

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

From: Tom or Julie Laub

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 11:09 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Comments on Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

I'm sure you've heard this before but as for employee's of National Laboratories the total benefits package should not be limited to 5% above "market average." You do not want average employees at a National Laboratory--you want the best and the brightest. Don't count on a sense of national pride to keep the exceptional employee at a National Laboratory. It is hard to have national pride when your nation does not appreciate your hard work and special talents. You can make more money some place other than a National Lab so the benefits have to be the way appreciation is shown. Benefits at National Labs have been in decline for ten years now and it's getting to where it is demeaning. Do not limit the value of benefits at National Labs.

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

From: Jeff Hay

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 11:09 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: DOE commitments to pensions and healthcare

<>DOE staff,

It is crucial that DOE maintain its commitment to current retirees regarding pensions and health care since they have no viable alternatives and have based their retirement planning on these commitments. In contrast current employees have greater flexibility in adjusting to potential changes in the retirement system. Retirees not affiliated with Social Security comprise a particularly vulnerable class of people. Since they are typically ineligible for Medicare coverage, these retirees rely on the DOE commitment as their only means of medical coverage in retirement. This situation relates to a significant number of employees hired when the DOE contractor was not coordinated with Social Security. <>

Sincerely,<>

Jeffrey Hay<>

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

From: David H. Lunt

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 10:44 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Fw:

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,
Herrick Lunt

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

From: APW63
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 10:11 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 eighteen 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,
AP Wegner

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

From: Harvey Jones
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 9:45 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: FW: Hanford Benefits

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 two 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,

Harvey Jones

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

From: Mark

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 9:08 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

Importance: High

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here for twenty 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,
Mark Kerns

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

From: Bill leckband
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 8:40 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Re: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

Gentlemen:

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 compared 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 own pension and medical plans are significantly more generous than those they want to eliminate for our workforce. 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 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 J. Leckband

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

From: Slaugh, Don M
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 6:20 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Pensions and Medical Funding

To whom it may concern,

DOE has the responsibility of stewardship for HANFORD and it's WORKERS. The workers have labored in some of the most hazardous environments any work place can have. I believe that it is because of the dedicated work force and the specialized training that work is successfully completed. To erode these benefits of these workers is irresponsible and a slap in the face. You should be ashamed of even considering this.

Dedicated Employee

Don M Slaugh

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

From: [RoynJune](#)
Sent: Thursday, May 03, 2007 10:56 AM
To: Weakley, Stephanie F
Subject: DOE Notice 351.1 (Pensions and Health Care)

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 lan 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 Notice 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: A. L. (Pete) Lotts
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2007 9:55 PM
To: Kolb, Ingrid
Cc: Bob Keil; Fred Shull; Dave Reichle
Subject: Fw: Comments on DOE Notice N 351.1

Dear Ms. Kolb-

Here is a copy of the comments of CORRE on the DOE Notice N 351.1. These were addressed by email to the web site posted for this purpose by DOE.

We appreciate your clarifications on DOE made in your previous emails in answer to our questions. However, those answers are not sufficiently reassuring for us not to seek changes to the notice, which we understand will eventually become DOE policy.

We trust that our comments will be taken seriously, as we are addressing an issues concerning defined benefit plans under which thousands retired. These issues deserve the careful attention of DOE management.

Sincerely-

A. L. (Pete) Lotts www.corre.info for information about CORRE)

----- Original Message -----
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2007 1:27 PM
Subject: Comments on DOE Notice N 351.1

Coalition of Oak Ridge Retired Employees (CORRE)

Working for Fair, Equitable, and Competitive Benefits

For Former K-25, Y-12, and ORNL Employees

April 16, 2007

Ms. Stephanie Weakley

Office of Procurement and Assistance Management

U.S. Department of Energy

1000 Independence Avenue SW

Washington, D.C. 20585

Sent by email to DOE at contractorpensions@hq.doe.gov

Dear Ms. Weakley:

Comments on DOE Notice N 351.1

In response to the Department of Energy's invitation given in the Federal Register, I am submitting the attached comments on the document. We had previously supplied amendments to the document shortly after the public meeting at Pellissippi State Community College. This set of comments replaces the amendments for N 351.1 that we supplied to DOE at that time. It does not replace the written questions we addressed to DOE at the meeting. We also supplied copies of those to the DOE delegation at the meeting.

We would emphasize that the draft N 351.1 document, while not primarily addressing the defined benefit plans in effect, does address them by restricting severely how adjustments can be made. The fact that little written guidance is given by present DOE procedures provides a vacuum in which retirees of those plans are easily forgotten. We think that has happened in Oak Ridge with the existing contractor pension plans. The comments we are supplying to you addresses our concerns that there be put in place adequate administrative guidelines to assure that interests of retirees are protected. Adoption of our recommendation, as contained in our comments, will assure that there are guidelines for proper reviews with criteria that all of us can understand.

We would also note that a large percentage of the retirees of DOE contractors rely extensively upon the contractor defined benefit plans, and, thus, it is important that their concerns be addressed in the N 351.1 document, such that when it becomes the order, it is known how the defined benefit plans will be administered.

We appreciate this opportunity to comment and would be pleased to discuss them with DOE management.

Sincerely,
David E. Reichle, President

Provided by COALITION of OAK RIDGE RETIRED EMPLOYEES (CORRE) April 12, 2007

CORRE recognizes that DOE Notice N 351.1, as drafted, is primarily about the transition from Defined Benefit (DB) plans to Defined Contribution (DC) plans for future DOE contractor retirees. However, the document is inadequate in the manner in which it addresses the problem of administering fairly the existing defined benefit plans under which most of DOE contractor retirees now receive benefits and which is still a prevalent methodology used by many contractors for the DOE. The document should address comprehensively all primary issues related to the administration of the defined benefit plans, especially since there is no other document that addresses properly how defined benefit plans will be administered to give fair treatment to retirees whose pensions are provided by these plans. Therefore, CORRE is making the major recommendation that detailed methodology for administration of defined benefit plans also be incorporated in N 351.1. It is not sufficient to say simply that changes in DB plan benefits must be approved by the Secretary of the Department of Energy.

DOE has 45 defined benefit plans in use across its operations in some 20 states. These plans were established by a variety of corporate entities at different times under conditions of a world war as well as more peaceful times, and with considerations that span some of the most turbulent times from a sociological and political perspective in our nation's history. Stewardship, management, and performance of these 45 different plans have varied dramatically. Some contractors have an exemplary record of managing costs, while periodically augmenting plans to help mitigate lost purchasing power due to the ravages of inflation. Others have apparently failed in this responsibility as indicated by a current deficit of pension assets to liabilities of some \$2 billion, according to DOE representatives.

It is the position of the Coalition of Oak Ridge Retired Employees that those plans with an exemplary record of responsible management NOT be lumped together with those less successful or under-funded. We believe and advocate that successful DB plans should be allowed to augment their plans in accordance with their ability to fund the augmentation, and also in special circumstances where additional funding is required by DOE. CORRE recommends that DOE modify N 351.1 by incorporating guidelines for governance of the method of augmenting benefits for retirees of DB plans.

CORRE recommends that the following criteria be used to implement and manage such augmentation, and that these criteria and provisions be incorporated into N 351.1:

A) DOE shall separate considerations for Defined Contribution (DC) plans and Defined Benefit (DB) plans.

B) DOE shall separate considerations for DB plans that are fully funded from those that are not fully funded.

C) DB plans that are under-funded shall be funded in accordance with the Pension Protection Act (PPA) requirements.

2

D) Retiree benefits from fully funded DB plans (i.e., assets/liabilities=100%) may be augmented at the contractor's request and with the advanced approval of the Secretary of Energy (Secretary), provided the funds are available and the augmentation is based on sound management practices as regards that individual DB plan fund.

E) Under no conditions shall the contractor propose or DOE approve a transfer of funds from the DB plan surplus.

F) Under all circumstances, any change or augmentation of DB plan benefits for future retirees (present employees) shall be granted immediately and in full to existing retirees or their qualified survivors. Where such augmentation has not been allowed for any reason, the contractor shall now propose this augmentation, and the Secretary shall approve it for immediate implementation, provided the funds are available as herein specified.

G) At least biennially (every two years), the contractor shall review lost purchasing power of existing retirees and qualified survivors and propose appropriate augmentation of pensions as follows:

1) At a minimum, the goal shall be to maintain pensions at 75% of lost purchasing power calculated as follows and using the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Inflation Calculator on their website or it's successor methodology:

For each \$100 of pension : (example =1985 retiree)

a.	Inflation calculator 1985-2006=	\$ 187.36
b.	Pension plus previous adjustments. =	\$ 130.38
c.	Lost purchasing power (a-b) =	\$ 56.98
d.	75% of lost purchasing power(c x .75) =	\$ 42.74
e.	After adjustment per \$100 (b+d) =	\$173.12
f.	After adjustment % of original pension in inflation-adjusted dollars (e/a)	92%

Note 1: In the case of Oak Ridge Multi-Employer Pension Program (MEPP), these adjustments could result in retirees being up to 16% behind inflation (lost purchasing power), and the average would be 8% behind inflation.

Note 2: In the case of the Oak Ridge MEPP covering over 11,000 current retirees, the cost of fully implementing this proposal plus the 2% spousal option (separate proposal) would require less than one half of the current surplus and cost DOE or the taxpayer nothing!

2) Any lost purchasing power adjustments shall be made for all then retired employees and qualified survivors regardless of salary level or year of retirement without exclusions or setbacks of any kind.

3

H) The Secretary of Energy or their designate shall approve contractor proposals for augmentation of existing DB plans provided:

1) The plan is fully funded before and will be fully funded after the requested augmentation, and

2) After augmentation, plan assets shall not fall below 100 % of plan liabilities using PPA guidelines and requirements. Should the biennial review of lost purchasing power on two consecutive reviews (4 years maximum) result in the need to make an adjustment for which pension funds are not available (assets/ liabilities would fall below 100%), the Secretary shall in that year reallocate operational funds as may be required to fully fund the lost purchasing power adjustment as indicated and as herein specified.

I) Contractors shall be cognizant of historical practices at the locations managed and provisions for augmentation of DB plans for retirees and covered employees at such locations, and

1) Conduct biennial reviews of lost purchasing power as herein specified, and

2) Propose to DOE Elements augmentation of such plans in accordance with these provisions, provided the plan meets the specified funding requirements for augmentation.

J) DOE Elements shall review contractor proposals for DB plan augmentation as herein described, and

1) Ensure that all provisions of this policy/order are met, and

2) Submit the proposal to the Secretary for approval and authorization to implement.

K) The contractor shall implement approved augmentations as soon as practicable.

CORRE

April 12, 2007

From: Eubanks, Randall D
Sent: Monday, April 09, 2007 9:09 AM
To:

Subject: FW: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

Subject: FW: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

This needs to be sent to: contractorpensions@hq.doe.gov
Change to your name at the bottom, change things around if you feel they need to be, like the number of years you've worked here.

—

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 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 has 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, honor the contractual obligations that we agreed to work under in 1987 and abandon any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode worker benefits.

Thank you,
Eric Alberty

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

From: Bruinekool, D J (Doug)

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 5:02 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 twenty seven 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,

Douglas Bruinekool

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

From: Edwards, Douglas D

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 4:59 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 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 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,

Douglas Edwards

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

From: Mertens, Bill

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 4:49 PM

To: contractor pensions

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

DOE should honor long standing commitments to current contractor employees and retirees related to pension and medical benefits. Many people have dedicated their entire careers as DOE contractors (i.e. -national labs) with specific expectations of benefits when they retire. Any significant changes to resolve financial issues should be addressed by adjusting pension and benefits commitments to future employees, and clearly communicating to them what they can expect ahead of time. This approach would ensure the integrity of the existing contract with employees and retirees, and establish a new benefits baseline for people considering careers in the US national interest.

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

From: Windsor, Blan D Jr

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 4:37 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: DOE

If you do it to your first @ the Judiciary body!!!

Blan

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

From: Burge, Marvel A

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 3:42 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Funding of Pensions and Health Care Benefits at DOE Sites

To Whom It May Concern:

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 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 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,
Marvel A. Burge

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

From: Collins, William E
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 2:52 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: RE: Pension Statement

To Whom It May Concern:

Hanford consolidated contractors in 1987 to save money. The savings from not having multiple contractor management, human resources, payroll, benefits, and an endless list of tasks, which were duplication of effort was supposed to ensure money was not wasted. Some contractor employees gained and some lost when establishing the Site Pension and Medical.

DOE then decided to divide up the Hanford Site in to contractors and subcontractors again less than ten years later. Now money is an issue because Hanford has multiple Companies with multiple Presidents, Vice Presidents, Human Resources, engineering departments, and many other tasks, which are a duplication of effort for getting clean up work done.

Why would the actual workers carry the burden of medical and pension? The Department of Labor is currently attempting to remedy sick Hanford workers or deceased Hanford worker's families for illnesses related to

handling dangerous material at Hanford. Now the DOE steps forward to push the financial burden of their legacy health hazards back on to the workers in the field. It is insensitive and hypocritical.

The Hanford Pension and medical benefits should be increased not decreased. The Department of Energy continues to focus on cutting benefits of their so called "Cold War Veterans". Hanford workers could get a better deal on the medical if DOE would earmark the same amount of money the contractors are spending now for the Insurance Pooling Program regulated by the State of Washington. School districts and many small businesses combine in a pool to collectively lower their insurance cost. The average age of a Hanford worker could be lowered by taking our population of workers and mixing them in with non-Hanford workers. Insurance pooling, look it up and save all of us some money and provide workers with a better deal.

Fluor Hanford Inc charges an excessive administrative fee on the medical insurance program at Hanford. There are different alternatives surfacing in the private sector better suited to cutting costs without increasing the burden to the workers or offering less and less coverage at a higher cost every year to the Hanford workers.

There are a lot of pensions better than Hanford. Hanford had the worst pension of any DOE Site and now has something comparable to organized labor jobs outside of Hanford. It might look fantastic compared to McDonalds, but it is not something to brag about for the type of work employees are performing at Hanford. UPS workers have better medical and their hourly rates continue to close in on Hanford rates and they don't handle hazardous waste or radioactively contaminated material.

It is time for some one to say it, get off the Hanford workers backs. Look some where else to save money besides the back pockets of the workers. And get modern; examine how school districts can deliver better medical insurance for less pay out of the pockets of their workers.

The contractors have made more money off the backs of the workers by charging their ridiculous administrative fees every year.

DOE offers Savannah River Site (SRS) a better pension agreement than Hanford and their workers live in a an area with lower standard of living than the Tri-Cities.

Get modern and stop attacking the workers. For the type of material being worked with at Hanford no worker should have to pay or beg for benefits.

William Collins

From: Ham-Huebner, Sallie A
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 8:48 AM
To: 'contractorpensions@hq.doe.gov'
Subject: Benefits

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've worked here for Thirty 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. 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, and have been for several years. 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.

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,

Sallie Ham-Huebner

-----Original

Message-----

From: Jinzo, Marty

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 3:38 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Pension Recommendation

[Retirement Pension Plan Recommendation: Have all new hires and employees with less than 10 years start paying a percentage of their income into the plan. Percentage would be based on employees income.](#)

Thank
Martin

You,
Jinzo

-----Original

Message-----

From: McRee, Susan R

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 3:29 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Comments on pension/medical benefits

Interesting that I know someone that works for a company that employs only 400 people yet they have better medical benefits than Sandia does these days.

I know this has been brought up in the past. Even though Sandia's salaries may be at market level, in order to protect our Great United States of America, we do need the best and brightest. There is not the same level of loyalty as in years past so it is harder to hire and retain the best and brightest at just market salaries. But, given that, we must at least be better than average in benefits to hold on to a little hope of hiring the quality staff needed to protect our country, and contribute in the many other areas.

Another note. For a number of Sandians (the personality types of staff hired), we put a lot of stress on ourselves to do our jobs to the best of our ability. I am one of those. My stress level was so high that it caused health issues, which cost ~ \$2,000/month for medication. I wound up with pre-cancerous cells and was taken off all hormone drugs, including this one. I actually thought I would wither away and have to take a medical retirement. Due to acupuncture, switching to a less stressful job, I am doing OK. Not great, but OK. I suspect stress is a major health issue for Sandians. Maybe including a massage therapist and acupuncturist at medical would reap huge benefits. I believe in doing whatever possible to help reduce medical costs per individual, not in continuing to pass the costs along to the individuals.

Another suggestion. Sandians, like myself, pay money for memberships to gyms, exercise equipment, running shoes, health food stores, etc. Then we are still faced with decreasing medical benefits. Years ago, we had to have physicals, provided by Medical. We should go back to that. One every x # of years. For those that don't do what is recommended to increase their health levels, they are the ones that should pay the increasing health costs. Not those of us that are already forking out money to try to stay in good health.

Decreasing retirement (even the City has higher percentage rate for retirement benefits) or getting rid of retirement altogether should not be an option. Again, we don't have the salaries so need to hire and retain staff based upon benefits. Many will come to SNL based upon benefits. I was one.

Susie

McRee

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

From: Bush, Lawrence P
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 3:23 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Benefit/Pension comments w/disclaimer added

I work for CH2M HILL (TANK FARMS) at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. 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,

Lawrence P. Bush

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

From: Artz, Ken A
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 3:20 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: RE:

Don,t do away with my Benifits it was part of the Vision I had for Retirement.Thats why I dedicated 28 years of my life.My Father dedicated his life also out here doing what he thought was his duty during the cold war,I too feel that is why DOE hired me for,to continue the cold war support.Please don,t forget about us!Were trying to clean up OUR messes out here.Ken Artz

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

From: Borup, Joyce E
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 3:04 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: RE: r Pension and Medical Funding

Joyce Borup

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here for 19 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.I adamantly oppose this new directive.

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, again 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,
Joyce Borup

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

From: Appel, Daniel B

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 12:39 PM
To: contractor pensions

Subject: Contractor Employee Benefits

Gentlepersons,

Pursuant to your request for public comment regarding the "challenge" presented by increasing departmental obligations to reimburse M&O Contractor Employee benefits, I have the following comments:

1) My first thoughts when I read of this opportunity for public comment were: Why not simply make good on the commitments made to those employees? Too complex a concept? Ah ha... too costly. Don't want to do it? Now that's integrity.

I also mused: The "public", in general, has no perceived use for the DOE, or particularly for the M&O contractors - - what do you expect the public to say? It looks to me as if we are seeking justification from the public to save some government money at the expense of a relatively small population of dedicated employees who have worked diligently in service to the nation for years.

2) The public may comment all they like. The fact is that the Department of Energy, and it's Contractors have made commitments and should be expected to meet those commitments. Integrity aside, the DOE and the Contractors have a legal obligation to provide the benefits that the employees have earned through their years of service to the nation.

3) If the issue is "stewardship of tax dollars", I suggest that the funds for these obligations to the M&O Contractor employees could easily be obtained by a responsible Congressional effort to stop wasting taxpayer dollars on failed entitlement programs that continue to provide funding for the lives of countless legal and illegal occupants of this nation who have never worked a day in their lives.

I believe that the suggested solution to the funding "challenge" (item 3 above) is the best path forward.

Thanks for asking.

Dan

Dan

Appel

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

From: Perea, Leanne M

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 12:27 PM
To: contractor pensions

Subject: Sandia National Laboratories - Contractor to DOE

I believe DOE has a moral obligation to honor the pension and medical benefits for current employees. These benefits were part of the reason many people decided to pursue a career working for a DOE prime contractor. As the old saying goes, "It would be unfair to change horses in the middle of a race." People have dedicated their professional careers to service to the nation and DOE should honor their commitments to these employees. I do agree that market-based pension and medical programs could be developed for new employees. However, if they are not comparable to existing programs, you will develop a two-way caste system at each contractor. This will not be good for morale or cohesiveness in the work environment.

Leanne M. Perea

-----Original

Message-----

From: Rogers, Scott

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 12:11 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: request for public comments on department of energy Contractor Employees Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

I believe DOE has a moral obligation to honor the pension and medical benefits for current employees. Many existing employees of DOE prime contractors are here today because of the benefits package offered at the time they began work. This being said, I believe that many of these employees who are concerned about their pension benefits in the current work environment probably were contributing to their plans at the onset of their employment. Many of these same employees, given the choice of their pension plan going away or beginning to make contributions to the plan, would certainly choose the contribution path. These employees have dedicated their careers to servicing the nation and DOE should honor the commitment originally made to these folks with regard to pension benefits.

Certainly developing new market based plans for new employees is an option. My interaction with folks just entering the workforce is that pension benefits are not a driving force in job selection that they once were. It appears to be the trend today that individuals look forward to having work careers with several different employers and perhaps many disciplines. This is indicative of an individual who would take control of his/her own destiny in retirement years, and who's employment choices would not be driven by the availability of a pension benefit. The fear with having two different systems for new versus established employees is that you create a sort of a caste system. My feeling is that the younger generation is not concerned about this.

The medical dilemma is a different question entirely. The main factor in the escalation of medical costs to DOE and their prime contractors is the escalation of the actual medical costs. This is not only a problem for DOE, but a problem for the entire nation. Merely changing the way medical benefits are paid for by employees and employers merely places a finger in the dike and does not address the actual problem of medical costs escalating exponentially out of control. The federal

government, including DOE, needs to work with both the private sector and the medical profession on the best ways to address this issue.

I have read where companies in the private sector have had success in lowering costs by creating a program rewarding employees (they pay less, or receive added benefits) who have chosen to live a healthy lifestyle. Perhaps DOE and its prime contractors should consider such a program. The one caveat with programs such as these is that there is always startup costs involved with such systems, often increasing costs during ramp up stage. So, DOE must keep an open mind with regard to starting a program that will probably cost more in the short term, but benefits derived in the future would far outweigh these startup costs.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment

D. Scott Rogers

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

From: Cristman, Verlie M
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 12:08 PM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: pensions

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 pension plan of 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,
Verlie M Cristman

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

From: Rivera, Ruben

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 11:55 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 seventeen 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, R RIVERA

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

From: Sharp, Ricky L

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 11:51 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 eighteen 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,
Ricky L. Sharp

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

From: Grant, Andrew J (Andy)
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 11:51 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject:

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 Eighteen 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,
Andrew J. Grant

-----Original

Message-----

From: Montoya, Lloyd A

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 11:46 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Comments on pension/benefits

I certainly understand the need to reduce costs, etc. However, as a long-time employee of the Nuclear Weapons Complex, this was one of the "benefits" that was given as part of my new-hire package when I started work over 23 years ago after graduate school.

My belief is that this discussion of increasing costs (specifically medical) should generate a national discussion on a "nationalized" health-care plan. This should be considered part of a more global discussion aimed at providing some form of safety-net for not only NNSA contract employees, but more importantly all citizens of the United States.

Regarding the pension, this again was one of the more important things to me as a new-hire within the NWC. I had other opportunities which would have provided me with more pay and possibly better benefits, but I chose to remain within the NWC partially because of the different challenges afforded me and because I felt (still do) strongly about the future defense of the United States. If others become persistent in removing some of those safety nets, then it will truly come down to dollars only and the complex will not be able to attract some of the needed skills required. (Some of this is now being evidenced with the war in Iraq where soldiers with the reserve in some states are now going on 15 month tours of duty versus the 12 months that were originally stated.)

I do strongly believe that employees within the NWC must be encouraged to contribute to 403b/401k/457 programs to supplement their retirement. Should this be the ONLY source of income in retirement.....NO. NNSA certainly needs to get out of the pension/benefits side, but NOT at the expense of security of the US. People should be reduced through attrition, etc, but if this country wants to maintain some knowledge, skills, etc in the nuclear arena, it should be willing to support somehow some of the pension/benefits for people willing to sacrifice their careers in a limited career path.

Thank you for letting me comment.

Sincerely,

Lloyd

A.

Montoya

-----Original

Message-----

From: Klein, Bill

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 11:42 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Request for Public Comment on Department of Energy Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

When I decided to become an employee of a DOE contractor, part of the decision process was considering the retirement plan. Taking away or freezing the pension at this point in my career would significantly affect my ability to retire at a decent age. It is estimated that I would have to work an additional 10 years (well into my 70s) to make up for the pension shortfall. It is unfair to employees to change the process when they are halfway or further to retirement. If I had known that the pension would not exist when I started my career, I would have acted significantly different in contributing to my 401k. I can never make up for 20 years of potential 401k contributions.

I am concerned about the welfare of the pension and the increasing costs of keeping the pension fully funded. It puts those who have many years of service in a state of concern over the future of their pension. It is recognized that employment benefits have evolved over the last 30 years and pensions are not offered at many employers. For this reason I would recommend that pensions no longer be offered to new employees and pensions be removed from benefits from anyone who is not vested. To effectively remove the pension benefit, there would need to be increases in 401k matching by contractors in order to attract and retain employees and to reduce the discrepancy between someone who has a pension and someone who does not. There would need to be a fair lump sum compensation to each employee, who is not vested, and the lump sum would need to be rolled over into their 401k. The opportunity should also exist for vested employees to have an option of a fair lump sum settlement in lieu of a pension.

Because the retirement burden would shift from contractor to their employee, there should be mandated changes in the 401k plans. In addition to the increased matching, employers need to offer many more choices for their employees to invest for their retirement. Limiting the number of funds to a couple of dozen funds or less does not give the employee the flexibility they need to plan accordingly for retirement. If the employee is taking on more responsibility for their retirement, they should have more options on how they manage their retirement funds.

It is imperative that DOE makes a decision of the pensions in a timely manner. Postponing any decision on this matter could significantly add costs to the contractors and make it more difficult for them to react to any mandates.

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

From: Powell, Rodger T

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 11:41 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 eleven 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,

Rod Powell

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

From: Flodin, Mark

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 11:35 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: pension and health care

I'm really concerned as a Hanford worker that the department of Energy is wanting to reduce our pension benefits and health insurance. I've been working here since 1978 and find it hard to believe that after all the years of negotiations for better benefits, DOE wants to decreased our benefits because we are not market-based plan. We here at Hanford work with some of the most hazardous material in the country and many of the people that are retired now have health issues. If anything the

Hanford worker should have complete medical coverage at no cost to the employee and a retirement that gives them a good quality of life after Hanford.

thanks
Mark Flodin

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

From: Vince Melito
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 11:33 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Money

All the money and it's value is made up and agreed upon by people for people--- There are those who would not stand for Americans in the US to live with lower standards than the Europeans or Asians.....(may they increase in their wealth also) ---shall we take a stand for the conversation to be about abundance and prosperity rather than paucity and lack. After all--once again, it's all made up to start with (not a gold standard anymore).

You can source all matters to a conversation and all breakdowns to a breach in integrity.

Henry Melito

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

From: Widdis, Michael A
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 11:06 AM
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 twenty two 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,

Michael A. Widdis

-----Original

Message-----

From: Calvert, Richard

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 11:08 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Sandia Laboratories Pension Plan

[Sandia Laboratories has done an excellent managing their pension funds program. Please do not penalize Sandia in the future and allow them to continue to manage their pension funding program within Sandia Corporation.](#)

Rick

Calvert

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

From: Weeks, Krista E (Kriss)
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 10:54 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding
Importance: High

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here for twenty 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 chemical and radiological hazards, 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,

Krista E Weeks

-----Original

Message-----

From: Shamber, Gary

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 10:51 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Pension and Medical benefits

The Labs are already experiencing difficulty attracting top recruits in the sciences and engineering fields. Further dilution or reduction of benefits will make these DOE entities even less attractive to those who already have many competitive options. If DOE feels that there are no longer national level issues to resolve, for which the national labs are best suited, then the further deliberate erosion of benefits to those employees will be a sure fired way to close these labs down or make them so mediocre that they are no longer productive. DOE should be thinking of ways to make the labs MORE attractive, not less.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Levin, Jann

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 10:49 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Comments about contractor benefits

I am an employee of Sandia National Laboratories, a DOE contractor. Although I no longer work in the world of benefits, I spent my first 15 year of employment as a benefit planner. I was on the team that rewrote the DOE order that is used for the management of benefits plans. I am also a Certified Employee Benefits Specialist. I am not writing this comment to complain or to assure that what I currently have for benefits is not taken away. I have had a good career at Sandia. I use to encourage my children to work for Sandia. However, I now tell them that there is no real compelling reason to work for Sandia as I do not think that they will receive the benefits package that I receive and they can make as much money or more working for a private company.

If DOE wants to continue to hire the best and the brightest, it needs to continue to offer a benefits package that will attract these people. Since stock option plans and profit sharing plans are not available to DOE contractor employees, contractor benefit programs need to provide above average pension and/or 401K benefits and time off programs.

At one time, working for a DOE contractor provided a sense of job security. Because long term funding of many work programs in uncertain this security is not longer certain. Without this sense of job security, why would the prospective hire choose to work for a DOE contractor that offers just comparable benefits and pay, but no opportunity to share in the success of the company. If job security is just comparable, the today's young people would rather have the opportunity to earn higher pay even if that opportunity is temporary.

I understand the need to limit the future liability for health and pension plans. I think that if DOE contractors begin to offer Medical Savings account to their younger employees, with the proper education and a plan design where the employer make a modest contribution into those accounts each year, when those employee retire, they should have enough money in their accounts to allow them to pay most of the premium for their retire health plan. This would limit the DOE liability for retire health to the current retire population and those that are going to retire in the next 10 to 15 years.

Since pension plan have become a thing of the past, I feel that offering only a 401K plan to future new hires is an ok thing to do as long as some percentage is contributed to the plan by the company whether the employee contributes or not. This would increase current cost, but would eliminate the future liability.

|
|

Jannifer

Levin

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

From: Rick Certo
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 10:47 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: RE: Comments re Pension & Medical Benefits

>I believe DOE has a duty to meets its obligations regarding the pension

>and medical benefits promised to their M&O contractors. Failure to do

>so can have a serious impact by reducing the competitive edge that the
>current plan has over that of many large companies not associated with
>DOE. It is imperative that many M&O contractors, particularly the
>national laboratories, continue to hire the best scientists,
engineers,
>and support personnel to keep our nation strong. In order to
accomplish
>that, the compensation package must be, at a minimum, competitive with
>that offered by other companies or agencies.
>While it is apparent that such costs are increasing, what is also
>apparent is that DOE and its contractors can do a better job of
>reigning in expenses in other areas of the budget to ensure that
>funds continue to be available for the pension and medical plans. As
>an example, a recent newspaper article in California alleged that
>significant sums of money are being wasted because of a lack of
>oversight regarding some contractor personnel who were assigned
>overseas and who are still receiving significant payments for per
>diem and other expenses, long after said assignments have terminated.
>If the allegations are true, it represents yet another example of
>DOE being penny wise and pound foolish.
>Our society today is replete with examples of government and industry
>failing its employees when it comes time to follow through with
>promises that were made years ago. Its about time to change that. The
>continuation of pension and medical benefits is probably the most
>important factor in an employee's decision to stay or go. DOE should
>find a way to meet its commitment to those who have committed
>themselves to DOE's mission. It's not as easy as cutting or reducing
>benefits, but it can be done.

>Thank you.

Richard J. Certo

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

From: Kenworthy, Troy J

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 10:43 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 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,

Troy Kenworthy

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

From: Lance McCold

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 10:22 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Documentation in support of market comparisons

Please let me know when documentary evidence to support the following statements (from the March 27 Federal Register notice) is available.

>According to Department of Energy market comparisons, on average, the
>pension benefits received by DOE contractor employees are higher than
>the benefits earned by Federal or private sector employees. In
>addition, on average, DOE contractor employees contribute less for
>their medical benefit costs than Federal employees or private sector
>workers.

Thank you ,

Lance McCold

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

From: Quinn, Joseph C

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 10:36 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject:

I work at the Hanford reservation in Wa. state. I have been here for 30 years. We have worked on our pension benefits thought negotiations that the contractors and DOE agreed with. It now appears that DOE does not want to full fill their obligations to the work force . We are cleaning up the most contaminated and hazardous site in the world. We were cold war heroes and now we are legacy pukes. It looks like the DOE and the government are turning their backs on their long term liability. If anything our benefits should be getting better not eroding.

Joe C. Quinn

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

From: Markel, Larry P
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 10:36 AM
To: contractor pensions
Cc: Markel, Larry P
Subject: 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 sixteen 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,
Larry P. Markel

-----Original

Message-----

From: Ambabo, Andrew J

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 10:16 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Comment and Recommendation

First, thank you for providing a forum for us to express our feelings and thoughts about this important topic. I believe medical and pension benefits for DOE contractors is a major factor in our decision to become employees in the first place. It is my belief that the majority of contractor employees choose this path because of a deep commitment to service to their country. These are people that are willing to sacrifice the lure of the spoils of private industry to dedicate their entire careers to this service. The promise of rock solid benefits is a great consolation for this sacrifice. DOE has a moral as well as financial obligation to ensure the viability and great appeal of these benefits.

The issues facing DOE are but part of a national crisis facing America. The time has come for every cabinet department head to join ranks with the President and demand the Congress and the country solve these social issues. I recommend that the Energy Secretary call for a united stand of cabinet secretaries and bring this issue to forefront of American politics. DOE can not solve this crisis on its own.

Sincerely,
Andy

Ambabo

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

From: Carpenter, Richard E
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 10:04 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Pensions

Dear Sirs,

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 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 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 E. Carpenter

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

From: Phipps, David J
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 9:40 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 18 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.

Thanks,
Dave Phipps

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

From: Culverwell, Teresa E
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 9:40 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: NO Pension cuts

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here for Twenty Six 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,

Teresa Culverwell

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

From: Boynton, James P
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 9:35 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: RE: retirement benefits

Sirs

I have been employed on the Hanford Project for 22 years. When I agreed to work for Westinghouse a DOE contractor for the a wage and the benefits. Westinghouse agreed that I would be paid a waged that could be increased and retirement package would be available upon retirement. I was told that upon retiring I would be able to take my medical insurance with me, along with a retirement based on servce and pay..

Now I have reach retirement, I find that the life insurance has been eliminated and the formula for computing insurance premiums has been changed. The insurance is now eating up the retirement.

I have turned down several offers to leave the Hanford Project for more money, but I have turned them down. I have been counting on DOE/ Government Contractors to fulfill the hiring agreement.

I believe a commitment was made by DOE / Government Contractors. Now 20-30 years later they are backing out of their obligation, leaving loyal employees holding an empty bag. This will adversely affect the loyalty and commitment of future employees.

James P. Boynton

-----Original

From: Brosseau, Douglas A

Message-----

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 9:36 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Comments on DOE M&O Benefits Challenge

As a long-time employee of Sandia National Laboratories, I must take issue with this latest DOE effort to continue eroding the benefits of the so-called DOE contractors. Sandia is a separate corporation operated as a subsidiary of Lockheed Martin. We are a laboratory that has demonstrated excellence in our service to this nation since just after World War II. We are known for the quality and brilliance of our staff and management, and the exceptional, innovative, creative and unique work that gets done here.

I was a consultant for Sandia from 1985 through 1991, and returned as a Sandia employee in September 1993. That was a memorable time due to a brilliant decision made at that time regarding the Sandia vacation benefit. Since Sandia was founded, all employees regardless of years of service enjoyed a 24-day/year vacation benefit. Similar vacation benefits are offered by other large corporations as well as many of our counterparts in Europe. This was one of the primary distinguishing Sandia benefits that attracted me to come on - and to stay.

For new employees coming on after September 1993, the 24-day vacation became history. All new employees were offered 15 days to start, and a graduated accrual schedule that required 20 years of service before they would catch up to those of us who signed on earlier. This new vacation policy created a great divide among our ranks. I met one of the DOE employees at that time who master-minded the reduction of that important benefit for all new employees coming on shortly after I signed up. He was very defensive in his justification and rationale for DOE making the decision, stating that cost reduction and savings to the taxpayer was the primary motivation. When I asked him how much vacation he enjoyed, he only begrudgingly stated that his 26-day vacation was different. When I asked him why DOE employees were not also required to give up vacation to save tax dollars, he stormed out of the room.

I continue to have the same question. Over the past few years, we have seen a steady erosion of our benefits, similar to what has happened to private employment nationwide. Our medical premiums have skyrocketed. At the beginning of 2006, we were suddenly faced with a change from the \$10-\$15 copays of HMO's to the 15 percent copays of the major medical plans of the past. That new 15 percent cost-share costs those of us with medical conditions dearly. Did DOE employees suffer the same negative changes in their benefits? We also saw our paid life insurance benefit change from two-times pay to one-times pay. Meaning, for a typical staff member making \$80,000 per year, the payout to their beneficiaries upon death just dropped by that amount. This was a large drop in our benefits that DOE employees also did not experience.

Anything DOE does in this process of evaluating employee pension and medical benefit costs must consider the full spectrum of personnel who serve this nation for the benefit of the taxpayer. That means DOE employees as well as the DOE contractor employees. Any plan of action or path forward that does not include equitable reductions in DOE employee benefits that will also save tax dollars should be summarily rejected.

Doug
Solar
Sandia

Technologies
National

Brosseau
Department
Laboratories

-----Original Message-----
From: Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 9:12 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: DOE Pensioner Benefit Comments

As a DOE contractor employee for over 30 years, I feel compelled to remind the DOE of its promises via the contractors of pensioner benefits. These promises were made during the Cold War to employees who risked exposure to chemicals and unproven process technology. These employees may suffer from existing medical conditions and problems yet determined. The United States Government through its agency the DOE made these commitments and as such, much be completely accountable and reliable for these commitments at any cost. In deed the government must set an example and honor their commitments. Failure to do so, bankrupts the moral high ground of the United States and sets up the government to be a deplorable precedent for private industry.

Indeed the DOE must establish pensioner benefits to be an equal priority with the management of legacy materials and fund these obligations adequately. I call on the DOE and the legislature to take the lead and enact laws that require the DOE to publicly acknowledge these obligations by making them a visible and formal component of future contract and budget processes.

-----Original Message-----
From: Widmer, Mike
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 8:42 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Pension & Medical

I believe DOE has a moral obligation to honor the pension and medical benefits for current employees. These benefits were part of the reason many people decided to pursue a career working for a DOE prime contractor. As the old saying goes, "It would be unfair to change horses in the middle of a race." People have dedicated their professional careers to service to the nation and DOE should honor their commitments to these employees. I do agree that market-based pension and medical programs could be developed for new employees. However, if they are not comparable to existing programs, you will develop a two-way caste system at each contractor. This will not be good for morale or cohesiveness in the work environment.

-----Original Message-----
From: Allred, John F.
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2007 6:30 AM
To: contractor pensions
Subject: Employee Pensions and Benefits

=====
Dir Sir or Madam,

"If" USAEC/ERDA/DOE had been more diligent to oversee operating contractors proper protection of their workers health and the environment in years past, the magnitude of "sick worker claims" and "legacy contamination cleanups" wouldn't exist today. The adverse financial impact to the DOE budget is not the fault of "the workers" or "the environment". The fault lies entirely with the DOE. DOE contractor workers have been loyal to perform the jobs DOE tasked them to do. These workers were promised retirement pensions and medical benefits. It goes against all moral and ethical reasoning for DOE to consider reducing or placing these workers pensions or medical benefits at risk.

Sincerely,

John F. Allred