

The experience and dedication you deserve

March 12, 2013

Mr. Alan Conroy Executive Director Kansas Public Employees Retirement System 611 South Kansas Avenue, Suite 100 Topeka, KS 66603

Re: Cost Study for House Bill 2301 and Hybrid Plan Design

Dear Alan:

As you requested, we have prepared a cost study to compare the estimated employer costs under House Bill 2301 (HB 2301) and a hybrid plan design (no bill introduced yet). HB 2301, as introduced earlier in this legislative session, modifies several key benefit provisions in the cash balance plan for Tier 3 members, including moving both the guaranteed interest crediting rate and the annuity interest rate (used to convert the member's account balance in the Cash Balance Plan into a monthly benefit amount) to 5.0%. Other key features of the existing law for the Tier 3 cash balance plan, including the effective date of the new plan design for Tier 3 of January 1, 2015, remain unchanged. The proposed hybrid plan is composed of a cash balance plan, funded entirely by employer contributions, and a pure defined contribution (DC) plan, funded entirely by employee contributions. Under both sets of cost projections, it is assumed that all employees hired on or after January 1, 2015 become members of KPERS Tier 3 with the exception of members of the state corrections group, who will continue to be covered under Tier 2. Active members of KPERS on January 1, 2015 will remain in their current tier, Tier 1 or 2. The plan changes currently in place for Tiers 1 and 2 (as set out in 2012 HB 2333) remain in effect under both HB 2301 and the hybrid plan design.

Plan Design Provisions

Cash Balance Plan Under HB 2301

A brief summary of the cash balance plan provisions for Tier 3 under HB 2301 are outlined below:

• The employer credit to the cash balance account is a service-based schedule, as shown below:

Years of Service	Employer credit
Less than 5	3%
5 but less than 12	4%
12 but less than 24	5%
24 or more	6%

Mr. Alan Conroy March 12, 2013 Page 3

CM

Hybrid Plan Design

Cash Balance Plan (Funded By Employer Contributions)

The provisions for the Tier 3 Cash Balance Plan are exactly the same as those outlined earlier for HB 2301 except there are no employee contributions to the Cash Balance Plan in the hybrid plan design. One other item is worth noting. The benefit provided by employer contributions in the Cash Balance Plan is payable to the member at retirement whether their employee contribution balance in the DC Plan is withdrawn or not.

Defined Contribution Plan (Funded By Employee Contributions)

- Employee contribution rate is 6% of pay and is deposited into the employee-directed account. Investment earnings and losses will directly accrue to the account balance.
- The employee is always 100% vested in the employee directed account.
- Upon termination of employment the employee can elect to roll the funds in his or her account balance to another qualified plan or an IRA.
- Upon retirement, the employee directed account balance is payable at the direction of the employee in either a lump sum, or periodic payments as determined by the employee. There is no guaranteed payment for the lifetime of the member unless the employee purchases an annuity.

Actuarial Assumptions and Methods

In general, the same actuarial methods and assumptions that were used in the December 31, 2011 actuarial valuation were used in the attached cost projections unless otherwise noted. The projection of future benefit amounts for Tier 3 members in the Cash Balance Plan requires the use of two additional assumptions that are not necessary in the valuation of projected benefits for Tier 1 and 2 members. They are:

- The interest crediting rate (applied to the account balance each year prior to retirement) and
- The annuity conversion factors (which require a postretirement interest rate and a mortality assumption).

Interest Crediting Rate

As stated earlier in this letter, the guaranteed interest crediting rate under both HB 2301 and the hybrid plan design is 5.00%. However, additional interest credits (called dividends) may be granted at the discretion of the KPERS Board of Directors, subject to certain conditions. If the total funded ratio of the system is less than 80%, the dividend shall be payable totally at the Board's discretion taking into account the funding of the system, market conditions, investment returns, and other related factors specified by the Board, with a maximum dividend of 4%. If the funded ratio of the system as a whole is equal to or more than 80%, the dividend cannot exceed the lesser of 4% or a percentage, equal to the funded ratio of the system multiplied by the rate of return on the system's assets that is above 8% for the fiscal year. In all cases, the dividend shall not be granted unless the rate of return on KPERS assets is at least 10% for that fiscal year. The criteria that determine whether or not dividends are granted and the maximum dividend are unchanged in the hybrid plan scenario.

Although the assumed rate of investment return on KPERS' assets is 8% per annum, investment returns are expected to vary from year to year, sometimes significantly. Given the parameters of the plan design (including the statutory dividend criteria) and the standard deviation of the portfolio, the *actual* interest crediting rate (including dividends) is expected to be higher than the guaranteed interest crediting rate

Mr. Alan Conroy March 12, 2013 Page 5



Results

Because both plan designs (HB 2301 and the hybrid plan design) make changes to the benefits for Tier 3 members only, the cost impact will unfold gradually over time as current Tier 1 and Tier 2 members leave covered employment and are replaced by Tier 3 members. Therefore, a projection of employer costs over a long period of time is necessary in order to compare the ultimate impact of the proposed plan design in HB 2301 and the hybrid plan design. The employer cost estimates under the current plan and HB 2301 are reflected in the attached exhibits. Exhibits A1 and A2 show the estimated employer contribution rate and corresponding dollar amounts of employer contributions under each plan design, by year, for the State/School and Local groups. Exhibits B1 and B2 show the projected employer contributions split into employer normal cost and unfunded actuarial liability (UAL) payments, by year and in total. Because such a large portion of the employer contributions are necessary to fund the UAL, the dollar amount of employer contributions under HB 2301 and the hybrid plan are not significantly different through 2033, i.e. the UAL contribution dollars are essentially the same under both proposals so the only difference is the employer cost for new hires.

The projections assume that all actuarial assumptions, including the 8% investment return assumption, are met in the future. To the extent this assumption is not met in the future, the cost projections in this cost study are also expected to change. Please note that the dollar amounts of employer contributions shown in the exhibits are future dollar amounts, calculated using the estimated employer contribution rate and projected payroll in future years. Due to the length of the projection period, the future payroll amounts grow significantly and the resulting contributions in nominal dollars in those years can appear very large. In order to provide a method for more direct comparison of results, the present value of the total employer contributions using an 8% discount rate has been included at the bottom of Exhibits A1 and A2.

The numbers in Exhibits A1 and A2 reflect the present value of all employer contributions, including the UAL payments, which are a substantial part of the overall employer contributions. Because the total UAL payments are roughly equivalent under either scenario, the difference in total employer contributions is due to differences in the employer normal cost of the cash balance plans in HB 2301 and the proposed hybrid. To further illustrate the magnitude of the contributions for the UAL, the following information is provided for the State/School group. The \$612.53 difference in present value is nearly lost in the magnitude of the numbers when total contributions are used. However, the difference is larger when the UAL payments are excluded from the comparison.

Employer Contributions	HB 2301	Hybrid Plan	\$ Difference	% Diff
A. Nominal dollars B. Present value (PV) of total contributions	\$22,080.99	\$29,459.54	\$7,378.54	33.4%
	9,026.92	9,639.45	612.53	6.8%
C. PV of UAL payments D. PV of future employer normal costs	7,546.31	7,546.31	0.00	0.0%
	\$ 1,480.61	\$ 2,093.14	\$ 612.53	41.4%

The employer normal cost rate also provides a reliable way to compare the ultimate cost of different plan designs many years into the future. For example, the long-term employer normal cost for the State/School group in 2060 under HB 2301 is 0.50%, while the employer normal cost in 2060 under the hybrid plan design is 2.45%. The differences in total employer contributions between HB 2301 and the hybrid plan are largely a function of the employer normal cost rate under both scenarios.

It should also be noted that HB 2301 and the hybrid plan do not provide the same amount of retirement benefits for Tier 3 members of the system. This, in turn, has an impact on the cost of the plan designs.

Mr. Alan Conroy March 12, 2013 Page 7



predict the System's financial condition or its ability to pay benefits in the future and do not provide any guarantee of future financial soundness of the System. Over time, a defined benefit plan's total cost will depend on a number of factors, including the amount of benefits paid, the number of people paid benefits, the duration of the benefit payments, plan expenses, and the amount of earnings on assets invested to pay benefits. These amounts and other variables are uncertain and unknowable at the time the projections were prepared. Because not all of the assumptions will unfold exactly as expected, actual results will differ from the projections. To the extent that actual experience deviates significantly from the assumptions, results could be significantly better or significantly worse than indicated in this study.

We, Patrice A. Beckham, FSA and Brent A. Banister, FSA, are consulting actuaries with Cavanaugh Macdonald Consulting, LLC. We are members of the American Academy of Actuaries, Fellows of the Society of Actuaries, and meet the Qualification Standards of the American Academy of Actuaries to render the actuarial opinion contained herein.

If you have any questions or additional information is needed, please let us know. We are available to provide additional analysis or explanation.

Sincerely,

Patrice A. Beckham, FSA, EA, FCA, MAAA

Principal and Consulting Actuary

Patrice Beckham

Brent A. Banister, PhD, FSA, EA, FCA, MAAA Chief Pension Actuary

But a But

Exhibit A2

HB 2301 vs. Hybrid Plan Local Group



(1)	(2)	(3) Employer Cont	(4) ribution Rate	(5)	Empl	(6) lover Contrib	utic	(7) on Amount (\$M	(8)
Fiscal	Total			 		•			Present Value
Year	Payroll	HB 2301	Hybrid Plan	HB 2301		Hybrid Plan		Difference	of Difference
2013	\$ 1,660.60	7.94%	7.94%	\$ 131.85		131.85	\$		\$ -
2014	1,706.61	8.84%	8.84%	150.86		150.86		_	_
2015	1,755.46	9.78%	9.78%	171.62		171.62		_	_
2016	1,809.70	10.52%	10.52%	190.43		190.43		_	_
2017	1,867.11	10.41%	10.05%	194.28		187.63		(6.64)	(4.70)
2018	1,927.21	10.41%	10.20%	200.61		196.52		(4.09)	(2.68)
2019	1,990.11	10.37%	10.30%	206.44		205.07		(1.36)	(0.83)
2020	2,055.72	10.37%	10.43%	213.12		214.51		1.39	0.83)
2021	2,124.94	10.36%	10.56%	220.10		224.50		4.39	2.28
2022	2,197.01	10.37%	10.69%	227.76		234.84		7.08	
2023	2,272.09	10.37%	10.79%	235.70		245.14		7.08 9.44	3.41 4.21
2024	2,351.35	10.38%	10.88%	244.18		255.91		11.74	
2025	2,434.78	10.39%	10.97%	253.03		267.08		14.06	4.84
2026	2,521.94	10.40%	11.04%	262.19		278.38			5.37
2027	2,613.06	10.42%	11.11%	272.16		290.22		16.19	5.73
2028	2,709.03	10.42%	11.11%	282.22		302.22		18.07	5.92
2029	2,809.54	10.44%	11.21%	293.18		314.90		20.00	6.07
2030	2,914.71	10.45%	11.23%	304.50		327.38		21.72	6.10
2031	3,024.53	10.46%	11.25%	316.43				22.88	5.95
2032	3,138.76	4.21%	5.07%	132.13		340.13		23.70	5.71
2033	3,257.50	3.16%	4.04%			159.13		27.00	6.02
2034	3,381.27	2.07%	2.98%	102.89 69.97		131.75		28.85	5.96
2035	3,510.46	1.69%	2.63%	59.39		100.73		30.76	5.88
2036	3,644.94	1.44%	2.40%	52.32		92.47		33.08	5.86
2037	3,785.22	1.30%	2.40%			87.45		35.13	5.76
2038	3,931.55	1.22%	2.21%	49.22 47.81		86.46		37.24	5.65
2039	4,084.19	1.15%	2.16%			86.82		39.01	5.48
2040	4,243.22	1.10%	2.13%	47.09		88.31		41.22	5.36
2041	4,408.81	1.06%		46.71		90.21		43.50	5.24
2042	4,581.37	1.03%	2.10% 2.08%	46.71		92.55		45.85	5.11
2043	4,761.25	1.00%	2.07%	47.13		95.36		48.23	4.98
2044	4,948.86	0.97%	2.06%	47.55		98.72		51.18	4.89
2045	5,144.01	0.95%	2.06%	47.95		102.18		54.23	4.80
2046	5,346.97	0.93%		48.85		105.71		56.86	4.66
2047	5,557.90	0.92%	2.05% 2.05%	49.77		109.82		60.05	4.56
2048	5,777.07	0.90%	2.06%	51.26		114.04		62.78	4.41
2049	6,004.27	0.90%		52.23		118.96		66.73	4.34
2050	6,240.32	0.89%	2.06%	53.82		123.42		69.60	4.19
2051	6,485.84	0.88%	2.06%	55.48		128.60		73.12	4.08
2052	6,741.16	0.88%	2.08%	57.21		134.62		77.40	4.00
2053	7,006.34	0.87%	2.08%	59.03		140.21		81.18	3.88
2054	7,000.34		2.09%	60.92		146.65		85.73	3.80
2055		0.86% 0.86%	2.10%	62.89		153.19		90.29	3.70
2056	7,569.72 7,868.83		2.11%	64.95		159.93		94.98	3.61
2057		0.84%	2.12%	66.30		166.94		100.64	3.54
2058	8,180.09 8 504 09	0.84%	2.13%	68.49		174.14		105.64	3.44
2059	8,504.09 8,841.31	0.83%	2.13%	70.76		181.42		110.66	3.34
2039		0.82%	2.14%	72.22		188.90		116.67	3.26
2060	9,192.25	0.81%	2.14%	74.62		196.62		122.00	3.15
2001	9,557.47	0.80%	2.15%	76.14		205.51		129.36	3.10
			Total	\$ 6,212.45	\$	8,390.00	\$	2,177.55	184.22
	Present	t Value at 8% as of Ja	nuary 1, 2013	\$ 2,268.88		2,453.10		184.22	2 11000

This exhibit is an attachment to a letter that contains important information and explanations regarding the numbers shown. Therefore, the exhibit should only be considered with the accompanying letter from Cavanaugh Macdonald dated March 12, 2013.

All assumptions, including the 8% investment return, are assumed to be met each year in the future.

3/12/2013



Kansas Public Employee Retirement System Comparison of Local Group Employer Contributions for Retirement Benefits HB 2301 vs. Hybrid Plan

Exhibit B2

Value of	A THE CHIEF		000	0.000	0.000	0.000	(4.698)	(0.827)	0.780	2.284	3.409	4.209	5.371	5.727	5.919	6.068	6.099	5.708	6.021	5,957	5.879	5.856	5.757	5.651	5.481	5.363	5.240	5.114	4.894	4.801	4.662	4.558	4.413	4,343	4,080	3,999	3.883	3.797	3.703	3.607	3.539	3.439	2,330	3.152	3.096	\$184.219
Difference (1)	1		000 03	0,000	000'0	0.000	(4.088)	(1.365)	1.389	4.394	7.082	9.444	14.056	16.187	18.068	20.003	21./16	23.000	27.002	28.853	30.756	33.084	35.130	37.240	39.010	41.220	43.498	45.847	51.175	54.228	56.861	60.048	62.785	69.603	73.122	77,401	81.179	85.726	90.294	94.981	100.640	110.664	110.664	110.673	129.361	\$2,177.545
	Total	Employer	Cost 22	150.864	171.618	187 634	196.521	205.074	214.507	224.497	234.841	245.140	267.081	278.375	290.224	302,225	377.2870	340.130	159.130	131.746	100.729	92.475	87.452	86.457	86.819	88.311	90.209	92.334	98,723	102.178	105.712	109.816	114.041	123.420	128.599	134.615	140.206	146.646	153.186	159.933	170.945	181 423	188 897	196.616	205.505	\$8,389.998
		UAL	Fayment	101.163	136.048	155.091	166.896	173.339	180.904	189.119	197.731	215 384	224.730	234.036	243.799	253.565	273 601	283.701	99.813	69.385	35.165	23.520	14,944	10.220	6.684	4.084	1.097	(1,441)	(3.809)	(5.444)	(7.202)	(8.555)	(10.004)	(12,609)	(13.729)	(14.269)	(15.505)	(16.115)	(16.749)	(17.410)	(18.098)	(19.614)	(20.335)	(21.142)	(21.026)	\$3,734.624
Hybrid Plan	Employer	Normal	\$48.361	49.701	35.570	27.249	29.625	31.735	33,603	35.378	37.110	40.528	42.351	44.339	46.425	48.660	53 691	56.429	59.317	62,361	65.564	68.955	72.508	76.237	80.136	84.227	900.012	97.652	102.532	107.621	112.914	118.371	124.046	136 029	142.327	148.884	155.711	162.761	169.935	105.043	192.043	200 983	209.232	217.758	226.531	\$4,655.374
	Employer	Normal	2.91%	2.91%	2.03%	1.93%	1.54%	1.59%	1.63%	1.66%	1.09%	1.72%	1.74%	1.76%	1.78%	1.80%	1.8278	1.87%	1.89%	1.91%	1.94%	1.96%	1.99%	2.01%	2.04%	2.06%	2.0278	2.13%	2.15%	2.17%	2.20%	2.21%	2.23%	2.27%	2.28%	2.30%	2.31%	2.32%	2.33%	2.3470	2.35%	2.36%	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%	
	Employer	Contribution	7.94%	8.84%	9.78%	10.05%	10.20%	10.30%	10.43%	10.56%	10.09%	10.88%	10.97%	11.04%	11.11%	11.10%	11.23%	11.25%	2.07%	4.04%	2.98%	2.63%	2.40%	2.28%	2.21%	2.16%	2.15%	2.08%	2.07%	2.06%	2.06%	2.05%	2.05% 2.06%	2.06%	2.06%	2.08%	2.08%	2.09%	2.10%	2.1176	2.13%	2.13%	2.14%	2.14%	2.15%	
	Total	Employer	\$131.852	150.864	171.618	194.276	200,609	206,438	213.118	220.104	735 696	244,176	253.025	262.188	272.155	203.120	304.502	316.426	132,128	102.893	69.973	59.391	52.322	49.216	47.809	47.091	46 707	47.128	47.548	47.950	48.851	49.767	52.226	53.817	55.477	57.215	59.027	60.920	62.892	305.75	68.494	70,759	72,224	74,620	76.144	\$6,212.453
		UAL Paument ⁽¹⁾	\$83,491	101.163	136.048	160,384	167.667	174.334	181.726	189.332	205 852	214.678	223.756	233,028	243.015	253.023	274.857	286.423	101.696	71.991	38.546	27.382	19.683	15.898	13.760	11.032	10.140	9.621	9.046	8.413	8.230	8,020	8.088	8,406	8.736	080'6	9.438	9.809	10.195	10.229	10.634	11.055	10.610	11.031	10.513	\$4,257.667
HB 2301	~		1				32.942	32.104	31.392	30.772	29.844	29.497	29,269	29,160	29.140	20.364	29.645	30.003	30,432	30.902	31.426	32.009	32,639	33,319	24.049	35.679	36.567	37,507	38.501	39,537	40.621	41./4/	44.138	45.411	46.741	48.134	49.589	51.112	54.354	56.076	57.860	59.704	61.615	63.589	65.631	\$1,954.786
	Employer	Normal Cost Rate	2.91%	2.91%	2.03%	1.82%	1.71%	1.61%	1.53%	1.45%	1.31%	1.25%	1.20%	1.16%	1.12%	1.05%	1.02%	0.99%	0.97%	0.95%	0.93%	0.91%	0.90%	0.88%	0.07%	0.84%	0.83%	0.82%	0.81%	0.80%	0.79%	0.78%	0.76%	0.76%	0.75%	0.74%	0.74%	0.73%	0.72%	0.71%	0.71%	0.70%	0.70%	0.69%	%69.0	
		Contribution	94%		97.78%		_	10.37%	10.3 1%	10.36%	10.37%	10.38%	10.39%	10.40%	10.42%	10 44%	10.45%	10.46%	4.21%	3.16%	2.07%	1.69%	1.44%	1.30%	1.24.78	1.10%	1.06%	1.03%	1.00%	0.97%	0.95%	0.93%	0.90%	0.90%	0.89%	0.88%	0.88%	0.8/%	0.86%	0.84%	0.84%	0.83%	0.82%	0.81%	0.80%	
		Tier 3	\$0.000	0.000	0.000	291.415	422.352	549.389	705 450	918 861	1.042,682	1,168.523	1,296.287	1,427.085	1,501.025	1.837.388	1,980.546	2,127.843	2,279.406	2,436.013	2,597.839	2,764.790	2,937.117	3,115.419	3 490 700	3,688.013	3,892.373	4,103.667	4,321.777	4,545.881	4,777.500	5 261 952	5,514.858	5,776.162	6,044.979	6,320.872	6,602.680	7 102 000	7.498.796	7,812,827	8,136.549	8,470.937	8,816.173	9,172.930	9,542.777	
	ŗ	Tier 1/2	\$1,660.604	1,706.606	1,658.682	1,575.692	1,504.853	1,440.724	1,301.630	1,278,151	1,229.411	1,182.829	1,138.492	1,094.860	1,032.038	972,150	934.164	896.687	859.356	821.485	745 773	707 877	179.101	631.744	593 492	555.203	516.439	477.700	439.470	402.975	330,311	295 949	262,213	228.104	195.344	156.96/	138.479	00.351	70.920	56.002	43.538	33.158	25.139	19.322	14.693	
		FYE _	2013	2014	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2032	2036	2037	2039	2040	2041	2042	2043	2044	2042	2047	2048	2049	2050	2021	707	2054	2055	2056	2057	2058	2059	2060	2061	:

(1) In millions.

This exhibit is an attachment to a letter that contains important information and explanations regarding the numbers shown. Therefore, the exhibit should only be considered with the accompanying letter from Cavanaugh Macdonald dated March 12, 2013.

All assumptions, including the 8% investment return, are assumed to be met each year in the future.