**Montgomery, Pamela**

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Paul Mast ▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓> |
| **Sent:** | Tuesday, March 25, 2008 4:26 PM |
| **To:** | Montgomery, Pamela |
| **Subject:** | Re: Paul Mast Pension Adjustment |

Hello Pamela,

I intentionally delayed replying to your last letter, so that I could answer it in a non-passionate manner.
This has been going on for between four and five years now. Two of your predecessors have delayed it until they were no longer in the office.

You state that since my case is one of a kind, that it is extremely complicated. That is just not true. It is no more complicated than it would be if the calculation were done for the over a thousand of the retired judges who are entitled to have the calculation done.

You should keep in mind that at the time of my settlement with your office, back in 1995, it was recognized by your office that over a thousand retired judges were entitled to the benefits that I was claiming. I agreed with your office, which was not a moral thing for me to do nor was it a moral thing for your office to propose, that our settlement would remain confidential. A "secrecy agreement". I have lived up to this. During this time, virtually all the affected retired judges probably have died. Virtually all of them would be 90 years of age at this time, if still living. The money is still owed, if not to them, to their heirs.
Although the actions of your office has probably relieved me of any obligation on the confidentiality agreement, I am not a crusader, and I do not intend to do anything about it. I am not threatening any thing, merely trying to put things in context, as there is a feeling I get that you feel that I am getting something that I am not entitled to. What is the truth is that I am receiving only what I am entitled to, and it is others who have been deprived of what they rightfully are entitled to.

In regard to your auditors, it is a simple thing t read the law and see what COLA is stated, and further, all the COLA's are easily accessed on the internet. It does not take time.

In addition to this, we have been through this all before, and finally got down to this merely being a calculation of whether my figures used the January COLA numbers, which your office insisted on for years, or the September COLA which is what the law states. Either way it is a very minor difference, as whatever differences there might be have averaged themselves out over the past years, and any resulting difference would not be enough for either of us to care about.

I am not an irascible person, but your office, in delaying this for so many years, and accruing a debt to me of $20,000 to $40,000 has been completely unreasonable. I do not know the exact amount, as I have not refigured this since I sent you the correct figures one and a half years ago. One and a half years is more than enough time for your office to have met your obligations. Please do so immediately.

If this is not yet finished, please share this email with your auditor and ask her/him to contact me.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.


On Mar 10, 2008, at 2:57 PM, Montgomery, Pamela wrote:

> Dear Judge Mast,
>
> Our Actuarial Office is reviewing your case. As I explained
> previously, your case is one of kind and for that reason, extremely
> complicated.
> Our Actuary has already spent hours just trying to confirm the
> appropriate cost of living index that would have applied to Judges had
> the Cory versus Olson case not existed. Again, I am sorry for the
> length of time it has taken, but we have not been able to confirm that
> you have been underpaid as you claim. I will let you know as soon as

1

> I receive any information from our Actuarial Office that will help us
> with a resolution in this matter.
>
> Sincerely,
>
>
> Pamela Montgomery, Manager
> Judges' Retirement System
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Paul Mast [mailto:███████████████]
> Sent: Monday, March 10, 2008 11:46 AM
> To: Montgomery, Pamela
> Subject: Paul Mast Pension Adjustment
>
>
> Hi Pamela,
>
> Please answer my former emails or give me someone in your office who
> is working on this that I can call.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Paul Mast
>
>

2