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# Cavanaugh Macdonald 

 C O N SULTIN G, LLCThe experience and dedication you deserve

April 23, 2020

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, 2020 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. The initial twenty-year amortization period has elapsed so the current valuation reflects a one-year amortization period.

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 retiring from 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, 2020.
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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.

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 Actuary

The County Equal Retirement Benefit Fund provides a benefit for members who had account balances on January 1, 1984 and elect to convert those balances to monthly income (annuity) at retirement. The Fund was established to protect members who might be negatively affected by the legal requirement to change from sex-distinct annuity factors to unisex annuity factors. As such, the characteristics of the liability of the Fund and the funding requirements are different from the other traditional defined benefit plans managed by the Nebraska Public Employees Retirement System (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. The initial amortization period, which was set at 20 years on January 1, 1999, has elapsed so a one year period was used in this valuation. There was an actuarial gain of $\$ 33,000$ on Plan assets due to the actual return of $20.9 \%$ for 2019 , compared to the $7.5 \%$ assumption. There was also a gain on liabilities of $\$ 5,000$. While there is insufficient data to quantify the sources of liability experience, the actuarial gain is likely from fewer members electing monthly income than expected. Note that if a member elects a full lump sum distribution, it eliminates the liability under this Plan and a liability gain occurs. Due to the aggregate experience on assets and liabilities, the amount of surplus in this valuation increased to $\$ 339,993$ from $\$ 280,937$ in the January 1,2019 valuation. Overall, the combined assets for all counties remain greater than the combined liabilities for the County Equal Retirement Benefit Fund. Harlan County is the only county in the current valuation with an unfunded liability, resulting in a required contribution for the 2020 plan year of $\$ 185$.

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 compared to other individuals who are also making this choice. The funding assumption is that $25 \%$ of the account balances of retiring members, in aggregate, will be converted to monthly income (an annuity). While we believe this assumption is reasonable, there are other assumptions that could also be considered reasonable that would result in a different funded status and contribution amount. In particular, if a greater portion of account balances are annuitized at retirement, the liability of the Fund would be higher than estimated in this report. The potential volatility in the amount of liability, especially at the individual county level, is a risk that 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 assuming $50 \%$ or $75 \%$ of the aggregate account balances are annuitized rather than the $25 \%$ assumed in the basic valuation calculations. Although these alternatives assumptions may or may not be reasonable in the aggregate, 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 - the account balances for both the cash balance and defined contribution members are assumed to increase at $7.50 \%$ annually. To the extent actual investment returns (or interest credits and dividends in the cash balance accounts) are lower, the benefits assumed to be paid from the Fund are lower and the liabilities are lower.
- Annuity factor interest rate - the defined contribution balances are assumed to be annuitized at the current applicable interest rate ( $2.87 \%$ as of January 1, 2020). If interest rates decrease in the future, the difference in the liability of a benefit determined using a unisex annuity factor and the benefit determined using a male annuity factor increases, and so the liabilities 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 annuity factor interest 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. 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. Although the current financial health of the Fund is very strong, that does not automatically imply this will continue indefinitely. There are potential economic scenarios that could adversely impact the Fund's current financial condition. As time goes on, this risk decreases because the Plan has been closed for many years and the number of members and the aggregate account balances are declining over time.

It is important to note that an unfunded liability is not, by itself, an indication of whether or not the Fund has sufficient assets to meet future liabilities. Further, the presence of an unfunded liability or surplus is not an indication of what future contributions may be required to fund the benefits. 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. Eventually, there will be no participants remaining.


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 fund the shortfall between liabilities and assets, the combined assets of the Fund are well above the aggregate liabilities.

## Exhibit 1 - Summary of actuarial results

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

| Results | Actuarial Valuation as of January 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2020 | 2019 |
| Number of Members |  |  |
| Cash Balance | 67 | 87 |
| Defined Contribution | 69 | 80 |
| Total | 136 | 167 |
| Pre-1984 Account Balance with Interest, Beginning of Year |  |  |
| Cash Balance | \$2,935,496 | \$3,955,420 |
| Defined Contribution | 2,617,802 | 2,845,254 |
| Total | \$5,553,298 | \$6,800,674 |
| Projected Benefit Cost* |  |  |
| a. Amount | \$85,049 | \$98,342 |
| b. As a Percent of the Account Balance | 1.532\% | 1.446\% |
| c. Annuity Factor Interest Rate - Cash Balance | 7.75\% | 7.75\% |
| d. Annuity Factor Interest Rate - Defined Contribution | 2.87\% | 3.84\% |
| Market Value of Assets |  |  |
| a. Asset Value as of Prior Year's Valuation | \$379,279 | \$410,152 |
| b. Deposits During the Year | 60 | 0 |
| c. Withdrawals During the Year | 15,262 | 11,426 |
| d. Investment Return or (Loss) | 76,173 | $(19,447)$ |
| e. Other | $(15,208)$ | 0 |
| f. Market Value of Assets as of Valuation Date $\text { [a. + b. - c. }+\mathrm{d}+\mathrm{e} .]$ | \$425,042 | \$379,279 |
| Unfunded Liability/(Surplus) | $(\$ 339,993)$ | $(\$ 280,937)$ |
| Total Contribution Amount (All Counties) | \$185 | \$0 |

*Cost is based on the assumption that $75 \%$ of all members will elect a lump sum or installment payments 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, perhaps significantly.

## EXHIBIT 2 - SUMMARY OF FUND ASSETS BY COUNTY

| County Name | BeginningBalanceJanuary 1, 2019 |  | Employer Contributions for 2019 |  | Withdrawals |  | Investment Return |  | Other |  | Ending Balance December 31, 2019 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Adams | \$ | 19,174 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 2,917 | \$ | 3,676 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 19,933 |
| 2. Box Butte |  | 7,628 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1,596 |  | 0 |  | 9,224 |
| 3. Buffalo |  | 19,177 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4,011 |  | 0 |  | 23,188 |
| 4. Cass |  | 1,267 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 265 |  | 0 |  | 1,532 |
| 5. Cheyenne |  | 1,910 |  | 0 |  | 1,099 |  | 273 |  | 0 |  | 1,084 |
| 6. Cuming |  | 14,401 |  | 0 |  | 867 |  | 2,934 |  | 0 |  | 16,468 |
| 7. Custer |  | 13,098 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2,739 |  | 0 |  | 15,837 |
| 8. Dawson |  | 26,521 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 5,546 |  | 0 |  | 32,067 |
| 9. Dodge |  | 22,841 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4,777 |  | 0 |  | 27,618 |
| 10. Gage |  | 8,653 |  | 0 |  | 1,121 |  | 1,649 |  | 0 |  | 9,181 |
| 11. Gosper |  | 1,465 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 306 |  | 0 |  | 1,771 |
| 12. Hall |  | 32,734 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 6,848 |  | 0 |  | 39,582 |
| 13. Harlan |  | 3,977 |  | 60 |  | 4,374 |  | 337 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 14. Hitchcock |  | 8,649 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1,810 |  | 0 |  | 10,459 |
| 15. Jefferson |  | 15,065 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 3,151 |  | 0 |  | 18,216 |
| 16. Kimball |  | 13,043 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2,728 |  | 0 |  | 15,771 |
| 17. Lincoln |  | 4,841 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1,012 |  | 0 |  | 5,853 |
| 18. Madison |  | 10,319 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2,159 |  | 0 |  | 12,478 |
| 19. Morrill |  | 13,957 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1,251 |  | $(15,208)$ |  | 0 |
| 20. Platte |  | 30,269 |  | 0 |  | 3,005 |  | 6,235 |  | 0 |  | 33,499 |
| 21. Polk |  | 1,042 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 218 |  | 0 |  | 1,260 |
| 22. Red Willow |  | 4,289 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 897 |  | 0 |  | 5,186 |
| 23. Richardson |  | 9,216 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1,928 |  | 0 |  | 11,144 |
| 24. Saline |  | 4,281 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 895 |  | 0 |  | 5,176 |
| 25. Sarpy |  | 26,941 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 5,635 |  | 0 |  | 32,576 |
| 26. Saunders |  | 18,007 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 3,766 |  | 0 |  | 21,773 |
| 27. Scottsbluff |  | 11,321 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2,368 |  | 0 |  | 13,689 |
| 28. Seward |  | 8,014 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1,676 |  | 0 |  | 9,690 |
| 29. Washington |  | 15,086 |  | 0 |  | 1,879 |  | 2,958 |  | 0 |  | 16,165 |
| 30. York |  | 12,093 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2,529 |  | 0 |  | 14,622 |
| Totals | \$ | 379,279 | \$ | 60 | \$ | 15,262 | \$ | 76,173 | \$ | $(15,208)$ | \$ | 425,042 |


| County Name | Number of Members | Projected Benefit Cost*: |  | Assets |  | 2019 Full Contribution |  | 2020 Full Contribution |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Adams | 4 | \$ | 1,222 | \$ | 19,933 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
| 2. Box Butte | 4 |  | 1,340 |  | 9,224 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 3. Buffalo | 14 |  | 6,986 |  | 23,188 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 4. Cass | 1 |  | 217 |  | 1,532 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 5. Cheyenne | 1 |  | 204 |  | 1,084 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 6. Cuming | 0 |  | 0 |  | 16,468 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 7. Custer | 6 |  | 2,826 |  | 15,837 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 8. Dawson | 4 |  | 2,947 |  | 32,067 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 9. Dodge | 9 |  | 9,368 |  | 27,618 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 10. Gage | 8 |  | 4,559 |  | 9,181 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 11. Gosper | 3 |  | 1,314 |  | 1,771 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 12. Hall | 8 |  | 3,613 |  | 39,582 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 13. Harlan | 2 |  | 185 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 185 |
| 14. Hitchcock | 2 |  | 1,718 |  | 10,459 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 15. Jefferson | 1 |  | 563 |  | 18,216 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 16. Kimball | 1 |  | 297 |  | 15,771 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 17. Lincoln | 3 |  | 684 |  | 5,853 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 18. Madison | 9 |  | 6,364 |  | 12,478 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 19. Platte | 11 |  | 6,726 |  | 33,499 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 20. Polk | 2 |  | 808 |  | 1,260 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 21. Red Willow | 2 |  | 130 |  | 5,186 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 22. Richardson | 3 |  | 2,697 |  | 11,144 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 23. Saline | 2 |  | 579 |  | 5,176 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 24. Sarpy | 14 |  | 11,175 |  | 32,576 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 25. Saunders | 5 |  | 6,030 |  | 21,773 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 26. Scottsbluff | 5 |  | 6,110 |  | 13,689 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 27. Seward | 5 |  | 3,111 |  | 9,690 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 28. Washington | 4 |  | 1,136 |  | 16,165 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 29. York | 3 |  | 2,140 |  | 14,622 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Totals | 136 | \$ | 85,049 | \$ | 425,042 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 185 |

* Cost is based on the assumption that $75 \%$ of retiring members will choose a lump sum or installment payments 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 the account balances of retiring members are converted to an annuity (the funding assumption) with alternative assumptions of $50 \%$ and $75 \%$. As the table below indicates, greater utilization of the annuity option by members could significantly increase the liability of the plan and, therefore, the unfunded liability and contribution amount. If a county has assets exceeding the liability of one or both of the alternative assumption scenarios, it indicates it is in a stronger financial position to withstand potential adverse experience.

| County Name | Number of Members | Projected <br> Benefit Cost 25\% Annuitize | Projected Benefit Cost 50\% Annuitize | Projected <br> Benefit Cost <br> 75\% Annuitize |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Adams | 4 | \$ 1,222 | \$ 2,444 | \$ 3,666 | \$ | 19,933 |
| 2. Box Butte | 4 | 1,340 | 2,680 | 4,020 |  | 9,224 |
| 3. Buffalo | 14 | 6,986 | 13,972 | 20,958 |  | 23,188 |
| 4. Cass | 1 | 217 | 434 | 651 |  | 1,532 |
| 5. Cheyenne | 1 | 204 | 408 | 612 |  | 1,084 |
| 6. Cuming | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 16,468 |
| 7. Custer | 6 | 2,826 | 5,652 | 8,478 |  | 15,837 |
| 8. Dawson | 4 | 2,947 | 5,894 | 8,841 |  | 32,067 |
| 9. Dodge | 9 | 9,368 | 18,736 | 28,104 |  | 27,618 |
| 10. Gage | 8 | 4,559 | 9,118 | 13,677 |  | 9,181 |
| 11. Gosper | 3 | 1,314 | 2,628 | 3,942 |  | 1,771 |
| 12. Hall | 8 | 3,613 | 7,226 | 10,839 |  | 39,582 |
| 13. Harlan | 2 | 185 | 370 | 555 |  | 0 |
| 14. Hitchcock | 2 | 1,718 | 3,436 | 5,154 |  | 10,459 |
| 15. Jefferson | 1 | 563 | 1,126 | 1,689 |  | 18,216 |
| 16. Kimball | 1 | 297 | 594 | 891 |  | 15,771 |
| 17. Lincoln | 3 | 684 | 1,368 | 2,052 |  | 5,853 |
| 18. Madison | 9 | 6,364 | 12,728 | 19,092 |  | 12,478 |
| 19. Platte | 11 | 6,726 | 13,452 | 20,178 |  | 33,499 |
| 20. Polk | 2 | 808 | 1,616 | 2,424 |  | 1,260 |
| 21. Red Willow | 2 | 130 | 260 | 390 |  | 5,186 |
| 22. Richardson | 3 | 2,697 | 5,394 | 8,091 |  | 11,144 |
| 23. Saline | 2 | 579 | 1,158 | 1,737 |  | 5,176 |
| 24. Sarpy | 14 | 11,175 | 22,350 | 33,525 |  | 32,576 |
| 25. Saunders | 5 | 6,030 | 12,060 | 18,090 |  | 21,773 |
| 26. Scottsbluff | 5 | 6,110 | 12,220 | 18,330 |  | 13,689 |
| 27. Seward | 5 | 3,111 | 6,222 | 9,333 |  | 9,690 |
| 28. Washington | 4 | 1,136 | 2,272 | 3,408 |  | 16,165 |
| 29. York | 3 | 2,140 | 4,280 | 6,420 |  | 14,622 |
| Totals | 136 | \$ 85,049 | \$ 170,098 | \$ 255,147 | \$ | 425,042 |


| County Name | Number of Members | UnfundedLiability25\% Annuitize |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Unfunded } \\ & \text { Liability } \\ & \text { 50\% Annuitize } \end{aligned}$ |  | Unfunded <br> Liability <br> $75 \%$ Annuitize |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Adams | 4 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
| 2. Box Butte | 4 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 3. Buffalo | 14 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 4. Cass | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 5. Cheyenne | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 6. Cuming | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 7. Custer | 6 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 8. Dawson | 4 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 9. Dodge | 9 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 486 |
| 10. Gage | 8 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4,496 |
| 11. Gosper | 3 |  | 0 |  | 857 |  | 2,171 |
| 12. Hall | 8 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 13. Harlan | 2 |  | 185 |  | 370 |  | 555 |
| 14. Hitchcock | 2 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 15. Jefferson | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 16. Kimball | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 17. Lincoln | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 18. Madison | 9 |  | 0 |  | 250 |  | 6,614 |
| 19. Platte | 11 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 20. Polk | 2 |  | 0 |  | 356 |  | 1,164 |
| 21. Red Willow | 2 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 22. Richardson | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 23. Saline | 2 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 24. Sarpy | 14 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 949 |
| 25. Saunders | 5 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 26. Scottsbluff | 5 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4,641 |
| 27. Seward | 5 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 28. Washington | 4 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 29. York | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Totals | 136 | \$ | 185 | \$ | 1,833 | \$ | 21,076 |


| Age | Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Range | Data | Male |  | Female |  | Total |  |
|  | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Less Than | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
| 55 | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
|  | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 55-59 | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
|  | Count of Members |  | 22 |  | 21 |  | 43 |
| 60-64 | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 25,615 | \$ | 21,231 | \$ | 23,474 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 563,534 | \$ | 445,852 | \$ | 1,009,386 |
|  | Count of Members |  | 33 |  | 28 |  | 61 |
| 65-69 | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 51,030 | \$ | 34,570 | \$ | 43,474 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 1,683,975 | \$ | 967,964 | \$ | 2,651,939 |
|  | Count of Members |  | 5 |  | 9 |  | 14 |
| 70-74 | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 61,322 | \$ | 57,177 | \$ | 58,657 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 306,610 | \$ | 514,593 | \$ | 821,203 |
|  | Count of Members |  | 11 |  | 7 |  | 18 |
| 75 and | Average of Total Balance | \$ | 68,495 | \$ | 45,332 | \$ | 59,487 |
| Above | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 753,444 | \$ | 317,326 | \$ | 1,070,770 |
| Total Members |  |  | 71 |  | 65 |  | 136 |
| Average of Total Balance |  | \$ | 46,585 | \$ | 34,550 | \$ | 40,833 |
| Grand Total Balance |  | \$ | 3,307,563 | \$ | 2,245,735 | \$ | 5,553,298 |

## EXHIBIT 6 - SUMMARY OF MEMBER DATA BY COUNTY

| County | Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Data | Male |  | Female |  | Total |  |
| Adams | Count of Members |  | 3 |  | 1 |  | 4 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 72,815 | \$ | 12,473 | \$ | 85,288 |
| Box Butte | Count of Members |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 4 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 68,664 | \$ | 25,821 | \$ | 94,485 |
| Buffalo | Count of Members |  | 6 |  | 8 |  | 14 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 170,018 | \$ | 264,995 | \$ | 435,013 |
| Cass | Count of Members |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 18,292 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 18,292 |
| Cheyenne | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 15,248 | \$ | 15,248 |
| Cuming | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 |
| Custer | Count of Members |  | 4 |  | 2 |  | 6 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 179,374 | \$ | 18,096 | \$ | 197,470 |
| Dawson | Count of Members |  | 4 |  | 0 |  | 4 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 206,825 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 206,825 |
| Dodge | Count of Members |  | 5 |  | 4 |  | 9 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 301,903 | \$ | 298,061 | \$ | 599,964 |
| Gage | Count of Members |  | 4 |  | 4 |  | 8 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 255,600 | \$ | 73,177 | \$ | 328,777 |
| Gosper | Count of Members |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 3 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 29,939 | \$ | 48,061 | \$ | 78,000 |
| Hall | Count of Members |  | 3 |  | 5 |  | 8 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 111,811 | \$ | 115,217 | \$ | 227,028 |
| Harlan | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 2 |  | 2 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 10,316 | \$ | 10,316 |
| Hitchcock | Count of Members |  | 2 |  | 0 |  | 2 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 93,152 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 93,152 |
| Jefferson | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 30,358 | \$ | 30,358 |
| Kimball | Count of Members |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 0 | \$ | 24,693 | \$ | 24,693 |
| Lincoln | Count of Members |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 30,477 | \$ | 15,229 | \$ | 45,706 |
| Madison | Count of Members |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | 9 |
|  | Sum of Total Balance | \$ | 148,203 | \$ | 219,763 | \$ | 367,966 |

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



Member

## Contributions

Eligibility for Benefits

## Benefit Amount

Cash Balance

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 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 2020 is 2.87\%.

## Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA)

 COLA, compounded annually.
## Changes in Benefit Provisions Since the Prior Year

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

## APPENDIX B - SUMMARY OF ACTUARIAL METHODS AND ASSUMPTIONS

## Economic Assumptions

1. Investment Return
2. Consumer Price Inflation
3. Interest on accumulated contribution balances (contributions made before January $1,1984)$
4. Annuity Conversion Interest Rates
$7.50 \%$ per annum, compounded annually, net of expenses.
$2.75 \%$ per annum, compounded annually.
$7.50 \%$ per annum, compounded annually.
$7.75 \%$ for annuities from the Cash Balance Plan
2.87\% 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 | $4.5 \%$ |
| 56 | 4.5 |
| 57 | 4.5 |
| 58 | 4.5 |
| 59 | 4.5 |
| 60 | 4.5 |
| 61 | 5.0 |
| 62 | 10.0 |
| 63 | 10.0 |
| 64 | 10.0 |
| 65 | 20.0 |
| 66 | 20.0 |
| 67 | 15.0 |
| 68 | 15.0 |
| 69 | 15.0 |
| $70-79$ | 20.0 |
| 80 | 100.0 |

$75 \%$ of the account balances of retiring members are assumed to be paid as a lump sum distribution or installment payment, and $25 \%$ of the account balances of retiring members are assumed to be paid as 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

\author{

1. Funding Method
}

## 2. Asset Valuation Method

The present value of future benefits or Projected Benefit Cost, less the Market 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.

## Changes in Assumptions Since the Prior Year

The assumed interest rate used for Defined Contribution annuity calculations is equal to the lesser of (i) the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation initial interest rate for valuing annuities for terminating plans as of the beginning of the year during which payment begins plus $0.75 \%$ or (ii) the interest rate used in the actuarial valuation as recommended by the actuary and approved by the board. The rate has changed from $3.84 \%$ to $2.87 \%$.

