

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

From: Ron Simpson  
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 9:10 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: SRS Retiree Benefits

To whom it may concern,

As a retiree from SRS with over seventeen years at SRS and twenty five years at DOE Sites I request that you put into writing as soon as possible that all existing retirees and personnel now working at SRS will be grandfathered as we were informed would be the case last year. We have all put a lot of years in to defense and protection of our country and are proud of our record.

The benefits and pension that was promised when we hired on was a strong motivator in our performance and reason we turned down offers to move on to other DOE Sites and private Industry.

Thank you for your interest in our remaining future and Life.

Ron Simpson - Senior Estimator

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

From: Betty Lepard  
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 10:44 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Pension Plans

My name is Betty B. Lepard. I retired from WSRC May 1, 2002. I based my retirement on pension funds calculated for me. I was under the impression that these funds were protected so retirees could depend on this amount and possibly cost of living increases for the rest of the retiree's life. Please add to the contract the wording that current retirees pension will be grandfathered in order to protect the pension for WSRC retirees.

Thanks you.  
Betty B. Lepard

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

From: Charles Parkman  
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 10:57 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Pension and Medical Benefits Comment

To Whom It May Concern:

When I retired in 1995 with 40 years of service with DuPont/Westinghouse (DOE), I was under the impression that as a retiree my Pension and Medical benefits would be something I would not have to worry about - including cost of living adjustments.

In a meeting with the Department of Energy person directly responsible for the challenges of costs and liabilities associated with contractor employee pension and medical benefits, SRS Retirees Association Board members were told that it was DOE's intent to "grandfather" current retirees. I respectfully ask that you consider making this a reality.

Sincerely,  
Charles Roy Parkman

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

From: Hilton Hoover  
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 9:28 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Issue of Grandfathering Existing SRS Retirees

My name is Hilton Hoover. I retired on disability from SRS in 1993. I receive a small pension check in addition to a disability check.

I implore you to leave existing retirees' income alone. If there is a change to be made, it would certainly be unfair to effect known retirees. Effecting future retirees, if absolutely necessary, would be a completely different issue.

Please consider grandfathering existing retirees so we will not be effected.

Sincerely,  
Hilton Hoover  
Employee 9530  
Retired while employed by Westinghouse

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

From: Hugh Harris  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 8:08 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Federal Register / Vol. 72, No. 58 / Tuesday, March 27, 2007 / Notices

I understand that the SRS Retirees Association Board members were told that it was DOE's intent to grandfather current retirees. I further understand that the SRS Retirees Association Board asked for DOE to document this and, so far, that DOE has not done so.

I do not understand why DOE is asking for a request for comments in this

matter; whomever indicated the intent to grandfather current retirees surely had the authority to speak on behalf DOE.

As a retiree and a member of the SRS Retirees Association I urge DOE to take appropriate action on this matter. Since DOE expressed its intent to grandfather SRS current employees, as an SRS retiree I feel that DOE is obligated to honor the commitment that has made regarding retiree benefits.

Thank you,  
Hugh L. Harris, Jr.

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

From: don entrolizo  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 7:28 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: SRS Retiree Benefits

I am a SRS retiree since May 1995. My existing benefits are of very important part of our income and medical and dental services. I ask DOE to grandfather these benefits as a component of the new contract that DOE is currently negotiating.

Don A. Entrolizo

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

From: whitlockgw  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 4:46 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject:

The SRSRA has concluded that the proposed new DOE Pensions and Benefits Policy, N351.1, contains provisions that pose a threat that could result in reducing retirement benefits and place further restrictions on obtaining pension inflation adjustments. 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".

We have 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. Ms. Kolb, the DOE sponsor of the proposed Policy N351.1, has communicated to the SRSRA that the "intention" of the DOE is to NOT use

the new Policy N351.1 to cut current retiree pension and benefit values. There is nothing written in the Policy that supports this commitment.

Please add words be added to the Policy that “grandfather” the benefits and pensions currently received by retirees. Adding such words will prohibit application of the Policy to our pensions and benefits. I believe that there is a real risk of future reductions in our post retirement benefits (particularly our medical benefits) unless the Policy is changed. The Policy needs to clearly state that current retiree benefits and pensions are to be "grandfathered" in any RFP or contract change for site activities. Thanks in advance

Warren Whitlock  
SRS Retiree

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

From: wwmem

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 3:35 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Current Retirees Medical and Pension Benefits

DOE N 351.1 Does not document that current retirees Medical and Pension benefits will be "grandfathered" and protected from adverse conditions caused by the proposed order. As a retiree of the SRS I request that the protection that present retirees need to maintain these benefits be codified in the order. In this manner the protection will be assured.

Thank you.

William E. McHugh

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

From: Iben Screwed

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 12:24 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Comment on DOE's Plans for Pension and Medical Funding

I work at the DOE Hanford site. During the last site contract re-compete in 1996, I was working for an incumbent contractor team. With 21 continuous years of service at Hanford I was clearly an incumbent Hanford employee. However as a result of the re-compete, my job was mapped to one of the so called Hanford “enterprise” companies. Since then I have proudly continued to contribute to the Hanford mission. I kept the same Hanford site phone number and the same Hanford employee ID number as before the contract change, and I continue using government owned equipment in the performance of my job; providing services to the rest of Hanford, including Fluor, CH2M Hill, and DOE. By any definition I am a career Hanford worker. However, since the contract re-compete in 1996, ten years and counting, I and hundreds of others in my position have not been accruing a pension or enjoyed anything close to Hanford benefits.

With the upcoming Hanford contract re-compete, DOE announced that they want to introduce a "market-based" plan because the DOE contractor workers receive higher

benefits to those in the private sector. I read into the DOE proposal that they believe that market based means fair and competitive. Ha! Ask anyone working for a Hanford enterprise company what market based looks like around here. There is no other place for skilled workers to go in this region, and because of this lock on decent jobs; I no longer receive the same benefits as the rest of Hanford workers, which means no defined pension and no group medical insurance at retirement. And my company match for 401k contributions is whopping 3%. And we pay 2-3 times what non-enterprise Hanford contractors pay for health insurance.

I ask that DOE not only be prohibited from implementing their latest attempt to pillage workers benefits, but that they also admit to the enterprise concept failure and reinstate the benefits of the Hanford enterprise workers, who have dedicated so much of their lives to the Hanford mission. We have a right to expect fairness and equal treatment from our government - the same government that criticizes private industry when workers are mistreated. How about a little leadership by example?

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

From: casper729

Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 10:50 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: SRS Retirees Association

All retired employees from SRS should be grandfathered in and exempted to any future changes to retiree benefits.

Gary Dillavou  
SRS retiree

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

From: Sgavin33

Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 10:45 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Contractor Pensions

Grandfather current retirees into pensions.

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

From: Bob Smith

Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 10:15 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Contractor Pensions and Medical Benefits

A couple of weeks ago, Ed Sommers, Savannah River Site Nuclear Weapons Plant Retire Association, sent out an email message to all members with email informing contractors

of a notice that the Department of Energy published in the Federal Register in which they were 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. The approach that they proposed last year did not address current retirees. In a subsequent meeting with the Department of Energy person directly responsible for this effort, SRS Retirees Association Board members were told that it was DOE's intent to grandfather current retirees. We have asked for DOE to document this and, so far, they have not done so.

Response: Bob Smith, Retired Fire Protection Engineer,

DOE and the federal government are no different from any individual American in the financial challenge it faces on contractor employee pension and medical benefits.

When we as individual Americans purchase a car, home, or get a loan from the bank and promise to pay the notes, we must if we are honest. The federal government is no different. How can DOE even consider not keeping its promises. I suggest that the persons recommending possible cuts in pension and/or medical benefits be summarily fired and get someone in there that can handle the job.

I am a former U.S. Marine. The federal government failed to keep its promises concerning medical care for veterans. Are we now supposed to quietly relinquish our retirement and medical benefits? We wonder what absurdities now await?

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

From: Ed Moore

Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 9:38 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: comments on pension reconsideration NOI in Federal Register Vol 72 no 58

To whom it may concern.

My comments regarding Request for Public Comments in Federal Register / Vol. 72, No. 58 / Tuesday, March 27, 2007 titled "Office of Management; Request for Public Comment on Department of Energy Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge" are as follows.

My name is Ed Moore. I am a Savannah River Site contractor retiree and am concerned about the implication of the notice that DOE is reconsidering honoring its pension liability to DOE contractor personal.

Please confirm that DOE will honor its existing pension liabilities. The notice presented a one-sided argument.

1) DOE has historically raided the well-funded pension originally

managed by Dupont and then by Westinghouse to fund DOE program expenses. The pension commitments have been established by decades of practice and represent a legal commitment to employees who devoted their working career to serve DOE. If there is a funding shortfall, it is due to DOE not properly funding the pension. Please reaffirm DOE's commitment to grandfather the pensions currently in place.

2) I found the factual content of the notice biased. Statements like "According to Department of Energy market comparisons, on average, the pension benefits received by DOE contractor employees are higher than the benefits earned by Federal or private sector employees. In addition, on average, DOE contractor employees contribute less for their medical benefit costs than Federal employees or private sector workers" are vague and biased. This may be true of national laboratory personnel and for hourly laborers, but it is not true for professional engineers and scientists. In fact, I doubt it is true of hourly laborers given the exceptional quality of workers employed at DOE sites. It sounds like the argument goes something like this. DOE sought out the most able employees in the market and promised them compensation comparable to that of industry (although being the most able employees they deserved more), but now wishes to reduce their pensions to less than the competitive market. In regard to comparing pensions with federal employees, who do you think you are kidding. Military pensions are at 2.5%/year service and inflation adjusted. My pension was at 1.2% times years of service and is not inflation adjusted. Moreover, the gap between federal and contract pay has narrowed over the years. My bet is that five years from now those with federal pensions will be much better off due to inflation adjustment. The term "private sector employees" without qualification includes those who work at Hardies. Please refrain from such vague and misleading statements.

3) If anything, the pension benefits should be increased to adjust for inflation. Regarding medical benefits there already have been increases far beyond my initially promised benefits.

4) In short, please cease efforts to reduce promised pension benefits.

Ed Moore

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

From: Terry Wendland

Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 10:10 PM

To: contractor pensions

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

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am an SRS Retiree and I worked with government contracts and contractors for many years. In order to assure that any aspect of a contract is carried out it must be in writing.

Cost Reduction Suggestions: I realize it is your primary concern to reduce DOE costs. One way to reduce DOE costs may be to phase out parts of the medical or pension benefits for future employees and existing unvested employees (i.e., with less than 15 years of qualified government contractor service).

Another way to reduce DOE costs may be to increase premium payments for medical benefits while still maintaining a medical benefits package for present unvested employees. A contributory pension plan may also be considered to reduce DOE costs for future and unvested employees.

Comments on Contractor Employee and Medical Benefits Program: All existing retirees and vested employees with 15 or more years of qualified government contractor service, should be "grandfathered" in writing to continue to receive unreduced benefits in your forthcoming revisions to Government Contractor Medical and Pension Benefit Programs.

Request: Therefore, I am asking you to include written provisions in your revised Contractor Employee and Medical Benefits Program to grandfather existing retirees, as well as currently qualified, vested, employees to continue to receive unreduced Pension and Medical Benefits. Your failure to do so would mean a huge, undeserved, shortfall for us. You must find a way of reducing DOE costs without penalizing present retirees or presently vested employees who are deserving of unreduced medical and pension benefits.

Thank You.  
Terry L. Wendland,  
Retired SRS Employee,

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

From: David Hopkins  
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 10:09 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: retirees benefits

Since you verbally express grandfathering the current retirees benefits what's the problem in putting this in writing? I strongly urge you to do this.

Thank you very much,  
Dave Hopkins SRS retiree

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

From: harold dudley

Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 9:58 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: pension & medical benefits

When I went to work at the Savannah River Plant it was promised that the plant would have pension & medical benefits after we retired. I worked most of my healthy life at the nuclear plant and now that I have given my life to this plant and the U S Government I understand, they want to take away our benefit package. What can I do I don't have the health to get another job now that I'm up in the years. I think this could have been told to the employees years ago. I think we the people, who ran this nuclear plant should be "Grandfathered" to have all our benefits. It's a shame that it has come to put all the retirees out in the cold, as we ran, the "Savannah River Plant (site) as well as we did. We helped bring down down the "Cold War" and put an end to communism should they be a price to cut pension & other benefits for those who worked so hard for this. There were tremendous hazards and working conditions and time tables that we put ourselves though. I love my country and as a Veitnam veteran what can I do. I have served my country well, both military and civilian and not to lose my earned benefits.

Thank you

Harold v Dudley

----Original Message-----

From: ROSJOEO

Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 9:43 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: FUTURE PENSION AND MEDICAL BENEFITS

Today all employers are rightfully concerned about future pension and medical benefits. Many companies are modifying their present programs. Some are reducing future pensioner benefits but compensating affected present employees by programs such as increasing company contributions to 401K programs. Since existing pensioners have no way of participating in these types of programs they are usually "grandfathered" with the programs they had at the time of their retirement. I believe that these types of "grandfathered" programs should be applied to pensioners from DOE sites.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

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

From: Aikenair

Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 9:39 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Retirees Benefits

Dear Sirs,

I would like to comment on the current controversy concerning the increasing costs of retirees' pensions and medical costs.

1. The promises of pension and medical benefits for retirees' was re-affirmed year after year during the years of our employment at SRS/SRP. To now cancel those promises would reflect greatly on future promises of DOE and other government agencies. It would also reflect on the integrity and moral responsibility of both DOE and subcontractors.
2. Most retirees planned for their retirement based on receiving these benefits. To now "pull the rug out from under" those retirees would be an act of DOE irresponsibility and abuse.
3. It is difficult to morally reconcile the fact that many government agencies spend million of dollars on benefits for millions of illegal aliens and yet fail to support a few thousand working group American Citizens who spent their lives in the production of materials for the defense of their country.
4. It is also difficult to understand how the US government can squander away billions of dollars on pork barrel projects, bogus foreign aid and widespread government waste, inefficiency and bureaucracy and then deny earned benefits to a few thousand hard working people.
5. A morally responsible way to phase out benefits to future retirees would be to advise new employees that these benefits would be no longer be available to them upon their retirement.

Don Barnes

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

From: mwalcher  
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 9:30 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Medical Benefits for Retirees

I retired in 1992 from SRS with the understanding that I would receive lifetime medical coverage. The coverage has been eroded over the years but is still important to me in its present form. I would hope and expect that the continuation of these benefits would be provided for in any future contracts for those of us who have already retired. It would be reassuring if we retirees could see that published as a mandatory provision for all future contract bidders.

Monroe W Walcher

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

From: Jackie Walker  
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 10:16 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Grandfather Retiree Benefits

Doe has not stated that current retirees benefits be grandfathered. In a meeting with the Department of Energy person directly responsible for this effort, SRS Retirees Association Board members were told that it was DOE's intent to grandfather current retirees. DOE stated that it would be documented and it was not. All SRS retirees are requesting that it be stated that the benefits would be grandfathered. No virus found in this outgoing message. Checked by AVG Free Edition.

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

From: Cesar Ansaldo  
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 9:00 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Public Comment on Department of Energy Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

Gentlemen:

My comment:

"Costs and liabilities associated with contractor employee pension and medical benefits proposed last year did not address current retirees. DOE's intent to grandfather current retirees must be documented in the proposal."

Sincerely yours,  
Cesar P. Ansaldo

----Original Message-----

From: JSeals8093  
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 8:30 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Proposal

International Association of Machinists  
and Aerospace Workers

May 9, 2007

Subj: Contractor Employee Pension and  
Medical Benefits Proposals

On behalf of the members of IAM Local 480, I thank you for the opportunity

to express our concerns and disagreement with DOE order 351.1. IAM Local Lodge 480 is comprised of well over 1200 retired and 300 active members, all of which are either former or current employees of DOE M&O contractors for the X-10 and Y-12 facilities and benefactors of Defined Benefits and Medical Ins. Within the notice the Department states the goal of the policy is: "The goals of the Notice were to improve the Department's stewardship of taxpayer dollars by mitigating the cost growth associated with benefit liabilities, moderating the volatility and improving the predictability of the Department's cost reimbursement obligations for benefits, ensuring that costs for contractor employee pension and medical benefits are more consistent with market trends, and ensuring fairness to incumbent contractor employees." I believe the 351.1 policy will not meet these goals nor, will a "one shoe fits all approach". It will increase costs for the tax payers, seriously damage the ability of DOE contractors to compete for and retain highly skilled employees in the marketplace, as well as deprive employees and contractors of the ability to collectively bargain benefits which are cost effective and beneficial to both the employees and the community. The Department's proposed policy would directly contradict Congress and President Bush's stated goal to strengthen private sector Defined Benefit plans with passage of the Pension Protection Act of 2006.

The current benefit plans are very reasonable in comparison to employers in private industry of the size, complexity and magnitude of DOE sites. The Defined Benefit Plan (DB) provides a level of income for participants or their families in the event of retirement, premature death, or total disability. Defined Contribution Plans (DC) does not provide this benefit nor assure costs to taxpayers will decrease.

For example: Where participants have depleted their Defined Contribution Plan, either employee and / or their dependents will rely on taxpayer social programs and be dependent on our communities.

Under the Department's current reasonableness and allowable costs, the department has the right and authority to control benefit reimbursement costs to contractors. DOE does not directly participate in the collective bargaining process at sites with CBAs, but the Department's policies significantly influence negotiations with DOE contractors. Any non-allowable costs by the Department is reflected in the Contractor's proposals and the Union's proposals in question for allowable costs, is addressed only after conferring with DOE prior to any commitment on the Contractor's part.

Due to limited information of DB / DC and Medical plans of other DOE sites, I can only speak to the effects of 351.1 on plans of the Oak Ridge facilities, but I am sure the effects of 351.1 at other sites will have similar results. When comparing pensions and medical benefits with the different pension calculations and varying medical plan designs of other sites, it is like comparing apples to oranges. The local Contractors, DOE Management and employees

have worked together to create Benefits Plans which addresses their particular region and site needs. The following are examples of Oak Ridge Contractor employee's benefits, which we feel benefits the taxpayer, our communities and provide a very reasonable income which is not as extravagant for hourly employees as the Department notice implies.

- \* The pension plan for the Oak Ridge facilities has been well funded for many years and required no contributions by DOE or their contractors.

- \* The employees pay a share of the cost of medical benefits and are based on market costs and the collectively bargained Agreements.

- \* In the event of a participant's death the DB provides a reduced surviving spouse or dependent monthly benefit if the participant has at least 5 years service.

- \* DB plan participants who become totally disabled are entitled to monthly benefit income as defined by the plan.

- \* A participant of the DB plan who acquires 30 years service, and service plus age equals 85 points, is eligible to receive 42% of his/her average straight time monthly earnings. This benefit is proportionally reduced with less than 85 points and further reduced with less than 30 years.

- \* The final calculated pension is reduced with the spouse option benefit and medical insurance costs. \* A vast number of hourly employees will never reach the maximum wage rate nor attain 30 years service which significantly reduces the following

- Ø Based on today's maximum hourly wage rate for Oak Ridge hourly employees, the maximum pension benefit with 30 years service is approximately \$2000 dollars, before any medical or spouse reductions.

- Ø Based on today's minimum hourly wage rate for Oak Ridge hourly employees, the maximum pension benefit with 30 years service is approximately \$1200 dollars, before any medical or spouse reductions.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to share our concerns and hope the Department will abandon the 351.1 approach to the outlined goals as described by their notice.

E. W. Seals

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

From: Ed Somers

Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 8:26 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Comments on Department of Energy Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

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.

Ed Somers

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

From: cbostonrun

Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 7:33 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: N 351.1 DOE request for comments on DOE Contractor Employee Pensions and Medical Benefits Challenge

As a retired (41 year) employee of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, I support the recommendations provided by Coalition of Oak Ridge Retired Employees (CORRE) in their responses to DOE's request for comments to DOE on N 351.1. Charles R. Boston

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

From: BAMTiffany]

Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 3:53 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Comments on Bill N351.1 concerning SRS Retirees Benefits

Dear Contractor Pension Personnel,

Attached are my comments concerning my pension and medical benefits as a retiree from the Savannah River Site with 32 years of service. I sincerely hope that Bill N351.1 can be amended to include a guarantee for continuing my pension and medical benefits as a retiree from the site.

I was employed at the Savannah River Site for 32 years – 22 years with Du Pont and 10 years with Westinghouse. As part of my contract, I was promised a pension upon retirement calculated on a percentage of my salary times the number of years of service. I was also promised that my medical benefits would not change upon retirement. My salary was computed on the basis of average pay for the same services at other companies. That calculation did not take into account the risk I was exposed to handling extremely dangerous radioactive materials. Many of us at the site should have been receiving hazard pay just as the naval submarine corps receives. I realized the risks and was willing to do the work for the good of my country. My pension does not include a cost-of-living adjustment so I have not received any increase in my pension since my retirement on December 31, 1999. In real dollars, my pension is at least 20% less than when I retired. I understand that my retirement benefits have not been grand-fathered into Bill N351.1 and should be included with specific statements to that effect.

Thank you in advance for your careful consideration of this request.

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

From: Ted DeHart

Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 10:18 AM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Policy N351.1

To whom it may concern:

I am a retired employee of Savannah River Site, having being employed for 40+years. When I started my employment, one of the reasons was the employment benefits being offered, which included a safe retirement program and a great medical insurance coverage. Losing this would be a financial disaster for me.

The RFP for the upcoming SRS contract rebid states that retirement benefits for present retirees would "grandfathered". I urge you to keep this promise and include this in Policy N351.1

Ted DeHart

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

From: Wes-Barb

Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2007 10:09 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Requested Comments on the DOE Notice 351.1

May 8, 2007

To: Ms. Stephanie Weakley,  
Department of Energy

Subject: Requested Comments on the DOE Notice 351.1

I do hope you are serious about wanting feedback and ideas on the pension and health benefit plans. I urge you to provide for equitable treatment of pension plan recipients from the various DOE contractors. In particular, I urge you to correct the serious inequity with the recipients of the Oak Ridge Pension plan compared to the other plans throughout the DOE complex. I support the position of the Coalition of Oak Ridge Retired Employees (CORRE) organization as outlined in their recent press release (April, 2007) about the pension plan. If a Defined Contribution plan is implemented for new employees, I support provision of a one time opportunity for incumbent DB Pension Plan participants to transfer to a DC Pension Plan.

The problem of high and rising costs for health care is a national problem that needs wide ranging attention and solutions. The DOE can demonstrate a viable solution to the nation. To deal with escalating health care costs you must initiate fundamental and drastic changes. One of the basic causes of the high costs is that the current medical treatment paradigm relies almost exclusively on surgery and artificially manufactured medicines, and the medical establishment discourages alternative treatment methods.

The solution is to deviate from that established paradigm and make use of natural medicines and therapies. Many natural treatments are just as cheap, safe and effective as the corresponding surgery or medicinal treatments, and in some cases more so. There is much literature available on the efficacy of natural therapies if you look for it. But don't look for it in the libraries of most establishment medical professionals. They and the pharmaceutical companies have vested interests in keeping the current paradigm. You will encounter stiff opposition from vested interests, but I believe you will find that money that can be saved with alternate therapies and disease prevention.

So I recommend you do four things to revise your health care plan: 1. Implement a rigorous and comprehensive education program for employees. One or more full time staff members (diet and natural health specialists) for each contractor should be dedicated to this mission. Educated employees will want to use natural therapies where possible when they learn that the therapies are safe, cheap and effective. And educated employees are more likely to be motivated to prevent various health problems. 2. Emphasize prevention of diseases and conditions via diet selection and nutritional therapies. 3. Implement financial incentives for both employees and providers to use natural therapies and prevention plans, e.g. to prevent high blood pressure, diabetes, etc. 4. Require consideration/evaluation of natural therapies for the treatment protocol of various conditions, and don't accept "No" for every condition.

I hope you will give serious consideration to these suggestions.

Thank you for your time.  
Wesley Sims  
Oak Ridge, TN 37830

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

From: Rich Borgatti  
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2007 9:43 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Revisions to policy N351.1

Please add wording to Policy N351.1 to grandfather the current benefits and pension received by SRS retirees. To take these benefits away would be a slap in the face to those of us who worked long and hard to make SRS a first class government complex.

Rich Borgatti

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

From: Gerald Malloy

Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2007 4:01 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Notice N351.1 Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Policy

Ladies and Gentlemen of DOE,

This is a request to honor the agreement made in 2002 to the retiring contractor employees at SRS. I am a retiree from the DOE Savannah River Site. I worked for Westinghouse as a Project Manager and a Principle Engineer from December 1998 to April 2002. In 2002 Doe offered an Early Retirement Incentive package (ERI). I accepted the offer, since I was to turn 65 just 4 and a half months after the official retirement date of April 30, 2002.

The purpose of the ERI was to allow Westinghouse and DOE to reduce the number of senior, older and more highly paid workers. This seemed like a WIN-WIN situation for all concerned. Had I not retired, my salary and benefits would have been significantly higher than the pension and health benefits that I now receive. I entered into an agreement with DOE and WSRC, by accepting the Early Retirement Incentive package offered by Doe and WSRC, I would receive a pension, life insurance and medical/dental benefits. I accepted the ERI and now find that DOE appears to be trying to not honor that agreement.

DOE needs to keep the agreement intact and "Grandfather" the pension and retiree benefits package into the SRS contract agreements. In fact, the grandfathering of the retiree benefits needs to be done at SRS as it has been done at Los Alamos, NM.

Sincerely,  
Gerald Malloy

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

From: t.montano

Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2007 2:03 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: public comment (Fed. Reg. Doc. E7-5545, Published 3-27-07)

Good afternoon. Attached is a letter I am submitting on behalf of my organization. I am also faxing a copy with the original being mailed via USPS.

May 8, 2007

Office of Management  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington D.C. 20585

Re: Request for Public Comment on DOE Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge (Fed. Reg. Doc. E7-5545, Published 3-27-07)

Dear Sir or Madam:

Please accept this comment on the above-referenced matter on behalf of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipe Fitters, Local Union No. 412, which represents over 1,700 workers in the State of New Mexico and El Paso, Texas. My organization strongly opposes implementation of the proposed policy discussed in Department of Energy's Notice 351.1 and submits that this is a misguided initiative on the part of the government that will cause multiple negative consequences for everyone affected, including the DOE. In the spring of '06, the DOE issued Notice 351.1 stating that it would no longer reimburse contractors for "non-market based" health or pension plans. This was an attempt to do away with defined benefit plans which would undermine decades of work at the bargaining table. Interestingly enough, the notice says that this action should not interfere with collective bargaining—but the major effect of this policy would be to interfere with and substantially undermine numerous collective bargaining agreements in every part of the nation in which DOE facilities exist.

There is no question that this policy would force DOE contractors to abandon their defined benefit pension plans and many existing medical plans. Any such policy would seriously undermine workers' health and retirement security and penalize responsible employers who provide workers with guaranteed retirement benefits and affordable health insurance. This policy would also violate the right of employees to collectively bargain for the terms and conditions of their employment and undercut fundamental protections included in long-standing federal prevailing wage laws.

Approximately 200,000 DOE contract workers and their families nationwide rely on defined benefit pension and medical plans for their medical coverage and retirement benefits. New Mexico plays host to two of the most prestigious National Laboratories in the country, with Sandia National Laboratories and Los Alamos National Laboratories. Many of these workers have worked for decades in arms-length collective bargaining with their contractor employers to establish these important benefits.

Study after study has shown that defined benefit plans are superior to defined contribution plans for the delivery of retirement security. As more and more companies reduce or eliminate pensions and retiree health insurance, as healthcare costs skyrocket, and as Social Security faces an increasingly uncertain future, retirement security is fast becoming a goal that is beyond the reach of most Americans.

If implemented, the policy discussed in Notice 351.1 would jeopardize the health and security of hundreds of thousands of workers. It could also send a signal to other federal agencies and private employers that they are similarly free to abandon their employees. Stripped of their health care and pensions, many of these workers could end up relying on government safety nets out of financial necessity. Thus, any "savings" the government

may realize now (a proposition we believe is premised on faulty data to begin with) will be spent elsewhere, housing and caring for an expanded impoverished elderly population. I submit DOE's initiative is misguided. The \$9 billion in health care liabilities and \$2.5 billion in pension liabilities referenced by DOE reflected information from the time period from 2000 to 2006 -- the single worst period for U.S. investments since the Great Depression. Many of the volatility and liability problems that were seen in the downturn from 2000 to 2006 were fixed in the Pension Protection Act of 2006, a bi-partisan effort in Congress. The greatest liability is seen in health plans, yet DOE already has a procedure to ensure that contractors' health plans are economical and competitive. Instead of undercutting federal contract workers, the federal government should promote secure, reliable pensions and health care for all workers, especially those employed in the critical facilities operated by DOE. Good wages and benefits are essential in our industry to attract and keep workers who offer the government the skills and productivity required to successfully perform the contracts in question. It is in the government's direct interest to ensure that contractors that support DOE's critical operations have the ability to attract and maintain the best qualified workforce in the industry. This proposed policy would seriously undermine such efforts and, therefore, should not be implemented. For all of these reasons, my organization strongly opposes implementation of the policies set forth in Notice 351.1. I thank you in advance for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Montañó  
Business Manager

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

From: Ken Perrine]

Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2007 1:00 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Fwd: Retiree pensions and benefits

>Dear friends,

>

>This is written in response to information provided by the Savannah  
>River Site Retiree Association (SRSRA) to its membership concerning  
>the re-bid to operate SRS after the current contract expires within  
>the near future. We have been told that a Ms. Kolb, the Department  
>of Energy sponsor of Policy N351.1, has communicated to SRSRA the  
>intention of DOE to protect the pensions and benefits of current  
>retirees, although the Policy does not specifically include language  
>to this effect. I strongly encourage you to consider including such  
>language in the Policy so that there is no ambiguity or uncertainty  
>in the minds of future contractors regarding treatment of pensions  
>and benefits for persons who have retired from SRS after many years  
>of service to the nation. Unlike current and future employees who  
>may be in position to adapt to changes in their financial packages,  
>those who have already retired and who depend on arrangements made

>during their periods of employment cannot easily make alternative  
>plans for pensions/benefits and many might face a very uncertain  
>financial future if those arrangements were modified. To abandon  
>current policies would constitute betrayal of a trust that I am  
>certain is not the intention of DOE management or of any other part  
>of the Federal government. Please take all steps necessary to  
>protect the financial interests of those who have partnered with you  
>in helping protect this great nation in times of peril.  
>  
>Thank you,  
>Kenneth Perrine, Ph.D.

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

From: Jim and Deb Bowers and Sandberg

Sent: Monday, May 07, 2007 5:23 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: RE: Grandfathering of SRS Employee Benefits, Policy N351.1 and RFPs

Office of Resource Management  
United States Department of Energy

RE: 'Grandfathering' of current retiree benefits and pensions

Dear Sirs and Mesdames:

We urge the United States Department of Energy to 'grandfather' the current retiree benefits and pensions for those employees from the US DOE Savannah River Site in any future Contractor RFPs.

We relocated to the Savannah River Site twenty years ago based on promised worker benefits that would continue through retirement. Our life plans were thus made accordingly. Through all of those years, until very recently, these benefits were kept. Now we have learned that the federal government is considering a reduction in retirement benefits for those already retired and too late to change our career and life plans.

We are asking that the Department of Energy keep these promises to the Cold War nuclear workers now and into the future.

Sincerely Yours,

James A. Bowers Ph. D. Retired Savannah River National Laboratory (Westinghouse)

Deborah A. Sandberg-Bowers, Retired Westinghouse Savannah River Company

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

From: Cooke, Darrell Lynn (DQL)

Sent: Monday, May 07, 2007 2:33 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Pension Plan

To Whom It Concerns,  
DOE and the United States Government have a moral and ethical responsibility to protect both the Health and Pension benefits of DOE and it's prime contractors. These people have worked with dangerous chemicals and substances and some have been doing it for decades. The environments that employees are subjected to are less than desirable ones to work in. Potential causes for incurring exposure to elements may have already exposed workers to hazards that won't be detected for years to come. Benefits should be maintained to support their current and future needs. Your consideration for maintaining the benefits would be appreciated by those involved.

Thanks,  
Darrell Cooke

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

From: Phebe Davis  
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2007 10:16 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject:

May 4, 2007

Office of Management  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20585

Re: Request for Public Comment of DOE Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge (Fed. Reg. Doc. E7-5545, Published 3-27-07)

Dear Sir or Madam:

As a Pension Trustee and Organizer for Pipefitters' Local Union 533 in Kansas City, Missouri, I am writing to share my thoughts on the proposed policy outlined in the DOE's Notice 351.1. If the DOE ceases to reimburse contractors for health coverage and defined pension benefits for workers, it will place some contractors in the untenable position of deciding whether or not they can continue as responsible employers, providing workers with guaranteed retirement benefits and health coverage. Workers throughout our country depend upon health care coverage provided by employers and as they age, they need to count on receiving guaranteed pensions.

This is America, we need to protect our workers, not turn away from them.

Sincerely,

Kerry Brandt  
Organizer and Pension Trustee  
Pipefitters' Local Union 533

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

From: Phebe Davis  
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2007 11:26 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject:

May 4, 2007

Office of Management  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20585

Re: Request for Public Comment of DOE Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge (Fed. Reg. Doc. E7-5545, Published 3-27-07)

Dear Sir or Madam:

The proposed policy (referenced above) to stop reimbursing DOE contractors for the costs of traditional, defined pension and medical plans for employees is a misguided initiative. As Business Agent for Pipefitters' Local Union 533 in Kansas City, Missouri, representing approximately 1,500 workers, I am in a position to recognize the devastating effects this ruling will have for working people across the country. The negative consequences this will have on workers' health plans and retirement security will affect everyone involved, including our government.

Pipefitters' Local Union 533 strongly opposes implementation of the policies set forth in Notice 351.1.

Sincerely,  
Patrick M. Julo  
Business Representative  
Pipefitters' Local Union 533

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

From: Phebe Davis  
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2007 10:16 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject:

May 4, 2007

Office of Management  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20585

Re: Request for Public Comment of DOE Contractor Employee Pension and  
Medical Benefits Challenge (Fed. Reg. Doc. E7-5545, Published 3-27-07)

Dear Sir or Madam:

As a Business Agent and Health & Welfare Trustee for Pipefitters' Local Union 533 in Kansas City, Missouri, I represent approximately 1,500 workers. Local 533 strongly opposes implementation of the proposed policy as stated in the Department of Energy's Notice 351.1. This policy will hurt thousands of workers throughout the country by taking away their retirement benefits and basic health benefits. Working people are the backbone of our country and our federal government should, without question, provide fundamental protections for workers - not take them away.

This initiative is misguided and will only be a disservice to everyone involved. It should not be implemented.

Sincerely,  
Robert A. Welch  
Business Representative  
and Health & Welfare Trustee

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

From: Phebe Davis  
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2007 11:23 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject:

May 4, 2007

Office of Management  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20585

Re: Request for Public Comment of DOE Contractor Employee Pension and  
Medical Benefits Challenge (Fed. Reg. Doc. E7-5545, Published 3-27-07)

Dear Sir or Madam:

As Financial Secretary-Treasurer and Pension Trustee for Pipefitters' Local Union 533 in Kansas City, Missouri, I represent approximately 1,500 workers. Our local strongly

opposes implementation of the above-referenced policy because of the extreme negative consequences it will impose upon workers nationwide. Workers will be penalized when retirement and healthcare benefits are placed beyond their reach. We depend upon our government to protect the rights of working people, and this initiative jeopardizes those fundamental rights.

The working people affected by this policy will be forced to turn to the government for help as their retirement income and healthcare benefits are eroded.

I urge you to reconsider implementation of this policy.

Sincerely,  
Scott A. Forbes  
Financial Secretary-Treasurer and Pension Trustee  
Pipefitters' Local Union 533

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

From: Walker, James Michael (WZG)  
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2007 9:45 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Pension Plans

DOE and the United States Government have a morale and ethical responsibility to protect both Health and Pension benefits of DOE and its Prime Contractors. These people have been working with the most dangerous chemicals and substances known to man, and some have been doing it for decades.

The company line says their Plants are a safe place to work, but our employees will testify that they are not a healthy place to work. Plant practices of several years ago are different then they are now.

The cause of Employees illness's may have happened many years ago.

DOE's Contract employees are proud to have served their country and only wish the Government to realize a career at Kroger's is substantially different than one at a DOE Plant.

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

From: Incerto, David V  
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2007 5:10 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: contractor's pension and benefits

In reference to your soliciting comments concerning contractor's pension and benefits plans, We would like to share a few of our experiences.

First, we don't know how our company actually fits into the DOE model concerning pension and benefits as it sub contracts to Sandia National Laboratories. We've been DOE Security Police Officers (SPO's) at the Tonopah Test Range for at least fifteen years ( in fact one of us has been here for twenty five years), employed by US Security

Associates, (formally Advance Security Inc.). When first hired on, we remember hearing promises and implied promises that with proper collective bargaining by the small union representing the SPO's, and lots of work, there would someday be a retirement plan for the SPO's. The summer of 1985, a company sponsored 401K plan was offered. In the initial selling of this plan, it was understood and stated that the company (Advanced Security Inc.), would pay maintenance costs plus, some very promising projections were made concerning the expected growth of this plan. Within a year, we discovered that the company would not pay money towards the maintenance of our accounts; that these fees would be coming out of our own accounts. The years that involved bargaining for a new contract never brought the company into contributing into the 401K or the stated projections for growth. The company's position was always these moneys were bargained and accepted into the wage portion. During the last contract negotiation the company agreed to match the first one thousand dollars contributed per year. Everything about this plan might have seemed good if we had lived in a vacuum where we never heard of other company's 401K plans, plans that had decent company contributions, allowed borrowing from your account and more flexibility.

It strikes us as a poor gesture for a company that has maintained this contract since approximately 1975, or any other government contract, not to have a retirement plan. This job has always paid a good living and the insurance benefits have ranged from good to poor, depending on the insurance company handling the benefits. At this time we have to deem the insurance coverage as poor as there seems to be few in plan providers and with health professionals reluctant to join. Items such as remote site pay were always brushed off as "things we were not entitled to", even though other DOE contractors on site received these entitlements. New equipment was scarce up to the year 2002 or so, and then it seemed the moneys flowed for a few years. Now, it seems moneys are sporadic at best for equipment and indeed, we are expected to do more with less. And, just recently, equipment that is needed at this site to do our job effectively, has been taken away and sent to other sites that are reported to be closing. In the eighties, we were constantly being told we were the best paid DOE site, but this proved to be false and around 1991, we were forced to take an 11% pay cut due to the speculation that we would no longer be conducting SNM testing. This proved also false as testing was resumed and we never recovered this wage decrease.

Throughout the years we've never seen a company sponsored Christmas party. We've always have been invited to other organization's holiday lunches and celebrations. The personnel manning posts have always had to bring in their own holiday meals. We always considered this normal until SPO,s that had worked for other company's at other locations pointed out that they had never experienced such a lack of caring of the employees by a company. It was stated by these individuals that at their previous sites, meals were brought out to personnel working and the company acted grateful for them manning posts and being away from their families on holidays. We've seen personnel depart after years of service with nothing more than a thanks and a cake to share. A previous Project Manager with 25 years of service left the company and only after SNL brought some pressure on the company, he was finally offered a position running a small office on the east coast. He only stayed a few months after he came to learn what a poor job he'd been given.

It's our opinion that most of these items reflect the contractor/subcontractor mentality. We've had competent managers throughout the years but the bottom line has been and still is the bottom line; performing the contract for the least overhead possible. Getting the workers to agree to work for the least amount, whatever this takes including threats, lies and innuendoes. And when time for contract negotiations, the work has always gone out: "Things are tough, take this and next time we'll try to do better for you. In fact you better take this or you'll be locked out. There are hundreds of people willing to work here and you can be replaced easily for half the pay". This adds up to tough negotiating and loss of moral. In the end the employees receive their 2.5% to 3% raise, (we have only received the cost of living equivalent one time in 25 years), and we go on with hopes that in three years something better will come along. Again we mention that this job has paid a good living, but it's our opinion that no company should be allowed any government contract without providing some sort of retirement plan.

The years have passed and we know it's our own fault for not pursuing careers elsewhere. We've remained here at TTR because we believe in the mission and the importance of a secure America. But the cost of staying has been high for us. Every year it becomes harder to maintain our physical qualifications. Over time our bodies are being broken down. Hearing has been lost to things pertaining to the job such as gunfire, tactical equipment, training, vehicles, machinery, and high performance aircraft. Years of working to maintain our physical fitness requirements have brought on knee, foot and ankle pain, back spasms and arthritis. Our future is questionable due to exposure to contaminants, radar emissions and other environment experiences while at work. Our normal work week has never been under fifty hours but because of job requirements, the overtime has dictated that we work sixty, seventy-two or even eighty-four hours during the week. These hours are the norm, not the exception. We have sacrificed vacations, family birthdays, anniversaries, graduations, reunions and many other precious family events for this job and in quite a few circumstances, marriages are destroyed because of the job requirements. We SPO's at TTR, have given DOE our time, bodies, privacy and sometimes our self respect. In fact, with the HRP program, here at TTR, DOE has entered our homes and bedrooms, allowing no privacy at all. For years we have been reminded that we are not allowed to possess a temper or give any impression of losing self control. We're told that the word "stress" cannot be a part of our vocabulary and it's unwise to let on that we're feeling anxious about anything. If we are insulted or threatened off the job, our Q clearance and HRP will not allow us any recourse but "to turn the other cheek" for fear of being brought up on reliability concerns. We have been told that we are no longer trusted enough to carry our federal firearms credential off duty. To us this felt like nothing short of a hard kick between our legs. Carrying this credential always reminded us that we needed to uphold higher standards than the public or even state and local law enforcement; that we were members of an elite team, with elite training and an elite mission. Now we are made to feel like we are nothing more than minimum wage security guards. May I remind you that we are not security guards but in fact highly trained security professionals who are tasked with protecting our country's nuclear weapons and secrets. Over time, our experience has taught us that we are not to rock the boat or cause the company any embarrassments. (This letter is just such an embarrassment and will most likely cause repercussions.) The older SPOs are now made to feel that after all their time and energy, DOE are anxiously trying to

eliminate them from the work force and being made to feel as if we are worthless. This attitude is reinforced with the recent DOE orders and the attitude that DOE has against federalization of the security forces in the DOE family. Logically we'd expect DOE would want to incorporate their protective forces into the federal work place as this would enlarge the bureaucracy and let DOE demand a bigger share of the federal budget but this does not seem to be the case. Instead, we have to continue to be made to lose our self respect by a company that thinks of us as nothing more then third class citizens with no rights at all.

Except to gain the best profit margin for the company, sacrificing the training and equipment needed to perform the mission.

In spite of all that has been said in this letter, we SPOs here at TTR, appreciate our jobs, believe in the mission and take pride in the fact that we are serving our country. We SPOs at TTR are willing to lay down our lives if necessary, in protecting our country's assets. We also acknowledge those spouses that have stood by and accepted and shared the sacrifices made and have taken on more responsibilities at home due to the job requirements and the time it demands. It is our wish only for DOE and the contractor companies to begin to show their appreciation and respect for our sacrifices.

Thank you for your time,  
David V. Incerto  
Security Police Officer  
Tonopah Test Range

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

From: Nick Kuehn  
Sent: Sunday, May 06, 2007 9:10 AM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: N351.1 Pension Adjustments

May 6, 2006

To: Department of Energy

From: Nicholas H. Kuehn III

Chairman Savannah River Site Retiree Association

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

#### RECOMMENDATION

It is the position of the Savannah River Site Retiree Association that the Department of Energy should modify the wording in N351.1 REQUIREMENTS (6) to acknowledge that Defined Pension Plan benefits can be augmented if the site contractor puts a request in their budget submission to the Department of Energy and Congress appropriates funds to fully fund the lifetime cost of the augmentation.

## DISCUSSION

The members of the Savannah River Site Retiree Association are concerned that a right we now have may be taken away. Historically there have been adjustments made to site retiree pensions to partially offset the loss of purchasing power due to inflation. The most recent adjustment was made in 2002 through the efforts of the then Westinghouse Savannah River Company and Senator (then congressman) Lindsey Graham. We were told at that time that there were no guarantees of future adjustments, but that there would be annual reviews to determine if an adjustment were warranted.

In a meeting with members of our organization in December of 2006, Ms. Ingrid Kolb, Director of the Office of Management, in response to our questions about the wording in N351.1 said that the primary reason for the wording was to ensure that DOE Headquarters had control of all augmentations across the complex and to ensure that full funding was provided for all augmentations. She stated, "It was not the intention of the DOE to ban future pension adjustments under N351.1. She indicated that the process for obtaining future pension adjustments in our recommendation was still in place. We do not see this path defined in the present wording of N351.1.

We think that providing for augmentation of contractor employee pension benefits should be retained. Even with the very low rates of inflation we are now enjoying our buying power is being reduced each and every year. Cost of living adjustments to retain the real worth of pensions is government policy in Social Security and in the pensions of Federal Workers. We think augmentation of pensions for DOE contractor employee retirees is comparable and the right thing to do.

Thank you for your consideration.

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

From: JP Millbauer

Sent: Saturday, May 05, 2007 1:26 PM

To: contractor pensions

Subject: Public Comment for Pension and Medical Funding

I understand the DOE is seeking public comment regarding the funding of pension and healthcare benefits for workers on the D.O.E. sites. I am concern as to why the DOE is just now concerned with this issue.

I am employed at the Hanford Site in Richland Washington. I have been employed here for just over 22 years. I have a great concern with the way the DOE wants to introduce a "market-based" plan because the DOE site workers receive higher benefits than those in the private sector. Why market-based? To me market-base means to compare us and the work we do to those in the private sector. There was an article in the front page of the Tri-City Herald dated March 28, 2007. "Hanford DOE fined \$1.14 million" in the article

the EPA regional administrator Elin Miller said, "Continued missteps at one of the country's most complex and difficult cleanup sites cannot-and will not - be tolerated,". This does not sound like a "market-based" job site to me. Again in an article in the Herald, section B dated April 4, 2007, titled "Dangerous waste tank emptied" page B2 "It took new technology developed with TMR Associates of Colorado called the sand mantis to blast that layer into bits...", again this does not sound like a "market-based" job site to me. I bring these up just to let you know we are not just building gismos and gadgets to sell to the public. We are engaged and exposed to one of the most contaminated and hazardous environments in the world. How can we be compared to "market-based". Don't reward the workers here at Hanford for their dedication and life long hard work by cutting back their benefits (pension and medical) it really hurts.

As I tax payer I am concerned about the rich pension plan DOE has for there workers. (2.2 x high 3 wages x years of service) and I understand the Medical plan for DOE is one to desire.

In closing, I want you to know how I oppose and dissatisfied I am with this new DOE directive. The DOE needs to honor their commitments to this workforce and abandon any plan now and in the future, to systematically erode worker benefits.

Sincerely,  
James P. Millbauer

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

From: Phebe Davis  
Sent: Friday, May 04, 2007 4:03 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: DOE Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge

May 4, 2007

Office of Management  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20585

Re: Request for Public Comment of DOE Contractor Employee Pension and Medical Benefits Challenge (Fed. Reg. Doc. E7-5545, Published 3-27-07)

Dear Sir or Madam:

On behalf of the Officers and the approximately 1,500 members of Pipefitters' Local Union 533 in Kansas City, Missouri, I am submitting the following comments on the above-referenced matter.

Our union strongly opposes the proposed policy as outlined in the Department of Energy's Notice 351.1. We believe this initiative will have dire results for all parties involved. DOL Notice 351.1 states that it will no longer reimburse contractors for "non-market based" health or pension plans. The effect of such a policy will substantially counteract years and years of work by organized labor to gain benefits for workers through collective bargaining.

This policy will push DOE contractors to drop their defined benefit pension plans and many medical plans, seriously affecting workers' retirement security and leaving them without adequate medical coverage. Employers who do continue these benefits for their employees will be unfairly penalized. DOE contractors will not be able to retain the highest-skilled work force, since good wages and benefits are the catalysts to attracting skilled, productive workers. Furthermore, employees will lose their rights to collectively bargain for the terms and conditions of their employment, protections included in long-standing federal prevailing wage laws.

The federal government should promote secure, reliable pensions and health care for all workers. We must not place retirement security and health care beyond the reach of thousands of hard-working U.S. citizens. Where will it stop - first the DOE, then other federal agencies and private employers? Workers stripped of retirement and health benefits will eventually be forced to turn to the government for assistance, so this is a no-win proposal for everyone involved.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,  
Neil F. Willis

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

From: Clinton Curtis  
Sent: Friday, May 04, 2007 9:54 PM  
To: contractor pensions  
Subject: Pension cutbacks

To whom it may concern:

I am a Health Physics Technician at the Hanford Reservation. I currently work at the Tank Farms. I started working at the Hanford Reservation in 1999. This was my first ever full time job with benefits; I did have them with the carpenters union while living in eastern Idaho. In the eight years as a member I only have 8500 hours of the required 10000 hours needed to qualify for the carpenter's pension. I was 38 when I hired on at Hanford. The pension was a plus for me and my family. I was fully vested in a short matter of time, after hiring on.

With the nation i.e., big business as a whole taking pensions away from people who are retired, and those looking down the road at retirement, this is just wrong. People were offered these benefits along with their wages, as incentives to take the jobs.

Reductions of benefits are all about profits for share holders in the private sector. The Department of Energy had no share holders. The share holders are you and I the tax payers. Sure as a taxpayer I want to see the D.O.E. perform as a lean and trim entity of the government.

I went to school to learn how to perform my job as a Health Physics Technician; I accepted the risk for working with Radiation and Contamination. Since working at the Tank Farms I have had on two different occasions been exposed to unknown vapors. This has unknown ramifications to my long term health. For this, every time our union contract with the current companies managing the Hanford Reservation come up for negotiation, we are expected to take a miniscule increase in on our wages, and cuts to our benefits. Hanford workers put themselves in harms way on occasion for their jobs, to help D.O.E., with the cleanup of Hanford. The thanks we get is to screw us in our so called "Golden Years".

The cost of living keeps going up but thanks to the wonders of statistic manipulation everyday expenses like energy, fuel, utilities are not part of the equation. The cost of everything keeps going up, our wages are not keeping pace with the cost increases... How do I, let alone a 20 year old just getting started in life, expect to survive 20 to 50 years from now. I know this is none of your concern you will be retired with your benefits, after all it's about looking out for number 1 right. Companies and, or government agencies do not want to help insure some financial security for the employees who may have risked there health during their job after 40 years of service.

The Department of Energy personnel are just paycheck earners like me. The employees within the Department of Energy have no risk other than to keep their spot in the pyramid of employment within the department. The only thing these employees really have a concern about is to perform their job, meet their performance evaluations, and hope to deflect any junk that may roll there way, on to someone else, all the while clawing their way up the ladder to the next of the so called "Management Success Level" within D.O.E... I have looked at the pension plan offered to the D.O.E. employees. You have a better deal. If you want to cut the fat why not start at home. Bring your pension in line with ours. That would be a start. How about quit leasing full size trucks and SUVs for everyone to drive. Why not lease smaller vehicles, with four or six cylinder engines. I drive 88 miles every day round trip to work. I I have a modest home, I have a three year old vehicle I make payments on to ensure I have one dependable vehicle for traveling out of town. I drive a second hand 15 year old car to get to work.

There use to be a bus system for the workers to use back in the 90's at Hanford. I know that the D.O.E., still offers these bus rides to personnel in Idaho, and I believe in Nevada as well. There is an alternative to me driving; it is a 15 passenger van pool. Have you ever had to climb over anyone to get in and out of the 15 passenger van? Walking up and down the center isle of a large bus and slipping in next to one other person is much easier. If nothing else let a private company like Ben Franklin Transit from Richland, get drivers cleared for access to Hanford, I am sure there are former site workers who would drive the buses. These buses could deliver passengers to the larger facilities at Hanford. I

would love to ride my bike to work, but I am too far away for that. However, I would pay a few dollars a day for a bus ride that offers some comfort, this would save wear and tear on my vehicle and I wouldn't have to buy a tank of gas every 5 days.

D.O.E. staff in Richland, WA, if I had to guess would be 1 to every 200 site personnel.

We do not see these guys out in the field very often, which is alright providing the work is being performed safe. Many of the site workers are putting themselves at potential risk for the pay. So tell me why D.O.E., wants to cut our benefits while risking our health for their benefit. Bottom line cut your own in house fat before cutting my retirement.

You asked for the comments so these are mine!

Clinton Curtis