

COMPREHENSIVE ACTUARIAL REVIEW OF THE
2016 ACTUARIAL VALUATION OF THE
DISTRICT ATTORNEYS' RETIREMENT SYSTEM



ACTUARIAL SERVICES
PRESENTED TO THE PUBLIC RETIREMENT SYSTEMS' ACTUARIAL COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 13, 2017



LOUISIANA LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR
DARYL G. PURPERA, CPA, CFE

February 3, 2017

Mr. E. Pete Adams
District Attorneys' Retirement System
1645 Nicholson Drive
Baton Rouge, LA 70802-8143

Re: Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation

Dear Mr. Adams:

To fulfill the requirements of R.S. 11:127(C), the Louisiana Legislative Auditor will prepare a comprehensive actuarial review every other year for each of the statewide retirement systems. Your system, the District Attorneys' Retirement System (System), is scheduled to receive a comprehensive review for funding valuations associated with even numbered years.

The remainder of this letter contains the results of our comprehensive review of your June 30, 2016, Actuarial Valuation. More specifically, we have evaluated for reasonableness the actuarial assumptions and methods employed by the System and its actuary. Based on this review, we expect to recommend at the February 13, 2017, meeting of PRSAC (the Public Retirement Systems' Actuarial Committee) that the Actuarial Valuation prepared by G.S. Curran & Company (GSC) for June 30, 2016, and dated December 22, 2016, be approved.

I would like to thank you and your staff for your cooperation and assistance with this review.

Sincerely,

Daryl G. Purpera, CPA, CPE
Legislative Auditor

cc: G.S. Curran & Company

Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation of the District Attorneys' Retirement System

1. Net Expected Rate of Return (eROR)

According to the 2016 Actuarial Valuation, the net eROR used in the determination of the discount rate for the System's actuarial valuation as of June 30, 2016, was 7.0%. It is stated to be net of investment-related expenses.

We would prefer to see a net eROR assumption closer to the 6.24% consensus expectation for the 15-year compound return (see below for more details). However, we find the use of 7.0% in the DARS funding valuation to be reasonable for the purpose at hand. It is just under the 7.06% consensus expectation for any one year during the mid-term horizon (again, see below for more details).

The three most significant factors in setting or evaluating an assumed eROR are:

- Expected future inflation (forward-looking) and
- Current and future asset allocation percentages by asset class and
- Professional forecasts of future performance (forward-looking) and other capital market assumptions for the different asset classes comprising the asset allocation.

Inflation

The 2016 Actuarial Valuation (page 4) states "An inflation rate of 2.5% was implicit in both the assumed rate of return and rate of salary increases." Various accounting-related reports we reviewed include disclosures of expected inflation and real rates of return which seem inconsistent and suggest further scrutiny beyond the scope of the actuarial review.

We would prefer to see an inflation assumption closer to the 2.25% suggested by the expected inflation rates in the exhibit below. However, we find the use of 2.5% in the DARS funding valuation to be reasonable for the purpose at hand.

Because arithmetic or geometric rates are relatively easy to calculate, and are therefore readily available, it is tempting to rely on historical rates based on the consumer price index. However, there are many professional sources available to actuaries and investment consultants that forecast inflation on a forward-looking basis. In our opinion, forward-looking forecasts are much more appropriate than historical rates. Actuarial Standards of Practice (ASOP) No. 27 section 3.4 states:

"Relevant Data—To evaluate relevant data, the actuary should review appropriate recent and long-term historical economic data. The actuary should not give undue weight to recent experience. The actuary should consider the possibility that some historical economic data may not be appropriate for use in developing assumptions for future periods due to changes in the underlying environment."

There are many reasons to rely far more on forward-looking forecasts than historical. The past history of inflation rates in the U.S. (whether the past 10, 25, 50, or 100 years) may be interesting and useful in understanding inflation forces, but they should not supplant forward-looking expectations from inflation-forecasting experts and should not be used to defend or support a current valuation assumption concerning future inflation rates.

Expert professional sources for forward-looking inflation forecasts are generally lower than 2.50%. Consider the forward-looking forecasts from expert professionals presented on the following page.

Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation of the District Attorneys' Retirement System

Forward-looking Annual Inflation Forecasts (From Professional Experts in the Field of Forecasting Inflation)	
Federal Reserve Board's Federal Open Market Committee Long-run Price Inflation Objective (Since Jan 2012)	2.00%
Congressional Budget Office: <i>The Budget and Economic Outlook</i> Overall Consumer Price Index (Aug 2016; Ultimate) Overall Consumer Price Index (Aug 2016; 11 Years) Personal Consumer Expenditures (Aug 2016; Ultimate) Personal Consumer Expenditures (Aug 2016; 11 Years)	2.40% 2.33% 2.00% 1.95%
2016 Social Security Trustees Report CPI-W 15-Year Intermediate Assumption CPI-W 30-Year Intermediate Assumption GDP Deflator 15-Year Intermediate Assumption GDP Deflator 30-Year Intermediate Assumption	2.50% 2.55% 2.13% 2.17%
Quarterly Survey of Professional Forecasters 2Q2016 Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia 10-Year Forecast	2.20%
Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland 30-Year Expectation on June 1, 2016 20-Year Expectation on June 1, 2016 10-Year Expectation on June 1, 2016	2.04% 1.87% 1.63%
Bond Investors (Excess Yield of Non-indexed Treasuries Over Indexed Treasuries) 30-Year Expectation on June 30, 2016 Median 30-year Expectation over 1/1/11 - 6/30/16 20-Year Expectation on June 30, 2015 Median 20-year Expectation over 1/1/11 - 6/30/16 10-Year Expectation on June 30, 2015 Median 10-year Expectation over 1/1/11 - 6/30/16	1.60% 2.28% 1.33% 2.27% 1.40% 2.14%
Investment Consultants and Forecasters 2016 GRS Survey major national investment forecasters and consultants Median expectation among 8 firms (6 to 20 Years) Median expectation among 2 firms (30 Years) 2016 HAS Survey of 12 investment advisors: Median (10 years) 2016 HAS Survey of 12 investment advisors: Median (20 years)	2.23% 2.38% 2.22% 2.31%

It has become much harder to defend inflation assumptions greater than or equal to 2.5% in the face of so many opinions to the contrary from experts in the field of inflation forecasting. Our preferred inflation

Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation of the District Attorneys' Retirement System

assumption currently would be 2.25% because it lies more comfortably within a consensus of the expectations above. Outliers may not be reasonable.

Asset Allocation

It has been generally accepted for many years that a fund's asset allocation to specified asset classes is responsible for over 90% of a fund's investment performance. Therefore, the asset allocation of the Fund is a core element in setting and evaluating the assumed future eROR.

In our evaluation of the actuary's net eROR assumption, we relied on the three target asset allocation percentages set forth in the System's formal Investment Policy Statement last updated February 11, 2014. These were supplemented with information derived from the System's investment performance report for the period ending December 31, 2016.

Professional Investment Forecasts

We applied those target asset allocations to the expectations in the Gabriel, Roeder, Smith & Company survey of eight major national investment consultants and forecasters. Given the brevity of the descriptions of the asset classes identified, our mapping of these three asset classes to the investment consultant's asset classes may not be exact.

We applied the investment consultants' expected returns. We replaced the investment consultants' respective inflation assumptions with 2.25%, our preferred assumption based on the inflation forecasters' expectations presented above. We reduced the respective forecasts by a reasonable level of passive investment-related expenses as expected by ASOP No. 27. This process results in normalized expected returns for any one given year in the forecast horizon (called the expected arithmetic return).

Finally, we reduced the resultant one-year arithmetic returns for volatility drag in the compound return expected over time. Following are the results of this process.

**Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation of the
 District Attorneys' Retirement System**

Investment Consultant	Distribution of 15-Year Average Geometric Net Nominal Return			Probability of exceeding 7.00%
	40th	50th	60th	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	4.49%	5.37%	6.25%	32.04%
2	4.62%	5.47%	6.34%	32.74%
3	5.28%	6.13%	6.99%	39.91%
4	5.63%	6.43%	7.24%	42.89%
5	5.48%	6.36%	7.24%	42.69%
6	5.86%	6.70%	7.54%	46.36%
7	5.88%	6.71%	7.54%	46.46%
8	5.79%	6.72%	7.66%	47.01%
Average	5.38%	6.24%	7.10%	41.26%

Notice the 50th percentile expectation of the consensus average is 6.24%. That can be considered the bottom of a range of reasonableness (unless additional conservatism is desired). Actuarially speaking, it is the preferred assumption because it is the 50th percentile expectation of compound returns over time.

The following is the backup showing the development of the one-year arithmetic returns.

Investment Consultant	Investment Consultant Expected Nominal One-Year Return	Investment Consultant Inflation Assumption	Expected Real Return (2)-(3)	Actuary Inflation Assumption	Expected Nominal One-Year Return (4)+(5)	Investment Expenses	Expected One-Year Nominal Return Net of Expenses (6)-(7)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1	6.58%	2.50%	4.08%	2.25%	6.33%	0.10%	6.23%
2	6.39%	2.25%	4.14%	2.25%	6.39%	0.10%	6.29%
3	7.04%	2.25%	4.79%	2.25%	7.04%	0.10%	6.94%
4	7.19%	2.20%	4.99%	2.25%	7.24%	0.10%	7.14%
5	7.07%	2.00%	5.07%	2.25%	7.32%	0.10%	7.22%
6	6.88%	1.56%	5.32%	2.25%	7.57%	0.10%	7.47%
7	7.58%	2.26%	5.32%	2.25%	7.57%	0.10%	7.47%
8	7.73%	2.20%	5.53%	2.25%	7.78%	0.10%	7.68%
Average	7.06%	2.15%	4.90%	2.25%	7.15%	0.10%	7.06%

Notice the one-year arithmetic average consensus is 7.06%. This can be considered the top end of a range of reasonableness.

Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation of the District Attorneys' Retirement System

For use in an actuarial valuation for pensions, where the entire measurement and funding model is built on compounding (forward or backward), the 50th percentile compound geometric expectation is the most appropriate choice of a net eROR assumption. Nevertheless, while we would prefer to see 6.24%, we therefore believe the System's 7.0% net eROR assumption is reasonable.

However, none of the eight major national investment consultants expects the 50th percentile of the compound return over time to be near the current 7.0% assumption. Some might consider this an outlier. According to the capital market assumptions of these investment consultants, there is only a 41.26% chance of achieving at least the 7.0% compound annual return over the next 15 years.

2. Treatment of Administrative Expenses

According to page 38 of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation, the Investment Rate of Return is "7.0% (Net of Investment Expenses)."

The report (page 9) also states "Each year a determination is made of the normal cost, and the actuarially required contributions are based on the sum of this value and administrative expenses." The report (page 18) includes estimated administrative expenses of \$515,976 in the calculation of the Employer Actuarially Required Contribution for Fiscal 2017.

It is therefore our understanding, confirmed by direct conversations and correspondence with the System's actuary, that the administrative expenses are recognized in advance for funding purposes by way of a load of expected administrative expenses on the normal cost. That process is consistent with a Actuarial Standards of Practice (ASOPs), including:

Actuarial Standards of Practice (ASOP) No. 4 section 3.13(c) states:

"Expenses should be considered when assigning periodic costs or actuarially determined contributions to time periods. For example, the expenses for a period may be added to the normal cost for benefits or expenses may be reflected as an adjustment to the investment return assumption or the discount rate. As another example, expenses may be reflected as a percentage of pension obligation or normal cost."

Actuarial Standards of Practice (ASOP) No. 27 section 3.8.3(e) states:

"Investment and Other Administrative Expenses—Investment and other administrative expenses may be paid from the plan assets. To the extent such expenses are not otherwise recognized, the actuary should reduce the investment return assumption to reflect these expenses."

Actuarial Standards of Practice (ASOP) No. 35 section 3.6.1 states:

"Administrative Expenses Charged to the Plan—The actuary should take into account expenses such as investment advisory, investment management, or insurance advisory services, to the extent that the costs of these services are not reflected in the investment return assumption; premiums paid to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC); accounting and auditing services; actuarial services; plan administration services; legal services; and trustee services. Formats for this

Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation of the District Attorneys' Retirement System

assumption may include a dollar amount, a specific percentage of assets, a specific (and explicitly disclosed) reduction in the investment return assumption, or a percentage of benefit obligation or normal cost.”

In conclusion, we concur with the actuary that the June 30, 2016, discount rate should be based on the net eROR without any reductions for administrative expenses since they are included explicitly in the calculation of the actuarially required contributions.

This approach used in the 2016 Actuarial Valuation is reasonable and appropriate.

3. Mortality

The 2016 Actuarial Valuation (page 38) states that the mortality assumption for annuitant and beneficiary mortality is the “RP 2000 Combined Healthy with White Collar Adjustment Sex Distinct Tables projected to 2032 (Female table set back one year).”

Base table

To evaluate the reasonableness of the mortality assumption, we reviewed the base mortality (RP2000 with White Collar Adjustments) separately from the projection scale (Scale AA).

We believe the use of the RP2000 with White Collar Adjustments as the base mortality table to be reasonable. The process we used to determine the reasonableness of the base mortality table is as follows:

1. Experience Study: An experience study (dated November 12, 2015) was prepared in 2015 covering the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2014. We reviewed the experience study report and found the section on mortality to be described with reasonable detail and careful recognition of relevant mortality experience. The report describes reasonable applications of actuarial credibility principles.
2. Size of the plan: Due to the small size of the experience group and low number of deaths during the study period, the results of the experience study are not fully credible (unlike LASERS which was fully credible). Only partial credibility can therefore be given to the results of the experience study. A weighted average of the group's experience and that of a standard reference table is needed to obtain a final mortality assumption for valuation purposes.
3. Standard mortality table: Since the experience study is not fully credible, it is necessary to select a standard mortality table as a reference table to be used in the determination of the mortality assumption. Possible candidates for a standard reference table include:
 - a. The mortality tables developed for LASERS or TRSL. However, an actuarial assessment would need to be made of the appropriateness of the actuarial methodology and the comparability of the groups covered before considering them for use as the standard reference table for this purpose.

Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation of the District Attorneys' Retirement System

- b. The RP2000 mortality table was published in or around the year 2000. It was developed by the Society of Actuaries based on national private sector pension data.
- c. RP2014 mortality table was published in October 2014. As for RP2000, this table was also developed by the Society of Actuaries based on national private sector pension data. It is the most recent reliable base mortality table available, for purposes of national estimates of mortality for pension plans.
4. Louisiana mortality rates: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has published data¹ demonstrating that mortality rates in Louisiana are generally higher than national averages. Therefore, it would be more prudent not to use a current national mortality table (such as RP2014) as the standard reference table in the weighted average calculations described above without adjustment.
5. RP2000 with white collar adjustment as the standard mortality table: The experience study states that RP2000 mortality table was selected as the standard base mortality table. The RP2014 mortality table, being the newest table available, was considered by the system's actuary. However, the RP2000 mortality table was ultimately selected to account for the higher mortality rates in Louisiana. We find this approach reasonable. We analyzed the data from CDC¹ and found that mortality rates in Louisiana are approximately 20% higher than national mortality rates. We found the mortality rates in RP2000 to be approximately 26% higher than those of RP-2014 (representative of national rates). In our opinion, this is close enough for RP-2000 to qualify as a reasonable standard reference table for reflecting general Louisiana mortality. The white collar adjustments are also reasonable.
6. Credibility weights: Credibility weights were calculated separately by GSC for males and females based on the number of deaths observed in the experience study. Due to the low number of deaths, the weights assigned to the combined group's experience were low (12% for males and 8% for females). The associated weights assigned to the standard reference table were the compliments of those (88% for males and 92% for females). These weighting factors calculated by GSC used standard actuarial treatment required for developing weighted average mortality that recognizes the credibility level of data in an experience study with insufficient data of its own.
7. Credibility weighted mortality: The credibility weights were applied to (a) the experience study mortality rates and (b) standard reference table's mortality rate (RP2000 as projected to 2012) to obtain the weighted mortality rates. The average rate was 100% of the standard reference table for males and 97% of the standard reference table for females.

¹ Refer to Table 3 in the *National Vital Statistics Reports* (Volume 60, Number 4) dated January 22, 2012 published by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, National Vital Statistics System.

Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation of the District Attorneys' Retirement System

8. Set-forwards and set-backs: The credibility weighted mortality rates were compared to the standard reference table to set the appropriate set-forwards and set-backs to determine the best fitting table to use for the final mortality assumption. No adjustment to the standard reference table was determined to be the best fit for males and a set-back one year (in the RP2000 table with white collar adjustments projected by Scale AA to 2012) was determined to be the best fit for females.

Therefore, we find the base table (before projection for future mortality) to be fully appropriate for the 2016 Actuarial Valuation.

Projection scales

Once the base table was found to be reasonable, we then reviewed the projection scale used in the mortality assumption (projection Scale AA). We believe the actuary's use of Scale AA projected to 2032 is not unreasonable.

However, there is an intermediate projection scale, Scale BB, which was developed to be used in connection with RP2000, pending creation and release of RP2014 and MP2014. Scale BB was released in September 2012 and available at the time of the experience study. Scale BB was developed after the results of the Society of Actuaries' analyses showed that the rates of mortality improvement in the U.S. over the then-recent past had differed significantly from those predicted by Scale AA. Scale BB would be a better choice for the projection of mortality improvements when coupled with RP2000.

Furthermore, there are two ways to reflect mortality improvement: (a) Project the improvements to a target year in the future or (b) Apply the improvement scale generationally. The first way applies the mortality rate for a 65-year old (for example) regardless of whether the member turns 65 in 2020 or turns 65 in 2040. The generational projection applies the improvements for the four years between 2016 and 2020 for a member turning 65 in 2020, but applies the improvements for the 24 years between 2016 and 2040 for a member turning 65 in 2040. While the actuarial literature permits the use of a static projection to a given future year, the actuarial profession is endorsing the generational approach as being preferable.

A more current approach to estimating mortality rates for valuation purposes would be to use either: (a) RP2000 projected generationally by Scale BB or (b) RP2014 loaded with 120% and projecting generationally using MP2016. White collar adjustment would also be reasonable for each. While either of these two approaches would be more current and preferable methodologies, we do not find the mortality tables used in the DARS 2016 actuarial funding valuation report to be unreasonable.

4. Cost of Living Adjustments

Page 4 of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation states:

“Although the board of trustees has authority to grant ad hoc Cost of Living Increases (COLAs) under limited circumstances, these COLAs have not been shown to have a historical pattern, the amounts of the COLAs have not been relative to a defined cost-of-living or inflation index, and there is no evidence to conclude that COLAs will be granted on a predictable basis in the future.

Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation of the District Attorneys' Retirement System

Therefore, for purposes of determining the present value of benefits, these COLAs were deemed not to be substantively automatic and the present value of benefits excludes COLAs not previously granted by the board of trustees.”

Certain Louisiana statutes are applicable to all state and statewide retirement systems and provide numerous rules, conditions, thresholds and benefit levels governing the granting and paying of cost-of-living adjustments or permanent benefit increases. For the purpose of this letter report, we refer to both as COLAs. For example, R.S. 11:241-248 provides substantive rules applicable broadly to many of Louisiana's retirement systems, including DARS. These statutes have been around for a very long time. Certain other Louisiana statutes are applicable to specific retirement systems. For example, R.S. 11:1638 provides substantive COLA rules specifically for DARS. Again, this specific statute has been around a long time.

The broadly applicable rules and the specific system rules have changed over time; most recently, in 2013 significant changes were adopted. Nevertheless, COLA statutes applicable to DARS have been part of the framework for many years. And this statutory history of providing a mechanism for DARS COLAs continues today.

Currently, the COLA statutes applicable to DARS provide for (a) mathematical and logical rules for *when* the DARS board is allowed to grant a COLA and (b) mathematical and logical rules for *how much* COLA the DARS board may grant. There is not much if any discretion in the application of these rules.

When

The statutory mechanism for *when* the DARS board is allowed to grant base COLAs and additional COLAs depends on whether the funded ratio is at or above certain percentage levels and on how long it has been since a COLA had previously been granted.

According to page 24 of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation, the funded ratio of DARS was 102.45% as of June 30, 2016. According to the statutes, during the time while DARS' funded ratio is at least 90% or more, a COLA is expected to be allowed every other year, subject to the excess earnings rule determining the amount, as described below.

Discretion

If these conditions are satisfied and the DARS board is allowed to grant a base COLA and possibly an additional COLA, the board must vote to actually grant the COLA. The board is free to vote for or against a COLA when allowed, or not to vote at all. This is the discretionary aspect of the COLA-granting process. This discretionary step is what prevents the COLA from being considered “automatic.” But consider the following internal and external forces at play which tend to press board members to grant COLAs when allowed:

- While we have no personal knowledge or experience with the DARS board, generally speaking, retirement board members often have a sense of duty to serve the plan members. The DARS retirement board of trustees is composed of individuals who have a natural constituency in plan members. There is a natural inclination to grant benefits when allowed.

**Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation of the
 District Attorneys' Retirement System**

- Social Security gives a COLA almost every year. In any given future year, if DARS retirees have not had a COLA in a couple years and since they are not generally covered by Social Security, there is a natural tendency to want to grant a COLA if allowed.
- If other retirement systems, such as LASERS, TRSL or other state or statewide systems give COLAs in a given year, DARS board members will feel some pressure to grant a COLA if allowed.
- Finally, if the funded ratio of the System continues to improve as it is expected to do, board members might feel like sharing that success with the plan members by granting a COLA.

These are usually strong forces that would press board members to grant COLAs whenever allowed.

On the other hand, the direction of the employer contribution rate (going upward or downward) also influences the willingness to grant a COLA. Indeed, there are fiscal pressures that move board members at times to refrain from granting benefits at the times when allowed if the employer contribution rate goes up by sufficient margins or if the funded ratio falls. There may also be other factors at play that discourage board members from granting COLAs when otherwise allowed.

The following table illustrates recent history of when DARS COLAs were allowed to be granted and how much.

DARS COLAs Granted			
Evaluated June 30	Effective January 1	Allowed to Grant COLA?	% COLA Granted
2016	2017	No*	0.00%
2015	2016	Yes	0.00%
2014	2015	Yes	0.00%
2013	2014	No	0.00%

** A full and detailed interpretive decision tree is needed to evaluate the actuary's conclusion that a COLA was not allowed.*

The recent examples of not granting a COLA when allowed (measured at fiscal year ending June 30, 2014 and 2015 sets DARS apart from other statewide systems that have shown at least some proclivity to grant COLAs when otherwise allowed. This may be an aberration. But it cannot be ignored. COLAs were not granted when otherwise allowed.

Important and material plan provisions like these COLA provisions require objective analysis, careful attention and reasonable actuarial judgement of the future to appropriately measure the cost and liability of a retirement plan.

Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation of the District Attorneys' Retirement System

How much

The statutory mechanism for *how much* COLA the DARS board may grant (assuming it is allowed to do so based on the conditions above) depends on (a) how far above the threshold the funded ratio is, (b) how far above the assumed valuation rate the actuarial valuation rate actually was during the year, (c) how much the present value of benefits for eligible members is measured to be, (d) whether it is a base COLA, in which case the increase amount for each eligible member is 3.0% per year, (e) whether it is an additional COLA, in which case the additional increase amount is 2% of the eligible member's initial commencement amount and (f) whether the A+B method in R.S. 11:241 is applied.

Legislative Framework Expects COLAs

The COLA provisions are in the Louisiana statutes for a reason: To pay COLAs -- sometimes. The sponsors and other legislators fully expect COLAs to be granted periodically, even if only every two or three years. If not, these statutory provisions probably would not have been codified.

It is incumbent upon the actuary to assess the possibility and likelihood that COLA benefits will be paid with some regularity, even if only every two or three years. In DARS' case, the current assessment might result in a reasonable current assumption that no COLA will be granted in the future. The first such COLA granted by DARS, however, may reasonably cause some recognition of COLAs in the future with some frequency.

Something is Better Than Nothing

Traditional actuarial methods model the payment of various plan benefits over time, none of which are known with certainty either. For example: the times when members will terminate, become disabled, die or retire are not known with certainty; how much employees' pensionable compensation will increase over time is not known with certainty; nor do we know with certainty what the future investment returns or future inflation will be. Nevertheless, these uncertainties do not stop us from making reasonable projections in reasonable calculations of the future costs and liabilities associated with any given plan benefit provisions. Decrement events and benefits do not need to be fully predictable before an actuary recognizes some likelihood within an actuarial valuation.

While COLA benefits are different from other benefit provisions in the events and conditions in which the actual benefits arise, they are the same as any other benefit provision in the sense that (a) they are well-defined benefits payable to plan members, (b) certain aspects of their eligibility and calculations can be programmed and calculated, and (c) other aspects of their eligibility/approval may be discretionary but they do have a reasonably likely chance of being approved whenever allowed. Actuarially measuring the future costs and liabilities of COLA benefits (recognizing a degree of likelihood and timing) is consistent with our traditional practice of actuarially measuring other legal plan benefit provisions (recognizing a degree of likelihood and timing).

Refer to the Appendix at the end of this letter for several citations from the Actuarial Standards of Practice (ASOPs).

Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation of the District Attorneys' Retirement System

Other Truly Ad Hoc COLAs

Other plans around the country have no special provisions for COLAs, no well-defined criteria or hurdle to satisfy for granting COLAs, and have no history (or no discernible pattern) of granting ad hoc COLAs. Those are different. In those cases, there is no good reason to expect COLAs to be paid in the future, until or unless some pattern of truly ad hoc COLAs emerges. But DARS is different, as are other Louisiana retirement systems. While DARS has not granted a COLA in the recent past, even when allowed, it does have a well-formed statutory structure for doing so.

Reasonable Actuarial Estimates

There are at least two approaches to actuarially measuring the cost and liabilities of DARS's COLA provision: stochastic modelling and rough estimating. Both methods result in assuming that an annual or biennial COLA increase of X% serves as a reasonable proxy for what would likely actually happen in the years to come. The value of X% serves as the single equivalent COLA, and is treated in the valuation "as if" it is a regular COLA increase. The only challenge is to make a reasonable estimate of X%.

1. An open group forecast valuation of the system forms the basis for a stochastic estimation of the current present values of future COLA benefits. There are other unforeseen benefits to an open group forecast that prove useful to both actuary and board members as they manage the funding of the system. Once the process solves for X%, the usual closed group valuation is then performed using the X% as a regular COLA.

An Excel spreadsheet can be developed with the necessary liability projections, projected fund values based on an investment return for each future year, and annual valuation calculations built into the spreadsheet. With the same expected return every year, the spreadsheet produces deterministic forecast valuations. But if Excel's random number generator selects return assumptions in a macro from its internal lognormal distribution function, the Fund's return varies from year to year, producing a stochastic forecast of future valuations. An added probability can be added easily for the likelihood of granting a COLA every year it is otherwise allowed. This probability can be set anywhere from zero to 1.0.

Running that forecast valuation with and without COLAs, the single equivalent X% can be solved so as to approximate the present value of simulated COLAs.

Some have argued that this is too complicated and expensive for a small plan. However, this is not too complicated for an actuary to design and run. It is being done more and more in many firms across the country. Furthermore, the cost should not be considered too much for a plan the size of DARS (approximately \$371 million in assets) for the worthy benefit of obtaining a decent actuarial measure of the cost and liability for providing these COLA benefits. Furthermore, once it is built, it can be adjusted for use on behalf of other retirement systems, thereby spreading the costs.

2. However, even a rough estimate would be better than nothing. Just following the reasoning set forth in the pages above, it is reasonable to expect COLAs to be allowed every three or four years in the next decade or so, but every other year thereafter, in the amount of 2.0% to 5.0% each time granted. With an assumption of granting every time allowed, that might work out to a

Comprehensive Actuarial Review of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation of the District Attorneys' Retirement System

single equivalent annual COLA of approximately 1.0% to 2.0% over the next 30 years. If only a 50-50 chance of granting when allowed or if excess earnings are available only 50% of the time, that might work out to be a single equivalent annual COLA of approximately 0.50% to 1.0%.

Currently, it is not unreasonable for the System's actuary to measure DARS' costs and liabilities without advance recognition of any future COLAs. This is highly dependent on the observed fact that in each of the two recent years when a COLA was otherwise allowed, the DARS board did not grant one. However, if DARS does grant a COLA when allowed, it should be given weight in assessing future likelihoods when performing subsequent valuations.

Much of the description of the COLA conditions and benefits above are merely a summary and much involves interpretation of statutes. This letter report should not be considered a legal opinion. The statutes should be consulted for more detailed descriptions and we defer to the Legislative Auditor's legal counsel and other authoritative sources for legal interpretations.

5. Calculations and Exhibits


We did not perform an actuarial audit and replication of the results. However, we reviewed the calculations presented in the 2016 funding valuation report to ensure there were no mathematical errors. Based on our review, we believe all the calculations in the report were done correctly and without any mathematical errors.

Pages 10-11 of the 2016 Actuarial Valuation include a few paragraphs with basic conclusions about whether a COLA is allowed, with reference to a few statutes. In the interest of transparency and ASOP No. 4 Section 4.1(i) and ASOP No. 41 Section 3.2, we would prefer to see a detailed exhibit that presents a step-by-step (decision tree) exhibit that demonstrates the path for determining whether a COLA is allowed and how much the COLA could be or will be.

This communication should not be construed to provide tax advice, legal advice, or investment advice.

6. Actuarial Certification

Although assisted by other actuaries, the actuarial opinions expressed in this report are the opinions of Paul T. Richmond, Manager of Actuarial Services for the LLA. This report was prepared under Mr. Richmond's supervision. He received support from actuaries employed by Gabriel, Roeder, Smith & Company. Mr. Richmond is a member of the American Academy of Actuaries and meets the qualification standards of the Academy necessary to render the professional actuarial opinions contained herein. His supporting actuaries are also members of the Academy and meet the qualification standards that allow Mr. Richmond to rely on their advice and work products.



Paul T. Richmond, ASA, MAAA, EA, FCA

2/3/17

Date

APPENDIX

ACTUARIAL STANDARDS OF PRACTICE (ASOPs)

ASOP No. 4 Section 3.5

3.5 Plan Provisions—When measuring pension obligations and determining **periodic costs** or **actuarially determined contributions**, the actuary should reflect all significant **plan provisions** known to the actuary as appropriate for the purpose of the measurement. However, if in the actuary’s professional judgment, omitting a significant **plan provision** is appropriate for the purpose of the measurement, the actuary should disclose the omission in accordance with section 4.1(d).

ASOP No. 4 Section 3.5.3

3.5.3 Plan Provisions that are Difficult to Measure—Some **plan provisions** may create pension obligations that are difficult to appropriately measure using traditional valuation procedures. Examples of such **plan provisions** include the following:

- a. gain sharing provisions that trigger benefit increases when investment returns are favorable but do not trigger benefit decreases when investment returns are unfavorable;
- b. floor-offset provisions that provide a minimum defined benefit in the event a **participant’s** account balance in a separate plan falls below some threshold;
- c. benefit provisions that are tied to an external index, but subject to a floor or ceiling, such as certain cost of living adjustment provisions and cash balance crediting provisions; and
- d. benefit provisions that may be triggered by an event such as a plant shutdown or a change in control of the plan sponsor.

For such **plan provisions**, the actuary should consider using alternative valuation procedures, such as stochastic modeling, option-pricing techniques, or deterministic procedures in conjunction with assumptions that are adjusted to reflect the impact of variations in experience from year to year. When selecting alternative valuation procedures for such **plan provisions**, the actuary should use professional judgment based on the purpose of the measurement and other relevant factors.

The actuary should disclose the approach taken with any **plan provisions** of the type described in this section, in accordance with section 4.1(i).

ASOP No. 27 Section 3.11.2

3.11.2 Cost-of-Living Adjustments—Plan benefits or limits affecting plan benefits (including the Internal Revenue Code (IRC) section 401(a)(17) compensation limit and section 415(b) maximum annuity) may be automatically adjusted for **inflation** or assumed to be adjusted for **inflation** in some manner (for example, through regular plan amendments). However, for some purposes (such as qualified pension plan funding valuations), the actuary may be precluded by applicable laws or regulations from anticipating future plan amendments or future cost-of-living adjustments in certain IRC limits.