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## Pensions

## NapaSan

- Definitions

Normal Cost - The cost of the retirement benefits that accrue for the plan year.

Unfunded Actuarial Liability (UAL) - This is the past service costs that have not yet been funded.

Discount Rate - The assumed rate of return on plan investments.

## Pensions

## NapaSan

- Pension Plans, Generally

Assets are not growing as fast as liabilities
Cumulative returns rebased


Average results US public and private DB pension funds.
Source: Ryan ALM, Inc

## Pensions

## NapaSan

## - Pension Plans, Generally



Source: UN

## CalPERS

## NapaSan

- CalPERS Pension Plan Funding Status



## CalPERS

## NapaSan

## - CalPERS Response

2013 - Changed amortization and smoothing policies (5 years)

2014 - Updated mortality tables
2015 - Funding Risk Mitigation policy (when investment returns are above discount rate, lowers discount rate and changes asset allocation)

2017 - Evaluating asset allocation mix (study concludes February 2018)

## CalPERS

## NapaSan

- CalPERS Response

Reduced Discount Rate:

FY 16-17 7.50\%<br>FY 17-18 7.375\%<br>FY 18-19 7.25\%<br>FY 19-20 7.00\%

Impact: Increases Normal Cost AND Increases unfunded liability

## CalPERS

## NapaSan

- CalPERS Response

Risk Mitigation Policy:

| Investment Returns <br> over Discount Rate (DR) |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| $2 \%$ over | $0.05 \%$ |
| $7 \%$ over | $0.10 \%$ |
| $10 \%$ over | $0.15 \%$ |
| $13 \%$ over | $0.20 \%$ |
| $17 \%$ over | $0.25 \%$ |

$1 / 2$ of "extra revenues" from investment returns used to lower the DR, and $1 / 2$ used to lower agency payments

## CalPERS

## NapaSan

- Result of Changes

Normal Cost: Increase of 1-3\% as percentage of payroll (e.g., increase cost from $13 \%$ of payroll to $14-16 \%$ of payroll)

Unfunded Liability: 30-40\% increase

## NapaSan

## NapaSan

- 3 Tiers of CalPERS Plans at NapaSan

|  | Tier 1 | Tier 2 | PEPRA |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Effective Date |  | Sept. 2009 | Jan. 2013 |
| Plan | $2.7 \%$ @ 55 | $2.0 \%$ @ 55 | $2.0 \%$ @ 62 |
| \# of Employees <br> (Active) | 34 | 6 | 8 |
| \# of Retirees | 60 | 0 | 0 |
| Normal Cost <br> (\% of payroll) | $13.7 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ |
| Employee Contribution <br> (\% of payroll) | $4.25 \%$ | $4.25 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ |
| Annual Payment of <br> Unfunded Liability | $\$ 1,111,132$ | $\$ 3,234$ | $\$ 496$ |

## NapaSan

- NapaSan Normal Cost

Normal Cost - The cost of the retirement benefits that accrue for the plan year.

Normal Cost (\% of salary)


11
NapaSan Finance Committee Meeting - November 14, 2017

## NapaSan

## NapaSan

- NapaSan Normal Cost

Normal Cost (\% of salary)
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## NapaSan

## NapaSan

## - Normal Cost Projection



## NapaSan

- NapaSan Pension Liability
(\% Funded Status)

Unfunded Actuarial Liability (UAL)This is the past service costs that have not yet been funded.


## NapaSan

## NapaSan

## - Funded Ratio Projection

The funded ratio is the ratio of the assets in your pension fund to your pension liability.
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## NapaSan

## NapaSan

- Liability Cost Projection $2018=\$ 1.25 \mathrm{M} \quad 2020=\$ 0.89 \mathrm{M} \quad 2031=\$ 1.56 \mathrm{M}$

This graph shows the main components of your annual pension costs.


## NapaSan

## NapaSan

## - Total Cost Projection

This graph shows the main components of your annual pension costs.
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## NapaSan

## NapaSan

## Funding Options

1. Pay-Go (current strategy)
2. One-time salary savings payments
3. Utilize side fund payments
4. New 15-Year amortization schedule
5. Pension Bonds

15\% of governments pay more than CalPERS requires annually

## NapaSan

## NapaSan

## Funding Options

## 1. Pay-Go (current strategy)



## NapaSan

## NapaSan

## Funding Options

## 2. One-time salary savings payments <br> (assumes three payments of \$150k)

Total employer contributions from 2016 to 2041 decrease relative to your baseline by a total of $\$ 1.14 \mathrm{M}$ on a cash basis


## NapaSan

## NapaSan

## Funding Options

## 3. Utilize side fund payments <br> (Two payments of \$500k, in FY 21 and FY 22)

Total employer contributions from 2016 to 2041 decrease relative to your baseline by a total of $\$ 2.81 \mathrm{M}$ on a cash basis in year 2018:

Unfunded Liability Contribution
O \$1.25M
from \$1.25M
Employer Normai Cost
0
Employee Contribution
0
$\bigcirc \$ 1.89 \mathrm{M}$
from $\$ 1.89 \mathrm{M}$

## NapaSan

## NapaSan

## Funding Options

4. New 15-Year amortization schedule
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## NapaSan

## Funding Options

## 5. Pension Obligation Bonds

Pension Obligation Bonds are taxable bonds issued by a state or local government as part of an overall strategy to fund the unfunded portion of the pension liabilities by creating debt.

## ADVISORY

## Pension Obligation Bonds

## Advisory:

GFOA Advisories identify specific policies and procedures necessary to minimize a governments exposure to potential loss in connection with its financial management activities. It is not to be interpreted as GFOA sanctioning the underlying activity that gives rise to the exposure

BACKGROUND:
Pension obligation bonds (POBs) are taxable bonds ${ }^{1}$ that some state and local governments have issued as part of an overall strategy to fund the unfunded portion of their pension liabilities by creating debt. The use of POBs rests on the assumption that the bond proceeds, when invested with pension assets in higher-yielding asset classes, will be able to achieve a rate of return that is greater than the interest rate owed over the term of the bonds. However, POBs involve considerable investment risk, making this goal very speculative. ${ }^{2}$ Failing to achieve the targeted rate of return burdens the issuer with both the debt service requirements of the taxable bonds and the unfunded ension liabilities that remain unmet because the investment portfolio did not perform as anticipated. in in in as anticip In recent years, local jurisdictions across the country have faced increased financial stress
result of their reliance on POBs, demonstrating the significant risks associated with these result of their reliance on POBs, demonstrating the
instruments for both small and large governments.

## RECOMMENDATION:

The Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) recommends that state and local governments do not issue POBs for the following reasons

1. The invested $P O B$ proceeds might fail to earn more than the interest rate owed over the term of the bonds, leading to increased overall liabilities for the government.
2. POBs are complex instruments that carry considerable risk. POB structures may incorporate the use of guaranteed investment contracts, swaps, or derivatives, which must be intensively scrutinized as these embedded products can introduce counterparty risk, credit risk and interest rate risk.
3. Issuing taxable debt to fund the pension liability increases the jurisdiction's bonded debt burden and potentially uses up debt capacity that could be used for other purposes. In addition, taxable debt is typically issued without call options or with "make-whole" calls, which can make it more difficult and costly to refund or restructure than traditional tax-exempt debt.
4. POBs are frequently structured in a manner that defers the principal payments or extends repayment over a period longer than the actuarial amortization period, thereby increasing the sponsor's overall costs.
5. Rating agencies may not view the proposed issuance of POBs as credit positive, particularly if the issuance is not part of a more comprehensive plan to address pension funding shortfalls.

## The GFOA recommends that state and local governments do not issue POBs for the following reasons:

## Discussion

## NapaSan

## Funding Options

## Payments to CalPERS <br> - or - <br> Payments to §115 Trust

## Discussion

## NapaSan

## Funding Options

1. Pay-Go (current strategy)
2. One-time salary savings payments
3. Utilize side fund payments
4. New 15-Year amortization schedule
5. Pension Bonds
$15 \%$ of governments pay more than CalPERS requires annually

## NapaSan

## OPEB Status Update

## OPEB - Status Update

## NapaSan

- Other Post-Employment Benefits
- Health Care

Hired before July 1, 2014 - family coverage
Hired after July 1, 2014 - single coverage

- Vision

Same as current employees

- Life Insurance
\$7,500 coverage

OPEB - Status Update
2009 Refinanced debt
2010 Established CERBT Trust
Annually Use savings from refinancing to make annual trust payments

## OPEB - Status Update

## NapaSan

- Total Liability $=\$ 10.1$ million Total Funded $=\$ 3.5$ million in trust Total Unfunded $=\$ 6.6$ million Percent Funded $=34.5 \%$


