the completion of such mission.

The workforce at Hanford is exposed to and responsible for one of the most hazardous and contaminated sites in the world. Given the unique complexity of the clean-up mission and the continuous exposure to radiological and chemical hazards, the workforce must be assured that their service to the federal government will not go unnoticed. The pension and medical benefit programs at Hanford were designed to provide incentives that would recruit and retain a highly skilled workforce. Recruitment and retention of an experienced, highly trained, knowledgeable and dedicated workforce is essential for fulfilling the moral and legal obligation of the federal government to clean up America's

nuclear legacy at Hanford. The preservation of established benefit programs is critical for a stable workforce that has resulted in safe, efficient and well documented clean-up efforts.

The pension and medical programs at Hanford represent a commitment from the federal government that employees performing extremely dangerous and hazardous work will be appropriately compensated for their efforts. The introduction of a "two-tiered" benefit program, which provides different benefits for identical work, will disincentivize the workforce from making long-term commitments to perform such work. This will most assuredly result in delays of clean-up efforts, TPA Milestones, and an unnecessary increase in costs to the American taxpayers.

In closing, the Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council is extremely proud to represent a workforce that has made severe sacrifices for their dedication in contributing to this nation's war efforts during World War II and the Cold War. These workers have now shifted that same dedication to cleaning up the environmental legacy as a result of their contributions to our national defense. Now, more than ever, the federal government must continue to support their efforts and not undermine the sacrifices that were made by eliminating worker benefits.

I adamantly oppose these new directives and respectfully request and urge the Department of Energy to abandon any plans, now and in the future, to eliminate and/or alter the Hanford pension and medical benefits programs.

Sincerely,

David E. Molnaa, President
Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council

-----Original Message-----

From: Walter D. Hedge
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2007 11:34 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Fw: Advice on DOE contractor pensions.

First, pension funds and medical cost should perhaps be considered as two different entities. Second, funding current pension plans should not necessarily take precedence over consideration of adjusting in-place pension plans. Thirdly, pension plans without adequate cost-of-living adjustments are not adequate to sustain those currently in retirement.

I sincerely trust that serious consideration will be giving to those currently in retirement who are depending on their pension plans to sustain their level of living. My devalued pension plan is now worth approximately 50% of the purchasing power it had when I retired in 1994, and the one increase that I received during my over twelve years of retirement was all absorbed by the increase in the cost of major medical supplemental insurance.

Walter Hedge

-----Original Message-----

From: Keith & Judy Kibbe
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2007 9:40 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Contractor Pensions

I submit the following comments:

- 1) Legacy DB programs must be maintained and managed fairly independent of the switch to DC plans for active employees. A majority of DOE Contractor retirees are covered by DB programs.
- 2) Stop the deceiving practice of lumping all DB plans together with health costs when presenting information to legislators and the public. This is despicable for a number of reasons including the fact that they are funded by entirely different mechanisms and DOE's lumping them is designed to create a negative image towards the retirement programs.
- 3) Stop the practice of denying retirees inflation compensating adjustments.
- 4) Eliminate all language in N 351.1 that is hostile to retirees on DB programs.
- 5) Manage each sites DB plan separately. Do not punish successfully managed funds to try to help unsuccessfully managed funds.

Keith Kibbe

-----Original Message-----

From: Nick2141 . . .
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2007 10:40 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Contractor Retiree Pension Comments

Hello DOE-HQ:

I retired as a BBWI contractor employee at the Idaho National Laboratory on July 1, 2001 and have since been drawing a monthly "defined benefit" pension check. At that time, we were encouraged by DOE-Idaho and BBWI management to accept an early retirement incentive to help "balance the budget." Many of who qualified did.

You should know that Idaho National Laboratory retirees DO NOT receive any COLA increases, and all of our subsidized medical/Rx/dental insurance coverage ended abruptly when we reached Medicare age at 65.

The only benefit we receive is our monthly pension check, and that amount will never increase.

We know that contractor retirees at several other DOE sites and national laboratories have a more liberal (and expensive) benefits package. So if changes are made, please don't take a budget axe to ours. We're at the bottom now.

Thanks for listening,

Forbes D. (Nick) Nichols

-----Original Message-----

From: Larry and Cathy Smith

Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2007 10:07 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

I have worked on the Hanford Reservation in Washington State for the last 26 years. In those 26 years my wife and I have been saving as much as we can for our retirement. Part of my planning over the years was that I "would" have this retirement when my time came. Now the DOE wants to introduce a "market-based" plan, which in a nut shell, reduces the number of participants and in effect will reduce the current retirement budget for the future...my future. Why is it so easy for the DOE to propose changes to other "workers" retirement, but keep their current plan? Currently for the Hanford worker it's 1.6 x high 60 months x years of service. But for the DOE it's 2.2 x high 36 months x years of service. Does the "market-based" proposal apply to the DOE? They seem to find the funding to keep theirs solvent! I find this to be unfair and a huge slap in the face to the workforce within the DOE complex. What ever happened to the time honored system of

being able to put in a hard working career and then be rewarded for your faithfully service? A service that requires working around some of the most dangerous material in the world!

I close this by adamantly opposing this new directive. It's time that the DOE (the Federal Government) step up to the plate and honor their commitment to the workforce, by keeping the current retirement package, so the people who have worked/will work in this environment be given the respect for the time they have given to the Hanford Reservation, the DOE, and this country.

Respectfully,

Lawrence D. Smith

-----Original Message-----

From: hcofer
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2007 5:30 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Retirees pensions, Oak Ridge, Tn.

My name is Harold Cofer. I worked at the Y-12 Nuclear Weapons facility for over 40 years. Since my retirement in 1989, my pension has been reviewed only one time. It is way past time for another review and hopefully brought into line with other Nuclear Facilities. As I understand it, other local facilities have removed the "spouse option" clause in the pension. It appears to me that Y-12 retirees would be included.

My wife worked at Y-12 for 10 years. Her retired pay does not even pay for her supplemental insurance. She has to write a \$147 check every month to pay the insurance. This is not right. All we are looking for is fair and equal treatment. Thank you.

-----Original Message-----

From:
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2007 10:17 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: comments on DOE Notice 351.1

Department of Energy; 1000 Independence Avenue SW; Washington, DC 20585

Subject: DOE Notice 351.1

My comments are in response to Federal Register; Vol. 72, No. 58; Tuesday March 27, 2007; p. 14267. Oftentimes, I feel that commenting in this format is like "a river into a desert"; however, I do appreciate the opportunity to comment this important subject. Please read about my concerns.

I am not accustomed to writing like this, so please be patient with me. This is very important to me and to families within the Tennessee

Valley, especially in the Oak Ridge/Knoxville, Tennessee area. I know that you are very busy, so I will be as brief as I can.

Fundamentally, the pension plan administered by Oak Ridge DOE is woefully inferior to other DOE plans at the Western Labs, and has been for decades. That is a documented fact. Inflation has run rampant through the pension funds being paid to employees and employee spouses. The DOE pension fund is currently significantly over-funded. Yet, no cost of living increases has been provided to even come close to the inflation rates for the past 2 decades. I would ask you to assign some of your staff to research the materials and documentation surrounding these bills. This is a national disgrace and patently unfair to people who gave their lives and careers to work for national missions of our country.

My mother, Barbara Denton, will be 85 in July. She is collecting \$271.00 net dollars each month as a surviving spouse of my father, Charles H. Denton, who dedicated his life as a carpenter at the K-25 Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee from 1945 until 1977, after spending 6 years in the Army and serving in 3 foreign campaigns as a Medic in the Ninth Army. He died in 2001. This amount of \$271.00 net dollars has been modestly increased a couple of times in the last two decades, so naturally it remains far behind the inflation rate for the same period of time. It is embarrassing and disappointing to see such disregard for faithful and reliable service. By ignoring the plights of people like my mother, she feels scoffed at, ignored, and essentially put on the back burner by the DOE. If you think about it for very long, it makes you angry and hurt by what your government is doing to you.

Since my own retirement from the DOE Oak Ridge plants in November, 1999, I have received no cost of living increase or adjustment to my pension at all for nearly 8 years. This just does not make any sense to me. It is simply unfair, unjust, and un-American! All this with a massive \$2+ Billion pension fund for Oak Ridge workers that is significantly over-funded, in fact no DOE money has gone into the pension fund since the early 1980's!

I recognize that nothing I as one person can say will "convince" you to do anything. Support for HR5362 and S2794 would be a good beginning and restore some semblance of fairness and humane treatment to neglected citizens and their families in the Oak Ridge, Tennessee area.

I do love my country just as much as you do. Please help people like my mother and many hundreds of others in the Oak Ridge area, who spent their lives working at the Oak Ridge facilities, to have fair and equitable treatment during their pension years.

I appreciate your consideration of my letter. Thank you very much.

Lynn F. Denton

-----Original Message-----

From: Tom Douglass

Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2007 8:38 AM

To: contractor pensions

Cc: Alfred Brooks
Subject: Pensions

Gentlemen:

Th pensions of retired Oak Ridgers need to be indexed upward about 18%. All the other DOE contractors other than Oak Ridge have already received such increases over the last 20 years. Thank you.

Tom Douglass

-----Original Message-----

From: David H. Lunt
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 10:45 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Sandia National Laboratory Pension

Dear Sir/Madame:

I am an employee with Sandia National Laboratories approximately two-thirds of the way towards conventional retirement.

I much prefer that Sandia National Laboratory convert the existing defined benefit (DB) pension plan to an enhanced defined contribution (DC) 401k pension.

The reasons for my preference are:

- (1) our pension plan is not indexed to inflation (no COLA)
- (2) I would rather control my pension funds than an employer;
- (3) It is becoming industry standard (now over 50% of large companies have defined contribution plans vs. defined benefit plans)
- (4) I have seen the outcome and future problems awaiting the Social Security entitlement and feel the same could happen to a company pension (this is why I believe many companies are opting for DC rather DB plans); it is in the employer's and employee's best interest to satisfy their retirement obligations in the year they accrue rather than at some undetermined future date.
- (5) a DC plan allows an employee to retire on their schedule rather than an age based company platform
- (6) a DC plan also enhances an employee's ability to change employers if the employee's skill set no longer matches the company objectives - this affords the employee the funding and opportunity to seek another job opportunity or return to school to develop a new (future oriented) skill set.

Sincerely,
David Lunt

-----Original Message-----

From: "Salmon Slayer"
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 10:43 PM
To: contractor pensions

Subject: Pension/ Medical Benefits

It amazes me how after 27 years of service with multiple contractors at the DOE site at Hanford I am about to be screwed. People I know have become sick and died at this site and now because of cost and poor planning by these contractors the workers must pay the price. I do not know what the fix is but I suspect it will come at the expense of the workers who dedicated their lives cleaning up your mess.

We are treating the elderly who were the backbone of this modern day society like garbage, leaving them out in the street to die and get hauled away. Our returning soldiers are feeling the pain Vietnam

Vets felt as they have returned crippled and sick and our country turns their backs on them. Yet we give billions a dollars each and every year to countries who would just as soon cut our hearts out but thank God they can't. Why is that you ask? It's simple our country has already done it!

It is time we woke up to the fact that change needs to happen. We need to take care of our own and the major contractors and the military need to step up to the plate and do the right thing. The workers of this great nation have done more than their part. What more do you want us to do?

Bruce Gradisher

-----Original Message-----

From: Jeanne Dahl
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 9:42 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Public Input

It seems to me that the conditions under which someone was hired should be maintained for the duration of their career whether explicit promises were made about maintaining them or not. Anything less seems like bait-and-switch.

Also, these people are dedicated patriots and often thought less of by those in their community because of their association with nuclear weapons, and deserve their compensation. The points made in the Wash Post article about recruitment are also valid, though changing a pension program for new hires is not so clearly wrong as is doing so for an existing employee.

Thank you for soliciting input.

-----Original Message-----

From: jerry
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 3:16 PM

To: contractor pensions
Subject: RETIREES PENSION AND HEALTH INSURANCE

DOE;

I retired in 1984 with what I considered a reasonable retirement and health plan. Since then the deductions from my retirement for Insurance has gone up each year, far outpacing the cost of living increase. Please, as you have done in New Mexico, return to us more of the monies that are in our pension fund.

Thanks,
Jerry Love

-----Original Message-----

From: Ashburn, David
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 1:28 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Comments on Federal Register Vol. 72, No. 58 DOE notice Request for public comment on Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

I do not see why the pension payment is so volatile and I do not see why it is a challenge to predict the future. I am a current DOE contractor grandfathered employee at the Paducah Kentucky Gaseous Diffusion Plant Clean-up. The pension payments for the retired employees has never increased. The current grandfathered employees have a fixed pension plan that does not change. The new employees that are picked up have no pension plan. I do understand the volatility of the medical benefits cost. Medical cost are sky rocketing for DOE and employees. This especially effects the retired employees whose pension does not increase but the medical premiums do. Tax dollars is the only source for DOE to receive more funds. The retirees do not have a pot to dip medical funds from. I do not have answers to increasing medical cost. I do think that DOE should continue with their obligation to pay the benefits due employees.

D. L. Ashburn

-----Original Message-----

From: Hamtcpres . . .
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 10:46 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

The Department of Energy is seeking public comment regarding the funding of pension and health care benefits for workers on DOE sites. Why is DOE only now concerned with this?

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here for twenty eight years. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was negotiated with the union and the contractors. Prior to this, there were multiple pension plans due to the multiple contractors performing work for DOE. The multi-employer plan was designed to save money for DOE. A detailed cost analysis was conveyed to DOE-Headquarters that showed what the plan would cost to fund through 2012. DOE-Headquarters approved the plan and, although the workers suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time, the plan was accepted by the unions and the workforce. It appears now that DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the workforce through pension benefit payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan altogether.

DOE wants to introduce a "market-based" plan because the DOE site workers receive higher benefits to those in the private sector. Does DOE even know what type of work is performed at Hanford? The Hanford site is not building "widgets" or cleaning up oil spills. We are engaged in and exposed to one of the most contaminated and hazardous environments in the world. The workforce have dedicated their lives to cleaning up the federal governments environmental legacy. Each day, they put themselves in harms way performing a critical service to the United States of America. Their dedication should not go unnoticed. They should expect from their government the same type of commitment and dedication in return for their service.

If DOE is so worried about how to fund benefit plans, they need to start within their own ranks. Their pension and medical plans are significantly higher than the very workforce they want to eliminate. For the workforce at Hanford, the pension multiplier is 1.6 X high 5 wages X years of service. For DOE, the multiplier is 2.2 X high 3 wages X years of service. They don't seem to be worried about how to fund themselves. In fact, by eliminating the workers pension plan, the DOE could enrich their own. That appears to be the case.

In closing, I adamantly oppose this new directive. It's time the federal

government honor their commitments to the workforce and abandon any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode worker benefits.

Thank you,

David E. Molnaa, President
Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council

-----Original Message-----

From: JOHN_MCK . . .
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 9:42 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: DOE Notice 351.1

I am a retiree in Oak Ridge, TN, from the Y-12 Plant operated by BWXT. Below are my concerns about the changes DOE is proposing to our pension and health care benefits.

1. The pension plan for Oak Ridge retirees is not connected in any way with money for health care benefits and is well funded. No money has been added to this fund since Union Carbide was the DOE contractor in Oak Ridge. To confuse this fund with money for health care benefits is an attempt to downgrade any changes requested by retirees to increases in our pensions.
2. Pensions for Oak Ridge retirees should be tied to the inflation rate as Social Security benefits are. Without increases, inflation and the rising cost of health care premiums have eaten away the amount that older retirees receive.
3. The cost of health care benefits is a national problem. DOE would serve its contractor employees well to lobby for a national solution. In the meantime, if all DOE contractor employees and retirees across the U.S. were included in a pool for health insurance purposes, perhaps better rates could be achieved.
4. When people are hired at any DOE facility, promises are made on both sides. Pensions and health care benefits are part of the contract when individuals sign on. DOE should honor those contracts by attempting to give its current employees and retirees what was part of the job package when people were hired.

-----Original Message-----

From: Bronson
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 9:41 AM
To: contractor pensions
Cc: Alfred Brooks
Subject:

This is a one-sided argument. The costs associated with having all work done by DOE employees was not presented. It is a very prejudiced view. All DOE employees get COLAs in their retirement packages but those of us who spent a career working in a GOCO facility are being treated like a disposable commodity.

Bronson Everman

-----Original Message-----

From: BHannafor . . .
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 9:16 AM
To: contractor pensions
Cc: BHannafor . . .
Subject: Comment from 1992 retiree ORNL

By my rough estimate, based on CPI data for 1992 to 2006, my pension has been effectively reduced by 30%. For local retirees this reduction is a hardship that is not shared by retirees from other DOE contractors, who provide some inflation protection. The question is why DOE continues to support such an inequitable arrangement. For many retirees their pension is a major source of their income.

A related concern for local retirees has been the attempted raid on our pension fund to serve as a kind of piggy bank for unfunded or underfunded DOE projects. Some of the "excess" money in the pension fund should be set aside to provide a measure of inflation protection for retirees.

Bruce Hannaford

-----Original Message-----

From: jcw . . .
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2007 7:34 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Healthy employees lower medical costs

Hello,

Recently Sandia announced a site-wide ban on tobacco, as a result of a Lockheed policy. My suggestion is to ban tobacco at all DoE facilities including contractor facilities. Employee health would improve within a year, then lower medical rates could be negotiated.

John Whitehead

-----Original Message-----

From: Bill Shepard
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2007 4:12 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject:

I retired from Martin-Marietta in 1994, since that time I have had one(1) increase in my retirement pay. I find this utterly ridiculous, when the cost-of-living has increase over twofold. As retirees, we know there is enough monies (over 500 million) in the retirement funds, that could and should allow us retirees to have cost-of-living increases. I think we are very deserving of a decent increase, that would make us compatible with other companies in our region.

Sincerely,

W H Shepard

-----Original Message-----

From: Taskel Dishman
Sent: Tuesday, January 04, 2000 3:57 PM
To: contractor pensions;
Subject: Dear DOE Director,

we 12,000 retired Oak Ridge TN atomic workers have had one half of one COLA raise in about 16 years, at a time we have more than \$3 billion of the tax payers dollars in a fund to have been paying us. This fund is growing by about a hundred million dollars each year ... the fund has more than \$500 million dollars that is not needed for future retirees. If you'll just pay us the growth in the fund yearly, it will save many from poverty and save the middle class in our area of E TN.

Not only have we been chated after devoting a lifetime of work for the country, the entire area has been cheated by perhaps as much as \$800 to a billion dollars over the years. Perhaps even worse, our elected reps and senators don't seem interested in helping us get our money (Sen. Corker has not been in office long and may help us in the years to come, but we don't have years to suffer and waite, some are hungry/cold and dying!

Do you really approve of the people who devoted a lifetime of service to the country to be cheated in this manner? Will the people now working in service at Y-12 and the X-10 lab be cheated in the same manner? Let me tell you how bed it is: Several months ago we rec an offer for dental and eye insurance from the retirement plan saying, " If you don't draw enough in your monthly check, you will be expected to pay the remainder out of pocket!" I ask you, if our checks (which have lost more than half of the buying power) are so small in the eyes of the people you allow to abuse us, how are we expected to live on it?

Everyone knows the country is going to the dogs, but this is a problem that you can correct and you need to do so while some of us still live and say to the people now working, "You'll not be cheated in the future as have been those who worked as you are to protect the country!" Will you help us now?

More info: Frank Munger writes Oak Ridge for the local paper or corre.info the 12,000 retiree families web page.....

Pleas don't make us waite any longer for help, if you do many of us will be dead and the bad people will have won, TL Dishman

Copy: A copy has been kept for my records.....

-----Original Message-----

From: Marie Lawler
Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2007 4:49 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Hanford Pensions

The recent article in the TriCity Herald is very misleading. I am a retired Hanford worker and I can assure you that the contractor pensions are not like the pensions the government employees receive. I worked for 40 years and was not the lowest paid employee. In fact I was one of the few women who was on the exempt payroll. My pensions are from 3 companies even thought I never changed my desk. Please keep in mind that we never receive an increase of any kind--the pensions remain the same regardless of the cost of living.

My medical coverage is from the Flour pension. In addition with Medicare paying much less of the billed amount for medical including prescriptions, the secondary also is paying less and less and in fact sometimes nothing.

My name is Marie L. Lawler

-----Original Message-----

From: Rhoads, Donald T
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2007 9:34 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: FW: Hanford News Slant

The following is in response the below article:

Just do what you did to the Portsmouth Ohio salary employees, just do it and let people deal with it. They can't do a thing about it, just cut back a home and hope for the best. In Ohio they (Bechtel Jacobs Company, LLC - BJC and DOE) took the salary employees cost/contribution for premiums for health insurance from 6% to 20%, went to a multi employer, multi state plan which limited competition which raised the costs and let the salary employees pay the brunt of the costs. The salary employees were hit with an increase of over 600% in the past six years, not to mention having higher deductibles, etc and less coverage. A couple years ago DOE's cost actually went down while the employees costs went up. In addition the salary employees lost a years worth of vacation because the new contractor that came (BJC) in did not know how the site accrued vacation and the amount of vacation that an employee could earn was reduced for the mid to younger employees. When it was brought up it was to late to fix, I guess or DOE did not want to. The

hourly were again not affected. One good thing is when we get cancer now we can get \$100K and free insurance, not sure it's worth it.

This all started when DOE allowed or promoted the multi state, multi employer plans to deal with an award to BJC to run the sites at Portsmouth Ohio, Paducah Kentucky and Oak Ridge Tennessee under an M&I verses M&O, it may have saved DOE money, but it cost the salary employees at Portsmouth dearly. Oak Ridge employees went from 12% to 20% because they always paid a little more to offset the state income tax in Ohio that wasn't a factor in Oak Ridge and was always a difference between the sites under Goodyear/Union Carbide and others, but DOE didn't consider this when BJC changed everyone. Again the Portsmouth salary employees took the blunt. But then again the Oak Ridge Benefits group was the ones who did the plans, so guess who made out and who got paid incentives for this???? (BJC Oak Ridge). The DOE Solicitation and ultimate Prime Contract required and the BJC Transition Plan stated pay and benefits would remain substantially equivalent (four quarters would equal a dollar), that for the grandfathered employees these were considered entitlements and would remain or extend past the two year transition period set for hiring preference/etc. All this was contract language and employees felt they were somewhat protected. It was changed by BJC and DOE two tears into the contract when they looked at cost and any potential savings. That is when they reworded things and said substantially equivalent really meant at the cost to DOE. Again the hourly were not affected.

When I came to the DOE site over 20 years ago I was willing to accept the hazards of Uranium and the lack of oversight by DOE and OSHA at Portsmouth because the pay and benefits were good. Now that things are going to cleanup and DOE is not making money off of production, because they gave the facilities to USEC (who today has less expensive but better benefits and pension that DOE contractors and DOE still reimburses them for those costs and pays out bonuses to their employees), DOE seems to forget the health of those that may not have been protected over the years. Of course that is probably why the health costs have risen at the sites to treat those who are sick. It should also be noted that if DOE had paid into the pension plan over the past several years, instead of letting it ride, they would have been better off as well and not in a panic now.

Everyone understands rising costs for health insurance and is willing to pay a fair share, but in Ohio the salary employees paid the blunt and offset costs for Oak Ridge employees, because the Oak Ridge administrators (BJC and DOE) were the ones that oversaw the plans and changes. I also know all of this very well as I am in contracts and have all the documents to back it up. None of this made a difference when brought to DOE's attention. Fraud, Waste, and Abuse must not apply when it hurts the little guy and will cost DOE some money. It sounds good though.

Under our current contract we continue to pay BJC (dearly) for multi state/multi company health insurance and plan administration. If DOE would eliminate this and go back to the way it was before BJC both the DOE and employees would save.

You might sense some frustration, but no one (DOE or local politicians) seemed to care what they did to the salary employees at Portsmouth, just the hourly, so why is DOE asking for comments in Hanford before they do it? Maybe if you determine something that is fair to all at Hanford you could go back and help us salary employees at PORTS. I don't expect it but its worth asking for.

Thanks for your time.

Don Rhoads

-----Original Message-----

From: John Stephens
Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2007 10:35 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: DOE-ORO Pension Comments

My net pension income decreased in January 2007 by 11%. This was after a 12% net decrease in 2006. I worked as a DOE contractor employee for 24 years with the expectation that my pension was secure. My pension is quickly becoming nil while the funds to do something positive about it from a very large benefit fund is being withheld. These funds were never meant to support future work, but were always planned to guarantee the futures of retired employees. the Department of Energy should recognize its responsibility to those past employees who have helped make the department and the Country successful.

John S. Stephens

-----Original Message-----

From: hampoose . . .
Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2007 8:45 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Pensions

Ms. Stephanie Weakley,
Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Ms. Weakly,

I am emailing you today because of what happened to me and about 300 of my fellow employees at the DOE Y12 plant in Oak Ridge Tn. We were outsourced in March of 1999 and out retirement and pensions were

taken away. What monies that we had in our 401K's were frozen for 3 years. We are working at the same place as before the outsource. We have been told we have no say in the matter but what happened to us is illegal. If this were a private company, the government would be up in arms over the blantant misdeeds DOE has put us through. What happened to us is nothing but stealing. I need for you and people just like you to understand that not only did they steal our retirement but they took about half of the people that worked here jobs too. We need out pensions back so we can retire and live comfortably without worry about health care. We need to have a voice in this matter. I beg of you,, don't sweep this under the rug,, please listen to us and do something

Ms. Fonda Hampton
Y12 Employee

--

Jer. 29:11 "for I know the plans I have for you, declares the Lord. Plans to prosper you and not to harm you, to give you hope and a future. "

-----Original Message-----

From: Virgil
Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2007 4:22 PM
To: contractor pensions
Cc: Alfred Brooks
Subject:

CORE has made compelling arguments concerning our benefits with the contractors and DOE stonewalling us. As a 42 year employee with 22 years of retirement my time is running out. Any pressure you could bring in this regard would be greatly appreciated. Virgil O. Haynes

-----Original Message-----

From: MCDANIELEW . . .
Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2007 2:29 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Pension Comments

I am an Oak Ridge National Laboratory who has been retired for 11 years. In that time I have had one pension increase. In increasing my pension my medical benefits were adjusted to where I actually took a cut in benefits.

I feel that DOE contractor benefits should be par with retired DOE employees. It is difficult to understand how a person who gets a COLA can, in good faith, decide that a contractor employee is not entitled to one even though the money is available. I understand that it has been a number of years since

the DOE has contributed to the Oak ridge Pension fund. Where is this money going?

If DOE expects the Oak Ridge facilities to remain world class, they must attract world class employees. The best way to attract these employees is to show that retired employees are treated as world class, not cast offs.

Earl W. Mc Daniel

-----Original Message-----

From: BLAMBDIN . . .
Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2007 1:53 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Pension Benefits for Oak Ridge employees

All we are asking is that DOE be FAIR to OR retirees regarding pension increases. I do not believe that is being done at the present time.

Foraker Lambdin

-----Original Message-----

From: Alfred Brooks
Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2007 11:05 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Requested Comments on DOE Notice 351.1

Ms. Stephanie Weakley,

Department of Energy

1000 Independence Avenue,

SW., Washington, DC 20585,

Dear Ms. Weakley,

Subject Requested comments on DOE Notice 351.1 re Pension Plans

I concur that there is a need to constrain the growth in the costs of health care in the DOE contracts as a part of the national need to do the same for the entire country. As you are aware proposals to do this form a part of the presidential campaigns which are now starting.

However, I believe that the requirements of DOE Notice 351.1 go far beyond this and, perhaps unwittingly, impose an unfair penalty upon a narrow group of retirees: those, without the protection of a negotiated wage contract, who have recently retired or soon will retire, both under defined benefit rules. Not only does N351.1 limit any medical benefits but it also limits any cost of living increases or, at least, it seriously discourages them. This is claimed to be consistent with

past practices although in the past Union Carbide suggested ad hoc cost of living increases and DOE approved them. This was consistent with the Carbide private sector actions.

To impose these limits on this small group is unfair and to do so in Oak Ridge, whose trust fund remains at the legal limit despite 24 years of no DOE additions, is particularly unfair. Most federal pension systems, eg. Social Security and your own federal employee plan are typically granted automatic cost of living increases. The rules of N351.1 expose us to the serious ravages of inflation which will amount to a 70 to 90 percent reduction in buying power over 20 to 30 years using the past rates of inflation.

Sincerely,

Alfred Brooks

Cc:

Sen. Alexander

Sen. Corker

Rep. Zach Wamp