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February 1, 2012
Boards of Trustees
City of Sioux Falls Employees' Retirement System
City of Sioux Falls Firefighters’ Pension Fund
229 West Ninth Street
P. O. Box 7402

Sioux Falls, SD 57117-7402
Dear Board Members:
We are pleased to submit our report on a plan design study for members of the City of Sioux Falls Employees' Retirement System and City of Sioux Falls Firefighters' Pension Fund.

The purpose of the study is to examine the current benefit structures of the plans, and to identify potential changes in contribution patterns and/or benefits that would produce more stable, sustainable cost levels for the City.

Future actuarial results may differ significantly from the results presented in this report due to such factors as the following: plan experience differing from that anticipated by the economic or demographic assumptions; changes in economic or demographic assumptions; increases or decreases expected as part of the natural operation of the methodology used for these measurements (such as the end of an amortization period or additional cost or contribution requirements based on the plan's funded status); and changes in plan provisions (other than those modeled) or applicable law.

To the best of our knowledge, this report is complete and accurate. The undersigned is a member of the American Academy of Actuaries and meets the Qualification Standards of the American Academy of Actuaries to render the actuarial opinion contained herein.

Respectfully submitted,


Thomas J. Cavanaugh, FSA, FCA, MAAA, EA
Chief Executive Officer

The City of Sioux Falls Employees’ Retirement System and the City of Sioux Falls Firefighters’ Pension Fund issued a Request For Proposal (RFP) with the following stated objective:
"The City of Sioux Falls’ two pension systems jointly request proposals from qualified actuarial or consulting firms interested in facilitating their Boards of Trustees' discussion and analysis on system alternatives and plan design changes necessary to reduce and stabilize City pension contribution rates. Consultant will identify options and/or pension benefit structure changes, provide cost analysis, and recommend system modifications for Board consideration. The Boards will forward recommendations to the Mayor. Ultimate decision(s) on pursuing any modifications rests with the Mayor and City Council."

Cavanaugh Macdonald Consulting, LLC was selected to provide the requested services. This report details the results of the plan design study undertaken in accordance with the RFP.

Those requested services are not unusual in the current economic environment. The recent market downturn has put pressure on employer contribution rates at a time when the economic outlook for revenue growth is uncertain. This combination of events has driven sponsors of pension plans to analyze alternatives to make sure the benefits promised to current members are secure while not overburdening the tax payers in the short-term. This report should help assist decision makers in deciding on any appropriate steps to mitigate the current financial strain.

It must be noted at the outset that any changes in the retirement programs of the City should be undertaken with the understanding that the programs are one part of the overall compensation package offered to employees and that the programs have an impact on the recruitment and retention of employees. Changes, if any, should only be made to the extent it is believed they help the City to attain its overall goals regarding City employment. The City's stated compensation and benefit objectives are:
a. Attract qualified applicants for employment by the City in all categories of work;
b. Retain experienced and qualified employees in all categories of work;
c. Provide incentives for employees to pursue career advancement opportunities as they arise within the City;
d. Accomplish these objectives within responsible economic parameters.

Having said that, this study deals with the retirement program specifically. In that regard there are two broad categories of plans - defined benefit (DB) plans, which focus on benefit security and defined contribution (DC) plans which focus on wealth accumulation. Of course, a retirement program could incorporate both a DB and a DC component (these plans are generally referred to as hybrid plans). The City plans also
provide retiree healthcare benefits which are addressed separately from the pension benefits in this report.

The Boards considered whether a DC plan should be created for new hires, but after discussing the various risks and the resulting impact on benefit levels a DC plan was not considered a viable alternative. There is often a misconception by the general public that changing to a DC plan will "solve" the funding problems of the retirement system. However, moving to a DC plan for a new hire does not reduce the unfunded actuarial accrued liability (UAAL) of the existing DB plans which will still need to be funded. In fact, the UAAL may grow in the future as the asset allocation of the then closed DB plans changes to a more conservative mix as the covered population ages and the asset levels decline. In addition, a DC plan is not really viable for police and fire employees given the earlier retirement ages desired by the City to maintain an effective police and fire force combined with the lack of Social Security coverage for these employee groups and the poor pre-retirement death and disability benefits provided through a DC plan, unless supplemental insurance is purchased.

Another alternative that was considered is placing new hires in the South Dakota Retirement System (SDRS). Prior to this plan design study, the Boards had asked their retained actuary, GRS, to perform studies to estimate the cost impact of moving all new hires into SDRS. GRS issued a Supplemental Actuarial Report dated October 26, 2010 that provided the Board with the requested cost projections. Because the Boards had previously studied this option, there was limited discussion of this alternative, particularly because it creates the same issues regarding the UAAL as a DC plan and will also introduce a loss of City control on decisions over benefit and contribution levels.

## Current Status of Plans

The current DB plans for City employees are well-funded plans. The annual required contribution (ARC) has always been paid by the City, the unfunded actuarial accrued liability (UAAL) of each plan is being amortized over a closed period which was 13 years at the last valuation date, and there have been no benefit improvements in many years.

The table below illustrates the contribution rates, the funded status and the amortization period of the unfunded actuarial accrued liability for the pension plans under the current assumptions and methods, based on the actuarial valuation conducted as of December 31, 2010.

| General <br> Employees | Police <br> Officers | Firefighters |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Normal Rate | $11.62 \%$ | $19.30 \%$ | $21.01 \%$ |
| Member Rate | $\underline{3.00}$ | $\underline{8.00}$ | $\underline{8.00}$ |
| Employer Normal Rate | $8.62 \%$ | $11.30 \%$ | $13.01 \%$ |
| UAAL Rate | $\underline{4.24}$ | $\underline{9.42}$ | $\underline{12.20}$ |
| Actuarially Determined | $12.86 \%$ | $20.72 \%$ | $25.21 \%$ |
| Contributions | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Amortization Period (Years) | $91.0 \%$ | $86.7 \%$ | $87.0 \%$ |
| Funded Ratio |  |  |  |

The funded ratio shown in the table is the actuarial value of assets divided by the actuarial accrued liability. The ratio for each employee group is very strong. As an example, only 29 of 126 systems included in the latest Public Funds Survey conducted by the National Association of State Retirement Administrators (NASRA) have a funded ratio above $86.7 \%$ (the aggregate for all plans in the survey is 77.2\%).

The plans also assist the employer in providing retiree healthcare benefits which are funded in a manner similar to the pension benefits. The following table shows the current status of those benefits.

| Retiree Healthcare | General <br> Employees | Police <br> Officers | Firefighters |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Normal Rate | $3.25 \%$ | $4.81 \%$ | $5.37 \%$ |
| Member Rate | $\underline{0.00}$ | $\underline{0.00}$ | $\underline{0.00}$ |
| Employer Normal Rate | $3.25 \%$ | $4.81 \%$ | $5.37 \%$ |
| UAAL Rate | $\underline{2.28}$ | $\underline{4.14}$ | $\underline{4.28}$ |
| Actuarially Determined Contributions | $5.53 \%$ | $8.95 \%$ | $9.65 \%$ |
| Amortization Period (Years) | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Funded Status | $42.7 \%$ | $37.2 \%$ | $37.7 \%$ |

While the funded ratios for the retiree healthcare plans are lower than the pension plans, they are higher than most retiree healthcare plans in our experience. Additionally, the
current use of a 401(h) subaccount as a funding vehicle links the funding of retiree healthcare benefits to pension plan normal costs, potentially limiting the City's ability to contribute the full ARC for retiree healthcare benefits.

The actuarially determined contribution rates in recent years are above historic averages for both pensions and retiree healthcare. The likelihood of continued upward pressure on those rates due to prior investment losses and, for retiree healthcare, the additional volatility and strain due to healthcare cost increases above price and wage inflation have created the need to study alternatives that will stabilize the rates and reduce them over time. The following graph and table shows the contribution rate history for the systems.

City Pension and Retiree Healthcare Contributions

|  | Fire |  |  | Police |  |  | General |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pension | Health* | Total | Pension | Health* | Total | Pension | Health* | Total |
| 1986 |  |  | 22.64\% |  |  | 18.33\% |  |  | 10.40\% |
| 1987 |  |  | 18.56 |  |  | 14.06 |  |  | 8.49 |
| 1988 |  |  | 18.04 |  |  | 12.44 |  |  | 8.00 |
| 1989 |  |  | 16.66 |  |  | 12.51 |  |  | 7.45 |
| 1990 |  |  | 14.92 |  |  | 10.67 |  |  | 8.77 |
| 1991 |  |  | 15.12 |  |  | 9.57 |  |  | 8.14 |
| 1992 |  |  | 16.65 |  |  | 11.66 |  |  | 10.06 |
| 1993 |  |  | 20.94 |  |  | 13.00 |  |  | 10.39 |
| 1994 |  |  | 22.85 |  |  | 19.05 |  |  | 11.21 |
| 1995 |  |  | 22.34 |  |  | 19.38 |  |  | 10.56 |
| 1996 |  |  | 22.52 |  |  | 19.88 |  |  | 10.81 |
| 1997 |  |  | 22.09 |  |  | 18.95 |  |  | 10.35 |
| 1998 |  |  | 21.62 |  |  | 19.06 |  |  | 10.32 |
| 1999 |  |  | 18.80 |  |  | 20.01 |  |  | 11.06 |
| 2000 | 14.43\% | 1.96\% | 16.39 | 16.85\% | 1.75\% | 18.60 | 9.68\% | 0.71\% | 10.39 |
| 2001 | 11.87 | 2.00 | 13.87 | 13.90 | 1.81 | 15.71 | 8.47 | 0.96 | 9.43 |
| 2002 | 7.86 | 3.01 | 10.87 | 15.60 | 2.60 | 18.20 | 7.60 | 1.59 | 9.19 |
| 2003 | 7.23 | 3.72 | 10.95 | 14.42 | 3.01 | 17.43 | 7.77 | 1.97 | 9.74 |
| 2004 | 9.31 | 4.39 | 13.70 | 15.68 | 3.58 | 19.26 | 8.68 | 2.18 | 10.86 |
| 2005 | 11.12 | 4.43 | 15.55 | 13.96 | 4.63 | 18.59 | 9.43 | 2.55 | 11.98 |
| 2006 | 16.21 | 4.35 | 20.56 | 14.84 | 3.58 | 18.42 | 9.80 | 2.03 | 11.83 |
| 2007 | 17.14 | 8.91 | 26.05 | 14.96 | 7.23 | 22.19 | 10.38 | 5.04 | 15.42 |
| 2008 | 15.99 | 9.47 | 25.46 | 13.36 | 7.57 | 20.93 | 9.50 | 5.49 | 14.99 |
| 2009 | 16.36 | 8.72 | 25.08 | 14.58 | 7.36 | 21.94 | 9.33 | 5.18 | 14.51 |
| 2010 | 19.97 | 8.33 | 28.30 | 17.66 | 7.45 | 25.11 | 10.93 | 5.03 | 15.96 |
| 2011 | 24.55 | 8.35 | 32.90 | 20.78 | 7.66 | 28.44 | 13.17 | 4.89 | 18.06 |
| 2012 | 25.21 | 9.65 | 34.86 | 20.72 | 8.95 | 29.67 | 12.86 | 5.53 | 18.39 |

* The City pre-funded retiree health benefits prior to 2000. However, separate contribution rates were not provided in the actuarial valuation report until 2000.


## Pension Plan Changes

Five alternative pension benefit designs were considered for each group (General Employees, Police, and Fire) and modeled to quantify the impact on the employer's required contribution rates. In all of the alternative pension plan designs that were studied, no change was made to the benefits for current retired members. In addition, in all but Alternatives 4 and 5, no change was made to the plan provisions for current active employees. The only change for current members considered in Alternative 4 was an increase of $2 \%$ in the employee contribution rate, phased in over a two year period. Alternative 5 eliminates the lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary for current active members, but leaves the current contribution rate in place for current members. All other changes considered would apply only to new hires. It must be kept in mind that the cost savings from reducing benefits for new hires takes many years to manifest itself. The full cost impact is only realized after all of the current active members leave City employment and are replaced by employees covered under the new benefit structure. This usually takes 15 to 30 years depending on the active member demographics and benefit provisions regarding retirement eligibility.

The five pension alternatives studied for each group modify different provisions of the current plan design to create the cost savings. Therefore, each pension alternative creates different projected contribution rates and related savings for the City. It is important to remember that the cost savings to the City are created by either increased employee contributions or lower benefits expected to be paid to employees. A brief summary of the range of cost savings under each alternative for each group is shown in the following table. Please note that the specifics of the plan design changes under each pension alternative vary for each group. Details of these plan designs and the related savings are included in the following sections of the report.

Estimated Pension Savings over 30 Year Projection Period (\$Millions)

|  | General | Fire | Police | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pension Alternative 1 | $\$ 96$ | $\$ 26$ | $\$ 33$ | $\$ 155$ |
| Pension Alternative 2 | 80 | 21 | 26 | 127 |
| Pension Alternative 3 | 93 | 18 | 27 | 138 |
| Pension Alternative 4 | 92 | 23 | 28 | 143 |
| Pension Alternative 5 | 107 | 34 | 39 | 180 |

One of the stated goals of the study was to improve the stability of the contribution rate. Section Four of the report presents a potential change to the funding policy for the pension plans that would help lower and stabilize the pension contribution rates. This change could be stand-alone or done in conjunction with changes in benefits.

## Healthcare Changes

Two alternative healthcare benefit designs were considered for each group (General Employees, Police, and Fire) and modeled to quantify the impact on the required contribution rates. In all of the healthcare plan design scenarios studied, no benefit changes were assumed for current retired members.

The benefit changes of Healthcare Scenario \#1 apply only to new hires and provide the cost impact to the retiree healthcare plan of the change to the normal retirement age modeled in the following pension alternatives:

- General Employees
o Pension Alternative 1
o Pension Alternative 2
o Pension Alternative 4
- Police and Fire
o Pension Alternative 3
It should be noted that changing the normal retirement age to sixty-five limits the payment of retiree healthcare benefits to early retirees, disabled retirees, and surviving spouses. As with the pension plan, the cost savings from reducing or eliminating benefits for new hires may take many years to materialize, as the current active membership must be replaced by employees covered under the new benefit structure.

The benefit changes modeled for Healthcare Scenario \#2 impact current active employees and new hires. The benefit changes of Healthcare Scenario \#2 are summarized as:

- Discontinue access to the City's healthcare plan for members retiring after 12/31/2013
- Provide a fixed dollar benefit to be applied to a retiree's healthcare costs for eligible employees retiring after 12/31/2013
o Fixed dollar amount based upon years of service
o Fixed dollar amount may be indexed by cost of living adjustments
- Discontinue the retiree healthcare benefit for employees hired after 12/31/2013

Scenario \#2 impacts current active employees, and, as a result, provides an immediate impact to current liabilities. As Scenario \#2 closes the plan to new entrants, this impact may be altered by any changes to asset allocation or amortization methodology.

The two healthcare scenarios studied for each group modify different provisions of the current plan design to create the cost savings. Therefore, each healthcare scenario creates
different projected contribution rates and related savings for the City. It is important to remember that the cost savings to the City are created by a reduction in expected benefit payments. A brief summary of the range of cost savings under each scenario for each group is shown in the following table. While a total for each alternative of Scenario \#2 is provided, the alternative elected for each employee group could vary. Details of the plan designs, including specific variations for each employee group, and the related savings are included in the section of the report titled "Current Retiree Healthcare Plans".

## Estimated Dollar Amount of Healthcare Savings over 30 Year Projection Period (\$Millions)

|  | General <br> Employees | Fire | Police | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Healthcare Scenario \#1 | $\$ 30$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 33$ |
| Healthcare Scenario \#2* |  |  |  |  |
| Alternative \#4 (\$10/mo./YOS) | $\$ 96$ | $\$ 49$ | $\$ 59$ | $\$ 204$ |
| Alternative \#8 (\$20/mo./YOS) | 83 | 42 | 49 | 174 |
| Alternative \#12 (\$30/mo./YOS) | 70 | 35 | 40 | 145 |

*The alternatives shown for scenario \#2 reflect a 3\% COLA adjustment. Furthermore, while a total savings for scenario \#2 is provided, the fixed dollar subsidy amount could vary by employee group and could provide for varying levels of indexing.

## Trends

Over the past few years, there has been a significant amount of activity in the public pension arena related to changes in the plan design of retirement benefits. These changes have been made to address concerns about the viability of retirement plan benefits and funding that date back to the 2001 recession, coupled with the severe investment losses in the 2007-2009 recession, demographic changes, and the fiscal condition of state budgets.

In most cases, systems have revised rather than replaced traditional defined benefit plans, usually creating a new "tier" with different benefit provisions. Costs have been shifted to members through higher employee contributions, longer service requirements and older ages for normal retirement, and lower post-retirement benefit adjustments. The details of recent activity in this area can be found on pages 15 to 16 in the Plan Design Basics section of this report. In addition, please see Appendix B for recent information on this topic published by the National Association of State Retirement Administrators (NASRA).

## Background

The purpose of this study is to examine the current benefit structures of the plans, and to identify potential changes in contribution patterns and/or benefits that would produce more stable, sustainable cost levels for the City.

However, it should be noted that in order to properly address this issue, the overriding retirement policy of the City needs to be identified. This requires a determination of the purpose of a retirement program and who should bear the risks associated with that program. The City's stated compensation and benefit objectives are:
a. Attract qualified applicants for employment by the City in all categories of work;
b. Retain experienced and qualified employees in all categories of work;
c. Provide incentives for employees to pursue career advancement opportunities as they arise within the City;
d. Accomplish these objectives within responsible economic parameters.

As is typically the case, the City's retirement programs are established to both attract and retain employees. Given that goal, the question becomes what design and level of benefits are appropriate to meet the goal? In answering that question the City should take into account the total compensation provided to employees, including salary, retirement, health, life and other fringe benefits. Reviewing the total compensation provided by entities competing for employees in the local labor market will be a help in this regard.

This study deals with the retirement program specifically. In that regard there are two broad categories of plans - defined benefit (DB) plans, which focus on benefit security by providing guaranteed lifetime income and defined contribution (DC) plans which focus on wealth accumulation by providing lump sum benefits through individual accounts. Of course a retirement program could incorporate both a DB and a DC component (these plans are generally referred to as hybrid plans).

DB plans include final average pay plans (like the City's), career average pay plans, flat dollar plans and cash balance plans. DC plans include 401(a) plans, 401(k) plans, 403(b) plans (mainly for teachers), and 457 plans, all named for sections of the Internal Revenue Code that created them. Any retirement program, whether DB or DC, involves risk. The categories of risk shared by both are:

- Investment risk (return on assets lower than expected)
- Inflation risk (the impact of inflation on wages prior to retirement and benefits after retirement)
- Contribution risk (absolute level and volatility of amounts needed to finance a given benefit level), and
- Longevity risk (the possibility of outliving retirement assets)

Two other risk areas that impact DC plans only are leakage risk (the risk that participants will withdraw and spend assets prior to retirement) and participation risk (the risk that some employees will fail to defer current compensation in a voluntary DC plan).

The four main risk areas are shared between employers and employees differently under DB and DC plans. Investment risk is usually borne by employers in DB plans unless increases in the contribution rate are shared with employees. In DC plans the investment risk is borne solely by employees. Inflation risk prior to retirement is borne by employers in salary related DB plans and by employees in DC plans. Postretirement inflation risk is the employee's responsibility in both plans unless a cost-ofliving adjustment (COLA) indexed to inflation is provided in a DB plan. In that case, the risk is shifted either entirely or partially to the employer depending on the design of the COLA.

Employers bear the contribution risk in DB plans, although some plans share this risk with employees. In DC plans, inadequate asset balances at retirement are the employees' risk regardless of the reason for the shortfall. DB plan longevity risk is covered by the employer exclusively, again unless the plan design includes sharing contribution increase with employees. In DC plans longevity risk is solely the employees'. Since the longevity risk is pooled in DB plans but falls on individuals in DC plans, DB plans are better able to manage this risk, thereby reducing its overall impact

The table on the following page provides a summary of the typical risk levels for plans, as well as some of the main features of the various basic plan designs.

|  | Current Defined Benefit |  | Pure Defined Contribution |  | Hybrid Plans |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Economic Risk | ER | EE | ER | EE | ER | EE |
| Investment Risk | High | Low | None | High | Medium | Medium |
| Inflation Risk - wage (pre-retirement) | High | None | None | High | Medium | Medium |
| Inflation Risk - price (post-retirement) | Medium | Medium | None | High | Low | Medium |
| Contribution Risk | High | Low | None | High | Medium | Medium |
| Longevity Risk | Medium | None | None | High | Low | Medium |
| Features |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Rewards older/longer service } \\ \text { employees }\end{array}$ | High |  | Low |  | Medium |  |
| Provides retirement security | High |  | Low |  | Medium |  |
| Attract employees | Medium |  | High |  | High |  |
| Retain employees | High |  | Low |  | Medium |  |
| Provides systematic retirement of employees | High |  | Low |  | Medium |  |

Both of the Sioux Falls plans are Internal Revenue Code (IRC) qualified DB plans. As noted earlier, a DB plan provides a guaranteed lifetime benefit at retirement based on a formula that reflects salary history and service with a covered employer. In contrast, a DC plan does not provide for a guaranteed benefit. A DC plan is funded by employer (and possibly employee) contributions. These contributions accumulate with actual investment earnings, and the participant's annual retirement income is whatever the accumulated assets can provide over the retiree's lifetime.

DB plans do a better job of providing retirement income whereas DC plans are better at creating retirement savings. Although the current approach in the public sector is to consider replacing a DB plan with a DC plan, they really are complimentary vehicles and should be offered together. Many employers also offer a DC plan in conjunction with the DB plan. For example, the City of Sioux Falls currently provides a 457 plan, with some employer matching contributions, in addition to the DB plan for certain employee groups.

The ultimate goal of any retirement program is to provide adequate retirement benefits to career employees when they reach normal retirement age. The most common method used to analyze and compare retirement programs and measure the relative income provided by the retirement plan is called the "replacement ratio". This measurement is expressed as a percentage of the employee's final salary at retirement. The replacement ratio includes income from all sources including employer provided retirement plans, Social Security, if applicable, and personal savings. The typical benchmark is that a replacement ratio of $75 \%$ to $90 \%$ of pre-retirement income is needed to maintain the employee's standard of living, depending on the level of preretirement income. A higher percentage usually applies if the employee is a lower wage earner and a lower percentage applies if the employee is a higher wage earner. The replacement ratio measurement is not a perfect measure because of the diversity in the personal situations of the working population, but it is the most commonly used tool to evaluate the adequacy of retirement benefits.

The replacement ratio for the current pension benefit structure will vary depending on the employee's age and years of service at retirement. Most often a DB plan is designed to replace a certain level of pre-retirement income for a "career employee", typically at least 30 years for non-public safety employees, and 20 to 25 years for public safety employees. The following table shows the replacement ratio for the retirement benefits provided by the current plans assuming the employee has met the age and service requirement for normal retirement (unreduced benefits). Please note that the replacement ratio is a measurement of benefit adequacy at retirement and, therefore, is not reflective of the level of benefits after retirement. To the extent that a full CPI-indexed cost of living adjustment is not included in the plan design, the purchasing power of the benefit may decline after the employee retires.

## Replacement Ratios (Retirement Benefit as a Percent of Final Year's Salary)

| Service | Current <br> Plan |
| :---: | :---: |
| General Employees |  |
| 20 | 38.7\% |
| 25 | 48.4\% |
| 30 | 58.0\% |
| 35 | 67.7\% |
| Police |  |
| 20 | 53.7\% |
| 25 | 67.2\% |
| 30 | 75.2\% |
| Fire |  |
| 20 | 55.2\% |
| 25 | 69.0\% |
| 30 | 77.3\% |

The retirement benefit received from the City-sponsored DB plan is only one component of retirement income. General Employees are covered by Social Security and can elect to receive those benefits as early as age 62. There clearly could be a lag between the time an employee retires and the time he begins to receive Social Security benefits. By design, the replacement ratio for Social Security benefits is higher for low wage earners and lower for high wage earners. The typical benchmark used is that Social Security benefits replace about 20 to $30 \%$ of pre-retirement pay. However, if benefits commence before full Social Security Retirement Age, a reduction applies and the benefit amount received will be less. For a career employee who works thirty years and retires at age 65, the pension plan (to which the employee has contributed) and Social Security together would provide a replacement ratio of around $85 \%$, which is in the target range of $75 \%$ to $90 \%$. However, at earlier retirement ages, the replacement ratio would be less. Since Social Security benefits cannot begin before age 62, but benefits in the City's plan may currently begin as early as age 55, there is a gap in target replacement ratio for the pre-62 years that must be filled with personal savings or other sources.

Police and Fire members are not covered by Social Security so the benefit from the City's DB plan is the main source of retirement income and thus must provide a higher replacement ratio than the General Employees' benefit structure.

In reviewing the replacement ratios produced by the current benefit structure in the DB plans, it is important to remember that the employees contribute to both the City DB plans and Social Security (for General employees) and thus are financing part of the benefits received. This review of the replacement ratio for the Sioux Falls plans indicates that, while the benefits provided are adequate, they are not overly generous or lucrative.

It is an undisputed fact that for a given employer commitment (i.e., contribution level) DB plans are the superior vehicle for achieving this goal. This is demonstrated below. For all pension plans, whether defined benefit or defined contribution, the basic retirement funding equation is:

$$
C+I=B+E
$$

Where:

- $\mathrm{C}=$ employer and member contributions
- $\mathrm{I}=$ investment income
- $\mathrm{B}=$ benefits paid
- $E=$ expenses paid from the fund, if any.

The underlying message is that dollars in have to equal dollars out. When comparing a DB plan and a DC plan with identical employer contributions ("C"), if investment income ("I") and expenses ("E") are the same, then the total benefits ("B") paid from the plans must be equal. However, DC plans are designed to allow members terminating prior to retirement to withdraw their account balance which includes vested employer contributions. Therefore under a DC plan the benefits paid to those who terminate prior to retirement are higher than under a DB plan (even when a member terminates prior to retirement under a DB plan with no right to a vested benefit, the employer contributions remain in the system). As a result under a DC plan, there are fewer benefit dollars available for members who retire when compared to a DB plan.

If there is to be a $\mathrm{DB} / \mathrm{DC}$ discussion and it is going to revolve around an "either/or" choice, then the City has a key decision to make. Is the goal of the pension program to provide adequate retirement income to employees who serve the citizens of Sioux Falls for a career, or to provide higher benefits for those employees who terminate prior to retirement after a period of service with the City?

In addition, moving to a DC plan for a new hires does not reduce the unfunded actuarial accrued liability of the existing DB plans which will still need to be funded. In fact, the liability will grow in the future as the asset allocation of the then closed DB plans changes to a more conservative mix as the covered population ages and the asset levels decline. The initial cost of the closed DB plan may also increase as contributions to amortize the unfunded actuarial accrued liability typically will be made on a level dollar basis rather than the current level percent of payroll basis. Finally a DC plan is not really viable for police and fire employees given the earlier retirement ages desired by the City to maintain an effective police and fire force combined with the lack of Social Security coverage for these employee groups and the poor pre-retirement death and disability benefits provided through a DC plan, unless supplemental insurance is purchased.

Another alternative that was considered as part of this study was placing new hires in the South Dakota Retirement System. The Boards had performed analysis prior to the commencement of this plan design study which included having their retained actuary, GRS, perform studies to estimate the cost impact of moving new hires into SDRS. GRS issued a Supplemental Actuarial Report dated October 26, 2010 that provided the Board with the requested cost projections. Because the Boards had previously studied this option, there was limited discussion of this alternative, particularly because it creates the same issues regarding the UAAL as a DC plan and will also introduce a loss of City control over decisions that impact benefit amounts and contribution levels.

## Trends

Over the past few years, there has been a significant amount of activity in the public pension arena related to the plan design of retirement benefits. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) 27 states enacted significant changes in public pension plans in 2011 and 21 enacted changes in 2010. Some states acted in both years. These plan design changes address concerns about the viability of retirement plan benefits and funding that date back to the 2001 recession, coupled with the severe investment losses in the 2007-2009 recession and demographic changes and the fiscal condition of state budgets. The most common changes made in the last two years were:

1. Increase in the employee contribution rate for at least some of the current membership (18 states),
2. Increase in the employee contribution rate for future members only (7 states),
3. Requiring a higher age and service requirement for normal retirement (unreduced) benefits ( 24 states), and
4. Reduced post-retirement benefit increases (18 states in total of which 6 have included current retirees).
Additional changes have included longer vesting periods for new hires (13 states) and a longer period for calculating final average salary (meaning a lower base for a pension)
in 14 states. Sixteen states have provided for a greater reduction in the amount of benefit payable under early retirement provisions and five states included current employees in this change. There have also been greater restrictions on the rules related to retirees returning to covered employment in twelve (12) states.

With two exceptions, states have revised rather than replaced traditional defined benefit pension plans, often creating a new "tier" with different benefit provisions. In 2010, Utah closed its DB plan for all state and local employees and is offering new employees a choice of a defined contribution plan and a combined plan that includes a DB plan and a DC plan. Also in 2010, Michigan replaced its School Employees DB plan with a combined plan. Indiana created an alternative DC plan in 2011.

Costs have been shifted to members through higher contributions, longer service requirements, older ages for normal retirement, and lower post-retirement benefit adjustments. Most states that increased employee contribution rates in 2011 offset them with lower employer contribution rates, at least temporarily. This appears to be a trend toward equalizing the employer and employee contribution rates. It also helps balance highly-stressed state (and sometime local) budgets.

The National Association of State Retirement Administrators (NASRA) recently published a document that provides the details on changes made to state-wide retirement systems to address the sustainability of those systems. It shows the same trend as discussed above, i.e. that most changes are made to the current benefit structure and a new tier is created as opposed to changing from a DB to a DC plan. The NASRA survey is attached to this report as Appendix B.

The ability to change benefits or contributions for current active employees varies from state to state as the pertinent law varies by state. It is very common for the plan provisions, including the employee contribution rate, to be considered part of the "contract" between the employee and employer and thus, be protected by contract law. In these situations the only changes that can be made are for new hires.

Because the Sioux Falls plans are well funded and the amortization period is relatively short in comparison to other public retirement plans, less dramatic changes to the current benefit structure are necessary to generate savings and bring contributions to reasonable levels. The sections of this report that follow present the results of potential alternative plan designs that were considered that are within the DB framework.

## Current Situation

The City of Sioux Falls Employees' Retirement System (covering general employees and police officers) and City of Sioux Falls Firefighters’ Pension Fund are well-funded plans. The annual required contribution (ARC) as always been paid by the employer, the (UAAL of each plan is being amortized over a closed period (currently 13 years), and there have been no benefit improvements in many years.

The tables below illustrate the current benefit structure of the plans. YOS stands for years of service.

| Item | General Employees |
| :---: | :---: |
| Benefit Multiplier | 1.8\% per YOS |
| Final Average Pay | High 3 years of last 10 including lump sum pay |
| Normal Retirement | Age 55 with 30 YOS or age 60 with 5 YOS |
| COLA | $100 \%$ of CPI change capped at $3 \%$. Commencing after 36 months of retirement. |
| Vesting | 5 YOS |
| Employee Contribution Rate | 3.0\% |
| Employer Contribution Rate | Actuarially determined |
| Form of Payment | Single life annuity |


| Item | Firefighters | Police Officers |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Benefit Multiplier | $2.5 \%$ for first 25 YOS + <br> $1.5 \%$ for YOS > 25 | $2.5 \%$ for first 25 YOS + <br> $1.5 \%$ for YOS > 25 |
| Final Average Pay | Final 3 years, including <br> lump sum pay | High 3 years of last 10, <br> including lump sum pay |
| Normal Retirement | Age 55 with 20 YOS or <br> Rule of 80 (min age 50) | Age 50 with 25 YOS or <br> age 60 with 15 YOS |
| COLA | $100 \%$ of CPI change <br> capped at 3\%. <br> Commencing after 36 <br> months of retirement | $100 \%$ of CPI change <br> capped at 3\%. <br> Commencing after 36 <br> months of retirement |
| Vesting | 15 YOS | 15 YOS |
| Employee Contribution Rate | 8.0\% | A.0\% |
| Employer Contribution Rate | Actuarially determined | Actuarially determined |
| Form of Payment | Single life annuity | Single life annuity |

As noted in the previous section, for all pension plans the basic retirement funding equation is:

$$
C+I=B+E
$$

As can be seen from the formula, for a given level of benefits and expenses the greater " I " is, the smaller " C " is. This is the underlying reason for advance funding a pension plan, and historically in a DB plan investment income pays for $70 \%$ to $75 \%$ of the benefit dollars received by plan participants. In other words, for every dollar paid to a participant only 25 to 30 cents comes from contributions.

Of course, the problem with the formula is that in order to figure out exactly how much to contribute, the plan would have to be closed to new members and allowed to operate until all retirees were deceased. At that point, the benefits and expenses actually paid out and the investment income actually earned would be known and, using the equation above, the true cost could be determined. Since the vast majority of plans are ongoing and have no intention of closing, and since even with a closed plan it takes a very long time before all benefits are finally paid out, plan sponsors hire actuaries to estimate the
true cost of their plans and to create a budget to make systematic contributions to meet that cost.

In order to determine the contributions needed, the actuary's first step is to estimate on a given date (the valuation date) the value of all benefits (and expenses) that will be paid to the existing active and retired membership over their remaining lifetimes based on the plan's current benefit structure. This estimation requires the use of assumptions regarding both future events (termination, disability, retirement, death, etc.) and future economic conditions (return on assets, inflation, salary growth, etc.).

By combining the assumptions about future events and the salary growth assumption, the actuary generates an expected benefit payment stream. In other words, a string of annual payments expected to be made to the current active and retired members from the valuation date until all members are no longer living. Then the actuary applies the asset return assumption to discount each year's payments to the valuation date, creating the present value of all future benefits or the total liability of the plan.

The difference between the total liability and the current assets of the plan represents the present value of future contributions (PVFC) that have to be made by the plan sponsor and employees in a contributory system. Usually the plan sponsor cannot contribute the entire difference in one year, but rather desires a relatively smooth contribution pattern over time that also meets any external constraints. In order to budget for the PVFC, the actuary applies an actuarial cost method. There are several acceptable cost methods, but it's important to recognize that they are nothing more than budgeting tools.

Different actuarial cost methods can provide for faster funding earlier in a plan's existence, more level funding over time, or more flexibility in funding. The choice of an actuarial cost method will determine the pattern or pace of the funding and, therefore, should be linked to long term financing objectives of the fund and benefit security considerations. However, it is important to keep in mind that the actuarial cost method used will not change the ultimate cost of the pension plan.

There are several credible funding methods that can be used to fund a public pension plan. They include entry age normal and projected unit credit. Entry Age Normal (EAN) is used by a large majority of public sector systems, including the Sioux Falls plans. Its popularity stems from the fact that it is designed to generate level contributions as a percent of active member payroll over an employee's working lifetime. The EAN method splits the present value of future contributions into a present value of future normal costs and an actuarial accrued liability. The "normal cost" is a measure of the contribution rate necessary, payable from date of hire until departure from active membership in the plan, to finance the benefits promised to active members. The difference between the present value of future contributions and the present value of future normal costs is called the actuarial accrued liability.

In the table below we present the contribution rates, the funded status and the amortization period of the unfunded actuarial accrued liability for the plans under the current assumptions and methods, based on the actuarial valuation conducted as of December 31, 2010.

| Item | General <br> Employees | Police <br> Officers | Firefighters |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Normal Rate | $11.62 \%$ | $19.30 \%$ | $21.01 \%$ |
| Member Rate | $\underline{3.00}$ | $\underline{8.00}$ | $\underline{8.00}$ |
| Employer Normal Rate | $8.62 \%$ | $11.30 \%$ | $13.01 \%$ |
| UAAL Rate | $\underline{4.24}$ | $\underline{9.42}$ | $\underline{12.20}$ |
| Actuarially Determined Contributions | $12.86 \%$ | $20.72 \%$ | $25.21 \%$ |
| Amortization Period (Years) | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Funded Status | $91.0 \%$ | $86.7 \%$ | $87.0 \%$ |

The recent market downturn has put pressure on employer contribution rates at a time when the economic outlook for revenue growth is uncertain. This combination of events has driven sponsors of pension plans to analyze alternatives to make sure the benefits promised to current members are secure while not overburdening the tax payers.

## Potential Changes for Current Actives

The system's ability to modify benefits for current active employees is contingent upon a change to the ordinance and an affirmative vote by both the council and the members of the system. Therefore, the potential changes considered for current active employees were limited to (1) an increase in the employee contribution rate and (2) elimination of lump sum payments in the calculation of final average salary.

## Potential Benefit Changes for New Hires

Defined benefit plan costs can be lowered by reducing the benefits paid (benefit multipliers, final compensation or cost-of-living adjustments), reducing the time period benefits are expected to be paid by increasing age and service requirements for when benefits commence (retirement eligibilities), increasing the employee's share of the contribution burden, or a combination of these. Depending on the changes made, the
cost impact is different for the various changes available. The impact generally falls into the following categories:

- Greatest savings:
- Benefit multiplier
- Retirement eligibility
- Cost-of-living-adjustments (COLAs)
- Elimination of inclusion of lump sum payments at retirement in final average salary definition
- Large savings:
- Final average salary
- Normal form of benefit payment
- Small savings:
- Vesting
- Interest on employee contributions
- Pre-retirement death and disability benefits
- Early retirement reduction factors

It must be kept in mind that the cost savings from reducing benefits for new hires takes many years to manifest itself. The full impact is only realized after all of the current active members leave City employment and are replaced by employees covered under the new benefit structure. This usually takes 15 to 30 years depending on the active member demographics and benefit provisions regarding retirement eligibility.

The table on the following page shows the ultimate savings from a number of potential changes to the benefit structure for new members. The savings is measured as a reduction in the employer normal cost rate. The baseline used to determine the savings is the valuation results produced by Cavanaugh Macdonald during the actuarial audit conducted as part of the services provided to the City. The results of that audit are detailed in a separate report. Please note that the cost impact of a combination of changes is not necessarily additive.

## Retirement Plan Changes

## For New Hires

|  | 12/31/10 GRS | uation CMC | Increase <br> Employee Contributions by 2\% of Pay | Change <br> Final Average Salary to 5 Years | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lower } \\ & \text { COLA to } \\ & 2 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Increase Normal Retirement Age to 65 with 5 YOS for General Employees and 55 with 25 YOS for Police \& Fire | Increase <br> Years for <br> Vesting to 10 for General Employees | Lower <br> Benefit Multiplier to $1.55 \%$ per year for General Employees and 2.00\% per year for Police \& Fire | Exclude LS <br> Pay in FAS <br> Calculation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GENERAL EMPLOYEES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Normal Cost | 11.62\% | 11.24\% | 11.29\% | 10.79\% | 10.49\% | 9.20\% | 11.16\% | 9.78\% | 10.03\% |
| Employer Normal Cost |  | 8.24\% | 6.29\% | 7.79\% | 7.49\% | 6.20\% | 8.16\% | 6.78\% | 7.03\% |
| Savings |  |  | -1.95\% | -0.45\% | -0.75\% | -2.04\% | -0.08\% | -1.46\% | -1.21\% |
| POLICE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Normal Cost | 19.30\% | 19.40\% | 19.44\% | 18.66\% | 17.98\% | 17.85\% |  | 16.32\% | 17.32\% |
| Employer Normal Cost |  | 11.40\% | 9.44\% | 10.66\% | 9.98\% | 9.85\% |  | 8.32\% | 9.32\% |
| Savings |  |  | -1.96\% | -0.74\% | -1.42\% | -1.55\% |  | -3.08\% | -2.08\% |
| FIRE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Normal Cost | 21.01\% | 21.15\% | 21.18\% | 20.34\% | 19.62\% | 20.19\% |  | 17.78\% | 18.44\% |
| Employer Normal Cost |  | 13.15\% | 11.18\% | 12.34\% | 11.62\% | 12.19\% |  | 9.78\% | 10.44\% |
| Savings |  |  | -1.97\% | -0.81\% | -1.53\% | -0.96\% |  | -3.37\% | -2.71\% |

## Financial Impact of Potential Changes

As noted above, the savings associated with changes in benefits are not necessarily additive. To demonstrate this, we have estimated the cost savings for five plan design change scenarios all with an effective date of changes of January 1, 2013. For general employees the scenarios are:

1. Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary; increase member contributions by $2 \%$ of pay; increase normal retirement age to age 65 with 5 years of service; increase final average salary to a 5 year average; reduce the COLA to $2 \%$. Applies only to new hires.
2. Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary; increase member contributions by $2 \%$ of pay; increase normal retirement age to age 65 with 5 years of service. Applies only to new hires.
3. Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary; increase member contributions by $2 \%$ of pay; increase normal retirement age to age 65 with 5 years of service or age 60 with 30 years of service; reduce the COLA to $2 \%$. Applies only to new hires.
4. Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary for new hires; increase member contributions for both current actives and new hires by $2 \%$ of pay ( $1 \%$ in the first year for current actives); increase normal retirement age to age 65 with 5 years of service for new hires.
5. Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary for both current actives and new hires; increase member contributions for new hires by $2 \%$ of pay; increase normal retirement age for new hires to age 65 with 5 years of service.

For police and fire the scenarios are:

1. Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary; increase member contributions by $2 \%$ of pay; increase final average salary to a 5 year average; reduce the COLA to $2 \%$. Applies only to new hires.
2. Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary; increase member contributions by $2 \%$ of pay; increase final average salary to a 5 year average. Applies only to new hires.
3. Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary; increase normal retirement age to age 55 with 25 years of service or age 60 with 15 years of service; reduce the COLA to $2 \%$. Applies only to new hires.
4. Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary for new hires; increase final average salary to a 5 year average for new hires, increase member contributions for both current actives and new hires by $2 \%$ of pay ( $1 \%$ in the first year for current actives).
5. Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary for both current actives and new hires, increase member contributions for new hires by $2 \%$ of pay, and increase final average salary for new hires to a 5 year average.

As mentioned earlier, the full impact of changes that are made to the benefit structure for new hires takes many years to unfold. Therefore, costs must be compared over a long period. For our modeling we used a thirty year projection period to permit adequate time for the long term trends to appear. The long term savings for each scenario are shown in the following tables.

Long Term Reduction in Employer Normal Cost Rate

|  | General <br> Employees | Fire | Police |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Pension Alternative 1 | $5.20 \%$ | $6.44 \%$ | $5.62 \%$ |
| Pension Alternative 2 | $4.38 \%$ | $5.19 \%$ | $4.42 \%$ |
| Pension Alternative 3 | $5.03 \%$ | $4.42 \%$ | $4.43 \%$ |
| Pension Alternative 4 | $5.03 \%$ | $5.19 \%$ | $4.42 \%$ |
| Pension Alternative 5 | $5.07 \%$ | $5.22 \%$ | $4.45 \%$ |

## Estimated Dollar Amount of Pension Savings over 30 Year Projection Period (\$Millions)

|  | General | Fire | Police | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pension Alternative 1 | $\$ 96$ | $\$ 26$ | $\$ 33$ | $\$ 155$ |
| Pension Alternative 2 | 80 | 21 | 26 | 127 |
| Pension Alternative 3 | 93 | 18 | 27 | 138 |
| Pension Alternative 4 | 92 | 23 | 28 | 143 |
| Pension Alternative 5 | 107 | 34 | 39 | 180 |

In the following pages, we provide further detail on the impact of these changes by projecting the contribution pattern expected over time under each of the scenarios, assuming all actuarial assumptions are met in future years. The projection results show how the long term savings are expected to emerge over time.

The following graphs show the projected employer contribution rates compared to the baseline for the three groups, General Employees, Fire and Police, under each of the five pension alternative plan designs described earlier. To provide stability in the contribution rate and improve comparability of the costs of each plan design, the UAAL is re-amortized using an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All actuarial assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return are assumed to be met each year in the projection period. Details, including projected employer contribution rates and dollar amounts by year are shown for each alternative plan design in Appendix A.

During the presentation on the actuarial audit, some possible changes to the set of actuarial assumptions were discussed. If a different set of assumptions is used, the baseline projection will change as well as the projected savings of the various alternatives.

General Employees - Alternative 1
City Contribution Rate


## Changes for New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Increase member contributions from $3 \%$ to $5 \%$ of pay;
- Increase normal retirement age to age 65 with 5 years of service;
- Increase final average salary from 3 years to a 5 year average, and
- Reduce the COLA from CPI up to $3 \%$ beginning 36 months after retirement to CPI up to $2 \%$ beginning 36 months after retirement.

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

The proposed changes are for new hires only so it takes about fifteen years for major savings to emerge. The City's cost under this alternative drops from about $14 \%$ of pay to about $5 \%$ of pay over the projection period and produces cumulative savings over the projection period of $\$ 96$ million. This option represents the most significant reduction in benefits, particularly for long service employees who can retire at age 55 with 30 year of service under the current plan. Under the proposed plan, unreduced retirement benefits are not available until an employee reaches age 65 with at least 5 years of service.

General Employees - Alternative 2
City Contribution Rate


## Changes for New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Increase member contributions from $3 \%$ to $5 \%$ of pay;
- Increase normal retirement age to age 65 with 5 years of service.

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

In this alternative the plan changes are only for new hires only so it takes fifteen years before major cost savings start to be realized. There are fewer benefit changes than in Alternative 1 so the cost savings is less. However, by the end of the thirty year projection period, the City's contribution rate is around $6 \%$ of payroll and the cumulative savings over the thirty year projection period is $\$ 80$ million.

General Employees - Alternative 3
City Contribution Rate


## Changes for New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Increase member contribution rate from $3 \%$ to $5 \%$;
- Increase normal retirement age to age 60 with 30 years of service or age 65 with 5 years of service;
- Reduce the COLA from CPI up to 3\% beginning 36 months after retirement to CPI up to $2 \%$ beginning 36 months after retirement.

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

Alternative 3 is similar to Alternative 1 except it does not move the final average salary (FAS) to a high 5 year average and it provides for unreduced retirement benefits at age 60 with 30 years of service as well as at age 65 with 5 years of service. Again, these changes are for new hires only so it takes about fifteen years before significant cost savings are realized. By 2026, the City's contribution rate is projected to be $8.43 \%$ and ultimately reaches about $5.25 \%$ of payroll in 2041 . The total savings under this alternative over the thirty year projection period is $\$ 93$ million, just slightly less than Alternative 1.

General Employees - Alternative 4
City Contribution Rate


Changes to Current Active Members: increase employee contributions from 3\% to 5\% over a two year period.

## Changes to New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Increase member contributions from 3\% to 5\% of pay,
- Increase normal retirement age to age 65 with 5 years of service.

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

There is more immediate cost savings to the City under this alternative because current active members are assumed to increase their contributions by $2 \%$, which lowers the City's contribution. Fewer changes are made to the new hires under this alternative so the cost savings is less than under the other three options. However, the ultimate City contribution rate in thirty years is about $6 \%$ and total savings over the projection period is $\$ 92$ million.

General Employees - Alternative 5
City Contribution Rate


Changes to Current Active Members: eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary.

## Changes to New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Increase member contributions from 3\% to 5\% of pay,
- Increase normal retirement age to age 65 with 5 years of service.

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

This alternative reflects the same benefit changes for new hires as Alternative 4, but instead of increasing the employee contribution rate by $2 \%$ for current members, lump sum payments are excluded from the determination of final average salary for current active members. Greater savings appear immediately under this alternative because of the reduction in benefits for current active members. The ultimate City contribution rate in thirty years is about $6 \%$ and total savings over the projection period is $\$ 107$ million.

Fire Employees - Alternative 1
City Contribution Rate


## Changes for New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Increase member contributions from $8 \%$ to $10 \%$ of pay;
- Increase final average salary from 3 years to a 5 year average, and
- Reduce the COLA from CPI up to $3 \%$ beginning 36 months after retirement to CPI up to $2 \%$ beginning after 36 months.

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

Given the desire to maintain the earlier retirement ages for public safety members, most of the alternatives studied leave the plan provisions for retirement unchanged. The proposed changes are for new hires only so it takes about fifteen years for significant savings to emerge. The City's cost under this alternative drops from about $33 \%$ of pay in 2014 to around $7 \%$ of pay in 2041, and producing about $\$ 26$ million in savings over the projection period.

Fire Employees - Alternative 2
City Contribution Rate


## Changes for New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Increase member contributions from $8 \%$ to $10 \%$ of pay;
- Increase final average salary from a 3 year to a 5 year average.

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

As mentioned earlier, this alternative leaves the plan provisions for retirement unchanged. The post-retirement cost of living adjustment is also unchanged. This alternative produces estimated cost savings of $\$ 21$ million over the thirty year projection period. The proposed changes are for new hires only so it takes fifteen years for significant cost savings to emerge. The City’s cost under this alternative drops from about $33 \%$ of pay in 2014 to around 8\% of pay in 2041.

Fire Employees - Alternative 3
City Contribution Rate


## Changes for New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Change eligibility for unreduced retirement benefits from the current provisions of:
- (1) age 55 with 20 years of service or (2) age plus years of service equal at least 80 (minimum age 50) to
- (a) age 55 with 25 years of service or (b) age 60 with 15 years of service
- Reduce the COLA from CPI up to $3 \%$ beginning 36 months after retirement to CPI up to $2 \%$ beginning 36 months after retirement.

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

This is the only alternative for Fire that changes to age at which unreduced retirement benefits may begin. This alternative produces estimated cost savings of $\$ 18$ million over the thirty year projection period. The proposed changes are for new hires only so it takes about fifteen years for significant cost savings to emerge. The City's cost under this alternative drops from about 33\% of pay in 2014 to just under 9\% of pay in 2041.

Fire Employees - Alternative 4
City Contribution Rate


Changes to Current Active Members: increase employee contributions from 8\% to $10 \%$ over a two year period.

## Changes to New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Increase final average salary from 3 years to a 5 year average,
- Increase member contributions from $8 \%$ to $10 \%$ of pay,

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

There is more immediate cost savings to the City under this option because current active members are assumed to increase their contributions from $8 \%$ to $10 \%$, providing an immediate decrease to the City's contribution rate. Because of the cost savings that result from current members contributing at a higher rate, fewer changes for new hires are necessary to provide similar cost savings as the other alternatives. Under this alternative, the City contribution rate declines from a high of nearly 33\% in 2014 to about $8.8 \%$ in 2041, representing $\$ 23$ million of estimated savings over the thirty year projection period.

Fire Employees - Alternative 5
City Contribution Rate


Changes to Current Active Members: eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary.

## Changes to New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Increase final average salary from 3 years to a 5 year average,
- Increase member contributions from $8 \%$ to $10 \%$ of pay,

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

This alternative reflects the same benefit changes for new hires as Alternative 4, but instead of increasing the employee contribution rate by $2 \%$ for current members, lump sum payments are excluded from the determination of final average salary for current active members. Greater savings appear immediately under this alternative because of the reduction in benefits for current active members. The ultimate City contribution rate in thirty years is about $8.75 \%$ and total savings over the projection period is $\$ 34$ million.

Police Employees - Alternative 1
City Contribution Rate


## Changes for New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Increase member contributions from $8 \%$ to $10 \%$ of pay;
- Increase final average salary from 3 years to a 5 year average, and
- Reduce the COLA from CPI up to $3 \%$ beginning 36 months after retirement to CPI up to $2 \%$ beginning 36 months after retirement.

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

Given the desire to maintain the earlier retirement ages for public safety members, most of the alternatives studied leave the plan provisions for retirement unchanged. The proposed changes are for new hires only so it takes around fifteen years for significant savings to emerge. The City's cost under this alternative drops from about $26 \%$ of pay in 2014 to around $4 \%$ of pay in 2041 and produces cumulative savings over the projection period of $\$ 33$ million.

Police Employees - Alternative 2
City Contribution Rate


## Changes for New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Increase member contributions from $8 \%$ to $10 \%$ of pay;
- Increase final average salary from 3 years to a 5 year average.

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

As mentioned earlier, this alternative leaves the plan provisions for retirement unchanged. It also leaves the post-retirement cost of living adjustment (COLA) unchanged. As seen in earlier projections, the proposed changes are for new hires only so it takes around fifteen years for significant cost savings to emerge. The City's cost under this alternative drops from about $26 \%$ of pay in 2014 to about $5.5 \%$ of pay in 2041. Based on the assumptions used, this alternative produces estimated cost savings of $\$ 26$ million over the thirty year projection period.

Police Employees - Alternative 3
City Contribution Rate


## Changes for New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Change eligibility for unreduced retirement benefits from the current provisions of: (1) age 50 with 25 years of service or (2) age 60 with 15 years of service, to (a) age 55 with 25 years of service or (b) age 60 with 15 years of service
- Reduce the COLA from CPI up to $3 \%$ beginning 36 months after retirement to CPI up to $2 \%$ beginning 36 months after retirement.

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

This is the only alternative for Police that changes to age at which unreduced retirement benefits may begin This option also lowers the post-retirement cost of living adjustments, but leaves the member contribution rate unchanged at $8 \%$. This alternative produces estimated cost savings of $\$ 27$ million over the thirty year projection period. The proposed changes are only for new hires only so it takes around fifteen years for significant cost savings to emerge. The City's cost under this alternative drops from about $26 \%$ of pay in 2014 to around $5.25 \%$ of pay in 2041.

Police Employees - Alternative 4
City Contribution Rate


Changes to Current Active Members: Increase employee contributions from 8\% to 10\% over a two year period.

## Changes to New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Increase final average salary from 3 years to a 5 year average
- Increase member contributions from $8 \%$ to $10 \%$ of pay.

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

There is more immediate cost savings to the City under this option because current active members are assumed to increase their contributions from $8 \%$ to $10 \%$, providing an immediate decrease to the City's contribution. Because of the cost savings that results from current members contributing at a higher rate, fewer changes for new hires are necessary to provide similar cost savings as the other alternatives. Under this alternative, the City contribution rate declines from a high of nearly $24 \%$ in 2014 to about $6 \%$ in 2041, representing $\$ 28$ million of estimated savings over the thirty year projection period.

Police Employees - Alternative 5
City Contribution Rate


Changes to Current Active Members: Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary.

## Changes to New Hires Only:

- Eliminate lump sum payments in the definition of final average salary;
- Increase final average salary from 3 years to a 5 year average
- Increase member contributions from $8 \%$ to $10 \%$ of pay.

The initial spike in the contribution rate is the result of the deferred investment losses difference between the market value and actuarial value of assets - being recognized through the asset smoothing method.

This alternative reflects the same benefit changes for new hires as Alternative 4, but instead of increasing the employee contribution rate by $2 \%$ for current active members, lump sum payments are excluded from the definition of final average salary for current active members. Greater savings appear immediately under this alternative because of the reduction in benefits for current active members. The ultimate City contribution rate in thirty years is about $5.90 \%$ and total savings over the projection period is $\$ 39$ million.

## Benefit Impact of Potential Changes

As is hopefully obvious, the savings detailed above come as a result of a reduction in benefit levels for new hires (and an increase in contributions for existing active members under alternative \#4 and a reduction in benefits for both current and future hires in Alternative 5). In order to put the benefit reductions in perspective, we have determined the change in the replacement ratio (the retirement benefits determined as a percent of final salary) under the current benefit structure and each pension alternative for a few sample retirement scenarios. The impact of the lump sum payments at retirement was estimated by using the load from the actuarial valuation (12\%) that is applied to active liabilities to estimate the additional benefits paid as a result of the lump sum payments. The actual impact will vary by employee depending on each individual's lump sum amount.

For the General Employees, all alternative plan designs change the earliest age at which an employee may retire with unreduced benefits. In the current plan, normal retirement (which permits benefits to begin without reduction) is age 55 with 30 years of service or age 60 with 5 years of service. Under all of the alternative plan designs other than Alternative 3 (which permits normal retirement at either age 65 with 5 years of service or age 60 with 30 years of service), normal retirement is age 65 with 5 years of service. If retirement benefits commence at an age earlier than normal retirement, the employee takes a full actuarial reduction in the amount of benefit payable. This significant change in the retirement eligibility requirements, in addition to other changes included in the plan design, results in much lower replacement ratios under all of the plan design alternatives studied for General Employees with the exception of Alternative 3 if a member is age 60 with at least 30 years of service and, therefore, eligible for unreduced benefits.

Dramatic changes in the normal retirement provisions were not made in the alternatives for Police and Fire members (with the exception of Alternative 3) so the decrease in the replacement ratios under the various alternatives for those groups are less dramatic.

The replacement ratios for Alternative 5 would be the same as for Alternative 4 because the only difference in the two alternative plan designs is changes that apply to current active members. The benefit structure for new hires is the same. Therefore, a column for Alternative 5 has not been included in the following table.

## Comparison of Benefits Provided by Alternative Plan Designs

|  |  |  | Replacement Ratios Under Plan Design |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | Service | Current | \#1 | \#2 | \#3 | \#4 |
| General Employees |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 | 30 | 58.0\% | 19.9\%* | 20.7\%* | 36.3\%* | 20.7\%* |
| 60 | 20 | 38.7\% | 23.2\%* | 24.2\%* | 24.2\%* | 24.2\%* |
| 65 | 30 | 58.0\% | 49.8\% | 51.8\% | 51.8\% | 51.8\% |
| 60 | 30 | 58.0\% | 34.8\%* | 36.3\%* | 51.8\% | 36.3\%* |
| Police Officers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | 25 | 67.2\% | 57.6\% | 57.6\% | 42.0\%* | 57.6\% |
| 60 | 15 | 40.3\% | 34.6\% | 34.6\% | 36.0\% | 34.6\% |
| 55 | 30 | 75.2\% | 64.5\% | 64.5\% | 67.2\% | 67.2\% |
| 60 | 20 | 53.7\% | 46.1\% | 46.1\% | 48.0\% | 48.0\% |
| Firefighters |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 | 30 | 77.3\% | 64.5\% | 64.5\% | 67.2\% | 67.2\% |
| 55 | 20 | 55.2\% | 46.1\% | 46.1\% | 33.6\%* | 46.1\% |
| 60 | 20 | 55.2\% | 46.1\% | 46.1\% | 48.0\% | 48.0\% |

*Reflects a reduction in the benefit amount due to commencement before normal retirement age.
The reduction in the COLA under several of the alternatives will also impact benefit levels years after retirement, but that impact will be dependent on the level of actual inflation during retirement, since the COLA is based on the change in the Consumer Price Index with an annual cap. The maximum impact of a $2 \%$ versus $3 \%$ COLA would be a benefit $6.4 \%$ lower after 10 years of retirement, $15.3 \%$ lower after 20 years and $23.2 \%$ lower after 30 years. The minimum impact would be no change in benefit which would be the case if actual inflation was $2.0 \%$ or less in each year after retirement.

One of the stated goals of the study was to achieve a stable and, if possible, lower employer contribution rate. While the main thrust of the study was an analysis of how to accomplish this goal through benefit reductions, there is a potential change in funding policy that could lower the current employer rates without changing benefits and offer some stability in those rates.

Before going further, it must be made clear that without changes in benefits, the overall liability of the plans does not change. Adjusting the funding policy simply alters the incidence of contributions. In fact, by extending the payment period, the ultimate cost to the employer is greater. Remember $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{I}=\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{E}$. If current contributions are lowered in favor of a longer contribution stream, the investment income that will be earned is less. If I is smaller, C must be larger for a given level of B and E.

The current funding policy of the plans calls for amortizing the unfunded actuarial accrued liability (UAAL) as a level percent of payroll over a fixed period of years. As of December 31, 2010 that period was 13 years for pensions and 25 years for healthcare. While the period for healthcare is too long to allow for meaningful redistribution, the pension period is not.

The potential change in funding policy is to increase the UAAL amortization period to 16 years and set the employer contribution rate based on that period. The 16 years is suggested as it is approximately the longest period that can be utilized without generating negative amortization of the UAAL. In other words the contribution will generate an amount at least equal to the interest owed on the UAAL. Then, establish a maximum funding period of 25 years to provide a reserve for adverse experience. As long as the actuarially determined amortization period does not exceed 25 years, the contribution rate is kept at the level calculated under 16 year amortization. If the amortization period does exceed 25 years, the contribution rate would have to be increased. The 25 year threshold was selected to provide as large a margin for adverse experience as possible before the contribution rate would be forced to increase.

Any positive experience will serve to accelerate the amortization of the UAAL. Should changes be made in the benefit structure for new hires, the savings that develop over time should be used to further reduce the UAAL rather than lower the employer contribution rate. Finally an ultimate funding target of $110 \%$ of the accrued liability should be used so as to provide a long term reserve to help in maintaining stable contribution rates.

Using the December 31, 2010 valuation results, the following table illustrates the impact of this potential change in funding policy.

Impact on Employer Contribution Rate

|  | General <br> Employees | Police Officers | Firefighters |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (a) Current (13 years) | $12.86 \%$ | $20.72 \%$ | $25.21 \%$ |
| (b) New (16 years) | $\underline{12.24 \%}$ | $\underline{19.35 \%}$ | $\underline{23.43 \%}$ |
| Reduction (a)-(b) | $0.62 \%$ | $1.37 \%$ | $1.78 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Reserve (\% of pay) | $0.97 \%$ | $2.17 \%$ | $2.81 \%$ |
| Reserve (\$ liability) | $\$ 6.0$ million | $\$ 5.2$ million | $\$ 5.3$ million |
| Accrued Liability | $\$ 184.6$ million | $\$ 105.0$ million | $\$ 110.7$ million |

As shown, based on the December 31, 2010 valuation results the potential change in the funding policy would produce an immediate reduction in employer contribution rates (e.g., $0.62 \%$ of payroll for general employees). In addition there would exist a reserve (equivalent to $0.97 \%$ of payroll for general employees) to absorb future adverse experience until the calculated amortization period exceeded 25 years. The reserve, as a percent of pay, is the difference between the contribution rate using 16 year amortization and that using 25 year amortization. The reserve, in dollars, represents the increase in accrued liability that can be absorbed before the contribution rate would have to be raised. While the amount of the reserve is relatively small in comparison to the accrued liability, it would provide some stability to the employer rate.

While the December 30, 2011 results will produce different amounts than shown above, the basic concept would remain the same, and is one that we recommend to be considered by the Board.

## Current Situation

The City of Sioux Falls Employees’ Retirement System (covering general employees and police officers) and City of Sioux Falls Firefighters' Pension Fund provide retiree healthcare benefits to members. These benefits are well funded in comparison to other retiree healthcare benefit programs which are often financed on a pay-as-you-go basis. The annual required contribution (ARC) has always been paid by the employer since the pre-funding these benefits commenced. In determining the unfunded actuarial accrued liability (UAAL) contribution for each plan, closed period (currently 25 years) amortization is assumed. While, at a basic level, there have been no benefit improvements in many years, increases to the required retiree contributions have not always kept pace with healthcare inflation, resulting in retiree contribution amounts of less than one-half of the full cost of benefits.

Provided they have participated in the City's employee healthcare plan for at least five years immediately prior to separation from City employment, retirees and their dependents (e.g., spouses, dependent children) are eligible to continue to participate in the City's employee healthcare plan until age 65 . The healthcare plan provides medical, prescription drug and dental coverage. The cost to the retiree and covered dependents, if any, is $50 \%$ of a stipulated premium developed by the City. As noted above, recent premium increases have been less than the actual claims cost increases, resulting in payments from retirees and dependents of less than half the cost of coverage.

The funding of retiree healthcare benefits is done in a similar manner to pensions as discussed in the previous section. In the table below, we present the contribution rates, the funded status and the amortization period of the unfunded actuarial accrued liability for the retiree healthcare benefits provided by the plans under the current assumptions and methods, based on the actuarial valuation conducted as of December 31, 2010.

| Item | General <br> Employees | Police <br> Officers | Firefighters |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Normal Rate | $3.25 \%$ | $4.81 \%$ | $5.37 \%$ |
| Active Member Rate | $\underline{0.00}$ | $\underline{0.00}$ | $\underline{0.00}$ |
| Employer Normal Rate | $3.25 \%$ | $4.81 \%$ | $5.37 \%$ |
| Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability Rate | $\underline{2.28}$ | $\underline{4.14}$ | $\underline{4.28}$ |
| Actuarially Determined Contributions | $5.53 \%$ | $8.95 \%$ | $9.65 \%$ |
| Amortization Period (Years) | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Funded Status | $42.7 \%$ | $37.2 \%$ | $37.7 \%$ |

From a historical perspective, the change to the valuation process brought about by the adoption and implementation of Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statements No. 43 and No. 45 (GASB 43/45) resulted in a significant increase to the City’s healthcare contributions, beginning in 2007. With the adoption and implementation of GASB 43/45, valuations are required to recognize not only explicit OPEB subsidies, but also reflect implicit rate subsidies. Here, the costs specific to providing retiree coverage are used in determining liabilities, instead of a cost basis reflecting the aggregate claims experience of the entire plan. Based upon the assumption retirees utilize healthcare benefits at a higher rate than active employees, this practice creates a higher OPEB liability, as retiree costs are not pooled with and subsidized by lower cost active employees.

As with pensions, the recent market downturn has put pressure on employer contribution rates for retiree healthcare benefits. In addition to the pressures applicable to pension benefits, two additional factors impact the stability and sustainability of retiree healthcare benefits. First, the volatility and strain due to healthcare cost increases above price and wage inflation. Second, the current use of a 401(h) subaccount as a funding vehicle, linking the funding of retiree healthcare benefits to pension plan normal costs, and potentially limiting the City's ability to contribute the full ARC for retiree healthcare benefits. This has led to a re-examination of the retiree healthcare benefits being provided to ensure long-term sustainability.

## Potential Benefit Changes for Retiree Healthcare Benefits

Retiree healthcare plan costs can be lowered in a similar manner to pensions by reducing the benefits paid (increased retiree cost-sharing through higher contributions, deductibles, co-pays, etc.), changing benefit eligibility requirements (increased age and service requirements), or a combination of the two.

One of the areas we specifically studied was the stability in the level of funding for retiree healthcare benefits. In order to better explain how the suggested plan changes were developed, we present a brief summary of the three major components of instability in the current plan.

The first element, healthcare cost inflation, or trend, is the assumption for how the cost of healthcare will change over time. It is a primary determinant in the final liability for any retiree healthcare plan. The inherent challenge with trend is two-fold. First, the near-term trends that are most accurate in predicting the future are significantly higher than the market forces of price and wage inflation. As a result, financial instruments, based on what they can earn in the market, will not be sufficient, in the long run, to effectively fund the healthcare benefits being provided. Second, there is a great deal of instability in how trend operates. With changes in technology, the advancement of medicine and pharmaceuticals, and the increasing options available for medical solutions, the landscape is constantly changing. The trend that is used at any point in
time runs the risk of becoming obsolete in the future, which results in an unstable migration of liability from one year to the next.

The next element is the link between the retiree healthcare plan and the active employee health plan. Currently, the level of healthcare cost-sharing (e.g., co-pays, deductibles, and coinsurance) for active employees is the same for retirees. As any of these items are changed to manage the cost of healthcare for active employees, they impact the cost to retirees, and add an element of instability in how the liabilities will morph over time.

Additionally, the premiums paid by retirees towards their healthcare coverage do not cover the full cost the system incurs. As a result, part of the risk of offering a retiree healthcare benefit that is structurally evolving is borne by the system.

The final element is the current use of a 401(h) subaccount as a funding vehicle linking the funding of retiree healthcare benefits to pension plan normal costs. Here, under IRS rules, the permissible funding of the retiree healthcare plan is subordinate to the pension plan. This may have an impact on the City's ability to properly fund retiree healthcare benefits over time. Therefore it would be prudent to explore all the qualified funding options available to determine if there is an option that will provide the City more flexibility in how it finances retiree healthcare benefits.

The following changes being proposed to the retiree healthcare plan reflect an attempt to address the three major causes for instability mentioned above. It is important to note that some of the proposals suggested modify benefits for current and future active employees. The system's ability to modify benefits for current active employees is contingent upon a change to ordinance, an affirmative vote by both the council and the membership of the system, and/or other constraints.

As with pensions, it must be kept in mind that the cost savings from reducing benefits for new hires takes many years to manifest themselves. The full impact is only felt after the current active membership leaves City employment and is replaced by employees covered under the new benefit structure. This usually takes 15 to 30 years depending on the active member demographics.

The potential changes to retiree healthcare benefits include the following scenarios:

1. Increase the normal retirement age for new hires to age 65 with 5 years of service for general employees and to age 55 with 25 years of service or age 60 with 15 years of service for police officers and firefighters, or
2. Make the following structural changes to current benefits:
a. Retain the current benefit structure for those already retired. This eliminates benefit disruption for those currently receiving a benefit and permits continued access to the active employee health plan for those retirees.
b. For future retirees, specifically, those active participants that were hired prior to January 1, 2014 and will retire after December 31, 2013 provide a fixed dollar subsidy to retirees and their dependents that is tiered according to the participant's years of service at retirement. Three specific variations are considered:

- \$10 per month, per year of service
- $\$ 20$ per month, per year of service
- \$30 per month, per year of service

For each of these variations, a further enhancement is considered by indexing the flat dollar subsidy:

- $1 \%$ Cost of Living Adjustment
- $2 \%$ Cost of Living Adjustment
- 3\% Cost of Living Adjustment

For example, a potential structure for handling this group of future retirees would be to offer a $\$ 20$ per month for each year the retiree worked, with a $2 \%$ annual Cost of Living Adjustment. Cost of Living Adjustments are assumed to begin in 2015 and are assumed to apply to all retirees eligible for benefits after the date of increase.

Additionally, beneficiaries under the proposed structure would no longer be permitted to access the City's employee healthcare plan for coverage. Instead, employees would have the opportunity to seek coverage through alternative sources such as an employer plan available through a spouse or individual coverage (e.g., coverage through health insurance exchanges to be made available under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act beginning in 2014). To maintain the tax-free status of distributions, beneficiaries and the plan would be required to link benefit payments to qualified medical expenses.

With access to the City's employee healthcare plan being discontinued, some consideration to continued access for duty-related disability retirees may need to be considered. Currently, it is assumed the plan has no liability for duty-related disability retirees, as Workers’ Compensation is assumed to cover the cost of benefits. Non-duty-
related disability retirees are assumed to be eligible for the proposed structure.

As a benefit enhancement, it is assumed the proposed healthcare benefit structure would be provided to participants that are vested terminated. While providing this enhancement would increase cost, the incidence of a vested terminated participant seeking the benefit is low enough that any cost addition would be minor. Moreover, providing this enhancement may translate well to employee groups from a political perspective.

The purpose of presenting a fixed dollar benefit is to stabilize the cost structure of the plan. Doing so would eliminate the instability caused by the fluctuation of medical trend and transfer a majority of the risk items mentioned in the previous section away from the employer.
c. Discontinue the retiree healthcare benefit for those active participants hired after $12 / 31 / 2013$. Elimination of retiree healthcare benefits may be the result of the modification of plan benefits or the provision of pension benefits for new hires through the South Dakota Retirement System or participation in a DC plan.

## Financial Impact of Potential Changes

The long term savings for scenario \#1 are again measurable by comparing employer normal cost rates as was done for the potential pension changes. The fixed dollar subsidy in scenario \#2 could vary by employee group and could provide for varying levels of indexing. If a specific target for costs of benefits is determined, the dollar and/or indexing amount could be adjusted to reach the desired level. Additionally, the exclusion of dependents and/or vested terminated participants could be considered. Since scenario \#2 impacts current employees, the savings impact can be measured immediately. The following table provides the savings including several different levels of fixed dollar subsidy and indexing. To maintain the comparability of scenarios, all results have been prepared using total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization where the period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years. As Scenario \#2 closes the plan to new entrants, the impact to savings may be altered by any changes to asset allocation or amortization methodology.

## Retiree Healthcare Plan Changes

|  | 12/31/10 <br> Valuation |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Scenario } \\ \text { \#1 } \end{gathered}$ | \$10 Initial Monthly Subsidy per Year of Service |  |  |  | Scenario \#2 <br> Monthly Subsidy per Year of Service |  |  |  | \$30 Initial Monthly Subsidy per Year of Service |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GRS | CMC |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 0\% } \\ \text { COLA } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \% \\ & \text { COLA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \% \\ & \text { COLA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & \text { COLA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 0\% } \\ \text { COLA } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1\% } \\ & \text { COLA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2\% } \\ & \text { COLA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & \text { COLA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ \text { COLA } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \% \\ & \text { COLA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \% \\ & \text { COLA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & \text { COLA } \end{aligned}$ |
| General |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Normal Cost | 3.25\% | 3.18\% | 1.51\% | 1.03\% | 1.07\% | 1.13\% | 1.19\% | 1.33\% | 1.42\% | 1.53\% | 1.66\% | 1.63\% | 1.77\% | 1.93\% | 2.12\% |
| UAAL | 2.28\% | 2.21\% | n/a | 0.04\% | 0.09\% | 0.13\% | 0.19\% | 0.51\% | 0.59\% | 0.69\% | 0.80\% | 0.97\% | 1.10\% | 1.25\% | 1.41\% |
| Total | 5.53\% | 5.39\% | n/a | 1.07\% | 1.16\% | 1.26\% | 1.38\% | 1.84\% | 2.01\% | 2.22\% | 2.46\% | 2.60\% | 2.87\% | 3.18\% | 3.53\% |
| Savings |  |  | -1.67\% | -4.32\% | -4.23\% | -4.13\% | -4.01\% | -3.55\% | -3.38\% | -3.17\% | -2.93\% | -2.79\% | -2.52\% | -2.21\% | -1.86\% |
| Police |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Normal Cost | 4.81\% | 5.07\% | 4.59\% | 1.06\% | 1.17\% | 1.29\% | 1.44\% | 1.70\% | 1.90\% | 2.15\% | 2.45\% | 2.33\% | 2.64\% | 3.01\% | 3.46\% |
| UAAL | 4.14\% | 4.10\% | n/a | $\underline{0.41 \%}$ | 0.50\% | 0.60\% | 0.71\% | 1.16\% | 1.33\% | 1.53\% | 1.76\% | 1.91\% | 2.17\% | $\underline{2.46 \%}$ | 2.81\% |
| Total | 8.95\% | 9.17\% | n/a | 1.47\% | 1.67\% | 1.89\% | 2.15\% | 2.86\% | 3.23\% | 3.68\% | 4.21\% | 4.24\% | 4.81\% | 5.47\% | 6.27\% |
| Savings |  |  | -0.48\% | -7.70\% | -7.50\% | -7.28\% | -7.02\% | -6.31\% | -5.94\% | -5.49\% | -4.96\% | -4.93\% | -4.36\% | -3.70\% | -2.90\% |
| Fire |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Normal Cost | 5.37\% | 5.65\% | 5.39\% | 1.11\% | 1.22\% | 1.35\% | 1.50\% | 1.76\% | 1.98\% | 2.23\% | 2.55\% | 2.41\% | 2.73\% | 3.12\% | 3.59\% |
| UAAL | 4.28\% | 4.10\% | n/a | 0.87\% | 0.94\% | 1.02\% | 1.12\% | 1.49\% | 1.63\% | 1.79\% | 1.98\% | 2.10\% | 2.32\% | 2.56\% | 2.84\% |
| Total | 9.65\% | 9.75\% | n/a | 1.98\% | 2.16\% | 2.37\% | 2.62\% | 3.25\% | 3.61\% | 4.02\% | 4.53\% | 4.51\% | 5.05\% | 5.68\% | 6.43\% |
| Savings |  |  | -0.26\% | -7.77\% | -7.59\% | -7.38\% | -7.13\% | -6.50\% | -6.14\% | -5.73\% | -5.22\% | -5.24\% | -4.70\% | -4.07\% | -3.32\% |

Again we provide below further detail on the impact of each scenario by projecting the contribution pattern expected over time. The projection results show how the long term savings are expected to emerge over time.

Long Term Reduction in Employer Healthcare Contribution Rate

|  | General <br> Employees | Fire | Police |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Scenario \#1 | $1.57 \%$ | $0.10 \%$ | $0.50 \%$ |
| Scenario \#2 | $2.97 \%$ | $5.94 \%$ | $5.00 \%$ |

Estimated Dollar Amount of Healthcare Savings over 30 Year Projection Period (\$Millions)

|  | General <br> Employees | Fire | Police | Total* |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Healthcare Scenario \#1 |  |  |  |
|  | $\$ 30$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 33$ |
| Healthcare Scenario \#2 |  |  |  |  |
| Healthcare Alternative 1 | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 52$ | $\$ 62$ | $\$ 214$ |
| Healthcare Alternative 2 | 99 | 51 | 61 | 211 |
| Healthcare Alternative 3 | 98 | 50 | 60 | 208 |
| Healthcare Alternative 4 | 96 | 49 | 59 | 204 |
| Healthcare Alternative 5 | 91 | 47 | 56 | 194 |
| Healthcare Alternative 6 | 89 | 46 | 54 | 189 |
| Healthcare Alternative 7 | 86 | 44 | 52 | 182 |
| Healthcare Alternative 8 | 83 | 42 | 49 | 174 |
| Healthcare Alternative 9 | 81 | 42 | 49 | 172 |
| Healthcare Alternative 10 | 78 | 40 | 47 | 165 |
| Healthcare Alternative 11 | 74 | 38 | 44 | 156 |
| Healthcare Alternative 12 | 70 | 35 | 40 | 145 |

*While a total for each alternative of scenario \#2 is provided, the fixed dollar subsidy could vary by employee group and could provide for varying levels of indexing.

## Scenario \#1 <br> City Contribution Rate



Changes for Current Retirees:

- None


## Changes for Future Retirees:

- None

Changes for New Entrants:

- Increase the normal retirement age:
o General: Age 65 with 5 years of service
o Police and Fire: Age 55 with 25 years of service or age 60 with 15 years of service

Cost Savings to Plan:

| Savings | General | Police | Fire |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contribution Rate | $1.57 \%$ | $0.50 \%$ | $0.10 \%$ |
| Dollar Amount | $\$ 30 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 3 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 0 \mathrm{mil}$ |

General Employees - Scenario \#2: Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 City Contribution Rate


## Changes for Current Retirees:

- None

Changes for Future Retirees:

- \$10 monthly subsidy per year of service at retirement
- Alternative 1: 0\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 2: 1\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 3: 2\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 4: 3\% COLA Adjustment


## Changes for New Entrants:

- Excluded from the retiree healthcare plan


## Cost Savings to Plan:

| Savings | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contribution Rate | $2.97 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Dollar Amount | $\$ 100 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 99 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 98 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 96 \mathrm{mil}$ |

## General Employees - Scenario \#2: Alternatives 5, 6, 7, and 8

 City Contribution Rate

## Changes for Current Retirees:

- None


## Changes for Future Retirees:

- \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service at retirement
- Alternative 5: 0\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 6: 1\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 7: 2\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 8: 3\% COLA Adjustment


## Changes for New Entrants:

- Excluded from the retiree healthcare plan


## Cost Savings to Plan:

| Savings | Alternative 5 | Alternative 6 | Alternative 7 | Alternative 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contribution Rate | $2.97 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Dollar Amount | $\$ 91 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 89 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 86 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 83 \mathrm{mil}$ |

## General Employees - Scenario \#2: Alternatives 9, 10, 11, and 12 City Contribution Rate



## Changes for Current Retirees:

- None

Changes for Future Retirees:

- \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service at retirement
- Alternative 9: 0\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 10: 1\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 11: 2\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 12: 3\% COLA Adjustment


## Changes for New Entrants:

- Excluded from the retiree healthcare plan


## Cost Savings to Plan:

| Savings | Alternative 9 | Alternative 10 | Alternative 11 | Alternative 12 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contribution Rate | $2.97 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Dollar Amount | $\$ 81 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 78 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 74 \mathrm{mil}$ | \$70mil |

## Police Employees - Scenario \#2: Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 City Contribution Rate



## Changes for Current Retirees:

- None

Changes for Future Retirees:

- \$10 monthly subsidy per year of service at retirement
- Alternative 1: 0\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 2: 1\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 3: 2\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 4: 3\% COLA Adjustment


## Changes for New Entrants:

- Excluded from the retiree healthcare plan


## Cost Savings to Plan:

| Savings | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contribution Rate | $5.00 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Dollar Amount | $\$ 62 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 61 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 60 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 59 \mathrm{mil}$ |

## Police Employees - Scenario \#2: Alternatives 5, 6, 7, and 8 City Contribution Rate



## Changes for Current Retirees:

- None


## Changes for Future Retirees:

- \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service at retirement
- Alternative 5: 0\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 6: 1\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 7: 2\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 8: 3\% COLA Adjustment


## Changes for New Entrants:

- Excluded from the retiree healthcare plan


## Cost Savings to Plan:

| Savings | Alternative 5 | Alternative 6 | Alternative 7 | Alternative 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contribution Rate | $5.00 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Dollar Amount | \$56mil | \$54mil | \$52mil | \$49mil |

## Police Employees - Scenario \#2: Alternatives 9, 10, 11, and 12 City Contribution Rate



## Changes for Current Retirees:

- None

Changes for Future Retirees:

- \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service at retirement
- Alternative 9: 0\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 10: 1\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 11: 2\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 12: 3\% COLA Adjustment

Changes for New Entrants:

- Excluded from the retiree healthcare plan


## Cost Savings to Plan:

| Savings | Alternative 9 | Alternative 10 | Alternative 11 | Alternative 12 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contribution Rate | $5.00 \%$ |  |  |  | $\$ 40 \mathrm{mil}$ |
| Dollar Amount | $\$ 49 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 47 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 44 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 1$ |  |

Fire Employees - Scenario \#2: Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4
City Contribution Rate


## Changes for Current Retirees:

- None

Changes for Future Retirees:

- \$10 monthly subsidy per year of service at retirement
- Alternative 1: 0\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 2: 1\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 3: 2\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 4: 3\% COLA Adjustment


## Changes for New Entrants:

- Excluded from the retiree healthcare plan


## Cost Savings to Plan:

| Savings | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contribution Rate | $5.94 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Dollar Amount | $\$ 52 \mathrm{mil}$ | \$51mil | \$50mil | $\$ 49 \mathrm{mil}$ |

Fire Employees - Scenario \#2: Alternatives 5, 6, 7, and 8
City Contribution Rate


## Changes for Current Retirees:

- None


## Changes for Future Retirees:

- \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service at retirement
- Alternative 5: 0\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 6: 1\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 7: 2\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 8: 3\% COLA Adjustment


## Changes for New Entrants:

- Excluded from the retiree healthcare plan


## Cost Savings to Plan:

| Savings | Alternative 5 | Alternative 6 | Alternative 7 | Alternative 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contribution Rate | $5.94 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Dollar Amount | $\$ 47 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 46 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 44 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 42 \mathrm{mil}$ |

Fire Employees - Scenario \#2: Alternatives 9, 10, 11, and 12 City Contribution Rate


## Changes for Current Retirees:

- None

Changes for Future Retirees:

- \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service at retirement
- Alternative 9: 0\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 10: 1\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 11: 2\% COLA Adjustment
- Alternative 12: 3\% COLA Adjustment

Changes for New Entrants:

- Excluded from the retiree healthcare plan


## Cost Savings to Plan:

| Savings | Alternative 9 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alternative 10 | Alternative 11 | Alternative 12 |  |  |
| Contribution Rate | $5.94 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Dollar Amount | $\$ 42 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 40 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 38 \mathrm{mil}$ | $\$ 35 \mathrm{mil}$ |

## General Employees

Alternative 1
Current members unchanged
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, members contribute 5\%, Normal Retirement = 65/5, High 5 Final Average Pay, 2\% COLA

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 13.17\% | 13.17\% | 4,754,091 | 4,754,091 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 12.37\% | 12.37\% | 4,667,656 | 4,667,656 | 0 |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 14.19\% | 13.79\% | 5,594,782 | 5,436,747 | $(158,035)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 16.44\% | 15.64\% | 6,769,692 | 6,440,873 | $(328,819)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 15.63\% | 14.44\% | 6,714,725 | 6,205,867 | $(508,858)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 15.42\% | 13.86\% | 6,913,177 | 6,216,131 | $(697,046)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 15.79\% | 13.88\% | 7,386,764 | 6,491,757 | $(895,007)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 16.26\% | 14.00\% | 7,936,205 | 6,832,521 | $(1,103,685)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 16.82\% | 14.19\% | 8,568,852 | 7,231,621 | $(1,337,231)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 17.51\% | 14.50\% | 9,319,676 | 7,718,989 | $(1,600,687)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 16.53\% | 13.27\% | 9,191,723 | 7,377,193 | $(1,814,531)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 15.37\% | 11.89\% | 8,919,063 | 6,903,306 | $(2,015,758)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 14.37\% | 10.69\% | 8,709,776 | 6,480,082 | $(2,229,694)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 13.58\% | 9.72\% | 8,597,393 | 6,150,228 | $(2,447,166)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 12.97\% | 8.93\% | 8,571,285 | 5,902,825 | $(2,668,459)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 12.50\% | 8.31\% | 8,621,999 | 5,730,713 | $(2,891,286)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 12.13\% | 7.80\% | 8,726,595 | 5,609,354 | $(3,117,241)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 11.84\% | 7.38\% | 8,891,716 | 5,540,050 | $(3,351,666)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 11.60\% | 7.03\% | 9,094,763 | 5,507,479 | $(3,587,284)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 11.41\% | 6.73\% | 9,333,981 | 5,508,152 | $(3,825,829)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 11.26\% | 6.49\% | 9,608,209 | 5,533,939 | $(4,074,271)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 11.14\% | 6.27\% | 9,914,656 | 5,579,212 | $(4,335,445)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 11.04\% | 6.08\% | 10,245,771 | 5,639,105 | $(4,606,666)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 10.96\% | 5.91\% | 10,601,966 | 5,714,540 | $(4,887,425)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 10.89\% | 5.75\% | 10,983,409 | 5,804,251 | $(5,179,157)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 10.83\% | 5.61\% | 11,390,172 | 5,904,422 | $(5,485,749)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 10.78\% | 5.49\% | 11,822,798 | 6,015,751 | $(5,807,047)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 10.75\% | 5.37\% | 12,289,231 | 6,141,168 | $(6,148,063)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 10.72\% | 5.27\% | 12,782,202 | 6,277,524 | $(6,504,679)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 10.69\% | 5.17\% | 13,293,237 | 6,424,261 | $(6,868,977)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 10.67\% | 5.08\% | 13,826,522 | 6,583,782 | (7,242,740) |
| Total |  |  |  | 284,042,088 | 188,323,588 | $(95,718,500)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Alternative 2
Current members unchanged
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, members contribute 5\%, Normal Retirement $=65 / 5$

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 13.17\% | 13.17\% | 4,754,091 | 4,754,091 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 12.37\% | 12.37\% | 4,667,656 | 4,667,656 | 0 |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 14.19\% | 13.85\% | 5,594,782 | 5,462,722 | $(132,061)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 16.44\% | 15.77\% | 6,769,692 | 6,494,956 | $(274,736)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 15.63\% | 14.64\% | 6,714,725 | 6,289,943 | $(424,782)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 15.42\% | 14.12\% | 6,913,177 | 6,331,668 | $(581,509)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 15.79\% | 14.19\% | 7,386,764 | 6,640,521 | $(746,243)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 16.26\% | 14.38\% | 7,936,205 | 7,016,572 | $(919,634)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 16.82\% | 14.63\% | 8,568,852 | 7,455,558 | $(1,113,294)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 17.51\% | 15.01\% | 9,319,676 | 7,988,195 | $(1,331,481)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 16.53\% | 13.82\% | 9,191,723 | 7,682,111 | $(1,509,612)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 15.37\% | 12.48\% | 8,919,063 | 7,241,583 | $(1,677,481)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 14.37\% | 11.31\% | 8,709,776 | 6,853,809 | $(1,855,966)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 13.58\% | 10.36\% | 8,597,393 | 6,560,098 | $(2,037,295)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 12.97\% | 9.61\% | 8,571,285 | 6,349,387 | $(2,221,898)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 12.50\% | 9.01\% | 8,621,999 | 6,214,264 | $(2,407,735)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 12.13\% | 8.52\% | 8,726,595 | 6,130,523 | $(2,596,072)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 11.84\% | 8.13\% | 8,891,716 | 6,100,494 | $(2,791,222)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 11.60\% | 7.79\% | 9,094,763 | 6,107,515 | $(2,987,248)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 11.41\% | 7.52\% | 9,333,981 | 6,148,804 | $(3,185,177)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 11.26\% | 7.29\% | 9,608,209 | 6,216,795 | $(3,391,414)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 11.14\% | 7.09\% | 9,914,656 | 6,306,341 | $(3,608,315)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 11.04\% | 6.91\% | 10,245,771 | 6,411,842 | $(3,833,929)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 10.96\% | 6.75\% | 10,601,966 | 6,533,906 | $(4,068,060)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 10.89\% | 6.62\% | 10,983,409 | 6,671,842 | $(4,311,567)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 10.83\% | 6.49\% | 11,390,172 | 6,821,766 | $(4,568,406)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 10.78\% | 6.37\% | 11,822,798 | 6,985,313 | $(4,837,485)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 10.75\% | 6.27\% | 12,289,231 | 7,165,273 | $(5,123,958)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 10.72\% | 6.17\% | 12,782,202 | 7,358,474 | $(5,423,728)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 10.69\% | 6.09\% | 13,293,237 | 7,564,559 | $(5,728,678)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 10.67\% | 6.01\% | 13,826,522 | 7,787,039 | $(6,039,482)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 284,042,088 | 204,313,620 | $(79,728,468)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Alternative 3
Current members unchanged
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, members contribute 5\%, Normal Retirement $=65 / 5$ or 60/30, 2\% COLA

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 13.17\% | 13.17\% | 4,754,091 | 4,754,091 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 12.37\% | 12.37\% | 4,667,656 | 4,667,656 | 0 |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 14.19\% | 13.80\% | 5,594,782 | 5,440,666 | $(154,116)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 16.44\% | 15.66\% | 6,769,692 | 6,449,144 | $(320,548)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 15.63\% | 14.47\% | 6,714,725 | 6,218,906 | $(495,819)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 15.42\% | 13.90\% | 6,913,177 | 6,234,308 | $(678,869)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 15.79\% | 13.93\% | 7,386,764 | 6,515,503 | $(871,261)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 16.26\% | 14.06\% | 7,936,205 | 6,862,271 | $(1,073,935)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 16.82\% | 14.27\% | 8,568,852 | 7,268,129 | $(1,300,723)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 17.51\% | 14.59\% | 9,319,676 | 7,763,263 | $(1,556,413)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 16.53\% | 13.36\% | 9,191,723 | 7,427,287 | $(1,764,437)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 15.37\% | 11.99\% | 8,919,063 | 6,958,672 | $(1,960,391)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 14.37\% | 10.79\% | 8,709,776 | 6,540,948 | $(2,168,828)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 13.58\% | 9.82\% | 8,597,393 | 6,216,630 | $(2,380,763)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 12.97\% | 9.04\% | 8,571,285 | 5,974,865 | $(2,596,420)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 12.50\% | 8.42\% | 8,621,999 | 5,808,493 | $(2,813,506)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 12.13\% | 7.92\% | 8,726,595 | 5,692,959 | $(3,033,636)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 11.84\% | 7.50\% | 8,891,716 | 5,629,714 | $(3,262,003)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 11.60\% | 7.15\% | 9,094,763 | 5,603,698 | $(3,491,065)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 11.41\% | 6.86\% | 9,333,981 | 5,611,680 | $(3,722,301)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 11.26\% | 6.62\% | 9,608,209 | 5,645,295 | $(3,962,914)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 11.14\% | 6.40\% | 9,914,656 | 5,699,140 | $(4,215,516)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 11.04\% | 6.22\% | 10,245,771 | 5,768,191 | $(4,477,580)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 10.96\% | 6.05\% | 10,601,966 | 5,853,235 | $(4,748,731)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 10.89\% | 5.90\% | 10,983,409 | 5,953,338 | $(5,030,070)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 10.83\% | 5.77\% | 11,390,172 | 6,064,514 | $(5,325,658)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 10.78\% | 5.64\% | 11,822,798 | 6,188,049 | (5,634,749) |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 10.75\% | 5.53\% | 12,289,231 | 6,326,497 | (5,962,733) |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 10.72\% | 5.43\% | 12,782,202 | 6,476,876 | $(6,305,327)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 10.69\% | 5.34\% | 13,293,237 | 6,638,912 | $(6,654,325)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 10.67\% | 5.26\% | 13,826,522 | 6,815,458 | (7,011,063) |
| Total |  |  |  | 284,042,088 | 191,068,390 | (92,973,698) |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Alternative 4
Current members: Members contribute 5\%
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, members contribute 5\%, Normal Retirement = 65/5

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 13.17\% | 13.17\% | 4,754,091 | 4,754,091 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 12.37\% | 12.37\% | 4,667,656 | 4,667,656 | 0 |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 14.19\% | 12.99\% | 5,594,782 | 5,124,075 | $(470,708)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 16.44\% | 13.94\% | 6,769,692 | 5,741,105 | $(1,028,587)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 15.63\% | 12.81\% | 6,714,725 | 5,504,383 | $(1,210,342)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 15.42\% | 12.40\% | 6,913,177 | 5,560,757 | $(1,352,420)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 15.79\% | 12.59\% | 7,386,764 | 5,891,640 | $(1,495,124)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 16.26\% | 12.89\% | 7,936,205 | 6,291,330 | $(1,644,876)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 16.82\% | 13.26\% | 8,568,852 | 6,758,226 | $(1,810,626)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 17.51\% | 13.76\% | 9,319,676 | 7,323,511 | $(1,996,165)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 16.53\% | 12.71\% | 9,191,723 | 7,065,704 | $(2,126,020)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 15.37\% | 11.50\% | 8,919,063 | 6,672,766 | $(2,246,297)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 14.37\% | 10.45\% | 8,709,776 | 6,331,959 | $(2,377,817)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 13.58\% | 9.61\% | 8,597,393 | 6,079,792 | $(2,517,602)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 12.97\% | 8.94\% | 8,571,285 | 5,905,937 | $(2,665,347)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 12.50\% | 8.41\% | 8,621,999 | 5,802,564 | $(2,819,435)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 12.13\% | 7.99\% | 8,726,595 | 5,748,464 | $(2,978,131)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 11.84\% | 7.65\% | 8,891,716 | 5,745,461 | $(3,146,255)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 11.60\% | 7.37\% | 9,094,763 | 5,775,474 | $(3,319,289)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 11.41\% | 7.13\% | 9,333,981 | 5,837,139 | $(3,496,842)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 11.26\% | 6.95\% | 9,608,209 | 5,926,343 | $(3,681,866)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 11.14\% | 6.78\% | 9,914,656 | 6,037,627 | $(3,877,030)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 11.04\% | 6.64\% | 10,245,771 | 6,164,931 | $(4,080,840)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 10.96\% | 6.52\% | 10,601,966 | 6,308,406 | $(4,293,560)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 10.89\% | 6.41\% | 10,983,409 | 6,467,300 | $(4,516,108)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 10.83\% | 6.31\% | 11,390,172 | 6,638,126 | $(4,752,045)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 10.78\% | 6.22\% | 11,822,798 | 6,823,287 | $(4,999,511)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 10.75\% | 6.15\% | 12,289,231 | 7,025,581 | $(5,263,650)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 10.72\% | 6.07\% | 12,782,202 | 7,241,688 | $(5,540,514)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 10.69\% | 6.01\% | 13,293,237 | 7,470,446 | $(5,822,791)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 10.67\% | 5.95\% | 13,826,522 | 7,715,841 | $(6,110,681)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 284,042,088 | 192,401,607 | $(91,640,480)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Alternative 5
Current members: Eliminate lump sum pay
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, members contribute 5\%, Normal Retirement $=65 / 5$

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 13.17\% | 13.17\% | 4,754,091 | 4,754,091 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 12.37\% | 8.27\% | 4,667,656 | 3,122,998 | $(1,544,658)$ |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 14.19\% | 9.43\% | 5,594,782 | 3,719,825 | $(1,874,957)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 16.44\% | 11.39\% | 6,769,692 | 4,691,782 | $(2,077,911)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 15.63\% | 10.34\% | 6,714,725 | 4,441,685 | $(2,273,040)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 15.42\% | 9.89\% | 6,913,177 | 4,434,210 | $(2,478,967)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 15.79\% | 10.03\% | 7,386,764 | 4,692,936 | $(2,693,828)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 16.26\% | 10.28\% | 7,936,205 | 5,015,260 | $(2,920,945)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 16.82\% | 10.59\% | 8,568,852 | 5,397,274 | $(3,171,578)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 17.51\% | 11.03\% | 9,319,676 | 5,871,995 | $(3,447,681)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 16.53\% | 10.52\% | 9,191,723 | 5,850,840 | $(3,340,883)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 15.37\% | 9.88\% | 8,919,063 | 5,733,427 | $(3,185,637)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 14.37\% | 9.29\% | 8,709,776 | 5,629,808 | $(3,079,968)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 13.58\% | 8.80\% | 8,597,393 | 5,566,605 | $(3,030,788)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 12.97\% | 8.38\% | 8,571,285 | 5,539,377 | $(3,031,908)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 12.50\% | 8.04\% | 8,621,999 | 5,548,114 | $(3,073,885)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 12.13\% | 7.76\% | 8,726,595 | 5,578,814 | $(3,147,781)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 11.84\% | 7.51\% | 8,891,716 | 5,639,065 | $(3,252,651)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 11.60\% | 7.29\% | 9,094,763 | 5,717,360 | $(3,377,403)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 11.41\% | 7.11\% | 9,333,981 | 5,815,176 | $(3,518,805)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 11.26\% | 6.95\% | 9,608,209 | 5,929,466 | $(3,678,744)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 11.14\% | 6.81\% | 9,914,656 | 6,057,842 | $(3,856,815)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 11.04\% | 6.68\% | 10,245,771 | 6,196,270 | $(4,049,501)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 10.96\% | 6.56\% | 10,601,966 | 6,346,260 | $(4,255,705)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 10.89\% | 6.45\% | 10,983,409 | 6,508,313 | $(4,475,095)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 10.83\% | 6.35\% | 11,390,172 | 6,679,746 | $(4,710,426)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 10.78\% | 6.26\% | 11,822,798 | 6,863,037 | $(4,959,761)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 10.75\% | 6.18\% | 12,289,231 | 7,061,167 | $(5,228,064)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 10.72\% | 6.10\% | 12,782,202 | 7,271,441 | $(5,510,761)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 10.69\% | 6.03\% | 13,293,237 | 7,493,730 | $(5,799,507)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 10.67\% | 5.97\% | 13,826,522 | 7,731,954 | $(6,094,567)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 284,042,088 | 176,899,865 | $(107,142,223)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

## Alternative 1

Current members unchanged
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, members contribute 10\%, High 5 Final Average Pay, 2\% COLA

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative | Difference |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 24.55\% | 24.55\% | 2,680,490 | 2,680,490 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 25.46\% | 25.46\% | 2,912,271 | 2,912,271 | 0 |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 28.98\% | 28.83\% | 3,445,094 | 3,428,116 | $(16,978)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 33.19\% | 32.85\% | 4,124,170 | 4,082,067 | $(42,103)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 31.18\% | 30.68\% | 4,021,795 | 3,957,404 | $(64,391)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 30.21\% | 29.51\% | 4,052,307 | 3,957,708 | $(94,598)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 30.25\% | 29.34\% | 4,225,714 | 4,099,042 | $(126,672)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 30.35\% | 29.25\% | 4,382,070 | 4,224,387 | $(157,683)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 30.56\% | 29.19\% | 4,569,620 | 4,365,117 | $(204,503)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 30.82\% | 29.17\% | 4,792,285 | 4,534,981 | $(257,304)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 27.74\% | 25.88\% | 4,478,214 | 4,177,511 | $(300,703)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 24.45\% | 22.37\% | 4,089,796 | 3,741,958 | $(347,839)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 21.75\% | 19.42\% | 3,750,841 | 3,349,386 | $(401,455)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 19.75\% | 17.10\% | 3,526,030 | 3,054,244 | $(471,786)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 18.19\% | 15.26\% | 3,339,499 | 2,801,283 | $(538,216)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 17.03\% | 13.79\% | 3,232,848 | 2,618,685 | $(614,163)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 16.07\% | 12.49\% | 3,161,893 | 2,458,262 | $(703,630)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 15.35\% | 11.45\% | 3,149,749 | 2,348,650 | $(801,099)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 14.87\% | 10.73\% | 3,176,750 | 2,292,141 | $(884,609)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 14.49\% | 10.12\% | 3,200,326 | 2,235,839 | $(964,487)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 14.17\% | 9.40\% | 3,258,314 | 2,161,926 | $(1,096,388)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 13.99\% | 8.92\% | 3,340,393 | 2,129,954 | $(1,210,439)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 13.93\% | 8.57\% | 3,457,544 | 2,127,651 | $(1,329,893)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 13.91\% | 8.27\% | 3,592,205 | 2,135,484 | $(1,456,721)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 13.89\% | 8.00\% | 3,737,010 | 2,151,444 | $(1,585,567)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 13.85\% | 7.72\% | 3,888,422 | 2,167,867 | $(1,720,556)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 13.79\% | 7.48\% | 4,038,684 | 2,190,659 | $(1,848,024)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 13.71\% | 7.23\% | 4,195,369 | 2,213,323 | $(1,982,046)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 13.67\% | 7.05\% | 4,378,310 | 2,255,986 | $(2,122,324)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 13.62\% | 6.90\% | 4,565,356 | 2,311,604 | $(2,253,752)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 13.59\% | 6.81\% | 4,766,282 | 2,387,096 | $(2,379,186)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 117,529,652 | 91,552,536 | $(25,977,115)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

## Alternative 2

Current members unchanged
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, members contribute 10\%, High 5 Final Average Pay

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative | Difference |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 24.55\% | 24.55\% | 2,680,490 | 2,680,490 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 25.46\% | 25.46\% | 2,912,271 | 2,912,271 | 0 |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 28.98\% | 28.86\% | 3,445,094 | 3,431,424 | $(13,670)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 33.19\% | 32.91\% | 4,124,170 | 4,090,275 | $(33,894)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 31.18\% | 30.78\% | 4,021,795 | 3,969,967 | $(51,827)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 30.21\% | 29.64\% | 4,052,307 | 3,976,177 | $(76,130)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 30.25\% | 29.52\% | 4,225,714 | 4,123,796 | $(101,918)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 30.35\% | 29.47\% | 4,382,070 | 4,255,235 | $(126,835)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 30.56\% | 29.46\% | 4,569,620 | 4,405,165 | $(164,455)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 30.82\% | 29.49\% | 4,792,285 | 4,585,443 | $(206,841)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 27.74\% | 26.24\% | 4,478,214 | 4,236,529 | $(241,685)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 24.45\% | 22.78\% | 4,089,796 | 3,810,260 | $(279,536)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 21.75\% | 19.88\% | 3,750,841 | 3,428,245 | $(322,596)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 19.75\% | 17.62\% | 3,526,030 | 3,146,942 | $(379,088)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 18.19\% | 15.83\% | 3,339,499 | 2,907,079 | $(432,419)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 17.03\% | 14.43\% | 3,232,848 | 2,739,471 | $(493,377)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 16.07\% | 13.20\% | 3,161,893 | 2,596,697 | $(565,196)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 15.35\% | 12.22\% | 3,149,749 | 2,506,331 | $(643,418)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 14.87\% | 11.55\% | 3,176,750 | 2,466,372 | $(710,378)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 14.49\% | 10.98\% | 3,200,326 | 2,425,925 | $(774,402)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 14.17\% | 10.34\% | 3,258,314 | 2,378,108 | $(880,206)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 13.99\% | 9.92\% | 3,340,393 | 2,368,751 | $(971,642)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 13.93\% | 9.63\% | 3,457,544 | 2,390,133 | $(1,067,411)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 13.91\% | 9.38\% | 3,592,205 | 2,423,218 | $(1,168,987)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 13.89\% | 9.16\% | 3,737,010 | 2,464,911 | $(1,272,100)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 13.85\% | 8.93\% | 3,888,422 | 2,508,332 | $(1,380,090)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 13.79\% | 8.73\% | 4,038,684 | 2,556,758 | $(1,481,926)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 13.71\% | 8.52\% | 4,195,369 | 2,606,434 | $(1,588,936)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 13.67\% | 8.36\% | 4,378,310 | 2,677,426 | $(1,700,884)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 13.62\% | 8.24\% | 4,565,356 | 2,759,959 | $(1,805,397)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 13.59\% | 8.16\% | 4,766,282 | 2,861,837 | (1,904,446) |
| Total |  |  |  | 117,529,652 | 96,689,963 | $(20,839,688)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

Fire Employees
Alternative 3
Current members unchanged
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, Normal Retirement 55/25 or 60/15, 2\% COLA

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative | Difference |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 24.55\% | 24.55\% | 2,680,490 | 2,680,490 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 25.46\% | 25.46\% | 2,912,271 | 2,912,271 | 0 |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 28.98\% | 28.88\% | 3,445,094 | 3,433,738 | $(11,357)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 33.19\% | 32.96\% | 4,124,170 | 4,095,987 | $(28,182)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 31.18\% | 30.84\% | 4,021,795 | 3,978,657 | $(43,138)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 30.21\% | 29.74\% | 4,052,307 | 3,988,879 | $(63,428)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 30.25\% | 29.64\% | 4,225,714 | 4,140,696 | $(85,018)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 30.35\% | 29.61\% | 4,382,070 | 4,276,107 | $(105,963)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 30.56\% | 29.64\% | 4,569,620 | 4,432,053 | $(137,567)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 30.82\% | 29.71\% | 4,792,285 | 4,618,977 | $(173,308)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 27.74\% | 26.48\% | 4,478,214 | 4,275,563 | $(202,651)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 24.45\% | 23.05\% | 4,089,796 | 3,855,327 | $(234,470)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 21.75\% | 20.18\% | 3,750,841 | 3,480,204 | $(270,636)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 19.75\% | 17.96\% | 3,526,030 | 3,207,978 | $(318,052)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 18.19\% | 16.21\% | 3,339,499 | 2,976,611 | $(362,888)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 17.03\% | 14.85\% | 3,232,848 | 2,818,674 | $(414,174)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 16.07\% | 13.66\% | 3,161,893 | 2,687,329 | $(474,564)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 15.35\% | 12.72\% | 3,149,749 | 2,609,343 | $(540,406)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 14.87\% | 12.06\% | 3,176,750 | 2,576,527 | $(600,223)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 14.49\% | 11.50\% | 3,200,326 | 2,538,887 | $(661,439)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 14.17\% | 10.88\% | 3,258,314 | 2,501,995 | $(756,319)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 13.99\% | 10.49\% | 3,340,393 | 2,504,217 | $(836,176)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 13.93\% | 10.23\% | 3,457,544 | 2,538,135 | $(919,409)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 13.91\% | 10.01\% | 3,592,205 | 2,585,347 | $(1,006,858)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 13.89\% | 9.82\% | 3,737,010 | 2,640,322 | $(1,096,688)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 13.85\% | 9.60\% | 3,888,422 | 2,695,733 | $(1,192,689)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 13.79\% | 9.41\% | 4,038,684 | 2,756,558 | $(1,282,126)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 13.71\% | 9.21\% | 4,195,369 | 2,819,299 | $(1,376,070)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 13.67\% | 9.06\% | 4,378,310 | 2,901,397 | $(1,476,913)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 13.62\% | 8.92\% | 4,565,356 | 2,989,842 | $(1,575,514)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 13.59\% | 8.83\% | 4,766,282 | 3,094,464 | $(1,671,818)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 117,529,652 | 99,611,610 | $(17,918,042)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

## Alternative 4

Current members: Members contribute 10\%
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, members contribute 10\%, High 5 Final Average Pay

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 24.55\% | 24.55\% | 2,680,490 | 2,680,490 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 25.46\% | 25.46\% | 2,912,271 | 2,912,271 | 0 |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 28.98\% | 27.92\% | 3,445,094 | 3,319,191 | $(125,903)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 33.19\% | 30.93\% | 4,124,170 | 3,844,481 | $(279,689)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 31.18\% | 28.73\% | 4,021,795 | 3,705,903 | $(315,892)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 30.21\% | 27.66\% | 4,052,307 | 3,709,923 | $(342,384)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 30.25\% | 27.61\% | 4,225,714 | 3,856,942 | $(368,772)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 30.35\% | 27.63\% | 4,382,070 | 3,989,638 | $(392,432)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 30.56\% | 27.73\% | 4,569,620 | 4,145,742 | $(423,878)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 30.82\% | 27.87\% | 4,792,285 | 4,332,525 | $(459,759)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 27.74\% | 24.74\% | 4,478,214 | 3,994,765 | $(483,449)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 24.45\% | 21.41\% | 4,089,796 | 3,582,331 | $(507,465)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 21.75\% | 18.66\% | 3,750,841 | 3,217,127 | $(533,713)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 19.75\% | 16.55\% | 3,526,030 | 2,955,729 | $(570,301)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 18.19\% | 14.90\% | 3,339,499 | 2,735,409 | $(604,090)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 17.03\% | 13.63\% | 3,232,848 | 2,587,580 | $(645,268)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 16.07\% | 12.54\% | 3,161,893 | 2,467,837 | $(694,056)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 15.35\% | 11.70\% | 3,149,749 | 2,400,015 | $(749,734)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 14.87\% | 11.13\% | 3,176,750 | 2,376,577 | $(800,174)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 14.49\% | 10.66\% | 3,200,326 | 2,353,402 | $(846,925)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 14.17\% | 10.17\% | 3,258,314 | 2,338,975 | $(919,338)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 13.99\% | 9.87\% | 3,340,393 | 2,356,231 | $(984,161)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 13.93\% | 9.69\% | 3,457,544 | 2,405,102 | $(1,052,442)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 13.91\% | 9.55\% | 3,592,205 | 2,466,941 | $(1,125,264)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 13.89\% | 9.43\% | 3,737,010 | 2,536,567 | $(1,200,444)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 13.85\% | 9.29\% | 3,888,422 | 2,607,948 | $(1,280,474)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 13.79\% | 9.15\% | 4,038,684 | 2,680,638 | $(1,358,045)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 13.71\% | 9.00\% | 4,195,369 | 2,755,041 | $(1,440,329)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 13.67\% | 8.90\% | 4,378,310 | 2,850,897 | $(1,527,413)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 13.62\% | 8.81\% | 4,565,356 | 2,953,173 | $(1,612,183)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 13.59\% | 8.76\% | 4,766,282 | 3,070,541 | $(1,695,741)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 117,529,652 | 94,189,933 | $(23,339,719)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

Alternative 5
Current members: Eliminate lump sum pay
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, members contribute 10\%, High 5 Final Average Pay

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 24.55\% | 24.55\% | 2,680,490 | 2,680,490 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 25.46\% | 18.41\% | 2,912,271 | 2,106,327 | $(805,944)$ |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 28.98\% | 21.18\% | 3,445,094 | 2,518,101 | $(926,993)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 33.19\% | 25.22\% | 4,124,170 | 3,134,325 | $(989,844)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 31.18\% | 23.15\% | 4,021,795 | 2,986,299 | $(1,035,496)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 30.21\% | 22.08\% | 4,052,307 | 2,961,822 | $(1,090,485)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 30.25\% | 22.02\% | 4,225,714 | 3,076,241 | $(1,149,473)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 30.35\% | 22.03\% | 4,382,070 | 3,181,122 | $(1,200,948)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 30.56\% | 22.09\% | 4,569,620 | 3,302,661 | $(1,266,958)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 30.82\% | 22.19\% | 4,792,285 | 3,450,038 | $(1,342,247)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 27.74\% | 20.00\% | 4,478,214 | 3,229,604 | $(1,248,610)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 24.45\% | 17.67\% | 4,089,796 | 2,955,273 | $(1,134,523)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 21.75\% | 15.73\% | 3,750,841 | 2,712,696 | $(1,038,145)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 19.75\% | 14.26\% | 3,526,030 | 2,546,804 | $(979,226)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 18.19\% | 13.10\% | 3,339,499 | 2,404,514 | $(934,984)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 17.03\% | 12.20\% | 3,232,848 | 2,315,363 | $(917,485)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 16.07\% | 11.41\% | 3,161,893 | 2,245,430 | $(916,463)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 15.35\% | 10.81\% | 3,149,749 | 2,217,581 | $(932,168)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 14.87\% | 10.41\% | 3,176,750 | 2,224,247 | $(952,503)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 14.49\% | 10.08\% | 3,200,326 | 2,225,520 | $(974,807)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 14.17\% | 9.73\% | 3,258,314 | 2,236,369 | $(1,021,944)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 13.99\% | 9.52\% | 3,340,393 | 2,272,099 | $(1,068,293)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 13.93\% | 9.41\% | 3,457,544 | 2,334,344 | $(1,123,200)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 13.91\% | 9.33\% | 3,592,205 | 2,407,969 | $(1,184,236)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 13.89\% | 9.25\% | 3,737,010 | 2,487,928 | $(1,249,082)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 13.85\% | 9.15\% | 3,888,422 | 2,570,233 | $(1,318,189)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 13.79\% | 9.06\% | 4,038,684 | 2,652,509 | $(1,386,174)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 13.71\% | 8.94\% | 4,195,369 | 2,737,065 | $(1,458,304)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 13.67\% | 8.87\% | 4,378,310 | 2,841,303 | $(1,537,007)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 13.62\% | 8.81\% | 4,565,356 | 2,950,963 | $(1,614,393)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 13.59\% | 8.77\% | 4,766,282 | 3,073,867 | $(1,692,416)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 117,529,652 | 83,039,109 | $(34,490,543)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

Alternative 1
Current members unchanged
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, members contribute 10\%, High 5 Final Average Pay, 2\% COLA

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative | Difference |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 20.78\% | 20.78\% | 2,862,255 | 2,862,255 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 20.75\% | 20.75\% | 2,988,702 | 2,988,702 | 0 |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 23.37\% | 23.19\% | 3,509,603 | 3,482,163 | $(27,440)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 26.39\% | 26.00\% | 4,124,505 | 4,064,827 | $(59,678)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 24.55\% | 23.97\% | 3,969,105 | 3,874,690 | $(94,415)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 23.42\% | 22.54\% | 3,928,075 | 3,781,368 | $(146,707)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 22.88\% | 21.74\% | 3,983,191 | 3,784,702 | $(198,490)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 22.31\% | 20.89\% | 4,030,499 | 3,773,738 | $(256,761)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 21.62\% | 19.88\% | 4,058,842 | 3,732,990 | $(325,852)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 20.80\% | 18.75\% | 4,048,608 | 3,648,551 | $(400,057)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 18.21\% | 15.85\% | 3,687,176 | 3,209,765 | $(477,412)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 15.79\% | 13.19\% | 3,328,996 | 2,780,961 | $(548,035)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 13.84\% | 11.02\% | 3,039,443 | 2,420,230 | $(619,213)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 12.43\% | 9.41\% | 2,837,896 | 2,148,865 | $(689,032)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 11.43\% | 8.20\% | 2,723,459 | 1,953,639 | $(769,820)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.72\% | 7.30\% | 2,662,992 | 1,813,958 | $(849,034)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.19\% | 6.59\% | 2,633,553 | 1,701,959 | $(931,594)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 9.83\% | 5.99\% | 2,646,888 | 1,612,102 | $(1,034,785)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 9.62\% | 5.55\% | 2,694,368 | 1,555,300 | $(1,139,068)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 9.51\% | 5.21\% | 2,768,584 | 1,516,615 | $(1,251,968)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 9.49\% | 4.91\% | 2,875,660 | 1,487,093 | $(1,388,567)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 9.51\% | 4.69\% | 3,009,490 | 1,483,815 | $(1,525,674)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.57\% | 4.54\% | 3,158,836 | 1,497,391 | $(1,661,445)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 9.63\% | 4.40\% | 3,311,585 | 1,514,023 | $(1,797,562)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 9.67\% | 4.25\% | 3,476,078 | 1,528,452 | $(1,947,626)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 9.72\% | 4.16\% | 3,646,362 | 1,559,427 | $(2,086,934)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 9.77\% | 4.08\% | 3,828,321 | 1,597,364 | $(2,230,957)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 9.83\% | 4.02\% | 4,023,502 | 1,644,323 | $(2,379,179)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 9.90\% | 4.01\% | 4,235,330 | 1,716,335 | $(2,518,995)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 10.00\% | 4.04\% | 4,464,327 | 1,805,382 | $(2,658,945)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 10.09\% | 4.10\% | 4,702,564 | 1,907,961 | $(2,794,603)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 107,258,794 | 74,448,947 | $(32,809,847)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

Alternative 2
Current members unchanged
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, members contribute 10\%, High 5 Final Average Pay

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 20.78\% | 20.78\% | 2,862,255 | 2,862,255 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 20.75\% | 20.75\% | 2,988,702 | 2,988,702 | 0 |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 23.37\% | 23.23\% | 3,509,603 | 3,488,210 | $(21,393)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 26.39\% | 26.09\% | 4,124,505 | 4,078,003 | $(46,501)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 24.55\% | 24.10\% | 3,969,105 | 3,895,582 | $(73,524)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 23.42\% | 22.74\% | 3,928,075 | 3,813,899 | $(114,176)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 22.88\% | 21.99\% | 3,983,191 | 3,828,823 | $(154,368)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 22.31\% | 21.20\% | 4,030,499 | 3,830,968 | $(199,531)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 21.62\% | 20.27\% | 4,058,842 | 3,805,854 | $(252,988)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 20.80\% | 19.21\% | 4,048,608 | 3,738,357 | $(310,251)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 18.21\% | 16.38\% | 3,687,176 | 3,316,744 | $(370,433)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 15.79\% | 13.77\% | 3,328,996 | 2,903,445 | $(425,551)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 13.84\% | 11.65\% | 3,039,443 | 2,558,297 | $(481,146)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 12.43\% | 10.08\% | 2,837,896 | 2,302,193 | $(535,703)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 11.43\% | 8.92\% | 2,723,459 | 2,124,687 | $(598,772)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.72\% | 8.06\% | 2,662,992 | 2,002,371 | $(660,622)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.19\% | 7.39\% | 2,633,553 | 1,908,493 | $(725,060)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 9.83\% | 6.84\% | 2,646,888 | 1,841,388 | $(805,500)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 9.62\% | 6.45\% | 2,694,368 | 1,807,581 | $(886,787)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 9.51\% | 6.16\% | 2,768,584 | 1,793,821 | $(974,763)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 9.49\% | 5.92\% | 2,875,660 | 1,794,519 | $(1,081,141)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 9.51\% | 5.76\% | 3,009,490 | 1,821,547 | $(1,187,943)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.57\% | 5.65\% | 3,158,836 | 1,865,105 | $(1,293,732)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 9.63\% | 5.56\% | 3,311,585 | 1,911,754 | $(1,399,831)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 9.67\% | 5.45\% | 3,476,078 | 1,959,286 | $(1,516,792)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 9.72\% | 5.39\% | 3,646,362 | 2,020,981 | $(1,625,381)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 9.77\% | 5.34\% | 3,828,321 | 2,090,666 | $(1,737,655)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 9.83\% | 5.30\% | 4,023,502 | 2,170,934 | $(1,852,568)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 9.90\% | 5.32\% | 4,235,330 | 2,275,136 | $(1,960,193)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 10.00\% | 5.37\% | 4,464,327 | 2,397,325 | $(2,067,002)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 10.09\% | 5.44\% | 4,702,564 | 2,533,349 | $(2,169,215)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 107,258,794 | 81,730,275 | $(25,528,519)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

Alternative 3
Current members unchanged
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, Normal Retirement 55/25 or 60/15, 2\% COLA

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative | Difference |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 20.78\% | 20.78\% | 2,862,255 | 2,862,255 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 20.75\% | 20.75\% | 2,988,702 | 2,988,702 | 0 |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 23.37\% | 23.22\% | 3,509,603 | 3,487,392 | $(22,211)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 26.39\% | 26.08\% | 4,124,505 | 4,076,096 | $(48,409)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 24.55\% | 24.08\% | 3,969,105 | 3,892,353 | $(76,753)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 23.42\% | 22.71\% | 3,928,075 | 3,808,554 | $(119,521)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 22.88\% | 21.95\% | 3,983,191 | 3,821,080 | $(162,111)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 22.31\% | 21.14\% | 4,030,499 | 3,820,232 | $(210,268)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 21.62\% | 20.19\% | 4,058,842 | 3,791,164 | $(267,678)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 20.80\% | 19.11\% | 4,048,608 | 3,718,744 | $(329,864)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 18.21\% | 16.27\% | 3,687,176 | 3,294,330 | $(392,847)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 15.79\% | 13.66\% | 3,328,996 | 2,879,351 | $(449,645)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 13.84\% | 11.54\% | 3,039,443 | 2,532,772 | $(506,671)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 12.43\% | 9.96\% | 2,837,896 | 2,275,437 | $(562,459)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 11.43\% | 8.80\% | 2,723,459 | 2,096,247 | $(627,212)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.72\% | 7.94\% | 2,662,992 | 1,972,420 | $(690,573)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.19\% | 7.26\% | 2,633,553 | 1,876,929 | $(756,624)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 9.83\% | 6.71\% | 2,646,888 | 1,807,315 | $(839,573)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 9.62\% | 6.32\% | 2,694,368 | 1,771,048 | $(923,320)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 9.51\% | 6.03\% | 2,768,584 | 1,754,543 | $(1,014,041)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 9.49\% | 5.78\% | 2,875,660 | 1,751,588 | $(1,124,072)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 9.51\% | 5.61\% | 3,009,490 | 1,775,206 | $(1,234,284)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.57\% | 5.50\% | 3,158,836 | 1,815,595 | $(1,343,242)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 9.63\% | 5.41\% | 3,311,585 | 1,859,335 | $(1,452,250)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 9.67\% | 5.30\% | 3,476,078 | 1,903,571 | $(1,572,507)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 9.72\% | 5.23\% | 3,646,362 | 1,961,675 | $(1,684,686)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 9.77\% | 5.17\% | 3,828,321 | 2,027,489 | $(1,800,833)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 9.83\% | 5.13\% | 4,023,502 | 2,100,630 | $(1,922,872)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 9.90\% | 5.13\% | 4,235,330 | 2,193,903 | $(2,041,427)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 10.00\% | 5.15\% | 4,464,327 | 2,300,482 | $(2,163,844)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 10.09\% | 5.18\% | 4,702,564 | 2,414,932 | $(2,287,632)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 107,258,794 | 80,631,368 | $(26,627,426)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

Alternative 4
Current members: Members contribute 10\%
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, members contribute 10\%, High 5 Final Average Pay

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative | Difference |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 20.78\% | 20.78\% | 2,862,255 | 2,862,255 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 20.75\% | 20.75\% | 2,988,702 | 2,988,702 | 0 |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 23.37\% | 22.30\% | 3,509,603 | 3,349,291 | $(160,312)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 26.39\% | 24.13\% | 4,124,505 | 3,772,561 | $(351,944)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 24.55\% | 22.09\% | 3,969,105 | 3,571,484 | $(397,621)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 23.42\% | 20.83\% | 3,928,075 | 3,494,054 | $(434,021)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 22.88\% | 20.19\% | 3,983,191 | 3,514,637 | $(468,555)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 22.31\% | 19.51\% | 4,030,499 | 3,524,726 | $(505,773)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 21.62\% | 18.70\% | 4,058,842 | 3,510,547 | $(548,294)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 20.80\% | 17.76\% | 4,048,608 | 3,456,039 | $(592,568)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 18.21\% | 15.10\% | 3,687,176 | 3,058,009 | $(629,167)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 15.79\% | 12.65\% | 3,328,996 | 2,666,299 | $(662,697)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 13.84\% | 10.66\% | 3,039,443 | 2,341,129 | $(698,314)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 12.43\% | 9.21\% | 2,837,896 | 2,102,781 | $(735,115)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 11.43\% | 8.16\% | 2,723,459 | 1,943,965 | $(779,493)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.72\% | 7.40\% | 2,662,992 | 1,837,963 | $(825,030)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.19\% | 6.82\% | 2,633,553 | 1,761,275 | $(872,278)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 9.83\% | 6.38\% | 2,646,888 | 1,716,960 | $(929,927)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 9.62\% | 6.09\% | 2,694,368 | 1,705,867 | $(988,501)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 9.51\% | 5.90\% | 2,768,584 | 1,718,145 | $(1,050,438)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 9.49\% | 5.78\% | 2,875,660 | 1,751,442 | $(1,124,218)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 9.51\% | 5.72\% | 3,009,490 | 1,808,958 | $(1,200,532)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.57\% | 5.70\% | 3,158,836 | 1,881,768 | $(1,277,068)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 9.63\% | 5.69\% | 3,311,585 | 1,956,743 | $(1,354,843)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 9.67\% | 5.66\% | 3,476,078 | 2,035,438 | $(1,440,639)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 9.72\% | 5.66\% | 3,646,362 | 2,123,246 | $(1,523,115)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 9.77\% | 5.67\% | 3,828,321 | 2,219,579 | $(1,608,742)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 9.83\% | 5.68\% | 4,023,502 | 2,325,395 | $(1,698,107)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 9.90\% | 5.73\% | 4,235,330 | 2,450,203 | $(1,785,127)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 10.00\% | 5.80\% | 4,464,327 | 2,590,726 | $(1,873,601)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 10.09\% | 5.88\% | 4,702,564 | 2,741,435 | $(1,961,129)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 107,258,794 | 78,781,624 | $(28,477,170)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met

## Police Employees

Alternative 5
Current members: Eliminate lump sum pay
New members: Eliminate lump sum pay, members contribute 10\%, High 5 Final Average Pay

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative | Difference |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 20.78\% | 20.78\% | 2,862,255 | 2,862,255 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 20.75\% | 14.84\% | 2,988,702 | 2,137,620 | $(851,083)$ |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 23.37\% | 16.79\% | 3,509,603 | 2,521,945 | $(987,658)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 26.39\% | 19.66\% | 4,124,505 | 3,073,664 | $(1,050,841)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 24.55\% | 17.73\% | 3,969,105 | 2,866,131 | $(1,102,974)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 23.42\% | 16.44\% | 3,928,075 | 2,757,784 | $(1,170,291)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 22.88\% | 15.76\% | 3,983,191 | 2,744,317 | $(1,238,874)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 22.31\% | 15.05\% | 4,030,499 | 2,718,610 | $(1,311,889)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 21.62\% | 14.20\% | 4,058,842 | 2,665,947 | $(1,392,895)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 20.80\% | 13.23\% | 4,048,608 | 2,574,488 | $(1,474,120)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 18.21\% | 11.38\% | 3,687,176 | 2,304,607 | $(1,382,570)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 15.79\% | 9.77\% | 3,328,996 | 2,060,485 | $(1,268,511)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 13.84\% | 8.50\% | 3,039,443 | 1,865,350 | $(1,174,093)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 12.43\% | 7.58\% | 2,837,896 | 1,731,510 | $(1,106,386)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 11.43\% | 6.94\% | 2,723,459 | 1,652,766 | $(1,070,693)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.72\% | 6.48\% | 2,662,992 | 1,609,620 | $(1,053,373)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.19\% | 6.13\% | 2,633,553 | 1,583,120 | $(1,050,433)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 9.83\% | 5.86\% | 2,646,888 | 1,577,690 | $(1,069,198)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 9.62\% | 5.70\% | 2,694,368 | 1,596,513 | $(1,097,855)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 9.51\% | 5.61\% | 2,768,584 | 1,631,555 | $(1,137,028)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 9.49\% | 5.55\% | 2,875,660 | 1,682,271 | $(1,193,388)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 9.51\% | 5.54\% | 3,009,490 | 1,752,893 | $(1,256,597)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.57\% | 5.56\% | 3,158,836 | 1,835,875 | $(1,322,962)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 9.63\% | 5.58\% | 3,311,585 | 1,919,509 | $(1,392,076)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 9.67\% | 5.58\% | 3,476,078 | 2,006,183 | $(1,469,895)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 9.72\% | 5.60\% | 3,646,362 | 2,100,498 | $(1,545,864)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 9.77\% | 5.62\% | 3,828,321 | 2,202,171 | $(1,626,150)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 9.83\% | 5.65\% | 4,023,502 | 2,313,010 | $(1,710,493)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 9.90\% | 5.71\% | 4,235,330 | 2,441,357 | $(1,793,973)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 10.00\% | 5.79\% | 4,464,327 | 2,584,651 | $(1,879,676)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 10.09\% | 5.88\% | 4,702,564 | 2,738,196 | $(1,964,368)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 107,258,794 | 68,112,587 | $(39,146,207)$ |

To provide stability in the contribution rate, re-amortization is set to an open 5 year period in 2019 for both the baseline and alternative scenarios. All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met

# General Employees <br> Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#1 <br> Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: Unchanged, New members: Increase normal retirement age to age 65 with 5 years of service 

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 4.89\% | 4.89\% | 1,765,186 | 1,765,186 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 5.48\% | 5.48\% | 2,067,731 | 2,067,731 | 0 |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 5.53\% | 5.40\% | 2,181,795 | 2,130,950 | $(50,845)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 5.56\% | 5.31\% | 2,289,398 | 2,185,503 | $(103,895)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 5.51\% | 5.14\% | 2,367,662 | 2,209,014 | $(158,648)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 5.50\% | 5.02\% | 2,465,674 | 2,250,736 | $(214,938)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 5.50\% | 4.91\% | 2,571,175 | 2,299,280 | $(271,895)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 5.50\% | 4.82\% | 2,682,528 | 2,351,517 | $(331,011)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 5.50\% | 4.72\% | 2,802,091 | 2,407,077 | $(395,014)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 5.50\% | 4.63\% | 2,928,945 | 2,465,425 | $(463,520)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 5.50\% | 4.54\% | 3,057,748 | 2,523,785 | $(533,963)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 5.50\% | 4.46\% | 3,190,833 | 2,586,015 | $(604,818)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 5.50\% | 4.38\% | 3,331,166 | 2,651,587 | $(679,579)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 5.50\% | 4.30\% | 3,478,849 | 2,721,469 | $(757,380)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 5.49\% | 4.23\% | 3,630,695 | 2,793,541 | $(837,154)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 5.49\% | 4.16\% | 3,788,408 | 2,868,710 | $(919,698)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 5.49\% | 4.10\% | 3,950,055 | 2,946,133 | $(1,003,922)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 5.50\% | 4.04\% | 4,127,205 | 3,035,297 | $(1,091,908)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 5.50\% | 4.00\% | 4,311,889 | 3,133,302 | $(1,178,587)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 5.51\% | 3.96\% | 4,505,125 | 3,239,183 | $(1,265,942)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 5.52\% | 3.92\% | 4,706,472 | 3,348,435 | $(1,358,037)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 5.53\% | 3.90\% | 4,924,286 | 3,466,973 | $(1,457,313)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 5.08\% | 3.44\% | 4,717,677 | 3,195,982 | $(1,521,695)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 4.62\% | 2.98\% | 4,466,559 | 2,885,081 | $(1,581,478)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 4.23\% | 2.60\% | 4,268,260 | 2,623,505 | $(1,644,755)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 3.94\% | 2.31\% | 4,139,778 | 2,425,445 | $(1,714,333)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 3.72\% | 2.08\% | 4,073,474 | 2,283,284 | $(1,790,190)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 3.55\% | 1.91\% | 4,059,366 | 2,186,628 | $(1,872,738)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 3.43\% | 1.78\% | 4,088,407 | 2,125,861 | $(1,962,546)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 3.34\% | 1.68\% | 4,149,953 | 2,094,025 | $(2,055,928)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 3.27\% | 1.61\% | 4,240,629 | 2,084,978 | $(2,155,651)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 109,329,019 | 79,351,638 | (29,977,381) |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#1
Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: Unchanged, New members: Increase normal retirement age to age 55 with 25 years of service or age 60 with 15 years of service

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 8.35\% | 8.35\% | 911,694 | 911,694 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 9.91\% | 9.91\% | 1,133,616 | 1,133,616 | 0 |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 10.10\% | 10.10\% | 1,200,338 | 1,200,494 | 156 |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 10.23\% | 10.24\% | 1,271,934 | 1,272,299 | 365 |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 10.22\% | 10.22\% | 1,318,425 | 1,318,963 | 538 |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 10.26\% | 10.27\% | 1,376,807 | 1,377,583 | 776 |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 10.33\% | 10.34\% | 1,443,568 | 1,444,597 | 1,029 |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 10.39\% | 10.40\% | 1,500,512 | 1,501,766 | 1,254 |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 10.48\% | 10.49\% | 1,566,827 | 1,568,425 | 1,598 |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 10.56\% | 10.58\% | 1,642,347 | 1,644,363 | 2,016 |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 10.63\% | 10.65\% | 1,716,869 | 1,719,267 | 2,398 |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 10.67\% | 10.69\% | 1,785,273 | 1,788,131 | 2,858 |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 10.73\% | 10.75\% | 1,850,304 | 1,853,700 | 3,396 |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 10.82\% | 10.84\% | 1,931,960 | 1,936,021 | 4,061 |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 10.95\% | 10.98\% | 2,010,948 | 2,015,689 | 4,741 |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 11.07\% | 11.10\% | 2,101,042 | 2,106,559 | 5,517 |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 11.13\% | 11.16\% | 2,188,932 | 2,195,313 | 6,381 |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 11.18\% | 11.22\% | 2,293,570 | 2,300,934 | 7,364 |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 11.22\% | 11.24\% | 2,396,151 | 2,401,979 | 5,828 |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 11.23\% | 11.24\% | 2,479,203 | 2,482,661 | 3,458 |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 11.26\% | 11.27\% | 2,588,090 | 2,590,035 | 1,945 |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 11.32\% | 11.31\% | 2,702,746 | 2,701,723 | $(1,023)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 10.40\% | 10.38\% | 2,579,915 | 2,575,301 | $(4,614)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 9.43\% | 9.40\% | 2,434,169 | 2,426,329 | $(7,840)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 8.62\% | 8.57\% | 2,318,102 | 2,306,072 | $(12,030)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 7.98\% | 7.92\% | 2,242,403 | 2,225,519 | $(16,884)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 7.51\% | 7.44\% | 2,198,520 | 2,178,135 | $(20,385)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 7.15\% | 7.07\% | 2,186,885 | 2,163,068 | $(23,817)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 6.88\% | 6.79\% | 2,202,069 | 2,173,787 | $(28,282)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 6.67\% | 6.57\% | 2,235,940 | 2,201,727 | $(34,213)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 6.53\% | 6.41\% | 2,288,318 | 2,247,537 | $(40,781)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 60,097,477 | 59,963,287 | $(134,190)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#1
Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: Unchanged, New members: Increase normal retirement age to age 55 with 25 years of service or age 60 with 15 years of service

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 7.66\% | 7.66\% | 1,055,095 | 1,055,095 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 9.33\% | 9.33\% | 1,343,140 | 1,343,140 | 0 |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 9.48\% | 9.47\% | 1,424,396 | 1,422,065 | $(2,331)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 9.58\% | 9.55\% | 1,497,225 | 1,492,293 | $(4,932)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 9.58\% | 9.53\% | 1,548,178 | 1,540,558 | $(7,620)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 9.63\% | 9.56\% | 1,615,382 | 1,603,901 | $(11,481)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 9.71\% | 9.62\% | 1,690,191 | 1,674,546 | $(15,645)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 9.78\% | 9.67\% | 1,767,469 | 1,747,474 | $(19,995)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 9.83\% | 9.70\% | 1,846,297 | 1,821,718 | $(24,579)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 9.87\% | 9.71\% | 1,920,506 | 1,890,569 | $(29,937)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 9.91\% | 9.73\% | 2,005,893 | 1,969,393 | $(36,500)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 9.96\% | 9.76\% | 2,099,207 | 2,056,439 | $(42,768)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 10.01\% | 9.78\% | 2,196,892 | 2,147,436 | $(49,456)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 10.06\% | 9.81\% | 2,297,436 | 2,241,357 | $(56,079)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 10.12\% | 9.85\% | 2,410,076 | 2,346,291 | $(63,785)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.16\% | 9.88\% | 2,524,595 | 2,453,196 | $(71,399)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.20\% | 9.90\% | 2,636,210 | 2,556,680 | $(79,530)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 10.25\% | 9.92\% | 2,760,374 | 2,670,914 | $(89,460)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 10.31\% | 9.95\% | 2,888,120 | 2,788,403 | $(99,717)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 10.38\% | 10.00\% | 3,019,758 | 2,908,743 | $(111,015)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 10.46\% | 10.05\% | 3,170,701 | 3,046,143 | $(124,558)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 10.55\% | 10.11\% | 3,338,558 | 3,199,887 | $(138,671)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.61\% | 9.15\% | 3,169,525 | 3,020,291 | $(149,234)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 8.61\% | 8.14\% | 2,961,562 | 2,801,542 | $(160,020)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 7.78\% | 7.31\% | 2,797,829 | 2,626,259 | $(171,570)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 7.15\% | 6.66\% | 2,682,173 | 2,499,124 | $(183,049)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 6.67\% | 6.17\% | 2,613,295 | 2,418,238 | $(195,057)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 6.31\% | 5.81\% | 2,585,707 | 2,378,513 | $(207,194)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 6.05\% | 5.54\% | 2,588,508 | 2,368,723 | $(219,785)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 5.86\% | 5.34\% | 2,617,449 | 2,384,846 | $(232,603)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 5.72\% | 5.20\% | 2,666,501 | 2,420,934 | $(245,567)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 71,738,248 | 68,894,711 | $(2,843,537)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 1
Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$10 monthly subsidy per year of service with $0 \%$ COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative | Difference |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 4.89\% | 4.89\% | 1,765,186 | 1,765,186 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 5.48\% | 1.07\% | 2,068,516 | 403,889 | $(1,664,627)$ |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 5.53\% | 0.97\% | 2,180,687 | 382,507 | $(1,798,180)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 5.56\% | 1.08\% | 2,289,951 | 444,811 | $(1,845,140)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 5.51\% | 1.04\% | 2,367,341 | 446,830 | $(1,920,511)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 5.50\% | 0.91\% | 2,466,577 | 408,106 | $(2,058,471)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 5.50\% | 0.81\% | 2,573,254 | 378,970 | $(2,194,284)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 5.50\% | 0.73\% | 2,684,264 | 356,275 | $(2,327,989)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 5.50\% | 0.66\% | 2,802,279 | 336,273 | $(2,466,006)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 5.50\% | 0.60\% | 2,927,333 | 319,345 | $(2,607,988)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 5.50\% | 0.54\% | 3,057,616 | 300,202 | $(2,757,414)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 5.50\% | 0.49\% | 3,192,505 | 284,423 | $(2,908,082)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 5.50\% | 0.44\% | 3,333,224 | 266,658 | $(3,066,566)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 5.50\% | 0.40\% | 3,481,029 | 253,166 | $(3,227,863)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 5.49\% | 0.35\% | 3,627,511 | 231,262 | $(3,396,249)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 5.49\% | 0.32\% | 3,786,932 | 220,732 | $(3,566,200)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 5.49\% | 0.28\% | 3,948,739 | 201,393 | $(3,747,346)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 5.50\% | 0.25\% | 4,129,239 | 187,693 | $(3,941,546)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 5.50\% | 0.22\% | 4,310,687 | 172,427 | $(4,138,260)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 5.51\% | 0.19\% | 4,507,770 | 155,440 | $(4,352,330)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 5.52\% | 0.16\% | 4,710,210 | 136,528 | $(4,573,682)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 5.53\% | 0.14\% | 4,921,460 | 124,594 | $(4,796,866)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 5.08\% | 0.14\% | 4,713,798 | 129,908 | $(4,583,890)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 4.62\% | 0.15\% | 4,469,248 | 145,105 | $(4,324,143)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 4.23\% | 0.15\% | 4,266,249 | 151,285 | $(4,114,964)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 3.94\% | 0.15\% | 4,143,293 | 157,740 | $(3,985,553)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 3.72\% | 0.15\% | 4,078,195 | 164,443 | $(3,913,752)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 3.55\% | 0.14\% | 4,058,531 | 160,055 | $(3,898,476)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 3.43\% | 0.14\% | 4,089,373 | 166,913 | $(3,922,460)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 3.34\% | 0.13\% | 4,151,890 | 161,601 | $(3,990,289)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 3.27\% | 0.12\% | 4,238,280 | 155,533 | $(4,082,747)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 109,341,167 | 9,169,293 | $(100,171,874)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 2
Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: $\$ 10$ monthly subsidy per year of service with 1\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative | Difference |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 4.89\% | 4.89\% | 1,765,186 | 1,765,186 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 5.48\% | 1.16\% | 2,068,516 | 437,861 | $(1,630,655)$ |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 5.53\% | 1.06\% | 2,180,687 | 417,998 | $(1,762,689)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 5.56\% | 1.17\% | 2,289,951 | 481,878 | $(1,808,073)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 5.51\% | 1.13\% | 2,367,341 | 485,498 | $(1,881,843)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 5.50\% | 1.00\% | 2,466,577 | 448,469 | $(2,018,108)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 5.50\% | 0.90\% | 2,573,254 | 421,078 | $(2,152,176)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 5.50\% | 0.81\% | 2,684,264 | 395,319 | $(2,288,945)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 5.50\% | 0.74\% | 2,802,279 | 377,034 | $(2,425,245)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 5.50\% | 0.68\% | 2,927,333 | 361,925 | $(2,565,408)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 5.50\% | 0.62\% | 3,057,616 | 344,677 | $(2,712,939)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 5.50\% | 0.56\% | 3,192,505 | 325,055 | $(2,867,450)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 5.50\% | 0.51\% | 3,333,224 | 309,081 | $(3,024,143)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 5.50\% | 0.47\% | 3,481,029 | 297,470 | $(3,183,559)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 5.49\% | 0.42\% | 3,627,511 | 277,514 | $(3,349,997)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 5.49\% | 0.38\% | 3,786,932 | 262,119 | $(3,524,813)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 5.49\% | 0.34\% | 3,948,739 | 244,548 | $(3,704,191)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 5.50\% | 0.31\% | 4,129,239 | 232,739 | $(3,896,500)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 5.50\% | 0.28\% | 4,310,687 | 219,453 | $(4,091,234)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 5.51\% | 0.25\% | 4,507,770 | 204,527 | $(4,303,243)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 5.52\% | 0.22\% | 4,710,210 | 187,726 | $(4,522,484)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 5.53\% | 0.19\% | 4,921,460 | 169,092 | $(4,752,368)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 5.08\% | 0.19\% | 4,713,798 | 176,303 | $(4,537,495)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 4.62\% | 0.18\% | 4,469,248 | 174,127 | $(4,295,121)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 4.23\% | 0.18\% | 4,266,249 | 181,543 | $(4,084,706)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 3.94\% | 0.17\% | 4,143,293 | 178,772 | $(3,964,521)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 3.72\% | 0.17\% | 4,078,195 | 186,369 | $(3,891,826)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 3.55\% | 0.16\% | 4,058,531 | 182,920 | $(3,875,611)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 3.43\% | 0.15\% | 4,089,373 | 178,836 | $(3,910,537)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 3.34\% | 0.14\% | 4,151,890 | 174,031 | $(3,977,859)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 3.27\% | 0.13\% | 4,238,280 | 168,494 | (4,069,786) |
| Total |  |  |  | 109,341,167 | 10,267,642 | $(99,073,525)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 3
Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: $\$ 10$ monthly subsidy per year of service with 2\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 4.89\% | 4.89\% | 1,765,186 | 1,765,186 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 5.48\% | 1.27\% | 2,068,516 | 479,382 | $(1,589,134)$ |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 5.53\% | 1.17\% | 2,180,687 | 461,375 | $(1,719,312)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 5.56\% | 1.28\% | 2,289,951 | 527,183 | $(1,762,768)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 5.51\% | 1.23\% | 2,367,341 | 528,463 | $(1,838,878)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 5.50\% | 1.10\% | 2,466,577 | 493,315 | $(1,973,262)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 5.50\% | 0.99\% | 2,573,254 | 463,186 | $(2,110,068)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 5.50\% | 0.91\% | 2,684,264 | 444,124 | $(2,240,140)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 5.50\% | 0.83\% | 2,802,279 | 422,889 | $(2,379,390)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 5.50\% | 0.77\% | 2,927,333 | 409,827 | $(2,517,506)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 5.50\% | 0.71\% | 3,057,616 | 394,710 | $(2,662,906)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 5.50\% | 0.65\% | 3,192,505 | 377,296 | $(2,815,209)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 5.50\% | 0.60\% | 3,333,224 | 363,624 | $(2,969,600)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 5.50\% | 0.55\% | 3,481,029 | 348,103 | $(3,132,926)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 5.49\% | 0.51\% | 3,627,511 | 336,982 | $(3,290,529)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 5.49\% | 0.46\% | 3,786,932 | 317,302 | (3,469,630) |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 5.49\% | 0.42\% | 3,948,739 | 302,089 | $(3,646,650)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 5.50\% | 0.39\% | 4,129,239 | 292,801 | $(3,836,438)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 5.50\% | 0.35\% | 4,310,687 | 274,316 | $(4,036,371)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 5.51\% | 0.32\% | 4,507,770 | 261,794 | $(4,245,976)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 5.52\% | 0.29\% | 4,710,210 | 247,457 | $(4,462,753)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 5.53\% | 0.26\% | 4,921,460 | 231,389 | $(4,690,071)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 5.08\% | 0.24\% | 4,713,798 | 222,699 | $(4,491,099)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 4.62\% | 0.23\% | 4,469,248 | 222,495 | $(4,246,753)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 4.23\% | 0.22\% | 4,266,249 | 221,885 | $(4,044,364)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 3.94\% | 0.20\% | 4,143,293 | 210,319 | $(3,932,974)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 3.72\% | 0.19\% | 4,078,195 | 208,295 | $(3,869,900)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 3.55\% | 0.17\% | 4,058,531 | 194,352 | $(3,864,179)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 3.43\% | 0.16\% | 4,089,373 | 190,758 | $(3,898,615)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 3.34\% | 0.15\% | 4,151,890 | 186,462 | $(3,965,428)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 3.27\% | 0.13\% | 4,238,280 | 168,494 | (4,069,786) |
| Total |  |  |  | 109,341,167 | 11,568,552 | (97,772,615) |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 4
Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: $\$ 10$ monthly subsidy per year of service with 3\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 4.89\% | 4.89\% | 1,765,186 | 1,765,186 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 5.48\% | 1.39\% | 2,068,516 | 524,678 | $(1,543,838)$ |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 5.53\% | 1.30\% | 2,180,687 | 512,639 | $(1,668,048)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 5.56\% | 1.40\% | 2,289,951 | 576,606 | $(1,713,345)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 5.51\% | 1.35\% | 2,367,341 | 580,020 | $(1,787,321)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 5.50\% | 1.21\% | 2,466,577 | 542,647 | $(1,923,930)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 5.50\% | 1.11\% | 2,573,254 | 519,329 | $(2,053,925)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 5.50\% | 1.02\% | 2,684,264 | 497,809 | $(2,186,455)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 5.50\% | 0.94\% | 2,802,279 | 478,935 | $(2,323,344)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 5.50\% | 0.88\% | 2,927,333 | 468,373 | $(2,458,960)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 5.50\% | 0.81\% | 3,057,616 | 450,303 | $(2,607,313)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 5.50\% | 0.75\% | 3,192,505 | 435,342 | $(2,757,163)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 5.50\% | 0.70\% | 3,333,224 | 424,228 | $(2,908,996)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 5.50\% | 0.65\% | 3,481,029 | 411,394 | $(3,069,635)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 5.49\% | 0.60\% | 3,627,511 | 396,449 | $(3,231,062)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 5.49\% | 0.55\% | 3,786,932 | 379,383 | $(3,407,549)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 5.49\% | 0.51\% | 3,948,739 | 366,823 | $(3,581,916)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 5.50\% | 0.47\% | 4,129,239 | 352,862 | $(3,776,377)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 5.50\% | 0.44\% | 4,310,687 | 344,855 | $(3,965,832)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 5.51\% | 0.41\% | 4,507,770 | 335,424 | $(4,172,346)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 5.52\% | 0.37\% | 4,710,210 | 315,721 | $(4,394,489)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 5.53\% | 0.34\% | 4,921,460 | 302,585 | $(4,618,875)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 5.08\% | 0.31\% | 4,713,798 | 287,653 | $(4,426,145)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 4.62\% | 0.28\% | 4,469,248 | 270,864 | $(4,198,384)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 4.23\% | 0.26\% | 4,266,249 | 262,228 | $(4,004,021)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 3.94\% | 0.23\% | 4,143,293 | 241,867 | $(3,901,426)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 3.72\% | 0.21\% | 4,078,195 | 230,221 | $(3,847,974)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 3.55\% | 0.19\% | 4,058,531 | 217,217 | $(3,841,314)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 3.43\% | 0.17\% | 4,089,373 | 202,680 | $(3,886,693)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 3.34\% | 0.16\% | 4,151,890 | 198,893 | $(3,952,997)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 3.27\% | 0.14\% | 4,238,280 | 181,455 | $(4,056,825)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 109,341,167 | 13,074,669 | $(96,266,498)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 5
Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service with $0 \%$ COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 4.89\% | 4.89\% | 1,765,186 | 1,765,186 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 5.48\% | 1.86\% | 2,068,516 | 702,088 | $(1,366,428)$ |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 5.53\% | 1.79\% | 2,180,687 | 705,864 | $(1,474,823)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 5.56\% | 1.89\% | 2,289,951 | 778,418 | $(1,511,533)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 5.51\% | 1.79\% | 2,367,341 | 769,064 | $(1,598,277)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 5.50\% | 1.65\% | 2,466,577 | 739,973 | $(1,726,604)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 5.50\% | 1.53\% | 2,573,254 | 715,832 | $(1,857,422)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 5.50\% | 1.43\% | 2,684,264 | 697,909 | $(1,986,355)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 5.50\% | 1.34\% | 2,802,279 | 682,737 | $(2,119,542)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 5.50\% | 1.27\% | 2,927,333 | 675,948 | $(2,251,385)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 5.50\% | 1.19\% | 3,057,616 | 661,557 | $(2,396,059)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 5.50\% | 1.12\% | 3,192,505 | 650,110 | $(2,542,395)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 5.50\% | 1.05\% | 3,333,224 | 636,343 | $(2,696,881)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 5.50\% | 0.99\% | 3,481,029 | 626,585 | $(2,854,444)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 5.49\% | 0.94\% | 3,627,511 | 621,104 | $(3,006,407)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 5.49\% | 0.88\% | 3,786,932 | 607,013 | $(3,179,919)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 5.49\% | 0.83\% | 3,948,739 | 596,986 | $(3,351,753)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 5.50\% | 0.79\% | 4,129,239 | 593,109 | $(3,536,130)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 5.50\% | 0.75\% | 4,310,687 | 587,821 | $(3,722,866)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 5.51\% | 0.71\% | 4,507,770 | 580,856 | $(3,926,914)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 5.52\% | 0.67\% | 4,710,210 | 571,710 | $(4,138,500)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 5.53\% | 0.64\% | 4,921,460 | 569,572 | $(4,351,888)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 5.08\% | 0.55\% | 4,713,798 | 510,352 | $(4,203,446)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 4.62\% | 0.46\% | 4,469,248 | 444,990 | $(4,024,258)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 4.23\% | 0.39\% | 4,266,249 | 393,342 | $(3,872,907)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 3.94\% | 0.33\% | 4,143,293 | 347,027 | $(3,796,266)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 3.72\% | 0.28\% | 4,078,195 | 306,961 | (3,771,234) |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 3.55\% | 0.24\% | 4,058,531 | 274,380 | $(3,784,151)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 3.43\% | 0.21\% | 4,089,373 | 250,370 | $(3,839,003)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 3.34\% | 0.18\% | 4,151,890 | 223,755 | $(3,928,135)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 3.27\% | 0.16\% | 4,238,280 | 207,378 | $(4,030,902)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 109,341,167 | 18,494,340 | $(90,846,827)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 6
Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service with $1 \%$ COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative | Difference |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 4.89\% | 4.89\% | 1,765,186 | 1,765,186 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 5.48\% | 2.04\% | 2,068,516 | 770,032 | $(1,298,484)$ |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 5.53\% | 1.98\% | 2,180,687 | 780,788 | $(1,399,899)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 5.56\% | 2.07\% | 2,289,951 | 852,554 | $(1,437,397)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 5.51\% | 1.97\% | 2,367,341 | 846,400 | $(1,520,941)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 5.50\% | 1.82\% | 2,466,577 | 816,213 | $(1,650,364)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 5.50\% | 1.70\% | 2,573,254 | 795,369 | $(1,777,885)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 5.50\% | 1.59\% | 2,684,264 | 775,996 | $(1,908,268)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 5.50\% | 1.50\% | 2,802,279 | 764,258 | $(2,038,021)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 5.50\% | 1.42\% | 2,927,333 | 755,784 | $(2,171,549)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 5.50\% | 1.34\% | 3,057,616 | 744,946 | (2,312,670) |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 5.50\% | 1.27\% | 3,192,505 | 737,178 | $(2,455,327)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 5.50\% | 1.20\% | 3,333,224 | 727,249 | $(2,605,975)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 5.50\% | 1.14\% | 3,481,029 | 721,522 | $(2,759,507)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 5.49\% | 1.08\% | 3,627,511 | 713,609 | $(2,913,902)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 5.49\% | 1.02\% | 3,786,932 | 703,583 | $(3,083,349)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 5.49\% | 0.97\% | 3,948,739 | 697,682 | $(3,251,057)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 5.50\% | 0.92\% | 4,129,239 | 690,709 | $(3,438,530)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 5.50\% | 0.87\% | 4,310,687 | 681,872 | $(3,628,815)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 5.51\% | 0.83\% | 4,507,770 | 679,029 | $(3,828,741)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 5.52\% | 0.79\% | 4,710,210 | 674,106 | $(4,036,104)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 5.53\% | 0.75\% | 4,921,460 | 667,468 | $(4,253,992)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 5.08\% | 0.64\% | 4,713,798 | 593,864 | $(4,119,934)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 4.62\% | 0.54\% | 4,469,248 | 522,380 | $(3,946,868)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 4.23\% | 0.45\% | 4,266,249 | 453,856 | $(3,812,393)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 3.94\% | 0.38\% | 4,143,293 | 399,607 | $(3,743,686)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 3.72\% | 0.32\% | 4,078,195 | 350,813 | $(3,727,382)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 3.55\% | 0.27\% | 4,058,531 | 308,677 | $(3,749,854)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 3.43\% | 0.23\% | 4,089,373 | 274,214 | $(3,815,159)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 3.34\% | 0.20\% | 4,151,890 | 248,616 | $(3,903,274)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 3.27\% | 0.17\% | 4,238,280 | 220,339 | $(4,017,941)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 109,341,167 | 20,733,899 | $(88,607,268)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 7
Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service with 2\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 4.89\% | 4.89\% | 1,765,186 | 1,765,186 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 5.48\% | 2.24\% | 2,068,516 | 845,525 | $(1,222,991)$ |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 5.53\% | 2.19\% | 2,180,687 | 863,599 | $(1,317,088)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 5.56\% | 2.28\% | 2,289,951 | 939,045 | $(1,350,906)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 5.51\% | 2.17\% | 2,367,341 | 932,329 | $(1,435,012)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 5.50\% | 2.02\% | 2,466,577 | 905,907 | $(1,560,670)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 5.50\% | 1.89\% | 2,573,254 | 884,264 | $(1,688,990)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 5.50\% | 1.79\% | 2,684,264 | 873,606 | $(1,810,658)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 5.50\% | 1.69\% | 2,802,279 | 861,064 | $(1,941,215)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 5.50\% | 1.61\% | 2,927,333 | 856,910 | $(2,070,423)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 5.50\% | 1.52\% | 3,057,616 | 845,014 | $(2,212,602)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 5.50\% | 1.44\% | 3,192,505 | 835,856 | $(2,356,649)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 5.50\% | 1.37\% | 3,333,224 | 830,276 | $(2,502,948)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 5.50\% | 1.30\% | 3,481,029 | 822,789 | $(2,658,240)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 5.49\% | 1.24\% | 3,627,511 | 819,328 | $(2,808,183)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 5.49\% | 1.18\% | 3,786,932 | 813,949 | $(2,972,983)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 5.49\% | 1.12\% | 3,948,739 | 805,571 | $(3,143,168)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 5.50\% | 1.07\% | 4,129,239 | 803,325 | $(3,325,914)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 5.50\% | 1.02\% | 4,310,687 | 799,437 | $(3,511,250)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 5.51\% | 0.98\% | 4,507,770 | 801,745 | $(3,706,025)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 5.52\% | 0.93\% | 4,710,210 | 793,568 | $(3,916,642)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 5.53\% | 0.89\% | 4,921,460 | 792,061 | $(4,129,399)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 5.08\% | 0.76\% | 4,713,798 | 705,214 | $(4,008,584)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 4.62\% | 0.63\% | 4,469,248 | 609,443 | $(3,859,805)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 4.23\% | 0.52\% | 4,266,249 | 524,456 | $(3,741,793)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 3.94\% | 0.43\% | 4,143,293 | 452,187 | $(3,691,106)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 3.72\% | 0.36\% | 4,078,195 | 394,664 | $(3,683,531)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 3.55\% | 0.30\% | 4,058,531 | 342,974 | $(3,715,557)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 3.43\% | 0.26\% | 4,089,373 | 309,982 | $(3,779,391)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 3.34\% | 0.22\% | 4,151,890 | 273,478 | $(3,878,412)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 3.27\% | 0.19\% | 4,238,280 | 246,261 | $(3,992,019)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 109,341,167 | 23,349,013 | $(85,992,154)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 8 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service with 3\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 4.89\% | 4.89\% | 1,765,186 | 1,765,186 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 5.48\% | 2.49\% | 2,068,516 | 939,892 | $(1,128,624)$ |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 5.53\% | 2.44\% | 2,180,687 | 962,184 | $(1,218,503)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 5.56\% | 2.53\% | 2,289,951 | 1,042,010 | $(1,247,941)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 5.51\% | 2.41\% | 2,367,341 | 1,035,443 | $(1,331,898)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 5.50\% | 2.25\% | 2,466,577 | 1,009,054 | $(1,457,523)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 5.50\% | 2.12\% | 2,573,254 | 991,872 | $(1,581,382)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 5.50\% | 2.01\% | 2,684,264 | 980,977 | $(1,703,287)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 5.50\% | 1.91\% | 2,802,279 | 973,155 | $(1,829,124)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 5.50\% | 1.82\% | 2,927,333 | 968,681 | $(1,958,652)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 5.50\% | 1.73\% | 3,057,616 | 961,759 | $(2,095,857)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 5.50\% | 1.65\% | 3,192,505 | 957,752 | $(2,234,753)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 5.50\% | 1.57\% | 3,333,224 | 951,484 | $(2,381,740)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 5.50\% | 1.50\% | 3,481,029 | 949,371 | $(2,531,658)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 5.49\% | 1.43\% | 3,627,511 | 944,871 | $(2,682,640)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 5.49\% | 1.36\% | 3,786,932 | 938,111 | $(2,848,821)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 5.49\% | 1.30\% | 3,948,739 | 935,038 | $(3,013,701)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 5.50\% | 1.24\% | 4,129,239 | 930,956 | $(3,198,283)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 5.50\% | 1.19\% | 4,310,687 | 932,676 | $(3,378,011)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 5.51\% | 1.14\% | 4,507,770 | 932,642 | $(3,575,128)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 5.52\% | 1.09\% | 4,710,210 | 930,096 | (3,780,114) |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 5.53\% | 1.04\% | 4,921,460 | 925,555 | $(3,995,905)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 5.08\% | 0.89\% | 4,713,798 | 825,843 | $(3,887,955)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 4.62\% | 0.73\% | 4,469,248 | 706,180 | $(3,763,068)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 4.23\% | 0.60\% | 4,266,249 | 605,142 | $(3,661,107)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 3.94\% | 0.50\% | 4,143,293 | 525,799 | $(3,617,494)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 3.72\% | 0.41\% | 4,078,195 | 449,479 | $(3,628,716)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 3.55\% | 0.34\% | 4,058,531 | 388,704 | $(3,669,827)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 3.43\% | 0.29\% | 4,089,373 | 345,749 | (3,743,624) |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 3.34\% | 0.24\% | 4,151,890 | 298,339 | $(3,853,551)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 3.27\% | 0.20\% | 4,238,280 | 259,222 | (3,979,058) |
| Total |  |  |  | 109,341,167 | 26,363,222 | (82,977,945) |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 9
Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service with $0 \%$ COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 4.89\% | 4.89\% | 1,765,186 | 1,765,186 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 5.48\% | 2.65\% | 2,068,516 | 1,000,286 | $(1,068,230)$ |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 5.53\% | 2.61\% | 2,180,687 | 1,029,221 | $(1,151,466)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 5.56\% | 2.70\% | 2,289,951 | 1,112,026 | $(1,177,925)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 5.51\% | 2.55\% | 2,367,341 | 1,095,593 | $(1,271,748)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 5.50\% | 2.38\% | 2,466,577 | 1,067,355 | $(1,399,222)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 5.50\% | 2.25\% | 2,573,254 | 1,052,695 | $(1,520,559)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 5.50\% | 2.13\% | 2,684,264 | 1,039,542 | $(1,644,722)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 5.50\% | 2.03\% | 2,802,279 | 1,034,296 | $(1,767,983)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 5.50\% | 1.93\% | 2,927,333 | 1,027,228 | $(1,900,105)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 5.50\% | 1.84\% | 3,057,616 | 1,022,912 | $(2,034,704)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 5.50\% | 1.75\% | 3,192,505 | 1,015,797 | $(2,176,708)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 5.50\% | 1.67\% | 3,333,224 | 1,012,088 | $(2,321,136)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 5.50\% | 1.59\% | 3,481,029 | 1,006,334 | $(2,474,695)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 5.49\% | 1.52\% | 3,627,511 | 1,004,338 | $(2,623,173)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 5.49\% | 1.45\% | 3,786,932 | 1,000,191 | $(2,786,741)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 5.49\% | 1.39\% | 3,948,739 | 999,772 | $(2,948,967)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 5.50\% | 1.33\% | 4,129,239 | 998,525 | (3,130,714) |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 5.50\% | 1.28\% | 4,310,687 | 1,003,215 | $(3,307,472)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 5.51\% | 1.23\% | 4,507,770 | 1,006,272 | $(3,501,498)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 5.52\% | 1.18\% | 4,710,210 | 1,006,893 | $(3,703,317)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 5.53\% | 1.14\% | 4,921,460 | 1,014,551 | $(3,906,909)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 5.08\% | 0.96\% | 4,713,798 | 890,797 | $(3,823,001)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 4.62\% | 0.78\% | 4,469,248 | 754,548 | (3,714,700) |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 4.23\% | 0.63\% | 4,266,249 | 635,399 | $(3,630,850)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 3.94\% | 0.51\% | 4,143,293 | 536,315 | $(3,606,978)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 3.72\% | 0.42\% | 4,078,195 | 460,441 | (3,617,754) |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 3.55\% | 0.34\% | 4,058,531 | 388,704 | $(3,669,827)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 3.43\% | 0.28\% | 4,089,373 | 333,826 | $(3,755,547)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 3.34\% | 0.24\% | 4,151,890 | 298,339 | $(3,853,551)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 3.27\% | 0.20\% | 4,238,280 | 259,222 | (3,979,058) |
| Total |  |  |  | 109,341,167 | 27,871,907 | (81,469,260) |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 10 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service with 1\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 4.89\% | 4.89\% | 1,765,186 | 1,765,186 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 5.48\% | 2.91\% | 2,068,516 | 1,098,428 | $(970,088)$ |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 5.53\% | 2.89\% | 2,180,687 | 1,139,635 | $(1,041,052)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 5.56\% | 2.97\% | 2,289,951 | 1,223,229 | $(1,066,722)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 5.51\% | 2.81\% | 2,367,341 | 1,207,301 | $(1,160,040)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 5.50\% | 2.64\% | 2,466,577 | 1,183,957 | $(1,282,620)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 5.50\% | 2.50\% | 2,573,254 | 1,169,661 | $(1,403,593)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 5.50\% | 2.38\% | 2,684,264 | 1,161,554 | $(1,522,710)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 5.50\% | 2.27\% | 2,802,279 | 1,156,577 | $(1,645,702)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 5.50\% | 2.17\% | 2,927,333 | 1,154,966 | $(1,772,367)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 5.50\% | 2.07\% | 3,057,616 | 1,150,775 | $(1,906,841)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 5.50\% | 1.98\% | 3,192,505 | 1,149,302 | $(2,043,203)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 5.50\% | 1.89\% | 3,333,224 | 1,145,417 | $(2,187,807)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 5.50\% | 1.81\% | 3,481,029 | 1,145,575 | $(2,335,454)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 5.49\% | 1.73\% | 3,627,511 | 1,143,095 | $(2,484,416)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 5.49\% | 1.65\% | 3,786,932 | 1,138,149 | $(2,648,783)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 5.49\% | 1.59\% | 3,948,739 | 1,143,624 | $(2,805,115)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 5.50\% | 1.53\% | 4,129,239 | 1,148,679 | $(2,980,560)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 5.50\% | 1.47\% | 4,310,687 | 1,152,129 | $(3,158,558)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 5.51\% | 1.42\% | 4,507,770 | 1,161,712 | $(3,346,058)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 5.52\% | 1.36\% | 4,710,210 | 1,160,487 | $(3,549,723)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 5.53\% | 1.31\% | 4,921,460 | 1,165,843 | $(3,755,617)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 5.08\% | 1.10\% | 4,713,798 | 1,020,704 | $(3,693,094)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 4.62\% | 0.89\% | 4,469,248 | 860,959 | $(3,608,289)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 4.23\% | 0.72\% | 4,266,249 | 726,170 | $(3,540,079)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 3.94\% | 0.58\% | 4,143,293 | 609,926 | $(3,533,367)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 3.72\% | 0.47\% | 4,078,195 | 515,256 | $(3,562,939)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 3.55\% | 0.38\% | 4,058,531 | 434,434 | $(3,624,097)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 3.43\% | 0.31\% | 4,089,373 | 369,593 | $(3,719,780)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 3.34\% | 0.26\% | 4,151,890 | 323,201 | $(3,828,689)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 3.27\% | 0.22\% | 4,238,280 | 285,144 | $(3,953,136)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 109,341,167 | 31,210,668 | (78,130,499) |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 11 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service with 2\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative | Difference |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 4.89\% | 4.89\% | 1,765,186 | 1,765,186 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 5.48\% | 3.22\% | 2,068,516 | 1,215,442 | $(853,074)$ |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 5.53\% | 3.21\% | 2,180,687 | 1,265,823 | $(914,864)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 5.56\% | 3.29\% | 2,289,951 | 1,355,025 | $(934,926)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 5.51\% | 3.11\% | 2,367,341 | 1,336,194 | $(1,031,147)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 5.50\% | 2.94\% | 2,466,577 | 1,318,498 | $(1,148,079)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 5.50\% | 2.79\% | 2,573,254 | 1,305,341 | $(1,267,913)$ |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 5.50\% | 2.67\% | 2,684,264 | 1,303,088 | $(1,381,176)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 5.50\% | 2.55\% | 2,802,279 | 1,299,238 | $(1,503,041)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 5.50\% | 2.44\% | 2,927,333 | 1,298,672 | $(1,628,661)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 5.50\% | 2.34\% | 3,057,616 | 1,300,877 | $(1,756,739)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 5.50\% | 2.24\% | 3,192,505 | 1,300,220 | $(1,892,285)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 5.50\% | 2.14\% | 3,333,224 | 1,296,927 | $(2,036,297)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 5.50\% | 2.06\% | 3,481,029 | 1,303,803 | $(2,177,226)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 5.49\% | 1.97\% | 3,627,511 | 1,301,675 | $(2,325,836)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 5.49\% | 1.89\% | 3,786,932 | 1,303,698 | $(2,483,234)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 5.49\% | 1.82\% | 3,948,739 | 1,309,054 | $(2,639,685)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 5.50\% | 1.75\% | 4,129,239 | 1,313,849 | $(2,815,390)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 5.50\% | 1.69\% | 4,310,687 | 1,324,557 | $(2,986,130)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 5.51\% | 1.63\% | 4,507,770 | 1,333,515 | $(3,174,255)$ |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 5.52\% | 1.57\% | 4,710,210 | 1,339,679 | $(3,370,531)$ |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 5.53\% | 1.51\% | 4,921,460 | 1,343,835 | $(3,577,625)$ |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 5.08\% | 1.27\% | 4,713,798 | 1,178,450 | $(3,535,348)$ |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 4.62\% | 1.02\% | 4,469,248 | 986,717 | $(3,482,531)$ |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 4.23\% | 0.82\% | 4,266,249 | 827,027 | $(3,439,222)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 3.94\% | 0.66\% | 4,143,293 | 694,054 | $(3,449,239)$ |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 3.72\% | 0.53\% | 4,078,195 | 581,033 | $(3,497,162)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 3.55\% | 0.43\% | 4,058,531 | 491,597 | $(3,566,934)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 3.43\% | 0.35\% | 4,089,373 | 417,283 | $(3,672,090)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 3.34\% | 0.29\% | 4,151,890 | 360,493 | $(3,791,397)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 3.27\% | 0.24\% | 4,238,280 | 311,066 | $(3,927,214)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 109,341,167 | 35,081,916 | $(74,259,251)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## General Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 12 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service with 3\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 36,097,881 | 4.89\% | 4.89\% | 1,765,186 | 1,765,186 | 0 |
| 2012 | 37,746,650 | 5.48\% | 3.59\% | 2,068,516 | 1,355,105 | $(713,411)$ |
| 2013 | 39,433,753 | 5.53\% | 3.59\% | 2,180,687 | 1,415,672 | $(765,015)$ |
| 2014 | 41,186,164 | 5.56\% | 3.66\% | 2,289,951 | 1,507,414 | $(782,537)$ |
| 2015 | 42,964,448 | 5.51\% | 3.47\% | 2,367,341 | 1,490,866 | $(876,475)$ |
| 2016 | 44,846,858 | 5.50\% | 3.29\% | 2,466,577 | 1,475,462 | $(991,115)$ |
| 2017 | 46,786,432 | 5.50\% | 3.14\% | 2,573,254 | 1,469,094 | (1,104,160) |
| 2018 | 48,804,802 | 5.50\% | 3.00\% | 2,684,264 | 1,464,144 | $(1,220,120)$ |
| 2019 | 50,950,523 | 5.50\% | 2.88\% | 2,802,279 | 1,467,375 | $(1,334,904)$ |
| 2020 | 53,224,243 | 5.50\% | 2.77\% | 2,927,333 | 1,474,312 | $(1,453,021)$ |
| 2021 | 55,593,018 | 5.50\% | 2.65\% | 3,057,616 | 1,473,215 | $(1,584,401)$ |
| 2022 | 58,045,550 | 5.50\% | 2.55\% | 3,192,505 | 1,480,162 | $(1,712,343)$ |
| 2023 | 60,604,067 | 5.50\% | 2.44\% | 3,333,224 | 1,478,739 | $(1,854,485)$ |
| 2024 | 63,291,428 | 5.50\% | 2.35\% | 3,481,029 | 1,487,349 | $(1,993,680)$ |
| 2025 | 66,074,873 | 5.49\% | 2.26\% | 3,627,511 | 1,493,292 | $(2,134,219)$ |
| 2026 | 68,978,721 | 5.49\% | 2.17\% | 3,786,932 | 1,496,838 | $(2,290,094)$ |
| 2027 | 71,926,022 | 5.49\% | 2.09\% | 3,948,739 | 1,503,254 | $(2,445,485)$ |
| 2028 | 75,077,074 | 5.50\% | 2.01\% | 4,129,239 | 1,509,049 | $(2,620,190)$ |
| 2029 | 78,376,136 | 5.50\% | 1.95\% | 4,310,687 | 1,528,335 | $(2,782,352)$ |
| 2030 | 81,810,706 | 5.51\% | 1.88\% | 4,507,770 | 1,538,041 | (2,969,729) |
| 2031 | 85,329,891 | 5.52\% | 1.81\% | 4,710,210 | 1,544,471 | (3,165,739) |
| 2032 | 88,995,667 | 5.53\% | 1.75\% | 4,921,460 | 1,557,424 | (3,364,036) |
| 2033 | 92,791,307 | 5.08\% | 1.47\% | 4,713,798 | 1,364,032 | (3,349,766) |
| 2034 | 96,736,966 | 4.62\% | 1.18\% | 4,469,248 | 1,141,496 | (3,327,752) |
| 2035 | 100,856,958 | 4.23\% | 0.95\% | 4,266,249 | 958,141 | $(3,308,108)$ |
| 2036 | 105,159,729 | 3.94\% | 0.76\% | 4,143,293 | 799,214 | (3,344,079) |
| 2037 | 109,628,908 | 3.72\% | 0.61\% | 4,078,195 | 668,736 | $(3,409,459)$ |
| 2038 | 114,324,826 | 3.55\% | 0.49\% | 4,058,531 | 560,192 | $(3,498,339)$ |
| 2039 | 119,223,689 | 3.43\% | 0.40\% | 4,089,373 | 476,895 | $(3,612,478)$ |
| 2040 | 124,308,084 | 3.34\% | 0.32\% | 4,151,890 | 397,786 | $(3,754,104)$ |
| 2041 | 129,611,004 | 3.27\% | 0.26\% | 4,238,280 | 336,989 | $(3,901,291)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 109,341,167 | 39,678,280 | $(69,662,887)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 1

Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$10 monthly subsidy per year of service with $0 \%$ COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 8.35\% | 8.35\% | 911,694 | 911,694 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 9.91\% | 2.02\% | 1,133,757 | 231,099 | $(902,658)$ |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 10.10\% | 1.74\% | 1,200,825 | 206,875 | $(993,950)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 10.23\% | 1.88\% | 1,271,355 | 233,641 | $(1,037,714)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 10.22\% | 1.85\% | 1,318,323 | 238,640 | $(1,079,683)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 10.26\% | 1.77\% | 1,376,156 | 237,407 | $(1,138,749)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 10.33\% | 1.73\% | 1,443,163 | 241,691 | $(1,201,472)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 10.39\% | 1.69\% | 1,500,378 | 244,046 | $(1,256,332)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 10.48\% | 1.65\% | 1,567,050 | 246,721 | $(1,320,329)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 10.56\% | 1.63\% | 1,641,783 | 253,419 | $(1,388,364)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 10.63\% | 1.61\% | 1,716,149 | 259,925 | $(1,456,224)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 10.67\% | 1.60\% | 1,784,975 | 267,663 | $(1,517,312)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 10.73\% | 1.58\% | 1,850,377 | 272,469 | $(1,577,908)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 10.82\% | 1.56\% | 1,932,138 | 278,571 | $(1,653,567)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 10.95\% | 1.55\% | 2,010,586 | 284,604 | $(1,725,982)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 11.07\% | 1.54\% | 2,101,572 | 292,360 | $(1,809,212)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 11.13\% | 1.53\% | 2,189,719 | 301,013 | $(1,888,706)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 11.18\% | 1.51\% | 2,293,435 | 309,757 | $(1,983,678)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 11.22\% | 1.50\% | 2,396,735 | 320,419 | $(2,076,316)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 11.23\% | 1.48\% | 2,480,135 | 326,857 | $(2,153,278)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 11.26\% | 1.44\% | 2,588,769 | 331,068 | $(2,257,701)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 11.32\% | 1.40\% | 2,702,944 | 334,286 | $(2,368,658)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 10.40\% | 1.23\% | 2,581,152 | 305,271 | $(2,275,881)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 9.43\% | 1.06\% | 2,435,071 | 273,720 | $(2,161,351)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 8.62\% | 0.91\% | 2,318,576 | 244,768 | $(2,073,808)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 7.98\% | 0.79\% | 2,241,004 | 221,854 | $(2,019,150)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 7.51\% | 0.69\% | 2,199,654 | 202,099 | $(1,997,555)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 7.15\% | 0.60\% | 2,187,897 | 183,600 | $(2,004,297)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 6.88\% | 0.53\% | 2,203,118 | 169,717 | $(2,033,401)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 6.67\% | 0.48\% | 2,234,940 | 160,835 | $(2,074,105)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 6.53\% | 0.43\% | 2,289,615 | 150,771 | $(2,138,844)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 60,103,045 | 8,536,860 | $(51,566,185)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 2

Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$10 monthly subsidy per year of service with $1 \%$ COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 8.35\% | 8.35\% | 911,694 | 911,694 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 9.91\% | 2.20\% | 1,133,757 | 251,692 | $(882,065)$ |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 10.10\% | 1.93\% | 1,200,825 | 229,465 | $(971,360)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 10.23\% | 2.07\% | 1,271,355 | 257,254 | $(1,014,101)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 10.22\% | 2.04\% | 1,318,323 | 263,149 | $(1,055,174)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 10.26\% | 1.96\% | 1,376,156 | 262,891 | $(1,113,265)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 10.33\% | 1.92\% | 1,443,163 | 268,236 | $(1,174,927)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 10.39\% | 1.88\% | 1,500,378 | 271,483 | $(1,228,895)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 10.48\% | 1.84\% | 1,567,050 | 275,131 | $(1,291,919)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 10.56\% | 1.81\% | 1,641,783 | 281,404 | (1,360,379) |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 10.63\% | 1.80\% | 1,716,149 | 290,599 | $(1,425,550)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 10.67\% | 1.78\% | 1,784,975 | 297,775 | $(1,487,200)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 10.73\% | 1.76\% | 1,850,377 | 303,510 | $(1,546,867)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 10.82\% | 1.73\% | 1,932,138 | 308,928 | $(1,623,210)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 10.95\% | 1.72\% | 2,010,586 | 315,818 | $(1,694,768)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 11.07\% | 1.71\% | 2,101,572 | 324,633 | $(1,776,939)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 11.13\% | 1.69\% | 2,189,719 | 332,491 | $(1,857,228)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 11.18\% | 1.67\% | 2,293,435 | 342,579 | $(1,950,856)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 11.22\% | 1.65\% | 2,396,735 | 352,461 | $(2,044,274)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 11.23\% | 1.62\% | 2,480,135 | 357,776 | $(2,122,359)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 11.26\% | 1.58\% | 2,588,769 | 363,255 | $(2,225,514)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 11.32\% | 1.52\% | 2,702,944 | 362,939 | $(2,340,005)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 10.40\% | 1.33\% | 2,581,152 | 330,090 | $(2,251,062)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 9.43\% | 1.14\% | 2,435,071 | 294,378 | $(2,140,693)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 8.62\% | 0.97\% | 2,318,576 | 260,907 | $(2,057,669)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 7.98\% | 0.83\% | 2,241,004 | 233,087 | $(2,007,917)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 7.51\% | 0.72\% | 2,199,654 | 210,886 | $(1,988,768)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 7.15\% | 0.62\% | 2,187,897 | 189,720 | $(1,998,177)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 6.88\% | 0.55\% | 2,203,118 | 176,121 | $(2,026,997)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 6.67\% | 0.49\% | 2,234,940 | 164,186 | $(2,070,754)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 6.53\% | 0.43\% | 2,289,615 | 150,771 | $(2,138,844)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 60,103,045 | 9,235,309 | (50,867,736) |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 3

Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: $\$ 10$ monthly subsidy per year of service with 2\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 8.35\% | 8.35\% | 911,694 | 911,694 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 9.91\% | 2.41\% | 1,133,757 | 275,717 | $(858,040)$ |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 10.10\% | 2.16\% | 1,200,825 | 256,810 | $(944,015)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 10.23\% | 2.30\% | 1,271,355 | 285,837 | $(985,518)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 10.22\% | 2.27\% | 1,318,323 | 292,817 | $(1,025,506)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 10.26\% | 2.18\% | 1,376,156 | 292,400 | $(1,083,756)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 10.33\% | 2.14\% | 1,443,163 | 298,971 | $(1,144,192)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 10.39\% | 2.11\% | 1,500,378 | 304,697 | $(1,195,681)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 10.48\% | 2.06\% | 1,567,050 | 308,027 | $(1,259,023)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 10.56\% | 2.04\% | 1,641,783 | 317,163 | $(1,324,620)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 10.63\% | 2.02\% | 1,716,149 | 326,117 | $(1,390,032)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 10.67\% | 2.00\% | 1,784,975 | 334,578 | $(1,450,397)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 10.73\% | 1.97\% | 1,850,377 | 339,724 | $(1,510,653)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 10.82\% | 1.94\% | 1,932,138 | 346,428 | $(1,585,710)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 10.95\% | 1.93\% | 2,010,586 | 354,377 | $(1,656,209)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 11.07\% | 1.91\% | 2,101,572 | 362,602 | $(1,738,970)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 11.13\% | 1.89\% | 2,189,719 | 371,839 | $(1,817,880)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 11.18\% | 1.86\% | 2,293,435 | 381,555 | $(1,911,880)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 11.22\% | 1.83\% | 2,396,735 | 390,911 | (2,005,824) |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 11.23\% | 1.80\% | 2,480,135 | 397,528 | $(2,082,607)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 11.26\% | 1.74\% | 2,588,769 | 400,041 | $(2,188,728)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 11.32\% | 1.68\% | 2,702,944 | 401,144 | $(2,301,800)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 10.40\% | 1.46\% | 2,581,152 | 362,354 | $(2,218,798)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 9.43\% | 1.23\% | 2,435,071 | 317,618 | $(2,117,453)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 8.62\% | 1.04\% | 2,318,576 | 279,735 | $(2,038,841)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 7.98\% | 0.88\% | 2,241,004 | 247,128 | $(1,993,876)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 7.51\% | 0.76\% | 2,199,654 | 222,601 | $(1,977,053)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 7.15\% | 0.64\% | 2,187,897 | 195,840 | $(1,992,057)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 6.88\% | 0.56\% | 2,203,118 | 179,324 | $(2,023,794)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 6.67\% | 0.49\% | 2,234,940 | 164,186 | $(2,070,754)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 6.53\% | 0.43\% | 2,289,615 | 150,771 | $(2,138,844)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 60,103,045 | 10,070,534 | (50,032,511) |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 4

Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$10 monthly subsidy per year of service with 3\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 8.35\% | 8.35\% | 911,694 | 911,694 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 9.91\% | 2.66\% | 1,133,757 | 304,318 | $(829,439)$ |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 10.10\% | 2.43\% | 1,200,825 | 288,911 | $(911,914)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 10.23\% | 2.56\% | 1,271,355 | 318,149 | $(953,206)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 10.22\% | 2.54\% | 1,318,323 | 327,646 | $(990,677)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 10.26\% | 2.45\% | 1,376,156 | 328,614 | $(1,047,542)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 10.33\% | 2.41\% | 1,443,163 | 336,691 | $(1,106,472)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 10.39\% | 2.37\% | 1,500,378 | 342,242 | $(1,158,136)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 10.48\% | 2.32\% | 1,567,050 | 346,904 | $(1,220,146)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 10.56\% | 2.30\% | 1,641,783 | 357,585 | $(1,284,198)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 10.63\% | 2.28\% | 1,716,149 | 368,092 | $(1,348,057)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 10.67\% | 2.25\% | 1,784,975 | 376,401 | $(1,408,574)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 10.73\% | 2.22\% | 1,850,377 | 382,837 | $(1,467,540)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 10.82\% | 2.19\% | 1,932,138 | 391,070 | $(1,541,068)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 10.95\% | 2.18\% | 2,010,586 | 400,281 | $(1,610,305)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 11.07\% | 2.15\% | 2,101,572 | 408,164 | $(1,693,408)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 11.13\% | 2.12\% | 2,189,719 | 417,089 | $(1,772,630)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 11.18\% | 2.08\% | 2,293,435 | 426,686 | $(1,866,749)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 11.22\% | 2.05\% | 2,396,735 | 437,906 | $(1,958,829)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 11.23\% | 2.01\% | 2,480,135 | 443,907 | $(2,036,228)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 11.26\% | 1.93\% | 2,588,769 | 443,723 | $(2,145,046)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 11.32\% | 1.86\% | 2,702,944 | 444,123 | $(2,258,821)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 10.40\% | 1.60\% | 2,581,152 | 397,100 | $(2,184,052)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 9.43\% | 1.35\% | 2,435,071 | 348,605 | $(2,086,466)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 8.62\% | 1.12\% | 2,318,576 | 301,253 | $(2,017,323)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 7.98\% | 0.94\% | 2,241,004 | 263,978 | $(1,977,026)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 7.51\% | 0.80\% | 2,199,654 | 234,317 | $(1,965,337)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 7.15\% | 0.67\% | 2,187,897 | 205,020 | $(1,982,877)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 6.88\% | 0.57\% | 2,203,118 | 182,526 | $(2,020,592)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 6.67\% | 0.50\% | 2,234,940 | 167,537 | $(2,067,403)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 6.53\% | 0.43\% | 2,289,615 | 150,771 | $(2,138,844)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 60,103,045 | 11,054,140 | $(49,048,905)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 5

Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service with $0 \%$ COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 8.35\% | 8.35\% | 911,694 | 911,694 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 9.91\% | 3.30\% | 1,133,757 | 377,538 | $(756,219)$ |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 10.10\% | 3.10\% | 1,200,825 | 368,570 | $(832,255)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 10.23\% | 3.24\% | 1,271,355 | 402,658 | $(868,697)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 10.22\% | 3.17\% | 1,318,323 | 408,912 | $(909,411)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 10.26\% | 3.07\% | 1,376,156 | 411,774 | $(964,382)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 10.33\% | 3.02\% | 1,443,163 | 421,912 | $(1,021,251)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 10.39\% | 2.96\% | 1,500,378 | 427,442 | $(1,072,936)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 10.48\% | 2.89\% | 1,567,050 | 432,135 | $(1,134,915)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 10.56\% | 2.85\% | 1,641,783 | 443,095 | $(1,198,688)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 10.63\% | 2.82\% | 1,716,149 | 455,272 | $(1,260,877)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 10.67\% | 2.77\% | 1,784,975 | 463,391 | $(1,321,584)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 10.73\% | 2.73\% | 1,850,377 | 470,786 | $(1,379,591)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 10.82\% | 2.68\% | 1,932,138 | 478,570 | $(1,453,568)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 10.95\% | 2.65\% | 2,010,586 | 486,580 | $(1,524,006)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 11.07\% | 2.61\% | 2,101,572 | 495,493 | $(1,606,079)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 11.13\% | 2.57\% | 2,189,719 | 505,623 | $(1,684,096)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 11.18\% | 2.51\% | 2,293,435 | 514,895 | $(1,778,540)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 11.22\% | 2.47\% | 2,396,735 | 527,624 | $(1,869,111)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 11.23\% | 2.42\% | 2,480,135 | 534,455 | $(1,945,680)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 11.26\% | 2.34\% | 2,588,769 | 537,986 | $(2,050,783)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 11.32\% | 2.25\% | 2,702,944 | 537,246 | $(2,165,698)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 10.40\% | 1.92\% | 2,581,152 | 476,520 | $(2,104,632)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 9.43\% | 1.59\% | 2,435,071 | 410,579 | $(2,024,492)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 8.62\% | 1.30\% | 2,318,576 | 349,669 | $(1,968,907)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 7.98\% | 1.07\% | 2,241,004 | 300,486 | $(1,940,518)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 7.51\% | 0.89\% | 2,199,654 | 260,678 | $(1,938,976)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 7.15\% | 0.74\% | 2,187,897 | 226,440 | $(1,961,457)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 6.88\% | 0.62\% | 2,203,118 | 198,537 | $(2,004,581)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 6.67\% | 0.54\% | 2,234,940 | 180,940 | $(2,054,000)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 6.53\% | 0.46\% | 2,289,615 | 161,290 | $(2,128,325)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 60,103,045 | 13,178,790 | $(46,924,255)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 6

Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service with $1 \%$ COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 8.35\% | 8.35\% | 911,694 | 911,694 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 9.91\% | 3.67\% | 1,133,757 | 419,868 | $(713,889)$ |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 10.10\% | 3.48\% | 1,200,825 | 413,749 | $(787,076)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 10.23\% | 3.62\% | 1,271,355 | 449,883 | $(821,472)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 10.22\% | 3.56\% | 1,318,323 | 459,220 | $(859,103)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 10.26\% | 3.45\% | 1,376,156 | 462,743 | $(913,413)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 10.33\% | 3.39\% | 1,443,163 | 473,603 | $(969,560)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 10.39\% | 3.34\% | 1,500,378 | 482,316 | $(1,018,062)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 10.48\% | 3.27\% | 1,567,050 | 488,956 | $(1,078,094)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 10.56\% | 3.22\% | 1,641,783 | 500,619 | $(1,141,164)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 10.63\% | 3.18\% | 1,716,149 | 513,392 | $(1,202,757)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 10.67\% | 3.14\% | 1,784,975 | 525,288 | $(1,259,687)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 10.73\% | 3.08\% | 1,850,377 | 531,143 | (1,319,234) |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 10.82\% | 3.03\% | 1,932,138 | 541,070 | $(1,391,068)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 10.95\% | 2.99\% | 2,010,586 | 549,009 | $(1,461,577)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 11.07\% | 2.95\% | 2,101,572 | 560,039 | $(1,541,533)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 11.13\% | 2.89\% | 2,189,719 | 568,579 | $(1,621,140)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 11.18\% | 2.83\% | 2,293,435 | 580,539 | $(1,712,896)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 11.22\% | 2.77\% | 2,396,735 | 591,707 | $(1,805,028)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 11.23\% | 2.71\% | 2,480,135 | 598,501 | $(1,881,634)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 11.26\% | 2.61\% | 2,588,769 | 600,061 | $(1,988,708)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 11.32\% | 2.51\% | 2,702,944 | 599,328 | $(2,103,616)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 10.40\% | 2.13\% | 2,581,152 | 528,640 | $(2,052,512)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 9.43\% | 1.74\% | 2,435,071 | 449,313 | $(1,985,758)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 8.62\% | 1.41\% | 2,318,576 | 379,257 | $(1,939,319)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 7.98\% | 1.15\% | 2,241,004 | 322,952 | $(1,918,052)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 7.51\% | 0.95\% | 2,199,654 | 278,252 | $(1,921,402)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 7.15\% | 0.77\% | 2,187,897 | 235,620 | $(1,952,277)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 6.88\% | 0.64\% | 2,203,118 | 204,941 | $(1,998,177)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 6.67\% | 0.54\% | 2,234,940 | 180,940 | $(2,054,000)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 6.53\% | 0.46\% | 2,289,615 | 161,290 | $(2,128,325)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 60,103,045 | 14,562,512 | $(45,540,533)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 7

Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service with 2\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 8.35\% | 8.35\% | 911,694 | 911,694 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 9.91\% | 4.09\% | 1,133,757 | 467,918 | $(665,839)$ |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 10.10\% | 3.94\% | 1,200,825 | 468,441 | $(732,384)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 10.23\% | 4.07\% | 1,271,355 | 505,808 | $(765,547)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 10.22\% | 4.01\% | 1,318,323 | 517,268 | $(801,055)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 10.26\% | 3.90\% | 1,376,156 | 523,100 | $(853,056)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 10.33\% | 3.84\% | 1,443,163 | 536,471 | $(906,692)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 10.39\% | 3.79\% | 1,500,378 | 547,299 | $(953,079)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 10.48\% | 3.71\% | 1,567,050 | 554,748 | $(1,012,302)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 10.56\% | 3.66\% | 1,641,783 | 569,027 | $(1,072,756)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 10.63\% | 3.62\% | 1,716,149 | 584,427 | $(1,131,722)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 10.67\% | 3.57\% | 1,784,975 | 597,222 | $(1,187,753)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 10.73\% | 3.51\% | 1,850,377 | 605,296 | $(1,245,081)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 10.82\% | 3.45\% | 1,932,138 | 616,070 | $(1,316,068)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 10.95\% | 3.40\% | 2,010,586 | 624,292 | $(1,386,294)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 11.07\% | 3.35\% | 2,101,572 | 635,977 | $(1,465,595)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 11.13\% | 3.28\% | 2,189,719 | 645,308 | $(1,544,411)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 11.18\% | 3.20\% | 2,293,435 | 656,439 | $(1,636,996)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 11.22\% | 3.13\% | 2,396,735 | 668,608 | $(1,728,127)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 11.23\% | 3.06\% | 2,480,135 | 675,798 | $(1,804,337)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 11.26\% | 2.93\% | 2,588,769 | 673,632 | $(1,915,137)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 11.32\% | 2.81\% | 2,702,944 | 670,960 | $(2,031,984)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 10.40\% | 2.37\% | 2,581,152 | 588,205 | $(1,992,947)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 9.43\% | 1.93\% | 2,435,071 | 498,376 | $(1,936,695)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 8.62\% | 1.55\% | 2,318,576 | 416,913 | $(1,901,663)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 7.98\% | 1.25\% | 2,241,004 | 351,035 | $(1,889,969)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 7.51\% | 1.02\% | 2,199,654 | 298,755 | $(1,900,899)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 7.15\% | 0.82\% | 2,187,897 | 250,920 | $(1,936,977)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 6.88\% | 0.67\% | 2,203,118 | 214,548 | $(1,988,570)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 6.67\% | 0.55\% | 2,234,940 | 184,290 | $(2,050,650)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 6.53\% | 0.46\% | 2,289,615 | 161,290 | $(2,128,325)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 60,103,045 | 16,220,135 | $(43,882,910)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 8

Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service with 3\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 8.35\% | 8.35\% | 911,694 | 911,694 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 9.91\% | 4.60\% | 1,133,757 | 526,265 | $(607,492)$ |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 10.10\% | 4.47\% | 1,200,825 | 531,454 | $(669,371)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 10.23\% | 4.61\% | 1,271,355 | 572,918 | $(698,437)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 10.22\% | 4.54\% | 1,318,323 | 585,635 | $(732,688)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 10.26\% | 4.44\% | 1,376,156 | 595,530 | $(780,626)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 10.33\% | 4.37\% | 1,443,163 | 610,515 | $(832,648)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 10.39\% | 4.32\% | 1,500,378 | 623,834 | $(876,544)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 10.48\% | 4.24\% | 1,567,050 | 633,997 | $(933,053)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 10.56\% | 4.19\% | 1,641,783 | 651,427 | $(990,356)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 10.63\% | 4.14\% | 1,716,149 | 668,378 | $(1,047,771)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 10.67\% | 4.09\% | 1,784,975 | 684,213 | (1,100,762) |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 10.73\% | 4.02\% | 1,850,377 | 693,245 | $(1,157,132)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 10.82\% | 3.95\% | 1,932,138 | 705,355 | $(1,226,783)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 10.95\% | 3.89\% | 2,010,586 | 714,263 | $(1,296,323)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 11.07\% | 3.84\% | 2,101,572 | 729,000 | $(1,372,572)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 11.13\% | 3.75\% | 2,189,719 | 737,776 | $(1,451,943)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 11.18\% | 3.65\% | 2,293,435 | 748,751 | $(1,544,684)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 11.22\% | 3.57\% | 2,396,735 | 762,598 | $(1,634,137)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 11.23\% | 3.48\% | 2,480,135 | 768,555 | $(1,711,580)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 11.26\% | 3.32\% | 2,588,769 | 763,296 | $(1,825,473)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 11.32\% | 3.17\% | 2,702,944 | 756,920 | $(1,946,024)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 10.40\% | 2.67\% | 2,581,152 | 662,661 | $(1,918,491)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 9.43\% | 2.16\% | 2,435,071 | 557,768 | $(1,877,303)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 8.62\% | 1.72\% | 2,318,576 | 462,639 | $(1,855,937)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 7.98\% | 1.37\% | 2,241,004 | 384,734 | $(1,856,270)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 7.51\% | 1.10\% | 2,199,654 | 322,186 | $(1,877,468)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 7.15\% | 0.88\% | 2,187,897 | 269,280 | $(1,918,617)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 6.88\% | 0.70\% | 2,203,118 | 224,154 | $(1,978,964)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 6.67\% | 0.57\% | 2,234,940 | 190,992 | $(2,043,948)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 6.53\% | 0.46\% | 2,289,615 | 161,290 | $(2,128,325)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 60,103,045 | 18,211,323 | $(41,891,722)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 9

Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service with $0 \%$ COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 8.35\% | 8.35\% | 911,694 | 911,694 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 9.91\% | 4.59\% | 1,133,757 | 525,121 | $(608,636)$ |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 10.10\% | 4.46\% | 1,200,825 | 530,265 | $(670,560)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 10.23\% | 4.59\% | 1,271,355 | 570,432 | $(700,923)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 10.22\% | 4.50\% | 1,318,323 | 580,475 | $(737,848)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 10.26\% | 4.38\% | 1,376,156 | 587,482 | $(788,674)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 10.33\% | 4.30\% | 1,443,163 | 600,736 | $(842,427)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 10.39\% | 4.23\% | 1,500,378 | 610,837 | $(889,541)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 10.48\% | 4.14\% | 1,567,050 | 619,045 | $(948,005)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 10.56\% | 4.07\% | 1,641,783 | 632,770 | $(1,009,013)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 10.63\% | 4.02\% | 1,716,149 | 649,005 | $(1,067,144)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 10.67\% | 3.95\% | 1,784,975 | 660,792 | $(1,124,183)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 10.73\% | 3.88\% | 1,850,377 | 669,102 | $(1,181,275)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 10.82\% | 3.80\% | 1,932,138 | 678,570 | $(1,253,568)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 10.95\% | 3.74\% | 2,010,586 | 686,721 | $(1,323,865)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 11.07\% | 3.68\% | 2,101,572 | 698,625 | $(1,402,947)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 11.13\% | 3.60\% | 2,189,719 | 708,265 | $(1,481,454)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 11.18\% | 3.52\% | 2,293,435 | 722,083 | $(1,571,352)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 11.22\% | 3.44\% | 2,396,735 | 734,828 | $(1,661,907)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 11.23\% | 3.36\% | 2,480,135 | 742,053 | $(1,738,082)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 11.26\% | 3.23\% | 2,588,769 | 742,604 | $(1,846,165)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 11.32\% | 3.11\% | 2,702,944 | 742,593 | $(1,960,351)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 10.40\% | 2.61\% | 2,581,152 | 647,770 | $(1,933,382)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 9.43\% | 2.11\% | 2,435,071 | 544,857 | $(1,890,214)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 8.62\% | 1.69\% | 2,318,576 | 454,570 | $(1,864,006)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 7.98\% | 1.35\% | 2,241,004 | 379,117 | $(1,861,887)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 7.51\% | 1.09\% | 2,199,654 | 319,257 | $(1,880,397)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 7.15\% | 0.87\% | 2,187,897 | 266,220 | $(1,921,677)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 6.88\% | 0.71\% | 2,203,118 | 227,357 | $(1,975,761)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 6.67\% | 0.59\% | 2,234,940 | 197,693 | $(2,037,247)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 6.53\% | 0.49\% | 2,289,615 | 171,809 | (2,117,806) |
| Total |  |  |  | 60,103,045 | 17,812,748 | $(42,290,297)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 10 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service with 1\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 8.35\% | 8.35\% | 911,694 | 911,694 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 9.91\% | 5.14\% | 1,133,757 | 588,044 | $(545,713)$ |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 10.10\% | 5.04\% | 1,200,825 | 599,223 | $(601,602)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 10.23\% | 5.17\% | 1,271,355 | 642,513 | $(628,842)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 10.22\% | 5.07\% | 1,318,323 | 654,002 | $(664,321)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 10.26\% | 4.95\% | 1,376,156 | 663,935 | $(712,221)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 10.33\% | 4.87\% | 1,443,163 | 680,368 | $(762,795)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 10.39\% | 4.79\% | 1,500,378 | 691,705 | $(808,673)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 10.48\% | 4.70\% | 1,567,050 | 702,780 | $(864,270)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 10.56\% | 4.63\% | 1,641,783 | 719,835 | $(921,948)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 10.63\% | 4.57\% | 1,716,149 | 737,799 | $(978,350)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 10.67\% | 4.50\% | 1,784,975 | 752,801 | $(1,032,174)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 10.73\% | 4.41\% | 1,850,377 | 760,500 | $(1,089,877)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 10.82\% | 4.32\% | 1,932,138 | 771,427 | $(1,160,711)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 10.95\% | 4.26\% | 2,010,586 | 782,201 | $(1,228,385)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 11.07\% | 4.19\% | 2,101,572 | 795,446 | $(1,306,126)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 11.13\% | 4.09\% | 2,189,719 | 804,668 | $(1,385,051)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 11.18\% | 3.99\% | 2,293,435 | 818,498 | $(1,474,937)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 11.22\% | 3.89\% | 2,396,735 | 830,954 | $(1,565,781)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 11.23\% | 3.80\% | 2,480,135 | 839,227 | $(1,640,908)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 11.26\% | 3.64\% | 2,588,769 | 836,867 | $(1,751,902)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 11.32\% | 3.49\% | 2,702,944 | 833,328 | $(1,869,616)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 10.40\% | 2.92\% | 2,581,152 | 724,708 | $(1,856,444)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 9.43\% | 2.35\% | 2,435,071 | 606,831 | $(1,828,240)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 8.62\% | 1.86\% | 2,318,576 | 500,296 | $(1,818,280)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 7.98\% | 1.47\% | 2,241,004 | 412,817 | $(1,828,187)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 7.51\% | 1.17\% | 2,199,654 | 342,689 | $(1,856,965)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 7.15\% | 0.93\% | 2,187,897 | 284,580 | $(1,903,317)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 6.88\% | 0.74\% | 2,203,118 | 236,963 | $(1,966,155)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 6.67\% | 0.60\% | 2,234,940 | 201,044 | $(2,033,896)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 6.53\% | 0.49\% | 2,289,615 | 171,809 | (2,117,806) |
| Total |  |  |  | 60,103,045 | 19,899,552 | $(40,203,493)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 11 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service with 2\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 8.35\% | 8.35\% | 911,694 | 911,694 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 9.91\% | 5.78\% | 1,133,757 | 661,263 | $(472,494)$ |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 10.10\% | 5.72\% | 1,200,825 | 680,071 | $(520,754)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 10.23\% | 5.85\% | 1,271,355 | 727,021 | $(544,334)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 10.22\% | 5.75\% | 1,318,323 | 741,718 | $(576,605)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 10.26\% | 5.62\% | 1,376,156 | 753,801 | $(622,355)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 10.33\% | 5.54\% | 1,443,163 | 773,971 | $(669,192)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 10.39\% | 5.46\% | 1,500,378 | 788,457 | $(711,921)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 10.48\% | 5.37\% | 1,567,050 | 802,964 | $(764,086)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 10.56\% | 5.29\% | 1,641,783 | 822,446 | $(819,337)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 10.63\% | 5.23\% | 1,716,149 | 844,352 | $(871,797)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 10.67\% | 5.15\% | 1,784,975 | 861,539 | $(923,436)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 10.73\% | 5.05\% | 1,850,377 | 870,867 | $(979,510)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 10.82\% | 4.95\% | 1,932,138 | 883,926 | $(1,048,212)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 10.95\% | 4.88\% | 2,010,586 | 896,042 | $(1,114,544)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 11.07\% | 4.79\% | 2,101,572 | 909,352 | $(1,192,220)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 11.13\% | 4.68\% | 2,189,719 | 920,745 | $(1,268,974)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 11.18\% | 4.55\% | 2,293,435 | 933,375 | $(1,360,060)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 11.22\% | 4.44\% | 2,396,735 | 948,441 | $(1,448,294)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 11.23\% | 4.32\% | 2,480,135 | 954,068 | $(1,526,067)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 11.26\% | 4.13\% | 2,588,769 | 949,522 | $(1,639,247)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 11.32\% | 3.94\% | 2,702,944 | 940,777 | $(1,762,167)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 10.40\% | 3.29\% | 2,581,152 | 816,537 | $(1,764,615)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 9.43\% | 2.63\% | 2,435,071 | 679,134 | $(1,755,937)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 8.62\% | 2.07\% | 2,318,576 | 556,781 | (1,761,795) |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 7.98\% | 1.62\% | 2,241,004 | 454,941 | $(1,786,063)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 7.51\% | 1.28\% | 2,199,654 | 374,908 | $(1,824,746)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 7.15\% | 1.00\% | 2,187,897 | 306,000 | $(1,881,897)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 6.88\% | 0.78\% | 2,203,118 | 249,772 | $(1,953,346)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 6.67\% | 0.62\% | 2,234,940 | 207,746 | $(2,027,194)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 6.53\% | 0.49\% | 2,289,615 | 171,809 | (2,117,806) |
| Total |  |  |  | 60,103,045 | 22,394,040 | $(37,709,005)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Fire Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 12 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service with 3\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 10,918,494 | 8.35\% | 8.35\% | 911,694 | 911,694 | 0 |
| 2012 | 11,440,536 | 9.91\% | 6.54\% | 1,133,757 | 748,211 | $(385,546)$ |
| 2013 | 11,889,353 | 10.10\% | 6.52\% | 1,200,825 | 775,186 | $(425,639)$ |
| 2014 | 12,427,714 | 10.23\% | 6.66\% | 1,271,355 | 827,686 | $(443,669)$ |
| 2015 | 12,899,446 | 10.22\% | 6.55\% | 1,318,323 | 844,914 | $(473,409)$ |
| 2016 | 13,412,830 | 10.26\% | 6.43\% | 1,376,156 | 862,445 | $(513,711)$ |
| 2017 | 13,970,599 | 10.33\% | 6.34\% | 1,443,163 | 885,736 | $(557,427)$ |
| 2018 | 14,440,597 | 10.39\% | 6.26\% | 1,500,378 | 903,981 | $(596,397)$ |
| 2019 | 14,952,771 | 10.48\% | 6.16\% | 1,567,050 | 921,091 | $(645,959)$ |
| 2020 | 15,547,183 | 10.56\% | 6.08\% | 1,641,783 | 945,269 | $(696,514)$ |
| 2021 | 16,144,392 | 10.63\% | 6.01\% | 1,716,149 | 970,278 | $(745,871)$ |
| 2022 | 16,728,917 | 10.67\% | 5.92\% | 1,784,975 | 990,352 | $(794,623)$ |
| 2023 | 17,244,896 | 10.73\% | 5.81\% | 1,850,377 | 1,001,928 | $(848,449)$ |
| 2024 | 17,857,095 | 10.82\% | 5.70\% | 1,932,138 | 1,017,854 | $(914,284)$ |
| 2025 | 18,361,519 | 10.95\% | 5.61\% | 2,010,586 | 1,030,081 | $(980,505)$ |
| 2026 | 18,984,387 | 11.07\% | 5.52\% | 2,101,572 | 1,047,938 | $(1,053,634)$ |
| 2027 | 19,674,029 | 11.13\% | 5.38\% | 2,189,719 | 1,058,463 | $(1,131,256)$ |
| 2028 | 20,513,734 | 11.18\% | 5.23\% | 2,293,435 | 1,072,868 | $(1,220,567)$ |
| 2029 | 21,361,277 | 11.22\% | 5.09\% | 2,396,735 | 1,087,289 | $(1,309,446)$ |
| 2030 | 22,084,908 | 11.23\% | 4.95\% | 2,480,135 | 1,093,203 | $(1,386,932)$ |
| 2031 | 22,990,840 | 11.26\% | 4.71\% | 2,588,769 | 1,082,869 | $(1,505,900)$ |
| 2032 | 23,877,595 | 11.32\% | 4.48\% | 2,702,944 | 1,069,716 | $(1,633,228)$ |
| 2033 | 24,818,767 | 10.40\% | 3.73\% | 2,581,152 | 925,740 | $(1,655,412)$ |
| 2034 | 25,822,598 | 9.43\% | 2.97\% | 2,435,071 | 766,931 | $(1,668,140)$ |
| 2035 | 26,897,628 | 8.62\% | 2.32\% | 2,318,576 | 624,025 | $(1,694,551)$ |
| 2036 | 28,082,761 | 7.98\% | 1.80\% | 2,241,004 | 505,490 | $(1,735,514)$ |
| 2037 | 29,289,669 | 7.51\% | 1.41\% | 2,199,654 | 412,984 | $(1,786,670)$ |
| 2038 | 30,599,956 | 7.15\% | 1.08\% | 2,187,897 | 330,480 | $(1,857,417)$ |
| 2039 | 32,022,057 | 6.88\% | 0.82\% | 2,203,118 | 262,581 | $(1,940,537)$ |
| 2040 | 33,507,348 | 6.67\% | 0.64\% | 2,234,940 | 214,447 | $(2,020,493)$ |
| 2041 | 35,063,014 | 6.53\% | 0.50\% | 2,289,615 | 175,315 | $(2,114,300)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 60,103,045 | 25,367,045 | (34,736,000) |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 1

 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$10 monthly subsidy per year of service with $0 \%$ COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative | Difference |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 7.66\% | 7.66\% | 1,055,095 | 1,055,095 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 9.33\% | 1.49\% | 1,343,785 | 214,602 | $(1,129,183)$ |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 9.48\% | 1.24\% | 1,423,707 | 186,223 | $(1,237,484)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 9.58\% | 1.39\% | 1,497,517 | 217,281 | $(1,280,236)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 9.58\% | 1.41\% | 1,548,643 | 227,932 | $(1,320,711)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 9.63\% | 1.35\% | 1,615,229 | 226,434 | $(1,388,795)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 9.71\% | 1.32\% | 1,690,440 | 229,802 | $(1,460,638)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 9.78\% | 1.29\% | 1,766,991 | 233,069 | $(1,533,922)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 9.83\% | 1.27\% | 1,845,467 | 238,428 | $(1,607,039)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 9.87\% | 1.25\% | 1,920,983 | 243,286 | $(1,677,697)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 9.91\% | 1.23\% | 2,006,383 | 249,026 | $(1,757,357)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 9.96\% | 1.22\% | 2,099,512 | 257,169 | $(1,842,343)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 10.01\% | 1.22\% | 2,197,618 | 267,842 | $(1,929,776)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 10.06\% | 1.21\% | 2,297,597 | 276,351 | $(2,021,246)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 10.12\% | 1.21\% | 2,410,839 | 288,252 | $(2,122,587)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.16\% | 1.22\% | 2,523,718 | 303,045 | $(2,220,673)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.20\% | 1.22\% | 2,635,284 | 315,201 | $(2,320,083)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 10.25\% | 1.23\% | 2,760,147 | 331,218 | $(2,428,929)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 10.31\% | 1.24\% | 2,889,012 | 347,466 | $(2,541,546)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 10.38\% | 1.25\% | 3,020,784 | 363,775 | $(2,657,009)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 10.46\% | 1.27\% | 3,171,007 | 385,008 | $(2,785,999)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 10.55\% | 1.29\% | 3,337,922 | 408,144 | $(2,929,778)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.61\% | 1.18\% | 3,170,634 | 389,318 | $(2,781,316)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 8.61\% | 1.06\% | 2,961,822 | 364,638 | $(2,597,184)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 7.78\% | 0.95\% | 2,796,459 | 341,470 | $(2,454,989)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 7.15\% | 0.85\% | 2,683,135 | 318,974 | $(2,364,161)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 6.67\% | 0.77\% | 2,613,289 | 301,684 | $(2,311,605)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 6.31\% | 0.71\% | 2,583,766 | 290,725 | $(2,293,041)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 6.05\% | 0.65\% | 2,587,095 | 277,952 | $(2,309,143)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 5.86\% | 0.59\% | 2,616,743 | 263,460 | $(2,353,283)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 5.72\% | 0.52\% | 2,664,774 | 242,252 | $(2,422,522)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 71,735,397 | 9,655,122 | $(62,080,275)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 2

 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$10 monthly subsidy per year of service with 1\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 7.66\% | 7.66\% | 1,055,095 | 1,055,095 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 9.33\% | 1.69\% | 1,343,785 | 243,408 | $(1,100,377)$ |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 9.48\% | 1.45\% | 1,423,707 | 217,761 | $(1,205,946)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 9.58\% | 1.59\% | 1,497,517 | 248,544 | $(1,248,973)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 9.58\% | 1.61\% | 1,548,643 | 260,263 | $(1,288,380)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 9.63\% | 1.55\% | 1,615,229 | 259,980 | $(1,355,249)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 9.71\% | 1.52\% | 1,690,440 | 264,621 | $(1,425,819)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 9.78\% | 1.48\% | 1,766,991 | 267,397 | $(1,499,594)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 9.83\% | 1.46\% | 1,845,467 | 274,098 | $(1,571,369)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 9.87\% | 1.44\% | 1,920,983 | 280,265 | $(1,640,718)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 9.91\% | 1.42\% | 2,006,383 | 287,494 | $(1,718,889)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 9.96\% | 1.40\% | 2,099,512 | 295,112 | $(1,804,400)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 10.01\% | 1.39\% | 2,197,618 | 305,164 | $(1,892,454)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 10.06\% | 1.39\% | 2,297,597 | 317,461 | $(1,980,136)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 10.12\% | 1.38\% | 2,410,839 | 328,751 | $(2,082,088)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.16\% | 1.38\% | 2,523,718 | 342,788 | $(2,180,930)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.20\% | 1.38\% | 2,635,284 | 356,538 | $(2,278,746)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 10.25\% | 1.38\% | 2,760,147 | 371,610 | $(2,388,537)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 10.31\% | 1.38\% | 2,889,012 | 386,696 | $(2,502,316)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 10.38\% | 1.39\% | 3,020,784 | 404,517 | $(2,616,267)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 10.46\% | 1.40\% | 3,171,007 | 424,418 | $(2,746,589)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 10.55\% | 1.42\% | 3,337,922 | 449,275 | $(2,888,647)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.61\% | 1.28\% | 3,170,634 | 422,311 | $(2,748,323)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 8.61\% | 1.13\% | 2,961,822 | 388,718 | $(2,573,104)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 7.78\% | 1.00\% | 2,796,459 | 359,442 | $(2,437,017)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 7.15\% | 0.89\% | 2,683,135 | 333,985 | $(2,349,150)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 6.67\% | 0.80\% | 2,613,289 | 313,438 | $(2,299,851)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 6.31\% | 0.73\% | 2,583,766 | 298,914 | $(2,284,852)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 6.05\% | 0.67\% | 2,587,095 | 286,505 | $(2,300,590)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 5.86\% | 0.60\% | 2,616,743 | 267,926 | $(2,348,817)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 5.72\% | 0.53\% | 2,664,774 | 246,911 | $(2,417,863)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 71,735,397 | 10,559,406 | (61,175,991) |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 3

Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$10 monthly subsidy per year of service with 2\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 7.66\% | 7.66\% | 1,055,095 | 1,055,095 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 9.33\% | 1.91\% | 1,343,785 | 275,094 | $(1,068,691)$ |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 9.48\% | 1.69\% | 1,423,707 | 253,804 | $(1,169,903)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 9.58\% | 1.83\% | 1,497,517 | 286,060 | $(1,211,457)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 9.58\% | 1.84\% | 1,548,643 | 297,443 | $(1,251,200)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 9.63\% | 1.78\% | 1,615,229 | 298,557 | $(1,316,672)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 9.71\% | 1.75\% | 1,690,440 | 304,662 | $(1,385,778)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 9.78\% | 1.71\% | 1,766,991 | 308,952 | $(1,458,039)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 9.83\% | 1.69\% | 1,845,467 | 317,278 | $(1,528,189)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 9.87\% | 1.66\% | 1,920,983 | 323,083 | $(1,597,900)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 9.91\% | 1.64\% | 2,006,383 | 332,035 | $(1,674,348)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 9.96\% | 1.62\% | 2,099,512 | 341,487 | $(1,758,025)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 10.01\% | 1.60\% | 2,197,618 | 351,268 | $(1,846,350)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 10.06\% | 1.59\% | 2,297,597 | 363,139 | $(1,934,458)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 10.12\% | 1.58\% | 2,410,839 | 376,396 | $(2,034,443)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.16\% | 1.57\% | 2,523,718 | 389,984 | $(2,133,734)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.20\% | 1.57\% | 2,635,284 | 405,627 | $(2,229,657)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 10.25\% | 1.56\% | 2,760,147 | 420,081 | $(2,340,066)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 10.31\% | 1.56\% | 2,889,012 | 437,135 | $(2,451,877)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 10.38\% | 1.56\% | 3,020,784 | 453,991 | $(2,566,793)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 10.46\% | 1.56\% | 3,171,007 | 472,923 | $(2,698,084)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 10.55\% | 1.57\% | 3,337,922 | 496,733 | $(2,841,189)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.61\% | 1.41\% | 3,170,634 | 465,202 | $(2,705,432)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 8.61\% | 1.23\% | 2,961,822 | 423,117 | $(2,538,705)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 7.78\% | 1.07\% | 2,796,459 | 384,603 | $(2,411,856)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 7.15\% | 0.94\% | 2,683,135 | 352,748 | $(2,330,387)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 6.67\% | 0.83\% | 2,613,289 | 325,192 | $(2,288,097)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 6.31\% | 0.75\% | 2,583,766 | 307,104 | $(2,276,662)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 6.05\% | 0.68\% | 2,587,095 | 290,781 | $(2,296,314)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 5.86\% | 0.61\% | 2,616,743 | 272,391 | $(2,344,352)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 5.72\% | 0.53\% | 2,664,774 | 246,911 | $(2,417,863)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 71,735,397 | 11,628,876 | $(60,106,521)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 4

 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: $\$ 10$ monthly subsidy per year of service with 3\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 7.66\% | 7.66\% | 1,055,095 | 1,055,095 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 9.33\% | 2.18\% | 1,343,785 | 313,982 | $(1,029,803)$ |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 9.48\% | 1.97\% | 1,423,707 | 295,855 | $(1,127,852)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 9.58\% | 2.11\% | 1,497,517 | 329,829 | $(1,167,688)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 9.58\% | 2.12\% | 1,548,643 | 342,706 | $(1,205,937)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 9.63\% | 2.06\% | 1,615,229 | 345,521 | $(1,269,708)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 9.71\% | 2.02\% | 1,690,440 | 351,667 | $(1,338,773)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 9.78\% | 1.99\% | 1,766,991 | 359,541 | $(1,407,450)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 9.83\% | 1.96\% | 1,845,467 | 367,967 | $(1,477,500)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 9.87\% | 1.93\% | 1,920,983 | 375,633 | $(1,545,350)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 9.91\% | 1.90\% | 2,006,383 | 384,675 | $(1,621,708)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 9.96\% | 1.87\% | 2,099,512 | 394,185 | $(1,705,327)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 10.01\% | 1.85\% | 2,197,618 | 406,153 | $(1,791,465)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 10.06\% | 1.83\% | 2,297,597 | 417,952 | $(1,879,645)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 10.12\% | 1.82\% | 2,410,839 | 433,570 | $(1,977,269)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.16\% | 1.80\% | 2,523,718 | 447,115 | $(2,076,603)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.20\% | 1.79\% | 2,635,284 | 462,467 | $(2,172,817)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 10.25\% | 1.78\% | 2,760,147 | 479,323 | $(2,280,824)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 10.31\% | 1.77\% | 2,889,012 | 495,980 | $(2,393,032)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 10.38\% | 1.76\% | 3,020,784 | 512,195 | $(2,508,589)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 10.46\% | 1.75\% | 3,171,007 | 530,522 | $(2,640,485)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 10.55\% | 1.75\% | 3,337,922 | 553,684 | $(2,784,238)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.61\% | 1.55\% | 3,170,634 | 511,393 | $(2,659,241)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 8.61\% | 1.34\% | 2,961,822 | 460,957 | $(2,500,865)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 7.78\% | 1.15\% | 2,796,459 | 413,358 | $(2,383,101)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 7.15\% | 1.00\% | 2,683,135 | 375,264 | $(2,307,871)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 6.67\% | 0.87\% | 2,613,289 | 340,864 | $(2,272,425)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 6.31\% | 0.78\% | 2,583,766 | 319,388 | $(2,264,378)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 6.05\% | 0.70\% | 2,587,095 | 299,333 | $(2,287,762)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 5.86\% | 0.62\% | 2,616,743 | 276,857 | $(2,339,886)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 5.72\% | 0.54\% | 2,664,774 | 251,570 | $(2,413,204)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 71,735,397 | 12,904,601 | (58,830,796) |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 5

Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service with $0 \%$ COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 7.66\% | 7.66\% | 1,055,095 | 1,055,095 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 9.33\% | 2.90\% | 1,343,785 | 417,682 | $(926,103)$ |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 9.48\% | 2.72\% | 1,423,707 | 408,490 | $(1,015,217)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 9.58\% | 2.86\% | 1,497,517 | 447,067 | $(1,050,450)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 9.58\% | 2.82\% | 1,548,643 | 455,864 | (1,092,779) |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 9.63\% | 2.74\% | 1,615,229 | 459,577 | $(1,155,652)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 9.71\% | 2.69\% | 1,690,440 | 468,309 | $(1,222,131)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 9.78\% | 2.63\% | 1,766,991 | 475,173 | $(1,291,818)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 9.83\% | 2.59\% | 1,845,467 | 486,242 | $(1,359,225)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 9.87\% | 2.53\% | 1,920,983 | 492,410 | $(1,428,573)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 9.91\% | 2.48\% | 2,006,383 | 502,102 | $(1,504,281)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 9.96\% | 2.44\% | 2,099,512 | 514,338 | $(1,585,174)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 10.01\% | 2.40\% | 2,197,618 | 526,901 | $(1,670,717)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 10.06\% | 2.37\% | 2,297,597 | 541,283 | $(1,756,314)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 10.12\% | 2.34\% | 2,410,839 | 557,447 | $(1,853,392)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.16\% | 2.31\% | 2,523,718 | 573,798 | (1,949,920) |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.20\% | 2.29\% | 2,635,284 | 591,647 | $(2,043,637)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 10.25\% | 2.26\% | 2,760,147 | 608,579 | $(2,151,568)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 10.31\% | 2.24\% | 2,889,012 | 627,681 | $(2,261,331)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 10.38\% | 2.22\% | 3,020,784 | 646,064 | (2,374,720) |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 10.46\% | 2.21\% | 3,171,007 | 669,974 | $(2,501,033)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 10.55\% | 2.20\% | 3,337,922 | 696,060 | $(2,641,862)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.61\% | 1.91\% | 3,170,634 | 630,168 | $(2,540,466)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 8.61\% | 1.61\% | 2,961,822 | 553,837 | $(2,407,985)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 7.78\% | 1.35\% | 2,796,459 | 485,247 | $(2,311,212)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 7.15\% | 1.14\% | 2,683,135 | 427,801 | $(2,255,334)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 6.67\% | 0.98\% | 2,613,289 | 383,961 | $(2,229,328)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 6.31\% | 0.86\% | 2,583,766 | 352,146 | $(2,231,620)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 6.05\% | 0.75\% | 2,587,095 | 320,714 | $(2,266,381)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 5.86\% | 0.66\% | 2,616,743 | 294,718 | $(2,322,025)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 5.72\% | 0.57\% | 2,664,774 | 265,546 | $(2,399,228)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 71,735,397 | 15,935,921 | $(55,799,476)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 6

 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service with 1\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 7.66\% | 7.66\% | 1,055,095 | 1,055,095 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 9.33\% | 3.29\% | 1,343,785 | 473,853 | $(869,932)$ |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 9.48\% | 3.13\% | 1,423,707 | 470,064 | $(953,643)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 9.58\% | 3.26\% | 1,497,517 | 509,593 | $(987,924)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 9.58\% | 3.22\% | 1,548,643 | 520,525 | $(1,028,118)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 9.63\% | 3.14\% | 1,615,229 | 526,669 | $(1,088,560)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 9.71\% | 3.08\% | 1,690,440 | 536,206 | $(1,154,234)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 9.78\% | 3.02\% | 1,766,991 | 545,635 | $(1,221,356)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 9.83\% | 2.97\% | 1,845,467 | 557,583 | $(1,287,884)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 9.87\% | 2.91\% | 1,920,983 | 566,369 | $(1,354,614)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 9.91\% | 2.85\% | 2,006,383 | 577,012 | $(1,429,371)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 9.96\% | 2.80\% | 2,099,512 | 590,224 | $(1,509,288)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 10.01\% | 2.76\% | 2,197,618 | 605,937 | $(1,591,681)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 10.06\% | 2.72\% | 2,297,597 | 621,219 | $(1,676,378)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 10.12\% | 2.68\% | 2,410,839 | 638,444 | $(1,772,395)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.16\% | 2.64\% | 2,523,718 | 655,769 | $(1,867,949)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.20\% | 2.61\% | 2,635,284 | 674,323 | $(1,960,961)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 10.25\% | 2.57\% | 2,760,147 | 692,056 | $(2,068,091)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 10.31\% | 2.54\% | 2,889,012 | 711,745 | $(2,177,267)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 10.38\% | 2.51\% | 3,020,784 | 730,459 | $(2,290,325)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 10.46\% | 2.47\% | 3,171,007 | 748,794 | $(2,422,213)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 10.55\% | 2.45\% | 3,337,922 | 775,157 | $(2,562,765)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.61\% | 2.12\% | 3,170,634 | 699,453 | $(2,471,181)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 8.61\% | 1.76\% | 2,961,822 | 605,436 | $(2,356,386)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 7.78\% | 1.47\% | 2,796,459 | 528,380 | $(2,268,079)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 7.15\% | 1.23\% | 2,683,135 | 461,574 | $(2,221,561)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 6.67\% | 1.04\% | 2,613,289 | 407,469 | $(2,205,820)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 6.31\% | 0.90\% | 2,583,766 | 368,524 | (2,215,242) |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 6.05\% | 0.78\% | 2,587,095 | 333,543 | $(2,253,552)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 5.86\% | 0.67\% | 2,616,743 | 299,184 | $(2,317,559)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 5.72\% | 0.58\% | 2,664,774 | 270,204 | $(2,394,570)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 71,735,397 | 17,756,498 | $(53,978,899)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 7

 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service with 2\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 7.66\% | 7.66\% | 1,055,095 | 1,055,095 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 9.33\% | 3.74\% | 1,343,785 | 538,666 | $(805,119)$ |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 9.48\% | 3.61\% | 1,423,707 | 542,150 | $(881,557)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 9.58\% | 3.74\% | 1,497,517 | 584,626 | $(912,891)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 9.58\% | 3.69\% | 1,548,643 | 596,503 | $(952,140)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 9.63\% | 3.60\% | 1,615,229 | 603,824 | $(1,011,405)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 9.71\% | 3.54\% | 1,690,440 | 616,288 | $(1,074,152)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 9.78\% | 3.48\% | 1,766,991 | 628,745 | $(1,138,246)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 9.83\% | 3.42\% | 1,845,467 | 642,065 | $(1,203,402)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 9.87\% | 3.36\% | 1,920,983 | 653,952 | $(1,267,031)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 9.91\% | 3.29\% | 2,006,383 | 666,095 | $(1,340,288)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 9.96\% | 3.23\% | 2,099,512 | 680,866 | $(1,418,646)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 10.01\% | 3.17\% | 2,197,618 | 695,949 | $(1,501,669)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 10.06\% | 3.13\% | 2,297,597 | 714,859 | $(1,582,738)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 10.12\% | 3.07\% | 2,410,839 | 731,351 | $(1,679,488)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.16\% | 3.03\% | 2,523,718 | 752,644 | $(1,771,074)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.20\% | 2.98\% | 2,635,284 | 769,916 | $(1,865,368)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 10.25\% | 2.93\% | 2,760,147 | 788,998 | $(1,971,149)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 10.31\% | 2.89\% | 2,889,012 | 809,820 | $(2,079,192)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 10.38\% | 2.84\% | 3,020,784 | 826,496 | $(2,194,288)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 10.46\% | 2.79\% | 3,171,007 | 845,804 | $(2,325,203)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 10.55\% | 2.75\% | 3,337,922 | 870,074 | $(2,467,848)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.61\% | 2.36\% | 3,170,634 | 778,636 | $(2,391,998)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 8.61\% | 1.95\% | 2,961,822 | 670,796 | $(2,291,026)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 7.78\% | 1.60\% | 2,796,459 | 575,107 | $(2,221,352)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 7.15\% | 1.32\% | 2,683,135 | 495,348 | $(2,187,787)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 6.67\% | 1.10\% | 2,613,289 | 430,977 | $(2,182,312)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 6.31\% | 0.94\% | 2,583,766 | 384,903 | $(2,198,863)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 6.05\% | 0.81\% | 2,587,095 | 346,371 | $(2,240,724)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 5.86\% | 0.69\% | 2,616,743 | 308,115 | $(2,308,628)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 5.72\% | 0.59\% | 2,664,774 | 274,863 | $(2,389,911)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 71,735,397 | 19,879,902 | $(51,855,495)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 8

 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$20 monthly subsidy per year of service with 3\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative | Difference |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 7.66\% | 7.66\% | 1,055,095 | 1,055,095 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 9.33\% | 4.28\% | 1,343,785 | 616,442 | $(727,343)$ |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 9.48\% | 4.17\% | 1,423,707 | 626,251 | $(797,456)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 9.58\% | 4.30\% | 1,497,517 | 672,163 | $(825,354)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 9.58\% | 4.25\% | 1,548,643 | 687,029 | $(861,614)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 9.63\% | 4.16\% | 1,615,229 | 697,752 | $(917,477)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 9.71\% | 4.09\% | 1,690,440 | 712,039 | $(978,401)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 9.78\% | 4.02\% | 1,766,991 | 726,309 | $(1,040,682)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 9.83\% | 3.96\% | 1,845,467 | 743,444 | $(1,102,023)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 9.87\% | 3.89\% | 1,920,983 | 757,105 | $(1,163,878)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 9.91\% | 3.81\% | 2,006,383 | 771,374 | $(1,235,009)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 9.96\% | 3.74\% | 2,099,512 | 788,371 | $(1,311,141)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 10.01\% | 3.67\% | 2,197,618 | 805,720 | $(1,391,898)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 10.06\% | 3.61\% | 2,297,597 | 824,485 | $(1,473,112)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 10.12\% | 3.55\% | 2,410,839 | 845,699 | $(1,565,140)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.16\% | 3.49\% | 2,523,718 | 866,907 | $(1,656,811)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.20\% | 3.43\% | 2,635,284 | 886,179 | $(1,749,105)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 10.25\% | 3.37\% | 2,760,147 | 907,483 | $(1,852,664)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 10.31\% | 3.30\% | 2,889,012 | 924,708 | $(1,964,304)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 10.38\% | 3.24\% | 3,020,784 | 942,904 | $(2,077,880)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 10.46\% | 3.17\% | 3,171,007 | 961,003 | $(2,210,004)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 10.55\% | 3.11\% | 3,337,922 | 983,975 | $(2,353,947)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.61\% | 2.65\% | 3,170,634 | 874,316 | $(2,296,318)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 8.61\% | 2.17\% | 2,961,822 | 746,476 | $(2,215,346)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 7.78\% | 1.76\% | 2,796,459 | 632,618 | $(2,163,841)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 7.15\% | 1.44\% | 2,683,135 | 540,380 | $(2,142,755)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 6.67\% | 1.19\% | 2,613,289 | 466,239 | $(2,147,050)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 6.31\% | 1.00\% | 2,583,766 | 409,472 | $(2,174,294)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 6.05\% | 0.85\% | 2,587,095 | 363,476 | $(2,223,619)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 5.86\% | 0.71\% | 2,616,743 | 317,046 | $(2,299,697)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 5.72\% | 0.60\% | 2,664,774 | 279,522 | $(2,385,252)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 71,735,397 | 22,431,982 | $(49,303,415)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

## Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 9

Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: $\$ 30$ monthly subsidy per year of service with $0 \%$ COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 7.66\% | 7.66\% | 1,055,095 | 1,055,095 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 9.33\% | 4.31\% | 1,343,785 | 620,762 | $(723,023)$ |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 9.48\% | 4.21\% | 1,423,707 | 632,258 | $(791,449)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 9.58\% | 4.33\% | 1,497,517 | 676,853 | $(820,664)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 9.58\% | 4.24\% | 1,548,643 | 685,412 | $(863,231)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 9.63\% | 4.13\% | 1,615,229 | 692,720 | $(922,509)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 9.71\% | 4.05\% | 1,690,440 | 705,076 | $(985,364)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 9.78\% | 3.98\% | 1,766,991 | 719,082 | $(1,047,909)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 9.83\% | 3.90\% | 1,845,467 | 732,179 | $(1,113,288)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 9.87\% | 3.81\% | 1,920,983 | 741,535 | $(1,179,448)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 9.91\% | 3.73\% | 2,006,383 | 755,178 | $(1,251,205)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 9.96\% | 3.65\% | 2,099,512 | 769,399 | $(1,330,113)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 10.01\% | 3.59\% | 2,197,618 | 788,157 | $(1,409,461)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 10.06\% | 3.53\% | 2,297,597 | 806,214 | $(1,491,383)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 10.12\% | 3.47\% | 2,410,839 | 826,641 | $(1,584,198)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.16\% | 3.41\% | 2,523,718 | 847,035 | $(1,676,683)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.20\% | 3.36\% | 2,635,284 | 868,094 | $(1,767,190)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 10.25\% | 3.30\% | 2,760,147 | 888,633 | $(1,871,514)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 10.31\% | 3.25\% | 2,889,012 | 910,697 | $(1,978,315)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 10.38\% | 3.20\% | 3,020,784 | 931,263 | $(2,089,521)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 10.46\% | 3.15\% | 3,171,007 | 954,940 | $(2,216,067)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 10.55\% | 3.11\% | 3,337,922 | 983,975 | $(2,353,947)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.61\% | 2.65\% | 3,170,634 | 874,316 | $(2,296,318)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 8.61\% | 2.16\% | 2,961,822 | 743,036 | $(2,218,786)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 7.78\% | 1.76\% | 2,796,459 | 632,618 | $(2,163,841)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 7.15\% | 1.44\% | 2,683,135 | 540,380 | $(2,142,755)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 6.67\% | 1.19\% | 2,613,289 | 466,239 | $(2,147,050)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 6.31\% | 1.00\% | 2,583,766 | 409,472 | $(2,174,294)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 6.05\% | 0.86\% | 2,587,095 | 367,752 | $(2,219,343)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 5.86\% | 0.73\% | 2,616,743 | 325,976 | $(2,290,767)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 5.72\% | 0.62\% | 2,664,774 | 288,839 | $(2,375,935)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 71,735,397 | 22,239,826 | $(49,495,571)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 10 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service with 1\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 7.66\% | 7.66\% | 1,055,095 | 1,055,095 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 9.33\% | 4.89\% | 1,343,785 | 704,299 | $(639,486)$ |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 9.48\% | 4.82\% | 1,423,707 | 723,868 | $(699,839)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 9.58\% | 4.94\% | 1,497,517 | 772,206 | $(725,311)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 9.58\% | 4.84\% | 1,548,643 | 782,404 | $(766,239)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 9.63\% | 4.72\% | 1,615,229 | 791,680 | $(823,549)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 9.71\% | 4.64\% | 1,690,440 | 807,790 | $(882,650)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 9.78\% | 4.56\% | 1,766,991 | 823,873 | $(943,118)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 9.83\% | 4.48\% | 1,845,467 | 841,068 | $(1,004,399)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 9.87\% | 4.38\% | 1,920,983 | 852,473 | $(1,068,510)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 9.91\% | 4.29\% | 2,006,383 | 868,555 | $(1,137,828)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 9.96\% | 4.20\% | 2,099,512 | 885,336 | $(1,214,176)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 10.01\% | 4.12\% | 2,197,618 | 904,514 | $(1,293,104)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 10.06\% | 4.05\% | 2,297,597 | 924,977 | $(1,372,620)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 10.12\% | 3.97\% | 2,410,839 | 945,754 | $(1,465,085)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.16\% | 3.90\% | 2,523,718 | 968,750 | $(1,554,968)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.20\% | 3.83\% | 2,635,284 | 989,523 | $(1,645,761)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 10.25\% | 3.76\% | 2,760,147 | 1,012,503 | $(1,747,644)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 10.31\% | 3.69\% | 2,889,012 | 1,033,992 | $(1,855,020)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 10.38\% | 3.62\% | 3,020,784 | 1,053,491 | $(1,967,293)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 10.46\% | 3.55\% | 3,171,007 | 1,076,202 | $(2,094,805)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 10.55\% | 3.49\% | 3,337,922 | 1,104,204 | $(2,233,718)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.61\% | 2.95\% | 3,170,634 | 973,296 | $(2,197,338)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 8.61\% | 2.39\% | 2,961,822 | 822,155 | $(2,139,667)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 7.78\% | 1.93\% | 2,796,459 | 693,723 | $(2,102,736)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 7.15\% | 1.56\% | 2,683,135 | 585,411 | $(2,097,724)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 6.67\% | 1.27\% | 2,613,289 | 497,583 | $(2,115,706)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 6.31\% | 1.06\% | 2,583,766 | 434,040 | $(2,149,726)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 6.05\% | 0.89\% | 2,587,095 | 380,581 | $(2,206,514)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 5.86\% | 0.75\% | 2,616,743 | 334,907 | $(2,281,836)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 5.72\% | 0.63\% | 2,664,774 | 293,498 | $(2,371,276)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 71,735,397 | 24,937,751 | $(46,797,646)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 11 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service with 2\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total <br> Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 7.66\% | 7.66\% | 1,055,095 | 1,055,095 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 9.33\% | 5.57\% | 1,343,785 | 802,238 | $(541,547)$ |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 9.48\% | 5.53\% | 1,423,707 | 830,496 | $(593,211)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 9.58\% | 5.65\% | 1,497,517 | 883,191 | $(614,326)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 9.58\% | 5.54\% | 1,548,643 | 895,562 | $(653,081)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 9.63\% | 5.43\% | 1,615,229 | 910,768 | $(704,461)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 9.71\% | 5.34\% | 1,690,440 | 929,655 | $(760,785)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 9.78\% | 5.25\% | 1,766,991 | 948,538 | $(818,453)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 9.83\% | 5.16\% | 1,845,467 | 968,730 | $(876,737)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 9.87\% | 5.05\% | 1,920,983 | 982,874 | $(938,109)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 9.91\% | 4.94\% | 2,006,383 | 1,000,155 | $(1,006,228)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 9.96\% | 4.84\% | 2,099,512 | 1,020,245 | $(1,079,267)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 10.01\% | 4.75\% | 2,197,618 | 1,042,826 | $(1,154,792)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 10.06\% | 4.66\% | 2,297,597 | 1,064,294 | $(1,233,303)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 10.12\% | 4.57\% | 2,410,839 | 1,088,689 | $(1,322,150)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.16\% | 4.48\% | 2,523,718 | 1,112,820 | $(1,410,898)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.20\% | 4.40\% | 2,635,284 | 1,136,789 | $(1,498,495)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 10.25\% | 4.31\% | 2,760,147 | 1,160,608 | $(1,599,539)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 10.31\% | 4.22\% | 2,889,012 | 1,182,505 | $(1,706,507)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 10.38\% | 4.13\% | 3,020,784 | 1,201,911 | $(1,818,873)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 10.46\% | 4.02\% | 3,171,007 | 1,218,685 | $(1,952,322)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 10.55\% | 3.94\% | 3,337,922 | 1,246,579 | $(2,091,343)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.61\% | 3.32\% | 3,170,634 | 1,095,370 | $(2,075,264)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 8.61\% | 2.67\% | 2,961,822 | 918,475 | $(2,043,347)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 7.78\% | 2.13\% | 2,796,459 | 765,611 | $(2,030,848)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 7.15\% | 1.71\% | 2,683,135 | 641,701 | $(2,041,434)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 6.67\% | 1.38\% | 2,613,289 | 540,680 | $(2,072,609)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 6.31\% | 1.13\% | 2,583,766 | 462,703 | $(2,121,063)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 6.05\% | 0.94\% | 2,587,095 | 401,962 | $(2,185,133)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 5.86\% | 0.78\% | 2,616,743 | 348,304 | $(2,268,439)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 5.72\% | 0.65\% | 2,664,774 | 302,815 | $(2,361,959)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 71,735,397 | 28,160,874 | $(43,574,523)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

## Police Employees

Retiree Healthcare Plan - Scenario \#2: Alternative 12 Current retirees: Unchanged, Current active members: \$30 monthly subsidy per year of service with 3\% COLA adjustment, New members: No longer eligible for retiree healthcare benefits

| Year | Total Payroll | Employer Contribution Rate |  | Employer Contribution Amount |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Baseline | Alternative | Baseline | Alternative |  |
| 2011 | 13,774,086 | 7.66\% | 7.66\% | 1,055,095 | 1,055,095 | 0 |
| 2012 | 14,402,840 | 9.33\% | 6.38\% | 1,343,785 | 918,901 | $(424,884)$ |
| 2013 | 15,018,006 | 9.48\% | 6.38\% | 1,423,707 | 958,149 | $(465,558)$ |
| 2014 | 15,631,698 | 9.58\% | 6.49\% | 1,497,517 | 1,014,497 | $(483,020)$ |
| 2015 | 16,165,380 | 9.58\% | 6.38\% | 1,548,643 | 1,031,351 | $(517,292)$ |
| 2016 | 16,772,886 | 9.63\% | 6.26\% | 1,615,229 | 1,049,983 | $(565,246)$ |
| 2017 | 17,409,273 | 9.71\% | 6.16\% | 1,690,440 | 1,072,411 | $(618,029)$ |
| 2018 | 18,067,396 | 9.78\% | 6.06\% | 1,766,991 | 1,094,884 | $(672,107)$ |
| 2019 | 18,773,830 | 9.83\% | 5.96\% | 1,845,467 | 1,118,920 | $(726,547)$ |
| 2020 | 19,462,848 | 9.87\% | 5.86\% | 1,920,983 | 1,140,523 | $(780,460)$ |
| 2021 | 20,246,047 | 9.91\% | 5.72\% | 2,006,383 | 1,158,074 | $(848,309)$ |
| 2022 | 21,079,433 | 9.96\% | 5.61\% | 2,099,512 | 1,182,556 | $(916,956)$ |
| 2023 | 21,954,224 | 10.01\% | 5.49\% | 2,197,618 | 1,205,287 | $(992,331)$ |
| 2024 | 22,838,932 | 10.06\% | 5.39\% | 2,297,597 | 1,231,018 | $(1,066,579)$ |
| 2025 | 23,822,519 | 10.12\% | 5.28\% | 2,410,839 | 1,257,829 | $(1,153,010)$ |
| 2026 | 24,839,740 | 10.16\% | 5.18\% | 2,523,718 | 1,286,699 | $(1,237,019)$ |
| 2027 | 25,836,119 | 10.20\% | 5.08\% | 2,635,284 | 1,312,475 | $(1,322,809)$ |
| 2028 | 26,928,268 | 10.25\% | 4.96\% | 2,760,147 | 1,335,642 | $(1,424,505)$ |
| 2029 | 28,021,457 | 10.31\% | 4.84\% | 2,889,012 | 1,356,239 | $(1,532,773)$ |
| 2030 | 29,101,968 | 10.38\% | 4.72\% | 3,020,784 | 1,373,613 | $(1,647,171)$ |
| 2031 | 30,315,559 | 10.46\% | 4.59\% | 3,171,007 | 1,391,484 | $(1,779,523)$ |
| 2032 | 31,639,071 | 10.55\% | 4.47\% | 3,337,922 | 1,414,266 | $(1,923,656)$ |
| 2033 | 32,993,070 | 9.61\% | 3.75\% | 3,170,634 | 1,237,240 | $(1,933,394)$ |
| 2034 | 34,399,796 | 8.61\% | 3.00\% | 2,961,822 | 1,031,994 | $(1,929,828)$ |
| 2035 | 35,944,197 | 7.78\% | 2.37\% | 2,796,459 | 851,877 | $(1,944,582)$ |
| 2036 | 37,526,370 | 7.15\% | 1.88\% | 2,683,135 | 705,496 | $(1,977,639)$ |
| 2037 | 39,179,739 | 6.67\% | 1.50\% | 2,613,289 | 587,696 | $(2,025,593)$ |
| 2038 | 40,947,162 | 6.31\% | 1.22\% | 2,583,766 | 499,555 | $(2,084,211)$ |
| 2039 | 42,761,899 | 6.05\% | 0.99\% | 2,587,095 | 423,343 | $(2,163,752)$ |
| 2040 | 44,654,313 | 5.86\% | 0.81\% | 2,616,743 | 361,700 | $(2,255,043)$ |
| 2041 | 46,586,952 | 5.72\% | 0.67\% | 2,664,774 | 312,133 | $(2,352,641)$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 71,735,397 | 31,970,930 | $(39,764,467)$ |

Results based upon total payroll (including new hire pay) and level percent of payroll amortization (period declines annually to an ultimate level of 5 years). All assumptions, including the $7.75 \%$ rate of return, are assumed to be met.

Appendix B - National Association of State Retirement Administratol
Survey of Plan Design Changes

## Selected Approved Changes to State Public Pensions <br> to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability

| System | Contributions | Benefits | Early Retirement | Actuarial Methods/Processes | Study Commission | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retirement Systems of Alabama | Raised contribution rates for current and future employees, as follows: <br> - general state employees and teachers, from 5\% to 7.5\%; <br> - firefighters, law enforcement officers and correctional officers, from 6\% to 8.25\% and 8.5\% <br> Employer rates will be reduced commensurate with the increase in employee rates. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona State Retirement System | Employee and employer contributions are matched and adjusted annually based on actuarial results; they rose on 7/1/10 from $9.0 \%$ to $9.6 \%$; this includes the retiree health insurance benefit. | For new hires: <br> - Change from Rule of 80 to Rule of 85 <br> - Change FAS from high 3 years to high 5 <br> - Eliminate access to ER contributions for terminating participants <br> Also, <br> - Made service purchases costneutral <br> - Decreased interest rate paid on refunds <br> - Requiring ERs to pay ASRS for early retirement incentives <br> - Rescinded modified DROP Program | Early retirement provisions revised commensurate with change in normal retirement eligibility |  |  | Changes approved in 2010 |

## Selected Approved Changes to State Public Pensions to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability

| System | Contributions | Benefits | Early Retirement | Actuarial Methods/Processes | Study Commission | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona statewide plans | Increased employee contributions for participants in the Public Safety Personnel Retirement System (firefighters and police officers), rising gradually from current level of $7.65 \%$ to $11.65 \%$. Also, requires employers to make contributions for retirees who return to work. | Changed terms of the investment-performance-based COLA for participants in the Correctional Officers, Public Safety Personnel, and Elected Officials plans. A COLA may be paid only if the funds' total return exceeds 10.5 percent, and the amount of the COLA is linked to the plans' funding condition. |  |  |  | Changes approved in 2011 |
| California PERF | State employee contributions, which for most workers are set in labor contracts, are rising by $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of pay for most employees, depending on bargaining unit and employee classification. | For new hires: <br> - Increased final average salary period from one year to three <br> - For general state employees, higher normal retirement age, from 55 to 60 <br> - For state public safety employees, lower retirement multiplier, from $3.0 \%$ to $2.5 \%$ or $2.5 \%$ to $2.0 \%$; and higher retirement age, from 50 to 55, depending on employee classification |  |  |  | Changes approved in 2010. PERF is an agent plan with many state and local employers. The changes shown here affect state employees; other employers have also made changes to benefits and/or contributions. |

## Selected Approved Changes to State Public Pensions <br> to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability

| System | Contributions | Benefits | Early Retirement | Actuarial Methods/Processes | Study Commission | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Colorado PERA | Employee and employer contribution rates will rise incrementally for several years. <br> Additionally, the legislature approved temporary increases in contribution rates for state employees by 2.5\%, for FY 2012 only, and reduced employer rates by a commensurate amount. | - Lower auto-COLA for existing retirees, to lesser of CPI-W or 2.0\% <br> - Require future retirees to be retired for 1 year before receiving a COLA <br> - 5-year service credit required on $50 \%$ employer match on contribution refunds, effective 1/1/11 | Increased actuarial reduction for early retirement |  | Changes were preceded by a statewide listening tour | Changes approved in 2010 and 2011. |
| Delaware PERS | Increased employee contribution rates from $3 \%$ to $5 \%$ on salaries above $\$ 6,000$, effective 1/1/12. | For new hires as of $1 / 1 / 12$ : <br> - 10-year vesting period, from 5; <br> - Raised normal retirement eligibility to 65 years of age with 10 years of service, 60/20, or any/30, up from 62/5, $60 / 15$, or any/30 <br> - Overtime will be excluded from final average salary calculation | Increased actuarial reduction for early retirement. |  |  | Changes approved in 2011. |
| Florida Retirement System | FRS, which previously was a non-contributory plan, will require participants to contribute $3 \%$ of pay beginning 7/1/11. | For new hires as of 7/1/11: <br> - 8-year vesting period, from 6 <br> - 8-year final average salary period, from 5 <br> - Raised normal retirement age, from 62 to 65 , and 55 to 60 for public safety workers <br> - Longer final avg salary period, from 5 highest years to 8 <br> Also, eliminates COLA for all service earned after 6/30/11 |  |  |  | Changes approved in 2011. FRS participants maintain option to select a DB or DC plan as their primary retirement benefit. |

## Selected Approved Changes to State Public Pensions <br> to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability

| System | Contributions | Benefits | Early Retirement | Actuarial Methods/Processes | Study Commission | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hawaii ERS | Increased EE contribution rates for those hired after 6/30/12, as follows: general EEs and teachers, from $7.8 \%$ to $9.8 \%$, and public safety personnel, from 12.2\% to 14.2\%. Higher ER rates will be phased in over several years, from $15 \%$ to $17 \%$ for general EEs and 19.7\% to $25 \%$ for public safety. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Illinois statewide plans (except judges and legislators) |  | For new hires as of $1 / 1 / 11$ : <br> - Normal retirement age increases to 67, from 60 <br> - Minimum retirement age set at 62 <br> - FAS basis is now highest 8 of last 10 years, up from final 4 <br> - Limits pension benefit to $75 \%$ of FAS or $\$ 106,800$, indexed to the lesser of $3 \%$ or half of CPI <br> - COLAs will be lesser of $3 \%$ or half of CPI, non-compounded, from current auto 3\% compounded <br> - COLAs begin at age 67 | Early retirement provisions revised commensurate with change in normal retirement eligibility |  |  | Changes approved in 2010. Suspends pension benefits for those who return-towork for another public employer in the state. |
| Iowa PERS | Contribution rates will rise incrementally, from 4.7\% to 5.3\% for EEs and 7.25\% to 8.15\% for ERs. Thereafter, the board has authority to adjust the total rate by up to $1 \%$. | - Vesting period for those not vested (currently 4 years) on $7 / 1 / 12$ will increase to 7 years. <br> - Increased FAS period from 3 years to 5 | Increased actuarial reduction for early retirement |  |  | Changes approved in 2010. |
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## Selected Approved Changes to State Public Pensions <br> to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability

| System | Contributions | Benefits | Early Retirement | Actuarial Methods/Processes | Study Commission | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kansas PERS | Cap on permissible annual increase in employer rates will rise gradually from $0.6 \%$ to $1.2 \%$ by 2017. <br> Participants employed before 1/1/09 may choose to keep the 4\% contribution rate with a lower future benefit accrual, or opt for $6 \%$ rate and keep the same benefit accrual rate. | See KPERS Contributions column entry. Also, those employed after $12 / 31 / 08$ will be permitted to choose to retain their $1.75 \%$ multiplier and forfeit accrual of their COLA (for all service), or to retain their COLA and reduce future accrual rate from $1.75 \%$ to 1.4\%. All changes would become effective in 2014. |  |  | Established a commission to study alternative plan designs and recommend a plan for System sustainability. Commission report due Jan 2012. <br> Recommendations must be voted on in the 2012 Legislature for the other parts of the bill to take effect. | Changes approved May 2011. The legislation also directs that 80\% of proceeds from excess real estate property sales will be used to pay down KPERS' unfunded liability. |
| Kentucky TRS |  | For new hires after 6/30/08: <br> - Increased normal retirement eligibility from $55 / 5$ to $55 / 10$; retained 60/27 <br> - Established graduated retirement factor schedule that is lower for those who accrue less than 30 years of service, beginning with $1.7 \%$ for 10 years and less | Increased actuarial reduction for early retirement |  |  | Changes were approved in 2008. |
| Maine PERS |  | - Increased age when most new hires and those with less than 5 years of service on $7 / 1 / 11$ are eligible to retire, from 62 to 65 . Members may be able to purchase other types of service to remain in the Age 62 plan. <br> - The retiree COLA will be frozen for 3 years, then based on CPI up to $3 \%$. Retirees will receive a COLA only on their first $\$ 20,000$ of benefits, indexed |  |  |  | Changes approved June 2011. |
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## Selected Approved Changes to State Public Pensions to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability

| System | Contributions | Benefits | Early Retirement | Actuarial Methods/Processes | Study Commission | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | each year by the CPI. <br> - State employees or teachers who are 1) normal retirement age; 2 ) retire after $7 / 11$, and, 3 ) return to work in a position covered by the State/Teacher plan may work no more than 5 years and only at a salary not more than $75 \%$ of that established for the position. |  |  |  |  |
| Maryland State Retirement Agency | For existing state workers and teachers not yet paying 7\%, raised contribution rate to that level. Establishes 7\% employee contribution rate for all new hires as of 7/1/11. | For new state workers and teachers as of $7 / 1 / 11$ : <br> - Increased vesting period from 5 years to 10 <br> - Increased FAS period from 3 years to 5 <br> - Increased normal retirement eligibility to Rule of 90 or 65/10 For existing state workers and teachers and new hires as of 7/1/11, reduced auto-COLA to CPI up to $2.5 \%$ when assumed investment return is achieved; $1 \%$ when it's not. Also, approved changes to DROP and other benefit provisions affecting state and local police and corrections officers. | For new state workers and teachers as of 7/1/11, Increased early retirement eligibility to age 60 or 15 years of service |  |  | Changes were approved in 2011. |
| Michigan Public School ERS | New hires on or after 7/1/10 participate in a hybrid plan featuring higher EE contributions to the DB plan and mandatory participation in the DC plan. | New school system hires have a hybrid plan instead of the current DB plan. Hybrid plan features the same multiplier as the legacy DB plan, but requires higher EE contributions and mandatory participation in DC plan. |  |  |  | Changes approved in 2010. |
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## Selected Approved Changes to State Public Pensions <br> to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability

| System | Contributions | Benefits | Early Retirement | Actuarial <br> Methods/Processes | Study Commission | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minnesota PERA | Employer contribution rates increased from 7.0\% to $7.25 \%$ and employee contributions increased from $6.0 \%$ to $6.25 \%$, on $1 / 1 / 11$. | - Reduction in COLA for existing retirees from $2.5 \%$ to $1.0 \%$, until funding ratio=90\% <br> - Reduction in interest paid on inactive and terminating accounts. <br> - Increase in vesting period, from 3 years to 5 |  |  | Directors of the 3 statewide systems were directed to conduct study of cost, benefits, and feasibility of DB, DC, and other plans, and report back by $6 / 11$. | Changes approved in 2010. |
| Minnesota SRS |  | - Reduction in COLA for existing retirees from $2.5 \%$ to $2.0 \%$, until funding ratio=90\% <br> - Reduction in interest paid on inactive and terminating accounts. <br> - Increase in vesting period, from 3 years to 5 |  | Extended amortization period from 2020 to 2040. | Directors of the 3 statewide systems were directed to conduct study of cost, benefits, and feasibility of DB, DC, and other plans, and report back by $6 / 11$. | Changes approved in 2010. |
| Minnesota Teachers | Employer and employee contributions will rise by $0.5 \%$ each year, from 5.5\% each to $7.5 \%$, phased over 4 years. After the phase-in, the TRA board has authority to adjust future rates (within limits) should the system have a contribution deficiency or sufficiency. | - For existing retirees, 2-yr suspension of COLA followed by permanent reduction in COLA from 2.5\% to 2.0\%, until funding ratio=90\% <br> - Reduction in interest paid on inactive and terminating accounts. |  |  | Directors of the 3 statewide systems were directed to conduct study of cost, benefits, and feasibility of DB, DC, and other plans, and report back by 6/11. | Changes approved in 2010. |
| Mississippi PERS | Raised contribution rates for all employees by 1.75\%. | For new hires after 7/1/11: <br> - Retirement eligibility raised to 30 years of service or age 65. <br> - Effective 7/1/11, ERs will be required to pay contributions on any re-employed retiree, and a 90-day break in service |  |  |  | Changes approved in 2010 and 2011. |
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## Selected Approved Changes to State Public Pensions <br> to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability

| System | Contributions | Benefits | Early Retirement | Actuarial Methods/Processes | Study Commission | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | will be required (up from 45, with an emergency provision). <br> - Increased age when COLA begins compounding, from 55 to 60 . |  |  |  |  |
| Missouri State ERS | New hires as of $1 / 1 / 11$ will be required to contribute 4\% of pay; plan currently is noncontributory. | For new hires as of 1/1/11: <br> - 10-year vesting (from 5 ) <br> - Normal retirement at age 67 or Rule of 90 at age 55 (from 62 or Rule of 80 at any age) | For new hires as of $1 / 1 / 11$ : <br> - Age 62 with 10 yrs of service (from 57/5) |  |  | Changes were approved in 2010. |
| Montana PERA | New hires as of 7/1/11 will contribute 7.9\% rather than 6.9\%. |  |  |  |  | Changes were approved in 2011. |
| Nebraska PERS | Rates for teachers and other school employees will rise from $8.28 \%$ to $9.78 \%$, phased in over 2 years beginning 9/1/11. Rates are scheduled to return to $7.28 \%$ in 2017. The state contribution of $1 \%$, up from $0.7 \%$, to teacher plans is extended to 2017. Also, state patrol employee and employer rates are increased from $16 \%$ to $19 \%$ for a 2 -year period beginning 7/1/11. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nevada PERS |  | For new hires as of 1/1/10: <br> - New minimum retirement age <br> - Lower multiplier <br> - Anti-spiking provision | Increased actuarial reduction for early retirement |  |  | Changes were approved in '09 and reflected a consensus among affected groups. |

## Selected Approved Changes to State Public Pensions <br> to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability

| System | Contributions | Benefits | Early Retirement | Actuarial <br> Methods/Processes | Study Commission | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Hampshire Retirement System | Rates for general employees and teachers will rise from $5 \%$ to $7 \%$; for police, from $9.3 \%$ to 11.55\%; and firefighters, from 9.3\% to 11.8\%. | For new hires as of $7 / 1 / 11$, normal retirement eligibility for firefighters and police will change from age 45 with 20 years of service to age 50 with 25 years of service. |  |  |  | Changes were approved in June 2011. Also placed limits on return-to-work. |
| New Jersey Division of Pension and Benefits | For general employees and teachers, raises employee contribution rates from 5.5\% to 6.5\%, then phases in to $7.5 \%$ over 7 years. For public safety officers, increases employee rate from 8.5\% to $10.0 \%$. The state police rate will rise from 7.5\% to 9.0\%. | - Future COLAs are suspended for all existing and future retirees until plans reach a funding level of $80 \%$. <br> - For new hires after $6 / 29 / 11$, a new tier is established with a retirement age of 65 . | For new hires after 6/28/11, early retirement eligibility with 30 years at any age, with a $3 \%$ reduction in benefit for each year of age under 65 . |  |  | Changes approved in 2011. |
| New Mexico <br> Educational <br> Retirement <br> Board | For EEs earning \$20k and more, increased EE contribution rate by $1.5 \%$ and reduced ER rate by same amount. | For new hires after 6/30/09: <br> - Increased normal retirement eligibility from any age w/25 years of service to any/30, from Rule of 75 to Rule of 80 , and 65/5 to 67/5 |  |  |  | Changes approved in 2009. |
| New Mexico PERA | Increased EE contribution rate by $1.5 \%$ and reduced ER rate by same amount. | For new hires after 6/30/10: <br> - Increased normal retirement eligibility from any age w/25 years of service to any/30. Retained retirement eligibility of Rule of 80 and $67 / 5$ |  |  |  | Changes approved in 2009. |
| New York State \& Local RS | Most new hires must now make contributions of 3\% their entire career, instead of only first 10 yrs | For new hires as of 1/1/10: <br> - 10-year vesting, from 5 <br> - Limit on use of OT in benefit calculation | Increased actuarial reduction for early retirement |  |  | Changes approved in2009. |

## Selected Approved Changes to State Public Pensions <br> to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability

| System | Contributions | Benefits | Early Retirement | Actuarial Methods/Processes | Study Commission | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New York State TRS | New hires must now make contributions of $3.5 \%$ their entire career, instead of only first 10 years. | For new hires as of $1 / 1 / 10$ : <br> - 10-year vesting, from 5 <br> - Full retirement factor of $2.0 \%$ after 25 years of service, up from 20 <br> - Normal retirement at age 57 with 30 years of service, up from age 55 <br> - Limit on use of OT in benefit calculation | Increased actuarial reduction for early retirement |  |  | Changes approved in 2009. |
| North Dakota PERS | Increased employee and employer rates by 2\% over 2 years beginning $1 / 1 / 12$. Employee rates will rise to $12.3 \%$ and employer rates will reach 18.7\%. |  |  |  |  |  |
| North Dakota Teachers | Increased employee rates by $4 \%$, from $7.75 \%$ to $11.75 \%$, in 2 increments of $2 \%$ each, effective $7 / 1 / 12$ and $7 / 1 / 14$. Increased employer rates in the same manner, from $8.75 \%$ to $12.75 \%$. EE and ER rates will return to 7.75\% when funding level reaches $90 \%$. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oklahoma statewide plans |  | Raised normal retirement eligibility criteria for teachers and state employees. Also, requires provision of a funding source to fund future COLAs. |  |  |  | Changes <br> approved in 2011. <br> Required COLA <br> funding provision <br> is estimated to <br> reduce OK PERS |
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Selected Approved Changes to State Public Pensions
to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability
to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability

| System | Contributions | Benefits | Early Retirement | Actuarial Methods/Processes | Study Commission | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | and TRS unfunded liabilities by roughly $30 \%$. |
| Pennsylvania Public Schools ERS | For new hires as of 7/1/11, reform bill establishes a "sharedrisk" provision that could result in higher future employee contribution rates, depending on fund investment performance, and creates a floor for employee rates at their present levels. Also, creates cap on amount employer rates may increase in any year. | For new hires as of 7/1/11: <br> - Reduced retirement multiplier, from 2.5\% to 2.0\% <br> - Permits option to retain 2.5\% multiplier with employee contribution rate of $10.3 \%$, rather than $7.5 \%$ current rate. <br> - 10-year vesting, up from 5 <br> - Replaces retirement provision of any age with 65 years of age and 3 years of service (from $60 / 30,62 / 3$ or any/35); or 35 years of svc with Rule of 92 , i.e., age and years of service must total 92 |  | Increases asset smoothing period from five years to 10 and increases amortization period to 24 years. |  | Changes were approved in 2010. Reform bill prohibits future use of pension obligation bonds to pay down unfunded pension liabilities. |
| Pennsylvania State ERS | For new hires as of $1 / 1 / 11$, reform bill establishes a "sharedrisk" provision that could result in higher future employee contribution rates, depending on fund investment performance, and creates a floor for employee rates at their present levels. Also, creates cap on amount that employer rates may increase in any year. | For new hires as of $1 / 1 / 11$ : <br> - Reduced retirement multiplier, from 2.5\% to 2.0\% <br> - Permits option to retain 2.5\% multiplier with employee contribution rate of 9.3\%, rather than $6.25 \%$ current rate <br> - 10-year vesting, up from 5 <br> - Raises normal retirement age to 65 from 60, and to 55 from 50 , depending on class <br> - Replaces retirement provision of any age w/ 35 years of svc with Rule of 92, i.e., age and years of service must total 92 <br> - Prohibits payment of lump-sum withdrawals with interest for |  | Restarts amortization period to 30 years. |  | Changes were approved in 2010. Reform bill prohibits future use of pension obligation bonds to pay down unfunded pension liabilities. |
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## Selected Approved Changes to State Public Pensions <br> to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability

| System | Contributions | Benefits | Early Retirement | Actuarial Methods/Processes | Study Commission | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | those who qualify for an annuity. |  |  |  |  |
| Rhode Island | As part of new hybrid plan for most current participants, employee contributions will be split between the DB and DC components. | New hybrid effective 7/1/12 for current active members features a retirement multiplier of 1.0 percent, with 5\% employee contributions and 1\% employer made to a DC plan. For teachers without Social Security, an additional $2 \%$ employee and $2 \%$ employer contribution. Also, revoked automatic COLA up to $3 \%$, in lieu of risk-adjusted COLA targeting $2 \%$, calculated as a 5 year smoothed investment return less $5.50 \%$ with a $0 \%$ floor and $4 \%$ cap, applied to first $\$ 25,000$ of benefit, indexed. COLA delayed until later of SS NRA or 3 years after retirement. |  |  |  | Changes were approved in 2011, effective $7 / 1 / 12$. |
| Rhode Island |  | Reduced benefits for state EEs, teachers and judges not eligible to retire on or before 9/30/09, by increasing retirement age to 62 with a methodology that proportionally changes age requirement based on years of service, so the closer one is to retirement, the less the impact. Also, increased FAS period from 3 years to 5 and reduced COLA to lesser of CPI or 3.0\%. |  |  |  | Changes were approved in 2009. A group of public employee unions has filed suit against the benefit reductions. |
| South Dakota RS |  | - New COLA format, affecting existing retirees, based on plan funding level <br> - Eliminate first-year pro-rated COLAs <br> - Reduce refunds of ER |  |  |  | Changes were approved in 2010. New limits on return-to-work |

[^0]
## Selected Approved Changes to State Public Pensions <br> to Restore or Preserve Plan Sustainability

| System | Contributions | Benefits | Early Retirement | Actuarial Methods/Processes | Study Commission | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | contributions |  |  |  |  |
| Texas ERS |  | For new hires, retirement eligibility increases to age 65 with 10 years of service, from 60/5. |  |  |  | Changes were approved in 2009. |
| Utah RS | Plan currently is noncontributory. New hybrid plan is projected to cost 7.5\%. ERs will fund first $10 \%$ of the hybrid or DC plan. Difference between the cost of the hybrid and $10 \%$ is deposited into EEs' DC account. If cost of the hybrid exceeds $10 \%$, EEs will pay the difference. | New hires as of $7 / 1 / 11$ will have their choice of DC or hybrid, and employers will fund the first $10 \%$ of either. |  |  | State will be studying projected costs of approved changes and may make additional changes. | Changes were approved in 2010. Employer liabilities for new hires as of $7 / 1 / 11$ are effectively capped at $10 \%$ of pay. |
| Vermont TRS | Raises contributions for current employees from $3.54 \%$ to $5.0 \%$. | For current teachers 5 years or more from normal retirement eligibility: <br> - raises normal retirement to 65 or Rule of 90, from 62 or any/30 <br> - increases max benefit to $60 \%$ of FAS, from $50 \%$ <br> - increases multiplier for those $\mathrm{w} / 20$ years of service, to 2.0 from 1.67 | Increases penalties for early retirement |  |  | Changes were approved in 2010. <br> Also increases <br> limits on <br> maximum <br> permissible <br> benefit and includes antispiking provision. |
| Virginia RS | New hires as of 7/1/10 are required to make contributions, of 5\% | For new hires as of 7/1/10: <br> - Normal retirement age tied to Social Security retirement age, from 65 <br> - Lower auto-COLA <br> - Final average salary period of 5 years, up from 3 | Early retirement provisions revised commensurate with change in normal retirement eligibility |  |  | Changes were approved in 2010. Will continue as non-contributory for existing employees. |
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