



EXPERIENCE STUDY

Frequently Asked Questions

Affordability, Relief Options, and Costs

1. Does MERS consider employers' ability to afford required contributions?
2. Isn't there more MERS could be doing to alleviate contributions given the times we are in and the challenges we are facing?
3. Should my municipality bond for our unfunded accrued liability (UAL)? What are MERS' thoughts on bonding?
4. What are MERS administrative costs?

Actuarial Assumptions

5. Does MERS plan to lower the rate of return assumption again in the near future? Is this reviewed during the Experience Study every five years or more frequently?
6. When conducting the Experience Study, where do you gather data? Is it MERS-specific? Public sector? Private and home rule plans?
7. We would like to get this report earlier in the year, is this a possibility?
8. Did MERS look at subgroups other than just police for distinct assumptions?
9. We haven't given pay raises to our employees for years. Why are you assuming a 3.00% wage inflation?
10. My payroll is shrinking and we aren't hiring any new people. How does this factor into our required contributions?
11. What numbers are used in the FAC load factor, and what happens when that changes?

Investments

12. Isn't MERS being overly optimistic trying to achieve 7.35%, when we all know that's unachievable?

Affordability, Relief Options, and Costs

Does MERS consider employers' ability to afford required contributions?

As the plan fiduciary, our primary responsibility is to ensure that plans are adequately funded. Plan costs vary by each municipality and depend on the benefit plan design and other plan-specific details. To help you proactively assess the affordability of your plan, we include projections and "what if" scenarios in your annual valuations. We are here to partner with you and can discuss various strategies that may help your specific goals and situation.

Isn't there more MERS could be doing to alleviate contributions given the times we are in and the challenges we are facing?

MERS is here to partner with you. We have staff across the state that are available to meet with you (see more information on your Regional Team here) – to review your plans, to explain your options, and to assist with communication and education to your stakeholders, including your elected officials, the public and your employees.

We carry the fiduciary responsibility of the plan for you – meaning, we have a legal duty to follow the law and best standards of best practice, and ensure there are enough assets to fund the benefits that have been accrued (which are constitutionally protected in Michigan).

We have consistently added options for plan design and funding strategies that can assist you with managing your liabilities and cost to your plans. This includes options to phase in assumption changes, as well as to request an extension to your amortization schedule.

There is no one-size-fits-all solution, and for some, multiple strategies will need to be employed to reduce contributions to a manageable level. We are continuously seeking feedback and are open to suggestions for additional ways we can help.

Should my municipality bond for our unfunded accrued liability (UAL)? What are MERS' thoughts on bonding?

Whether or not your local unit of government should issue a pension obligation bond (POB) is a complex question, and we recommend consulting with a qualified expert before reaching a decision. If you plan to explore bonding as an option, MERS will work closely with you and your consultant to provide the necessary information to assist you with your decision. To ensure an efficient experience for you, we continue to work closely with the Michigan Department of Treasury and others to ensure the information we are providing meets the needs of all stakeholders.

It is important to remember that issuing a POB does not change the underlying liability for your plan. Even if a POB is issued for an amount equal to the current UAL, there is no guarantee against the development of future UAL (whether from adverse experience or assumption changes). Ultimately we consider the issuance of a POB to be an investment decision.

What are MERS administrative costs?

At December 31, 2019, the cost of the Defined Benefit Plan was 0.32% (0.21% for administration and 0.11% for investments). It's important to remember these are the costs of administering your plan, not the cost of your benefits. The contribution requirements to your plan are the actuarially determined contributions, based on your plan design and funded status, calculated by Gabriel, Roeder, Smith & Company (GRS) and required by law to prefund.

Actuarial Assumptions

Does MERS plan to lower the rate of return assumption again in the near future? Is this reviewed during the Experience Study every five years or more frequently?

At this time, we don't have plans to review this assumption again in the short-term. However, that may change based on market performance and our asset allocation. If it does, we will give customers as much advance notice as possible.

When conducting the Experience Study, where do you gather data? Is it MERS-specific? Public sector? Private and home rule plans?

Data used in the Experience Study is MERS-specific and comes from the census data in the annual actuarial valuations. In some cases, for example when assessing mortality rates, we look to broader data sets such as U.S. public sector employees and Social Security data. But even then, we adjust the national data to MERS' experience.

We would like to get this report earlier in the year, is this a possibility?

Our actuaries make every effort to provide your reports as soon as possible. It's important to remember that the reports as of 12/31 of any given year are received in June of the following year, and set forth the contributions that will be required in your next fiscal year. For example, the 12/31/19 report sent to you this past June is for your fiscal year beginning in 2021.

In addition, each report provides you with five-year projections to allow you the opportunity to proactively review your contribution estimates.

Did MERS look at subgroups other than just police for distinct assumptions?

It is common for plans across the country to review experience for general and public safety members separately. When GRS performed the review of public safety groups separately from the general membership, they observed significant differences in retirement and withdrawal behavior that warranted reflecting in the assumptions.

GRS completed additional analysis for some other subsets as well, but observed two things:

- (1) The experience of other subsets was not that different from MERS as a whole, and
- (2) Many subsets were too small to give full weight to their experience. If we slice and dice the data to isolate one small group, it may be harder to give that group's experience full weight to select a new assumption. This uncertainty increases the smaller the group is.

We haven't given pay raises to our employees for years. Why are you assuming a 3.00% wage inflation?

Wage inflation is an assumption that considers large-scale or general economic factors and is used to project long-term increases of total payroll. Two key factors of this assumption are:

- (1) Price inflation (2.50%)
- (2) Real wage growth (0.50%)

The key to remember is that wage inflation is a long-term assumption, whereas year-to-year pay increases are short-term experience. Short-term experience will always differ from long-term assumptions, and one purpose of annual actuarial valuations is to adjust each year to what has actually occurred.

My payroll is shrinking and we aren't hiring any new people. How does this factor into our required contributions?

Shrinking payroll affects required contributions in two ways. First, lower-than-expected payroll translates into lower benefit accruals, and hence lower active actuarial liability. In this way, a shrinking payroll may increase a plan's funded level and decrease employer contribution dollar requirements.

On the other hand, amortization rates are generally set based on expected future payroll, so a lower payroll may require a higher rate. Specifically, open divisions (where new employees become members of the division) are invoiced on a percent-of-payroll basis; however, the employer contribution is remitted to MERS in dollars. So a division with a shrinking payroll may see their contribution increase when measured as a percent-of-payroll, even if the dollar amount paid remains relatively stable.

If payroll is shrinking because the number of covered active employees is decreasing, this means fewer employees are receiving a benefit, resulting in lower costs in the long run. However, if the number of active employees is lower, but actual payroll is higher on average (such as from paying additional overtime or higher pay increases), any long-term cost savings may be offset.

If your plan is experiencing short-term fluctuations in payroll, you can opt to be billed as a flat dollar amount vs. percentage of payroll to ensure your actuarially determined contributions reflect that short-term change.

What numbers are used in the FAC load factor, and what happens when that changes?

Previous Experience Studies found that the Final Average Compensation (FAC) of new retirees was often higher than expected, compared to the reported annual pays from the years prior to retirement (the most recent Experience Study confirms this as well). Employees retiring with higher-than-expected FAC have higher-than-expected liabilities, leading to actuarial losses at retirement. Loading for the anticipated increase in FAC allows the employer to fund for the anticipated higher liability during the working lifetime of the employee, rather than paying for the liability loss after the employee retires.

For each new retiree in the five-year study period, the actuaries compared the actual FAC at retirement against the projected FAC based on previous year-end valuation data. The recent Experience Study showed that, on average, the actual FACs were 3% higher than expected.

Because FAC increases varied significantly from one group to another, FAC loads were developed separately for each affected municipality. A higher FAC load results in larger active employee liability. However, the FAC load does not determine the ultimate cost of the benefit – the ultimate cost depends on the actual FAC used upon retirement. In other words, if an employee's FAC was understated during their employment, the liability loss generated at retirement would need to be paid during the employee's retirement years – and vice-versa.

Note that the FAC load factors reflect things like lump sum payments at retirement or extra overtime in the final year of employment. However, the load factors do not reflect any overtime increases that occur during the entire 3-5 year FAC period.

Investments

Isn't MERS being overly optimistic trying to achieve 7.35%, when we all know that's unachievable?

Public retirement systems, like MERS, follow a process for establishing the investment return assumption that considers various financial, economic and market factors, and is based on a long-term view. We use analysis and forecasts from independent experts and governmental sources to validate the assumptions that we use.

For those local units of government who wish to plan more conservatively, your Annual Actuarial Valuation contains a "what if" scenario showing what your required contributions would be with a lower investment return assumption.