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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, 1978.

Our report analyzes the actuarial status of the System, and determines the cost factors which are used to project contribution requirements for Fiscal 1980-81 for the Commission to certify to the Legislature.

The actuarial calculations which this report presents were directed by Sherman B. Lieberman, F.S.A., M.A.A.A.

We received a great deal of help from State employees in obtaining the information which forms the basis of this report. Most important, Mrs 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 ASSUMPTIONS AND METHODS
VII. RESULTS OF VALUATION
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This valuation and this report were completed, except for editorial review of the text, prior to the decision of the Federal District Court in Pineman v. Oechslin. This valuation and this report, accordingly, do not account or or otherwise reflect that court decision--which invalidated the attempt of the Legislature in 1975 to reinstate the age 55 requirement for unreduced
benefits to employees retiring after July 1,1980 as to persons already employed at the time the Legislature so acted. The cost effects of the application of this decision will be treated in separate reports to the Commission.

We will be pleased to meet with you to discuss this report at your convenience.
Sincerely yours,
MARTIN E. SEGAL COMPANY, INCORPORATED


Senior Vice President
SGS/1f

## 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 -- Plan B, providing benefits coordinated with Social Security, and Plan C, providing maximum benefits. Employees contribute 5 per cent of their annual earnings, except that Plan B members contribute only 2 per cent on earnings covered under Social Security (with the 5 per cent rate applying to any excess earnings).

The System provides unreduced benefits of 2 per cent per year of service. Such benefits are available to members at least 55 with 25 years of service or age 65 with 10 years of service. State police can retire at age 47 if they have 20 years of service, at 50 per cent of salary plus 2 per cent for each year of service over 20.* Benefits are based on the average of the highest 3 years' earnings. After retirement, "cost-of-living increases" amounting to 3 per cent per year are provided, independent of actual changes in the Consumer Price Index.

The Plan also provides non-service-connected disability and vested benefits after 5 and 10 years of service, respectively, and serviceconnected disability pensions with no minimum service requirement.

## Employee Data

We received data on 43,855 active employees as of December 31, 1978 who were participating in the State System. Their average salary was $\$ 12,700$. (We excluded 4,114 members from the calculation because they had less than one year of service, leaving 39,741 active employees included in the valuation.) On the average, the participants were age 42 and had 9 years of service. This average salary has increased by 20 per cent since our last valuation, three years ago.
*As used in this report, "state police" also includes certain correctional department employees described in Section 5-173 for retirement (but not survivor) benefits.

We received data on 13,328 pensioners and 280 beneficiaries as of December 31, 1978. The pensioners' average monthly benefit was $\$ 428$. In the last three years, the number of pensioners has increased by 6.1 per cent per year, the average benefit by 4.6 per cent per year, and the total annual payment level by 10.9 per cent per year. Of all the pensioners on the rolls, 8 per cent had retired in 1978.

## Retirement Fund

As of December 31, 1978, the Fund had assets of $\$ 200$ million (at adjusted cost value) available as an offset to the actuarial liabilities for future benefits.

## Actuarial Valuation

Our valuation was prepared as of December 31, 1978. Our calculations were based on what we believe are reasonable assumptions as to expected future experience. The assumptions are the same as those used in our previous actuarial valuation with the exception of a modified salary scale and Social Security wage base, the plan transfer assumption, and the assumed post-retirement cost-of-living adjustments. 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 normal cost* to the State is $\$ 49$ million. This is 8.86 per cent of the payroll of participating employees.

The past service liability* is $\$ 1.998$ billion of which $\$ 875$ million represents the liability for pensioners currently on the rolls. The unfunded past service liability at the end of 1978 was $\$ 1.798$ billion.

[^0]The value of the System's vested benefits is $\$ 1.374$ billion. Thus the assets are short of this amount by $\$ 1.174$ billion.

Based on the normal cost plus 40 year amortization of the unfunded past service liability, the annual cost to the State as of January 1, 1979 is $\$ 169$ million or 30.32 per cent of covered payroll. This amount is in addition to the required employee contributions.

## Coverage

Virtually all non-teaching employees of the State are 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 "Plan $B$," which provides benefits integrated with Social Security benefits, or "Plan 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 Plan $B$ to Plan C.

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

Employee Contributions

State police and Plan C employees contribute 5 per cent of their salary. Plan $B$ employees contribute 2 per cent of that part of their earnings on which Social Security contributions are deducted plus 5 per cent on salary in excess of that amount. In addition, State police contribute $13 / 4$ per cent 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 employees at age 55*, and after 10 years of service to 65*-year-olds. Benefits are computed on "base salary" -- the average salary of the three highest years of State service.
*The age requirement is five years lower for retirements prior to July 1, 1980.

Plan C members receive a pension of 2 per cent of base pay per year of service. Plan $B$ members receive the same benefit until age 65, at which time their benefit is recomputed based on 1 per cent of the first $\$ 4,800$ of base pay plus 2 per cent 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 per cent of base salary plus 2 per cent of salary per year of service over 20 .

Employees retiring after age 70* with at least 5 years of service receive a benefit of $21 / 2$ per cent of salary ( $1 / 4$ per cent on the first $\$ 4,800$ under Plan B) per year of service (maximum 20 years) if this will provide a larger benefit. Those retiring after age 55* with 10 but less than 25 years of service receive reduced benefits at rates which vary from 1 per cent to 1.99 per cent of salary.

Note that Plan 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 Plan B contributions are decreased but the Plan 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 spouse after his death.

If a pensioner dies before a fixed portion (currently 25 per cent) 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 3 per cent each year, starting

[^1]with the first January 1 or July 1 following nine months of retirement. This increase is provided regardless of the actual changes in the Consumer Price Index.*

## Disability Benefits

A member who becomes unable to perform. his job due to disability will get a pension if he has five years of service. The five-year service requirement does not apply if the disability was job-connected. After two years of payments, the employee must be totally disabled for this coverage to continue. The benefit formula is 3 per cent of base salary for each year of service, but not more than $12 / 3$ per cent of base salary for each year of service the employee would have had if he had continued to work until age 60 . For service-connected disability, the benefit is $12 / 3$ per cent of base salary for each year of service projected as if the employee worked to age 60 . There are also certain limits to the disabled pensioner's total income including Social Security, outside earnings, workers' compensation, and pension.

## 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 spouse. The widow of a policeman receives $\$ 275$ per month, 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 terminated 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 contri-
*Under most collective bargaining agreements, employees who retire prior to January 1, 1980 are eligible for "cost-of-living" adjustments based on actual changes in the CPI (minimum 3\%, maximum 5\%).
butions. Any other former employee is entitled only to a refund of his contributions, unless he is already eligible for a pension.

## Changes since December 31, 1975

In the period following our prior valuation, there have been these two significant changes in the benefits of the System which affect the actuarial cost determination:

1. Interim legislative action as well as subsequent collective bargaining agreements effectively increased the post-retirement cost-of-living adjustments for all participants retiring before January 1, 1980 while preserving the flat 3 per cent per year formula for retirements after that date. The pre-1980 formula provides for full annual CPI adjustments with a minimun increase of 3 per cent and a maximum of 5 per cent in each year of retirement.
2. In the case of Fitzpatrick v. Bitzer, it was held that the System discriminated against male employees by requiring them to work until higher ages than were required of women for the same benefits. In 1975, the legislature responded to this decision by providing that the benefits formerly payable to women would be payable to all employees retiring before July 1 , 1980. The former male level of benefits was made applicable to retirements by all employees on and after that date.

Collective bargaining agreements recognized the post June 30, 1980 reversion to the pre-Fitzpatrick benefit levels adding a grandfather provision permitting employees eligible for retirement on Junne 30, 1980 to have their benefit percentages frozen as a minimum guarantee if they were to retire at a later date. Both the benefit level reversion and the grandfather provision are accounted for in this valuation for the first time.

We received data on 43,855 State employees participating in the System as of December 31, 1978. The data included age, service, sex, salary, and retirement plan for each of them. The average salary of the participants was $\$ 12,700$, a 20 per cent increase over the average salary of $\$ 10,600$ three years ago.

As part of our turnover assumption, we take no cost for members with less than a full year of actual state service. There were 4,114 members for whom we took no cost. This left 39,741 employees to be included in the valuation. In our valuations as of December 31, 1975 and 1972 there were 32,158 and 30,540 such members respectively -reflecting a significantly greater expansion ( 24 per cent) of the work force during the last three years as compared to the three-year period ended December 31, 1975 (5 per cent).

The distribution of members by retirement plan has also fluctuated noticeably since 1969. The percentage membership in each plan as of the indicated valuation dates is shown below:

| Retirement | As of December 31 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plan | 1969 | 1972 | 1975 | 1978 |
| Police | 2.2\% | 2.4\% | 2.5\% | 2.0\% |
| Plan B | 73.1 | 62.0 | 57.4 | 61.2 |
| Plan C | 24.7 | 35.6 | 40.1 | 36.8 |

It can be seen that the trend exhibited in the past of movement from Plan $B$ to Plan C by members nearing retirement is being offset in the overall distribution by new entrants electing to participate in Plan B. This is apparently in reaction to the rapid escalation of the Social Security wage base since the passage of the 1977 Social Security amendments. New employees are not willing to contribute the extra 3 per cent of pay below the FICA base ( $\$ 22,900$ in 1979 and rising to $\$ 29,700$ in 1981) in order to qualify for the additional Plan C benefits.

Switching from Plan B to Plan C continues to be a good buy for current retirees as the payments required by the member are based on the much lower prior FICA salary bases than apply today. In fact, the Retirement Division reports that roughly 65 per cent of new pensioners are under Plan C -- compared with 60 per cent reported three years ago. We are continuing to make adjustments to our plan transfer assumptions to conform with the external factors which have an impact on the System's operations. These are discussed later in this report in the section that treats assumptions and methods.

Tables 1A, 1B, and 1C give age, service, and salary statistics by retirement plan. Tables 2A, 2B, and 2 C give summary statistical data by retirement plan. In these tables, "normal" retirement means retirement at the unreduced rate of 2 per cent (or more) per year of service.

It should be noted that the problems encountered in assembling the data for our actuarial studies remain as significant as when actuarial studies were begun nine years ago. The Retirement Division does not have a single record of the age, service, sex, plan and salary for each participant, nor does such a record exist elsewhere in the State. As a result, records have to be assembled from the payroll and personnel department each time a valuation is done. Then each employee's several records must be combined into a single record. We believe that the overall efficiency of the Retirement Division could be improved, and that the valuations could be produced earlier and at lower cost, if there were a master retirement record available in computer-applicable form for each employee. We understand that the State has undertaken such a program and recommend it be carried to completion.

ALL PARTICIPANTS*

| Age | Total | Years of service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-14 | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35 and over | Unknown |
| Total | 43,855 | 14,876 | 9,080 | 7,110 | 3,437 | 2,251 | 986 | 538 | 193 | 5,384 |
|  | \$12,700 | \$ 9,900 | \$12,800 | \$14,700 | \$15,800 | \$17,000 | \$18,200 | \$18,200 | \$17,100 | \$12,000 |
| Under 20 | $\begin{array}{r} 343 \\ \$ 7,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 327 \\ \$ 6,900 \end{array}$ |  | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 16 $\$ 8,500$ |
| 20-24 | 3,327 8,600 | 2,921 8,500 | 118 $\$ 10,100$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 288 8,900 |
| 25-29 | 5,377 10,400 | 3,591 9,900 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,154 \\ 11,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 68 \\ \$ 12,400 \end{array}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 564 \\ 10,500 \end{array}$ |
| 30-34 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,891 \\ 12,700 \end{array}$ | 2,139 11,500 | 1,537 13,200 | 796 15,100 | 55 $\$ 14,800$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 364 \\ 12,300 \end{array}$ |
| 35-39 | 4,353 13,500 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,398 \\ 10,600 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,106 \\ 14,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,119 \\ 15,700 \end{array}$ | 407 16,400 | 52 $\$ 15,400$ | -- | -- | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 271 \\ 12,000 \end{array}$ |
| 40-44 | 4,050 14,200 | 1,090 10,500 | 869 14,100 | 877 16,200 | 568 16,800 | 385 18,300 | 44 $\$ 17,200$ | -- | -- | 217 11,300 |
| 45-49 | 4,570 13,900 | 1,071 10,100 | 976 13,200 | 941 15,400 | 537 16,700 | 494 17,100 | 231 18,100 | 54 $\$ 19,100$ | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 266 \\ 10,500 \end{array}$ |
| 50-54 | 4,751 13,600 | 922 9,800 | 1,057 12,000 | 1,088 14,500 | 605 16,200 | 432 17,800 | 240 18,100 | 148 16,700 | 11 $\$ 14,000$ | 248 11,100 |
| 55-59 | 4,248 13,100 | 684 9,700 | 968 11,300 | 968 13,000 | 549 14,900 | 396 16,200 | 237 19,100 | 157 18,400 | 56 14,800 | 233 10,700 |
| 60-64 | 2,645 13,000 | 320 10,800 | 636 11,600 | 685 13,100 | 348 13,500 | 266 14,800 | 103 16,800 | 97 18,700 | 64 17,900 | 126 10,100 |
| 65 and over | 628 13,400 | 57 10,700 | 147 12,000 | 157 13,000 | 91 13,400 | 59 14,600 | 35 16,000 | 26 21,200 | 25 18,200 | 31 12,000 |
| Unknown | $\begin{array}{r} 4,672 \\ 13,700 \end{array}$ | 356 11,800 | $\begin{array}{r} 512 \\ 14,100 \end{array}$ | 411 13,700 | 277 15,600 | 167 18,400 | $\begin{array}{r} 96 \\ 19,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 56 \\ 18,500 \end{array}$ | 37 19,600 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,760 \\ 13,100 \end{array}$ |

*Includes 873 Police members.
CONNECTICUT SERS

PLAN B

| Age | Tota1 | Years of service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-14 | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35 and over | Unknown |
| Total | 26,824 | 10,000 | 4,058 | 4,261 | 2,373 | 1,433 | 553 | 266 | 57 | 3,823 |
|  | \$13,000 | \$ 9,800 | \$13,400 | \$15,700 | \$16,800 | \$18,000 | \$19,700 | \$19,300 | \$19,000 | \$12,100 |
| Under 20 | 269 $\$ 7,200$ | $\begin{array}{r} 256 \\ \$ 7,200 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | -- | -- | -- | 13 $\$ 7,200$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2,556 \\ & 8,300 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,245 \\ & 8,200 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 73 \\ \$ 10,300 \end{array}$ |  | -- |  | -- | -- | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 238 \\ 8,700 \end{array}$ |
| 20-24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25-29 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,022 \\ 10,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,756 \\ & 9,700 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 761 \\ 12,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 54 \\ \$ 13,000 \end{array}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 451 \\ 10,400 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30-34 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,408 \\ 13,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,577 \\ 11,500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 886 \\ 13,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 615 \\ 15,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 51 \\ \$ 15,000 \end{array}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 279 \\ 12,100 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 2,932 \\ 14,200 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 943 \\ 10,800 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 606 \\ 14,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 806 \\ 16,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 339 \\ 17,200 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 44 \\ \$ 15,300 \end{array}$ | -- | -- | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 194 \\ 11,900 \end{array}$ |
| 35-39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 2,693 \\ 15,200 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 669 \\ 10,400 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 444 \\ 14,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 645 \\ 17,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 440 \\ 17,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 306 \\ 19,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 38 \\ \$ 17,500 \end{array}$ | -- | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 151 \\ 11,600 \end{array}$ |
| 40-44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 2,608 \\ 14,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 549 \\ 10,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 350 \\ 13,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 633 \\ 16,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 416 \\ 17,700 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 340 \\ 18,200 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 146 \\ 19,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34 \\ \$ 19,700 \end{array}$ | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 140 \\ 10,200 \end{array}$ |
| 45-49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 2,341 \\ 14,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 362 \\ 9,700 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 317 \\ 12,800 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 621 \\ 15,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 425 \\ 16,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 270 \\ 18,700 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 141 \\ 20,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 89 \\ 18,200 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ \$ 9,400 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 114 \\ 11,800 \end{array}$ |
| 50-54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 1,770 \\ 14,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 239 \\ 9,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 220 \\ 11,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 425 \\ 14,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 329 \\ 15,500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 247 \\ 16,500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 127 \\ 21,800 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 75 \\ 19,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20 \\ 14,800 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 88 \\ 10,700 \end{array}$ |
| 55-59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 921 \\ 13,500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 131 \\ 11,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 139 \\ 11,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 227 \\ 12,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 174 \\ 14,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 113 \\ 15,500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 38 \\ 17,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 40 \\ 20,200 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ 21,500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 43 \\ 8,700 \end{array}$ |
| 60-64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 197 \\ 12,800 \end{array}$ | 308,400 | 2812,000 | $\begin{array}{r} 41 \\ 13,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 41 \\ 14,800 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18 \\ 13,700 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 12,700 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 18,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 19,000 \end{array}$ | 109,100 |
| 65 and over |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 3,107 \\ 13,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 243 \\ 12,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 234 \\ 14,400 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 194 \\ 14,200 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 158 \\ 16,900 \end{array}$ | 9520,700 | 4820,300 | $\begin{array}{r} 22 \\ 19,700 \end{array}$ | 1124,800 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,102 \\ 13,200 \end{array}$ |
| Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

CONNECTICUT SERS

PLAN C

| Age | Total | Years of service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-14 | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35 and over | Unknown |
| Total | $\begin{array}{r} 16,158 \\ \$ 12,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,698 \\ \$ 10,200 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,797 \\ \$ 12,400 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,617 \\ \$ 13,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 944 \\ \$ 13,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 748 \\ \$ 15,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 425 \\ \$ 16,300 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 270 \\ \$ 17,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 136 \\ \$ 16,400 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,523 \\ \$ 11,800 \end{array}$ |
| Under 20 | 74 $\$ 6,400$ | \$ $\begin{array}{r}71 \\ \$ 6,000\end{array}$ | -- | -- | - | --- | --- | $\bigcirc$ | --- | 3 $\$ 14,300$ |
| 20-24 | 724 9,300 | $\begin{array}{r} 632 \\ 9,300 \end{array}$ | 45 $\$ 9,700$ | -- | --- | -- | -- | --- | --- | 47 9,900 |
| 25-29 | 1,218 10,900 | 744 10,500 | 356 11,700 | 13 $\$ 10,400$ | -- | -- | --- | --- | -- | 105 10,800 |
| 30-34 | 1,290 12,100 | 526 11,300 | 544 12,800 | 139 13,100 | 4 $\$ 12,800$ | -- | -- | -- | --- | 77 12,700 |
| 35-39 | 1,200 12,300 | 449 10,100 | 431 13,500 | 194 13,900 | 45 13,600 | 8 $\$ 16,400$ | - | - | - | 73 12,500 |
| 40-44 | 1,228 12,600 | 420 10,600 | 415 13,500 | 177 14,100 | 70 15,200 | 78 14,400 | 6 $\$ 14,800$ | -- | -- | 62 10,300 |
| 45-49 | 1,880 12,700 | 522 10,100 | 626 13,100 | 295 14,200 | 93 14,300 | 116 15,700 | 85 16,600 | 20 $\$ 17,900$ | -- | 123 10,700 |
| 50-54 | 2,372 12,300 | 560 9,800 | 740 11,700 | 467 13,700 | 172 14,900 | 139 16,600 | 96 15,400 | 59 14,500 | 9 $\$ 15,100$ | 130 10,600 |
| 55-59 | 2,472 12,200 | 445 9,900 | 748 11,300 | 543 12,300 | 220 14,000 | 147 15,700 | 106 16,100 | 82 16,900 | 36 14,700 | 145 10,700 |
| 60-64 | 1,722 12,800 | 189 10,600 | 497 11,600 | 458 13,200 | 174 13,000 | 153 14,200 | 64 16,300 | 56 17,800 | 48 16,700 | 83 10,900 |
| 65 and over | 431 13,700 | 27 13,300 | 119 11,900 | 116 12,900 | [ $\begin{array}{r}50 \\ 12,200\end{array}$ | 41 15,000 | 20 18,600 | 20 22,100 | 17 17,800 | 21 13,400 |
| Unknown | 1,547 13,400 | 113 11,100 | 276 13,800 | 215 13,200 | 116 13,900 | 66 14,900 | 48 17,700 | 33 17,700 | 26 17,400 | $\begin{array}{r} 654 \\ 12,800 \end{array}$ |

Table 2A
Statistical Data on Active Employees
ALL PARTICIPANTS

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { December } 31, \\ 1978 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { December } 31, \\ 1975 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of covered employees | 43,855 | 34,294 |
| Total annual salary | \$556,243,500 | \$362,397,300 |
| Average annual salary | \$12,700 | \$10,600 |
| Average age | 42 | 43 |
| Average years of service ${ }^{+}$ | 9 | 9 |
| Number excluded from costs because of service less than one year | 4,114 | 2,136 |
| Number* eligible to retire on: <br> Normal retirement <br> Early retirement | $\begin{aligned} & 3,000 \\ & 4,013 \end{aligned}$ | 2,360 2,899 |
| Number* vested but not eligible to retire | 7,655 | 4,406 |

CONNECTICUT SERS +Includes purchased service adjustment.
*Based on plan in effect on valuation date. Includes only employees with known age and/or service.

Table 2B
Statistical Data on Active Employees
PLAN B

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { December } 31, \\ 1978 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{1975}{\text { December }} 31,$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of covered employees | 26,824 | 19,701 |
| Total annual salary | \$348,514,000 | \$209,169,700 |
| Average annual salary | \$13,000 | \$10,600 |
| Average age | 39 | 40 |
| Average years of service ${ }^{+}$ | 9 | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Number excluded from costs because of service less than one year | 2,903 | 1,456 |
| Number* eligible to retire on: Normal retirement | 1,219 | 884 |
| Early retirement | 2,317 | 1,685 |
| Number* vested but not eligible to retire | 5,435 | 3,101 |

CONNECTICUT SERS
+Includes purchased service adjustment.
*Based on plan in effect on valuation date. Includes only employees with known age and/or service

Table 2C
Statistical Data on Active Employees
PLAN C

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { December } 31, \\ 1978 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { December } 31, \\ 1975 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of covered employees | 16,158 | 13,746 |
| Total annual salary | \$198,233,300 | \$142,776,300 |
| Average annual salary | \$12,300 | \$10,400 |
| Average age | 461/2 | 471/2 |
| Average years of service ${ }^{+}$ | $9 \frac{1}{2}$ | 9 |
| Number excluded from costs because of service less than one year | 1,193 | 654 |
| Number* eligible to retire on: <br> Normal retirement <br> Early retirement | 1,724 1,688 | 1,438 1,204 |
| Number* vested but not eligible to retire | 1,688 1,853 | 1,204 1,036 |

CONNECTICUT SERS
+Includes purchased service adjustment.
*Based on plan in effect on valuation date. Includes only employees with known age and/or service.

## IV. RETIREE DATA

The data on retired members and beneficiaries included age, sex, monthly benefit, retirement date, option, and type of pension. It should be noted that the records on retired employees are generally complete and accessible.

The following are significant statistics on the retired group:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\begin{array}{c}
\text { December 31, } \\
1978
\end{array} \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$

Item
Pensioners:

Number
Average age
Average monthly benefit
Beneficiaries:

| Number | 280 | 262 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Average age | 73 | 71 |
| Average monthly benefit | $\$ 378$ | $\$ 237$ |

13,328
68
$\mathbf{\$}$ $\$ 428$

11,158

Average monthly benefit
\$378 237

Since 1975 the pension rolls have increased by 2,170 participants. Thus there has been a 19.4 per cent three-year increase -- a 6.1 per cent annual compound rate. The average benefit shows a 14.4 per cent increase ( 4.6 per cent per year). These two items have combined to increase the total pensioner payroll (excluding beneficiaries) from $\$ 4.2$ million to $\$ 5.7$ million per month. This is a 36.5 per cent increase in three years about 10.9 per cent per year. (This experience illustrates one of the main reasons for the transition to "level" actuarial funding of retirement costs -- to get away from the irregular severe year-to-year increases that necessarily occur on "pay-as-you-go" type funding.

Table 3 gives distributions of the 1,081 new 1978 pensions which were still in force at the end of the year by type of pension and amount. Table 4 does the same for age at retirement.

Table 5 gives distributions for all 13,328 pensions in force at the end of 1978 by type and amount. Tables 6 does the same thing by age.

In addition to the active employees, pensioners and beneficiaries, there are 164 former employees who are vested and therefore eligible for an immediate or deferred pension.

Tab1e 3
Pensions Awarded in the Year Ended December 31, 1978
by Type and by Month1y Amount

| Monthly amount | Total | Type of pension |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service <br> disability | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Regular } \\ & \text { disability } \end{aligned}$ | Police | Sec. 5-173 |
| Total | 1,081 | 1,006 | 9 | 37 | 16 | 13 |
| Under \$50 | 12 | 9 | -- | 3 | -- | -- |
| \$ 50- 99 | 23 | 20 | -- | 3 | -- | -- |
| 100-149 | 114 | 108 | -- | 6 | -- | -- |
| $150-199$ | 131 | 125 | - | 5 | -- | 1 |
| 200-249 | 138 | 133 | 3 | 2 | -- | -- |
| $250-299$ | 87 | 83 | 2 | 2 | -- | -- |
| $300-349$ | 82 | 77 | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| $350-399$ | 64 | 60 | -- | 4 | -- | -- |
| 400-449 | 59 | 55 | -- | 4 | -- | -- |
| $450-499$ | 56 | 53 | 2 | 1 | -- | -- |
| $500-599$ | 83 | 78 | 1 | 2 | -- | 2 |
| $600-699$ | 56 | 53 | -- | -- | 1 | 2 |
| $700-799$ | 37 | 31 | -- | -- | 4 | 2 |
| $800-899$ | 44 | 39 | -- | -- | 2 | 3 |
| $900-999$ | 31 | 25 | -- | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 1,000-1,099 | 19 | 17 | -- | -- | 2 | - |
| 1,100-1,199 | 11 | 8 | -- | -- | 2 | 1 |
| 1,200-1,299 | 8 | 8 | -- | -- | - | -- |
| 1,300-1,399 | 8 | 7 | -- | -- | 1 | -- |
| 1,400-1,499 | 7 | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 1,500-1,999 | 8 | 7 | -- | -- | 1 | -- |
| 2,000-2,499 | 3 | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |

CONNECTICUT SERS


CONNECTICUT SERS

Pensions in Force on December 31, 1978
by Type and by Monthly Amount

| Monthly amount | Total | Type of pension |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service disability | Regular disability | Police | Sec. 5-173 |
| Total | 13,328 | 11,462 | 370 | 1,252 | 144 | 100 |
| Under \$50 | 131 | 129 | -- | 2 | -- | -- |
| \$ 50- 99 | 750 | 733 | 2 | 15 | -- | -- |
| 100-149 | 1,189 | 1,129 | 14 | 46 | -- | -- |
| 150-199 | 1,215 | 1,096 | 17 | 101 | -- | 1 |
| 200-249 | 1,175 | 1,013 | 31 | 131 | -- | -- |
| 250-299 | 1,000 | 825 | 33 | 141 | 1 | -- |
| $300-349$ | 1,273 | 988 | 47 | 218 | 20 | -- |
| 350-399 | 961 | 728 | 52 | 167 | 12 | 2 |
| $400-449$ | 840 | 664 | 37 | 129 | 10 | -- |
| $450-499$ | 767 | 620 | 44 | 97 | 4 | 2 |
| $500-599$ | 1,170 | 1,005 | 42 | 103 | 5 | 15 |
| 600-699 | 774 | 675 | 20 | 44 | 6 | 29 |
| $700-799$ | 613 | 523 | 16 | 31 | 28 | 15 |
| $800-899$ | 431 | 378 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 19 |
| $900-999$ | 270 | 238 | 1 | 3 | 19 | 9 |
| 1,000-1,099 | 202 | 181 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 5 |
| 1,100-1,199 | 142 | 131 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 1 |
| 1,200-1,299 | 109 | 103 | 1 | 2 | 3 | -- |
| 1,300-1,399 | 71 | 66 | 2 | -- | 2 | 1 |
| 1,400-1,499 | 79 | 76 | -- | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1,500-1,999 | 140 | 135 | 1 | -- | 4 | - |
| 2,000-2,499 | 23 | 23 | -- | -- | -- | - |
| 2,500-2,999 | 2 | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 3,500-3,999 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- |

CONNECTICUT SERS

Pensions in Force on December 31, 1978
by Type and by Age

| Age on December 31, 1978 | Total | Type of pension |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular | Service disability | Regular disability | Police | Sec. 5-173 |
| Total | 13,328 | 11,462 | 370 | 1,252 | 144 | 100 |
| 25-29 | 3 | -- | 3 | -- | -- | -- |
| $30-34$ | 12 | -- | 10 | 2 | -- | -- |
| $35-39$ | 23 | -- | 14 | 9 | -- | -- |
| 40-44 | 50 | -- | 27 | 23 | - | -- |
| 45-49 | 120 | 1 | 43 | 61 | 8 | 7 |
| 50-54 | 822 | 613 | 40 | 110 | 44 | 15 |
| $55-59$ | 1,356 | 1,049 | 52 | 193 | 26 | 36 |
| 60-64 | 2,280 | 1,937 | 70 | 233 | 12 | 28 |
| $65-69$ | 3,129 | 2,787 | 49 | 255 | 27 | 11 |
| $70-74$ | 2,673 | 2,398 | 39 | 214 | 19 | 3 |
| $75-79$ | 1,673 | 1,545 | 11 | 110 | 7 | -- |
| 80-84 | 817 | 782 | 8 | 26 | 1 | -- |
| 85-89 | 296 | 280 | 3 | 13 | -- | -- |
| 90-94 | 64 | 60 | 1 | 3 | -- | -- |
| 95-99 | 5 | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 100-104 | 3 | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 105-109 | 2 | 2 | -- | -- | -- | - |

CONNECTICUT SERS
V. RETIREMENT FUND

The State Treasurer maintains the State Employees' Retirement Fund. The Retirement Division provided us with financial statements as of December 31, 1978

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 and available for reinvestment. 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

At December 31, 1978, the Fund Balance was \$202,375,700 at book value. A detailed breakdown of these assets is shown in Table 7. Three years ago the assets totalled $\$ 107,335,100$.

In prior valuations, assets were carried at book value as reported by the State Treasurer. After discussion with members of the Retirement Commission, it was agreed that for actuarial purposes a procedure should be used which would recognize the fair market value of all assets while minimizing cost fluctuations resulting from short-term market movements. Therefore beginning with this review, assets are carried at an "adjusted cost value" reflecting the capital appreciation or depreciation of the investment portfolio.

The adjusted cost value of assets as of December 31, 1978 was $\$ 200,036,800$; derived as follows:

## Determination of Adjusted Cost Value of Assets

1. Value of Fund at beginning of year
\$154,966,149
47,409,504
202,375,653
190,681,362
152,545,090
228,817,634
$(2,338,858)$
200,036,795

200,036,795
$(2,338,858)$

The preceding determination is used for two purposes:
(1) The adjusted cost value is applied to the System's total accrued liability to determine the unfunded accrued liability.
(2) The amount of write-up or write-down is considered part of the investment yield for the year. This procedure treats realized and unrealized capital gains on all investments equally.

Net investment income for the year ended December 31, 1978 totalled $\$ 10,285,500$ and represented an annual yield of 5.97 per cent at adjusted cost value. The total income consisted of interest and dividends amounting to $\$ 12,624,400$ (a return of 7.32 per cent) offset by the $\$ 2,338,900$ write-down.

## Table 7

Assets as of December 31, 1978

## Cash

Accounts receivable

## \$ 3,147,975

Investments
Mutual fixed income fund
Mutual equity fund
Short-term investment fund
Total assets at book value
Less: Accounts payable
Net assets at book value
(Market value $\$ 190,681,362$ )
Adjustment to adjusted cost value
Net assets at adjusted cost value

| $3,147,975$ <br> 9,018 |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 133,530,601$ <br> $55,331,469$ <br> $10,359,088$ | $199,221,158$ <br> $\$ 202,378,152$ <br> 2,500 |
|  | $\underline{\$ 202,375,652}$ <br> $\underline{\$ 200,338,857)}$ |
|  |  |

Note: Detail figures may not add to totals shown because of rounding.
CONNECTICUT SERS

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 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, and therefore 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 because broad questions of fiscal policy are implicit in certain of the assumptions

As noted earlier, with the exception of changes in salary scale and Social Security wage base, assumed plan transfers and the assumed post-retirement cost-of-1iving adjustments, the assumptions for this review are the same as those used in our previous valuation.

## Mortality Rates

We assumed that mortality rates would conform with the 1971 Group Annuity Mortality Table. This is a recently published table of pension plan mortality, and we believe it is a reasonable basis for anticipating experience under the System. It is one of the tables in general use in valuing pensions plans in the United States.

## 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 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 normal costs which are 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 per cent of his pay when he was young and a lower per cent 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 general salary changes?

For purposes of our cost determination, we have made a moderate allowance for general salary increases in the future. As a result of ecomonic changes and negotiated settlements occurring since our last review, this component has been increased from 3 per cent to $3 \mathrm{l} / 2$ per cent per annum. We also reflect salary increases 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:

| Present Salary as a \% of Age 65 Salary |  | Annual Increase (Rate \%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Assumptions | Old Assumptions | New Assumptions | 0ld Assumptions |
| 14.04 | 17.45 | 5.34 | 4.84 |
| 18.19 | 22.07 | 5.26 | 4.75 |
| 23.43 | 27.76 | 5.10 | 4.59 |
| 29.94 | 34.62 | 4.90 | 4.39 |
| 37.81 | 42.68 | 4.58 | 4.08 |
| 46.98 | 51.76 | 4.22 | 3.72 |
| 57.44 | 61.77 | 3.95 | 3.45 |
| 69.53 | 72.98 | 3.83 | 3.33 |
| 84.02 | 86.08 | 3.66 | 3.16 |

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 year 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. We assumed that terminations each year from all causes except retirement would be as follows:

## Rate (\%)

| Age | Death* | Disability | Withdrawal | Total* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | . 05 | . 06 | 5.44 | 5.55 |
| 25 | . 06 | . 09 | 5.29 | 5.44 |
| 30 | . 08 | . 11 | 5.07 | 5.26 |
| 35 | . 11 | . 15 | 4.70 | 4.96 |
| 40 | . 16 | . 22 | 4.19 | 4.57 |
| 45 | . 29 | . 36 | 3.54 | 4.19 |
| 50 | . 53 | . 61 | 2.47 | 3.61 |
| 55 | . 85 | 1.01 | . 94 | 2.80 |
| 60 | 1.31 | -- | -- | 1.31 |

*Rates shown are for men. Rates for women are slightly lower

We have assumed that future disabilities will occur at about the same rates as reported by the Social Security Administration. Service-connected disability rates comprise 50 per cent of disabilities for Police and 20 per cent for other participants.

The System provides unreduced benefits as early as age 55 for general employees and 47 for State police. Experience in recent years (both before and after the Fitzpatrick decision), however, has been that, on the average, general employees retire at age 61. We have therefore assumed employees will retire at age 61 , or completion of 10 years of service if later. State police retirements are assumed to occur when the officer is both age 53 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 assumed 3 per cent annual post-retirement increases as provided by Statute in respect of employees now active, and $41 / 2$ per cent increases for those current pensioners covered by the "up to 5 per cent" program. An additional liability allowance was held for employees active on December 31, 1978 who were known to have retired prior to December 31, 1979 under the "up to 5 per cent" cost-of-living program. (The previous valuation assumed 3 per cent increases for the current and future pensioners as provided by the Statute then in force.)

## Investment Return

Investment return has a major effect on the ultimate cost of a retirement system. In general, if a system is actuarially funded and if its invested assets cover a significant percentage of its liabilities, a yield of 6 per cent - in contrast to a 5 per cent yield - will reduce cost by $16-20$ per cent.

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 investment return assumption of $61 / 2$ per cent per year for our calculation. This assumption takes account of probable moderate long-term inflation but is not tied directly to the higher rates currently available.

## Social Security Wage Base

Plan B participants' contributions depend in part on the Social Security wage base in effect in any year, because a lower rate of contribution is required on salaries below that base. For our calculations, we assumed that the base would increase at the rate of $3 \mathrm{l} / 2$ per cent per year. This change from 3 per cent used in our previous review is consistent with the salary scale revisions described earlier.

## Transfers Between Plans

Plan B participants may transfer to Plan C prior to retirement by making up the difference in employee contributions (without interest) Experience indicates that this continues to be a common practice. As discussed in Section III, only 37 per cent of all participants are in Plan C, and yet 65 per cent of new retirements are under Plan C. Therefore, the reported costs for Plan B include a factor to cover the expectation that enough present Plan B members will transfer to Plan C at a later date to sustain a pattern of 60 per cent of retirements being under plan C. This assumption represents no change from our previous valuation. Because of changes in the Social Security law passed in 1977, however, we have added the following new assumption: 80 per cent of new entrants will elect coverage and retire under Plan $B$, with the remaining 20 per cent electing the higher employee contributions and retiring under Plan c.

## 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.

## Overall Actuarial Basis

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.

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 reported 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 normal cost to the State is 8.86 per cent ( $\$ 49.3$ million) of the payroll of participating employees. This is lower than the figure in 1975 of 9.21 per cent. The difference is attributable to (a) changes in the active employee group (the average entry age dropped a full year); (b) the change in the expected Plan $B$ elections of new members (with the cost reduction being more than offset by the decline in ultimate employee contributions); (c) the reduction in benefits after June 30, 1980 to the pre-Fitzpatrick male level (offset only partially by the grandfather guarantees), and, finally, (d) the one-half per cent increase in the salary scale assumption. .

A reconciliation of these changes is presented below:
State Normal Cost as \% of Participating Payroll

As of December 31, 1975
(a) lower entry-age of group
(b) change in Plan $B$ elections for new entrants
(.62)
new entrants
c) reduction in benefits
(d) one-half per cent increase in salary scale assumption
. .77

The past service liability totals nearly two billion dollars $\$ 1,997,991,700$. About 44 per cent - $\$ 874,786,700$ - of this represents the value of benefits to present pensioners. That sum of almost $\$ 900$ million is the amount required to meet lifetime payments to present pensioners, if one were to assume no additional contributions. The calculation of the lump sum takes account of the monthly benefit amount
of each pensioner, the life expectancy of each pensioner (based on sex and attained age), the applicable post-retirement cost-of-living adjustment, and an investment return of $61 / 2$ per cent on the sum before it is expended in pension payments. Three years ago the pensioner liability was 45 per cent of the total. This shows that over time the pensioners remain a substantial actuarial burden compared to the employees actively at work for the State - another 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 $\$ 200$ million at adjusted cost value. The unfunded past service liability of the System is therefore $\$ 1.798$ billion. (This does not represent an accounting deficit in the usual sense - it is a calculated value of earned pension credits that are due to be covered in future pension contributions expressly earmarked for amortization of this unfunded present value.) This compares with an unfunded liability reported as of December 31, 1975 of $\$ 1.162$ billion -- an increase of $\$ 636$ million. The bulk of this increase is attributed to two factors:
(a) Contributions to the System are currently being made on a transition basis -- that is, a specified (by statute) increasing percentage of "full cost" is deposited in each fiscal year. The difference between this deposit and the sum of normal cost and interest on the unfunded liability becomes an addition to the unfunded liability each year. (This addition has been estimated to be roughly $\$ 170$ million.)
(b) Average annual salaries have increased in the last three years by 19.8 per cent -- an annual rate of 6.2 per cent. This is substantially higher than that assumed in our previous review (about 4 per cent) and was a primary consideration in adopting a modification in the salary scale assumption. Because the System provides benefits based on final average salary,
these actuarial losses have the effect of raising projected benefits not only for prospective service (funded by normal costs) but also for service earned prior to the valuation date (which is approximated by the past service liability). Thus, salary losses represented 'a major portion of the increase in the unfunded liability since December 31, 1975. (Again, a rough estimate of this loss is $\$ 190$ million.)

Other factors contributing to the change in unfunded liability were the "up to 5 per cent" cost-of-living program for employees retiring prior to January 1, 1980 (an increase of about $\$ 136$ million), and the modified salary scale assumption (a $\$ 33$ million increase). Offsetting these was the effect of revision to pre-Fitzpatrick male benefit levels after June 30, 1980 which resulted in a $\$ 66$ million reduction in liability.

The magnitude of the unfunded past service liability underscores the need to continue on the State's present funding schedule.

## "Full Cost" as of January 1, 1979

The "full cost" to the State for the year beginning January 1, 1979 based on the December 31, 1978 valuation cost factors is $\$ 168,635,200$, calculated as follows (per cents of payroll reflect total participating payroll, including employees with less than one year of service):

|  | Item | Amount |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| (1) of $12 / 31 / 78$ Payroll |  |  |  |
| Participating payroll, $12 / 31 / 78$ | $\$$ | $556,243,500$ | - |
| (2) Normal cost to State | $49,288,600$ | $8.86 \%$ |  |
| (3) Unfunded past service liability | $1,797,954,900$ | -- |  |
| (4) Payment on unfunded liability* | $119,346,600$ | 21.46 |  |
| (5) Total annual cost $=(2)+(4)$ | $168,635,200$ | 30.32 |  |

*40 years remaining from January 1, 1979. This schedule will continue to show 40 years remaining until 1986, where the scheduled contribution will be the full cost of the System. Thereafter, the period will be decreased annually.

These factors are to be used in projecting the Fiscal 1980-81 State contribution requirement. As mentioned earlier, the State is currently funding the System on a transition basis with the required Fiscal 1980-81 contribution being $70 \%$ of the "full cost" for that year. The "full cost" is the normal cost rate applied to the projected 1980-81 payroll plus 40 -year amortization of the unfunded liability as estimated as of July 1, 1980. This determination is presented in a separate report letter to the Commission.

## Value of Vested Benefits

In private pension plans, it is customary for the actuary to provide the "value of vested benefits." This figure is used by accountants in preparing financial statements, both as a disclosure item and as a factor in determining the pension expense charge, in accordance with Opinion No. 8 of the Accounting Principles Board of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, "Accounting for the Cost of Pension Plans." While we recognize that the State may not be covered by this Opinion, a brief discussion of this subject may be helpful.

The "value of vested benefits" represents the single premium value under the plan's net investment return and mortality assumptions of all benefits to present and former employees which do not have future employment by the employee as a required condition for their receipt. Thus it includes the present value of an immediate or deferred pension for all pensioners, beneficiaries, vested former employees, and active participants with at least ten years of service. For active employees with less than ten years of service, only the accumulated employee contributions are included, since that is all such employees would receive if they had no further employment (except for those already over 65 with at least five years of service).

For the Connecticut State Employees' Retirement System, the value of vested benefits is $\$ 1,373,680,500$.

It was noted earlier that the System's assets amount to $\$ 200,036,800$ at adjusted cost value. Thus the State has vested benefits worth $\$ 1,173,643,700$ more than the Retirement Fund holds in assets. Once again, we see that a strong commitment to funding is required to bring the System's assets and obligations into balance.

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.

Table 8
Summary of Cost Factors as of December 31, 1978

| Item | Retirement Benefits | Death Benefits | Disability Benefits | Withdrawal Benefits | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Service Cost -- |  |  |  |  |  |
| Police | \$ 1,363,500 | \$ 48,700 | \$ 85,600 | \$ 196,200 | \$ 1,694,000 |
| Plan B | 27,550,000 | 188,700 | 4,371,200 | 3,833,300 | 35,943,200 |
| Plan C | 21,230,700 | 203,000 | 2,546,100 | $1,918,100$ | 25,897,900 |
| Total | \$ 50, 144,200 | 440,400 | \$ 7,002,900 | \$ 5,947,600 | \$ 63,535,100 |
| Less Imputed Employee Contributions* |  |  |  |  | $-14,246,500$ |
| Normal Cost to State |  |  |  |  | \$ 49,288,600 |
| Past Service Liability -- |  |  |  |  |  |
| Police | \$ 27,641,600 | \$ 218,200 | \$ 712,800 | \$ 901,000 | \$ 29,473,600 |
| Plan B | 573,384,000 | 4,335,100 | 46,905,200 | 35,536,600 | 660,160,900 |
| Plan C | 415,046,400 | 2,607,700 | 19,355,100 | 12,135,700 | 449,144,900 |
| Total Active Employees | \$1,016,072,000 | \$7,161,000 | \$66,973,100 | \$48,573,300 | \$1,138,779,400 |
| Active Liability for "up to 5\%" COLA |  |  |  |  | 25,445,100 |
| Credit against active liability** |  |  |  |  | $(59,025,000)$ |
| Total Active Employees adjusted |  |  |  |  | \$1,105,199,500 |
| Vested Former Employees |  |  |  |  | 2,784,600 |
| Pensioners . |  |  |  |  | 874,786,700 |
| Beneficiaries |  |  |  |  | 15,220,900 |
| Total Past Service Liability |  |  |  |  | \$1,997,991,700 |
| Less Assets in Fund (at adjusted cost value) |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r}-200,036,800 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| Unfunded Past Service Liability |  |  |  |  | \$1,797,954,900 |

CONNECTICUT SERS
*Ultimate new entrant basis (80\% Plan B)
**Present value of difference of actual over imputed employee contributions.
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## Actuarial Valuation

This is to certify that we have prepared an actuarial valuation of the System as of December 31, 1978

The valuation was made with respect to the following participants as of the valuation date:
a. 13,608 pensioners (including 280 beneficiaries of
deceased pensioners and active employees)
b. 43,855 active participants (including 14,668 fully vested) with total annual salaries of \$556,243,500
c. $\quad 164$ inactive employees with vested right to immediate or deferred pension
The cost factors as of the valuation date are as follows:

1. Current service cost . ........................................................
$\qquad$ Projected employee contributions

63,535,100 14,246,500 $14,246,500$
$49,288,600$
4. Past service liability -
a. Active participants.

1,105,199,500 ,105,199,500 $2,784,600$
$874,786,700$ 874,786,700 1,997,991,700 ,997,991,700
200,036,800 1,797,954,900
5. Assets in fund (at adjusted cost value) ....................................................................................
. Unfunded past service liability (Item 4e less Item 5) ...
Payment on unfunded liability (Amortization of Item 6 over
40 years from January 1, 1979) $\qquad$ 168,635,200

## Present Value of Vested Benefits: $\$ 1,373,680,500$

*Based on full normal cost and 40 -year amortization. The funding statute calls for an increasing percentage of this "full cost" to be contributed by the State each year. For fiscal 1979-80, this percentage is 65 per cent, increasing by 5 per cent each year. For fiscal 1986-87 and later years, the entire "full cost" will be required.

## CONNECTICUT STATE EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Actuarial Valuation . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -2
The actuarial assumptions and funding method are as follows:
Mortality rates -- 1971 Group Annuity Mortality Table
Termination rates before retirement (no cost included for 4,114 employees with less than one year of service):

Rate (\%)

| Age | Death* | Disability |  | Withdrawal |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | .05 | .06 |  | Tota1* |  |
| 20 | .06 | .09 | 5.44 | 5.55 |  |
| 25 | .08 | .11 | 5.29 | 5.44 |  |
| 30 | .11 | .15 | 5.07 | 5.26 |  |
| 35 | .16 | .22 | 4.70 | 4.96 |  |
| 40 | .29 | .36 | 4.19 | 4.57 |  |
| 45 | .33 | .61 | 3.54 | 4.19 |  |
| 50 | .85 | 1.01 | 2.47 | 3.61 |  |
| 55 | 1.31 | - | .94 | 2.80 |  |
| 60 |  |  | .- | 1.31 |  |

Service-connected disability rates comprise $50 \%$ of disabilities for Police and $20 \%$ for other participants.
*Rates shown are for men. Rates for women are slightly lower Salary scale:

| Age | Present salary as a <br> percent of salary at 65 | Annual increase <br> (Rate $\%$ ) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 20 | 14.04 | 5.34 |
| 25 | 18.19 | 5.26 |
| 30 | 23.43 | 5.10 |
| 35 | 29.94 | 4.90 |
| 40 | 37.81 | 4.58 |
| 45 | 46.98 | 4.22 |
| 50 | 57.44 | 3.95 |
| 55 | 69.53 | 3.83 |
| 60 | 84.02 | 3.66 |

Social Security wage base increases: $3 \frac{1}{2} \%$ per year
Retirement age -- Police: 53, or completion of 25 years of service if later
thers: 61, or completion of 10 years of service if later
Investment return -- 612 $\%$

## CONNECTICUT STATE EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

## Actuarial Valuation . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . - $3-$

 Transfers:(a) Present Active Employees - Plan B members to transfer to Plan C prior to retirement such that $60 \%$ of all to Plan C prior to retirement
retirements are under Plan C.
(b) New Entrants - $80 \%$ of all non-Police new entrants will elect and retire under Plan B. Remainder will elect Plan C.
Cost-of-living increases: $4 \frac{1}{2} \%$ per year for retirees awarded prior to January 1, 1980. $3 \%$ per year for all other awards.
Valuation assets --. .
Funding method -- Entry age normal cost (non-participants not funded for)
*Adjusted cost value of assets written up by $20 \%$ of the difference between market value and adjusted cost value, plus an additional write-up as necessary so that the resulting adjusted cost value is within $20 \%$ of market value.
imilar formula followed for write-down if adjusted cost value exceeds market value.



[^0]:    *Please refer to the "Actuarial Assumptions and Methods" section of the report for definitions of these terms.

[^1]:    * The age requirement is five years lower for retirements prior to July l, 1980.

