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Investments and liabilities

- Liabilities discounted at expected return on portfolio
  - Higher returns/higher risk means “better funded”
- Plans already underfunded, projected returns lower
  - Wilshire: Avg 2010 portfolio return 1.3% less than 2007 projections
- But, expected return often set by legislature
  - Cutting return would have huge effect on funding
  - Plans arrange portfolio to achieve expected return
How have plans reacted?

- **Double down**
  - Make up for 2007 losses and/or maintain current discount rate by taking more risk

- **Folding cards**
  - Chastened by 2007 losses, cut back on risk, think about asset-liability management, etc.

- **Hold steady**
  - Keep on truckin’
Public pension assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$2.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NASRA and author's calculations.
Lower projected returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Equity</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-U.S. Equity</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Equity</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Bonds</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-U.S. Bonds</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wilshire Consulting
Which portfolio?

- **Current portfolios**
  - Mean assumed return rose from 7.91% in 2007 to 7.94% in 2009
    - Real returns up by 0.06%
  - More detail, but changes based on market swings

- **Target portfolio**
  - Less detail; only broad asset classes
  - But shows plans *intent* regarding asset allocation and market risk
Sample

- 30 large public sector pension plans
- Assets equal to ~50% of total pension funds under management
- Target portfolios obtained from plan CAFRs for 2007 and 2010
Basic approach

- Tabulate target portfolios for 2007 and 2010
  - Equities; bonds; alternatives; real estate; cash.
- Use simplified Wilshire projected returns, risk and covariations to estimate portfolio risk
  - Note: Use Wilshire’s 2010 covariation matrix for both years
- Compare estimated standard deviation of target portfolio returns for 2007 to 2010
Median target asset allocations, with 10th and 90th percentiles, 2007

Source: Author’s calculations, from plan data.
Median target asset allocations, with 10th and 90th percentiles, 2010

Source: Author's calculations, from plan data. When 2010 target data was unavailable, 2009 targets were used.
Caveats: Due to limited detail of target asset allocations, matrix combines classes, e.g., US and foreign equities; U.S. and foreign bonds; private equity class includes hedge funds.
How risk changed

Change in standard deviation of target portfolio return
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Results

- **Mean standard deviation**
  - 2007: 12.2%; 2010: 12.7%
  - 14 increased risk >0.3%; 5 reduced; 11 unchanged
  - Largest increase: 2.6% (S. Carolina/Illinois Teachers)
  - Largest reduction: 0.8% (CalSTRS)

- **Mean return (using 2010 returns)**
  - 2007: 6.35%; 2010: 6.51%
  - 6.5% return would increase ARCs by around 67% vs. 8% return
Conclusions

- Plans have increased risk on average
  - Most plans held reasonably steady
  - Small number may be “doubling down”
  - Very few have shifted back

- Further research
  - Compare to earlier period (e.g., 2001)
  - More detailed analysis by asset class

- What pensions themselves should do
  - Disclose risk of investments!