

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

From: tn6562

Sent: Thursday, May 24, 2007 11:17 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Continue Support of Pensions for SRS Retirees

As the contract for SRS changes hands I want to thank you for your continued support of the SRS retirees pensions and medical benefit's. For the past ten years I have depended upon these benefits for my support and welfare.

This is a very important issue of which I have great concern. Your attention in incorporating existing pension and medical benefits into the new contract is appreciated.

Thank you

Thomas S Mann, retiree

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

From: Madden, Daniel

Sent: Friday, May 25, 2007 5:37 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Late comment

DOE should act aggressively to end defined benefit pensions. I was surprised to see that DOE did not take advantage of the changing contract at the Nevada Test Site on July 1, 2006 to change to enhanced 401k (greater match) and terminate the pension plan. Especially after publication of the April 2006 policy had been issued.

Daniel Madden

----Original Message-----

From: Stevens, Lance R

Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2007 9:51 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 seven years. In 1987, a multi-contractor pension system was negotiated with the union and the contractors. Prior to this, there were multiple pension plans due to the multiple contractors performing work for DOE. The multi-employer plan was designed to save money for DOE. A detailed cost analysis was conveyed to DOE-Headquarters that

showed what the plan would cost to fund through 2012. DOE-Headquarters approved the plan and, although the workers suffered a loss of pension benefits at the time, the plan was accepted by the unions and the workforce. It appears now that DOE is having to fulfill their obligations to the workforce through pension benefit payments, they want to re-negotiate (eliminate) the plan altogether.

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

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

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

Thank you,