

Trends in Public Retirement Systems: Stresses in the System

By Sujit M. CanagaRetna

Severe weaknesses in the financial health of the nation's public retirement systems rank as yet another force currently buffeting state and local government finances. Further compounding the problems faced by these public retirement funds are the following developments: the precarious financial position of private sector pensions and the federal Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation; the looming shortfalls expected in the Social Security and Medicare programs in coming decades; and the low personal savings rates of most Americans, coupled with the high rates of consumer and household debt. Given that the baby boomer generation is rapidly nearing retirement age and that America's senior population is growing faster than the number of younger workers needed to cover their retirement needs, policy-makers across the country are paying a great deal of attention to this unfortunate confluence of events.

For some years now, a variety of interest groups and concerned citizens have emphasized that policy-makers need to initiate concrete steps to prepare for the "graying" of America and the huge increase in the number of retirees. In fact, the number of people in the United States aged 65 and over is expected to nearly double by 2030; specifically, that age group is forecast to grow from about 13 percent of the total population in 2000, to 20 percent in 2030, and to remain above 20 percent for at least several decades thereafter.¹ In this context, there is growing concern that more attention needs to be directed toward retirement planning and developing a retirement infrastructure that has the capacity to absorb the retirement needs of all Americans.

Financial planners often recommend the three-legged stool concept in planning for retirement. Each leg of the stool represents a source of income in retirement, and the goal is to cumulatively attain a standard of living comparable to, if not slightly below, the one experienced prior to retirement. In this analysis, if the first leg of the stool is Social Security income, the other two legs of the stool refer to personal savings and retirement or pension system income. Alas, a close review of national financial and demographic trends reveals that all three legs of this metaphorical retirement stool remain rickety, a development that could seriously endanger the retirement plans of a majority of Americans.

Social Security payments remain critical for most retirees; these payouts make up about 40 percent of the total income of people 65 and over. In addition, about two-thirds of those people receive at least half of their income from Social Security, and one-third receives at least 90 percent.² In fact, in 2008, a scant

four years away, the first cohort of baby boomers will reach 62 and be eligible to claim Social Security benefits; a few years later in 2011, they will be eligible to claim Medicare benefits. However, the Social Security Trust Fund will start paying out more than it takes in by 2018 and be depleted by 2044, based on current projections, while Medicare will start running deficits in 2013 and run out of money in 2026 requiring remedial action from policy-makers.³

Unfortunately, alongside the tenuous long-term financial viability of Social Security, there are serious problems associated with the other two legs of the symbolic retirement stool. It is becoming increasingly clear that relying on personal savings to bolster retirement income is not a realistic option for most Americans. According to the federal government, during the past few decades, savings as a proportion of disposable income has declined steadily. Specifically, the nation's personal savings rate has plummeted from 11.2 percent of disposable income in 1982 (the highest level in the past three decades) to 1.7 percent in 2001, a precipitous decline indeed, before rising marginally to 2 percent in 2003.⁴ Further compounding this rapidly shrinking personal savings rate is the mountain of debt accumulated by most American households in recent years. Since 1999, household debt has leapt from 70 percent, to nearly 83 percent of the current gross domestic product.⁵ Moreover, consumers racked up \$1.1 trillion in new mortgage and consumer debt between the end of 2001 and the third quarter of 2003, bringing the total of consumer and mortgage loans held by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) insured institutions to \$2.6 trillion.⁶

Finally, the remaining leg of the figurative retirement stool, income flows from both public and private pension plans, is also wobbly. The asset base of both private and public sector pension plans experienced substantial erosion as a result of the bleak economic tide that enveloped the country in the initial years of this decade. For 10 years, between March 1991 and March 2001, the American economy experienced an unprecedented growth spurt and the positive flows of this expansion reflected very well on the asset base of both private and public sector retirement plans. However, in mid-2001, the U.S. economy began lurching to a stop, and the tragic events of September 11, 2001, pushed the already teetering economy into recession. Despite technically emerging from this recession after two quarters, the lingering effects of the economy continued for several years later with job creation, in particular, being very tepid. Compounding these economic trends were a number of additional problems that resulted in the equity markets taking a wallop for almost a three-year period, 2000 through 2002.

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC), the federal organization that protects the pensions of 44.3 million American workers, indicated earlier this year that it was running a deficit of \$11.2 billion and warned about its ability to protect private pensions in the future.⁷ Deficit forecasts for 2004 continue to be alarming with an increasing number of corporations seeking to be "trusteed" by the PBGC. Major corporations ranging from Bethlehem Steel to United Airlines to a host of others indicated their inability to meet their pension obligations to their retired employees and sought the protection of the PBGC in meeting these retirement expenditures.

At the public pension level, the scenario remains bleak too. These economic and stock market developments, alongside crushing unfunded liability growth, according to the National Association of State Retirement Administrators, resulted in the actuarial funding levels of public retirement plans plunging to lower levels in fiscal year 2002, compared to fiscal year 2001.⁸ Specifically, between the fiscal years 2001 and 2002, the actuarial value of public retirement systems' assets increased by 3 percent, or \$57 billion; in contrast, liabilities grew by \$154 billion, or 8.1 percent. Also, studies released by Wilshire Associates in March 2003 and 2004 confirmed this trend, indicating that the funding ratio (the ratio of pension assets-to-liabilities) for all state pension plans combined declined from 106 percent in 2001, to 91 percent in 2002, to 82 percent in 2003; the median (50th percentile) state pension plan had

a funding ratio of 79 percent in the March 2004 survey.⁹

In the last few years, these public retirement funds have attracted a great deal of attention, sometimes because of their shrinking asset base and sometimes for a variety of other reasons.¹⁰ From an 1857 retirement plan established in New York City to assist policemen injured in the line of duty, according to the latest federal data (June 30, 2002), the number of state and local government pension plans across the nation proliferated to 2,670, serving every stratum of state and local government. The importance of payments to beneficiaries from these state and local government retirement systems is a given, and the onus is on policy-makers to ensure the solvency and financial health of these plans. Notwithstanding the \$2.2 trillion in cash and investment holdings in these retirement systems at the end of fiscal year 2002, more than 17.3 million total members and payments to over 6.2 million beneficiaries during this period, there is considerable interest in ensuring that this component of the U.S. retirement system remains on firm financial ground and continues to flourish in coming years.¹¹

The stresses faced by state and local government retirement systems in the aftermath of what has been described as the worst fiscal crisis to sweep over states in more than six decades, and the continued sluggish performance of the economy, is illustrated by reviewing federal data over the most recent 10-year period. Specifically, total receipts plunged precipitously by 102 percent between June 1998 and June 2002 (\$263.4 billion to -\$6.1 billion), while they grew by 109 percent between June 1993 and June 1998 (\$125.9 billion to \$263.4 billion). Conversely, total payments by state and local government retirement systems more than doubled between June 1993 and June 2002 (\$52.6 billion to \$122 billion).

In addition to the information gleaned from the federal government, information obtained by means of a survey forwarded to 190 state and local government retirement plans in the 50 states and the District of Columbia remains useful here too. Of these 190 plans, 105 plans provided information for at least three of the five questions posed to them. Based on the survey responses, 36 of the 105 plans specifically had an asset base greater than \$10 billion but less than \$100 billion; two additional plans had an asset base greater than \$100 billion. In terms of the number of annuitants (members or their family members receiving benefits) as a percentage of actives (members continuing to work and contribute), the survey indicated that a majority of the plans (70

RETIREMENT

plans) fell between 20 percent and 69.9 percent. The survey also revealed that in terms of actuarial funding ratios, i.e., the actuarial value of a pension plan's assets divided by its actuarial liabilities, only 25 of the 93 plans that provided information (of the 105 plans, 12 plans did not provide either the value of their actuarial assets or liabilities or both) were fully funded, with the remaining 68 plans underfunded to varying degrees.

State legislatures play a critical role in the administration of these retirement plans given the fact that they are responsible for some of the appointments to the boards of trustees, most often the administrative entity charged with the responsibility of managing and planning investments and benefit payouts. Hence, these trustees play a pivotal role in ensuring the continued growth of the retirement system funds taking into consideration a number of factors, such as the active-to-inactive member ratio, active participants to number of retirees receiving payments ratio, the overall investment climate (national and international) and ways to tweak an investment portfolio to diminish negative economic trends. One example where a legislature immersed itself in the activities of a state retirement system involves Maryland. After learning about their state pension fund's abysmal record, Maryland legislators and other state policy-makers began a series of investigations and explorations into determining the reasons for this poor performance. In response to these queries and concerns, comprehensive reforms were introduced, both statutorily and organizationally, including a number of senior officials being relieved of their duties. In addition, federal authorities indicated that they had initiated a criminal investigation of a number of former employees, an investigation that eventually resulted in indictments, trials and convictions for several employees for fraud. A number of other legislatures also delved into the affairs of their public retirement systems either to buttress their finances through a bond issue (California, Illinois, Kansas) or to initiate reforms to enhance their efficiency and effectiveness (Louisiana).

Policy Options and Considerations

Ensuring both the short-term and long-term financial viability of the different elements in America's retirement systems, both private and public, remains of paramount importance. It is a challenge and responsibility that extends to policy-makers at every level of government—federal, state and local—and every American. In fact, first resuscitating and then sustaining the financial health of our different retire-

ment income flows provides the underpinnings for the foundation of the United States as an economic, political and military powerhouse in the global context. Consequently, it is imperative that policy-makers and citizens alike initiate efforts now to bolster the shaky pillars of America's current retirement system so that the costs of making these fundamental reforms in the future are minimized.

In reviewing and analyzing related data, it is quickly apparent that all three legs of the proverbial retirement stool are wobbly and require urgent attention. Research shows weaknesses in the Social Security and Medicare systems and the PBGC; the low savings rate in contemporary American society coupled with the crushing level of consumer debt; and, finally, the severe losses suffered by a majority of the public sector retirement plans in recent years due to the souring economy, the collapse of the equities markets and occasional lax oversight by plan administrators. The grim news percolating from these different retirement sources in recent years accentuates the importance for both citizens and policy-makers to be energized about initiating remedial action. The fact that in a short four years the first wave of baby boomers will begin retiring in sizable numbers, precipitating tremendous fiscal strains on these different retirement sources, further reinforces the urgency for these reforms.

In formulating comprehensive policy responses to this nascent crisis, it is important to consider the following issues.

- In order to overcome the severe disadvantages associated with an abysmally low savings rate, is it time for policy-makers—at all levels of government—to begin an assortment of educational and incentive programs to first, instill the importance of savings, and then increase savings rates? These programs could be introduced into the curriculum of schools throughout the country, possibly as early as the elementary level, building up in complexity as the children proceed through the school system. At the other end, even greater incentives for individuals to save for retirement could also potentially be offered by the different levels of government. A quick comparison of household savings ratios among the world's three largest economic regions reinforces the fact that the United States lags significantly in this area, a statistic that should spur remedial action at every level of our society. According to a report released in June 2004, the household saving ratio in 2002 in the Euro area loomed at about 15 percent, ahead

of the approximately 6.5 percent in Japan and significantly ahead of the United States' ratio of about 2 percent.¹² The United States has to improve its performance in this critical area and the sooner policy-makers initiate programs to do so, the better.

- In order to avoid a financial catastrophe related to Social Security, Medicare and the PBGC in the near future, is it time for policy-makers, primarily at the federal level, to engage the public in a substantive debate about fundamental reforms? The sooner this discussion is initiated the better because the potential for these federal programs to quickly convert from ticking time bombs to explosive issues looms large. While there has been some peripheral discussion about reforming the Social Security and Medicare systems, the PBGC's plight has largely been out of the public arena. The PBGC, which is mandated to protect the pensions of bankrupt and flailing corporations, remains severely underfunded and an ever increasing number of corporations, from small, relatively unknown ones to the more famous, established ones, have sought the protection of this federal agency. Bethlehem Steel, Consolidated Freightways, Acme Steel and the National Steel Pellet Company are a mere fraction of the companies covering more than 500,000 Americans that have failed in the past three years and been taken over by the federal government. The level of pension underfunding in the airline industry alone is estimated to be about \$31 billion on a termination basis at the end of 2003, a staggering amount for just a single industry. Cumulatively, the level of pension underfunding for the companies seeking the protection of the federal government could be gargantuan, possibly eclipsing the magnitude of the federal government's bail out of the savings and loan industry in the 1980s. At a time when the fiscal demands being leveled at the federal government are increasing exponentially, and at a time when the federal government's budget situation is awash in a sea of red ink, the potential for these ticking fiscal time bombs (Social Security, Medicare and the PBGC) to explode remains a most alarming possibility.
- Finally, is it time for state policy-makers and citizens to closely and continuously monitor the performance of state and local government retirement funds so as to avoid the financial pitfalls faced by some entities with the introduction of features such as Deferred Retirement Option Plans, the

mismanagement of fund assets, the investment choices made by fund managers, the practice of deferring contributions to retirement funds during a time of budget shortfalls among other issues? Another important development related to these public sector retirement funds in these fiscally trying times involves the administrative entities of these plans whittling away at the benefits they offer to lower their expenditures. Will this emerging trend affect the ability of state and local governments to attract top-flight candidates to staff public sector positions? The case could be made that the ability of the public sector to attract high-caliber employees pivoted around the benefits offered in the public sector from the defined benefit retirement plan to healthcare coverage, both before and during retirement.

These policy considerations related to America's retirement systems remain of great importance as policy-makers and citizens deal with the onset of an aging population and a series of other, complex policy issues that will confront the nation in the next few decades. The sooner we begin the discussion about strengthening the shaky legs of our figurative retirement stool, the better.

Note: In October 2004, the Southern Legislative Conference (SLC), the southern office of The Council of State Governments, issued a 50-state Special Series Report entitled "America's Public Retirement Plans: Stresses in the System." This article is based on information and analysis carried out for this report.

Notes

¹The Congress of the United States, Congressional Budget Office (CBO), *Baby Boomers' Retirement Prospects: An Overview*, November 2003.

²*Ibid.*, 4.

³"Medicare and Social Security Challenges," *The New York Times*, March 2, 2004.

⁴U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, *Personal Income and its Disposition*, March 1, 2004.

⁵"Debt-Heavy Economy May Be Too Jittery About Rates," *The New York Times*, January 31, 2004.

⁶"Consumer Debt: How Much Is Too Much," *EconSouth*, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, First Quarter 2004.

⁷"Pension Agency Deficit Mounts," *The Baltimore Sun*, January 16, 2004.

⁸National Association of State Retirement Administrators, *Public Fund Survey: Summary of Findings*, August 2003.

⁹Wilshire Associates, Inc., 2003 *Wilshire Report on State Retirement Systems: Funding Levels and Asset Allocation*,

RETIREMENT

March 12, 2003 and 2004 Wilshire Report on State Retirement Systems: Funding Levels and Asset Allocation, March 12, 2004.

¹⁰There has been a spate of articles in media outlets across the country probing the financial status of the nation's public retirement system. This reporting has been particularly pronounced in the aftermath of the 2000–2002 stock market declines when the shriveling asset base of these retirement funds prompted all sorts of inquiries and analysis by a range of different investigative bodies and interested parties.

¹¹U.S. Department of Commerce, State and Local Government Employee Retirement Systems, www.census.gov/govs/www/retire.html.

¹²"Comparison of Household Savings Ratios: Euro Area, Japan and United States," *Statistics Brief*, (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, June 8, 2004), No. 8.

About the Author

Sujit M. CanagaRetna is currently the senior fiscal analyst at The Council of State Governments' Southern Office, the Southern Legislative Conference (SLC), where he has been since March 1998. He is responsible for tracking fiscal, economic development and transportation trends for CSG and SLC. CanagaRetna has a bachelor's degree (BA) from Bennington College, Vermont and graduate degrees in International Affairs and Public Administration (MIA/MPA) from Columbia University. Prior to joining CSG/SLC, CanagaRetna worked for the New York City Comptroller's Office.

Table A
ACTUARIAL FUNDING RATIO

State or other jurisdiction	Plan name	Actuarial assets		Actuarial liabilities		Actuarial funding ratio percent
		Value	Date	Value	Date	
Washington	Judicial Retirement System (a)	\$ 8,000,000	Sept. 2002	\$ 95,000,000	Sept. 2002	8.4%
West Virginia	Teachers' Retirement System (Defined Benefit)	1,190,882,000	June 2003	6,243,834,000	June 2003	19.1
Illinois	General Assembly Retirement System	49,676,302	June 2003	196,510,067	June 2003	25.3
Illinois	Judges' Retirement System	330,053,560	June 2003	1,076,231,965	June 2003	30.7
Illinois	Teachers' Retirement System of Illinois (b)	23,124,823,000	June 2003	46,933,432,000	June 2003	49.3
Illinois	State Universities' Retirement System	9,714,500	June 2003	18,025,000	June 2003	53.9
Oklahoma	Teachers' Retirement System	6,436,852,137	June 2003	11,925,161,689	June 2003	54.0
Oklahoma	Teachers' Retirement System	3,752,285	June 2003	5,835,609	June 2003	64.3
Alaska	Teachers' Retirement System	2,646,000,000	Sept. 2002	4,042,000,000	Sept. 2002	65.5
Washington	Law Enforcement Officers' and Firefighters' Retirement System—Plan 2 (a)	6,487,538,000	June 2003	9,796,306,000	June 2003	66.2
Washington	State Employees' Retirement System	11,828,900,000	June 2003	17,173,300,000	June 2003	68.9
Louisiana	Teachers' Retirement System	5,900,000,000	June 2002	8,500,000,000	June 2002	69.4
Maine	Maine State Retirement System	17,074,650,000	Dec. 2003	24,519,059,000	Dec. 2003	69.6
Massachusetts	Massachusetts Teachers' Retirement System	15,403,200,907	June 2003	22,108,936,178	June 2003	69.7
Iowa	Iowa Public Employees' Retirement System	658,376,086	June 2003	944,688,430	June 2003	69.7
Louisiana	Firefighters' Retirement System of Louisiana	7,687,281	June 2003	10,561,563	June 2003	72.8
Alaska	Public Employees' Retirement Board	2,699,941,000	June 2003	3,694,001,000	June 2003	73.1
West Virginia	Public Employees' Retirement System	6,100,000,000	June 2003	8,200,000,000	June 2003	74.4
Indiana	Indiana State Teachers' Retirement Fund	70,017,875	June 2003	93,361,000	June 2003	74.8
Iowa	Judicial Retirement System	3,500,000,000	June 2003	4,669,000,000	June 2003	75.0
New Hampshire	New Hampshire Retirement System	10,853,000,000	Dec. 2003	14,440,000,000	Dec. 2003	75.2
Kansas	Public Employees' Retirement System	51,696,919,000	June 2003	68,734,061,000	June 2003	75.2
Ohio	State Teachers' Retirement System	30,600,000,000	Dec. 2003	40,500,000,000	Dec. 2003	75.6
Colorado	Public Employees' Retirement Association	5,354,795,771	July 2003	6,974,583,356	July 2003	76.8
Oklahoma	Public Employees' Retirement System	11,361,346,260	June 2002	15,253,882,989	June 2002	78.4
Connecticut	Teachers' Retirement Board	16,980,000	June 2003	21,486,000	June 2003	79.0
Mississippi	Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi	527,004,456	Dec. 2002	663,069,805	Dec. 2002	79.6
Ohio	State Highway Patrol Retirement System	246,643,600	June 2003	306,098,170	June 2003	80.5
Iowa	Iowa Dept. of Public Safety Peace Officers' Retirement, Accident, and Disability System	20,048,000,000	June 2003	24,719,400,000	June 2003	81.1
Missouri	Public School Retirement System	11,195,902,000	July 2003	13,776,198,000	July 2003	81.3
Minnesota	Public Employees' Retirement Association	15,900,000,000	June 2003	19,500,000,000	June 2003	81.5
Nevada	Public Employees' Retirement System	10,701,000,000	Sept. 2002	13,093,000,000	Sept. 2002	81.7
Washington	Public Employees' Retirement System—Plans 2 & 3 (a)	1,677,800,000	June 2003	2,049,700,000	June 2003	81.9
Missouri	Public School Non-Teacher Employee Retirement System	15,500,000,000	June 2003	18,890,000,000	June 2003	82.1
Kentucky	Kentucky Retirement Systems	10,815,090,275	Dec. 2003	13,100,126,794	Dec. 2003	82.6
Texas	Municipal Retirement System	6,682,703,560	Jan. 2003	20,508,366,996	Jan. 2003	82.6
Ohio	Police and Fire Pension Fund (c)	22,860,101,000	June 2003	27,377,055,000	June 2003	83.5
South Carolina	South Carolina Retirement Systems (d)	15,930,753,000	Dec. 2003	18,996,053,000	Dec. 2003	83.9
Massachusetts	Massachusetts State Retirement System	1,519,000,000	Sept. 2002	1,804,000,000	Sept. 2002	84.2
Washington	School Employees' Retirement System—Plans 2 & 3 (a)	1,392,043,000	July 2003	1,646,979,675	July 2003	84.5
Oklahoma	Police Pension and Retirement System					

See footnotes at end of table.

RETIREMENT

ACTUARIAL FUNDING RATIO—Continued

State or other jurisdiction	Plan name	Actuarial assets		Actuarial liabilities		Actuarial funding ratio percent
		Value	Date	Value	Date	
North Dakota	Teachers' Fund for Retirement	1,438,400,000	July 2003	1,690,300,000	July 2003	85.1
Washington	Public Employees' Retirement System—Plan 1 (a)	10,757,000,000	Sept. 2002	12,532,000,000	Sept. 2002	85.8
Washington	Teachers' Retirement System—Plans 2 & 3 (a)	3,800,000,000	Sept. 2002	4,422,000,000	Sept. 2002	85.9
New Jersey	Judicial Retirement System	372,800,000	June 2003	431,500,000	June 2003	86.4
Oregon	Public Employees' Retirement System	35,537,100,000	Dec. 2002	39,520,500,000	Dec. 2002	89.9
Texas	County and District Retirement System	9,788,900,000	Dec. 2003	10,813,500,000	Dec. 2003	90.5
Arkansas	Arkansas Local Police and Fire Retirement System	553,000,000	Dec. 2003	610,000,000	Dec. 2003	90.7
Missouri	State Employees' Retirement System	6,057,329,872	June 2003	6,662,291,406	June 2003	90.9
Nebraska	Nebraska Public Employees' Retirement Systems	5,259,423,944	June 2003	5,760,891,499	June 2003	91.3
Wyoming	Wyoming Retirement System (e)	4,657,898,000	Jan. 2004	5,077,443,000	Jan. 2004	91.7
Washington	Teachers' Retirement System—Plan 1 (a)	9,366,000,000	Sept. 2002	10,209,000,000	Sept. 2002	91.7
New Jersey	Teachers' Pension and Annuity Fund	34,600,000,000	June 2003	37,300,000,000	June 2003	92.8
Utah	State Retirement Systems	14,700,000,000	Dec. 2003	15,800,000,000	Dec. 2003	93.0
Alabama	Teachers' Retirement Systems of Alabama	18,100,000,000	June 2003	19,400,000,000	June 2003	93.3
Maryland	State Retirement and Pension System	32,631,465,000	June 2003	34,974,601,000	June 2003	94.5
Texas	Teachers' Retirement System	89,033,023,666	Aug. 2003	94,263,027,542	Aug. 2003	95.2
California	California Public Employees' Retirement System (f)	156,067,000,000	June 2002	163,961,000,000	June 2002	96.4
Alabama	Employees' Retirement System of Alabama	8,100,000,000	Sept. 2002	8,400,000,000	Sept. 2002	96.4
Montana	Public Employee Retirement Association (g)	3,679,960,000	June 2002	3,815,811,000	June 2002	96.4
Missouri	Missouri Local Government Employees Retirement System	2,604,000,000	June 2002	2,700,000,000	June 2002	96.4
South Dakota	South Dakota Retirement System	4,685,890,770	June 2003	4,818,943,695	June 2003	97.2
Pennsylvania	Public School Employees' Retirement System	52,900,000,000	June 2003	54,400,000,000	June 2003	97.3
New Mexico	Public Employees' Retirement Association	8,971,080,804	June 2003	9,215,945,484	June 2003	97.6
Illinois	Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund	17,529,890,818	Dec. 2003	17,966,103,485	Dec. 2003	97.6
Texas	Employees' Retirement System of Texas	19,478,554,993	Aug. 2003	19,959,111,546	Aug. 2003	97.9
New Jersey	Public Employees' Retirement System	27,400,000,000	June 2003	28,000,000,000	June 2003	99.2
Wisconsin	Wisconsin Retirement System	62,685,300,000	Dec. 2003	63,211,700,000	Dec. 2003	99.8
Tennessee	Consolidated Retirement System—State, Teachers & Higher Education Employees	22,099,000,000	July 2003	22,152,000,000	July 2003	100.0
Arizona	Arizona State Retirement System	24,303,639,447	June 2003	24,303,639,447	June 2003	100.0
Arizona	Public Safety Personnel Retirement System	8,600,000,000	June 2003	8,600,000,000	June 2003	100.0
Dist. of Columbia	District of Columbia Teachers' Retirement Fund	917,800,000	Sept. 2003	917,800,000	Sept. 2003	100.0
Dist. of Columbia	Police Officers' and Fire Fighters' Retirement Board	1,427,800,000	Sept. 2003	1,427,800,000	Sept. 2003	100.0
Delaware	State of Delaware Employees' Deferred Compensation Plan	209,343,469	April 2004	209,343,469	April 2004	100.0
New York	Teachers' Retirement System	74,400,000,000	June 2002	74,400,000,000	June 2002	100.0
Tennessee	Consolidated Retirement System—Political Subdivision Pension Plan	3,606,000,000	July 2003	3,606,000,000	July 2003	100.0
Washington	Judges' Retirement System (a)	5,000,000	Sept. 2002	5,000,000	Sept. 2002	100.0
Washington	Washington State Patrol Retirement System (a)	689,000,000	Sept. 2002	686,000,000	Sept. 2002	100.4
Georgia	Employees' Retirement System	12,124,414,000	June 2002	11,994,850,000	June 2002	101.1
Virginia	State Retirement System	38,957,000,000	June 2002	38,265,000,000	June 2002	101.8
New Jersey	State Police Retirement System	1,865,100	June 2003	1,815,700	June 2003	102.7

See footnotes at end of table.

ACTUARIAL FUNDING RATIO—Continued

State or other jurisdiction	Plan name	Actuarial assets		Actuarial liabilities		Actuarial funding ratio percent
		Value	Date	Value	Date	
New Jersey	Police and Fireman's Retirement System	18,400,000,000	June 2002	17,900,000,000	June 2002	102.8
Minnesota	Teachers' Retirement Association	17,384,179,000	June 2003	16,856,379,000	June 2003	103.1
Pennsylvania	State Employees' Retirement System	27,465,000,000	Dec. 2003	26,179,000,000	Dec. 2003	104.9
Washington	Volunteer Firefighters' and Reserve Officers' Relief and Pension Principal Fund (b)	124,000,000	Dec. 2002	118,000,000	Dec. 2002	105.1
North Carolina	North Carolina Retirement Systems (i)	55,183,595,877	Dec. 2002	51,877,037,007	Dec. 2002	106.4
Texas	Law Enforcement & Custodial Officer Supplemental Retirement Fund	666,588,289	Aug 2003	597,914,188	Aug 2003	111.5
Florida	Florida Retirement System (PRS) (j)	101,900,000,000	July 2002	89,300,000,000	July 2002	114.1
Georgia	Public School Employees' Retirement System	727,529,000	June 2002	630,295,000	June 2002	115.4
Georgia	Judicial Retirement System—Plan II	129,425,907	Aug 2003	111,115,600	Aug 2003	116.5
Texas	Law Enforcement Officers' and Firefighters' Retirement System—Plan I (e)	5,095,000,000	Sept. 2002	4,338,000,000	Sept. 2002	117.5
Washington	Legislative Retirement System	26,637,000	June 2002	21,779,000	June 2002	122.3
Georgia	Georgia Judicial Retirement System	228,417,000	June 2002	175,154,000	June 2002	130.1
Idaho	Public Employee Retirement System of Idaho	6,498,685,238	July 2003	534,638,594	July 2003	1215.5

Source: The Council of State Governments' Southern Office Survey (For additional details on the survey responses, please see, Sijit Canagaratnam, America's Public Retirement Plans: Stresses in the System, Special Series Report, Southern Legislative Conference, October 2004, www.slc.stateia.org/Publications.htm.)

Note: The survey was forwarded to 190 plans of which responses were received from 105 plans. Of these 105 plans, 12 plans did not provide information on their actuarial assets and/or actuarial liabilities. (See Table B, below, for these 12 plans). Hence, it was impossible to calculate an actuarial funding ratio for these 12 plans. This lowered the number of plans for which information is presented in Table A above from 105 plans to 93 plans.

Key:

(a) For this Washington state plan's actuarial liability, the Present Value of Fully Projected Benefits (PVFPB) is presented.

(b) Illinois issued \$10 billion in pension obligation bonds in June 2003. TRS' share of \$4,330,374,000 was received after the close of the fiscal year and not included in asset figures.

(c) The market value of this plan is unaudited.

(d) Data for the SCRS includes South Carolina Retirement System (serving state employees, teachers and other government employees); Police Officers' Retirement System; General Assembly Retirement System; and the Judges' and Solicitors' Retirement System.

(e) Data for the Wyoming Retirement System includes the Public Employee Retirement System; Wyoming Game & Fish Employees' Retirement System; Volunteer Firemen's Pension Fund; Paid Firemen's System (Plan A and Plan B); Wyoming Law Enforcement System; and the Wyoming Judicial Retirement Plan.

(f) Data for CalPERS includes the California Public Employees' Retirement System; the Legislators' Retirement System; Judges' Retirement System I; Judges' Retirement System II; State Peace Officers' and Firefighters' Defined Contribution Program; and the Volunteer Firefighters' Length of Service Award System.

(g) Data for MPERA includes the Public Employees' Retirement System; Judges' Retirement System (JRS); Highway Patrol Officers' Retirement System (HPORS); Sheriffs' Retirement System (SRS); Game Wardens' & Peace Officers' Retirement System (CWPORS); and the Volunteer Firefighters' Compensation Act (VFCA).

(h) For the Volunteer Firefighters' and Reserve Officers' Relief and Pension Principal Fund, relief liabilities are not included; only pension liabilities.

(i) Data for the North Carolina Retirement System includes the Teachers' and State Employees' Retirement System; Local Government Employees' Retirement System; Consolidated Judicial Retirement System; and the Firemen and Rescue Squad Workers' Pension Fund.

(j) This is based on the market value as of March 23, 2004.

**Table D
TWELVE PLANS THAT DID NOT PROVIDE EITHER ACTUARIAL ASSETS AND/OR ACTUARIAL LIABILITIES**

State or other jurisdiction	Plan name	Actuarial assets		Actuarial liabilities	
		Value	Date	Value	Date
Alaska	Alaska State Pension Investment Board	Not provided	...	Not provided	...
Colorado	Colorado County Officials and Employees Retirement Association	Not provided	...	Not provided	...
Colorado	State of Colorado 457 Match Plan Plus	\$246,972,207	March 2005	Not available	...
Dist. of Columbia	District of Columbia 457 Deferred Compensation Plan (DCPlus)	Not available	...	Not available	...
Florida	Deferred Compensation Plan	Not available	...	Not available	...
Florida	Municipal Police Officers' and Firefighters' Retirement Trust Funds Office	Unknown	...	Unknown	...
Maryland	Teachers and State Employees Supplemental Retirement Plans	Not applicable	...	Not applicable	...
New Mexico	State Deferred Compensation Plan	Not provided	...	Not provided	Dec. 2003
Nevada	457 Deferred Compensation Plan	\$0	Dec. 2003	\$0	...
Nevada	Deferred Compensation Plan	Not available	...	Not available	...
Texas	Judicial Retirement System—Plan 1	Not available	...	\$19,959,111,546	Aug. 2003
Georgia	Georgia Military Pension Fund	Not applicable	June 2002	\$8,322,000	June 2002

plans, 12 plans did not provide information on their actuarial assets and/or actuarial liabilities. (See Table B, below, for these 12 plans). Hence, it was impossible to calculate an actuarial funding ratio for these 12 plans. This lowered the number of plans for which information is presented in Table A above from 105 plans to 93 plans.

Source: The Council of State Governments' Southern Office Survey (For additional details on the survey responses, please see, *Southern Office Survey: America's Public Retirement Plans: Stresses in the System*, Special Series Report, Southern Legislative Conference, October 2004, www.statllnra.org/Publications.htm.)

Note: The survey was forwarded to 190 plans of which responses were received from 105 plans. Of these 105 plans, 12 plans did not provide information on their actuarial assets and/or actuarial liabilities. (See Table B, below, for these 12 plans). Hence, it was impossible to calculate an actuarial funding ratio for these 12 plans. This lowered the number of plans for which information is presented in Table A above from 105 plans to 93 plans.