A Comparison Study of State Employee Pension Programs

Presentation to the Pension Management Oversight Commission October 25, 2006

Indiana Legislative Services Agency Office of Fiscal and Management Analysis

Office of Fiscal and Management Analysis

The Indiana Legislative Services Agency is a nonpartisan research and support staff to the Indiana General Assembly. The Office of Fiscal and Management Analysis is a division within the Legislative Services Agency that performs fiscal, budgetary, and management analysis.

This report and other publications of the Office of Fiscal and Management Analysis are available on the General Assembly's website:

http://www.in.gov/legislative/publications/

Contact Information:

Legislative Services Agency Office of Fiscal and Management Analysis 200 W. Washington Street, Suite 302 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2789 (317) 233-0696 (317) 232-2554 (FAX)

Diane Powers, Director Alan Gossard, Deputy Director

Christopher Baker Bernadette Bartlett Sarah Brooks Adam Brown Karen Firestone Mark Goodpaster Jim Landers David Lusan Charles W. Mayfield Phyllis McCormack Kathy Norris Robert J. Sigalow James P. Sperlik Mike Squires Lia Treffman

Executive Summary

This study is for the purpose of comparing Indiana's state employee pension system with other states' systems. The annual benefit from a defined benefit plan is generally a function of a member's years of service, a final average salary (FAS) computation, and a multiplier. The FAS calculation and the multiplier typically differ between states. In addition, the retiring employee's total net benefit is a result of several factors that go beyond the defined benefit formula's individual components. First among these factors is the employee's contribution level required over the course of employment in order for the employee to receive a benefit upon retirement.

Complicating even further any comparison between states, states offer either a defined benefit program, a defined contribution program, or some combination of the two (as in Indiana's two-part plan consisting of a statutorily defined benefit as well as an annuity savings account component). In addition, some states match optional employee contributions for a defined contribution program or deferred compensation plan (e.g., Indiana's 457 Plan).

Finally, some states opt not to participate in the federal Social Security program, thus potentially reducing a retiree's total pension benefits but also relieving both the employer and employee of the program's contribution requirements. A state electing not to participate in Social Security may at least partially compensate with a higher state pension benefit formula or lower employee contribution rates for the state-sponsored plan.

This study takes into account employee benefit levels as well as total employer and employee contribution amounts required to generate those future benefits. This is done by applying the parameters of each other state's retirement system to hypothetical individuals under three of Indiana's retirement scenarios and two final salaries of \$30,000 or \$60,000. In order to make a consistent comparison, the present value of employee benefits and the present value of employer and employee contributions are computed for each retirement and salary scenario and for each state's pension program. For deferred compensation plans which provide a state match for optional employee contributions, the level of employee participation is assumed to be that which is required to receive any state matching contribution.

65/10 Scenario with \$30,000 Final Salary -Defined Benefit Program - Indiana's statutorily defined benefit formula provides for an annual benefit of 1.1% times the retiree's years of creditable service times the retiree's FAS over five years. Indiana is one of three states that have a multiplier less than 1.5%, with 20 states having a multiplier between 1.5% and 2%, and another 21 states having a multiplier between 2% and 2.5%. (Some states also vary their multipliers depending on the employee's years of service.)

For a 65-year-old employee with 10 years of service and a final year's salary equaling \$30,000, Indiana's formula produces an annual pension benefit of \$3,198, or a replacement value of 10.7% of the final year's salary. (The present value of this stream of annual benefits over the expected remaining life of a 65-year-old individual totals \$31,378.) This benefit level ranks Indiana as 49th out of the 49 states with a defined benefit program.

However, while 36 states require their state employees to contribute a portion of their salary towards the defined benefit program, Indiana is one of 14 states that do not. Indiana's benefit is funded through state appropriations and investment earnings on money in the Public Employees' Retirement Fund. Consequently, all of the \$31,378 in benefits are attributable to state contributions, resulting in a ranking of 41st on state effort among all states' defined benefit programs.

Defined Contribution Program - Indiana also has as part of its pension program an annuity savings account component requiring employee contributions of 3% of salary. However, the state of Indiana pays this amount for its state employees. Funds are invested in member-determined investment options, with the resulting contributions and investment earnings available to the employee upon retirement along with the monthly pension benefit from the defined benefit component. This contribution level over a 10-year employment period results in an additional \$1,150 in annual benefit, or 3.8% of replacement value. Because the state is paying the employee contribution, the present value of benefits of \$11,281 is all due to state effort.

Deferred Compensation Program - Indiana offers to its employees the opportunity to invest in a deferred compensation plan (i.e., 457 Plan), as do most other states. However, Indiana is one of only 12 states that contribute toward an employee's plan. Indiana offers to match a state employee's contribution up to \$15 per pay period, or \$390 per year. This is estimated to result in an additional \$1,111 in annual retirement benefits and an additional 3.7% in salary replacement value. The present value of these estimated benefits is \$10,905, with half contributed by the state. Indiana's rank for state contributions is 5th out of the 12 states.

Social Security Program - Seven states do not participate in the federal Social Security program. Not participating in the program results in no Social Security benefits to employees upon retirement that are attributable to state employment. However, it also eliminates employer and employee contributions to the program, relieving each of a contribution of 7.65% of salary. Indiana and 42 other states have elected to participate. Participation in the program for an employee of this age and salary level would provide an estimated \$7,092 in annual retirement benefits, representing \$69,594 in present value of benefits and a 23.6% replacement of salary. After subtracting off the present value of employee contributions of \$28,767, the balance equal to \$40,827 in present value represents the state effort for this individual.

Total Retirement Benefits - All Programs - Totaling the contributions and benefits for all retirement programs that each state provides or participates in gives an overall view of the relative contributions of employer and employees and their rankings within the nation. Totaling estimated employee benefits to Indiana state employees, the total estimated annual benefit is \$12,550, for a 41.8% replacement of final salary (24th highest out of the 50 states). This corresponds to a present value of benefits of \$123,158, with a present value of \$88,939 being contributed by the state (16th highest in state effort). The state contribution as a percentage of employee benefits, or 72.2%, ranks Indiana as 13th highest in percentage funded by the state. The present value of the total employee contribution is \$34,219 (32nd highest).

65/10 Scenario with \$60,000 Final Salary - For an individual of the same age and creditable service as above, but with a higher final salary (\$60,000), Indiana is ranked lowest in required employee contributions, 49th in present value of employee benefits, 41st in relative state effort, and 49th in replacement value percentage. For the deferred compensation program, Indiana is ranked 5th in present value of employee benefits, 6th in net employee benefits, and 6th in replacement value. Considering the total retirement program, Indiana is ranked 36th in present value of employer contributions, 34th in employee benefits, 17th in net employee benefits, and 34th in replacement value.

55/30 Scenario with \$30,000 Final Salary - For a 55-year-old employee with 30 years of service and a final year's salary equaling \$30,000, Indiana's statutorily defined benefit formula produces an annual pension benefit of \$9,593, or a replacement value of 32.0% of the final year's salary. This benefit level ranks Indiana as 49^{th} out of the 50 states, the same as for the 65/10 scenario. Because Indiana employees are not required to contribute any salary towards their defined benefit program, all of the \$111,644 in benefits are attributable to state contributions, resulting in a ranking of 32^{nd} in state effort in defined benefit programs (compared to 41^{st} on state effort for the 65/10 scenario).

Indiana's annuity savings account component over a 30-year employment period results in an additional \$4,349 in annual benefit, or 14.5% of replacement value. Because the state is paying the employee contribution, the corresponding present value of benefits of \$50,617 is all due to state effort.

The Indiana deferred compensation plan with the \$390-per-year matching contribution over a 30-year employment period is estimated to result in an additional \$6,623 in annual retirement benefits and an additional 22.1% in salary replacement value. The present value of these estimated benefits is \$77,078, with half contributed by the state. Indiana's rank for state contributions is 4th out of the 12 states that contribute toward an employee's plan.

Indiana's participation in the federal Social Security program for an employee of this age and salary level would provide an estimated \$10,212 in annual retirement benefits, representing \$62,907 in present value of benefits and a 34.0% replacement of salary.

Totaling estimated employee benefits to Indiana state employees, the total estimated annual benefit is \$30,777, for a 102.6% replacement of salary (9th highest). This corresponds to a present value of benefits of \$302,246, with a present value of \$134,634 being contributed by the state (8th highest). The state contribution as a percentage of employee benefits, or 44.5%, ranks Indiana as 11th highest in percentage funded by the states. The present value of the total employee contribution is \$167,612 (29th highest).

55/30 Scenario with \$60,000 Final Salary - For a 55-year-old retiree and 30 years of creditable service, but with a higher final salary (\$60,000), Indiana is ranked lowest in required employee contributions, 49th in present value of employee benefits, 32nd in relative state effort, and 49th in replacement value percentage. For the deferred compensation program, Indiana is ranked 4th in present value of employer contributions, 4th in employee benefits, 5th in net employee benefits, and 4th in replacement value. Considering the total retirement program, Indiana is ranked of employer contributions, 31st in employee benefits, 12th in net employee benefits, and 27th in replacement value.

Comparison of Indiana's Pension Replacement Value - The replacement value associated with the employee's total pension benefit from all programs and for all retirement scenarios are summarized and compared to the replacement value if deferred compensation program benefits are excluded. In all cases, the replacement value declines significantly when excluding deferred compensation benefits, especially in the retirement scenarios involving greater years of service. For 55/30 and \$30,000 final salary scenario, the replacement value decreases from 102.6% to 80.5% when excluding deferred comp benefits. However, relative to other states, Indiana's ranking declines even further, from 9th to 37th, showing the potential importance of the deferred compensation match as part of Indiana's retirement program. Similar results are apparent with the 62/25 and \$30,000 final salary scenario.

It also appears that in a comparison with other states, the deferred compensation program benefits can be relatively more beneficial to lower-salaried individuals. For the 55/30 scenario, when excluding deferred compensation benefits from the replacement value calculation, the relative state rankings are pretty similar. However, the difference is much greater when the deferred compensation benefits are included. These results are consistent for the other two retirement scenarios: 62/25 and 65/10.

A Comparison Study of State Employee Pension Programs

This report provides the results of a comparison study conducted by the Legislative Services Agency for the Pension Management Oversight Commission. This study is for the purpose of comparing Indiana's state employee pension system with other states' systems. This report provides (1) a brief explanation of our assumptions and limitations and a description of the column contents in the attached spreadsheets and (2) a summary of the results for two of the retirement scenarios.

The annual benefit from a defined benefit plan is generally a function of a member's years of service, a final average salary (FAS) computation, and a multiplier. The FAS calculation and the multiplier typically differ between states. The central premise of our study and presentation is that any comparison of states' pension benefits goes further than merely comparing the individual factors in each state's defined benefit formula.

The retiring employee's total net benefit is a result of several factors that go beyond the defined benefit formula's individual components. First among these factors is the employee's contribution level required over the course of employment in order for the employee to receive a benefit upon retirement. A retiring employee will view two pension systems with identical benefit formulas differently if one system requires years of employee contributions while the other system does not. Similarly, two retirement systems that require the same annual employee contributions but have different benefit formulas will provide a different net benefit to the retiree.

Complicating even further any comparison between states, states offer either a defined benefit program, a defined contribution program, or some combination of the two (as in Indiana's two-part plan consisting of a statutorily defined benefit as well as an annuity savings account component). In addition, some states match optional employee contributions for a defined contribution program or deferred compensation plan (e.g., Indiana's 457 Plan).

Finally, some states opt not to participate in the federal Social Security program, thus potentially reducing a retiree's total pension benefits but also relieving both the employer and employee of the program's contribution requirements. A state electing not to participate in Social Security may at least partially compensate with a higher state pension benefit formula or lower employee contribution rates for the state-sponsored plan.

This study takes into account employee benefit levels as well as total employer and employee contribution amounts required to generate those future benefits.

The state of Indiana offers three regular retirement alternatives to its employees. A state employee is eligible for normal retirement benefits if the employee has reached: (1) an age of 65 years while accumulating at least 10 years of creditable service; (2) an age of 60 years while accumulating at least 15 years of creditable service; or (3) the age of 55 with the sum of age and years of service totaling at least 85 (the "Rule of 85"). In addition, an employee may qualify for early retirement with reduced retirement benefits if the employee has reached an age of 50 with at least 15 years of creditable service.

Assumptions -

This study applies the parameters of each other state's retirement system to hypothetical individuals under three retirement scenarios (i.e., age 65 with 10 years of service; age 55 with 30 years of service; and age 62

with 25 years of service). Retirements are assumed to occur on July 1, 2006, with final salaries of \$30,000 or \$60,000. Salary increases are assumed to be those which have actually been provided over the last 30 years. In order to make a consistent comparison, the present value of employee benefits and the present value of employer and employee contributions are computed for each retirement and salary scenario and for each state's pension program.

[Note: A present value computation collapses a cost or benefit stream into a single number for the purpose of making comparisons and is based on the premise that receiving \$1,000 today is worth more than receiving \$1,000 one year from now. For example, if one can invest funds and earn a 7.25% annual return, then receiving \$932.40 today, the present value, is <u>equivalent</u> to receiving \$1,000 a year from now.]

For deferred compensation plans which provide a state match for optional employee contributions, the level of employee participation is assumed to be that which is required to receive the state matching contribution. For example, since the state of Indiana will match up to \$15 per pay period (\$390 per year) for the state's deferred compensation program, this study assumes an annual contribution of \$390 by the state and a \$390 annual contribution by the employee.

Four states have made or are in the process of making substantial changes to their retirement systems. While significant, these changes were not factored into the comparison calculations because they involve new hires or new contribution rates that would not affect the retirement scenarios used in the model. (1) Alaska: Employees hired after 7/1/2006 will be covered by a defined contribution plan, rather than the current defined benefit plan. (2) Illinois: Currently, the state picks up 50% of the employee contribution for most state employees; however, employees resume the full contribution in 2006. (3) Louisiana: New hires beginning 7/1/2006 will contribute 8.00% (rather than 7.5%), and the final average salary calculation will be based on the five highest consecutive years (instead of three). (4) Michigan: New hires after 4/1/1997 are covered under a defined contribution plan with a state contribution of 4%; the state will additionally match an employee contribution of up to 3%.

Information for each state's pension systems is based primarily on those reported in <u>2006 State Employee</u> <u>Benefits Survey: Benefits in Effect January 1, 2006</u> (published by Workplace Economics, Inc., Washington D.C.).

The attached spreadsheets show state comparisons for each of the three retirement scenarios. For each of the component types of retirement programs (i.e., state defined benefit, state defined contribution, state deferred compensation, and federal Social Security), there are eight columns presented in the summary spreadsheets. A description of the contents for each spreadsheet column follows.

• The column headed "**EE Contrib.**" (i.e., employ<u>ee</u> contributions) represents the estimated present value of required employee contributions made over each retirement scenario's employment duration. Optional employee contributions are not considered unless required to obtain a state match. [Note: The column to the right titled "Rnk" represents the ranking for that state.]

[Example: The examples in this explanation are for the retirement scenario of age 65 with 10 years of service and a final salary of \$30,000 (See Appendix A). Alabama's present value of employee contributions is calculated as \$18,802. The present value number of \$18,802 is equivalent to the accumulation of Alabama's required 5.00% employee contribution rate over the 10-year period, taking into account salary growth plus investment earnings of 7.25% per year. In other words, the value to the employee of contributing a \$18,802 lump sum on July 1, 2006, is <u>equivalent</u> to paying

5.00% of salary over the 10-year period.]

٠

The column headed "**EE Benefits**" (i.e., employee benefits) represents either the present value of the statutorily defined benefit amount or, in the case of defined contribution or deferred compensation plans, the present value of employer and employee contributions. (A 7.25% annual investment return is assumed, the same rate PERF assumes in their fund valuations.)

[Example: Alabama provides a statutory annual benefit based on a 2.0125% multiplier times the number of years of service times the final average salary calculation based on the 3 highest years over a 10-year period. Alabama's present value of employee pension benefits is calculated as \$58,092. The present value number of \$58,092 is the amount needed today to pay the employee's benefits over the employee's estimated remaining life, taking into account assumed investment earnings of 7.25% per year. In other words, the value to the employee of receiving a \$58,092 lump sum on July 1, 2006, is equal to an annual benefit based on the statutory formula for the remainder of the employee's expected life.]

The column headed "**Net EE Benefits**" (i.e., net employee benefits) is the difference between the present value of employee benefits and the present value of employee contributions, which represents the benefits attributable to a source of funds other than employee contributions (in this case, state contributions or obligations). This amount represents a measure of each state's effort toward the provision of retirement benefits.

[Example: The use of present value calculations allows subtracting the employee's present value of contributions from the employee's present value of benefits, which gives the net employee benefits, or that amount of benefits attributable to some source other than employee contributions (i.e., employer contributions). In Alabama's case, the present value amount of benefits attributable to state contributions is \$39,290 for their defined benefit program. This number can be compared to the same number for other states as a measure of a state's relative effort in the provision of pension benefits.]

The column headed "**Repl. Value %**" (i.e., replacement value) represents the percentage of an employee's final year's salary replaced by the annual benefit from that component of the state's pension system.

[Example: In Alabama's case, the state defined benefit program provides an annual benefit to the retiree of 19.7% of the retiree's final salary.]

Data similar to that described in the column descriptions, above, for states' defined benefit programs are also provided for each state's defined contribution, deferred compensation, and federal Social Security programs, when applicable. However, an additional column is provided in the "Total - All Programs" section.

• The columns in the "Total - All Programs" section represent totals for all of each state's retirement benefit programs. This section also has one additional column headed "% Fund By State" and represents an estimate of the percentage of the employee's total benefit that is attributable to each state's contributions.

[Example: This number is calculated from the percentage that the present value of net employee benefits (i.e., benefits attributable to state funding) represents of the total employee benefits. In Alabama's case, 62.7% of a retiree's total benefit is attributable to sources other than the employee

(i.e., the <u>state</u> or other sources) and the balance, or 37.3%, is attributable to the <u>employee's</u> contributions.]

The final two columns of the table represent data excluding each state's deferred compensation program.

• The next-to-last column of the table, headed "**Replace. Value % w/o Def Comp**", is the replacement value represented by the <u>total</u> annual pension benefit from all component programs exclusive of deferred compensation benefits. The final column represents the state ranking for this value.

[Example: Alabama's retirement system considering all components except benefits from the deferred compensation program would provide an annual benefit of 43.4% of the retiree's final salary. Alabama's "replacement value" for all components exclusive of deferred compensation ranks 8^{th} highest out of all states.]

Caveats -

This model does not factor in differences in state policies for cost-of-living allowances (COLAs) or tax rates and tax treatment of benefits. Accounting for these differences, while important, would add substantially to the difficulty of the present value calculations.

It is also important to note that this state-by-state comparison only includes those factors related to a state's pension system and the provision of cash retirement benefits. Retiree health insurance or other retiree benefits are not considered here.

Also, differences in average state employee salary levels and the cost of living in the various states are not considered here. While it is true that a given level of pension benefit may go further in some states than others due to geographically related cost-of-living differences, it is also true that retirees are free to move to lower-or higher-cost states, thus complicating any effective comparison.

Indiana's State Employee Pension System (Age 65/10 Year Service/\$30,000 Salary Scenario)-

The following results are for a hypothetical 65-year-old employee with 10 years of service and a final year's salary equaling \$30,000 (See Appendix A).

Defined Benefit Program -

Indiana's statutorily defined benefit formula provides for an annual benefit of 1.1% times the retiree's years of creditable service times the retiree's final average salary over five years (based on the 20 highest calendar quarters). For a 65-year-old employee with 10 years of service and a final year's salary equaling \$30,000, the formula produces an annual pension benefit of \$3,198, or a replacement value of 10.7% of the final year's salary. (The present value of this stream of annual benefits over the expected remaining life of a 65-year-old individual totals \$31,378, shown in the "**EE Benefits**" column.) This benefit level ranks Indiana as 49th out of the 50 states [Nebraska has no defined benefit program.].

However, while 36 states require their state employees to contribute a portion of their salary towards the defined benefit program, Indiana is one of 14 states that do not. The benefit is funded through state

appropriations and investment earnings on money in the Public Employees' Retirement Fund. Consequently, all of the \$31,378 in benefits are attributable to state contributions, resulting in a ranking of 41st on state effort among the defined benefit programs.

Nevada requires the highest employee contribution of 10.5% of salary (resulting in a present value of employee contributions of \$39,484). Nevada's benefit formula also produces the 2nd highest annual benefit level of \$7,604 with a replacement value of 25.3% of salary (a present value of benefits of \$74,617). However, because of the required employee contributions, Nevada's state effort only ranks 33rd among the states. [Again, Nevada's state effort of \$35,133 equals the difference between the present value of employee benefits of \$74,617 and the present value of employee contributions of \$39,484.] [Note: While Nevada's system produces the second highest annual benefit among all defined benefit programs, as will be described later, Nevada has elected to not participate in the federal Social Security program.]

New Mexico's benefit formula provides the highest annual benefit of \$8,825 (replacement value of 29.4%), with a present value of benefits of \$86,597. New Mexico's required employee contribution rate ranks 9^{th} for a present value of employee contributions of \$27,902, resulting in a present value of state effort of \$58,695, 2^{nd} highest in the nation.

Wyoming maintains the greatest state effort by providing \$61,339 in present value of employee benefits with no required employee contributions. The annual benefit payment of \$6,251 has a replacement value of 20.8%.

On the other hand, Rhode Island has the lowest state effort of the states with a defined benefit program, with a present value of \$16,168. Rhode Island employees are required to contribute the 3^{rd} highest rate of 8.75% of salary, resulting in a present value of employee contributions of \$32,903, in order to receive a \$5,001 annual benefit (with a present value of \$49,071 and a ranking of 32^{rd}).

Defined Contribution Program -

Indiana also has as part of the retirement pension program an annuity savings account component, similar in function to a defined contribution program. This component requires employee contributions of 3% of salary. However, the state of Indiana pays this amount for its state employees. Funds are invested in member-determined investment options, with the resulting contributions and investment earnings available to the employee upon retirement along with the monthly pension benefit from the defined benefit component. This level of contributions over a 10-year employment period results in an additional \$1,150 in annual benefit, or 3.8% of replacement value. Because the state is paying the employee contribution, the corresponding present value of benefits of \$11,281 is all due to state effort.

The only other state with a defined contribution program is Nebraska, which has no defined benefit program. Annual employee benefits amount to \$5,180, or 17.3% of replacement value. The corresponding present value of benefits is \$41,665, of which \$25,383 is contributed by the state.

[Note: Alaska employees hired after July 1, 2006, will be covered by a defined contribution plan, and Michigan employees hired after April 1, 1997, are covered by a defined contribution plan. Neither plan is considered here because they are new enough that a direct comparison of employees cannot be made.]

Deferred Compensation Program -

Indiana offers to its employees the opportunity to invest in a deferred compensation plan (i.e., 457 Plan), as do most other states. However, Indiana is one of 12 states that contribute toward an employee's plan. Indiana offers to match a state employee's contribution up to \$15 per pay period, or \$390 per year. This is estimated to result in an additional \$1,111 in annual retirement benefits and an additional 3.7% in salary replacement value. The present value of these estimated benefits is \$10,905, with half contributed by the state. Indiana's rank for state contributions is 5th out of the 12 states.

The state of Minnesota contributes the most toward the employees' deferred compensation plans, \$16,777 in matching funds. The state contribution plus the employee's contribution results in an annual benefit of \$3,419, representing a replacement value of 11.4% of salary and a present value of \$33,554.

Of the 12 contributing states, Delaware's state contribution is the least with a present value of \$1,678. The resulting annual benefit \$342 represents a present value of \$3,355 and a salary replacement value of 1.1%.

Social Security Program -

Seven states do not participate in the federal Social Security program: Alaska, Colorado, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Nevada, and Ohio. Not participating in the program results in no Social Security benefits to employees upon retirement that are attributable to state employment. However, it also eliminates employer and employee contributions to the program, relieving each of a contribution of 7.65% of salary.

Indiana and 42 other states have elected to participate. Once electing to participate, a state may not withdraw. Participation in the program for an employee of this age and salary level would provide an estimated \$7,092 in annual retirement benefits, representing \$69,594 in present value of benefits and a 23.6% replacement of salary. After subtracting off the present value of employee contributions of \$28,767, the balance equal to \$40,827 in present value represents the state effort for this individual. [While contributions are shared equally between employer and employee, it is assumed that the reason the present value of employee contributions estimate is less than the employer effort is that the benefits for this employee category (age 65/10 years of service) are subsidized by other employee categories.]

Total Retirement Benefits - All Programs -

Totaling the contributions and benefits for all retirement programs that each state provides or participates in gives an overall view of the relative contributions of employer and employees and their rankings within the nation.

Totaling estimated employee benefits to Indiana state employees, the total estimated annual benefit is 12,550, for a 41.8% replacement of salary (24^{th} highest out of the 50 states). This corresponds to a present value of benefits of 123,158, with a present value of \$88,939 being contributed by the state (16^{th} highest in state effort). The state contribution as a percentage of employee benefits, or 72.2%, ranks Indiana as 13^{th} highest in percentage funded by the state. The present value of the total employee contribution is \$34,219 (32^{nd} highest).

State retirees in New Mexico have the highest total annual benefit of \$15,917, representing a replacement value estimated to be 53.1% of salary. This corresponds to the highest present value of benefits of \$156,190, the 4th highest required employee contributions (present value of \$56,669) and the 4th highest state contribution level (\$99,521 in present value). The state contribution as a percentage of employee benefits,

or 63.7%, ranks New Mexico as 26th highest in percentage funded by the states.

At the other end of the spectrum, state retirees in Alaska have the lowest total annual benefit of \$5,814, representing a replacement value estimated to be 19.4% of salary. This corresponds to the lowest present value of benefits of \$57,051, the lowest required employee contributions (present value of \$25,383) and the 48th highest state contribution level (\$31,669 in present value). The state contribution as a percentage of employee benefits, or 55.5%, ranks Alaska as 44th highest in percentage funded by the states.

Rhode Island requires the highest employee contribution level with a present value of \$61,670. However, coupled with the 43^{rd} highest state effort, the annual benefit is only 30^{th} in the nation at \$12,093, a present value of benefits of \$118,665.

65/10 with \$60,000 Final Salary -

For an individual of the same age as above (65 years) and the same amount of creditable service (10 years), but with a higher final salary (\$60,000), the relative rankings of the state programs change some but not by a great amount. (See Appendix B for present values and ranks. See Appendix G for a comparison of all of the retirement and salary scenarios for Indiana, only.)

The higher salary level results in a greater present value of employee benefits (\$62,756) for the Indiana defined benefit program, and since the employee makes no contribution, all is due to state effort. The annual benefit of \$6,395 represents 10.7% replacement of final salary. Compared to the same scenario with a \$30,000 final salary, Indiana's relative rankings for the defined benefit program remain the same, being ranked lowest in required employee contributions, 49th in present value of employee benefits, 41st in relative state effort, and 49th in replacement value percentage. The relative rankings for Nevada, New Mexico, Rhode Island, and Wyoming are the same as described above for an individual with a \$30,000 final salary.

For the annuity savings account component of the Indiana retirement program, the present value of employee benefits total \$22,562, and again, all of the benefits are due to state contributions. This results in an additional annual benefit of \$2,299 for an additional 3.8% of replacement value.

The present value of benefits associated with the deferred compensation program is estimated to be \$10,905, half of which is attributable to state matching funds. The annual benefit is estimated to be \$1,111 and an additional replacement value of 1.9%. Among the 12 states with contributions to employee deferred compensation plans, Indiana's relative rankings decline, largely because Colorado's and Utah's contributions are based on a percentage of salary while all of the other states match or contribute a specific dollar amount. Indiana's ranking drops for the amount of employee contributions required to receive the state matching funds (from 4th to 5th), the amount of resulting estimated benefits (from 4th to 6th), relative state effort (from 5th to 6th).

Because Colorado's and Utah's contributions are based on a percentage of salary, their relative rankings increased. For the amount of employee contributions required to receive the state matching funds, Colorado's ranking increased from 9th to 4th. For the amount of resulting estimated benefits, Colorado increased from 9th to 4th, and Utah increased from 11th to 5th. For relative state effort, Colorado increased from 10th to 5th, and Utah increased from 4th to 3rd. And for replacement value percentage, Colorado increased from 9th to 4th, and Utah increased from 11th to 5th. Rankings for all other states either fell or remained the same.

The present value of employee benefits from the Social Security program total \$96,089 and an annual benefit of \$9,792. The replacement value percentage for all states participating in the federal Social Security program, including Indiana, fell from 23.6% for an individual with a final salary of \$30,000, to only 16.3% for an individual with a final salary of \$60,000.

Considering all components of the Indiana retirement program, the present value of employee benefits totals \$192,312, \$129,326 of which is a result of contributions from a source other than the employee. The total estimated annual benefit is \$19,598 and a replacement value of 32.7%. For the total retirement package for an employee with a \$60,000 final salary compared to a \$30,000 salary, Indiana's relative rankings drop for the amount of employee contributions (from 32nd to 36th), the amount of resulting estimated benefits (from 24th to 34th), relative state effort (from 16th to 17th), and replacement value percentage (from 24th to 34th). However, the relative ranking of the percent of present value of employee benefits funded by a source other than the employee actually increased marginally from 13th to 12th.

Indiana's State Employee Pension System (Age 55/30 Years Service/\$30,000 Salary Scenario)-

The following results are for Indiana's retirement scenario at the other extreme of age and years of service than the 65/10 scenario described above: a younger retiree with more years of service and who meets the "rule of 85" requirements. In this example, the retiree is a 55-year-old employee with 30 years of service and a final year's salary equaling \$30,000. (See Appendix E for present values and ranks. See Appendix G for a comparison of all of the retirement and salary scenarios for Indiana, only.)

Defined Benefit Program -

For a 55-year-old employee with 30 years of service and a final year's salary equaling \$30,000, Indiana's statutorily defined benefit formula produces an annual pension benefit of \$9,593, or a replacement value of 32.0% of the final year's salary. (The present value of this stream of annual benefits over the expected remaining life of a 55-year-old individual totals \$111,644, shown in the "**EE Benefits**" column.) This benefit level ranks Indiana as 49th out of the 50 states, the same as for the 65/10 scenario.

Because Indiana employees are not required to contribute any salary towards their defined benefit program, all of the \$111,644 in benefits are attributable to state contributions, resulting in a ranking of 32nd in state effort in defined benefit programs (compared to 41st on state effort for the 65/10 scenario).

Nevada requires the highest employee contribution of 10.5% of salary (resulting in a present value of employee contributions of \$177,159). Nevada's benefit formula also produces the 2nd highest annual benefit level of \$22,312 with a replacement value of 74.4% of salary (a present value of benefits of \$259,671). However, because of the required employee contributions, Nevada's state effort only ranks 45th among the states. [Again, Nevada's state effort of \$82,512 equals the difference between the present value of employee benefits of \$259,671 and the present value of employee contributions of \$177,159.]

New Mexico's benefit formula provides the highest annual benefit of 26,474 (replacement value of 88.2%), with a present value of benefits of 308,113. New Mexico's required employee contribution rate ranks 9^{th} for a present value of employee contributions of 125,192, resulting in a present value of state effort of 182,921, 5^{th} highest in the nation.

Wyoming maintains the greatest state effort by providing \$224,666 in present value of employee benefits with

no required employee contributions. The annual benefit payment of 19,304 has a replacement value of 64.3%, 12^{th} highest in the nation.

On the other hand, South Dakota has the lowest state effort of the states with a defined benefit program, with a present value of \$65,661. South Dakota employees are required to contribute 6.0% of salary, resulting in a present value of employee contributions of \$101,234, in order to receive a \$14,340 annual benefit (with a present value of \$166,894 and a ranking of 42nd). [South Dakota replaces Rhode Island (see 65/10 scenario, above) as the state with the lowest state effort. Rhode Island's defined benefit program has a tiered benefit formula resulting in a relatively higher benefit for individuals with greater length of service.]

Defined Contribution Program -

Indiana's annuity savings account component over a 30-year employment period results in an additional \$4,349 in annual benefit, or 14.5% of replacement value. Because the state is paying the employee contribution, the corresponding present value of benefits of \$50,617 is all due to state effort.

The only other state with a defined contribution program is Nebraska, which has no defined benefit program. Annual employee benefits amount to \$5,180, or 17.3% of replacement value. The corresponding present value of benefits is \$186,945, of which \$113,888 is contributed by the state.

[Note: Alaska employees hired after July 1, 2006, will be covered by a defined contribution plan, and Michigan employees hired after April 1, 1997, are covered by a defined contribution plan. Neither plan is considered here because they are new enough that a direct comparison of employees cannot be made.]

Deferred Compensation Program -

The Indiana deferred compensation plan with the \$390-per-year matching contribution over a 30-year employment period is estimated to result in an additional \$6,623 in annual retirement benefits and an additional 22.1% in salary replacement value. The present value of these estimated benefits is \$77,078, with half contributed by the state. Indiana's rank for state contributions is 4th out of the 12 states.

The state of Minnesota again contributes the most toward the employees' deferred compensation plans, equal to a present value of \$237,163, resulting in an annual benefit of \$20,378 representing a replacement value of 67.9% of salary.

Of the 12 contributing states, Delaware's state contribution is the least with a present value of \$11,858. The resulting annual benefit \$2,038 representing a present value of \$23,716 and a salary replacement value of 6.8%.

Social Security Program -

Indiana's participation in the federal Social Security program for an employee of this age and salary level would provide an estimated \$10,212 in annual retirement benefits, representing \$62,907 in present value of benefits and a 34.0% replacement of salary. [The fact that the present value of employee contributions greatly outweighs the present value of employee benefits is partially due to the fact that no cost-of-living increases are built into the present value calculations. It may also imply that employers and employees of this age and service category subsidize other employee categories.]

Total Retirement Benefits - All Programs -

Totaling estimated employee benefits to Indiana state employees, the total estimated annual benefit is 30,777, for a 102.6% replacement of salary (9th highest out of the 50 states). This corresponds to a present value of benefits of 302,246, with a present value of 134,634 being contributed by sources other than the employee (8th highest). The state contribution as a percentage of employee benefits, or 44.5%, ranks Indiana as 11th highest in percentage funded by the states. The present value of the total employee contribution is 167,612 (29th highest).

State retirees in Minnesota have the highest total annual benefit of \$45,415, representing a replacement value estimated to be 151.4% of salary. This corresponds to the highest present value of benefits of \$472,611, the highest required employee contributions (present value of \$315,144) and the 4th highest state contribution level (\$157,468). The state contribution as a percentage of employee benefits, or 33.3%, ranks Minnesota as 24th highest in percentage funded by the states.

At the other end of the spectrum, state retirees in Hawaii have the lowest total annual benefit of \$21,243, representing a replacement value estimated to be 70.8% of salary. This corresponds to the lowest present value of benefits of \$191,287, the 41st highest required employee contributions (present value of \$129,073) and the 33rd highest state contribution level (\$62,214). The state contribution as a percentage of employee benefits, or 32.5%, ranks Hawaii as 26th highest in percentage funded by the states.

55/30 with \$60,000 Final Salary -

For an individual of the same age as above (55 years) and the same amount of creditable service (30 years), but with a higher final salary (\$60,000), the relative rankings of the state programs change some but not by a great amount. (See Appendix F for present values and ranks. See Appendix G for a comparison of all of the retirement and salary scenarios for Indiana, only.)

The higher salary level results in a greater present value of employee benefits (\$223,289) for the defined benefit program, and since the employee makes no contribution, all is due to state effort. The annual benefit of \$19,186 represents 32.0% replacement of final salary. Compared to the same scenario with a \$30,000 final salary, Indiana's relative rankings for the defined benefit program remain the same, being ranked lowest in required employee contributions, 49th in present value of employee benefits, 32nd in relative state effort, and 49th in replacement value percentage. The relative rankings for Nevada, New Mexico, South Dakota, and Wyoming are the same as described above for an individual with a \$30,000 final salary.

For the annuity savings account component of the retirement program, the present value of employee benefits total \$101,234, and again, all of the benefits are due to state contributions. This results in an additional annual benefit of \$8,698 for an additional 14.5% of replacement value.

The present value of benefits associated with the deferred compensation program is estimated to be \$77,078, half of which is attributable to state matching funds. The annual benefit is estimated to be \$6,623 and an additional replacement value of 11.0%. Among the 12 states with contributions to employee deferred compensation plans, Indiana's relative rankings stay about the same. Indiana's ranking for the amount of employee contributions required to receive the state matching funds, replacement value percentage, and the amount of resulting estimated benefits remain at 4th. However, the ranking for relative state effort declined from 4th to 5th.

Because Colorado's and Utah's contributions are based on a percentage of salary, their relative rankings increased from the \$30,000 scenario to the \$60,000 scenario. For the amount of employee contributions required to receive the state matching funds, Colorado's ranking increased from 10th to 6th. For the amount of resulting estimated benefits, Colorado increased from 10th to 6th, and Utah increased from 11th to 10th. For relative state effort, Colorado increased from 11th to 7th, and Utah increased from 9th to 4th. And for replacement value percentage, Colorado increased from 10th to 6th, and Utah increased from 11th to 10th. Rankings for all other states either fell or remained the same.

The present value of employee benefits from the Social Security program total \$96,245 and an annual benefit of \$15,624. The replacement value percentage for all states participating in the federal Social Security program, including Indiana, fell from 34% for an individual with a final salary of \$30,000, to only 26% for an individual with a final salary of \$60,000.

Considering all components of the retirement program, the present value of employee benefits totals \$497,846, \$201,161 of which is a result of contributions from a source other than the employee. The total estimated annual benefit is \$50,131 and a replacement value of 83.6%. For the total retirement package, Indiana's relative rankings drop for the amount of employee contributions (from 29th to 36th), the amount of resulting estimated benefits (from 9th to 31st), relative state effort (from 8th to 12th), and replacement value percentage (from 9rd to 27th). In addition, the relative ranking of the percent of present value of employee benefits funded by the state increased marginally from 11th to 12th.

[An intermediate retiree scenario, age 62 with 25 years of service, is not summarized here. However, spreadsheet summaries are attached in Appendix C (\$30,000 final salary) and Appendix D (\$60,000 final salary). See Appendix G for a comparison of all of the retirement and salary scenarios for Indiana, only.]

Comparison of Indiana's Pension Replacement Value

The replacement value associated with the employee's total pension benefit from all programs (i.e., defined benefit, defined contribution, deferred compensation, and Social Security) and for all retirement scenarios are provided in Appendices A through F (6th column from the right). These replacement values are summarized in Appendix H and compared to the replacement value if deferred compensation program benefits are excluded.

In all cases, the replacement value declines significantly when excluding deferred compensation benefits, especially in the retirement scenarios involving greater years of service. For 55/30 and \$30,000 final salary scenario, the replacement value decreases from 102.6% to 80.5% when excluding deferred comp benefits. However, relative to other states, Indiana's ranking declines even further, from 9th to 37th, showing the potential importance of the deferred compensation match as part of Indiana's retirement program.

Similar results are apparent with the 62/25 and 330,000 final salary scenario. Replacement value decreases from 84.9% to 68.6% when excluding deferred compensation benefits. And Indiana's ranking declines from 10^{th} (for total replacement value) to 36^{th} when excluding deferred compensation benefits. The trend is the same for the 65/10 scenario with the replacement value only decreasing from 41.8% to 38.1%, but ranking falling from 24^{th} to 40^{th} .

It also appears that in a comparison with other states, the deferred compensation program benefits can be relatively more beneficial to lower-salaried individuals. For the 55/30 scenario, when excluding deferred

compensation benefits from the replacement value calculation, the relative state rankings are pretty similar $(37^{th} \text{ for the } 30,000 \text{ final salary compared to } 41^{st} \text{ for the } 60,000 \text{ final salary})$. However, the difference is much greater when the deferred compensation benefits are included (9th for the \$30,000 final salary compared to 27th for the \$60,000 final salary). These results are consistent for the other two retirement scenarios: 62/25 and 65/10.

State Pension Multipliers

A pie chart is provided in Appendix I showing the distribution of multipliers used by states in the calculation of their defined benefit pensions. Indiana, with a multiplier of 1.1%, is one of three states that have a multiplier less than 1.5%. Hawaii has a multiplier of 1.25%, and Nebraska does not have a defined benefit pension. Twenty states have multipliers between 1.5% and 2%, while another 21 states have multipliers between 2% and 2.5%.

Some states also vary their multipliers depending on the employee's years of service. Arizona's multiplier is 2.1% for service less than 20 years, increasing to 2.15% for service between 20 and 25 years, 2.2% for service between 25 and 30 years, and 2.3% for service over 30 years.

References

2006 State Employee Benefits Survey: Benefits in Effect January 1, 2006, Workplace Economics, Inc., Washington D.C., 2006.

Appendices

(A Comparison Study of State Employee Pension Programs)

Appendix A

Scenario: 65 Years/10 Years of Service Credit Assumptions: Interest:

PV of \$1 annual benefit:

 7.25%
 Salary:
 \$ 30,000

 \$9.8130
 PV of 1% Contr.
 3,760.38

SS Monthly Benefit \$ 591

			State Defin	ned Be	enefit Prog	Iram			State D	efined Contr	ribution Pr	ogram		State	Deferred Cor	mpen	sation Pr	ogra	m		Federa	I Social Se	curity Pro	gram	1			Total -	- All Progra	ams					Replace.	
State			Present Va	alue of	F		Repl.		Pr	resent Value	of	Repl.		F	Present Value	of			Repl.		Pre	esent Value	e of	Repl.			Present V	alue o	of		Repl.		% Fund		Value %	
	EE		EE		Net EE		Value		EE	EE	Net EE	Value	EE		EE	N	Net EE		Value		EE	EE	Net EE	Value	EE		EE		Net EE		Value		Ву		w/o	
	Contrib.	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	%	Rnk	Contrib.	Benefits	Benefits	%	Contrib.	Rnk	Benefits Rn	k B	enefits R	lnk	%	Rnk	Contrib.	Benefits	Benefits	%	Contrib.	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	%	Rnk	State	Rnk	Def Comp	Rnk
Alabama	18,802	19	58,092	13	39,290	25	19.7%	6 13	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	<mark>13</mark>	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	47,569	14	127,686	14	80,117	25	43.4%	14	62.7%	29	43.4%	8
Alaska (1)	25,383	12	57,051	22	31,669	38	19.4%	6 22	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13					25,383	50	57,051	50	31,669	48	19.4%	50	55.5%		19.4%	50
Arizona	29,143	6	60,618	11	31,475	40	20.6%	6 11	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	57,910	3	130,211	12	72,302	36	44.2%	12	55.5%		44.2%	6
Arkansas	- 18.802	37	50,082 73,598	31	50,082 54,796	6	17.0%	6 31	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	28,767	40	119,676 143,191	29	90,909	10	40.7%	30	76.0% 66.8%	3	40.7%	25
California Colorado	18,802	19	73,598	3	42,081	4	25.0% 24.5%	6 3	-	-	-	0.0%	3,760	12	7,521	3	- 3.760	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	47,569 33,843	14	143,191 79,685	5	95,622 45,841	5	48.6% 27.1%	5	57.5%	18	48.6% 24.5%	45
Connecticut	30,063	37	38,391	4	38,391	22	13.0%	0 4	-	-	-	0.0%	3,700	12	7,521	3	3,700	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	28,767	40	107,985	44	79,218	26	36.7%	44	73.4%		36.7%	43
Delaware	8,765	32	53,618	25	44,853	15	18.29	6 25				0.0%	1,678	11	3,355 12	2	1.678	12	1.1%	12	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	39,209	28	126,567	22	87,358	19	43.0%	22	69.0%		41.9%	18
Florida	- 0,705	37	47.923	40	47.923	12	16.3%				_	0.0%	-	12	- 12	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69.594	40.827	23.6%	28,767	40		35	88.750	17	39.9%	36	75.5%		39.9%	34
Georgia	4,700	36	58.301	12	53.600	5	19.8%	6 12	-	-	_	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69.594	40.827	23.6%	33,467	36	127.895	13	94.427	6	43.4%	13	73.8%		43.4%	7
Hawaii	-	37	36,082	48	36,082	30	12.3%	6 48	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	28,767	40	105,676	43	76,909	29	35.9%	43	72.8%	12	35.9%	43
Idaho	23,427	15	57,488	20	34,061	34	19.5%	6 20	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	52,194	9	127,082	17	74,888	32	43.2%	17	58.9%		43.2%	14
Illinois (2)	7,521	34	47,851	42	40,330	24	16.3%	6 42	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	36,288	30	117,444	37	81,157	24	39.9%	38	69.1%	16	39.9%	36
Indiana	-	37	31,378	49	31,378	41	10.7%	<mark>6 49</mark>	-	11,281	11,281	3.8%	5,452	4	10,905 4	4	5,452	5	3.7%	4	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	34,219	32		24	88,939	16	41.8%	24	72.2%		38.1%	40
lowa	13,913		57,731	14	43,818	19	19.6%		-	-	-	0.0%	8,388	3	16,777	3	8,388	3	5.7%	3	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	51,069	13	144,102	4	93,033	8	48.9%	4	64.6%		43.3%	10
Kansas	15,042	25	50,515	30	35,473	32	17.2%		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	43,808	22	120,108	28	76,300	31	40.8%	29	63.5%		40.8%	24
Kentucky	18,802	19	57,051	22	38,249	28	19.4%		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	47,569	14	126,645	20	79,076	27	43.0%	20	62.4%		43.0%	16
Louisiana (3)	28,203	8	72,164	4	43,961	17	24.5%	6 4	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13					28,203	49	72,164	46	43,961	45 50	24.5%	46	60.9%		24.5%	46
Maine	28,767	24	57,731	14	28,964 31,736	40	19.6% 13.3%	0 14	-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	-	12	- 1.	3	-	13	0.0%	13	20.767	60 504	40.007	22.69/	28,767	48	57,731	49	28,964	50	19.6%	49	50.2%		19.6%	49 41
Maryland Massachusetts	7,521 33,843	34	39,257 72,164	40	38,320	27	24.5%	6 40	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	2	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	36,288 33,843	30	108,851 72,164	41	72,563 38,320	35	37.0% 24.5%	41	66.7% 53.1%		37.0%	41
Michigan (4)	33,043	37	43,298	45	43,298	20	14.7%	0 4 6 45				0.0%	-	12	- 13	3		13	0.0%	13	28,767	69.594	40,827	23.6%	28,767	40	112,892	30	84.125	21	38.3%	40	74.5%		38.3%	39
Minnesota	15.042	25	48,494	35	33,452	36	16.5%	6 35	_	_	_	0.0%	16,777	1	33,554	1	16,777	1	11.4%	1	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	60,585	2	151,641	2	91,056	9	51.5%	2	60.0%		40.1%	29
Mississippi	27.263	10	57.306	21	30,043	42	19.5%	6 21	-	-	_	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	56,030	6	126,900	19	70,870	37	43.1%	19	55.8%		43.1%	15
Missouri		37	49,071	32	49,071	7	16.7%	6 32	-	-	-	0.0%	4,194	6	8,388	6	4,194	7	2.8%	6	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	32,961	37	127,054	18	94,093	7	43.2%	18	74.1%		40.3%	26
Montana	25,947	11	51,525	29	25,578	47	17.5%	6 29	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	54,714	7	121,119	27	66,405	40	41.1%	27	54.8%	45	41.1%	22
Nebraska	-	37	-	50	-	50	0.0%	6 50	16,282	41,665	25,383	17.3%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	45,049	21	111,259	40	66,209	41	40.9%	28	59.5%	36	40.9%	23
Nevada	39,484	1	74,617	2	35,133	33	25.3%	62	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13					39,484	27	74,617	45	35,133	47	25.3%	45	47.1%		25.3%	44
New Hampshire	18,802	19	48,205	36	29,404	44	16.4%	6 <mark>36</mark>	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	47,569	14	117,799	31	70,230	39	40.0%	32	59.6%	35	40.0%	30
New Jersey	18,802	19	52,478	27	33,676	35	17.8%	6 27	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	47,569	14	122,071	25	74,503	33	41.5%	25	61.0%	32	41.5%	20
New Mexico	27,902	9	86,597	1	58,695	2	29.4%		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	56,669	4	156,190	1	99,521	4	53.1%	1	63.7%		53.1%	1
New York	11,281	31	48,205	36	36,924	29	16.4%		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	40,048	26	117,799	31	77,751	28	40.0%	32	66.0%		40.0%	30
North Carolina	22,562	10	52,149	28	29,586	43	17.7%	6 <u>28</u>	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 10	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	51,329	10	121,742	20	70,413	38 22	41.4%	20	57.8%		41.4%	21 10
North Dakota Ohio	15,042 31,963	25	57,731 63,504	14	42,690 31,541	21	19.6% 21.6%	0 14	-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	-	12	- 10	2	-	13	0.0% 0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	43,808 31,963	22	127,325 63.504	10	83,516 31,541	22	43.3% 21.6%	10	65.6% 49.7%		43.3% 21.6%	48
Oklahoma	13,161	29	57,731	14	44,570	16	19.6%	6 14				0.0%	4,194	6	8,388 6	6	4.194	7	2.8%	6	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	46,122	19	135,713	40 Q	89,591	12	46.1%	40 Q	66.0%		43.3%	40 Q
Oregon	-	37	48,205	36	44,370	11	16.4%	6 36	-	_	_	0.0%	-, 10-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	28,767	40	117,799	31	89,032	15	40.1%	32	75.6%		40.0%	30
Pennsylvania	23,502	13	72,164	4	48,661	9	24.5%		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 10	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	52,269	8	141,758	6	89,488	13	48.2%	6	63.1%		48.2%	3
Rhode Island	32,903	3	49,071	32	16,168	49	16.7%	6 32	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	61,670	1	118,665	30	56,995	43	40.3%	31	48.0%		40.3%	26
South Carolina	23,502	13	52,535	26	29,033	45	17.8%	6 26	-	-	-	0.0%	4,194	6	8,388	6	4,194	7	2.8%	6	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	56,463	5	130,517	11	74,054	34	44.3%	11	56.7%	40	41.5%	19
South Dakota	22,562	16	46,906	43	24,344	48	15.9%	6 43	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	51,329	10	116,500	38	65,171	42	39.6%	39	55.9%	41	39.6%	37
Tennessee	-	37	44,928	44	44,928	14	15.3%	6 44	-	-	-	0.0%	5,033	5	10,066 5	5	5,033	6	3.4%	5	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	33,800	35	124,588	23	90,788	11	42.3%	23	72.9%		38.9%	38
Texas	22,562	16	66,391	8	43,828	18	22.6%	6 8	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	51,329	10	135,985	8	84,655	20	46.2%	8	62.3%		46.2%	4
Utah	-	37	57,731	14	57,731	3	19.6%	6 14	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	5,641 11	1	5,641	4	1.9%	11	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	28,767	40	132,965	10	104,199	2	45.2%	10	78.4%		43.3%	10
Vermont	12,597	30	48,205	36	35,608	31	16.4%	6 36	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	3	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	41,364	25	117,799	31	76,435	30	40.0%	32	64.9%		40.0%	30
Virginia	-	37	49,071	32	49,071	7	16.7%	6 <u>32</u>	-	-	-	0.0%	13,421	2	26,843	2	13,421	2	9.1%	2	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	42,188	24	145,508	3	103,320	3	49.4%	3	71.0%		40.3%	26
Washington	8,461	33	57,051	22	48,590	10	19.4%	0 22	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	5	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	37,228	29	126,645	20	89,417	14	43.0%	20	70.6%		43.0%	16 10
West Virginia	16,922	24	57,731	14	40,809	23	19.6% 16.3%	0 14	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	- 13	2	-	13	0.0%	13	28,767	69,594 69,594	40,827 40.827	23.6%	45,689 28,767	20 40	127,325 117,446	15	81,636	23	43.3%	15	64.1%		43.3% 39.9%	10 35
Wisconsin	-	37	47,852 61,339	41	47,852 61,339	13	16.3%	-	-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	3.355	12	6.711 10		3.355	13	0.0% 2.3%	10	28,767 28,767	69,594 69,594	40,827 40.827	23.6% 23.6%	28,767	40	117,446 137.644	30	88,679 105,522	18	39.9% 46.8%	37	75.5% 76.7%		39.9% 44.5%	35
Wyoming	-	3/	61,339	10	61,339		20.8%	0 10	u -	-	-	0.0%	3,355	10	0,711 10	0	১,	11	2.3%	10	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.0%	32,122	38	137,644		105,522		40.8%	1	10.1%	_	44.5%	5

(1) Alaska: Employees hired after 7/1/2006 will be covered by a defined contribution plan. (2) Illinois: State pickup of 50% of employee contribution for most state employees; employees resume full contribution 1/1/2006.

(3) Louisiana: New hires beginning 7/1/2006 will contribute 8.00% and final average salary will be based on 5 highest consecutive years. (4) Michigan: New hires after 4/1/97 are covered under a defined contribution plan with a state contribution of 4%; state will additionally match an employee contribution of up to 3%.

Souces of Information: Primary sources of data included: (a) 2006 State Employee Benefits Survey: Benefits in Effect January 1, 2006, Workplace Economics, Inc., Washington, D.C.; (b) 2004 Comparative Study of Major Public Employee Retirement Systems. Wisconsin Legislative Council, December 2005; and (c) actuaries for the Indiana Public Employees Retirement Fund; and (d) state pension plan Internet websites.

EE Contrib. - Present value of employee contributions over the employment period.

EE Benefits - Present value of employee benefits over the remaining expected life of the employee.

Net EE Benefits - Present value of employee benefits ("EE Benefits") minum present value of employee contributions ("EE Contrib."). This represents the amount of employee benefits attributable to state effort.

Replacement Value % - Annual pension benefit as a percentage of employee's final year's salary.

Scenario: 65 Years/10 Years of Service Credit

Scenario:	65 Years/10 Years	of Service Credit	
Assumptio	ons:	Interest:	7.25%

PV of \$1 annual benefit:

\$9.8130

Salary: \$ 60,000 PV of 1% Contr. 7,520.77

SS Monthly Benefit \$ 816

			State Defi	ned B	enefit Prog	Iram			State D	efined Cont	ribution Pr	ogram	1	State	e Deferred C	omp	ensation P	roar	am		Federa	Social Se	ecurity Pro	ogram	1		т	otal -	- All Progra	ams					Replace.	<u> </u>
State			Present Va				Repl.	1		resent Value		Repl.			Present Valu	· •	onounonn		Repl.			sent Value		Repl.			Present Va		<u> </u>		Repl.		% Fund		Value %	
Otate	EE		EE	ilue o	Net EE		Value		EE	EE	Net EE	Value	EE		EE		Net EE		Value		EE	EE	Net EE	Value	EE		EE	iue o	Net EE	1	Value		By		w/o	
	Contrib.	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	%	Rnk	Contrib.	Benefits	Benefits	%	Contrib.	Rnk	Benefits F	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk		Rnk	Contrib.	Benefits		%	Contrib.	Rnk		Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	%	Rnk		Rnk	Def Comp	Rnk
Alabama	37,604	19	116,184	13	78,580	25	19.7%	6 13		-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	95,138	13	212,273	13	117,135	25	36.1%	13	55.2%	32	36.1%	8
Alaska (1)	50,765	12	114,102	22	63,337	38	19.4%	6 22	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	01,001	00,000	00,000		50,765	50	114,102	50	63,337	48	19.4%	50	55.5%	31	19.4%	50
Arizona	58,286	6	121,235	11	62,949	40	20.6%	6 11	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57.534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	115.820	2	217.324	11	101,504	35	36.9%	11	46.7%	47	36.9%	6
Arkansas	-	37	100,163	31	100,163	6	17.0%	6 31	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	57,534	40	196,252	27	138,718	8	33.3%	27	70.7%	3	33.3%	24
California	37,604	19	147,195	3	109,591	4	25.0%	6 3	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	95,138	13	243,284	2	148,146	5	41.3%	2	60.9%	19	41.3%	2
Colorado	60,166	5	144,328	4	84,162	22	24.5%	6 4	-	-	-	0.0%	7,521	4	15,042	4	7,521	5	2.6%	4					67,687	32	159,369	44	91,682	40	27.1%	43	57.5%	26	24.5%	45
Connecticut	-	37	77,539	47	77,539	26	13.2%	6 47	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	57,534	40	173,628	42	116,094	26	29.5%	41	66.9%	13	29.5%	41
Delaware	20,046	32	107,235	25	87,190	19	18.2%	6 25	-	-	-	0.0%	1,678	11	3,355	12	1,678	12	0.6%	12	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	79,257	26	206,680	21	127,422	18	35.1%	21	61.7%	17	34.5%	18
Florida	-	37	95,846	40	95,846	12	16.3%	6 40	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	57,534	40	191,935	35	134,401	13	32.6%	35	70.0%	5	32.6%	33
Georgia	9,401	36	116,602	12	107,201	5	19.8%	6 <mark>12</mark>	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	66,935	34	212,690	12	145,756	6	36.1%	12	68.5%	8	36.1%	7
Hawaii	-	37	72,164	48	72,164	30	12.3%		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	57,534	40	168,253	43	110,719	29	28.6%	42	65.8%	14	28.6%	42
Idaho	46,854	15	114,977	20	68,122	34	19.5%	6 20	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	104,388	9	211,065	16	106,677	32	35.8%	16	50.5%	39	35.8%	14
Illinois (2)	15,042	34	95,701	42	80,660	24	16.3%	6 42	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	72,575	29	191,790	37	119,215	24	32.6%	37	62.2%	16	32.6%	35
Indiana	-	37	62,756	49	62,756	41	10.7%	<mark>6 49</mark>	-	22,562	22,562	3.8%	5,452	5	10,905	6	5,452	6	1.9%	6	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	62,986	36		34	129,326	17	32.7%	34	67.2%	12	30.8%	39
lowa	27,827	28	115,462	14	87,635	18	19.6%	6 14	-	-	-	0.0%	8,388	3	16,777	3	8,388	4	2.8%	3	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	93,749	18	228,328	5	134,579	12	38.8%	5	58.9%	21	35.9%	9
Kansas	30,083 37.604	25	101,029 114,102	30	70,946 76,499	32	17.2% 19.4%		-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0% 0.0%	13	57,534 57,534	96,089 96,089	38,555 38,555	16.3%	87,617 95,138	22	197,118 210,191	26	109,501 115,054	31	33.5% 35.7%	20	55.6% 54.7%	30	33.5%	23 16
Kentucky Louisiana (3)	56,406	19	144,328	22	76,499 87,922	20	24.5%		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	10	0.0%	10	57,534	90,069	36,000	16.3%	95,138 56,406	49	144.328	46	87,922	43	35.7% 24.5%	10	54.7% 60.9%	10	35.7% 24.5%	46
Maine	57,534	0	115,462	14	57,922	46	19.6%	0 4 6 14	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12		13		13	0.0%	13					57,534	49	115,462	40	57,922	50	19.6%	40	50.9%	40	19.6%	40
Maryland	15,042	34	78,514	46	63,473	37	13.3%	46				0.0%		12		13		13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	72,575	20	174,603	41	102,028	34	29.7%	40	58.4%	23	29.7%	40
Massachusetts	67.687	2	144,328	40	76,641	27	24.5%	6 4	-	-	-	0.0%		12		13		13	0.0%	13	57,554	30,003	30,333	10.570	67,687	32	144.328	46	76.641	45	24.5%	46	53.1%	36	24.5%	46
Michigan (4)	-	37	86,597	45	86,597	20	14.7%	6 45	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57.534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	57,534	40	182,686	39	125,152	20	31.0%	39	68.5%	9	31.0%	38
Minnesota	30,083	25	96,987	35	66,904	36	16.5%		-	-	-	0.0%	16,777	1	33,554	1	16,777	1	5.7%	1	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	104,394	8	226,630	6	122,236	22	38.5%	6	53.9%	35	32.8%	28
Mississippi	54,526	10	114,612	21	60,087	42	19.5%		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	112,059	4	210,701	17	98,642	37	35.8%	17	46.8%	46	35.8%	15
Missouri	-	37	98,143	32	98,143	7	16.7%	6 32	-	-	-	0.0%	4,194	7	8,388	8	4,194	8	1.4%	8	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	61,728	38	202,620	22	140,892	7	34.4%	22	69.5%	7	33.0%	25
Montana	51,893	11	103,050	29	51,157	47	17.5%	6 29	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	109,427	5	199,139	25	89,712	41	33.8%	25	45.0%	49	33.8%	22
Nebraska	-	37	-	50	-	50	0.0%	6 <mark>50</mark>	32,565	83,330	50,765	8.6%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	90,099	20	179,419	40	89,320	42	25.0%	45	49.8%	41	25.0%	44
Nevada	78,968	1	149,235	2	70,267	33	25.3%	6 2	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13					78,968	27	149,235	45	70,267	47	25.3%	44	47.1%	45	25.3%	43
New Hampshire	37,604	19	96,411	36	58,807	44	16.4%	6 <mark>36</mark>	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	95,138	13	192,500	30	97,362	39	32.7%	30	50.6%	38	32.7%	29
New Jersey	37,604	19	104,955	27	67,351	35	17.8%	6 27	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	95,138	13	201,044	23	105,906	33	34.1%	23	52.7%	37	34.1%	20
New Mexico	55,804	9	173,193	1	117,389	2	29.4%		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	113,338	3	269,282	1	155,944	3	45.7%	1	57.9%	25	45.7%	1
New York	22,562	31	96,411	36	73,849	29	16.4%	6 <u>36</u>	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	80,096	25	192,500	30	112,404	28	32.7%	30	58.4%	24	32.7%	29
North Carolina	45,125	16	104,297	28	59,173	43	17.7%	6 28	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	102,659	10	200,386	24	97,728	38	34.0%	24	48.8%	43	34.0%	21
North Dakota	30,083 63,927	25	115,462 127.008	14	85,379 63.082	21	19.6% 21.6%	6 14	-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	87,617 63.927	22	211,551 127.008	14	123,934 63.082	21	35.9% 21.6%	14	58.6% 49.7%	22	35.9% 21.6%	9 48
Ohio Oklahoma	••,•=·	20	1	9		15		0 9	-	-	-		4,194	12	- 8,388	13	- 4.194	13	0.0%	13	57 524	06.090	38,555	16 20/		21	,	40		49		40		42		40
Oregon	26,323	29	115,462 96,411	14	89,139 96,411	10	19.6% 16.4%	0 14 (36	-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	4,194	12	0,300	13	4,194	0 13	1.4% 0.0%	13	57,534 57,534	96,089 96,089	38,555	16.3% 16.3%	88,051 57,534	21	219,939 192,500	30	131,889 134,966	10	37.4% 32.7%	30	60.0% 70.1%	20	35.9% 32.7%	29
Pennsylvania	47,005	13	144,328	30	97,323	a	24.5%	6 30		-		0.0%		12		13		13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	104,539	40	240,417	30	135,878	9	40.8%	30	56.5%	29	40.8%	29
Rhode Island	65,807	3	98,143	32	32,336	49	16.7%	6 32		_	_	0.0%		12		13		13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	123,341	1	194,232	29	70,891	46	33.0%	29	36.5%	50	33.0%	25
South Carolina	47.005	13	105,071	26	58,066	45	17.8%	6 26	_	-		0.0%	4,194	7	8,388	8	4.194	8	1.4%	8	57.534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	108,733	6	209.548	20	100.815	36	35.6%	20	48.1%	44	34.2%	19
South Dakota	45,125	16	93,813	43	48,688	48	15.9%	6 43	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	57.534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	102,659	10	189,902	38	87,243	44	32.3%	38	45.9%	48	32.3%	36
Tennessee	-	37	89,856	44	89,856	14	15.3%	6 44	-	-	-	0.0%	5,033	6	10,066	7	5.033	7	1.7%	7	57.534	96.089	38,555	16.3%	62,567	37	196,011	28	133,444	15	33.3%	28	68.1%	10	31.6%	37
Texas	45,125	16	132,781	8	87,657	17	22.6%	6 8	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	102,659	10	228,870	4	126,212	19	38.9%	4	55.1%	33	38.9%	4
Utah	-	37	115,462	14	115,462	3	19.6%	6 14	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	11,281	5	11,281	3	1.9%	5	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	57,534	40	222,832	8	165,298	1	37.8%	8	74.2%	1	35.9%	9
Vermont	25,195	30	96,411	36	71,216	31	16.4%	6 36	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	82,728	24	192,500	30	109,771	30	32.7%	30	57.0%	27	32.7%	29
Virginia	-	37	98,143	32	98,143	7	16.7%	6 32	-	-	-	0.0%	13,421	2	26,843	2	13,421	2	4.6%	2	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	70,955	31	221,075	9	150,119	4	37.5%	9	67.9%	11	33.0%	25
Washington	16,922	33	114,102	22	97,181	10	19.4%	6 22	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	74,456	28	210,191	18	135,736	10	35.7%	18	64.6%	15	35.7%	16
West Virginia	33,843	24	115,462	14	81,619	23	19.6%	6 14	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	91,377	19	211,551	14	120,174	23	35.9%	14	56.8%	28	35.9%	9
Wisconsin	-	37	95,704	41	95,704	13	16.3%		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	57,534	40	191,793	36	134,259	14	32.6%	36	70.0%	6	32.6%	34
Wyoming	-	37	122,679	10	122,679	1	20.8%	6 10	-	-	-	0.0%	3,355	10	6,711	11	3,355	11	1.1%	11	57,534	96,089	38,555	16.3%	60,889	39	225,478	7	164,589	2	38.3%	7	73.0%	2	37.2%	5

(1) Alaska: Employees hired after 7/1/2006 will be covered by a defined contribution plan. (2) Illinois: State pickup of 50% of employee contribution for most state employees; employees resume full contribution 1/1/2006. (3) Louisiana: New hires beginning 7/1/2006 will contribute 8.00% and final average salary will be based on 5 highest consecutive years. (4) Michigan: New hires after 4/1/97 are covered under a defined contribution plan.

with a state contribution of 4%; state will additionally match an employee contribution of up to 3%.

Souces of Information: Primary sources of data included: (a) 2006 State Employee Benefits Survey: Benefits in Effect January 1, 2006, Workplace Economics, Inc., Washington, D.C.; (b) 2004 Comparative Study of Major Public Employee Retirement Systems. Wisconsin Legislative Council, December 2005; and (c) actuaries for the Indiana Public Employees Retirement Fund; and (d) state pension plan Internet websites.

EE Contrib. - Present value of employee contributions over the employment period.

EE Benefits - Present value of employee benefits over the remaining expected life of the employee.

Net EE Benefits - Present value of employee benefits ("EE Benefits") minum present value of employee contributions ("EE Contrib."). This represents the amount of employee benefits attributable to state effort.

Replacement Value % - Annual pension benefit as a percentage of employee's final year's salary.

Appendix C

Scenario: 62 Years/25 Years of Service Credit

Assumptions: 62 fe			Interest: ual benefit		7.25% \$10.417	1		PV o	Salary: of 1% Contr.	\$ 30,000 \$ 13,119			PV of \$1 C	Cont.	\$ 65.57						SS Month	ly Benefit	\$ 733									
			State De	fined E	Benefit Pro	gram			State De	efined Cont	ribution Pr	<u> </u>		Stat	e Deferred	Com	pensation	Progra			Federa	I Social Se	curity Pro	U U			Т	otal -	All Progra	ms		
State						_	Repl.					Repl.							Repl.					Repl.		r	 1				Repl.	
	EE Contrib.	Rnk	EE Benefits	Rnk	Net EE Benefits		Value	Rnk	EE Contrib.	EE Benefits	Net EE Benefits	Value %	EE Contrib.	Rnk	EE Benefits	Rnk	Net EE Benefits	Rnk	Value %	Rnk	EE Contrib.	EE Benefits	Net EE Benefits	Value %	EE Contrib.	Rnk	EE Benefits	Rnk	Net EE Benefits	Rnk	Value %	Rn
Alabama	65,595	19	154,170	15	88,57	5 27	49.3%	15	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	165,956	14	245,799	19	79,843	31	78.7%	o <mark>1</mark>
Alaska (1)	88,554	12	168,534	8	79,98	0 32	53.9%	8	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	-		,		88,554	50	168,534	48	79,980	30	53.9%	6 4
Arizona	101,673	6	164,704	11	63,03	1 39	52.7%	11	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	202,034	3	256,332	14	54,298	43	82.0%	5 <mark>1</mark>
Arkansas	-	38	133,601	34	133,60	1 4	42.8%	34	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	100,361	41	225,230	33	124,869	10	72.1%	5 3
California	65,595	19	156,257	13	90,66		50.0%	13	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	165,956	14	247,885	17	81,929	29	79.3%	6 1
Colorado	104,953	5	191,516		86,56		61.3%	3	-	-	-	0.0%	13,119	10	26,238	10	13,119	11	8.4%	10					118,072	36	217,754	38	99,682	22	69.7%	
Connecticut	26,238	34	153,213		126,97		49.0%	16	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	126,599	30	244,841	20	118,242	15	78.3%	<mark>ه 2</mark>
Delaware	27,555	33	148,846	28	121,29		47.6%	28	-	-	-	0.0%	7,868	11	15,736	12	7,868	12	5.0%	12	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	135,784	28	256,211	15	120,426	13	82.0%	o 1
Florida	-	38	121,127	43	121,12		38.8%	43	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	100,361	41	212,755	40	112,394	18	68.1%	
Georgia	16,399	37	154,725		138,32		49.5%	14	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	116,760	38	246,353	18	129,593	9	78.8%	6 1
Hawaii	-	38	95,758		95,75		30.6%	48	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	100,361	41	187,387	47	87,026	27	60.0%	
ldaho	81,732	15	152,568	24	70,83		48.8%	24	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13 13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	182,093	10	244,197	24	62,104	39	78.1%	
Illinois (2)	26,238	34	126,991	41	100,75			41	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	126,599	30	218,620	37	92,021	24	70.0%	63 61
Indiana	48.541	38 28	83,275 153,213	49	83,27 104.67			49 16	-	39,357	39,357	12.6%	25,571	4	51,141	4	25,571	4	16.4% 25.2%	4	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	125,932	33	265,402	10	139,470	6	84.9%	-
lowa Kansas	52.476	28	134.061	10	81.58		49.0%	10		-	-	0.0%	39,339	12	78,679	13	39,339	3	25.2%	3	100,361	91,629 91.629	(8,732)	29.3% 29.3%	188,241 152.837	8	323,520 225,690	20	135,279 72,853	25	103.5%	
	65.595	20	151,408	33	85,81		42.9%	26	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	12	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	165,956	20	243,037	32	72,853	33	77.8%	6 2
Kentucky Louisiana (3)	98.393	19	191,408		93,12		61.3%	20	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	12	100,301	91,029	(0,732)	29.3%	98.393	14	191,516	20	93,123	23	61.3%	-
Maine	100,361	0	153,213		93,12 52,85		49.0%	16	-	-		0.0%	-	12		13		13	0.0%	13					100,361	49	153,213	50	93,123 52,852	45	49.0%	4
Maryland	26.238	34	96.830	47	70.59			47		-	_	0.0%		12		13		13	0.0%	13	100.361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	126,599	30	188,459	46	61.860	40	60.3%	6 4
Massachusetts	118,072	2	190,941		70,33		61.1%	6	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12		13		13	0.0%	13	100,301	31,023	(0,752)	23.370	118.072	36	190,941	45	72,869	34	61.1%	-
Michigan (4)	-	38	114,910	46	114,91		36.8%	46	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	100,361	41	206,538	42	106,177	19	66.1%	6 4
Minnesota	52,476	25	128.697	38	76.22			38	-	-	-	0.0%	78.679	1	157,358	1	78,679	1	50.4%	1	100.361	91.629	(8,732)	29.3%	231,516	1	377.684	1	146.167	4	120.9%	
Mississippi	95,113	10	152,085	25	56,97		48.7%	25	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	195,474	6	243,714	25	48,239	47	78.0%	
Missouri	-	38	130,231	36	130,23		41.7%	36	-	-	-	0.0%	19.670	6	39,339	6	19,670	7	12.6%	6	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	120.031	35	261,199	12	141.168	5	83.6%	6 1
Montana	90,522	11	136,742	32	46,22		43.8%	32	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	190,883	7	228,371	31	37,488	48	73.1%	6 3
Nebraska	-	38	-	50	-	50	0.0%	50	56,806	145,360	88,554	17.3%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	157,167	22	236,988	28	79,822	32	46.6%	6 5
Nevada	137,750	1	194,120	2	56,37	0 45	62.1%	2	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13			,		137,750	27	194,120	43	56,370	42	62.1%	6 4
New Hampshire	65,595	19	127,933	39	62,33	7 40	40.9%	39	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	165,956	14	219,561	35	53,605	44	70.3%	6 B
New Jersey	65,595	19	139,270		73,67		44.6%	30	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	165,956	14	230,899	29	64,943	37	73.9%	s 2
New Mexico	97,344	9	229,819		132,47		73.5%	1	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	197,705	5	321,448	4	123,743	11	102.9%	٥
New York	39,357	31	153,213	16	113,85		49.0%	16	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	139,718	26	244,841	20	105,123	20	78.3%	2 ه
North Carolina	78,715	16	138,397	31	59,68		44.3%	31	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	179,076	11	230,026	30	50,951	46	73.6%	2 ہ
North Dakota	52,476	25	153,213	16	100,73		49.0%	16	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	152,837	23	244,841	20	92,004	25	78.3%	
Ohio	111,512	4	168,534	9	57,02		53.9%	9	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100.05	04.007	(0 =0		111,512	40	168,534	49	57,022	41	53.9%	6 4
Oklahoma	45,917	29	153,213		107,29		49.0%	16	-	-	-	0.0%	19,670	6	39,339	6	19,670	7	12.6%	6	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	165,948	19	284,181	6	118,233	16	90.9%	
Oregon	-	38	127,933		127,93		40.9%	39	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	100,361	41	219,561	35	119,200	14	70.3%	3 ار
Pennsylvania	81,994	13	191,516	3	109,52		61.3%	3	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	182,355	9	283,145	10	100,789	21	90.6%	۲
Rhode Island	114,792	3	156,277	12	41,48		50.0%	12 29	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	215,153	2	247,906	16	32,753	50	79.3%	
South Carolina	81,994	13	139,424	29	57,42		44.6%	29	-	-	-	0.0%	19,670	6	39,339	6	19,670	12	12.6%	6	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	202,025	4	270,392	8	68,367	30	86.5%	
South Dakota	78,715	16	124,485		45,77		39.8%	42	-	-	-	0.0%		12	47 207	13	-	13	0.0%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	179,076	11	216,114	39	37,039	49	69.2%	
Tennessee	- 78.715	38	119,234		119,23 97,48		38.2% 56.4%	44	-	-	-	0.0%	23,604	5 12	47,207	5 13	23,604	12	15.1% 0.0%	0 12	100,361 100.361	91,629 91,629	(8,732)	29.3% 29.3%	123,965 179.076	34	258,070	13	134,105 88,748	26	82.6% 85.7%	1
Texas Utah	/0,/15	10	176,195 153,213		97,48 153,21		56.4% 49.0%	16	-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	-	12	- 19,679	13	- 19,679	13	0.0% 6.3%	13	100,361	91,629 91,629	(8,732) (8,732)	29.3% 29.3%	179,076	44	267,823 264,520	9	88,748 164,159	20	85.7% 84.6%	<i>.</i> .
Vermont	43.949	30	1153,213		71.75			45				0.0%		12	19,079	13	19,079	13	0.3%	13	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3% 29.3%	144.310	25	204,520 207,335	11	63,025	38	84.6% 66.3%	6 1 6 4
Vermont	40,949	50	110,700	40	120.22		31.0%	40		-	-	0.0%	62.043	12	125 996	13	-	13	40.3%	13	100,301	91,029	(0,732)	29.3%	162 204	23	207,335	41	194 442	- 30	00.3%	44

125.886

-

62.943

-

13

13

11

40.3%

0.0%

0.0%

0.0%

100.361

100,361

100.361

100,361

91.629

91,629

91.629

91,629

(8,732)

(8,732)

(8,732)

(8,732)

29.3%

29.3%

29.3%

29.3%

29.3%

163.304

129,879

159.397

100,361

116,097

347.746

243,037

244.841

223,553

289,719

29

41

184,442

113,158

123,192

173,622

85.445

Replace

Value %

w/o

Def Comp

78.7

53.9%

82.0% 72.1%

79.3%

61.3%

78.3%

76.9%

68.1%

78.8%

60.0% 78.1%

70.0%

68.6%

78.3%

72.2%

77.8%

61.3%

49.0%

60.3%

61.1%

66.1%

70.5%

78.0% 71.0%

73.19

46.6%

62.1%

70.3%

73.9%

78.3% 73.6%

78.3%

53.9%

78.3%

70.3%

90.6%

79.3%

73.9%

69.2%

67.5%

85.7%

78.3%

66.3%

71.0%

77.8%

78.3%

71.5%

82.6%

Rnk

1

2

42

2

3

1

34

36

10

26

10

42

49

44

4

3

2

-50

4

32

24

16

33

3

- 29

1

10

2

% Func

By State

32.5

47.5%

21.2%

55.4%

33.1%

45.8%

48.3%

47.0%

52.8%

52.6%

46.4%

25.4%

42.1%

52.6%

41.8%

32.3%

31.7%

48.6%

34.5%

32.8%

38.2%

51.4%

38.7%

19.8%

54.0%

33.7%

29.0%

24.4%

28.1%

38.5% 42.9%

22.1%

37.6%

33.8%

41.6%

54.3%

35.6%

13.2%

25.3%

17.1%

52.0%

33.1%

62.1%

30.4%

53.0%

46.6%

34.9%

55.1%

59.9%

111.3%

77.8%

78.3%

71.5%

92.79

28

10

Rnk

Wyoming - 38 166,619 10 166,619 1 53.3% 10 - - 0.0% 15,736 9 31,472 9 15,736 10 10.1% 9 100,361 91,629 (8,732) (1) Alaska: Employees hired after 7/1/2006 will be covered by a defined contribution plan. (2) Illinois: State pickup of 50% of employee contribution for most state employees; employees resume full contribution 1/1/2006.

-

-

(3) Louisiana: New hires beginning 7/1/2006 will contribute 8.00% and final average salary will be based on 5 highest consecutive years. (4) Michigan: New hires after 4/1/97 are covered under a defined contribution plan

-

with a state contribution of 4%; state will additionally match an employee contribution of up to 3%.

Souces of Information: Primary sources of data included: (a) 2006 State Employee Benefits Survey: Benefits in Effect January 1, 2006. Workplace Economics, Inc., Washington, D.C.; (b) 2004 Comparative Study of Major Public Employee Retirement Systems. Wisconsin Legislative Council, December 2005; and (c) actuaries for the Indiana Public Employees Retirement Fund; and (d) state pension plan Internet websites.

0.0%

0.0%

0.0%

0.0%

62.943

-

1:

EE Contrib. - Present value of employee contributions over the employment period.

130.231

151,408

153.213

131,924

29,518

59,036 24

32

38

Virginia

Washington

Wisconsin

West Virginia

EE Benefits - Present value of employee benefits over the remaining expected life of the employee.

Net EE Benefits - Present value of employee benefits ("EE Benefits") minum present value of employee contributions ("EE Contrib."). This represents the amount of employee benefits attributable to state effort.

-

-

-

Replacement Value % - Annual pension benefit as a percentage of employee's final year's salary.

% Fund by State - Total present value of state effort as a percentage of total present value of all employee benefits.

130,231

121,890

94,177

131,924

41.7

48.4%

49.0%

42.2%

Appendix D

Scenario: 62 Years/25 Years of Service Credit

5 rears of Service Credit			
Interest:	7.25%	Salary:	\$ 60,000

Assumptions:	Interest:	7.25%	Salary: \$ 60,000		
	PV of \$1 annual benefit:	\$10.4171	PV of 1% Contr. \$ 26,238	PV of \$1 Cont.	\$ 65.57

			State Defi	ined B	enefit Progr	ram			State De	fined Cont	ribution Pro	ogram		State D	eferred C	ompe	ensation Pro	ograr	m		Federal	Social Se	curity Pro	gram	T		Т	fotal - A	All Progra	ams					Replace.	
State							Repl.					Repl.							Repl.					Repl.							Repl.		% Fund		Value %	
	EE		EE		Net EE		Value		EE	EE	Net EE	Value	EE		EE		Net EE		Value		EE	EE	Net EE	Value	EE		EE		Net EE		Value		Ву		w/o	
		Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	%	Rnk	Contrib.	Benefits	Benefits	%	Contrib.	Rnk Be	enefits F	Rnk	Benefits R	lnk		Rnk			Benefits	%		Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	Benefits		%	Rnk	State	Rnk	Def Comp	Rnk
	131,191	19	308,341 337.068	15	177,150 159,960	27	49.3% 53.9%	15	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	331,913	14	451,847 337.068	16	119,933 159,960		72.3% 53.9%	16	26.5% 47.5%	36	72.3%	9
	177,108 203,346	12	329,407	11	126,061	32	53.9% 52.7%	11			-	0.0% 0.0%		12		13		13	0.0% 0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	177,108 404,068	2	472,913	47	68,845		53.9% 75.7%	40	47.5%	13	53.9% 75.7%	40
Arkansas	203,340	38	267,203	34	267.203	4	42.8%	34				0.0%		12		13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	200.722	41	410,709	34	209,987	7	65.7%	33	51.1%	70	65.7%	27
	131.191	19	312,513	13	181.322	26	50.0%	13	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	331,913	14	456.019		124.106	31	73.0%	14	27.2%	35	73.0%	7
	209,906	5	383,032	3	173,126	28	61.3%	3	-	-	-	0.0%	26,238	4 5	52,476	4	26,238	5	8.4%	4		,	(**)= **)		236,144	33	435,508		199,364		69.7%	27	45.8%	15	61.3%	39
Connecticut	52,476	34	306,425	16	253,949	10	49.0%	16	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	253,199	30	449,931	17	196,733	13	72.0%	17	43.7%	16	72.0%	12
Delaware	66,913	32	297,692	28	230,779	14	47.6%	28	-	-	-	0.0%	7,868	<mark>11</mark> 1	15,736	12	7,868	12	2.5%	12	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	275,503	26	456,934	12	181,431	18	73.1%	12	39.7%	19	70.6%	21
Florida	-	38	242,253	43	242,253	12	38.8%	43	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	200,722	41	385,759		185,037	17	61.7%	40	48.0%	11	61.7%	38
Georgia	32,798	37	309,449	14	276,651	3	49.5%	14	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	233,520	35	452,955		219,435		72.5%	15	48.4%	10	72.5%	8
Hawaii	- 163.464	38	191,516 305,137	48	191,516 141,673	23	30.6% 48.8%	48	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	200,722 364,186	41	335,022	49	134,300		53.6%	48	40.1% 18.8%		53.6% 71.8%	48 17
Idaho Illinois (2)	163,464 52,476	10	305,137 253,982	24 11	201,505	20	48.8% 40.6%	24		-		0.0% 0.0%		12		13		13	0.0% 0.0%	13	200,722 200,722	143,506 143,506	(57,216) (57,216)	23.0% 23.0%	364,186 253,199	30	448,643 397,488	21	84,456 144,289		71.8% 63.6%	21	18.8% 36.3%	42	71.8% 63.6%	17 34
Indiana	32,410	38	166,549	49	166,549	30	26.6%	41		78,715	78,715	12.6%	25,571	5 5	51.141	5	25,571	6	8.2%	5	200,722 200,722	143,506	(57,216) (57,216)	23.0% 23.0%	255,199 226,293	36	439.911	26	213,618	6	70.4%	26	48.6%	22	63.0%	34 36
lowa	97.081	28	306.425	16	209.344	19	49.0%		-	-	-	0.0%	39.339		78.679	3	39.339	4	12.6%	3	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	337,143	13	528.610		191.467	14	84.6%	4	36.2%	23	72.0%	10
Kansas	104,953	25	268,122	33	163,169	31	42.9%	33	- 1	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	305,675	22	411,628	33	105,953	37	65.9%	32	25.7%	37	65.9%	26
Kentucky	131,191	19	302,817	26	171,626	29	48.4%	26	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	331,913	14	446,323	23	114,409		71.4%	23	25.6%	38	71.4%	19
Louisiana (3)	196,787	8	383,032	3	186,245	25	61.3%	3	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13					196,787	49	383,032	42	186,245		61.3%	41	48.6%	8	61.3%	39
	200,722	7	306,425	16	105,703	46	49.0%	16	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13					200,722	48	306,425	50	105,703		49.0%	49	34.5%	25	49.0%	49
Maryland	52,476	34	193,661	47	141,184	38	31.0%	47	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	253,199	30	337,167	46	83,968		53.9%	45	24.9%	39	53.9%	45
	236,144	2	381,883	6	145,739	35	61.1%	6	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	000 700	4 40 500	(57.040)	00.00/	236,144	33	381,883	43	145,739		61.1%	42	38.2%	20	61.1%	42
Michigan (4)	- 104.953	38	229,819 257,394	40	229,819 152,441	15	36.8% 41.2%	40	-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	- 78.679	12	- 57,358	13	78,679	13	0.0% 25.2%	13	200,722 200,722	143,506 143,506	(57,216) (57,216)	23.0% 23.0%	200,722 384,354	41	373,325 558,258	45	172,603 173,904		59.7% 89.3%	44	46.2% 31.2%	14	59.7% 64.1%	44 31
Minnesota Mississippi	104,955	25	304,170	25	113,943	33	41.2%	25				0.0%	70,079	12	57,356	13	/0,0/9	13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	390,949	0	447,676	22	56,727	47	71.6%	22	12.7%	29	71.6%	18
Missouri	-	38	260.462	36	260.462	7	40.7%	36		-		0.0%	19.670	7 3	39.339	8	19.670	8	6.3%	8	200,722	143,500	(57,210)	23.0%	220.392	39	443.307		222.915	47	70.9%	25	50.3%		64.6%	29
Montana	181,044	11	273,485	32	92,441	47	43.8%	32	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	381,766	7	416,991	32	35,225		66.7%	31	8.4%	49	66.7%	25
Nebraska	-	38	-	50	-	50	0.0%	50	113,611	290,719	177,108	8.6%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	314,334	20	434,225	28	119,892		31.6%	50	27.6%	34	31.6%	50
Nevada	275,501	1	388,241	2	112,740	45	62.1%	2	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13					275,501	27	388,241	40	112,740		62.1%	39	29.0%	32	62.1%	37
	131,191	19	255,865	39	124,674	40	40.9%	39	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	331,913	14	399,371	36	67,458		63.9%	35	16.9%	43	63.9%	32
	131,191	19	278,541	30	147,350	34	44.6%	30	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	331,913	14	422,047	30	90,133		67.5%	29	21.4%	41	67.5%	23
New Mexico	194,687	9	459,638	1	264,951	5	73.5%	1	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	395,410	3	603,144		207,734		96.5%	1	34.4%		96.5%	1
New York	78,715 157,429	31	306,425 276,795	10	227,711 119,365	16	49.0% 44.3%	10	-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	200,722 200,722	143,506 143,506	(57,216) (57,216)	23.0% 23.0%	279,437 358,151	25	449,931 420,301	17	170,494 62,149		72.0% 67.2%	17	37.9% 14.8%	21	72.0% 67.2%	12 24
North Carolina North Dakota	157,429	25	306,425	16	201.473	21	44.3%	16				0.0%		12		13		13	0.0% 0.0%	13	200,722	143,506		23.0%	305,675	22	420,301 449,931	17	144,256		72.0%	17	32.1%	28	72.0%	24 12
	223,025	4	337,068	9	114.043	43	49.0% 53.9%	9		-	_	0.0%		12		13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	1-10,000	(01,210)	20.070	223.025	38	337,068		114,043		53.9%	47	33.8%	27	53.9%	47
Oklahoma	91,834	29	306,425	16	214,592	18	49.0%	16	l - 1	-	-	0.0%	19,670	7 3	39,339	8	19,670	8	6.3%	8	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	312,226	21	489,271	9	177,045		78.3%	9	36.2%	24	72.0%	10
Oregon	-	38	255,865	39	255,865	9	40.9%	39	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	200,722	41	399,371	36	198,649	12	63.9%	35	49.7%	7	63.9%	32
Pennsylvania	163,989	13	383,032	3	219,043	17	61.3%	3	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	364,711	8	526,538	5	161,827	23	84.2%	5	30.7%	30	84.2%	2
	229,584	3	312,554	12	82,970	49	50.0%	12	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	430,306	1	456,060	13	25,753	50	73.0%	13	5.6%	50	73.0%	6
South Carolina	163,989	13	278,847	29	114,858	42	44.6%	29	-	-	-	0.0%	19,670	7 3	39,339	8	19,670	8	6.3%	8	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	384,381	5	461,692	11	77,312	43	73.9%	11	16.7%	44	67.6%	22
South Dakota	157,429	16	248,971	42	91,541	48	39.8%	42	-	-	-	0.0%		12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	358,151	10	392,477	39	34,325		62.8%	38	8.7%	48	62.8%	35 41
Tennessee Texas	- 157.429	38	238,468 352,389	44	238,468 194,960	13	38.2% 56.4%	44	-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	23,604	12	47,207	12	23,604	12	7.6% 0.0%	12	200,722 200,722	143,506 143,506	(57,216) (57,216)	23.0% 23.0%	224,326 358,151	37	429,181 495.895		204,856 137,744		68.7% 79.3%	28	47.7% 27.8%	12	61.1% 79.3%	41
Utah		38	306,425	16	306,425	22	49.0%	16				0.0%		12 3	39,357	7	39,357	3	6.3%	7	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	200,722	41	495,895		288,566		79.3%	8	59.0%		79.3%	12
Vermont	87.898	30	231.412	45	143.514	36	37.0%	45	-	-	-	0.0%		12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	288.620	24	374.918	44	86.298		60.0%	43	23.0%	40	60.0%	43
Virginia	-	38	260,462	36	260,462	7	41.7%	36	- 1	-	-	0.0%	62,943	2 12	25,886	2	62,943	2	20.1%	2	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	263,665	28	529,854	3	266,188		84.8%	3	50.2%	6	64.6%	30
Washington	59,036	33	302,817	26	243,781	11	48.4%	26	-	-	-	0.0%		12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	259,758	29	446,323		186,564		71.4%	23	41.8%	17	71.4%	19
West Virginia	118,072	24	306,425	16	188,353	24	49.0%	16	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	318,794	19	449,931		131,137	30	72.0%	17	29.1%	31	72.0%	12
Wisconsin	-	38	263,848	35	263,848	6	42.2%	35	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	200,722	41	407,354		206,631	9	65.2%	34	50.7%	4	65.2%	28
Wyoming	-	38	333,238	10	333,238	1	53.3%	10	<u> </u>	-	-	0.0%	15,736	<mark>10</mark> 3	31,472	11	15,736	11	5.0%	11	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	216,458	40	508,215	6	291,757	1	81.3%	6	57.4%	2	76.3%	4

SS Monthly Benefit \$ 1,148

(1) Alaska: Employees hired after 7/1/2006 will be covered by a defined contribution plan. (2) Illinois: State pickup of 50% of employee contribution for most state employees; employees resume full contribution 1/1/2006.

(3) Louisiana: New hires beginning 7/1/2006 will contribute 8.00% and final average salary will be based on 5 highest consecutive years. (4) Michigan: New hires after 4/1/97 are covered under a defined contribution plan

with a state contribution of 4%; state will additionally match an employee contribution of up to 3%.

Souces of Information: Primary sources of data included: (a) 2006 State Employee Benefits Survey: Benefits in Effect January 1, 2006, Workplace Economics, Inc., Washington, D.C.; (b) 2004 Comparative Study of Major Public Employee Retirement Systems, Wisconsin Legislative Council, December 2005; and (c) actuaries for the Indiana Public Employees Retirement Fund; and (d) state pension plan Internet websites.

EE Contrib. - Present value of employee contributions over the employment period.

EE Benefits - Present value of employee benefits over the remaining expected life of the employee.

Net EE Benefits - Present value of employee benefits ("EE Benefits") minum present value of employee contributions ("EE Contrib."). This represents the amount of employee benefits attributable to state effort.

Replacement Value % - Annual pension benefit as a percentage of employee's final year's salary.

Appendix E

Scenario: 55 Ye Assumptions:			Service Cre Interest: ual benefit:	dit	7.25% \$11.6383			PV o		\$ 30,000 \$ 16,872			PV of \$1 (Cont.	\$ 98.82						SS Monthl	v Benefit	\$ 851											
				inod B	Benefit Progra	200			0	efined Cont	ribution Pr	ogram	1		-	Com	pensation I	Drogra			_		ecurity Pro	aram	1 -	otal		ame (A	ssumes So	ocial S	ocurity	at 62)		
State			State Dei	ineu L	Sellent Flogra	am	Repl.		State D	enneu com		Repl.		Jiai	e Deletteu	Com	pensation	riogra	Repl.		reuer	ai Sociai S	ecunty FIO	Repl.		otai -	All Flogia	anis (P	ssumes or		Repl.	al 02)	% Fund	
State	EE	1	EE	1	Net EE	1	Value		EE	EE	Net EE	Value	EE	1	EE		Net EE		Value		EE	EE	Net EE	Value	EE		EE		Net EE		Value		By	í .
	Contrib.	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	%	Rnk	Contrib.	Benefits	Benefits	%	Contrib.	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	%	Rnk	Contrib.	Benefits	Benefits	%	Contrib.	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	%	Rnk	State	Rnk
Alabama	84,361	19	206,692	16	122,331	27	59.2%	16	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	213,434	16	269,599	21	56,165	35	93.2%	20	20.8%	35
Alaska (1)	113,888	12	231,085	8	117,197	30	66.2%	8	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13					113,888	50	231,085	42	117,197	13	66.2%	47	50.7%	3
Arizona	130,760	6	225,949	9	95,189	37	64.7%	9	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	259,833	4	288,856	15	29,023	42	98.8%	14	10.0%	44
Arkansas	-	38	187,966	30	187,966	3	53.8%	30	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	129,073	41	250,873	33	121,800	11	87.9%	29	48.6%	5
California	84,361	19	209,489	14	125,128	26	60.0%	14	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	213,434	16	272,396	19	58,962	34	94.0%	18	21.6%	34
Colorado	134,978	5	256,761	3	121,782	28	73.5%	3	-	-	-	0.0%	16,872	10 12	33,745	10	16,872	11	9.7%	10	400.070	00.007	(00.400)	04.00/	151,851	37	290,505		138,655	5	83.2%	34	47.7%	6
Connecticut Delaware	33,745 32,830	33 36	205,409 200,530	17	171,664 167,701	9	58.8% 57.4%	17	-	-	-	0.0%	- 11,858	12	- 23,716	13	- 11,858	13 12	0.0% 6.8%	13	129,073 129,073	62,907 62,907	(66,166) (66,166)	34.0% 34.0%	162,818 173,761	32	268,316 287,153		105,498 113,393	18	92.9% 98.3%	16	39.3% 39.5%	18 17
Florida	32,030	38	162.392	29 43	162,392	13	46.5%	43	-	-	-	0.0%	11,000	12	23,710	12	11,000	12	0.0%	12	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	129,073	20 //1	225,299		96.226	22	98.3% 80.6%	39	39.5% 42.7%	17
Georgia	21,090	37	207.436	15	186.345	4	40.3 % 59.4 %	15	_	_		0.0%		12	_	13	_	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	129,073	39	270.343	20	120,179	12	93.5%	19	44.5%	14
Hawaii	-	38	128,380	48	128,380	25	36.8%	48	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	129,073	41	191,287	50	62,214	33	70.8%	46	32.5%	26
Idaho	105,114	15	204,545	26	99,430	36	58.6%	26	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	234,187	10	267,452	27	33,264	41	92.6%	26	12.4%	43
Illinois (2)	33,745	33	170,254	41	136,509	21	48.8%	41	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	162,818	32	233,161	41	70,343	30	82.8%	37	30.2%	29
Indiana	-	38	111,644	49	111,644	32	32.0%	49	-	50,617	50,617	14.5%	38,539	4	77,078	4	38,539	4	22.1%	4	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	167,612	29	302,246	9	134,634	8	102.6%	9	44.5%	11
lowa	62,427	28	205,409	17	142,981	19	58.8%	17	-	-	-	0.0%	59,291	3	118,582	3	59,291	3	34.0%	3	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	250,791	7	386,897	3	136,106	7	126.8%	3	35.2%	22
Kansas	67,489	25	179,733	34	112,243	31	51.5%	34	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	196,562	23	242,639	37	46,077	38	85.5%	32	19.0%	38
Kentucky	84,361	19 8	202,990	27	118,628	29	58.1%	27	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	213,434	16	265,897	28	52,462	36	92.2%	27	19.7%	36
Louisiana (3) Maine	126,542 129,073	8	256,761	3 17	130,219	23 48	73.5% 58.8%	3	-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	-	12 12	-	13	-	13 13	0.0% 0.0%	13					126,542 129,073	49 48	256,761 205,409	31	130,219 76,336	28	73.5% 58.8%	43 49	50.7% 37.2%	3 20
Maryland	33.745	22	205,409 128,723	47	76,336 94,978	40	36.9%	47	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129.073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	129,073	40	191.630		28,812	20	58.8% 70.9%	49	15.0%	39
Massachusetts	151,851	2	254,193	6	102,343	35	72.8%	6	-	-	-	0.0%	_	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	123,075	02,307	(00,100)	34.070	151,851	37	254,193		102,343	20	72.8%	44	40.3%	16
Michigan (4)	-	38	154,056	45	154,056	16	44.1%	45	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	129,073	41	216,963	46	87,890	24	78.2%	40	40.5%	15
Minnesota	67,489	25	172,541	38	105,052	33	49.4%	38	-	-	-	0.0%	118,582	1	237,163	1	118,582	1	67.9%	1	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	315,144	1	472,611	1	157,468	4	151.4%	1	33.3%	24
Mississippi	122,324	10	212,392	13	90,068	40	60.8%	13	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	251,397	6	275,299	18	23,902	45	94.9%	17	8.7%	46
Missouri	-	38	174,597	36	174,597	7	50.0%	36	-	-	-	0.0%	29,645	6	59,291	6	29,645	6	17.0%	6	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	158,718	35	296,795	11	138,077	6	101.0%	11	46.5%	8
Montana	116,419	11	205,409	17	88,990	41	58.8%	17	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	245,492	8	268,316		22,824	46	92.9%	21	8.5%	47
Nebraska	-	38	-	50	-	50	0.0%	50	73,057	186,945	113,888	17.3%	-	12 12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	202,130	22	249,852	34	47,722	37	51.3%	50 42	19.1%	37 27
Nevada New Hampshire	177,159 84,361	19	259,671 171,516	20	82,512 87,155	45 42	74.4% 49.1%	20	-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13 13	0.0% 0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	177,159 213,434	27	259,671 234,423	30	82,512 20,989	27 47	74.4% 83.2%	42 35	31.8% 9.0%	27 45
New Jersev	84,361	19	186.716	32	102.355	42	49.1% 53.5%	32	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12		13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	213,434	16	234,423	35	20,989	47	87.5%	30	9.0% 14.5%	45
New Mexico	125,192	9	308,113	1	182,921	5	88.2%	1	-	-	-	0.0%	_	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	254,265	5	371,020	4	116,754	14	122.3%	4	31.5%	28
New York	50,617	31	205,409	17	154,792	15	58.8%	17	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129.073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	179,690	26	268.316	22	88.626	23	92.9%	21	33.0%	25
North Carolina	101,234	16	185,546	33	84,312	43	53.1%	33	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	230,307	11	248,453	36	18,146	48	87.2%	31	7.3%	48
North Dakota	67,489	25	205,409	17	137,919	20	58.8%	17	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	196,562	23	268,316	22	71,753	29	92.9%	21	26.7%	30
Ohio	143,414	4	225,949	9	82,535	44	64.7%	9	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13					143,414	40	225,949	44	82,535	26	64.7%	48	36.5%	21
Oklahoma	59,053	29	205,409	17	146,356	18	58.8%	17	-	-	-	0.0%	29,645	6	59,291	6	29,645	6	17.0%	6	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	217,771	15	327,606	6	109,835	17	109.9%	6	33.5%	23
Oregon	-	38	171,516	39	171,516	10	49.1%	39	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	129,073	41	234,423	39	105,350	19	83.2%	35	44.9%	10
Pennsylvania	105,452	13	256,761	3	151,309	17	73.5%	3	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	234,525	9	319,668	1	85,143	25	107.6%		26.6%	31 49
Rhode Island South Carolina	147,633 105,452	12	225,949 186,922	21	78,317 81,470	47	64.7% 53.5%	31	-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	- 29,645	12	- 59,291	13	- 29,645	13	0.0% 17.0%	13	129,073 129,073	62,907 62,907	(66,166) (66,166)	34.0% 34.0%	276,706 264,170	2	288,856 309,120	15	12,151 44,949	49	98.8% 104.6%	14	4.2% 14.5%	49 40
South Dakota	101,234	16	166,894	42	65,661	40	47.8%	42	-	-	-	0.0%	29,043	12	39,291	13	29,045	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	230,307	11	229,801	43	(505)	50	81.8%	38	-0.2%	50
Tennessee	-	38	159,854	44	159,854	14	45.8%	44	_		_	0.0%	35,574	5	71.149	5	35,574	5	20.4%	5	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	164,647	31	293,910	12	129,263	10	100.2%	12	44.0%	13
Texas	101,234	16	236,220	7	134,986	22	67.7%	7	-	-	-	0.0%		12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	230,307	11	299,127	10	68,820	31	100.2%	10	23.0%	33
Utah	-	38	205,409	17	205,409	2	58.8%	17	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	25,308	11	25,308	9	7.2%	11	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	129,073	41	293,624	13	164,551	3	100.1%	13	56.0%	1
Vermont	56,522	30	150,667	46	94,145	39	43.2%	46	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	185,595	25	213,574	47	27,979	44	77.2%	41	13.1%	42
Virginia	-	38	174,597	36	174,597	7	50.0%	36	-	-	-	0.0%	94,865	2	189,731	2	94,865	2	54.3%	2	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	223,938	14	427,235	2	203,297	1	138.4%	2	47.6%	7
Washington	37,963	32	202,990	27	165,027	12	58.1%	27	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	167,036	30	265,897	28	98,861	21	92.2%	27	37.2%	19
West Virginia	75,925	24	205,409	17	129,483	24	58.8%	17	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	204,998	21	268,316	22	63,317	32	92.9%	21	23.6%	32
Wisconsin	-	38	177,601	35	177,601	6	50.9%	35	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	129,073	41	240,508	38	111,435	16	84.9%	33	46.3%	9
Wyoming	-	38	224,666	12	224,666	1	64.3%	12	-	-	-	0.0%	23,716	9	47,433	9	23,716	10	13.6%	9	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	152,789	36	335,005	5	182,216	2	112.0%	5	54.4%	2

Replace. Value % w/o Def Comp

> 93.2% 66.2%

> 98.8% 87.9%

94.0% 73.5%

92.9%

91.5%

80.6%

93.5% 70.8%

92.6%

82.8%

80.5%

92.9% 85.5%

92.2%

73.5%

58.8%

70.9% 72.8%

78.2%

83.5%

94.9% 84.0% 92.9%

51.3%

74.4%

83.2%

87.5% 122.3% 92.9%

87.2%

92.9%

64.7% 92.9% 83.2%

107.6% 98.8% 87.6% 81.8%

79.8%

101.7% 92.9%

77.2%

84.0%

92.2%

92.9%

84.9%

98.4%

Rnk

47

23

42

11

22

36

46

19

34

37

27

20

42

49

44

39

31

11

50

41

32

1

26

11

32

35

38

11

40

29

20

11

28

(1) Alaska: Employees hired after 7/1/2006 will be covered by a defined contribution plan. (2) Illinois: State pickup of 50% of employee contribution for most state employees; employees resume full contribution 1/1/2006.

(3) Louisiana: New hires beginning 7/1/2006 will contribute 8.00% and final average salary will be based on 5 highest consecutive years. (4) Michigan: New hires after 4/1/97 are covered under a defined contribution plan

with a state contribution of 4%; state will additionally match an employee contribution of up to 3%.

Souces of Information: Primary sources of data included: (a) 2006 State Employee Benefits Survey: Benefits in Effect January 1, 2006. Workplace Economics, Inc., Washington, D.C.; (b) 2004 Comparative Study of Major Public Employee Retirement Systems. Wisconsin Legislative Council, December 2005; and (c) actuaries for the Indiana Public Employees Retirement Fund; and (d) state pension plan Internet websites.

EE Contrib. - Present value of employee contributions over the employment period.

EE Benefits - Present value of employee benefits over the remaining expected life of the employee.

Net EE Benefits - Present value of employee benefits ("EE Benefits") minum present value of employee contributions ("EE Contrib."). This represents the amount of employee benefits attributable to state effort.

Replacement Value % - Annual pension benefit as a percentage of employee's final year's salary.

Appendix F

Scenario: 55 Years/30 Years of Service Credit

Scenario: 55 Ye	ars/30 Year	s of S	Service Cre	dit																																
Assumptions:		4	Interest:		7.25%	,				\$ 60,000					¢ 00.00						CC Manihi	Denefit	¢ 4.000													
	PV01\$	i ann	ual benefit:		\$11.6383)		PVC	or 1% Contr	. \$ 33,745			PV of \$1 C	ont.	\$ 98.8Z						SS Monthly	/ Benefit	\$ 1,302													
i			State Defi	ined B	enefit Proc	Iram			State D	efined Cont	ribution Pr	rogram	1	Stat	e Deferred	Com	pensation Pr	ogra	n	T	Federa	I Social Se	curity Pro	gram	T	Total -	All Program	ms (A	Assumes S	ocial S	Security a	at 62)			Replace.	. I
State							Rep	pl.				Repl.							Repl.				,	Repl.							Repl.		% Fund	$\neg \neg$	Value %	
	EE		EE		Net EE	T	Valu		EE	EE	Net EE	Value	EE		EE		Net EE		Value		EE	EE	Net EE	Value	EE		EE		Net EE		Value		By		w/o	
	Contrib.	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	%	6 Rnk	Contrib.	Benefits	Benefits	%	Contrib.	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	Benefits I	Rnk	%	Rnk	Contrib.	Benefits	Benefits	%	Contrib.	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	%	Rnk	State	Rnk	Def Comp	р
Alabama	168,723	19	413,385	16	244,662		59.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	426,869	14	509,630	20	82,761	35	85.2%	17	16.2%	35	85.2%	
Alaska (1)	227,776	12	462,169	8	234,393		66.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13					227,776	50	462,169	37	234,393	6	66.2%	45	50.7%	3	66.2%	
Arizona	261,521	6	451,899	9	190,378		64.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12 12	-	13 13	-	13 13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	519,667	2	548,144	11	28,478	42	90.8%	10	5.2%	44	90.8%	
Arkansas California	- 168.723	30	375,932 418,979	30	375,932 250,256		53. 60.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146 258,146	96,245 96,245	(161,901) (161,901)	26.0% 26.0%	258,146 426,869	41	472,177 515.224	33	214,031 88.355	24	79.9% 86.0%	15	45.3% 17.1%	24	79.9% 86.0%	
Colorado	269,957	5	513,522	3	243,565		73.		-		-	0.0%	33,745	6	67,489	6	33,745	7	9.7%	6	230,140	90,243	(101,901)	20.076	303,701	33	581,011	7	277,309	4	83.2%	28	47.7%	5	73.5%	
Connecticut	67.489	34	410,817	17	343.328		58.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13		13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	325,635	30	507,063	22	181,427	16	84.9%	18	35.8%	19	84.9%	
Delaware	83,447	32	401,060	29	317,614	14	57.		-	-	-	0.0%	11,858	11	23,716	12	11,858	12	3.4%	12	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	353,451	27	521,022	15	167,571	19	86.9%	14	32.2%	21	83.5%	%
Florida	-	38	324,783	43	324,783	3 12	46.	.5% 43	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	258,146	41	421,029	45	162,883	23	72.6%	42	38.7%	15	72.6%	
Georgia	42,181	37	414,871	15	372,690		59.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	300,327	35	511,117	19	210,790	9	85.5%	16	41.2%	10	85.5%	
Hawaii	-	38	256,761	48	256,761		36.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	258,146	41	353,006	50	94,860	33	62.8%	48	26.9%	27	62.8%	
Idaho	210,229 67,489	15	409,089 340,508	26	198,860 273.018		58. 48.		-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146 258,146	96,245 96,245	(161,901) (161,901)	26.0% 26.0%	468,375 325,635	9	505,335 436,753	27 43	36,960 111.118	40 30	84.6% 74.8%	23	7.3% 25.4%	41 28	84.6% 74.8%	
Illinois (2) Indiana	07,489	34 38	340,508 223,289	41 49	273,018 223,289		48. 32.		-	101,234	101,234	0.0% 14.5%	38,539	12	77.078	13	38.539	5	0.0%	13	258,146 258,146	96,245 96.245	(161,901)	26.0%	325,635 296.685	30	436,753 497.846	43 31	201.161	30 12	74.8% 83.6%	37 27	25.4%	20	74.8%	
lowa	124.855	28	410,817	17	285,962		58.		-		- 101,234	0.0%	59,291	3	118.582	3	59,291	3	17.0%	3	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	442,292	13	625.644	4	183,352	15	101.9%	4	29.3%	23	84.9%	
Kansas	134,978	25	359,465	34	224,487		51.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12		13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	393,125	22	455,710	38	62,586	38	77.5%	33	13.7%	38	77.5%	
Kentucky	168,723	19	405,979	27	237,256		58.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	426,869	14	502,225	29	75,355	36	84.2%	25	15.0%	36	84.2%	
Louisiana (3)	253,085	8	513,522	3	260,437		73.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13					253,085	49	513,522	18	260,437	5	73.5%	40	50.7%	3	73.5%	
Maine	258,146	7	410,817	17	152,671		58.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13					258,146	48	410,817	46	152,671	25	58.8%	49	37.2%	16	58.8%	
Maryland	67,489	34	257,445	47	189,956	_	36.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	325,635	30	353,691	49	28,055	43	62.9%	47	7.9%	40	62.9%	
Massachusetts	303,701	2	508,386 308,113	6	204,685 308,113		72. 44.		-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0% 0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	303,701 258,146	33	508,386 404,358	21 47	204,685 146,212	10	72.8% 70.2%	41	40.3% 36.2%	13	72.8% 70.2%	
Michigan (4) Minnesota	- 134.978	25	308,113	40	210,104		44.					0.0%	- 118,582	12	- 237,163	13	- 118,582	13	34.0%	13	258,146	96,245 96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	258,146 511.706	41	404,358 678,491	47	146,212	20	109.4%	43	36.2% 24.6%	29	70.2%	
Mississippi	244.648	10	424.785	13	180,136		60.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	502,795	5	521.030	14	18,236	45	86.9%	13	3.5%	45	86.9%	
Missouri	-	38	349,195	36	349,195		50.		-	-	-	0.0%	29,645	7	59,291	7	29,645	8	8.5%	7	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	287,792	38	504,731	28	216,939	7	84.5%	24	43.0%	8	76.0%	
Montana	232,838	11	410,817	17	177,979	9 41	58.	.8% 17	-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	490,984	7	507,063	22	16,079	46	84.9%	18	3.2%	46	84.9%	%
Nebraska	-	38	-	50	-	50		.0% 50	146,114	373,890	227,776	8.6%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	404,260	21	470,136	34	65,875	37	34.7%	50	14.0%	37	34.7%	
Nevada	354,318	1	519,341	2	165,023		74.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13					354,318	26	519,341	16	165,023	22	74.4%	38	31.8%	22	74.4%	
New Hampshire	168,723 168,723	19	343,032 373,433	39 32	174,309 204,710		49. 53.		-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	-	12 12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146 258,146	96,245 96,245	(161,901) (161,901)	26.0% 26.0%	426,869 426,869	14	439,278 469.678	41	12,409 42,809	47	75.2% 79.5%	35	2.8% 9.1%	47	75.2% 79.5%	
New Jersey New Mexico	250,385	19	616,226	32	365,841	0	53. 88.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12		13		13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	426,869	14	712,471	30 1	203,940	39	114.3%	31	9.1%	25	114.3%	
New York	101,234	31	410,817	17	309,583		58.		_	_	_	0.0%	_	12		13		13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	359,380	25	507,063	22	147.683	26	84.9%	18	29.1%	23	84.9%	
North Carolina	202,468	16	371,092	33	168,624		53.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	460,614	10	467,337	36	6,724	48	79.2%	32	1.4%	48	79.2%	
North Dakota	134,978	25	410,817	17	275,839		58.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	393,125	22	507,063	22	113,938	29	84.9%	18	22.5%	31	84.9%	
Ohio	286,829	4	451,899	9	165,070		64.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13					286,829	39	451,899	39	165,070	21	64.7%	46	36.5%	17	64.7%	
Oklahoma	118,106	29	410,817	17	292,711		58.		-	-	-	0.0%	29,645	7	59,291	7	29,645	8	8.5%	7	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	405,898	20	566,353	9	160,456	24	93.4%	8	28.3%	26	84.9%	
Oregon	-	38	343,032	39	343,032		49.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13 13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	258,146	41	439,278	41	181,132	17	75.2%	35	41.2%	11	75.2%	
Pennsylvania Rhode Island	210,904 295,265	13	513,522 451,899	3	302,618 156,634		73. 64.		-	-	-	0.0% 0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0% 0.0%	13	258,146 258,146	96,245 96,245	(161,901) (161,901)	26.0% 26.0%	469,050 553,411	8	609,767 548,144	5	140,717 (5,267)	28	99.6% 90.8%	5	23.1% -1.0%	30	99.6% 90.8%	
South Carolina	295,265	13	373,844	31	156,634		53.				_	0.0%	29.645	7	- 59.291	7	29.645	8	0.0% 8.5%	7	258,146	96,245 96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	498.695	6	548,144 529.380	13	(5,267) 30,685	49	90.8% 88.1%	12	-1.0%	49	90.8% 79.6%	
South Dakota	202,468	16	333,789	42	131,321	_	47.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	460,614	10	430,034	44	(30,579)	50	73.8%	39	-7.1%	50	73.8%	_
Tennessee	-	38	319,709	44	319,709		45.		-	-	-	0.0%	35,574	5	71,149	5	35,574	6	10.2%	5	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	293,721	37	487,103	32	193,382	13	82.0%	29	39.7%	14	71.8%	
Texas	202,468	16	472,440	7	269,972		67.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	460,614	10	568,685	8	108,071	31	93.7%	7	19.0%	33	93.7%	
Utah	-	38	410,817	17	410,817		58.		- 1	-	-	0.0%	-	12	50,617	10	50,617	4	7.2%	10	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	258,146	41	557,680	10	299,533	2	92.1%	9	53.7%	1	84.9%	
Vermont	113,044	30	301,334	46	188,290	_	43.		-	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-	13	-	13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	371,191	24	397,580	48	26,389	44	69.2%	44	6.6%	42	69.2%	-
Virginia	-	38	349,195	36	349,195		50.		-	-	-	0.0%	94,865	2	189,731	2	94,865	2	27.2%	2	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	353,011	28	635,171	3	282,159	3	103.2%	3	44.4%	7	76.0% 84.2%	
Washington West Virginia	75,925 151,851	33	405,979 410,817	27	330,054 258,967		58. 58.				-	0.0% 0.0%		12		13		13	0.0%	13	258,146 258,146	96,245 96,245	(161,901) (161,901)	26.0% 26.0%	334,072 409,997	29	502,225 507,063	29 22	168,153 97,066	18 32	84.2% 84.9%	25	33.5% 19.1%	20	84.2% 84.9%	
Wisconsin		38	355,203	35	355.203		50.					0.0%		12		13		13	0.0%	13	258,146	96,245 96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	258,146	41	451,448	40	193.302	14	76.9%	34	42.8%	92	76.9%	
Wyoming	-	38	449,331	12	449,331		64.		-	-	-	0.0%	23,716	10	47,433	11	23,716	11	6.8%	11	258,146	96,245	(161,901)	26.0%	281,863	40	593,009	6	311,147	1	97.2%	6	52.5%	2	90.4%	
(1) Alaska: Emplo	vees hired a	fter 7	1/2006 will	he cov			contrib	bution plan	(2) Illin	ois: State pic	kup of 50%	of employ	- 1 - 1	tion fo	,	emple	., .	vees		ull con	, .	/2006	, . ,,								. , , ,					<u>سالہ</u>

np Rnk

1.

(1) Alaska: Employees hired after 7/1/2006 will be covered by a defined contribution plan. (2) Illinois: State pickup of 50% of employee contribution for most state employees; employees resume full contribution 1/1/2006.

3) Louisiana: New hires beginning 7/1/2006 will contribute 8.00% and final average salary will be based on 5 highest consecutive years. (4) Michigan: New hires after 4/1/97 are covered under a defined contribution plan

with a state contribution of 4%; state will additionally match an employee contribution of up to 3%.

Souces of Information: Primary sources of data included: (a) 2006 State Employee Benefits Survey: Benefits in Effect January 1, 2006, Workplace Economics, Inc., Washington, D.C.; (b) 2004 Comparative Study of Major Public Employee Retirement Systems, Wisconsin Legislative Council, December 2005; and (c) actuaries for the Indiana Public Employees Retirement Fund; and (d) state pension plan Internet websites.

EE Contrib. - Present value of employee contributions over the employment period.

EE Benefits - Present value of employee benefits over the remaining expected life of the employee.

Net EE Benefits - Present value of employee benefits ("EE Benefits") minum present value of employee contributions ("EE Contrib."). This represents the amount of employee benefits attributable to state effort.

Replacement Value % - Annual pension benefit as a percentage of employee's final year's salary.

		5	State Defi	ned Be	enefit Prog	gram			State De	fined Conti	ribution Pr	ogram		State De	eferred C	Comp	ensation Pro	ogram			Federa	Social S	ecurity Prog	gram			Т	otal - A	II Progra	ms					Replace.	
Retirement		-	Present Va	alue of			Repl.		Pr	esent Value	of	Repl.		Pres	sent Valı	ue of		R	pl.		Pre	sent Valu	e of	Repl.		Pre	sent Va	lue of			Repl.	%	% Fund		Value %	
Scenario	EE		EE		Net EE		Value		EE	EE	Net EE	Value	EE		EE		Net EE	Va	lue	11	EE	EE	Net EE	Value	EE		EE		Net EE		Value		Ву		w/o	
	Contrib.	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	Benefits	Rnk	%	Rnk	Contrib.	Benefits	Benefits	%	Contrib.	Rnk Be	nefits F	Rnk	Benefits Rr	ık	% Rn	k	Contrib.	Benefits	Benefits	%	Contrib.	Rnk Be	enefits	Rnk E	Benefits	Rnk	%	Rnk	State	Rnk [Def Comp	Rnk
65/10 \$30 K Sal	-	37	31,378	49	31,378	41	10.7%	6 49	-	11,281	11,281	3.8%	5,452	4 1	0,905	4	5,452	5	3.7%	4	28,767	69,594	40,827	23.6%	34,219	32 12	23,158	24	88,939	16	41.8%	24	72.2%	13	38.1%	40
55/30 \$30 K Sal	-	38	111,644	49	111,644	32	32.0%	6 49	-	50,617	50,617	14.5%	38,539	4 7	7,078	4	38,539	4 2	2.1%	4	129,073	62,907	(66,166)	34.0%	167,612	29 30	02,246	9	134,634	8	102.6%	9	44.5%	11	80.5%	37
62/25 \$30 K Sal	-	38	83,275	49	83,275	30	26.6%	49	-	39,357	39,357	12.6%	25,571	4 5	1,141	4	25,571	4 1	5.4%	4	100,361	91,629	(8,732)	29.3%	125,932	33 26	65,402	10	139,470	6	84.9%	10	52.6%	10	68.6%	36
																-		_																		
65/10 \$60 K Sal		37	62,756	-	62,756	41	10.7%	-	-	22,562	22,562	3.8%		-	0,905	6	5,452			6		96,089	38,555						129,326				67.2%	12	30.8%	39
55/30 \$60 K Sal		38	223,289	49	223,289	32	,		-	101,234	101,234	14.5%	38,539	4 7	7,078	4	38,539	5 1			258,146	96,245	(161,901)						201,161	12	83.6%	27	40.4%	12	72.5%	41
62/25 \$60 K Sal	-	38	166,549	49	166,549	30	26.6%	49	-	78,715	78,715	12.6%	25,571	5 5	1,141	5	25,571	6	3.2%	5	200,722	143,506	(57,216)	23.0%	226,293	36 43	39,911	26	213,618	6	70.4%	26	48.6%	9	62.2%	36

Appendix G

		Α	ge 55 w	ith 30	Years S	Servio	e		A	ge 62 with	25 Years S	ervi	ce		Α	ge 65 wit	h 10) Years	Servic	e	
		\$60,00	0 Salary			\$30,000) Salary		\$60,00	0 Salary	\$	30,00	0 Salary	\$6	60,000	Salary			\$30,000	Salary	
	All Bene	efits	Exc Def	Comp	All Bene	efits	Exc Def Co	mp	All Benefits	Exc Def Com	p All Benef	fits	Exc Def Comp	All Benefi	its	Exc Def Cor	mp	All Bene	fits	Exc Def C	omp
	% Rep	Rank	% Rep	Rank	% Rep	Rank	% Rep R	ank	% Rep Rank	% Rep Rai	ik % Rep F	Rank	% Rep Rank	% Rep R	Rank	% Rep Ra	ank	% Rep	Rank	% Rep	Rank
Alabama	85.2%	17	85.2%	10	93.2%	20	93.2%	10	72.3% 16	72.3%	9 78.7%	19	78.7% 9	36.1%	13	36.1%	8	43.4%	14	43.4%	8
Alaska	66.2%	45	66.2%	45	66.2%	47	66.2%	47	53.9% 46	53.9% 4	6 53.9%	47	53.9% 47	19.4%	50	19.4%	50	19.4%	50	19.4%	50
Arizona	90.8%	10	90.8%	4	98.8%	14	98.8%	4	75.7% 10	75.7%	5 82.0%	14	82.0% 5	36.9%	11	36.9%	6	44.2%	12	44.2%	6
Arkansas	79.9%	30	79.9%	23	87.9%	29	87.9%	23	65.7% <u>33</u>	65.7% 2		32	72.1% 27	33.3%	27		24	40.7%	30	40.7%	25
California	86.0%	15	86.0%	8	94.0%	18	94.0%	8	73.0% 14	10.070	7 79.3%	17	79.3% 7	41.3%	2	41.3%	2	48.6%	5	48.6%	2
Colorado	83.2%	28	73.5%	37	83.2%	34	73.5%	42	69.7% 27	61.3% 3		37	61.3% 42	27.1%	43		45	27.1%	44	24.5%	45
Connecticut	84.9%	18	84.9%	14	92.9%	21	92.9%	11	72.0% 17	72.0% 1		20	78.3% 10	29.5%	41	20.070	41	36.7%	42	36.7%	42
Delaware	86.9% 72.6%	14 42	83.5% 72.6%	22 40	98.3%	16 39	91.5% 80.6%	22 36	73.1% 12 61.7% 40	70.6% 2 61.7% 3		15 39	76.9% 21 68.1% 37	35.1% 32.6%	21 35		18 33	43.0% 39.9%	22 36	41.9% 39.9%	18 34
Florida Georgia	85.5%	42	85.5%	40 9	80.6% 93.5%	19	93.5%	9	61.7% 40 72.5% 15		8 78.8%	18	78.8%	32.0%	12	32.6%	7	39.9% 43.4%	13	39.9% 43.4%	7
Hawaii	62.8%	48	62.8%	48	70.8%	46	70.8%	46	53.6% 48	53.6% 4		46	60.0% 46	28.6%	42		42	35.9%	43	35.9%	43
Idaho	84.6%	23	84.6%	19	92.6%	26	92.6%	19	71.8% 21	71.8%		24	78.1% 17	35.8%	16		14	43.2%	17	43.2%	14
Illinois	74.8%	37	74.8%	34	82.8%	37	82.8%	34	63.6% 37	63.6% 3		36	70.0% 34	32.6%	37		35	39.9%	38	39.9%	36
Indiana	83.6%	27	72.5%	41	102.6%	9	80.5%	37	70.4% 26	62.2% 3	6 84.9%	10	68.6% 36	32.7%	34	30.8%	39	41.8%	24	38.1%	40
lowa	101.9%	4	84.9%	11	126.8%	3	92.9%	11	84.6% 4	72.0% 1	0 103.5%	3	78.3% 10	38.8%	5	35.9%	9	48.9%	4	43.3%	10
Kansas	77.5%	33	77.5%	27	85.5%	32	85.5%	27	65.9% <u>32</u>	65.9% 2	6 72.2%	31	72.2% 26	33.5%	26	33.5%	23	40.8%	29	40.8%	24
Kentucky	84.2%	25	84.2%	20	92.2%	27	92.2%	20	71.4% 23	71.4% 1		26	77.8% 19	35.7%	18		16	43.0%	20	43.0%	16
Louisiana	73.5%	40	73.5%	37	73.5%	43	73.5%	42	61.3% 41	61.3% 3		43	61.3% 42	24.5%	46		46	24.5%	46	24.5%	46
Maine	58.8%	49	58.8%	49	58.8%	49	58.8%	49	49.0% 49	49.0% 4		49	49.0% 49	19.6%	49		49	19.6%	49 41	19.6%	49
Maryland	62.9%	47 41	62.9% 72.8%	47 39	70.9% 72.8%	45 44	70.9%	45 44	53.9% 45 61.1% 42	53.9% 4 61.1% 4		45 44	60.3% 45 61.1% 44	29.7% 24.5%	40 46		40 46	37.0% 24.5%	41	37.0% 24.5%	41 46
Massachusetts Michigan	72.8% 70.2%	41	72.8%	43	72.8%	44	72.8%	39	59.7% 44	59.7% 4		44	66.1% 44 66.1% 40	24.5%	40 39		40 38	24.5%	40	24.5%	39
Minnesota	109.4%	2	75.5%	31	151.4%	+0	83.5%	31	89.3% 2	64.1%		1	70.5% 31	38.5%	6		28	51.5%	2	40.1%	29
Mississippi	86.9%	13	86.9%	7	94.9%	17	94.9%	7	71.6% 22	71.6% 1		25	78.0% 18	35.8%	17		15	43.1%	19	43.1%	15
Missouri	84.5%	24	76.0%	30	101.0%	11	84.0%	30	70.9% 25	64.6% 2		12	71.0% 30	34.4%	22		25	43.2%	18	40.3%	26
Montana	84.9%	18	84.9%	14	92.9%	21	92.9%	11	66.7% 31	66.7% 2	5 73.1%	30	73.1% 25	33.8%	25	33.8%	22	41.1%	27	41.1%	22
Nebraska	34.7%	50	34.7%	50	51.3%	50	51.3%	50	31.6% 50	31.6% 5		50	46.6% 50	25.0%	45	25.0%	44	40.9%	28	40.9%	23
Nevada	74.4%	38	74.4%	35	74.4%	42	74.4%	41	62.1% <u>39</u>	62.1% 3		42	62.1% <mark>41</mark>	25.3%	44		43	25.3%	45	25.3%	44
New Hampshire	75.2%	35	75.2%	32	83.2%	35	83.2%	32	63.9% <u>35</u>	63.9% 3		34	70.3% 32	32.7%	30		29	40.0%	32	40.0%	30
New Jersey	79.5%	31	79.5%	25	87.5%	30	87.5%	25	67.5% 29	67.5% 2		28	73.9% 23	34.1%	23		20	41.5%	25	41.5%	20
New Mexico	114.3% 84.9%	1 18	114.3% 84.9%	1 14	122.3% 92.9%	4 21	122.3% 92.9%	1	96.5% 1 72.0% 17	96.5% 72.0% 1	1 102.9%	4 20	102.9% 1 78.3% 10	45.7% 32.7%	1 30	45.7% 32.7%	1 29	53.1% 40.0%	1 32	53.1% 40.0%	1 30
New York North Carolina	84.9% 79.2%	32	84.9% 79.2%	26	92.9% 87.2%	31	92.9% 87.2%	26	67.2% 30	67.2%		20	73.6% 24	32.7%	24		29 21	40.0%	26	40.0%	21
North Dakota	84.9%	18	84.9%	14	92.9%	21	92.9%	11	72.0% 17	72.0%		20	78.3% 10	35.9%	14	35.9%	9	43.3%	15	43.3%	10
Ohio	64.7%	46	64.7%	46	64.7%	48	64.7%	48	53.9% 47	53.9% 4		48	53.9% 48	21.6%	48		48	21.6%	48	21.6%	48
Oklahoma	93.4%	8	84.9%	11	109.9%	6	92.9%	18	78.3% 9	72.0% 1		6	78.3% 16	37.4%	10	35.9%	9	46.1%	9	43.3%	9
Oregon	75.2%	35	75.2%	32	83.2%	35	83.2%	32	63.9% 35	63.9% 3	2 70.3%	34	70.3% 32	32.7%	30	32.7%	29	40.0%	32	40.0%	30
Pennsylvania	99.6%	5	99.6%	2	107.6%	7	107.6%	2	84.2% 5		2 90.6%	7	90.6% 2	40.8%	3	40.8%	3	48.2%	6	48.2%	3
Rhode Island	90.8%	10	90.8%	4	98.8%	14	98.8%	4	73.0% 13		6 79.3%	16	79.3% 6	33.0%	29		25	40.3%	31	40.3%	26
South Carolina	88.1%	12	79.6%	24	104.6%	8	87.6%	24	73.9% 11	67.6% 2		8	73.9% 22	35.6%	20		19	44.3%	11	41.5%	19
South Dakota	73.8%	39	73.8%	36	81.8%	38	81.8%	35	62.8% <u>38</u>	62.8% 3		38	69.2% <u>35</u>	32.3%	38		36	39.6%	39	39.6%	37
Tennessee	82.0% 93.7%	29 7	71.8% 93.7%	42	100.2% 101.7%	12 10	79.8% 101.7%	38	68.7% 28 79.3% 7	61.1% 4 79.3%	1 82.6% 3 85.7%	13 9	67.5% 38 85.7% 3	33.3% 38.9%	28 4	31.6% 38.9%	37	42.3% 46.2%	23 8	38.9% 46.2%	38 4
Texas	93.7% 92.1%	9	93.7% 84.9%	3 11	101.7%	10	92.9%	3	79.3% 7	79.3%		9 11	78.3% 10	38.9%	4	38.9%	4	46.2% 45.2%	10	46.2% 43.3%	4 10
Utah Vermont	92.1% 69.2%	44	84.9% 69.2%	44	77.2%	41	92.9% 77.2%	40	60.0% 43	60.0%		40	66.3% 39	37.8%	30		29	45.2% 40.0%	32	43.3%	30
Virginia	103.2%	3	76.0%	29	138.4%	2	84.0%	29	84.8% 3	64.6% 3		2	71.0% 29	37.5%	9		25	49.4%	3	40.3%	26
Washington	84.2%	25	84.2%	20	92.2%	27	92.2%	20	71.4% 23	71.4%		26	77.8% 19	35.7%	18		16	43.0%	20	43.0%	16
West Virginia	84.9%	18	84.9%	14	92.9%	21	92.9%	11	72.0% 17	72.0% 1		20	78.3% 10	35.9%	14	35.9%	9	43.3%	15	43.3%	10
Wisconsin	76.9%	34	76.9%	28	84.9%	33	84.9%	28	65.2% 34	65.2% 2		33	71.5% 28	32.6%	36		34	39.9%	37	39.9%	35
Wyoming	97.2%	6	90.4%	6	112.0%	5	98.4%	6	81.3% <mark>6</mark>	76.3%	4 92.7%	5	82.6% 4	38.3%	7	37.2%	5	46.8%	7	44.5%	5

Appendix H

Appendix I **State Pension Multipliers** No Defined Benefit, 1 Less than 1.5%, 2 Greater than 2.5%, 6 Between 1.5% and 2%, 20 Between 2% and 2.5%, 21

■ No Defined Benefit ■ Less than 1.5% ■ Between 1.5% and 2% ■ Between 2% and 2.5% ■ Greater than 2.5%