

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

From: Meyers, Robert D

Sent: Monday, April 23, 2007 6:29 PM

To: 'contractorpensions@hq.doe.gov'

Subject: Pension 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 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. You cheat Hanfords workforce of it's pensions only to pad your own pensions. It's a fine way to thank Hanford's workforce.

Robert Meyers

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

From: Jim Knight

Sent: Monday, April 23, 2007 6:21 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

I work at the Hanford Reservation in Washington State. I've been here for 15 years. I understand that 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 presumably because the DOE site workers receive higher benefits than those in the private sector. Here at Hanford, we are engaged in cleanup of one of the most contaminated and hazardous environments in the world. The workforce has dedicated their lives to cleaning up the federal government's environmental legacy. Each day, workers put themselves in harm's way performing a critical service to the United States of America. Their dedication should not go unnoticed. They expect from their government the same type of commitment and dedication in return for their service.

I'm led to believe that DOE's pension and medical plans are significantly higher than the contractor plans they want to eliminate or extensively diminish. 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. That appears to be an unwarranted inconsistency.

In closing, I adamantly oppose this new directive. The federal government should honor its commitments to the workforce and abandon any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode contractor employee benefits.

Sincerely,  
James O. Knight

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

From: RONNY ANDERSON

Sent: Monday, April 23, 2007 6:08 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: N351.1

I AM A MEMBER OF THE "SRSRA" AND I AM CONCERNED ABOUT THE PROPOSED NEW DOE PENSIONS AND BENEFITS POLICY, N351.1 WHICH DOES NOT CONSIDER "GRANDFATHERING" FOR THE CURRENT RETIREES. THIS IS IN CONTRAST TO INFORMATION GIVEN ME AT RETIREMENT IN 1993 AND TO THE SRSRA IN 2006. YOUR CONSIDERATION WOULD BE APPRECIATED.

THANK YOU

RONALD E. ANDERSON (MEMBER SRSRA)

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

From: Leyva, David M  
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2007 4:30 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Do not change the pension/medical benefits

To whom it may concern:

I am a long service employee with Sandia National Laboratories.

The reduction of pension/medical benefits would serve to discourage much needed new talent from coming to the service of the national need.

As you know, there are already many cost saving efforts under consideration by the M&O contractors as well and extremely painful sacrifices and concessions have been made by the represented personnel.

Please reconsider the ill conceived notion that slashing the reimbursement for these important benefits will in any way offset the drastic negative effect of implementation.

Sincerely,  
David Leyva  
Metal Trades Council

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

From: Domingues, R Sidney  
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2007 9:38 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: RE: Employee Benefits

Develop a way in which eventual retirees may, upon retirement, take a lump sum payment from the pension account of the laboratory pension fund based on the actuarial tables .

The lump sum payment could be structured such it would be placed in instruments (funds, accounts, etc) chosen by retiree and taxed as it is removed as income from these instruments Example:

Employee with 30 years service retires at 65 and life expectance of 82  
High three avg. salary \$100,000  $30 \times 2 + \$60000 \times 17 \text{ years} = \$1,020,000$

The retiree takes the option to have the lump sum placed in self directed IRA like account. The funds will be taxed at the time and the rate applicable to the total of the yearly withdrawals.

The Pension fund will be depleted by larger amounts at a time, but the majority of retirees will probably not take this option ensuring there still be a large enough base to provide the defined benefits for those. However I believe enough would take this option that it will reduce the burden of having large numbers of retirees living longer than original projected by actuarial tables.

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

From: rminardi5  
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2007 9:04 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Comments on Proposed Policy N351.1

I am opposed to implementation of the Proposed Policy N351.1 as written.

I am requesting that language be added to the Proposed Policy N351.1 that "grandfather" the benefits and pension currently received by all retirees from all DOE nuclear materials and weapons production site.

Vincent C. Minardi

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

From: Randy and Debbie Jones  
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2007 7:54 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: At Energy, Benefits Are a Growing Liability

I have been a Security Police Officer at the Pantex Plant in the Texas panhandle for 25 years now. Throughout my career at the Pantex plant, the continuing theme is that "We must cut all benefits". They are much too costly to the taxpayer. Not only should the DOE cease efforts to slash benefits for Subcontractor employees, it should be increasing them. I don't know, maybe funding erodes tremendously as it passes from Government coffers through the hands of the Sub-contractors, and a tiny remnant finally makes it's way to the employee's pocket. Whatever the circumstance, it is nowhere near enough to live on in retirement.

The following, is a list of reasons that should be considered every time that benefit slashing is considered:

I drive 32 miles to work every day with a work schedule that prohibits

carpooling. At today's gasoline prices, the cost is around \$215 per month. I maintain a "Q" clearance that requires that I conduct my life like that of a monk. I am required to be included in the "Human Reliability Program". If I am ill, although punished for taking sick leave, there is an extensive list of prescription drugs that I am forbidden to take for a period of 8 hours before or while at work. I have not taken prescription pain killers for 25 years. If my blood sugar rises too high, if my cholesterol or blood pressure get to be too much, I am in danger of losing my HRP, and then my job. If my financial situation should come into question, I am in danger of losing my HRP, my "Q" clearance, and my job. I must maintain both a semiannual weapons qualification, and an annual physical fitness qualification. I have chronic back pain from spending 12-hour days in HMMWV vehicles. I have endured years of medical judgment calls from people who apparently cannot get work in the private sector as medical professionals. These calls rule my life and existence, if I wish to remain employed at Pantex. Over the years, I have been in the vicinity of radiation, radioactive contamination, asbestos, beryllium, and been exposed to God only knows what else. I have watched concrete benefits erode away and be replaced with small pay raises and one-time-bonuses that don't even keep pace with the rate of inflation. Now that my employer has "self insured", almost all of my insurance claims are initially denied. I am now being told that now I must bear an ever-increasing amount of the cost for insurance coverage. Every time that our union members are forced to go on strike, there is always some member of the news media out there referring to us as greedy, overweight night watchmen in search of another dough nut. And now I am being told that if I cannot run a mile in 8 minutes and 30 seconds, I am too old to be of any further use to my company and my government. Physical fitness standards are being increased once again. If I wish, and there are any openings, I may apply to be a janitor or yard worker at a massive reduction in pay. After these 25 years of service, even though I probably will be unable to gain meaningful employment elsewhere, I am willing to retire. Just give me enough breathing room that I may retire with a modicum of dignity. I too, am a taxpayer.

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

From: jdrichards83

Sent: Sunday, April 22, 2007 10:28 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Public Comments on DOE Contractor Employee Benefit Plans

I am writing in regards to the DOE Request for public comments on how to address the challenge it faces due to increasing costs and liabilities associated with contractor employee pension and medical benefits.

I have several recommendations.

- DOE should review how other federal agencies address this issue for their contractor operated sites. Specifically NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory (operated by the California Institute of Technology) and DOD's Lincoln Laboratory (operated by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology). DOE should also look at other NASA and DOD base operations contractors that are basically equivalent to DOE's M&O contracts.
- DOE should avoid issuing RFPs that interfere with the basic abilities of contractors to provide pension and medical benefits to their employees working at DOE sites. RFPs should discourage separate pension/medical systems from the parent organization, unless it is clearly demonstrated to be a cost savings. For example, if DOE were to compare the per employee cost at LBNL (still in the UC's benefit system) and LANL (formally in UC and now a separate system), it would be shown that the cost at LANL are definitely higher to the contractor and subsequently the DOE.
- DOE should avoid fake companies (limited liability companies) from being set up to shield contractors from their pension/medical duties owed to their employees. Setting up separate LLCs reduces the contractor's ability to leverage the economy of scale discounts available to them and thus reduce overall cost by including the DOE site employees into the larger corporation's benefit systems.
- DOE should not require defined contribution plans unless that is what the contractor already offers to its non-DOE site employees. Employees at DOE sites "supposedly" work for the contractor, and it is the contractor's responsibility to attract and retain the workforce. DOE should not force or allow contractors to discriminate against its employees that happen to work at a DOE site.
- DOE should evaluate pension/medical cost as part of the contractor selection process - not after the award is made. If a contractor already has a strong and solvent pension/medical system, this should be factored in to the weighting of its bid. UC's pension/medical system was self-sufficient and of no reimbursable cost to DOE, however this was not taken into account when UC was forced by DOE to form a LLC to bid on the LANL contract. If hypothetically DOE/NNSA could have evaluated these three bids for LANL from; UC alone, LANS LLC (UC, Bechtel, BWXT, Washington Group), and the Lockheed Martin/Univ of Texas LLC... I'm positive the UC alone bid would have had the lowest pension/medical cost and saved DOE the most employee pension/benefit reimbursement money over the life of the new contract.
- DOE should require in RFPs and contracts approaches for making the money held by contracts for contractor pension/medical benefits transferable from outgoing to new contractors without adding undue cost to the contractors.
- DOE should make a clear distinction between its FFRDC sites and its other M&O sites. Under the federal rule (48CFR35) that governs Federally Funded Research & Development Centers. The whole idea is for FFRDCs to serve as long-term strategic partners with their sponsoring government agencies to assist the agency in addressing

long-term problems of considerable complexity, analyze technical questions with a high degree of objectivity, and provide creative and cost-effective solutions to government/national problems. Key to this is the ability of the operating contractor of the FFRDC to provide the continuity that will attract high-quality personnel to the FFRDC. And key to this ability is the contractor's ability to provide attractive pension/medical benefits and an employee-employer relationship that treats the employees at the FFRDC just like employees at the contractor's other sites.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments.

Sincerely  
John Richards

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

From: Jann Smith  
Sent: Sunday, April 22, 2007 5:37 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: SRS pensions

Pensions and medical/dental benefits need to be grandfathered into any RFP or future contractor policy for the Savannah River Site. Those of us who have spent 30 or more years in the industry and are now retired (no cost of living increases) should not be penalized or put at risk for pension reductions.

----Original Message-----

From: Etommybooth  
Sent: Sunday, April 22, 2007 4:57 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Include Guarantees for Health Insurance and Pension for Retirees & Near Retirees

There is potential for a terrible injustice by the Department of Energy against Savannah River Site contractor retirees and near retirees, particularly those who worked for DuPont and then Washington Savannah River Company (WSRC).

In the proposed new DOE Pensions and Benefits Policy N351.1, there is no promise or guarantee that current retiree or near retiree pensions and medical benefits will continue. Though I am not retired yet, I am age 60 and not that far from retiring.

All the years I worked for DuPont and then WSRC, I was told that we were not paid the highest salaries in direct compensation (as some other major

commercial companies paid) because of the benefits we received and would receive upon retirement. Now it appears DOE is ready to force contractors to renege on that promise.

I am not young and have a lifetime ahead to search for the highest dollar so I can be prepared to buy my own health insurance and fully pay my pension.

When the SRS Retirees Association met with the DOE Headquarters person directly responsible for the N351.1 policy, they were told that current retirees' benefits would be "grandfathered." However, that guarantee is not in the DOE Request for Proposal for the SRS contract re-bids. IF IT IS NOT IN WRITING, IT DOES NOT EXIST. Verbal words are just hot air meaning nothing. GUARANTEES NEED TO GO IN THE POLICY.

On top of that the Bush Administration recently announced health benefits for illegal alien babies. So money can be found for illegal aliens' health care, but not contractor employees who were promised medical benefits for 30 and 40 years or more. What an insult by our government! Illegal aliens mean more to some in the Bush Administration than American citizens who have worked practically their entire life for the nation.

Sincerely,  
Elton T. Booth

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

From: TThi584232

Sent: Sunday, April 22, 2007 1:24 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Re: FW: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

In a message dated 4/19/2007 11:09:39 A.M. Pacific Standard Time,

I agree with the statement below. Having been on site for 23 years I have seen how the companies and DOE are squeezing more benefits out of the employees while we are doing more work under pressure with less union people. None of the people laid off or that receive less benefits under the scam of privatization are any better off today. Neither is the community. The money given to the community is temporary, it does nothing to the economy like steady jobs. I think it is interesting that Congress is passing laws so companies like Enron, General Motors etc. can't spend or go bankrupt and deny the workers pensions and then we have a branch of the Federal Government (DOE) trying to take away our pension.. The Hanford site budget was in the millions instead of the billions and more benefits were provided to the employees. WE had more union workers less exempt. Not only is there more supervisors per worker, you have more than one contractor with a redundancy in Human resources, Payroll, Engineering etc. More



work was done safely without unrealistic goals. Now the company makes more profit or is bending the rules to make more profit because they are forced to lie about how quick they can do the job to save money. If DOE wants to really save some money without cutting the small amount of benefits the employees receive, then I am willing to discuss these options or be on a committee. Speaking of committees. During the last contract the issue of health care cost came up. The company wanted a committee of union\exempt personnel to find a better less expensive insurance or research the health care problem with solutions. After the contract was approved ,the issue was never looked at again. If health care cost was so important to the company then they should have followed thru. It turned out to be an excuse to raise our premiums. Each extra supervisor\manager could be a worker in the field making a lot less pay per year but actually getting work done.

Tom Thielen

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

From: A. LAMBEL  
Sent: Sunday, April 22, 2007 3:32 AM  
To: Lambel, E Ann; contractor pensions  
Subject: Re: FW: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

My honest opinion for you:

OKAY! Now I am sending this from my home and you can consider it legit. It is not forced or coersed from my hand to yours. I don't want to give up my hard earned pension so D.O.E. can further line their pensions and will fight against it every possible step of the way. Clear enough? We work hard in the field so you can make money it is that simple. Why would you even attempt to take away something we already earned with our sweat? There's only one word for that...

And F.Y.I. this is my personal opinion and does not reflect or represent anyone else. Honor your promise to this workforce.

Ann Lambel :

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

From: Lambel, E Ann  
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 1:45 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 thirteen years. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was

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

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

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

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

Thank you,  
E. Ann Lambel

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

From: Wbusser721

Sent: Saturday, April 21, 2007 11:24 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Pension Change comments N351.1

The proposed new DOE Pensions and Benefits Policy, N351.1 needs to clearly state "In Writing" that current retiree benefits and pensions are to be "grandfathered" in any RFP or contract change for site activities. Verbal promises tend to be lost at later dates. When we wrote safety manuals and nuclear processing procedures, the DOE would not let us make "Verbal Promises" that we would operate the reactors and canyons in a safe manner. The same should apply to our pensions.

SRS Retiree  
William Busser

Original Message-----

From: akbunch  
Sent: Saturday, April 21, 2007 8:33 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Pension/Insurance

Please grandfather-in current retiree benefits at the Savannah River Plant. It would be almost impossible for us to start over or get another job at this stage in life.

Sincerely,  
Allen K. Bunch

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

From: lharmon006  
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2007 11:38 PM  
To: contractorpensions@hq.doe.gov.  
Subject: Request for Proposal Savannah River Site

DOE Policy N351.1 needs to clearly state that current retiree benefits and pensions are to be "grandfathered" in any RFP or contract change for Savannah River site activities.

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

From: casper729  
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2007 6:13 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Retirees Benefits

Policy N351.1

We retirees request that DOE explicitly state in the Request for Proposal that pension and post retirement benefits for present retirees, given at the time of their retirement, be grandfathered.

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

From: Khalil, Nazir S

Sent: Friday, April 20, 2007 4:06 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Comment to Notice - Federal Register Vol 72, Number 58, March 27, 2007

This is a comment solicited by the Federal Register Notice dated March 27, 2007 (Volume 72, Number 58), on the topic of DOE Contractor Pensions.

While it is acknowledged that contractor pensions and retiree health benefits costs are rising, the Notice inappropriately discusses and implies that DOE contractor pension and health benefit costs are too generous when compared to private sector employees. While the stand-alone comparison may be accurate (I have not researched this personally), more appropriately, it should be discussed with an overall assessment of private sector compensation. I refer here to the stock options and profit-sharing plans offered by private sector companies, that typically augment retiree pension plans. DOE contractors have no such stock option or profit-sharing plans to supplement their pension plans. Therefore, it is appropriate that, by themselves, DOE contractor pension plans be designed to be more "generous" than their equivalent in the private sector. Such a variance is necessary to permit the DOE contractors to continue to attract highly-qualified individuals to work for the national good.

Thank you, Nazir Khalil.

----Original Message-----

From: John-Meg Jones

Sent: Friday, April 20, 2007 3:49 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Pensioner Benefits

Present pensioners have received many promises, written and verbal, from DOE and SRS Contractors over the years. Many of us have made retirement decisions based on this. The RFP should include wording that existing retiree's benefits will be grandfathered as of retirement date.

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

From: Harvey Scherr

Sent: Friday, April 20, 2007 3:36 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: DOE funded pensions and medical benefits policy

I would like to comment on the issue of DOE funded pensions and medical benefits policy as it pertains to retirees of contractor companies managing DOE nuclear waste sites. I am restricting my comments to retirees as this is my area of concern.

In the interest of both saving money for the DOE and protecting the medical benefits and pensions of retired workers of these facilities, I would offer the following as a reasonable recommendation.

Maintain the current level of medical benefit coverage to retirees and eliminate future increases in pension benefits to those presently receiving pensions funded by DOE. For those retirees who receive medical benefits, which in most cases apply to those of us already covered by Medicare, maintain the coverage now provided, as the DOE funded plans do not provide the primary medical insurance.

There are retirees who pay nothing for this <sup>3</sup>secondary<sup>2</sup> medical benefit, and there are are retirees who do pay for this benefit as a deduction from their monthly pensions. DOE could, by requiring those who pay nothing, to pay the same as those who do pay thereby helping to offset retiree medical coverage cost to the DOE and still provide the benefit as was promised at reasonable cost.

As a retiree of the Westinghouse Savannah River Company and being 69 years of age, it would be very difficult for me to obtain a secondary medical insurance plan that I could afford. My wife and I receive Medicare parts A and B and depend on the DOE funded medical plan that covers us. It is too late in the game for us to strike out on our own for such coverage; the time has passed for us. This was most feasible at the time that I retired, but is no longer viable. I am certain that the majority of retirees depend on Medicare as their primary medical insurance as my wife and I do.

I hope that the DOE will be reasonable and treat retirees fairly knowing that our options are limited since we have passed the time in which we could have made other arrangements for secondary medical coverage. I believe that fairness would be for the current benefits to be grandfathered for retirees.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.  
Harvey J. Scherr

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

From: Orval Bradt

Sent: Friday, April 20, 2007 2:05 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Pensions

I arrived at Hanford in 1983. Part of what attracted me was the decent benefits, including the pension plan. In the 90's when "Enterprise" companies arrived the change in benefits by freezing pensions for certain employees was an insult. Although I was not impacted, it was virtually blind luck that made the selection.

The current Hanford situation appears to benefit DOE employees whose benefits appear more secure, and contractor managers who receive nice

bonuses for merely doing their jobs, for which they are already well paid.

Please do not further reduce Hanford pension benefits. There are other ways to cut costs, eliminate waste, and improve efficiency without sacrificing the dedicated, trained, dependable, professional employees here at Hanford.

Thank You,  
Orval Bradt

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

From: John Goodell  
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2007 11:07 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Pension and Medical Benefits

Dear Sir,

I certainly hope you are not trying to save money at the expense of the retirees. We retired early because of the package that was offered to us, it was our understanding that we would receive this modest pension and medical benefits without reduction and in fact adjustments for inflation. Our plans for the future were based on your contract with us. At the time of our retirement we were told that there was enough in the pension fund to meet these goals. I do hope that DOE is not trying to save money at the expense of the retirees, this would not be moral or ethical.

Sincerely,  
John S. Goodell  
Retiree 2005

---Original Message-----

From: Jackie Walker  
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2007 11:55 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Policy N351.1

Policy N351.1

We retirees request that DOE explicitly state in the Request for Proposal that pension and post retirement benefits for present retirees, given at the time of their retirement, be grandfathered.

Jacqueline S. Walker

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

From: Barry Myers

Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 7:17 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Contractor Pensions

You made the deal, we worked along under the deal. We rolled over and are paying for benefits that we were promised. At least grandfather the benefit to that at which we retired. When Congress starts cutting their benefits, then bring this back up.

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

From: Nancy Smith  
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 6:13 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: We Need Your Support

I recently learned through the SRS Retirees Association that DOE representatives' response to the "grandfathering" of current employees and retirees' benefits are contradictory. Retirees were told that retirees would be "grandfathered" when representatives met with the DOE Headquarters person who is responsible for the new DOE Pensions and Benefits Policy, N351.1. The DOE representative responsible for the Requests for Proposal for the re-bid stated a definite "NO" when questioned about retiree and current employee "grandfathering". Why opposite answers to the same question?

Thousands of people have dedicated their lives to SRS and DOE. Most of us are dependent upon the pension and, particularly, the medical benefits provided through our previous employer. My husband worked at the Site for 27 years and I have worked there for 15 years.

Please do not allow the population that has served the Department of Energy for so many years become another victim of "big business". We will only end up in the welfare lines and on Medicaid. Help us by ensuring WGI provides us with benefits we earned.

Sincerely,  
Nancy Smith

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

From: Carne, Thomas G  
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 6:05 PM  
To: contractor pensions

Subject: RE: Pension and Medical of contractor employees

Medical costs in the US have certainly been increasing at a truly alarming rate, and something is required at the federal level to restrain those cost. However, this particular issue is more specifically focused: What does DOE do to constrain these costs from rising so rapidly. The first thing that one need to do is to make a comparison

of cost between the contractor employees and the civil service employees that work for DOE. We need to know what is the cost of pension and medical insurance for DOE employees, so that a reasonable comparison can be made with those cost for contractor employees. Now it may be that both are too high and rising too fast, but by making the comparison one can determine whether this is a contractor problem or a global national problem.

This comparison really need to be made before one can go any further along a path of resolving the problem. But, if we find that the costs and rate of increase is comparable, then we would know that this is a global problem and not just a contractor problem. I suspect we will find that the cost increases are typical of that which we see in civil service or other economic sectors in the country. In that case, we have a national problem, not just a DOE contractor problem. In that case, we would need to review the costs involved in providing medical care in the US, and find out what is driving the huge cost increases. Then, some difficult decisions will have to made regarding the way and the availability of medical care. Anybody that has been in a hospital lately and actually reviewed the costs involved in staying at the hospital would be absolutely astounded by the costs. It is inconceivable that an organization can actually spend that much resources on a single person. I don't think one could come close to spending that amount of money even at a nuclear weapons design facility.

You could not get that many people working on one persons problems to spend the amount that gets spent on a typical hospital stay. And, finally, most money that get spent on medical care in this country and by the DOE contractors is spent in the last few months of a person life in a hospital.

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

From: Brent Sexon  
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 5:42 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Comment

I worked at Savannah River for 29 years and retired in 06. I have since been diagnosed with cancer. My medical bills last year were over \$80,000. There is no way I could afford this without medical insurance. I believe we (retirees) have earned the benefits promised by our employers. I realize retirement benefits were not guaranteed, but it would be a serious breach of trust for DOE not to look out for those of us who provided loyal service to the DOE and its subcontractors. My pension is my sole source of income.

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

From: Rogulich, Andrew J



Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 2:58 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Sandia National Laboratory

President Tom Hunter reported last week to all Sandia management that Sandia National Labs made a 15% profit in the management of Sandia's pension plan. Sandia National Labs is doing a better job at managing our pension plan than the other facilities in the Nuclear Weapons Complex. Sandia should not be lumped in with everyone else and essentially be penalized for poor management of pension funds. Treat each lab according to their need

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

From: Bob Smith  
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 4:03 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Policy N351.1

Dear Sirs,

It is my understanding that the SRS Retirees Association met with the DOE Headquarters person directly responsible for the N351.1 policy; we were told that current retirees' benefits would be "grandfathered".

The SRS Retirees Association also met with the DOE personnel responsible for the Requests for Proposal for the upcoming SRS contract re-bids and have commented on the Request for Proposal. We specifically requested that DOE explicitly state in the Request for Proposal that pension and post retirement benefits for present retirees, given at the time of their retirement, will be grandfathered. The Department of Energy's answer was NO. This is in direct contradiction of the promise made in our meeting with the personnel responsible for the governing Policy N351.1.

I retired from WSRC in 2002 and request DOE to include the specific promises to existing retirees made in the RFP.

Regards,  
Robert L. Smith, Jr.

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

>From: Vin Taneja  
>Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2007 6:54 PM  
>To: contractor pensions  
>Subject: DOE Contractor Pension and Health Benefits  
>  
>My suggestion is to drop the defined benefit pension plan for new hires  
>effective FY2008 (offer only 401k or 403b), and create a two tier

>contribution to the health plan - a reasonable contribution for  
>non-smokers, and a significantly higher contribution for smokers and  
>grossly obese employees.

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

From: Wilson, Robert (Aiken, SC) [  
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 2:08 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: RETIREE BENEFITS

I was made aware that the new DOE Benefits Policy, N351.1, does not have any protection for existing retirees. I am a retired contract employee of WSRS SRP and stayed at the site in order to have my medical and retirement benefits in retirement. I believe any policy change, RFP or contract change should have a clause grandfathering existing retirees to the benefits they were promised upon retiring. If you want to reduce benefits to new hires and that is explained up front then fine but to change benefits after the fact is not only not in good faith to those who served DOE in the cold war but borders on being immoral. If you believe the only way this policy can be implemented is by speaking with our congressional legislators please let me know and I will pursue it through them.

Thank you.  
Robert Wilson

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

From: Joseph, Jeffrey  
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 1:35 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: RE: Reduced pensions -- Sandia employee's comments

As if anyone in the DOE or US government will actually bother to read these...  
I give you at least 3 points of discussion...

1. Disingenuous use of the term "contractors". In sending out the request for comments, and putting the idea of reducing pensions out in the press, the term "contractor" is continually used. To the vast majority of full-time employees at DOE national labs and research sites, they think that this is referring

to "contract employees" of the local lab --- not themselves. This in and of itself is a highly unethical treatment of an issue which will affect, for example, around 7000 people at Sandia Labs. The method with which the DOE does business -- having an oversight company, which then has a management contract with the actual day-to-day business obfuscates this issue entirely. If the DOE wants to be on the right side of ethics and morality, they would be wise to flat out state that they wish to reduce the pensions of people working at DOE national labs --

period. Hiding behind the hidden bureaucracy of, for example, Lockheed-Martin managing

Sandia Corporation, which then runs the DOE Sandia lab (and calling Sandia employees contractors) is the stuff we expect out of criminalistic and scummy politicians, rather than the honest and ethical level expected of employees.

2. The DOE isn't the only game in town. In an era where fewer Americans are going into engineering and science professions, the DOE would be wise to heed this term: "Show me the money" (benefits, pensions, etc). As one who myself moved from Lockheed to Sandia (without losing service time) for a slightly better pension and pay, I'm quite willing to pick up and leave if the DOE starts ruminating about reduced pensions or benefits. Most DOE lab employees have the ability to jump to the company managing their location (in Sandia's case, Lockheed), without any loss of service time. When Lockheed-Martin's pension/benefits start to look better than the DOEs why would anyone stay at a DOE lab.

3. This applies to new hires as well.

Making new employees second class citizens surely isn't going to make many of them want to come to Sandia. If the DOE can somehow get every other company in the country to have as poor a pension plan as they are desiring to give new employees, then that might work. Somehow though, I don't think this is exactly going to be a real marketing coup, or is going to make the U.S. government look like a real supporter of science and engineering (as supposedly touted by this president). The DOE labs are populated by one of the highest percentages of Ivy League type PhD and Masters degrees. When these people stop going to work at these labs-- well, good luck trying to come up with engineering and science breakthroughs that companies don't want to bother researching.

Jeff Joseph  
Senior Technical Staff

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

From: Joseph R. Johnson]

Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 11:56 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Comments on DOE Notice N351.1, Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Policy

I am writing to express my concerns about the potential impact of DOE's Notice N351.1, Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Policy. While I realize the need for DOE to reduce costs for future pensions and benefits for contractor personnel, I must protest very strongly any plans that would cut these benefits for existing retired personnel. Many of these retired individuals, including myself, are living on fixed incomes and are very dependent on the continuation of these benefits. Reduction or loss of these benefits would impose severe financial hardships on many individuals.

Additionally, the retired individuals receiving a pension should be afforded periodic inflation adjustments in their pension benefits similar to that currently provided by other Federal pensions and social security benefits. Many of the retired personnel currently drawing pensions have devoted the better part of their lives in service to DOE and were promised these pension and medical benefits as part of their overall benefit package for their lifetime of service at DOE facilities around the country. It would be a great injustice for DOE to fail to meet these obligations.

I was informed that the Board of Directors of the Savannah River Site (SRS) Retirees Association met with the DOE Headquarters personnel directly responsible for the N351.1 policy, and they were told (by Ms. Kolb I believe) that current retirees' benefits would be "grandfathered". They also met with the DOE personnel responsible for the "Requests for Proposal" for the upcoming SRS contract re-bids and specifically requested that DOE explicitly state in the Request for Proposal that pension and post retirement benefits for present retirees, given at the time of retirement, will be "grandfathered". The Department of Energy's answer was "NO". This was in direct contradiction to the promise made to them in their meeting with the personnel responsible for the governing Policy N351.1. This action appears to indicate that DOE may indeed actually have plans for reducing or eliminating these benefits for existing retired personnel.

Again, I must protest very strongly any plans that would cut these benefits for existing retired personnel. I specifically request that the N351.1 policy document and any future contract re-bid documents be revised to include words that would "grandfather" these pension and medical benefits for all personnel that were retired before the changes in this new policy were implemented.

If DOE needs to reduce the pension and medical benefits of currently active employees to reduce costs, I would encourage you to do so on a limited basis and apply those changes only to "new" workers or workers under the age of 50. Those workers 50 and over have most likely already planned for these benefits for their retirement and have already "earned" the right to receive these benefits.

The following mechanisms could be used to reduce overall costs at DOE facilities and therefore provide additional funds to cover the costs of pension and medical benefits:

- a.. Reduce the paperwork burdens imposed on contractor personnel by eliminating many of the useless reporting and oversight requirements. Many extra contractor staff are needed just to provide all the reports. Reducing staff will save salary and reduce benefits cost.
- b.. Change the archaic budgeting methodology that leads to huge amounts of wasteful spending and thousands of wasted man-hours each year. Contractor organizations spend millions of extra dollars each year toward the latter part of the fiscal year buying things that may not be needed just to "spend the remaining budget", because if they don't spend it, the budget for next year will be cut. Managers have to "pad the budget" each year to ensure they have enough funds for unexpected expenditures. They may not need that

much money but it is commonplace to spend what they have so they don't lose it the following year

c.. Numerous extra budgeting staff are needed and technical staff resources are wasted each year trying to write all the justifications for "minor" and "routine" expenditures. Change the requirements for all the written justifications for these expenditures and save on manpower costs.

d.. Provide greater oversight and accountability of DOE management personnel at DOE facilities, and reduce their direct involvement in DOE facility operations. Frequently these personnel are incompetent and add several additional bureaucratic layers of project management between DOE headquarters and site contractor management. This is wasteful "middle management" and creates additional costs and burdens to contractor personnel through excessive micro management of contractor activities. I refer you to the example of DuPont's successful management of the Savannah River Site for over 40 years with limited DOE involvement.

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

From: Senkowsky, Richard

Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 9:12 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Comments to N351.1 as Requested

To Whom it may concern:

As I understand the management of legacy costs is a difficult one for an entity the size of the DoE, it is even harder and more difficult for an individual. As a young adult I went to work at the Savannah River Plant later the Savannah River Site to work. Part of what kept me at the site was the quality of the pension plan that was offered. Over the years I planned for my retirement based on the benefits summaries that were supplied to me over the 21 years I was employed at the site. My decision to early retire in 2005 was based on my ability to maintain the medical benefits that were part of the benefit program that NEVER changed during my tenure at site. My decision to leave the site earlier than expected was based on DoE's reduction of missions at the site and I chose to early retire. I have taken new employment to ensure some financial stability in the future but it is imperative that my retirement benefits from my employment at SRS be grandfathered for the future. Any future change of contract relative to the mission at SRS should include the clause that current retiree benefits and pensions should be grandfathered until all obligations have been met regarding our service to the site and DoE's mission.

Regards,  
Rick Senkowsky  
Project Manager

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

From: carol.pate  
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 10:26 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Contractor Pension and Medical Benefits

I do not think it is fair to discontinue or buy out our pension plan or medical benefits. I have worked all my life to be sure I have the resources I need to be able to retire and live comfortably without worrying about how I will pay my bills, get the medicine and medical help I need, or get necessary items for survival. I realize people are living longer and need additional medical help to keep them functioning which makes the cost of our medical plans keep climbing, but taking away their source of getting this help is not the answer. People in retirement are not able to go back to work to make ends meet.

The best answer I have is to have the stipulation that new hires to government contracts are told that they will not be included in the pension plan. They will have medical benefits at a higher rate, and the retirees will have to pay more as well. Since the retirees will not live as long as the new employees, the problem with the pension plan will level out and disappear when all the retirees have passed away.

Carol A. Pate –

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

From: Billbrum  
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 8:47 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: comment on retirement plan.

Regarding your request for comments by May 11:

The issue boils down to integrity.

I am currently receiving retirement benefits from previous employment as a DOE contractor employee. Since I am now older, and continuing to grow older, it is not feasible for me to seek an alternative source of income for the rest of my life. I enjoy receiving this retirement income

I am a taxpayer to the US Government, which provides the funding for my retirement income as well as a host of other services. I wish that my tax burden could be lower, thus yielding more money for my personal expenses. I do not enjoy paying taxes.

How should this dilemma be resolved? It should be resolved in favor of keeping promises. DOE should continue to honor the commitment it made to previous employees. To relieve "worry" on the part of retirees, DOE should continually publicize and specify in writing it's promise to continually honor it's

commitment. As for current and future employees, it should offer a "new promise" (based partly on current "supply & demand") and then resolve to keep whatever that commitment is.

I am willing to pay my share of taxes to a Government that is willing to keep it's promises.

William (Bill) A. Brummer

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

From: Killien, Richard  
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 2:53 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: N351.1

Mrs. Kolb and Others:

I just received word that you and others are requesting comments on our pension, etc. I'm a retiree from SRS. You will be receiving this email from Texas. Since DOE has been so generous in its pensions and benefits, I have had to go back to work! You need to find a way to increase the pension and raises not lower it or reduce the cost of living!! Try taxing the rich and the big corporations, not the backbone of America, the middle class worker!!

I am requesting that you Grandfather all benefits from SRS in the N351.1 by adding words that make it impossible to Mess With It!! It is detrimental enough that now I cannot go back to work for Bechtel on any good jobs or any government jobs but must SHOP and move all over the country, which is hard on families because of your ignorant policies! If I do take a job which there are many I cannot take, I loose my pension and my medical benefits. By penalizing people that want to be productive and work is not the American way and not in Americas interest!!

I suggest you do a through review of all your blundering laws!

Thank You!  
Richard J. Killien

----Original Message-----

From: Mmbrm  
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 10:58 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Pension and Benefits - N351.1

My name is Moses Mims, and I am a June 1, 2005, retiree from the Savannah River Site, which is currently being managed by the Washington Savannah River

Company, a subsidiary of the Washington Group.

This e-mail is to address my concerns about the language that is contained in Notice N351.1, Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Policy. This policy, as currently written, does not contain any language that guarantees the protection of current retiree benefits for retirees of the Savannah River Site. This is very disturbing to me and my fellow retirees. When we went to work at the site, and subsequently retired many years later, we were told that we would continue to have certain retiree benefits protected for life. Apparently this commitment is in jeopardy, and I believe that it can be rectified by including language in N351.1 that guarantees that current retiree benefits will be "grandfathered" in any future contracts that are entered into by DOE with commercial entities for the management and operation of the Savannah River Site.

Retirees from the site contributed many years of dedicated service to the site to ensure its safe and successful operation. We believe that the maintenance of retiree benefits is a way for DOE to keep faith with the retirees and to reward them for the many years of exceptional service.

Your consideration of this concern is respectfully requested.

Thank you,  
Moses Mims

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

From: Van Williams]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 10:15 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

I would like to see the pension and post retirement benefits for present retirees, given at the time of their retirement, be grandfathered. When we retired from SRS in 1995 we were promised that we would get our pension and insurance for life. So that is what we based our cost of living on. If it is changed I would have to go on government subsidized programs just to survive.

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

From: Green, Philip W  
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 9:53 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 Fifteen years. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was negotiated with the union and the contractors. Prior to this, there were multiple pension plans due to the multiple contractors performing work for DOE. The multi-employer plan was designed to save money for DOE. A detailed cost analysis was conveyed to DOE-Headquarters that showed what the plan would cost to fund through 2012. DOE-Headquarters approved the plan and, although the workers suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time, the plan was accepted by the unions and the workforce. It appears now that DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the workforce through pension benefit payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan altogether.

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

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

In closing, I adamantly oppose this new directive. It's time the federal government honor their commitments to the workforce and abandon any plan, now and in the future, to systematically erode worker benefits. With the work that we are doing, thats never been done before, we need your help.

Thank you,  
Phil Green

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

From: Nav Shah

Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 9:43 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Comments on DOE N351.1

I am a retiree from Savannah River Site. I am concerned about my pension and benefits. I request that the following words be added to the policy proposed in the DOE N351.1

"Grandfather" the benefits and pension currently received by retiree.

Thanks for your consideration.

N. Shah

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

From: Luckman, Michael A  
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 5:02 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Pensions

I don't get it, I know from reading the Sunday paper that CEO's made 139 times what their employees made in 1993 and now it's more like 369 times. But you're the DOE why is everyone is trying to stick it to the worker. You don't seem to have a problem funding your own pension plan, or giving anyone exempt a raise. So what do you hope to gain to trying to take away one of the few benefits that we have left? Why don't you pull yourself out from behind your desk and come to my place of employment, put yourself in a room where the Substance your working with on the other side of 30 mils of plastic could put you in the Hospital permanently. Leave my benefits alone!! I have already alerted my congressman and senator. I am certain they will convey the same message.

Michael Luckman

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

From: brenda.berry  
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 4:58 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Contractor Pension and Medical Benefits

Below is in regards to your request for input on Contractor Pension and Medical Benefits within the document posted at: <http://management.energy.gov/PensionNotice.pdf>.

What type of culture will you be breeding when the employees are treated as dollar numbers on paper? I do expect good stewardship of funding tax payer dollars; however, I also expect that Government knowledge workers be treated as valued assets and commitments not be broken nor expectations previously set be ripped apart.

The perception is that now that the Cold War era is over, kick out the pioneering generation because they are eating up funding for the new generation coming in; Also, make sure we don't make a mistake and let the new Energy generation think we might

care for their long-term needs...

Brenda Berry,

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

From: Melissa Douthit

Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 3:38 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Employee pension and medical benefits comments

To Whom It May Concern,

In response to the paragraph below, I would suggest either renewing, or extending indefinitely, LLNL's current contract with UC as transitioning to a new contractor will cost the DOE money it does not have.

Summary

The Department of Energy (DOE) is seeking public comments and/or recommendations on how to address the challenge it faces due to increasing costs and liabilities associated with contractor employee pension and medical benefits. Under the Department's unique Management and Operating (M&O) and other site management contracts, DOE reimburses its contractors for allowable costs incurred in providing employee pension and medical benefits to current employees and retirees who are eligible to participate in the contractors' pension and medical benefit plans. DOE has established a website for the public to submit comments and/or recommendations on how it should address the financial challenge it faces on contractor employee pension and medical benefits.

Sincerely,

MD

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

From: robert.buckner

Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 3:25 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Benefits for Nuclear Workers.

It amazes me that DOE can justify raising the price of operating The Savannah River Site from a cost of just over three hundred million dollars for the last contract period to over seven BILLION dollars for the next one. Yet in the same breath, they want to renege on their promise of retirement benefits and health care to the workers who may have sacrificed their health during the Cold War and during the clean-up afterwards. It is still

unknown just what effects long term exposure to radiation has on the human body, and these people deserve to have health care for the remainder of their lives. It seems like DOE is stooping to the unscrupulous or unethical business practices of companies like GM and Enron who are trying to beat their employees out of their pension while still allowing the top management positions to reap huge salaries.

Most of the workers who took jobs at nuclear weapons installations knew the risks involved, but felt that they were off-set by the benefits packages offered. Now, when many of these workers are reaching retirement age, DOE appears to be threatening to pull those benefits out from under them. The health and security of these workers should be no less important than cleaning up the environmental wastes left behind at the plants. Both are legacies left behind by the Cold War.

Bob Buckner

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

From: Kroshus, Roger K

Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 2:44 PM

To: contractorpensions@hq.doe.gov.

Subject: Pensions!!

I would very much like to add my comments to the DOE proposal for pension benefits changes:

I am a current employee at the Hanford site and have been employed for 26 plus years. I, as is the case with hundreds if not thousands of workers, have dedicated the majority of my working life to the important missions at Hanford. It distresses me no end to witness the hierarchy of DOE chip away at worker benefits over the years while adding to its own coffers in terms of pension, health and other benefits embellishments.

We, the people in the trenches have faithfully performed the work in whatever venue which has come along in the hope of rendering a valuable service to our government and country. Now, again, DOE proposes yet another slap in the face and in the pocketbooks of many all the while enriching the proverbial fatted-calf. We, the many have potentially sacrificed well-being and overall richness of personal health in day to day, year to year, providing our services.

Workers such as me and many, many others have worked in the most hazardous environs and dangerous work in this entire great nation with a reasonable and well-earned expectation of being able to retire with accrued pension & health benefits. It appears that this is not a concern which DOE can embrace but rather turn away from those who have labored so long and hard in the hope of LIFE after DOE/GO-CO contractors.

Ask within your own ranks what is just and right for those who have served, rather than fatten up at their expense. As dedicated workers over the years, we have an inherent

right to equitable consideration and treatment as we approach the "Golden years." Perhaps even the application of the "Golden Rule" would be appropriate in these matters.

Roger K. Kroshus

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

From: Best, Keith M

Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 2:12 PM

To: contractorpensions@hq.doe.gov.

Subject: FW: PENSION

I WOULD LIKE TO ADD MY COMMENT TO THE LIST. DOE WANTS TO DIMINISH BENEFITS FOR WORKERS AT THE HANFORD SITE. I AM A WORKER AT THE HANFORD SITE. I AM ADAMANTLY OPPOSED TO THIS AND ANY OTHER PROPOSALS TO LESSEN THE BENEFITS FOR THOSE WHO HAVE WORKED AT THIS SITE. DOE OBVIOUSLY DOES NOT KNOW, OR CARE, ABOUT THE SEVERE HEALTH RISKS THE WORKERS AT HANFORD MUST ABSORB ON A DAILY BASIS. THIS SITE IS " THE MOST CONTAMINATED SITE" IN THE DOE SPECTRUM, AND YET DOE DOES NOT WANT TO COMPENSATE THE WORKFORCE THAT DEDICATES ITSELF TO THE CLEANUP MISSION AT HANFORD. MANY WORKERS BEGAN THEIR CAREERS HERE AT HANFORD WITH THE HOPE OF SOMEDAY RETIRING WITHOUT THE WORRY OF WHERE THEIR NEXT RETIREMENT CHECK WOULD COME FROM. IT SEEMS DOE WANTS TO REINSTALL THAT WORRY ALONG WITH MAKING THE WORKFORCE TURN OVER GREATER PORTIONS OF THEIR WEEKLY "PAYCHECK" TO FUND HEALTH CARE FOR THEMSELVES AND THEIR FAMILIES. AT THIS RATE , IT WON'T BE LONG BEFORE THE DEDICATED WORKFORCE THAT DOES ALL OF THE HAZARDOUS ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT THE CLEANUP WILL BECOME PART OF THE WORKING POOR, PAYING FOR THEIR OWN PENSION AND HEALTH CARE OUT OF THEIR OWN POCKETS EACH WEEK. AND WHAT ABOUT THE DOE STAFF BENEFITS? DO YOU THINK MAYBE THEY SHOULD LOOK IN THEIR OWN WALLETS TO SEE WHO IS RECEIVING THE GREATER BENEFITS? I WISH I HAD THEIR PENSION AND MEDICAL PLANS!

IN CLOSING, LOOK SOMEWHERE ELSE. LEAVE THE BENEFIT PACKAGE ALONE FOR THE PEOPLE WHO ARE DOING THE DIRTY WORK, PLACING THEMSELVES IN THIS HAZARDOUS ENVIRONMENT EVERY DAY TO SUPPORT THE CLEANUP OF THE PAST GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS. AFTER ALL, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGREED TO FUND THE BENEFIT PACKAGE YEARS AGO, NOW LIVE UP TO THOSE AGREEMENTS.

KEITH BEST

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

From: Brewer, Craig E  
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 1:06 PM  
To: contractorpensions@hq.doe.gov.  
Subject: Pension

I WOULD LIKE TO ADD MY COMMENT TO THE LIST. DOE WANTS TO DIMINISH BENEFITS FOR WORKERS AT THE HANFORD SITE. I AM A WORKER AT THE HANFORD SITE. I AM ADAMANTLY OPPOSED TO THIS AND ANY OTHER PROPOSALS TO LESSEN THE BENEFITS FOR THOSE WHO HAVE WORKED AT THIS SITE. DOE OBVIOUSLY DOES NOT KNOW, OR CARE, ABOUT THE SEVERE HEALTH RISKS THE WORKERS AT HANFORD MUST ABSORB ON A DAILY BASIS. THIS SITE IS " THE MOST CONTAMINATED SITE" IN THE DOE SPECTRUM, AND YET DOE DOES NOT WANT TO COMPENSATE THE WORKFORCE THAT DEDICATES ITSELF TO THE CLEANUP MISSION AT HANFORD. MANY WORKERS BEGAN THEIR CAREERS HERE AT HANFORD WITH THE HOPE OF SOMEDAY RETIRING WITHOUT THE WORRY OF WHERE THEIR NEXT RETIREMENT CHECK WOULD COME FROM. IT SEEMS DOE WANTS TO REINSTALL THAT WORRY ALONG WITH MAKING THE WORKFORCE TURN OVER GREATER PORTIONS OF THEIR WEEKLY "PAYCHECK" TO FUND HEALTH CARE FOR THEMSELVES AND THEIR FAMILIES. AT THIS RATE , IT WON'T BE LONG BEFORE THE DEDICATED WORKFORCE THAT DOES ALL OF THE HAZARDOUS ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT THE CLEANUP WILL BECOME PART OF THE WORKING POOR, PAYING FOR THEIR OWN PENSION AND HEALTH CARE OUT OF THEIR OWN POCKETS EACH WEEK. AND WHAT ABOUT THE DOE STAFF BENEFITS? DO YOU THINK MAYBE THEY SHOULD LOOK IN THEIR OWN WALLETS TO SEE WHO IS RECEIVING THE GREATER BENEFITS? I WISH I HAD THEIR PENSION AND MEDICAL PLANS!

IN CLOSING, LOOK SOMEWHERE ELSE. LEAVE THE BENEFIT PACKAGE ALONE FOR THE PEOPLE WHO ARE DOING THE DIRTY WORK, PLACING THEMSELVES IN THIS HAZARDOUS ENVIRONMENT EVERY DAY TO SUPPORT THE CLEANUP OF THE PAST GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS. AFTER ALL, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGREED TO FUND THE BENEFIT PACKAGE YEARS AGO, NOW LIVE UP TO THOSE AGREEMENTS.

Craig Brewer  
Crane & Rigging Engineering

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

From: Smith, Dale A  
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 12:48 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: PENSION

I WOULD LIKE TO ADD MY COMMENT TO THE LIST. DOE WANTS TO DIMINISH BENEFITS FOR WORKERS AT THE HANFORD SITE. I AM A

WORKER AT THE HANFORD SITE. I AM ADAMANTLY OPPOSED TO THIS AND ANY OTHER PROPOSALS TO LESSEN THE BENEFITS FOR THOSE WHO HAVE WORKED AT THIS SITE. DOE OBVIOUSLY DOES NOT KNOW, OR CARE, ABOUT THE SEVERE HEALTH RISKS THE WORKERS AT HANFORD MUST ABSORB ON A DAILY BASIS. THIS SITE IS THE MOST CONTAMINATED SITE IN THE DOE SPECTRUM, AND YET DOE DOES NOT WANT TO COMPENSATE THE WORKFORCE THAT DEDICATES ITSELF TO THE CLEANUP MISSION AT HANFORD. MANY WORKERS BEGAN THEIR CAREERS HERE AT HANFORD WITH THE HOPE OF SOMEDAY RETIRING WITHOUT THE WORRY OF WHERE THEIR NEXT RETIREMENT CHECK WOULD COME FROM. IT SEEMS DOE WANTS TO REINSTALL THAT WORRY ALONG WITH MAKING THE WORKFORCE TURN OVER GREATER PORTIONS OF THEIR WEEKLY "PAYCHECK" TO FUND HEALTH CARE FOR THEMSELVES AND THEIR FAMILIES. AT THIS RATE , IT WON'T BE LONG BEFORE THE DEDICATED WORKFORCE THAT DOES ALL OF THE HAZARDOUS ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT THE CLEANUP WILL BECOME PART OF THE WORKING POOR, PAYING FOR THEIR OWN PENSION AND HEALTH CARE OUT OF THEIR OWN POCKETS EACH WEEK. AND WHAT ABOUT THE DOE STAFF BENEFITS? DO YOU THINK MAYBE THEY SHOULD LOOK IN THEIR OWN WALLETS TO SEE WHO IS RECEIVING THE GREATER BENEFITS? I WISH I HAD THEIR PENSION AND MEDICAL PLANS!

IN CLOSING, LOOK SOMEWHERE ELSE. LEAVE THE BENEFIT PACKAGE ALONE FOR THE PEOPLE WHO ARE DOING THE DIRTY WORK, PLACING THEMSELVES IN THIS HAZARDOUS ENVIRONMENT EVERY DAY TO SUPPORT THE CLEANUP OF THE PAST GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS. AFTER ALL, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGREED TO FUND THE BENEFIT PACKAGE YEARS AGO, NOW LIVE UP TO THOSE AGREEMENTS.

DALE SMITH

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

From: Lowder, Kelly S

Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 12:30 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: RE: Ideas for DOE Pension/Medical Problems

- 1) Offer a competitive pension buyout package that allows employees to roll the present value of future pension benefits into a 401K account. Replace future benefit accrual with a more competitive 401K matching program.
- 2) Allow employees to opt out of the health insurance program and accept a medical stipend of several thousand dollars (equal to the forgone benefit) to be deposited in a tax-free medical savings account. Employees would benefit by being able to manage their own health care costs, while earning interest on the balance. DOE would benefit by not

having to contribute when the employee retires. A side effect might be that the employees take better care of themselves and avoid unnecessary risks since they would be paying for healthcare with money that could be their own someday. Another side effect is that lower demand for medical services would also tend to decrease the cost of services.

Thanks,  
Kelly Lowder

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

From: Vine Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 12:14 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: comments on employee pension

Response to Dept. of Energy's solicitation for comments regarding Contractor Pensions:

Dear Sir:

Upon reading the summary in the Federal Register, March 27, 2007/Notices, it seems that the Dept. of Energy (DOE) is looking to examine its' fiscal policies and expenditures. However in the "fine print" this sounds like a gross mismanagement of an entire program. For DOE to have 45 contractor defined pension plans it must take considerable DOE resources to administer that program, not to mention each contractor's administrative expenses that are ultimately paid by the DOE. To me it is obvious; why not have one pension program for DOE and all M & O contractors. This same idea could also be applied to life insurance and medical benefit plans that the DOE reimburses its contractors for.

Ethically speaking, reducing pension benefits for employees who have in many cases devoted their lives to the DOE would be immoral. This would be analogous to declaring Social Security bankrupt and immediately cease all payments to all retirees who had contributed all of their working careers. The Enron scandal would pale in comparison. What would be next, to cut benefits for our soldiers?

If by some way DOE is looking to quit funding these benefits in order to tighten their budget. DOE's vision of attracting and keeping top quality people must be also abandoned. In this day and age one of the top reasons to stay with a company is a solid pension and benefit package.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
M. Perry Nelson, employee at INL

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

From: Albert Kennedy



Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 10:42 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Funding of Contractor Pensions and Other Post Retirement Benefits

My suggestion for funding contractor pensions is for DOE to require contractors to make reasonable pension contributions every year, not just when they are legally required to.

I do not know if the same thing happened at other sites as happened at Savannah River Site, but I know why the pension fund at SRS became substantially under-funded. When DOE changed contractors for the first time in 1989, the employees' pension fund was extremely healthy (that is to say it was over-funded). The pension fund got that healthy by making modest contributions every year (usually 4-6% of gross wages), whether it was needed or not. By making contributions every year, regardless of whether the market was up or down, or the interest rate up or down, the fund built steadily. When the market was performing well, the fund earned enough to make up for the bad years. As a result, it was never necessary to make enormous contributions to maintain a "qualified plan."

That practice changed in 1989, when DOE received their pro-rata share of the Dupont pension plan to fund the employee pension fund for those employees remaining at the Savannah River Site. Instead of rolling the entire amount into the new pension fund, DOE chose to retain those "excess assets" in a separate account, and used those assets to supplement annual appropriations as needed. In the 1990's DOE used over \$600 million of these "excess assets"--which should have remained in the employees' pension plan--to do other government work. In addition, no pension contributions at all were made for many (~10?) years.

As a future beneficiary (I hope) of this pension fund, it is very disturbing to me to hear DOE wondering how it can deal with the "wild swings" needed to maintain its defined benefits plans. If DOE had rolled over all pension funds from one contractors' plan into the next contractors' plan, or if they had continued to make modest contributions in the good years of the 1990's, there would be no need for the huge contributions now. In fact, the \$600 million alone, used to fund other DOE work, would have been enough to avoid the massive catch-up contributions needed in recent years.

In my opinion, DOE has a moral imperative to honor the commitments it has made to contractor employees (not just the pensions, but the other post-retirement benefits (primarily medical insurance) as well. Hiring a third party (contractor) to renege on those commitments does not morally or ethically absolve DOE of that responsibility either. Most DOE sites are in a contracting (down-sizing) mode, and many employees will not have the option to work as long as they had planned to prepare for retirement. They should at least be assured that their government will not add insult to injury by changing the retirement rules, and hence the terms of their employment contract, after many have devoted their entire careers to the government's work.

Pam Kennedy

