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Dear Members of the Board:
We are pleased to submit the Actuarial Valuation of the Employees' Retirement System of the State of Rhode Island as of June 30, 1991.

The purpose of the valuation is to determine and analyze the funded status of the System by comparing the value of assets with the value of accrued liabilities and to calculate the contribution requirements for the fiscal year 1992-1993 for the Board to submit to the Legislature for certification.

We provided preliminary employer contribution rates (letter dated December 13, 1991) based on the financial information and census information available by early December 1991. The final rates, developed in this report, are unchanged. The employer contribution rate for the State Employees' Retirement Plan is $10.37 \%$ and the employer contribution rate for the Teachers' Retirement Plan is $14.74 \%$.

The fiscal 1992-93 rate for the State Employees' Plan is less than the current (199192 ) fiscal year rate of $11.7 \%$. The reduction is a result of several offsetting factors. A change to a more realistic salary scale and the recognition of previously unrecognized asset gains in the valuation of plan assets reduced the contribution rate. This reduction was partly offset by the effects of the 1990 early retirement window and the decision by the State to defer a portion of the fiscal 1990-91 and fiscal 1991-92 contribution requirements.

The contribution requirement for the Teachers' Plan was also reduced from $15.1 \%$ for the current (1991-92) fiscal year. The size of the reduction was smaller than for the State Employees' Plan. The same factors played a part in producing the reduction, however, the impact of the 1990 early retirement window was greater (due presumably to the absence of a 1989 early retirement window for Teachers) resulting in a smaller reduction to the contribution requirement.

This report provides details of the asset information and census data utilized, the valuation method and actuarial assumptions and our actuarial certification which details the development of the contribution requirements of the System.
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We would like to extend our thanks to James Reilly, Louis Capizano and Robert Ridings of the State Retirement System whose help in providing information and in answering our questions is greatly appreciated.

We look forward to the opportunity to meet with you to discuss the report.
Sincerely,


Barry M. Gilman, M.A.A.A.
Enrolled Actuary \#90-2841
Principal
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## SECTION I - SUMMARY OF VALUATION

## Contribution Requirements

The contribution requirements for fiscal 1992-93 for the State Employees' Retirement Plan and the Teachers' Retirement Plan are set out below. For comparison the contribution requirements for the previous two fiscal years are also shown.

## Fiscal 1992-93 Fiscal 1991-92 Fiscal 1990-91

| State Employees Plan: <br> Normal Cost | $3.84 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unfunded Llablilty Cost | $6.53 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |
| Total | $10.37 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ |
| Teachers Plan: <br> Normal Cost | $4.81 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |
| Unfunded Llability Cost | $9.93 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ |
| Total | $14.74 \%$ | $15.1 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ |

Before recognition of the salary increase assumptions, the Normal Cost percentage generally remains constant. The reduction for fiscal 1992-93 is due to adopting a new salary scale assumption which is designed to more accurately estimate future pay increase experience.

The Unfunded Liability Cost has increased. This is a result of the following offsetting factors:

- Adoption of revised asset valuation method
- Early retirement program
- Change in salary increase assumption
- Deferral of State contributions

Overall the contribution requirements for fiscal 1992-93 are below previous years.

## SECTION I - Summary of Valuation (cont'd)

For fiscal 1992-93, the Teachers' Plan rate is to be paid $36 \%$ by the State and $64 \%$ by the cities and towns. The overall rate of $14.74 \%$ includes to cost of prior fiscal year State contribution deferrals. The deferral represents $0.6 \%$ of the rate and is payable by the State, the cities and towns share is therefore $64 \%$ of $14.14 \%$ or $9.05 \%$ and the State will contribute the balance of the $14.74 \%$ or $5.69 \%$.

## Towns which did not Participate In the 1990 Early Retirement Incentive Program

There were a number of town which did not participate in the 1990 early retirement incentive program. These were:

Code Number: 2003 Burillville
2009 East Greenwich
2015 Jamestown
2018 Little Compton
2025 North Smithfield
As a result the contribution requirement for these towns is reduced by the cost of the early retirement incentive program. The overall contribution requirement of the group is $12.96 \%$ and as above the State will meet the full cost of prior fiscal year deferrals of $0.6 \%$. The contribution for these towns is therefore $7.91 \%$ and the State contributes the balance of 5.05\%.

## Funded Status of the System

The funding method utilized by the System does not measure liabilities accrued to the valuation date against plan assets (the method aims to fund sufficient assets as a level annual percentage of pay for future benefits). There are several measures commonly used to describe the funded status of the plan. The following table summarizes two measures which are described below:

SECTION I - Summary of Valuation (cont'd)

Ratio of Assets to Llabilities
Flscal 1992-93 Fiscal 1991-92 Fiscal 1990-91
State Employees Plan:

| Projected Beneflts Llability | $62.56 \%$ | $60.31 \%$ | $61.45 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vested Benefits Llability | $77.54 \%$ | $87.39 \%$ | $86.44 \%$ |

Teachers Plan:
Projected Benefits Llability
56.66\%
54.50\%
50.91\%

Vested Benefits Liability
75.47\%
91.43\%
81.17\%

The ratio of assets to the projected benefit liability compares the value of accrued benefits including salary increases to retirement, to the actuarial value of assets. The ratio of assets to the vested benefit liability compares the value of vested benefits (basically the value of accrued benefits, no salary projection, for participants with more than ten years of service and the value of former employee's benefits) to the market value of assets.

The projected benefit ratio improved marginally since the prior fiscal year. This improvement results from the change in assumptions and calculation of actuarial asset value offsetting the detrimental effects of State contribution deferrals and the early retirement incentive programs. Note the large improvement between fiscal 1990-91 and fiscal 1991-92 for the Teachers' plan as compared to the State Employees' Plan. This reflects the fact that the 1989 early retirement program was not offered to Teachers but only the State Employees.

The vested benefit ratio, however has worsened since the prior fiscal year. For this ratio, salaries are not projected and liabilities are compared to the market value of assets. Therefore the changes made in the salary and asset assumptions have no beneficial impact on the vested benefit ratio.

## SECTION I - Summary of Valuation (cont'd)

## The Early Retirement Incentive Program of 1989

The incentive program allowed participants with 25 or more years of service (or if over age 60 , 10 or more years of service) to retire and receive a $10 \%$ enhancement in their benefit service. The program was only available to state employees and approximately 750 state employees took the incentive offered. The cost of the incentive is spread, as a level percentage of payroll, over 30 years (see Appendix II for a description of the funding method) commencing in the fiscal year 1991-92. The cost of the program is $0.67 \%$ of payroll.

## The Early Retirement incentive Program of 1990

Unlike the 1989 program, the 1990 program was available to both state employees and teachers. Any participants with 23 or more years of service, could retire and receive a $10 \%$ enhancement in their benefit service. In addition, the benefit was based on the final year's salary (rather than a three year average). Approximately 500 state employees and 800 teachers took the 1990 incentive program.

For the State Employees Plan, the cost of the incentive is spread, as a level percentage of payroll, over 30 years commencing in the fiscal year 1992-93. The cost for the State Employees Plan is $0.66 \%$ of payroll.

For the Teachers' Plan, the cost is spread over a 24 year period (see Exhibit III for a description of the funding method) commencing in the fiscal year 1992-93 and is equal to $1.78 \%$ of payroll.

## Assets of the Retirement System

Section III describes the assets of the retirement system, analyzes the cash flow during the previous fiscal year and shows the proportion of funds invested in each of the major investment categories.

## SECTION I - Summary of Valuation (cont'd)

The table below provides a plan year summary of certain key statistics of the performance and transactions of the retirement fund:
$\left.\begin{array}{lcccc} & \begin{array}{c}7 / 1 / 90 \text { to } \\ 6 / 30 / 91\end{array} & & \begin{array}{c}7 / 1 / 89 \text { to } \\ 6 / 30 / 90\end{array} & \end{array} \begin{array}{c}7 / 1 / 88 \text { to } \\ \hline\end{array}\right)$

The return achieved by the fund should be compared with the assumed return of $8 \%$.

Comparison of the market and actuarial values of assets in prior fiscal years shows a widening gap (the gap using the prior method of calculating the actuarial value of assets which only recognizes part of any investment gain would have been in excess of $\$ 0.3$ billion). A discussion of the rationale of changing the asset valuation method can be found in Section III.

The change in asset valuation method reduced the State Employees' Plan cost by $1.19 \%$ and the Teachers' Plan cost by $1.59 \%$.

The swing from net income in fiscal years 1988-89 and 1989-90 to net outgo (i.e. benefit payments exceeded contributions) in fiscal 1990-91 resulted from the effect of the early retirement incentives increasing payments and State contribution deferrals reducing income. The fund did increase during fiscal 1990-91 after accounting for investment results.

## SECTION I - Summary of Valuation (cont'd)

## Actuarial Method and Assumptions

Exhibit III describes the actuarial method adopted to calculate the contribution requirement and also the assumptions utilized in the calculation.

For the June 30, 1991 valuation the Retirement Board approved two changes to the assumptions. Firstly, assets were valued at market value and starting July 1, 1991 future investment gains and losses will be spread over a 3 year period. Secondly, the salary scale used to project eamings to retirement date was changed to an annual increase of $4.5 \%$.

The financial effect of these changes is described in Exhibit I.

## Plan Beneflt Structure

The plan benefit structure is described in detail in Exhibit IV. There have been no changes to the standard benefit provisions since the June 30, 1990 valuation except the early retirement incentive available to eligible participants who chose retirement between July 1, 1990 and December 31, 1990.

## SECTION II - EMPLOYEE DATA

## Active Employees

The pertinent information for active employees as of June 30, 1991, can be summarized as follows:

|  | State Employees |  | Teachers |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | June 30, 1 | June 30, 1990 | June 30, 19 | June 30, 1990 |
| Number of Covered Employees | 14,590 | 15,158 | 11,090 | 10,778 |
| Average Annual Salary | \$27,300 | \$26,300 | \$37,600 | \$38,700 |
| Average Age (years) | 43.3 | 43.5 | 43.0 | 44,0 |
| Average Service (years) | 10.2 | 10.5 | 13.6 | 16.0 |
| Number of Vested Employees | 7,163 | 6,133 | 7,101 | 6,687 |
| Number of Employees Ellgible for Retirement | 1,150 | 1,367 | 764 | 1,274 |

When compared to last year a shift in the average demographic profile of the active population can be seen. The average annual salary for state employees rose slightly from an average of $\$ 26,300$. This represents and increase of $3.8 \%$ on average, as opposed to a $6.9 \%$ average increase from June 1989 to June 1990. The average salary for an active teacher dropped by $2.8 \%$ from $\$ 38,700$ to $\$ 37,600$. This may be partly explained by the early retirement incentive program.

Other effects of the incentive program can be seen in the summary statistics. The average age for teachers dropped a full year, from 44 years to 43 years. Average years of service also dropped. Finally, the number of teachers eligible for service retirement under normal plan provisions dropped from 1,274 in June 1990 to 764 in June 1991.

## SECTION II - Employee Data (cont'd)

The effects of the incentive program on state employees was smaller in scale but still significant. Average age and service dropped by two-tenths and three-tenths of a year respectively and the number of employees eligible for retirement under the normal provisions of the plan dropped by 217 , from 1,367 to 1,150 . This is similar to last year when decreases in average age, average service, and the number of employees eligible for service retirements resulted from the 1989 early retirement incentive program.

Missing data was estimated by using an average for employees with similar available data. For example, a person missing a date of hire, would be given an estimated date of hire based on his date of birth. Active employees missing salaries were given the average salary of all employees who had no data missing. For active state employees there were 33 missing salaries, 12 missing dates of birth, and 34 missing dates of hire. For active teachers there were approximately 240 missing salaries, 210 missing hire dates and 180 missing birth dates. The greater number of missing figures for teachers can be attributed to the greater difficulty in obtaining their data. In light of the large populations we are dealing with, the amount of missing data that needed estimation does not have a significant impact on the results of the valuation.

Tables 1A and 1 B provide a distribution of employees by age and service for state employees and teachers, respectively.

## Retirees and Beneficiarles

The data provided for analysis of retiree and beneficiary liability included dates of hire and retirement, sex, monthly benefit, type of benefit, and payment option. The more significant statistics for retirees and beneficiaries are summarized as follows:

## SECTION II - Employee Data (cont'd)

|  | State Emplovees |  | Teachers |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | June 30, 1 | 30, 1 | 30,19 | ¢ 30.1 |
| Pensioners |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 7,851 | 7,217 | 4,704 | 5,699 |
| Average Age | 70.0 | 70.5 | 68.8 | 72.0 |
| Average Monthly Benefit | \$850 | \$773 | \$1,697 | \$1,422 |
| Beneficlarles |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 565 | 612 | 130 | 170 |
| Average Age | 72.0 | 72.0 | 68.3 | 70 |
| Average Monthly Benefit | \$616 | \$617 | \$782 | \$827 |

The sizable increase in number of pensioners and average monthly benefit, and the corresponding decrease in the average age of pensioners can be all attributed in large part to the impact of the 1990 early retirement incentive program.

Again the impact is greater for teachers than state employees. This is most likely due to the effect of the 1989 early retirement incentive program which was only available to State employees.

Tables 2A and $2 B$ show distributions for pensions in payment status as of June 30, 1991 by age and pension type. These tables also indicate total monthly pension payments by age, average payments by age, and total monthly payments by type.

| Age | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-14 | 15-19 | $\underline{20-24}$ | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | $40 \pm$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-19 | 18,958 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18,958 |
| 20-24 | 454 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 458 |
|  | 21,536 | 16,653 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21,493 |
| 25-29 | 970 | 287 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,287 |
|  | 23,383 | 23,588 | 22,865 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23,416 |
| 30-34 | 801 | 554 | 407 | 69 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,831 |
|  | 24,087 | 26,714 | 25,517 | 25,514 |  |  |  |  |  | 25,253 |
| 35-39 | 650 | 408 | 580 | 563 | 55 |  |  |  |  | 2,256 |
|  | 24,677 | 29,051 | 28,370 | 27,651 | 27,095 |  |  |  |  | 27,219 |
| 40-44 | 540 | 424 | 535 | 638 | 327 | 20 |  |  |  | 2,484 |
|  | 25,059 | 27,699 | 30,755 | 33,253 | 33,375 | 26,981 |  |  |  | 29,951 |
| 45-49 | 450 | 377 | 407 | 378 | 296 | 85 | 7 |  |  | 2,000 |
|  | 23,939 | 26,044 | 29,503 | 33,101 | 35,961 | 35,384 | 28,563 |  |  | 29,481 |
| 50-54 | 341 | 287 | 299 | 319 | 160 | 82 | 23 | 3 |  | 1,514 |
|  | 24,113 | 24,407 | 29,095 | 29,303 | 31,929 | 37,765 | 36,481 | 31,538 |  | 28,014 |
| 55-59 | 217 | 231 | 296 | 283 | 214 | 60 | 29 | 9 | 2 | 1,341 |
|  | 22,862 | 25,708 | 27,430 | 28,121 | 28,237 | 35,600 | 39,704 | 43,813 | 27,030 | 27,409 |
| 60-64 | 118 | 209 | 235 | 213 | 112 | 40 | 20 | 6 | ${ }^{6}$ | 959 |
|  | 25,800 | 24,341 | 25,868 | 28,367 | 27,582 | 36,569 | 49,210 | 47,584 | 35,875 | 27.414 |
| 65-69 |  | 52 | 106 | 72 | 44 | 20 |  |  |  | 342 |
|  | 28,048 | 21,096 | 26,258 | 27,729 | 26,938 | 32,309 | 31,933 | 45,227 | 27,880 | 26,989 |
| 70-74 |  |  |  | 18 |  | 2 |  | ${ }^{2}$ | ${ }^{1}$ | ${ }^{88}$ |
|  | 24,293 | 16,178 | 22,498 | 26,606 | 28,245 | 25,037 | 46,235 | 31,819 | 35,541 | 24,536 |
| 75+ |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26 16.980 |
|  | 10,000 | 12,205 | 17,313 | 22,238 | 27,125 |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL |  | 2,854 | 2,938 | 2,556 | 1,218 | 309 | 93 | ${ }^{28}$ | ${ }^{12}$ | 14,590 27,303 |
|  | 23,873 | 26,101 | 28,104 | 30,104 | 31,818 | 35,401 | 39,558 |  |  |  |


| Age | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-14 | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | $40+$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.19 - - - - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-24 | 154 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 22,018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 154 \\ 22,018 \end{array}$ |
| 25-29 | 609 | 57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 24,912 | 29,945 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 666 25,343 |
| 30-34 | $\begin{array}{r} 417 \\ 27,868 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 224 \\ 32,794 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 69 \\ 37,901 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 710 30,397 |
| 35-39 | $\begin{array}{r} 689 \\ 30,018 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 237 \\ 35,936 \end{array}$ |  | $315$ | ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 35,936 | 39,898 | $40.157$ | 41,586 |  |  |  |  | 35,337 |
| 40-44 | $\begin{array}{r} 624 \\ 31,526 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 270 \\ 37,409 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 411 \\ 37,668 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,131 \\ 40,737 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,113 \\ 41,754 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3 \\ 40,772 \end{array}$ |  |  |  | 3,552 38,830 |
| 45-49 | 344 | 159 | 156 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 33,535 | 37,236 | 41,465 | 41,746 | 1,048 42,417 | 348 43,406 | 42,291 |  |  | 2,356 40,768 |
| $50-54$ | $\begin{array}{r} 142 \\ 35,063 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 74 \\ 40,168 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 92 \\ 41,807 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 153 \\ 41,007 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 254 \\ 42,276 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 252 \\ 43,974 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 85 \\ 45,642 \end{array}$ |  |  | 1,052 41,608 |
| 55-59 | 44 | 31 | 42 | 99 | 133 | 61 | 68 | 18 |  | 496 |
|  | 35,243 | 40,252 | 41,466 | 41,373 | 41,964 | 43,368 | 43,363 | 43,493 |  | 41,521 |
| 60-64 | 18 | 12 | 25 | 44 | 95 | 44 | 38 | 24 | 18 | 318 |
|  | 35,820 | 41,435 | 43,603 | 41,546 | 41,569 | 41,979 | 43,300 | 43,707 | 41,832 | 41,835 |
| 65-69 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 27 | 7 | 12 | 2 | 6 | 85 |
|  | 42,320 | 36,183 | 41,491 | 41,508 | 42,159 | 45,085 | 42,270 | 55,083 | 47,920 | 42,612 |
| 70-74 |  |  |  |  | $5$ | $2$ | $3$ | ${ }^{1}$ | $2$ | ${ }^{18}$ |
|  |  | 38,280 | 38,685 | $41,801$ | 37,789 | 44,904 | 39,960 | 42,156 | 44,886 | 40,718 |
| 75+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
|  | 23,272 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23,272 |
| TOTAL | 3,048 | 1,070 | 1,244 | 2,056 | 2,676 | 717 | 208 | 45 | ${ }^{26}$ | 11.090 |
|  | 29,359 | 36,007 | 39,528 | 40,869 | 42,064 | 43,525 | 44,161 | 44,092 | 43,472 | 37,627 |

William M. Mercer, Inconporated

Table 2A - Distribution of Pensions - State Employees

Number of Pensloners and Total Monthly Penslons Pald by Age

| Age | Pension Trpe |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total by Age |  | Percent of Pensioners/ Average Pension |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Service Retirements |  | Beneficiaries |  | Legislator's Pension |  | Accidental Disabilities |  | Ordinary Disabilities |  |  |  |  |  |
| $<30$ |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0.02\% |
|  | \$ | 0 | \$ | 133 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 1,003 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 1,136 | \$ | 568.00 |
| 30-39 |  | 0 |  | 8 |  | 0 |  | 4 |  | 11 |  | 23 |  | 0.27\% |
|  |  | 0 |  | 5,045 |  | 0 |  | 2,021 |  | 3,778 |  | 10,844 |  | 471.48 |
| 40-49 |  | 104 |  | 18 |  | 1 |  | 12 |  | 38 |  | 173 |  | 2.06\% |
|  |  | 202,808 |  | 8,666 |  | 565 |  | 8,816 |  | 14,345 |  | 235,200 |  | 1,359.54 |
| 50-54 |  | 209 |  | 14 |  | 7 |  | 2 |  | 22 |  | 254 |  | 3.02\% |
|  |  | 483,844 |  | 13,080 |  | 7,465 |  | 717 |  | 13,060 |  | 518,166 |  | 2,040.02 |
| 55-59 |  | 315 |  | 30 |  | 23 |  | 16 |  | 70 |  | 454 |  | 5.39\% |
|  |  | 694,897 |  | 20,493 |  | 19,469 |  | 9,758 |  | 34,234 |  | 778,851 |  | 1,715.53 |
| 60-64 |  | 1,073 |  | 55 |  | 36 |  | 18 |  | 102 |  | 1,284 |  | 15.26\% |
|  |  | 1,198,626 |  | 36,190 |  | 31,222 |  | 10,354 |  | 43,022 |  | 1,319,414 |  | 1,027.58 |
| 65-69 |  | 1,776 |  | 101 |  | 29 |  | 23 |  | 90 |  | 2,019 |  | 23.99\% |
|  |  | 1,416,883 |  | 60,603 |  | 27,922 |  | 13,848 |  | 33,538 |  | 1,552,794 |  | 769.09 |
| 70-74 |  | 1,533 |  | 97 |  | 28 |  | 12 |  | 90 |  | 1,760 |  | 20.91\% |
|  |  | 1.058,919 |  | 58,564 |  | 25,731 |  | 6,372 |  | 30,295 |  | 1,179,881 |  | 670.39 |
| 75-79 |  | 1,107 |  | 99 |  | 27 |  | 10 |  | 43 |  | 1,286 |  | 15.28\% |
|  |  | 691,560 |  | 59,349 |  | 23,336 |  | 6,103 |  | 11,644 |  | 791,992 |  | 615.86 |
| 80-84 |  | 635 |  | 78 |  | 12 |  | 5 |  | 21 |  | 751 |  | 8.92\% |
|  |  | 344,475 |  | 47,518 |  | 11,464 |  | 3,462 |  | 5,817 |  | 412,736 |  | 549.58 |
| 85-89 |  | 242 |  | 41 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 287 |  | 3.41\% |
|  |  | 125,448 |  | 23,500 |  | 1,344 |  | 779 |  | 903 |  | 151,974 |  | 529.53 |
| 90-94 |  | 77 |  | 17 |  | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 97 |  | 1.15\% |
|  |  | 43,040 |  | 12,341 |  | 2,688 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 57,069 |  | 588.34 |
| $95-99$ |  | 18 |  | 6 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 25 |  | 0.30\% |
|  |  | 7,079 |  | 2,564 |  | 538 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 10,181 |  | 407.24 |
| $100+$ |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0.01\% |
|  |  | 228 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 228 |  | 228.00 |
|  |  | 7,090 |  | 565 |  | 169 |  | 104 |  | 488 |  | 8,416 |  |  |
| Total | \$ | 6,266,809 | \$ | 348,046 | \$ | 151,742 | \$ | 63,234 | \$ | 190,636 | \$ | 7,020,467 | \$ | 834.18 |

Table 2B - Distribution of Pensions - Teachers

Number of Pensioners and Total Monthly Pensions Pald by Age


[^0]
## SECTION III - PLAN ASSETS

## Market Value of Assets

The Employees' Retirement Fund receives all member and employer contributions. The assets are invested by the State Investment Commission, with the income being added to the Fund and available for reinvestment. Payments from the Fund are primarily for refunds of employee contributions, lump sum death benefits, and 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 payments from the Fund equal to his total contributions.

Table 3 shows a summary of income and expenditures for the years ended June 30, 1991 and 1990. For the plan year ending June 30, 1991 the Employees' Retirement Fund showed a net increase of $\$ 80,861,970$.

The total market value of assets as of June 30, 1991 was $\$ 2,316,654,500$. This is divided among the plans as follows:

| State Employees | $\$$ | $985,796,300$ | $42.5 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Teachers | $1,261,831,500$ | $54.5 \%$ |  |
| Teacher's Survivors |  | $69,026,700$ | $3.0 \%$ |
|  | $\$$ | $2,316,654,500$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 4 shows the composition of the investments of the fund.

Please note that the allocation of the assets incorporated in the valuation as of June 30, 1991 reflects the allocations provided by the Treasury Department of the State of Rhode Island available as of December 1991. If the final allocation of funds between plans differs from the above figures, subsequent valuations will record a gain or loss which will be spread forward as part of future years contribution requirements.

Table 5 shows the allocation of reserves to State Employees Plan, Teachers Plan, and Teacher's Survivors Plan as of June 30, 1991 and 1990. The reserve allocations are based on the book value of assets. The financial statements indicate that $43.5 \%$ of the book value of assets relate to State Employees, $53.5 \%$ relate to Teachers, and $3.0 \%$ relate to Teachers Survivors benefits. There is also a small unallocated reserve for unclaimed benefits.

## SECTION III - Plan Assets (cont'd)

## Actuarial Value of Assets

As of the current valuation, a new method to calculate the actuarial value of assets has been employed. Comparison of prior years market and actuarial values of assets indicate a widening gap, the actuarial value lagging further behind the market value each year. The gap was created because in prior years the actuarial value only recognized a portion of each years' investment gain or loss. The large investment gains on equity investments earlier in the 1980's initially created the gap. The actuarial value of assets as of June 30, 1991 was written up to equal the market value of assets at that date. A three year period to spread future investment gains and losses will commence effective July 1, 1991.

Table 3 - Summary Statement of Income and Expenses


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

Table 4 -Composition of Assets as of June 30, 1991

|  | Market Value |
| :--- | ---: |
| Cash/Short Term Investments |  |
| Short Term Investment Fund |  |
| Money Market Instruments | $1,109,000,000$ |
| Equities - Domestic | $46,700,000$ |
| Equities - International | $664,200,000$ |
| Fixed Income - Government | $39,200,000$ |
| Fixed Income - Corporate | $31,400,000$ |
| Fixed Income - In State | $106,000,000$ |
| Real Estate | $14,900,000$ |
| Venture Capital | $\$ 2,316,700,000$ |

Table 5 - Allocation of Book Value Assets by Plan - Reserve Values
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
State Employees:

Employer resenves Member reserves Total State Employees reserves

Teachers:
Employer reserves Member reserves Total Teacher reserves

Teachens Survivors:
Employer reserves Member reserves Total Teachers Sunivors reserves

Unallocated:
Unclaimed bonefit reserve
Total mesets
\$ $663,786,787$ 189,365,218
\$ 853,152,005
\$ 784,472,996 265,096,192
$\qquad$

5 $48,048,389$
$\qquad$
$\begin{array}{r}652,779,874 \\ 178,270,045 \\ \hline\end{array}$
\$ 831,049,919
\$ 722,997,705 $\underline{270,899,404}$
$\begin{array}{r}45,100,506 \\ 0,520,071 \\ \hline\end{array}$
57,802,829
54,718,578
$\qquad$
\$ $1,879,891,535$

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

## SECTION IV - RESULTS OF THE VALUATION

The funding statute calls for the contribution requirement to be calculated as the normal cost of the plan plus the total of the amortization payment for each unfunded cost element. The table below shows the development of the contribution requirement for the State Employees' Plan and the Teachers' Plan.

## Normal Cost

Unfunded Cost due to:

## State Employees' Plan

$3.84 \%$

| $6.87 \%$ | $9.94 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $(0.69 \%)$ | $0.00 \%{ }^{*}$ |
| $0.67 \%$ | None |
| $0.66 \%$ | $1.78 \%$ |
| $(1.19 \%)$ | $(1.59 \%)$ |
| $(0.45 \%)$ | $(0.80 \%)$ |
| $0.35 \%$ | $0.31 \%$ |
| $0.31 \%$ | $0.29 \%$ |
| $10.37 \%$ |  |
|  |  |

* the effect of the 1989 assumption changes in the Teachers Plan was less than the minimum threshold for setting up a separate base, the effect was aggregated with the existing unfunded. See Exhibit III for a description of the amortization method.

The contributions are assumed to be made on a monthly basis. The amounts of the unfunded liabilities in respect of each of the above cost elements together with the length of the remaining amortization period are shown in detail in Exhibit I, parts A3 and B3.

The Teachers' Plan cost is paid $64 \%$ by the cities and towns and $36 \%$ by the State. However the State will pay the total cost of $0.6 \%$ for the contribution deferrals. This results in a contribution requirement for cities and towns of $9.05 \%$ and a contribution requirement for the State of $5.69 \%$.

As described in Section 1, certain towns elected not to participate in the 1990 early retirement incentive program. The contribution requirement for these towns is $7.91 \%$ and for the State is 5.05\%.

## SECTION IV - Results of the Valuation (cont'd)

It will be noted that the impact of the 1990 early retirement incentive was greater for the Teacher's Plan. This is primarily due to a much larger participation in the incentive program, approximately twice the number of teachers opted to retire than state employees.

The change in the salary scale also impacted the Teachers' Plan to a greater extent. This was due to the larger proportion of active employee liabilities in the Teachers' Plan (changing the salary scale only affects active employee liabilities).

State employees contribute to the System at a rate of $7.75 \%$ of pay. The inclusion of the additional $0.25 \%$ contribution for retiree medical benefits reduces the State contribution by $0.23 \%$ (after allowing for refunds on termination). Consistent with this, it has been assumed that the State's contribution to the separate retiree health fund is $0.23 \%$ (in addition to the above contribution requirements).

The State Employee's Plan fiscal 1992-93 contribution requirement of 10.37\% compares to the fiscal 1991-92 contribution requirement of $11.70 \%$. The decrease in the contribution requirement is the result of several offsetting factors. If the salary and asset assumptions had not been changed the contribution requirement would have increased as a result of both the 1990 early retirement incentive program and the state contribution deferrals and also due to slightly adverse investment experience during the previous fiscal year. The effect of the changes to the salary scale assumption and asset valuation method more than offset the increase in the contribution requirement discussed above. The table on the previous page details the change to the contribution requirement of these events. Development of the fiscal 1992-93 contribution is shown in Exhibit I, parts A1, A2 and A3.

The Teachers' Plan fiscal 1992-93 contribution requirement of $14.74 \%$ compares to the fiscal 1991-92 contribution requirement of $15.1 \%$. The comments above concerning the reduction of the contribution requirement of the State Employee's Plan also apply to the Teacher's Plan. However, the decrease in the contribution requirement for the Teacher's Plan was not as large. This can be explained by the greater impact of the 1990 early retirement incentive program. Development of the contribution for Teachers for fiscal 1992-93 is shown in Exhibit 1 , parts B1, B2 and B3.

## SECTION IV - Results of the Valuation (cont'd)

It will be noted that the impact of the 1990 early retirement incentive was greater for the Teacher's Plan. This is primarily due to a much larger participation in the incentive program, approximately twice the number of teachers opted to retire than state employees.

The change in the salary scale also impacted the Teachers' Plan to a greater extent. This was due to the larger proportion of active employee liabilities in the Teachers' Plan (changing the salary scale only affects active employee liabilities).

State employees contribute to the System at a rate of $7.75 \%$ of pay. The inclusion of the additional $0.25 \%$ contribution for retiree medical benefits reduces the State contribution by $0.23 \%$ (after allowing for refunds on termination). Consistent with this, it has been assumed that the State's contribution to the separate retiree health fund is $0.23 \%$ (in addition to the above contribution requirements).

The State Employee's Plan fiscal 1992-93 contribution requirement of $10.37 \%$ compares to the fiscal 1991-92 contribution requirement of $11.70 \%$. The decrease in the contribution requirement is the result of several offsetting factors. If the salary and asset assumptions had not been changed the contribution requirement would have increased as a result of both the 1990 early retirement incentive program and the state contribution deferrals and also due to slightly adverse investment experience during the previous fiscal year. The effect of the changes to the salary scale assumption and asset valuation method more than offset the increase in the contribution requirement discussed above. The table on the previous page details the change to the contribution requirement of these events. Development of the fiscal 1992-93 contribution is shown in Exhibit I, parts A1, A2 and A3.

The Teachers' Plan fiscal 1992-93 contribution requirement of 14.74\% compares to the fiscal 1991-92 contribution requirement of $15.1 \%$. The comments above concerning the reduction of the contribution requirement of the State Employee's Plan also apply to the Teacher's Plan. However, the decrease in the contribution requirement for the Teacher's Plan was not as large. This can be explained by the greater impact of the 1990 early retirement incentive program. Development of the contribution for Teachers for fiscal 1992-93 is shown in Exhibit I, parts B1, B2 and B3.

## SECTION IV - Results of the Valuation (cont'd)

## Teacher Survivors Plan

A complete analysis of the finances of the Teacher Survivors Plan is not possible due to lack of sufficient data. However, making reasonable assumptions regarding age and family size we estimate that the current assets of $\$ 69.0$ million together with future income will be sufficient to meet benefit payments when they fall due.

# EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND 

## CERTIFICATE OF ACTUARIAL VALUATION

This is to certify that we have prepared an actuarial valuation of the plan as of June 30, 1991. This certificate contains the following attached exhibits:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Exhibit I - Actuarial Cost Development of Fiscal Year 1992-93 Contribution } \\
& \text { Percentage }
\end{array}
$$

A. State Employees
B. Teachers

EXHIBIT II - Pension Benefit Obligation, Vested Benefit Liability
EXHIBIT III - Actuarial Method and Assumptions
EXHIBIT IV - Summary of Plan Provisions

To the best of my knowledge, the information supplied in this actuarial valuation is complete and accurate and in my opinion each individual assumption used (a) is reasonably related to the experience of the plan and to reasonable expectations and (b) represents my best estimate of anticipated experience under the plan.


Associate


## EXHIBIT I - DEVELOPMENT OF CONTRIBUTION PERCENTAGES

## A1. State Emplovees - Development of Normal Cost

The valuation was made with respect to the following data supplied to us by the Retirement Board:

- 14,590 active participants (including 7,163 fully vested)
- 2,263 inactive participants
- 8,416 pensioners (including 565 beneficiaries of deceased pensioners and active employees)

The actuarial factors as of the valuation date are as follows:

1. Actuarial present value of benefits
(a) Active employees
\$ $936,163,400$
(b) Inactive employees
30,520,700
(c) Retirees and beneficlaries
$826,764,700$
(d) Total
\$ 1,793,448,800
2. Actuarial value of assets
$985,796,300$
3. Frozen Initial Liability (unfunded liability)

422,611,800
4. Present value of future employee contributions
$257,434,200$
5. Present value of future employer normal costs (1.(d) - 2. - 3. - 4.)
$127,606,500$
6. Actuarial present value of future compensation
$3,321,731,000$
7. Normal cost percentage $(5 .+6$. $)$
$3.84 \%$
8. Covered Payroll - Employees under Retirement Age 373,936,500
9. Normal Cost, $(7, \times 8$.)
$14,359,200$

## EXHIBIT I - Development of Contribution Percentages (cont'd)

A2. State Emplovees - Development of Emplover Cost

1. Total Covered Payroll \$ 389,586,600
2. Normal Cost ..... $14,359,200$
3. Amortization of Frozen Initial Liability ..... $25,581,200$
4. Projected 1992-93 Covered Payroll ..... 407,118,000
5. 1992-93 Employer Normal Cost $((2 .+1) \times 4.$. ..... $15,022,700$
6. Total annual cost if paid on July 1, 1992 (3. +5 .) ..... $40,603,900$
7. Total annual cost if paid in uniform installments throughout the year (6. plus one-half year's interest) \$ 42,228,100
8. Employer fiscal 1992-93 cost as a percent of payroll $(7+4)$ ..... 10.37\%

## EXHIBIT I - Development of Contribution Percentages (cont'd)

A3. State Emplovees - Determination of Frozen Initial Llablity or Unfunded Llability

Base | Amortization |
| :---: |
| Period |

1. June 30, 1990 Unfunded bases at July 1, 1990
(a) Original Unfunded
(b) 1989 Plan Amendment and
Assumption Change ${ }^{(1)}$
\$ 445,731,800
25
\$ 25,743,500
(c) 1989 Early Retirement Window ${ }^{(1)}$
$(49,393,400) \quad 29$
30
(2,601,600)
(d) Total
\$ 445,473,100
\$ $25,678,500$
2. Breakdown of 1991 Bases
(a) 1990 Early Retirement Window $\$ 50,000,000$
(b) Change in Salary Scale
$(33,994,000)$
(c) Change in Asset Method
( $90,446,900$ )
(d) Subtotal ${ }^{(1)}$
(e) 1990-91 Deferral of Contributions ${ }^{(2)}$
$(74,440,900) \quad 30$
$(3,843,000)$
(f) 1991-92 Deferral of Contributions ${ }^{(2)}$

23,409,900
24
1,388,400
(g) Total
$\$(30,766,400)$
1,201,900
3. Bases at July 1, 1991

| (a) Original Unfunded | $\$ 453,587,400$ | 24 | $\$$ | $26,901,800$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| (b) 1989 Base |  | $(50,535,100)$ | 28 |  | $(2,718,600)$ |
| (c) 1989 Early Retirement Window |  | $50,325,900$ | 29 |  | $2,650,700$ |
| (d) 1991 Bases |  | $(30,766,400)$ |  | $(1,252,700)$ |  |
| (e) Total | $\$ 422,611,800$ |  | $\$ 25,581,200$ |  |  |

Notes: ${ }^{(1)}$ Following the funding method, if the change in unfunded liability is greater than $10 \%$ of the existing amount of unfunded liability, the change in unfunded liability is separately amortized over a 30 -year period.
(2) The contribution deferral amounts are being separately amortized over the remaining amortization period of 24 years. This is an exception to the normal funding method where the contribution deferral amounts would be added to the other 1991 bases and then amortized together.

## EXHIBIT I - Development of Contribution Percentages (cont'd)

## B1. Teachers - Development of Normal Cost

The valuation was made with respect to the following data supplied to us by the Retirement Board:

- 11,090 active participants (including 7,101 fully vested)
- 2,644 inactive participants
- 4,834 pensioners (including 565 beneficiaries of deceased pensioners and active employees)

The actuarial factors as of the valuation date are as follows:

1. Actuarial present value of benefits
(a) Active employees \$ 1,537,495,700
(b) Inactive employees
$34,535,200$
(c) Retirees and beneficiaries

968,882,900
(d) Total
\$ 2,540,913,800
2. Actuarial value of assets
$1,261,831,500$
3. Frozen Initial Liability (unfunded liability)
$723,777,800$
4. Present value of future employee contributions
$355,331,100$
5. Present value of future employer normal costs
(1.(d) $-2 .-3 .-4$. )
6. Actuarial present value of future compensation $4,180,366,400$
7. Normal cost percentage $(5 .+6) \quad 4.78 \$.
8. Covered Payroll - Employees under Retirement Age $415,607,900$
9. Normal Cost, (7. $\times 8$. ) \$ 19,866,100

## EXHIBIT I - Development of Contribution Percentages (cont'd)

B2. Teachers - Development of Employer Cost

1. Total Covered Payroll ..... \$ 430,036,200
2. Normal Cost ..... $19,866,100$
3. Amortization of Frozen Initial Liability ..... 42,926,500
4. Projected 1992-93 Covered Payroll ..... $449,387,800$
5. 1992-93 Employer Normal Cost $((2 .+1) \times 4.$. ..... 20,761,700
6. Total annual cost if paid on July 1, 1992 (3. +5 .) ..... 63,688,200
7. Total annual cost if paid in uniform installments throughout the year (6. plus one-half year's interest) ..... \$ ..... $66,235,700$
8. Employer fiscal 1992-93 cost as a percent of payroll $(7+4)$ ..... 14.74\%

## EXHIBIT I - Development of Contribution Percentages (cont'd)

B3. Teachers - Determination of Frozen Initlal Lability

Base | Amortization |
| :---: |
| Period | Payment

1. June 30, 1990 bases at July 1, 1990
(a) Original Unfunded
\$ 711,780,500 25 \$ 41,109,400
2. Breakdown of 1991 Bases
(a) 1990 Early Retirement Window
(b) Change in Salary Scale
\$ 130,000,000
(c) Change in Asset Method
$(58,074,300)$
(d) Sublotal ${ }^{(4)}$
(e) 1990-91 Deferral of Contributions ${ }^{(2)}$
(f) 1991-92 Deferral of Contributions ${ }^{(2)}$
(g) Total
$(115,773,200)$

|  | $(43,847,500)$ | 24 |  | $(2,600,500)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $22,297,000$ | 24 |  | $1,322,400$ |  |
|  | $21,003,500$ | 24 |  | $1,245,700$ |
| $\$$ | $(547,000)$ |  | $\$$ | $(32,400)$ |

3. Bases at July 1, 1991
(a) Original Unfunded
(b) 1991 Base
\$ 724,324,800
24
\$ $42,958,900$
$(547,000)$
24
$(32,400)$
(c) Total
\$ 723,777,800
\$ 42,926,500

Notes: ${ }^{(1)}$ If the change in the unfunded liability is less than $10 \%$ of the existing unfunded liability, the change in the unfunded liability is amortized over the remaining amortization period of the original unfunded liability.
(2) The contribution deferral amounts are being separately amortized over the remaining amortization period of 24 years. This is an exception to the normal funding method where the contribution deferral amounts would be added to the other 1991 bases and then amortized together.

## EXHIBIT II - PENSION BENEFIT OBLIGATION, VESTED BENEFIT LIABILITY

## Pension Benefit Obligation

The value of the pension benefit obligation required for disclosure by Statement No. 5 of the Govemmental Accounting Standards Board is shown below as of June 30, 1991.

1. Participants current recelving benefits and terminated employees not yet recelve benefits
2. Current employees

> Accumulated employee contributions Employer-financed vested Employer-financed nonvested
3. Total pension benefit obligation

| Penslon Beneflt Oblication <br> State <br> Emplovees | Teachers |
| :--- | :--- |

\$ $857,285,400$ \$ $1,003,418,100$


# EXHIBIT II - Pension Benefit Obligation, Vested Beneflt Llability (cont'd) 

## Vested Benefit Llability

The value of vested benefits represents the current value of all benefits accrued by present and former employees which are not conditional on the future employment of the employee for payment. The benefits valued include benefits payable to current retirees and beneficiaries, deferred pensions and benefits accrued by active participants with at least ten years of service. For active employees with less than ten years of senvice, only the accumulated employee contributions are included.

The value of vested benefits as of June 30, 1991 is as follows:

|  | Vested Benefit Llability <br> State <br> Emplovees |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |

## EXHIBIT III - ACTUARIAL METHOD AND ASSUMPTIONS

## a. Actuarial Funding Method

Actuarial Funding Method - Frozen initial liability method. This method is altematively referred to as the entry age normal cost method with frozen initial liability.

Entry Age - The employee's age at the time he or she would have commenced participation if the plan had always been in existence.

Frozen actuarial liability - At the time this funding method was introduced June 30, 1985 the unfunded liability was calculated and called the Frozen Actuarial Liability. This amount was originally to be funded over a 30 year period by the sum-of-thedigits amortization method. Effective from 1989, however the outstanding balance, referred to as the Unfunded Liability, is to be amortized over the remaining amortization period using a level percent of salary funding. (ref. General Laws section 36-10-2 and 36-10-2.1). Subsequent changes to the Unfunded Liability due to changes to benefits or actuarial assumptions are amortized either over a new 30year period or over the remaining initial amortization period depending on how large the total change to the unfunded liability for each fiscal year is relative to the existing unfunded liability. The following table illustrates the amortization method:

Change in Unfunded Liability

Less than $1 \%$ of existing Unfunded

Between $1 \%$ and $10 \%$ of existing Unfunded

Over 10\% of existing Unfunded

## Amortization Period

No new base set up (existing Unfunded not changed)

The change to Unfunded is amortized over current remaining period i.e., aggregated with existing Unfunded

A separate base equal to change in Unfunded is set up and amortized over a new 30 year period

## EXHIBIT III - Actuarial Method and Assumptions (cont'd)

b. Actuarial Assumptions Concerning Future Events

Mortality - 1971 Group Annuity Mortality Table with Mortality for disabled persons set equal to the age 65 mortality under 1971 Group Annuity Mortality Table.


Investment Return - 8.0\%, compounded annually.

Salary Increases - Salaried will increase at a rate of $4.5 \%$, compounded annually.

Retirement Age - State employees are assumed to retire at the later of age 62-1/2 or completion of the service requirements. Teachers are assumed to retire at the later of age 61 or completion of the service requirements.

Disability - Disability is assumed to occur in accordance with the following table with $15 \%$ of disabilities being occupational.

Disability - Sample Rates
Age Rate of Disability
20 . $06 \%$
25 . 09
30 . 11
35 . 15
40 . 22
45 . 36
50 . 61
$55 \quad 1.01$
60

## EXHIBIT III - Actuarial Method and Assumptions (cont'd)

Withdrawal - Termination of service for reasons other than death, retirement, or disability will be in accordance with the following tables.

## Sample Withdrawal Rates

| Age | State Employees | Teachers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | 21.20\% | 12.39\% |
| 25 | 15.80\% | 9.70\% |
| 30 | 11.60\% | 7.50\% |
| 35 | 8.40\% | 5.66\% |
| 40 | 6.20\% | 4.14\% |
| 45 | 4.20\% | 2.75\% |
| 50 | 2.60\% | 1.35\% |
| 55 | -- | -- |
| 60 | -- | -- |

Cost of Living Adjustments - 3\% compound annually beginning on the January 1st following a participants third anniversary of retirement.

Actuarial Value of Assets - The actuarial value of assets was set equal to the market value of assets as of June 30, 1991 as reported to Mercer by the Treasury Department in December 1991. Gains and losses from this date onward will be recognized over a 3 -year smoothing period.

Estimation of Unknown Employee Characteristics - Missing dates for participants are estimated using a band-type averaging method assigning band grouped average dates to those individuals with missing dates of birth or hire. For example, an employee missing a date of hire is given an estimated date of hire based on the average of known dates of hire for persons in his age band. For Employees who are missing salaries, their salaries are estimated by the average salaries for those employees whose data is complete. For State Employees this is $\$ 27,585$, and for Teachers it is $\$ 37,840$ for the salary year July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.
Employees' Retirement System of the State of Rhode
Island

FINAL AVERAGE SALARY
Final average salary is the three highest consecutive years of earned salary exclusive of overtime, bonuses, or severance pay.

## NORMAL RETIREMENT

## Age and Service Requirements

General Employees may retire with full accrued benefits at age 60 with 10 years of service or after 28 years of service regardless of age.

Correctional Officers may retire with unreduced accrued benefits at age 50 with 20 years of service.

Leglslators may retire with unreduced accrued benefits at age 55 with 8 years of service or after 20 years of service with no restriction on age.

Amount of Retirement Benefits

For State Employees and Teachers:
$1.7 \%$ of final average salary times service up to 10 years, plus
$1.9 \%$ of final average salary times service in excess of ten years through 20 years, plus
$3.0 \%$ of final average salary times service in excess of 20 years up to the 34th year of service, plus
$2.0 \%$ of final average salary for the 35th year. Maximum benefit is $80 \%$ of final average salary.

## EXHIBIT IV - Summary of Plan Provisions (cont'd)

## For Correctional Officers:

2.0\% of final average salary for the first 30 years of service, plus
$6.0 \%$ of final average salary for the 31st year, plus
$5.0 \%$ of final average salary for the 32 nd year, plus
$4.0 \%$ of final average salary for the 33 rd year, plus
$3.0 \%$ of final average salary for the 34th year, plus
$2.0 \%$ of final average salary for the 35th year.
Maximum benefit is $80 \%$ of final average salary.

For Legislators:
$\$ 600$ per year of service.
Maximum benefit is $\$ 12,000$.

## DISABILITY BENEFIT

Non-occupational

Service Requirement: 5 years

Amount of Benefit: Regular pension benefit based on service to disability and final average salary at time of disability. The minimum benefit is $17 \%$ of final average salary.

## Occupational

There is no age or service requirements for the occupational disability benefit.

Amount of Benefit: Two thirds of final salary at time of disability, payable immediately. completion of 10 years of service.

EXHIBIT IV - Summary of Plan Provisions (cont'd)

PRE-RETIREMENT DEATH BENEFITS

Lump Sum Benefit

There are no age or service requirements for this benefit.

Amount of Benefit:
(a) $\$ 800$ per year of service with a minimum of $\$ 4,000$ and a maximum of $\$ 16,000$, plus
(b) Refund of employee contributions.

Joint and Survivor Benefit (optional)

Service Requirement: 10 years for General Employees and Correctional officers, 8 years for Legislators.

Amount of Benefit: Benefit employee would have received had he/she retired the day before he/she died and chosen the joint and survivor option.

Occupational Death Benefit

This benefit has no age or service requirement.

Amount of benefit:
(a) $50 \%$ of salary to spouse or children of employees under age 18, less workmen's compensation, plus
(b) refund of employee contributions.

## EXHIBIT IV - Summary of Plan Provisions (cont'd)

# POST-RETIREMENT DEATH BENEFITS 

Lump sum in the amount of:
(a) $100 \%$ of employee contributions less benefits paid, plus
(b) Pre-retirement death benefit, reduced $25 \%$ per year of retirement, with a minimum of $\$ 4,000$.

EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS State Employees: $7.75 \%$ of which $.25 \%$ reflects

Teachers: 8.5\%
Legislators: $30.0 \%$

AVAILABLE BENEFIT OPTIONS Joint and Survivor: Actuarially Equivalent Benefit paying either $100 \%$ or $50 \%$, depending on option selected, of retirement benefit to surviving beneficiary.

Social Security: Pays an increased benefit until age 62 and a reduced benefit thereafter to provide a level benefit when Social Security payments are accounted for.

Retirees' benefits are adjusted annually by $3 \%$, compounded, to allow for increases in cost of living.

Cost of living adjustments begin on the January 1st following the third anniversary of an employee's retirement.

## APPENDIX - Model Letter to Cities and Towns Participating in the Teacher's Retirement Plan

The (city) (town) of $\qquad$ provides retirement benefits to its public school teachers through its participation in the Rhode Island Retirement System, a statutory, mandatory, state-wide, multi-employer retirement system, which first covered Rhode Island teachers on July 1, 1949. This System is administered as a unified state-wide system by the State Retirement Board, the composition of which is set forth in the pertinent state statute. The assets are held in the custody of the State Treasurer as an undivided single fund.

The actuarial costs of the retirement benefits are partially funded by employee contributions of $8-1 / 2$ percent of pay effective July 1,1986 . The net employer actuarial costs are determined annually by the actuary and as provided by statute are certified by the Retirement Board to the Department of Administration as a rate percent of payroll, payable in part by the State of Rhode Island and in part by the (city) (town). The split between State and Municipality is specified in the statute. For fiscal year 1992-93, the State will pay $36 \%$ and the Municipality will pay $64 \%$. The statute provided for increasing graduated percentages of the annual normal cost and interest on the unfunded liability until the year beginning July 1, 1986 when the full normal cost and amortization payments on a 30 -year schedule are required.

The actuarial valuation prepared by William M. Mercer, Incorporated applying the entry age normal cost method with the frozen initial liability, assuming 8 percent interest return on invested assets and applying assumed rates of salary progression, allowance for postretirement increases and other actuarial assumptions - all as set forth in the published annual reports of the Retirement Board - reveal the following comparative highlights of the last three years for the Teachers system as a whole:


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

* Prepared by previous actuary.

Actuarial costs and liabilities, as shown in the summary presentation, are determined in the aggregate for the Teachers System. Accordingly, employer contributions are first determined in the aggregate for all participating employers in this multi-employer system; are then expressed as a rate percent of the aggregate participating payroll; and for fiscal year 1992-93, sixty-four percent of this rate percent is then promulgated to each participating employer as the actuarial cost factor to be applied to its participating payroll (the remaining thirty-six percent of the employer cost is contributed by the State as well as the full cost of deferred contributions by the State).

Employer contributions by the (city) (town) of $\qquad$ for each of the last year years (together with the amount for the current year, based on the promulgated rate percent of $9.05 \%$ ) are as follows:

Year Ended June 30. 1990 1991

## Participating payroll

Employer contributions

With respect to the Teachers Retirement System, William M. Mercer, Incorporated, independent actuaries advising the Retirement Board, have stated on December 20, 1991:
"We believe that the funding program set forth in the state statute is a reasonable basis for funding the Rhode Island Teachers Retirement System. If the statutory funding program is followed without change, the System will be fully funded - that is, the assets will equal the actuarial liability on June 30, 2021. In the interim the assets are projected to be sufficient at all times to meet the cash requirements for projected benefit payments."

According to the statutory funding schedule, the combined contributions required each year of the (city) (town) of $\qquad$ and the State will remain relatively level as a percent of payroll as the System moves toward funding the full actuarial liability. Ultimately,
however, because the actuarial funding results in the accumulation of reserves that are invested, the required appropriation will be significantly less than would be required if this System were on a pay-as-you-go basis.

- The promulgated rate percent for certain towns which did not participant in the 1990 early retirement incentive program is $7.91 \%$. These towns are listed below:

Code 2003 Burrillville
2009 East Greenwich
2015 Jamestown
2018 Little Compton
2025 North Smithfield


[^0]:    William M. Mercer, Incarporated

