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Seattle City Council
Seattle, Washington 98104
I am pleased to transmit the 2010 Annual Report of the Seattle City Employees' Retirement System. This Annual Report consists of four sections: the Introductory Section contains the Executive Director's letter of transmittal and the identification of the administrative organization of the System; the Financial Section contains the audited financial statements of the System, as well as a report from the System's certified public accountants; the Actuarial Section contains the independent consulting actuary's opinion, along with related actuarial data and statements; and the Statistical Section includes tables of significant data pertaining to the System operations.
The compilation of this report is the result of the combined effort of the Staff under the leadership of the Retirement Board. The intention is to provide complete and reliable information to assist in management decisions, to present evidence of compliance with legal provisions and to demonstrate responsible stewardship for the assets contributed by the members and their employers.

The Executive Director and staff have reviewed the internal accounting controls and the financial statements, supporting schedules and statistical tables, and we are of the opinion that they fairly represent the condition of the Retirement System.
The accuracy and completeness of the data contained in this report are the sole responsibility of the management of the Seattle City Employees' Retirement System.

## Overview of the Seattle City Employees' Retirement System

The Retirement System was created and established by amendment to the Charter of the City of Seattle (Article XXII - Section 13) submitted to the voters at the municipal election of March 8, 1927. The System, known thereafter as the Seattle City Employees' Retirement System (SCERS), is to provide retirement income to help maintain the quality of life for its former employees. The retirement plan is a defined benefit plan, which means the employee's salary, years of service and age at the time of retirement are used to determine the amount of retirement benefits. Members of the Retirement System also participate in the U.S. social security program and have access to participate in an IRC 457 deferred compensation plan.

The Retirement System covers employees of the City of Seattle, and certain employees of King County, METRO and the Seattle City Library. The Retirement System does not cover uniformed Police and Fire Department employees. The year ended December 31, 2010, concludes our 81st year of operations.
The City of Seattle also sponsors a voluntary deferred compensation plan which permits employees to make pre-tax contributions up to the federal limits and manage the investment allocation of their contributions. This plan is administered through the City Personnel department and a third party administrator.

## Financial Information and Management Responsibility

SCERS focus in 2010 was to identify and implement measures that respond to the national and international economic turmoil of 2008 that affected every investor as well as SCERS to ensure that SCERS is financially secure for generations to come. The respective employee and employer contribution rates were increased from $8.03 \%$ to $9.03 \%$ of gross compensation effective January 2011. The Board of Administration and management staff participated in a yearlong Asset / Liability
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Study which concluded in December 2010. The implementation of this study's results began in January 2011 and will be complete in 2013. Additionally, in 2010 the City Council passed legislation which called for an analysis of the Retirement System to be completed for presentation in mid-2012. The study will provide a comprehensive review of the Retirement System structure and benefits and make recommendations to the City Council in 2012.

The ultimate responsibility for the financial statements and annual report belongs to the management of SCERS with the SCERS Board providing an oversight role. SCERS' management is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting and operations. Internal control over financial reporting is designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. Management has concluded that as of December 31, 2010, our internal control over financial reporting was effective.

## Investments during 2010

The investment portfolio income represents a significant source of revenue to the SCERS fund. The SCERS investment closed at year-end 2010 with a market value of $\$ 1,812,754,488$, compared to $\$ 1,645,297,349$ as of year-end 2009. This represents a $10.2 \%$ net increase in asset value or alternatively $\$ 167,457,139$. This compares favorably with total contributions by members and employers of $\$ 45,364,624$ and $\$ 45,224,787$ respectively.

For the year-end 2010, the fund had a rate of return of $13.2 \%$ on a market value basis. SCERS' annualized net rate of return over the last three years was negative 2.6 percent, over the last five years it was 2.3 percent, and over the last 10 years it was 3.7 percent. Proper funding and healthy investment returns are paramount to the financial soundness of SCERS. Changes in the composition of the portfolio are consistently evaluated and reflected in this Annual Report.

## Distribution of the 2010 Annual Report

The report will be posted to the System's website. We trust the departments and Retirement System members will find this report both informative and helpful.

We would like to express our gratitude to the staff, the advisors, and to the many other people who have worked so diligently to assure the successful operation of the System.


Cecelia M. Carter
Executive Director
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## REPORT OF INDEPENDENT AUDITORS

To the Board of Administration
Seattle City Employees' Retirement System
Seattle, Washington
We have audited the accompanying statements of plan net assets of the Seattle City Employees' Retirement System (the "System"), a pension trust fund of the City of Seattle, as of December 31, 2010 and 2009, and the related statements of changes in plan net assets for the years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the System's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audits to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the System's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial status of the System as of December 31, 2010 and 2009, and the changes in plan net assets for the years then ended, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Management's Discussion and Analysis and the Schedule of Funding Progress and Schedule of Employer Contributions, which are presented as Required Supplementary Information, are not a required part of the basic financial statements but are supplementary information required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board. This supplementary information is the responsibility of the System's management. We have applied certain limited procedures, which consisted principally of inquiries of management regarding the methods of measurement and presentation of the required supplementary information. However, we did not audit the information and express no opinion on it.

Our audits were conducted for the purpose of forming an opinion on the basic financial statements taken as a whole. The schedules of administrative and investment expenses are presented for purposes of additional analysis and are not a required part of the basic financial statements. This additional information is the responsibility of the System's management. The schedules of administrative and investment expenses have been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in our audits of the basic financial statements and, in our opinion, are fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole.

The introductory, actuarial, and statistical sections included in the Annual Report are presented for purposes of additional analysis and are not a required part of the basic financial statements of the System. Such additional information has not been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements, and accordingly, we express no opinion on it.

## Moss Adams LLP

Seattle, Washington
May 6, 2011

# SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2010 AND 2009 

This section presents management's discussion and analysis of the Seattle City Employees' Retirement System's (SCERS or the System) financial performance during the year ended December 31, 2010. Please read it in conjunction with the accompanying financial statements and the related notes.

The City of Seattle is responsible for establishing and maintaining an internal control structure designed to ensure the protection of assets from loss, theft, or misuse, and to ensure the accounting information generated is adequate to prepare financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles. The internal control structure is designed to provide reasonable, though not absolute, assurance of achieving these objectives.

As a department of the City of Seattle, the Seattle City Employees' Retirement System is subject to this internal control structure. In addition, section 4.36.140.D of the Seattle Municipal Code requires the Board of Administration to annually transmit a report of the financial condition of the System to the City Council.

This report is prepared in accordance with the principles of governmental accounting and reporting promulgated by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB). Investments are stated at fair value, and revenues include the recognition of unrealized gains and losses. The accrual basis of accounting is used to record assets, liabilities, revenues and expenses. Revenue recognition occurs when earned without regard to the date of collection. Expense recognition occurs when the corresponding liabilities are incurred, regardless of payment date. The basis of contributions to the System follows the principles of level cost financing, with current service financed on a current basis. Milliman Consultants and Actuaries, the consulting actuary, evaluates the funding status of the System.

## This report contains the following information:

1. Basic Financial Statements including:
a. Statements of Plan Assets
b. Statements of Changes in Plan Net Assets
c. Notes to the Financial Statements
2. Required Supplementary Information including:
a. Schedule of Funding Progress
b. Schedule of Employer Contributions
3. Additional Information including:
a. Schedule of Administrative Expenses
b. Schedule of Investment Expenses

The basic financial statements are described as follows:

- The Statement of Plan Net Assets shows the account balances at year-end and includes the net assets available for future benefit payments. The liabilities for future benefit payments are not included in this statement; however, they are shown in the Schedule of Funding Progress that is included in the Required Supplementary Information.
- The Statement of Changes in Plan Net Assets shows the sources and uses of funds during the year and illustrates the change in net assets from the previous year.


# SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS (CONTINUED) YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2010 AND 2009 

- The Notes to the Financial Statements are an integral part of the financial statements and include additional detailed information and schedules to provide a better understanding of the financial statements.

The required supplementary information provides historical trends that help to reflect the ongoing plan perspective and the long-term nature of the defined benefit plan.

- The Schedule of Funding Progress contains actuarial information about the status of the plan.
- The Schedule of Employer Contributions contains historical trend information regarding the value of the total annual contributions the employer must pay and the actual contributions by employers in meeting this requirement.


## Financial Highlights

- SCERS assets that are held in trust for the payment of future benefits do not exceed the estimate of actuarially accrued liabilities as of December 31, 2010.
- Net assets increased by $\$ 167$ million (10.2\%) during 2010. The primary drivers of this increase were the portfolio's allocation to U.S. and non-U.S. equity, which returned $21.4 \%$ and $12.8 \%$ for the year, respectively.
- Revenue for 2010 was $\$ 299$ million which includes member and employer contributions of $\$ 90.6$ million and revenue from investment activity totaling $\$ 209$ million.
- Expenses (deductions from net assets) for 2010 increased by $\$ 11.4$ million (9.4\%) from 2009. This can be primarily attributed to a $\$ 5.5$ million increase in retiree benefits and a $\$ 5.0$ million increase in contribution refunds compared to 2009.


## Plan Net Assets

The table below provides a summary of assets and current liabilities for the years ended December 31:

|  | 2010 |  | 2009 |  | 2008 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash, short-term investments and receivables | \$ | 21,115,635 | \$ | 34,520,842 | \$ | 31,851,993 |
| Investments at fair value |  | 1,806,418,126 |  | 1,624,966,184 |  | 1,461,014,814 |
| Securities lending collateral |  | 33,896,148 |  | 36,491,886 |  | 69,838,616 |
| Equipment |  | - |  | 2,273 |  | 2,618 |
| Total assets |  | 1,861,429,909 |  | 1,695,981,185 |  | 1,562,708,041 |
| Securities lending payable |  | 37,295,301 |  | 40,437,944 |  | 75,393,782 |
| Other payables |  | 11,380,120 |  | 10,245,892 |  | 9,887,781 |
| Total liabilities |  | 48,675,421 |  | 50,683,836 |  | 85,281,563 |
| Total net assets | \$ | 1,812,754,488 | \$ | 1,645,297,349 | \$ | 1,477,426,478 |

# SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS (CONTINUED) YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2010 AND 2009 

## Changes in Plan Net Assets

The table below provides a summary of the changes in plan net assets and reflects the activities of the fund for the years ended December 31:

|  | 2010 |  | 2009 |  | 2008 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Additions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employer contributions | \$ | 45,224,787 | \$ | 46,650,169 | \$ | 45,961,040 |
| Member contributions |  | 45,364,624 |  | 46,613,886 |  | 45,986,139 |
| Net investment and other |  | 208,528,529 |  | 194,905,072 |  | $(618,956,502)$ |
| Total additions (deductions) |  | 299,117,940 |  | 288,169,127 |  | $(527,009,323)$ |
| Deductions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retiree benefits |  | 113,650,795 |  | 108,138,820 |  | 102,703,230 |
| Refunds of contributions |  | 14,715,000 |  | 9,742,692 |  | 10,223,415 |
| Administrative expenses |  | 3,295,006 |  | 2,416,745 |  | 2,035,665 |
| Total deductions |  | 131,660,801 |  | 120,298,257 |  | 114,962,310 |
| Net increase (decrease) | \$ | 167,457,139 | \$ | 167,870,870 | \$ | (641,971,633) |

## Revenues - Additions to Net Plan Assets

- In 2010, member contributions decreased by $\$ 1.2$ million (2.7\%) compared to 2009. In 2009, member contributions increased by $\$ 0.6$ million (1.4\%) compared to 2008.
- Employer contributions decreased by $\$ 1.4$ million (3.0\%) compared to 2009. In 2009, employer contributions increased by $\$ .7$ million (1.5\%) compared to 2008.
- Net investment change and other income was a gain of $\$ 209$ million in 2010 compared to a gain of $\$ 195$ million in 2009.


## Expenses - Deductions from Net Plan Assets

- Retiree benefits increased in 2010 by $\$ 5.5$ million ( $5.1 \%$ ) compared to 2009 , primarily due to the increased number of members making application for retirement in 2010, as well as the mandatory COLA (Cost of Living Adjustment) increase implemented in 2009. Retiree benefits increased in 2009 by $\$ 5.4$ million (5.3\%) compared to 2008.
- Refunds of contributions increased in 2010 by $\$ 5$ million (51\%) compared to amounts paid in 2009. City workforce reductions in 2010 contributed to an increase in contribution refunds. Refunds of contributions decreased in 2009 by $\$ .5$ million ( $4.7 \%$ ) compared to 2008.


# SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS (CONTINUED) YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2010 AND 2009 

## Changes in Plan Membership

The table below reflects the active membership and retiree changes for the years ended December 31:

|  | 2010 | 2009 | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retirees and beneficiaries receiving benefit | 5,428 | 5,304 | 2.3\% |
| Current and terminated employees entitled to, but not yet receiving benefits |  |  |  |
| Current employee members | 8,599 | 9,071 | (5.2\%) |
| Vested employee members | 1,998 | 2,006 | (0.4\%) |
| Total | 10,597 | 11,077 | (4.3\%) |

## Funding Status

> Schedule of Funding Progress
> Funding Ratio
> As of January $1^{\text {st }}$ Valuation Date


Funds are accumulated from employer and employee contributions, and investment earnings, and are used to pay present and future benefit obligations and administrative expenses. The better the level of funding, the larger the ratio of assets accumulated and investment income potential. We continue to make a constant effort to achieve a fully funded status, thereby assuring the participants of a financially sound retirement system. Most active members contribute $8.03 \%$ of their salaries to the retirement fund and the City contributes 8.03\%.

## Investment Activities

One-year returns on asset classes and comparative benchmarks are presented in the table below for the years ended December 31:

|  | 2010 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total Portfolio | $13.2 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ |
| Domestic Equities | $21.4 \%$ | $29.3 \%$ |
| Benchmark: Russell 3000 Index | $16.9 \%$ | $28.3 \%$ |
| International Equities | $12.8 \%$ | $36.1 \%$ |
| Benchmark: MSCE EAFE Index | $8.2 \%$ | $32.5 \%$ |
| Fixed Income | $7.4 \%$ | $19.5 \%$ |
| Benchmark: Barclays Capital Aggregate | $7.2 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ |
| Real Estate | $0.1 \%$ | $(31.3 \%)$ |
| Benchmark: Russell NCREIF Property Index | $5.8 \%$ | $(16.8 \%)$ |
| Alternative Investments | $6.8 \%$ | $14.2 \%$ |
| Benchmark: Treasury Bills + 5\% | $3.3 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ |
| Mezzanine Debt | $10.8 \%$ | $(39.8 \%)$ |
| Benchmark: $9 \%$ Assumption | $9.0 \%$ | $9.0 \%$ |
| Cash | $2.7 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| Benchmark: 91-Day T-bills | $0.1 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |

The investments of the System are governed primarily by the prudent person rule. The prudent person rule, as set forth by the Revised Code of Washington, establishes a standard for all fiduciaries, which includes anyone who has authority with respect to the fund.

The recoup of the financial markets in the U.S. and abroad impacted the System's investments and resulted in an increase in plan asset value in 2010 and 2009, compared to the loss experienced in plan asset values in 2008. The System invests retirement funds for the long-term, anticipating both good and poor performing financial markets. The overall investment portfolio is positioned in a diversified manner to minimize investment risk.

## Contacting the Seattle City Employees' Retirement System

If you have questions about this report or need additional information, please contact us by telephone at: 206.386.1293 or by e-mail at: City.Retirement@Seattle.gov or you may mail your questions to:

Seattle City Employees' Retirement System
720 Third Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98104

# SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM STATEMENTS OF PLAN NET ASSETS <br> DECEMBER 31, 2010 AND 2009 

Assets:
Cash and equity in pooled investments
Short-term investment funds
Securities lending collateral held
Total cash and short-term investments

Receivables:
Members
Employer
Interest and dividends

| 2010 |  |  | 2009 |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\$$ | $12,882,916$ |  | $\$$ | $18,347,438$ |
| $3,183,239$ |  | $11,026,863$ |  |  |
|  | $33,896,148$ |  | $36,491,886$ |  |
|  | $49,962,303$ |  | $65,866,187$ |  |


| $1,864,510$ | $1,989,617$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $1,438,899$ | $1,332,367$ |
| $1,746,071$ |  |
| $5,049,480$ | $1,824,557$ |

Investments, at fair value:
U.S. Government obligations

Corporate bonds
Domestic stocks
International stocks
Real estate
Alternative/venture capital
Mezzanine debt
Total investments

Equipment and fixtures, at cost, net of accumulated depreciation of \$201,830 in 2009

Total assets
Liabilities:
Pensions payable and other
Securities lending obligation
Total liabilities

Net assets held in trust for pension benefits

|  | $11,380,120$ |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $37,295,301$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $10,245,892$ |
|  | $48,675,421$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | $50,437,944$ |
|  |  |  |  |


|  | 2010 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADDITIONS: |  |  |  |  |
| Contributions: |  |  |  |  |
| Employer | \$ | 45,224,787 | \$ | 46,650,169 |
| Member |  | 45,364,624 |  | 46,613,886 |
| Total contributions |  | 90,589,411 |  | 93,264,055 |
| Investment activities: |  |  |  |  |
| Investment income: |  |  |  |  |
| Net change in fair value of investments |  | 197,390,947 |  | 183,523,735 |
| Interest |  | 8,542,125 |  | 13,405,079 |
| Dividends |  | 7,063,945 |  | 1,127,943 |
| Net investment income |  | 212,997,017 |  | 198,056,757 |
| Investment activity expenses: |  |  |  |  |
| Investment management fees |  | $(4,050,116)$ |  | $(3,015,468)$ |
| Performance consultant fees |  | $(370,810)$ |  | $(256,170)$ |
| Investment custodial fees |  | $(111,851)$ |  | $(95,376)$ |
| Total investment activity expenses |  | (4,532,777) |  | (3,367,014) |
| Net income from investment activities |  | 208,464,240 |  | 194,689,743 |
| Securities lending activities: |  |  |  |  |
| Securities lending income |  | 85,693 |  | 361,238 |
| Securities lending expenses: |  |  |  |  |
| Borrower rebates |  | - |  | $(75,156)$ |
| Management fees |  | $(21,404)$ |  | $(70,753)$ |
| Total securities lending expenses |  | $(21,404)$ |  | $(145,909)$ |
| Net income from securities lending activities |  | 64,289 |  | 215,329 |
| Total additions |  | 299,117,940 |  | 288,169,127 |
| DEDUCTIONS: |  |  |  |  |
| Benefits |  | 113,650,795 |  | 108,138,820 |
| Refunds of contributions |  | 14,715,000 |  | 9,742,691 |
| Administrative expenses |  | 3,295,006 |  | 2,416,745 |
| Total deductions |  | 131,660,801 |  | 120,298,256 |
| NET CHANGE |  | 167,457,139 |  | 167,870,871 |
| NET ASSETS HELD IN TRUST FOR PENSION BENEFITS |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning of year |  | 1,645,297,349 |  | 1,477,426,478 |
| End of year | \$ | 1,812,754,488 | \$ | 1,645,297,349 |

# SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS DECEMBER 31, 2010 AND 2009 

## Note 1 - Plan Description

The Seattle City Employees' Retirement System (the System) is a single-employer defined benefit public employee retirement plan, covering employees of the City of Seattle and administered in accordance with Chapter 4.36 of the Seattle Municipal Code. The System is a pension trust fund of the City of Seattle.

The System is administered by the Retirement System Board of Administration (the Board). The Board consists of seven members including the Chair of the Finance Committee of the Seattle City Council, the City of Seattle Finance Director, the City of Seattle Personnel Director, two active and one retired members of the System who are elected by other system members, and one outside board member who is appointed by the other six board members. Elected and appointed board members serve for three year terms.

All employees of the City of Seattle are eligible for membership in the system with the exception of uniformed police and fire personnel who are covered under a retirement system administered by the State of Washington. Employees of METRO and the King County Health Department who established membership in the System when these organizations were City of Seattle departments were allowed to continue their System membership. There are currently 5428 retirees and beneficiaries receiving benefits, and 8599 active members of the System. There are 1998 terminated employees entitled to future benefits.

The System provides retirement, death, and disability benefits. Retirement benefits vest after five years of credited service, while death and disability benefits vest after ten years of service. Retirement benefits are calculated as $2 \%$ multiplied by years of creditable service, multiplied by average salary, based on the highest 24 consecutive months. The benefit is actuarially reduced for early retirement.

## Note 2 - Summary of Significant Accounting Policies and Plan Asset Matters

Basis of Accounting - The financial statements were prepared using the accrual basis of accounting.
Cash and Equity in Pooled Investments - The System classifies cash and equity in pooled investments as cash on deposit in financial institutions and cash on deposit in the City of Seattle's internal cash management pool. The System also recognizes certain short-term highly liquid securities with an original maturity of three months or less as cash equivalents.

Method Used to Value Investments - U.S. equities, non-U.S. equities, U.S. fixed income, non-U.S. fixed income, and short-term investments are reported at fair market value, which is based on the quoted market price. Private equity and real estate equities are reported at fair value which has been determined by independent appraisers and, to a limited extent, in-house appraisers. Investment income consists of realized and unrealized appreciation (depreciation) in the fair value of investments, interest income earned, less investment expense, plus income from securities lending activities, less deduction for security lending expenses. Securities and securities transactions are reflected in the financial statements on a trade-date basis. Investments are made in accordance with the Prudent Person Rule as defined by the State of Washington RCW 35.39.060.

# SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS DECEMBER 31, 2010 AND 2009 

## Note 2 - Summary of Significant Accounting Policies and Plan Asset Matters (Continued)

Contributions - Employee and employer contributions are reported in the period and for the calendar year in which the contributions are due.

Equipment and Fixtures - Equipment and fixtures are stated at actual cost less accumulated depreciation. Estimated useful lives of major classes include three years for computer equipment and 15 year for office furniture and equipment. The straight-line method of depreciation method is used.

Benefits and Refunds of Contributions - Benefits and refunds of contributions are recognized when due and are payable in accordance with the System's policy.

## Note 3 - Contributions

Member and employer contributions rates are established by the Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 4.36.

The employer contribution rate is determined by the actuarial formula identified as the Entry Age Cost Method. The formula determines the amount of contributions necessary to fund the current service cost, representing the estimated amount necessary to pay for benefits earned by the employees during the current service year and the amount of contributions necessary to pay for prior service costs. Total required contributions, including amounts necessary to pay administrative costs, are determined through biannual actuarial valuations.

Actuarially determined contribution rates are currently $8.03 \%$ for most members and $8.03 \%$ for the employer. There are no long-term contracts for contributions outstanding and currently no legally required reserves.

As of January 1, 2010, the most recent valuation date, the funded status of the fund was $62.0 \%$. The schedule of funding progress, immediately following the notes to the financial statements, presents multi-year trend information about the funded status, actuarial value of assets, and actuarial accrued liability.
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## Note 3 - Contributions (Continued)

The information presented in the required supplementary schedules was determined as part of the actuarial valuation at the dates indicated. Additional information as of the latest actuarial valuation is as follows:

| Valuation date | January 1, 2010 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Actuarial cost method | Entry age |
| Amortization method | Level percent |
| Remaining amortization period | 30+ years |
| Asset valuation method | Market |
| Actuarial assumptions: |  |
| Investment rate of return* | 7.75\% |
| Projected salary increases* | 4.00\% |
| Post-retirement benefit increases | 1.50\% annual COLA and 65\% Restoration of |
|  | Purchasing Power |
| Funding progress: |  |
| Actuarial value of assets | \$ 1,645.3 million |
| Actuarial accrued liability | \$ 2,653.8 million |
| Unfunded actuarial accrued liability | \$ 1,008.5 million |

## Note 4 - Cash and Equity in Pooled Investments

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) insures the cash deposits up to $\$ 250,000$. As provided by the State of Washington RCW 43.84, the Washington Public Deposit Protection Commission (PDPC) collateralizes deposits in excess of $\$ 100,000$. The bank balances of deposits of a FDIC institution as of the balance sheet date are insured.

## Note 5 - Investments

The System's investments include investments that are insured or registered or securities held by the System or its agent in the System's name.

Short-term Investment Funds (STIF) is a collective trust that may include certificates of deposit, treasury bills, and mutual funds. The Alternative Investments category currently includes private equity, hedge funds and real estate funds.
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Note 5 - Investments (Continued)
Custodial Credit Risk - Custodial credit risk is the risk that in the event of the failure of a financial institution or a bank, the System will not be able to recover the value of its deposits or investments that are in the possession of an outside party. The System mitigates custodial credit risk by having its investment securities held by the System's custodian (BNY Mellon) and the investments are registered in the System's name. The System's short-term investments are created through daily sweeps of excess cash by the System's custodian, and invested in a vehicle managed by the custodian. Additionally, the System keeps on hand with the City of Seattle such cash dollar amounts to support two months equivalent of pension payments and other administrative expenses.

Credit Risk - Credit risk is the risk that an issuer, or other counterparty, to an investment will not fulfill its obligations. In accordance with the System's Investment Policy, the Retirement Board provides each of the System's investment managers with a set of investment guidelines. These guidelines specify eligible investments, minimum diversification standards, and applicable investment restrictions necessary for diversification and risk control. In general, these guidelines require that at least 70 percent of the net asset value of a manager's portfolio be invested in investment-grade securities. Managers do not have authority to depart from their guidelines.

Concentration of Credit Risk - Concentration of credit risk is the risk of loss attributed to the magnitude of a government's investment in a single issuer. In accordance with the System's Investment Policy, the Retirement Board provides each of the System's investment managers with a set of investment guidelines. These guidelines specify eligible investments, minimum diversification standards, and applicable investment restrictions necessary for diversification and risk control. In general, these guidelines require that investments in any one issuer may not exceed 5 percent of the net asset value of a manager's portfolio. Managers do not have authority to depart from their guidelines.

Interest Rate Risk - Interest rate risk is the risk that changes in interest rates over time will adversely affect the fair value of an investment. Market or interest rate risk is the greatest risk faced by an investor in the debt securities market. The price of a debt security typically moves in the opposite direction of the change in interest rates. In accordance with the System's Investment Policy, the Retirement Board provides each of the System's investment managers with a set of investment guidelines. These guidelines specify eligible investments, minimum diversification standards, and applicable investment restrictions necessary for diversification and risk control. In general, these guidelines require that the weighted average duration of the security holdings of a manager's portfolio not vary from that of the applicable benchmark by more than 20 percent. Managers do not have authority to depart from their guidelines.

Foreign Currency Risk - Foreign currency risk is the risk that changes in exchange rates will adversely impact the fair value of an investment. The System's currency risk exposures, or exchange rate risk, primarily reside within the international equity investment holdings. The System expects these managers to maintain adequately diversified portfolios to limit foreign currency and security risk.

## SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS DECEMBER 31, 2010 AND 2009

Note 5 - Investments (Continued)
The fixed income portfolio is primarily managed by four external money management firms, hired through a competitive bid process, to manage a diversified portfolio of fixed income securities. Managers have agreed to a set of guidelines that provide ranges and limits for varying types of securities that may be held within the portfolio. A consultant is hired to measure performance and monitor the investment style. The Investment Committee reviews the consultant's results quarterly.
SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2010 AND 2009
Note 5 - Investments (Continued)

| Fair Value |  | Investment Maturities (in years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $<1$ |  | 1-5 |  | 6-10 |  | > 10 |  |
| \$ | 42,505,452 | \$ | 7,835,251 | \$ | 15,071,149 | \$ | 15,431,933 | \$ | 4,167,119 |
|  | 1,462,679 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 1,462,679 |
|  | 13,201,951 |  | - |  | 7,827,442 |  | 3,333,952 |  | 2,040,557 |
|  | 1,448,358 |  | - |  | 163,970 |  | 266,347 |  | 1,018,041 |
|  | 40,367,846 |  | - |  | 371,440 |  | 8,522,650 |  | 31,473,756 |
|  | 7,195,221 |  | - |  | - |  | 1,883,665 |  | 5,311,556 |
|  | 2,172,810 |  | - |  | - |  | 97,742 |  | 2,075,068 |
|  | 5,521,387 |  | - |  | 37,891 |  | 112,294 |  | 5,371,202 |
|  | 39,738,271 |  | 777,487 |  | 10,798,145 |  | 18,669,525 |  | 9,493,114 |
|  | 13,686,434 |  | 804,623 |  | 4,393,430 |  | 2,832,486 |  | 5,655,895 |
|  | 17,065,242 |  | 701,389 |  | 7,500,736 |  | 3,598,767 |  | 5,264,350 |
|  | 307,239 |  | - |  | - |  | 307,239 |  | - |
|  | 115,031 |  | 115,031 |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| \$ | 184,787,921 | \$ | 10,233,781 | \$ | 46,164,203 | \$ | 55,056,600 | \$ | 73,333,337 |

As of December 31, 2010, the fixed income portfolio of the System had the following investment maturities and ratings:

Note 5 - Investments (Continued)

|  | Fair Value | Treasury |  | Agency |  | AAA |  | AA |  | A |  | BBB |  | BB |  | B |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CCC } \\ \& \text { Below } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Not <br> Rated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 42,505,452 | \$ | 42,487,725 | \$ | - | \$ | 17,727 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  | 1,462,679 |  | 1,462,679 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
|  | 13,201,951 |  | 2,444,110 |  | 8,790,306 |  | - |  | 213,603 |  | 1,753,932 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
|  | 1,448,358 |  | - |  | - |  | 443,130 |  | 156,984 |  | 848,244 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
|  | 40,367,846 |  | - |  | 25,460,527 |  | 14,907,319 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
|  | 7,195,221 |  | - |  | 26,874 |  | 5,013,079 |  | - |  | 190,039 |  | 77,080 |  | - |  | - |  | 1,744,430 |  | 143,719 |
|  | 2,172,810 |  | - |  | 1,892,048 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 280,762 |  | - |
|  | 5,521,387 |  | - |  | 10,655 |  | 2,700,674 |  | 193,389 |  | 272,917 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 1,981,047 |  | 362,705 |
|  | 39,738,271 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 4,282,377 |  | 15,729,493 |  | 15,020,708 |  | 1,841,087 |  | 2,695,636 |  | 168,970 |  | - |
|  | 13,686,434 |  | - |  | - |  | 5,632,680 |  | 237,218 |  | - |  | 717,682 |  | 667,825 |  | 1,944,740 |  | 3,285,074 |  | 1,201,215 |
|  | 17,065,242 |  | - |  | - |  | 6,632,401 |  | 2,193,268 |  | 3,915,811 |  | 743,988 |  | 67,498 |  | 1,423,062 |  | - |  | 2,089,214 |
|  | 307,239 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 15,397 |  | - |  | 133,212 |  | 158,630 |
|  | 115,031 |  | $-$ |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 47,300 |  | 67,731 |
| \$ | 184,787,921 | \$ | 46,394,514 | \$ | 36,180,410 | \$ | 35,347,010 | \$ | 7,276,839 | \$ | 22,710,436 | \$ | 16,559,458 | \$ | 2,591,807 | \$ | 6,063,438 | \$ | 7,640,795 | \$ | 4,023,214 |

Fixed income portfolio investments are included in U.S. Government obligations and corporate bonds on the Statements of Plan Net Assets as of December 31, 2010 and 2009 along with related investments held in other federal and corporate securities, mutual funds and short-term investments.
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## Note 6 - Securities Lending Transactions

Gross income from securities lending transactions are recorded in the operating statements as well as the various fees paid to the institution that oversees the lending activity. The value of the collateral that is being held is represented as an asset and a liability on the Statement of Plan Net Assets.

Under the authority of State of Washington RCW 41.28.005 and the Seattle Municipal Code 4.36.130, the System's Board of Administration adopted investment policies that define eligible investments, which include securities lending transactions. Through a custodial agent, the System participates in a securities lending program whereby securities are lent for the purpose of generating additional income to the System. The System lends securities from its investment portfolio on a collateralized basis to third parties, primarily financial institutions. The market value of the required collateral must meet or exceed $102 \%$ of the market value of the securities lent, providing a margin against a decline in the market value of the collateral, and is limited to a volume of less than $\$ 75$ million. The contractual agreement with the System's custodian provides indemnification in the event the borrower fails to return the securities lent or fails to pay the System income it is due on the securities lent. Cash and U.S. government securities were received as collateral for these loans. The System invests cash collateral received; accordingly, investments made with cash collateral appear as an asset. A corresponding liability is recorded as the System must return the cash collateral to the borrower upon the expiration of the loan. As of December 31, the System has no credit risk exposure to borrowers; amounts owed to borrowers exceeds the amount the borrower owes the System.

|  | 2010 |  |  |  | 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fair Value of Securities Lent |  | Collateral |  | Fair Value of Securities Lent |  | Collateral |  |
| Types of Securities Lent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| U.S. Government and Agencies | \$ | 14,338,459 | \$ | 14,630,175 | \$ | 14,597,822 | \$ | 14,911,180 |
| U.S. Corporate Fixed Income |  | 2,866,505 |  | 2,936,675 |  | 1,211,466 |  | 1,228,985 |
| U.S. Equities |  | 19,274,570 |  | 19,728,451 |  | 23,557,576 |  | 24,297,779 |
| Total Securities Lent | \$ | 36,479,534 | \$ | 37,295,301 | \$ | 39,366,864 | \$ | 40,437,944 |
|  |  |  |  | 2010 |  |  |  | 2009 |
| Collateral Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| U.S. Corporate Obligations |  |  | \$ | 3,500,438 |  |  | \$ | 20,500,000 |
| Bank Obligations |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | 5,535,035 |
| Repurchase Agreements |  |  |  | 31,796,237 |  |  |  | 1,875,000 |
| Asset Backed Securities |  |  |  | 1,998,626 |  |  |  | 7,650,909 |
| Certificates of Deposits |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | 4,877,000 |
| Total Collateral |  |  | \$ | 37,295,301 |  |  | \$ | 40,437,944 |
| Fair Value of Collateral Held |  |  | \$ | 33,896,148 |  |  | \$ | 36,491,886 |

## SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS DECEMBER 31, 2010 AND 2009

## Note 7 - Commitments

The System has entered into capital commitments to fund partnership interests in certain mezzanine debt and alternative investments. At December 31, 2010, the System has unfunded commitments of approximately $\$ 31.5$ million to these partnerships.

# SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM <br> SCHEDULE OF FUNDING PROGRESS 

(Dollar Amounts in Millions)
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2010

| Actuarial <br> Valuation <br> Date <br> January 1 | Actuarial <br> Value of <br> Assets <br> (a) | Actuarial Accrued Liabilities (AAL) Entry Age ${ }^{1}$ (b) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Unfunded } \\ \text { AAL } \\ (\mathrm{UAAL})^{2} \\ (\mathrm{~b}-\mathrm{a}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Funded <br> Ratio <br> (a/b) | Covered Payroll ${ }^{3}$ <br> (c) | UAAL as a <br> Percentage <br> of Covered <br> Payroll <br> ( $(b-a) / c$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 | \$1,582.7 | \$1,403.1 | \$ (179.6) | 112.8\% | \$ 383.6 | (46.8\%) |
| 2002 | \$1,383.7 | \$1,581.4 | \$ 197.7 | 87.5\% | \$ 405.1 | 48.8\% |
| 2004 | \$1,527.5 | \$1,778.9 | \$ 251.4 | 85.9\% | \$ 424.7 | 59.2\% |
| 2006 | \$1,791.8 | \$2,017.5 | \$ 225.7 | 88.8\% | \$ 447.0 | 50.5\% |
| 2008 | \$2,119.4 | \$2,294.6 | \$ 175.2 | 92.4\% | \$ 501.9 | 34.9\% |
| 2010 | \$1,645.3 | \$2,653.8 | \$ 1,008.5 | 62.0\% | \$ 580.9 | 173.6\% |

1 Actuarial present value of benefits less actuarial present value of future normal cost based on Entry Age Actuarial Cost Method.

2 Actuarial accrued liabilities less actuarial value of assets.
3 Covered Payroll includes compensation paid to all active employees on which contributions are calculated.

| Year Ended <br> December 31 | Actual <br> Employer <br> Contributions |  | 35.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\$$ | Percentage <br> Contributed |  |
| 2005 | $\$$ | 37.9 | $100 \%$ |
| 2006 | $\$$ | 40.3 | $100 \%$ |
| 2007 | $\$$ | 46.0 | $100 \%$ |
| 2008 | $\$$ | 46.6 | $100 \%$ |
| 2009 | $\$$ | 45.2 | $100 \%$ |
| 2010 |  | $100 \%$ |  |

For additional information regarding employer contributions, see the notes to the financial statements.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ |  | Actual Expenses |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2010 |  | 2009 |  |
| Personnel Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 1,033,611 | \$ | 966,058 | \$ | 758,830 |
| Payroll Taxes and Benefits |  | 339,940 |  | 319,243 |  | 255,545 |
| Total Personnel Services |  | 1,373,551 |  | 1,285,301 |  | 1,014,375 |
| Maintenance and Operations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professional Services |  | 311,868 |  | 854,285 |  | 393,623 |
| Office Rent |  | 110,000 |  | 136,143 |  | 153,696 |
| Data Processing |  | 707,534 |  | 663,589 |  | 681,322 |
| Office Supplies |  | 256,893 |  | 259,730 |  | 88,815 |
| Postage |  | 55,000 |  | 41,205 |  | 40,093 |
| Telephone |  | 17,480 |  | 33,350 |  | 20,171 |
| Travel |  | 75,000 |  | 11,250 |  | 13,638 |
| Training |  | 30,464 |  | 7,880 |  | 10,667 |
| Depreciation |  | - |  | - |  | 345 |
| Gain/Loss Disposition Fixed Asset |  | - |  | 2,273 |  | - |
| Total Maintenance and Operations |  | 1,564,239 |  | 2,009,705 |  | 1,402,370 |
| Total Administrative Expense: | \$ | 2,937,790 | \$ | 3,295,006 | \$ | 2,416,745 |

Investment Services
American Core Realty Fund ..... \$ 20,365
Babson Tower Square Partners II ..... 123,848
Bison Capital Equity Partners II ..... 143,588
Calmos ..... 20,292
Carlyle Mezzanine Partners ..... 117,936
Carlyle Realty Fund IV ..... 22,478
Dimensional ..... 610,829
Earnest ..... 33,622
Evergreen ..... 27,110
Attucks Cap ..... 641,389
BlackRock ..... 232,285
Pugh ..... 71,606
JP Morgan Real Estate Funds ..... 596,233
Nogales Investors Fund II ..... 59,400
Reams Asset Management ..... 148,490
RREEF American REIT II ..... 8,410
Rhumbline ..... 42,215
PIMCO ..... 265,285
PIMCO Liquidating ..... 40,635
Smith Whiley Pelham Fund III ..... 420,177
TCW Crescent Mezzanine Partners IV ..... 85,704
Washington Capital Management ..... 93,732
Western Asset Management ..... 224,487 ..... 4,050,116
Performance MeasurementPension Consulting Alliance370,810
Custodial Services
Bank of New York Mellon ..... 111,851 ..... 111,851
Securities Lending ServicesBank of New York Mellon21,404
Total Investment Expenses+ 4,554,181
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Retirement Board
Seattle City Employees' Retirement System
720 Third Avenue, Suite 1000
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Members of the Board:
As requested, we have made an actuarial valuation of the Seattle City Employees' Retirement System (SCERS) as of January 1, 2010. This report reflects the benefit provisions and contribution rates in effect as of January 1, 2010 (including the maximum increases in member rates that were recently negotiated). There are three changes since the prior valuation (January 1, 2008) that we consider material:

- Significant investment losses that occurred in 2008 have decreased the market value of assets.
- New assumptions reflecting increased life expectancies were adopted with the recent (2009) study of mortality experience.
- It is our understanding that increases in contributions for most members will be capped at $10.03 \%$ of pay based on recent negotiations.


## Actuarial Certification

In preparing this report, we relied, without audit, on information (some oral and some in writing) supplied by SCERS staff. This information includes, but is not limited to, statutory provisions, employee data, and financial information. We found this information to be reasonably consistent and comparable with information used for other purposes. The valuation results depend on the integrity of this information. If any of this information is inaccurate or incomplete our results may be different and our calculations may need to be revised.

All costs, liabilities, rates of interest, and other factors for the System have been determined on the basis of actuarial assumptions and methods which are individually reasonable (taking into account the experience of the System and reasonable expectations); and which, in combination, offer a reasonable estimate of anticipated experience affecting the System.

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

[^0]plan provisions or applicable law. Due to the limited scope of our assignment, we did not perform an analysis of the potential range of future measurements. The Retirement Board has the final decision regarding the appropriateness of the assumptions and adopted them as indicated in Appendix A.

Actuarial computations presented in this report are for purposes of determining the recommended funding amounts for SCERS. Actuarial computations under GASB Statement No. 25 are for purposes of fulfilling financial accounting requirements. The computations prepared for these two purposes may differ as disclosed in our report. The calculations in the enclosed report have been made on a basis consistent with our understanding of SCERS' funding requirements and goals. Determinations for purposes other than meeting these requirements may be significantly different from the results contained in this report. Accordingly, additional determinations may be needed for other purposes.

Milliman's work is prepared solely for the internal business use of the SCERS. To the extent that Milliman's work is not subject to disclosure under applicable public records laws, Milliman's work may not be provided to third parties without Milliman's prior written consent. Milliman does not intend to benefit or create a legal duty to any third party recipient of its work product. Milliman's consent to release its work product to any third party may be conditioned on the third party signing a Release, subject to the following exception(s):
a) SCERS may provide a copy of Milliman's work, in its entirety, to the System's professional service advisors who are subject to a duty of confidentiality and who agree to not use Milliman's work for any purpose other than to benefit the System.
b) SCERS may provide a copy of Milliman's work, in its entirety, to other governmental entities, as required by law.

No third party recipient of Milliman's work product should rely upon Milliman's work product. Such recipients should engage qualified professionals for advice appropriate to their own specific needs.

The consultants who worked on this assignment are pension actuaries. Milliman's advice is not intended to be a substitute for qualified legal or accounting counsel.

On the basis of the foregoing, I hereby certify that, to the best of our knowledge and belief, this report along with the information contained in the CAFR is complete and accurate and has been prepared in accordance with generally recognized and accepted actuarial principles and practices. I am a member of the American Academy of Actuaries and meet the Qualification Standards to render the actuarial opinion contained herein.

[^1]I would like to express appreciation to the system staff who gave substantial assistance in supplying the data on which this report is based.

Respectfully submitted,


Nick J. Collier, ASA, EA, MAAA
Principal and Consulting Actuary
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## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Section 1 Summary of the Findings



Contribution Sufficiency

Based on the actuarial valuation of the benefits in effect under the Seattle City Employees' Retirement System as of January 1, 2010, the current contribution rate of 16.06\% of members' salaries is not sufficient to maintain the current benefits, assuming future experience follows the actuarial assumptions. This is mainly due to the recent large asset losses that were reflected in this valuation.

The current Retirement Board funding policy states that "if the Funding Ratio is less than 100\% and a UAAL (Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability) occurs which can not be amortized over a period of less than 20 years by the combined total contribution rates, additional employer contributions may be considered." The practical goal of SCERS is to amortize the UAAL over a period of 30 years or less.

It should be noted that a 30-year amortization period is the longest acceptable period under GASB standards, and is often used by retirement systems as a benchmark for funding. We prefer an amortization period shorter than 30 years, as it provides stronger funding.

The contribution rates currently in effect are not projected to amortize the UAAL over any period. Additional contributions will be required if the System is to both fund ongoing benefits, and amortize the UAAL over a period of 30 years. If the necessary increase were implemented as of January 1, 2011, the Total Contribution Rate would need to be increased from $16.06 \%$ of pay to $25.03 \%$ of pay. Since this includes the $2.00 \%$ increase allowable on the member contribution rate, the effective employer contribution rate increase needed would be $6.97 \%$ of pay. See Section 8 of this report for a discussion of possible alternate contribution rate increase schedules.

The current contribution rates for the death benefit program are sufficient to finance the $\$ 2,000$ death benefit.

## Funding Progress

Funding Progress (continued)

## Contingent COLA Benefits

On the basis of the January 1, 2008 actuarial valuation the Funding Ratio was 92.4\%. Based on the January 1, 2010 valuation, the Funding Ratio is $62.0 \%$. The decrease in the Funding Ratio is due mainly to the reflection of large asset losses since the last valuation. Because SCERS uses Market Value of Assets to calculate its Funded Ratio, the full impact of the 2008 asset loss is reflected in the 2010 valuation. A summary of the historical Funding Ratio and other measurements are shown on Graph 1 and 2.

Most public retirement systems use asset smoothing to mitigate investment volatility by recognizing portions of investment gains and losses over a period of years. A 5-year period is the most common. After a significant asset loss, systems that use asset smoothing are likely to initially appear significantly better-funded than systems that do not. Due to SCERS' policy of immediately recognizing all asset gains and losses, comparisons of SCERS with other systems will likely show a lower Funding Ratio even if the systems are in similar financial health.

All assumptions for the January 1, 2010 actuarial valuation are the same as those used for the January 1, 2008 actuarial valuation, except for the new mortality assumptions that were adopted by the Board earlier this year.

A summary of the changes in the Funding Ratio is shown below.

| Sources of Change | Funding <br> Ratio |
| :--- | ---: |
| January 1, $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ Actuarial Valuation | $\mathbf{9 2 . 4} \%$ |
| Expected Valuation-to-Valuation Change | $2.0 \%$ |
| Asset Gain/(Loss) | $(30.0) \%$ |
| Salary Less/(Greater) Than Expected | $(0.2) \%$ |
| Assumption Change (Mortality) | $(2.8) \%$ |
| Other | $0.6 \%$ |
| Total Change | $\mathbf{( 3 0 . 4 ) \%}$ |
| January 1, $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ Actuarial Valuation | $\mathbf{6 2 . 0} \%$ |

The Seattle Municipal Code allows for an increase in the cost-ofliving adjustment (COLA) available to current and future retired members. Currently, the Floor COLA is at the $65 \%$ level. The enhanced COLA benefit (70\% Floor COLA) does not become effective until the System attains at least a $100 \%$ funding level.

Since it is unknown when this benefit will become effective, especially given the current funded status of the System, we have not included the valuation of these potential benefit changes in this valuation.

## Summary Exhibit A summary of the key results of this valuation, along with a

 comparison to the January 1, 2008 valuation is shown in Table 1.
## Current Economic Environment

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Table 1 Summary of Results

|  | Valuation | Valuation | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| January 1, 2010 | January 1, 2008 | Change |  |

I. Total Membership
A. Active Members

| 9,071 | 8,842 | $2.6 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 5,304 | 5,201 | $2.0 \%$ |
| 2,006 | 2,050 | $(2.1) \%$ |
|  | 16,381 | $1.8 \%$ |

II. Pay Rate as of January 1, 2010
A. Annual Total (\$millions)

| $\$$ | 597.0 | $\$$ | 529.1 | $12.8 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $\$$ | 65,810 | $\$$ | 59,835 | $10.0 \%$ |

III. Average Monthly Benefit Paid to

Current Retirees and Beneficiaries

| A. Service Retirement | $\$$ | 1,862 | $\$$ | 1,781 | $4.5 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B. Disability Retirement |  | 1,071 |  | 1,090 | $(1.7) \%$ |
| C. Surviving Spouse and Dependents |  | 1,024 |  | 1,057 |  |
|  |  | $\$ 1,712$ |  | $\$$ | 1,647 |

IV. Actuarial Accrued Liability
A. Active Members
B. Retired Members
C. Vested Terminated Members
D. Total

| $\$$ | $1,477.4$ |  | $\$$ | $1,209.7$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  | $1,062.5$ |  | 959.9 | $22.1 \%$ |
|  | 113.9 |  | 125.0 | $(8.9) \%$ |
|  | $2,653.8$ |  | $\$$ | $2,294.6$ |

V. Assets
A. Market Value of Fund (\$millions) $\quad \$ \quad 1,645.3 \quad \$ \quad 2,119.4 \quad$ (22.4)\%
VI. Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability or Surplus Funding (\$millions)
$\begin{array}{llll}\$ & 1,008.5 & \$ & 175.2\end{array}$
475.8\%
VII. Amortization of UAAL
A. Period Based on Current Contribution does not amortize 16.2 years
B. Additional Amount Needed for 30-Year Amortization (as a \% of Payroll)
8.97\% * 0.00\%

* Total member plus employer contributions. Since member increases are capped at 2.00\%, the City would need to make up the remaining $6.97 \%$ beginning January 1, 2011.

| VIII. Funded Ratio | $62.0 \%$ | $92.4 \%$ | $(32.9) \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IX. Normal Cost as a Percent of Salary | $15.23 \%$ | $13.32 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ |

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

Graph 1 Historical Asset and Liability Comparison


Graph 2 Historical Funding Ratios


| Year | (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Funding <br> Ratio |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 2}$ | $1,221.2$ | 660.0 | 410.7 | 150.5 | $81.4 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 4}$ | $1,358.9$ | 781.8 | 432.7 | 144.4 | $84.4 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ | $1,492.0$ | 980.2 | 472.3 | 39.5 | $96.1 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ | $1,539.3$ | $1,224.6$ | 433.5 | $(118.8)$ | $110.7 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $1,872.4$ | $1,582.7$ | 469.3 | $(179.6)$ | $112.8 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | $2,088.7$ | $1,383.7$ | 507.3 | 197.7 | $87.5 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | $2,229.8$ | $1,527.5$ | 450.9 | 251.4 | $85.9 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $2,448.5$ | $1,791.8$ | 431.0 | 225.8 | $88.8 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $2,825.8$ | $2,119.4$ | 531.2 | 175.2 | $92.4 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $3,328.7$ | $1,645.3$ | 674.9 | $1,008.5$ | $62.0 \%$ |
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## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Section 2 Scope of the Report



This report presents the actuarial valuation of the Seattle City Employees' Retirement System as of January 1, 2010.

A summary of the findings resulting from this valuation is presented in the previous section. Section 3 describes the assets of the System. A summary of the assets is set forth in Table 2. Sections 3, 4, and 5 describe how the obligations of the System are to be met under the actuarial cost method in use.

Section 6 discloses actuarial information based on the requirements of Statements No. 25 and 27 of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board. Section 7 sets forth estimated actuarial gains or losses from the various sources. Section 8 discusses the current status of the System's funding and assumptions in view of recent economic volatility.

Appendix A is a summary of the actuarial procedures and assumptions used to compute the liabilities and contributions shown in this report.

The current benefit structure, as determined by the provisions of the governing law on January 1, 2010, is summarized in Appendix B. Schedules of valuation data classifying the data used in the valuation by various categories of contributing members, former contributing members, and beneficiaries make up Appendix C.

Comparative statistics are presented on the System's membership and contribution rates. Appendix D is a glossary of actuarial terms used in this report.
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## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Section 3 Assets



In many respects, an actuarial valuation can be regarded as an inventory process. The inventory is taken as of the actuarial valuation date, which for this valuation is January 1, 2010. On that date, the assets available for the payment of benefits are appraised. These assets are compared with the actuarial liabilities, which are generally well in excess of the assets. The actuarial process thus leads to a method of determining what contributions by members and their employers are needed to strike a balance.

This section of the report deals with the asset determination. In the next section, the actuarial liabilities will be discussed. Section 5 will deal with the process for determining required contributions, based on the relationship between the assets and the actuarial liabilities.

Table 2 summarizes the financial resources of the System on January 1, 2010. Of the total assets, a minor portion is set aside for the payment of current liabilities and expenses. Table 2 shows the market value of assets at January 1, 2010 and January 1,2008 . The actuarial value of assets is equal to the market value.

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Table 2 Summary of Assets

|  | January 1,2010 |  | January 1,2008 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Market Value | Distribution | Market Value | Distribution |
| Assets |  |  |  |  |
| Cash and short-term investments | 29,374,301 | 1.8\% | 81,770,726 | 3.9\% |
| Securities lending collateral | 36,491,886 | 2.2\% | 103,323,467 | 4.9\% |
| Receivables |  |  |  |  |
| Employee | 745,865 | 0.0\% | 1,029,194 | 0.0\% |
| Employer | 2,576,119 | 0.2\% | 4,387,860 | 0.2\% |
| Interest and Dividends | 1,824,557 | 0.1\% | 2,615,783 | 0.1\% |
| Total Receivables | 5,146,541 | 0.3\% | 8,032,837 | 0.4\% |
| Investments at fair value |  |  |  |  |
| US Government obligations | 178,650,109 | 10.9\% | 134,906,565 | 6.4\% |
| Domestic corporate bonds | 108,951,282 | 6.6\% | 102,791,739 | 4.9\% |
| Domestic stocks | 631,591,667 | 38.4\% | 763,843,752 | 36.0\% |
| International stocks | 305,943,218 | 18.6\% | 402,965,990 | 19.0\% |
| Real estate | 183,024,765 | 11.1\% | 286,646,176 | 13.5\% |
| Alternative/Venture capital | 159,010,143 | 9.7\% | 233,789,609 | 11.0\% |
| Mezzanine debt | 57,795,000 | 3.5\% | 114,462,620 | 5.4\% |
| Total investments | 1,624,966,184 | 98.8\% | 2,039,406,451 | 96.2\% |
| Equiment | 2,273 | 0.0\% | 2,963 | 0.0\% |
| Total assets | 1,695,981,185 | 103.1\% | 2,232,536,444 | 105.3\% |
| Liabilities |  |  |  |  |
| Pension \& Other payables | 10,245,892 | -0.6\% | 9,814,866 | -0.5\% |
| Securities lending collateral | 40,437,944 | -2.5\% | 103,323,467 | -4.9\% |
| Total Liabilities | 50,683,836 | -3.1\% | 113,138,333 | -5.3\% |
| Market Value of Net Assets |  |  |  |  |
| Held in Trust For Pension |  |  |  |  |
| Benefits | 1,645,297,349 | 100.0\% | 2,119,398,111 | 100.0\% |

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Section 4 Actuarial Liabilities



In the previous section, an actuarial valuation was related to an inventory process, and an analysis was given of the inventory of assets of the System as of the valuation date, January 1, 2010. In this section, the discussion will focus on the commitments of the System, which will be referred to as its actuarial liabilities.

Table 3 contains an analysis of the actuarial present value of all future benefits for contributing members, for former contributing members, and for beneficiaries. The analysis is given by type of benefit.

The actuarial liabilities summarized in Table 3 include the actuarial present value of all future benefits expected to be paid with respect to each member. For an active member, this value includes a measure of both benefits already earned and future benefits to be earned. Thus, for all members, active and retired, the value extends over benefits earnable and payable for the rest of their lives and, if an optional benefit is chosen, for the lives of their surviving beneficiaries.

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

Table 3 Actuarial Present Value of Future Benefits
(All dollar amounts in millions)

January 1, 2010
January 1, 2008
A. Active Members

| Service Retirement | \$ | $2,010.3$ | $\$$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vested Retirement | 58.4 |  | $1,619.6$ |
| Disability Retirement | 15.6 |  | 47.1 |
| Survivor Benefits | 27.0 |  | 12.9 |
| Refund of Member Contributions |  | 41.0 |  |
|  | $\$$ | $2,152.3$ | $\$$ |

B. Inactive Members and Annuitants

| Service Retirement | $\$$ | 970.5 | $\$$ | 864.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Disability Retirement |  | 9.5 |  | 9.4 |
| Beneficiaries | 82.5 |  | 86.5 |  |
| Inactive Members |  | 113.9 |  | 125.0 |
| Total | $\$$ | $1,176.4$ | $\$$ | $1,084.9$ |
| Grand Total | $\$$ | $3,328.7$ | $\$$ | $2,825.8$ |

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Section 5 Employer Contributions



Funding

As shown in Tables 2 and 3, the total actuarial liability exceeds the current assets. This is to be expected, because the System is anticipating future member and employer contributions. The actuarial valuation develops a contribution method to fund this shortfall.

The actuarial cost method utilized is the Entry Age Actuarial Cost Method. This cost method has two components:

1. A normal cost, and
2. An amortization of the unfunded actuarial accrued liability.

Most actuarial cost methods utilize a cost method with these two components. The vast majority of public pension plans utilize the entry age (EA) actuarial cost method, as does SCERS.

The normal cost under EA is developed so that benefits are funded as a level percentage of payroll for each member from the member's membership date to the member's termination date. One key feature of this method is that costs tend to be stable from year-to-year because most members' entry age cost percentages do not change materially from year-to-year, and because the population does not change considerably from year-to-year. Normal costs by benefit type are shown in Table 4.

> The Normal Cost Rate for the January 1,2010 actuarial valuation is significantly higher than the rate as of the January 1 , 2008 valuation. This is because: 1) The longer life expectancies increase the value of benefits, and 2 ) the higher member contribution rate of $10.03 \%$ increases the normal cost attributable to the minimum retirement benefit ( $2 x$ match) and the refund of employee contributions.

When the present value of future normal costs is subtracted from the present value of total benefits, the result is the actuarial accrued liability. This can also be thought of as the present value of past normal costs, or the amount which would be in the fund if all prior assumptions had been exactly met. To the extent that this actuarial accrued liability exceeds plan assets, an unfunded actuarial accrued liability (UAAL) exists. This is currently the situation for the SCERS.

Actuarial Gains and Losses

Because a UAAL exists, the total System costs must reflect an amortization of this UAAL. In general, a UAAL exists when liabilities increase more than anticipated or assets increase less than anticipated.

## Amortization of UAAL

When experience is different from actuarial expectation, an actuarial gain or loss occurs. Section 7 illustrates the historical actuarial gains and losses by source. Note that the large investment losses during 2008 resulted in an actuarial loss on assets of $\$ 765.5$ million for the two-year period. Ongoing actuarial gains and losses decrease and increase the UAAL. Table 6 compares the $16.06 \%$ total contribution rate with the necessary funding components: normal cost and amortization of UAAL. The table shows that the total contribution rate exceeds the normal cost, with the remaining contribution going toward an amortization of the UAAL. The resulting amortization payment of $0.83 \%$ is not projected to amortize the UAAL over any period of time as of January 1, 2010. This means that if the contribution rate is not increased, and all actuarial assumptions are met, the UAAL is not projected to be paid off in the future.

The current Retirement Board funding policy states that "if the Funding Ratio is less than $100 \%$ and a UAAL occurs which can not be amortized over a period of less than 20 years by the combined total contribution rates, additional employer contributions may be considered." The contribution rates currently in effect do not amortize the UAAL over any period of time. In Section 8 of this report, we discuss optional increases to the contribution rate that would be projected to amortize the UAAL over a period of 30 years.

If SCERS were to immediately (i.e., as of the beginning of the next calendar year) increase the contribution rate to amortize the UAAL over 30 years from January 1, 2010, the Total Contribution Rate would increase from $16.06 \%$ of pay to $25.03 \%$ of pay. Since this includes the maximum $2.00 \%$ increase on the employee contribution rate, the additional employer contribution rate increase needed would be 6.97\%. This change is assumed to be effective at January 1, 2011.

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

Table 4 Normal Cost Contribution Rates as Percentages of Salary

|  | January 1, 2010 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| January 1, 2008 |  |  |
| Service Retirement | $11.57 \%$ | $10.23 \%$ |
| Vested Retirement | 1.25 | 1.00 |
| Disability Retirement | 0.18 | 0.17 |
| Survivor Benefits | 0.21 | 0.21 |
| Refund of Member Contributions | 1.62 | 1.31 |
| Administrative Expenses | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| Total | $15.23 \%$ | $13.32 \%$ |

# Seattle City Employees' Retirement System <br> Actuarial Valuation 

## Table $5 \quad$ Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability

(All dollar amounts in millions)

January 1, $2010 \quad$ January 1, 2008
A. Actuarial present value of all future benefits for present and former members and their survivors (Table 3)
$\begin{array}{llll}\$ & 3,328.7 & \$ & 2,825.8\end{array}$
B. Less actuarial present value of total future normal costs for present members

|  | 674.9 |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2,653.8 |  |

C. Actuarial accrued liability $[A-B]$
D. Less actuarial value of assets available for benefits (Table 2)

1,645.3
2,119.4
E. Unfunded actuarial accrued liability (Funding Excess, if negative) [C - D]
F. Funding Ratio $[\mathrm{D} \div \mathrm{C}]$
62.0\%
92.4\%

# Seattle City Employees' Retirement System <br> Actuarial Valuation 

Table 6 Contribution Rates as Percentages of Salary

|  |  | January 1, 2010 | January 1, 2008 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | Employer contribution rate | 8.03 \% | 8.03 \% |
| B. | Member contribution rate | 8.03 | 8.03 |
| C. | Total contribution rate ${ }^{(1)}$ | 16.06 \% | 16.06 \% |
| D. | Less total normal cost rate ${ }^{(2)}$ | 15.23 | 13.32 |
| E. | Excess of contribution rate over normal cost rate | 0.83 \% | 2.74 \% |
| F. | Amortization period | does not amortize | 16.2 years |
| G. Allocation of employer contribution rate ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Normal cost | 7.20 \% | 5.29 \% |
|  | Amortization payment | 0.83 | 2.74 |
|  | Total employer contribution rate | 8.03 \% | 8.03 \% |
| ${ }^{(1)} 16.06 \%$ is the current rate being contributed as of January 1, 2010. To maintain a 30-year amortization, the rate must be increased as discussed on page 1 of this report. |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{(2)}$ Reflects anticipated increase in member rate to $10.03 \%$ of payroll. |  |  |  |
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## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Section 6 Actuarial Information for Accounting Purposes



The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) has issued standards under Statements No. 25 and 27. Statement 25 is required reporting by the plan (the System) and Statement 27 is reporting by state and local governmental employers (the City).

Statement 25 included certain supplementary information:

1. A schedule of funding progress, and
2. A schedule of employer contributions.

The schedule of funding progress is shown in Table 8 and compares assets and liabilities over the years. In particular, it shows the funded ratio and Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability (UAAL). As shown by Table 8, the plan was fully funded or nearly fully funded from 1996 through 2000. Because of the poor investment returns of 2000 through 2003, as well as the extreme market downturn of 2008, the plan is not fully funded. In this case, "fully funded" means that assets exceed actuarial accrued liabilities, so that no positive UAAL exists. This can also be seen as a funded ratio in excess of $100 \%$.

The schedule of employer contributions is shown in Table 10, and shows that the employer has consistently made contributions equal or greater to the ARC.

Table 7 develops the Annual Pension Cost (APC) and Net Pension Obligation (NPO). The NPO can be thought of as the accumulated value of APC in excess of employer contributions. Because contributions have exceeded the APC in prior years, a negative NPO has built up. The current Board policy is to set the Actuarial Required Contribution (ARC) equal to the fixed contribution rate, solving for the amortization period.

If the fixed rate is not sufficient to fund the UAAL over a period of 30 years or less, the ARC will be equal to the amount to fund the normal cost for the year plus a 30 -year amortization payment of the UAAL. This is the minimum allowed for accounting purposes under current GASB parameters.

# Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation 

## Table $7 \quad$ GASB Statement No. 27 Annual Pension Cost and Net Pension Obligation

## For Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2009 <br> Based on January 1, 2008 Valuation

|  |  | Fiscal Year Ended December 31 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2008 | 2009 |
| 1 a | Total Normal Cost Rate | 13.32\% | 13.32\% |
| 1 b | Employee Contribution Rate | 8.03\% | 8.03\% |
| 1c | Employer Normal Cost Rate (1a-1b) | 5.29\% | 5.29\% |
| 2a | Total Employer Contribution Rate | 8.03\% | 8.03\% |
| 2 b | Amortization Payment Rate (2a-1c) | 2.74\% | 2.74\% |
| 2 c | Amortization Period | 16.2 | 16.2 |
| 2d | GASB 27 Amortization Rate | 2.74\% | 2.74\% |
| 3 | Total Annual Required Contribution (ARC) Rate (1c + 2d) | 8.03\% | 8.03\% |
| 4 | Covered Employee Payroll** | 572,366,625 | 580,948,555 |
| 5 a | ARC (3x4) | 45,961,040 | 46,650,169 |
| 5b | Interest on Net Pension Obligation (NPO) | $(6,078,596)$ | $(6,056,564)$ |
| 5 c | ARC Adjustment | 6,362,880 | 6,339,817 |
| 5 d | Annual Pension Cost (APC) $(5 a+5 b+5 c)$ | 46,245,324 | 46,933,422 |
| 6 | Employer Contribution | 45,961,040 | 46,650,169 |
| 7 a | Change in NPO (5d-6) | 284,284 | 283,253 |
| 7b | NPO at Beginning of Year | $(78,433,500)$ | $(78,149,216)$ |
| 7 c | NPO at End of Year (7a + 7b) | $(78,149,216)$ | $(77,865,963)$ |
| * | If the amortization period determined by the actual contribution rate exceeds the maximum amortization period required by GASB Statement No. 27, the ARC is determined using an amortization of the UAAL over 30 years. |  |  |
| ** | Covered payroll includes compensation paid to all active employ year preceding the valuation date. | on which contributio | re made in the |

Seattle City Employees' Retirement System
Actuarial Valuation
Table 8 Schedule of Funding Progress
(All dollar amounts in millions)

| Covered <br> Payroll |
| ---: |
| $\$ \quad 159.4$ |
| 182.0 |
| 199.0 |
| 212.3 |
| 239.4 |
| 291.8 |
| 310.6 |
| 316.9 |
| 341.5 |
| 370.4 |
| 383.6 |
| 405.1 |
| 424.7 |
| 447.0 |
| 501.9 |
| 580.9 |

${ }^{(1)}$ Covered Payroll includes compensation paid to all active employees on which contributions are calculated. Covered Payroll differs from the Active Member Valuation Payroll shown in Table 1, which is an annualized compensation of only those members who were active on the actuarial valuation date.
${ }^{(2)}$ Reflects increased COLA benefits adopted by the City Council after the valuation was completed.

| Actuarial Value of Valuation Assets | Actuarial Accrued Liabilities for |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) |
|  | Active Member Contributions | Inactives, Retirees and Beneficiaries | Active Members (Employer Financed Portion) | Total |
| \$ 329.8 | \$ 90.1 | \$ 243.0 | \$ 210.9 | \$ 544.0 |
| 395.7 | 110.7 | 263.1 | 187.5 | 561.3 |
| 445.4 | 136.0 | 303.6 | 155.7 | 595.3 |
| 558.8 | 164.0 | 332.8 | 241.1 | 737.9 |
| 660.0 | 202.6 | 357.9 | 250.0 | 810.5 |
| 781.8 | 248.4 | 383.1 | 294.7 | 926.2 |
| 980.2 | 294.1 | 409.3 | 316.3 | 1,019.7 |
| 1,094.8 | 313.1 | 449.8 | 324.4 | 1,087.3 |
| 1,224.6 | 337.3 | 551.8 | 377.6 | 1,266.7 |
| 1,375.0 | 358.4 | 577.6 | 390.6 | 1,326.6 |
| 1,582.7 | 385.2 | 599.4 | 418.5 | 1,403.1 |
| 1,383.7 | 434.3 | 675.6 | 471.5 | 1,581.4 |
| 1,527.5 | 482.5 | 758.9 | 537.5 | 1,778.9 |
| 1,791.8 | 539.7 | 902.2 | 575.6 | 2,017.5 |
| 2,119.4 | 590.1 | 1,084.9 | 619.6 | 2,294.6 |
| 1,645.3 | 684.7 | 1,176.4 | 792.7 | 2,653.8 |



${ }^{(1)}$ Reflects increased COLA benefits adopted by the City Council after the valuation was completed.





| Annual Required <br> Contribution <br> (ARC) $\%^{(4)}$ |
| :---: |
| $0.91 \%$ |




## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Table 11 GASB Statement No. 27 Five-Year Trend Information

$\left.\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Fiscal Year Ending } & & \begin{array}{c}\text { Annual Pension } \\ \text { Cost (APC) }\end{array} & & \begin{array}{c}\text { Contribution as a } \\ \text { Percentage of APC }\end{array} & \end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Net Pension } \\ \text { Obligation (NPO) }\end{array}\right]$

| Gain/Loss | Amort. <br> Factor | Amort. Of Gain/Loss | Ending <br> Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 18.49780 | $(4,107,791)$ | $(78,064,047)$ |
| - | 13.30912 | $(5,865,455)$ | $(78,248,556)$ |
| - | 13.30912 | (5,879,319) | $(78,433,500)$ |
| - | 12.32673 | $(6,362,880)$ | $(78,149,216)$ |
| - | 12.32673 | $(6,339,817)$ | $(77,865,963)$ |

Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation
GASB Statement No. 27 Annual Development of Pension Cost

$$
\begin{gathered}
\begin{array}{c}
\text { ARC at } \\
\text { EOY }
\end{array} \\
\hline 35,897,345 \\
37,939,358 \\
40,299,506 \\
45,961,040 \\
46,650,169
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Change in } \\
\text { NPO } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\begin{array}{c}
\text { Annual } \\
\text { Pension } \\
\text { Cost (APC) }
\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}
\text { Total } \\
\text { Employer } \\
\text { Contributions }
\end{array} \\
\cline { 1 - 2 } & \\
35,897,345
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1,802,480) \\
& (184,509)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\begin{array}{c}
\text { Interest } \\
\text { on NPO }
\end{array} \\
\hline(5,910,271) \\
(6,049,964) \\
(6,064,263) \\
(6,078,596) \\
(6,056,564)
\end{gathered}
$$

Amortization Period: Open 30 years, unless fixed rate amortizes in less than 30 years Amortization Method: Level Percentage of Projected Payroll.

This page intentionally left blank.

## Seattle City Employees’ <br> Retirement System

## Section 7 Actuarial Gains or Losses



An analysis of actuarial gains or losses was performed in conjunction with the January 1, 2006, January 1, 2008 and January 1, 2010 actuarial valuations.

The results of our analysis of the financial experience of the System in the three most recent actuarial valuations are presented in Table 13. Each gain or loss shown represents our estimate of how much the given type of experience caused the UAAL to change in the two-year period since the previous actuarial valuation.

Gains and losses due to demographic sources are approximate. Demographic experience is analyzed in greater detail in our periodic assumption studies.

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

Table 13 Analysis of Actuarial Gains or Losses
(All dollar amounts in millions)*

|  | Gain (Loss) for Period |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008-2009 | 2006-2007 | 2004-2005 |
| Investment Income. Investment income was greater (less) than expected. | \$(765.5) | \$ 93.7 | \$ 54.5 |
| Pay Increases. Pay increases were less (greater) than expected. | (6.4) | (15.2) | 23.0 |
| Age and Service Retirements. Members retired at older (younger) ages or with less (greater) final average pay than expected. | 2.1 | 2.8 | (6.2) |
| Disability Retirements. Disability claims were less (greater) than expected. | (0.3) | (0.4) | (0.3) |
| Death-in-Service Benefits. Survivor claims were less (greater) than expected. | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
| Withdrawal from Employment. More (less) reserves were released by withdrawals than expected. | 34.8 | 7.4 | (8.1) |
| Death after Retirement. Retirees died younger (lived longer) than expected. | (3.9) | (12.8) | (8.3) |
| Total Gain or (Loss) during Period from Financial Experience. | \$(739.2) | \$75.6 | \$ 55.5 |
| Nonrecurring Items: |  |  |  |
| Changes in actuarial assumptions and plan amendments caused a gain (loss). | (119.1) | (43.6) | (17.9) |
| Change in actuarial asset valuation method caused a gain (loss). | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Composite Gain (Loss) during Period. | \$(858.3) | \$32.0 | \$ 37.6 |
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## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Section 8 Current Economic Environment



The last several years have been a time of great volatility in the financial and economic markets. The effect of widespread investment losses on public pension plans has been wellpublicized, and systems which use Market Value of Assets rather than smoothing gains and losses, such as SCERS, may appear to have been even harder-hit since the recognition of the full impact of these losses is reflected immediately.

While it is important to be aware of current short-term financial and market trends, the actuarial assumptions take a long-term view of the economic and demographic patterns of the System.

Actuarial Standard of Practice (ASOP) No. 27, Selection of Economic Assumptions for Measuring Pension Obligations, provides guidance for actuaries on selecting economic assumptions for measuring obligations under defined benefit plans. Because no one knows what the future holds, the best an actuary can do is to use professional judgment to estimate possible future economic outcomes. These estimates are based on a mixture of past experience, future expectations, and professional judgment. The actuary should consider a number of factors, including the purpose and nature of the measurement, and appropriate recent and long-term historical economic data. However, the standard explicitly advises the actuary not to give undue weight to recent experience.

## Investment Return and Price Inflation Assumptions

The investment return assumption is one of the primary determinants in the calculation of the expected cost of the System's benefits, as it is used to discount future benefit payments to reflect the time value of money. This assumption has a direct impact on the calculation of liabilities, normal costs, member contribution rates, and the factors for optional forms of benefits. The current investment return assumption for SCERS is 7.75\%.

Price inflation (hereafter referred to as "inflation") is an economic assumption closely tied to the investment return assumption. The inflation assumption has an indirect impact on the results of the actuarial valuation through the development of the assumptions for investment return, general wage increases and the payroll increase assumption. It also has a direct impact on the valuation results as it is used to determine the expected floor COLA payment. The current price inflation assumption for SCERS is $3.50 \%$ per year.

## Investment Return and Price Inflation <br> Assumptions (continued)

The economic and active demographic assumptions will be studied in detail in 2011. To illustrate the possible impact of alternative economic scenarios, we have performed a sensitivity analysis of the results of the January 1, 2010 actuarial valuation.

Table 14 below shows the results of 1) lowering the investment return assumption to $7.0 \%$, and 2 ) lowering the investment return assumption to $7.0 \%$, while also lowering the inflation (CPI) assumption to $3.0 \%$. Note the only direct impact inflation has on SCERS' funding is on the Floor COLA, but it can also have an indirect impact if it effects the wage increase or the investment return. In the second scenario, the reduction of $0.5 \%$ in the inflation assumption is assumed to result in a $0.5 \%$ reduction to the Wage Growth assumption.

The choice of $7.0 \%$ for this analysis does not mean we are advocating a change to this investment return assumption. Table 14 is shown only to illustrate the sensitivity of the valuation results to a lower investment return assumption.

As can be seen in the table, there is a significant impact on the expected contributions needed if the expected investment return is lowered. Lowering the expected increase in wages has a much smaller impact.

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

Table 14 Interest Sensitivity of January 1, 2010 Valuation Results

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valuation } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | Alt Scenario \#1 | Alt Scenario \#2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interest Return | 7.75\% | 7.00\% | 7.00\% |
| CPI | 3.50\% | 3.50\% | 3.00\% |
| Wage Inflation | 4.00\% | 4.00\% | 3.50\% |
| Normal Cost as a Percent of Salary | 15.23\% | 17.79\% | 17.33\% |
| Total Contribution Rate * | 25.03\% | 29.00\% | 28.75\% |
| Funded Ratio | 62.0\% | 56.8\% | 57.8\% |
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## Contribution Increases

As discussed in this report, the current contribution rate is not sufficient to amortize the UAAL over any projected period of time. If the entire contribution rate increase needed to amortize the UAAL over 30 years were to be implemented on January 1, 2011, an $8.97 \%$ increase would be required (resulting in a Total Contribution Rate of $25.03 \%$ ). This increase reflects both employer and member contributions. Since the member increases are capped at 2.00\%, the employer increase required would be $6.97 \%$ of pay. The current funded status of the System is $62.0 \%$.

Many other public retirement systems are facing similar drops in their Funding Ratio and rising required contribution rates as the large investment losses are recognized in actuarial valuations. Due to serious budget constraints, not all are able to immediately implement necessary contribution rate increases. SCERS has asked us to provide a schedule of step increases that would ultimately lead to a projected 30 year amortization of the UAAL. Using an approach with graduated increases results in a slightly higher ultimate Total Contribution Rate due to the deferral of the increases.

The following tables shows scheduled employer contribution rate increases of 2.0\% per year (with an additional 2.0\% member contribution beginning in the first year), the following schedule of total contribution rates would be required to achieve a 30-year amortization of the UAAL as of the valuation date:

| Effective Date of <br> Contribution Rate | Total <br> Contribution <br> Rate | Total <br> Increase | Employer <br> Increase |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| January 1, 2010 | $16.06 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| January 1, 2011 | $20.06 \%$ | $4.00 \% *$ | $2.00 \%$ |
| January 1,2012 | $22.06 \%$ | $6.00 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| January 1, 2013 | $24.06 \%$ | $8.00 \%$ | $6.00 \%$ |
| January 1, 2014 ** | $25.59 \%$ | $9.53 \%$ | $7.53 \%$ |

* 2011 increase includes $2.00 \%$ employer increase and a $2.00 \%$ member increase.
** Total Contribution Rate remains at 25.59\% until January 1, 2040.


## Demographic Factors

There may be some short-term fluctuations in demographic experience due to the current economic environment; however, we do not foresee the impact on SCERS' funding to be significant unless there are dramatic changes. The impact on two of the key demographic assumptions would likely be as follows:

- Termination: If actual termination rates are lower than assumed, it would be expected that the contribution rate needed would rise and the Funding Ratio would decline (all other things being equal).
- Retirement: If actual retirement rates are lower than assumed, it would be expected that the contribution rate needed would rise and the Funding Ratio would decline (all other things being equal).


## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Appendix A Actuarial Procedures and Assumptions



## Actuarial Cost Method

This section of the report describes the actuarial procedures and assumptions used in this valuation. The assumptions used in this valuation were adopted by the SCERS Board at their May, 2008 meeting, with the exception of the mortality assumptions, which were adopted by the SCERS Board at their January, 2010 meeting.

The actuarial assumptions used in the valuation are intended to estimate the future experience of the members of the System and of the System itself in areas that affect the projected benefit flow and anticipated investment earnings. Any variations in future experience from that expected from these assumptions will result in corresponding changes in the estimated costs of the System's benefits. Table A-1 summarizes the actuarial assumptions.

Table A-2 presents expected annual salary increases for various years of service. Tables A-3 through A-6 show rates of decrement for service retirement, disablement, mortality, and other terminations of employment. Table A-7 shows probabilities of vesting upon termination.

The actuarial valuation was prepared using the entry age actuarial cost method. Under this method, the actuarial present value of the projected benefits of each individual included in the valuation is allocated as a level percentage of the individual's projected compensation between entry age and assumed exit. The portion of this actuarial present value allocated to a valuation year is called the normal cost. The portion of this actuarial present value not provided for at a valuation date by the sum of (a) the actuarial value of the assets, and (b) the actuarial present value of future normal costs is called the unfunded actuarial accrued liability or UAAL. The UAAL is amortized as a level percentage of the projected salaries of present and future members of the System.

| Records and Data | The data used in the valuation consist of financial information; records of age, sex, service, salary, and contribution rates and account balances of contributing members; and records of age, sex, and amount of benefit for retired members and beneficiaries. All of the data were supplied by the System and are accepted for valuation purposes without audit. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Replacement of Terminated Members | The ages at entry and distribution by sex of future members are assumed to average the same as those of the present members they replace. If the number of active members should increase, it is further assumed that the average entry age of the larger group will be the same, from an actuarial standpoint, as that of the present group. Under these assumptions, the normal cost rates for active members will not vary with the termination of present members. |
| Employer Contributions | At the time of this valuation, the total employer contribution rate for normal costs and amortization of the UAAL was $8.03 \%$ of members' salaries. |
| Administrative Expense | The annual contribution assumed to be necessary to meet general administrative expenses of the system, excluding investment expenses, is $0.40 \%$ of members' salaries. This figure is included in the calculation of the normal cost rate. |
| Valuation of Assets | All assets are valued at market as of the valuation date, January 1, 2010. |
| Investment Earnings | The annual rate of investment earnings of the assets of the System is assumed to be $7.75 \%$. This rate is compounded annually and is net of investment expenses. |
| Postretirement <br> Benefit Increases | Postretirement benefit increases include: <br> - Automatic 1.5\% Annual COLA - This benefit applies to all members. <br> - $65 \%$ Restoration of Purchasing Power (ROPP) - The member's benefit is the greater of $65 \%$ of the annual initial benefit adjusted for CPI or their applicable benefit. This minimum benefit is available to all retirees and beneficiaries. The financial impact of the ROPP benefit is valued assuming an annual price inflation rate of $3.5 \%$. |

$\left.\begin{array}{ll}\text { Postretirement } \\ \text { Benefit Increases } \\ \text { (continued) }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l}\text { Additional contingent COLA increases that were adopted in } \\ 2001, \text { but will not be effective until the System reaches at least a } \\ \text { 100\% Funding Ratio, are not included in the valuation results. }\end{array}\right\}$

## Portability

Probability of Marriage

Commencement for Terminated Vested Members

The cost of portability with other public retirement systems is not included in this valuation.

We assumed 60\% of the active members are married or have a registered domestic partner.

Vested members who terminate but elect to leave their contributions in the System are assumed to commence receiving benefits at age 62.

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Table A-1 Summary of Valuation Assumptions as of January 1, 2010

I. Economic assumptions
A. Price inflation
3.50\%
B. General wage increases
4.00
C. Investment return
7.75
D. Increase in membership
0.00
E. Interest on member accounts 5.75
II. Demographic assumptions
A. Salary increases due to promotion and longevity Table A-2
B. Retirement

Table A-3
C. Disablement

Table A-4
D. Mortality* among contributing members

Table A-5
Men RP 2000 Employees Table for Males, with ages set back one year.
Women RP 2000 Employees Table for Females, with ages set back one year.
E. Mortality* among service retired members and beneficiaries

Table A-5
Men RP2000 Combined Healthy Males, with ages set back one year.
Women RP2000 Combined Healthy Females, with ages set back one year.
F. Mortality* among disabled members

Table A-5
Men RP2000 Disabled Males, with ages set back four years.
Women RP2000 Disabled Females, with ages set back four years.
G. Other terminations of employment

Table A-6
H. Probabilities of vesting on termination

Table A-7
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## Table A-2 Future Salaries

| Annual Rate of Increase |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Years of Service | Promotion and Longevity | Total |
| 0 to 1 | 5.75\% | 9.98\% |
| 1 to 2 | 4.75 | 8.94 |
| 2 to 3 | 3.75 | 7.90 |
| 3 to 4 | 2.75 | 6.86 |
| 4 to 5 | 2.25 | 6.34 |
| 9 to 10 | 1.00 | 5.04 |
| 14 to 15 | 0.50 | 4.52 |
| 19 to 20 | 0.29 | 4.30 |
| 24 to 25 | 0.25 | 4.26 |
| 29 to 30 | 0.25 | 4.26 |
| 35 or more | 0.25 | 4.26 |

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Table A-3 Retirement

| Age | Annual Probability |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Men |  |  | Women |  |  |
|  |  | Eligible for | ull Benefits |  | Eligible for Full Benefits |  |
|  | Eligible for Reduced Benefits | Less than 30 years of service | 30 years or more of service | Eligible for Reduced Benefits | Less than 30 years of service | 30 years or more of service |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less than } \\ & 50 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 8.0\% |  |  | 10.0\% |
| 50 |  |  | 10.0 |  |  | 12.0 |
| 51 |  | 10.0\% | 10.0 |  | 10.0\% | 12.0 |
| 52 | 6.0\% | 12.0 | 12.0 | 5.0\% | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| 53 | 6.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 5.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| 54 | 6.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 5.0 | 12.0 | 15.0 |
| 55 | 6.0 | 12.0 | 15.0 | 5.0 | 12.0 | 20.0 |
| 56 | 6.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 5.0 | 12.0 | 15.0 |
| 57 | 6.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 5.0 | 12.0 | 15.0 |
| 58 | 6.0 | 10.0 | 15.0 | 6.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| 59 | 7.0 | 12.0 | 15.0 | 8.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| 60 | 10.0 | 18.0 | 20.0 | 10.0 | 18.0 | 20.0 |
| 61 | 15.0 | 18.0 | 20.0 | 14.0 | 18.0 | 20.0 |
| 62 | 18.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 24.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 |
| 63 | 15.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 15.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| 64 | 15.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 15.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| 65 |  | 50.0 | 50.0 |  | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 66 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| 67 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| 68 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| 69 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| 70 |  | * | * |  | * | * |
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## Table A-4 Disablement*

|  | Annual Rates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Men | Women |  |
| 20 |  | $.00 \%$ | $.00 \%$ |
| 25 | .00 | .00 |  |
| 30 |  | .05 | .05 |
| 35 |  | .05 | .05 |
| 40 | .07 |  |  |
|  |  | .07 |  |
| 45 |  | .07 | .10 |
| 50 |  | .10 | .10 |
| 55 |  | .10 | .10 |
| 60 |  | .00 | .00 |

*/t is assumed that one-third of all disabilities are duty related and two-thirds are non-duty related.

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Table A-5 Mortality

| Age | Annual Probability* |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Contributing Members |  | Members Retired for Service and Beneficiaries of Members |  | Disabled Members |  |
|  | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| 22 | 0.04 \% | 0.02 \% | 0.04 \% | 0.02 \% | 2.26 \% | 0.74 |
| 27 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 2.26 | 0.74 |
| 32 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 2.26 | 0.74 |
| 37 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 2.26 | 0.74 |
| 42 | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.08 | 2.26 | 0.74 |
| 47 | 0.16 | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.12 | 2.26 | 0.74 |
| 52 | 0.23 | 0.18 | 0.24 | 0.19 | 2.64 | 0.98 |
| 57 | 0.33 | 0.28 | 0.42 | 0.31 | 3.29 | 1.45 |
| 62 | 0.54 | 0.43 | 0.77 | 0.58 | 3.93 | 1.97 |
| 67 | 0.81 | 0.62 | 1.44 | 1.10 | 4.66 | 2.53 |
| 72 | N/A | N/A | 2.46 | 1.86 | 5.69 | 3.32 |
| 77 | N/A | N/A | 4.22 | 3.10 | 7.33 | 4.58 |
| 82 | N/A | N/A | 7.20 | 5.08 | 9.76 | 6.35 |
| 87 | N/A | N/A | 12.28 | 8.64 | 12.83 | 8.78 |
| 92 | N/A | N/A | 19.98 | 14.46 | 16.22 | 12.25 |
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## Table A-6 Other Terminations of Employment Among Members Not Eligible to Retire

| Years of Service | Annual Rates for Men | Annual Rates for Women |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 to 1 | 11.0\% | 13.0\% |
| 1 to 2 | 10.0 | 11.5 |
| 2 to 3 | 9.0 | 10.3 |
| 3 to 4 | 8.0 | 9.0 |
| 4 to 5 | 7.0 | 8.0 |
| 5 to 6 | 6.0 | 7.0 |
| 6 to 7 | 5.3 | 6.3 |
| 7 to 8 | 4.6 | 5.7 |
| 8 to 9 | 4.0 | 5.1 |
| 9 to 10 | 3.5 | 4.5 |
| 10 to 11 | 3.1 | 4.0 |
| 11 to 12 | 2.8 | 3.5 |
| 12 to 13 | 2.5 | 3.0 |
| 13 to 14 | 2.3 | 2.6 |
| 14 to 15 | 2.0 | 2.3 |
| 15 to 16 | 1.8 | 2.0 |
| 16 to 17 | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| 17 to 18 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| 18 to 19 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| 19 to 20 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| 20 to 21 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 21 to 22 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| 22 to 23 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| 23 to 24 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| 24 to 25 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| 25 to 26 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| 26 to 27 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| 27 to 28 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| 28 to 29 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| 29 to 30 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| 30 and up | 0.5 | 0.5 |

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Table A-7 Probability of Refund

| Age | Probabilities of Refund <br> upon Termination* |
| :---: | :---: |
| 25 |  |
| 30 | $85.0 \%$ |
| 35 | 75.0 |
| 40 | 65.0 |
|  | 55.0 |
| 45 | 45.0 |
| 50 | 40.0 |
| 55 | 35.0 |
| 60 | 30.0 |
|  |  |

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Appendix B Provisions of Governing Law



## Effective Date

## Members' Contribution Rate

City Contribution Rate

Final Compensation

Service Retirement

All actuarial calculations are based upon our understanding of the provisions governing the Seattle City Employees' Retirement System, Chapter 4.36 of the Seattle City Code. The benefit and contribution provisions are summarized briefly below, along with corresponding references to the City code. This summary encompasses the major provisions of the System; it does not attempt to cover all of the detailed provisions.

The effective date of the retirement system was July 1, 1929.
(Section 4.36.080)
The members' contribution rate is currently $8.03 \%$ of salary. Certain members who were contributing at a lower rate on June 23, 1972 continue to contribute at a lower rate.
(Section 4.36.110A)
Note: For purposes of the valuation, rates are assumed to increase by $2.00 \%$ in the future to reflect recent negotiated changes and the current funded situation.
The City contribution rate is the amount that is actuarially determined to be necessary to fund that portion of the retirement allowances not covered by the members' contributions. This amount shall be at least the members' contribution rate and is currently $8.03 \%$.
(Sections 4.36.110C and 4.36.170)
Final compensation is based on highest average compensation (excluding overtime) during any consecutive 24 months.
(Sections 4.36.040C and 4.36.050B)
Eligibility $\quad 30$ years of service;
Age 52 and 20 years of service;
Age 57 and 10 years of service; or
Age 62 and 5 years of service.
Normal Form Straight life benefit.
Optional Forms Actuarial equivalent according to the mortality and interest basis adopted by the Retirement Board for such purposes.

## Service Retirement (continued)

$\left.\begin{array}{ll}\text { Disability Retirement } \quad \begin{array}{l}\text { Eligibility } \\ \text { Ten years of service credited within the } 15 \\ \text { years preceding disability retirement. If } \\ \text { disablement occurs in the course of City } \\ \text { employment, there is no service } \\ \text { requirement. }\end{array} \\ \text { Modified cash refund annuity. An optional } \\ \text { survivor's benefit is available if the spouse } \\ \text { is the beneficiary. }\end{array}\right\}$
(Sections 4.36.220 and 4.36.230)

## Death Benefits

| Retired Members | Death benefits to retired members are <br> payable according to the form of <br> retirement allowance elected. |
| :--- | :--- |

Active Members (a) Payment to the beneficiary of accumulated contributions, including interest; or
(b) If the member had completed 10 years of service at the time of death, a surviving spouse or a registered domestic partner may elect to receive, in place of (a) above, either:
(1) a monthly allowance for life equal to the benefit the spouse would have received had the member just retired with a 100\% contingent annuitant option in force; or
(2) a cash payment of no more than one-half of the member's accumulated contributions, along with a correspondingly reduced retirement allowance.
(Section 4.36.270)

Withdrawal Benefits
Form
Payment of accumulated contributions, with interest.
(Section 4.36.190)

## Vested Withdrawal Benefits

Eligibility Five years of service.
Amount of Allowance Same as service retirement benefit.
Benefits Commence Age 52, if 20 or more years of service;
Age 57, if 10-19 years of service; or
Age 62, otherwise.
(Section 4.36.200)

## Postretirement

 Benefit IncreasesEffective January 1, 2007, the City Council adopted a $65 \%$ Restoration of Purchasing

Power benefit and an automatic 1.5\% annual COLA to all members.

If the System reaches a 100\% Funding Ratio, the restoration amount increases to 70\%.
(Sections 4.36.155 and 4.36.215)

## Death Benefit System

| Eligibility | Mandatory for all active members; optional <br> for retired members. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Benefits | $\$ 2,000$ upon the death of an active <br> member or a participating retired member. |
| Assessment | Members pay an assessment of \$12 per <br> year; the City pays a matching amount. If <br> these assessments are not adequate, <br> additional amounts may be transferred <br> from the interest earnings in the retirement <br> fund. |

(Sections 4.36.320 and 4.36.330)

| Additional | Provisions | Members may voluntarily make <br> contributions in excess of the regular <br> Contributions |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $8.03 \%$ rate; these are make-up <br> contributions that apply only in specific <br> situations. |  |
|  | Retirement Benefit |  |
| A monthly annuity which is the actuarial |  |  |
| equivalent of accumulated additional |  |  |
| contributions with interest. |  |  |

(Sections 4.36.030 and 4.36.210)

## Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

## Appendix C Valuation Data



This valuation is based upon the membership of the system as of January 1, 2010. Membership data were supplied by the System and accepted for valuation purposes without audit. However, extensive tests were performed to ensure that the data are sufficiently accurate for valuation purposes.

The data for all contributing members, former contributing members, and their survivors are summarized in Table C-1.

Tables C-2 through C-4 present distributions of members receiving service retirement benefits, members receiving disability retirement benefits, and survivors receiving benefits. Shown in the tables are the numbers of persons receiving benefits, the total annual benefits received (including payments for the annual bonus), and the average annual benefit per recipient.

Table C-5 contains summaries of the data for contributing members. Values shown in the tables are the numbers of members and their total and average annual salaries.

The valuation also includes liabilities attributable to members who have terminated employment but have neither retired nor withdrawn their contributions.
Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation

Table C-1
Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation
Inactive Lives
Table C-2 Members Receiving Service Retirement Benefits as of January 1, 2010

Table C-3

| Table C-3 Mem | mbers | Receiving | Disability | Retirem | ent Bene | ts as of | anuary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<50$ | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 |  | 80-84 | 85-89 |  | 90+ |  | Totals |
| Number of Pe | ersons |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | 2 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Female | 3 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 32 |
| Total | 4 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 6 |  | 2 | 5 |  | 3 |  | 67 |
| Annual Benefi in Thousands |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male \$ | \$ 16 | \$ 25 | \$ 65 | \$ 95 | \$ 30 | \$ 47 | \$ 60 | \$ | 15 | \$ 42 | \$ | 29 | \$ | 424 |
| Female | 37 | 145 | 90 | 63 | 38 | 30 | 11 |  | 0 | 10 |  | 0 |  | 424 |
| Total | 53 | 170 | 155 | 158 | 68 | 77 | 71 |  | 15 | 52 |  | 29 |  | 848 |
| Average Annu |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benefits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male \$ | 16,000 | \$ 12,500 | \$ 16,250 | \$ 13,571 | \$ 10,000 | \$ 11,750 | \$ 12,000 | \$ | 7,500 | \$ 10,500 | \$ | 9,667 | \$ | 12,114 |
| Female | 12,333 | 16,111 | 12,857 | 15,750 | 9,500 | 10,000 | 11,000 |  | 0 | 10,000 |  | 0 |  | 13,250 |
| Total | 13,250 | 15,455 | 14,091 | 14,364 | 9,714 | 11,000 | 11,833 |  | 7,500 | 10,400 |  | 9,667 |  | 12,657 |

## Inactive Lives
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## Inactive Lives

Table C-4 Survivors Receiving Retirement Benefits as of January 1, 2010*
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## Active Lives

## Table C-5 <br> Distribution of Employees and Salaries as of January 1, 2010
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Seattle City Employees' Retirement System
Table C-5 Distribution of Employees and Salaries as of January 1, 2010
Table C-5
(continued)
Table C-5

| Active Lives |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table C-5 | Distribution of Employees and Salaries as of January 1, 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | mber of | mployees | By Age | roup - F | males |  |  |  |  |
| Nearest Year of |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service | $<20$ | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70+ | Totals |
| 0 |  | 2 | 14 | 10 | 14 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 |  | 62 |
| 1 | 2 | 10 | 39 | 44 | 33 | 27 | 26 | 25 | 23 | 9 |  |  | 238 |
| 2 |  | 13 | 61 | 57 | 38 | 43 | 43 | 36 | 23 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 330 |
| 3-4 |  | 13 | 76 | 86 | 81 | 67 | 68 | 51 | 45 | 24 | 5 |  | 516 |
| 5-9 |  | 5 | 32 | 111 | 112 | 127 | 126 | 119 | 73 | 60 | 16 | 8 | 789 |
| 10-14 |  |  | 1 | 21 | 91 | 112 | 117 | 116 | 89 | 50 | 18 | 7 | 622 |
| 15-19 |  |  |  | 3 | 26 | 78 | 106 | 96 | 93 | 78 | 20 | 12 | 512 |
| 20-24 |  |  |  |  |  | 22 | 114 | 136 | 137 | 102 | 14 | 1 | 526 |
| 25-29 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29 | 100 | 98 | 58 | 19 | 2 | 306 |
| 30-34 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 44 | 87 | 51 | 14 | 7 | 205 |
| 35-39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 24 | 30 | 11 |  | 66 |
| 40+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 7 | 1 | 12 |
| Totals | 2 | 43 | 223 | 332 | 395 | 481 | 636 | 728 | 698 | 478 | 128 | 40 | 4,184 |
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Distribution of Employees and Salaries as of January 1, 2010
Average Monthly Salaries - By Age Group - Females
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# Seattle City Employees' Retirement System Special Actuarial Valuation 

## Appendix D Glossary



Accrued Benefit

## Actuarial Accrued Liability

Actuarial<br>Assumptions<br>\section*{Actuarial Cost Method}

## Actuarial Gain (Loss)

Actuarial Present
Value

Actuarial Valuation

## Actuarial Value of Assets

The following definitions are largely excerpts from a list adopted in 1981 by the major actuarial organizations in the United States. In some cases the definitions have been modified for specific applicability to the Seattle City Employees' Retirement System. Defined terms are capitalized throughout this Appendix.

The amount of an individual's benefit (whether or not vested) as of a specific date, determined in accordance with the terms of a pension plan and based on compensation and service to that date.

That portion, as determined by a particular Actuarial Cost Method, of the Actuarial Present Value of pension plan benefits and expenses which is not provided for by future Normal Costs.

Assumptions as to the occurrence of future events affecting pension costs, such as: mortality, withdrawal, disablement, and retirement; changes in compensation, rates of investment earnings, and asset appreciation or depreciation; procedures used to determine the Actuarial Value of Assets; and other relevant items.

A procedure for determining the Actuarial Present Value of pension plan benefits and expenses and for developing an actuarially equivalent allocation of such value to time periods, usually in the form of a Normal Cost and an Actuarial Accrued Liability.

A measure of the difference between actual experience and that expected based upon a set of Actuarial Assumptions during the period between two Actuarial Valuation dates, as determined in accordance with a particular Actuarial Cost Method.

The value of an amount or series of amounts payable or receivable at various times, determined as of a given date by the application of a particular set of Actuarial Assumptions.

The determination, as of a valuation date, of the Normal Cost, Actuarial Accrued Liability, Actuarial Value of Assets, and related Actuarial Present Values for a pension plan.

The value of cash, investments and other property belonging to a pension plan, as used by the actuary for the purpose of an Actuarial Valuation.

| Actuarially | Of equal Actuarial Present Value, determined as of a given date <br> wquivalent <br> with each value based on the same set of Actuarial <br> Assumptions. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Amortization | That portion of the pension plan contribution that is designed to <br> pay interest on and to amortize the Unfunded Actuarial Accrued <br> Liability or (UAAL). |
| Payment | A method under which the Actuarial Present Value of the <br> Projected Benefits of each individual included in an Actuarial <br> Valuation is allocated on a level basis over the earnings of the <br> individual between entry age and assumed exit ages. The <br> portion of this Actuarial Present Value allocated to a valuation <br> year is called the Normal Cost. The poltion of this Actuarial <br> Present Value not provided for at a valuation date by the <br> Actuarial Present Value of future Normal Costs is called the <br> Actuarial Accrued Liability. |
| Normal Cost | That portion of the Actuarial Present Value of pension plan <br> benefits and expenses which is allocated to a valuation year by <br> the Actuarial Cost Method. |
| Projected Benefits | Those pension plan benefit amounts which are expected to be <br> paid at various future times under a particular set of Actuarial |
| Assumptions, taking into account such items as the effect of |  |
| advancement in age and past and anticipated future |  |
| compensation and service credits. |  |

## STATISTICAL




## SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM <br> SCHEDULE OF REVENUES BY SOURCE

| Employee Contribution \% * | Employer Contribution \% ** | Fiscal Year | Member Contributions | Employer Contribution | Investment Income | Miscellaneous Income | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8.03 | 7.91 | 1980 | \$ 9,166,162 | \$ 10,470,335 | \$ 16,284,473 | \$ 846 | \$ 35,921,816 |
| 8.03 | 8.54 | 1981 | 11,845,089 | 13,309,388 | 18,488,195 | 2,311 | 43,644,983 |
| 8.03 | 8.54 | 1982 | 12,465,220 | 14,790,039 | 21,106,414 |  | 48,361,673 |
| 8.03 | 8.54 | 1983 | 12,926,545 | 14,265,554 | 27,224,215 | 5,050 | 54,421,364 |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1984 | 14,076,607 | 15,961,211 | 30,543,443, | 67 | 60,581,328, |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1985 | 14,399,465 | 16,280,464 | 25,317,826 |  | 55,997,755 |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1986 | 15,164,105 | 16,758,439 | 33,081,706 |  | 65,004,250 |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1987 | 16,088,280 | 17,799,789 | 46,029,652 | 410 | 79,918,131 |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1988 | 16,701,142 | 18,521,365 | 36,397,481 |  | 71,619,988 |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1989 | 17,246,117 | 18,983,634 | 41,803,863 | 545 | 78,034,159, |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1990 | 20,405,149 | 21,810,612 | 27,725,284 |  | 69,941,045 |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1991 | 21,111,940 | 21,458,952 | 37,758,671 |  | 80,329,563 |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1992 | 21,564,881 | 25,117,924 | 41,792,730, |  | 88,475,535 |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1993 | 23,473,485 | 26,139,925 | 100,705,007 | *** | 150,318,417, |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1994 | 24,764,862 | 26,704,211 | 3,670,356 |  | 55,139,429, |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1995 | 26,069,124 | 27,816,819, | 181,470,912 |  | 235,356,855 |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1996 | 25,835,147 | 28,372,760 | 118,399,056 |  | 172,606,963 |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1997 | 25,571,634 | 28,310,353 | 143,719,597 |  | 197,601,584 |
| 8.03 | 8.91 | 1998 | 27,311,815 | 30,554,650, | 168,477,507, |  | 226,343,972 |
| 8.03 | 8.03 | 1999 | 29,201,844 | 29,898,474 | 240,904,299 |  | 300,004,617 |
| 8.03 | 8.03 | 2000 | 30,962,052 | 30,956,217 | $(79,832,672)$ |  | $(17,914,403)$ |
| 8.03 | 8.03 | 2001 | 32,602,859 | 32,667,381 | $(93,021,798)$ |  | $(27,751,558)$ |
| 8.03 | 8.03 | 2002 | 39,388,249 | 36,599,830, | (116,907,340) |  | (40,919,261) |
| 8.03 | 8.03 | 2003 | 36,243,490 | 34,200,693, | 296,239,050 |  | 366,683,233 |
| 8.03 | 8.03 | 2004 | 37,192,591 | 36,819,271 | 177,211,711 |  | 251,223,573 |
| 8.03 | 8.03 | 2005 | 35,962,449 | 35,897,345 | 139,866,897, |  | 211,726,691 |
| 8.03 | 8.03 | 2006 | 38,228,475 | 38,077,976 | 251,934,917 |  | 328,241,368 |
| 8.03 | 8.03 | 2007 | 40,533,554 | 40,299,506. | 149,708,740 |  | 230,541,800 |
| 8.03 | 8.03 | 2008 | 45,986,139 | 45,961,040 | $(612,803,880)$ |  | (520,856,701) |
| 8.03 | 8.03 | 2009 | 46,613,886 | 46,650,169, | 198,417,995 |  | 291,682,050 |
| 8.03 | 8.03 | 2010 | 45,364,624 | 45,224,787, | 213,082,710, |  | 303,655,168 |

* Employee Contributions reflected above are representative for the overall majority of active members. There are a small percentage of active members whose employee contribution rate is "grandfathered" at a slightly lower rate.
** Employer Contributions reflected as a percentage of covered payroll.
*** Beginning with 1993, the investment income reflects unrealized gains (losses) required by GASB 25.


## SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM SCHEDULE OF EXPENSES BY TYPE

| Year | Benefits | Refunds | Administrative \& Investment | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | \$ 17,584,611 | \$ 1,786,654 | \$ 331,600 | \$ 19,702,865 |
| 1981 | 19,114,992 | 2,074,078 | 419,568 | 21,608,638 |
| 1982 | 21,358,214 | 2,151,528 | 458,261 | 23,968,003 |
| 1983 | 23,029,611 | 2,086,102 | 538,059 | 25,653,772 |
| 1984 | 25,175,469 | 3,366,999 | 737,445 | 29,279,913 |
| 1985 | 27,090,615 | 2,753,418 | 1,076,324 | 30,920,357 |
| 1986 | 28,777,844 | 3,212,415 | 1,340,874 | 33,331,133 |
| 1987 | 30,499,027 | 3,141,868 | 1,494,189 | 35,135,084 |
| 1988 | 32,093,902 | 3,293,088 | 1,408,946 | 36,795,936 |
| 1989 | 34,121,917 | 3,257,432 | 1,538,544 | 38,917,893 |
| 1990 | 36,431,265 | 3,592,483 | 1,636,911 | 41,660,659 |
| 1991 | 37,862,028 | 3,731,762 | 1,870,922 | 43,464,712 |
| 1992 | 38,884,790 | 3,585,672 | 2,109,340 | 44,579,802 |
| 1993 | 40,131,325 | 2,944,003 | 2,525,620 | 45,600,948 |
| 1994 | 42,420,358 | 3,412,882 | 2,639,538 | 48,472,778 |
| 1995 | 44,352,180 | 3,874,980 | 7,217,337 | 55,444,497 |
| 1996 | 46,257,605 | 3,888,043 | 7,989,200 | 58,134,848 |
| 1997 | 50,349,474 | 5,463,464 | 11,875,158 | 67,688,096 |
| 1998 | 56,247,811 | 7,502,444 | 12,145,939 | 75,896,194 |
| 1999 | 58,704,086 | 9,730,803 | 10,447,151 | 78,882,040 |
| 2000 | 62,844,355 | 11,641,902 | 10,634,557 | 85,120,814 |
| 2001 | 65,553,605 | 8,785,879 | 7,293,821 | 81,633,305 |
| 2002 | 68,825,558 | 12,019,852 | 7,250,214 | 88,095,624 |
| 2003 | 73,559,728 | 13,218,137 | 7,081,030 | 93,858,895 |
| 2004 | 77,289,288 | 9,791,692 | 7,188,848 | 94,269,828 |
| 2005 | 82,268,449 | 10,385,215 | 11,773,914 | 104,427,578 |
| 2006 | 87,583,509 | 10,553,067 | 10,715,425 | 108,852,001 |
| 2007 | 98,391,533 | 11,525,660 | 12,380,123 | 122,297,316 |
| 2008 | 102,703,230 | 10,223,415 | 8,188,287 | 121,114,932 |
| 2009 | 108,138,820 | 9,742,692 | 5,929,667 | 123,811,179 |
| 2010 | 113,650,795 | 14,714,999 | 7,834,508 | 136,200,302 |

## SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM <br> BENEFIT EXPENSE BY TYPE

Twenty Years Ending December 31, 2010

| Year | Age \& Service <br> Retirants | Benefits <br> Survivors | Disability <br> Retirants <br> Benefits | Death <br> Benefit | Refunds | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1991 | $33,567,142$ | $3,323,900$ | 626,986 | 344,000 | $3,731,762$ | $41,593,790$ |
| 1992 | $34,273,859$ | $3,368,285$ | 626,647 | 346,000 | $3,585,672$ | $42,470,463$ |
| 1993 | $35,288,173$ | $3,864,495$ | 632,657 | 346,000 | $2,944,033$ | $43,075,328$ |
| 1994 | $37,177,394$ | $4,240,343$ | 654,621 | 348,000 | $3,412,882$ | $45,833,240$ |
| 1995 | $38,909,838$ | $4,469,103$ | 645,239 | 328,000 | $3,874,980$ | $48,227,160$ |
| 1996 | $40,783,384$ | $4,530,161$ | 618,060 | 326,000 | $3,888,043$ | $50,145,648$ |
| 1997 | $44,350,246$ | $4,996,325$ | 612,903 | 390,000 | $5,463,464$ | $55,812,938$ |
| 1998 | $48,684,577$ | $6,500,622$ | 714,624 | 347,988 | $7,502,444$ | $63,750,255$ |
| 1999 | $50,902,672$ | $6,821,887$ | 698,527 | 281,000 | $9,730,803$ | $68,434,889$ |
| 2000 | $54,518,311$ | $7,260,855$ | 714,799 | 350,390 | $11,641,902$ | $74,486,257$ |
| 2001 | $57,122,024$ | $7,486,988$ | 672,593 | 272,000 | $8,785,879$ | $74,339,484$ |
| 2002 | $59,991,882$ | $7,821,555$ | 686,121 | 326,000 | $12,019,852$ | $80,845,410$ |
| 2003 | $64,301,813$ | $8,215,109$ | 714,806 | 328,000 | $13,218,137$ | $86,777,865$ |
| 2004 | $67,794,624$ | $8,486,860$ | 711,804 | 296,000 | $9,791,692$ | $87,080,980$ |
| 2005 | $72,390,702$ | $8,754,471$ | 785,276 | 338,000 | $10,351,215$ | $92,653,664$ |
| 2006 | $77,320,260$ | $9,180,292$ | 814,957 | 268,000 | $10,553,067$ | $98,136,576$ |
| 2007 | $87,019,040$ | $10,230,265$ | 864,228 | 278,000 | $11,525,660$ | $109,917,193$ |
| 2008 | $91,265,085$ | $10,282,919$ | 885,227 | 270,000 | $10,223,415$ | $112,926,645$ |
| 2009 | $95,951,625$ | $11,022,403$ | 886,684 | 278,108 | $9,742,692$ | $117,881,512$ |
| 2010 | $101,965,821$ | $10,526,966$ | 918,009 | 240,000 | $14,714,999$ | $128,365,795$ |

## REVENUE RATIOS BY SOURCE <br> 1973 Through 2010

| Year | Member Contributions $\%$ | Employer Contributions \% | Investment Income \% | Total Revenue \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1973 | 26 | 32 | 42 | 100 |
| 1974 | 26 | 31 | 43 | 100 |
| 1975 | 26 | 31 | 43 | 100 |
| 1976 | 26 | 31 | 43 | 100 |
| 1977 | 25 | 29 | 46 | 100 |
| 1978 | 25 | 29 | 46 | 100 |
| 1979 | 27 | 30 | 43 | 100 |
| 1980 | 26 | 29 | 45 | 100 |
| 1981 | 27 | 31 | 42 | 100 |
| 1982 | 25 | 31 | 44 | 100 |
| 1983 | 24 | 26 | 50 | 100 |
| 1984 | 23 | 26 | 51 | 100 |
| 1985 | 26 | 29 | 45 | 100 |
| 1986 | 24 | 26 | 50 | 100 |
| 1987 | 20 | 22 | 58 | 100 |
| 1988 | 23 | 26 | 51 | 100 |
| 1989 | 22 | 24 | 54 | 100 |
| 1990 | 29 | 31 | 40 | 100 |
| 1991 | 26 | 27 | 47 | 100 |
| 1992 | 25 | 28 | 47 | 100 |
| 1993 | 16 | 17 | 67 | 100 |
| 1994 | 45 | 48 | 7 | 100 |
| 1995 | 11 | 12 | 77 | 100 |
| 1996 | 15 | 16 | 69 | 100 |
| 1997 | 13 | 14 | 73 | 100 |
| 1998 | 12 | 14 | 74 | 100 |
| 1999 | 10 | 10 | 80 | 100 |
| 2000 |  |  | Net Loss |  |
| 2001 |  |  | Net Loss |  |
| 2002 |  |  | Net Loss |  |
| 2003 | 10 | 9 | 81 | 100 |
| 2004 | 15 | 15 | 70 | 100 |
| 2005 | 17 | 17 | 66 | 100 |
| 2006 | 12 | 12 | 76 | 100 |
| 2007 | 18 | 18 | 64 | 100 |
| 2008 |  |  | Net Loss |  |
| 2009 | 16 | 16 | 68 | 100 |
| 2010 | 15 | 15 | 70 | 100 |

Beginning with 1993, the investment income reflects unrealized gains (losses) required by GASB 25.
** Beginning with 1996 (and 1995 has been restated) investment income includes the gross income from Securities Lending as required by GASB 28.

## SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM <br> SCHEDULE OF INVESTMENT RESULTS <br> Ten Years Ending December 31, 2010

| Year | Investment <br> Income | Investments <br> Market Value | Securities <br> Lending Collateral | Return on <br> Market Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2001 | $(93,021,798)$ | $1,366,651,234$ | $120,215,604$ | $(6.0) \%$ |
| 2002 | $(116,907,340)$ | $1,245,668,385$ | $133,817,297$ | $(8.4) \%$ |
| 2003 | $296,239,050$ | $1,517,907,621$ | $148,226,605$ | $23.6 \%$ |
| 2004 | $177,211,711$ | $1,664,178,577$ | $239,087,447$ | $11.5 \%$ |
| 2005 | $139,866,897$ | $1,777,219,827$ | $122,862,720$ | $8.1 \%$ |
| 2006 | $251,934,917$ | $1,986,714,717$ | $145,097,240$ | $13.9 \%$ |
| 2007 | $149,708,740$ | $2,106,345,982$ | $103,323,467$ | $7.3 \%$ |
| 2008 | $(612,803,880)$ | $1,467,556,416$ | $69,838,616$ | $(40.0) \%$ |
| 2009 | $198,417,995$ | $1,635,993,047$ | $36,491,886$ | $12.0 \%$ |
| 2010 | $213,082,710$ | $1,809,601,365$ | $33,896,148$ | $11.0 \%$ |

* Investment Income includes market gains and losses, and gross income from Securities Lending.


## SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM SERVICE AND DISABILITY PENSIONERS BY AGE <br> As of December 31, 2010



## SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM <br> RETIREMENT ALLOWANCE DISTRIBUTION <br> As of December 31, 2010



## SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP EXPERIENCE

For the Last Thirty Years

| Year | Members at End of Period | New Members During Period | Withdrawals During Period | Re-entering \& Re-depositing | Deaths <br> During Period | Pensions Granted <br> During Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1981 | 7,037 | 776 | 467 | 77 | 13 | 230 |
| 1982 | 6,972 | 555 | 439 | 73 | 14 | 240 |
| 1983 | 6,870 | 471 | 363 | 50 | 13 | 247 |
| 1984 | 6,710 | 531 | 522 | 57 | 16 | 210 |
| 1985 | 6,946 | 628 | 244 | 72 | 11 | 209 |
| 1986 | 7,020 | 570 | 382 | 77 | 11 | 180 |
| 1987 | 7,196 | 622 | 312 | 72 | 16 | 190 |
| 1988 | 7,252 | 542 | 361 | 45 | 10 | 160 |
| 1989 | 7,544 | 672 | 251 | 51 | 12 | 168 |
| 1990 | 7,813 | 872 | 454 | 45 | 12 | 182 |
| 1991 | 8,037 | 681 | 354 | 43 | 13 | 133 |
| 1992 | 8,171 | 463 | 220 | 32 | 17 | 124 |
| 1993 | 8,317 | 537 | 279 | 39 | 15 | 136 |
| 1994 | 8,553 | 512 | 201 | 133 | 16 | 192 |
| 1995 | 8,741 | 477 | 284 | 136 | 12 | 153 |
| 1996 | 8,584 | 339 | 270 | 13 | 12 | 227 |
| 1997 | 8,572 | 435 | 287 | 36 | 18 | 178 |
| 1998 | 8,743 | 557 | 236 | 29 | 9 | 170 |
| 1999 | 9,576 | 1,289 | 238 | 14 | 17 | 215 |
| 2000 | 9,836 | 876 | 393 | 17 | 13 | 227 |
| 2001 | 10,111 | 706 | 241 | 25 | 18 | 197 |
| 2002 | 9,737 | 426 | 503 | 16 | 12 | 301 |
| 2003 | 9,964 | 628 | 202 | 5 | 14 | 190 |
| 2004 | 10,222 | 636 | 123 | 4 | 8 | 251 |
| 2005 | 10,387 | 635 | 212 | 3 | 11 | 247 |
| 2006 | 10,493 | 710 | 325 | 15 | 16 | 278 |
| 2007 | 10,892 | 948 | 292 | 37 | 8 | 286 |
| 2008 | 10,831 | 833 | 340 | 83 | 9 | 187 |
| 2009 | 11,077 | 347 | 313 | 122 | 16 | 221 |
| 2010 | 10,597 | 273 | 397 | 17 | 15 | 355 |

Figures Quoted as of the End of Each Fiscal Period

|  | Number Retired During Period |  |  | Number Deceased During Period |  | Pensions Discontinued |  |  | Benefit Cont' to Beneficiary Service | Number on Payroll at End of Period |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Service | Sec. 19-b | Disability | Service | Disability | Service | Beneficiary | Disability |  | Service | Beneficiary | Disability |
| 1929-1976 Inclusive | 5,014 | 367 | 885 | 2,674 | 545 | 3 | 243 | 84 | 391 | 4,019 | 924 | 471 |
| December 31, 1977 | 292 | 15 | 10 | 109 | 20 |  | 19 |  | 28 | 2,567 | 542 | 246 |
| December 31, 1978 | 246 | 9 | 13 | 87 | 14 |  | 24 |  | 29 | 2,726 | 556 | 245 |
| December 31, 1979 | 237 | 7 | 10 | 112 | 17 |  | 12 |  | 35 | 2,851 | 586 | 238 |
| December 31, 1980 | 220 | 14 | 8 | 101 | 13 |  | 19 |  | 35 | 2,970 | 616 | 233 |
| December 31, 1981 | 223 | 7 | 7 | 94 | 15 |  | 25 |  | 33 | 3,099 | 631 | 225 |
| December 31, 1982 | 254 | 12 | 5 | 120 | 23 |  | 38 |  | 41 | 3,233 | 646 | 207 |
| December 31, 1983 | 248 | 12 | 5 | 137 | 10 |  | 29 |  | 55 | 3,344 | 684 | 202 |
| December 31, 1984 | 206 | 9 | 4 | 135 | 14 |  | 28 |  | 51 | 3,415 | 716 | 192 |
| December 31, 1985 | 202 | 4 | 7 | 115 | 18 |  | 19 | 1 | 48 | 3,505 | 743 | 183 |
| December 31, 1986 | 175 | 10 | 4 | 140 | 9 |  | 13 |  | 20 | 3,540 | 760 | 178 |
| December 31, 1987 | 184 | 6 | 7 | 132 | 16 |  | 6 |  | 16 | 3,592 | 776 | 169 |
| December 31, 1988 | 158 | 2 | 3 | 120 | 9 |  | 25 |  | 37 | 3,627 | 790 | 163 |
| December 31, 1989 | 163 | 8 | 5 | 141 | 12 |  | 5 |  | 43 | 3,660 | 780 | 154 |
| December 31, 1990 | 181 | 10 | 1 | 128 | 16 |  | 7 |  | 44 | 3,695 | 827 | 140 |
| December 31, 1991 | 129 |  | 4 | 158 | 12 |  | 31 |  | 70 | 3,665 | 866 | 132 |
| December 31, 1992 | 121 |  | 3 | 161 | 4 |  | 32 |  | 50 | 3,625 | 884 | 131 |
| December 31, 1993 | 133 | 6 | 3 | 157 | 6 |  | 42 |  | 45 | 3,601 | 894 | 127 |
| December 31, 1994 | 181 | 10 | 1 | 159 | 10 |  | 53 |  | 55 | 3,608 | 922 | 117 |
| December 31, 1995 | 148 | 5 | 2 | 162 | 5 |  | 54 |  | 38 | 3,591 | 914 | 114 |
| December 31, 1996 | 225 | 3 | 1 | 173 | 8 |  | 44 |  | 49 | 3,659 | 907 | 106 |
| December 31, 1997 | 170 | 9 | 1 | 186 | 9 |  | 75 |  | 69 | 3,622 | 931 | 98 |
| December 31, 1998 | 166 | 2 | 2 | 170 | 9 | 1 | 45 |  | 51 | 3,614 | 942 | 91 |
| December 31, 1999 | 208 | 5 | 2 | 167 | 5 |  | 67 |  | 51 | 3,662 | 931 | 88 |
| December 31, 2000 | 222 | 4 | 1 | 142 | 4 |  | 46 |  | 43 | 3,699 | 933 | 84 |
| December 31, 2001 | 192 | 4 | 1 | 152 | 8 |  | 53 |  | 33 | 3,733 | 924 | 76 |
| December 31, 2002 | 290 | 5 | 6 | 170 | 5 |  | 49 |  | 48 | 3,836 | 945 | 77 |
| December 31, 2003 | 189 | 6 | 1 | 163 | 5 |  | 67 |  | 57 | 3,858 | 945 | 73 |
| December 31, 2004 | 243 | 2 | 6 | 172 | 6 |  | 61 |  | 39 | 3,924 | 930 | 73 |
| December 31, 2005 | 235 | 6 | 6 | 164 | 3 |  | 66 |  | 70 | 3,993 | 942 | 76 |
| December 31, 2006 | 270 | 6 | 2 | 151 | 6 |  | 72 |  | 33 | 4,113 | 908 | 72 |
| December 31, 2007 | 277 | 6 | 2 | 155 | 2 |  | 70 |  | 59 | 4,231 | 897 | 72 |
| December 31, 2008 | 192 | 5 | 1 | 158 | 2 |  | 72 |  | 51 | 4,295 | 875 | 77 |
| December 31, 2009 | 221 | 16 | 1 | 144 | 4 |  | 60 |  | 47 | 4,345 | 885 | 75 |
| December 31, 2010 | 355 | 5 | 0 | 159 | 0 |  | 68 |  | 41 | 4,546 | 808 | 74 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2010 | nd Total |  | 5,428 |

## SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM <br> EXPERIENCE IN MISCELLANEOUS AVERAGES

## For the Last Thirty Years

|  | AVERAGE <br> SERVICE <br> RETIREMENT <br> ALLOWANCE | AVERAGE <br> AGE OF <br> SERVICE PENSIONERS | AVERAGE <br> DISABILITY <br> RETIREMENT <br> ALLOWANCE | AVERAGE AGE OF DISABILITY PENSIONERS | ACTIVE MEMBERS DECEASED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | \# OF | AVERAGE |
|  |  |  |  |  | DEATHS | AGE |
| 1981 | \$ 441.69 | 69.86 | \$ 267.88 | 65.12 | 13 | 49.31 |
| 1982 | 468.28 | 70.07 | 269.71 | 65.64 | 14 | 48.54 |
| 1983 | 501.76 | 70.18 | 272.98 | 66.55 | 13 | 52.54 |
| 1984 | 530.44 | 69.97 | 281.36 | 66.29 | 16 | 51.28 |
| 1985 | 556.72 | 70.26 | 290.71 | 66.22 | 11 | 53.66 |
| 1986 | 582.18 | 70.57 | 296.27 | 66.70 | 11 | 48.18 |
| 1987 | 608.43 | 70.80 | 314.43 | 66.60 | 16 | 49.13 |
| 1988 | 655.62 | 70.02 | 357.61 | 66.40 | 14 | 49.93 |
| 1989 | 664.36 | 71.45 | 343.74 | 66.53 | 12 | 49.17 |
| 1990 | 697.54 | 71.72 | 352.75 | 65.88 | 12 | 47.67 |
| 1991 | 757.07 | 72.19 | 378.41 | 66.61 | 13 | 57.77 |
| 1992 | 749.31 | 72.44 | 366.23 | 66.30 | 17 | 50.94 |
| 1993 | 775.72 | 73.42 | 394.13 | 67.80 | 15 | 53.00 |
| 1994 | 811.55 | 73.28 | 407.60 | 67.52 | 16 | 55.00 |
| 1995 | 850.50 | 73.45 | 431.19 | 67.78 | 12 | 53.67 |
| 1996 | 904.11 | 73.43 | 423.86 | 68.88 | 12 | 44.92 |
| 1997 | 961.30 | 73.29 | 448.15 | 68.12 | 18 | 54.72 |
| 1998 | 1,063.66 | 73.30 | 594.09 | 68.13 | 9 | 56.11 |
| 1999 | 1,114.34 | 73.10 | 609.19 | 68.25 | 17 | 55.24 |
| 2000 | 1,167.60 | 72.88 | 622.66 | 68.69 | 13 | 50.77 |
| 2001 | 1,222.42 | 72.70 | 654.53 | 67.84 | 18 | 51.39 |
| 2002 | 1,289.77 | 72.16 | 703.83 | 67.25 | 12 | 54.33 |
| 2003 | 1,338.49 | 72.14 | 734.85 | 66.78 | 14 | 53.14 |
| 2004 | 1,404.86 | 71.93 | 788.94 | 65.40 | 8 | 50.62 |
| 2005 | 1,477.58 | 71.78 | 827.46 | 65.15 | 11 | 53.18 |
| 2006 | 1,552.57 | 71.53 | 877.96 | 64.75 | 16 | 51.94 |
| 2007 | 1,768.13 | 71.42 | 1,010.15 | 65.53 | 8 | 53.13 |
| 2008 | 1,822.44 | 71.92 | 1,038.93 | 65.49 | 9 | 52.33 |
| 2009 | 1,873.39 | 71.51 | 1,077.33 | 64.15 | 16 | 58.00 |
| 2010 | 1,965.36 | 71.32 | 1,110.10 | 65.84 | 15 | 55.73 |

* Beginning in 1998 the average retirement allowance numbers include the monthly COLA amounts.


## SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM SCHEDULE OF AVERAGE BENEFIT PAYMENTS

| Retirement Effective Dates |
| ---: |
| Jan. 1, 2001 to Dec. 31, 2010 |
| Period 1/1/01 to 12/31/01 |
| Average Monthly Benefit |
| Average Final Salary |
| Number of Active Retirees |

Period $1 / 1 /$ o2 to $12 / 31 / 02$
Average Monthly Benefit

Average Final Salary
Number of Active Retirees

Period 1/1/o3 to 12/31/03
Average Monthly Benefit
1,034.2

Average Final Salary
Number of Active Retirees

Period 1/1/04 to 12/31/04
Average Monthly Benefit
1,056.92

Average Final Salary
Number of Active Retirees

Period 1/1/05 to 12/31/05
Average Monthly Benefit

Number of Active Retirees

Period 1/1/06 to 12/31/06

Average Monthly Benefit

Average Monthly Benefit
1,200
\$ 3,7

$$
4,261
$$

$$
4,349.56
$$

Average Final Salary

Average Monthly Benefit
Average Final Salary
Number of Active Retirees

Period 1/1/07 to 12/31/07

Average Final Salary
Number of Active Retirees

Period 1/1/08 to 12/31/08

Average Final Salary
Number of Active Retirees

Period 1/1/og to 12/31/09
Average Monthly Benefit
Average Final Salary
Number of Active Retirees

Period $1 / 1 / 10$ to $12 / 31 / 10$
Average Monthly Benefit
Average Final Salary
Number of Active Retirees

| $\$$ | 725.0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$$ | $6,221.4$ |

$\begin{array}{lr}\$ & 743 . \\ \$ & 4,657\end{array}$

| $\$$ | 503.66 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$$ | $4,404.61$ |

$$
\begin{array}{r}
496.91 \\
3,782.43 \\
32
\end{array}
$$

$\$ \quad 674$ \$ 4,928.96

| $\$$ | 693.96 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$$ | $5,616.72$ |

$\square$
-
1,230
1,230
5,098

Years Credited Service

| 11-15 | $\underline{\mathbf{1 6 - 2 0}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{2 1 - 2 5}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{2 6 - 3 0}}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 +}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 837.60 | $1,349.54$ | $1,719.53$ | $2,369.43$ | $2,374.36$ |
| $3,715.90$ | $4,241.27$ | $4,121.40$ | $4,654.58$ | $4,544.36$ |
| 23 | 25 | 30 | 65 | 24 |

$1,054.23$
$4,203.54$
31
$1,254.66$
$3,773.37$

| $1,925.74$ | $2,458.67$ | $2,616.86$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $4,571.61$ | $4,653.62$ | $4,919.14$ |
| 58 | 96 | 42 |

1,43
669.55
$1,744.45$
$4,653.31$
41

| $2,579.91$ | $2,628.56$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $4,901.87$ | $4,953.21$ |
| 39 | 39 |

$$
1,449.5
$$

$$
4,737.24
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
1,773.5 \\
4,405.5
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
2,4 \\
5
\end{array}
$$

| $2,480.00$ | $2,812.38$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $5,210.92$ | $5,259.10$ |
| 76 | 42 |


| $1,137.59$ | $1,706.94$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $4,733.59$ | $4,915.39$ |


| $2,270.53$ | $2,653.34$ | $2,807.79$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $5,423.36$ | $5,164.89$ | $4,973.41$ |
| 55 | 65 | 37 |


| $2,196.45$ | $2,831.74$ | $3,053.19$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $5,170.19$ | $5,313.48$ | $5,472.54$ |
| 50 | 55 | 56 |


| $\$$ | 658.92 | $1,406.25$ | $1,650.87$ | $2,132.89$ | $2,814.90$ | $3,129.50$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$$ | $5,017.90$ | $5,992.08$ | $4,865.08$ | $5,096.68$ | $5,414.43$ | $5,412.96$ |
|  | 53 | 36 | 37 | 54 | 61 | 44 |

$1,307.50$
$5,133.11$
18
$1,683.04$
$5,029.50$
$2,237.23$
$5,470.66$
37
$3,032.86$
$5,896.14$

3,467.66
5,682.79
46

## NEW MEMBERS IN THE RETIREMENT SYSTEM IN 2010 BY DEPARTMENT

| DEPARTMENT NAME | COUNT |
| :---: | :---: |
| City Employees' Retirement | 2 |
| DolT | 2 |
| Executive Departments | 9 |
| FFD | 7 |
| Finance | 10 |
| Fire | 0 |
| Human Services | 10 |
| Law | 10 |
| Legislative | 10 |
| Library | 44 |
| Municipal Court | 3 |
| Neighborhoods | 0 |
| Other Depts | 1 |
| Parks | 42 |
| Personnel | 1 |
| Planning \& Dev | 2 |
| Police | 20 |
| SCL | 46 |
| SDOT | 16 |
| Seattle Center | 12 |
| SPU | 26 |
| Total | 273 |

RETURNING MEMBERS IN THE RETIREMENT SYSTEM IN 2010 BY DEPARTMENT

| REDEPOSITING |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Fire |  |
| SPU |  |
|  |  |
| RE-ENTERING |  |
| Library |  |
| Finance |  |
| Parks and Recreation |  |
| SCL |  |
| Planning \& Development |  |
| Legislative |  |
| SPU |  |
| Executive and Office of Housing |  |

## SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM <br> SERVICE RETIREMENTS GRANTED IN 2010

| Retiree | Dept Name | Position | Yrs | Days | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abiera, Timoteo Alvaniz | Seattle Center | Dining Room Attendant | 12 | 126 | 71 |
| Acedo, Marta | Vested / Dual |  | 6 | 241 | 68 |
| Agatsuma,Calvin H | SDOT | IT Programmer Analyst Spec | 37 | 46 | 65 |
| Albert, Patricia M | Law | Legal Asst | 19 | 318 | 57 |
| Alin, Max | City Light | Power Marketer | 30 | 2 | 64 |
| Allwine, Herbert W. | SDOT | Civil Engineering Spec, Assoc | 41 | 256 | 67 |
| Anderson, Robert Wyan | Parks | Manager 2 | 23 | 315 | 60 |
| Anderson, Virginia L. | Vested |  | 11 | 243 | 63 |
| Aramaki, Arvin | City Light | Warehouse - BU | 23 | 161 | 55 |
| Ardena, Edwin M | City Light | Meter Electrician (77) | 37 | 78 | 64 |
| Arnold, Dean Louis | DolT | Executive 2 | 31 | 344 | 58 |
| Atwood, Cheryl A | DEA | Buyer, Sr | 42 | 198 | 65 |
| Austin, Laura L | Parks | Admin Staff Asst | 30 | 105 | 52 |
| Avirett,Russell J | Fleets \& Facilities | Auto Mechanic | 30 | 76 | 59 |
| Backas, Brian R | Vested/Dual |  | 12 | 177 | 65 |
| Baker, Michael A | City Light | Carpenter | 39 | 353 | 64 |
| Balagot,Editha G. | SPU | Utilities Act Rep 1 | 20 | 278 | 64 |
| Banakes,Sandra J | K.C. Health | Nutrition Assistant | 20 | 360 | 68 |
| Barbour, Judith B | Law | City Attorney, Asst | 31 | 9 | 69 |
| Bardsley, Ken A | SDOT | Civil Engineering Spec., Sr | 26 | 23 | 57 |
| Barnard, Laura Jean | Library | Coordinator Library Tech | 23 | 14 | 61 |
| Barouh, Shelley E | SDOT | Material Controller | 27 | 161 | 59 |
| Barr, Meredith Ann | Police | Disp-1 | 14 | 39 | 62 |
| Barrie, Kristin G | SPU | Utilities Act Rep 1 | 43 | 363 | 70 |
| Baughman, Thomas R | City Light | Material Supplier | 35 | 43 | 62 |
| Bauman,Esther | Vested |  | 10 | 48 | 67 |
| Berg, Robert | Strategic Planning | Manager 2 | 29 | 255 | 66 |
| Bigting, Edgardo C | SPU | Accounting | 5 | 36 | 62 |
| Boatsman, Carolyn M | Vested / Dual | Muni-Court | 14 | 247 | 57 |
| Bonham, Leonard K | City Light | Line Worker | 16 | 2 | 68 |
| Bordas, Bonnie E | DCLU | Admin Spec II | 5 | 64 | 62 |
| Borja, Albert C | Human Services | Parking Sup | 12 | 101 | 59 |
| Boyle, Stephen Francis | SPU | Meter Reader | 12 | 243 | 65 |
| Braden, John R | Parks | Exec-3 | 25 | 300 | 63 |
| Bradley, Charles Jr | Library | Library Tech I | 41 | 346 | 73 |
| Bray, John P | SDOT | Traffic Marking Lead Worker | 31 | 257 | 64 |
| Breidenbach, Terrance L | City Light | Cable splicer in Charge | 42 | 127 | 64 |
| Brenneman, Phillip | Vested / Dual | Law - Vested | 17 | 225 | 61 |
| Brennen, Lou Ann | SDOT | Finance Analyst, Sr | 25 | 18 | 57 |
| Broughton, Deborah C | Vested / Dual |  | 5 | 128 | 57 |
| Brown, Delores I | SPU | Senior Exec Asst | 18 | 67 | 70 |
| Browning,Georgianne C | DEA | Licenses \& Standards Inspector | 16 | 324 | 60 |
| Bubelis, Dona J | Library | Librarian | 30 | 222 | 66 |
| Bungard, Terry W. | City Light | Hydroelectric Operator II | 23 | 19 | 63 |
| Butler, Connie L | Vested |  | 19 | 212 | 64 |
| Cabaccang, Constancia C | Police | Accounting Tech II | 30 | 210 | 70 |


| Retiree | Dept Name | Position | Yrs | Days | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Caliwag,Amanda G | Vested |  | 17 | 55 | 71 |
| Campbell, Jacqueline F | Fleets \& Facilities | Property Manager | 19 | 67 | 66 |
| Campbell, Larry T | Parks | Security Supervisor | 29 | 117 | 56 |
| Capaci, Anthony M | Vested / Dual |  | 2 | 218 | 62 |
| Cardenas, Samuel A | Vested / Dual |  | 12 | 298 | 62 |
| Cardinal, Jane E | Personnel | Admin Spec 1 | 31 | 133 | 62 |
| Carr, Frances J | Vested / Dual | Vested-Mayor's Office | 6 | 188 | 73 |
| Carson, Joan Sharon | DPD | Land Use Planner II | 22 | 3 | 63 |
| Casey, Margaret M | Human Services | Planning \& Dev Spec II | 8 | 180 | 72 |
| Casson, Chet J | Parks | Manager 2 | 29 | 92 | 54 |
| Ceis, Timothy Y. | Mayor's Office | Executive 4 | 7 | 336 | 54 |
| Cervantes, Jose A | Neighborhoods | Neighborhoods District Coordinator | 31 | 114 | 62 |
| Chappel, Marget | SPU | Strategic Advisor 1 | 14 | 353 | 63 |
| Cheng,Wing H | City Light | Mechanical Engineer, Sr | 29 | 124 | 65 |
| Chin, Yen | Vested |  | 8 | 7 | 62 |
| Clemons, Barbara Lee | Legislative | Legislative Asst. | 15 | 172 | 68 |
| Coffey,Thomas | Vested |  | 8 | 232 | 62 |
| Connally, Merle A | City Light | Meter Electrician | 37 | 54 | 65 |
| Conner, Jimmy W | Fleets \& Facilities | Auto Mechanic | 31 | 208 | 65 |
| Cooke, William E. | Vested |  | 8 | 22 | 81 |
| Couhig,Nancy K | Vested |  | 26 | 254 | 63 |
| Cox,Orrin R | Fleets \& Facilities | Auto Mechanic Sr | 30 | 55 | 65 |
| Crisologo, Alfredo V | Seattle Center | Security Officer | 20 | 115 | 66 |
| Crisostomo, Evelinda | Library | Library Tech 1 | 34 | 346 | 66 |
| Cunningham, Robert L | City Light | Electrical Power Systems Engineer, Principal | 40 | 86 | 62 |
| Curameng, Mary D | Seattle Center | Admin Spec - II | 20 | 212 | 71 |
| Dadosio, Patrick J | Doit | Info Technology Prof | 33 | 84 | 57 |
| Dahl, Randal Alvin | SPU | Meter Reader Supervisor | 21 | 10 | 55 |
| Dalton, Ann Louise | Library | Librarian | 18 | 13 | 57 |
| Danielson, F Elaine | Police | Contract Employee | 30 | 239 | 63 |
| Dannenfelser, Theresa | Civil Rights | A.S.A. | 11 | 49 | 62 |
| Davick, Steven A | City Light | Protection \& Control Electrician | 26 | 20 | 52 |
| Davis, Kenneth S | Vested / Dual | Vested- DPD | 13 | 136 | 57 |
| De Vink, Robert D | SPU | Civil Engineer Spec. , Sr. | 25 | 78 | 60 |
| Deane, Thatcher Elliott | City Light | Info Technology Professional | 20 | 96 | 55 |
| Deen, Mary Louise | SPU | Admin Asst 2 | 17 | 126 | 62 |
| dela Cruz,Lydia C | Police | Police Data Tech | 31 | 271 | 68 |
| DeLeon, Beto | Vested | Vested- Seattle Center | 24 | 243 | 57 |
| Divina, Ted C | Neighborhoods | Neighborhoods District Coordinating Supervisor | 38 | 73 | 62 |
| Dobbs, Janice M | Parks | Laborer | 8 | 214 | 62 |
| Dombek, Margaret A | Library | Librarian | 8 | 220 | 68 |
| Dooley, Christina A | Police | Police Communications Dispatcher 1 | 8 | 332 | 64 |
| Douce, Molly A | Fire | Battalion Chief | 30 | 155 | 53 |
| Drago, Jan | Legislative | Legislative - City Council | 15 | 353 | 69 |
| Dugger, Darlene W | Fleets \& Facilities | Accountant | 29 | 57 | 70 |
| Duke,Tamera M | SDOT | Civil Engineering Spec Supervisor | 30 | 41 | 50 |
| Dunbar, Theresa L | Legislative | Council Clerk | 27 | 64 | 55 |
| Earls,Susan D | City Light | Structural Iron Worker | 23 | 147 | 57 |
| Eaton, Patricia L | Fleets \& Facilities | Fleet Mgmt Analyst | 23 | 118 | 55 |
| Eckholt, Cindy Lynne | DEA | Manager 3 | 33 | 28 | 55 |

ST 15

| Retiree | Dept Name | Position | Yrs | Days | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eckley, Stella L | SDOT | Admin. Spec I | 38 | 211 | 66 |
| Edison, Dyan Phillis | Police | Admin spec II-BU | 34 | 59 | 70 |
| Edwards, Donald A | DEA | Info Technology Prof B-BU | 30 | 32 | 50 |
| Elliott, Barbara | K.C. Health | Public Health Nurse | 25 | 280 | 65 |
| Erckmann Jr, William James | SPU | Manager 3 Utilities | 22 | 94 | 66 |
| Erfle, Wayne D | SPU | Warehouse, Sr | 41 | 161 | 65 |
| Erickson, Franklin P. | City Light | Info Technology Prof | 43 | 270 | 70 |
| Estrada, Candi L | Parks | Truck Driver | 30 | 362 | 57 |
| Etquibal. Martin N | Fleets \& Facilities | Warehouse Supervisor | 20 | 154 | 61 |
| Euteneier, Richard A | Parks | Metal Fabricator | 15 | 109 | 63 |
| Faist, John A | Fleets \& Facilities | Manager of Fleet Admin. | 23 | 124 | 61 |
| Fenkner, Kathleen L | Police | Admin. Spec I | 26 | 167 | 64 |
| Flores, David | City Light | Real Property Agent, Sr. | 29 | 196 | 60 |
| Flynn, John Lawrence | Human Services | Manager 3 | 16 | 187 | 69 |
| Forester,Leslie W | Parks | Accounting Tech II | 18 | 338 | 65 |
| Forsberg,Gail E | DEA | Info Technology Prof B | 31 | 252 | 63 |
| Fort, Susan S | Library | Library Assoc IV | 22 | 54 | 65 |
| Foz, Lourdes V | Law | Admn. Spec. I | 17 | 197 | 73 |
| Frick, Anita E | Vested | Vested-Police | 7 | 257 | 63 |
| Friedman, Kathleen M | Municipal Courts | Manager 2,CL\&PS | 6 | 56 | 62 |
| Garrison, Marge Kidd | Personnel | Workers' Comp Analyst, Sr | 13 | 175 | 64 |
| Gates, Jerome | DolT | Info Tech | 23 | 65 | 58 |
| George, Fred O | SPU | Constr \& Maint Equip Operator, Sr | 37 | 61 | 70 |
| Geyen, Sandre Carolyn | Human Services | Counselor | 15 | 333 | 64 |
| Goff, Rowland Dale | Municipal Courts | Deputy Marshall | 11 | 9 | 68 |
| Gorski, Robert W | Parks | Plumber | 29 | 188 | 60 |
| Graham, Steve | DEA | Personnel Specialist, Asst | 30 | 309 | 60 |
| Grauman, Kathleen H | Vested / Dual | Vested - Light | 8 | 273 | 60 |
| Gray, Warren W | SPU | Manager 2 | 39 | 91 | 61 |
| Greene, Joseph C | City Light | Electrical Power Systems Engineer | 24 | 42 | 57 |
| Grenfell, Dale A | SPU | Drainage\&Wststr Coll Lead Worker | 30 | 21 | 52 |
| Griffin, Sharon L | Vested / Dual | Vested- Engineer | 3 | 209 | 60 |
| Hairston, Lois A | City Light | Material Sup, Elec-Asg | 27 | 350 | 56 |
| Handler, Joseph F | City Light | Electrical Engineering Spec, Sr | 40 | 247 | 69 |
| Hansen, Audrey Clare | SPU | Manager 2, Fin.Budget\&Fin | 27 | 188 | 67 |
| Hansen, Ellen | Vested / Dual | Vested - FFD | 5 | 321 | 64 |
| Hansen, Neil M. Jr | Police | Crime Prevention Coordinator | 34 | 32 | 61 |
| Hanson, Kurt H | Vested | Vested-DPD | 38 | 21 | 66 |
| Hanson, Mary A | Vested | Vested - Water | 8 | 130 | 64 |
| Harper, Dorothy M | SPU | Truck Driver | 26 | 171 | 57 |
| Harrison, Gerald D | SDOT | Truck Driver | 29 | 278 | 59 |
| Haslam, Karen F | Parks | Mgmt Systems Analyst. Sr | 16 | 358 | 65 |
| Hasme,Marilyn | K.C. Health | Admin Spec II | 32 | 353 | 68 |
| Hastings, Patrick J | SPU | Surveyor, Chief | 25 | 128 | 56 |
| Haywood, Ivory | Municipal Courts | Admin Support Supervisor | 30 | 294 | 56 |
| Helbert, Cynthia Jean | Fleets \& Facilities | Admin Spec I | 22 | 129 | 62 |
| Hendrickson, Carol J | Police | Parking Enforcement Officer | 35 | 266 | 63 |
| Hensley, Raymond C | DEA | Info Tech Prof C-BU | 32 | 98 | 65 |
| Hill, Raymond L | SPU | Customer Billing Services | 43 | 120 | 71 |


| Retiree | Dept Name | Position | Yrs | Days | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hillis, Linda G | SPU | Utilities Act Rep 1 | 18 | 292 | 63 |
| Hoff, Diane L B | SPU | Utilities Act Rep II | 29 | 161 | 57 |
| Holiman,Michael L | Fleets \& Facilities | Auto Mechanic / Vested | 10 | 177 | 59 |
| Hooks, Gina R | DolT | Mgmt Systems Analyst, Sr | 26 | 163 | 54 |
| Hooper Sr.,Clinton Forrest | Parks | Coordinator | 17 | 339 | 63 |
| Hooper, Claudia N | Fire | Admin Support Supervisor | 15 | 34 | 62 |
| Houck, Deanna | K.C. Health | Education Consultant I | 30 | 286 | 72 |
| Hubbard, Thomas P | Vested / Dual |  | 3 | 169 | 59 |
| Hughes, Pamela Carabba | DEA | Strategic Advisor 3 | 15 | 232 | 62 |
| Hulbert, Jack E | City Light | Line worker | 27 | 18 | 64 |
| Hurley, Bill J | Fleets \& Facilities | Shop Operations Supervisor | 30 | 294 | 60 |
| Imori, David S | City Light | Electrical Work Rev-CC (77) | 26 | 85 | 60 |
| Inkley, Edwin K | Law | Asst. City Attorney | 18 | 315 | 57 |
| Ip, Hermia K | Strategic Planning | Land Use Planner II | 22 | 67 | 67 |
| Jackson, Barrie | Human Services | Program Intake Rep | 13 | 116 | 78 |
| Jensen, Jeffrey Marvin | SPU | Civil Engineer Supervisor | 14 | 215 | 57 |
| Jensen, Robert A | Fleets \& Facilities | Auto Mechanic | 35 | 102 | 59 |
| Jewell, Bette | Doit | Info Technology Systems Analyst | 5 | 260 | 62 |
| Jewett,Richard M | City Light | Wastewater-Treatment Plant Op | 19 | 133 | 65 |
| Johanson, Judi G.A | SDOT | A.S.A. | 27 | 58 | 54 |
| Johnston, Leanne M | Vested |  | 21 | 32 | 52 |
| Johnston, Patricia A | SPU | Admin Spec III- BU | 29 | 354 | 66 |
| Jones, Lawrence D | Police | Evidence Warehouser | 12 | 361 | 66 |
| Jordan,Thomas P | DEA | Info Technology Prof B-BU | 32 | 321 | 64 |
| Kaiser, Jamie D | Fleets \& Facilities | Mgmt Systems Analyst | 23 | 1 | 62 |
| Kefgen, Edward B | City Light | Meter Electrician Working CC | 28 | 76 | 54 |
| Keiler, Jay W | Vested | Vested-FFD | 14 | 209 | 57 |
| Kelly, Thomas P | City Light | Chief Operator | 34 | 47 | 63 |
| Kesler, Julie A | Vested / Dual | Vested /Muni - Court | 1 | 8 | 65 |
| Kim, Hyun Jae | City Light | Associate-Elect-Engineer | 21 | 10 | 66 |
| Kim, Joohak | Vested |  | 10 | 150 | 57 |
| Kim, Kyung Ja | City Light | Manager 2 | 26 | 100 | 65 |
| Kimball, Dennis H. | DPD | Construction Plans Engineer Sup. | 36 | 55 | 60 |
| Kingman, James Irving | Parks | Forestry Crew Chief | 20 | 240 | 66 |
| Kinton, Deborah R | Vested / Dual | Vested- Health | 8 | 233 | 62 |
| Klinger, Fred M | SPU | Info Technology Prof | 31 | 360 | 61 |
| Knee, Joseph Leonard | Fleets \& Facilities | Mgmt Systems Analyst, Sr. | 33 | 113 | 63 |
| Koslosky, Robert F | Fleets \& Facilities | Auto Mechanic | 34 | 336 | 65 |
| Kozelisky,Paul C | Fleets \& Facilities | Metal Fabricator | 30 | 139 | 58 |
| Kremer, Carole c | SPU | Utility Acct Rep I | 22 | 197 | 65 |
| Kutz, Kathleen O'Donnell | Parks | Maintenance Laborer | 28 | 70 | 56 |
| La Bay, Melvin | SPU | Civil Engineering Spec, Sr | 53 | 193 | 72 |
| Landon, Redentor F | City Light | Line C C C | 29 | 290 | 53 |
| Larson, Steven W | SPU | Strategic Advisor-2 | 19 | 304 | 62 |
| Laski, Mary E | Fleets \& Facilities | Property Mgmt Spec | 7 | 12 | 66 |
| Lastimosa, Roland A | City Light | Mechanical Engineer, Sr | 31 | 47 | 61 |
| Laughlin,Jay B | SPU | Manager 2 | 24 | 364 | 59 |
| Lawton, James J | DPD | Building Inspector | 30 | 5 | 63 |
| Le, Hieu V | Retirement | Acct Tech I | 6 | 153 | 68 |
| Lee, Jerry Michael | Vested | Vested-DPD | 16 | 96 | 61 |


| Retiree | Dept Name | Position | Yrs | Days | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lee, Victor Kwong | SPU | Mgmt Systems Analyst | 21 | 127 | 60 |
| Leurquin, Thomas R | Strategic Planning | Plans Engineer | 23 | 320 | 60 |
| Lewis, Debra L | Fleets \& Facilities | Property Mgmt. Spec. | 32 | 24 | 56 |
| Lipnick,Barry R. | DCLU | Bldg Inspector, Structural | 31 | 151 | 66 |
| Locken II, Arthur N | City Light | Cable Splicer CC | 30 | 262 | 53 |
| Loo, Sheldon | Fleets \& Facilities | Auto Maintenance CC | 37 | 51 | 68 |
| Lowthian, Richard A | Vested / Dual |  | 12 | 222 | 63 |
| Luedtke, Janet Ruth | Vested | Vested-Water | 20 | 302 | 59 |
| Luiten, Linda A | Municipal Courts | Prob. Counselor 1 | 15 | 214 | 65 |
| Lundstrom, Lavry C | Strategic Planning | Bldg Inspector, Sr | 16 | 313 | 70 |
| Lyons, Vincent T | DPD | Strategic Advisor 2 | 29 | 79 | 66 |
| Madeira, Joseph H | Municipal Courts | Admin. Spec. 1 | 21 | 220 | 63 |
| Makasini, Marcia M | Fleets \& Facilities | Warehouser- BU | 26 | 23 | 61 |
| Manalo, Edita Ordona | SPU | Utilities Act Rep 1 | 20 | 279 | 64 |
| Mannix,Timothy C | City Light | electrician | 18 | 299 | 58 |
| Markovich, James Gill | Seattle Center | Sound \& Video Equip Tech | 43 | 305 | 70 |
| Marten, Steve | Police | Strategic Advisor 2, CL \& PS | 19 | 3 | 67 |
| Martin, Barbara L | Personnel | Personnel Analyst, Sr-Comp | 7 | 72 | 65 |
| Martin,Vernin G | SDOT | Civil Eng Spec, Sr. | 35 | 138 | 61 |
| Masterjohn, John L | Vested | Vested- SDOT | 16 | 113 | 66 |
| Mathews, David M | Police | Police Comm Dispatcher, Chief | 5 | 4 | 62 |
| McClain, Evelyn A | SPU | Utilities Acct Rep 1 | 36 | 117 | 60 |
| McCormick, Robert T | Strategic Planning | Electrical Inspector Supervisor | 30 | 130 | 62 |
| McDermott, Mark Morelli | Personnel | Executive 3 | 12 | 85 | 60 |
| McGuire, Patricia E | Police | Admin. Spec. 1 | 17 | 234 | 73 |
| McIntyre, Sharon A | SPU | Customer Svc Rep 2 | 32 | 343 | 67 |
| Mclver, Richard J | Legislative | Council Member | 28 | 344 | 68 |
| McMahan Jr, Richard H | SDOT | Civil Engineer, Sr | 25 | 15 | 57 |
| McVay, Roland L.C. | Metro Transit | Service Supervisor | 48 | 153 | 71 |
| Metrokin, Michael E | Vested | Vested-Muni-Court | 7 | 163 | 62 |
| Miao, Wei | SPU | Sr Finance Analyst | 30 | 13 | 59 |
| Michels,Vicki S | City Light | Admin spec I-BU | 23 | 7 | 67 |
| Middleswart, Brent D | SPU | Manager 3, Engineering \& Plans Rev | 30 | 3 | 57 |
| Milano, David A | SPU | Manager-2 Utilities | 22 | 311 | 57 |
| Miller, Albert M | City Light | Communications Electrician II | 30 | 84 | 60 |
| Mitchell Jr.,Horace | SDOT | Truck Driver | 19 | 287 | 62 |
| Mitchell, Kathleen Mary | City Light | Electrical Helper | 28 | 231 | 57 |
| Moody, Gary D | City Light | Electrician | 41 | 111 | 62 |
| Moon, Michael C | Vested | Vested-Sea. Ctr | 10 | 147 | 59 |
| Moore, Carolyn J | City Light | Accounting Tech I | 25 | 147 | 63 |
| Mullin, Julia T | SPU | Utilities Svc Rep | 17 | 29 | 72 |
| Mumm, David | City Light | Hydro Elect Machine | 12 | 71 | 59 |
| Murashige, Robert F | Law | Sr. Asst Attorney | 19 | 134 | 58 |
| Nagamatsu, Lois H | City Light | IT_Tech | 26 | 88 | 58 |
| Nakamura, Susan | Legislative | Strategic Advisor I | 7 | 356 | 59 |
| Nickels, Gregory J | Mayor's Office | Mayor | 16 | 0 | 54 |
| Nicol, Susan Maloney | Vested |  | 18 | 22 | 60 |
| Nosal, T.A. | City Light | Electrical Service Rep | 28 | 118 | 57 |
| Novik, Jill S | Dolt | Strategic Advisor 2 | 26 | 243 | 61 |
| Ocampo, Jane Jeannette | Retirement | Accountant | 15 | 120 | 59 |
| Ogren, Rodger P | Parks | Aquarium Biologist 2 | 20 | 322 | 63 |


| Retiree | Dept Name | Position | Yrs | Days | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ojima, Fred Y | Vested | Vested- City Light | 23 | 173 | 63 |
| O'Neill, Maureen J | City Light | Power Analyst | 29 | 283 | 60 |
| Otnes, Laurie L | Vested | Vested-DEA | 14 | 103 | 57 |
| Ouse, Julia M | Municipal Courts | Court Clerk Supervisor | 35 | 273 | 60 |
| Pahlman, Darlene A | SDOT | Civil Engineering Spec., Sr | 25 | 38 | 60 |
| Paige, Jerry J | Vested / Dual | Vested -Parks | 0 | 248 | 65 |
| Palecek, Barbara Ann | Library | Library Assoc II | 11 | 118 | 72 |
| Paraiso, Alicia A | K.C. Health | Nurse | 32 | 325 | 65 |
| Parast, Youssef H. | DPD | Mechanical Plans Engineer | 25 | 171 | 63 |
| Pearson, John R | Personnel | Personnel Analyst Supervisor | 34 | 351 | 67 |
| Pendleton, Don | City Light | Energy Mgmt Analyst, Asst | 4 | 152 | 65 |
| Peterson,Joanne Marie | SPU | Executive 2 | 12 | 227 | 54 |
| Pool, Martin C | DEA | Info Technology Prof B-BU | 29 | 89 | 55 |
| Porter, Sandra D | Vested | Vested-Muni-court | 11 | 44 | 57 |
| Portman, J.Clifford | DPD | Manager 3 | 32 | 85 | 57 |
| Potter, Terry Lee | City Light | Office Asst | 39 | 198 | 63 |
| Pullins, Verita | Police | Admin. Asst. | 20 | 136 | 65 |
| Pumphrey Jr., Donald H | SPU | Maintenance Laborer | 46 | 263 | 68 |
| Purdy, Michael E | Vested / Dual | Vested-HSA | 21 | 23 | 55 |
| Quist,Ronald E | Vested / Dual | Vested-OMB | 5 | 90 | 67 |
| Ramos, Cesar G | Municipal Courts | Accounting Tech II | 21 | 41 | 62 |
| Rankin, Duane D | SDOT | Civil Engineer, SR | 17 | 314 | 59 |
| Reese, Eugene A | SDOT | Construction Maintenance Senior | 30 | 50 | 61 |
| Richardson, Janet M | Police | Police Communications Dispatcher I | 14 | 165 | 59 |
| Richardson,Dennis E | SPU | Transmission CC | 41 | 137 | 65 |
| Ricker,Timothy T | SDOT | Maintenance Laborer | 20 | 159 | 55 |
| Robison, Jeannie Marie | SPU | Utilities Act Rep | 31 | 100 | 61 |
| Rodriguez, Roseann Bradley | City Light | Truck Driver | 27 | 357 | 53 |
| Roloff, Riana R | Police | Parking Enforcement | 20 | 64 | 58 |
| Ross, Leonard R | City Light | Power Dispatcher | 27 | 317 | 63 |
| Rothwell, Robert C | Metro Transit | Transit Operator | 43 | 48 | 71 |
| Rousu, Vernon C | Fleets \& Facilities | Auto Mechanic | 31 | 138 | 61 |
| Russell, Richard B | Seattle Center | Stage Tech, Lead | 30 | 196 | 61 |
| Sanders, Philip M | Parks | Utilities Laborer | 20 | 240 | 67 |
| Sarkissian, Julia | K.C. Health | Project/Program Manager IV | 25 | 64 | 61 |
| Saunders, Christine Marie | Library | Admin Asst | 10 | 4 | 61 |
| Schaefer, Nancy J | Vested / Dual |  | 8 | 270 | 62 |
| Schaefer, Gayle L | Parks | Parks Special Events Scheduler | 23 | 60 | 62 |
| Schneidler, David G. | SDOT | Traffic-Records-Admin | 5 | 255 | 67 |
| Scott,Mary A. | City Light | Ad Spec III BU | 32 | 45 | 68 |
| Segan,Akiva Kenneth | Library | Library Assoc II | 17 | 163 | 60 |
| Sendejar,Liboria | Personnel | TES | 8 | 12 | 67 |
| Seretse, Sheree | Parks | Rec Cntr Coordinator, Asst | 28 | 198 | 58 |
| Sharp, Paulette Diane | City Light | Admin Spec 11-BU | 30 | 325 | 56 |
| Shaw, Kathleen Marie | Parks | Admin Spec II | 9 | 149 | 62 |
| Sherwood, Don R | ESD | Admin Staff Asst | 14 | 52 | 66 |
| Shoemaker,Charles William | City Light | Electrical Quality Assurance Spec | 20 | 159 | 72 |
| Sider, Kathleen M | Parks | Manager 2-Aquarium | 31 | 7 | 67 |
| Sidran, Mark H | Vested / Dual | Vested-Law | 11 | 363 | 58 |
| Sievert, Judy L | Vested | Vested- Parks | 25 | 347 | 55 |


| Retiree | Dept Name | Position | Yrs | Days | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sigley, Margaret S | K.C. Health | Physician | 19 | 294 | 67 |
| Sigman, Walter M | SPU | Info Tech Prof | 39 | 190 | 63 |
| Skraban, Kenneth J | Info Technology | Manager I Info Technology | 43 | 176 | 66 |
| Small. Gloria J | Municipal Courts | Court Cashier | 25 | 103 | 67 |
| Smart, Robert L | City Light | Electrician -Con-Working CC | 39 | 244 | 59 |
| Smith, Lois M | Vested | Vested-TES | 6 | 167 | 65 |
| Smith, Mark a | Parks | Stage Tech Lead | 25 | 333 | 62 |
| Smith, Michael A | Fleets \& Facilities | Janitor, Lead | 32 | 77 | 66 |
| Smith, Nina N | Police | Admin. Spec 1-BU | 16 | 134 | 69 |
| Soltani,Reza | Vested / Dual |  | 7 | 60 | 65 |
| Soltar, Steven D | Personnel | Planning \& Dev Spec., Sr | 2 | 79 | 67 |
| Sparkman,Kirsten M | SDOT | Street Paving CC | 24 | 222 | 52 |
| Srirangadhama, Rajaraman J | Parks | Aquarium Systems Op | 23 | 168 | 67 |
| Staal, Elizabeth A | Vested / Dual | Vested- Health | 2 | 132 | 67 |
| Stack, William J | City Light | Electrical Svc Rep | 20 | 5 | 64 |
| Standish, Cheryl D | City Light | Cable splicer | 31 | 51 | 52 |
| Stave,Martha M. | Vested/Dual | Land Use Planner | 3 | 139 | 66 |
| Steiner, Teri L | DolT | Computer Ops., SR | 30 | 5 | 51 |
| Strom, James H | Vested / Dual | Vested- City Light | 9 | 11 | 62 |
| Stuart,Elizabeth D | Police | Parking Enforcement Officer | 30 | 136 | 68 |
| Swan, Mary L | Fire | Admin Spec 1 | 14 | 172 | 66 |
| Tachibana, Debra-Laurent | City Light | Energy Res \& Eval Analyst | 22 | 339 | 59 |
| Thirasawat, Jane M | DEA | Sr. Accountant | 34 | 164 | 62 |
| Thomson, William A | City Light | Electrical-Con | 36 | 68 | 56 |
| Tonkyn, Kasey A | City Light | Carpenter | 30 | 356 | 50 |
| Trueblood, Sharon Kay | Human Services | Admin Staff Asst | 18 | 299 | 64 |
| Turner, William A | Vested / Dual | Vested-C.L.U. | 10 | 257 | 61 |
| Turner,Lewis P | Parks | Manager 2, Fin, Bud \& Accounting | 30 | 1 | 65 |
| Turnsen, Michael P | SPU | Solid Waste Field Rep, Lead | 16 | 205 | 63 |
| Underwood, Marjorie F. | Vested | Vested-Library | 8 | 336 | 62 |
| Valencia, Jimmy L | SDOT | Cement Finisher | 26 | 183 | 58 |
| VanSanden, Janine M | Parks | Volunteer Programs Coordinator | 15 | 209 | 66 |
| Vea, Gloria P | SPU | Accounting Tech - II | 31 | 114 | 66 |
| Vinson, Mary E | Human Services | Human Services Program Supervisor | 31 | 72 | 62 |
| Vogel, Kenneth P | DolT | Info Technology Prof | 20 | 216 | 58 |
| Vognild, Ronald M | Fleets \& Facilities | Auto Mechanic | 37 | 24 | 60 |
| Wagoner, Marcia D | Vested | Vested_CLU | 16 | 318 | 63 |
| Wallace, Jacqueline Jean | Law | Legal Assistant | 14 | 158 | 62 |
| Walsh, Sue A | City Light | Manager 3 | 25 | 160 | 66 |
| Walsh,Eileen F. | K.C. Health | Application Worker | 28 | 246 | 57 |
| Walter, Louis R. | City Light | Line Crew Chief | 24 | 52 | 64 |
| Wang,Shadi | City Light | Info Tech Prof B | 14 | 303 | 61 |
| Watland, Percy G. | Parks | Maintenance Laborer | 41 | 151 | 73 |
| Watson, Sandra M | Law | Director - Land Use | 24 | 71 | 59 |
| Wawrzycki, Anthony J | Seattle Center | Stage Tech, Lead | 29 | 312 | 62 |
| Westphall, Merri Ellen | SPU | Strategic Advisor 2 | 10 | 277 | 60 |
| Whitney, Marilyn Kay | City Light | Accounting Tech 2 | 20 | 2 | 61 |
| Wickstrom, Phyllis Jo | Police | Admin Spec I | 24 | 118 | 66 |
| Williams, Rebecca E | Human Services | Program Aide | 9 | 122 | 70 |
| Willis, Donald C | Library | Librarian | 26 | 102 | 66 |


| Retiree | Dept Name | Position | Yrs | Days | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wilson, Clarice A | Library | Asst Manager | 42 | 138 | 67 |
| Wittman, Theresa M | DolT | Strategic Advisor -2 | 30 | 219 | 55 |
| Wong,Debra | Parks | Project Manager | 12 | 138 | 57 |
| Woodworth, Jay R | Vested | Vested-Muni-Court | 20 | 283 | 57 |
| Wright, Barbara Ann | Vested / Dual | Vested - Water | 3 | 139 | 64 |
| Wu, Enoch | City Light | Electrical Engineer, Assoc | 36 | 296 | 65 |
| Wuest,Marcia M | City Light | Admin Spec II | 19 | 273 | 60 |
| Yeomans, Ruth A | Parks | Public Ed. Program Spec | 18 | 108 | 66 |
| Zacher, Rodney P | Parks | Facilities Maintenance Worker | 21 | 158 | 62 |
|  |  | Total Service Retirements | 355 |  |  |

DISABILITY RETIREMENTS GRANTED IN 2010

| Retiree | Dept Name | Position | Yrs | Days | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Disability Retirements | 0 |  |  |

## SEATTLE CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM <br> RETIRED MEMBERS DECEASED IN 2010

| Name | Dept Name | Retired For | Date Retired | Date of Death | Age At Death |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adams, Marvin | Seattle Center | service | 12/31/1994 | 6/22/2010 | 89 |
| Allen, Cleo | Engineering-Vested | service | 8/26/1998 | 1/22/2010 | 68 |
| Andler, Maxine A |  | service | 5/1/1982 | 3/4/2010 | 94 |
| Andrew, Nancy E | Light | service | 1/1/1995 | 6/30/2010 | 76 |
| Arntsen, Charles R |  | service | 6/1/1990 | 4/15/2010 | 82 |
| Arthurs, Ida M. | SPU | service | 6/4/2003 | 3/28/2010 | 71 |
| Bannister, George | SPU | service | 1/6/1996 | 5/20/2010 | 70 |
| Bauer,Raymond J | City Light | service | 1/1/1995 | 1/12/2010 | 83 |
| Beaver,Dorothy | City Light | service | 9/1/1982 | 9/9/2010 | 86 |
| Benson, Margaret M | Muni Ct | service | 9/6/1989 | 1/25/2010 | 79 |
| Berg,Clarence J | Metro-Transit | service | 1/1/1990 | 6/14/2010 | 83 |
| Berry,Donald K | Engineering | service | 2/1/1991 | 2/6/2010 | 81 |
| Berube, Frederick Alton | Library | service | 4/10/2007 | 12/5/2010 | 65 |
| Blake,Dick Lee | Engineer | service | 9/10/1996 | 6/12/2010 | 78 |
| Bossart,Anthony J | Health | service | 4/4/1998 | 11/17/2010 | 73 |
| Bounds, Richard E | Parks | service | 4/1/1985 | 8/7/2010 | 81 |
| Boxrz,George |  | service | 3/1/1984 | 10/26/2010 | 89 |
| Boyar,Ethel | City Light | service | 9/1/1985 | 12/13/2010 | 78 |
| Boyd,Wilda E | Fleets \& Facilities | service | 9/22/2004 | 2/12/2010 | 81 |
| Bozarth, Charles W | City Light | service | 5/5/1979 | 2/20/2010 | 91 |
| Broderick,Ethel L | Library | service | 7/1/1979 | 3/5/2010 | 90 |
| Campbell, Carl R | Engineering | service | 4/1/1981 | 11/10/2010 | 94 |
| Carlson, William E | Engineering | service | 4/1/1978 | 5/25/2010 | 88 |
| Casey, Clifton B | City Light | service | 3/3/1993 | 5/26/2010 | 76 |
| Chapman Jr,Edward |  | service | 10/1/1986 | 2/6/2010 | 88 |
| Christian, Edgar A | City Light | service | 8/19/1972 | 6/30/2010 | 98 |
| Clark,Morris W | City Light | service | 8/1/1990 | 12/9/2010 | 83 |
| Clay,Mildred E |  | service | 4/1/1984 | 10/23/2010 | 92 |
| Cohen,Sandra Lynn | Law | service | 1/31/2007 | 8/25/2010 | 59 |
| Collen, William E | City Light | service | 6/1/1978 | 1/17/2010 | 94 |
| Cook,Noland E |  | service | 1/21/1989 | 6/7/2010 | 83 |
| Cox, Ella J |  | service | 1/1/1981 | 5/25/2010 | 95 |
| Craft, Kenneth E.C. | Parks | service | 10/1/2002 | 4/12/2010 | 65 |
| Craft,Axel H | Engineering | service | 6/1/1975 | 2/25/2010 | 87 |
| Cuplin,Ethel E | Police | service | 4/1/1994 | 11/20/2010 | 91 |
| D'aquila,Michael A | Seattle Center | service | 8/1/1989 | 7/26/2010 | 90 |
| Deliso,Fred S | City Light | service | 3/1/1989 | 2/4/2010 | 83 |
| Dineen, Chloe N | City Light | service | 8/2/1986 | 5/9/2010 | 89 |
| Domenowske,Stephie M | City Light | service | 1/1/1976 | 6/14/2010 | 99 |
| Dunham,George | City Light | service | 7/1/1978 | 10/1/2010 | 89 |
| Dupree, Winnifred M | Police | service | 9/1/1982 | 8/14/2010 | 83 |
| Embury,William D | City Light | service | 9/1/1975 | 1/19/2010 | 90 |
| English, Walter | Parks | service | 12/4/2002 | 2/16/2010 | 67 |
| Flores, David | City Light | service | 3/23/2010 | 12/3/2010 | 61 |


| Name | Dept Name | Retired For | Date Retired | Date of Death | Age At Death |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Foerster,Homer P | City Light | service | 2/14/1981 | 3/21/2010 | 93 |
| Gehrts,Charles | Metro | service | 5/4/1996 | 8/26/2010 | 72 |
| Giesler, Charles J |  | service | 2/1/1982 | 5/15/2010 | 92 |
| Gilje,Luella E |  | service | 3/1/1995 | 6/12/2010 | 86 |
| Golob,Eugene | Metro | service | 4/16/1977 | 1/7/2010 | 95 |
| Grosso,Frank | Engineering | service | 1/1/1981 | 1/16/2010 | 91 |
| Hairston, Lois A | City Light | service | 6/1/2010 | 12/14/2010 | 57 |
| Harding, Melvin W. | Parks | service | 10/1/2002 | 3/6/2010 | 70 |
| Haw,Arthur E | Engineering | service | 9/1/1980 | 2/25/2010 | 87 |
| Hendrickson, Grace Eleanor | DHHS | service | 7/9/1997 | 8/17/2010 | 93 |
| Hession, Michael P | Health | service | 6/1/1979 | 6/27/2010 | 93 |
| Hettrick,Lawrence A | City Light | service | 8/1/1981 | 6/14/2010 | 87 |
| Hirai, Owen R. | City Light | service | 5/21/2003 | 4/23/2010 | 66 |
| Hoffman,Hans | Parks | service | 5/1/1972 | 7/14/2010 | 100 |
| Isherwood,Foster E | Engineering | service | 1/1/1989 | 3/21/2010 | 78 |
| Johnson, Jr., Joseph | DAS | service | 3/2/1996 | 1/12/2010 | 76 |
| Johnson,Ernest B | HSD | service | 12/1/1990 | 1/4/2010 | 85 |
| Johnson, Richard T | SPU | service | 3/2/2005 | 7/11/2010 | 63 |
| Johnson, William E | City Light | service | 8/1/1980 | 1/25/2010 | 86 |
| Johnston,Virginia |  | service | 4/1/1981 | 8/23/2010 | 86 |
| Jordan,John Henry | Water | service | 7/1/1979 | 2/6/2010 | 93 |
| Kertes,Jay | Engineering | service | 4/1/1979 | 11/16/2010 | 87 |
| Kerton, Betty L | City Light | service | 7/1/1976 | 2/24/2010 | 93 |
| Kimball,Richard S | Metro-Transit | service | 2/1/1982 | 8/13/2010 | 90 |
| Kirkpatrick,Dale W | City Light | service | 10/4/2006 | 7/15/2010 | 67 |
| Kiyomizu,Shozo | Engineering | service | 1/1/1978 | 12/21/2010 | 95 |
| Klein, Rosemary E | City Light | service | 5/1/1998 | 7/25/2010 | 81 |
| Koch,Jeanne A |  | service | 9/1/1990 | 6/9/2010 | 88 |
| Kruger,Donna M. | SEATRAN | service | 10/14/2000 | 1/3/2010 | 76 |
| Kunz, Charles M. | City Light | service | 3/13/1999 | 2/9/2010 | 75 |
| Lane, Evelyn L | Health | service | 9/1/1977 | 1/6/2010 | 90 |
| Liapis, George S | City Light | service | 1/1/1984 | 6/6/2010 | 87 |
| Locke,Edward S |  | service | 1/1/1975 | 7/2/2010 | 99 |
| Lombardo,Peter | Parks | service | 4/1/1983 | 9/22/2010 | 95 |
| Maddocks,George E | LC\&A | service | 1/1/1981 | 9/10/2010 | 91 |
| Madison,Donald E. | Dual Member | service | 4/1/2000 | 2/1/2010 | 73 |
| Marston,Alice Y |  | service | 12/1/1994 | 5/16/2010 | 78 |
| May,Salone | Water | service | 10/2/1996 | 12/19/2010 | 76 |
| Mayovsky, Gary J. | Seattle Center | service | 9/25/2002 | 9/27/2010 | 67 |
| Mc Cormick,Jack | Engineering | service | 5/1/1983 | 3/25/2010 | 88 |
| Mcghee,James R |  | service | 4/1/1991 | 5/1/2010 | 72 |
| McGifford,Edwin G. | Engineering | service | 1/1/1997 | 9/2/2010 | 83 |
| Mead,Wendell B |  | service | 11/1/1983 | 1/2/2010 | 87 |
| Moellendorf, Nona L | Seattle Center | service | 2/1/1985 | 12/22/2010 | 93 |
| Moore,Donlee | Building | service | 4/1/1977 | 1/8/2010 | 97 |
| Murakami,Kazuo | City Light | service | 3/1/1984 | 9/28/2010 | 89 |
| Murdock, Harry P |  | service | 6/1/1984 | 2/18/2010 | 90 |
| Naud,Raymond W | City Light | service | 5/1/1987 | 11/21/2010 | 84 |
| Nelson, Russell L |  | service | 6/1/1991 | 10/13/2010 | 78 |
| Noel,Allen H. | Fire | service | 5/1/1997 | 4/23/2010 | 68 |


| Name | Dept Name | Retired For | Date Retired | Date of Death | Age At Death |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Noland, M Roy | City Light | service | 12/1/1994 | 8/22/2010 | 82 |
| Ostberg,Jimmie D | ESD | service | 6/10/1998 | 7/9/2010 | 72 |
| Owens, Julia C | Library | service | 7/1/1994 | 11/23/2010 | 76 |
| Palkowski,Laurena E. | Library | service | 1/19/1997 | 9/8/2010 | 75 |
| Patton, Wesley R |  | service | 3/1/1993 | 2/9/2010 | 82 |
| Payne, Dana A. | Vested | service | 8/27/2007 | 3/20/2010 | 54 |
| Petty, John T | Water | service | 11/1/1978 | 12/15/2010 | 94 |
| Pollard, Irwin D | Seattle Center | service | 3/3/1990 | 3/1/2010 | 82 |
| Pond, C Earle | City Light | service | 8/1/1982 | 2/4/2010 | 89 |
| Primoli,Margaret L | Police | service | 10/1/1979 | 9/23/2010 | 94 |
| Pruzan,Irvin | Metro | service | 12/1/1977 | 12/22/2010 | 94 |
| Puckett,Leo N |  | service | 6/1/1990 | 6/4/2010 | 86 |
| Quandt,Gordon L | Engineering | service | 8/1/1979 | 8/8/2010 | 83 |
| Raganot, Nelda B. | Library | service | 7/7/1999 | 9/24/2010 | 73 |
| Reich,Virginia M | Library | service | 1/1/1976 | 2/22/2010 | 90 |
| Richardson, Earl N | Metro | service | 9/1/1976 | 11/24/2010 | 89 |
| RIVAS,LYNNE H | City Light | service | 5/4/1999 | 11/3/2010 | 76 |
| Rockey, Cosmo T | City Light | service | 3/1/1990 | 11/1/2010 | 82 |
| RUDEN,ROY E. | SDOT | service | 1/4/2000 | 11/21/2010 | 73 |
| Saturnini,George | Water | service | 6/1/1980 | 11/4/2010 | 89 |
| Severson, Donald L |  | service | 2/1/1976 | 2/26/2010 | 96 |
| Shannon, Clarence | Muni Court | service | 4/15/1996 | 9/20/2010 | 81 |
| Shepard,Sheldon F | General Services | service | 8/1/1975 | 4/14/2010 | 88 |
| Shields, James R. | Metro | service | 3/8/1997 | 9/27/2010 | 72 |
| Shimizu,Kazuko | Engineering | service | 4/2/1983 | 5/25/2010 | 91 |
| Sincavage,Michael | Seattle Center | service | 2/1/1985 | 12/11/2010 | 94 |
| Sleater, Dorothy A |  | service | 9/1/1979 | 8/6/2010 | 93 |
| Smith, Carolyn | ESD | service | 8/13/2002 | 6/8/2010 | 63 |
| Sorbo,Boyd H | City Light | service | 2/1/1984 | 9/20/2010 | 82 |
| Southwick,Leonard | Engineering | service | 3/1/1980 | 9/19/2010 | 86 |
| Spearman,Jean G | Health | service | 3/1/1980 | 9/10/2010 | 87 |
| Stateman, Gloria | Treasury | service | 1/1/1986 | 3/16/2010 | 86 |
| Stern, Ollie J | Health | service | 5/1/1987 | 1/1/2010 | 79 |
| Stewart,Verginia E | Engineering | service | 6/1/1986 | 1/22/2010 | 91 |
| Storms,Robert S | City Light | service | 9/1/1981 | 12/7/2010 | 90 |
| Strom, Kenneth R | Metro-Transit | service | 3/1/1983 | 2/10/2010 | 87 |
| Suto,Dorothy M |  | service | 2/1/1984 | 4/16/2010 | 91 |
| Swanson,Alice I | City Light | service | 8/1/1975 | 7/27/2010 | 100 |
| Tanagi,Mariko O | DAS | service | 6/1/1992 | 9/5/2010 | 83 |
| Tarwater, Carol | Library | service | 9/1/1980 | 12/8/2010 | 87 |
| Tate,Alvin | Parks | service | 6/27/1984 | 2/20/2010 | 87 |
| Tencate,Dorothea D | City Light | service | 7/1/1994 | 5/6/2010 | 82 |
| Tester,Joy D | Parks | service | 12/1/1994 | 2/10/2010 | 80 |
| Thompson,Arthur C | Engineering | service | 6/1/1986 | 1/5/2010 | 85 |
| Torkelson, Eric T. | DEA | service | 2/25/2004 | 11/26/2010 | 63 |
| Tsai,Ryo M | Library | service | 6/1/1984 | 2/22/2010 | 88 |
| Warnke,Kenneth E. | City Light | service | 4/5/2000 | 10/30/2010 | 73 |
| Watkins, Mary N |  | service | 10/1/1985 | 9/6/2010 | 87 |


| Name | Dept Name | Retired For | Date Retired | Date of Death | Age At Death |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Watkins,Ray B | Health | service | 1/1/1985 | 10/26/2010 | 88 |
| Watters, Robert | City Light | service | 5/1/1981 | 7/18/2010 | 91 |
| Weisgerber,Laurence G. | SDOT | service | 3/2/2002 | 9/9/2010 | 71 |
| West, Helen T | SPU | service | 1/11/2006 | 6/19/2010 | 70 |
| Whitlock, Leonard B | Water | service | 3/1/1987 | 9/8/2010 | 86 |
| Wiegand,Doris S |  | service | 2/1/1979 | 10/26/2010 | 91 |
| Wilcox, G Grant |  | service | 6/1/1981 | 1/7/2010 | 91 |
| Wills,Donald K | Engineering | service | 4/1/1981 | 10/13/2010 | 84 |
| Wilson, Girtha L C |  | service | 6/1/1995 | 7/17/2010 | 79 |
| Wilson,John | City Light | service | 9/1/1979 | 3/22/2010 | 86 |
| Winter,Frederick W |  | service | 12/1/1989 | 7/15/2010 | 83 |
| Winter,Louise D | Civil Service | service | 10/1/1977 | 8/14/2010 | 95 |
| Withrow,Ernest R | Engineering | service | 2/1/1981 | 11/9/2010 | 91 |
| Woche,Paul L | Light | service | 5/1/1993 | 4/6/2010 | 81 |
| Woods, Howard W | Light | service | 4/1/1985 | 5/9/2010 | 90 |
| Wright, Lewis W. | City Light | service | 12/4/2007 | 7/15/2010 | 72 |
| Yokoyama, Helen H | Seattle Center | service | 1/1/1993 | 1/18/2010 | 95 |
| Average Age of Deceased Pensioner |  |  |  |  | 83.45 |
| Average Age of Deceased Disability Pensioner |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Service Pensioners Deceased |  |  |  |  | 159 |
| Number of Disability Pensioners Deceased |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Death Benefits for Deceased Active and Retired |  |  |  |  | 240,000 |
| Refunds Under Option " $A$ " |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Refunds Under Disability |  |  |  |  | 0 |

## DEATHS IN ACTIVE SERVICE DURING 2010

| Name | Position | Department | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ach, James D | Permit Spec II | DPD | 57 |
| Adams, Rosheida Alfreda | Admin Spec II-BU * | SDOT | 27 |
| Day, Sheridan Louise | Admin Spec II-MC | Muni Court | 66 |
| Dixon, Sigrid Ebron | Wtr Pipe Wkr | SPU | 36 |
| Elfrink-Thompson, Charles D. | Radio Comms Spec | SDOT | 66 |
| Goldmanis, Zane L | Librn | Library | 66 |
| Jackson, Edward Charles | Actg Tech I-BU | SCL | 53 |
| Liang, Willy | Accountant,Sr | ESD | 61 |
| Mar,George W | Auto Mechanic | FAS | 58 |
| Reid, Jr. Lonnie E. | Laborer | Parks | 42 |
| Robinson,Joan M | Wtr Pipe Wkr-WDM I | SPU | 55 |
| Swigger,Nancy D | Rec Leader * | Parks | 67 |
| Thacker, Wilma E | Contract Employee * | ESD | 61 |
| Tiruneh, Asmamaw A. | Parking Attendant, Sr | Seattle Center | 54 |
| Vehikite, Asaeli | Maint Laborer | Parks | 67 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Count | 15 |
|  |  | Average Age | 55.73 |

## DEATH BENEFIT SYSTEM

## For The Year Ended December 31, 2010

All active members and those retired members who so elect are covered by the Death Benefit System. The Death Benefit System is similar to a life insurance policy and pays $\$ 2,000$ to the beneficiary of an active or retired member.

The annual premium for each member is $\$ 12$, with the City matching this amount. Any additional funds needed to fund the Death Benefit System come from the undistributed earnings of the Retirement System.

There were 13 payouts for deaths in active service and 107 claims from retired employees - a total of 120 claims. This compares with 13 deaths in active service in 2009, and 126 claims from retired employees - a total of 135 . The claims totaled $\$ 278,108$ in 2009, and \$270,000 in 2008.

| Income from Active and Retired Employees: Income from Employers: |  |  | \$ | 142,896 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seattle City Light | \$ | 30,690 |  |  |
| General Fund |  | 33,066 |  |  |
| Engineering / Transportation |  | 12,930 |  |  |
| Seattle Parks Department |  | 15,330 |  |  |
| Seattle Public Utilities |  | 21,018 |  |  |
| Administrative Services |  | 5,232 |  |  |
| Library |  | 8,856 |  |  |
| Seattle Center |  | 5,244 |  |  |
| Planning and Development |  | 5,364 |  |  |
| Metro Transit Fund |  | 1,764 |  |  |
| Employees' Retirement System |  | 258 |  |  |
| King County Health \& Custodial |  | 3,144 |  |  |
| Total Employers Fund | \$ | 142,896 |  |  |
| Total from Employer Funds |  |  | \$ | 142,896 |
| Total paid into Death Benefit Reserve |  |  | \$ | 285,792 |
| Transfer from Undistributed Investment Earnings |  |  | \$ | 45,792 |
| Less: Death Benefit Claims - 2010 |  |  | \$ | 240,000 |
| Death Benefit Reserve Balance December 31, 2010 |  |  | \$ | (240,000) |

## UNUSED SICK LEAVE

At the time of retirement, some members may elect to receive a cash payment equal to $25 \%$ of the monetary value of their "unused sick leave." The monetary value is developed by multiplying the number of hours of unused sick leave by the hourly rate, and is calculated and paid to the employee by the employing department when the person retires immediately following employment. Vested members retiring at a future date do not receive a sick leave payout. This may not apply to certain represented positions.

The member may elect to write a check payable to the City, and deliver it to the Retirement System, for the amount of the sick leave payout, and this amount will be placed in an account to be used to pay health care premiums for self and spouse. Since the health care premiums are paid from the Health Care Fund, these funds do not accrue interest. If the retiree dies before the credit is exhausted, the surviving spouse may use the remaining credit to pay for health care coverage.

In the event of the death of an active employee eligible for sick leave benefits, the employing department will pay the beneficiary an amount equal to $25 \%$ of said employees' accumulated unused sick leave.

Of the 355 service retirements during 2010, there were no retirees that deposited the value of their sick leave payout to an account that will be used to pay their medical premiums.

# RETIREMENT ESTIMATE INFORMATION 

Percentage of Average Salary

| Years of | Years of |
| :--- | ---: |
| Retirement | Retirement |
| Credit | Credit |


|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Any | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 |  |
| 30 | 60 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60 | 30 |
| 29 |  | 58.0 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 58.00 | 58.00 | 58.00 | 58.00 | 58.00 | 58.00 | 58.00 | 58.00 | 58 | 29 |
| 28 |  | 56.0 | 56.0 | 56.0 | 56.0 | 56.0 | 56.00 | 56.00 | 56.00 | 56.00 | 56.00 | 56.00 | 56.00 | 56.00 | 56 | 28 |
| 27 |  | 51.3 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 54.00 | 54.00 | 54.00 | 54.00 | 54.00 | 54.00 | 54.00 | 54.00 | 54 | 27 |
| 26 |  | 46.8 | 49.4 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 52.00 | 52.00 | 52.00 | 52.00 | 52.00 | 52.00 | 52.00 | 52.00 | 52 | 26 |
| 25 |  | 42.5 | 45.0 | 47.5 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 50 | 25 |
| 24 |  | 38.4 | 40.8 | 43.2 | 45.6 | 48.0 | 48.00 | 48.00 | 48.00 | 48.00 | 48.00 | 48.00 | 48.00 | 48.00 | 48 | 24 |
| 23 |  | 34.5 | 36.8 | 39.1 | 41.4 | 43.7 | 46.00 | 46.00 | 46.00 | 46.00 | 46.00 | 46.00 | 46.00 | 46.00 | 46 | 23 |
| 22 |  | 30.8 | 33.0 | 35.2 | 37.4 | 39.6 | 41.80 | 44.00 | 44.00 | 44.00 | 44.00 | 44.00 | 44.00 | 44.00 | 44 | 22 |
| 21 |  | 27.3 | 29.4 | 31.5 | 33.6 | 35.7 | 37.80 | 39.90 | 42.00 | 42.00 | 42.00 | 42.00 | 42.00 | 42.00 | 42 | 21 |
| 20 |  | 24.0 | 26.0 | 28.0 | 30.0 | 32.0 | 34.00 | 36.00 | 38.00 | 40.00 | 40.00 | 40.00 | 40.00 | 40.00 | 40 | 20 |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28.88 | 30.02 | 31.16 | 32.30 | 33.44 | 34.58 | 35.72 | 36.86 | 38 | 19 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27.36 | 28.44 | 29.52 | 30.60 | 31.68 | 32.76 | 33.84 | 34.92 | 36 | 18 |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25.84 | 26.86 | 27.88 | 28.90 | 29.92 | 30.94 | 31.96 | 32.98 | 34 | 17 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.32 | 25.28 | 26.24 | 27.20 | 28.16 | 29.12 | 30.08 | 31.04 | 32 | 16 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.80 | 23.70 | 24.60 | 25.50 | 26.40 | 27.30 | 28.20 | 29.10 | 30 | 15 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21.28 | 22.12 | 22.96 | 23.80 | 24.64 | 25.48 | 26.32 | 27.16 | 28 | 14 |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.76 | 20.54 | 21.32 | 22.10 | 22.88 | 23.66 | 24.44 | 25.22 | 26 | 13 |
| 12 |  |  | Eligib | To Re |  |  | 18.24 | 18.96 | 19.68 | 20.40 | 21.12 | 21.84 | 22.56 | 23.28 | 24 | 12 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.72 | 17.38 | 18.04 | 18.70 | 19.36 | 20.02 | 20.68 | 21.34 | 22 | 11 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15.20 | 15.80 | 16.40 | 17.00 | 17.60 | 18.20 | 18.80 | 19.40 | 20 | 10 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.38 | 16.92 | 17.46 | 18 | 9 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.56 | 15.04 | 15.52 | 16 | 8 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.74 | 13.16 | 13.58 | 14 | 7 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.92 | 11.28 | 11.64 | 12 | 6 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.10 | 9.40 | 9.70 | 10 | 5 |

Identify percentage factor above that applies to your age and years of service.
Percentages increase with each day of service.
Maximum percentage factor $=60 \%$ with 30 years of retirement credit.
Average Salary = Average of Highest Consecutive 24 months.
If expected retirement date is 2 years or more from now, use today's salary as estimated Final Average Salary.

| Eligibility for Retirement |
| :---: |
| 5 to 9 years of service - and are age 62 or older |
| 10 to 19 years of service - and are age 57 or older |
| 20 to 29 years of service - and are age 52 or older |
| 30 years of service - any age |

Example: 22 years of credit, age 56, and final average salary is $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 5 0 0}$
\$ 2,500
Final Average Salary
39.6 \%
percentage factor from table
based on age and years of credit
\$ 990
Estimated Un-modified Monthly Amount

Note: This form is only intended to provide a general profile of how an estimated pension amount is calculated. Any unpaid leave during your career is not counted towards retirement credit, but may be purchased under certain circumstances.


[^0]:    This work product was prepared solely for SCERS for the purposes described herein and may not be appropriate to use for other purposes. Milliman does not intend to benefit and assumes no duty or liability to other parties who receive this work.

[^1]:    This work product was prepared solely for SCERS for the purposes described herein and may not be appropriate to use for other purposes. Milliman does not intend to benefit and assumes no duty or liability to other parties who receive this work.

[^2]:    * Effects related to losses are shown in parentheses. Numerical results are expressed as a decrease (increase) in the UAAL.

[^3]:    * Rate needed to fund the UAAL over 30 years, assuming full increase takes effect on January 1, 2011.

[^4]:    * All mortality tables are generational using Projection Scale AA

[^5]:    * Immediate retirement is assumed for every person age 70 or over.

[^6]:    *The mortality rates shown above are generationally projected on an individual basis using Projection Scale AA for the valuation.

