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# Cavanaugh Macdonald <br> C ONSULTING, LLC <br> The experience and dedication you deserve 

April 1, 2016

Public Employees Retirement Board
Nebraska Public Employees Retirement Systems
1526 "K" Street
Suite 400
Lincoln, NE 68509-4816

## RE: Certification of Actuarial Valuation County Equal Retirement Benefit Fund

Members of the Board:
At your request, we have prepared an actuarial valuation of the County Equal Retirement Benefit Fund as of January 1, 2016 for the purpose of determining the funded status of the Plan and any required contributions for the plan year. Funding required from each participating County for current plan members, as approved by the Retirement Board, is equal to an amount necessary to fully fund the benefit obligation, or alternatively, an annual payment which would amortize the unfunded liability over a period of twenty years commencing January 1, 1999. There were no changes to the plan provisions or actuarial methods from the prior valuation. The only change to the actuarial assumptions was the annual update of the annuity conversion interest rate for members of the Defined Contribution Plan.

The actuarial valuation is based on unaudited financial data provided by the System and member data provided by Ameritas, the record keeper for the Plan. We found this information to be reasonably consistent and comparable with the information used in the prior report. The valuation results depend on the integrity of this information. If any of this information is inaccurate or incomplete, our results may be different and our calculations may need to be revised. The benefits considered are those delineated in Nebraska State Statutes as of January 1, 2016.

We further certify that all costs, liabilities, rates of interest and other factors for the County Equal Retirement Benefit Fund have been determined on the basis of actuarial assumptions and methods which are individually reasonable (taking into account the experience of the System and reasonable expectations); and which, in combination, offer the best estimate of anticipated experience affecting the System. Nevertheless, the emerging costs will vary from those presented in this report to the extent actual experience differs from that projected by the actuarial assumptions. The Public Employees Retirement Board has the final decision regarding the appropriateness of the assumptions and adopted them as indicated in Appendix B.
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Future actuarial measurements may differ significantly from the current measurements presented in this report due to such factors as the following: plan experience differing from that anticipated by the economic or demographic assumptions; changes in economic or demographic assumptions; increases or decreases expected as part of the natural operation of the methodology used for these measurements (such as the end of an amortization period or additional cost or contribution requirements based on the plan's funded status); and changes in plan provisions or applicable law. Due to the limited scope of our assignment, we did not perform an analysis of the potential range of future measurements.

The consultants who worked on this assignment are pension actuaries. CMC's advice is not intended to be a substitute for qualified legal or accounting counsel.

On the basis of the foregoing, we hereby certify that, to the best of our knowledge and belief, this report is complete and accurate and has been prepared in accordance with generally recognized and accepted actuarial principles and practices. We are members of the American Academy of Actuaries and meet the Qualification Standards to render the actuarial opinion contained herein. We are available to answer any questions on the material contained in the report or to provide explanations or further details as may be appropriate.

We respectfully submit the following report and look forward to discussing it with you.
Respectfully submitted,


Patrice Beckham, FSA, FCA, EA, MAAA Principal and Consulting Actuary


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

The County Equal Retirement Benefit Fund provides a benefit for members who had account balances on January 1, 1984 and who elect to annuitize those balances upon retirement. The fund was established to protect members who might have been negatively affected by the change in annuitization factors at that time when sex-distinct factors were replaced with unisex factors. As such, the characteristics of the actuarial liability of the Fund and the funding requirements are somewhat different from the other defined benefit plans overseen by NPERS. This report determines the contribution requirements for the counties who still have members in the Fund as well as providing statistical information that may provide insight into the Fund's longer term financial health.

There are several risk factors that are key to the Fund's financial status over time. One of the most significant of these factors is the proportion of retirees that elect to take an annuity rather than a lump sum. An individual member's choice is based on their own personal situation and may consider different factors from other individuals who are also making this choice. The funding assumption is that $25 \%$ of retirees, in aggregate, will elect an annuity. While this assumption is reasonable, there are other assumptions that would also be considered to be reasonable. If a greater portion of retirees elect an annuity at retirement, the liability of the Fund would be higher than estimated in this report. The possible liability volatility, especially at the individual county level, should be considered and evaluated. To assist with this analysis, we have included an exhibit in the report that shows the impact of a higher annuity election by retiring members (Exhibit 4). Liability results are shown should $50 \%$ or $75 \%$ of the retirees elect an annuity rather than the $25 \%$ assumed in the basic liability calculations. These alternatives assumptions may or may not be reasonable in the aggregate, but because most counties have relatively few members, the alternative results provide some measure of the possible downside risk.

Other factors and assumptions affecting the results include the following:

- Account growth - both the cash balance and defined contribution member balances are assumed to grow at $7.75 \%$ annually. To the extent investment returns are lower, the benefits assumed to be paid from the Fund are lower and so are the costs.
- Annuitization rate - the defined contribution balances are assumed to be annuitized at the current applicable interest rate ( $3.57 \%$ as of January 1, 2016). If interest rates decrease in the future, higher benefit amounts would be payable and the cost of the Fund would increase.
- General economic conditions - there are connections between the growth in the members' account balances, the interest rate environment (affecting the annuitization rate), the investment return on the assets of the Fund, and the way in which potential retirees view the financial ramifications of retiring and electing an annuity are linked together. The exact interplay of these variables is extremely complex, but the fact that there is a connection means that the possible variability of the Fund's financial situation is potentially greater than it might otherwise appear. Consequently, we urge caution in concluding that the current strong health will continue indefinitely.

The following graphs show trends in the Fund over recent years:




Because there are no new members in the Fund, the number of participants has declined in past years and is expected to continue to decline in future years.

When comparing the total account balances in the current and past years, the growth in account balances due to investment earnings partially offsets the impact of a declining membership.

While an individual county may occasionally need to make a contribution to avoid a shortfall between liabilities and assets, the combined assets of the Fund are well above the aggregate liabilities.

Below is a comparison of the aggregate results of the current and prior years' actuarial valuations.

|  | Actuarial Valuation as of January 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Results | 2016 | 2015 |
| Number of Members |  |  |
| Cash Balance | 135 | 154 |
| Defined Contribution | 105 | 120 |
| Total | 240 | 274 |
| Pre-1984 Account Balance with Interest, Beginning of Year |  |  |
| Cash Balance | \$ 4,959,013 | \$ 5,032,281 |
| Defined Contribution | 3,342,350 | 3,855,655 |
| Total | \$8,301,363 | \$8,887,936 |
| Projected Benefit Cost* |  |  |
| a. Amount | \$ 117,774 | \$ 126,348 |
| b. As a Percent of the Account Balance | 1.419\% | 1.422\% |
| c. Annuity Factor Interest Rate - Cash Balance | 7.75\% | 7.75\% |
| d. Annuity Factor Interest Rate - Defined Contribution | 3.57\% | 3.64\% |
| Actuarial Value of Assets (Market Value) |  |  |
| a. Asset Value as of Prior Year's Valuation | \$ 380,600 | \$ 367,326 |
| b. Deposits During the Year | 0 |  |
| c. Withdrawals During the Year | 17,778 | 13,484 |
| d. Investment Return or (Loss) | (754) | 26,758 |
| e. Actuarial Value of Assets as of Valuation Date $[\mathrm{a} .+\mathrm{b} .-\mathrm{c} .+\mathrm{d}]$ | \$ 362,068 | \$ 380,600 |
| Unfunded Liability/(Surplus) | \$ $(244,294)$ | \$ $(254,252)$ |
| Total Contribution Amount (All Counties) | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |

*Cost is based on the assumption that $75 \%$ of members will elect a lump sum or installment payment instead of an annuity. To the extent that actual experience in the future deviates from this assumption, the costs in future years could vary as well, at times significantly.

## EXHIBIT 2 - SUMMARY OF FUND ASSETS BY COUNTY

| County Name | Beginning Balance January 1, 2015 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Employer } \\ & \text { Contributions } \\ & \text { for } 2015 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Withdrawals |  | Investment Return |  | Ending Balance December 31, 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Adams | \$ | 16,147 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | (40) | \$ | 16,107 |
| 2. Box Butte |  | 6,424 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (16) |  | 6,408 |
| 3. Buffalo |  | 19,298 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (46) |  | 19,252 |
| 4. Cass |  | 1,067 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (3) |  | 1,064 |
| 5. Cedar |  | 1,177 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (2) |  | 1,175 |
| 6. Cheyenne |  | 3,501 |  | 0 |  | 1,846 |  | (51) |  | 1,604 |
| 7. Cuming |  | 12,127 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (29) |  | 12,098 |
| 8. Custer |  | 11,030 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (27) |  | 11,003 |
| 9. Dawson |  | 24,533 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (60) |  | 24,473 |
| 10. Dodge |  | 20,885 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (50) |  | 20,835 |
| 11. Gage |  | 8,727 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (21) |  | 8,706 |
| 12. Gosper |  | 3,178 |  | 0 |  | 1,970 |  | 22 |  | 1,230 |
| 13. Hall |  | 28,666 |  | 0 |  | 1,073 |  | (94) |  | 27,499 |
| 14. Harlan |  | 3,349 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (8) |  | 3,341 |
| 15. Hitchcock |  | 7,284 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (18) |  | 7,266 |
| 16. Jefferson |  | 12,686 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (31) |  | 12,655 |
| 17. Kimball |  | 11,292 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (27) |  | 11,265 |
| 18. Lincoln |  | 4,076 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (9) |  | 4,067 |
| 19. Madison |  | 9,358 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (23) |  | 9,335 |
| 20. Morrill |  | 11,753 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (28) |  | 11,725 |
| 21. Platte |  | 26,881 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (65) |  | 26,816 |
| 22. Polk |  | 4,456 |  | 0 |  | 1,679 |  | 19 |  | 2,796 |
| 23. Red Willow |  | 4,517 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (11) |  | 4,506 |
| 24. Richardson |  | 7,761 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (19) |  | 7,742 |
| 25. Saline |  | 7,882 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (19) |  | 7,863 |
| 26. Sarpy |  | 40,642 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (98) |  | 40,544 |
| 27. Saunders |  | 18,871 |  | 0 |  | 3,773 |  | 29 |  | 15,127 |
| 28. Scotts Bluff |  | 18,394 |  | 0 |  | 5,735 |  | 17 |  | 12,676 |
| 29. Seward |  | 11,114 |  | 0 |  | 1,703 |  | 10 |  | 9,421 |
| 30. Washington |  | 13,342 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (32) |  | 13,310 |
| 31. York |  | 10,183 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | (24) |  | 10,159 |
| Totals | \$ | 380,601 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 17,779 | \$ | (754) | \$ | 362,068 |

## EXHIBIT 3 - ACTUARIAL RESULTS AND CONTRIBUTION ALTERNATIVES BY COUNTY

| County Name | Number of Members | Benefit <br> Cost** |  | Assets |  | 2015 Full Contribution |  | 2016 Full Contribution |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Adams | 7 | \$ | 2,076 | \$ | 16,107 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
| 2. Box Butte | 6 |  | 2,589 |  | 6,408 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 3. Buffalo | 21 |  | 7,807 |  | 19,252 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 4. Cass | 2 |  | 851 |  | 1,064 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 5. Cedar* | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1,175 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 6. Cheyenne | 2 |  | 356 |  | 1,604 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 7. Cuming | 1 |  | 153 |  | 12,098 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 8. Custer | 10 |  | 3,715 |  | 11,003 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 9. Dawson | 8 |  | 4,527 |  | 24,473 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 10. Dodge | 12 |  | 9,550 |  | 20,835 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 11. Gage | 11 |  | 4,796 |  | 8,706 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 12. Gosper | 3 |  | 892 |  | 1,230 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 13. Hall | 11 |  | 3,506 |  | 27,499 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 14. Harlan | 5 |  | 2,298 |  | 3,341 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 15. Hitchcock | 3 |  | 2,208 |  | 7,266 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 16. Jefferson | 5 |  | 3,009 |  | 12,655 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 17. Kimball | 3 |  | 501 |  | 11,265 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 18. Lincoln | 7 |  | 1,561 |  | 4,067 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 19. Madison | 13 |  | 5,413 |  | 9,335 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 20. Morrill | 2 |  | 1,862 |  | 11,725 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 21. Platte | 20 |  | 9,535 |  | 26,816 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 22. Polk | 4 |  | 1,533 |  | 2,796 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 23. Red Willow | 4 |  | 685 |  | 4,506 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 24. Richardson | 5 |  | 2,786 |  | 7,742 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 25. Saline | 6 |  | 2,317 |  | 7,863 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 26. Sarpy | 30 |  | 19,562 |  | 40,544 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 27. Saunders | 11 |  | 8,064 |  | 15,127 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 28. Scotts Bluff | 10 |  | 8,251 |  | 12,676 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 29. Seward | 7 |  | 3,776 |  | 9,421 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 30. Washington | 8 |  | 1,439 |  | 13,310 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 31. York | 3 |  | 2,156 |  | 10,159 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Totals | 240 | \$ | 117,774 | \$ | 362,068 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |

* County no longer has any members covered by the fund.
** Cost is based on the assumption that $75 \%$ of retiring members will choose a lump sum or installment payment instead of an annuity. To the extent that actual experience in the future deviates from this assumption, the costs in future years could vary as well, at times significantly.


## Exhibit 4 - Risk Measures By County

This exhibit compares the Projected Benefit Cost (liability) assuming $25 \%$ of retirees elect an annuity (the funding assumption) with alternative assumptions of $50 \%$ and $75 \%$. If a county has assets exceeding the liability of one or both of the alternative assumption scenarios, it indicates it is in a better position to withstand possible adverse experience.

| County Name | Number of Members | Projected Benefit Cost 25\% Annuitize |  | Projected Benefit Cost 50\% Annuitize |  | Projected Benefit Cost 75\% Annuitize |  | Assets |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Adams | 7 | \$ | 2,076 | \$ | 4,152 | \$ | 6,228 | \$ | 16,107 |
| 2. Box Butte | 6 |  | 2,589 |  | 5,178 |  | 7,767 |  | 6,408 |
| 3. Buffalo | 21 |  | 7,807 |  | 15,614 |  | 23,421 |  | 19,252 |
| 4. Cass | 2 |  | 851 |  | 1,702 |  | 2,553 |  | 1,064 |
| 5. Cedar | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1,175 |
| 6. Cheyenne | 2 |  | 356 |  | 712 |  | 1,068 |  | 1,604 |
| 7. Cuming | 1 |  | 153 |  | 306 |  | 459 |  | 12,098 |
| 8. Custer | 10 |  | 3,715 |  | 7,430 |  | 11,145 |  | 11,003 |
| 9. Dawson | 8 |  | 4,527 |  | 9,054 |  | 13,581 |  | 24,473 |
| 10. Dodge | 12 |  | 9,550 |  | 19,100 |  | 28,650 |  | 20,835 |
| 11. Gage | 11 |  | 4,796 |  | 9,592 |  | 14,388 |  | 8,706 |
| 12. Gosper | 3 |  | 892 |  | 1,784 |  | 2,676 |  | 1,230 |
| 13. Hall | 11 |  | 3,506 |  | 7,012 |  | 10,518 |  | 27,499 |
| 14. Harlan | 5 |  | 2,298 |  | 4,596 |  | 6,894 |  | 3,341 |
| 15. Hitchcock | 3 |  | 2,208 |  | 4,416 |  | 6,624 |  | 7,266 |
| 16. Jefferson | 5 |  | 3,009 |  | 6,018 |  | 9,027 |  | 12,655 |
| 17. Kimball | 3 |  | 501 |  | 1,002 |  | 1,503 |  | 11,265 |
| 18. Lincoln | 7 |  | 1,561 |  | 3,122 |  | 4,683 |  | 4,067 |
| 19. Madison | 13 |  | 5,413 |  | 10,826 |  | 16,239 |  | 9,335 |
| 20. Morrill | 2 |  | 1,862 |  | 3,724 |  | 5,586 |  | 11,725 |
| 21. Platte | 20 |  | 9,535 |  | 19,070 |  | 28,605 |  | 26,816 |
| 22. Polk | 4 |  | 1,533 |  | 3,066 |  | 4,599 |  | 2,796 |
| 23. Red Willow | 4 |  | 685 |  | 1,370 |  | 2,055 |  | 4,506 |
| 24. Richardson | 5 |  | 2,786 |  | 5,572 |  | 8,358 |  | 7,742 |
| 25. Saline | 6 |  | 2,317 |  | 4,634 |  | 6,951 |  | 7,863 |
| 26. Sarpy | 30 |  | 19,562 |  | 39,124 |  | 58,686 |  | 40,544 |
| 27. Saunders | 11 |  | 8,064 |  | 16,128 |  | 24,192 |  | 15,127 |
| 28. Scotts Bluff | 10 |  | 8,251 |  | 16,502 |  | 24,753 |  | 12,676 |
| 29. Seward | 7 |  | 3,776 |  | 7,552 |  | 11,328 |  | 9,421 |
| 30. Washington | 8 |  | 1,439 |  | 2,878 |  | 4,317 |  | 13,310 |
| 31. York | 3 |  | 2,156 |  | 4,312 |  | 6,468 |  | 10,159 |
| Totals | 240 | \$ | 117,774 | \$ | 235,548 | \$ | 353,322 | \$ | 362,068 |


| Age | Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Range | Data | Male |  | Female |  | Total |  |
|  | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Less Than | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
| 40 | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
|  | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 40-44 | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
|  | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 45-49 | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
|  | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 50-54 | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
|  | Count of Members |  | 19 |  | 18 |  | 37 |
| 55-59 | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 13,615 | \$ | 13,269 | \$ | 13,447 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 258,686 | \$ | 238,850 | \$ | 497,536 |
|  | Count of Members |  | 64 |  | 45 |  | 109 |
| 60-64 | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 37,569 | \$ | 23,947 | \$ | 31,945 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 2,404,399 | \$ | 1,077,593 | \$ | 3,481,992 |
|  | Count of Members |  | 27 |  | 30 |  | 57 |
| 65-69 | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 52,187 | \$ | 34,609 | \$ | 42,935 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 1,409,051 | \$ | 1,038,257 | \$ | 2,447,308 |
|  | Count of Members |  | 9 |  | 8 |  | 17 |
| 70-74 | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 47,766 | \$ | 49,642 | \$ | 48,649 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 429,894 | \$ | 397,136 | \$ | 827,030 |
|  | Count of Members |  | 14 |  | 6 |  | 20 |
| 75 and | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 64,631 | \$ | 23,776 | \$ | 52,375 |
| Above | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 904,840 | \$ | 142,657 | \$ | 1,047,497 |
| Total Members |  |  | 133 |  | 107 |  | 240 |
| Total Average Balance |  | \$ | 40,653 | \$ | 27,051 | \$ | 34,589 |
| Grand Total Balance |  | \$ | 5,406,870 | \$ | 2,894,493 | \$ | 8,301,363 |

## EXHIBIT 6 (Continued) - SUMMARY OF MEMBER DATA BY COUNTY

| County* | Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Data | Male |  | Female |  | Total |  |
| Adams | Count of Members |  | 4 |  | 3 |  | 7 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 104,597 | \$ | 52,637 | \$ | 157,234 |
| Box Butte | Count of Members |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 6 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 53,962 | \$ | 143,067 | \$ | 197,029 |
| Buffalo | Count of Members |  | 11 |  | 10 |  | 21 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 315,244 | \$ | 244,279 | \$ | 559,523 |
| Cass | Count of Members |  | 2 |  | 0 |  | 2 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 71,502 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 71,502 |
| Cheyenne | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 2 |  | 2 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 29,818 | \$ | 29,818 |
| Cuming | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 11,577 | \$ | 11,577 |
| Custer | Count of Members |  | 6 |  | 4 |  | 10 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 188,665 | \$ | 69,182 | \$ | 257,847 |
| Dawson | Count of Members |  | 6 |  | 2 |  | 8 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 251,961 | \$ | 77,280 | \$ | 329,241 |
| Dodge | Count of Members |  | 6 |  | 6 |  | 12 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 330,540 | \$ | 300,172 | \$ | 630,712 |
| Gage | Count of Members |  | 6 |  | 5 |  | 11 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 237,992 | \$ | 116,212 | \$ | 354,204 |
| Gosper | Count of Members |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 3 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 22,902 | \$ | 34,885 | \$ | 57,787 |
| Hall | Count of Members |  | 4 |  | 7 |  | 11 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 119,023 | \$ | 115,439 | \$ | 234,462 |
| Harlan | Count of Members |  | 1 |  | 4 |  | 5 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 117,050 | \$ | 55,468 | \$ | 172,518 |
| Hitchcock | Count of Members |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 3 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 62,584 | \$ | 65,182 | \$ | 127,766 |
| Jefferson | Count of Members |  | 3 |  | 2 |  | 5 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 151,493 | \$ | 53,408 | \$ | 204,901 |
| Kimball | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 3 |  | 3 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 40,055 | \$ | 40,055 |
| Lincoln | Count of Members |  | 3 |  | 4 |  | 7 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 81,660 | \$ | 41,283 | \$ | 122,943 |
| Madison | Count of Members |  | 7 |  | 6 |  | 13 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 186,835 | \$ | 165,020 | \$ | 351,855 |
| Morrill | Count of Members |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance |  | 135,690 | \$ | 21,437 | \$ | 157,127 |

* Cedar County no longer has any members covered by the Fund.


## EXHIBIT 6 (Continued) - SUMMARY OF MEMBER DATA BY COUNTY



* Cedar County no longer has any members covered by the Fund.


## Member

## Contributions

## Eligibility for <br> Benefits

Benefit Amount

## Cash Balance Conversion

Any person employed by a County participating in either the Defined Contribution or Cash Balance Benefit under the County Employees Retirement System who has an accumulated account balance based on contributions which were made prior to January 1, 1984.

Each participating County shall make contributions to the fund on an actuarial basis as approved by the Retirement Board.

Any member who retires or terminates service and elects to convert to an annuity using their accumulated account balance, with interest, commencing on or after age 55, is eligible to receive a benefit from the fund.

The fund shall provide the Actuarially Equivalent amount required to purchase the additional monthly annuity, if any, which is equal to:
a. the income provided by the accumulated contributions made prior to January 1, 1984 with interest, based on male annuity conversion factors in effect on the annuity starting date,

## Less

b. the income provided by the accumulated contributions made prior to January 1, 1984 with interest, which are based on $50 \%$ male / 50\% female annuity conversion factors in effect on the annuity starting date.

Any member who elected to transfer his or her account balance to the Nebraska County Cash Balance Plan as of January 1, 2003, January 1, 2008 or January 2, 2013 will have his or her Benefit Amount determined using the annuity conversion interest rate applicable to the County Employees Retirement System (Cash Balance Benefit), which for 2016 is $7.75 \%$. Any other member will have his or her Benefit amount determined using the annuity conversion interest rate applicable to the County Employees Retirement System (Defined Contribution benefit), which for 2016 is $3.57 \%$.

## Changes in Benefit Provisions Since the Prior Year

There were no changes in the benefit provisions since the last valuation.

## Economic Assumptions

1. Investment Return
2. Consumer Price Inflation
3. Interest on accumulated contribution balances (contributions made before January 1, 1984)
4. COLA (optional purchase applicable to annuities)
5. Annuity Conversion Interest Rates
7.75\% per annum, compounded annually, net of expenses.
$3.25 \%$ per annum, compounded annually.
7.75\% per annum, compounded annually.
2.50\% per annum, compounded annually.
7.75\% for annuities from the Cash Balance Plan
3.57\% for annuities from the Defined Contribution Plan

## Demographic Assumptions

1. Mortality
a. Pre-retirement
b. Post-retirement
2. Withdrawal
3. Disability

None.
1994 Group Annuity Mortality (based on Actuarial Equivalence definition in statute).

None.
None
4. Retirement

## Other Assumptions

1. Payment election
2. Form of Annuity Payment

Rates vary by age as follows:

| Age | County Annual <br> Rates |
| :---: | :---: |
| 55 | $5 \%$ |
| 56 | 5 |
| 57 | 5 |
| 58 | 5 |
| 59 | 5 |
| 60 | 5 |
| 61 | 5 |
| 62 | 10 |
| 63 | 10 |
| 64 | 10 |
| 65 | 20 |
| 66 | 20 |
| 67 | 15 |
| 68 | 15 |
| 69 | 15 |
| $70-79$ | 20 |
| 80 | 100 |

$75 \%$ of retiring members were assumed to elect a lump sum distribution or installment payments, and $25 \%$ of retiring members were assumed to elect an annuity form of distribution.

Of members electing an annuity, $80 \%$ of those members were assumed to elect a 5 -year certain and life annuity without COLA, and $20 \%$ of those members were assumed to elect a 5 -year certain and life with a $2.5 \%$ annual COLA.

## APPENDIX B - SUMMARY OF ACTUARIAL METHODS AND ASSUMPTIONS

## Methods

1. Funding Method
2. Asset Valuation Method

The present value of future benefits or Projected Benefit Cost, less the Actuarial Value of Assets, equals the Unfunded Liability or Surplus. The minimum recommended contribution is equal to an annual amount necessary to amortize the Unfunded Liability over twenty years from January 1, 1999.
2. Asset Valuation Method Fair market value.

## Changes in Assumptions Since the Prior Year

The assumed interest rate used for Defined Contribution annuity calculations is the annuitization rate in effect as of the valuation date. The rate has changed from $3.64 \%$ to $3.57 \%$.

