

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

From: Kenneth Perrine  
Sent: Friday, May 04, 2007 3:40 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Retiree pensions and benefits

Dear friends,

This is written in response to information provided by the Savannah River Site Retiree Association (SRSRA) to its membership, of which I am one, concerning the re-bid to operate SRS after the current contract expires within the near future. We have been told that a Ms. Kolb, the Department of Energy sponsor of Policy N351.1, has communicated to SRSRA the intention of DOE to protect the pensions and benefits of current retirees, although the Policy does not specifically include language to this effect. I strongly encourage you to consider including such language in the Policy so that there is no ambiguity or uncertainty in the minds of future contractors regarding treatment of pensions and benefits for persons who have retired from SRS after many years of service to the nation. Unlike current and future employees who may be in position to adapt to changes in their financial packages, those who have already retired and who depend on arrangements made during their periods of employment cannot easily make alternative plans for pensions/benefits and many might face a very uncertain financial future if those arrangements were modified. To abandon current policies would constitute betrayal of a trust that I am certain is not the intention of DOE management or of any other part of the Federal government. Please take all steps necessary to protect the financial interests of those who have partnered with you in helping protect this great nation in times of peril.

Thank you,  
Kenneth Perrine, Ph.D.

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

From: Jerrone Piwetz  
Sent: Friday, May 04, 2007 1:29 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: pensions

To whom it may concern,

Back in 1985, when I decided that I needed to go back to college, if I were to be successful in life. My interpretation of being successful in life is a good wage, good health insurance, a retirement saving plan, and also a pension., and of course a job that I enjoy. After graduating from college with an associates degree, I spent 5 years working as a subcontractors for commercial nuclear plants, with very little benefits consisting of medical insurance if the contractor provided any. In those 5 years my goal was to gain the experience and knowledge to acquire employment with good benefits. And in 1992 I was able to gain that employment for Westinghouse at the Dept. of Energy Site Handford.

Since then the contractor has changed to Fluor, with decreasing benefits as time has gone by. I understand the cost of benefits is expensive and some of the cost must go to the employee, but to continue to lose our benefits, and including our pension is not acceptable. I have worked to be a professional and hard worker at the Hanford Site, as a Lead Radiological Control Technician, facing many obstacles and challenges to perform high risk radiological work, and perform these duties efficiently and safely.

The challenges the employees of contractors for the Dept. of Energy are many, and are well deserving of good benefits. To continue to lose these benefits would only compromise the quality of work accomplished at the DOE sites. Although, I enjoy my work at the Hanford Site, and will continue to do a good job there with safety the number one priority, I do believe I am well deserving of good benefits to go with my employment.

Thank you,  
Jerome Plwetz  
Lead Radiological Control  
Technician

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

From: b Moran  
Sent: Friday, May 04, 2007 12:30 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: DOE Contractor Pension and Retiree Medical Benefits Should Not Change For Long-Service, Older Employees

I am a 54 year-old contractor employee at the Savannah River Site (SRS) with 30 years of dedicated service to protecting the nation and now cleaning up the site. I started work at the site with the intent of helping protect our country. I could have pursued other interests in the last 10-15 years, but I stayed here with the intent to continue to serve my country and also clean up the environment.

For thirty years, my retirement planning was based on the current pension plan and retiree medical insurance. To eliminate either of these when I am 54, along with a substantial number of other employees in their fifties at SRS, is an extraordinarily unfair situation to place older employees. Finding full time employment with benefits for mature employees who have dedicated their entire careers working for the federal government is practically impossible. SRS is also currently in a down-sizing mode, and therefore many employees in their fifties will not have the option to work as long as they had planned to prepare for retirement. We should also be able to rely on the government not to change the retirement rules with a few years left on very honorable careers.

With the current breaking up of the existing contract to two separate entities handling M&O Operations and Liquid Waste, and the outsourcing of Information Technology services to an Indian Tribe from New Mexico, Emergency Services to another local firm,

cyber services, medical, and infrastructure services, DOE is de facto eliminating or drastically reducing benefits for older employees who honorably served this country. These employees are now being used in the last years of their careers to simply get the lowest cost bidder, without regard for retaining core competencies to safely and quickly execute current and future missions.

In summary, DOE has a moral imperative, the responsibility, and ethical and arguably the legal obligation to honor commitments made to the Cold War Veterans of SRS. Do not let new third party contractors now 1) become the low cost bidders on the backs of the Cold War Veterans by renegeing on pension and retirement health benefits, and 2) ignore current employees for employment under the new contracts. For employees to be so casually reduced to a number and also be discarded by DOE is extremely disconcerting, and should not be allowed by the government and our politicians.

Thank You,  
Holt Moran

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

From: Len  
Sent: Thursday, May 03, 2007 9:29 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Comments on DOE Pension & Medical

Medical costs could be significantly reduced if the prescription drug costs were addressed. The VA drug costing approach could be used to significantly lower a major component of health care costs. Also, prescription drugs costs are significantly lower in other countries. Why are those issues not dealt with rather than just taking benefits away from the workers?

Pension benefits should not be reduced. Myself and others, specifically chose to work at Sandia National Labs because of many factors but pension was one of the big deciding factors. How is Sandia to attract, hire and keep the best and the brightest if health and pension benefits are less than the private sector. We have been told for years that our benefits are comparable to the private sector!

Many of us are at a point in our career and of an age that we cannot start over. It is not fair for pensions to be reduced when we are at an age when we cannot do anything about it. We are relying upon the pension plans that are in place, so don't reduce them.

Len Buchholz

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

From: terry bedell  
Sent: Thursday, May 03, 2007 3:54 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: DOE Pensions and Benefits Policy, N351.1

03 May 2007

Gentlemen:

As a retiree of Savannah River Site and a member of the SRS Retirees Association, having dedicated a significant portion of my engineering career to the successful completion of the Defense Waste Processing Facility, I am dismayed to learn that your proposed new DOE Pensions and Benefits Policy fails to specifically address "grandfathering" of our pension and medical benefits which were promised us at our time of retirement. I have heard many of the verbal responses from DOE to SRSRA appeals to include such wording in any RFP to continue our benefits, all of which appear to support the original DOE commitment made many years ago. Nothing, however, seems to have been written into a document to confirm that commitment. I urge you to please carefully consider our past efforts and contributions to SRS and officially include our continued level of pensions and benefits in your policy document. Anything less would be a breach of faith.

Sincerely,  
Terrence M. Bedell

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

From: Hoe, Gary

Sent: Thursday, May 03, 2007 2:07 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Public Comment on DOE Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

Here's my 2¢ worth:

Pensions and Retirement:

The current pension and 401(k) plan at Sandia Labs seems to work OK. The main gripe about the pension is that it is a fixed amount and is not adjusted for inflation. It should be, and that is my primary recommendation for change.

I do have further recommendations:

Sandia has a rather large pension fund, so much so that it could suspend employee contributions into the fund for a number of years. If pension costs increase or the investments market turns down, resume those contributions for all employees.

Consider scrapping all company pension plans and make employees eligible for the Federal Employees' Retirement Program at their equivalent GS-level, with contributions from salaries. Make this mandatory for new employees and work out some optional transition for existing employees. At least the cost is predictable and there are already administrative procedures in place for FERP.

Medical:

Fully reimburse for preventive medicine such as regular medical exams (once per year or two), dental exams (semiannual) and eye exams (annual), after a fixed copay (about \$25

per visit). Fully reimburse any and all nonelective, routine and emergency medical and dental treatment, as well as purchase of equipment such as glasses and hearing aids, after a fixed copay (about \$25 per visit) until some annual limit (about \$1500) is reached. Then reimburse nothing until an umbrella amount (about \$5000, or maybe 10% of salary) is reached, and finally resume reimbursement at 75% (or more) of the remaining charges. Do not reimburse elective treatment such as facelifts, liposuction, braces, etc, unless there is a true medical need for it, in which case it falls under the previous bullet. If an employee does not spend the full \$1500 in a year, the remainder carries over to the next year and is added to that year's annual fund (\$1500+carryover). However, any unspent funds are forfeit if an employee leaves the company - it isn't "real" money. For employees with families, permit them to sign up for multiples of the \$1500 annual fund up to (but not over) the number of family members, and pool the multiple funds for the whole family.

Whatever premium is deducted from an employee's salary for the annual \$1500 fund, election of multiple funds for family members will cost the same multiple of premium - no quantity discounts. Partially subsidize (about 10%, up to some small limit) wellness programs such as gym membership and lifestyle classes, but do not provide gyms and classes on site and do not employ full-time personnel to staff them. There are plenty off-site with better hours. Retain the optional, employee-paid, pre-tax Reimbursable Spending Accounts. Use of these accounts by the employee does not reduce the annual \$1500 benefit. Do not maintain staff or a contractor to pore over medical claims with a fine-tooth comb, just enough to classify them as preventive, necessary, elective or wellness. Just accept the employee's receipt and reimburse as above, with the burden of proof resting on the employee.

If an employee remains on staff after age 65, decide whether Medicare will be a required thing or not. Lobby Congress for real tort reform. This means DOE will incur no more than about \$1800 (\$1500 plus exams) per employee per year, except in a very few extreme cases. This should level out the cost load as a function of the number of employees. It will also reduce the administrative cost of the programs.

Thanks for the ear -  
Gary L. Hoe, PE/PMP/CMRP

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

From: Ted Thompson  
Sent: Thursday, May 03, 2007 11:58 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Pension Changes

I am dismayed at the stories I have heard regarding the possible reductions in pensions for DOE contractors' employees. I am a retiree of a DOE contractor, and my pension is my only source of income.

I regard the changes as a breach of a contract that I entered when I began work for a DOE contractor. It was an agreement that I honored and I had assumed that DOE would also honor it. But apparently that is not the case if the reputed changes are to be made. I put in 44 years working for DOE contractors, and I think that I decidedly earned the pension that I am getting. I don't need any reduction in monthly income to continue to survive.

T T Thompson

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

From: Prior Jr, Ray F

Sent: Wednesday, May 02, 2007 4:03 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Employee comment on Contractor pension situation

Twenty seven years ago I moved across the country to start a career at Sandia Laboratories. I had six job offers, but selected Sandia because of the type of work - and the benefits. We had a package of vacation, salary, health, pension, 401k etc that was "Top of the class", which were just the type of people hired by Sandia. Since then, every one of our benefits has eroded to the point of nothing more than mediocrity. Benefits have even been rephrased to be termed "Rewards", implying something that comes as a result of good behavior, but not required, instead of part of a compensation package earned from decades of dedicated employment.

When the criteria for selecting benefits packages (health, dental, vision, vacation, 401k, pension etc) is to measure like industries and provide no more than 5% above the average benefits, you are doming your laboratories to also hire those that are no more than 5% above the industry standard. If you wish your laboratories that maintain and develop your national security to be average, your on the correct path. Simply put, top 10% candidates do not choose middle of the road employment - which is how the labs benefits are now valued. The saying "You get what you pay for." never applied more.

You are thinking that I don't have the big picture. That I don't understand the costs. Your mostly correct; I don't negotiate the benefits packages and sign the pension checks, but I do understand that government chooses how it spends its dollars, just as I do with my budget. I also know you get what you pay for. If you are willing to pay only middle of the road benefits, you get middle of the road employees. Your national labs have given excellent service, because for its history it hired above average staff, lured by above average "rewards". Not any more.

While the decline is already in place, for a moment, let's assume government wants to continue to have 1980's quality staff and benefits to draw them...with 2007 financial problems. Tough decisions would need to be made to continue to provide for the contractors and to draw quality employees. There are no short term solutions, save the continued decline of our benefits. If that happens the best employees will leave for greener pastures leaving the contractors in a dismal, weak condition. Undeniably, costs

must be cut - yet maintain high benefits to draw and maintain the high quality staff. I propose the following long term solutions be considered:

Reduce facilities

(1) Create a BRAC like process to remove unnecessary contractors and facilities, merging needed capability from closed areas to others left open. Better long term to have fewer - high capability contractors i.e. staff - then many mediocre ones. Provide for employee assistance, job relocation, early retirement etc, but reduce the overall redundancy like BRAC did for the military. With the savings, return the benefits as they were in 1980 and continue to draw and keep top talent.

Reduce staffing levels

(2) Give the undesirable duty to each contractor to reduce its staff by 10 percent. Once selected, these 10% would either get early retirement with a bonus, or severance based on a years of service multiplier. Terminated employees keep all thus far earned benefits: pensions, 401k, medical etc.

(3) Provide early retirement to thin the roles, and then put on a hiring freeze until the contractors reach a lower staff level. The employees that take early retirement may be dipping into retirement dollars earlier, but they would be getting considerably fewer dollars per month than if they stayed to full retirement potential.

Increase customers:

(4) Allow contractors to compete with industry and take on work as industry dose. This would bring in additional WFO dollars.

Other

(5) Give incentives for employees to cut costs. I don't mean a bonus to work in winter without heat, but more real costs: medical payments, operational costs, etc

\*\*\* For employees that have the one or more of the 4 highest long term high cost health problems (high lipids, diabetes, obesity and high blood pressure) give real, immediate and personal incentives for them to improve there health i.e. reduce health care cost by millions. Incentives to loose weight, get fit, etc. Competitions between departments/centers to increase fitness. Winners get vacation, better offices, bonuses based on weight loss, miles run/walked etc. Having a fit work force would cut costs by millions, reduce stress and make staff more productive.

\*\*\* Remove old energy inefficient facilities with modern energy efficient ones. Many buildings and infrastructures are decades old.

Thank you for the opportunity to enter my comments

Ray Prior

PMTS

Sandia Labs

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

From: Clyde D Pedigo

Sent: Wednesday, May 02, 2007 10:12 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: N351.1/Oak Ridge, TN Pension Plan

Sir/Madam:

As a retired K-25 employee since 1996, I would like to urge you to utilize the wealth of information furnished you by CORRE and utilize it to modify your policy to bring Oak Ridge Retirees into some sort of equal standing with other sites and plans.

The fact that DOE has not contributed to our 'pension fund' since 1984 should certainly place us in 'another category' when considering the CORRE requests. We have had no 'cost-of-living adjustments' since my retirement 11 years ago, even though the cost of living has risen (using Dept of Labor figures) almost 40% during this time.

This alone should raise concerns with anyone viewing this subject!!!!

My Medicare supplemental insurance premium consumes almost half of my retirement check now!!!!!!

Clyde Pedigo

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

From: Shafik Iskander  
Sent: Wednesday, May 02, 2007 2:34 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Requested comments on DOE Notice 351.1 re Pension Plans

Most federal pension systems, for instance, 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. 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.

I am deeply concerned about the growth in health care costs, for the entire country and in DOE contracts. I concur that there is a need for constrain. 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.

Sincerely,  
Shafik K. Iskander  
Oak Ridge retiree

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

From: RoynJune  
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2007 7:48 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Comments DOE Notice 351.1

May 1, 2007  
Oak Ridge, Tennessee

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

Subject: DOE 351.1

Dear Ms. Weakley,

I am an 80 year old retiree from the Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant (formerly K-25 ) in Oak Ridge, with 36 years of service. I have been retired 19 years. I have the following comments concerning "pension plans and health care prior to May 11, 2007."

I "hired in" at the K-25 Plant in 1951. At that time the prime contractor here in Oak Ridge was Union Carbide Corporation which had a "contributory" retirement plan in effect which I joined along with almost everyone else. Sometime later they "encouraged" all employees to drop the contributory plan and cash out of it in favor of a noncontributory plan which was explained to us as being better because the benefits were more advantageous to us. The vast majority of the employees at that time (a claim that is impossible to prove because these numbers are not available) opted for this new plan because they were led to believe that AEC or ERDA or whatever DOE was known as at that time was

on board, because any plan had to be bankrolled by "DOE". And we were all grandfathered into this plan as the DOE contract was awarded later to the Martin Marietta Corporation, and even later fragmented to many smaller contractors.

So, naively, from that point on all of us planned our retirement based on what we were led to believe, that initially our pensions at retirement would be calculated using the Union Carbide formula, with adjustments to our pensions to be made on the basis of inflation. Now, these adjustments have been so neglected by DOE that, on average, our buying power, at best, is about 50% of what it was at the time of retirement.

Now, it appears to us that in DOE Notice 351.1, DOE is proposing to make changes to our plan that will not only effect current and newly hired employees, but will also effect retroactively all past retirees. And, from the comments made by DOE representatives at a meeting of contractor retirees last summer, it sounds as though there may not be any more adjustments to our pensions to compensate even partially for inflation and rising health costs. Does this smack of "ex post facto" to you?

It is high time that our pensions be adjusted upwards, if not to recover all of our loses due to inflation, then at least a major portion thereof.

If DOE Note 351.1 is adopted by DOE it should apply only to new employees and explained to them early on. At least they would have time to plan their retirement accordingly. If I am "off base" on this or "over the line", please explain to me and publicize the explanation for others as well.

Roy Smitherman

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

From: Martin & Susan Keathley  
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2007 6:56 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Pension

The plan that was proposed last year which cut the pension plan for new hires but left the current program in place for current personnel and retirees seemed to be adequate.

The retiree plan was a portion of the hiring contract agreed to by each current employee and the contract should be upheld by both parties. The new plan would have to supplement the 401K plans more that the current matching plans of the contractor companies and should be set up so that the contractor companies cannot take advantage of the system by pocketing the extra matching amounts.

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

From: whiteor2  
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2007 2:26 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Oak Ridge Pensions

Please correct the unjustified pension problem with Oak Ridge retirees. We have not had an increase in years, and the money is there! Compared with other DOE sites, we are well behind. The buying power of our pensions decreases yearly, with no encouragement from DOE toward correcting this injustice. Please help!

David E. and Betty F. White

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

From: kiran vashi  
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 5:39 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: DOE POLICY N351.1

Dear Sir/Madam

I am a WSRC (Westinghouse Savannah River Site) retiree. I am terribly concerned & unhappy that the current words in the subject policy clearly threaten certain benefits & pensions including medical benefits that I worked so very hard to earn for my old age. The subject policy must clearly & explicitly state that current retiree benefits & pensions including medical benefits must be "grandfathered" in any Request For Proposal (RFP) or contract change for Savannah River Site (SRS) activities.

Very Sincerely Yours,  
Kiranchandra (Kiran) M. Vashi

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

From: Padilla-Vigil, Yolanda  
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 3:51 PM  
To: contractorpensions@hq.doe.gov.  
Subject: Request for Public Comment on DOE Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. DOE Contractor Employees are dedicated members of the team and work to preserve that security of the nation. To retain, recruit and reward this valuable resource it is important that the Pension and Medical Benefits for DOE Contractor Employees remain competitive.

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

From: gty  
Sent: Sunday, April 29, 2007 5:17 PM  
To: contractor pensions; contractor pensions  
Subject: Comments on DOE N 351.1

I retired from Oak Ridge National Laboratory in 2001 with 40+ years of company service. I applaud DOE's effort to establish a policy on Contractors employee pension and medical benefits. However, I feel that separate policies are required for the pension and medical benefits. It is the medical benefits that are causing the rapidly increasing DOE costs for Contractors employee pension and medical benefits. The rising cost of medical care is an enormous problem for the entire nation and especially for every aging US citizen, not just DOE. Neither I nor DOE can solve the problem of the rising cost of medical care. The US Congress will have to solve that problem.

DOE must take responsibility for assuring that the Oak Ridge contractor employees are treated fairly. Union Carbide looked out for the Oak Ridge retirees by periodically getting AEC to fund increases in pensions to reduce the impact of inflation. The subsequent contractors have not. Thus, if DOE doesn't assume this responsibility, no one looks for the retirees. The US tries to maintain a slightly inflationary economy. An inflation rate of just 3% means my pension's purchasing power will be reduced to 50% in 24 years. At 6% inflation, my pension's purchasing power will be reduced to 25% in 24 years. As noted in the previous paragraph, medical costs continue to rise much faster than inflation. It should be apparent that I may die due to starvation unless my pension is increased periodically to offset inflation.

Therefore, I believe it is incumbent on DOE to add a fifth OBJECTIVE to DOE N 351.1 as follows:

e. To assure that all DOE Contractors retirees are treated fairly and equitably.

George Terry Yahr

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

From: McCrosson1  
Sent: Saturday, April 28, 2007 9:38 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Comments on Proposed Policy N351.1

Following are my comments on N351.1. I am a retired physicist from the Savannah River Site.

As a taxpayer, I applaud DOE's objective to prudently manage the increasing costs and liabilities associated with contractor employee pension and medical benefits. The premises of N351.1 are correct: medical costs have grown dramatically in recent years and the ratios of assets to liabilities in our defined pension plans have experienced significant volatility since the bursting of the technology bubble in the equity markets.

However, N351.1 is seriously flawed because it fails to acknowledge that retirees are facing similar financial challenges. The fall in the stock market reduced our IRAs, and our out-of-pocket medical costs continue to rise. An even more serious flaw of N351.1, is that it leaves open the option of cutting the retirement packages of existing retirees. Obviously, this lack of commitment is of great concern to retirees. Even curtailment of the time-honored practice of occasional cost-of-living increases would amount to a reduction and make it very difficult for us to meet our increasing expenses.

Just as we retirees were the front line in the Cold War, we are also the first retirees to experience the aforementioned financial challenges. The new landscape calls for a restructuring of benefits packages. Some private companies, facing bankruptcy, have gone so far as to advocate the backfitting of the packages of existing retirees. It is inappropriate for DOE to resort to such extremes because as a taxpayer-financed entity its business plan is fundamentally different. DOE has other options, and ethics requires these options be completely exhausted before asking the retirees to chip in. The burden on us would be disproportionately great, especially in our later years.

For background, I retired from the Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) in 1995. I have a Ph.D. in physics and began working at the Savannah River Lab (SRL) in the Theoretical Physics Division in Nov. 1965, a week after I married. My wife of 42 years is a mathematician and began working in the Applied Mathematics Division at SRL at the same time. We went to work at SRL because we wanted to contribute to the government's defense efforts, and the salary and benefits packages were very attractive. The government desperately needed scientists, mathematicians and engineers for the Cold War effort; the attractive packages were the principal way the Atomic Energy Commission attracted the needed talent. We have three grown sons and six grandchildren. My wife did not work long enough to retire with a pension. She stopped working when our first son was born, and she did not reenter the workforce until the youngest son was a sophomore in high school. This was not unusual in our day, but it means we are living on one pension.

It goes without saying that when we were young, our rare talents gave us plenty of options. The government enterprise needed us more than we needed it. We retirees now have no power to develop new sources of money to cover our increasing expenses, and it is DOE that has the plenitude of options. We are depending on the government to do the right thing.

We retirees went into service for the government during the Cold War with enthusiasm. We went out as heroes. We developed awesome technologies and equally awesome safety records. The very thing our government desired of us. Now we only ask that the government fulfill the explicit and implied commitments it made to us. We all know what these commitments were because all retired Cold War warriors have received these benefits from their respective companies until the day they died. We want the same.

N351.1 should clearly state that all past commitments and practices to existing retirees shall be honored. Don't Walter Reid us!

Respectfully,  
F. Joseph McCrosson

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

From: Jamie & Cliff Cole

Sent: Saturday, April 28, 2007 11:29 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Department of Energy -Request for Public Comment on Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

To Whom It May Concern:

I believe the Department of Energy should continue to provide the benefits that were contractual agreed with the M&O's at their sites. Thousands of employees have planned their retirements on the basis of the Federal Government's promise. Reducing benefits could dramatically and unfairly impact thousands of employees in their later years when their ability to adequately respond may be greatly diminished.

Sincerely yours,  
Clifford M. Cole, Sr.

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

From: arenson

Sent: Friday, April 27, 2007 8:56 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: DOE N 351.1

US DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

To whom it may concern:

I retired from SRS in 1995 and now find myself to be concerned about the survivability of my benefits (medical and pension) based on the wording in the subject document. Along with many of my fellow employees at SRS and other DOE facilities, I made a decision to come to the site based on a number of reasons. One of the major motivators were the benefits being offered. If I had been made aware of the possibility that DOE would subsequently consider reducing or doing away with those benefits I may have decided to pursue other opportunities that were available to me at the time.

As I read the April 2006 issue of the subject document, it appears that "incumbent" plan participants covers retirees currently participating in plans and that DOE would continue to reimburse contractors for their plan costs beyond contract closeout. However, the language is not crystal clear on this important issue as it relates to retiree benefits. Language needs to be added to make it absolutely clear that CURRENT RETIREE benefits will be protected and GRANDFATHERED in any new contracts.

I can understand the need for DOE to make changes in benefit packages that will relate to "new" employees, but there is no excuse for reneging on promises made over the years to employees who have now joined the ranks of the "retired". It is only fair and fitting that if DOE elects to put into jeopardy the benefits now being received by its contractor retired personnel community it should also move to make similar adjustments to the retirement benefits being received by DOE retired personnel. If this move would not seem palatable by DOE, then perhaps it is something that needs to be acted upon by CONGRESS. In fact, DOE would only be on top of the list of GOVERNMENT employee benefits that should be examined within the framework outlined in the subject document. By a copy of this letter I am requesting my Senators and Representatives to pursue having all of our US government employee benefits examined as proposed by the subject document. DOE site contractor personnel represent a very small portion of the overall US government retirement obligations and all of these obligations should be reviewed and acted upon instead of isolating a small group for action.

I also believe the issues raised here would be of interest to some of our major newspapers and TV stations to whom I will also send a copy of this e-mail.

Your consideration of these comments are appreciated.

Sincerely,  
Joel Arenson

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

From: tweber4300

Sent: Friday, April 27, 2007 9:47 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: DOE Pensions and Benefits Policy, N351.1

The Policy needs to clearly state that current retiree benefits and pensions are to be "grandfathered" in any RFP or contract change for site activities.

SRS Retiree  
Tom Weber

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

From: Nick Kuehn [  
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2007 8:35 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Reply to Request for Public Comment on DOE Contractor Employee Pension  
and Medical Benefits Challenge

April 27, 2006

To: Department of Energy

From: Nicholas H. Kuehn III

Chairman Savannah River Site Retiree Association

RE: Request for Public Comment on Department of Energy Contractor Employee  
Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

#### RECOMMENDATION

It is the position of the Savannah River Site Retiree Association that the Department of Energy should include words in the introduction to Notice 351.1 or other DOE documents and contracts to the effect that the Department of Energy has a legacy obligation to honor pension and benefit commitments made to present retirees and incumbent employees. This legacy obligation needs to be an integral consideration in all future Department of Energy plans to meet the Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge. The introduction to N351.1 now focuses only on the Department of Energy's efforts to reduce costs.

#### DISCUSSION

The members of the Savannah River Site Retiree Association are concerned that the Department of Energy's focus on controlling the cost of long term contractor benefit obligations will result in a reduction of the benefits we were given at the time of our retirement. We recognize that the focus of Notice 351.1 is on New Employee pension and benefit plans and that our pensions and benefits are addressed in Order 350.1. However, in the BACKGROUND section of DOE N 351.1, there is no distinction made between new employees and incumbent employees and present retirees. The focus of this section is entirely on containing costs and does not address the Department of Energy's legacy obligation to those of us who worked at DOE facilities during the cold war. When we worked at the Savannah River Site during the 1960's, 70's, 80' and 90's we accepted the



risks associated with working on nuclear fuel fabrication, operation of production nuclear reactors, processing of spent nuclear fuel and targets and separation and packaging of tritium. During those years, the Department of Energy (DOE) recognized these risks and challenging technical requirements. DOE, through its prime contractors, offered a defined benefit pension plan; comprehensive medical benefits, which included prescription drug coverage and dental benefits, and life insurance coverage in order to attract and retain the technically competent and dedicated workforce needed to safely meet the nuclear material requirements essential to the security of our country. We were proud to serve our country. We in turn expected the Department of Energy to live up to its obligations so in retirement we could count on the benefits we received when we retired. We have all made our life plans based on continuing to receive these benefits.

In discussions and meetings the Department of Energy has verbally acknowledged our past service and has explicitly stated that our pension and benefit plans are to be grandfathered. In a presentation made to members of our organization in December of 2006, Ms. Ingrid Kolb Director of the Office of Management gave a presentation on Notice 351.1 in which her very first slide emphasized "grandfathering" pension and benefit programs for incumbent employees. In subsequent discussions she stated that this also included present retirees. At that meeting both Ms. Kolb and Mr. Edward Simpson stated very clearly that DOE as an organization and Secretary Bodman recognized a legacy obligation to retirees. Unfortunately these words do not appear in either N 351.1 or in the Recent Request for Proposals for the new Savannah River Site contracts. One aspect of the concept of "grandfathering" is contained in N 351.1 and the recent Request for Proposals - incumbent employees and present retirees are to be treated differently than new employees. Initially we are to retain our pension and benefit plans. We strongly endorse this approach.

We are very concerned that the Department of Energy's exclusive emphasis on containing costs in DOE N 351.1 will result in a reduction of our benefits for the following reasons:

(1) Section 6 DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES (4) states: "Encourage that Contractors take appropriate steps to preserve existing rights to modify, change, suspend or terminate in whole or in part (e.g. by annually communicating to both active and retired plan participants an appropriate reservation of rights as permitted by law) the medical plans they sponsor and not compromise any such rights in existing or new medical benefit plans without prior written approval for cost reimbursement." This makes words about grandfathering appear hollow.

(2) In Order 350.1, the Order N 351.1 directs to be used for "EXISTING MEDICAL BENEFIT PLANS AND INCUMBENT ENROLLEES", DOE's objective is to "develop employee benefit programs that will attract and retain competent and productive employees and that facilitate the achievement of objectives and business strategies in support of DOE missions in a cost effective manner." Looking forward DOE requires contractors to use either "the U. S. Chamber of Commerce Benefit Survey comparison method" or the Value Study method." We believe that in the future our benefits could be determined by criteria for retaining present employees or attracting future employees. In

today's world were the trend is to reduce worker benefits, we think that this is the wrong approach. We believe that a comparison appropriate in the 1960's, 70's, 80's and 90's was the method used to establish our benefits while we were working and that now that we are retired these benefits should be "grandfathered."

As taxpayers we understand the need for the Department of Energy's efforts to contain the cost for pension and benefit programs for future employees or new hires with the methods proposed in Order 351.1. However as former workers at the Savannah River Site, we do have some reservations about the selection of companies for comparison studies to set benefits. In selecting these companies it is essential that the Department of Energy recognize the nature of operations at each DOE site. Workers in facilities handling large quantities of highly radioactive material are subjected to risks not found in most other industries. Developing and implementing the processes and procedures for handling and disposing of this material requires competent technical managers, highly skilled engineers and scientists. If the Department of Energy does not include these considerations in selecting comparison companies, we believe that the safety and efficiency of operations at these DOE facilities will be degraded because, in the future, DOE's contractors will not be able to attract and retain a high quality work force.

Thank you for your consideration.

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

From: Jaramillo, James G

Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2007 4:08 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: SUBJECT: DOE Order N. 351.1

SUBJECT: DOE Order N. 351.1

As an employee of Sandia National Laboratories, I would like to express my concern and profound opposition for the Department of Energy's proposed policy on pension and medical benefits (DOE Order N. 351.1). The language is murky but the intent to reduce/eliminate benefits is clear. Your office must review and stop this policy; it is poorly thought out and will be counterproductive to DOE's mission. DOE's stated purpose is to restrain medical and retirement costs to no more than 5% above industry average. Faltering corporations (i.e. airlines) are constantly driving this average down and DOE should not follow their lead. Consider Sandia's motto: "Exceptional Service in the National Interest". I will tell you there is nothing average about working in one of this nation's premier nuclear weapons laboratories. I am held to high standards of safety, security, professional competence and professional integrity. The demands are world class, the pay is not, and my service to the country is deserving of decent benefits. Please consider. . . .

1) Medical care costs at Sandia National Laboratories are not excessive compared to industry. Employees and management work proactively to contain costs. Examples are an on-site pharmacy concept to reduce prescriptions expenses, mail order prescriptions,

encouraging employees to utilize in-network physicians, and we are jointly involved on a Benefits Review Committee to find ways to continually reduce costs.

2) The pension fund known as the Pension Security Plan is currently well funded, with liabilities under 50% of assets. This fund does not need DOE's interference and any attempt "TO REDUCE" this benefit would be viewed with anger and suspicion. It currently is self sustaining and requires no funding from DOE, SNL, or Lockheed Martin. There are no savings for DOE to find in our pension.

3) Federal law governs the pensions of DOE employees, and their pension continues to increase. If Sandia's pension benefits are frozen or reduced while DOE's pension benefits continue to increase, resentment toward DOE would compound.

4) DOE order N. 351.1 was proposed last year and the U.S. Senate delayed its implementation due to the mid term election. Poor policy choices which are also unpopular and unneeded will always carry a political price and will always take effect prior to an upcoming election. I will be watching your action regarding this issue with great interest.

Please review this policy and work to stop it – not merely delay it – STOP IT!!!! Thank you in advance for your attention toward this issue.

Sincerely,  
James Jaramillo

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

From: Retta  
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2007 2:39 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Increase

Mrs. Weakley,

I am a concerned family member. My mother is a dependant survivor. The high cost of insurance is consuming a great deal of her survival pension. The high cost rate need to cease! If her name is required it will be provided upon request or on any partition.

Thank you for listening.  
Lauretta D. Gordon

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

From: Jim & Shannon  
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2007 1:36 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Policy N351.1,

Ms. Kolb, the DOE sponsor of the proposed Policy N351.1, has communicated to the SRSRA that the "intention" of the DOE is to NOT use the new Policy N351.1 to cut current retiree pension and benefit values. There is nothing written in the Policy that supports this commitment. Comments need to focus on requesting that words be added to the Policy that "grandfather" the benefits and pensions currently received by retirees. Adding such words will prohibit application of the Policy to our pensions and benefits.

The Policy needs to clearly state that current retiree benefits and pensions are to be "grandfathered" in any RFP or contract change for site activities.

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

From: Allen, Jason T

Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2007 12:25 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: RE: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here for 3 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,  
Jason Allen CHG Janitor  
Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council

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

From: Buckhead2000  
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2007 10:05 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: PENSION HUNT

To whom it may Concern:

All of us (retirees) are fully aware of the sky-rocketing costs in the economy today, including the medical arena. I personally agree that it is the governments responsibility to try to cut government spending. However, any citizen true to himself knows that you wouldn't or shouldn't go after the pensions and medical coverage of those that for 20, 30, or 40 years helped you, (the government), "run and support the country." Saying it another way, if there were 10,000 places to cut government spending (and there are) pensions and medical coverage for retirees should be 9,999 on that list.

Let me say one last thing in earnest. Give me 100 retirees of my choosing and turn us lose for six months to find ways of cutting government waste. We could triple our pensions and give you a billion dollars back in the process.

I respectfully request you look elsewhere for these cuts.

James F. Smith  
Retiree

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

From: Charlie  
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2007 10:05 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Policy N351.1

Comment:

I do not see any statement within the policy that would assure that current

retiree pensions and benefits must be maintained. I oppose the policy as written since it does not address the "grandfathering" of the current benefits. Without a statement to this effect in the policy, the risk of future reduction would be unacceptable. I am communicating my concern addressed here to my senators.

C. Roach  
Martinez, Ga.

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

From: Bowen, William W  
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2007 5:32 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: FW: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

From: McGee, Cheryl L (Cheri)  
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2007 2:26 PM  
To: Bowen, William W  
Subject: FW: 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 thirty three 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,  
William W. Bowen

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

From: Payton, Amy I.

Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2007 5:26 PM

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 fourteen 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 deteriorate worker benefits.

Thank you,  
Amy Payton  
Radiological Control Technician

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

From: drkorslund  
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2007 11:02 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Fw: health care & pensions

This is my home e-mail which I do not what difference it makes. I work at Hanford the contractors are attacking our pension and health care benefits. as a worker at Hanford and as a citizen of the USA I have a problem with whats happening here and across the country. it seems the US government is backing these attacks on pensions. Maybe it's the republican way? D.O.E. has always had a say about the contract negotiations now you arc saying its not our business what's the deal? Not your problem? Must not be your benefits!

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Korslund, Daryl R  
> Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 9:40 PM  
> To: contractor pensions  
> Subject: health care & pensions  
>

> What is the deal with the attack on our health care benefits and  
> pensions? This is not the airline industry which I am beginning not to  
> trust. These are issues we should not have to fight to keep they were  
> promised in prior contracts. Is DOE's health care benefits and  
> pensions being questioned? Is this not something you would be?  
> concerned about if we were talking about cutting or taking your  
> benefits away you have worked for? I don't imagine anyone is talking



> about cutting president bush' health care benefits and pension? What  
> about congress is theirs in jeopardy? This Hanford site has the  
> largest collection of hazardous and radioactive waste in the united  
> states and would rival any other site in the world. I just got a  
> e-mail from the vice president of CH2Mhill jerry long wanting to know  
> what we want for celebratory lunches for our achievements in the  
> coming year. I could give a hoot about getting a free lunch when the  
> company he is representing is trying to cut everything we have worked  
> for out of existence. I am 55, my wife is 45 and we have a 2 year old  
> daughter they mean more to me then a stupid free lunch from jerry  
> long. We need to keep our benefits. The federal government needs to  
> stop this theft of benefits from the workers on this site and across  
> the country it is robbery its disgraceful!

> daryl korslund

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

From: Eugene Strycula

Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2007 9:28 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Comments on RFP for WSRC- Retiree Pension and Benefits

Comments on Contractor Pensions     April 25, 2007

I retired from the Savannah River Site (SRS) in June of 2005, after 15 years of service with the Westinghouse / Washington Group. I have medical benefits and have been collecting a pension since that time. I will go on Medicare in August of 2007.

I understand that DOE is under pressure to reduce costs, but find it very disturbing to learn that DOE is attempting to do this by reducing pensions and benefits already obtained by retirees in previous contract negotiations. DOE did not explicitly state in the RFP for the Savannah River Site that pensions and medical benefits for present retirees, given at the time of their retirement, are to be continued.

I feel that benefits, obtained in previous contracts, should be honored, especially by a government agency. Otherwise, what the purpose of a contract? I worked with the expectation that a pension and medical benefits would be available upon my retirement. To take away part, or all of these benefits, after a person is already in retirement is unconscionable.

I request that DOE clearly state that current retiree benefits and pensions are to be grandfathered in any RFP or contract changes for SRS activities.

Eugene C. Strycula

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

From: David Johnson  
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2007 11:16 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: N351.1

I am outraged that some people in the US Department of Energy are trying to make it possible for the DOE to weasel out of agreements to fund contractor pension plans.

This is robbery. I agreed to work for DOE contractors in exchange for a combination of pay and benefits. The pay and benefit packages offered me were consistent with the terms of the contract under my employers have been operating.

I have been exposed to radiation and to hazardous substances in my work at Hanford and at the Savannah River Site; the performance of my employers has been such that they have earned Award Fees and other bonuses for the work done by me and my co-workers. My employers and I have fulfilled our end of the bargain.

Policy N351.1 MUST be revised to specifically state that current and past workers' pension plans will be fully funded forever, and that COLA adjustments to these plans will be identical to those received by Federal employees.

Anything less than this is dishonest, immoral, and absolutely un-American. If you have a shred of integrity, you will make this change to N351.1 immediately.

David Johnson

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

From: charles.mills  
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2007 3:48 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: DOE Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

I have never been too worried about another contractor coming to this site, because the DOE has always protected their employees from someone coming in and making a lot of changes.

I knew if a new contractor wanted to cut our pay and/or benefits, that DOE would have to approve it.

Please don't cut the benefits, or cause us to pay dearly for our insurance. I have given you 28 years of my life, and would like to give you 7 more. After this I would like to retire, knowing that my pension will get me and my wife through our retirement years.

I have always been proud to say I work for the Department of Energy. Please don't change that.

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

From: Moore, Richard J

Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2007 1:55 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: FW: 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 even 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,  
Richard J. Moore

NCO/200W

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

From: GarvinPA

Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2007 12:00 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Request for Proposal

I am a retiree of the Savannah River Site. I am one of those who was laid off. In fact, the entire Illustrating staff was called in and told we were being laid off. After we were sent home, we were told that DOE didn't allow the layoff and we were told we could come back at our previous pay but not our previous jobs. I was an artist with over 36 years of service when this happened to me. And I was told I could drive a truck, empty trash, mow lawns or tear down buildings. Even after being treated this way, I have managed to get my life back together. I have retired.

And now I find out that the retirement benefits that I was given are being threatened in the Request for Proposal document. The SRS Retiree Association was told verbally that current retirees' benefits would be "Grandfathered". And now I've heard that a request to have this wording included in the Request for Proposal was denied. If we were told the truth and our pension and post retirement benefits are indeed going to be grandfathered, why can't this wording be added to the Request for Proposal document?

Peggy Garvin

Member of SRS Retiree Association