

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

From: fawnmiller

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 11:34 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Pension Plans for Contractor Workers

I have been an employee for a DOE contractor for more than 26 years. I can not imagine not having good medical insurance and pension benefits from our company. Cancer, beryllium poisoning, asbestosis and many other diseases are being looked into for the workers that have given many years to the defense of our country. We never considered our loyalty to our nation and our companies however, we are starting to consider the loyalty of our companies to us. How would you like to have your insurance and pensions compromised as you approach middle age? I have had cancer, I cannot get other insurance. I would like to retire with the pension I have planned on. The contractors are sure to get plenty of the monies for their own management. They have deep pockets being filled while the small man is unable to see any future with compensation. The old adage of the rich get richer and poor get poorer is not only in corporate America but is now in the DOE and it's contractors. Please reconsider taking any benefits away and make the contractors responsible for what and for whom they are spending American's monies.

My plea is "please don't take my benefits or pensions!"

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

From: JORDAN2CBCL

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 11:30 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Contractor employee pension and medical benefits

To The Department of Energy

In regard to the Department of Energy publishing in the Federal Register that the DOE is seeking public comments and/or recommendations in regard to contractor employee pension and medical benefits, it is my hope that the DOE will recognize its commitment to those retirees who are at this time receiving pension and medical benefits and will honor that commitment by grandfathering those who are currently receiving these benefits. To not honor this commitment would, in many cases, be an extreme hardship to those who worked for many years in service for the DOE.

Chris B. Jordan, Civil Engineer, Retiree SRS

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

From: terrance phillips

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 9:36 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: retiree benefits

If the DOE and/or other Federal agencies take the position that it is their right and privilege to modify contractual arrangements pertaining to pension and medical benefits than I believe that our credibility will be lost. This loss of credibility will have the consequence of creating lack of trust when in the future such agencies are once again in need of hiring personnel either directly into the agency or indirectly through outside contractors. The 200,000 or so retirees so affected by immediate action will be multiplied many times over in long term distrust. Consider the general attitude toward various companies such as Bendix. The myth which has developed is likely far worse than the truth. We don't wish to see our Federal government agencies develop the sad reputation of so many companies which in fact the Federal government has investigated and rightfully criticised.

Yours respectfully  
Terrance Duane Phillips  
retiree

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

From: COMcast Email  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 9:34 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: SRS New Contract

Dear sir;

I came to know that new contract does not have protection (medical and pension) for those who retired. I can not believe that MY GOVERNMENT AGENCY (to whom I have utmost faith) will not include grand fathering retiree's medical and pension benefits. We retired based on continuing receiving these benefits. You are NOT PROFIT MAKING organization.

I urge you to revise the contract terms by Grandfathering the Retirees Benefit remains as is

Sincerely'  
Nilesh Chokshi

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

From: Thomas Drago  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 9:21 PM

To: contractor pensions  
Subject: SRS Retiree's Pension and Medical Benefits

I am a retiree of Savannah River Site. I am proud to have served my nation during 21 years of employment at SRS. During that time I was subject to yearly background checks which included financial, mental health, and even polygraph exams. In addition, I was exposed to radiation and contamination on a routine basis. I realize that this was a condition of employment, however for DOE to compare us to "outside industries" is a large stretch. I have worked in commercial nuclear and industrial facilities and I assure you, nothing compares to the conditions found in F or H Canyons or any of the reactors at SRS. Part of the trust that we put in DOE was that promised pension and medical benefits we earned would be there for us when we retired. I urge you to honor the promises made to the many thousands of retirees from SRS and other weapons facilities who served our great nation during the cold war and after. Please continue to fund these pension and medical programs for those who earned them.

Thank you,  
Thomas L. Drago Sr.

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

From: mdaddy  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 9:18 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Comments on DOE Notice 351.1

DOE Notice 351.1 states that DOE has a responsibility, among other things, to treat retirees and dependents fairly. Meanwhile retirees of former Oak Ridge contractor, Union Carbide, have watched the purchasing power of their pensions shrink steadily while the cost-of-living index relentlessly crept upward year after year.

The last cost-of-living adjustment for Carbide retirees occurred in 2001 and the last one previous to that occurred in 1992 and both adjustments were only partially restorative of purchasing power.

The current Oak Ridge contractors who administer Union Carbide retirees pensions with DOE acquiescence, are taking a calloused view of their responsibilities in adamantly refusing to maintain purchasing power of pensions paid to loyal and long-serving employees, now retirees. DOE also states in Notice 351.1 that "on average, the pension benefits received by DOE contractor employees are higher than benefits earned by Federal or private sector employees".

This may be true for the "average" but there are wide variations in the 45 contractor defined benefit plans. Some plans have a multiplier of 2.5 (LBNL and LLNL) while the Carbide multiplier is 1.2. There is another disparity in the various DOE plans. Some

plans receive annual contributions from DOE (BNL and ANL) while DOE has not contributed to the Oak Ridge plan since 1984.

It should also be noted that inflation has been beneficial in growing the assets of the Oak Ridge plan. And, by not adjusting the payout to Carbide retirees, the plan has grown a significant surplus, all without any DOE contribution since 1984.

It is not surprising that the combined effect of inflation and DOE's adamant refusal to adjust for inflation, has had a detrimental effect on the buying power of the pensions now being paid to former Carbide employees, now retirees. Union Carbide employees retiring before 1975 now receive pensions whose buying power is below 50% of what it was at the start.

One further observation: Several years ago, the surplus existing in the Oak Ridge plan led the current contractor to propose syphoning off some 20 million dollars (\$20,000,000) from the plan to be used for other purposes. To his credit, the then Secretary of Energy did not allow that to happen.

Yes, DOE should treat retirees fairly and there is a crying need to restore the purchasing power of Union Carbide retirees whose pension dollars are worth less and less, year after year.

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

From: edward.manning

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 9:10 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Contractor Pensions

First, the DOE should not act like a private sector employer and reduce pensions and retiree medical benefits of cold war workers at its sites. These pensions and medical benefits should be grandfathered. Individuals have made significant financial decisions based upon the belief that these pension and medical benefits would not be changed. Retirees living on fixed-incomes from pension and social security should not be required to reduce their standard of living. If a worker cannot trust promises made by its government then one must question the very foundation of the republic.

DOE has the ability to advise contractors on re-competing contracts that it will not guarantee future contractor pensions and retired health benefits. Current site employees can have their defined benefit pension plans frozen at existing level with future monies going to 401 (k) plans with enhanced company matching. Workers within 3-5 years of retirement should be allowed to continue with the existing plan. Future retiree medical benefits can also be addressed so individuals know before they retire what to expect and to financially plan ahead.

Ed Manning

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

From: J&J Carney

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 9:04 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Contractor employee pension and medical benefits

As a retired contractor employee I would like to submit the following comments. The Department of Energy has a clear obligation to continue the pension and medical benefits for retirees and current employees that are presently covered by existing policies offering these benefits. These employees continued or are continuing to offer their expert services to the government despite adverse conditions, including major changes in management and employers, continuing budgetary and staffing cutbacks resulting in increased individual workloads and compensation falling behind comparable commercial activities. While there are many reasons that employees have continued to stay on, I am sure that many have done so simply because they knew that they "would be taken care of" when their working career has ended. Please keep in mind where these persons have worked, they are not "nice" places.

Due to the probable wide variations in the various benefits policies, consolidation under one or several programs does not appear to be a viable option. It would seem to make some sense to consolidate some of the operations/activities under a centralized administration. This could conceivably result in some cost savings by avoiding redundancy at multiple locations and might also mitigate the recurring problems in addressing this issue when rebidding contracts. An activity such as this might also be capable of identifying and recommending potential cost savings.

With respect to possible reductions for future employees, a gradual phased-in reduction would be necessary to avoid disparate treatment and recruiting difficulties. There is no easy solution for any of these concerns.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

John L. Carney

Formerly at the Savannah River Site

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

From: Jim Sproull

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 9:00 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: grandfathering of retirees' pensions

It was with great anguish that I learned that DOE does not include grandfathering of DOE subcontractor pensions with its Request for Proposals for the future M & O contract for the Savannah River Site.

I came to work at the Savannah River Site based on the salary I was to receive and the benefits I was told I could expect. Included in those benefits was a calculation of the pension I would get based on my years of service and salary at the time of my retirement. These benefits were approved and accepted by DOE. Nowhere was it ever stated that these retirement benefits could be reduced. The only thing that was ever clear was that subcontractors did not get COLA coverage which DOE gets and expects.

I accepted retirement from SRS based on a pension calculation that I was lead to believe would never be reduced but, based on the generosity of DOE, might be adjusted for inflation in the future. I have no options now if my pension income is reduced. I can't go back to my previous job. Current employees, on the other hand, have other options, such as taking other jobs. How can we, retirees, possibly be lumped for benefits with current workers?

Lots of companies have eliminated their pensions, but most have applied that to employees hired after a certain date. Some companies have filed for bankruptcy and eliminated their pensions entirely. I believe that DOE is subject to a major lawsuit if they attempt to renege on the promise they made to all of us subcontractor employees. It is so difficult to understand why DOE will not support us subcontractor retirees now while still expecting to receive their own promised pensions with COLAs. We did everything asked and expected of us while we worked with stated benefits when we retired. Now that we have done what was asked of us, we are being left unsupported by the very organization that needed us earlier.

Please consider the promises made and implied to the DOE subcontractor retirees and protect the pensions that we earned.

Thank you.  
James F. Sproull

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

From: T. B. Brown  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 8:42 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Contractor Pensions

The DOE has asked for public comment on its efforts to reduce/control costs associated with contractor pensions and medical benefits. A DOE order was issued relative to the DOE's funding of pensions for new employees as of 03/01/2007, but that order has been placed on hold for a year.

In regard to controlling rising costs, I have no other suggestions to offer that would differ from those already made. In regard to new employees, I think the DOE and contractors are free to establish whatever policies deemed fit. The key is that persons know up front what they are getting into and what benefits they can or cannot expect. That information

weighs in the decision of an individual to seek or accept employment with a particular company or federal agency. It may later be a factor in whether an employee remains with a particular company or agency. The key is that the individual knows what he or she is accepting and can expect.

As for myself, I have a vested interest in how incumbent retirees are treated in the future as I am a retiree of WSRC at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina. As did many, many others, I put in my years of service with DuPont and Westinghouse with the understanding of what the pension and retiree health care benefits would be. Now that I am retired, it would seem unfair for the federal government to do anything which would be detrimental to the benefits I have. After all, I served the DOE and made personal sacrifices in many cases to ensure that the Department met its goals. I do not deny that I was compensated, of course, but part of that compensation I viewed as the benefits I received and expected to receive in the future. This I did in good faith. It would be unethical, in my opinion, for the DOE to turn around and treat me and others in a manner other than what was intended when we retired.

Certain DOE employees have said that the current proposals are not meant to apply to existing retirees but only to new employees. However, the documentation that I have seen does not make that crystal clear. Furthermore, the DOE seems reluctant to make it clear by including appropriate language in its orders and other documents. This is not very comforting to those of us who spent most of our working lives doing what the DOE asked of us and our employers. After all, my company's pension plan was funded (reimbursed by the DOE, of course) for my retirement during my working years and that fund should be providing earnings today on that investment that will sufficiently cover my benefit costs.

The bottom line of my comment is that the DOE should address in its documentation how it intends to treat persons who have already retired under their company's approved pension and other benefit plans in place at the time. I and others want that assurance.

Thank you,  
Thomas B. Brown

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

From: Ed Leibfarth  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 8:27 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Employee Pension & Medical Benefits Survey

Gentlemen,

As a Department of Energy employee is nearing retirement he must decide on the proper time for retirement based on the benefits that are to be provided. These benefits should be a binding contract, because once retirement is started there is no going back! Medical insurance is

especially important for the retiree and changes from in the plan after retirement could easily ruin a retirement. Therefore I think it is important to honor all promises made at the retirement date. As retirees reach the age of 65, commonly Medicare becomes the primary insurance for the retiree's medical, so the cost of contracting with a provider should reduce at that time. If it is necessary to reduce the medical or pension benefits these changes should only apply to the group of employees retiring at the time changes are made. Earlier retirees should continue on the plan that was presented at retirement. That is the only fair way to treat employees and retirees. That is the only way that they will be able to plan their retirement.

Sincerely,  
Edward C. Leibfarth  
\*

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

From: MYCONDO

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 8:19 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: DOE Pensions & Medical Benefits for SRS Retirees

I feel these benefits were set up by the DuPont Contractor and Westinghouse during the many years of service that the SRS Employee Retirees provided for the Security & Safety of this Country. I was told when I retired that DuPont had invested these benefits very wisely and the pension investments were receiving very good returns. I trusted the contractor (DuPont and DOE) and gave 41 years of my life at SRS. I was also told that our Medical benefits were very safe. If I can't trust my "government", then who can we trust and believe?

I know that you are looking for answers, and I do not have a solution, except to say that it is not right to start with the "older generation" who has served their country well.

I do believe there is so much "waste" in our government, that can be uncovered in order to solve this problem of benefits and pensions! I sincerely believe this! I am 72 years old and unfortunately I encounter the wasteful spending fairly often.

I am not trying to be critical, but honest. Please look in our avenues of government for your solution. I don't think the pensions and benefits are the problem.

My husband gave 42 years of service at SRS and died before he could draw his benefits, including Social Security. Where did his 42 years of Social Security go? I worked 41 years and drew mine. If we had been able to save SS in our



account instead of giving it to the government - that would be a very good benefit for me now as a widow. We could have invested the SS better than the government has done, because the interest rates were very high during many of our working years. The government was only paying 1 to 2%.  
So please do not take away my pension and benefits too, I sincerely ask!

Stella Woodward

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

From: MandMLockhart

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 7:43 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: DOE N 351.1

I am a retiree from Los Alamos National Laboratory. My pension is paid by the University of California and supposedly is not covered by DOE N 351.1 even though DOE guarantees the pension funding. My health and dental benefits are provided under the contract between the DOE and Los Alamos National Security LLC, and do fall under DOE N 351.1.

I oppose the issuance of DOE N 351.1.

1. DOE N 351.1 has the potential to terminate all defined benefit plans, even for employees presently covered, when operating and maintenance contracts are renewed.
2. Inclusion of employees and retirees presently covered by defined benefit plans in a "total benefit package" under DOE O 350.1 has the potential to drastically reduce benefits to retirees.

Milton Glenn Lockhart

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

From: qtwhite

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 1:26 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Contractor Pensions-M&O Contracts

Importance: High

To Whom It May Concern:

My concern is the Department of Energy (DOE) must recognize that it has a long-term commitment to the current retirees whose careers involved running facilities that were instrumental in winning the Cold War for the United States and then, unselfishly, working ourselves out of jobs as we shutdown and deactivated those same facilities.

The Department of Energy, specifically Ms. Ingrid Kolb, has stated that it is the Department's intent to grandfather existing post retirement benefits for current Savannah River Site retirees. The Department must document this commitment clearly and unambiguously. This must be done in such a way that all future administrations will easily recognize the existence of this commitment and that it is inviolable.

The DOE must act on this concern immediately.

Thank you,  
Quitman White  
SRS Retiree  
Quitman White

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

**From:** Parker, Richard D  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 10, 2007 7:08 PM  
**To:** contractor pensions  
**Subject:** Benefit cost savings

Hello,

My name is Richard D. Parker and I am an employee of Sandia National Laboratories (28 years) in Albuquerque, New Mexico. A good cost saving measure we are working to implement at SNL is to create a company pharmacy. One outlet will be on site (Kirtland Air Force Base) and one outlet will be offsite for retirees. This has been studied and significant cost savings are anticipated. This concept comes from Toyota and it might be suitable for all contractor sites. Union represented people found this idea and pushed our management to study it and work to implement it. Why the highly paid benefits managers didn't come up with this idea may be an insight into their value and possibly further cost savings may be found there.

Pension issues are a different bird. Our pension fund for the represented population (the Pension Security Plan) at Sandia is well funded and self sustaining. The latest IRS documentation shows this fund at 48% liabilities vs. assets. Our pension requires NO FUNDING from the taxpayer, DOE, Lockheed Martin, or Sandia. There are no cost savings to be had from our pension plan. It will take care of the represented population for decades so please don't mess with it. Great anger will follow if you do. Consider: SNL's motto is "Exceptional Service in the National Interest": this means I am held to very high standards of safety, security, personal integrity and professional competence. If DOE continues to meddle with our benefits, DOE should expect industry average service in the national interest and what will be your return on investment there? The demands on employees here are world class and the pay is not. DOE requires my pay be compared to local area average in a state ranked 47th in per capita income. What do you want - world class or local area average? What I am saying is that I deserve the benefits I earn and DOE should look elsewhere to find cost savings. The pavement in our parking lots seem to receive more attention and preventative maintenance than any other pavement I've seen. Use some programmatic money to fund our benefits. I know - that's a different color money. So paint it Cold war veterans deserve decent benefits and if this nation can't afford decent benefits for them, then we need to admit this nation can no longer afford nuclear weapons. Do not misinterpret my next statement as it is not intended as a threat - but do we really want to push our cost savings to the point where our nuclear weapons become no more than 5% more reliable than an industry average manufactured product??? There becomes a point where you get what you pay for. In blunt blue collar language - you pay peanuts, you get

monkeys. You do not want monkeys working at SNL! Yes, our NW programs are expensive but when it comes to the people serving this nation - it's darn well worth it.

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

From: George Chandler  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 5:40 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: comment on N351.1

I am a retiree from Los Alamos National Laboratory drawing a pension from the University of California: i.e., I am a retiree of a DOE contractor. My medical benefits are delivered as an add-on to the benefits provided to employees of Los Alamos National Security, a DOE contractor.

I have read the proposed order N351.1. It appears to me that the order preserves, or rather does not disturb, the DOE's commitment to maintain contractually required funding for pensions for current contractor retirees. In addition, it appears to me that the proposed order preserves, or does not disturb, the DOE' existing commitment to fund the current level of medical benefits for current contractor retirees.

Therefore, to the extent that my interpretation of the order's effect on my benefits is correct, I have no personal objection to the order.

However I do object to the order on a broader ground. The order puts the DOE on the ideologically inspired bandwagon that is moving the nation's labor force away from defined benefit pension plans and reducing the provision of medical insurance through employers. The delivery of these benefits through employers to employees was a major contributor to the development of the United States economy following the great depression and through the last half of the twentieth century. The financial security of the American worker supported the greatest consumer marketplace in history.

This bandwagon will produce short-term gains for some American businesses and short-term reductions in costs for the government. The long-term effect will be the gradual impoverishment of the work force and the disappearance of the middle class - and with it, the disappearance of that great consumer marketplace that is such an important driver for our economy. It would be far more productive to retain these benefits at home and encourage other countries to provide them, using trade treaties (such as NAFTA purported to do but without enforcement it fell flat) for incentive.

Thank you for your attention.  
George Chandler

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

From: Ed Somers  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 5:02 PM

To: contractor pensions  
Subject: FW: Existing pensions/ current retirees @SRS

From: yeffam1  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 10:04 AM  
Subject: Existing pensions/ current retiree's @SRS

Please send this for me; the DOE addresses don't get recognized. Thanks  
Bob

Please confirm in writing DOE's intent to grandfather current retirees pensions @ SRS per verbal comments made to SRS retiree board members that it was your intent to grandfather current retirees

Sincerely'  
Robert J. Maffey

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

**From:** Joseph I Pruitt  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 10, 2007 4:45 PM  
**To:** contractor pensions  
**Subject:** Comments on DOE proposed actions

I read the Federal register notice with great distrain for the Department of Energy. For many years now the contractor employees have done all the hazardous, tedious, radioactive, and work directed by DOE site employees, and now the Department wants to cut their benefits. It is a good thing slavery was abolished after the civil war because this reduction in benefits equates to penalizing the workers that have done all of DOE's dirty work and now they want to get rid of the liability for the retirement and medical costs.

These employees will be before off on the welfare rolls so they can get insurance for free, free housing, food stamps, utilities paid, and cash for incidentals. This reduction is not being allowed in the private sector if they want to keep qualified employees, so why does DOE think that they will keep qualified employees if they cut the benefits for the contract employees?

I did not see any where in the notice that there are too many DOE people or that they will have their benefits cut. Why shouldn't the federal employees have to go through the same benefit reduction process that the contractor employees are subject to?

So now that the aging work force at DOE sites needs medical care and retirement benefits does the Department want to eliminate those benefits?

The company's will not be able to get and keep qualified employees if these changes go into affect.

I will be e-mailing the Senators from the states that have DOE facilities to voice my opinion.

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

**From:** vincedaly  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 10, 2007 3:51 PM

To: contractor pensions  
Subject: SRS Retiree Association-Comment Period Ending for DOE Retirement Input

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to express my concern about the upcoming DOE decision(s) to possibly reduce pension benefits to current retirees of SRS. I strongly urge you to make certain the new documentation in the Federal Register states that current retirees of SRS will not be affected by any reduction in future pension benefits and that the words "GRANDFATHER" are included in the register to insure future DOE officials cannot alter the pension benefits of current SRS retirees.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation in this matter.

I remain,

Vince Daly  
SRS Retiree

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

From: nuckols  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 4:24 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: SRS Retiree pension plan

Dear Sir's

The DOE has previously verbally stated that the retiree's pension would be grandfathered but have failed to put that statement in writing.

As a SRS retiree it is very important to me that our pension be stable and I hope that DOE will find the means to insure that our benefits remain in tact.

Sincerely  
Harold D. Nuckols

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

From: larryandorothy  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 4:12 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: retiree pension & medical

It is my understanding that the DOE has given its word to "grandfather" current retirees within the framework of the contract.

Therefore the proper thing to do is to put it in writing.

Respectfully,  
Larry Metcalf

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

From: Jack Roberts  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 4:09 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: contractor pensions and benefits public comment

Dear Sirs:

Following are my comments regarding the Department of Energy considerations relative to contractor employee pension, medical, and other benefits:

Do not renege on the legal and moral obligations of the DOE for providing medical and pension benefits earned by previous contract employee who are now retired. In my case, I worked for the E. I DuPont Company and Westinghouse Savannah River Company at the Savannah River Site located in Aiken SC. I and other similar personnel were told that we would receive pension, medical, and other benefits when we retired. We were lead to believe that these benefits were earned and the legal obligation of the U.S. Government, and would never be reduced. The DOE will be encountering serious law suits if such benefits were to be reduced.

These comments refer to the following:

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.

Regards,  
John S. Roberts

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

From: charleshall123  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 3:10 PM  
To: contractor pensions

Subject: Contractor Pensions

My pension is very important to me. I'm counting on it as a part of my retirement, along with social security, an IRA and 401k. None of this is going to make me wealthy, but the hope is that it will cover everything my wife and I need in our retirement, including medical coverage, which continues to increase, along with taxes, food, insurance, etc. By continuing to reimburse contractors for retirement costs, we workers will be covered in our retirement years, after years of service to the US government. Any change that might shift the burden to the contractor for this would effectively make retirement coverage an expense to be minimized in order to increase the company's bottom line. As workers at DOE sites, we remain in place, performing work that is critical to our nations security, even when the company managing the operation changes. Although we have to secure our pay increases through recurring contract negotiations with the company, the pension - our retirement, should be one thing we can rest assured will be there for us. Many contract workers for DOE remain in their positions for thirty, forty, even fifty years, faithfully and expertly performing critical and potentially dangerous jobs. This long term commitment to our work for DOE, supporting the security of our country, merits the assurance of knowing that our retirement will be there for us when we get to that point in life. We should also be able to see adjustments for cost of living increases in our pension plan. The truth is that ultimately we are performing our jobs for DOE. Although contractors change from time to time, workers remain in place, and we should be able to rest assured that our pension will be there for us.

Respectfully,  
Charles Hall  
Electronics Technician  
Pantex Plant

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

From: dwightmrrw  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 3:03 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Comments to DOE Notice 351.1

This e-mail is to direct comments concerning DOE Notice 351.1 as requested by DOE.

I object to the implication that there will be no more adjustments for retirees, regardless of the surplus or lack thereof, in the Pension Trust Fund covering their retirement. In fact, I see no need for the notice to have ANY reference to current retirees! "Please remove any reference to current retirees from your 351.1."

We also see no reason to lump pensions for retirees with other liabilities that DOE may have such as medical insurance.

Thank you.

DL Morrow  
Bechtel Jacobs Grandfathered Retiree

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

From: hildes  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 2:02 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject:

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing as a private citizen and 2004 retiree from the Los Alamos National Laboratory, then under contract with the University of California, to comment on the challenge the Department of Energy faces due to increasing costs and liabilities associated with the contractor employee pension and medical benefits. Although I cannot offer a solution to this enormously complex challenge, I am providing input that could be folded into your deliberations and consultations on this matter.

As a retiree under the DOE/University of California contract for operating and managing Los Alamos National Laboratory, I am receiving a pension and the option to enroll in medical and dental insurance programs. If changing or eliminating the option for medical and dental insurance coverage is being considered as a cost reduction measure, I urge the Department to work with the University of California (UC) and other appropriate entities to ensure that retirees under the previous contract, as well as other affected retirees from other DOE contractor organizations, are offered options to enroll in medical and dental benefits equivalent to those offered to retirees from the Federal Government.

Although the Department has invited numerous national and international labor organizations to informational stakeholder meetings, I am wondering whether it has also actively engaged organizations representing retirees from the national laboratories and other laboratories and facilities under DOE contract, for example, the Council of University of California Retiree Associations (CUCRA), the Los Alamos National Laboratory – Laboratory Retiree Group, or any of the other retiree organizations listed at [http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/retirees/associations\\_centers.html](http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/retirees/associations_centers.html). If the Department has not already actively sought input from these organizations and other similar groups representing retiree interests, I strongly encourage the Department to engage these groups directly as has been done for the national and interational organizations listed on



the Department's website.

Thank you in advance for considering this input.

Sincerely,  
Carl E. Hildebrand

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

From: Goldie Randle  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 2:58 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: RE: POLICY N351.1 COMMENTS

I oppose the implementation of the Policy N351.1 as it is written. If this Policy is not supposed to cut the pensions and benefits of the current retirees, it should be clearly stated in the Policy. My request is that the words be added to the Policy that "GRANDFATHER" the benefits and pensions currently received by retirees. When these words are added, it will prohibit application of the policy to our benefits and pensions. The Policy, N351.1, needs to clearly state that current retiree benefits and pensions are to be "GRANDFATHERED" in any RFP or contract change for the Site.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of adding this statement to Policy N351.1.  
Goldie S. Randle

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

From: Teri  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 2:30 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Comments concerning retirees

Sirs,

I am currently a retiree. I request that you document current retirees as grandfathered.  
Thank you.

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

**From:** merris SUTHERLAND  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 10, 2007 12:43 PM  
**To:** contractor pensions  
**Subject:** Current Retirees

Sir or Madam,

I think it would be in our best interest to continue to ask DOE to document their stated intent to grandfather current retiree's medical plan. Thank you. Merris

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

From: qtwhite  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 1:26 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Contractor Pensions-M&O Contracts  
Importance: High

To Whom It May Concern:

My concern is the Department of Energy (DOE) must recognize that it has a long-term commitment to the current retirees whose careers involved running facilities that were instrumental in winning the Cold War for the United States and then, unselfishly, working ourselves out of jobs as we shutdown and deactivated those same facilities.

The Department of Energy, specifically Ms. Ingrid Kolb, has stated that it is the Department's intent to grandfather existing post retirement benefits for current Savannah River Site retirees. The Department must document this commitment clearly and unambiguously. This must be done in such a way that all future administrations will easily recognize the existence of this commitment and that it is inviolable.

The DOE must act on this concern immediately.

Thank you,  
Quitman White  
SRS Retiree

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

From: nina grady  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 2:15 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: comment on pension retirement plan

I worked at SRS for 38 years. My wife worked there for 37. We started when DOE was AEC. We devoted our entire working lives to the Department of Energy. We both retired in 1993. When we retired we considered our retirement benefits as a contract with DOE. Any planned changes to the retirement program should not include those already retired. To do so would at best be a breach of trust and at worst a breach of contract. DOE has stated they plan to grandfather those already retired but have not put this in writing. If they truly plan to grandfather them then it should be no problem to put it in writing. Not to do so is suspect.

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

From: Sandra  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 1:59 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Contractor pension comments

The statement has been made verbally but not in writing that the benefits and pensions would be grandfathered. Therefore, the policy (N351.1) must clearly state that current retiree benefits and pensions are to be "grandfathered" in any RFP or contract change for site activities. If any change are made they should begin with those who retire under the new contract, no those who are already retired.

Sandra Walker, SRS Retiree 2002

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

From: larryferderber

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 12:51 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Comments on DOE Employee Pension and Medical Benefit Challenges

This message is in response to the request, published in the Federal Register on March 27, 2007, seeking public comments on how DOE should address the challenges it faces associated with employee pension and benefits.

I am one who believes that the original approach, as reflected in DOE Notice 351.1, is overly constraining and not reflective of best-in-class management approaches in the business sectors relevant to the variety of DOE Management and Operating (M&O) contractors. I would recommend that DOE consider the following in evaluating next steps to address this issue.

Key principles:

Provide contractors sufficient flexibility to offer benefits that will attract and retain highly qualified workers and treat incumbent employees, retirees and dependents fairly

Recognize that there a variety of types of contractors in the DOE M&O community and they have different recruiting/retention needs. For example industrial operations are significantly different that Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDC) organizations, and the "market" for each is different

Focus the policy on the "what" (e.g. cost containment and sustainability), not the "how" (e.g. defined benefit or defined contribution)

Assure that the approach taken with respect to pension and benefits for the DOE FFRDC are consistent with the principals provided in Office of Federal Procurement Policy letter 84-1 and FAR Part 35.017.

Key Observations:

M&O operators like the University of California have managed actuarially sound pension and benefit programs for decades, so it can be done, even with defined benefit programs. They have been able to recruit and retain the best and brightest under these conditions and caution should be exercised in forcing any change to these successful approaches

There are 20 FFRDCs outside of the DOE system that have histories and best practices that the DOE can draw upon to determine viable approaches that balance recruiting/retention and cost containment.

FFRDCs are created to explicitly respond to requirements that cannot be met within the federal norm so great caution should be exercised in applying federal pension and benefit norms to FFRDC contractors. Similarly DOE has M&O industrial contractors (rather than federal employees) operating their plants for a reason and caution should be exercised in applying the federal norm to them also.

So long as the M&Os, the FFRDCs in particular, can demonstrate that they can successfully grow WFO programs, their total compensation (including pension and benefits) must be reasonable by the greater market standard

Recommendations:

Survey the Non-DOE FFRDCs for best-in-class approaches

Allow M&O contractors to retain defined benefit as well as define contribution programs as they see fit to meet their individual needs

Require contractors to maintain actuarially sound pension and benefit programs and establish regular independent (of DOE) audits of the system soundness

Use national the FFRDC market for DOE FFRDC benchmarks, and Industrial market for DOE Industrial M&O operations – with modified market constructs as can be justified by the Contractors

If deemed necessary, set standards for the percent of total compensation that can go to pension and benefits, based upon appropriate/individual markets, with a reasonable time average to account for market fluctuations, but do not over prescribe the details of how the contractors meet those standards.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment.  
Lawrence J. Ferderber

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

From: T.E. Wooten

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 8:54 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: pension and insurance

I retired from SRS in 2002 where I worked as a staff nurse. I never imagined that my pension could be stopped or cut back or that my insurance coverage could be reduced. The proposed DOE Pensions and Benefits Policy N351.1 contains provisions that pose a threat that could result in reducing retirement benefits. We were told by DOE that current retirees' benefits would be grandfathered. We are now told that the personnel responsible for the upcoming SRS contract re-bids said this will not happen.

This is very upsetting and discouraging I never thought that our government would do this to us. My pension is only \$1004 a month but I depend on it. So please consider those who are not wealthy when you decide to take away our benefits.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my plea.

Sincerely,  
Mary Wooten

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

From: Ruth H. Christos  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 12:40 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: SRS Retirees Benefits  
Importance: High

As a 'Cold War worker in Aiken SC.

I need you to be assured that we will continue to have the benefits that we earned will serving at the SRS for the DOE.

Being retired at 55 back in 1997, did not leave any of us with opportunities for reemployment in the Augusta/Aiken area. I finally had to leave the area, I still have not been able to receive employment that matches my skills and or education after being forced to retire in 1997.

Do not take away what we have earned.

Chris G. Christos,

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

From: Karen Dunlap/YM/RWDOE  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 11:37 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Cc: Susan Harris/YM/RWDOE  
Subject: Comments on DOE N 351.1

Consider an exemption for contractors who already have closed defined benefit plans. The impact of new requirements for a plan such as ours, that has less than 100 active participants, has the potential for cost to far outweigh the benefit.

Develop clear guidelines and framework for Relative Benefit Value Index and cost comparisons among Contractors.

Allow for phasing in change.

Provide clarification on the requirement for market-based defined contribution plans. If a current plan is determined to not be market-based, will the employer be required to establish a plan for new employees only or make amendments to the current plan that will apply to all employees?

Karen Dunlap  
Total Compensation Manager

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

From: mchow  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 12:42 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Comments

My wife and I have worked for DOE located at Aiken, SC for a long time. "The Department of Energy must recognize that it has a long-term commitment to the current retirees whose careers involved running facilities that were instrumental in winning the Cold War for the United States and then, unselfishly, working ourselves out of jobs as we shutdown and deactivated those same facilities.

The Department of Energy, specifically Ms. Ingrid Kolb, has stated that it is the Department's intent to grandfather existing post retirement benefits for current Savannah River Site retirees. The Department must document this commitment clearly and unambiguously. This must be done in such a way that all future administrations will easily recognize the existence of this commitment and that it is inviolable."

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

From: Jerry Slusher  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 12:28 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Contractor Pensions / Retiree Benefits

Dear Sirs:

In the process of downsizing, I was recently forced into early retirement from Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC. I will be eternally grateful for the opportunity afforded me to serve my country as well as providing a modest living for my family. However, I always believed in the retirement plan as it was described throughout my fifteen years of employment. Now, in an effort to further reduce the Federal liability, I find there may be portions of my retirement benefits in jeopardy. Anyone can plainly acknowledge the rising cost for medical care, groceries and cost of living in general. At a minimum, I would like to see the retirement benefits for the existing retirees "Grand-Fathered" into any scheme that is presented.

Since these issues seem to be based on budgets, why not force Iraq to co-sponsor our involvement in this war by at least compensating us with oil to lower our gasoline prices. As it is now, the taxpayers are liable for the cost of a never-ending / no-win "War on Terrorism". No wonder we can't afford anything. And, possibly have a round-table discussion with the Medical staff and major insurance companies around the nation to set a financial cap on services rendered to prevent matters from escalating further. Of all the ways there are to alleviate budgetary problems involving the American workforce and retirees, I believe the DOE can find other solutions rather than cutting benefits which, at our age and for many of us, is all we can expect to ever have in this lifetime.

Respectfully,  
Jerry H. Slusher

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

From: Zdravkovich, Steve  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 12:28 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Comments to Pension Plan

When asked to consider taking an early retirement because of staffing requirements as SRS. The main consideration given was that our pension plan would remain in tact. Our retirement association has held meetings with DOE to discuss this issue and have reported that they have been told that our plan would be grandfathered and have requested that information be provided in writing to pass along to the ex-employees that told our benefit package would remain intact. This note is to encourage DOE to maintain the fair treatment that we have received to date.

Steven R. Zdravkovich, RA  
Vice President

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

**From:** KarlJr Bergmann  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 10, 2007 12:25 PM  
**To:** contractor pensions

**Subject:** grandfathering pension and medical benefits for current retirees for new contract at SRS

Its impossible for current retirees, like myself, to make new pension and medical plans for their retirement years, after they have actually retired, when they have been planning to use the pension and medical benefits EARNED during the many years of employment with a government contractor.

The pension and medical benefits were EARNED for the many hours of work performed, just like the salary was earned for the many hours of work performed. My salary was less because of these benefits. These benefits are NOT a gift from the U.S. government taxpayers.

Current retirees must be grandfathered into any future government contractor contracts at the Savannah River Site.

Karl

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

From: jan2rob

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 11:27 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Fwd: GRANDFATHERING RETIREES IN FUTURE CONTRACTS

Please refer to the following email relative to documenting my comments relative to future contract wording for retirees of the Savannah River Plant. I am a former WSRC (Washington Group) employee who retired in 2005. Thank you.

Jan Daniels

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

From: jan2rob

To: contractorpensions@hq.doe.gov

Sent: Thu, 10 May 2007 11:22 AM

Subject: GRANDFATHERING RETIREES IN FUTURE CONTRACTS

Dear DOE:

I respectfully request that you word any future contracts awarded that include pensioners that will specifically "grandfather retirees" relative to medical and other benefits as to the level of coverage we currently have, and hopefully retaining costs that we as retirees can afford to pay on our fixed income going in the future. Without the specific words of grandfathering, we fear the benefits we worked so long and hard for to have in retirement may be sacrificed in the efforts to save money.

Let me know if there is another format or vehicle I must use to express this request.



Thank you for your consideration.  
Jan Daniels - 2005 Retiree of WSRC (Washington Group)

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

From: Gary Hohmann  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 11:59 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Retiree Benefits

DOE:

Like any other reputable business DOE should honor the pension and medical benefits promised to contractor personnel at the time they retired. If changes need to be made to these programs, the changes should only apply to new retirees and should be fully explained prior to the need for them to select retirement. This is only fair to those who have retired based on the promises of DOE and would allow present workers to be fully informed when they make their retirement decision.

Garold L. Hohmann, member  
SRS Retirees Association

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

From: Douglas Leader  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 12:02 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: SRS New Contract

I am an SRS retiree and am concerned that the proposed contract for the next operator of SRS does not contain specific language "grandfathering" the present employee pension and medical benefits. I know that we have been "promised" that these items are going to be "grandfathered", but I am well aware of the difference between a political promise and a written contract. I, and most of the retirees that I know, would prefer to have this "promise" written into the new contract.

Sincerely,  
Douglas Leader

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

From: jan2rob]  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 11:22 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: GRANDFATHERING RETIREES IN FUTURE CONTRACTS

Dear DOE:

I respectfully request that you word any future contracts awarded that include pensioners that will specifically "grandfather retirees" relative to medical and other benefits as to the level of coverage we currently have, and hopefully retaining costs that we as retirees can afford to pay on our fixed income going in the future. Without the specific words of grandfathering, we fear the benefits we worked so long and hard for to have in retirement may be sacrificed in the efforts to save money.

Let me know if there is another format or vehicle I must use to express this request.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jan Daniels - 2005 Retiree of WSRC (Washington Group)

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

From: John Church

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 11:32 AM

To: contractor pensions

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

Here's my thoughts:

1. Honor your existing commitments and past promises.
2. Make all contractor employee pensions and benefits equal to those now enjoyed by DOE employees.
3. Eliminate the waste in the DOE budget by firing the 50% of DOE employees and managers who do nothing but shuffle paper, have no technical expertise, and don't have a clue about the technical expertise that is required to perform the tasks at Savannah River Site or Hanford.
4. Eliminate DOE's Mass Transit Benefits Program. A METRO FARE card is issued to Fed Employees, including DOE employees at the Forrestal Bldg. The GAO arm of congress has reported widespread abuse. Cards can be used by anyone, family, friends, SRS retirees, EBay buyers, etc. The system is the "honor" system. There is no way to verify user is qualified to use the card. Benefit averages \$1,000 /year for 250,000 Fed employees, or \$250 million. The GAO reports at least \$17 million in fraud in 2006 among only seven agencies in DC alone. Dozens of agencies were not audited. The Feds have 30 major agencies, only 7 were audited. DOE had 14,333 employees in 2006. Potential DOE savings of about \$15 million dollars.

Very truly yours,  
John Church

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

From: Thomas J McDonald  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 11:15 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Retired Employee Benefits

I am a retiree of The Savannah River Project. I worked for Bechtel Corp. Bechtel & Westinghouse worked jointly as a contractor who replaced Dupont. The SRS Retirees Association was told last year that our pension benefits would be covered under The Grandfather Clause. TJ McDonald

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

From: dan rogers  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 10:41 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Comment Benefits for Retirees

TO: USDOE Representative

I hired on at the Savannah River Plant in 1981 with the understanding and assurance (per HR) that as part of the compensation package (salary) I would receive the employee pension and medical benefits (EP/MB). In 1981 the EP/MB added approximately 30% to the base salary (total dollars). The EP/MB dollars were part of my salary and were seen as payment for work at the SRP/SRS for USDOE, then and now.

To ensure that my past compensation is used properly for the future and my retirement package remains intact, I request that the USDOE document that the SRP/SRS contractor employee pension and medical benefits be grandfathered for current retirees.

Future retirees must be made aware that their EP/MB will be addressed as a separate compensation and negotiated at time of hire. With the award of a new contract existing employees should be compensated with a reasonable lump sum of money to pay back some of the compensation they were also promised at time of hire. This would save the USDOE millions in litigation and liabilities for the past and much more in the future.

Employees that work at USDOE sites and are exposed to radiological hazards must be monitored their entire life for health problems that may have been caused by work practices and site radiation exposure. Annual medical check-up with report to USDOE would help ensure no surprises.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and give suggestions to help address your challenges and my concerns. Your help in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you.  
Charles Dan Rogers

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

From: Tom  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 10:26 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Retiree benefits

Gentlemen:

I am a Bechtel retiree from the Savannah River Plant. I am concerned that contractor pension and medical benefits need to be maintained for current retirees.

Thank you;  
Thomas D. Kohli, P.E.

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

From: B.M. Burke  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 8:56 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Pensions

First your new contracts are with contractors who for all purposes are employees of the DOE and should have health benefits. If you hire them as independent contractors then they will carry their own health insurance. As for retired employees, they were given a retirement package (contract) and it should be honored.

Sincerely,  
B. M. (Mike) Burke