

All findings, interpretations, and conclusions of this presentation represent the views of the author(s) and not those of the Wharton School or the Pension Research Council. © 2008 Pension Research Council of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania. All rights reserved.

May 1, 2008

Estimating State and Local Government Pension and Retiree Health Care Liabilities

Stephen T. McElhaney
Richmond, VA

Background

- Recently, high attention has been given to unfunded liabilities of states and local governments
- Questions are being raised about how these liabilities have been calculated

Magnitude of Public Sector Retiree Liability

- States (Pew Study 2007: *Promises with a Price*)
(amounts below in billions)

– Pension: Liabilities:	\$2,353
Assets:	<u>1,992</u>
Unfunded Liability:	\$ 361
– OPEB: Liabilities:	\$ 381
Assets:	<u>11</u>
Unfunded Liability:	\$ 370

- All state and local governments
 - Pension – Estimated to be \$700 billion to \$1 trillion
 - OPEB – Estimated to be \$1.5 trillion
- Totals are based upon individual results that use dissimilar cost methods and use actuarial assumptions that have varying degrees of aggressiveness or conservatism

General Measurement Issues

- Measurement of liability depends upon:
 - Actuarial cost method
 - Actuarial assumptions
- Guidance from Actuarial Standards of Practice (ASOPs)
 - ASOP No. 4: *Measuring Pension Obligations and Determining Pension Plan Costs or Contributions*
 - ASOP No. 6: *Measuring Retiree Group Obligations*
 - ASOP No. 27: *Selection of Economic Assumptions for Measuring Pension Obligations*
 - ASOP No. 35: *Selection of Demographic and Other Noneconomic Assumptions for Measuring Pension Obligations*

Comments Regarding Guidance in ASOPs

- Standards permit a very broad range of actuarial methods and assumptions
- Cost methods
 - Some methods do not re-compute actuarial accrued liability at each valuation date, but only “roll-forward” unfunded amounts from prior dates
 - One method (aggregate method) does not compute any actuarial accrued liability
- Assumptions
 - ASOP No. 27 only requires that economic assumptions (such as investment return rate) be selected from a best-estimate range
- ASOPs are not concerned with comparability among different retirement programs, but only concerned with compliance to generally accepted actuarial principles

Private Sector Measurement

- Three primary standards issued by the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB)
 - FAS 87 *Employers' Accounting for Pensions*
 - FAS 106 *Employers' Accounting for Postretirement Benefits Other Than Pensions*
 - FAS 158 *Employers' Accounting for Defined Benefit Pension and Other Postretirement Plans—an amendment of FASB Statements No. 87, 88, 106, and 132(R)*
- Requires use of one actuarial cost method: Projected Unit Credit Method
- Requires discount rate based on current long-term bond rates (market value liability)
- FAS standards eliminate most issues regarding comparability

Public Sector Measurement

- Two primary standards issued by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB)
 - *GASB 27 Accounting for Pensions by State and Local Governmental Employers*
 - *GASB 45 Accounting and Financial Reporting by Employers for Postemployment Benefits Other Than Pensions*
- Standards generally incorporate principles of ASOPs
- Broad choices are permitted for actuarial cost methods and assumptions
- Discount rate
 - For funded plans, use the assumed rate of return for the fund's asset allocation (average public plan uses an 8% discount rate)
 - For unfunded plans (primarily retiree medical plans funded pay-as-you-go) use the assumed rate of return on the employer's unrestricted assets

Public Sector Measurement *(continued)*

- Actuarial assumptions are usually selected by the retirement system board with advice from the actuary
 - Some actuarial assumptions are stated in statutes
 - General tendency has been not to lower investment return rate since it would have adverse effects on funded ratios and contribution rates
- Results from various systems may not be comparable due to a wide range of flexibility in methods and assumptions

Comments Regarding Private vs. Public Measurement Differences

- Some observers have called for public plans to disclose liability at market similar to FASB requirements
 - Ennis paper *Moral Hazard in Public Pensions*
 - Gold and Latter paper being presented on this panel
- GASB 2006 white paper: *Why Governmental Accounting and Financial Reporting Is – And Should Be – Different*
 - Private business: “Voluntary exchange between any willing buyer and seller”
 - Governments: “Involuntary payment of taxes”
 - Governmental accounting should focus on resources and allocation of costs to generations of taxpayers
 - GASB 27 and 45 are based upon research with users of governmental financial statements

Potential Changes

- Mark to market
 - Private sector model – may not be consistent with principles of public sector finance
 - Not yet clear that this information would be useful to users of financial statements
 - Significant increase in disclosed unfunded liabilities
 - Huge paradigm shift for public sector
- Modifications to current practice which could make information more useful
 - Restrict cost method selection to those that re-compute liability at each valuation (Entry Age Normal and Projected Unit Credit)
 - Require actuarial certification of assumptions as the actuary's best estimate