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Fundamental Pension Concepts
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Defined Contribution Plans


Defined Benefit Plans

Defined Contribution Plans

stack of cash

## Defined Benefit Plans


stream of payments

## POP QUIZ!

$\$ 100,000$ in $401(k)$ vs. $\$ 1,000$ per month for life Which is worth more at age 62?

Present Value of $\$ 1,000 /$ month pension plan


## equals \$165,000!

Common Defined Benefits Formulas

| Flat Benefit | Unit Benefit |
| :--- | :--- |
| One variable | Two variables |
| -years of service | -years of service <br> -final average salary |

## Growth of Flat Benefit Plan



## Divorce at 20 years



## Separate Interest <br> Actuarially Equivalent Benefit

(1) Assume that wife is 5 years younger than husband.
$\$ 400$ /month for husband's lifetime = $\$ 360 /$ month for wife's lifetime
(2) What if they are the same age?
**PERS will honor separate interest divisions for Tier One, Tier Two and OPSRP.**
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Growth of Unit Benefit Plans
Two increasing variables (years of service \& wages) produces a geometric curve

$]^{\text {st }}$ Method to Divide:
Current Accrued Benefits Method
Assume divorce at 15 years of service, benefit $=\$ 1,500 /$ month, no premarital service

$2^{\text {nd }}$ Method to Divide:
"Time Rule" aka "Coverture Fraction"
The "Straight Line" Method
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Early Retirement Subsidy A "Bonus" for a Career Employee


## Present Value Calculations are

 based on Current Benefit \& may short change the Alternate Payee (e.g. $\$ 750 /$ month in example)

When representing the alternate payee in a pre-retirement split of a Unit Benefit Plan (e.g. PERS) and if Member is likely to continue to work and gain salary increases, consider that a time share division could be worth a lot more to your client ultimately.
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## Pers

Every Member has...

## Individual Account Program (IAP)

- Defined Contribution Plan
- Started in 2004
- $6 \%$ of salary with earnings
- Giant pooled fund managed by ING


## Pers

and one of these three Defined Benefit Plans:
, PERS Tier One (hired before 1996)
, PERS Tier Two (hired between 1/1/96 \& 8/28/03)

- OPSRP (hired after 8/28/03)


## Dividing the IAP

- Defined contribution plan; cash in the bank
- Must tie division date to December 31 of any year
- Mid year split requires calculation by hand to specify dollar amount
- PERS will allow immediate payment
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IAP Hand Calculations
to divide at $9 / 30 / 13$

2012 INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNT PROGRAM (IAP) ACCOUNT INFORMATION
Account belance December 31,2011
\$32,310.89
Employec conrtbutions in 2012
( 53.571 .73 * $\times 9 / 12=2,678.80$

Account balance Deeember 31, 2012 $\$ 40,938.48$ as of $12 / 31 / 12$

Your 2012 IAP balance*: $\$ 40,938.48$
*ING - link at PERS website - Member can log in and get actual current year contributions.

## OPSRP

(employees hired after 8/28/2003)

- Pure Unit Defined Benefit Plan
- No account balance
- Formula benefit -
years of service $\times$ final average salary $\times 1.5 \%$
e.g. 30 years of service $=45 \%$ of salary at age 65 (compares to average PERS 30 year retiree in $2011=74 \%$ of salary)
- Payable at age 55 or later with actuarial reduction @ 6.5\% per year under age 65 (e.g. retirement at 55 years $=35 \%$ of the age 65 retirement benefit)
- Not available at all before age 55.


Pension earned so far:
$62 / 3$ years $\times \$ 34,686 \times 1.5 \% \div 12=$
$\$ 289 /$ month at age 65

## OPSRP (employees hired after $8 / 28 / 2003$ )

Normal way to divide is "Time Rule" - Separate Interest

Consider offsetting OPSRP with IAP
(Rule of thumb: OPSRP value $=$ IAP balance at age 40, less if younger than 40, more if older than 40)

- Requires actuarial value of OPSRP
- Promotes disentanglement, especially for younger members


## OPSRP Survivor Issues

(Member dies before retirement)

- Only a 50\% benefit is paid
- Other 50\% evaporates
- Only a current spouse can receive survivor benefits

What is Member has not remarried?

- Benefits for both Member and AP are lost - the "hole"
- If Member has remarried, AP can share payment for life of second spouse if provided in Court order.


Consider life insurance on
Member to replace lost
income for Alternate Payee

## PERS Formulas -a Hybrid Plan-

 (Tier One and Two Members)Money Match (defined contribution)
Member's PERS account $\mathbf{x} 2 \times$ annuity factor
Full Formula (defined benefit)
Final average salary x years of service $\times 1.67 \%$ ( $2 \%$ for police \& fire employees)

Member receives the best of both. Sometimes an apple sometimes an orange.

## Key Point
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PERS stopped contributing 6\% to PERS Tier One and Tier Two accounts after 2003.

Starting in 2004, those dollars are going into $\qquad$ the IAP.

RESULT: Gradual shift to Full Formula


Trend in retirement calculation methods $\qquad$
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## Full Formula

Final average salary $\mathbf{x}$ years of service $\mathbf{x} 1.67 \%$


## Money Match

Member's PERS account $\times 2 \times$ annuity factor
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Typical "old" Tier One
(hired mid 1980's or earlier)
Rule of Thumb - divide up front


Analysis: Full formula will never catch
up with Money match

Tier Two
Rule of Thumb - divide on time rule


Analysis: Tier Two accounts are too small and are overtaken by full formula almost every time now.
Exception - Member no longer working

## "Younger" Tier One

Hired in the mid 1980's to early 1990's -
Toss up as to which division method to use


## Preferred Methods to Divide

## If Money Match will prevail

Divide account balance now "up front"

## If Full Formula will prevail

 earliest retirement age) based on time rule and give Alternate Payee a separate interest$\qquad$
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## Analysis

Member will receive at least $\$ 1,802$ /month at age 58, even if he quits today.
(Present value $=\$ 190,000$ )
AP's share $=\$ 901 /$ month plus more if Member continues to work and have salary increases. $\qquad$

But if we divide account up front, AP will get $\qquad$ half of $\$ 1,254$, or only $\$ 627 /$ month at retirement. (Present value $=\$ 66,000$ )
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So.....

Know which formula the Member is most likely to retire under before you draft your judgment!

To divide account up front when full formula will prevail serves to short change Alternate Payee.

Judgment says "Divide husband's PERS account equally at time of this Judgment."

## What does that mean?

## I don't know! May be forced into up

front division even if not fair to Alternate Payee.

## Tip

"Account" $=$ "Benefit"
Don't describe PERS "account" describe as a "benefit."

Key Differences between Tier One and Tier Two
, 8\% earnings guarantee for Tier One "regular" account
, Normal retirement age: Tier One - 58
Tier Two-60
, Early retirement reduction 8\%/year:
Tier One at age $55=76 \%$ of age 58 normal retirement benefit
Tier Two at age $55=60 \%$ of age 60 normal retirement benefit)


Can only divide payment stream based on election made at retirement

## First, know \& understand your payment option

- Option 1 - single life
- Option 2 - joint \& 100\% survivor (气 approx. $15 \%$ reduction from Option 1)
- Option 3 - joint \& $50 \%$ survivor ( $\cong$ approx. $8 \%$ reduction from Option 1)
- 2A - 3A - "pop up"
- Refund Annuity - single life with account balance minimum
- 15 certain - single life with 15 year minimum


## Division - focus on payments

- No "account" to divide

Specify what happens on either death --

- Member dies first -
- to Alternate Payee?
- to beneficiary?
- Alternate Payee dies first -
- to Member?
- to Alternate Payee's beneficiary?


## Two special rules

1. Member can change beneficiary at divorce, if expressly provided in the Court order.
e.g. Option 2 - can change beneficiary to child, benefit will be recalculated
2. If 2 A or 3 A , member can "pop up" to Option 1 at divorce unless restricted by Court order.
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Either change would deprive the AP of assurance of income for life. Must restrict these changes to protect income of Alternate Payee.


## Value of Survivor Benefit as <br> Separate Asset

- Miller case [208 Or. App. 619 (2006)] - says to value spouse's survivor benefit as a separate asset.
, I say that's only half the issue! Also should consider Member's survivor benefit if he survives the Alternate Payee. Could have equal, offsetting value.


## Value of Survivor Benefit as <br> Separate Asset

- To be precise, may need to value each contingent survivor benefit separately based on age \& probability of who will survive.
- Alternative: Allow each party to control beneficiary of his/her half on the first death. That neutralizes the issue entirely. $\qquad$
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"Separate Interest" vs. "Joint \& Survivor"


## Separate Interest

## Joint \& Survivor

- Requires Member to elect survivorship option for complete.
- Each party can elect own benefit for own lifetime.
- Alternate payee can commence after Member's earliest retirement date, even if Member keeps working.
- Only survivor issues are on pre-retirement death.

Alternate Payee at retirement and then split payments.

- Alternate Payee must wait for Member's actual retirement - commence together.
- Appropriate when one party has shortened life expectancy.


## Dual PERS Members

(Husband and Wife are both Members)
Do we offset?

- Only if in same system and both will retire under the same formula.
- But if so, beneficial to keep payment options open, especially for survivorship with new spouse.


## "Invisible" Tier Two Members



Members hired between June 1 and August 28, 2003 are Tier Two with \$0 account.
Member is not receiving a Tier Two statement.


Can we rely on PERS forms alone?


## Summary

Recognize that Tier One and Tier Two are worth many more times the balance shown on statement.

Money Match - at least three times the account balance

Full Formula - even more
e.g. Tier Two benefit with $\$ 8,000$ account was

## PERS forms

- Must be attached to Judgment (or Supplemental Judgment)
- Must be incorporated by reference

However . . .

No
(despite instructions on forms) $\qquad$

- Forms don't cover all situations
- Forms don't cover all alternatives
- Forms are subject to interpretation

You still should have specific division language in judgment and specify that the language is to control over forms.
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## Summary

$\qquad$

IAP is a defined contribution (DC) plan. $\qquad$
OPSRP is a defined benefit (DB)plan.
Tier Two is usually a defined benefit plan.
Tier One can be either and can change over time if member continues to work.
Know what you are dividing!
If a DC plan, typically divide up front.
If a DB plan, typically divide using the time rule.

## Summary

If the time rule, usually provide Alternate Payee with a separate interest.

But, if either party has a shortened life expectancy then consider mandated Option 2 or 3 (joint \& survivor) with "survivor take all" approach to give the survivor both halves of the benefit after first death.
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## Summary

$\qquad$

Get a restraining order if you fear Member will withdraw, die or retire pending the divorce.

Restraining order must reference PERS benefits. A generic restraining order that does not reference PERS is not sufficient.
$\qquad$

## Don't try this at home!

Get a QDRO lawyer involved before the judgment. PERS is too complicated and too valuable for most family law lawyers to divide without expert help.
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Call your friendly QDRO attorney!
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Oregon Public Employees Retirement System (Tier 1 / TJer 2) and Oregon Public Service Retirement Plan (OPSRP) Actuarial Equivalency Factors Effective January 1, 2012 (OPSRP)

Mortality Table: Blended Healthy Mortallty

Question: Can a PERS Tier Two benefit with an $\$ 8,000$ account balance be worth $\$ 150,000$ ?
Answer: Yes, and often so!
This occurred in a case that I was involved in just last week (as I write this). I will explain why later in this article.

My point is that PERS benefits are not what they seem. Often there is much more than meets the eye. So this article will attempt to dispel some of the mystery of the various PERS benefit systems in a way that will help you better understand PERS benefits and better serve your clients.

Every PERS member has two sets of retirement benefits. First, virtually everyone has an IAP account. ${ }^{1}$ Second, every member has a benefit from one of these three systems: Tier One, Tier Two or OPSRP. I will address each below.

## IAP Accounts.

IAP stands for the Individual Account Plan under ORS 238A. 300 et. seq. This is the easiest system to understand. IAP accounts are comprised of the $6 \%$ "employee" contributions ${ }^{2}$ for all PERS members plus earnings thereon. IAP accounts first started in 2004. The accounts are cash in the bank, so to speak, much like a $401(\mathrm{k})$ or IRA. However, IAP accounts are not self-directed. Rather, all IAP accounts are invested as a multi-billion dollar pooled fund ${ }^{3}$ managed by a Wall Street firm. So the investment earnings are determined, and allocated to individual accounts, only once per year.

For that reason, IAP accounts can be divided on divorce only as of December 31 of any year. If a mid-year division is desired, then the amount to be awarded to an alternate payee must be determined by hand. This is done by determining the alternate payee's share as of the prior December 31, then adding the alternate payee's share of the $6 \%$ employee contribution (not earnings) for the portion of the calendar year up to the division date, and then to award that sum as a dollar amount to the alternate payee as of the prior December 31. By using the prior December 31 date as the division date, the alternate payee will automatically receive earnings on his/her share going forward.

OPSRP.
This stands for the "Oregon Public Service Retirement Plan" under ORS Chapter 238A and applies only to PERS members first employed after August 29, 2003. OPSRP is a true defined benefit plan. There is no "account balance" as with Tier One or Tier Two. Rather, it is designed to pay a pension (i.e., a stream of payments) at retirement. It is akin to Social Security - no pot of money, only retirement income for life.

[^0]In OPSRP the amount of retirement income is strictly a function of the member's years of service and final average salary. The benefit, payable at age 65, is based on this formula: (years of service) $x$ (1.5\%) x (final average salary). So an OPSRP member with 20 years of service will receive a pension equal to $30 \%$ of his/her final average salary ( 20 years $\times 1.5 \%=30 \%$ ). If final average salary is $\$ 4,000 /$ month, then the OPSRP pension will be $\$ 1,200 /$ month starting at age 65 and continuing for life. The member can choose joint-and-survivor options with a spouse beneficiary for a slight reduction in the monthly benefit.

What is an OPSRP benefit worth? It could be a lot. An actuary is required to determine the value precisely, and that value will vary with interest rates. But it is not uncommon for the value of a member's OPSRP benefit to approximate the balance of the member's IAP account. And an OPSRP is not divisible until the member's earliest retirement age. Therefore, a good approach to divide an OPSRP member's PERS benefits is to have the member keep the OPSRP and let the spouse take the IAP. The OPSRP will have to be valued, and the difference from the IAP balance will have to be adjusted in some manner. But that approach best serves the interests of disentangling the parties.

If an OPSRP is to be divided, then the "time rule" approach, as explained in the Kiser" and Stokes ${ }^{5}$ cases, is generally appropriate and most fair. PERS will now re-calibrate the portion assigned to the alternate payee so that it is payable for the alternate payee's lifetime rather than the member's lifetime. That is a good and recent development. This "separate interest" division best accomplishes the interest of disentanglement and in most cases eliminates the need to award or be concerned about survivor benefits. ${ }^{6}$

## Tier Two.

Tier Two covers members first hired between January 1, 1996 and August 28, 2003. Their account balances are comprised of their $6 \%$ employee contributions up thru 2003, plus earnings. And those earnings are not guaranteed (as are Tier One regular accounts, see below).

But here is an important truth - for nearly all Tier Two members, the balance of a Tier Two member's account has no bearing on the value of the Tier Two benefit!! Let me say it again - almost always the account balance is irrelevant to value. The actual value is usually much greater.

This is because no new contributions have been added to the Tier Two accounts since 2003 (after which the $6 \%$ contributions were diverted to the new IAP accounts). At most, those accounts received six or seven years of contributions. So Tier Two accounts are relatively small. Yet Tier Two members are still earning service credits under the Full Formula, including for service after 2003. Tier Two members will receive retirement income based on the higher result of two calculation methods:

[^1]the Money Match method (based solely on the account balance, doubled) and the Full Formula method (based solely on total years of service and final average salary). And now that nearly 10 years have elapsed since the cut-off of new contributions to Tier Two accounts at the end of 2003, the Full Formula is the prevailing method almost every time. The only exceptions are Tier Two members who left PERScovered employment before or shortly after 2003.

Tier Two members can retire at age 60 (rather than 65 as under OPSRP) and the formula is $1.67 \% /$ year of service (rather than $1.5 \%$ under OPSRP). These differences make the Full Formula under Tier Two much more valuable than OPSRP. Therefore, for Tier Two you should have the benefit valued by an actuary every time. You will be surprised.

This is the example first stated above. That member entered Tier Two in 2002, so her account received only two years of contributions before the cutoff in 2003, and her account balance now is only $\$ 8,000$. Yet she has 10 years of service, a very good salary and is close to retirement. Thus, the present value of the total benefit is $\$ 150,000$, meaning that husband's $50 \%$ marital share is worth $\$ 75,000$. Husband had no idea! He was about to agree to offset $\$ 8,000$ of his 401(k) account against her \$8,000 Tier Two account. So he was glad to have called me before he agreed to that settlement.

If a Tier Two benefit is to be divided, then generally it is most fair (as with OPSRP) to divide the benefit using the "time rule" approach and to create a "separate interest" for each party at the member's actual retirement (or when elected by the alternate payee at the member's earliest retirement date). Tier Two does not have the same "hole" as does OPSRP ${ }^{7}$ with regard to a preretirement death. However, until retirement the benefit is still in one piece, which makes it important to require that the member designate the alternate payee as beneficiary of at least $50 \%$ of the marital portion. Once benefits commence to the alternate payee, then each party will have his/her own share for his/her own lifetime and the member can be released from the beneficiary restriction.

## Tier One.

Tier One members are those who first started PERS-covered employment before 1996. Their retirement benefits differ from Tier Two in two important respects: (1) normal retirement date is age 58 rather than 60, making the benefit significantly more valuable; and (2) earnings in the "regular" account are guaranteed to be at least $8 \%$ per year ${ }^{8}$. As a result, the account balances of more senior Tier One members often produce a larger Money Match benefit than the Full Formula. For those members, even though no new contributions have been added since 2003, the $8 \%$ annual growth in their accounts is out-stripping the additional service credits under the Full Formula. So it is common, still, to find a Tier One member (typically those who started work before 1990) for whom the Money Match method will produce a retirement benefit larger than the Full Formula method.

As a "rule of thumb," the present value of a Tier One member's benefit is at least three to four times the present account balance, at today's interest rates. Here's why: (1) the regular Tier One account continues to grow at $8 \%$ per annum between now and retirement, far above current market rate; (2) at retirement the account will be doubled by the Money Match; (3) the account (as doubled) is

[^2]then converted to a monthly payment based on a PERS table that also has an $8 \%$ interest rate built into it ${ }^{9}$; and (4) the monthly benefit will then receive an annual COLA increase of up to $2 \%$ per year for life ${ }^{10}$. As a result, the projected monthly benefit usually has a present value of between three and four times the current account balance ${ }^{11}$.

The present value of a Tier One benefit can be more than four times the account balance if the Full Formula method is the prevailing method to determine the benefit. In other words, the "three to four times account balance" rule of thumb is the "floor" for the present value of a Tier One benefit. If the Full Formula method is projected to provide a higher benefit than the Money Match method, then the present value of the Tier One benefit is proportionately higher.

Whether a Tier One benefit will paid based on the Money Match method or the Full Formula Method should dictate the approach to be taken in dividing the Tier One benefit on divorce. And this takes expert help to determine. If the Full Formula method will prevail, then the "time rule" approach for dividing the benefit is the most balanced approach, just as with Tier Two and OPSRP. But if the Money Match method will prevail, then perhaps it is fair to divide the account "up front" now, so that each party has his/her own account.

But now some strategy: if the Full Formula will prevail in a Tier One case, an astute lawyer representing the member might rather seek to divide the account in half "up front." That will limit the alternate payee to the Money Match calculation and allow the member to retain the member's half of the Money Match benefit plus all of the difference in value of the Full Formula over the Money Match. And the reverse is true, too. When the Money Match method will prevail, then to divide the account "up front" means giving away $50 \%$ of the final benefit. So if the Money Match method will prevail and if the member will continue working after the divorce, then the lawyer for the member might rather apply the "time rule" division in order to allow the member to keep more than $50 \%$ of the final benefit.

## Conclusion.

Lawyers addressing PERS benefits in divorce should recognize the differences in the nature and values of the several PERS retirement systems and, where appropriate, seek expert help in evaluating and dividing PERS benefits ${ }^{12}$.

[^3]
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## Public Employees Retirement System

11410 SW 68 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Parkway
Tigard, OR 97223
503-598-7377 or toll free 888-320-7377 http://oregon.gov/PERS

## 1. System Demographics (as of December 31, 2011)

PERS employers: Approximately 900, including all state agencies, universities, and community colleges; all school districts; and almost all cities, counties, and other local government units.

PERS members: approximately $95 \%$ of all public employees in Oregon.
Membership by category

|  |  | State Govt. | Local Govt. | School Districts | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tier One | Active | 12,866 | 15,368 | 18,648 | 46,882 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Inactive | 5,222 | 6,941 | 8,089 | 20,252 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tier Two | Active | 12,757 | 16,640 | 19,733 | 49,130 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Inactive | 3,226 | 6,049 | 6,914 | 16,189 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Active | 19,751 | 25,122 | 30,087 | 74,960 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Inactive | 1,056 | 1,345 | 1,665 | 4,066 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total | Active | 45,374 | 57,130 | 68,468 | $\mathbf{1 7 0 , 9 7 2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Inactive | 9,504 | 14,335 | 16,668 | $\mathbf{4 0 , 5 0 7}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirees* | 28,310 | 31,383 |  | 58,715 | $\mathbf{1 1 8 , 4 0 8}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{3 2 9 , 8 8 7}$ |

* Includes beneficiaries but not members who received total lump-sum retirement or account withdrawal payouts.

Member age distribution (as of December 31, 2011)


## 2. System Benefits

## PERS benefit component comparisons

The primary components and differences among the PERS Tier One and Tier Two programs, the Oregon Public Service Retirement Plan (OPSRP) Pension Program, and the Individual Account Program (IAP) are shown below. Tier One covers members hired before January 1, 1996; Tier Two covers members hired between January 1, 1996 and August 28, 2003; and OPSRP covers members hired on or after August 29, 2003. The IAP contains all member contributions ( $6 \%$ of covered salary) made on and after January 1, 2004.

|  | Tier One | Tier Two | OPSRP Pension | IAP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Normal retirement age | $\begin{aligned} & 58 \text { (or } 30 \mathrm{yrs} \text { ) } \\ & \mathrm{P} \& F=\text { age } 55 \text { or } 50 \mathrm{w} / 25 \\ & \mathrm{yrs} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \text { (or } 30 \mathrm{yrs} \text { ) } \\ & \mathrm{P} \mathrm{\& F}=\text { age } 55 \text { or } 50 \\ & \mathrm{w} / 25 \mathrm{yrs} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65(58 \mathrm{w} / 30 \mathrm{yrs}) \\ & \text { P\&F }=\text { age } 60 \text { or } 53 \\ & \mathrm{w} / 25 \mathrm{yrs} \end{aligned}$ | 55 |
| Early retirement | 55 (50 for P\&F) | 55 (50 for P\&F) | 55, if vested ( 50 for P\&F) | 55 |
| Regular account earnings | Guaranteed assumed rate annually (currently 8\%) | No guarantee; market returns | N/A; no member account | No guarantee; market returns |
| Variable account earnings | Market returns on $100 \%$ global equity portfolio | Market returns on $100 \%$ global equity portfolio | N/A; no member account | N/A |
| Retirement calculation methods | Money Match, Full Formula, or Formula + Annuity (if eligible) | Money Match or Full Formula | Formula | Six account distribution options |
| Full Formula benefit factor | $1.67 \%$ general; <br> $2.00 \%$ P\&F | $1.67 \%$ general; $2.00 \%$ P\&F | 1.50\% general; <br> $1.80 \% \mathrm{P} \& \mathrm{~F}$ | N/A |
| Formula + Annuity benefit factor | $1.00 \%$ general; $1.35 \% \mathrm{P} \& F$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Oregon state income tax remedy | If eligible, higher of $9.89 \%$ on service time before Oct. 1,1991 or $4.0 \%$ or less based on total service time | No tax remedy provided | No tax remedy provided | No tax remedy provided |
| Lump-sum vacation payout |  |  |  |  |
| Included in covered salary (6\%) | Yes | Yes | No | Yes for Tier One and Tier Two; no for OPSRP |
| Included in FAS | Yes | No | No | N/A |
| Unused sick leave included in FAS | Yes, if the employer participates in the sick leave program | Yes, if the employer participates in the sick leave program | No | N/A |
| 6\% "pickup" included in FAS | Yes | Yes | No | N/A |
| Vesting | Contributions in each of 5 yrs or active member at age 50 | Contributions in each of 5 yrs or active member at age 50 | 5 yrs qualifying service or normal retirement age | Immediate |
| $2 \%$ maximum annual COLA after retirement | Can retire through July 1 and receive maximum COLA for the year | Can retire through July 1 and receive maximum COLA for the year | COLA prorated in year of retirement based on retirement date |  |

P\&F = police and firefighters; FAS = final average salary; COLA = cost-of-living adjustment; $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}=$ not applicable
Note: PERS uses three methods to calculate Tier One and Tier Two retirement benefits: Full Formula. Formula + innuity (for members who made contributions before August 21, 1981), and Money Match. PERS uses the method (for which a member is eligible) that produces the highest benefit amount. OPSRP Pension benefits are based only on a formula method.

## 2. System Benefits (continued)

## Summary of findings from PERS' Replacement Ratio Study for 2011

The Replacement Ratio Study population of 75,179 retirements was drawn from 92,456 retirements from January 1990 through December 2011, and covers retired members who selected comparable monthly benefit options. The techniques used in the 2011 PERS Replacement Ratio Study are consistent with the techniques used in previous studies.

The calculations do not include any federal Social Security benefits that a retiree may be eligible for based on the retiree's work history. The calculations also do not include the effects of the postretirement Strunk/Eugene benefit adjustments, which generally impacted retirements occurring in 2000-2004 and would reduce the reported replacement ratios for those periods by several percentage points.

Average age at retirement: 59 years old
Average years of service at retirement: 22 years of service

## Average monthly retirement benefit

- For all retirees from 1990-2011, the average monthly retirement benefit at time of retirement was $\$ 2,160$ per month, or about $\$ 25,920$ annually
- For those retirees in the most recent year (2011), the average monthly retirement benefit was $\$ 2,672$ per month, or about $\$ 32,064$ annually


## Average public employee salaries at retirement

- For all retirees from 1990-2011, the final salary at retirement averaged $\$ 45,425$ annually
- For 2011 retirees, the final salary at retirement averaged $\$ 62,108$ annually


## Average salary replacement ratio (see chart on following page)

- For all retirees from 1990-2011, the average annual retirement benefit equaled $54 \%$ of final salary at the time of retirement
- For 2011 retirees, the average annual retirement benefit equaled $50 \%$ of final salary
- For all retirees from 1990-2011, there were $7.6 \%$ who received annual benefits more than $100 \%$ of final salary. The average years of service for this group was 31 years
- For 2011 retirees, there were $5.3 \%$ who received annual benefits more than $100 \%$ of final salary. The average years of service for this group was 34 years

For members who retire with 30 years of service (see chart on following page)

- From 1990-2011, the average retirement benefit for 30 -year members equaled $80 \%$ of final salary and the average monthly benefit was $\$ 3,468$ per month
- The average retirement benefit for 30 -year members peaked at $100 \%$ of final salary in 2000 and their average monthly benefit was $\$ 4,200$ per month
- For 2011 only, the average retirement benefit for 30 -year members equaled $74 \%$ of final salary and the average monthly benefit was $\$ 3,990$ per month
- $11.49 \%$ of retirees from 1990-2011 had 30 years of service
- $10.35 \%$ of retirees in 2011 had 30 years of service


## 2. System Benefits (continued)

Summary of findings from PERS' Replacement Ratio Study for 2011 (continued)
Average salary replacement ratio based on final salary (FS) at retirement

|  | Retirees with 30 Years of Service |  | All Retirees in Study |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Calendar Year | \# of Retirees in Study* | Average Replacement Ratio Based on FS | \# of Retirees in Study* | Average Replacement Ratio Based on FS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of Retirees } \\ & \text { Receiving } \\ & >100 \% \text { of FS } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1990 | 146 | 61\% | 1,866 | 44\% | .0\% |
| 1991 | 217 | 61\% | 2,377 | 45\% | .1\% |
| 1992 | 205 | 67\% | 2,432 | 48\% | . $5 \%$ |
| 1993 | 289 | 66\% | 2,744 | 48\% | .5\% |
| 1994 | 302 | 67\% | 3,298 | 49\% | . $3 \%$ |
| 1995 | 304 | 66\% | 2,827 | 47\% | 1.0\% |
| 1996 | 281 | 70\% | 2,477 | 49\% | 1.4\% |
| 1997 | 295 | 83\% | 3,107 | 57\% | 7.5\% |
| 1998 | 465 | 89\% | 4,567 | 65\% | 12.0\% |
| 1999 | 548 | 93\% | 4,644 | 65\% | 14.0\% |
| 2000 | 273 | 100\% | 2,112 | 63\% | 15.8\% |
| 2001 | 391 | 99\% | 3,146 | 66\% | 16.5\% |
| 2002 | 670 | 96\% | 4,605 | 68\% | 17.4\% |
| 2003 | 942 | 93\% | 7,631 | 66\% | 14.4\% |
| 2004 | 471 | 84\% | 3,259 | 55\% | 5.5\% |
| 2005 | 393 | 84\% | 2,548 | 51\% | 4.4\% |
| 2006 | 347 | 83\% | 2,952 | 50\% | 4.3\% |
| 2007 | 372 | 84\% | 3,226 | 51\% | 4.9\% |
| 2008 | 417 | 80\% | 3,480 | 52\% | 5.0\% |
| 2009 | 432 | 77\% | 3,881 | 53\% | 6.2\% |
| 2010 | 414 | 75\% | 3,516 | 48\% | 4.3\% |
| 2011 | 464 | 74\% | 4,484 | 50\% | 5.3\% |
| Total/Avg | 8,639 | 80\% | 75,179 | 54\% | 6.4\% |

* Includes monthly benefit payments for members retiring from active service within the preceding 12 months. Benefits related to inactive, lump sum, judge and legislator retirements are excluded.


## 2. System Benefits (continued)

Monthly benefit payment amounts as of January 1, 2013
Based on 121,276 monthly benefit payments (includes alternate payees and survivors; excludes lump sum and unit payments) totaling $\$ 281.2$ million for the month.


| Monthly <br> Benefit (\$) | Number of <br> Retirees | Percent of <br> Benefits Paid | Monthly <br> Benefit (\$) | Number of <br> Retirees | Percent of <br> Benefits Paid |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| $0-500$ | $\mathbf{1 8 , 7 3 4}$ | $15.45 \%$ | $3,001-3,500$ | 7,571 | $6.24 \%$ |
| $501-1,000$ | 18,645 | $15.37 \%$ | $3,501-4,000$ | 6,799 | $5.61 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 1 - 1 , 5 0 0}$ | 15,135 | $12.48 \%$ | $4,001-4,500$ | 5,955 | $4.91 \%$ |
| $1,501-2,000$ | 12,328 | $10.17 \%$ | $4,501-5,000$ | 4,986 | $4.11 \%$ |
| $2,001-2,500$ | 10,478 | $8.64 \%$ | $5,001-5,500$ | $\mathbf{3 , 6 8 6}$ | $3.04 \%$ |
| $2,501-3,000$ | 8,846 | $7.29 \%$ | $5,501-6,000$ | $\mathbf{2 , 6 1 7}$ | $2.16 \%$ |
| Subtotal | $\mathbf{8 4 , 1 6 6}$ |  | Subtotal | $\mathbf{3 1 , 6 1 4}$ |  |
| \% of total | $\mathbf{6 9 . 4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 0 4 \%}$ | \% of total | $\mathbf{2 6 . 0 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 . 4 1 \%}$ |


| Monthly <br> Benefit (\$) | Number of <br> Retirees | Percent of <br> Benefits Paid | Monthly <br> Benefit (\$) | Number of <br> Retirees | Percent of <br> Benefits Paid |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $6,001-6,500$ | 1,801 | $1.49 \%$ | $9,001-10,000$ | 270 | $0.22 \%$ |
| $6,501-7,000$ | 1,125 | $0.93 \%$ | $10,001-11,000$ | 160 | $0.13 \%$ |
| $7,001-7,500$ | 786 | $0.65 \%$ | $11,001-12,000$ | 73 | $0.06 \%$ |
| $7,501-8,000$ | 515 | $0.42 \%$ | $12,001-13,000$ | 36 | $0.03 \%$ |
| $8,001-8,500$ | 387 | $0.32 \%$ | $13,001-14,000$ | 30 | $0.02 \%$ |
| $8,501-9,000$ | 249 | $0.21 \%$ | 14,001 and up | 64 | $0.05 \%$ |
| Subtotal | $\mathbf{4 , 8 6 3}$ |  | Subtotal | $\mathbf{6 3 3}$ |  |
| \% of total | $\mathbf{4 . 0 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 0 4 \%}$ | \% of total | $\mathbf{0 . 5 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 5 0 \%}$ |

- Average annual benefit: $\$ 27,820$
- Median annual benefit: $\$ 21,825$


## System Benefits (continued)

## Retirees with Hours Reported Working in a PERS-Covered Position in 2012

| Hours | Employer Group |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | State | Local Govt | K-12 | Total |
| $<200$ | 388 | $\mathbf{1 , 2 0 2}$ | 2,913 | 4,503 |
| $200-400$ | 270 | 559 | 1,290 | 2,119 |
| $401-600$ | 211 | 408 | 830 | 1,449 |
| $601-800$ | 169 | 317 | 552 | 1,038 |
| $801-1039$ | 294 | 467 | 576 | 1,337 |
| $>1039$ | 141 | 266 | 203 | 610 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 , 4 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 2 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 3 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 , 0 5 6}$ |

## Replacement ratio trends



Trend in retirement calculation methods


## 2. System Benefits (continued)

## Average IAP account balances and distributions to retirees, withdrawals, and deceased

| Year | Total IAP Account <br> Balance After Earnings <br> Crediting (\$M) | \# of <br> Members | Average IAP <br> Account <br> Balance (\$) | \# of Distributions to <br> Retirees, Withdrawals, <br> and Deceased |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2004 | 423.4 | 162,119 | 2,611 | 2 |
| 2005 | 928.9 | 181,055 | 5,130 | 4,131 |
| 2006 | $1,396.8$ | 197,491 | 7,072 | 6,557 |
| 2007 | $2,120.5$ | 210,133 | 10,091 | 6,705 |
| 2008 | $1,851.2$ | 218,192 | 8,484 | 8,624 |
| 2009 | $2,742.8$ | 231,256 | 11,847 | 7,727 |
| 2010 | $3,536.9$ | 236,265 | 14,970 | 8,695 |
| 2011 | $3,939.7$ | 238,062 | 16,549 | 11,479 |

Tier One/Tier Two benefit payment options selected in calendar year 2011

| Option (definitions below) | Quantity | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2,026 | 26.12 |
| Refund Annuity | 633 | 8.16 |
| 15-Year Certain | 400 | 5.16 |
| 2 | 1,353 | 17.44 |
| $2 A$ | 1,474 | 19.00 |
| 3 | 226 | 2.91 |
| 3A | 466 | 6.00 |
| Lump Sum 1 | 166 | 2.14 |
| Lump Sum 2 | 83 | 1.07 |
| Lump Sum 2A | 87 | 1.12 |
| Lump Sum 3 | 3 | 0.00 |
| Lump Sum 3A | 29 | 0.40 |
| Total Lump Sum | 688 | 8.90 |
| AS refund | 122 | 1.57 |
| Total | 7,756 | $100 \%$ |

Option 1 (non-refund): This option is paid for the member's lifetime. No benefit of any kind is paid to anyone after the member dies.
Refund Annuity Option: This option is paid for the member's lifetime. When the member dies, the designated beneficiary receives a lump-sum refund of any amount remaining in the member's account, if any.
15-Year Certain Option: This option is paid for the member's lifetime. If the member dies before receiving 180 monthly payments ( 15 years), the beneficiary is entitled to receive the remainder of the 180 monthly payments. Once the member has received at least 180 payments, no benefit is payable to the beneficiary.
Survivorship Options (Option 2, Option 2A, Option 3, and Option 3A): Under any of the survivorship options, the member may name only one beneficiary who must be a living person. The monthly benefit payment is paid to the member until his/her death, and then paid to the beneficiary if then living (under Options 2 and 2 A , at the same base amount as the member; under Option 3 and 3 A , at $1 / 2$ the base amount of the member).
Lump-Sum Options (Lump-Sum Option 1, Lump-Sum Option 2, Lump-Sum Option 2A, Lump-Sum Option 3, and Lump-Sum Option 3A): These options provide a lump-sum payment of the member's account balance plus a lifetime monthly pension from the employer's contributions. The lifetime monthly pension options are the same as those for the non-refund and survivorship options described above.
Total Lump-Sum: The balance of the member's account and a matching amount funded by employers' contributions are paid out in total; there is no ongoing monthly benefit.
AS refund is a one-time payment based on an actuarial calculation if the Option i benefit is less than $\$ 200$ per month.

## 2. System Benefits (continued)

## PERS Retiree Health Insurance Program information

The Oregon PERS Health Insurance Program offers optional medical, dental, and long-term care insurance plans to eligible Tier One/Tier Two retirees, their spouses, and dependents. Upon retirement, these insurance options become a choice available to all PERS retirees. While primarily serving our Medicare-eligible (age 65 and over) population, the PERS Health Insurance Program also offers insurance coverage options for those not yet Medicare eligible.
Active members, their spouses, and dependents are not eligible for the PERS Health Insurance Program. Oregon Revised Statute 243.303 requires Oregon public employers to make their active employee group insurance programs available to their retirees and dependents that are not yet Medicare eligible (the rate must be no more than the blended rate for the entire group). Public employers may charge pre-Medicare retirees the entire monthly premium (as state government does) or may choose to subsidize the insurance premium for eligible retirees (as provided in varying degrees by individual school districts and local governments).

There are two statutory trust funds administered by PERS as part of the Health Insurance Program that provide premium subsidies for eligible Tier One and Tier Two retirees or surviving spouses. These trusts are known as the Retirement Health Insurance Account (RHIA), serving all qualifying PERS retirees, and the Retiree Health Insurance Premium Account (RHIPA), serving qualifying state government retirees. Both trusts are funded from employer contributions on an actuarial basis.

## Program Enrollment (as of September 2012)

| Medical Plans (four plans offered) | Totals | Medicare | Non-Medicare |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Covered lives | 55,922 | 53,268 | 2,654 |
| Retirees (or surviving spouses) | 45,158 | 43,572 | 1,586 |
| Spouses/Dependents | 10,764 | 9,696 | 1,068 |
| Average age of enrolled retirees | 74 | 75 | 57 |
| Dental Plans (two plans offered) | 32,893 |  |  |
| Long Term Care Plan | 1,968 |  |  |

## Statutory Health Insurance Premium Subsidies

Retirees receiving RHIA (trust fund held by PERS*)
Retirees receiving RHIPA (trust fund held by PERS**)
41,817
RHIA monthly payment total
RHIPA monthly payment total

1,165
\$2,509,020
\$ 331,211

Employer rates (effective July 1, 2011):
RHIA: 0.59\%
RHIPA (state only): $0.16 \%$
Unfunded actuarial liabilities (as of December 31, 2011): $\$ 222$ million (RHIA); $\$ 30$ million (RHIPA)

* The RHIA subsidy is $\$ 60$ per month for Medicare eligible retirees.
** The RHIPA subsidy is for state government pre-Medicare retirees only and varies depending on the employee's years of state service, from $\$ 158.08$ ( 8 years) to $\$ 316.16$ ( $30+$ years) per month for Plan Year 2012.


## 3. System Funding Level and Status

Funded status as of December 31, 2012
The Oregon Public Employees Retirement Fund (OPERF) is invested under oversight and direction of the Oregon Investment Council with staff support from the Investment Division of Oregon State Treasury.

As of December 31, 2012, PERS was estimated to be $87 \%$ funded (including employer side accounts). Side accounts hold deposits of pension obligation bond proceeds and other advance lump-sum payments.

As of December 31, 2012, the unfunded actuarial liability (UAL) (when including side accounts) was estimated to be $\$ 8.5$ billion. The UAL fluctuates based on various factors including investment returns, Board reserving policies, statutory plan design changes, and litigation outcomes.

PERS fund value (calendar year ending December 31, 2012)


## 3. System Funding Level and Status (continued)

Unfunded actuarial liability history and funded ratio for Tier One/Tier Two*

| Valuation** <br> Date | With Side Accounts*** <br> (starting in 2002) |  | Without Side Accounts |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | UAL (\$M) | Funded Ratio (\%) | UAL (\$M) | Funded Ratio (\%) |
| 1993 | 1,449 | 92.4 | 1,449 | 92.4 |
| 1995 | 2,291 | 90.2 | 2,291 | 90.2 |
| 1997 | 2,556 | 91.9 | 2,556 | 91.9 |
| 1999 | 943 | 97.7 | 943 | 97.7 |
| 2000 | 1,545 | 96.4 | 1,545 | 96.4 |
| 2001 | $-2,031$ | 105.4 | $-2,031$ | 105.4 |
| 2002 | 3,204 | 92.0 | 3,983 | 89.9 |
| 2003 | 1,751 | 96.1 | 6,227 | 86.0 |
| 2004 | 2,122 | 95.6 | 7,678 | 84.0 |
| 2005 | $-1,751$ | 104.0 | 4,919 | 91.0 |
| 2006 | $-5,019$ | 109.7 | 2,229 | 95.7 |
| 2007 | $-6,120$ | 111.5 | 1,538 | 97.1 |
| 2008 | 10,998 | 80.0 | 16,133 | 70.4 |
| 2009 | 8,108 | 86.0 | 13,598 | 76.0 |
| $2010^{* * * *}$ | 7,700 | 87.0 | 13,300 | 78.0 |
| 2011 | 11,030 | 82.0 | 16,255 | 73.0 |
| 2012 (estimated) | 8,500 | 87.0 | 14,000 | 78.0 |

* Includes RHIA/RHIPA.
** 2000-2003 UALs were calculated using actuarial value of assets (AVA) based on year-to-year changes in asset values smoothed over four-year periods. All other UALs since 1997 were calculated using an AVA based on fair market value.
*** The official PERS valuation UAL and funded ratio are based on accepted actuarial standards and methodologies. These methodologies are subject to review and revision every two years. A negative UAL amount represents a surplus.
**** 2010 and after includes the OPSRP Pension Program.

Unfunded actuarial liability history and funded ratio for the OPSRP Pension Program*

| Valuation Date | UAL (\$M) | Funded Ratio (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 | -1.2 | 102.3 |
| 2006 | -36.0 | 131.3 |
| 2007 | -72.1 | 135.5 |
| 2008 | 66.3 | 80.3 |
| 2009 | $\mathbf{9 0 . 0}$ | 83.2 |

* The official PERS valuation UAL and funded ratio are based on accepted actuarial standards and methodologies. These methodologies are subject to review and revision every two years. A negative UAL amount represents a surplus. The OPSRP Pension Program UAL for 2010 and after is reported with Tier One/Tier Two.


## 3. System Funding Level and Status (continued)

## Actuarial accrued liabilities

Before PERS reform in 2003, PERS' liabilities were growing by about $12 \%$ annually. Reform reduced liability growth to an expected average of 3 to $4 \%$ annually over the long-term, which is close to the system's annual inflation rate assumption of 2.75\%. Liabilities grew about 3.4\% per year in 2010 and 2011.

Approximately $68 \%$ of PERS' total accrued liability is for members who are no longer working in PERS-covered employment (retirees and inactives). As a result, approximately $40 \%$ of an employer's contribution rate is associated with these groups.

Tier One active members represent $24 \%$ of the accrued liabilities. More than $56 \%$ of Tier One active member liability is for members over age 55 , and approximately $80 \%$ of the Tier One active member liability is for members over age 50 . Because the average retirement age is 59 , a large shift in liabilities between active and retired is anticipated in the near future.

More than 67,000 PERS members are currently eligible to retire based on age or service.


## 4. System Revenue

Member and employer contributions and investment income for calendar years

| Year | Member <br> Contributions <br> $(\mathbf{S M})$ | Employer <br> Contributions <br> $\mathbf{( \$ M )}$ | Amortization of <br> Employer Side <br> Accounts (\$M)* | Total <br> Employer <br> $(\$ \mathbf{M})$ |  <br> Other Income <br> $\mathbf{( \$ M )}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1995 | 287 | 427 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 427 | 4,110 |
| 1996 | 296 | 463 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 463 | 4,358 |
| 1997 | 291 | 473 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 473 | 4,582 |
| 1998 | 318 | 488 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 488 | 3,978 |
| 1999 | 347 | 577 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 577 | 7,463 |
| 2000 | 359 | 654 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 654 | 143 |
| 2001 | 385 | 689 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 689 | $-2,708$ |
| 2002 | 398 | 725 | 8 | 733 | $-3,460$ |
| 2003 | 405 | 582 | 97 | 679 | 8,866 |
| 2004 | $371^{* *}$ | 408 | 278 | 686 | 5,933 |
| 2005 | 434 | 504 | 357 | 861 | 6,179 |
| 2006 | 456 | 637 | 474 | 1,111 | 8,163 |
| 2007 | 468 | 633 | 466 | 1,099 | 5,808 |
| 2008 | 484 | 669 | 541 | 1,210 | $-17,235$ |
| 2009 | 515 | 561 | 540 | 1,101 | 8,053 |
| 2010 | 502 | 435 | 558 | 993 | 6,444 |
| 2011 | 510 | 627 | 509 | 1,136 | 1,935 |
| $2012^{* * *}$ | 533 | 923 | 443 | 1,366 | 7,573 |

* PERS' methodology to track amortization of side accounts began in 2002. Side accounts hold deposits of pension obligation bond proceeds and other lump-sum payments.
** Since January 1, 2004, member contributions have been placed in the Individual Account Program (IAP), instead of the legacy Tier One/Tier Two member accounts.
*** 2012 is estimated.
- Member contributions equal $6 \%$ of covered salary and now go to the IAP. The member contribution is currently assumed and paid or "picked up" by $53 \%$ of all employers for more than $50 \%$ of their employees. This totals approximately $70 \%$ of all employees.
- PERS Reform legislation led to a reduction in employer rates beginning in 2003. Also, starting in 2002, employers were given the option to deposit lump-sum payments into side accounts, reducing subsequent "new dollar" annual contributions for the employers that make such deposits.
- Employer contribution amounts are from the calendar year-end records. Data for calendar year 2004 and beyond includes employer contributions for OPSRP Pension Program, Tier One/Tier Two, and post- retirement health care (RHIA, RHIPA).



## 4. System Revenue (continued)

## Regular account earnings available for crediting and actual distributions to Tier One and Tier Two member regular, variable, and Individual Account Program (IAP) accounts

| Year | Earnings <br> Regular Account (\%) | Distributions (\%) |  |  |  | The PERS Board originally credited these accounts at $20 \%$. That allocation was later reduced to $11.33 \%$ to comply with subsequent court decisions and legislative findings. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Tier One | Tier Two | Variable Account | LAP |  |
| 1970 | 5.09 | 5.09 |  | 7.47 |  |  |
| 1971 | 6.27 | 6.27 |  | 9.47 |  |  |
| 1972 | 7.46 | 7.46 |  | 13.87 |  |  |
| 1973 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | -16.39 |  |  |
| 1974 | 0.00 | 5.50 |  | -18.16 |  |  |
| 1975 | 9.19 | 7.50 |  | 18.94 |  | ** Tier Two regular account crediting, |
| 1976 | 10.38 | 7.75 |  | 18.58 |  | based solely on earnings, was $13.74 \%$. |
| 1977 | 4.79 | 7.00 |  | -2.62 |  | However, the PERS Board deployed \$9 million from the Capital Preservation |
| 1978 | 7.37 | 7.00 |  | 7.03 |  | Reserve and \$17 million from the |
| 1979 | 12.32 | 11.09 |  | 20.40 |  | Contingency Reserve that was added to |
| 1980 | 16.92 | 13.00 |  | 29.94 |  | Tier Two earnings. As a result, Tier Two |
| 1981 | 4.37 | 7.50 |  | -2.25 |  | was credited with a total of $18.31 \%$. The |
| 1982 | 15.31 | 11.50 |  | 22.39 |  | dollars allocated from the reserves were |
| 1983 | 18.37 | 13.00 |  | 23.12 |  | originally withheld from Tier Two |
| 1984 | 7.33 | 7.50 |  | 4.00 |  | regular account earnings. |
| 1985 | 21.38 | 15.00 |  | 27.99 |  | *** After crediting Tier One accounts with |
| 1986 | 22.70 | 18.37 |  | 18.98 |  | the assumed rate of $8 \%$, member |
| 1987 | 9.00 | 7.50 |  | 4.54 |  | attorney fees in the Strunk case were |
| 1988 | 16.86 | 13.50 |  | 18.62 |  | deducted by order of the Oregon <br> Supreme Court resulting in an effective |
| 1989 | 19.74 | 14.50 |  | 26.84 |  | crediting rate of $7.97 \%$. |
| 1990 | -1.53 | 8.00 |  | -7.84 |  |  |
| 1991 | 22.45 | 15.00 |  | 35.05 |  | **** 2012 data is preliminary. |
| 1992 | 6.94 | 8.00 |  | 10.54 |  |  |
| 1993 | 15.04 | 12.00 |  | 12.65 |  | - In determining plan funding, the actuary |
| 1994 | 2.16 | 8.00 |  | -1.76 |  | must project future earnings of the PERS |
| 1995 | 20.78 | 12.50 |  | 29.92 |  | Fund. This is called the "assumed |
| 1996 | 24.42 | 21.00 | 24.42 | 21.06 |  | earnings rate." Historical assumed |
| 1997 | 20.42 | 18.70 | 20.42 | 28.87 |  | earnings rates are: |
| 1998 | 15.43 | 14.10 | 13.63 | 21.45 |  | - 5.0\% for 1971-1974 |
| 1999 | 24.89 | 11.33* | 21.97 | 28.83 |  | - 7.0\% for 1975-1978 |
| 20.00 | 0.63 | 8.00 | 0.54 | -3.24 |  | $7.5 \%$ for 1979 - 1988 |
| 2001 | -7.17 | 8.00 | -6.66 | -11.19 |  | - $8.0 \%$ for 1989 - current. |
| 2002 | -8.93 | 8.00 | -8.93 | -21.51 |  |  |
| 2003 | 23.79 | 8.00 | 22.00 | 34.68 |  | Earnings credited to IAP accounts since 2004: 7.8\%. |
| 2004 | 13.80 | 8.00 | 13.27 | 13.00 | 12.7 | - Earnings credited to Tier Two accoun |
| 2005 | 13.04 | 8.00 | 18.31** | 8.29 | 12.8 | since 1996: 9.7\%. |
| 2006 | 15.57 | 8.00 | 15.45 | 15.61 | 14.9 | 43-year averages (1970-2012) |
| 2007 | 10.22 | 7.97*** | 9.47 | 1.75 | 9.46 | - Regular account earnings availabl |
| 2008 | -27.18 | 8.00 | -27.18 | -43.71 | - | for crediting: 10.4\%. |
| 2009 | 19.12 | 8.00 | 19.12 | 35.57 | 18.4 | Earnings credited to Tier One regular |
| 2010 | 12.44 | 8.00 | 12.44 | 15.17 | 12.1 | accounts: $9.7 \%$. |
| 2011 | 2.21 | 8.00 | 2.21 | -7.80 | 2.15 |  |
| 2012**** | 14.29 | 8.00 | 14.75 | 18.34 | 14.1 | accounts: $10.9 \%$. |

## 4. System Revenue (continued)

Regular account earnings available for crediting and actual distributions to Tier One member regular accounts (2012 is preliminary)


Actual distributions to Tier Two member regular accounts and to Tier One and Tier Two member variable accounts (invested in an equity only portfolio) (2012 is preliminary)


## 4. System Revenue (continued)

Preliminary 2012 earnings crediting (\$ millions)

| Reserve/Account | Balance Before <br> Crediting | 2012 <br> Crediting | Balance After <br> Crediting | 2012 <br> Rates |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Contingency Reserve | $\$ 533.3$ | $\$ 70.4$ | $\$ 603.7$ | N/A |
| Tier One Member Regular Accts | $5,961.8$ | 476.9 | $6,438.7$ | $8.00 \%$ |
| Tier One Rate Guarantee Reserve | $(345.3)$ | 325.5 | $(19.8)$ | N/A |
| Benefits-In-Force (BIF) Reserve | $19,160.7$ | $2,739.4$ | $21,900.1$ | $14.30 \%$ |
| Tier Two Member Regular Accts | 666.2 | 97.2 | 763.4 | $14.59 \%$ |
| Employer Reserves | $16,744.9$ | $2,391.9$ | $19,136.8$ | $14.28 \%$ |
| OPSRP Pension Program | $1,040.0$ | 144.3 | $1,184.9$ | $13.87 \%$ |
| UAL Lump-Sum Payment Side Accts* | $4,782.3$ | 731.3 | $5,513.6$ | Various |
| IAP Accounts** | $4,250.8$ | 595.7 | $4,846.5$ | $14.19 \%$ |
| Regular Account Total | $\mathbf{\$ 5 2 , 7 9 5 . 3}$ | $\$ 7,572.6$ | $\$ 60,367.9$ |  |

* Side account earnings rates for lump sums on deposit vary depending on when the deposit was made within the calendar year and are not affected by Board reserving or crediting decisions.
** Informational only; not affected by Board reserving or crediting decisions.
Contingency Reserve: This reserve can be used for any purpose the Board determines is appropriate so long as the use of the funds furthers the trust's purpose. It is funded in years that investment income exceeds the assumed rate (currently 8 percent).
Tier One Rate Guarantee Reserve: This reserve is used to credit the assumed rate on Tier One member regular accounts in years when the fund earns below 8 percent, and to hold excess earnings from the years when the fund earns more than 8 percent.
Benefits-In-Force Reserve: This reserve is used to pay retired member's benefits and annuities. It is funded by earnings and fund transfers from member accounts and employer reserves associated with retirements processed during a calendar year.


## Percent of total Regular Account after 2012 earnings crediting (preliminary)



## 4. System Revenue (continued)

System-wide average employer contribution rates excluding retiree health insurance (RHIA/RHIPA)

| Valuation <br> Year | Rate Effective <br> Dates | Average Rate With Side <br> Accounts (\%) | Average Rate Without <br> Side Accounts (\%) | Annualized <br> Salary (\$M) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1975 | Various | 11.21 | 11.21 | $1,014.5$ |
| 1977 | Various | 11.87 | 11.87 | $1,226.8$ |
| 1979 | Various | 10.97 | 10.97 | $1,488.0$ |
| 1982 | Various | 10.13 | 10.13 | $2,062.1$ |
| 1985 | Various | 10.87 | 10.87 | $2,428.3$ |
| 1987 | Various | 11.30 | 11.30 | $2,764.7$ |
| 1989 | Various | 9.74 | 9.74 | $3,199.4$ |
| 1991 | Various | 9.19 | 9.19 | $3,887.5$ |
| 1993 | Various | 9.15 | 9.15 | $4,466.8$ |
| 1995 | Various | 9.42 | 9.42 | $4,848.1$ |
| 1997 | Various | 11.40 | 11.40 | $5,161.6$ |
| 1999 | $7 / \mathrm{I} / 01-6 / 30 / 03$ | 10.74 | 10.74 | $5,676.6$ |
| 2001 | $7 / 1 / 03-6 / 30 / 05$ | 10.64 | 10.64 | $6,256.5$ |
| $2003^{*}$ | $7 / 1 / 05-6 / 30 / 07$ | $14.47 *$ | $18.89^{*}$ | $6,248.5$ |
| $2005^{* *}$ | $7 / 1 / 07-6 / 30 / 09$ | 8.22 | 15.01 | $6,792.0$ |
| 2007 | $7 / 1 / 09-6 / 30 / 11$ | 4.73 | 12.42 | $7,721.8$ |
| 2009 | $7 / 1 / 11-6 / 30 / 13$ | 10.8 | 16.3 | $8,512.0$ |
| 2011 | $7 / 1 / 13-6 / 30 / 15$ | 15.7 | 21.4 | $8,600.0$ |

* December 31, 2003 rates were phased-in. Actual rate paid averaged $10.58 \%$ with employer side accounts and $15.10 \%$ without employer side accounts.
** Includes weighted average rate for Tier One/Tier Two and OPSRP beginning in 2005.

System-wide average employer contribution rates as a percent of covered salary (net rates include side account offsets)


- EXCLUDES 6\% MEMBER CONTRIBUTION AND PENSION OBLIGATION BOND DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS
- INCLUDES TIER ONE/TIER TWO AND OPSRP
- RATES FOR 2005-07 AND BEFORE ARE AS OF VALUATION DATE


## 5. Economic Impact of PERS Benefit Payments

## PERS benefits contribute to Oregon's economy

Oregon PERS paid approximately $\$ 3.2$ billion in total monthly benefits in 2011 , with $\$ 2.8$ billion to PERS benefit recipients living in Oregon. Funding of these benefits came primarily from investment earnings on contributions previously paid by members and public employers. These benefit recipients spent a significant portion of this money on goods and services in Oregon, which helped support local businesses. These businesses then purchased goods, in part, from other local vendors, further supporting Oregon's workforce and economy.

## Annual PERS benefits generate $\$ 3.3$ billion in total economic value to Oregon

PERS benefits paid to Oregon residents have a significant impact on Oregon's economy. The $\$ 2.8$ billion in annual benefit payments multiply to $\$ 3.3$ billion in total economic value to Oregon when the full financial impact of these dollars spent in local communities is considered (based upon economic multipliers provided by the U.S. Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis).

The economic activity generated by PERS benefit payments sustain an estimated 29,725 Oregon jobs, and add approximately $\$ 906$ million in wages to Oregon's economy.

Additionally, the state of Oregon collected an estimated $\$ 136$ million in income taxes on PERS retiree benefits during 2011.

Investment income provided 73\% of total PERS' revenues from 1970-2012, with member contributions providing $6 \%$ and employer contributions providing $21 \%$.

## 5. Economic Impact of PERS Benefit Payments (continued)

PERS benefit payments by county (2011 calendar year)


## 5. Economic Benefit of PERS (continued)

PERS benefit payments by state (2011 calendar year)



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The exceptions are: (1) anyone who has not worked in a PERS covered position since 2003; and (2) those who are retired or terminated and who have already withdrawn or rolled over their IAP elsewhere.
    ${ }^{2} 6 \%$ of the member's compensation for the year. For most PERS members, this contribution is made ("picked up") by the employer even though it is called an "employee" contribution on PERS statements.
    ${ }^{3} \$ 3.9$ billion at the end of 2011.

[^1]:    ${ }^{4} 176$ Or.App. 627 (2001)
    ${ }^{5} 234$ Or.App. 566 (2010)
    ${ }^{6}$ One "hole" in OPSRP is that, if after divorce the member dies before retirement and without remarrying, then the benefits of both parties are entirely lost. This would not occur if the parties stay married until the member's retirement. So a spouse is in a worse position for having become divorced. This may be fixed by legislation. But in the meantime, life insurance on the member's life in favor of the alternate payee until the member retires may be necessary to cover this contingency.

[^2]:    ${ }^{7}$ See footnote 6.
    ${ }^{8}$ The 2003 Oregon Legislature tried to take away the $8 \%$ earnings guarantee, but in the 2005 Strunk case the Oregon Supreme Court held that the $8 \%$ guarantee is constitutionally protected.

[^3]:    ${ }^{9}$ At age 58 , the conversion rate is $\$ 7.60 / \$ 1,000$. So for example, a $\$ 50,000$ account, doubled to $\$ 100,000$, will convert to a monthly payment of $\$ 760 /$ month for life. That is far more than current commercial rates.
    ${ }^{10}$ This COLA adjustment may be limited for higher-paid retirees under legislation now pending in the Legislature.
    ${ }^{11}$ This week (as I write this) I reviewed an actuarial valuation for a 47-year-old Tier One PERS member whose account balance is $\$ 67,000$ and the present value is $\$ 237,000$ (almost four times more). This is not uncommon.
    ${ }^{12}$ This article assumes a pre-retirement divorce. This article does not address other additional issues that arise in dividing PERS benefits for members who have already retired and commenced benefits.

