

The experience and dedication you deserve



Experience Study

For the Three-Year Period

Ending June 30, 2022



www.CavMacConsulting.com



April 12, 2023

Board of Trustees Oklahoma Public Employees Retirement System 5400 N Grand Boulevard, Suite 400 P.O. Box 53007 Oklahoma City, OK 73112-5625

Dear Members of the Board:

We are pleased to submit the results of a study of the economic and demographic experience for the Oklahoma Public Employees Retirement System (OPERS) and the Uniform Retirement System for Justices and Judges (URSJJ). The purpose of this investigation is to assess the reasonability of the actuarial assumptions for each of the Plans. This investigation covers the three-year period from July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2022. As a result of the investigation, it is recommended that revised assumptions be adopted by the Board for future use.

The recommended assumptions and decrement tables are shown in Appendix B of this report for OPERS and Appendix C for URSJJ. In the actuary's judgment, the recommended rates are suitable for use until further experience indicates that modifications are needed.

Actuarial assumptions are used to measure and budget future costs. Changing assumptions will not change the actual cost of future benefits. Once the assumptions have been adopted, the actuarial valuation measures the adequacy of the statutory contribution rates.

We hereby certify that, to the best of our knowledge and belief, this report is complete and accurate and has been prepared in accordance with generally recognized and accepted actuarial principles and practices which are consistent with the principles prescribed by the Actuarial Standards Board (ASB) and the Code of Professional Conduct and Qualification Standards for Public Statements of Actuarial Opinion of the American Academy of Actuaries.

> 3550 Busbee Pkwy, Suite 250, Kennesaw, GA 30144 Phone (678) 388-1700 • Fax (678) 388-1730 www.CavMacConsulting.com Offices in Kennesaw, GA • Bellevue, NE



April 12, 2023 OPERS Board Page 2

In particular, we have prepared the assumptions developed in this report in keeping with our understanding of Actuarial Standards of Practice 27 (Selection of Economic Assumptions for Measuring Pension Obligations) and 35 (Selection of Demographic and Other Non-economic Assumptions for Measuring Pension Obligations).

In order to prepare the measurement of the impact on liabilities in this report, we have utilized actuarial models that we developed to measure liabilities and develop actuarial costs. These models include tools that we have produced and tested, along with commercially available valuation software that we have reviewed to confirm the appropriateness and accuracy of the output. In utilizing these models, we develop and use input parameters and assumptions about future contingent events along with recognized actuarial approaches to develop the needed results.

We note that as we prepare this report, the world has been in a pandemic during much of the experience study period of the last three years. We have taken this into consideration as we reviewed the experience, particularly regarding mortality, retirement, termination and disability patterns. While we do not believe that there is yet sufficient data to warrant the significant modification of any of our assumptions specifically due to COVID-19, we will continue to monitor the situation and advise the Board in the future of any adjustments that we believe would be appropriate.

We would like to acknowledge the help in the preparation of the data for this investigation given by the OPERS staff.

We, Alisa Bennett and Brent Banister, are Members of the American Academy of Actuaries and meet the Qualification Standards of the American Academy of Actuaries to render the actuarial opinion contained herein.

Respectfully submitted,

Alia Brit

Alisa Bennett, FSA, EA, FCA, MAAA President

Brent a Bante

Brent Banister, PhD, FSA, EA, FCA, MAAA Chief Actuary



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
Ι	Summary of Results	1
II	Economic Assumptions	3
III	Demographic Assumptions	18
	Rates of Mortality	19
	Rates of Retirement	21
	Rates of Disability Retirement	24
	Rates of Withdrawal	24
	Rates of Electing a Vested Benefit	25
	Rates of Salary Increase	25
	Miscellaneous Assumptions	25
IV	Actuarial Methods	27
<u>Appendix</u>		
А	Capital Market Assumptions and Asset Allocation	28
В	Proposed OPERS Assumptions	29
С	Proposed URSJJ Assumption	40
D	Analysis Graphs	44
E	Analysis Tables	57



Section I: Summary of Results

The following summarizes the findings and recommendations for the assumptions utilized by the Oklahoma Public Employees Retirement System. Explanations for the recommendations are found in the sections that follow.

Recommended Economic Assumption Changes

The table below lists the three key economic assumptions used in the actuarial valuation and their current and proposed rates. We are not recommending any changes to these assumptions at this time.

Item	Current	Proposed
Price Inflation	2.50%	2.50%
Investment Return	6.50%	6.50%
Real Wage Growth	0.75%	0.75%

Recommended Demographic Assumption Changes

The table below lists the demographic assumptions that we recommend be changed based on recent observed experience. While the results in this study generally show data from the three-year study period, we have also considered prior studies in making our recommendations.

Assumption Changes			
 OPERS ➢ Adopt a "gen mortality imp ➢ Adjust rates of 	erational" approach to reflecting expected provement of retirement		
URSJJ → Adopt a "gen mortality imp	erational" approach to reflecting expected provement		

Recommended Method Changes

We do not recommend any changes in the actuarial methods. We note that since the last experience study was completed, the Board has adopted a new amortization policy using layered bases following our recommendation after the July 1, 2021 valuation.



<u>Financial Impact</u>

The tables below highlight the impact on the Oklahoma Public Employees Retirement System (OPERS) and the Uniform Retirement System for Justices and Judges (URSJJ) if the proposed assumptions are adopted. The tables show the change in the unfunded actuarial accrued liability (UAAL), funded ratio and employer contribution rate for both Plans of the System as of July 1, 2022. The actual changes, which will first be reflected in the July 1, 2023 valuations, will be different, but should be of a similar magnitude.

	Before Assumption Changes	After Assumption Changes
OPERS		
Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability	(\$171,875,249)	(\$13,279,353)
Funded Ratio	101.5%	100.1%
Employer Contribution Rate	6.68%	7.70%
URSJJ		
Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability	(\$38,279,258)	(\$27,916,121)
Funded Ratio	110.9%	107.7%
Employer Contribution Rate	(2.40%)	(1.14%)



There are three economic assumptions used in performing the actuarial valuation for the Oklahoma Public Employees Retirement System (OPERS) and the Uniform Retirement System for Justices and Judges (URSJJ). The assumptions are:

- Price Inflation
- Investment Return
- Wage Inflation

Unlike demographic assumptions, economic assumptions do not lend themselves to analysis largely on the basis of internal historical patterns because economic assumptions are impacted by external forces in the economy. The investment return and general wage increase assumptions are selected on the basis of expectations in an inflation-free environment and then increased by the long-term expectation for inflation, called the "building block" approach.

Sources of data considered in the analysis and selection of the economic assumptions included:

- The 2022 Social Security Trustees Report
- Future expectations of OPERS investment consultant, Verus
- Future expectations of other investment consultants (2022 Horizon Survey)
- U.S. Department of the Treasury bond rates
- Assumptions used by other large public retirement systems, based on the Public Fund Survey, published by the National Association of State Retirement Administrators (NASRA)
- Historical observations of price and wage growth statistics and investment returns

Actuarial Standard of Practice Number 27

Guidance regarding the selection of economic assumptions for measuring pension obligations is provided by Actuarial Standard of Practice (ASOP) 27, *Selection of Economic Assumptions for Measuring Pension Obligations*. Because no one knows what the future holds, the best an actuary can do is to use professional judgment to estimate possible future economic outcomes. These estimates are based on a mixture of past experience, future expectations, and professional judgment.

ASOP 27 requires the actuary to select a "reasonable" assumption. For this purpose, an assumption is reasonable if it has the following characteristics:

- a. it is appropriate for the purpose of the measurement;
- b. it reflects the actuary's professional judgment;
- c. it takes into account historical and current economic data that is relevant as of the measurement date;
- d. it reflects the actuary's estimate of future experience, the actuary's observation of the estimates inherent in market data, or a combination thereof; and
- e. it has no significant bias (i.e., it is neither significantly optimistic nor pessimistic) except when provisions for adverse deviation or plan provisions that are difficult to measure are included.

Section II: Economic Assumptions



With respect to relevant data, the standard recommends the actuary review appropriate recent and long-term historical economic data but advises the actuary not to give undue weight to recent experience. Furthermore, it advises the actuary to consider that some historical economic data may not be appropriate for use in developing assumptions for future periods due to changes in the underlying environment. In addition, with respect to any particular valuation, each economic assumption should be consistent with all other economic assumptions over the measurement period.

ASOP 27 recognizes that economic data and analyses are available from a variety of sources, including representatives of the plan sponsor, investment advisors, economists, and other professionals. The actuary is permitted to incorporate the views of experts, but the selection or advice must reflect the actuary's professional judgment.

The standard also discusses a "range of reasonable assumptions" which in part states "the actuary should also recognize that different actuaries will apply professional judgment and may choose different reasonable assumptions. As a result, a range of reasonable assumptions may develop both for an individual actuary and across actuarial practice."

The remaining section of this report will address the relevant types of economic assumptions used in the actuarial valuation to determine the obligations of the System. In our opinion, the economic assumptions proposed in this report have been developed in accordance with ASOP 27.

	Current Assumptions	Proposed Assumptions
Price Inflation	2.50%	2.50%
Investment Return	6.50%	6.50%
Real Wage Growth	0.75%	0.75%
Payroll Growth	3.25%	3.25%

The following table summarizes the current and proposed economic assumptions:



PRICE INFLATION

Use in the Valuation

Future price inflation has an indirect impact on the results of the actuarial valuation through the development of the assumptions for investment return, general wage growth (which then impacts individual salary increases), and payroll growth.

Inflation also has a direct impact on the valuation results. The long-term relationship between price inflation and investment return has long been recognized by economists. The basic principle is that the investor demands a more or less level "real return" – the excess of actual investment return over price inflation. If inflation rates are expected to be high, investment return rates are also expected to be high, while low inflation rates are expected to result in lower expected investment returns, at least in the long run.

The current assumption for price inflation is 2.50% per year which was recommended and adopted in the last experience study.

Past Experience

Although economic activities, in general, and inflation in particular, do not lend themselves to prediction solely on the basis of historical analysis, historical patterns and long-term trends are factors to be considered in developing the inflation assumption. The Consumer Price Index, US City Average, All Urban Consumers, CPI (U), has been used as the basis for reviewing historical levels of price inflation. The following table provides historical annualized rates and annual standard deviations of the CPI-U over periods ending June 30th.

Period	Number of Years	Annualized Rate of Inflation	Annual Standard Deviation
1926 - 2022	96	2.98%	4.08%
1962 - 2022	60	3.88	2.92
1972 - 2022	50	4.00	3.11
1982 - 2022	40	2.83	1.76
1992 - 2022	30	2.53	1.83
2002 - 2022	20	2.53	2.23
2012 - 2022	10	2.59	2.69



Section II: Economic Assumptions

The following graph illustrates the historical annual change in price inflation, measured as of December 31 for each of the last 70 years, as well as the 30-year rolling average through that date.



From 2008 through 2020, the annual rate of increase in the CPI-U was below the current assumption of 2.50% almost every year. The period of high inflation from 1973 to 1982 has a significant impact on the averages over periods which include these rates, as does the spike in 2021 and 2022.

Forecasts of Inflation

Additional information to consider in formulating this assumption is obtained from measuring the spread on Treasury Inflation Protected Securities (TIPS) and from the prevailing economic forecasts. The spread between the nominal yield on treasury securities (bonds) and the inflation indexed yield on TIPS of the same maturity is referred to as the "breakeven rate of inflation" and represents the bond market's expectation of inflation over the period to maturity. Current market prices as of December 2022 suggest that investors expect inflation to be around 2.3% over the next 5 to 30 years. The bond market expectations may be heavily influenced by the interest rate environment created by the Federal Reserve Bank's manipulation of the bond market.

OPERS' investment consultant, Verus, also has an inflation forecast in their capital market assumptions. Their short-term assumption (10 years) is 2.5%. Horizon Actuarial Services surveys a significant portion of the major investment advisors and publishes their assumptions. For the 2022 study, the long-term inflation assumption was 2.44%



Social Security Projections

Although many economists forecast lower inflation than the assumptions used by retirement systems, they are generally looking at a shorter time horizon (10 years) than is appropriate for a pension valuation. To consider a longer, similar time frame, we looked at the expected increase in the CPI by the Office of the Chief Actuary for the Social Security Administration. In the most recent report (June 2022), the projected average annual increase in the CPI over the next 75 years was estimated to be 2.4%, under the intermediate (best estimate) cost assumption. The range of price inflation used in the Social Security 75-year modeling, which includes low and high-cost scenarios, in addition to the intermediate cost projection, was 1.8% to 3.0%.

Peer System Comparison

While we do not recommend the selection of any assumption based on what other systems use, it does provide another set of relevant information to consider. Based on the Public Plan Database (a survey of over 125+ state and local retirement systems maintained by a collaboration between the Center for Retirement Research at Boston College, the Center for State and Local Government Excellence, and the National Association of State Retirement Administrators), the average inflation assumption for governmental plans has been steadily declining. Based on the current data, the average inflation assumption is 2.52%. This data is largely based on actuarial valuations prepared with measurement dates in 2021. Although inflation has spiked recently, we have not seen a reversal of this trend and expect most systems to take a wait-and-see approach.

Recommendation

The current inflation assumption is 2.50%. This assumption was reduced by 0.25% in each of the prior two experience studies as actual inflation remained persistently low. While there has been a spike in inflation the last two years, recent monthly CPI measurements suggest that this may be temporary. Most forecasts, including the financial market pricing are also indicating that inflation is expected to return to where it was prior to this spike. Based on all of this information, we recommend retaining the price inflation assumption of 2.50%.

Price Inflation	
Current Assumption	2.50%
Recommended Assumption	2.50%



INVESTMENT RETURN

Use in the Valuation

The investment return assumption reflects anticipated returns on the current and future assets. It is one of the primary determinants in the calculation of the expected cost of the System's benefits, providing a discount of the estimated future benefit payments to reflect the time value of money. This assumption has a direct impact on the calculation of liabilities, normal costs, and contribution rates. Generally, the investment return assumption should be set with consideration of the asset allocation policy, expected long term real rates of return on the specific asset classes, the underlying inflation rate, and any investment expenses, but is also impacted by the dynamics of the system along with the risk tolerance and preferences of the Board.

The current investment return assumption is 6.50% per year, net of all investment-related and administrative expenses. This investment assumption was set in our last experience study. The 6.50% rate of return is referred to as the nominal rate of return and is composed of two components. The first component is price inflation (previously discussed). Any excess return over price inflation is referred to as the real rate of return. The real rate of return, based on the current set of assumptions, is 4.00% (6.50% nominal return less 2.50% inflation).

ASOP 27 provides guidance to actuaries on the selection of economic assumptions used for measuring pension obligations. Our findings and analysis, following that ASOP, are discussed below.

Long Term Perspective

Because the economy is constantly changing, assumptions about what may occur in the near term are volatile. Asset managers and investment consultants usually focus on this near-term horizon so as to make prudent choices regarding how to invest the trust funds, i.e., the asset allocation. For actuarial calculations, we typically consider very long periods of time as some current employees will still be receiving benefit payments more than 80 years from now. For example, a newly hired employee who is 25 years old may work for 35 years, to age 60, and live another 30 years, to age 90. The retirement system would receive contributions for the first 35 years and then pay out benefits for the next 30 years. During the entire 65-year period, the system is investing assets on behalf of the member. For such a typical career employee, more than one-half of the investment income earned on assets accumulated to pay benefits is received <u>after</u> the employee retires. This difference in time horizon is frequently a source of debate and confusion when setting economic assumptions.



OPERS Historical Perspective

One of the inherent problems with analyzing historical data is that the results can look significantly different depending on the timeframe used, especially if the year-to-year results vary widely. In addition, asset allocation can also impact the returns so comparing results over long periods when different asset allocations were in place may not be meaningful. The recent experience for the retirement funds over the last twenty four years is shown in the table below.

Year Ending 6/30	Market Value (\$ million)	Market Value Rate of Return (Net of fees)
1999	\$ 4,831	9.2%
2000	5,246	9.9
2001	4,815	(6.0)
2002	4,486	(5.3)
2003	4,619	5.4
2004	5,126	14.0
2005	5,504	10.3
2006	5,817	7.9
2007	6,640	16.3
2008	6,255	(4.2)
2009	5,174	(15.4)
2010	5,774	13.9
2011	6,841	21.5
2012	6,821	2.2
2013	7,442	12.0
2014	8,570	18.0
2015	8,636	3.1
2016	8,436	0.2
2017	9,230	12.6
2018	9,702	8.4
2019	9,958	6.0
2020	10,098	4.5
2021	12,526	27.8
2022	10,393	(14.7)



Clearly there is a significant amount of variation year to year. By considering compound returns over time, we can get some additional sense of the expected return. The following table shows the effective rate of return over various time periods through June 30, 2022.

Period	Rate of Return (net of investment fees)		
5 years	5.52%		
10 years	7.23		
20 years	6.93		

Forward Looking Analysis

We believe the most appropriate analysis to consider in setting the investment return assumption is to model the expected returns given the system's target asset allocation and forward-looking capital market assumptions. However, we are trained as actuaries and not as investment professionals. As such, we rely heavily on professional investment consultants, such as Verus, to provide investment expertise including capital market assumptions.

In performing our analysis, we use the building block approach so the real rate of return of the portfolio is modeled, based on the target asset allocation, and then the expected return is added to the price inflation assumption. Therefore, our analysis focuses on the real rate of return while the analysis of the investment consultants more typically focuses on the nominal return in their asset allocation consulting. OPERS' current target asset allocation, along with their investment consultant's (Verus) long-term capital market assumptions, are shown in the following table (more detail is shown in Appendix A):

Asset Class	Target Allocation	Ten Year Return Forecast*	Standard Deviation Forecast
US Large Cap Equity	34.0%	7.6%	15.6%
US Small Cap Equity	6.0%	7.6%	21.5%
Global Equity ex-US	28.0%	10.7%	19.9%
Core Fixed Income	25.0%	4.4%	4.6%
Long Term Treasuries	3.5%	4.6%	13.2%
US TIPS	3.5%	4.3%	5.6%
Total	100.0%		

OPERS Target Asset Allocation and Verus Assumptions

*Arithmetic mean, assumes 2.5% inflation.



Section II: Economic Assumptions

Verus does not provide long-term capital market assumptions, which would be expected to be higher. Based on their 2022 capital market assumptions, Verus' expected one-year arithmetic mean return is 7.44%. Because of the nature of compounding returns, however, the arithmetic mean is of limited value. A more important measure is the geometric mean, which is the expected long-term compound rate of return. Mathematically, the geometric return will be less than the arithmetic return. Under the Verus assumptions, the geometric mean is 6.7%.

It should be noted that there is currently a fair amount of variation in expectations among investment professionals, and that the assumptions have been changing (generally upwards) over the last several months as interest rates have increased.

It must be noted that one-year expected returns come with high standard deviations, over 12% in this case, and therefore high volatility. It is helpful to look at expected returns over a longer time horizon as shown in the table that follows. The returns shown are real returns (excluding inflation) so that a long-term inflation assumption can be incorporated. The table uses the Verus 10-year assumptions.

Time Span In	Verus 10-year Assumptions Real Returns by Percentile						
Ŷears	95 th	95 th 75 th 50 th 25 th 5 th					
1	26.87%	12.98%	4.21%	-3.90%	-14.49%		
5	13.81%	8.04%	4.21%	0.50%	-4.60%		
10	10.91%	6.91%	4.21%	1.58%	-2.10%		
20	8.90%	6.11%	4.21%	2.34%	-0.29%		
30	8.03%	5.76%	4.21%	2.68%	0.52%		
50	7.15%	5.41%	4.21%	3.02%	1.34%		
75	6.61%	5.19%	4.21%	3.24%	1.86%		

The chart above shows the percentile rankings for expected returns. Thus, for the 20-year time span, 5% of the resulting real rates of return are expected to be below -0.29% and 95% expected to be above that. As the time span increases, the results begin to converge. Over a 75-year time span, the results indicate there is a 25% chance that the real return will be below 3.24% and a 25% chance it will be above 5.19%. In other words, there is a 50% chance the real returns will be between 3.24% and 5.19%.

Peer System Comparison

Public retirement systems have historically compared their investment performance to their peer group. While we believe there is some merit in assessing the movement in the assumed rate of return for other systems, this is not an appropriate basis for setting this assumption in our opinion. For example, different plans have different plan dynamics which will impact their choice of the assumed investment return. This peer group information merely provides another set of relevant data to consider as long as we recognize that asset allocation varies from system to system.



Section II: Economic Assumptions

The graph below shows the change in the distribution of the investment return assumption from fiscal year 2001 through 2022 for the 120+ large public retirement systems included in the NASRA Public Fund Survey. As it indicates, the investment return assumptions used by public plans have decreased over the last two decades, likely heavily impacted by a corresponding decrease in the underlying inflation assumption from over the same period. It is worth noting that the median investment return assumption in fiscal year 2011 dropped from 8.00% to 7.75% and has declined further to 7.00% in 2023.





Administrative and Investment Expenses

Budgeted administrative expenses are directly reflected as a separate component in the calculation of the contribution rate, and so no assumption is required. Generally, capital market assumptions are reflective of passive investment strategies where there are minimal investment expenses. Where active management is utilized, it is assumed that the additional return from active management is at least as great as the additional expense, and so no investment expense adjustment is required.

Recommendation

Using the building block approach of ASOP 27 and the projection results outlined above, we can develop a range for the investment return assumption of the 25th to 75th percentile real returns over the 75-year time span plus the recommended inflation assumption. The following tables details the ranges using Verus' 10-year assumptions.

ver	us 10-1 ear Assu	inpuons	
Item	25 th Percentile	50 th Percentile	75 th Percentile
Real Rate of Return	3.24%	4.21%	5.19%
Inflation	<u>2.50</u>	2.50	2.50
Net Investment Return	5.74%	6.71%	7.69%

Verus 10-Year Assumptions

One additional consideration for OPERS is that the plan is partially closed. Over a fairly long period of time, this is anticipated to result in benefit payments being increasingly larger than the contributions from members and employers. This requires the gradual reduction of the investment pool but is not a cause for concern – this is the very reason the investment pool exists. This drawdown may require some change in asset allocation, however, which could affect the net investment returns shown above. We have discussed this long-term drawdown with OPERS investment staff and believe some degree of caution is in order, although the ultimate impact cannot yet be fully quantified. While the URSJJ portfolio is not subject to these same concerns, the fact that the large OPERS portfolio and the much smaller URSJJ portfolio are invested together argues for a common investment return assumption for the time being.

Considering the different sources discussed above (OPERS experience, historical markets, Verus' short-term expectations), we believe that 6.50% continues to be a reasonable assumption. The volatility in the markets over the last two to three years also makes us cautious about changing this assumption, preferring to see if there is clarity in three years when we review assumptions again.

Investment Return Assumption		
Current	6.50%	
Recommended	6.50%	



GENERAL WAGE GROWTH

Background

General wage growth, thought of as the "across-the-board" rate of salary increases, is composed of the price inflation assumption and an assumption for the real rate of wage increases/real wage growth. The excess of wage growth over price inflation represents the increase in the standard of living, also called productivity growth.

In constructing the salary increase assumption used to project future salary increases for individual members, the wage growth assumption is combined with an assumption for service-based salary increases (called a merit scale). The service-based salary increase assumption will be addressed when the demographic assumptions are studied. Currently, the 2.50% inflation assumption combined with the 0.75% real wage growth assumption leads to a general wage growth assumption of 3.25%.

Historical Perspective

Wage statistics are found in the Social Security System database on the National Average Wage data. This information goes back to 1955 and is the most comprehensive database available. Because the National Average Wage is based on all wage earners in the country who are covered by Social Security, it can be influenced by the mix of jobs (full-time vs. part-time, manufacturing vs. service, etc.) as well as by changes in some segments of the workforce that are not seen in all segments (e.g., regional changes or growth in computer technology). Furthermore, if compensation is shifted between wages and benefits, the wage index would not accurately reflect increases in total compensation. OPERS membership is composed exclusively of governmental employees working in Oklahoma, whose wages and benefits are somewhat linked as a result of state and local tax revenues, funding allocations, and governing policies. Because the competition for workers can, in the long term, extend across industries and geography, the broad national earnings growth will have some impact on OPERS members. In the shorter term, however, the wage growth of OPERS and the nation may be less directly correlated.

The excess of wage inflation over price inflation represents the real wage inflation rate. Although real wage inflation has been very low in recent years, likely due to the slow recovery from the 2008 financial crisis, our focus must remain on the long term. The following tables show the compounded wage growth over various periods, along with the comparable price inflation rate for the same period. The differences represent the real wage inflation rate. The table on the left shows the real wage inflation over different 10-year periods while the table on the right shows the real wage inflation over increasing periods of 10 to 60 years.



Section II: Economic Assumptions

Decade	General Wage Inflation	CPI Incr.	Real Wage Inflation	Period	General Wage Inflation	CPI Incr.	Real Wage Inflation
2011-2021	3.49%	2.14%	1.35%	2011-2021	3.49%	2.14%	1.35%
2001-2011	2.70%	2.48%	0.22%	2001-2021	3.10%	2.31%	0.79%
1991-2001	4.20%	2.51%	1.69%	1991-2021	3.46%	2.37%	1.09%
1981-1991	4.70%	3.91%	0.79%	1981-2021	3.77%	2.76%	1.01%
1971-1981	7.80%	8.62%	(0.82%)	1971-2021	4.57%	3.90%	0.67%
1961-1971	4.75%	3.20%	1.55%	1961-2021	4.60%	3.77%	0.83%

Similar information over rolling 30-year periods is shown in the following graph:





Forecasts of Future Wages

The wage index used for the historical analysis is projected forward by the Office of the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration in their 75-year projections. In the June, 2022 Trustees Report, the annual increase in the National Average Wage Index under the intermediate cost assumption (best estimate) was 3.55%, 1.15% higher than the Social Security intermediate inflation assumption of 2.40% per year. The range of the assumed real wage inflation in the 2022 Trustees Report was 0.53% to 1.77% per year.

Public Sector Compensation and Wages

The Bureau of Labor Statistics publishes the Employment Cost Index, including detail for real (net of inflation) total compensation and wages and salaries. Further, this index is also broken down for state and local government workers. From 2004 through 2022, total compensation grew at an annualized rate of 2.78%, while wages and salaries grew at a rate of 2.12%. (Inflation was 2.51% over the same period.) This difference is a reflection that state and local government workers have had much of their compensation increase delivered through benefits rather than wages and salaries. While it is certainly reasonable to anticipate that total compensation will continue to increase faster than wages and salaries, it is also reasonable to anticipate that the difference between the two will moderate over time.

Recommendation

Over the last 50-60 years, the actual experience on a national basis has been close to the current assumption. However, this is based on SSA data which uses the average wages of all US workers. As mentioned earlier, the median real wage increase has been significantly lower. We believe that wages will continue to grow at a greater rate than prices over the long term, although not necessarily at the level projected for all employers (private and governmental) by the SSA. We anticipate wage growth for governmental employees could be lower than the national average, at least in the short term, due to budget challenges still being experienced by both state and local governmental employers.

Based on the available data and our professional judgment, we recommend that the long-term assumed real wage growth be kept at 0.75% per year. When coupled with the price inflation assumption of 2.50%, the resulting general wage growth assumption remains at 3.25%.



PAYROLL GROWTH ASSUMPTION

Senate Bill 2120 and House Bill 2630, in combination, have begun to significantly reduce the number of new members entering the plan after November 1, 2015. While this has had an impact on the valuation results as of July 1, 2016 and will have an impact going forward, the impact emerges slowly since it only concerns employees hired after November 1, 2015. However, there are potential ramifications of this legislation that will affect on-going plan funding. In particular, the current amortization of the UAAL is based on the assumption of increasing payroll. The current provision of this legislation provide the difference between the defined contribution plan match and the statutory rate for the System be added to the defined benefit plan. This is expected to provide at least as much payment toward the UAAL as would have been expected otherwise, so we are comfortable with continuing the methodology of amortizing as a level percentage of payroll. We would encourage the Board to study the long-term impact of this legislation.

Therefore, the valuation requires an assumption regarding future annual increases in covered payroll. The wage growth assumption is typically used for this purpose. The current payroll growth assumption for OPERS is 3.25%, the same as the current wage growth assumption.

Based on the recommended wage growth assumption of 3.25%, we recommend the payroll growth assumption be retained at 3.25%.

SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC CHANGES

The following table summarizes the current set of economic assumptions along with the recommended set of economic assumptions:

	Current Assumptions	Recommended Assumptions
Price Inflation	2.50%	2.50%
Investment Return	6.50%	6.50%
General Wage Growth	3.25%	3.25%
Payroll Growth	3.25%	3.25%



There are several demographic assumptions used in the actuarial valuations performed for the Oklahoma Public Employees Retirement System (OPERS) and the Uniform Retirement System for Justices and Judges (URSJJ). They are:

- Rates of Mortality
- Rates of Service Retirement
- Rates of Disability Retirement
- Rates of Withdrawal
- Probability of Electing a Vested Benefit
- Rates of Salary Increase for Merit and Promotions

The Actuarial Standards Board has issued Actuarial Standard of Practice (ASOP) 35, "Selection of Demographic and Other Noneconomic Assumptions for Measuring Pension Obligations", which provides guidance to actuaries in selecting demographic assumptions for measuring obligations under defined benefit plans. In our opinion, the demographic assumptions recommended in this report have been developed in accordance with ASOP 35.

The purpose of a study of demographic experience is to compare what actually happened to the membership during the study period (July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2022) with what was expected to happen based on the assumptions used in the most recent actuarial valuations.

Detailed tabulations by age, service and/or gender are performed over the entire study period. These tabulations look at all active and retired members during the period as well as separately identifying those who experience a demographic event, referred to as a decrement. In addition, the tabulation of all members together with the current assumptions permits the calculation of the number of expected decrements during the study period. Comparing the actual to expected results provides an indication of the reasonableness of the assumption. This actual to expected ratio, or A/E ratio, is not the only indicator, however, since an assumption that is too high for part of the group and too low for another part might still have an A/E ratio near 100%. Consequently, we also consider graphical displays of the results as another aid in assessing the results of a study period.

If the actual experience differs significantly from the overall expected results, or if the pattern of actual decrements by age, gender, or service does not follow the expected pattern, new assumptions are recommended. Recommended changes usually do not follow the exact actual experience during the observation period. Judgment is required to extrapolate future experience from past trends and current member behavior. In addition, non-recurring events, such as early retirement windows, need to be taken into account in determining the weight to give to recent experience. We note in particular that the period of time in this study overlaps with the Covid-19 pandemic that affected not only the health of individuals, but also led to individuals and employers responding differently than they had before. As a result, we have been more cautious in recommending changes for demographic assumptions than we would be in a more normal period.

Because a major purpose of an actuarial valuation is to determine the liability, it is often preferable to measure the events that occurred by the proportion of liability that experience the change rather than simply the proportion of individuals who experienced the change. This "liability weighting"



reflects that if certain events are connected with the salary or service level of individuals, then we should give more weight to those with greater liability. In some cases, there may be a noticeable difference in the results based upon whether we look at the analysis on a count or weighted basis. In these cases, we may select an assumption somewhere in between the two and move over time as the credibility of the liability-weighted results increases.

The remainder of this section presents the results of the demographic study. We have prepared graphs and tables that show a comparison of the actual and expected decrements and the overall ratio of actual to expected results under the current assumptions. If a change is being proposed, the revised actual to expected ratios are shown as well. These tables are presented in Appendices D and E.

Rates of Mortality

Mortality tables are a fundamental assumption in actuarial valuations. Because benefits are typically paid over a retiree's lifetime, it is important to appropriately reflect what a typical lifetime looks like. In addition, deaths before retirement may also result in the payout of benefits to a spouse or survivor. For valuation purposes, we must consider mortality tables for retirees, beneficiaries of retirees, disabled retirees, and active members.

Retiree Mortality:

The post-retirement mortality rates used in the actuarial valuation estimate the percentage of retirees who are expected to die in a given future year. This assumption typically has the most significant impact on liability projections of any demographic assumption. The current assumption is based on a table from the Society of Actuaries and is technically described as the PubG-2010(B) table (the "G" indicates general membership and the "(B)" indicates below median benefit amounts) with female ages set forward two years, projected to 2030 using projection scale MP-2019. Female ages set forward two years means that, for example, a woman aged 80 would be expected to die at the same rate as an 82-year-old woman based on the table. The male table appears is a good fit without any adjustment.

Based upon the long-term trend of mortality improvement, actuaries seek to account for future improvements in longevity, either by directly projecting future improvements or by maintaining a sufficient margin in expected rates of mortality to allow for future improvement. Historically, OPERS has used the approach of maintaining a margin, a practice in which mortality rates are set with some future expected improvement already included. We have discussed the idea of directly projecting mortality improvements with OPERS staff several times over the years, and they have now indicated that they believe that the administrative concerns that had seemed to be a barrier to this approach are no longer an issue. Consequently, we are recommending adopting the "generational mortality" approach in which we will have no appreciable initial margin, and we will instead build in expected improvement each year in the future. Generational mortality means that the probability of death depends not only on a person's age but the year that age is obtained. Therefore, a person aged 80 in 2022 will have a higher expected probability of death than a person who will be age 80 in 2052.

Graphs showing actual versus expected post-retirement mortality rates for OPERS members are shown in Appendix D in Table D-1 for males and D-2 for females, and Appendix E Tables E-1



and E-2 have the corresponding numerical data. The analysis of the actual post-retirement mortality experience over the three-year experience study period are significantly inconsistent with the observed mortality in the prior studies. Additional review of the data indicates that this is almost certainly related to the impact of Covid-19 during the study period. While Covid-19 is likely to remain as an endemic disease that will contribute to additional deaths among retired populations, especially the older and less healthy portion, we do not anticipate that what we observed during the three-year study period will be predictive of the future. Consequently, we are not reflecting the 2019-2022 mortality data in developing our recommendations for the mortality table to be used.

In reviewing our work from the prior study three years ago, we believe that we could reasonably use the table we recommended at that time, but without the projection to 2030 that was made to provide a margin. Instead, the projection can be made generationally from the table's 2010 base date. We are recommending a change to the mortality tables for retirees and beneficiaries to use the PubG-2010(B) table, the table for below median amounts for general membership, with a two-year age set forward for females and no age adjustment for males, projected generationally using scale MP-2019.

Because of the small URSJJ retiree population, we cannot obtain credible analysis of retiree mortality experience. Drawing upon the general background on factors affecting mortality, we do anticipate that this group will have better mortality (i.e., live longer) than the broader OPERS membership. This has been recognized in the past by setting the OPERS table back one year, so a 65-year-old URSJJ retiree is treated as having the same mortality rate as a 64-year-old OPERS member. With the movement to the generational mortality approach and consideration of the age distribution of Judges versus general OPERS members, we believe a small adjustment is in order based on our professional judgment. Using a static projection of the MP-2019 mortality improvement scale to 2030 compared to using the generational mortality improvement approach generally results in higher mortality in the earlier years (e.g. before 2030) and lower mortality in the later years. Due to the demographics of the URSJJ retiree population, we believe that this additional shift is appropriate to maintain the anticipated improvements in mortality that had been approximated with the margin. We recommend setting the OPERS table back two years for URSJJ members.

Beneficiary Mortality:

For benefits payable with a joint and survivor option, an assumption is needed regarding the beneficiary's lifetime. Because many members take a lifetime only benefit, there is less data available for beneficiaries. Further, data tracking of beneficiaries is less precise during the years when the member is alive. Some studies indicate that survivor mortality may differ from member mortality due to factors such as different work experiences or the stress of being a surviving spouse, but we do not have enough data to credibly assess whether this might be applicable. Consequently, we do not attempt to analyze this group separately. We recommend that for both OPERS and URSJJ that the same table used for retirees also be used for beneficiaries.

Disabled Retiree Mortality:

Members who retire under the disability retirement provisions are generally expected to be less healthy than the overall population. Currently, the assumption for this group is the same as the



regular members with a 12-year age set forward. With the new mortality table being recommended for healthy mortality, we believe a 12-year age set forward remains an appropriate adjustment. There is admittedly not a lot of data to draw from, but the disability incidence is also low enough that this assumption is not significant. We recommend retaining the current mortality assumption.

Active Member Mortality:

For active members, the mortality assumption is less significant since it represents only a small portion of cases where employment ends and benefits begin. There are also additional challenges with collecting accurate data since some members may begin a disability retirement or terminate shortly before death, thereby affecting the reliability of the data. We had the following experience over the study period for active members ages 20 to 65:

	Actual Deaths	Expected Deaths	A/E Ratio
Males	121	99	122%
Females	54	70	77%

Because we are recommending a change to the mortality tables for retirees and beneficiaries, we believe it is reasonable to make the corresponding adjustment for active employees. We are recommending the employees version of the PubG-2010(B) table, the table for below median amounts for general membership, with a two-year age set forward for females and no age adjustment for males, projected generationally using scale MP-2019. For hazardous duty members, the current assumption is that the death rates should be 10% higher to reflect an increased risk of death in the line of duty. With the very limited data available, we cannot assess the adequacy of this assumption, but we find it reasonable and recommend its continued use.

Optional Form Tables:

For OPERS, we have retained the same underlying mortality tables, including the use of the MP-2019 projection scale used for mortality improvements. However, based on discussions with staff, we are recommending using the generational approach for the MP-2019 projection scale for valuation purposes. The underlying mortality tables have not changed, and thus, for purposes of the optional form tables, we recommend retaining the optional form tables for OPERS, which uses a static projection of scale MP-2019 to 2030. For URSJJ, we recommended using the OPERS mortality tables with a two-year setback in lieu of the one-year setback previously used. As such, we recommend updating the optional form tables for URSJJ to align with the new mortality assumptions.

Rates of Retirement

The service retirement rates used in the actuarial valuations project the percentage of employees who are expected to retire during a given year. This assumption does not include the retirement patterns of the individuals who terminated from active membership prior to their retirement.



The System provides for two types of retirements based on different eligibility requirements. The first of these is for an unreduced retirement benefit. The second is for an early retirement benefit which is reduced. Separate assumptions have been developed for each type of retirement benefit.

Regular OPERS Members

OPERS provides for a normal, unreduced retirement benefit upon the earlier of (a) age 62 and six years of service or (b) "Rule of 80" (if hired prior to July 1, 1992) or "Rule of 90" (if hired on or after July 1, 1992). Members hired after October 31, 2011 must be 65 rather than 62 or reach age 60 with "Rule of 90". OPERS also provides for an early, reduced retirement benefit upon reaching age 55 (age 60 for members hired after October 31, 2011) and completing ten years of participating service. Under the provisions for early retirement, the benefit is reduced 1/15th for each of the first five years and 1/30th per year for the next two years.

Because the Rule of 90 affected new hires about 30 years ago, we are just beginning to observe members hired under that provision who are eligible for unreduced retirement before age 62. Members hired before that date, in contrast, have been largely eligible for unreduced retirement for several years. Very few of those hired since 2011 have reached age 65, or even reached eligibility for early retirement because of the 10-year service requirement. We do see similar retirement patterns for between the pre-2011 groups at ages above 62, and so we believe it reasonable to anticipate that retirement patterns among eligible employees who will eventually meet Rule of 90 before age 62 are not unlike the patterns of those who now meet Rule of 80 at those ages. Over the coming years, we will begin to be able to test the validity of that belief. For now, the practical result of the groups and eligibility requirements is that we use a uniform retirement assumption for those eligible to retire.

Graphs and detailed tables showing actual versus expected retirement rates are shown in Appendices D-3, D-4, E-3, and E-4. The analysis of the actual retirement experience over the three-year period yields an actual/expected ratio of 71% for early retirement and 85% for unreduced retirement, indicating fewer retirements than expected.

The early retirement rates from 55 to 61 were lowered in the last study and early retirement continues to exhibit a similar pattern in this study. We believe that a further reduction in the early retirement rates toward the observed rates will improve the overall fit. For normal (unreduced) retirement, the rates up to age 65 are a decent fit. For ages 66 to 69 we recommend an increase to the rates, while for ages 70 to 74 we believe a decrease in rates would be appropriate.

Retirement rates for members hired after October 31, 2011 are based upon professional judgment rather than actual experience because no meaningful experience yet exists, especially for early retirement. Experience will be limited for many years. We will continue to base the rates on professional judgment and will monitor actual experience as it becomes available.

Elected Officials

Elected officials may retire with a normal, unreduced retirement benefit upon the earlier of (a) age 60 and six years of elected service or (b) "Rule of 80". They may also retire with an early, reduced retirement benefit upon reaching age 55 and completing ten years of creditable service. Under the



provisions for early retirement, the benefit is reduced 6% per year before age 60. (For those hired after October 31, 2011, the retirement age is 65 with 8 years of service or 62 with 10 years.)

Because elected officials' retirements often coincide with elections, three-year experience studies capture either one or two general elections. This study period includes just one election, and so observed retirements were less than half of what was expected. Based on this, we are not confident that we can meaningfully adjust rates, and so recommend retaining the current elected official retirement rates.

Retirement rates for members hired after October 31, 2011 are based upon professional judgment rather than actual experience because very few members in this group have reached retirement eligibility yet. We will continue to base the rates on professional judgment and will monitor actual experience as it becomes available.

Hazardous Duty

Hazardous Duty members may retire with a normal, unreduced retirement benefit upon the earlier of (a) 20 years of hazardous duty service, (b) age 62 with 6 years of service, or (c) "Rule of 80" (if hired prior to July 1, 1992) or "Rule of 90" (if hired on or after July 1, 1992). They may also retire with an early, reduced retirement benefit upon reaching age 55 and completing ten years of creditable service. Under the provisions for early retirement, the benefit is reduced 1/15th for each of the first five years before age 62 and 1/30th per year for the next two years. New rules affect those hired after October 31, 2011.

Graphs and detailed tables showing actual versus expected retirement rates are shown in Appendices D-5 to D-7 and E-5 to E-7. Note that unreduced retirement has an assumption that is split into a service-based component (for those eligible because of 20 years of service) and an age-based component (for those eligible due to age, but with less than 20 years of service).

As in the prior three studies, retirement experience has been somewhat volatile in terms of retirement utilization. Because of the relatively limited number of exposures and recognizing that the Covid-19 pandemic may have contributed to the atypical experience, we are not proposing any changes in the assumptions at this time.

Retirement rates for members hired after October 31, 2011 are based upon professional judgment rather than actual experience because no such experience yet exists. These members will begin to become retirement eligible in the next experience study period, but this experience will still be limited. We will continue to base the rates on professional judgment and will monitor actual experience as it becomes available.

<u>URSJJ</u>

URSJJ members may retire with a normal, unreduced retirement benefit upon the earlier of (a) 65 with eight years of service, (b) age 60 with ten years of service or (c) "Rule of 80". For Judges taking office after January 1, 2012, retirement age is sixty-seven (67) with eight (8) years of service



or age sixty-two (62) with ten (10) years of service. No early retirement option is available for Judges.

Detailed tables showing actual versus expected retirement rates are shown in Appendices D-8 and E-8. The analysis of the actual retirement experience over the three-year period yields an actual/expected ratio of 57%. In the last experience study, the A/E ratio was over 100%. We recognize that some judicial positions are subject to election and so we would expect that the prior study would be over 100% and this study would be under 100% because of the election cycle relative to the study period. As a result, we do not recommend any changes at this time. In addition, we recommend using a single set of retirement rates for all Judges, whether hired before or after January 1, 2012, since we do not have any reason to anticipate different behavior.

Rates of Disability Retirement

The rates of disability used in the actuarial valuation project the percentage of employees who are expected to become disabled each year and begin to receive a disability retirement benefit. In order to qualify for disability benefits, the member must have at least eight years of service and qualify for Social Security or Railroad Retirement Board disability benefits.

Graphs and detailed tables showing actual versus expected disability rates are shown in Appendices D-9, D-10, E-9, and E-10.

In the prior experience study, we proposed two sets of unisex rates for the OPERS, one for Regular and Elected members and one for Hazardous Duty members. Judges are not assumed to have any disability retirements. While liability-weighted results are typically used in analyzing decrements, we use counts for analyzing the disability assumption in order to better reflect situations in which a member has had reduced earnings in the year ahead of disability.

As has been the case in recent studies, observed disabilities remain well below the expected rates. Because we reduced disability rates in the prior study and because of the potential impacts of the recent economy and Covid on behavior, we prefer not to adjust rates further at this time. We recommend retaining the current disability rates for both Regular/Elected and Hazardous Duty members.

Rates of Withdrawal

The rates of withdrawal are used to determine the expected number of separations from active service that will occur prior to attaining the eligibility requirement for a retirement benefit as a result of resignation or dismissal.

The current URSJJ termination rates are 2% for all years of service. Termination from employment for reasons other than death, disability or retirement is uncommon in Judges' systems across the country. Over this period, with an observed termination rate of 1.4%, slightly lower than expected. **We recommend this assumption be maintained**.



The OPERS assumption is based on years of service and uses unisex rates. We believe the current rates are doing an appropriate job and **recommend retaining the current rates.** The complete tables of recommended withdrawal rates are shown in Appendices D-11 and E-11.

Probability of Electing a Vested Benefit

When a vested member terminates employment, the member (eventually) chooses to either take a deferred retirement benefit or to receive a refund of member contributions in lieu of the deferred benefit. An assumption for the frequency of this election is used for OPERS regular members. Because of the benefit structure, retirement eligibility, and demographic make-up of elected officials, hazardous duty members, and URSJJ members, these members are not expected to take a refund.

The probabilities are based on duration. Appendices D-12 and E-12 show the analysis of the last three years' experience. We believe the current assumption remains a good predictor of behavior and recommend continuing with this assumption.

Rates of Salary Increase for Merit and Promotion

Under the "building block" approach recommended in ASOP 27, this assumption is composed of three components: inflation, productivity (real wage increases), and merit/promotion. The inflation and productivity components are combined to produce the assumed rates of wage inflation. The rate represents the "across the board" average annual increase in salaries shown in the experience data. The merit component includes the additional increases in salary due to performance, seniority, promotions, etc.

During this study period, OPERS salary increases averaged above the expected levels, reversing the pattern observed in the prior three years. We also recognize that in addition to some possible catching up, this period of time was influenced by Covid-19, labor challenges, and some periods of high inflation. As a result, we want to be somewhat cautious in making any adjustments. Because the general "shape" of the increases is largely in line with what we observed, and because recent studies have shown smaller than expected increases, we are proposing to leave the merit scale unchanged. Detailed salary increase rates at all ages are shown in Appendices D-13 and E-13.

For URSJJ, a flat 3.50% assumption was used. In general, there is little merit component in judges' pay, with all judges at the same level usually receiving the same pay rate, and very little promotion to higher courts. While this would normally argue for an assumption of pay increases equal to the wage growth assumption, there have been very few pay increases over the past decade, and so there may be some catch up over time. Therefore, we recommend keeping this assumption at 3.50%, a rate slightly above our assumed wage inflation.

Miscellaneous Assumptions

Percent Married: Currently 85% of members are assumed to be married with the husband four years older than the wife. These are common and reasonable assumptions and **we recommend maintaining these assumptions.**



Missing Data: In preparing the valuation data, certain data items are missing, unavailable, or unreasonable. In such cases, we have developed assumptions for what the data element should be. These assumptions are described in Appendices D and E. We recommend keeping these assumptions.



Section IV: Actuarial Methods

Actuarial valuations utilize methods to determine the liabilities, assets, and costs. While these are not like other assumptions that may change over time, an experience study is still a good opportunity to review these methods to see if they are still appropriate for systematically funding the promised benefits. Significant methods are described below.

Actuarial Cost Method: The cost method is used to allocate the present value of benefits between past service (actuarial accrued liability) and future service (normal cost). Currently the valuation uses the entry age normal cost method. This is the most widely used cost method of large public sector plans and has demonstrated the highest degree of stability as compared to alternative methods. We recommend no change in the use of this method.

Actuarial Value of Assets: The purpose of the asset smoothing is to dampen the impact that market volatility has on valuation results by spreading the unexpected market gains and losses over several years. Currently the System uses a smoothing method that recognizes 20% of the difference between the market value of assets and the expected actuarial value of assets, based on the assumed rate of return. The actuarial value of assets cannot be less than 80% or more than 120% of market value. We recommend no change in the use of this method.

Amortization Method: The unfunded actuarial accrued liability as of July 1, 2021 is amortized as a level percent of payroll over a 20-year closed period commencing July 1, 2007. New experience bases due to assumption changes or actual experience gains/losses will be established each year and will be amortized over closed 15-year periods. Given a stable active workforce, this amortization method is expected to produce a payment stream that is consistent as a percent of covered payroll. This method was adopted following the last experience study based on our recommendations to reduce the amortization cost volatility. We recommend no change in the use of this method.

COLA Reserve: With the 2011 valuation we removed the use of an explicit COLA assumption and the reserve following legislation that would require a COLA to be funded (House Bill 2132). While there have been recent considerations of COLAs, they have not been provided with any regularity and therefore, we recommend continuing the practice of not valuing any future COLA contingency. However, this recommendation could change if COLAs or stipends are funded from the plan with any regularity. While an *ad hoc* COLA being granted, as was done in 2020, does not give the expectation that it would be provided again, granting these every year or two over six or eight years would cause a COLA expectation to be reasonable and we would anticipate reinstating the assumption and reserve.



Capital Market Assumptions and Asset Allocation

Target Allocation, Rates of Return, and Standard Deviation by Asset Class

Asset Class	Target Allocation	Ten Year Return Forecast*	Standard Deviation Forecast
US Large Cap Equity	34.0%	7.6%	15.6%
US Small Cap Equity	6.0%	7.5%	21.5%
Global Equity ex-US	28.0%	10.7%	19.9%
Core Fixed Income	25.0%	4.4%	4.6%
Long Term Treasuries	3.5%	4.6%	13.2%
US TIPS	3.5%	4.3%	5.6%
Total	100.0%		

Asset Class Correlation Coefficients

	US Large	US Small	Global	Core	Treas	TIPS
US Large	1.00	0.90	1.00	0.30	0.00	0.40
US Small	0.90	1.00	0.90	0.20	-0.10	0.30
Global	1.00	0.90	1.00	0.40	0.00	0.40
Core	0.30	0.20	0.40	1.00	0.90	0.80
Long Treas	0.00	-0.10	0.00	0.90	1.00	0.80
TIPS	0.40	0.30	0.40	0.80	0.80	1.00



Actuarial Cost Method

Liabilities and contributions shown in this report are computed using the Individual Entry Age method of funding. Sometimes called the "funding method," this is a particular technique used by actuaries for establishing the amount of the annual actuarial cost of pension benefits, or normal cost, and the related unfunded actuarial accrued liability. Ordinarily the annual contribution to the System is comprised of (1) the normal cost and (2) an amortization payment on the unfunded actuarial accrued liability.

Under the Entry Age Actuarial Cost Method, the **Normal Cost** is computed as the level percentage of pay which, if paid from the earliest time each member would have been eligible to join the System if it then existed (thus entry age) until his retirement or termination, would accumulate with interest at the rate assumed in the valuation to a fund sufficient to pay all benefits under the System.

The **Actuarial Accrued Liability** under this method, at any point in time, is the theoretical amount of the fund that would have accumulated had annual contributions equal to the normal cost been made in prior years (it does not represent the liability for benefits accrued to the valuation date). The **Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability** is the excess of the actuarial accrued liability over the actuarial value of System assets on the valuation date.

Under this method, experience gains or losses, i.e. decreases or increases in actuarial accrued liabilities attributable to deviations in experience from the actuarial assumptions, adjust the unfunded actuarial accrued liability.



Asset Valuation Method

The actuarial value of assets is based on a five-year moving average of expected and actual market values determined as follows:

- at the beginning of each fiscal year, a preliminary expected actuarial asset value is calculated as the sum of the previous year's actuarial value increased with a year's interest at the System valuation rate <u>plus</u> net cash flow adjusted for interest (at the same rate) to the end of the previous fiscal year;
- the expected actuarial asset value is set equal to the preliminary expected actuarial value plus the unrecognized investment gains and losses as of the beginning of the previous fiscal year;
- the difference between the expected actuarial asset value and the market value is the investment gain or loss for the previous year;
- the (final) actuarial asset value is the preliminary value plus 20% of the investment gains and losses for each of the five previous fiscal years, but in no case more than 120% of the market value or less than 80% of the market value.



Amortization Method

The unfunded actuarial accrued liability as of July 1, 2021 is amortized as a level percent of payroll over a 20-year closed period commencing July 1, 2007. New experience bases due to assumption changes or actual experience gains/losses will be established each year and will be amortized over closed 15-year periods. Given a stable active workforce, this amortization method is expected to produce a payment stream that is consistent as a percent of covered payroll.

Valuation Procedures

The actuarial accrued liability held for nonvested, inactive members who have a break in service, or for nonvested members who have quit or been terminated, even if a break in service has not occurred as of the valuation date, is equal to the amount of the individual's unclaimed contributions.

The wages used in the projection of benefits and liabilities are considered earnings for the year ending on the June 30 prior to the valuation date, increased by the salary scale to develop expected earnings for the current valuation year.

Earnings are annualized for members with less than twelve months of reported earnings.

In computing accrued benefits, average earnings are determined using actual pay history provided for valuation purposes.

The calculations for the required employer contribution are determined as of mid-year. This is a reasonable estimate since contributions are made on a monthly basis throughout the year.

We do not value the 415 limit for active participants. The impact was assumed to be *de minimus*.

The compensation limitation under IRC Section 401(a)(17) is considered in this valuation.

Liability is included for members who appear to be deferred vested, but who are not in the vested data provided. An estimated benefit was calculated based on pay and service from prior valuations. A corrected benefit and status will be provided by the System when the actual benefit and status have been finalized.

Members who are contributing to the System, but have not yet filled out an enrollment application, are included as active members. Service for this group was provided by the System.



SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTUARIAL ASSUMPTIONS

Economic Assumptions

Price Inflation:

Investment Return:

Salary Increases:

2.50% per annum, compounded annually

6.50% net of investment expenses per annum, compounded annually

Sample rates below (midpoint of range shown):

<u>Nearest Age</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
20 - 24	9.25
25 - 29	7.55
30 - 34	6.05
35 – 39	5.25
40 - 44	4.95
45 - 49	4.55
50 - 54	4.25
55 – 59	4.05
60 - 64	3.55
65+	3.25

Wage and Payroll Growth:

3.25% per year

Ad hoc benefit increase assumptions

Monthly benefits	No increases assumed
Medical Supplement	No increases assumed

Projection of 401(a)(17)compensation limit:Projected with inflation at 2.50%


•

State of Oklahoma Oklahoma Public Employees Retirement System

Demographic Assumptions

<u>Annual</u>	Rates of Retirement	Per 100 Eligible Re	egular Non-Elected	Members
	Hired Prior to 11/1/2011		Hired on or After 11/1/2011	
	Those Eligible	Those Eligible	Those Eligible	Those Eligible
	For Unreduced	For Reduced	For Unreduced	For Reduced
<u>Age</u>	<u>Retirement</u>	<u>Retirement</u>	<u>Retirement</u>	Retirement
50	15	N/A	N/A	N/A
51	15	N/A	N/A	N/A
52	15	N/A	N/A	N/A
53	15	N/A	N/A	N/A
54	15	N/A	N/A	N/A
55	10	3.5	N/A	N/A
56	10	3.5	N/A	N/A
57	11	3.5	N/A	N/A
58	12	3.5	N/A	N/A
59	13	4.5	N/A	N/A
60	14	5.25	30/15*	5
61	20	11	30/15*	6
62	25	N/A	30/15*	6
63	15	N/A	30/15*	6
64	15	N/A	30/15*	13
65	30	N/A	30/15*	N/A
66	30	N/A	25	N/A
67	30	N/A	25	N/A
68	30	N/A	25	N/A
69	30	N/A	25	N/A
70	40	N/A	50	N/A
71	40	N/A	50	N/A
72	40	N/A	50	N/A
73	40	N/A	50	N/A
74	40	N/A	50	N/A
75	100	N/A	100	N/A
		*3	0 when first eligible	e to retire and

15 thereafter



Demographic Assumptions (continued)

Annual Rates of Retrement 1 er 100 Englote Elected Members			
Elected Prior to 11/1/2011		Elected on or After 11/1/2011	
Those Eligible	Those Eligible	Those Eligible	Those Eligible
For Unreduced	For Reduced	For Unreduced	For Reduced
Retirement	Retirement	Retirement	Retirement
25	N/A	N/A	N/A
25	N/A	N/A	N/A
25	N/A	N/A	N/A
25	N/A	N/A	N/A
25	N/A	N/A	N/A
20	7.0	N/A	N/A
20	7.0	N/A	N/A
20	7.0	N/A	N/A
20	7.0	N/A	N/A
20	7.0	N/A	N/A
20	N/A	N/A	10
20	N/A	N/A	10
20	N/A	20	N/A
20	N/A	20	N/A
20	N/A	20	N/A
20	N/A	20	N/A
20	N/A	20	N/A
35	N/A	35	N/A
35	N/A	35	N/A
35	N/A	35	N/A
100	N/A	100	N/A
	$\begin{array}{c} \underline{\text{Elected Prior to}}\\ \underline{\text{Elected Prior to}}\\ \hline \text{Those Eligible}\\ \hline \text{For Unreduced}\\ \underline{\text{Retirement}}\\ 25\\ 25\\ 25\\ 25\\ 25\\ 25\\ 20\\ 20\\ 20\\ 20\\ 20\\ 20\\ 20\\ 20\\ 20\\ 20$	Elected Prior to $11/1/2011$ Those EligibleFor UnreducedFor ReducedRetirementRetirement25N/A25N/A25N/A25N/A25N/A25N/A25N/A25N/A207.0207.0207.0207.0207.0207.0207.020N/A20N/A20N/A20N/A20N/A20N/A20N/A20N/A20N/A35N/A35N/A35N/A100N/A	Elected Prior to $11/1/2011$ Elected on or AfThose EligibleThose EligibleThose EligibleThose EligibleFor UnreducedFor ReducedFor Unreduced25N/AN/A25N/AN/A25N/AN/A25N/AN/A25N/AN/A25N/AN/A25N/AN/A25N/AN/A207.0N/A207.0N/A207.0N/A207.0N/A207.0N/A207.0N/A207.0N/A207.0N/A207.0N/A207.0N/A207.0N/A207.0N/A20N/A2020N/A2020N/A2020N/A2020N/A2020N/A2020N/A3535N/A3535N/A3535N/A35100N/A100

Annual Rates of Retirement Per 100 Eligible Elected Members



Demographic Assumptions (continued)

	Annual Rates	s of Retirem	ent Per 100	Eligible	Hazardous D	outy Member	<u>S</u>
	Hired Prior to 11/1/2011				Hired on or	After 11/1/20)11
Le	ess Than 20	At Le	east 20	Less	Than 20	At L	east 20
Yea	ars of Service	Years o	f Service	Years	of Service	Years of	of Service
Age		Service		Age		Service	
50	N/A	20	25	50	N/A	20	25
51	N/A	21	25	51	N/A	21	25
52	N/A	22	20	52	N/A	22	20
53	N/A	23-24	15	53	N/A	23-34	15
54	N/A	25-29	23	54	N/A	25-29	23
55	4	30-34	25	55	N/A	30-34	25
56	5	35+	100	56	N/A	35+	100
57	5			57	N/A		
58	5			58	N/A		
59	5			59	N/A		
60	5			60	7		
61	20			61	20		
62	40			62	20		
63	22			63	20		
64	25			64	20		
65	40			65	40		
66	25			66	25		
67	25			67	23		
68	25			68	22		
69	25			69	21		
70	100			70	100		



Appendix B

State of Oklahoma Oklahoma Public Employees Retirement System

Demographic Assumptions (continued)

Mortality Rates

Active participants and	
nondisabled pensioners	Pub-2010 Below Median, General Membership Active/Retiree Healthy Mortality Table with base rates projected generationally using Scale MP-2019. Male rates are unadjusted and female rates are set forward two years.
Disabled pensioners	Nondisabled retiree mortality set forward 12 years for disabled experience.
Hazardous Duty members	For Department of Corrections officers, we assumed the mortality rate is 10% higher than the above table while the participant is active. This 10% is assumed to be in-line-of-duty.

Disability Rates:

Graduated rates

Disabled rates per 100 members

Nearest		Hazardous
Age	Regular/Elected	Duty
20	0.009	0.009
30	0.009	0.022
40	0.022	0.058
50	0.139	0.180
60	0.200	0.400



Demographic Assumptions (continued)

Withdrawal Rates:

Service	Rate
0	26.0%
1	22.0%
2	18.0%
3	14.0%
4	12.0%
5	10.5%
6	9.0%
7	8.0%
8	7.0%
9	6.5%
10	6.0%
11	5.5%
12	5.0%
13	4.8%
14	4.5%
15	4.3%
16	4.0%
17	3.8%
18	3.5%
19	3.3%
20	3.0%
21	2.8%
22	2.5%
23	2.3%
24	2.0%
25	1.8%
26	1.5%
27	1.3%
28+	1.0%



Demographic Assumptions (continued)

Probability of Electing Vested Benefit:

Regular Members Only		
Duration	Rate	
8	80%	
13	85%	
18	90%	
23	95%	
28	100%	

Marital Status:

Percentage Married	85%
Age difference	Males assumed to be four years older than spouses.
Children:	Special death benefits are provided upon the in-line- of-duty death of Department of Corrections' employees who have young children. We have assumed the average age of the youngest child of such employees is nine and that 50% of such children will attend an institution of higher education to age 22.
Form of Payment:	Participants are assumed to elect a life-only form of payment. In the event an Elected Official has previously commenced their benefits, has no beneficiary on the record, and has no defined optional form of payment, it is assumed that 60% will receive the 50% joint and survivor annuity.



Demographic Assumptions (continued)

Assumed age for commencement of deferred benefits:	Currently active members assumed to terminate in the future prior to retirement eligibility are assumed to commence benefits at age 62 (non-elected members) or age 60 (elected members).
	Currently active members hired on or after 11/1/2011 assumed to terminate in the future prior to retirement eligibility are assumed to commence benefits at age 65.
	Currently inactive members with deferred benefits are assumed to commence benefits on a date provided by OPERS.
Provision for expenses:	Administrative expenses, as budgeted by the Oklahoma Public Employees Retirement System.



Entry Age Actuarial Cost Method

Liabilities and contributions shown in this report are computed using the individual Entry Age Level Percent of Pay actuarial cost. Sometimes called the "funding method," this is a particular technique used by actuaries for establishing the amount of the annual actuarial cost of pension benefits, or normal cost, and the related unfunded actuarial accrued liability. Ordinarily the annual contribution to the System is comprised of (1) the normal cost and (2) an amortization payment on the unfunded actuarial accrued liability.

Under the Entry Age Actuarial Cost method, the **Normal Cost** is computed as the level percentage of pay which, if paid from the earliest time each member would have been eligible to join the System if it then existed (thus, entry age) until his retirement or termination, would accumulate with interest at the rate assumed in the valuation to a fund sufficient to pay all benefits under the System.

The **Actuarial Accrued Liability** under this method, at any point in time, is the theoretical amount of the fund that would have accumulated had annual contributions equal to the normal cost been made in prior years (it does not represent the liability for benefits accrued to the valuation date). The **Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability** is the excess of the actuarial accrued liability over the actuarial value of System assets actually on hand on the valuation date.

Under this method, experience gains or losses, i.e. decreases or increases in actuarial accrued liabilities attributable to deviations in experience from the actuarial assumptions, adjust the unfunded actuarial accrued liability.

Asset Valuation Method

The actuarial value of assets is based on a five-year moving average of expected and actual market values determined as follows:

- at the beginning of each fiscal year, a preliminary expected actuarial asset value is calculated as the sum of the previous year's actuarial value increased with a year's interest at the System valuation rate <u>plus</u> net cash flow adjusted for interest (at the same rate) to the end of the previous fiscal year;
- the expected actuarial asset value is set equal to the preliminary expected actuarial value plus the unrecognized investment gains and losses as of the beginning of the previous fiscal year;
- the difference between the expected actuarial asset value and the market value is the investment gain or loss for the previous fiscal year;
- the (final) actuarial asset value is the preliminary value plus 20% of the investment gains and losses for each of the five previous fiscal years, but in no case more than 120% of the market value or less than 80% of the market value.



Amortization Method

The unfunded actuarial accrued liability as of July 1, 2021 is amortized as a level percent of payroll over a 20-year closed period commencing July 1, 2007. New experience bases due to assumption changes or actual experience gains/losses will be established each year and will be amortized over closed 15-year periods. Given a stable active workforce, this amortization method is expected to produce a payment stream that is consistent as a percent of covered payroll.

Valuation Procedures

The actuarial accrued liability held for nonvested, inactive members who have a break in service, or for nonvested members who have quit or been terminated, even if a break in service has not occurred as of the valuation date, is equal to the amount of the individual's unclaimed contributions.

The wages used in the projection of benefits and liabilities are considered earnings for the year ending on the June 30 prior to the valuation date, increased by the salary scale to develop expected earnings for the current valuation year.

In computing accrued benefits, average earnings are determined using actual pay history provided for valuation purposes.

The calculations for the required employer contribution are determined as of mid-year. This is a reasonable estimate since contributions are made on a monthly basis throughout the year.

We do not value the 415 limit for active participants. The impact was assumed to be *de minimus*.

The compensation limitation under IRC Section 401(a)(17) is considered in this valuation.

Liability is included for members who appear to be deferred vested, but who are not in the vested data provided. An estimated benefit was calculated based on pay and service reported for prior valuations. A corrected benefit and status will be provided by the System when the actual benefit and status have been finalized.

Members who are contributing to the System, but have not yet filled out an enrollment application, are included as active members. Where data elements are missing, reasonable estimates are used. Service is estimated based on hours worked. Age is based on average entry age for other members. Gender is assigned in proportion to the overall group.



SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTUARIAL ASSUMPTIONS

Economic Assumptions

Price Inflation:	2.50% per annum, compounded annually
Investment Return:	6.50% net of investment expenses per annum, compounded annually
Salary Increases:	3.50% per year
Wage and Payroll Growth:	3.25% per year
Ad hoc benefit increase assumption: Monthly benefits Medical supplement	No increases assumed No increases assumed
Projection of 410(a)(17) compensation limit	Projected with inflation at 2.50%

Demographic Assumptions

Retirement age:

	Annual Rates of
	Retirement
Attained Age	Per 100 Eligible
	Members
Below 59	5
59 - 61	10
62 - 66	15
67 - 68	20
69 - 74	25
75+	100

Deferred vested members

Participants with deferred benefits are assumed to commence benefits on a date provided by URSJJ. Actives expected to terminate with a vested benefit are expected to commence benefits at age 60.



Mortality Rates:	
Active Participants and	
nondisabled pensioners	Pub-2010 Below Median, General Membership Active/Retiree Healthy Mortality Table with base rates projected generationally using Scale MP- 2019. Male rates are set back two years and female rates are unadjusted.
Disabled pensioners	Nondisabled retiree mortality set forward 12 years for disabled experience.
Separation Rates:	
Separation for all reasons other	
than death	2% for all years of service prior to retirement eligibility.
Disability Rates:	0%
Marital Status:	
Age difference Percentage married	Males are assumed to be four years older than spouses. 85%
Other Assumptions:	
Provisions for expenses	Administrative expenses, as budgeted for the Oklahoma Uniform Retirement System for Justices and Judges.
Form of payment	Active members who were contributing 8% of pay as of August 31, 2005, are assumed to retire with an unreduced benefit payable as a 50% Joint and Survivor annuity. All other members are assumed to retire with a single life annuity.
Missing age or service	For members who have not completed the application process and are missing data, we assume they are 50 years old as of the valuation date with half a year of service.



Experience Study 2019-2022 Exhibit D-1 Probability of Death - Healthy Retirees OPERS - Males



		Expected - Current	Expected - Proposed
	Actual	Assumptions	Assumptions
Weighted Count	1,906	1,302	1,395
Actual/Expected		146%	137%



Experience Study 2019-2022 Exhibit D-2 Probability of Death - Healthy Retirees OPERS - Females



		Expected - Current	Expected - Proposed
	Actual	Assumptions	Assumptions
Weighted Count	1,847	1,387	1,485
Actual/Expected		133%	124%



Experience Study 2019-2022 Exhibit D-3 Retirement Rates Regular - Early



		Expected -	Expected -
		Current	Proposed
	Actual	Assumptions	Assumptions
Weighted Count	315,576	443,196	385,016
Actual/Expected		71%	82%



Experience Study 2019-2022 Exhibit D-4 Retirement Rates Regular - Unreduced



		Expected -	Expected -
		Current	Proposed
		Current	Tioposed
	Actual	Assumptions	Assumptions
Weighted Count	3,439,010	4,052,232	4,071,271
Actual/Expected		85%	84%



Experience Study 2019-2022 Exhibit D-5 Retirement Rates Hazardous Duty - Early



		Expected -	Expected -
		Current	Proposed
	Actual	Assumptions	Assumptions
Weighted Count	1,448	4,243	4,243
Actual/Expected		34%	34%



Experience Study 2019-2022 Exhibit D-6 Retirement Rates Hazardous Duty - Unreduced



		Expected -	Expected -
		Current	Proposed
	Actual	Assumptions	Assumptions
Total Count	60,928.44	76,380	76,380
Actual/Expected		80%	80%



Experience Study 2019-2022 Exhibit D-7 Retirement Rates Hazardous Duty - Unreduced (Age)



		Expected -	Expected -
		Current	Proposed
	Actual	Assumptions	Assumptions
Weighted Count	5,469	9,549	9,549
Actual/Expected		57%	57%



Experience Study 2019-2022 Appendix D-8 Retirement Rates Judges



		Expected -	Expected -
		Current	Proposed
	Actual	Assumptions	Assumptions
Weighted Count	62,714	109,202	109,202
Actual/Expected		57%	57%



Experience Study 2019-2022 Exhibit D-9 Rate of Disability - Active Lives Regular and Elected Members



		Expected -	Expected -
		Current	Proposed
	Actual	Assumptions	Assumptions
Total Count	65	83	83
Actual/Expected		78%	78%

Experience Study 2019-2022 Exhibit D-10 Rate of Disability - Active Lives Hazardous Duty Members



		Expected -	Expected -
		Current	Proposed
	Actual	Assumptions	Assumptions
Total Count	4	5	5
Actual/Expected		80%	80%



Experience Study 2019-2022 Appendix D-11 Rate of Termination of Employment OPERS



		Expected -	Expected -
		Current	Proposed
	Actual	Assumptions	Assumptions
Weighted Count	153,579	143,619	143,619
Actual/Expected		107%	107%



Experience Study 2019-2022 Eshibit D-12 Probability of Contributions Remaining with the System OPERS - Regular



		Expected -	Expected -
		Current	Proposed
	Actual	Assumptions	Assumptions
Total Count	108,299	103,879	103,879
Actual/Expected		104%	104%



Experience Study 2019-2022 Exhibit D-13 Total Salary Scale OPERS



		Expected -	Expected -
		Current	Proposed
	Actual	Assumptions	Assumptions
Average Increase	5.29%	4.61%	4.61%
Actual/Expected		115%	115%



		Prob	ability of Dea	ath - Healthy l	Retirees		
			OPER	S - Males			
Δαρ	Exposure	Actual	Actual Rate	Current	Current	Proposed	Proposed
55 Age	242	Deatils	0 4%	2.0	0.8%	2.1	
56	242 364	1	0.4%	2.0	0.8%	2.1	0.9%
57	471	5	1.3%	5.2 4 3	0.9%		1.0%
58	537	2	0.4%	5.2	1.0%	5 5	1.0%
59	612	10	1.6%	6.1	1.0%	6.6	1.0%
60	651	7	1.1%	6.8	1.0%	7.3	1.1%
61	688	6	0.9%	7.5	1.1%	8.0	1.2%
62	868	13	1.5%	9.8	1.1%	10.5	1.2%
63	1.185	24	2.0%	13.8	1.2%	14.8	1.2%
64	1.332	23	1.7%	16.0	1.2%	17.1	1.3%
65	1,497	31	2.1%	18.5	1.2%	19.8	1.3%
66	1,664	25	1.5%	22.0	1.3%	23.5	1.4%
67	1,875	45	2.4%	26.8	1.4%	28.5	1.5%
68	1,923	44	2.3%	29.8	1.5%	31.6	1.6%
69	1,930	40	2.1%	32.5	1.7%	34.5	1.8%
70	1,902	49	2.6%	35.0	1.8%	37.0	1.9%
71	1,923	59	3.1%	38.7	2.0%	41.0	2.1%
72	1,992	70	3.5%	44.0	2.2%	46.6	2.3%
73	1,957	68	3.5%	47.5	2.4%	50.4	2.6%
74	1,770	61	3.4%	47.4	2.7%	50.3	2.8%
75	1,584	68	4.3%	46.8	3.0%	49.9	3.1%
76	1,506	58	3.9%	49.3	3.3%	52.6	3.5%
77	1,406	82	5.8%	51.0	3.6%	54.6	3.9%
78	1,273	81	6.4%	51.3	4.0%	55.1	4.3%
79	1,148	83	7.2%	51.4	4.5%	55.4	4.8%
80	1,072	85	7.9%	53.5	5.0%	57.8	5.4%
81	937	68	7.3%	52.2	5.6%	56.4	6.0%
82	851	86	10.1%	52.9	6.2%	57.3	6.7%
83	734	74	10.1%	51.0	6.9%	55.2	7.5%
84	662	100	15.1%	51.3	7.7%	55.5	8.4%
85	587	60	10.2%	50.6	8.6%	54.8	9.3%
86	506	64	12.6%	48.6	9.6%	52.5	10.4%
87	436	71	16.3%	46.4	10.6%	50.0	11.5%
88	329	63	19.1%	38.7	11.8%	41.7	12.7%
89	288	52	18.1%	37.3	12.9%	40.1	13.9%
90	235	47	20.0%	33.4	14.2%	35.8	15.2%
Total							

Appendix E-1

Note: Counts are weighted

39,591

1,906

4.8%

1,302.1

3.3%

1,395.4

to 100

3.5%



Appendix E-2
Probability of Death - Healthy Retirees
OPERS - Females

		Actual	Actual	Current	Current	Proposed	Proposed
Age	Exposure	Deaths	Rate	Expected	Rate	Expected	Rate
55	178	-	0.0%	0.9	0.5%	0.9	0.5%
56	323	3	0.9%	1.6	0.5%	1.7	0.5%
57	459	2	0.4%	2.4	0.5%	2.5	0.6%
58	598	3	0.5%	3.2	0.5%	3.4	0.6%
59	715	7	1.0%	3.9	0.5%	4.2	0.6%
60	840	11	1.3%	4.8	0.6%	5.1	0.6%
61	958	10	1.0%	5.6	0.6%	6.0	0.6%
62	1,312	10	0.8%	8.0	0.6%	8.5	0.6%
63	1,823	18	1.0%	11.6	0.6%	12.3	0.7%
64	2,036	15	0.7%	14.1	0.7%	14.9	0.7%
65	2,249	31	1.4%	17.1	0.8%	17.9	0.8%
66	2,411	35	1.5%	20.1	0.8%	21.1	0.9%
67	2,524	34	1.3%	23.2	0.9%	24.4	1.0%
68	2,569	35	1.4%	26.1	1.0%	27.5	1.1%
69	2,540	33	1.3%	28.7	1.1%	30.3	1.2%
70	2,503	54	2.2%	31.4	1.3%	33.3	1.3%
71	2,496	57	2.3%	35.0	1.4%	37.2	1.5%
72	2,455	60	2.4%	38.4	1.6%	41.1	1.7%
73	2,290	45	2.0%	40.1	1.8%	43.1	1.9%
74	2,027	64	3.2%	39.8	2.0%	42.9	2.1%
75	1,817	66	3.6%	40.0	2.2%	43.3	2.4%
76	1,734	70	4.0%	43.0	2.5%	46.6	2.7%
77	1,653	52	3.1%	46.1	2.8%	50.1	3.0%
78	1,557	68	4.4%	49.0	3.1%	53.3	3.4%
79	1,357	58	4.3%	48.3	3.6%	52.5	3.9%
80	1,240	69	5.6%	49.9	4.0%	54.2	4.4%
81	1,112	72	6.5%	50.7	4.6%	55.0	4.9%
82	991	67	6.8%	51.2	5.2%	55.5	5.6%
83	870	72	8.3%	51.1	5.9%	55.2	6.3%
84	805	59	7.3%	53.7	6.7%	57.9	7.2%
85	735	79	10.7%	55.6	7.6%	59.9	8.1%
86	657	73	11.1%	56.3	8.6%	60.5	9.2%
87	573	67	11.7%	55.5	9.7%	59.4	10.4%
88	512	59	11.5%	55.7	10.9%	59.5	11.6%
89	441	73	16.6%	53.5	12.1%	57.0	12.9%
90	362	55	15.2%	48.5	13.4%	51.6	14.2%
Total							
to 100	50,944	1,847	3.6%	1,387.1	2.7%	1,484.7	2.9%



Appendix E-3 Retirement Rates Regular - Early

		Actual	Actual	Current	Current	Proposed	Proposed
Age	Exposure	Retirements	Rate	Expected	Rate	Expected	Rate
55	1,108,482	35,634	3.2%	44,339.3	4.0%	38,796.9	3.5%
56	1,164,123	35,522	3.1%	46,564.9	4.0%	40,744.3	3.5%
57	1,157,449	32,862	2.8%	46,297.9	4.0%	40,510.7	3.5%
58	1,134,007	31,778	2.8%	45,360.3	4.0%	39,690.2	3.5%
59	1,076,109	38,531	3.6%	53,805.5	5.0%	48,424.9	4.5%
60	1,063,571	49,270	4.6%	63,814.3	6.0%	55,837.5	5.3%
61	1,100,106	91,979	8.4%	143,013.7	13.0%	121,011.6	11.0%
	7,803,847	315,576	4.0%	443,195.9	5.7%	385,016.2	4.9%



Appendix E-4 Retirement Rates Regular - Unreduced

		Actual	Actual	Current	Current	Proposed	Proposed
Age	Exposure	Retirements	Rate	Expected	Rate	Expected	Rate
50	128,050	15,861	12.4%	19,207.5	15.0%	19,207.5	15.0%
51	219,743	25,450	11.6%	32,961.4	15.0%	32,961.4	15.0%
52	316,583	48,324	15.3%	47,487.4	15.0%	47,487.4	15.0%
53	417,639	43,337	10.4%	62,645.8	15.0%	62,645.8	15.0%
54	514,284	69,319	13.5%	77,142.6	15.0%	77,142.6	15.0%
55	591,446	55,740	9.4%	59,144.6	10.0%	59,144.6	10.0%
56	758,810	81,792	10.8%	75,881.0	10.0%	75,881.0	10.0%
57	912,905	88,265	9.7%	100,419.5	11.0%	100,419.5	11.0%
58	1,069,136	127,579	11.9%	128,296.3	12.0%	128,296.3	12.0%
59	1,021,340	96,057	9.4%	132,774.2	13.0%	132,774.2	13.0%
60	1,128,052	124,638	11.0%	157,927.3	14.0%	157,927.3	14.0%
61	2,215,499	272,111	12.3%	443,099.7	20.0%	443,099.7	20.0%
62	2,123,896	407,147	19.2%	530,973.9	25.0%	530,973.9	25.0%
63	1,725,574	238,925	13.8%	258,836.0	15.0%	258,836.0	15.0%
64	1,535,073	276,539	18.0%	230,260.9	15.0%	230,260.9	15.0%
65	1,292,085	332,815	25.8%	387,625.6	30.0%	387,625.6	30.0%
66	1,011,138	326,915	32.3%	252,784.6	25.0%	303,341.5	30.0%
67	759,127	227,195	29.9%	189,781.7	25.0%	227,738.0	30.0%
68	586,010	168,080	28.7%	146,502.4	25.0%	175,802.9	30.0%
69	449,214	130,877	29.1%	112,303.6	25.0%	134,764.3	30.0%
70	370,776	89,449	24.1%	185,388.0	50.0%	148,310.4	40.0%
71	275,227	64,156	23.3%	137,613.3	50.0%	110,090.6	40.0%
72	241,802	52,567	21.7%	120,901.1	50.0%	96,720.9	40.0%
73	179,380	37,488	20.9%	89,690.0	50.0%	71,752.0	40.0%
74	145,167	38,385	26.4%	72,583.4	50.0%	58,066.7	40.0%
	19,987,954	3,439,010	17.2%	4,052,232.0	20.3%	4,071,271.3	20.4%



Appendix E-5 Retirement Rates Hazardous Duty - Early

		Actual	Actual	Current	Current	Proposed	Proposed
Age	Exposure	Retirements	Rate	Expected	Rate	Expected	Rate
55	16,171	-	0.0%	646.9	4.0%	646.9	4.0%
56	18,342	-	0.0%	917.1	5.0%	917.1	5.0%
57	20,170	408	2.0%	1,008.5	5.0%	1,008.5	5.0%
58	15,320	581	3.8%	766.0	5.0%	766.0	5.0%
59	10,723	-	0.0%	536.1	5.0%	536.1	5.0%
60	7,372	458	6.2%	368.6	5.0%	368.6	5.0%
61	-	-	0.0%	-	20.0%	-	20.0%
	88,099	1,448	1.6%	4,243.2	4.8%	4,243.2	4.8%



Appendix E-6 Retirement Rates Hazardous Duty - Unreduced

		Actual	Actual	Current	Current	Proposed	Proposed
Duration	Exposure	Retirements	Rate	Expected	Rate	Expected	Rate
20	126,599	36,681	29.0%	31,649.6	25.0%	31,649.6	25.0%
21	38,435	8,273	21.5%	9,608.8	25.0%	9,608.8	25.0%
22	26,514	2,968	11.2%	5,302.8	20.0%	5,302.8	20.0%
23	30,492	4,382	14.4%	4,573.8	15.0%	4,573.8	15.0%
24	17,630	-	0.0%	2,644.4	15.0%	2,644.4	15.0%
25	13,667	-	0.0%	3,143.5	23.0%	3,143.5	23.0%
26	10,419	-	0.0%	2,396.5	23.0%	2,396.5	23.0%
27	10,709	-	0.0%	2,463.0	23.0%	2,463.0	23.0%
28	11,870	1,475	12.4%	2,730.1	23.0%	2,730.1	23.0%
29	14,153	1,351	9.5%	3,255.2	23.0%	3,255.2	23.0%
30	12,923	2,890	22.4%	3,230.8	25.0%	3,230.8	25.0%
31	10,383	1,295	12.5%	2,595.9	25.0%	2,595.9	25.0%
32	5,407	-	0.0%	1,351.7	25.0%	1,351.7	25.0%
33	3,660	1,614	44.1%	915.0	25.0%	915.0	25.0%
34	2,078	-	0.0%	519.5	25.0%	519.5	25.0%
35	1,648	-	0.0%	1,647.7	100.0%	1,647.7	100.0%
	336,586	60,928	18.1%	78,028.2	23.2%	78,028.2	23.2%



Appendix E-7 Retirement Rates Hazardous Duty - Unreduced (Age)

		Actual	Actual	Current	Current	Proposed	Proposed
Age	Exposure	Retirements	Rate	Expected	Rate	Expected	Rate
62	4,145	929	22.4%	1,658.0	40.0%	1,658.0	40.0%
63	6,013	477	7.9%	1,322.8	22.0%	1,322.8	22.0%
64	6,668	-	0.0%	1,667.1	25.0%	1,667.1	25.0%
65	6,517	1,045	16.0%	2,606.9	40.0%	2,606.9	40.0%
66	4,310	2,347	54.5%	1,077.4	25.0%	1,077.4	25.0%
67	394	394	100.0%	98.5	25.0%	98.5	25.0%
68	891	277	31.1%	222.6	25.0%	222.6	25.0%
69	679	-	0.0%	169.8	25.0%	169.8	25.0%
70	726	-	0.0%	725.5	100.0%	725.5	100.0%
	30,342	5,469	18.0%	9,548.7	31.5%	9,548.7	31.5%



Appendix E-8 Retirement Rates URSJJ

		Actual	Actual	Current	Current	Proposed	Proposed
Age	Exposure	Retirements	Rate	Expected	Rate	Expected	Rate
55	-	-	0.0%	-	5.0%	-	5.0%
56	2,519	2,519	100.0%	126.0	5.0%	126.0	5.0%
57	-	-	0.0%	-	5.0%	-	5.0%
58	5,988	-	0.0%	299.4	5.0%	299.4	5.0%
59	26,032	-	0.0%	2,603.2	10.0%	2,603.2	10.0%
60	31,104	-	0.0%	3,110.4	10.0%	3,110.4	10.0%
61	39,072	3,491	8.9%	3,907.2	10.0%	3,907.2	10.0%
62	30,283	-	0.0%	4,542.5	15.0%	4,542.5	15.0%
63	41,892	2,405	5.7%	6,283.7	15.0%	6,283.7	15.0%
64	37,326	10,158	27.2%	5,599.0	15.0%	5,599.0	15.0%
65	27,006	2,176	8.1%	4,051.0	15.0%	4,051.0	15.0%
66	33,843	3,118	9.2%	5,076.5	15.0%	5,076.5	15.0%
67	40,278	5,063	12.6%	8,055.6	20.0%	8,055.6	20.0%
68	38,538	4,072	10.6%	7,707.6	20.0%	7,707.6	20.0%
69	36,855	7,551	20.5%	9,213.7	25.0%	9,213.7	25.0%
70	27,899	8,540	30.6%	6,974.8	25.0%	6,974.8	25.0%
71	14,438	3,392	23.5%	3,609.6	25.0%	3,609.6	25.0%
72	12,213	984	8.1%	3,053.2	25.0%	3,053.2	25.0%
73	27,185	3,412	12.5%	6,796.2	25.0%	6,796.2	25.0%
74	28,326	3,651	12.9%	7,081.6	25.0%	7,081.6	25.0%
75	21,111	2,183	10.3%	21,110.8	100.0%	21,110.8	100.0%
	521,909	62,714	12.0%	109,201.7	20.9%	109,201.7	20.9%



Appendix E-9 Rate of Disability - Active Lives Regular and Elected Members

		Actual	Actual	Current	Current	Proposed	Proposed
Age	Exposure	Disabilities	Rate	Expected	Rate	Expected	Rate
20	311	-	0.000%	0.0	0.009%	0.0	0.009%
21	439	-	0.000%	0.0	0.009%	0.0	0.009%
22	465	-	0.000%	0.0	0.009%	0.0	0.009%
23	543	-	0.000%	0.0	0.009%	0.0	0.009%
24	601	-	0.000%	0.1	0.009%	0.1	0.009%
25	640	-	0.000%	0.1	0.009%	0.1	0.009%
26	702	-	0.000%	0.1	0.009%	0.1	0.009%
27	846	-	0.000%	0.1	0.009%	0.1	0.009%
28	985	-	0.000%	0.1	0.009%	0.1	0.009%
29	1,212	-	0.000%	0.1	0.009%	0.1	0.009%
30	1,366	-	0.000%	0.1	0.009%	0.1	0.009%
31	1,521	-	0.000%	0.1	0.009%	0.1	0.009%
32	1,502	-	0.000%	0.1	0.009%	0.1	0.009%
33	1,557	-	0.000%	0.1	0.009%	0.1	0.009%
34	1,674	-	0.000%	0.2	0.009%	0.2	0.009%
35	1,725	-	0.000%	0.2	0.009%	0.2	0.009%
36	2,012	-	0.000%	0.2	0.011%	0.2	0.011%
37	2,132	-	0.000%	0.3	0.013%	0.3	0.013%
38	2,117	1	0.047%	0.3	0.016%	0.3	0.016%
39	2,185	-	0.000%	0.4	0.019%	0.4	0.019%
40	2,210	-	0.000%	0.5	0.022%	0.5	0.022%
41	2,168	3	0.138%	0.6	0.027%	0.6	0.027%
42	2,204	-	0.000%	0.7	0.032%	0.7	0.032%
43	2,093	1	0.048%	0.8	0.039%	0.8	0.039%
44	2,120	2	0.094%	1.0	0.046%	1.0	0.046%
45	2,138	1	0.047%	1.2	0.056%	1.2	0.056%
46	2,204	1	0.045%	1.5	0.067%	1.5	0.067%
47	2,252	2	0.089%	1.8	0.080%	1.8	0.080%
48	2,354	2	0.085%	2.3	0.096%	2.3	0.096%
49	2,543	2	0.079%	2.9	0.116%	2.9	0.116%
50	2,599	6	0.231%	3.6	0.139%	3.6	0.139%
51	2,610	3	0.115%	4.3	0.166%	4.3	0.166%
52	2,549	2	0.078%	5.1	0.200%	5.1	0.200%
53	2,510	9	0.359%	5.0	0.200%	5.0	0.200%
54	2,472	2	0.081%	4.9	0.200%	4.9	0.200%
55	2,553	4	0.157%	5.1	0.200%	5.1	0.200%
56	2,728	2	0.073%	5.5	0.200%	5.5	0.200%
57	2,862	5	0.175%	5.7	0.200%	5.7	0.200%
58	2,889	6	0.208%	5.8	0.200%	5.8	0.200%
39 60	2,835	3	0.106%	5.7	0.200%	5.7	0.200%
0U	2,833	4	0.141%	5.7	0.200%	5.7	0.200%
01	2,807	4	0.143%	5.6	0.200%	5.6	0.200%
62	2,618	-	0.000%	5.2	0.200%	5.2	0.200%
	81,686	65	0.080%	83.2	0.102%	83.2	0.102%



Appendix E-10 Rate of Disability - Active Lives Hazardous Duty Members

		Actual	Actual	Current	Current	Proposed	Propos	ed
Age	Exposure	Disabilities	Rate	Expected	Rate	Expected	Rate	
20	20	-	0.000%	0.0	0.009%	0.0	0.009%	20
21	98	-	0.000%	0.0	0.009%	0.0	0.009%	21
22	152	-	0.000%	0.0	0.009%	0.0	0.009%	22
23	197	-	0.000%	0.0	0.009%	0.0	0.009%	23
24	239	-	0.000%	0.0	0.009%	0.0	0.009%	24
25	259	-	0.000%	0.0	0.014%	0.0	0.014%	25
26	220	-	0.000%	0.0	0.014%	0.0	0.014%	26
27	240	-	0.000%	0.0	0.014%	0.0	0.014%	27
28	257	-	0.000%	0.0	0.014%	0.0	0.014%	28
29	256	-	0.000%	0.1	0.022%	0.1	0.022%	29
30	244	-	0.000%	0.1	0.022%	0.1	0.022%	30
31	251	-	0.000%	0.1	0.022%	0.1	0.022%	31
32	217	-	0.000%	0.0	0.022%	0.0	0.022%	32
33	222	-	0.000%	0.0	0.022%	0.0	0.022%	33
34	214	-	0.000%	0.1	0.029%	0.1	0.029%	34
35	203	-	0.000%	0.1	0.036%	0.1	0.036%	35
36	182	-	0.000%	0.1	0.036%	0.1	0.036%	36
37	165	-	0.000%	0.1	0.036%	0.1	0.036%	37
38	164	-	0.000%	0.1	0.043%	0.1	0.043%	38
39	170	-	0.000%	0.1	0.050%	0.1	0.050%	39
40	160	-	0.000%	0.1	0.058%	0.1	0.058%	40
41	161	-	0.000%	0.1	0.058%	0.1	0.058%	41
42	160	-	0.000%	0.1	0.065%	0.1	0.065%	42
43	155	1	0.645%	0.1	0.079%	0.1	0.079%	43
44	145	-	0.000%	0.1	0.086%	0.1	0.086%	44
45	149	-	0.000%	0.2	0.101%	0.2	0.101%	45
46	129	-	0.000%	0.1	0.108%	0.1	0.108%	46
47	149	-	0.000%	0.2	0.122%	0.2	0.122%	47
48	124	1	0.806%	0.2	0.144%	0.2	0.144%	48
49	137	-	0.000%	0.2	0.166%	0.2	0.166%	49
50	133	-	0.000%	0.2	0.180%	0.2	0.180%	50
51	124	-	0.000%	0.3	0.216%	0.3	0.216%	51
52	101	-	0.000%	0.3	0.252%	0.3	0.252%	52
53	85	1	1.176%	0.2	0.288%	0.2	0.288%	53
54	75	-	0.000%	0.3	0.342%	0.3	0.342%	54
55	79	-	0.000%	0.3	0.400%	0.3	0.400%	55
56	84	-	0.000%	0.3	0.400%	0.3	0.400%	56
57	79	-	0.000%	0.3	0.400%	0.3	0.400%	57
58	62	-	0.000%	0.2	0.400%	0.2	0.400%	58
59	53	-	0.000%	0.2	0.400%	0.2	0.400%	59
60	39	-	0.000%	0.2	0.400%	0.2	0.400%	60
61	37	-	0.000%	0.1	0.400%	0.1	0.400%	61
62	24	1	4.167%	0.1	0.400%	0.1	0.400%	62
	6,414	4	0.062%	5.4	0.084%	5.4	0.084%	



Appendix E-11 Rate of Termination of Employment OPERS

		Actual	Actual	Current	Current	Proposed	Proposed
Duration	Exposure	Terminations	Rate	Expected	Rate	Expected	Rate
0	6,532	2,395	36.7%	1,698	26.0%	1,698	26.0%
1	15,612	3,793	24.3%	3,435	22.0%	3,435	22.0%
2	28,739	5,586	19.4%	5,173	18.0%	5,173	18.0%
3	47,003	7,246	15.4%	6,580	14.0%	6,580	14.0%
4	87,608	10,873	12.4%	10,513	12.0%	10,513	12.0%
5	126,980	12,116	9.5%	13,333	10.5%	13,333	10.5%
6	161,505	13,537	8.4%	14,535	9.0%	14,535	9.0%
7	166,216	13,786	8.3%	13,297	8.0%	13,297	8.0%
8	155,986	12,341	7.9%	10,919	7.0%	10,919	7.0%
9	116,525	9,898	8.5%	7,574	6.5%	7,574	6.5%
10	115,655	8,238	7.1%	6,939	6.0%	6,939	6.0%
11	127,088	7,324	5.8%	6,990	5.5%	6,990	5.5%
12	141,662	6,879	4.9%	7,083	5.0%	7,083	5.0%
13	144,222	8,443	5.9%	6,851	4.8%	6,851	4.8%
14	139,653	6,427	4.6%	6,284	4.5%	6,284	4.5%
15	129,203	6,008	4.7%	5,491	4.3%	5,491	4.3%
16	111,075	5,968	5.4%	4,443	4.0%	4,443	4.0%
17	102,344	4,275	4.2%	3,838	3.8%	3,838	3.8%
18	107,840	3,827	3.5%	3,774	3.5%	3,774	3.5%
19	101,451	3,023	3.0%	3,297	3.3%	3,297	3.3%
20	108,943	3,990	3.7%	3,268	3.0%	3,268	3.0%
	2,241,842	155,974	7.0%	145,317.3	6.5%	145,317.3	6.5%

Note: Counts are weighted, except for duration 0.

Appendix E



Appendix E-12 Probability of Contributions Remaining with the System OPERS - Regular

		Actual	Actual	Proposed	Proposed
Duration	Exposure	Remaining	Rate	Expected	Rate
8	12,452	10,547	84.7%	9,962	80.0%
9	10,783	9,397	87.1%	8,734	81.0%
10	9,386	8,214	87.5%	7,696	82.0%
11	9,045	8,040	88.9%	7,507	83.0%
12	7,768	6,663	85.8%	6,525	84.0%
13	9,332	8,092	86.7%	7,932	85.0%
14	7,707	7,056	91.6%	6,628	86.0%
15	8,333	8,038	96.5%	7,249	87.0%
16	7,034	6,652	94.6%	6,190	88.0%
17	5,021	4,796	95.5%	4,469	89.0%
18	4,646	4,408	94.9%	4,182	90.0%
19	3,860	3,400	88.1%	3,513	91.0%
20	5,275	4,617	87.5%	4,853	92.0%
21	5,003	4,520	90.4%	4,653	93.0%
22	3,981	3,981	100.0%	3,742	94.0%
23	4,030	3,842	95.4%	3,828	95.0%
24	2,443	2,305	94.4%	2,345	96.0%
25	1,301	1,301	100.0%	1,262	97.0%
26	698	698	100.0%	684	98.0%
27	529	331	62.6%	524	99.0%
28	1,093	1,093	100.0%	1,093	100.0%
29	43	43	100.0%	43	100.0%
30	266	266	100.0%	266	100.0%
	120,027	108,299	90.2%	103,879	86.5%


Appendix E-13 Total Salary Scale OPERS

	Initial	Subsequent		Current		Proposed	
	Salary	Salary	Actual	Expected	Current	Expected	Proposed
Age	(\$ Millions)	(\$ Millions)	Rate	(\$ Millions)	Rate	(\$ Millions)	Rate
21	3.7	4.0	8.00%	4.1	9.25%	4.1	9.25%
22	5.9	6.4	7.86%	6.5	9.25%	6.5	9.25%
23	9.5	10.3	8.25%	10.4	8.95%	10.4	8.95%
24	12.9	13.9	7.56%	14.0	8.65%	14.0	8.65%
25	15.8	17.0	7.95%	17.1	8.35%	17.1	8.35%
26	18.5	20.1	8.39%	20.0	7.95%	20.0	7.95%
27	24.2	26.4	8.98%	26.0	7.55%	26.0	7.55%
28	32.5	34.9	7.42%	34.8	7.25%	34.8	7.25%
29	40.6	43.6	7.36%	43.4	6.95%	43.4	6.95%
30	48.6	51.8	6.72%	51.8	6.65%	51.8	6.65%
31	53.9	58.0	7.60%	57.3	6.35%	57.3	6.35%
32	57.7	61.8	6.96%	61.2	6.05%	61.2	6.05%
33	62.4	66.3	6.36%	66.0	5.85%	66.0	5.85%
34	67.7	72.3	6.72%	71.6	5.65%	71.6	5.65%
35	73.9	78.7	6.54%	78.0	5.55%	78.0	5.55%
36	78.4	83.5	6.57%	82.6	5.45%	82.6	5.45%
37	84.6	90.0	6.45%	89.0	5.25%	89.0	5.25%
38	90.9	96.9	6.59%	95.6	5.15%	95.6	5.15%
39	97.2	102.7	5.66%	102.2	5.15%	102.2	5.15%
40	97.1	103.1	6.18%	102.0	5.05%	102.0	5.05%
41	97.4	103.4	6.16%	102.3	5.05%	102.3	5.05%
42	99.0	105.3	6.39%	103.9	4.95%	103.9	4.95%
43	95.1	100.7	5.96%	99.7	4.85%	99.7	4.85%
44	97.8	103.3	5.65%	102.4	4.75%	102.4	4.75%
45	98.9	104.1	5.28%	103.6	4.75%	103.6	4.75%
46	102.1	107.6	5.40%	106.8	4.65%	106.8	4.65%
47	103.3	108.7	5.26%	108.0	4.55%	108.0	4.55%
48	107.8	113.5	5.35%	112.6	4.45%	112.6	4.45%
49	115.6	121.6	5.20%	120.8	4.45%	120.8	4.45%
50	118.0	124.0	5.14%	123.1	4.35%	123.1	4.35%
51	117.6	123.0	4.60%	122.7	4.35%	122.7	4.35%
52	114.3	120.2	5.16%	119.2	4.25%	119.2	4.25%
53	113.9	119.5	4.94%	118.7	4.25%	118.7	4.25%
54	111.8	117.0	4.73%	116.5	4.25%	116.5	4.25%
55	111.9	116.9	4.50%	116.6	4.25%	116.6	4.25%
56	119.9	125.9	4.96%	124.9	4.15%	124.9	4.15%
57	127.2	132.8	4.37%	132.4	4.05%	132.4	4.05%
58	128.5	133.8	4.17%	133.5	3.95%	133.5	3.95%
59	124.4	130.2	4.66%	129.2	3.85%	129.2	3.85%
60	124.3	129.6	4.26%	129.0	3.75%	129.0	3.75%
61	119.4	124.7	4.37%	123.8	3.65%	123.8	3.65%
62	104.9	108.8	3.74%	108.6	3.55%	108.6	3.55%
63	93.5	97.1	3.80%	96.8	3.45%	96.8	3.45%
64	77.9	80.8	3.63%	80.5	3.35%	80.5	3.35%
65	60.1	62.2	3.64%	62.0	3.25%	62.0	3.25%
	3,660.3	3,856.4	5.36%	3,831.1	4.67%	3,831.1	4.67%