Governor's FY 2014 Budget: Article 11

Staff Presentation to the House Finance Committee February 7, 2013

- New 3-year program to encourage:
 - Sustainable funding of retirement plans
 - □ Reduce unfunded liabilities
- Budget includes \$10 million for first year
- Distributed to eligible municipalities on population basis if certain conditions are met

Article 11 - Background

Characteristics of Municipal Pension Plans

- MERS state administered
- Local Pension Plans locally administered

Municipal Employees Retirement System (MERS)

- □ Established in 1951 plan benefits contained in State Statute (Title 45 of RIGL)
- ■110 State Administered Plans
 - 67 units covering general employees
 - 43 covering police and fire employees

Municipal Employees Retirement System (MERS)

- State is administrative agent, but has no funding responsibility
- Separate actuarial valuations are performed for each participating plan
- Requires local employers to make 100% of annually required contribution (ARC) Aid could be withheld if not fully funded

- 36 plans provided through 24 municipalities, of which half cover public safety employees
 - Not governed by state law
 - Municipality is entirely responsible for administering and funding the plans
 - May be included in collective bargaining agreements

- 24 out of the 36 locally administered pension plans are considered at risk by the Auditor General (September 2011)
- Locally administered plans do not have the level of available assets to meet benefit obligations

- Covers general municipal, police and fire
- Combined total assets of \$1.4 billion as of June 30, 2010
- Combined Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability of \$2.1 billion as of June 30, 2010
- Overall funded ratio of 40.3% as of June 30, 2010

Locally Administered Plans	Members
(as of November 2011)	
Active	6,916
Retired	5,276
Disabled	897
Beneficiaries	899
Terminated, Other	606
Total	14,594

- Nearly 2/3rds of the communities with local plans have only one local plan – rest of employees are in MERS
- Plans among and within communities vary on plan design, vesting periods, COLA provisions, employee contribution rates

Municipal Pensions - Issues

- Variance in local fiscal capacity
- Differences in size and severity of unfunded liabilities
- Employer contributions have not been sufficient to support benefit levels

Article 11 - Background

- Assembly created a local pension study commission as part of pension reform enacted in November 2011
- Law required all local plans to submit an actuarial valuation to the Commission by April 1, 2012

Article 11 - Background

- If the plan is <60% funded that means it is in critical status
- Municipality has 180 days to submit an alternative Funding Improvement Plan (FIP) to emerge from critical status

- New 3-year program to encourage:
 - Sustainable funding of retirement plans
 - Reduce unfunded liabilities
- Budget includes \$10 million for first year
- Distributed to eligible municipalities on population basis if certain conditions are met

- For FY 2014, a municipality may receive funds if:
 - 1) If it has no locally administered pension plan, or
 - 2) It has submitted an approved Funding Improvement Plan, if required, by May 1, 2013, or
 - 3) If its local plan is not required to submit a Funding Improvement Plan (FIP)

- For FY 2015 and FY 2016, a municipality may receive funds if:
 - 1) All local plans are in MERS or have transitioned to MERS by June 30, 2014, or
 - 2) Has submitted or implemented FIP that has been approved by plan sponsor and local governing body, or
 - 3) No FIP is required and municipality is meeting 100% of ARC

- Municipalities with only MERS plans automatically qualify for aid:
- If a municipality does not qualify, the unused amount will be distributed among other eligible municipalities
- FY 2014 distributions are in <u>Staff Budget</u>
 Analysis FY 2014 publication

- Pension reform legislation required municipalities to submit Funding Improvement Plans if local plan is in "critical status"
- 13 plans in 10 communities are exempt
- 23 plans in 18 communities are in critical status

Communities with Plans in Critical Status		
Bristol (1)	Pawtucket (2)	
Coventry (3)	Portsmouth (1)	
Cranston (1)	Providence (1)	
Cumberland (1)	Scituate (1)	
East Providence (1)	Smithfield (1 of 2)	
Johnston (2)	Tiverton (1)	
Narragansett (2)	Warwick (1 of 5)	
Newport (2)	West Warwick (1)	
North Providence (1)	Woonsocket (1)	

Communities with <u>No</u> Plans in Critical Status		
Jamestown	Middletown	
Lincoln	Westerly	
Little Compton	Central Falls*	

Communities Only in MERS		
Barrington	New Shoreham	
Burrillville	North Kingstown	
Charlestown	North Smithfield	
East Greenwich	Richmond	
Exeter	South Kingstown	
Foster	Warren	
Glocester	West Greenwich	
Hopkinton		

Governor's FY 2014 Budget: Article 11

Staff Presentation to the House Finance Committee February 7, 2013