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State Employees' Retirement Commission
State of Connecticut
30 Trinity Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06115
Dear Commissioners:
We are pleased to submit herewith our Actuarial Valuation of the State Employees' Retirement System as of December 31, 1972.

Our report analyzes the actuarial status of the System, and projects the cost requirements for the Commission to certify to the Legislature.

The actuarial work has been under my direction. Others participating included Mr. Sherman G. Sass, a Senior Vice President and Manager of our New England operations, and Mr. Louis J. Zebedeo, a Vice President and Manager of our Hartford Office.

We received a great deal of help from State employees in obtaining the information which forms the basis of this report. Mr. Hugo F. Benigni of the Auditor's office, Mr. Phillip D. Hurley of the Personnel Department, Mr. William Brooks of the Payroll Department, and Mr. Ronald Oneto of the Comptroller's Data Center were most helpful in uncovering possible sources of data and making them available to us as needed. Most important, Mr. Henry J. Rigney and Mr. Robert Ruth, Chief and Assistant Chief of the Retirement Division, were available whenever needed to answer any questions and provide any information requested. Indeed, the material they provided on their own initiative anticipated many of our needs.

For convenience, this report is divided into the following sections:
I. SUMMARY
II. BENEFIT PROVISIONS
III. EMPLOYEE DATA
IV. RETIREE DATA
V. RETIREMENT FUND
VI. ACTUARIAL VALUATION

We will be pleased to meet with you to discuss this report at your convenience.


TDL: jas

## I. SUMMARY

## Benefit Provisions

The Connecticut State Employees' Retirement System covers most State employees except legislators, judges, State's attorneys, and those teachers electing coverage under the Teachers Retirement System. There are two levels of benefits -- Part B, providing benefits coordinated with Social Security, and Part C, providing maximum benefits. Employees contribute $5 \%$ of their annual earnings, except that Part B members contribute only $2 \%$ on earnings covered under Social Security ( $\$ 10,800$ in 1973 and $\$ 12,600$ in 1974).

The System provides unreduced benefits of $2 \%$ per year of service. Such benefits are available to men at least age 55 with 25 years service or age 65 with 10 years service. Women may take their benefits 5 years younger than men. State police* can retire at age 47 if they have 20 years service, at $50 \%$ of salary plus $2 \%$ for each year of service over 20 . Benefits are based on the highest 3 years' earnings. After retirement, cost-of-living increases based on the Consumer Price Index are provided up to $3 \%$ per year.

The plan also provides disability and vesting benefits after 10 years of service.

Employee Data

We received data on 39,942 active employees as of December 31, 1972. Of these, 33,455 were participating in the State System. Their average salary was $\$ 10,100$. We excluded 2,915 members from the calculation because they had less than one year of service, leaving 30,540 active employees included in the valuation. On the average, these employees were age $451 / 2$, had 10 years of service, and were earning $\$ 10,300$ per year. This average salary has been increasing at a rate of $7.9 \%$ per year since our last valuation, three years ago.

[^0] correctional department employees described in Section 5-173, for retirement (but not survivor) benefits.

Retiree Data

We received data on 8,558 pensioners and 173 beneficiaries as of December 31, 1972. The pensioners' average monthly benefit was $\$ 311$. In the last three years, the number of pensioners has increased by $10.8 \%$ per year, the average amount by $6.9 \%$ per year; and the total pension payroll by $18.4 \%$ per year. Almost $16 \%$ of the pensioners retired in 1972.

## Retirement Fund

As of December 31, 1972, the Fund had assets of $\$ 66.4$ million available as an offset to the liabilities for future benefits.

## Actuarial Valuation

Our valuation was prepared as of December 31, 1972. Our calculations were based on what we feel are reasonable assumptions as to mortality, disability, terminations from employment, and retirement ages. For salary projections, we used a scale reflecting the State's salary schedules. We assumed that investment yield over the long term would be $4 \%$. We used the "entry age normal cost" method of funding, which spreads the cost of each employee's pension as a level percentage of his earnings from date of hire to retirement. The assumptions and methods are identical to those used in our previous actuarial valuation (December 31, 1969).

The normal cost* (or current service cost) to the State is 27.7 million. This is $8.8 \%$ of the payroll of participating employees with at lease one year of service.

The past service liability* (for benefits earned before 1973) is $\$ 955$ million, of which $\$ 334$ million represents the liability to those already receiving pensions. The unfunded past service liability at the end of 1972 was $\$ 889$ million. (This is not a deficit, in the usual accounting sense, but rather is a figure calculated so as to be a basis for determining an appropriate pension contribution.)

[^1]Based on the normal cost plus 40 year amortization of the unfunded past service liability, the annual cost is $23.95 \%$ of payroll. In Fiscal 1974-75, the State's funding scheme calls for $45 \%$ of this amount to be contributed ( $10.78 \%$ of payroll). Using our estimate of the expected 1974-75 payroll, this produces a required appropriation of $\$ 39,697,600$.
+
The costs are very close to what would have been predicted based on our previous valuation. This indicates that the actuarial assumptions, taken as a whole, remain reasonable.

The incidence of disability retirement has been much higher than predicted by our assumptions. In 1972, there were 215 disability awards, compared to 75 expected awards.

The recommended reimbursement rate for programs which are billed at "full cost" is $22.3 \%$ of payroll, effective July I, 1974.
$\pm$

## II. BENEFIT PROVISIONS

## Coverage

Virtually all non-teaching employees of the State axe eligible to be covered except for those covered under the General Assembly, State's Attorneys' and Probate Court Retirement Systems. Teachers in State employment may elect either the State Employees' Retirement System or the Retirement System for Teachers. Prior to becoming a permanent employee in the classified service, each employee (except police) may elect either "Part B," which provides benefits integrated with Social Security benefits, or "Part C," providing maximum benefits unreduced for Social Security. Prior to 1973, he could also elect not to participate. Once an employee becomes a permanent employee in the classified service, he may not change his election except to upgrade his benefits from Part B to Part C.

State police are covered for benefits similar to those of Part C; they are not under Social Security.

## Employee Contributions

State police and Part C employees contribute $5 \%$ of their salary. Part $B$ employees contribute $2 \%$ of that part of their earnings on which Social Security contributions are deducted ( $\$ 10,800$ in 1973 and $\$ 12,600$ in 1974) plus $5 \%$ on salary in excess of that amount. In addition, State police pay $13 / 4 \%$ of the first $\$ 4,800$ of salary to pay for survivor's benefits.

## Retirement Benefits

Normal unreduced benefits are available after 25 years of service to men age 55 and women age 50 , and after 10 years of service to 65 year old men and 60 year old women. Benefits are based on "base salary" -- the average salary of the three highest years of State service.

Part C members receive a pension of $2 \%$ of base pay per year of service. Part $B$ members receive the same benefit until age 65 , at which time their benefit is recomputed based on $1 \%$ of the first $\$ 4,800$ of base pay plus $2 \%$ of base pay in excess of $\$ 4,800$ per year of service.

State police can take unreduced benefits at age 47 if they have 20 years of service. Their benefit is $50 \%$ of base salary plus $2 \%$ of salary per year of service over 20 .

Men retiring after age 70 and women retiring after age 65 with at least 5 years of service get a benefit of $21 / 2 \%$ of salary ( $11 / 4 \%$ on the first $\$ 4,800$ under Part B) per year of service (maximum 20 years) if this will provide a larger benefit.

Note that Part B benefits are integrated based on a $\$ 4,800$ salary, although contributions are based on the actual Social Security wage base each year. Thus each time the Social Security wage base is increased, the Part B contributions are decreased but the Part B benefits are not.

A member may elect an option that gives him a reduced pension but guarantees that some or all of his pension will be payable to his widow after his death.

If a pensioner dies before a fixed portion (currently 25\%) of his pension payments exceeds his own contributions, the balance of his contributions will be paid to his beneficiary.

After retirement, there is a cost-of-living adjustment every year. Each person's pension is increased by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index over the previous year. If this would give more than a $3 \%$ increase, then only a $3 \%$ increase is in fact given; the excess over $3 \%$ does not carry forward to the cost-of-living calculation for the following year.

## Disability Benefits

A member who becomes unable to perform his job due to disability will get a pension if he has ten years of service or if the cause of disability was job-connected. The pension is $50 \%$ of base salary plus $2 \%$ of salary per year of service in excess of 25 years ( 20 years for State Police). At age 65 (or qualification for Social Security disability benefits if earlier), Part $B$ members will get a reduction based on the first $\$ 4,800$ of salary.

## Death Benefits

In general, the beneficiary of an employee who dies in active service will receive a refund of the employee's own contributions. If an option is in effect, however, there may be a pension payable to the widow. The widow of a policeman receives $\$ 175$ per month as long as she has children under 18 or is herself over age 55 , provided she has not remarried. In addition, there is a payment of $\$ 100$ a month for one child under 18 and $\$ 175$ a month for more than one such child.

## Withdrawal Benefits

An employee who terminates employment after 10 years of service (with at least the last 5 continuous) may choose either a deferred pension (based on his accumulated credits) or a refund of his contributions. Any other former employee is entitled only to a refund of his contributions, unless he is already eligible for a pension.

Census and Average Salaries of Employees in Active Service
As of December 31, 1972
By Age and By Years of Service

| Age | Total | Years of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-14 | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35 and over | Unknown |
| Total | $\begin{array}{r} 33,455 \\ \$ 10,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12,830 \\ \$ 8,700 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,740 \\ \$ 10,200 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,636 \\ \$ 10,600 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,145 \\ \$ 11,500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,807 \\ \$ 12,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 874 \\ \$ 12,800 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 379 \\ \$ 13,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 192 \\ \$ 14,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 852 \\ \$ 13,700 \end{array}$ |
| Under 20 | 166 $\$ 5,800$ | 165 $\$ 5,800$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | --- | -- | \$ $5,60{ }^{1}$ |
| 20-24 | 1,894 7,300 | 1,694 7,200 | 153 $\$ 8,200$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | --- | -- | 47 7,800 |
| 25-29 | 3,179 9,100 | 2,090 8,800 | 935 9,600 | 68 $\$ 9,100$ | -- | --- | -- | -- | -- | 86 9,700 |
| 30-34 | 3,185 10,400 | 1,435 9,700 | 1,155 11,000 | 427 10,600 | 63 $\$ 11,500$ | --- | --- | -- | -- | 105 12,700 |
| 35-39 | 3,207 11,000 | 1,173 9,800 | 917 11,700 | 595 11,700 | 382 11,500 | 42 $\$ 10,800$ | -- | --- | -- | 98 13,900 |
| 40-44 | 3,912 10,900 | 1,390 9,400 | 985 11,200 | 601 12,000 | 541 12,100 | 232 12,200 | 44 11,800 | --- | -- | 119 14,300 |
| 45-49 | 4,729 10,700 | 1,434 9,000 | 1,244 10,500 | 692 11,000 | 583 12,600 | 441 12,600 | 181 11,400 | 30 $\$ 11,800$ | --- | 124 14,500 |
| 50-54 | 4,741 10,300 | 1,415 8,500 | 1,157 9,700 | 713 10,600 | 562 11,400 | 419 13,200 | 259 12,900 | 114 12,500 | 10 $\$ 13,100$ | 92 15,300 |
| 55-59 | 4,037 10,000 | 994 8,300 | 1,052 9,200 | 667 9,300 | 509 10,400 | 347 12,000 | 212 13,100 | 120 15,500 | 62 12,500 | 74 15,600 |
| 60-64 | 2,519 10,100 | 486 8,100 | 662 8,800 | 462 9,800 | 357 10,600 | 231 11,800 | 125 14,100 | 76 13,600 | 72 14,000 | 48 14,800 |
| 65 and over | 787 10,800 | 101 9,400 | 224 9,700 | 156 10,300 | 109 10,500 | 71 11,700 | 39 12,700 | 27 17,100 | 39 15,100 | r 21 |
| Unknown | 1,099 9,700 | 453 8,300 | 256 9,400 | 255 9,600 | 39 11,000 | 24 13,100 | 14 15,200 | 12 10,300 | 20, $\begin{array}{r}9 \\ \end{array}$ | 37 20,100 |

Table 1C
Census and Average Salaries of Employees in Active Service
as of December 31, 1972
By Age and By Years of Service
Women

| Age | Total | Years of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-14 | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35 and over | Unknown |
| Total | $\begin{array}{r} 13,389 \\ \$ 8,200 \end{array}$ | 5,687 $\$ 7,200$ | 3,649 $\$ 8,300$ | 1,724 $\$ 8,400$ | 961 $\$ 9,100$ | $\begin{array}{r} 560 \\ \$ 10,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 257 \\ \$ 10,500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 138 \\ \$ 11,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 79 \\ \$ 12,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 334 \\ \$ 12,000 \end{array}$ |
| Under 20 | 98 $\$ 5,400$ | 97 $\$ 5,400$ | -- |  | -- |  | -- | -- | -- | \$ $\begin{array}{r}1 \\ \text { \% }\end{array}$ |
| 20-24 | 957 6,600 | 860 6,600 | 78 $\$ 7,100$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 19 7,000 |
| 25-29 | 1,075 8,100 | 694 7,900 | 326 8,400 | 27 $\$ 7.200$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 28 9.100 |
| 30-34 | 909 8,300 | 493 7,800 | 287 9,000 | 92 8,500 | 10 $\$ 7,700$ | -- | --- | -- | -- | 27 10,900 |
| 35-39 | 937 8,400 | 493 7,700 | 255 8,900 | 86 9,000 | 66 8,700 | \$ $\begin{array}{r}10 \\ \text { \$ }\end{array}$ | -- | -- | -- | 27 12,300 |
| 40-44 | 1,427 8,100 | 663 7,300 | 388 8,400 | 156 9,000 | 102 9,400 | 73 9,300 | 10 $\$ 9,000$ | -- | -- | 35 10,000 |
| 45-49 | 1,967 8,300 | 730 7,300 | 593 8,400 | 272 8,600 | 137 9,400 | 102 9,800 | 71 9,600 | 13 $\$ 10,000$ | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 49 \\ 11,600 \end{array}$ |
| 50-54 | 2,172 8,300 | 732 7,000 | 645 8,300 | 314 8,600 | 195 9,100 | 115 10,600 | 67 10,700 | 57 11,800 | \$13,100 | $\begin{array}{r} 45 \\ 11,600 \end{array}$ |
| 55-59 | 1,917 8,300 | 473 7,000 | 569 8,000 | 359 8,000 | 232 8,700 | 121 10,000 | 59 10,700 | 32 12,000 | 29 9,900 | $\begin{array}{r} 43 \\ 13,600 \end{array}$ |
| 60-64 | 1,064 8,600 | 190 7,400 | 309 7,800 | 222 8,300 | 146 9,200 | 93 10,200 | 32 11,400 | 20 10,000 | 29 10,500 | 23 12,400 |
| 65 \& over | 288 9,000 | 35 7,900 | 66 7,400 | 55 8,500 | 52 9,200 | 31 9,000 | 13 12,100 | $10,8{ }^{9}$ | 15 15,700 | 12 9,500 |
| Unknown | 578 8,200 | 227 6.400 | 133 7,300 | 141 7,800 | 21 9,100 | 15 11,200 | 11, 500 | 11, $\begin{array}{r}7 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 26, ${ }^{\text {4 }}{ }^{4}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25 \\ 23,800 \end{array}$ |
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Honorable Gerald McCann
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Department of Finance and Control
State Capitol
Hartford，Connecticut 06115
Dear Deputy Commissioner McCann：

At the request of Honorable J．Frederick Bitzer，Chairman，it is our pleasure to enclose the Connecticut State Employees Retirement System Actuarial Valuation as of December 31,1972 prepared by the Martin E．Segal Company，Inc．

Very truly yours，
STATE RETIREMENT COMMISSION NATHAN G．AGOSTINELII，SECRETARY


Henry J。Rigney，Chief
Retirement Division
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Table 2A
Statistical Data on Employees
As of December 31, 1972
All Participants

|  | Total | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Covered Employees | 33,455 | 20,066 | 13,389 |
| Less: employees with less than 1 year of service | 2,915 | 1,603 | 1,312 |
| Active employees included in valuation: |  |  |  |
| Number | 30,540 | 18,463 | 12,077 |
| Total annual salary | \$314, 825, 200 | \$214, 680,400 | \$100,144,800 |
| Average age | $451 / 2$ | $441 / 2$ | $461 / 2$ |
| Average years of service ${ }^{+}$ | 10 | $10 \mathrm{l} / 2$ | $91 / 2$ |
| Average annual salary | \$ 10,300 | \$ 11,600 | \$ 8,300 |
| Number* eligible at end of year to retire on: |  |  |  |
| Normal retirement pension | 1,788 | 759 | 1,029 |
| Early retirement pension | 2,734 | 1,398 | 1,336 |
| Number* as of end of year with vested right to deferred pension | 6,227 | 5,000 | 1,227 |

CONNECTICUT SERS
${ }^{+}$Includes purchased service adjustment.
*Includes only employees with known age and service.

Table 2B
Statistical Data on Employees
As of December 31, 1972
Police

|  | Total | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Covered employees | 797 | 786 | 11 |
| Less: employees with less than 1 year of service | 78 | 78 | -- |
| Active employees included in valuation: |  |  |  |
| Number | 719 | 708 | 11 |
| Total annual salary | \$8,393,100 | \$8,268,300 | \$ 124,800 |
| Average age | 37 | $361 / 2$ | 39 |
| Average years of service ${ }^{+}$ | $10 \mathrm{l} / 2$ | $101 / 2$ | $10 \mathrm{l} / 2$ |
| Average annual salary | \$ 11,700 | \$ 11,700 | \$ 11,300 |
| Number eligible at end of year to retire on: |  |  |  |
| Normal retirement pension | 39 | 37 | 2 |
| Early retirement pension | -- | -- | -- |
| Number as of end of year with vested right to deferred pension | 257 | 256 | 1 |

## CONNECTICUT SERS

${ }^{+}$Includes purchased service adjustment.

Table 2C
Statistical Data on Employees As of December 31, 1972

Part B

|  | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Covered employees <br> Less: employees with less than <br> 1 year of service | 20,750 | 13,196 | 7,554 |
| Active employees included in <br> valuation: | 1,611 | 870 | 741 |
| Number | 19,139 | 12,326 | 6,813 |
| Total annual salary <br> Average age | $\$ 199,097,300$ | $\$ 143,809,800$ | $\$ 55,287,500$ |
| Average years of service | $431 / 2$ | $431 / 2$ | $431 / 2$ |
| Average annual salary | 10 | 11 | $81 / 2$ |
| Number* eligible at end of year <br> to retire on: | $\$ 10,400$ | $\$ 11,700$ | $\$ 8,100$ |
| Normal retirement pension | 550 | 267 | 283 |
| Early retirement pension | 1,482 | 820 | 662 |
| Number* as of end of year with <br> vested right to deferred pension | 4,705 | 3,912 | 793 |

## CONNECTICUT SERS

${ }^{+}$Includes purchased service adjustment.
*Includes only employees with known age and service.

Table 2D
Statistical Data on Employees As of December 31, 1972

Part C

|  | Total | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Covered employees | 11,908 | 6,084 | 5,824 |
| Less: employees with less than 1 year of service | 1,226 | 655 | 571 |
| Active employees included in valuation: |  |  |  |
| Number | 10,682 | 5,429 | 5,253 |
| Total annual salary | \$107,334,800 | \$ 62,602,300 | \$ 44,732,500 |
| Average age | $491 / 2$ | 49 | $50.1 / 2$ |
| Average years of service ${ }^{+}$ | $10 \mathrm{l} / 2$ | $101 / 2$ | $101 / 2$ |
| Average annual salary | \$ 10,000 | \$ 11,500 | \$ 8,500 |
| Number* eligible at end of year to retire on: |  |  |  |
| Normal retirement pension | 1,199 | 455 | 744 |
| Early retirement pension | 1,252 | 578 | 674 |
| Number* as of end of year with vested right to deferred pension | 1,265 | 832 | 433 |

## CONNECTICUT SERS

${ }^{+}$Includes purchased service adjustment.
*Includes only employees with known age and service.

## IV. RETIREE DATA

The data on retired members and beneficiaries included age, sex, monthly benefit, retirement date, option, and type of pension.

The following are significant statistics on the retired group:

| Item | Total |  |  | Male | Female |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pensioners: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 8,558 |  |  | , 592 |  | ,966 |  |
| Average age | 68 |  |  | 68 |  | 68 | 1/2 |
| Average monthly benefit | \$ 311 |  | \$ | 366 | \$ | 248 |  |
| Beneficiaries: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 173 |  |  | 6 |  | 167 |  |
| Average age | 70 | $1 / 2$ |  | 71 |  | 70 | 1/2 |
| Average monthly benefit | \$ 201 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Our 1969 review showed 6,296 pensioners. Thus there has been a $35.9 \%$ three-year increase -- a $10.8 \%$ annual compound rate. The average benefit increased from $\$ 255$ to $\$ 311$-- a $22.0 \%$ increase ( $6.9 \%$ per year). These two items have combined to increase the total pensioner payroll (excluding beneficiaries) from $\$ 1.6$ million to $\$ 2.7$ million per month. This is a $65.8 \%$ increase in only three years -- about $18.4 \%$ per year. As the 1973 amendment revising the method of computing cost-of-living increases takes effect, the rate of increase in the average amount should escalate still more. This is one of the main reasons for the transition to "level" actuarial funding of retirement costs -- to get away from the drastic year-to-year increases that necessarily occur on "pay-as-yougo" type funding.

Tables 3A, 3B, and 3C give amount distributions of the 1,365 new pensions in 1972 by type of pension and sex. Tables 4A, 4B, and 4C do the same for age at retirement.

Tables 5A, 5B, and 5C give amount distributions for all 8,558 pensions in force at the end of 1972 by type and by sex. Tables 6A, 6 B , and 6 C do the same thing by age.

In addition to the active employees, pensioners and beneficiaries, there are 232 former employees who will be eligible for a vested pension.

Table 3A
Pensions Awarded in the Year Ended December 31, 1972 by Type and by Monthly Amount

| Monthly Amount | Total | Type of Pension |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service Disability | Regular Disability | Police | Sec. 5-173 |
| Total | 1,365 | 1,115 | 34 | 181 | 9 | 26 |
| Under \$49 | 7 | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| \$50-99 | 68 | 68 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 100-149 | 142 | 141 | 1 | -- | -- | -- |
| 150-199 | 142 | 136 | -- | 6 | -- | -- |
| 200-249 | 104 | 96 | -- | 8 | -- | -- |
| 250-299 | 126 | 94 | 2 | 30 | -- | -- |
| $300-349$ | 118 | 86 | 2 | 30 | -- | -- |
| $350-399$ | 123 | 72 | 9 | 41 | -- | 1 |
| 400 - 449 | 86 | 58 | 9 | 19 | -- | -- |
| $450-499$ | 61 | 43 | 7 | 9 | -- | 2 |
| $500-599$ | 100 | 72 | 2 | 11 | -- | 16 |
| 600-699 | 84 | 73 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| $700-799$ | 51 | 36 | -- | 6 | 7 | 2 |
| $800-899$ | 39 | 33 | -- | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| $900-999$ | 33 | 29 | -- | 4 | -- | -- |
| 1,000-1,099 | 21 | 17 | -- | 4 | -- | -- |
| 1,100-1,199 | 13 | 13 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 1,200-1,299 | 23 | 21 | -- | 2 | -- | -- |
| 1,300-1,399 | 6 | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 1,400-1,499 | 9 | 8 | -- | 1 | -- | -- |
| 1,500-1,999 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- |
| 2,000-2,499 | 2 | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- |

CONNECTICUT SERS

Pensions Awarded in the Year Ended December 31, 1972 by Type and by Monthly Amount Male

| Monthly Amount | Total | Type of Pension |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service Disability | Regular <br> Disability | Police | Sec.5-173 |
| Total | 756 | 574 | 25 | 122 | 9 | 26 |
| Under \$49 | 5 | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| \$50-99 | 34 | 34 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 100-149 | 53 | 53 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 150-199 | 50 | 48 | -- | 2 | -- | -- |
| $200-249$ | 42 | 37 | -- | 5 | -- | -- |
| $250-299$ | 48 | 30 | 1 | 17 | -- | -- |
| $300-349$ | 58 | 37 | 1 | 20 | -- | -- |
| $350-399$ | 78 | 41 | 7 | 29 | -- | 1 |
| $400-449$ | 51 | 27 | 9 | 15 | -- | -- |
| $450-499$ | 40 | 26 | 5 | 7 | -- | 2 |
| $500-599$ | 71 | 45 | 2 | 8 | -- | 16 |
| $600-699$ | 58 | 50 | -- | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| $700-799$ | 44 | 32 | -- | 3 | 7 | 2 |
| $800-899$ | 31 | 26 | -- | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| $900-999$ | 27 | 23 | -- | 4 | -- | -- |
| 1,000-1,099 | 18 | 15 | -- | 3 | -- | -- |
| 1,100-1,199 | 11 | 11 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 1,200-1,299 | 19 | 18 | -- | 1. | -- | -- |
| 1,300-1,399 | 5 | 5 | -- | - | -- | -- |
| 1,400-1,499 | 8 | 7 | -- | 1 | -- | -- |
| 1,500-1,999 | 4 | 3 | -- | 1 | -- | -- |
| 2,000-2,499 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
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Table 3C
Pensions Awarded in the Year Ended December 31, 1972
by Type and by Monthly Amount
Female

| Monthly Amount | Total | Type of Pension |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service <br> Disability | Regular <br> Disability |
| Total | 609 | 541 | 9 | 59 |
| Under \$49 | 2 | 2 | -- | -- |
| \$50-99 | 34 | 34 | - | -- |
| 100-149 | 89 | 88 | 1 | - |
| 150-199 | 92 | 88 | -- | 4 |
| 200- 249 | 62 | 59 | -- | 3 |
| $250-299$ | 78 | 64 | 1 | 13 |
| $300-349$ | 60 | 49 | 1 | 10 |
| $350-399$ | 45 | 31 | 2 | 12 |
| 400 - 449 | 35 | 31 | -- | 4 |
| $450-499$ | 21 | 17 | 2 | 2 |
| $500-599$ | 30 | 27 | -- | 3 |
| $600-699$ | 26 | 23 | 1 | 2 |
| $700-799$ | 7 | 4 | -- | 3 |
| $800-899$ | 8 | 7 | -- | 1 |
| $900-999$ | 6 | 6 | -- | -- |
| 1,000-1,099 | 3 | 2 | -- | 1 |
| 1,100-1,199 | 2 | 2 | -- | - |
| 1,200-1,299 | 4 | 3 | -- | 1 |
| 1,300-1,399 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- |
| 1,400-1,499 |  | 1 | -- | -- |
| 1,500-1,999 | 2 | 1 | 1 | -- |
| 2,000-2,499 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- |
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Table 4A
Pensions Awarded in the Year Ended December 31, 1972 By Type and by Age on Effective Date

| Age on Effective Date | Total | Type of Pension |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service Disability | Regular Disability | Police | Sec.5-173 |
| Total | 1,365 | 1,115 | 34 | 181 | 9 | 26 |
| 25-29 | 1 | -- | 1 | --- | -- | -- |
| $30-34$ | 2 | -- | 2 | -- | - | -- |
| $35-39$ | 5 | --- | 2 | 3 | -- | -- |
| 40-44 | 17 | -- | 7 | 10 | -- | -- |
| 45-49 | 27 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 4 | 4 |
| 50 | 26 | 17 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 51 | 24 | 12 | -- | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| 52 | 17 | 10 | 1 | 4 | -- | 2 |
| 53 | 16 | 11 | -- | 3 | -- | 2 |
| 54 | 17 | 8 | 1 | 6 | -- | 2 |
| 55 | 91 | 79 | 3 | 6 | -- | 3 |
| 56 | 49 | 40 | 2 | 6 | -- | 3 |
| 57 | 48. | 36 | -- | 9 | 1 | 2 |
| 58 | 53 | 43 | -- | 9 | 1 | -- |
| 59 | 47 | 39 | -- | 7 | -- | 1 |
| 60 | 63 | 48 | 2 | 12 | -- | 1 |
| 61 | 72 | 54 | 2 | 15 | -- | 1 |
| 62 | 108 | 93 | 4 | 10 | -- | 1 |
| 63 | 84 | 75 | -- | 9 | -- | -- |
| 64 | 63 | 49 | 1 | 12 | -- | 1 |
| 65 | 130 | 124 | 1 | 5 | -- | - |
| 66 | 81. | 73 | 2 | 5 | -- | 1 |
| 67 | 63 | 54 | -- | 9 | -- | -- |
| 68 | 41 | 35 | - | 6 | -- | -- |
| 69 | 47 | 43 | -- | 4 | -- | -- |
| 70 | 118 | 115 | -- . | 3 | -- | --- |
| 71 | 28 | 28 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 72 | 14 | 14 | -- | ~- | -- | -- |
| 73 | 11 | 11 | -- | -- | --- | -- |
| 75 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 76 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- |  |  |
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Table 4C
Pensions Awarded in the Year Ended December 31, 1972 By Type and By Age on Effective Date

Female

| Age on Effective Date | Total | Type of Pension |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service Disability | Regular Disability |
| Total | 609 | 541 | 9 | 59 |
| 40-44 | 3 | -- | 1 | 2 |
| 45-49 | 3 | -- | -- | 3 |
| 50 | 17 | 17 | -- | -- |
| 51 | 12 | 11 | -- | 1 |
| 52 | 9 | 9 | -- | -- |
| 53 | 10 | 10 | -- | -- |
| 54 | 11 | 8 | 1 | 2 |
| 55 | 23 | 19 | 1 | 3 |
| 56 | 20 | 16 | -- | 4 |
| 57 | 18 | 16 | -- | 2 |
| 58 | 29 | 25 | -- | 4 |
| 59 | 17 | 13 | -- | 4 |
| 60 | 19 | 16 | -- | 3 |
| 61 | 32 | 25 | 1 | 6 |
| 62 | 52 | 45 | 3 | 4 |
| 63 | 45 | 39 | -- | 6 |
| 64 | 28 | 22 | 1 | 5 |
| 65 | 73 | 71 | -- | 2 |
| 66 | 43 | 40 | 1 | 2 |
| 67 | 30 | 28 | -- | 2 |
| 68 | 23 | 21 | -- | 2 |
| 69 | 29 | 28 | -- | 1 |
| 70 | 36 | 35 | -- | 1. |
| 71 | 14 | 14 | -- | -- |
| 72 | 8 | 8 | -- | -- |
| 73 | 5 | 5 | -- | -- |
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| Monthly Amount | Total | Type of Pension |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service <br> Disability | Regular <br> Disability | Police | Sec.5-173 |
| Total | 8,558 | 7,222 | 248 | 1,045 | 15 | 28 |
| Under \$49 | 335 | 335 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| \$50-99 | 985 | 964 | 9 | 12 | -- | -- |
| 100-149 | 992 | 885 | 16 | 91 | -- | -- |
| 150-199 | 866 | 704 | 26 | 136 | -- | -- |
| 200-249 | 857 | 647 | 40 | 170 | -- | -- |
| $250-299$ | 926 | 647 | 53 | 226 | -- | -- |
| $300-349$ | 771 | 580 | 27 | 163 | 1 | -- |
| $350-399$ | 628 | 483 | 27 | 116 | 1 | 1 |
| $400-449$ | 478 | 410 | 19 | 49 | -- | - |
| $450-499$ | 370 | 327 | 15 | 25 | -- | 3 |
| $500-599$ | 486 | 438 | 5 | 25 | 2 | 16 |
| $600-699$ | 316 | 298 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 4 |
| $700-799$ | 174 | 154 | 1 | 10 | 7 | 2 |
| $800-899$ | 116 | 107 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| $900-999$ | 83 | 78 | -- | 5 | -- | -- |
| 1,000-1,099 | 49 | 45 | -- | 4 | -- | -- |
| 1,100-1,199 | 35 | 35 | -- | - | -- | -- |
| 1,200-1,299 | 39 | 36 | 1 | 2 | -- | -- |
| 1,300-1,399 | 18 | 18 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 1,400-1,499 | 16 | 15 | -- | 1 | -- | -- |
| 1,500-1,999 | 16 | 14 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- |
| 2,000-2,499 | 2 | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
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Pensions in Force on December 31, 1972
by Type and by Monthly Amount Male

| Monthly Amount | Total | Type of Pension |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service Disability | Regular Disability | Police | Sec. 5-173 |
| Total | 4,592 | 3,743 | 155 | 651 | 15 | 28 |
| Under \$ 49 | 143 | 143 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| \$50-99 | 383 | 373 | 5 | 5 | -- | -- |
| 100-149 | 391 | 341 | 9 | 41 | -- | -- |
| $150-199$ | 405 | 307 | 15 | 83 | -- | -- |
| $200-249$ | 385 | 276 | 17 | 92 | -- | -- |
| $250-299$ | 449 | 294 | 25 | 130 | -- | -- |
| 300-349 | 450 | 312 | 20 | 117 | 1 | -- |
| $350-399$ | 385 | 278 | 23 | 82 | 1 | 1 |
| $400-449$ | 294 | 239 | 17 | 38 | -- | -- |
| $450-499$ | 275 | 239 | 13 | 20 | -- | 3 |
| $500-599$ | 354 | 313 | 4 | 19 | 2 | 16 |
| $600-699$ | 234 | 220 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| $700-799$ | 142 | 126 | -- | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| $800-899$ | 88 | 80 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| $900-999$ | 68 | 63 | -- | 5 | -- | -- |
| 1,000-1,099 | 42 | 39 | -- | 3 | -- | -- |
| 1,100-1,199 | 27 | 27 | -- | - | -- | -- |
| 1,200-1,299 | 32 | 30 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- |
| 1,300-1,399 | 16 | 16 | -- | - | -- | -- |
| 1,400-1,499 | 14 | 13 | -- | 1 | -- | -- |
| 1,500-1,999 | 14 | 13 | -- | 1 | -- | -- |
| , $000-2,499$ | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
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Table 5C
Pensions in Force on December 31, 1972
by Type and by Monthly Amount
Female

| Monthly Amount | Total | Type of Pension |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service Disability | Regular Disability |
| Total | 3,966 | 3,479 | 93 | 394 |
| Under \$49 | 192 | 192 | -- | -- |
| \$50-99 | 602 | 591 | 4 | 7 |
| 100-149 | 601 | 544 | 7 | 50 |
| 150-199 | 461 | 397 | 11 | 53 |
| 200-249 | 472 | 371 | 23 | 78 |
| $250-299$ | 477 | 353 | 28 | 96 |
| $300-349$ | 321 | 268 | 7 | 46 |
| $350-399$ | 243 | 205 | 4 | 34 |
| $400-449$ | 184 | 171 | 2 | 11 |
| $450-499$ | 95 | 88 | 2 | 5 |
| $500-599$ | 132 | 125 | 1 | 6 |
| 600-699 | 82 | 78 | 2 | 2 |
| $700-799$ | 32 | 28 | 1 | 3 |
| 800-899 | 28 | 27 | -- | 1 |
| $900-999$ | 15 | 15 | -- | -- |
| 1,000-1,099 | 7 | 6 | -- | 1 |
| 1,100-1,199 | 8 | 8 | -- | -- |
| 1,200-1,299 | 7 | 6 | -- | 1 |
| 1,300-1,399 | 2 | 2 | -- | -- |
| 1,400-1,499 | 2 | 2 | -- | -- |
| 1,500-1,999 | 2 | 1 | 1 | -- |
| 2,000-2,499 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- |
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Pensions in Force on December 31, 1972
By Type and By Age

| Age on <br> December 31, 1972 | Total | Type of Pension |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service Disability | Regular Disability | Police | Sec. 5-173 |
| Total | 8,558 | 7,222 | 248 | 1,045 | 15 | 28 |
| 25-29 | 4 | -- | 4 | -- | -- | -- |
| 30-34 | 7 | -- | 6 | 1 | -- | -- |
| 35-39 | 13 | -- | 6 | 7 | -- | -- |
| $40-44$ | 52 | 1 | 24 | 27 | -- | $\cdots$ |
| 45-49 | 99 | 13 | 19 | 58 | 5 | 4 |
| $50-54$ | 303 | 154 | 31 | 102 | 6 | 10 |
| $55-59$ | 870 | 657 | 49 | 152 | 4 | 8 |
| 60-64 | 1,554 | 1,271 | 42 | 236 | --- | 5 |
| 65-69 | 2,141 | 1,874 | 34 | 232 | -- | 1 |
| $70-74$ | 1,821 | 1,655 | 18 | 148 | -- | -- |
| $75-79$ | 1,017 | 970 | 8 | 39 | -- | -- |
| $80-84$ | 489 | 457 | 5 | 27 | -- | -- |
| 85-89 | 151 | 137 | 2 | 12 | -- | -- |
| 90-94 | 29 | 25 | - | 4 | -- | -- |
| $95-99$ | 6 | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 100-104 | 2 | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
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Table 6B
Pensions in Force on December 31, 1972
by Type and by Age Male

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Age on } \\ \text { December 31, } 1972 \end{gathered}$ | Total | Type of Pension |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service Disability | Regular Disability | Police | Sec. 5-173 |
| Total | 4,592 | 3,743 | 155 | 651 | 15 | 28 |
| 25-29 | 2 | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- |
| 30-34 | 5 | -- | 4 | 1 | -- | -- |
| $35-39$ | 8 | -- | 3 | 5 | -- | -- |
| $40-44$ | 37 | -- | 16 | 21 | - | -- |
| $45-49$ | 70 | 11 | 14 | 36 | 5 | 4 |
| 50-54 | 139 | 31 | 20 | 72 | 6 | 10 |
| $55-59$ | 503 | 365 | 34 | 92 | 4 | 8 |
| 60-64 | 850 | 681 | 23 | 141 | -- | 5 |
| $65-69$ | 1,117 | 956 | 20 | 140 | -- | 1 |
| $70-74$ | - 975 | 878 | 8 | 89 | -- | -- |
| $75-79$ | 524 | 489 | 6 | 29 | -- | -- |
| 80-84 | 272 | 253 | 4 | 15 | -- | -- |
| 85-89 | 72 | 63 | 1 | 8 | -- | -- |
| $90-94$ | 13 | 11 | -- | 2 | -- | -- |
| 95-99 | 4 | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 100-104 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
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Table 6C
Pensions in Force on December 31, 1972 By Type and By Age

Female

| Age on December 31, 1972 | Total | Type of Pension |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service Disability | Regular Disability |
| Total | 3,966 | 3,479 | 93 | 394 |
| 25-29 | 2 | -- | 2 | -- |
| 30-34 | 2 | -- | 2 | -- |
| $35-39$ | 5 | -- | 3 | 2 |
| $40-44$ | 15 | 1 | 8 | 6 |
| $45-49$ | 29 | 2 | 5 | 22 |
| 50-54 | 164 | 123 | 11 | 30 |
| $55-59$ | 367 | 292 | 15 | 60 |
| 60-64 | 704 | 590 | 19 | 95 |
| $65-69$ | 1,024 | 918 | 14 | 92 |
| 70-74 | 846 | 777 | 10 | 59 |
| $75-79$ | 493 | 481 | 2 | 10 |
| $80-84$ | 217 | 204 | 1 | 12 |
| 85-89 | 79 | 74 | 1 | 4 |
| 90-94 | 16 | 14 | -- | 2 |
| 95-99 | 2 | 2 | -- | -- |
| 100-104 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- |
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## V. RETIREMENT FUND

In connection with the State Employees' Retirement System, the State Treasurer maintains the State Employees' Retirement Fund. The Retirement Division provided us with financial statements as of December 31, 1972

The Fund receives all employee and State contributions. The assets are invested in accordance with the State's trust law, with the income being added to the Fund. In general, the bulk of the assets are invested in the State's mutual investment accounts for retirement funds.

Payments out of the Fund are primarily for refunds of employee contributions and for pension payments. Contribution refunds occur when an employee terminates employment and elects to take a refund, or when he dies after retirement without having received a portion of his payments from the Fund equal to his total contributions.

As of December 31, 1972, the Fund Balance was $\$ 66,369,897.62$ A detailed breakdown of these assets is shown in Table 7.

Table 7
Assets as of December 31, 1972

| Cash |  | \$. $530,918.97$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Investments |  |  |
| Mutual fixed income fund | \$44,767,541.51 |  |
| Mutual equity fund | 15,890,437.14 |  |
| Short-term investment fund | 5,088,155.00 |  |
| Savings accounts | 100,000.00 | 65,846,133.65 |
| Total assets |  | \$66,377,052.62 |
| Less: Accounts payable |  | 7,155.00 |
| Net assets |  | $\underline{\$ 66,369,897.62}$ |
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## VI. ACTUARIAL VALUATION

## Valuation as of December 31, 1972

Our valuation was prepared as of December 31, 1972, the latest date for which the necessary data was available.

## Actuarial Assumptions

The actual cost of a pension plan consists of the benefit payments and administrative expenses less any investment earnings. An actuarial cost method aims to budget this true cost so as to establish a reasonable relationship between employer pension contributions and the employee services that give rise to the pension obligation. The result is an employer contribution which anticipates future costs. A fund accumulates which earns investment income, thus reducing the ultimate cost.

Calculating the appropriate contribution requires that projections or assumptions be made as to future experience. Some items, such as mortality rates, can be predicted fairly accurately. Others, such as future salary increases, are, of course, subject to considerable error. It will be useful to identify the assumptions used, particularly since broad questions of fiscal policy are implicit in certain of the assumptions.

It should be noted that our assumptions are identical to those used in our previous valuation, as of December 31, 1969.

We assumed that mortality rates would conform with the Group Annuity Mortality Table for 1951, projected to 1960 , set back 5 years for females. This has proven to be a reasonable basis for predicting the current mortality of white collar groups. It is one of the tables in general use in valuing pension plans in the United States.

We have assumed employees will become disabled according to the following rates:

| $\frac{\text { Age }}{}$ | Rate $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 37 | .1 |
| 42 | .1 |
| 47 | .2 |
| 52 | .6 |
| 57 | 1.1 |
| 62 | 3.2 |

These rates are based on Railroad Retirement studies and are generally conservative - that is, they predict fairly high rates of disability. It is one of the tables in general use today.

## Salary Projections

The System provides benefits that are based on the three highest years' salary for each employee. To assume that each employee's salary will be the same in the three years before retirement as it is today would therefore seriously understate the System's cost. Accordingly, we use a salary projection to anticipate future increases in earnings. Additionally, it is appropriate to compute pension cost level as a percentage of payroll rather than level as a dollar amount, and a salary projection is also used for this purpose. If the cost were calculated as a level dollar amount for an individual, the cost might be a high percent of his pay when he was young and a lower percent of his higher salary at a later age. By use of a salary projection, the contribution for an individual, all other things remaining the same, tends to stay at the same percentage over the years

How to project future salaries is a major policy question. To what extent should one seek to anticipate, through present contributions, the full impact on pension costs of future salary changes?

For purposes of our cost determination, we have ignored the effect of general salary (as opposed to career type) increases in the future. It is our feeling that the State should not set aside today's "hard" dollars to meet comparatively "soft" dollar obligations in the future. Rather, such benefits should be funded with the same, post inflation dollars that gave rise to those benefits

Our basic calculation therefore reflects salary increases only as the result of longevity and promotions. The scale has relatively greater increases at the younger ages to correspond with the State's salary schedules, which have only seven steps in each salary group. The salary scale factors are:

| Age |
| ---: |
| 22 |
| 27 |
| 32 |
| 37 |
| 42 |
| 47 |
| 52 |
| 57 |
| 62 |

Present Salary as a \% of Age 65 Salary $48.4 \frac{1}{0}$ 56.8 65.1 73.4 81.8 89.4 95.0 98.

As will appear, the problem of salary projection has a parallel in the question of choosing an assumption as to future investment yield and the two are somewhat interrelated.

## Termination Rates

In any employee group, many employees will terminate and receive less than full benefits. Employees terminating with less than ten years of active service, for example, receive only a refund of their contributions. The termination assumption anticipates the release of State funds that may have been accumulated for such people, thus resulting in a reduced
ongoing cost. Our termination data, although limited, showed quite high turnover rates for new employees. As a result, we decided to include no cost for employees with less than one year of service. For employees with more than one year of service, we assumed that terminations each year from all causes except retirement would be as follows:

| Age |
| ---: |
| 22 |
| 27 |
| 32 |
| 37 |
| 42 |
| 47 |
| 52 |
| 57 |
| 62 |


| Rate (\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Men | Women |
| 6.0\% | $7.9 \%$ |
| 5.1 | 7.7 |
| 4.8 | 7.0 |
| 4.4 | 6.0 |
| 3.9 | 4.9 |
| 3.2 | 3.9 |
| 1.7 | 2.7 |
| 2.4 | 2.4 |
| 5.1 | 5.1 |

These rates are moderately high.

## Retirement Ages

The System provides unreduced benefits as early as age 55 for men, 50 for women and 47 for State police. Experience in recent years, however, has been that, on the average, men retire around age 62 and women at a slightly younger age. We have assumed men will retire when they are both over age 60 and have completed 30 years of service, but not later than age 65 with 10 years of service. Women, we have assumed, will retire at age 60 , or completion of 10 years of service if later. State police retirements are assumed to occur when the officer is both age 52 and has 25 years of service. In any case where the employee already meets these assumed conditions of age and service, it is projected that he will retire immediately.

## Post-Retirement Increases

Cost-of-living increases are regularly provided to pensioners. Our calculation assumes no future benefit increases due to changes in the cost of living. The reasons for this are the same as the ones given above for omitting general increases from the salary scale.

## Investment Yield

Investment yield has a profound effect on the ultimate cost of a retirement system. In general, if a system is actuarially funded (so that it has a substantial reserve which is earning an investment yield), a yield of $5 \%$ - in contrast to a $4 \%$ yield - will reduce cost by $16-20$ percent.

An assumption must be made concerning future yields. It must be a rate that will be valid for the long run, that is, not only for money invested today or next year, but also for money invested 10 and 20 years from now.

We selected an interest rate assumption of $4 \%$ per year for our calculation. In the light of current practices, the $4 \%$ assumption is conservative, that is, it projects higher contribution requirements tha would a $41 / 2 \%$ or $5 \%$ assumption, both of which are in current usage. On the other hand, we have made our calculation without including the ultimate effect of continuing general increases in salary levels. As explained earlier, that fact tends to understate the actual cost that will emerge. The two factors are - in a very broad sense - compensating.

## Funding Method

We have used the "entry age normal cost method of funding." This method spreads the cost of the benefits to be provided to an individual as a level percentage of his pay from his date of employment to his assumed date of retirement. The normal cost for the entire system is equal to the sum of the normal costs for all participants. In a rough sense, it can be visualized as the cost of benefits earned during the current year.

The past service liability represents the amount by which the future normal costs fall short of meeting the cost of future benefit payments. It can also be viewed, roughly, as the value of benefits accrued for service prior to the valuation date.

We believe that our assumptions, taken as a whole, are reasonable. To the extent that actual experience is better or worse than assumed, gains or losses will develop, with appropriate decreases or increases in future costs.

## Missing Data

It was also necessary to make certain "non-actuarial" assumptions where data was missing or incomplete. In all cases, we assumed such individuals had the same characteristics as other participants, taking into account the known characteristics (e.g. male members age 37 with unknown service were assumed to have the same service distribution as male members age 37 with known service). We also made an adjustment for purchased service and estimated the current value of each employee's past contributions.

## Results of Valuation

The plan provides benefits on four different occurrences: retirement, death, disability, and withdrawal from employment. We calculated costs separately for each of these types of benefits. The cost factors are shown in Table 8. As previously indicated in our discussion of employee turnover, these cost factors do not include either State or employee contributions for employees with less than one year of service.

The costs are based on the following distribution of salaries and employees by plan. Excluded are employees with less than one year of service and employees who have not elected to be covered under the System.

|  | Number |  | Total Salary |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 719 |  | $\$, 393,100$ |
| Police | 19,139 |  | $199,097,300$ |
| Part C | $\underline{10,682}$ |  | $107,334,800$ |
|  | 30,540 | $\$ 314,825,200$ |  |

Table 8
Summary of Cost Factors as of December 31, 1972

| Item | Retirement <br> Benefits | Death <br> Benefits | Disability Benefits | Withdrawal Benefits | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Service Cost -- |  |  |  |  |  |
| Police | \$ 1,430,300 | \$ 63,700 | \$ 14,000 | \$ 95,300 | \$ 1,603,300 |
| Part B | 15,995,800 | 219,800 | 2,397,600 | 2,875,200 | 21,488,400 |
| Part C | 12,178,800 | 277,200 | 1,753,600 | 1,343,400 | 15,553,000 |
| Total | \$ 29,604,900 | \$ 560,700 | \$4,165,200 | \$ 4,313,900 | \$38,644,700 |
| Less Employee Contributions Normal Cost to State |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r}-10,987,500 \\ \hline \$ 27,657,200\end{array}$ |
| Past Service Liability -- |  |  |  |  |  |
| Police | \$ 25,804,300 | \$ 117,900 | \$ 89,100 | \$ ( 16,800 ) | \$ 25,994,500 |
| Part B | 277,617,900 | 2,723,500 | 31,203,400 | 17,583,900 | 329,128,700 |
| Part C | 236,119,300 | 1,938,100 | 17,762,100 | ( 784,400 ) | 225,035,100 |
| Total Active Employees | \$539,541,500 | \$4,779,500 | \$49,054,600 | \$16,782,700 | \$610,158,300 |
| Vested Former Employees |  |  |  |  | 6,650,300 |
| Pensioners |  |  |  |  | 334,119,700 |
| Beneficiaries |  |  |  |  | 4,521,700 |
| Total Past Service Liability |  |  |  |  | \$955,450,000 |
| Less Assets in Fund |  |  |  |  | 66,369,900 |
| Unfunded Past Service |  |  |  |  | \$889,080,100 |
| Liability |  |  |  |  |  |
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The normal cost to the State is $8.8 \%$ ( $\$ 27.7$ million) of the payroll of participating employees with at least one year of service. This is slightly higher than the $8.5 \%$ figure in 1969 . However, the difference is entirely attributable to the shift from Part B to the higher cost Part $C$ and the increase in the Social Security wage base from $\$ 7,800$ in 1970 to $\$ 12,600$ in 1974 (which decreases Part B employee contributions without decreasing the Part B benefits payable).

The past service liability for benefits earned before 1973 totals almost a billion dollars - $\$ 955,450,000$. About $35 \%-\$ 339,119,700-$ of this represents the value of benefits to present pensioners. That sum of about a third-of-a-billion dollars is the amount required to meet lifetime payments to present pensioners, if one were to assume no additional contributions. The calculation of that lump-sum takes account of the monthly benefit amount of each pensioner, the life expectancy of each pensioner, based on sex and attained age, and investment yield of $4 \%$ on the sum before it is expended in pension payments. Three years ago the pensioner liability was $30 \%$ of the total. This shows that over time the pensioners become an increasing burden compared to the employees actively at work for the State - a key factor in the decision to adopt level funding.

As an offset to this liability, there are assets in the State Employees' Retirement Fund of $\$ 66.4$ million. The unfunded past service liability of the System is therefore $\$ 889.1$ million. (This does not represent a deficit in the usual sense -- it is a calculated amount used to establish the required level of pension fund contributions).

The scheduled State contribution for the 1974-75 fiscal year is $\$ 39,697,600$, calculated as follows:

## Item

(1) Payroll, 12/31/72
(2) Normal cost to State
(3) Unfunded past service liability
(4) Payment on unfunded liability*
5) Total annual cost $=$ (2) $+(4)$ Adjustment for future transfer of Part B members to Part $C$
7) Adjustment for amendment revising postretirement cost-ofliving calculation

Total annual cost, adjusted $=(5)+(6)+(7)$

75,399,000
$17 \%$

88,216,800
11) Scheduled portion of total cost to be contributed
$45 \%$

39,697,600
(9) Estimated payroll increase, $12 / 31 / 72$ to Fiscal 1974-75

45
Scheduled contribution
Fiscal 1974-75 $=$
(10) $\times(11)$

응 of 12/31/72 Payroll

## \$314,825,200

27,657,200
$8.78 \%$
$889,080,100$
13.72
22.50
$70,850,000$

799,000

Several items in the above schedule require explanatory comments.

As discussed in Section III on Employee Data, far more pensions are awarded under Part $C$ than would be expected from the active employee data. In Fiscal 1972-73, it was decided to make advance allowance for transfers, since it was clear that they were going to continue to occur. In this way, the State will not be faced with an unexpected additional cost as members convert to Part $C$. We have calculated that the added cost of these transfers is $\$ 1,198,500$. This is the increase in State normal cost plus 40 year amortization payment if Part B employees transfer to Part C in sufficient numbers to make the non-police active group $60 \%$ Part $C$. The cost of potential future transfers is being added in three annual steps. Fiscal 1974-75 is the second year of the transition, so the cost included in line (6) is two-thirds of $\$ 1,198,500$, or $\$ 799,000$.

Public Act 534 of 1973 changed the frequency of cost-of-living increases to pensioners. The retirement law requires that this improvement be funded. Since there is no specific allowance for increases in the cost of living in the actuarial assumptions, the added cost of this amendment is not automatically reflected in the valuation. We have estimated that, with $3 \%$ or greater annual inflation, the level added cost of the change is $\$ 3,750,000$. This amount is included as line (7), above. (With regard to this act, we note that the Fiscal 1973-74 appropriation of $\$ 350,000$ was well below the required contri-/ bution. The calculations assume that an additional amount will be appropriated for that fiscal year.)

Our data included salaries as of December 31, 1972. Obviously, the covered payroll in Fiscal 1974-75 will be higher. . Based on the changes in payroll that occurred from 1969 to 1972 , we have estimated that the 1974-75 payroll will be $17 \%$ higher than the pay rates at the end of 1972. Since the costs are intended to remain level as a percent of payroll, we have applied this $17 \%$ increase to the costs as calculated as of December 31, 1972 in arriving at the 1974-75 contribution.

The 23.95 percent of payroll cost is very close to what we would have predicted based on our previous valuation. This indicates that our actuarial assumptions are, in total working out to be quite reasonable. We recommend that no changes be made at the present time in those assumptions.

## Disability Experience

The Commission has been studying the incidence of disability pension awards, with an eye to possible recommendations for changes in the retirement law.

In 1972, there were 215 new disability pensions -- about $16 \%$ of all new pension awards in the year. Applying our assumed disability rates (which are conservative for most private employment), we would have expected only 75 new disabilities, which is less than half the actual number. This confirms what previous studies have indicated was likely there are far more disability pensions than is customary in most pension plans.

Note that is spite of this we have not recommended a change in the assumed disability rates. This reflects our belief that the assumptions in total are reasonable. While we are clearly understating the disability cost, we do not suggest that changes be made in one or two assumptions under these circumstances. If at a future date a major overhaul of assumptions is indicated, we would then recommend that the disability rates be increased significantly. For now, however, we reiterate that there is sufficient margin in the other assumptions to compensate for the understatement of the disability cost.

## Reimbursement Rate

Throughout the State, there are various programs which are billed at "full cost," rather than the fraction of cost that the State contributes to the Retirement Fund. The full cost figure is $23.95 \%$ of payroll, based on the actual valuation, as shown on line (8), above. However, this figure is overstated for such programs, since the unfunded liability is based on the actual assets (which include contributions at less than the full actuarial cost). We estimate that, if the State had been contributing the full cost, the actuarial cost would instead be $22.3 \%$ of payroll, and we recommend that outside programs be billed at this rate starting July 1, 1974. (Note that this is the same as the rate currently in effect.)

## Overall Status of System

We believe that the State is progressing as expected on its plan to put the System on a sound financial basis, and look forward to assisting the Commission as it continues towards this goal.

## MARTIN E. SEGAL COMPANY

GONSULTANTS AND ACTUARIES
100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA - hARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103 - (203) 522-0125

November 20, 1973


CONNECTICUT STATE EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM

## Actuarial Valuation

This is to certify that we have prepared an actuarial valuation of the System as of December 31, 1972, taking into account the amendments adopted in the 1973 Session of the General Assembly.
The valuation was made with respect to the following participants as of the valuation date:
a. 8,731 pensioners (including 173 beneficiaries of deceased pensioners and active employees)
b. 33,455 active employees
c. $\quad 232$ inactive employees with vested right to immediate or deferred pension

The cost factors as of the valuation date and scheduled contribution for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 1974 are as follows:

1. Current service cost.................................... $\$ 38,644,700$
2. Projected employee contributions. .................... . . . $10,987,500$

3. Past service liability --
a. Active employees..

610,158,300
6,650,300

5. Assets in fund
6. Unfunded past service liability (Item 4e less Item 5)............................................... 889,080,100
7. Payment on unfunded liability (Amortization of Item 6 over 40 years from January 1,
1973)................................................................. 43,192,800 $70,850,000$
9. Adjustment for future transfer of Part B members to Part C...................
10. Adjustment for amendment revising

11. Total annual cost, adjusted (Item 8
12. Estimated payroll increase from valuation

75,399,000
date to contribution year..................
Total annual cost in contribur
(Item 11 increased by Item 12 percentage)...
14. Scheduled portion of total cost to be paid
$17 \%$
$88,216,800$
5. Scheduled contribution for Fiscal Year
beginning July 1, 1974 (Item 13
times Item 14)
...................................

The actuarial assumptions and funding method are as follows:
Mortality rates -- Group Annuity Table for 1951, projected to 1960 , set projected to 1960 ,
females
Disability rates:

| Age | Rate (\%) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 37 | .1 |
| 42 | .1 |
| 47 | .2 |
| 52 | .6 |
| 57 | 1.1 |
| 62 | 3.2 |

$\qquad$

Termination rates before retirement, all causes (no cost included for 2,915 active employees with less than one year of actual State service):

| Age | Rate (\%) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Men | Women |
|  |  |  |
| 22 | 6.0 | 7.9 |
| 27 | 5.1 | 7.7 |
| 32 | 4.8 | 7.0 |
| 37 | 4.4 | 6.0 |
| 42 | 3.9 | 4.9 |
| 47 | 3.2 | 3.9 |
| 52 | 1.7 | 2.7 |
| 57 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| 62 | 5.1 | 5.1 |

Salary scale:

| Age | Present salary as a <br> 口of age 65 salary |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| 22 | 48.4 |
| 27 | 56.8 |
| 32 | 65.1 |
| 37 | 73.4 |
| 42 | 81.8 |
| 47 | 89.4 |
| 52 | 95.0 |
| 57 | 98.7 |
| 62 | 100.0 |

Retirement age -- Men: The earlier of
(1) age 60 and completion of 30 years of service (2) age 65 and completion of 10 years of service State police: Age 52 and completion of 25 years of service
Interest rate -- 4
Funding method - Entry age normal cost

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Thomas D. Levy, F.S.A. } \\
& \text { Actuary }
\end{aligned}
$$


[^0]:    * As used in this report, "state police" also includes certain

[^1]:    *Please refer to the "Actuarial Valuation" section of the report for definitions of these terms.

