

STATE OF WISCONSIN

RETIREMENT RESEARCH COMMITTEE

STAFF REPORT NO. 82

**DR. H. RUPERT THEOBALD
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE
REFERENCE BUREAU
100 N HAMILTON
P.O BOX 2037
MADISON WI 53701-2037**

1996 COMPARATIVE STUDY OF

MAJOR PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

**DR. H. RUPERT THEOBALD
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE
REFERENCE BUREAU
100 N HAMILTON
P.O BOX 2037
MADISON WI 53701-2037**

RECEIVED

MAR 17 1997

**LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU
STATE DOCUMENTS**

Prepared by RRC Staff
Blair Testin, Consultant
December, 1996

Retirement Research Committee
Room 316 - 110 E. Main Street
Madison, WI 53703
(608) 267-0507

RRC
Room 316
110 E. Main Street
Madison, WI 53703
608/267-0507

STATE OF WISCONSIN

12/17/96

RETIREMENT RESEARCH COMMITTEE

MEMBERSHIP ROSTER

Term Expires

LEGISLATIVE MEMBERS (6)

**Senator Richard Grobschmidt, Senate Co-Chair;
1513 Mackinac Avenue; South Milwaukee, WI 53172 1/1/99

**Representative Judith Klusman, Assembly Co-Chair;
7544 Green Meadow Road; Oshkosh, WI 54904 1/1/99

**Senator Joseph Andrea, Senate Vice-Chair;
2405-45th Street; Kenosha, WI 53140 1/1/99

**Representative Timothy Hoven, Assembly Vice-Chair;
111 N. Milwaukee Street; Port Washington, WI 53074 1/1/99

**Senator Timothy Weeden
1821 Sherwood Drive, S.W.; Beloit, WI 53511 1/1/99

**Representative Robert Wirch
3007 Springbrook Road; Kenosha, WI 53142 1/1/99

TAXPAYER REPRESENTATIVES (4)

***Ms. Susan J. Fisher, 8644 Glencoe Circle, Wauwatosa, WI 53226 7/1/95

*VACANCY

*Mr. Michael Mesenbourg; 5900 N. Port Washington Rd.; Milwaukee, WI 53217 7/1/95

*Mr. Earl A. Lieberg, 3608 Pine Place Rd.; Eau Claire, WI 54701 7/1/97

EMPLOYER REPRESENTATIVE

*Mayor Dolores Meyer; 612 East Perkins St.; Medford, WI 54451 7/1/95

STATE EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVE

*Mr. Timothy J. Pelzek; 6332 West Manitoba St.; Milwaukee, WI 53219 7/1/97

TEACHER REPRESENTATIVE NOT FROM MILWAUKEE

*Mr. Ronald Jordi; 2149 County Z; Friendship, WI 53934 7/1/97

TEACHER REPRESENTATIVE FROM MILWAUKEE

*Ms. Alice Olson; 4978 West Goodrich Lane; Brown Deer, WI 53223 7/1/95

ANNUITANT REPRESENTATIVE

#Mr. Otto Schultz; 96 Kessel Court, Apt. 25, Madison, WI 53711 5/1/99

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL APPOINTED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

**Attorney Jane Hamblen; 123 W. Washington Ave., Madison, WI 53703

EXPERIENCED ACTUARY APPOINTED BY THE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER

**Mr. David Heineck; 121 E. Wilson Street; Madison, WI 53703

SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYEE TRUST FUNDS, OR DESIGNEE

**Mr. David Stella, 201 E. Washington Ave.; Madison, WI 53703

SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS, OR DESIGNEE

Ms. Jessica O'Donnell, 137 E. Wilson Street; Madison, WI 53703

*Appointed by the Governor #Elected by Annuityants
**Member of the Joint Survey Committee on Retirement Systems (JSCRS)

STATE OF WISCONSIN
RETIREMENT RESEARCH COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT NO. 82
1996 COMPARATIVE STUDY OF
MAJOR PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>I. SURVEY OF STATEWIDE PERS</u>	
A. Pension System Descriptions	Pages 1 & 2
B. Pension Plan Charts	Pages 3 & 4
<u>II. NORMAL AND EARLY RETIREMENT PROVISIONS</u>	
A. Age and Service Requirements	Pages 5 & 6
B. Pension Plan Charts	Pages 7 & 8
<u>III. VESTING AND CONTRIBUTION RATES</u>	
A. Provision Descriptions	Pages 9 & 10
B. Pension Plan Charts	Pages 11 & 12
<u>IV. RETIREMENT BENEFIT CALCULATIONS</u>	
A. Calculation Provisions	Pages 13 & 14
B. Pension Plan Charts	Pages 15 & 16
<u>V. POST-RETIREMENT ADJUSTMENTS & BENEFIT TAXES</u>	
A. COLA's and State Taxes	Pages 17 & 18
B. Pension Plan Charts	Pages 19 & 20
<u>VI. ACTUARIAL AND ACCOUNTING INFORMATION</u>	
A. Information Descriptions	Pages 21 & 22
B. Pension Plan Charts	Pages 23 & 24

I. SURVEY OF STATEWIDE PERS

A. Pension System Descriptions

Survey. Every two years since 1982, the Wisconsin Retirement Research Committee (RRC) has compared major statewide public employee retirement systems (PERS) across the country with public pension plans in Wisconsin. These surveys have emphasized retirement programs for general employees and teachers. The Wisconsin plans included in the studies are the statewide WRS and two other plans administered under homerule -- the Milwaukee City ERS and the Milwaukee County ERS.

The 1996 comparative study includes 85 public pension plans, which are the same systems that are found in previous studies since 1982. Although this study does not include all major public pension plans, it does include one or more statewide PERS from each state. Also, because the same pension plans are always included, the biennial studies may reflect trends in the public pension sector as they occur over time.

Data. The Wisconsin RRC files on major PERS across the country include annual reports, employee handbooks, statutes, actuarial reports, etc. For most of the PERS in the 1996 study, information is current through 1995. Data in this report may also reflect other sources of information published by the Public Pension Coordinating Council, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the American Association of Retired Persons, etc.

Coverage. The types of employees covered by the PERS in this study are designated on Chart I found on pages 3 and 4 of this report as "S"=state; "L"-local; and "T"=teachers. The 85 PERS surveyed reflect the following:

<u>Employee Coverage</u>	<u>Fund</u>	<u>Employee Coverage</u>	<u>Fund</u>
State Employees Only	11 funds	State and Local	16 funds
Teachers Only	27 funds	State and Teacher	3 funds
Local employees Only	8 funds	State, Local & Tchr.	20 funds

Participation. The 85 PERS in the 1996 study provide pension coverage for 10.1 million active employees and 3.8 million retirees, for a total of 13.9+ million participants. This total is 5% greater than the 13.3 million active and retired participants noted in the 1994 study. The active participants have grown between the 1994 and the 1996 studies by 3.1%, while the retirees have grown by 8.8% in the same time period.

Chart I also shows the ratio of actives to retirees for the 85 systems surveyed. For 70% of the systems, the ratio of actives to retired declined over the two-year period. The average ratio of all systems was 2.89 in the 1996 survey. Eight of the systems (including Milwaukee City and County) have an active to retiree ratio of less than two.

Systems Size. The systems in the 1996 study range in size from the Milwaukee County Plan with 5,854 actives to Texas's TRS with 625,878 active participants. The sizes of the systems are reflected in the following tables for the last three surveys.

<u>Active Employees</u>	<u>1992 Survey</u>	<u>1994 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
Less than 50,000	30 funds	28 funds	26 funds
50,000 - 100,000	21 funds	23 funds	25 funds
100,000 - 150,000	17 funds	15 funds	13 funds
150,000 - 200,000	5 funds	7 funds	9 funds
Over 200,000	12 funds	12 funds	12 funds

Social Security. Coverage under the federal OASDHI program was once elective for public employers, but it is now frozen for those employers who had elected such coverage. Of the 85 PERS included in the 1994 study, social security coverage is also provided for participants of 68 of the systems. Of the 17 systems which do not provide social security coverage, ten represent pension plans covering teachers only. The 17 PERS in this study without social security coverage include 2.0 million active employees, or 19.7% of the total actives in this survey.

Integration. "Integration" relates to the explicit recognition of social security coverage in the design of private and public pension plans. While integration is common in the private sector, it is unusual in public pension plans. Of the 68 PERS with social security in the RRC studies for 1990 and 1996, the degree and type of integration is as follows:

	<u>1990 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
No integration	56 funds	60 funds
Step-Up formula	6 funds	5 funds
Formula offset	4 funds	2 funds
Combined maximum	<u>2 funds</u>	<u>1 fund</u>
TOTALS	68 funds	68 funds

Step-up formulas reflect different multipliers or contribution rates applied to varying salary levels. Formula offsets provide in the benefit calculation for an offset recognizing part of the primary social security benefit. One plan provides a maximum on benefits including both the primary social security and pension plan benefit.

Trends. Chart I reflects a continued growth in the total number of participants in the PERS surveyed by about 5% every two years. Nearly all plans had a growth in number of retirees, and 68% of the plans had a growth in active participants. However, the number of retirees is growing at a faster percentage than active employees, and this is reflected in declining ratios of active to retired participants for the majority of PERS surveyed.

Because social security has been frozen by federal law, there is no change in the social security coverage for the PERS in the RRC studies. However, the explicit recognition of social security in the design of PERS benefits appears to be gradually declining over time.

CHART I-1996
PUBLIC RETIREMENT SYSTEMS SURVEY

<u>State</u>	<u>Fund Name</u>	<u>Employee Coverage</u>	<u>Number Actives</u>	<u>Number Annuitants</u>	<u>Ratio of Act./Annt.</u>	<u>S.S. Cover.</u>	<u>S.S. Integrat</u>
1. Alab.	ERS	S,L	72,600+	20,713+	3.50-	Yes	None
2. Alab.	TRS	T	120,334+	34,650+	3.47-	Yes	None
3. Alas.	PERS*	S,L	31,450+	10,173+	3.09-	No	-
4. Alas.	TRS*	T	9,452-	4,459+	2.12-	No	-
5. Ariz.	SRS	S,L,T	159,572+	45,975+	3.47-	Yes	None
6. Arka.	PERS	S,L	42,510+	12,073+	3.52+	Yes	None
7. Arka.	TRS*	T	58,876+	13,206+	4.46-	Yes	None
8. Calif.	PERS*	S,L	619,088+	337,750+	1.83-	Yes	FAS Off.
9. Calif.	TRS	T	327,513+	146,805+	2.23-	No	-
10. Colo.	PERA	S,L,T	144,420+	44,040+	3.28-	No	-
11. Conn.	SERS*	S	55,973+	27,570+	2.03	Yes	Step-Up
12. Conn.	TRS	T	42,395+	17,987+	2.35+	No	-
13. Dela.	SEPP	S,T	29,409+	13,511+	2.18+	Yes	Maximum
14. Flor.	FRS	S,L,T	586,625+	140,737+	4.17-	Yes	None
15. Geor.	ERS	S	73,298+	18,901+	3.88	Yes	None
16. Geor.	TRS	T	170,493+	35,714+	4.77	Yes	None
17. Hawaii	ERS*	S,L,T	56,985+	26,926+	2.12-	Yes	None
18. Idaho	PERS	S,L,T	55,811+	19,272+	2.90+	Yes	None
19. Ill.	SERS	S	79,212+	39,232+	2.02+	Yes	None
20. Ill.	TRS	T	121,974-	59,611+	2.05-	No	-
21. Ill.	MRF*	L	133,733+	62,742+	2.13-	Yes	None
22. Ind.	PERF	S,L	136,034+	37,802+	3.60	Yes	None
23. Ind.	TRF	T	84,915+	29,364+	2.89+	Yes	None
24. Iowa	PERS	S,L,T	147,431+	57,954+	2.54+	Yes	None
25. Kans.	PERS	S,L,T	134,565+	48,572+	2.77-	Yes	None
26. Kent.	ERS*	S,L	120,853+	35,750+	3.38-	Yes	None
27. Kent.	TRS	T	55,281+	23,934+	2.31-	No	-
28. Louis.	SERS	S	68,463+	25,287+	2.64	No	-
29. Louis.	TRS	T	84,671-	38,714+	2.19-	No	-
30. Maine	SRS	S,L,T	38,790-	18,256+	2.13-	No	-
31. Mary.	SRS*	S,L,T	168,666+	64,594+	2.61-	Yes	Step-Up
32. Mass.	SERS	S	82,992+	43,623-	1.90+	No	-
33. Mass.	TRS	T	62,992+	26,156+	2.41	No	-
34. Mich.	SERS	S	65,133+	30,562+	2.13-	Yes	None
35. Mich.	MERS*	L	34,589+	12,001+	2.88	Yes	None
36. Mich.	PSERS	T	294,911-	103,151+	2.86-	Yes	None
37. Minn.	MSRS*	S	49,705+	16,141+	3.08-	Yes	None
38. Minn.	PERA*	L	126,612+	37,706+	3.36+	Yes	None
39. Minn.	TRA*	T	68,490+	24,307+	2.82-	Yes	None
40. Miss.	PERS	S,L,T	144,003+	43,242+	3.33-	Yes	None
41. Mou.	SERS	S	51,837+	15,362+	3.37-	Yes	None
42. Mou.	LAGERS*	L	23,000+	7,041+	3.27-	Yes	None
43. Mou.	PSRS	T	62,854+	21,394+	2.94+	No	-
44. Mont.	PERS	S,L	27,895+	12,344+	2.26-	Yes	None
45. Mont.	TRS	T	18,062+	7,736+	2.34-	Yes	None

(Coverage: S - State; L - Local; T - Teachers)

(Fund Name* = more than one plan or tier)

("+" or "-" = higher or lower than 1994 Report)

CHART I - 1996
PUBLIC RETIREMENT SYSTEMS SURVEYED

<u>State</u>	<u>Fund Name</u>	<u>Employee Coverage</u>	<u>Number Actives</u>	<u>Number Annuitants</u>	<u>Ratio of Act./Annt.</u>	<u>S.S. Cover.</u>	<u>S.S. Integration</u>
46. Nebra.	SERS*	S,L	18,644+	4,201+	4.44	Yes	Step-Up
47. Nebra.	TRS	T, Sch.	33,318+	8,248+	4.04-	Yes	None
48. Nevada	PERS*	S,L,T	68,115+	17,583+	3.87-	No	-
49. N.H.	NHRS	S,L,T	39,679+	12,153+	3.27-	Yes	Age Offset
50. N.J.	PERS*	S,L	274,510+	86,014+	3.19-	Yes	None
51. N.J.	TRS*	T	117,399+	42,534+	2.76-	Yes	None
52. N.M.	PERA*	S,L	50,470+	13,185+	3.83+	Yes	None
53. N.M.	ERA	T	54,480+	16,593+	3.28-	Yes	None
54. N.Y.	ERS*	S,L	553,649+	274,330+	2.02+	Yes	None
55. N.Y.	TRS*	T	199,398+	82,459+	2.42-	Yes	None
56. N.C.	TSERS	S,T	249,080+	81,143+	3.07-	Yes	None
57. N.C.	LGERS	L	95,885+	21,331+	4.50-	Yes	None
58. N.D.	PERS	S,L	15,478+	3,443+	4.50-	Yes	None
59. N.D.	TRF	T	9,663-	4,433+	2.18-	Yes	None
60. Ohio	PERS	S,L	343,477-	116,001+	2.96-	No	-
61. Ohio	STRS	T	166,623+	83,136+	2.00-	No	-
62. Okla.	PERS	S,L	44,125-	17,743+	2.49-	Yes	None
63. Okla.	TRS	T	78,942+	29,984+	2.63-	Yes	None
64. Oreg.	PERS	S,L,T	142,895+	64,996+	2.20-	Yes	None
65. Penns.	SERS	S	112,637+	81,204+	1.39	Yes	None
66. Penns.	PSERS	T	210,783+	115,960+	1.82+	Yes	None
67. R.I.	ERS	S,T	25,629-	13,660+	1.88-	Yes	None
68. S.C.	SCRS*	S,L,T	175,410+	52,076+	3.37-	Yes	None
69. S.D.	SRS	S,L,T	33,390+	12,436+	2.68-	Yes	None
70. Tenn.	CRS	S,L,T	175,584+	61,992+	2.83-	Yes	Step-Up
71. Texas	ERS	S	160,279+	35,864+	4.47-	Yes	None
72. Texas	TRS	T	625,878+	147,751+	4.24+	No	None
73. Texas	MRS*	L	75,754+	13,459+	5.63-	Yes	None
74. Utah	SRS*	S,L,T	85,095-	23,802+	3.58-	Yes	None
75. Verm.	SRS*	S	7,309-	2,978+	2.45-	Yes	None
76. Verm.	TRS*	T	10,185+	3,092+	3.29-	Yes	None
77. Virg.	SRS*	S,L,T	262,297+	78,100+	3.36-	Yes	Step-Up
78. Wash.	PERS	S,L	178,833+	54,097+	3.31-	Yes	None
79. Wash.	TRS	T	59,103+	26,466+	2.23-	Yes	None
80. W.V.	PERS	S,L	33,157+	16,324+	2.03+	Yes	None
81. W.V.	TRS*	T	43,464-	21,978-	1.98-	Yes	None
82. Wyom.	WRS*	S,L,T	31,804+	11,864+	2.68-	Yes	None
83. Milw.	City	L	14,003+	8,731+	1.60-	Yes	None
84. Milw.	County*	L	5,854-	6,870+	0.85-	Yes	None
85. Wis.	WRS	S,L,T	233,973+	88,998+	2.63	Yes	None
			Actives	Annuitants	Ratio		
1996 Totals: (85 Funds)=			10,120,817	3,770,252	2.89		

II. NORMAL AND EARLY RETIREMENT PROVISIONS

A. Age and Service Requirements

Normal Retirement. Nearly all of the PERS in this study are defined benefit plans in which the benefits are calculated by a formula and payable when the normal retirement requirements have been met. Most PERS require a minimum age and/or years of service in order to qualify for normal retirement -- i.e., benefits payable without actuarial discount. Actually, most PERS in this study have adopted multiple combinations of age and service that qualify for full benefits without actuarial discount. These requirements are reflected in Chart II found on pages 7 and 8 of this report.

Social Security Normal. The normal retirement age under social security is 65, but this age is scheduled to increase to 66 and 67 over time. All of the PERS in the 1996 study allow normal retirement at 65 or earlier with some minimum years of service. The three Minnesota PERS are the only plans in this study which provide that the normal retirement age shall keep pace with the social security normal retirement age as it gradually increases in the future to age 67 by 2027.

Age 62 Normal. Age 62 is the earliest age at which social security benefits are payable, but with a 20% actuarial discount reflecting the longer pay-out period. The 1996 survey reflects that 52 of the 85 systems permit normal retirement at 62 with 10 or less years of service. Actually, 76 of the PERS in this study permit normal retirement at age 62 or earlier, with long service, and only 9 systems are restricted to the age 65 normal retirement now found under social security. In fact, the most common normal retirement of the PERS in the 1996 study is age 60 with "N" years of service.

"X" Years and Out. Many public retirement systems have adopted "X years and out" provisions which allow participants to retire at any age (or a minimum age of 55) after "X" years of service. The most common provision is age 55 or earlier with 30 years of service. The number of plans with "X years and out" provisions has not changed substantially over the last six years, as noted in the following summary:

	<u>1990 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
35 years/55 or any age	8 plans	7 plans
30 years/55 or any age	35 plans	34 plans
28 years/55 or any age	2 plans	2 plans
27 years/55 or any age	1 plan	2 plans
25 years/55 or any age	9 plans	13 plans
20 years/55 or any age	<u>1 plan</u>	<u>1 plan</u>
TOTALS*	56 plans	59 plans

(*Some plans have more than one "X years and out" provision)

"Rule of Y". In addition to the "X years and out" provisions, some PERS in the study have adopted a "rule" which permits normal retirement when age plus years of service equals a specified number. The rule provisions have changed little over the last six years, as noted in the following summary.

	<u>1990 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
Rule of 92	1 plan	0 plan
Rule of 90	2 plans	4 plans
Rule of 88	0 plans	1 plan
Rule of 85	4 plans	3 plans
Rule of 80	2 plans	4 plans
Rule of 75	<u>1 plan</u>	<u>1 plan</u>
TOTAL	10 plans	13 plans

Early Retirement. Ninety percent of the PERS in the 1996 study permit retirement before the normal age and service requirements have been met, but subject to actuarial discount. The most common age for allowing early retirement is age 55 with some minimum service, followed by age 50. There has been little change in the last five comparative studies relative to early retirement. Eight systems do not provide early retirement presumably because their normal retirement are already at 55 or lower with long service.

Actuarial Discount. The actuarial discount applied for early retirement presumably compensates for some or all of the longer pay-out period. Some systems use a reduction table based upon age which reflects the "actuarial adjustment" that is required to compensate the system for the longer pay-out period. Most PERS, however, use a specified percent reduction for each year under normal.

The actuarial discount requirements have undergone little change over the last six years as noted in the following summary:

	<u>1990 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
- PERS using discount rates less than 3%	1 fund	0 funds
- PERS using discount rates of 3% to 5.9%	21 funds	20 funds
- PERS using discount rates of 6% or more	21 funds	18 funds
- PERS that vary discount rate on serv. or age	16 funds	18 funds
- PERS that use an actuarial discount table	14 funds	16 funds
- PERS that change formula multiplier by age	4 funds	4 funds
- PERS that are money purchase	1 fund	2 funds
- PERS that do not provide early retirement	7 funds	7 funds

Trends. The 1996 study indicates a stabilizing of the trend in the public sector to permit normal retirement at earlier ages -- particularly for career employees with long service. In the 1996 study, only 4 funds reduced their normal retirement provisions. This is less change than noted in prior surveys.

Several PERS in this study also initiated retirement incentive windows (W) of various designs and lengths during the two-year period. This presumably reflects efforts by state and local government to downsize their payrolls. The use of periodic windows may also reduce the pressure for permanent reductions in normal retirement requirements.

CHART II-1996
NORMAL AND EARLY RETIREMENT REQUIREMENTS

<u>State</u>	<u>Fund Name</u>	<u>EE Coverage</u>	<u>Normal Retirement Provisions (Age/Yrs.)</u>	<u>Early Retirement Provisions</u>	<u>Actuarial Discount</u>
1. Alab.	ERS	S,L	60/10; A/25	None	-
2. Alab.	TRS	T	60/10; A/25	None	-
3. Alas.	PERS	S,L	60/5; A/30	55/5	Act. Table
4. Alas.	TRS	T	60/8; A/20	55/8	Act. Table
5. Ariz.	SRS	S,L,T	65, 62/10; R-80	50/5	3%/5%
6. Arkan.	PERS	S,L	65/10; A/30	55/10	6% @ year
7. Arkan.	TRS	T	60/10; A/30	A/25	5% @ year
8. Calif.	PERS	S,L	60/5	50/5	Multiplier Varies
9. Calif.	TRS	T	60/5	55/5; 50/30	6%/3% @ year
10. Colo.	PERA	S,L,T	65/5; 60/20; 55/30; A/35	60/5; 55/20; 50/25	4% & 6%/4%
11. Conn.	SERS	S	62/10; 60/25; 70/5	55/10	3% @ year
12. Conn.	TRS	T	60/20; A/35	A/25; 55/20	6%/4% @ year
13. Dela.	SEPP	S,T	62/5; 60/15; A/30	55/15; A/25	4.8% @ year
14. Flor.	FRS	S,L,T	62/10; A/30	A/10	5% @ year
15. Geor.	ERS	S	65/10; A/30	60/10	5% @ year
16. Geor.	TRS	T	60/10; A/30	55/25	7% @ year
17. Hawaii	ERS	S,L,T	62/10; 55/30	55/20	6% @ year
18. Idaho	ERS	S,L,T	65/5; R-90	55/5	3%/5.75%
19. Ill.	SERS	S	60/8; A/35 (W)	55/30	6% @ year
20. Ill.	TRS	T	62/5; 60/10; 55/35	55/20	6% @ year
21. Ill.	MRF	L	60/8; A/35 (W)	55/8	3% @ year
22. Ind.	PERF	S,L	65/10	50/15	1.2%/5% @ ye
23. Ind.	TRF	T	65/10; 60/15; R-85	50/15	1.2%/5% @ ye
24. Iowa	PERS	S,L,T	65/4; R-90; 62/30	55/4	3% @ year
25. Kans.	PERS	S,L,T	65, 62/10; R-85	55/10	2.4%/7.2% @ year
26. Kent.	ERS	S,L	65/4; A/27	55/5; A/25	5%/4% @ year
27. Kent.	TRS	T	60/5; A/27	55/5	5% @ year
28. Louis.	SERS	S	60/10; 55/25; A/30	50/10	Act. Table
29. Louis.	TRS	T	65/20; A/30; 55/25	60/10; A/20	Multiplier Varies
30. Maine	SRS	S,L,T	62/10	A/25; 60/10	6% @ year
31. Mary.	SRS	S,L,T	65/2 to 62/5; A/30 (W)	55/15	6% @ year
32. Mass.	SERS	S,L	65/10	55/10; A/20	Multiplier Varies
33. Mass.	TRS	T	65/10	55/10; A/20	Multiplier Varies
34. Mich.	SERS	S	60/10; 55/30; (W)	55/15	6% @ year
35. Mich.	MERS	L	60/10	55/15; 50/25	6% @ year
36. Mich.	PSERS	T	60/10; A/30	55/15	6% @ year
37. Minn.	MSRS	S	Soc. Sec. Normal	55/3	Act. Table
38. Minn.	PERS	L	Soc. Sec. Normal	55/3	3% @ year
39. Minn.	TRA	T	Soc. Sec. Normal	55/3	4%/5%
40. Miss.	PERA	S,L,T	60/4; A/25	None	-
41. Mou.	SERS	S	65/4; 60/15; R80	55/10	6% @ year
42. Mou.	LAGERS	L	60/5; R-80 option	55/5	6% @ year
43. Mou.	PSRS	T	60/5; A/30; 55/25	A/25; 55/5	Act. Table
44. Mont.	PERS	S,L	65/A; 60/5; A/30	50/5; A/25	Act. Table
45. Mont.	TRS	T	60/5; A/25	50/5	6%; 3.6% @ year

(W) = Temporary Retirement Incentive Window

(x/y) = Age/Service

CHART II-1996
NORMAL AND EARLY RETIREMENT REQUIREMENTS

<u>State</u>	<u>Fund Name</u>	<u>EE Coverage</u>	<u>Normal Retirement Provisions (Age/Years)</u>	<u>Early Retirement Provisions</u>	<u>Actuarial Discount</u>
46. Nebr.	SERS	S	65/A	55/5	Money Purchase
47. Nebr.	TRS	T, Sch	65/5; 60/R-90	60/5; A/35	3% @ year
48. Nevada	PERS	S,L,T	65/5; 60/10; A/30	A/5;	4% @ year
49. N.H.	NHRS	S,L,T	60/A	50/10; A/20; R-70	Vary by Service
50. N.J.	PERS	S,L	60/10; 55/25	A/25	3% @ year
51. N.J.	TRS	T	60/10; 55/25	A/25	-
52. N.M.	PERA	S,L	65/5 to 61/17; 60/20; A/25	None	2.4%/7.2% @ year
53. N.M.	ERA	T	65/5; A/25; 60/R75	R-70	6.67%/5%
54. N.Y.	ERS	S,L	62/10; 55/30	55/10	Act. Table
55. N.Y.	TRS	T	62/10; 55/30; 70/5	55/10	3% @ year
56. N.C.	TSERS	S,T	65/5; 60/25; A/30	60/5; 50/20	5%/3% @ year
57. N.C.	LGERS	L	65/5; 60/25; A/30	60/5; 50/20	6% @ year
58. N.D.	PERS	S,L	65/A; R-88	55/5	6% @ year
59. N.D.	TRF	T	65/5; R-85	55/5	Act. Table
60. Ohio	PERS	S,L	60/5; A/30; (W-option)	55/25	Act. Table
61. Ohio	STRS	T	65/5; A/30; (W-option)	55/25; 60/5	Act. Table
62. Okla.	PERS	S,L	62/6; R-90	55/10	Act. Table
63. Okla.	TRS	T	62/10; R-90	55/10; A/30	Act. Table
64. Oreg.	PERS	S,L,T	58/5; A/30	55/5	8% @ year
65. Penn.	SERS	S	60/3; A/35; (W)	A/10	Act. Table
66. Penn.	PSERS	T	62; 60/30; A/35; (W)	A/10; 55/25	3% @ year
67. R.I.	ERS	S,T	60/10; A/28	None	-
68. S.C.	SCRS	S,L,T	65/5; A/30	55/25; 60/5	5%/4% @ year
69. S.D.	SRS	S,L,T	65/5; R-85 if 55	55/5	3% @ year
70. Tenn.	CRS	S,L,T	60/5; A/30	A/25; 55/10	4.85% @ year
71. Texas	ERS	S	60/5; 55/25; 50/30	None	-
72. Texas	TRS	T	65/5; 60/20; 50/30	55/5; A/30	Act. Table
73. Texas	MRS	L	60/10; 50/25; A/28	None	-
74. Utah	SRS	S,L,T	65/4; A/30	A/25; 60/20; 62/10	3% @ year
75. Vert.	SRS	S	62/5; A/30	55/5	6% @ year
76. Vert.	TRS	T	62/10; A/30	55/10	6% @ year
77. Virg.	SRS	S,L,T	65/5; 55/30	55/5; 50/10	6%/4.8% @ year
78. Wash.	PERS	S,L	65/5	55/20	Act. Table
79. Wash.	TRS	T	65/5	55/20	Act. Table
80. W.V.	PERS	S,L	60/5; R-80 if 55	55/10; A/30	6% @ year
81. W.V.	TRS	T	55/12	-	Money Purchase
82. Wycm.	WRS	S,L,T	60/4; R-85	50/4	5% @ year
83. Milw.	City	L	60/4	55/15	Act. Table
84. Milw.	County	L	60/A; 55/30; R-75	55/15	5% @ year
85. Wis.	WRS	S,L,T	65; 57/30	55/5	Vary by Service

(W) = Temporary Retirement Incentive Window
(x/y) = Age/Service

III. VESTING AND CONTRIBUTION RATES**A. Provision Descriptions**

Vesting. The term "vesting" as used in this study relates to an employee's right, after satisfying some minimum service requirement, to receive a pension benefit regardless of whether the employe remains in covered employment. The vesting requirements for the PERS included in the 1996 study are found in Chart III on pages 11 and 12. The changes in requirements for vesting over a six-year period can be summarized as follows:

	<u>1990 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
Vesting immediate	0 plans	1 plan
Vesting after 3 years	3 plans	3 plans
Vesting after 4 years	5 plans	5 plans
Vesting after 5 years	35 plans	38 plans
Vesting after 8 years	3 plans	4 plans
Vesting after 10 years	35 plans	30 plans
Vesting after 20 years	1 plan	0 plans
Graded or varying	<u>3 plans</u>	<u>4 plans</u>
TOTAL	85 plans	85 plans

Only one plan changed its vesting period during the 1994-96 period. About 55% of the PERS now require five or less years of service to vest. The trend appears to be towards five-year vesting or shorter, perhaps reflecting federal vesting requirements that apply to private sector pension plans. Nevertheless, vesting is one of the few areas that the public sector is more conservative than the private sector. Nearly forty percent still require 10 or more years to vest.

Employee Contributions. Major corporations usually provide pension plans that are non-contributory relative to their primary plan, but often also provide a supplemental profit-sharing or savings plan which permits employee contributions with some employer matching. In contrast, most public employee pension plans require employee contributions for the primary pension, and any secondary savings plan such as a 457 deferred compensation plan is usually funded only from employee contributions.

The 1996 study of employee contribution requirements expressed as a percent of payroll is found in Chart III, and the requirements may be summarized and compared with the 1990 survey as follows:

<u>Employee Contributions</u>	<u>1990 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
Employee rate of 0 - 5%	25 plans	30 plans
Employee rate over 5%	43 plans	38 plans
Rate varies by age or group	5 plans	6 plans
Plan is non-contributory	<u>12 plans</u>	<u>11 plans</u>
TOTAL	85 plans	85 plans

This summary reflects little change over the six years in PERS that are non-contributory -- i.e., the plan is by design financed only by employer contributions in a manner similar to the private sector. This may indicate that "pick-up" arrangements achieve most of the advantages of adopting a non-contributory status.

Employer "Pick-Up". One of the strongest trends reflected in recent RRC studies is the adoption of Internal Revenue Code 414(h) provisions. Under this IRC authorization, employers may "pick-up" the employee contributions presumably in lieu of a salary increase, or employees may continue to make contributions but on a tax-sheltered basis. Under both approaches, take-home pay is greater because of federal/state tax-sheltering.

The 1986 comparative study noted that 37 PERS had adopted 414(h) provisions. The current study reflects that nearly all of the 74 contributory systems have adopted 414(h) provisions, presumably reflecting perceived advantages of tax-sheltering by both employees and employers. The 1996 study also attempts to differentiate the "pick-up" plans as to whether payments are actually made by the employer or employee.

Employer Contributions. The employer contribution information found in Chart III is perhaps of less reliability than other information found in this report. Employer contributions are often stated in annual reports as dollars rather than as a percent of payroll. Also, employer costs often vary significantly from year to year and from one covered group to another. In addition, employer costs may be paid from several sources such as school districts and the state, or from several separate appropriations. Lastly employer costs are often designated under several categories reflecting normal cost, amortization, administrative costs, unfunded post-retirement increases, etc.

The employer contribution information found in Chart III presumably reflects actual contributions made by the employer. Some of the PERS in this study received employer contributions at rates less than those determined by actuarial valuation as necessary to fully fund accruing benefits and to amortize unfunded accrued liabilities over some specified time period.

Trends. The slow trend in vesting is towards five years or shorter, although nearly 40% of the plans still require 10 or more years to vest. Employee contribution rates have been relatively stable over the two-year period from 1994-96. Most of the contributory plans have adopted IRC 414(h) provisions to give the advantages of tax-sheltering.

Employer contribution rates fluctuated considerably between the 1994 and 1996 surveys. These fluctuations probably reflect numerous changes in the economic actuarial assumptions that are noted in Section VI of this report, employer contribution delays or "holidays" in some plans, and benefit changes in others.

CHART III - 1996
CONTRIBUTION & VESTING REQUIREMENT

<u>State</u>	<u>Fund</u>	<u>Soc. Sec.</u>	<u>Employee Contribution</u>	<u>IRC 414 (h)</u>	<u>Total Employer Contribution</u>	<u>Vesting Period</u>
1. Alab.	ERS	Yes	5.0%	*ER	6.99%	10 yrs.
2. Alab.	TRS	Yes	5.0%	*ER	9.23%	10 yrs.
3. Alas.	PERS	No	6.75%	*EE	12.82%	5 yrs.
4. Alas.	TRS	No	8.65%	*EE	12.48%	8 yrs.
5. Ariz.	SRS	Yes	3.20%	*EE	3.36%	Immediate
6. Arka.	PERS	Yes	Non-Contributory	-	10%/6%	5 yrs.
7. Arka.	TRS	Yes	Non-Contributory	-	12%	10 yrs.
8. Calif.	PERS	Yes	Non-Contributory/5%	-	9.93%/Vary	10/5 yrs
9. Calif.	TRS	No	8.0%	*ER	12.50%	5 yrs.
10. Colo.	PERA	No	8.0%	*EE	10.8%/9.2%	5 yrs.
11. Conn.	SERS	Yes	Non-Contributory	-	13.74%	10 yrs.
12. Conn.	TRS	No	7.0%	*	7.5%	10 yrs.
13. Dela.	SEPP	Yes	3.0%	*EE	5.76%	5 yrs.
14. Flor.	FRS	Yes	Non-Contributory	-	16.91%	10 yrs.
15. Geor.	ERS	Yes	1.25%	*ER	15.64%	10 yrs.
16. Geor.	TRS	Yes	5.0%	*EE	11.81%	10 yrs.
17. Hawaii	ERS	Yes	Non-Contributory	-	14.48%	10 yrs.
18. Idaho	ERS	Yes	6.97%	*EE	11.61%	5 yrs.
19. Ill.	SERS	Yes	4%	*ER	5.098%	8 yrs.
20. Ill.	TRS	No	8%	*ER	8.06%	5 yrs.
21. Ill.	MRF	Yes	4.5%	*EE	10.19%	8 yrs.
22. Ind.	PERF	Yes	3%	*ER	6.5%	10 yrs.
23. Ind.	TRF	Yes	3%	*ER	16.59%	10 yrs.
24. Iowa	PERS	Yes	3.7%	*EE	5.75%	4 yrs.
25. Kans.	PERS	Yes	4%	*ER	3.99%/2.78%	10 yrs.
26. Kent.	ERS	Yes	5%	*ER	8.89%/8.94%	5 yrs.
27. Kent.	TRS	No	9.855%	*ER	13.105%	5 yrs.
28. Louis.	SERS	No	7.5%	*EE	11.9%	10 yrs.
29. Louis.	TRS	No	8.0%	*ER	16.6%	10 yrs.
30. Maine	SRS	No	7.65%	*ER	18.1%	10 yrs.
31. Mary.	SRS	Yes	5% wages over S.S.	*	13.50%	5 yrs.
32. Mass.	SERS	No	8%	?	16.0%	10 yrs.
33. Mass.	TRS	No	8%	?	16.0%	10 yrs.
34. Mich.	SERS	Yes	Non-Contributory	-	10.38%	10 yrs.
35. Mich.	MERS	Yes	Varies by Plan	*	Varies by Plan	6-10 elected
36. Mich.	PSERS	Yes	3 to 4.3%	*EE	11.21%	10 yrs.
37. Minn.	MSRS	Yes	4.07%	*EE	4.20%	3 yrs.
38. Minn.	PERA	Yes	4.23%	*EE	4.48%	3 yrs.
39. Minn.	TRA	Yes	6.5%	*EE	8.14%	3 yrs.
40. Miss.	PERS	Yes	7.25%	*EE	9.75%	4 yrs.
41. Mou.	SERS	Yes	Non-Contributory	-	10.69%	5 years
42. Mou.	LAGERS	Yes	0% to 4%	*ER	Varies by Plan	5 years
43. Mou.	PSRS	No	10.5%	*EE	10.5%	5 years
44. Mont.	PERS	Yes	6.7%	*EE	6.7%	5 years
45. Mont.	TRS	Yes	7.044%	*EE	7.47%	5 years

(* = IRC 414 (h) (2) provisions: EE = employee paid; ER = employer paid)

(%/ % = state vs. local rates)

CHART III- 1996
CONTRIBUTION & VESTING REQUIREMENT

<u>State</u>	<u>Fund</u>	<u>Soc. Sec.</u>	<u>Employee Contribution</u>	<u>IRC 414 (h)</u>	<u>Total Employer Contributions</u>	<u>Vesting Period</u>
46. Nebra.	SERS	Yes	7.25%	*EE	156% of EE Rate	5 years
47. Nebra.	TERS	Yes	7.73%	*EE	7.32%	5 years
48. Nevada	PERS	No	Non-Contributory	-	18.75%	5 years
49. N.H.	NHRS	Yes	5%	*EE	3.86%/4.05%	10 years
50. N.J.	PERS	Yes	5%	*EE	2.19%/1.36%	10 years
51. N.J.	TRS	Yes	5%	*EE	2.19%	10 years
52. N.M.	PERA	Yes	6.18%/9.15%	*ER	13.83%/9.15%	5 years
53. N.M.	ERA	Yes	7.6%	*ER	8.65%	5 years
54. N.Y.	ERS	Yes	3%	*EE	2.2%	10 years
55. N.Y.	TRS	Yes	3%	*EE	7.24%	10 years
56. N.C.	TSERS	Yes	6%	*EE	8.15%	5 years
57. N.C.	LGERS	Yes	6%	*EE	4.63% + UAAL	5 years
58. N.D.	PERS	Yes	4%	*ER	3.23%	5 years
59. N.D.	TRF	Yes	6.75%	*ER	6.75%	5 years
60. Ohio	PERS	No	8.5%	*ER	13.31%/13.55%	5 years
61. Ohio	STRS	No	9.3%	*ER	12.0%	5 years
62. Okla.	PERS	Yes	2.5%/3.5% (split)	*ER	12.0%	8 years
63. Okla.	TRS	Yes	6.5%/7.0% (split)	*ER	9.5%	10 years
Oreg.	PERS	Yes	6%	*ER	8.08%	5 years
Penn.	SERS	Yes	5.0%	*EE	7.69%	10 years
66. Penn.	PSERS	Yes	6.25%	*EE	10.0%	10 years
67. R.I.	ERS	Yes	8.75%/9.5%	*ER	9.45%/14.71%	10 years
68. S.C.	SCRS	Yes	6%	*EE	7.70%	5 years
69. S.D.	SRS	Yes	5%	*EE	5%	5 years
70. Tenn.	CRS	Yes	Non-Contributory	-	7.35%/7.74%	5 years
71. Texas	ERS	Yes	6%	*EE	6.0%	5 years
72. Texas	TRS	No	6.4%	*ER	6.0%	5 years
73. Texas	MRS	Yes	5% to 7%	*EE	6% to 6.99%	10 years
74. Utah	SRS	Yes	Non-Contributory	-	12.97%/8.68%	4 years
75. Vert.	SRS	Yes	2.75%	*ER	9.86%	5 years
76. Vert.	TRS	Yes	3.73%	*ER	6.15%	10 years
77. Virg.	SRS	Yes	5%	*ER	4.75%/6.86%	5 years
78. Wash.	PERS	Yes	5.08%	*EE	7.42%	5 years
79. Wash.	TRS	Yes	6.59% to 8.5%	*EE	12.22%	5 years
80. W.V.	PERS	Yes	4.5%	*ER	9.5%	5 years
81. W.V.	TRS	Yes	4.5%	*	7.5%	6/9/12 yrs.
82. Wyom.	WRS	Yes	5.57%	*ER	5.68%	4 years
83. Milw.	City	Yes	5.5%	*ER	0.66%	4 years
84. Milw.	County	Yes	Non-Contributory	-	10.3%	10 years
85. Wis.	WRS	Yes	6.4%	*ER	6.3%	5 years

(* = IRC 414 (h) (2) provisions: EE = employee paid; ER - employer paid)
 (%/% = state vs. local rates)

IV. RETIREMENT BENEFIT CALCULATIONS

A. Calculation Provisions

Benefit Formulas. Chart IV on pages 15 and 16 is intended to reflect current benefit formulas of the PERS surveyed. Also, the formulas represent those applying to general employees and teachers, and may not apply to elected officials, protective employees and others who may have higher benefits, earlier normal retirement, etc. As Chart IV indicates, 82 of the PERS are defined benefit plans in which benefits are calculated by one or more formulas of -

- Multiplier x years of service x final average salary (FAS)

The multiplier indicates a percentage of FAS that is earned for each year of service. The FAS (final average salary), is the average rate of salary for a specified time period expressed in months or years.

Basic. Members of 17 of the PERS (*before the formula) do not have social security coverage for their public employment. Such systems presumably have a higher formula to reflect the lack of social security coverage, and the 17 systems have multipliers ranging between 2% and 2.5% accrual for each year of service. The average multiplier for career employees (30 years) in the 17 plans is 2.23% @ year. Only one basic plan improved its benefits over the two-year period.

Coordinated. Members of 68 PERS in the study also receive social security coverage for their public employment. These coordinated plans reflect a wide range of multipliers, which may also vary between the various decades of service, or by specific effective dates or by the age at retirement. The formulas noted on Chart IV may be summarized as follows, assuming a career employee with 30 years of service and FAS of about \$40,000:

<u>Formula Multiplier</u>	<u>1992 Survey</u>	<u>1994 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
1.1% to 1.3%	5 plans	5 plans	4 plans
1.3+% to 1.5%	9 plans	7 plans	6 plans
1.5+% to 1.7%	19 plans	16 plans	18 plans
1.7+% to 1.9%	6 plans	9 plans	8 plans
1.9+% to 2.1%	19 plans	20 plans	20 plans
2.1+%	4 plans	4 plans	4 plans
Employer Plan Election	2 plans	2 plans	2 plans
Money Purchase	2 plans	3 plans	3 plans
Formula & Annuity	<u>2 plans</u>	<u>2 plans</u>	<u>3 plans</u>
TOTAL	68 plans	68 plans	68 plans

The gradual trend during the 1980's to improve benefit formulas appears to be continuing into the 1990's. The 1996 study indicates that 8 coordinated plans provided modest improvements in their formulas. The current average multiplier of the 68 coordinated plans is about 1.81%.

FAS. Most of the PERS surveyed provide that benefits shall be based upon a final average salary (FAS) representing the highest earnings over a specified number of years or months. The FAS periods used by the PERS surveyed may be summarized and compared to the 1990 survey as follows:

<u>FAS Period</u>	<u>1990 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
2-year FAS Period	2 plans	2 plans
3-year FAS Period	55 plans	55 plans
4-year FAS Period	7 plans	8 plans
5-year FAS Period	19 plans	18 plans
Money Purchase Plans	<u>2 plans</u>	<u>2 plans</u>
Total	85 plans	85 plans

Fourteen of the 85 PERS place some type of cap on earnings that may be included in the FAS calculations. These caps may reflect a limitation on gross earnings or on annual salary increases that may be considered during the FAS period.

Benefit Limitations. Chart IV also notes that several of the PERS have established a limit on pension benefits which may be expressed as a percent of FAS, or as a maximum number of creditable years, or maximum salary levels. On the other hand, the majority of plans surveyed provide no maximum benefit limitation, but such plans are subject to the limits established by IRC Section 415 -- i.e., 100% of defined compensation.

	<u>1990 Survey</u>	<u>1994 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
No Specified Limitation*	51 plans	49 plans	48 plans
FAS Limit at 100%	6 plans	14 plans	18 plans
FAS Limit under 100%	21 plans	17 plans	16 plans
Salary Maximum	4 plans	3 plans	0 plan
Service Credit Cap	<u>3 plans</u>	<u>2 plans</u>	<u>3 plans</u>
	85 plans	85 plans	85 plans

(*Subject to federal IRC, Section 415)

Trends. The FAS periods for the formula plans appear to have stabilized reflecting little change between 1990-96. Benefit limitations appear to be moving toward the maximum limits allowed under IRC Section 415 -- 100% of "compensation".

The trend to improve formula benefits is continuing into the 1990's in spite of government budgeting problems. These improvements continue to narrow the difference in benefits between basic and coordinated plans.

Although the advantages and disadvantages of defined benefit plans (formula) versus defined contribution plans (money purchase) is being debated in many jurisdictions, only one of the surveyed PERS has changed from defined benefit to defined contribution over the last 5 years. On the other hand, several formula plans are modifying their provisions to reflect some of the advantages of the defined contribution approach.

CHART IV - 1996
FINAL AVERAGE PERIODS-FORMULAS-LIMITATIONS

<u>State</u>	<u>Fund</u>	<u>FAS Period</u>	<u>Benefit Formula</u>	<u>Limitation</u>
1. Alab.	ERS	3 H/10	2.0125% x yrs. x FAS	None
2. Alab.	TRS	3 H/10	2.0125% x yrs. x FAS	None
3. Alas.	PERS	3 HC	*2% x 1st 10 yr; 2 1/4% x 2nd 10; 2.5% + yr.	None
4. Alas.	TRS	3 HC	*2% x 1st 20 yrs; 2.5% x added yrs.	None
5. Ariz.	SRS	3 HC/10+	2% x yrs. x FAS	None
6. Arka.	PERS	4 HC+	1.65% + .342% x yrs. to age 62	100% FAS
7. Arka.	TRS	5 H	1.29% x yrs. x FAS	None
8. Calif.	PERS	3 HC+	2% at 60; 2.418% at 63	None
9. Calif.	TRS	3 HC	*2% x yrs. x FAS	None
10. Colo.	PERA	3 H + (cap)	*2.5% x 1st 20 yr.; 1.50% added yrs.	100% FAS
11. Conn.	SERS	3 H (cap)	1.33% + 0.5% FAS over \$22,896	35 yrs. max
12. Conn.	TRS	3 H	*2% x yrs. x FAS	75% FAS
13. Dela.	SEPP	5 H	1.67% x yrs. x FAS	75% FAS
14. Flor.	FRS	5 H	1.6% at 62/30 yrs. to 1.68% if 65/33 yrs.	100% FAS
15. Geor.	ERS	2 HC + (cap)	1.64% x yrs. x FAS	None
16. Geor.	TRS	2 HC (cap)	2% x yrs. x FAS	40 yrs. max.
17. Hawaii	ERS	3 HC	1.25% x yrs. x FAS	None
18. Idaho	PERS	3 1/2 HC +	1.917% x yrs. x FAS	100% FAS
19. Ill.	SERS	4 HC/10+	1% x 1st 10 yr. to 1.5% x yrs. over 30	75% FAS
20. Ill.	TRS	4 HC/10(cap)	*1.67% x 1st 10 yr. to 2.3% x yrs. 30+	75% FAS
21. Ill.	MRF	4 HC/10+(cap)	1.67% x 1st 15 yrs.; 2% x added yrs.	75% FAS
22. Ind.	PERF	5 H	1.1% x yrs. x FAS + "EE" M.P. Annuity	45 yrs. max.
23. Ind.	TRF	5 H	1.1% x yrs. x FAS + "EE" M.P. Annuity	None
24. Iowa	PERS	3 H	2% x 1st 30 yrs.; 1% x next 5 yrs.	None
25. Kans.	PERS	3 H	1.75% x yrs. x FAS	None
26. Kent.	ERS	5 H	1.97%-state; 2.2%-county	None
27. Kent.	TRS	5 H	*2.5% x yrs. x FAS	100% FAS
28. Louis.	SERS	3 HC +	*2.5% x yrs. x FAS	100% FAS
29. Louis.	TRS	3 HC + (cap)	*2.5% x yrs. x FAS	100% FAS
30. Maine	SRS	3 H (cap)	*2.0% x yrs. x FAS	100% FAS
31. Mary.	SRS	3 HC	(.8% x yearly SSIL) + (1.5% x excess SSIL)	None
32. Mass.	SERS	3 HC	*2.5% x yrs. x FAS (if 65)	80% FAS
33. Mass.	TRS	3 HC	*2.5% x yrs. x FAS (if 65)	80% FAS
34. Mich.	SERS	3 HC +	1.5% x yrs. x FAS	None
35. Mich.	MERS	5/3 HC +	Employer Plan Options	None
36. Mich.	PSERS	5/3 HC +	1.5% x yrs. x FAS	None
37. Minn.	MSRS	5 HC +	1.5% x yrs. x FAS	100% FAS
38. Minn.	PERA	5 HC	1.5% x yrs. x FAS	100% FAS
39. Minn.	TRA	5 HC	1.63% x yrs. x FAS	100% FAS
40. Miss.	PERS	4 HC (cap)	1.875% x 1st 25 yrs.; 2% x added years	100% FAS
41. Mou.	SERS	3 HC +	1.6% x yrs. x FAS	None
42. Mou.	LAGERS	5/3 HC +	Employer Plan Options (1% to 1.5%)	None
43. Mou.	PSRS	5 HC	*2.3% x yrs. x FAS	100% FAS
44. Mont.	PERS	3 HC +	1.79% x yrs. x FAS	None
45. Mont.	TRS	3 HC	1.67% x yrs. x FAS	None

(* No Social Security)

(+ High years in FAS actually expressed in months)

CHART IV - 1996
FINAL AVERAGE PERIODS-FORMULAS-LIMITATIONS

<u>State</u>	<u>Fund</u>	<u>FAS Period</u>	<u>Benefit Formula</u>	<u>Limitation</u>
46. Nebr.	SERS	-	Money Purchase	None
47. Nebr.	SRS	3 HC	1.73% x yrs. x FAS	None
48. Nevada	PERS	3 HC +	*2.5% x yrs. x FAS	75% FAS
49. N.H.	NHRS	3 H (cap)	1.67% to 65; 1.515% after 65	None
50. N.J.	PERS	3 H	1.67% x yrs. x FAS	None
51. N.J.	TRS	3 H	1.67% x yrs. x FAS	None
52. N.M.	PERS	3 HC +	2.5% x yrs. x FAS	75% FAS
53. N.M.	ERA	5 HC	2.35% x yrs. x FAS	None
54. N.Y.	ERS	3 HC (cap)	(2% x 1st 30 yrs) + (1.5% x add. yrs.)	None
55. N.Y.	TRS	3 HC (cap)	(2% x 1st 30 yrs) + (1.5% x add. yrs.)	None
56. N.C.	TSERS	4 HC	1.75% x yrs. x FAS	None
57. N.C.	LGERS	4 HC	1.72% x yrs. x FAS	None
58. N.D.	PERS	3 HC/10 +	1.74% x yrs. x FAS	100% FAS
59. N.D.	TRF	3 HC	1.55% x yrs. x FAS	None
60. Ohio	PERS	3 H	*(2.1% x 1st 30 yrs) + (2.5% x add yrs.)	100% FAS
61. Ohio	STRS	3 H	*(2.1% x 1st 30 yrs) + (2.5% x add yrs.)	100% FAS
62. Okla.	PERS	3 H/10 (cap)	2% x yrs. x FAS	None
63. Okla.	TRS	5 HC	2% x yrs. x FAS	None
64. Oreg.	PERS	3 H/10 +	1.67% x yrs. x FAS	None
65. Penn.	SERS	3 H	2% x yrs. x FAS	None
66. Penn.	PSERS	3 H	2% x yrs. x FAS	None
67. R.I.	ERS	3 HC	(1.7% x 1st 10 yr.) to 3.0% yr. over 20	80% FAS
68. S.C.	SCRS	3 HC +	1.82% x yrs. x FAS	None
69. S.D.	SRS	3 HC/10 +	1.4% x FAS x yrs.	None
70. Tenn.	CRS	5 HC	(1.5% x yrs. x FAS) + .25% FAS over \$24,600	75% FAS
71. Texas	ERS	3 H +	2% x yrs. x FAS	100% FAS
72. Texas	TRS	3 H	*2% x yrs. x FAS	None
73. Texas	MRS	-	Money Purchase Options	None
74. Utah	SRS	3 HC (cap)	2% x yrs. x FAS	None
75. Vert.	SRS	3 HC	1.67% x yrs. x FAS	50% FAS
76. Vert.	TRS	3 HC	1.67% x yrs. x FAS	50% FAS
77. Virg.	SRS	3 HC	(1.5% x \$13,200 FAS) + (1.65% added FAS)	100% FAS
78. Wash.	PERS	5 HC +	2% x yrs. x FAS	None
79. Wash.	TRS	5 HC +	1.0% x yrs. x FAS + "EE" M.P. annuity ('96)	None
80. W.V.	PERS	3 HC/10	2% x yrs. x FAS	None
81. W.V.	TRS	-	Money Purchase	None
82. Wyo.	WRS	3 HC	2% x yrs. x FAS	None
83. Milw.	City	3 H	2% x yrs. x FAS	70% FAS
84. Milw.	County	5 HC	1.5% x yrs. x FAS	80% FAS
85. Wis.	WRS	3 H	1.6% x yrs. x FAS	65% FAS

(* No Social Security)

(+ High years in FAS actually expressed in months)

V. POST-RETIREMENT ADJUSTMENTS AND BENEFIT TAXES

A. COLAs and State Taxes

Social Security. Pension designers are concerned with the adequacy of benefits at the time of retirement, and also with the continuing purchasing power of those benefits during retirement as effected by inflation and taxes. Since 1975, social security benefits have been automatically adjusted each year according to changes in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). The automatic adjustments in the most recent 10-year period are as follows:

<u>CPI Year</u>	<u>% Increase</u>	<u>Payable</u>
1986	1.3%	1/1/87
1987	4.2%	1/1/88
1988	4.0%	1/1/89
1989	4.7%	1/1/90
1990	5.4%	1/1/91
1991	3.7%	1/1/92
1992	3.0%	1/1/93
1993	2.6%	1/1/94
1994	2.8%	1/1/95
1995	2.6%	1/1/96

Hence, to the degree that social security is part of total retirement planning (80% of PERS in study), at least that part of income keeps pace with inflation -- compounding 40% over the above 10-year period. Although social security benefits were once tax-free, effective January 1, 1994, up to 50% of such benefits are now subject to federal tax if recognized income during retirement falls within specified levels -- \$25,000 to \$34,000, if single and \$32,000 to \$44,000 if filing joint. If income exceeds these levels, then 85% of social security benefits are taxable.

A 1992 publication by AARP* notes that the 50 states have different policies on taxing social security benefits as follows:

- 26 states allow full exemption of social security benefits from personal income tax.
- 14 states allow partial exemption of social security benefits from personal income tax.
- 10 states have very limited or no personal income tax.

COLA Plans. The inflation of the 1970's caused many public pension plans to adopt post-retirement adjustment plans (COLAs) to protect annuity purchasing power. The types of plans are noted in Chart V on pages 19 and 20, and that information can be summarized and compared with 1990's survey as follows:

	<u>1994 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
CPI Plan Plus/Minus Cap	39 plans	37 plans
Automatic Annual Increase	17 plans	20 plans
Investment Surplus	5 plans	3 plans
Ad Hoc or Money Purchase	<u>24 plans</u>	<u>25 plans</u>
TOTAL	85 plans	85 plans

(*=American Association of Retired Persons)

The COLA tables note only a few changes in the type and number of post-retirement adjustment plans over the last two years. Two plans adopted CPI provisions but with adjustments subject to some conditions. Two other plans changed from CPI types to automatic increases. Also, at least one plan changed from a simple to a compound increase in their COLA provisions.

Pension Plan Taxes. The taxability of public pension benefits at the state level was dramatically effected by the 1989 Federal Supreme Court decision in Davis v. Michigan. This decision noted that federal law (The Public Salary Tax Act of 1939) requires that federal and military retirees be treated at least as favorably as state and local retirees under state law.

Comparative studies in the 1980's noted that well over 50% of the 85 PERS were in states with no state income tax law, or were totally exempted from state income taxes. These results were drastically altered by the Supreme Court case. The current survey may be summarized and compared with the 1986 and 1990 surveys as follows:

	<u>1986 Survey</u>	<u>1990 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
No state income tax law**	15 plans	15 plans	13 plans
Benefits totally exempt	46 plans	21 plans	21 plans
Benefits partially exempt	11 plans	31 plans	23 plans
Benefits most or totally tax.	10 plans	15 plans	25 plans
Exempt for some	<u>3 plans</u>	<u>3 plans</u>	<u>3 plans</u>
TOTAL	85 plans	85 plans	85 plans

Trends. The majority of PERS in this study enacted some type of automatic post-retirement adjustment plan during the 1970's and 1980's. Most of these "COLA plans" are based upon changes in the CPI, with some type of annual limit to control costs. Some of these COLA plans are pre-funded during the working career, while others are not. The small number of changes in COLA plans in the last two years reflect less concern with inflation, and may best be described as "fine tuning". Actuarial funding of the COLA plans presumably is a major concern for some of the PERS.

The 1996 study reflects that most states have now reacted to the Michigan-Davis Supreme Court Case, and have made necessary changes to state income tax laws to comply. Where the majority of PERS in the studies before 1989 were exempt from state taxes, the majority are now partially or totally subject to state income taxes. Some of these changes are being challenged in court. In total, the changes in state and federal laws relative to the taxation of pension and social security benefits may well affect the future adequacy of retiree income.

(**Includes PERS in New Hampshire and Tennessee which have very limited income taxes.)

VI. ACTUARIAL AND ACCOUNTING INFORMATION**A. Information Description**

Actuarial Methods. An actuarial method is a procedure for determining the present value of pension benefits that will be paid in the future, and allocating that value and the cost of such benefits to specific time periods. There are a number of accepted actuarial methods that presumably will reach the same goal of fully funding all pension obligations as they become due, but they allocate costs in different ways during the working career or accumulation stage.

Chart VI on pages 23 and 24 notes the actuarial methods used by the 85 PERS, and this information can be compared with the 1994 survey as follows:

	<u>1994 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
PERS Using entry age normal	65 plans	65 plans
PERS using unit credit	12 plans	13 plans
PERS using aggregate cost	4 plans	5 plans
PERS using attained age	1 plans	1 plan
PERS using projected benefits	2 plans	0 plans
Money Purchase	<u>1 plan</u>	<u>1 plan</u>
TOTAL	85 plans	85 plans

This survey indicates that about 76% of the PERS use entry age normal, with a goal to provide level normal cost projections over the long-term -- from generation to generation of taxpayers.

Interest Assumption. The interest or earnings assumption adopted by the various PERS is one of the key economic assumptions in determining contribution rates. Chart VI notes the interest assumptions used by the 85 surveyed PERS, and the information can be compared with previous surveys as follows:

	<u>1992 Survey</u>	<u>1994 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
5% - 7%	5 plans	2 plans	1 plans
7+% - 8%	51 plans	54 plans	61 plans
8+%	28 plans	28 plans	22 plans
Unknown/Money Purchase	<u>1 plans</u>	<u>1 plan</u>	<u>1 plan</u>
TOTAL	85 plans	85 plans	85 plans

The 1996 survey indicates that the majority of PERS studied have adopted an interest assumption equal to or exceeding 8%, with an average assumption of 8.0%--slightly less than the 1994 average of 8.1%

Economic Spread. Another important economic assumption is the assumption as to inflation or across-the-board salary increases that are over and above merit or seniority adjustments. The difference between the inflationary salary assumption and the interest assumption is often referred to as the "economic spread"-- i.e., the assumed real return on invested assets above the inflation rate.

Chart VI notes the wage inflation assumptions and resulting spreads of the 85 PERS in this study, and this information can be summarized and compared with previous studies as follows:

	<u>1992 Survey</u>	<u>1994 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
0 - 1% Spread	2 plans	2 plans	2 plans
1+% - 2% spread	17 plans	15 plans	8 plans
2+% - 3% spread	25 plans	27 plans	27 plans
3+% spread	26 plans	22 plans	37 plans
Spread undefined	<u>15 plans</u>	<u>19 plans</u>	<u>11 plans</u>
TOTAL	85 plans	85 plans	85 plans

The 1996 study indicates that the average "spread" was 3.17%, up from the 1994 average of 2.85%. During the 1994-96 period, 29 PERS increased and 2 PERS decreased their economic spreads.

PBO Funding Ratio. Until 1995, the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) required public pension plans to disclose the "pension benefit obligation", or PBO, which is a measure of the present value of pension benefits, adjusted for the effects of projected salary increases, but estimated on service earned to date only. A new GASB statement (#25) provides that future funding disclosures shall be based upon regular actuarial valuations.

The PBO funding ratio compares plan assets to its PBO liabilities, but this disclosure allows pension assets to be valued at cost, market, or some smoothed market approach. Therefore, PBO funding ratios are most informative if used to note the ratio trend of a particular PERS from year to year.

	<u>1992 Survey</u>	<u>1994 Survey</u>	<u>1996 Survey</u>
PBO Ratio of 100+%	23 plans	25 plans	26 plans
PBO Ratio of 90+%-100%	7 plans	20 plans	9 plans
PBO Ratio of 80+%-90%	20 plans	11 plans	12 plans
PBO Ratio of 70+%-80%	14 plans	16 plans	14 plans
PBO Ratio of 60+%-70%	9 plans	1 plans	3 plan
PBO Ratio of 50+%-60%	5 plans	7 plans	5 plans
PBO Ratio of Under 50%	6 plans	4 plans	4 plans
GASB 25-Actuarial	<u>1 plans</u>	<u>1 plan</u>	<u>12 plans</u>
TOTAL	85 plans	85 plans	85 plans

Trends. During the 1994-96 time period, there were some changes in the actuarial methods used by the 85 PERS studied. The Entry Age Normal is the predominant method used by 76% of the PERS studied.

During the 1994-96 period, numerous changes were made in the PERS interest and salary assumptions. As a result, 29 plans increased and 2 plans decreased their "economic spread". This activity is significant, and reflects that many PERS are "spending" some of their actuarial conservatism.

The PBO ratios of the 85 PERS remain strong with an average ratio of 86.8% in the 1996 study. Sixty-three percent of the PERS disclosing their PBO improved their funding ratio from the 1994 survey levels.

CHART VI-1996
ACTUARIAL AND ACCOUNTING

	<u>State</u>	<u>Fund</u>	<u>Actuarial Method</u>	<u>Interest Assumption</u>	<u>Rate Inflation</u>	<u>Economic Spread</u>	<u>PBO Fund</u>
1.	Alab.	ERS	Entry Age	8%	N.D.	-	102.0%-
2.	Alab.	TRS	Entry Age	8%	N.D.	-	97.4%-
3.	Alas.	PERS	Unit Credit	8.0%-	4.0%	4.0%	90.4%-
4.	Alas.	TRS	Unit Credit	8.0%-	4.0%	4.0%	85.4%-
5.	Ariz.	SRS	Unit Credit	8%	5.0%	3.0%	104.5%-
6.	Ark.	PERS	Entry Age	7.75%+	4.75%-	3%+	113.0%A
7.	Ark.	TRS	Entry Age	8%	5.0%	3.0%+	89.0%+
8.	Calif.	PERS	Entry Age	8.5%-	4.5%-	4.0%+	106.0%+
9.	Calif.	TRS	Entry Age	8.0%-	5.5%-	2.5%+	87.0%A
10.	Colo.	PERA	Entry Age	8.5%	5.5%	3.0%	89.8%A
11.	Conn.	SERS	Unit Credit	8.5%	N.D.	-	59.0%+
12.	Conn.	TRS	Entry Age	8.5%	N.D.	-	73.4%+
13.	Dela.	SEPP	Entry Age	8.5%	5.0%	3.5%	99.4%A
14.	Flor.	FRS	Entry Age	8.0%	5.5%	2.5%	87.9%+
15.	Geor.	ERS	Entry Age	7.5%	4%	3.5%	94.0%+
16.	Geor.	TRS	Entry Age	7.5%	N.D.	-	93.1%+
17.	Hawaii	ERS	Entry Age-FIL	8.0%	4.0%-	4.0%+	83.1%+
18.	Idaho	ERS	Entry Age	8.0%+	5.75%	2.25%	71.1%+
19.	Ill.	SERS	Unit Credit	8.0%	4.5%	3.5%	59.5%+
20.	Ill.	TRS	Unit Credit	8.0%	4.0%	4.0%	52.7%-
21.	Ill.	MRF	Entry Age	7.5%	4.25%+	3.25%-	106.5%+
22.	Ind.	PERF	Entry Age	7.5%	6.5%	1.0%	112.5%+
23.	Ind.	TRF	Entry Age	7.5%	5.5%	2.0%	37.0%+
24.	Iowa	PERS	Entry Age	7.5%+	N.D.	-	104.0%-
25.	Kans.	PERS	Unit Credit	8.0%	4.0%-	4.0%+	79.0%-
26.	Kent.	ERS	Entry Age	8.0%	6.5%	1.5%	100.3%+
27.	Kent.	TRS	Unit Credit	8.0%	5.0%	3.0%	75.2%+
28.	Louis.	SERS	Unit Credit	8.25%	N.D.	-	59.4%+
29.	Louis.	TRS	Unit Credit	8.25%	3.5%	4.75%	57.5%+
30.	Maine	SRS	Entry Age	8.0%-	6.0%	2.0%-	39.0%+
31.	Mary.	SRS	Entry Age	7.5%	5.0%	2.5%	75.0%+
32.	Mass.	SERS	Entry Age	8.0%	6.0%	2.0%	68.3%+
33.	Mass.	TRS	Entry Age	8.0%	6.0%	2.0%	60.93+
34.	Mich.	SERS	Entry Age	8.0%-	5.0%-	3.0%+	97.6%+
35.	Mich.	MERS	Attained Age	8.0%	5.5%	2.5%	91.2%-
36.	Mich.	PSERS	Entry Age	8.0%-	5.0%	3.0%-	65.2%-
37.	Minn.	MSRS	Entry Age	8.5%	5.0%-	3.5%+	101.8%+
38.	Minn.	PERA	Entry Age	8.5%	5.0%-	3.5%+	84.6%+
39.	Minn.	TRA	Entry Age	8.5%	5.0%-	3.5%+	96.8%+
40.	Miss.	PERS	Entry Age	8.0%	4.5%-	3.5%+	75.0%A
41.	Mou.	SERS	Entry Age	8.5%	4.5%-	4.0%+	85.1%A
42.	Mou.	LAGERS	Entry Age	7.0%	4.0%	3.0%	90.6%A
43.	Mou.	PSRS	Entry Age	8.0%	5.5%-	2.5%+	92.8%A
44.	Mont.	PERS	Entry Age	8.0%	6.25%-	1.75%+	89.2%A
45.	Mont.	TRS	Entry Age	8.0%	6.0%-	2.0%+	63.5%+

(N.D. = not defined; salary assumption stated as age/range)

(Assumptions and PBO: + = higher; - = lower than 1994 Report)

(A = Actuarial Funding Ratio)

CHART VI-1996
ACTUARIAL AND ACCOUNTING

<u>State</u>	<u>Fund</u>	<u>Actuarial Method</u>	<u>Interest Assumption</u>	<u>Wage Inflation</u>	<u>Economic Spread</u>	<u>PBO % Funding</u>
46. Nebr.	SERS	-	Money Purchase	-	-	-
47. Nebr.	TRS	Entry Age-FIL	7.5%	4.0%	3.0%	102.1%+
48. Nevada	PERS	Entry Age	8.0%	5.0%	3.0%	76.4%+
49. N.H.	NHRS	Aggregate	9.0%	4.0%-	5.0%+	104.1%-
50. N.J.	PERS	Unit Credit	8.75%	5.95%	2.8%	100.3%+
51. N.J.	TRS	Unit Credit	8.75%	5.95%	2.8%	86.6%+
52. N.M.	PERA	Entry Age	8.0%	5.0%	3.0%	80.5%
53. N.M.	ERA	Entry Age	8.0%	4.0%	4.0%	72.6%-
54. N.Y.	ERS	Aggregate	8.5%-	4.75%-	3.75%	GASB 25
55. N.Y.	TRS	Aggregate	8.0%	4.5%-	3.5%+	96.2%A
56. N.C.	TSERS	Entry Age	7.5%	N.D.	-	103.3%
57. N.C.	LGERS	Entry Age	7.5%	N.D.	-	107.7%
58. N.D.	PERS	Entry Age	8.0%	4.5%-	3.5%+	104.0%A
59. N.D.	TRF	Entry Age	8.0%	4.0%-	4.0%+	98.1%+
60. Ohio	PERS	Entry Age	7.75%	5.25%	2.5%	89.0%A
61. Ohio	STRS	Entry Age	7.5%-	5.0%	2.5%	78.0%-
62. Okla.	PERS	Entry Age	7.5%	4.0%-	3.5%+	110.8%+
63. Okla.	TRS	Entry Age	8.0%	4.0%-	4.0%+	39.1%-
64. Oreg.	PERS	Entry Age	8.0%	5.5%-	2.5%+	94.3%-
65. Penn.	SERS	Entry Age	8.5%-	3.0%-	5.5%+	111.2%-
66. Penn.	PSERS	Entry Age	8.5%	4.0%	4.5%	88.7%-
67. R.I.	ERS	Entry Age-FIL	8.0%+	4.5%	3.5%	79.0%+
68. S.C.	SCRS	Entry Age	7.25%-	4.25%-	3.0%	88.2%+
69. S.D.	SRS	Entry Age	8.0%	6.0%	2.0%	100.3%-
70. Tenn.	CRS	Entry Age-FIL	8.0%	7.0%	1.0%	108.5%-
71. Texas	ERS	Entry Age	8.0%-	4.0%-	4.0%	107.5%-
72. Texas	TRS	Entry Age	8.0%	4.75%-	3.25%+	88.6%+
73. Texas	MRS	Unit Credit	8.0%-	N.D.	-	81.9%+
74. Utah	SRS	Entry Age	8.0%	4.0%-	4.0%+	84.0%A
75. Vert.	SRS	Entry Age-FIL	8.5%	4.5%-	4.0%+	110.3%+
76. Vert.	TRS	Entry Age-FIL	8.5%	4.5%	4.0%+	99.1%+
77. Virg.	SRS	Entry Age	8.0%	4.0%	4.0%	77.4%+
78. Wash.	PERS	Aggregate	7.5%	5.0%-	2.5%+	84.9%-
79. Wash.	TRS	Aggregate	7.5%	5.0%-	2.5%+	70.8%+
80. W.V.	PERS	Entry Age	7.5%	3.5%	4.0%	113.5%+
81. W.V.	TRS	Entry Age	7.5%-	3.5%	4.0%	15.3%+
82. Wyom.	WRS	Entry Age	8.0%	4.5%	3.5%	116.9%+
83. Milw.	City	Entry Age	8.5%	5.5%	3.0%	102.2%-
84. Milw.	County	Entry Age	8.5%	5.0%	3.5%	113.9%-
85. Wis.	WRS	Entry Age-FIL	8.0%	5.3%-	2.7%+	126.4%+

(N.D. = not defined; salary assumption stated as age/range)
 (Assumptions and PBO: + = higher; - = lower than 1994 report)
 (A = Actuarial Funding Ratio)

LEGIS REFERENCE BUREAU



3034628

0

0