Classic Values, Innovative Advice



City of San José Police and Fire Department Retirement Plan

Demographic Experience Study as of June 30, 2023

Produced by Cheiron

November 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>

Section 1	Executive Summary	1
Section 2	Certification	3
Section 3	Demographic Assumptions	4
Merit Sa	lary Increases	5
Retireme	ent Rates	7
Disabilit	ty Rates	16
Mortalit	y Rates	19
Termina	tion Rates	27
Reciproc	city	31
Family (Composition	32
Adminis	strative Expenses	33

<u>Appendices</u>

Appendix A	Summary of Current Demographic Assumptions	
Appendix B	Summary of Proposed Demographic Assumptions	



SECTION 1 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Actuarial assumptions are intended to be long term in nature and should be both individually reasonable and consistent in the aggregate with no significant bias except when provisions for adverse deviation are explicitly included. The purpose of this experience study is to evaluate whether the current demographic assumptions adequately reflect the long-term expectations for the Plan, and if not, to recommend any adjustments that might be needed. It is important to note that significant changes in the actuarial assumptions are not typically recommended, unless there are known fundamental changes in expectations that would warrant such significant changes. In accordance with the San José Municipal Code, demographic experience studies are performed every two years.

Demographic assumptions are used to predict membership behavior, including rates of retirement, termination, disability, and mortality. These assumptions are based primarily on the historical experience of the Plan, with some adjustments where future experience is expected to differ from historical experience and with deference to standard tables where the Plan's experience is not fully credible and a standard table is available. For purposes of this study, merit salary increases are also considered a demographic assumption because the assumption is based primarily on the Plan's historical experience.

The table below shows the Plan's historical liability gains and losses by source for the last four actuarial valuations, reflecting experience since the demographic experience studies in 2019 and 2021. Salary increases were the primary source of losses during this period, particularly in the last two years. There were also consistent but smaller losses from retirements and terminations. Disability incidence and mortality provided consistent gains during the period.

	Historical Sources of Liability (Gain) or Loss										
Year Ending June 30th											
Source	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total						
Salary Increases	\$ (14,405)	\$ 9,202	\$ 24,411	\$ 71,972	\$ 91,179						
Retirement	(1,099)	2,685	4,524	1,986	8,096						
Termination	4,229	6,401	2,269	4,826	17,724						
Mortality	2,648	(5,753)	(2,043)	(3,934)	(9,082)						
Disability	(7,377)	(3,353)	(7,701)	(6,235)	(24,666)						
Other	653	(2,456)	(1,195)	1,006	(1,992)						

Table 1-1

Dollar amounts in thousands



SECTION 1 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SUMMARY OF DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTION ANALYSIS

This experience study specifically analyzes and proposes the following changes to demographic assumptions.

Table 1-2

Demographic Assumption	Proposed Changes
Merit Salary Scale	• No changes
Retirement Rates	 Split rates for 20-29 years of service into 20-24 and 25-29 years of service Same/lower rates for 20-24 years of service Higher rates for 25-29 years of service Lower rates 30+ years of service
Disability Rates	Lower disability incidence ratesSame rates for Police and Fire
Mortality Rates	• Lower mortality rates for healthy retirees
Termination Rates	Lower termination rates for Police
Reciprocity	• No changes
Family Composition	• No changes
Administrative Expenses	• Prior year's expenses increased by wage inflation and allocated to tier groups in proportion to assets

The proposed changes are expected to slightly increase City contribution rates and decrease member contribution rates, particularly for Tier 2 members.



SECTION 2 – CERTIFICATION

The purpose of this report is to present the results of the experience study of the City of San José Police and Fire Department Retirement Plan ("The Plan") covering demographic experience through June 30, 2023. This report is for the use of the Plan in selecting assumptions to be used in actuarial valuations beginning June 30, 2023.

In preparing our report, we relied on information (some oral and some written) supplied by the Plan. This information includes, but is not limited to, the plan provisions, employee data, and financial information. We performed an informal examination of the obvious characteristics of the data for reasonableness and consistency in accordance with Actuarial Standard of Practice No. 23.

Cheiron utilizes ProVal actuarial valuation software leased from Winklevoss Technologies (WinTech) to develop exposures and decrements for demographic experience studies. We have relied on WinTech as the developer of ProVal. We have a basic understanding of ProVal and have used ProVal in accordance with its original intended purpose. We have not identified any material inconsistencies in assumptions or output of ProVal that would affect this experience study.

This report and its contents have been prepared in accordance with generally recognized and accepted actuarial principles and practices and our understanding of the Code of Professional Conduct and applicable Actuarial Standards of Practice set out by the Actuarial Standards Board as well as applicable laws and regulations. Furthermore, as credentialed actuaries, we meet the Qualification Standards of the American Academy of Actuaries to render the opinion contained in this report. This report does not address any contractual or legal issues. We are not attorneys, and our firm does not provide any legal services or advice.

This report was prepared exclusively for the Plan for the purpose described herein. Other users of this report are not intended users as defined in the Actuarial Standards of Practice, and Cheiron assumes no duty or liability to any other user.

Willie R. Hallank

William R. Hallmark, ASA, EA, FCA, MAAA Consulting Actuary

ame Hayper

Anne D. Harper, FSA, EA, MAAA Principal Consulting Actuary



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

INTRODUCTION TO ANALYSIS OF DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

For the demographic assumptions (other than merit salary scale), we determined the ratio of the actual number of decrements for each membership group compared to the expected number of decrements (A/E ratio or actual-to-expected ratio). For example, if the A/E ratio is 90 percent, it means that for every 100 decrements expected, there were only 90 actual decrements in the analysis. If the assumption is perfect, this ratio will be 100 percent, and any recommended assumption change should move from the current A/E ratio towards 100 percent unless future experience is expected to be different than the experience during the period of study.

In addition, we calculated the 90 percent confidence interval, which represents the range within which the true decrement rate during the experience study period fell with 90 percent confidence. (If there is insufficient data to calculate a confidence interval, no confidence interval will be shown.) We generally propose assumption changes when the current assumption is outside the 90 percent confidence interval of the observed experience. However, adjustments are made to account for differences between future expectations and historical experience, to account for the past experience represented by the current assumption, and to maintain a neutral to slight conservative bias in the selection of the assumption. For disability and mortality rates, we compare the Plan's experience to that of a benchmark table and only adjust the benchmark table to the extent the Plan's experience is large enough to be credible and to ensure that the aggregate mortality or disability rate falls within the 90 percent confidence interval of aggregate experience.

To track how well the assumption fits the pattern of the data, we calculate the percentage of the assumptions that fall within the 90 percent confidence interval, and we calculate an r-squared statistic for each assumption. R-squared can be thought of as the percentage of the variation in actual data explained by the assumption. Ideally, all the assumptions would fall within the 90 percent confidence interval and r-squared would equal 100 percent although this is never the case. Any proposed assumption change should increase the percentage of assumption making it closer to 100 percent unless the pattern of future decrements is expected to be different from the pattern experienced during the period of study.

Except as otherwise noted, this analysis is based on the last 10 years of plan experience. We reviewed the experience during the pandemic, and if it was materially different than other experience, we considered whether it should be included in the study as representative of a potential future trend or excluded from the study because it was not likely to represent future experience.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS MERIT SALARY INCREASES

MERIT SALARY INCREASES

Wage inflation is one of two components of total individual salary increases. In this section, the analysis develops the second of these components: the merit increase. Generally, newer employees are more likely to earn a step increase or receive a promotion, so their salary increases tend to be greater than those for longer service employees.

The merit salary increase assumption is added to the wage inflation assumption to calculate the total salary increase expected for an individual. To analyze the merit component, the across-the-board wage increase negotiated for a given year, representing wage inflation, is subtracted from the average total salary increase for continuing active members at each year of service.

The analysis of the merit salary increase assumption is based on experience from 2014 through 2023. Table 3-S1 below shows the actual increases, the current assumption, and the proposed assumption. Chart 3-S1 on the following page shows the information graphically.

]	Merit/Longev	ity Salary Inc	reases
Service	Actual	Current	Proposed
0	3.86%	6.50%	6.50%
1	6.14%	6.50%	6.50%
2	4.60%	6.25%	6.25%
3	5.92%	5.75%	5.75%
4	5.21%	5.25%	5.25%
5	4.92%	4.25%	4.25%
6	0.73%	2.50%	2.50%
7	0.52%	1.50%	1.50%
8	1.02%	1.00%	1.00%
9	0.92%	0.80%	0.80%
10	1.16%	0.60%	0.60%
11	0.82%	0.60%	0.60%
12	0.83%	0.60%	0.60%
13	1.26%	0.60%	0.60%
14	1.29%	0.60%	0.60%
15	0.60%	0.60%	0.60%

Table 3-S1



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS MERIT SALARY INCREASES



Merit salary increases have been lower than expected for early years of service, with the average experience in the first three years of service heavily affected by one year of low increases. The average merit salary increases after the first three years of service remain close to our assumption. and decline afterward. We are not proposing any changes at this time, but will continue to monitor the experience specifically for increases at 10 or more years of service.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS RETIREMENT RATES

RETIREMENT RATES

TIER 1

The current retirement rates vary by age and are applied only to members who are eligible to retire with no early retirement reduction. There are separate rates for Police and Fire. All members are currently assumed to retire when they reach age 62 or have 30 or more years of service. The data represents experience from 2014 through 2023. The retirement experience in this study supports separate rates for members with less than 24 years of service, members with 25 to 29 years of service, and members with 30 or more years of service. The tables below show the calculation of actual-to-expected ratios, the percentage of rates that are within the 90 percent confidence interval, and the r-squared statistic for each group analyzed. The accompanying charts show the information graphically.

Table 3-R1 below and Chart 3-R1 on the following page show the analysis for Tier 1 Police members with 20 to 24 years of service. The rates of retirement are slightly lower than the current assumption, so we propose a slight decrease to the assumption for ages 58 through 61. The proposed assumption increases the aggregate A/E ratio from 92% to 95%.

	Police Tier 1 Retirement Rates - 20 to 24 Years of Service											
]	Retirement	s	Retirement Rates			A/E Ratios				
Age	Exposures	Actual	Current	Proposed	Actual	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed			
55	53	15	16	16	28.3%	30.0%	30.0%	94%	94%			
56	31	10	9	9	32.3%	30.0%	30.0%	108%	108%			
57	22	5	7	7	22.7%	30.0%	30.0%	76%	76%			
58	11	5	6	5	45.5%	50.0%	45.0%	91%	101%			
59	4	1	2	2	25.0%	50.0%	45.0%	50%	56%			
60	6	4	3	3	66.7%	50.0%	45.0%	133%	148%			
61	2	0	1	1	0.0%	50.0%	45.0%	0%	0%			
TOTAL	129	40	43	42	31.0%	33.6%	32.7%	92%	95%			
Confiden	Confidence Interval %			100%								
R-square	d		96%	96%								

Table 3-R1



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS RETIREMENT RATES

Chart 3-R1



Table 3-R2 below and Chart 3-R2 on the following page show the analysis for Tier 1 Fire members with 20 to 24 years of service. The data is consistent with the current assumption, and no change is proposed.

	Fire Tier 1 Retirement Rates - 20 to 24 Years of Service											
]	Retirement	s	Re	tirement Ra	A/E Ratios					
Age	Exposures	Actual	Current	Proposed	Actual	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed			
55	53	15	16	16	28.3%	30.0%	30.0%	94%	94%			
56	30	7	8	8	23.3%	25.0%	25.0%	93%	93%			
57	22	3	4	4	13.6%	20.0%	20.0%	68%	68%			
58	20	6	6	6	30.0%	27.5%	27.5%	109%	109%			
59	6	3	2	2	50.0%	27.5%	27.5%	182%	182%			
60	3	1	1	1	33.3%	27.5%	27.5%	121%	121%			
61	2	1	1	1	50.0%	27.5%	27.5%	182%	182%			
TOTAL	136	36	36	36	26.5%	26.7%	26.7%	99%	99%			
Confiden	ce Interval 9	%	100%	100%								
R-squared		97%	97%									

Table 3-R2



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS RETIREMENT RATES



Fire Tier 1 Retirement Rates - 20 to 24 Years of Service

Chart 3-R2

Table 3-R3 and Chart 3-R3 on the following page show the analysis for Tier 1 Police members with 25 to 29 years of service. The rates of retirement are slightly higher than the current assumption. We propose changes for ages 52 through 57. The proposed changes decrease the aggregate A/E from 105% to 100%.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS RETIREMENT RATES

	Police Tier 1 Retirement Rates - 25 to 29 Years of Service												
]	Retirement	S	Retirement Rates			A/E Ratios					
Age	Exposures	Actual	Current	Proposed	Actual	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed				
50	163	97	90	90	59.5%	55.0%	55.0%	108%	108%				
51	107	44	48	48	41.1%	45.0%	45.0%	91%	91%				
52	85	30	34	30	35.3%	40.0%	35.0%	88%	101%				
53	80	27	24	28	33.8%	30.0%	35.0%	113%	96%				
54	55	17	17	19	30.9%	30.0%	35.0%	103%	88%				
55	35	15	11	14	42.9%	30.0%	40.0%	143%	107%				
56	24	10	7	11	41.7%	30.0%	45.0%	139%	93%				
57	10	5	3	5	50.0%	30.0%	50.0%	167%	100%				
58	8	4	4	4	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100%	100%				
59	7	3	4	4	42.9%	50.0%	50.0%	86%	86%				
60	4	0	2	2	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0%	0%				
61	3	1	2	2	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	67%	67%				
TOTAL	567	249	237	249	43.9%	41.8%	43.8%	105%	100%				
Confiden	ce Interval 🤉	/0	100%	100%									
R-square	d		99%	99%									

Table 3-R3









SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS RETIREMENT RATES

Table 3-R4 below and Chart 3-R4 on the following page show the analysis for Tier 1 Fire members with 25 to 29 years of service. The rates of retirement are higher than the current assumption. We propose changes for all ages. The proposed assumptions decrease the aggregate A/E from 116% to 98%, increase the percentage of rates that are within the confidence interval, and increase the r-squared from 84% to 91%.

	I	Fire Tier	1 Retirer	nent Rate	es - 25 to	29 Years	of Servic	e	
]	Retirement	S	Retirement Rates			A/E Ratios	
Age	Exposures	Actual	Current	Proposed	Actual	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
50	47	21	16	21	44.7%	35.0%	45.0%	128%	99%
51	38	8	13	11	21.1%	35.0%	30.0%	60%	70%
52	40	14	14	16	35.0%	35.0%	40.0%	100%	88%
53	41	21	14	16	51.2%	35.0%	40.0%	146%	128%
54	31	12	11	12	38.7%	35.0%	40.0%	111%	97%
55	22	10	7	9	45.5%	30.0%	40.0%	152%	114%
56	11	4	3	4	36.4%	25.0%	40.0%	145%	91%
57	9	1	2	4	11.1%	20.0%	40.0%	56%	28%
58	10	5	3	4	50.0%	27.5%	40.0%	182%	125%
59	8	3	2	3	37.5%	27.5%	40.0%	136%	94%
60	4	0	1	2	0.0%	27.5%	40.0%	0%	0%
61	1	2	0	0	200.0%	27.5%	40.0%	727%	500%
TOTAL	249	96	83	98	38.6%	33.3%	39.4%	116%	98%
Confiden	ce Interval	%	80%	90%					
R-square	d		84%	91%					

Table 3-R4



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS RETIREMENT RATES

Chart 3-R4



Fire Tier 1 Retirement Rates - 25 to 29 Years of Service

Table 3-R5 and Chart 3-R5 on the following page show the analysis for Tier 1 Police members with 30 or more years of service. While there is not a lot of data because most members retire by the time they have 30 years of service, the rates of retirement are clearly lower than the current assumption of 100%. We propose changing the assumption to 60% for all ages. The proposed assumptions increase the aggregate A/E from 60% to 100%.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS RETIREMENT RATES

	Police Tier 1 Retirement Rates - 30 to 35 Years of Service												
]	Retirement	S	Retirement Rates			A/E Ratios					
Age	Exposures	Actual	Current	Proposed	Actual	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed				
50	0	0	0	0	0.0%	100.0%	60.0%	0%	0%				
51	0	0	0	0	0.0%	100.0%	60.0%	0%	0%				
52	4	3	4	2	75.0%	100.0%	60.0%	75%	125%				
53	1	1	1	1	100.0%	100.0%	60.0%	100%	167%				
54	5	2	5	3	40.0%	100.0%	60.0%	40%	67%				
55	6	5	6	4	83.3%	100.0%	60.0%	83%	139%				
56	2	1	2	1	50.0%	100.0%	60.0%	50%	83%				
57	4	1	4	2	25.0%	100.0%	60.0%	25%	42%				
58	3	2	3	2	66.7%	100.0%	60.0%	67%	111%				
59	1	1	1	1	100.0%	100.0%	60.0%	100%	167%				
60	0	0	0	0	0.0%	100.0%	60.0%	0%	0%				
61	1	0	1	1	0.0%	100.0%	60.0%	0%	0%				
TOTAL	25	15	25	15	60.0%	100.0%	60.0%	60%	100%				
Confiden	ce Interval 🤉	%	67%	100%									
R-square	d		76%	76%									

Table 3-R5





Police Tier 1 Retirement Rates - 30 to 35 Years of Service

Table 3-R6 and Chart 3-R6 on the following page show the analysis for Tier 1 Fire members with 30 or more years of service. While there is not a lot of data because most members retire by the time they have 30 years of service, the rates of retirement are clearly lower than the current



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS RETIREMENT RATES

assumption of 100%. We propose changing the assumption to 50% for ages 50 to 54. The proposed assumptions increase the aggregate A/E from 36% to 59%.

	ŀ	Fire Tier	1 Retiren	nent Rate	es - 30 to	35 Years	of Servic	e		
]	Retirement	S	Retirement Rates			A/E Ratios		
Age	Exposures	Actual	Current	Proposed	Actual	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	
50	2	1	2	1	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	50%	100%	
51	2	0	2	1	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0%	0%	
52	3	1	3	2	33.3%	100.0%	50.0%	33%	67%	
53	4	1	4	2	25.0%	100.0%	50.0%	25%	50%	
54	6	2	6	3	33.3%	100.0%	50.0%	33%	67%	
55	4	2	4	4	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50%	50%	
56	0	0	0	0	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0%	0%	
57	1	1	1	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	
58	0	0	0	0	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0%	0%	
59	1	1	1	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	
60	0	0	0	0	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0%	0%	
61	1	1	1	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	
TOTAL	22	8	22	14	36.4%	100.0%	61.4%	36%	59%	
Confiden	Confidence Interval %		40%	100%						
R-square	d		64%	80%						

Table 3-R6

Chart 3-R6



Fire Tier 1 Retirement Rates - 30 to 35 Years of Service



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS RETIREMENT RATES

TIER 2

New Tier 2 retirement rates were developed in April 2017 for the implementation of Measure F based on experience from CalPERS for a plan with comparable benefits. The period of this experience study does not include any retirement experience for Tier 2. As a result, we are not proposing any changes to the retirement rate assumptions for Tier 2.

RETIREMENT AGE FOR TERMINATED VESTED MEMBERS

Tier 1 terminated vested members are eligible to retire as early as age 50 with 25 years of service and age 55 with 20 years of service. Currently, we assume Tier 1 terminated vested members with 25 or more years of service will retire at age 50 and terminated vested members with less than 25 years of service will retire at age 55. We propose no change to this assumption.

Tier 2 terminated vested members receive an actuarially equivalent benefit if they retire before age 60. For valuation purposes, Tier 2 terminated vested members are assumed to retire at age 60.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS DISABILITY RATES

DISABILITY RATES

This section analyzes the incidence of disability by the age of the employee. There is one unisex assumption for males and females at each age. Unlike many of the other demographic assumptions that rely exclusively on the experience of the plan, disability rates are a blend between a table based on a much larger data set and adjustments to that table to better match the Plan's actual experience to the extent it is credible.

The current assumption for Police members is based on the sum of the 2014 CalPERS police industrial and non-industrial disability rates for public agencies adjusting the rates to 90 percent of the CalPERS rates for ages under 50 and 140 percent of the CalPERS rates for ages 50 and older. The current assumption for Fire members is based on the sum of the 2014 CalPERS fire industrial and non-industrial disability rates for public agencies adjusting the rates to 90 percent of the CalPERS rates for ages under 50 and 140 percent of the Sum of the 2014 CalPERS fire industrial and non-industrial disability rates for public agencies adjusting the rates to 90 percent of the CalPERS rates for ages under 50 and 180 percent of the CalPERS rates for ages 50 and older.

Disability reforms appear to have reduced rates of disability for both Police and Fire members, particularly for members aged 50 or older. To reflect the experience after the reforms while maintaining a sufficient amount of data for analysis, we did not use data prior to 2016. We also excluded experience after 2021 because there is a lag in processing disabilities that makes data in the most recent years unreliable. We also found that the disability experience for Police and Fire members was similar, so we combined the data into a single analysis.

Table 3-D1 summarizes our analysis of the disability incidence assumption for all active Police and Fire members showing the calculation of actual-to-expected ratios, the percentage of rates that are within the 90 percent confidence interval, and the r-squared statistic. Actual rates of disability are significantly lower than the current assumption for ages 50 and older. The proposed assumption of 104% of the 2021 CalPERS Police Officers & Firefighters (POFF) industrial and non-industrial rates improves the A/E ratio from 46% to 109%.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS DISABILITY RATES

	All Disability Incidence Rates												
Age			Disabilities		Avera	ge Disability	y Rates	A/E Ratios					
Band	Exposures	Actual	Current	Proposed	Actual	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed				
20 - 34	2,157	0	7	4	0.00%	0.31%	0.21%	0%	0%				
35 - 39	1,474	5	8	6	0.34%	0.53%	0.41%	64%	83%				
40 - 44	1,706	13	14	11	0.76%	0.80%	0.63%	95%	120%				
45 - 49	2,393	21	27	23	0.88%	1.12%	0.95%	78%	93%				
50 - 54	1,660	28	88	22	1.69%	5.31%	1.31%	32%	129%				
55 - 59	335	10	26	6	2.99%	7.75%	1.78%	39%	168%				
60+	26	2	3	1	7.69%	10.17%	2.34%	76%	329%				
Total	9,751	79	172	72	0.81%	1.76%	0.74%	46%	109%				
Confidence Interval %		67%	100%										
R-squar	R-squared			70%									

Table 3-D1

Chart 3-D1 below shows the actual disability rates for age bands of Police and Fire members, the 90 percent confidence interval for each age band, the current assumption, and the proposed assumption. As noted above, the proposed assumption reflects the lower disability rates for ages 50 and older.

Chart 3-D1







SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS DISABILITY RATES

PROPORTION OF DUTY AND NON-DUTY DISABILITIES

When a member suffers from a disability, the nature of the disablement determines the benefit amount they will receive while disabled. The current assumption is that 100 percent of disabilities are duty related.

The June 30, 2023 valuation data has 848 disabled retirees, 820 (over 96%) are retired due to duty-related disabilities. We propose maintaining the assumed percentage of duty-related disabilities at 100 percent.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS MORTALITY RATES

MORTALITY RATES

Post-retirement mortality assumptions are typically developed separately by sex for both healthy annuitants and disabled annuitants. Pre-retirement mortality assumptions are also developed separately for males and females. Unlike many of the other demographic assumptions that rely exclusively on the experience of the plan, for mortality, published mortality tables and projection scales serve as the primary basis for the assumption.

The steps in our analysis are as follows:

- 1. Select an appropriate mortality improvement projection scale to apply to the base mortality table.
- 2. Select a published mortality table that is based on experience most closely matching the anticipated experience of the Plan.
- 3. Compare actual experience of the Plan to what would have been predicted by the selected published table for the period of the experience study.
- 4. Adjust the published table either fully or partially depending on the level of credibility for the Plan's experience. This adjusted table is called the base table.

When actual experience of the Plan is compared to that of the published table, the experience is weighted based on the amount of benefit being paid (or salary for active members). Mortality studies in the U.S. have consistently shown that higher income individuals have longer life expectancies than lower income individuals. Because higher income individuals also typically have higher pension benefit amounts, it is important for a pension plan to use assumptions that are weighted to reflect the impact on the Plan's liability.

Historically, pension plans used a static mortality assumption. That is, the same mortality rates were used for all members regardless of their year of birth. With mortality improvements, however, we expect that the mortality rate at age 70, for example, will be different for someone who is currently age 40 than it is for someone who is age 70 today.

A generational mortality assumption uses a separate mortality table for each year of birth so that the mortality rate at age 70 of someone who is 40 today reflects 30 years of expected mortality improvement while the rate for someone who is currently age 70 does not. A generational assumption more accurately measures the liability associated with each individual. Consequently, the Society of Actuaries and others strongly recommend the use of generational mortality assumptions.

Mortality Projection Scale

There has been a long history of mortality improvement among pensioners in the U.S., and there is an expectation that mortality rates will continue to improve in the future. The Society of Actuaries published mortality improvement scales each year from 2014 to 2021. However, with the impact of COVID on mortality, no new scales have been published. Consequently, we propose continuing to use the MP-2021 mortality projection scale.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS MORTALITY RATES

The current assumptions are based on the Pub-2010 tables published in January 2019, by the Society of Actuaries. These tables were developed exclusively using public plan experience and contain separate tables based on public safety member mortality experience. The Pub-2010 tables (other than disability) are also separated based on income or benefit amount. We found the above median income safety tables to provide the best fit for members and the main general tables to provide the best fit for beneficiaries.

Our analysis is based on the Plan's experience from 2009 through 2023, producing a central year for the study of 2016. Since the central year of the Pub-2010 tables is 2010, our analysis adjusts those tables for mortality improvement to 2016 using scale MP-2021 to compare to the Plan's experience.

Healthy Retiree Mortality

Base Mortality Table for Healthy Retirees							
Assumption	Published Table	Male Factor	Female Factor				
Current	PubS-2010(A) Healthy Retirees	1.002	1.002				
Proposed	PubS-2010(A) Healthy Retirees	0.972	0.972				

The table below summarizes our analysis and development of the base mortality tables for healthy retirees. The actual-to-expected ratios are shown on the right side of the table. The ratio for the current assumption for males is 92 percent. Since this is a benefit-weighted analysis, this means that there were \$92 of benefits that ceased due to actual deaths for every \$100 of benefits expected to cease. Given the credibility of the data, we propose to reduce the factor currently applied to the published table from 1.002 to 0.972, which increases the A/E ratio to 95 percent.

The A/E ratio for the current assumption for females is 29%, but there were only three deaths in the analysis. Since this data is not credible, we continue to apply the same adjustment factor for females that we apply for males, which increases the A/E ratio for females to 30%.

Healthy Retiree Mortality									
		Actual	Weighted	Weighted Weighted Deaths A/E Ratios					
Sex	Exposures	Deaths	Exposures	Actual	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	
Male	12,031	133	105,391,666	979,765	1,066,383	1,034,455	92%	95%	
Female	736	3	5,903,880	10,555	36,045	34,966	29%	30%	
Total	12,767	136	111,295,546	990,320	1,102,428	1,069,421	90%	93%	

Table 3-M1



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS MORTALITY RATES

The chart below shows the actual mortality rates for male retirees for five-year age bands from age 50 to age 89 plus all experience for ages 90 and older, the 90 percent confidence interval for each age band, the current assumption, and the proposed base table assumption. Given the lack of data, there is no chart for female retirees.

Chart 3-M1



Male Healthy Retiree Mortality



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS MORTALITY RATES

Disabled Retiree Mortality

Base Mortality Table for Disabled Retirees							
Assumption	Published Table	Male Factor	Female Factor				
Current	PubS-2010 Disabled Retirees	0.915	0.915				
Proposed	PubS-2010 Disabled Retirees	0.915	0.915				

The table below summarizes our analysis and development of the base mortality table for disabled retirees. The actual-to-expected ratios are shown on the right side of the table. For the current assumption, the actual-to-expected ratio is 95 percent for males and 71 percent for females. As with healthy retiree mortality, the data for females is not credible, so we apply the same adjustment factor of 0.915 that we use for males to the published table. We propose no changes for disabled retiree mortality.

Table 3-M2

	Disabled Retiree Mortality							
		Actual	Weighted	Weighted Deaths A/E Ratios				
Sex	Exposures	Deaths	Exposures	Actual	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
Male	11,554	296	83,682,641	1,737,552	1,830,184	1,830,179	95%	95%
Female	506	5	3,311,598	16,751	23,490	23,490	71%	71%
Total	12,060	301	86,994,239	86,994,239 1,754,303 1,853,674 1,853,668 95% 9				

The chart on the following page shows the actual mortality rates for male disabled retirees for fiveyear age bands from age 55 to age 89 plus all experience for ages 90 and older, the 90 percent confidence interval for each age band, the current assumption, and the proposed base table assumption. Given the lack of data, there is no chart for female retirees.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS MORTALITY RATES

Chart 3-M2



Male Disabled Annuitant Mortality



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS MORTALITY RATES

Beneficiary Mortality

Base Mortality Table for Beneficiaries							
Assumption	Published Table	Male Factor	Female Factor				
Current	PubG-2010 Healthy Retirees	1.032	1.032				
Proposed	PubG-2010 Healthy Retirees	1.032	1.032				

The Plan's valuation data for beneficiaries is only maintained after the death of the retiree. In the SOA's analysis, mortality rates for contingent survivors are higher than the mortality rates for similarly categorized retirees. There have been studies documenting a grieving widow(er) effect on mortality, but the higher mortality rates could also be due to other factors correlated with beneficiary status. Because the beneficiary data available is only after the retiree's death, we would expect the mortality tables to produce higher actual-to-expected ratios.

The table below summarizes our analysis and development of the base mortality table for beneficiaries. The actual-to-expected ratios are shown on the right side of the table. For the current assumption, the actual-to-expected ratio is 119 percent for males and 117 percent for females. The data for males is not credible, so we apply the same adjustment factor of 1.032 that we use for females to the published table. We propose no changes for beneficiary mortality.

	Beneficiary Mortality							
		Actual	Weighted	Weighted Deaths A/E Ratios				
Sex	Exposures	Deaths	Exposures	Actual	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
Male	38	2	104,877	3,843	3,235	3,235	119%	119%
Female	3,643	119	12,572,895	372,189	318,511	318,511	117%	117%
Total	3,681	121	12,677,772	12,677,772 376,033 321,746 321,746 117% 117%				

Table 3-M3

The chart on the next page shows the actual mortality rates for female beneficiaries for five-year age bands from age 50 to age 89 plus all experience for ages 90 and older, the 90 percent confidence interval for each age band, the current assumption, and the proposed base table assumption. Given the lack of data, there is no chart for male beneficiaries.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS MORTALITY RATES

Female Beneficiary Mortality 30% ■ 90% Confidence Interval ■ Observed Rate → Current → Proposed 25% 20% 15% 10% 5% 0% -50 - 54 55 - 59 60 - 64 65 - 69 75-79 80-84 85-89 70 - 74 90 +Age





SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS MORTALITY RATES

Non-Annuitant Mortality

Base Mortality Table for Non-Annuitants							
Assumption	Published Table	Male Factor	Female Factor				
Current	PubS-2010(A) Employees	0.979	0.979				
Proposed	PubS-2010(A) Employees	0.979	0.979				

The table below summarizes our analysis and development of the base mortality table for nonannuitants. The actual-to-expected ratios are shown on the right side of the table. For the current assumption, the actual-to-expected ratio is 70 percent for males and 121 percent for females. With only 12 combined deaths, the actual experience of the Plan is not credible. We propose no change.

Non-Annuitant Mortality								
		Actual	Weighted	Weighted Weighted Deaths A/E Ratios				
Sex	Exposures	Deaths	Exposures	Actual	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
Male	22,308	11	2,840,388,424	1,404,956	2,011,004	2,011,004	70%	70%
Female	1,961	1	245,011,475	147,510	122,088	122,088	121%	121%
Total	24,269	12	3,085,399,899	1,552,466	2,133,093	2,133,093	73%	73%

Table 3-M4



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS TERMINATION RATES

TERMINATION RATES

The current termination assumptions vary depending on the member's years of service. The data represents the experience of the Plan from 2014 through 2023. Tier 1 and Tier 2 members are analyzed together although setting the assumption based on service effectively divides the two tiers.

Table 3-T1 below shows the calculation of actual-to-expected ratios, the percentage of rates within the 90 percent confidence interval, and the r-squared statistic for Police members; and Chart 3-T1 on the following page shows the information graphically.

	Police Termination Rates - Ages 20 to 61									
		1	ermination	IS	Ter	Termination Rates			A/E Ratios	
Service	Exposures	Actual	Current	Proposed	Actual	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	
0	790	101	109	87	12.78%	13.75%	11.00%	93%	116%	
1	597	32	70	48	5.36%	11.75%	8.00%	46%	67%	
2	476	28	48	30	5.88%	10.00%	6.25%	59%	94%	
3	397	8	34	20	2.02%	8.50%	5.00%	24%	40%	
4	311	17	23	13	5.47%	7.50%	4.25%	73%	129%	
5	250	10	17	9	4.00%	6.75%	3.75%	59%	107%	
6	251	2	15	9	0.80%	6.00%	3.55%	13%	22%	
7	265	14	15	9	5.28%	5.50%	3.40%	96%	155%	
8	241	7	12	8	2.90%	5.00%	3.30%	58%	88%	
9	206	11	10	7	5.34%	4.75%	3.25%	112%	164%	
10	223	15	10	7	6.73%	4.50%	3.25%	149%	207%	
11	248	9	11	8	3.63%	4.25%	3.25%	85%	112%	
12	293	8	11	9	2.73%	3.75%	3.15%	73%	87%	
13	292	8	9	9	2.74%	3.25%	2.95%	84%	93%	
14	326	5	9	9	1.53%	2.75%	2.75%	56%	56%	
15	354	4	8	8	1.13%	2.25%	2.25%	50%	50%	
16	334	7	6	6	2.10%	1.75%	1.75%	120%	120%	
17	400	6	6	6	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	100%	100%	
18	434	7	5	5	1.61%	1.25%	1.25%	129%	129%	
19	443	5	4	4	1.13%	1.00%	1.00%	113%	113%	
20	404	10	4	4	2.48%	1.00%	1.00%	248%	248%	
21	429	7	4	4	1.63%	1.00%	1.00%	163%	163%	
22	409	6	4	4	1.47%	1.00%	1.00%	147%	147%	
23	427	6	4	4	1.41%	1.00%	1.00%	141%	141%	
TOTAL	8,800	333	448	328	3.78%	5.09%	3.73%	74%	102%	
Confiden	ce Interval 🤉	%	71%	79%						
R-square	d		84%	91%						

Table 3-T1



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS TERMINATION RATES

Chart 3-T1



In aggregate, the data shows lower actual termination rates than expected under the current assumption with an actual-to-expected ratio of 74 percent. Somewhat high termination experience in 2014 and 2015 balanced out the low termination experience during the pandemic. The proposed assumptions decrease the termination rates for members with less than 14 years of service which increases the A/E ratio to 102 percent.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS TERMINATION RATES

Table 3-T2 shows the calculation of actual-to-expected ratios, the percentage of rates within the 90 percent confidence interval, and the r-squared statistic for Fire members; and Chart 3-T2 shows the information graphically.

	Fire Termination Rates - Ages 20 to 61									
		Terminations			Termination Rates			A/E Ratios		
Service	Exposures	Actual	Current	Proposed	Actual	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	
0	247	16	21	21	6.48%	8.50%	8.50%	76%	76%	
1	242	7	10	10	2.89%	4.00%	4.00%	72%	72%	
2	218	4	6	6	1.83%	2.75%	2.75%	67%	67%	
3	217	2	4	4	0.92%	1.75%	1.75%	53%	53%	
4	205	2	3	3	0.98%	1.25%	1.25%	78%	78%	
5	205	3	2	2	1.46%	1.00%	1.00%	146%	146%	
6	262	3	2	2	1.15%	0.90%	0.90%	127%	127%	
7	256	0	2	2	0.00%	0.80%	0.80%	0%	0%	
8	244	1	2	2	0.41%	0.70%	0.70%	59%	59%	
9	240	3	1	1	1.25%	0.60%	0.60%	208%	208%	
10	217	2	1	1	0.92%	0.50%	0.50%	184%	184%	
11	217	1	1	1	0.46%	0.50%	0.50%	92%	92%	
12	249	1	1	1	0.40%	0.50%	0.50%	80%	80%	
13	277	2	1	1	0.72%	0.50%	0.50%	144%	144%	
14	273	2	1	1	0.73%	0.50%	0.50%	147%	147%	
15	285	1	1	1	0.35%	0.50%	0.50%	70%	70%	
16	248	0	1	1	0.00%	0.50%	0.50%	0%	0%	
17	257	1	1	1	0.39%	0.50%	0.50%	78%	78%	
18	280	0	1	1	0.00%	0.50%	0.50%	0%	0%	
19	295	4	1	1	1.36%	0.50%	0.50%	271%	271%	
20	262	3	1	1	1.15%	0.50%	0.50%	229%	229%	
21	252	1	1	1	0.40%	0.50%	0.50%	79%	79%	
22	240	5	1	1	2.08%	0.50%	0.50%	417%	417%	
23	214	6	1	1	2.80%	0.50%	0.50%	561%	561%	
TOTAL	5,902	70	70	70	1.19%	1.19%	1.19%	99%	99%	
Confiden	ce Interval	/0	79%	79%						
R-square	d		77%	77%						

Table 3-T2



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS TERMINATION RATES

Chart 3-T2



The data shows actual termination rates are close to those expected under the current assumption with an actual-to-expected ratio of 99 percent. No changes are proposed for Fire member termination rates.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS RECIPROCITY

RECIPROCITY

If an employee terminates employment and works for a reciprocal employer, the employee's retirement benefit is ultimately based on the employee's service with the City of San José and Final Compensation based on employment with any reciprocal employer. The current assumption is that 75 percent of terminating employees work for reciprocal employers and receive salary increases equal to the payroll growth assumption. We don't have good data for this assumption as the reciprocal data includes those with reciprocal service before and after their service with San José, and many vested members do not report their reciprocal service until applying for retirement benefits. We intend to work with the Office of Retirement Services for the next experience study to isolate recent retirees from vested status and identify those who claimed reciprocal service. No changes are proposed to the reciprocity assumption at this time.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS FAMILY COMPOSITION

FAMILY COMPOSITION

Members who are married or have a domestic partner at the time of retirement are entitled to an unreduced joint and survivor annuity. The current assumption is that 85 percent of members qualify for an automatic spousal continuance at retirement. Based on recent experience, no change is proposed to this assumption.

In addition, spouses/domestic partners of male retirees are assumed to be three years younger than the retiree, and spouses/domestic partners of female retirees are assumed to be 3 years older than the retiree. Spouses/domestic partners are also assumed to be the opposite gender of the retiree. Based on recent experience, no change is proposed to this assumption.

]	Family Composition Assumptions								
Year	Total New Retirees	New Retirees with J&S Benefit	Percent Married	Average Age Difference (Male - Female)					
2009-2010	130	108	83%	3.3					
2010-2011	105	80	76%	2.8					
2011-2012	71	62	87%	2.1					
2012-2013	63	56	89%	3.3					
2013-2014	56	46	82%	3.4					
2014-2015	94	69	73%	2.0					
2015-2016	55	42	76%	3.0					
2016-2017	64	52	81%	2.9					
2017-2018	75	54	72%	2.5					
2018-2019	83	70	84%	2.6					
2019-2020	84	68	81%	1.9					
2020-2021	98	88	90%	3.1					
2021-2022	90	77	86%	2.4					
2022-2023	101	89	88%	2.9					
Total	1169	961	82%	2.7					

The family composition analyses examined the data for all retirements since July 1, 2009.



SECTION 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Administrative expenses are incurred on active employees when collecting contributions and retaining records, on retirees to calculate and pay benefits, and on the plan as a whole for legal, actuarial, and auditing services. Historically, the total administrative expenses were divided by headcount to allocate them to the different groups within the plan.

For example, administrative expenses for FYE 2023 were assumed to be \$1,415 per pension member and were assumed to increase each year with wage inflation (3.00%). The current assumption for FYE 2024 is \$1,457 per member.

The allocation of administrative expenses by headcount has not proven to match their actual allocation. We understand that expenses that can be attributed to a specific group are allocated to that group, but any remaining expenses are allocated in proportion to assets. The table below shows the administrative expenses for the last four years for each group and tier as a percentage of their Market Value of Assets.

	Poli	ce	Fire							
FYE	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 1	Tier 2						
2023	0.16%	0.16%	0.15%	0.15%						
2022	0.13%	0.12%	0.13%	0.12%						
2021	0.16%	0.15%	0.15%	0.14%						
2020	0.16%	0.16%	0.16%	0.14%						
2019	0.15%	0.15%	0.15%	0.11%						
2018	0.17%	0.15%	0.17%	0.15%						
2017	0.15%	0.14%	0.16%	0.28%						

Administrative Expenses as % of Assets

Administrative expenses do not vary much between tiers as a percentage of assets. Consequently, we propose changing the administrative expense assumption to equal the administrative expenses paid by the Plan in the most recent fiscal year, increased with wage inflation to the year the contribution will be paid, and allocated to groups and tiers in proportion to their respective market values of assets. Total administrative expenses would continue to be assumed to increase with wage inflation each year in the future.



APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CURRENT DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

1. Merit Salary Increase Rate

The following merit component is added to wage inflation based on an individual member's years of service:

Merit Salary Increases				
Years of Service	Increase			
0	6.50%			
1	6.50			
2	6.25			
3	5.75			
4	5.25			
5	4.25			
6	2.50			
7	1.50			
8	1.00			
9	0.80			
10+	0.60			

Table A-1

2. Rates of Retirement

Rates of retirement are based on age and service according to the following Tables A-2, A-3, and A-4. Tier 1 rates only apply when the member is eligible for unreduced benefits.

Tier 1 Rates of Retirement by Age and Service					
	Pol	lice	Fi	re	
Age	<30 Years	30+ Years	<30 Years	30+ Years	
50	55.0%	100.0%	35.0%	100.0%	
51	45.0	100.0	35.0	100.0	
52	40.0	100.0	35.0	100.0	
53	30.0	100.0	35.0	100.0	
54	30.0	100.0	35.0	100.0	
55	30.0	100.0	30.0	100.0	
56	30.0	100.0	25.0	100.0	
57	30.0	100.0	20.0	100.0	
58 - 61	50.0	100.0	27.5	100.0	
62+	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Table A-2



APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CURRENT DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

Tier 2 Rates of Retirement by Age and Service					
Λσο	5 - 19 Vears	20 - 24 Voors	25 – 29 Voors	30+ Voors	
50 – 56	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	5.0%	
57 – 59	7.5	10.0	20.0	100.0	
60 - 61	10.0	20.0	35.0	100.0	
62 - 64	25.0	50.0	75.0	100.0	
65+	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Table A-3

Table A-4

Tier 2 Rates of Retirement by Age and Service Fire					
Age	5 - 19 Years	20 - 24 Years	25 – 29 Years	30 + Years	
50 - 56	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	2.5%	
57 – 59	5.0	7.5	15.0	100.0	
60 - 61	7.5	15.0	25.0	100.0	
62 - 64	20.0	35.0	50.0	100.0	
65+	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Tier 1 vested terminated members are assumed to retire at age 50 if they have 25 or more years of service or at age 55 if they have less than 25 years of service. Tier 2 vested terminated members are assumed to retire at age 60.



APPENDIX A - SUMMARY OF CURRENT DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

3. Rates of Termination

Rates of termination are shown in Table A-5 below.

Rates of Termination				
Service	Police	Fire		
0	13.75%	8.50%		
1	11.75	4.00		
2	10.00	2.75		
3	8.50	1.75		
4	7.50	1.25		
5	6.75	1.00		
6	6.00	0.90		
7	5.50	0.80		
8	5.00	0.70		
9	4.75	0.60		
10	4.50	0.50		
11	4.25	0.50		
12	3.75	0.50		
13	3.25	0.50		
14	2.75	0.50		
15	2.25	0.50		
16	1.75	0.50		
17	1.50	0.50		
18	1.25	0.50		
19+	1.00	0.50		

Table A-5

Termination rates do not apply once retirement rates apply.

Tier 1 members who terminate with less than 10 years of service and Tier 2 members who terminate with less than 5 years of service are assumed to receive a refund of contributions. For terminating employees who are not assumed to receive a refund, 75% are assumed to subsequently work for a reciprocal employer and receive 3.00% pay increases per year.

4. Rates of Disability

For Police, disability rates are equal to the CalPERS police industrial and non-industrial rates for public agencies multiplied by 90 percent for ages under 50 and 140 percent for ages 50 and older. For Fire, disability rates are equal to the CalPERS fire industrial and non-industrial rates for public agencies multiplied by 90% for ages under 50 and



APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CURRENT DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

180 percent for ages 50 and older. Sample disability rates of active participants are provided in Table A-6.

Rates of Disability at Selected Ages				
Age	Police	Fire		
25	0.16%	0.03%		
30	0.45	0.08		
35	0.74	0.15		
40	1.03	0.28		
45	1.32	0.50		
50	2.70	5.08		
55	6.88	7.54		
60	8.71	10.77		
65	10.47	14.84		

Table A-6

100 percent of disabilities are assumed to be duty related.

5. Rates of Mortality

Mortality rates for actives, retirees, beneficiaries, terminated vested, and reciprocals are based on the sex-distinct employee and annuitant mortality tables shown below. Future mortality improvements are reflected by applying the SOA MP-2021 projection scale on a generational basis from the base year of 2010.



APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CURRENT DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

Table A-7

Base Mortality Tables				
Category	Male	Female		
Healthy Retirees	1.002 times the 2010 Public Safety Above Median Income Mortality Table (PubS-2010(A)) for Healthy Retirees	1.002 times the 2010 Public Safety Above Median Income Mortality Table (PubS-2010(A)) for Healthy Retirees		
Disabled Retiree	0.915 times the 2010 Public Safety Mortality Table (PubS-2010) for Disabled Retirees	0.915 times the 2010 Public Safety Mortality Table (PubS-2010) for Disabled Retirees		
Beneficiaries	ries 1.032 times the 2010 General 1.032 times the 201 Member Mortality Table (PubG- 2010) for Healthy Retirees 2010) for Healthy Retire			
Healthy Non-Annuitant	0.979 times the 2010 Public Safety Above Median Income Mortality Table (PubS-2010(A)) for Employees0.979 times the 2010 Public S Above Median Income Mor Table (PubS-2010(A)) Employees			

It is assumed that 50% of active deaths are service related.

6. Family Composition

Percentage married is shown in the following Table A-8. Women are assumed to be three years younger than men.

Table A-8

Percentage Married			
Gender	Percentage		
Males	85%		
Females	85%		

7. Administrative Expenses

Based on the 2021 Experience Study, the administrative expense assumption was set to \$1,334 per member for FYE 2022 with annual increases equal to the assumed wage inflation of 3.00%. For FYE 2025, administrative expenses are assumed to equal \$1,457 per member.



APPENDIX B - SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

1. Merit Salary Increase Rate

The following merit component is added to wage inflation based on an individual member's years of service:

Merit Salary Increases				
Years of Service	Increase			
0	6.50%			
1	6.50			
2	6.25			
3	5.75			
4	5.25			
5	4.25			
6	2.50			
7	1.50			
8	1.00			
9	0.80			
10+	0.60			

Table B-1

2. Rates of Retirement

Rates of retirement are based on age and service according to the following Tables B-2, B-3, and B-4. Tier 1 rates only apply when the member is eligible for unreduced benefits.

Table B-2						
	Tier 1 Rates of Retirement					
Police Fire Years of Service Years of Service					ce	
Age	<25	25 - 29	30+	<25	25 – 29	30+
50	0.0%	55.0%	60.0%	0.0%	45.0%	50.0%
51	0.0	45.0	60.0	0.0	30.0	50.0
52	0.0	35.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	50.0
53	0.0	35.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	50.0
54	0.0	35.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	50.0
55	30.0	40.0	60.0	30.0	40.0	100.0
56	30.0	45.0	60.0	25.0	40.0	100.0
57	30.0	50.0	60.0	20.0	40.0	100.0
58 - 61	45.0	50.0	60.0	27.5	40.0	100.0
62+	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0





APPENDIX B - SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

Police Tier 2 Rates of Retirement					
Years of Service					
Age	5 - 19	20 - 24	25 – 29	30+	
50 - 56	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	5.0%	
57 – 59	7.5	10.0	20.0	100.0	
60 - 61	10.0	20.0	35.0	100.0	
62 – 64	25.0	50.0	75.0	100.0	
65+	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Table B-4

Fire Tier 2 Rates of Retirement						
	Years of Service					
Age	5 - 19	20 - 24	25 – 29	30+		
50 - 56	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	2.5%		
57 – 59	5.0	7.5	15.0	100.0		
60 - 61	7.5	15.0	25.0	100.0		
62 - 64	20.0	35.0	50.0	100.0		
65+	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		

Tier 1 vested terminated members are assumed to retire at age 50 if they have 25 or more years of service or at age 55 if they have less than 25 years of service. Tier 2 vested terminated members are assumed to retire at age 60.



APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

3. Rates of Termination

Rates of termination are shown in Table B-5 below.

Rates of Termination				
Service	Police	Fire		
0	11.00%	8.50%		
1	8.00	4.00		
2	6.25	2.75		
3	5.00	1.75		
4	4.25	1.25		
5	3.75	1.00		
6	3.55	0.90		
7	3.40	0.80		
8	3.30	0.70		
9	3.25	0.60		
10	3.25	0.50		
11	3.25	0.50		
12	3.15	0.50		
13	2.95	0.50		
14	2.75	0.50		
15	2.25	0.50		
16	1.75	0.50		
17	1.50	0.50		
18	1.25	0.50		
19+	1.00	0.50		

Table B-5

Termination rates do not apply once retirement rates apply.

Tier 1 members who terminate with less than 10 years of service and Tier 2 members who terminate with less than 5 years of service are assumed to receive a refund of contributions. For terminating employees who are not assumed to receive a refund, 75% are assumed to subsequently work for a reciprocal employer and receive 3.00% pay increases per year.



APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

4. Rates of Disability

For Police and Fire, disability rates are equal to the CalPERS Police Officers & Firefighters (POFF) industrial and non-industrial rates multiplied by 104%. Sample disability rates of active participants are provided in Table B-6.

Rates of Disability at Selected Ages		
Age	Disability Incidence	
25	0.12%	
30	0.20	
35	0.33	
40	0.52	
45	0.80	
50	1.17	
55	1.65	
60	2.24	
65	2.96	

Table B-6

All disabilities are assumed to be duty related.

5. Rates of Mortality

Mortality rates for actives, retirees, beneficiaries, terminated vested, and reciprocals are based on the sex-distinct employee and annuitant mortality tables shown below. Future mortality improvements are reflected by applying the SOA MP-2021 projection scale on a generational basis from the base year of 2010.



APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

Table B-7

Base Mortality Tables				
Category	Male	Female		
Healthy Retirees	0.972 times the 2010 Public Safety Above Median Income Mortality Table (PubS-2010(A)) for Healthy Retirees	0.972 times the 2010 Public Safety Above Median Income Mortality Table (PubS-2010(A)) for Healthy Retirees		
Disabled Retiree	0.915 times the 2010 Public Safety Mortality Table (PubS-2010) for Disabled Retirees	0.915 times the 2010 Public Safety Mortality Table (PubS-2010) for Disabled Retirees		
Beneficiaries	1.032 times the 2010 General Member Mortality Table (PubG- 2010) for Healthy Retirees	1.032 times the 2010 General Member Mortality Table (PubG- 2010) for Healthy Retirees		
Healthy Non-Annuitant	0.979 times the 2010 Public Safety Above Median Income Mortality Table (PubS-2010(A)) for Employees	0.979 times the 2010 Public Safety Above Median Income Mortality Table (PubS-2010(A)) for Employees		

It is assumed that 50 percent of active deaths are service related.

6. Family Composition

Percentage married is shown in the following Table B-8. Women are assumed to be three years younger than men.

Table	B-8
-------	------------

Percentage Married		
Gender	Percentage	
Males	85%	
Females	85%	

7. Administrative Expenses

Administrative expenses are assumed to equal the prior year's actual administrative expenses increased by the wage inflation assumption to the year of the contribution. Administrative expenses are allocated to tier groups in proportion to each groups' market value of assets.





Classic Values, Innovative Advice