MICHAEL R. TURNER
3RD DISTRICT, OHIO

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
CHAIRMAN
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
STRATEGIC FORCES

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND
GOVERNMENT REFORM

ASSISTANT MAJORITY WHIP

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

2454 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-6465

DISTRICT OFFICES:

120 WEST 3RD STREET
SUITE 305
DAYTON, OH 45402
(937) 225-2843

61 EAST MAIN STREET
WILMINGTON, OH 45177
(937) 383-8931

November 16, 2011

Mr. Vincent Snowbarger
Deputy Director for Operations
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
1200 K St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Mr. Snowbarger:

I am writing to inform you that I have submitted questions for the record to the November 14, 2011 Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing on "Delphi Pension Fallout: Federal Government Picked Winners and Losers, So Who Won and Who Lost?" in Dayton, Ohio.

On November 9, 2011 you provided responses to questions I presented to you on June 22, 2011. Several of these responses, as well as your testimony in the November 14 hearing, fail to sufficiently address questions posed and do not identify relevant parties with specificity.

As a result, I have submitted the attached questions for the record and expect to receive answers in a timely fashion. For your reference, I have also enclosed your November 9, 2011 responses.

Sincerely,

Michael R. Turner
Member of Congress

Oversight & Government Reform Committee Hearing
"Delphi Pension Fallout: Federal Government Picked Winners and Losers, So Who Won and Who Lost?"

Questions for the Record
Submitted by Congressman Michael R. Turner on November 16, 2011

1. In your November 9, 2011 response to Question 1, you stated, "PBGC periodically informed the PBGC Board of matters involving the Delphi Pension Plans, including their potential impact on PBGC, plan participants, and estimates of benefit reductions resulting from large unfunded benefits that exceeded PBGC's statutory guarantee limits." Who at PBGC periodically informed the PBGC Board, and by what means of communication? Provide documentation and records of any such communications that occurred in written form.

2. Who at the PBGC Board was periodically informed by PBGC?

3. In your November 9, 2011 response to Question 1, you stated, "PBGC provided estimates of the unfunded status of the Delphi Pension Plans to the Auto Task Force." Who at the PBGC provided estimates to the Auto Task Force, and by what means of communication? Provide documentation and records of any such communications that occurred in written form.

4. Who at the Auto Task Force was provided estimates by the PBGC?

5. In your November 9, 2011 response to Question 1, you stated, "PBGC provided its Board with additional information on estimated benefit reductions for retired Delphi Pension Plan participants." Who at the PBGC provided additional information on estimated benefit reductions to the PBGC Board, and by what means of communication? Provide documentation and records of any such communications that occurred in written form.

6. Who at the PBGC Board was provided additional information on estimated benefit reductions?

7. To which retired Delphi Pension Plan participants did the additional information on estimated benefit reductions pertain?

8. In your November 9, 2011 response to Question 1, you stated, "PBGC sent a memorandum to the PBGC Board that included estimates of the number of Delphi Pension Plan participants that would have their benefits reduced to the guarantee limit." Who at the PBGC wrote, or otherwise contributed to, the memorandum to the PBGC Board?"

9. To whom at the PBGC Board was the memorandum addressed?

10. Who at the PBGC Board had access, whether direct or indirect, to the memorandum?

11. In your November 9, 2011 response to Question 3, you state, "PBGC kept the PBGC Board periodically informed of matters involving Delphi Pension Plans, including their potential impact on PBGC, plan participants and estimates of benefit reductions resulting from large unfunded benefits that exceeded the guarantee limits under ERISA." Who at the PBGC kept the PBGC Board periodically informed of matters involving Delphi Pension Plans, and by what means of communication? Provide documentation and records of any such communications that occurred in written form.

12. Who at the PBGC Board was periodically informed by the PBGC?

13. In periodically informing the PBGC Board, which plan participants were included in the PBGC's analysis of potential impact?

14. In your November 9, 2011 response to Questions 6 and 26, you state, "PBGC notes that attorneys for the Auto Task Force participated along with PBGC, GM, Delphi, and Delphi's debtor-in-possession lenders in telephone conferences during which the terms of the PBGC settlements were negotiated." Which attorneys for the Auto Task Force participated in the telephone conferences, and what were their responsibilities in the negotiations?

15. Who at PBGC participated in the telephone conferences, and what were their responsibilities in the negotiations?

16. Who at GM participated in the telephone conferences, and what were their responsibilities in the negotiations?

17. Who at Delphi participated in the telephone conferences, and what were their responsibilities in the negotiations?

18. Who at Delphi's debtor-in-possession lenders participated in the telephone conferences, and what were their responsibilities in the negotiations?

19. Which terms of the PBGC settlements were negotiated in the telephone conferences?

20. In your November 9, 2011 response to Question 11, you state, "The PBGC Board had no involvement in the process of reducing benefits." Which PBGC Board members were not involved in the process of reducing benefits?

21. In your November 9, 2011 response to Question 19, you state, "We are not aware of any conflicts." Please clarify the entity or group of individuals to which you assign to the term "We", as used in your response to Question 19.

22. Please provide and describe the processes used by this entity or group of individuals in concluding that no conflicts existed.

23. In your November 9, 2011 response to Question 23, you state, "PBGC approved the [settlement] agreements and signed them as a party." Who at PBGC approved the settlement agreements?

24. By what processes were the settlement agreements approved by PBGC?

25. Which individuals not employed by PBGC were consulted, whether formally or informally, in the process of PBGC approving the settlement agreements, and by what means of communication were these individuals consulted? Provide documentation and records of any such communications that occurred in written form.

26. In your November 9, 2011 response to Question 23, you state, "In negotiating the settlement, PBGC sought to protect its economic interests and obtain the best outcome for the pension insurance program and its stakeholders, including the participants in the terminating Delphi Pension Plans." Who at PBGC participated in negotiating the settlement, and by what means of communication? Provide documentation and records of any such communications that occurred in written form.

27. With whom did PBGC participate in negotiating the settlement?

28. Please clarify what meaning you assign to the term "economic interests", as used in your response to Question 23.

29. In your November 9, 2011 response to Question 24, which asked when the PBGC made the Department of Treasury aware of its belief that there were $2.4 billion in foreign Delphi assets upon which the PBGC could assert liens, you state that "as of June 15, 2009, PBGC had perfected $195.9 million in liens on behalf of the Delphi Salaried Plan[,]" and that "[t]he $195.9 million represented the full amount of the liens that PBGC could assert under law on behalf of the Delphi Salaried Plan at the time of its termination." However, in a report presented to the PBGC dated April 16, 2009, Greenhill & Company, Inc. (a third party consultant that the PBGC hired to "evaluate the relative value of Delphi and its foreign businesses") stated that "[t]he combined collateral value potentially subject to foreign liens is currently estimated at $2.4 billion dollars." Is it your position that, despite the fact that you served as the Acting Director of the PBGC and signed the notice of determination that the Delphi plans should be terminated, you did not know that after the PBGC initiated termination proceedings against the Delphi plans it had the right, under ERISA §§ 4062 and 4068, to assert additional liens upon Delphi assets? Are you also stating that you were unaware of the $2.4 billion estimate provided to the PBGC by Greenhill? Various PBGC memorandum directed to you at the time you were serving as Acting Director suggest that it was the need to perfect the PBGC's rights to these foreign liens that justified the PBGC's decision to initiate termination proceedings when it did. If you did not believe that the PBGC had the right to secure additional liens beyond the $195.9 million it had already perfected, why did you authorize the PBGC to institute termination proceedings as to the Delphi plans?

30. In your November 9, 2011 response to Question 24, you also state that "PBGC did not discuss its assessment of the value of Delphi's foreign assets with the Treasury Department." You elsewhere acknowledged that the PBGC took part in discussions with the Auto Task Force (which is of course a part of Treasury) over the terms of the PBGC Settlement Agreements, see, e.g., your answer to Question 26, and a key provision of these Settlement Agreements was the release of all liens asserted and/or assertable by PBGC against Delphi (and any entities in

Delphi's controlled group). See Delphi-PBGC Settlement Agreement at 4-6; GM-PBGC Settlement Agreement at 4, 6. Is it your testimony that the PBGC never discussed the release of its liens, both asserted and assertable, with Treasury and/or Auto Task Force officials?

31. In your November 9, 2011 response to Question 22, you state that "[t]hough Delphi continued to state its hope of GM assumption publicly through the spring of 2009, no one from Old GM, the Treasury Department, or the Auto Task Force ever communicated to PBGC that GM had any intention of assuming the Delphi Salaried Plan." Did the PBGC consider what the effect on GM would be if the PBGC refused to release its liens, both asserted and assertable, on Delphi assets? Did the PBGC ever propose to the Auto Task Force, Treasury or Old or New GM that Old or New GM assume the Salaried Plan? Did the PBGC ever prepare any financial estimates reflecting the cost to GM of assuming the Delphi Salaried Plan? If so, did the PBGC ever share such estimates with employees of the Treasury or Auto Task Force?

32. In your November 9, 2011 response to Question 5, which asked whether the Treasury Department initiated discussions with the PBGC regarding the Delphi Salaried Plan, you stated that "[n]either the Treasury Department nor the Auto Task Force had a role in authorizing, approving or consenting to the termination of the Delphi Salaried Plan." This suggests that there was no interaction between the PBGC and the Treasury/Auto Task Force regarding the Delphi Salaried Plan. Are you denying that representative from the PBGC and Treasury/Auto Task Force discussed Delphi's Pension Plans between March and August 2009? If not, please list the communications that took place, stating the date and time of the communication, the exact topics discussed, and the individuals from each agency that took part in the communications.

PBGC
Protecting America's Pensions
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
1200 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005-4026

November 9, 2011

The Honorable Michael R. Turner
U.S. House of Representatives
2454 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Re: Responses to Questions Regarding the Treatment of Delphi Salaried Retiree Pensions

Dear Representative Turner:

At the Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight & Government Spending Subcommittee's (House Oversight & Government Reform) June 22 hearing on the "Lasting Implications of the General Motors Bailout," you asked me to provide PBGC's responses to 30 questions related to the treatment of Delphi Salaried Retirees Pensions. Please find below responses to these questions.

1. **The administrative record produced by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation ("PBGC") indicates that PBGC staff discussed the Delphi pension plans with officials from the Treasury Department and the Auto Task Force before the plan was finalized to cut the pension plans. At what date did PBGC first notify parties regarding planned cuts to the Delphi pension plans?**

   Answer: PBGC's administrative record documents the basis for the agency's decision to initiate termination of the Delphi Salaried Plan, the Delphi Hourly Plan, and four smaller Delphi pension plans (collectively, "Delphi Pension Plans"). The guarantee limits established by Congress and implementing regulations resulted in the benefit reductions applied to the Delphi Pension Plans. Neither the Treasury Department nor the Auto Task Force had a role in authorizing, approving or consenting to the termination of the Delphi Salaried Plan, or in determining the level of benefit reductions applied to that plan.

   The Treasury Secretary serves as a member of the PBGC Board of Directors ("PBGC Board"), along with the Secretaries of the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce. In that role, each Secretary is supported and advised by a designated PBGC Board representative ("Board Representative"). PBGC periodically informed the PBGC Board of matters involving the Delphi Pension Plans, including their potential impact on PBGC, plan participants and estimates of benefit reductions resulting from large unfunded benefits that exceeded PBGC's statutory guarantee limits. In February 2009 and again in June 2009, PBGC provided estimates of the unfunded status of the Delphi

Pension Plans to the Auto Task Force. Those estimates also showed large unfunded pension benefits that exceeded the legal guarantee limits.

Following termination and trusteeship of the Delphi Pension Plans, PBGC provided its Board with additional information on estimated benefit reductions for retired Delphi Pension Plan participants. Specifically, in advance of a February 23, 2010 meeting of PBGC's Board, PBGC sent a memorandum to the PBGC Board that included estimates of the number of Delphi Pension Plan participants that would have their benefits reduced to the guarantee limit. PBGC began notifying participants of these estimated reductions by letters sent January through March 2010.

2. **In what manner did PBGC notify parties about the cuts to the Delphi Salaried Retiree pension plans?**

Answer: See Answer to Question 1.

3. **Does the Treasury Department acknowledge that they knew about the Delphi Salaried Retiree pension cuts prior to final administrative action from PBGC to implement any cuts to those pensions?**

Answer: This question is directed to the Treasury Department. As noted in the Answer to Question 1, PBGC kept the PBGC Board periodically informed of matters involving Delphi Pension Plans, including their potential impact on PBGC, plan participants and estimates of benefit reductions resulting from large unfunded benefits that exceeded the guarantee limits under ERISA. In addition, PBGC provided estimates of the unfunded status of the Delphi Pension Plans to the Auto Task Force in February 2009 and again in June 2009.

4. **With what frequency did these discussions occur, and at what level?**

Answer: See Answer to Question 1.

5. **Did the Treasury Department initiate the discussions with the PBGC regarding the Delphi Salaried Pension plans?**

Answer: No. Neither the Treasury Department nor the Auto Task Force had a role in authorizing, approving or consenting to the termination of the Delphi Salaried Plan. See Also Answer to Question 7.

6. **Is the Treasury Department consulted in PBGC pension fund plan settlement negotiations?**

Answer: This question is directed to the Treasury Department. PBGC notes that attorneys for the Auto Task Force participated along with PBGC, GM, Delphi, and Delphi's debtor-in-possession lenders in telephone conferences during which the terms of the PBGC settlements were negotiated.

7. **Did the Treasury Department authorize, approve, or consent to the PBGC terminating the Delphi Salaried workers pension plans?**

Answer: No. PBGC made the decision to initiate termination of the Delphi Pension Plans. The Treasury Department played no role in that decision.

8. **Does the Treasury Department deny it had the authority to disapprove of the cuts to the Delphi Salaried Retiree pension plans?**

Answer: This question is directed to the Treasury Department. See Answers to Questions 7, 9, 14, and 15.

9. **What authority does the PBGC have to prevent the cuts to the Delphi Salaried Retiree pension plans?**

Answer: The pension benefit guarantee limits were established by Congress and are set forth in Title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and implementing regulations. PBGC may not legally pay benefits above those limits. See 29 U.S.C. § 1322 and 29 C.F.R. Part 4022. See also Answer to Question 15.

10. **In the discourse between the Treasury, the PBGC and any other parties, what role did the Treasury Department play in the decision to terminate the pension plan of the Delphi Salaried workers?**

Answer: The Treasury Department played no role in that decision. PBGC made the decision to initiate termination of the Delphi Pension Plans.

11. **What was the position of the Treasury Department in any of those discussions and the reasoning behind any decision to force only the Delphi Salaried workers to undergo substantial cuts in their pensions?**

Answer: This question is directed to the Treasury Department. However, as described above, benefit reductions are not discretionary as the guarantee limits were established by Congress and implementing regulations. The PBGC Board had no involvement in the process of reducing benefits.

12. **It was decided that certain hourly retirees and other union workers whose pensions were cut by the PBGC would have those pensions "topped-up" by the new GM. What role did the Treasury Department have in that decision?**

Answer: This question is directed to the Treasury Department. In 2009, in connection with the bankruptcy proceedings of General Motors Corporation ("Old GM"), General Motors Co. ("New GM") assumed certain commitments into which Old GM had entered, including the top-up agreements with three unions entered into in 1999 and extended in 2007. Those agreements provided that, in the event that benefits under the Delphi Hourly Plan were frozen or the plan was terminated, Old GM would cover any shortfall below

the level of benefits promised. Old GM did not enter top-up agreements with any other unions, nor did it enter into an agreement with participants in the Delphi Salaried Plan.

13. **How much is the "topping-up" costing New GM?**

Answer: This question is directed to New GM.

14. **The Secretary of the Treasury sits as one of three board members of the PBGC. Did the Secretary of the Treasury take any action to prevent the cuts to the Delphi Salaried Retiree pension plans?**

Answer: The Treasury Secretary had no role in authorizing, approving or consenting to the termination of the Delphi Salaried Plan, or in determining the level of benefit reductions applied to those plans. As provided in section 4002 of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1302, members of the PBGC Board set policy for PBGC. The Board is not involved in day-to-day operations and, specifically, is not involved in decisions on individual cases.

15. **The Secretary of the Treasury sits as one of three board members of the PBGC. Did the Secretary affirmatively consent and/or approve of cuts to the Delphi Salaried Retiree pension plans?**

Answer: The estimated reductions to Delphi participants' benefits resulted from statutory limits on the amount of benefits that PBGC may guarantee and PBGC's long-standing regulations implementing these limits, which were promulgated pursuant to notice and comment procedures. See 29 U.S.C. § 1322, and 29 C.F.R. Part 4022. Neither the Treasury Secretary nor the Board had any involvement in the process of reducing benefits or effecting PBGC's implementation of the guarantee limits.

16. **The Secretary of the Treasury sits as one of three board members of the PBGC. Why did the Secretary not exercise any authority to prevent the cuts to the Delphi Salaried retiree pension plans?**

Answer: See Answer to Question 15.

17. **Did the PBGC vote on the cuts to these plans, and what was the Treasury Secretary's vote?**

Answer: No. The PBGC Board does not vote on benefit reductions. As noted above, reductions are calculated in accordance with the statute and regulations cited in the Answer to Question 9. As a result, the PBGC Board is not involved in this process. See also Answers to Questions 1, 8, 11, 15, and 19.

18. **The Secretary of the Treasury sits as one of three PBGC board members. What does PBGC see as the Secretary's responsibilities to the PBGC as a board member?**

Answer: As noted above, the Treasury Secretary serves as a member of the PBGC Board, along with the Secretaries of the Department of Labor (as Chairman) and the Department of Commerce. ERISA provides for the PBGC Board to set policy for PBGC and for the PBGC Director to administer the agency subject to such policy. PBGC's bylaws, published at 29 CFR Part 4002, set forth the roles and responsibilities of the members of the PBGC Board. These include approval of regulations, review and approval of the investment policy, approval of the annual management report and ERISA-required reports, approval of any policy matter that would have a significant impact on the pension insurance program or its stakeholders, and review of inspector general reports to the Board of Directors. As noted in our Answer to Question14, the Board of Directors is not involved in day-to-day operations and, specifically, is not involved in decisions on individual cases.

19. **Please describe the actual conflicts and potential conflicts between the Secretary's duties as a PBGC board member and the Treasury Department's duties as the majority owner of New GM?**

Answer: We are not aware of any conflicts. As reported by GAO, to the extent interested parties may perceive tension between these roles:

> "Treasury established a protective barrier between the Treasury officials (beneath the Secretary level) who make policy-related decisions with respect to investments in the automakers and the Treasury officials who are responsible for regulating pensions and overseeing the PBGC. In theory, this barrier prevents Treasury in its role as owner from interacting with Treasury in its role as pension regulator or overseers of PBGC. Treasury officials stated that, in the management of its investment in GM and Chrysler, the Treasury auto team does not communicate with the IRS or PBGC."[1]

20. **How does the Secretary prevent conflicts between those two roles?**

Answer: See Answer to Question 19.

---

[1] Troubled Asset Relief Program, GAO 10-492 (April 2010).

21. **After the Treasury Department's increased involvement in General Motor's operations, General Motors seemed to reverse its position with respect to assuming the obligations of Delphi's pension plan for salaried workers. Please describe the role of PBGC in that decision?**

Answer: General Motors consistently maintained that it would not assume the Delphi Salaried Plan. PBGC had no role in that decision.

22. **Please provide and describe any communications between PBGC and all other relevant parties, including, but not limited to GM, new GM, Treasury, and the Auto Task Force, with respect to General Motors' position of assuming the obligations of Delphi's pension plan for salaried workers.**

Answer: On January 30, 2009, PBGC met with Delphi executives and representatives at their request. At that meeting, Delphi expressed its hope that it could persuade GM to assume the Delphi Salaried Plan. PBGC asked to be kept informed of any proposal from GM. Neither Delphi nor GM ever advised PBGC of any such proposal. Though Delphi continued to state its hope of GM assumption publicly through the spring of 2009, no one from Old GM, the Treasury Department, or the Auto Task Force ever communicated to PBGC that GM had any intention of assuming the Delphi Salaried Plan.

23. **By the time the PBGC initiated termination proceedings against Delphi's pension plans, the PBGC held approximately $200 million in liens against Delphi foreign assets, and estimated that there were approximately $2.4 billion in Delphi foreign assets that the PBGC could potentially assert liens against. The PBGC ultimately released these liens as part of settlement agreements with New GM and Delphi, in exchange for payments by New GM which did not include Delphi Salaried Retirees pension plans. What role did PBGC play in approving and/or crafting this settlement?**

Answer: When the Delphi Salaried Plan was terminated, PBGC had perfected $195.9 million in liens for the benefit of the Salaried Plan due to Delphi's failure to make statutorily required minimum funding contributions. That was the largest lien amount that PBGC could assert under law, because a secured interest exists only to the extent there is a debt. PBGC participated in extended negotiations over the terms of the settlement of its liens and claims against Delphi and its bankrupt domestic and non-bankrupt foreign subsidiaries during the weeks preceding the signing of the agreements. PBGC approved the agreements and signed them as a party. In negotiating the settlement, PBGC sought to protect its economic interests and obtain the best outcome for the pension insurance program and its stakeholders, including the participants in the terminating Delphi Pension Plans. In fact, the amount of PBGC's total recoveries in the settlements greatly exceeded the amount of the Delphi Salaried Plan liens; therefore, those liens have been effectively paid off and the Delphi Salaried Plan assets were increased by $195.9 million as a result of the settlements.

24. **When did PBGC make the Department of Treasury aware of its belief that there were $2.4 billion in foreign Delphi assets upon which the PBGC could assert liens?**

Answer: PBGC did not discuss its assessment of the value of Delphi's foreign assets with the Treasury Department. The fact that as of June 15, 2009, PBGC had perfected $195.9 million in liens on behalf of the Delphi Salaried Plan was publicly available from PBGC lien filings with the D.C. Recorder of Deeds. The $195.9 million represented the full amount of the liens that PBGC could assert under law on behalf of the Delphi Salaried Plan at the time of its termination.

25. **Had the PBGC refused to remove the liens, would the Treasury Department have been willing to permit New GM to assume sponsorship of the Salaried pension plan?**

Answer: This question is directed to the Treasury Department. See Answer to Question 22.

26. **Did the Treasury Department (or the Auto Task Force) take part in negotiations with the PBGC in an attempt to have the PBGC release its liens against Delphi Assets? And in what manner?**

Answer: This question is directed to the Treasury Department. PBGC notes that attorneys for the Auto Task Force participated along with PBGC, GM, Delphi, and Delphi's debtor-in-possession lenders in telephone conferences during which the terms of the PBGC settlements were negotiated.

27. **When the Treasury Department communicated with the PBGC regarding the negotiation of a settlement agreement and the release of the PBGC's liens, did the Treasury Department take any measures to ensure that the PBGC would not give undue weight to the negotiation position of GM and/or the Treasury Department due to political considerations?**

Answer: This question is directed to the Treasury Department. See Answers to Questions 23 and 24.

28. **Salaried Delphi retirees have made requests under the Freedom of Information Act to PBGC regarding their involvement in the termination of the Salaried pension plan. These requests have so far been ignored. Can you explain why PBGC has refused to comply with these requests?**

Answer: PBGC has responded to each FOIA request made on behalf of the Delphi Salaried Retirees Association (DSRA) by DSRA's counsel and has produced over 8,000 pages of records. Attached hereto is a chart of each document production, which includes documents produced to this Committee as well. PBGC has withheld some documents under FOIA exemptions, including Exemption 6 protecting the personal privacy of

participants, and Exemption 5, which protects from disclosure documents that would not be producible in litigation.

29. **The United Auto Workers has stated that Delphi Salaried Retirees should be treated with "fairness and equity." Additionally, the UAW stated in a letter dated January 15, 2010 that it supports providing the same "top-ups" to the Salaried workers as a matter of "fairness and equity" that were provided to the other Delphi workers. Does PBGC agree?**

Answer: PBGC treats all pension participants fairly and equitably in accordance with applicable law. PBGC is not a party to the "top-up" agreements between GM and its unions.

30. **Please provide and describe PBGC's plan for restoring Delphi salaried retirees' pensions and benefits.**

Answer: Under 29 U.S.C. § 1347, Congress gave PBGC the power to restore a pension plan terminated under 29 U.S.C. § 1341 or § 1342 to its pre-termination status if the Agency determines such action would be appropriate and consistent with its duties under Title IV of ERISA.

Prior to termination, the Delphi Salaried Plan was sponsored by Delphi. Post bankruptcy, Delphi is a liquidating entity known as DPH Holdings Corp. PBGC therefore cannot restore the Delphi Salaried Plan to its pre-termination status; DPH Holdings Corp. is in no position to reassume responsibility for operating and funding the Salaried Plan.

Sincerely,



Vincent K. Snowbarger
Deputy Director for Operations

Attachment

FOIA Disclosures to Miller Chevalier for DSRA, and Congress

FOIA Case Number	Requester	Received Date	Response Date	Number of Pages	Complete Date	Released Document Type	Requested Records Description
2009-4392	Miller & Chevalier (DSRA)	9/24/09	10/16/09	5,037	10/16/09	Administrative Record	Administrative Record
2009-4451	Miller & Chevalier (DSRA)	9/28/09	11/10/09	0	11/10/09	Responsive records contained plan participant data. Information wittheld in its entirety under (b)(6)	Documents not included in the administrative Record
2010-0179	Miller & Chevalier (DSRA)	10/20/09	Multiple Releases:	Total: 1,030	4/9/10	Email discussing the GM/PBGC Waiver and Release Agreement & Delphi/PBGC Settlement Agreement (reviewed over 10, 000 pages)	Correspondence to and from PBG discussing the GM/PBGC Waiver and Release Agreement & Delphi/PBGC Settlement Agreement
			1/18/10	232			
			1/28/10	378			
			4/9/10	420			
2010-3821	Miller & Chevalier (DSRA)	6/30/10	Multiple Releases:	Total: 4,085	11/4/10	Actuarial and financial Information; PBGC memorandums; email correspondence; Delphi evaluation reports; Liens information	Actuarial and financial Information; PBGC memorandums; email correspondence; Delphi evaluation reports; Liens information
			7/28/10	420			
			8/24/10	1,610			
			9/22/10	1,202			
			11/4/10	853			
2011-1101	Miller & Chevalier (DSRA)	12/8/10	1st partial: 01/31/2011	876	2/23/11	Liens filed by OCC in connection with the Delphi salaried plan, recommendation, calculation, and email communications concerning the liens	Liens filed by OCC in connection with the Delphi salaried plan, recommendation, calculation, and email communications concerning the liens
			2nd & Final: 02/23/2011				
2011-1102	Miller & Chevalier (DSRA)	12/8/10	1st partial 01/31/2011	Provided a CD containing 2,480 pages	4/14/11	PBGC Operation Manual for various departments	PBGC Operation Manual for various departments
			2nd partial 02/23/2011	311 pages			
			Final 4/14/2011	0			
2011-0690	Congressional: Commitee On Oversight & Government Reform	11/23/10	1st partial: 02/23/2010	Total: 5,712	12/8/10	communications between PBGC and Delphi, GM, Treasury/Auto Task Force, United Auto Workers and any other public official (all internal communications were excluded) for the time period of November 1, 2008 and November 1, 2009	communications between PBGC and Delphi, GM, Treasury/Auto Task Force, United Auto Workers and any other public official (all internal communications were excluded) for the time period of November 1, 2008 and November 1, 2009 .
			2nd & Final: 04/01/2010				