

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### NIRS: Pension Basics In Your State: Constituents with Pensions (Table 1 below, columns 1 & 2)



**Key Data:**

Provides data on the total number of constituents in your state—both retirees and active workers—covered by a state or local pension plan.



**How to Use:**

Can be used to show legislators that public pensions are an issue important to many of their constituents.

### NIRS: Pension Basics In Your State: Average Benefit Payments (Table 1 below, columns 3 & 4)



**Key Data:**

Provides information on the average pension benefit in your state.



**How to Use:**

Can be used to show that public pension benefits, in general, are quite modest.

### NIRS: Pension Basics In Your State: Economic Impacts (Table 1 below, columns 5, 6 & 7)



**Key Data:**

Provides information on the economic impacts from state and local pension expenditures in your state. Includes economic output generated, new jobs created, and new tax revenue received—all as a result of public pensions expenditures.



**How to Use:**

Can be used to show how important public pension benefits are to state and local economies—expenditures made from these plans provide a much needed economic stimulus in both the private sector, in terms of jobs and economic output, and to state and local governments, in terms of tax revenue.

## LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENT

### NCSL: State Retirement Reform Legislation



**Key Data:**

Powerpoint presentation shows the changes made to state retirement systems between 2009-2013.



**How to Use:**

Can be used to understand and show what actions your state has already taken to keep its pensions solvent.

### NCSL: Pensions and Retirement State Legislation Database



**Key Data:**

Searchable database of all pension legislation in 2013.



**How to Use:**

Can be used to understand and show the types of pension changes recently considered by your state.

## ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

### NCSL: State Budget Update, Fall 2013: Employee Actions



**Key Data:**

Report includes information on state revenue performance, areas of spending over budget, and includes a summary of state fiscal situations.



**How to Use:**

Can be used to show legislators a snapshot of the current economic environment—that state budgets appear to be stabilizing and settling into a period of modest growth.

### CBPP: States Continue to Feel Recession's Impact



**Key Data:**

Report shows that in fiscal year 2013 states faced a cumulative budget gap of \$55 billion, which they managed to close.



**How to Use:**

Can be used to show the severity of the problems that your state may still face due to the financial crisis on states—but that these problems are nationwide; every state faces these challenges.

## NIRS: Pensionomics 2012: Measuring the Economic Impact of DB Pension Expenditures



### Key Data:

Provides information, including state-by-state fact sheets, on the economic impact of DB pension benefits.



### How to Use:

Can be used to show that DB pension benefits have a sizable impact that ripples through every state and industry across the nation.

## CONTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS/UNFUNDED LIABILITY

### NASRA's Public Fund Survey: Historical ARC Payments (Table 2 below)



### Key Data:

Shows the percentage of annual required contributions (ARCs) paid by the 126 largest state and local retirement systems between 2003 and 2012.



### How to Use:

Can be used to educate yourself on how your state has historically kept up with its annual payment obligations. If your state hasn't met its ARC year after year, the funded status will be lower than if it had. The argument could be made that filling this gap should not be made on the backs of workers, who have always paid their fair share.

### NASRA: Public Fund Survey: Summary of Findings for FY 2012



### Key Data:

Report provides data on the funded ratios for the largest 126 state and local pension plans in the country, for fiscal year 2012.



### How to Use:

Can be used to educate yourself on the extent of the funding gap problems in your state.

### Wisconsin Legislative Council: 2012 Comparative Study of Major Public Employee Retirement Systems (Chart III, pp. 21-22)



### Key Data:

The above mentioned Chart III provides employee contributions, employer statutory contributions/normal cost, and vesting periods for state public pension plans.



### How to Use:

Can be used to understand and show how much employees have contributed to their pension fund over the years out of their own paychecks.

## Center for Retirement Research at Boston College: State and Local Pension Costs: Pre-Crisis, Post-Crisis, and Post-Reform



### Key Data:

Report analyzes pension costs before the financial crisis, after the financial crisis, and after reforms, for 32 plans in 15 states. The report finds that changes to contribution rates and benefit design already implemented should fully offset the effects of the financial downturn for most states.



### How to Use:

Can be used to understand and show that no further pension reforms or reductions are necessary.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF YOUR PENSION

### NIRS: A Better Bang for the Buck: The Economic Efficiencies of Defined Benefit Pension Plans



### Key Data:

Report analyzes the cost to fund the same retirement benefit in a defined benefit (DB) plan versus a defined contribution (DC) plan. Report finds that the DB plan is 46% cheaper than the DC plan.



### How to Use:

Can be used to understand and show that DB plans are an efficient and prudent use of taxpayer money.

### NIRS: The Retirement Savings Crisis: Is It Worse Than We Think?



### Key Data:

Report broadly examines how American households are faring in relation to retirement savings targets recommended by some financial services firms and finds retirement savings are dangerously low, with a U.S. retirement savings deficit between \$6.8 and \$14.0 trillion.



### How to Use:

Can be used to understand and show the current state of retirement insecurity in America.

June 8, 2013

### New York Times: For Retirees, a Million-Dollar Illusion

### Article Highlights:

“We’re facing a crisis right now, and it’s going to get worse,” said Alicia Munnell, director of the Center for Retirement Research at Boston College. “Most people haven’t saved nearly enough, not even people who have put away \$1 million.” Without another source of income, perhaps from traditional pensions from either or both spouses...a household like this won’t come close to replacing 80 percent of its pre-retirement income — often considered an acceptable target level.

# COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENTS (COLAs)

## Wisconsin Legislative Council: 2012 Comparative Study of Major Public Employee Retirement Systems (Chart V, pp. 33-34)



**Key Data:**

The above mentioned Chart V gives data on post-retirement increases (also called “COLAs”) by state. Report also gives data on state taxation of pension benefits and Social Security coverage by state.



**How to Use:**

Can be used to understand the myriad of COLA, Social Security and taxation of pension benefits around the country.

## NIRS Interactive COLA Spreadsheet (separate attachment)



**Key Data:**

Calculator assesses the purchasing power of your pension benefit.



**How to Use:**

Can be used to gauge whether your pension benefit has kept up with inflation over time.

**TABLE 1. PUBLIC PENSION BASICS AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS IN YOUR STATE, 2009**

State	Public Pension Basics				Economic Impacts		
	Active Workers with a Public Pension Benefit	Retirees with a Public Pension Benefit	Average Monthly Benefit	Average Annual Benefit	Total No. of New Jobs Added	Total Output Generated (in millions)	Total State/ Local Tax Revenue Generated (in millions)
Alabama	246,062	111,216	\$1,784	\$21,404	24,576	\$2,909.9	\$408.8
Alaska	41,433	35,831	\$2,727	\$32,720	9,752	\$1,358.7	\$233.5
Arizona	275,933	129,571	\$1,696	\$20,352	33,447	\$4,509.2	\$650.7
Arkansas	132,759	65,399	\$1,466	\$17,595	11,528	\$1,430.6	\$230.3
California	1,767,618	1,005,515	\$2,488	\$29,852	324,761	\$52,502.9	\$7,686.9
Colorado	223,636	106,391	\$2,539	\$30,462	31,951	\$4,521.2	\$663.4
Connecticut	133,148	94,127	\$2,682	\$32,187	29,005	\$4,595.0	\$728.0
Delaware	44,640	29,407	\$1,479	\$17,749	5,540	\$882.6	\$150.2
Florida	665,145	360,065	\$1,668	\$20,011	91,741	\$11,832.5	\$1,596.5
Georgia	392,668	157,013	\$2,212	\$26,547	51,504	\$7,101.3	\$913.1
Hawaii	66,589	38,688	\$1,827	\$21,924	6,706	\$877.9	\$153.3
Idaho	67,864	35,757	\$1,392	\$16,698	6,345	\$715.5	\$105.1
Illinois	633,233	402,312	\$2,279	\$27,348	127,065	\$18,910.5	\$2,643.5
Indiana	232,917	114,881	\$1,249	\$14,990	23,409	\$3,237.2	\$408.8
Iowa	172,709	95,342	\$1,175	\$14,106	16,667	\$2,162.8	\$274.5
Kansas	159,924	75,092	\$1,304	\$15,652	12,862	\$1,710.8	\$220.0
Kentucky	223,088	133,604	\$1,772	\$21,260	29,270	\$3,522.9	\$510.4
Louisiana	223,996	145,671	\$1,722	\$20,664	29,869	\$3,872.3	\$481.7
Maine	50,477	36,802	\$1,478	\$17,737	7,354	\$866.3	\$159.9
Maryland	241,199	152,357	\$1,740	\$20,876	32,004	\$4,395.8	\$723.1
Massachusetts	315,822	187,931	\$2,139	\$25,667	49,869	\$7,796.0	\$1,153.3
Michigan	390,892	301,626	\$1,618	\$19,413	71,894	\$9,222.6	\$1,267.4
Minnesota	293,183	165,994	\$1,719	\$20,633	41,337	\$5,739.4	\$806.0
Mississippi	167,901	80,719	\$1,607	\$19,287	14,442	\$1,687.5	\$225.6
Missouri	265,049	149,001	\$1,851	\$22,209	38,518	\$4,921.5	\$640.1
Montana	53,350	34,670	\$1,220	\$14,642	5,332	\$600.3	\$94.0
Nebraska	76,508	26,387	\$1,741	\$20,891	7,126	\$992.3	\$136.0
Nevada	105,462	55,000	\$2,228	\$26,736	15,011	\$1,963.6	\$307.7
New Hampshire	52,576	27,280	\$1,551	\$18,616	6,129	\$808.6	\$158.5
New Jersey	525,042	248,462	\$2,289	\$27,467	67,470	\$10,873.0	\$1,611.7
New Mexico	122,026	62,109	\$1,765	\$21,184	12,366	\$1,458.6	\$203.8
New York	1,201,409	768,392	\$2,220	\$26,645	200,106	\$33,180.9	\$5,064.5
North Carolina	494,218	212,910	\$1,537	\$18,443	45,480	\$5,712.6	\$814.4

**TABLE 1. PUBLIC PENSION BASICS AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS IN YOUR STATE, 2009 (CONTINUED)**

North Dakota	31,358	15,678	\$1,184	\$14,213	2,581	\$323.5	\$56.0
Ohio	700,709	398,061	\$2,129	\$25,544	110,513	\$13,885.6	\$2,030.4
Oklahoma	160,417	95,634	\$1,500	\$17,998	18,344	\$2,445.2	\$313.1
Oregon	172,481	113,485	\$2,165	\$25,981	33,472	\$4,185.3	\$668.4
Pennsylvania	519,496	384,834	\$1,869	\$22,424	99,383	\$13,720	\$1,808.3
Rhode Island	39,474	30,440	\$2,401	\$28,817	8,489	\$1,101.7	\$202.9
South Carolina	219,733	119,012	\$1,441	\$17,293	23,908	\$2,689.2	\$376.1
South Dakota	39,849	25,203	\$1,404	\$16,853	3,933	\$484.1	\$62.0
Tennessee	246,145	131,395	\$965	\$11,578	21,751	\$2,989.7	\$357.1
Texas	1,430,210	478,767	\$1,776	\$21,318	128,204	\$20,175.8	\$2,482.1
Utah	108,016	45,528	\$1,717	\$20,605	12,919	\$1,583.8	\$215.5
Vermont	26,283	13,935	\$1,233	\$14,794	2,459	\$299.8	\$61.2
Virginia	408,196	178,278	\$1,621	\$19,454	36,337	\$5,080.7	\$731.8
Washington	252,364	136,526	\$1,717	\$20,606	30,605	\$4,468.2	\$590.4
West Virginia	74,346	53,591	\$1,263	\$15,152	8,143	\$1,007.9	\$131.4
Wisconsin	282,139	164,469	\$2,131	\$25,577	50,317	\$6,249.7	\$856.7
Wyoming	40,534	22,175	\$1,227	\$14,726	2,600	\$377.5	\$48.9

Source: Boivie, I. Pensionomics 2012: Measuring the Economic Impact of DB Pension Expenditures. Washington, DC: National Institute on Retirement Security

**TABLE 2. PERCENTAGE OF ARC MADE BY LARGE PLANS, 2001-2012**

State	Plan Name	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
AK	Alaska PERS	110.3%	100%	52.7%	61%	77.3%	111%	116%	114.4%	86%	92.7%
AK	Alaska Teachers	133%	83%	45%	45%	54.1%	62.2%	106%	139.3%	78.6%	84.6%
AL	Alabama ERS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
AL	Alabama Teachers	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
AR	Arkansas PERS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
AR	Arkansas Teachers	102.6%	102.4%	117%	113.5%	108.5%	101.8%	104.4%	104.4%	95.9%	89.9%
AZ	Arizona Public Safety Personnel	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	104%	103.1%	104.3%	104.9%	104.6%
AZ	Arizona SRS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
AZ	Phoenix ERS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
CA	California PERF	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
CA	California Teachers	91%	69%	70%	64%	64%	66%	66%	55%	47%	46%
CA	Contra Costa County	98.6%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
CA	LA County ERS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
CA	San Diego County	100%	100%	110.6%	119.8%	111.6%	100%	100%	100.6%	114.4%	100%
CA	San Francisco City & County	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
CO	Colorado Affiliated Local	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
CO	Colorado Fire & Police Statewide	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
CO	Colorado Municipal	69%	62%	62%	85%	84%	98%	96%	101%	101%	163%
CO	Colorado School				62%	60%	68%	65%	70%	70%	84%
CO	Colorado State				58%	56%	63%	61%	62%	62%	83%
CO	Denver Employees	100%	86.6%	99.7%	92.2%	100%	100%	82.7%	86.2%	87.9%	88.8%
CO	Denver Public Schools	36.7%	61%	67.2%	73.3%	82.9%	830.7%		8.0%	8.0%	27.0%
CT	Connecticut SERS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.3%	86.3%	75.6%	82.6%	100%
CT	Connecticut Teachers		68.5%		91.2%	93.3%	464.2%	101.3%	101%	100.9%	100%
DC	DC Police & Fire	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
DC	DC Teachers	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
DE	Delaware State Employees	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
FL	Florida RS	98%	92%	102%	96%	111%	107%	111%	111%	83%	60%
GA	Georgia ERS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.2%
GA	Georgia Teachers	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HI	Hawaii ERS	100%	100%	100%	100%	95.3%	95.7%	109.9%	102.1%	102.1%	102.1%
IA	Iowa PERS	99.2%	90.9%	85.6%	82.7%	83.3%	87.2%	86.9%	90%	82.4%	98.2%
ID	Idaho PERS	110%	97%	100%	105%	110%	109%	123%	109%	85%	84%
IL	Chicago Teachers	75%	82.8%	59.7%	35.9%	33.4%	56.7%	67.8%	81.7%	33.3%	46.5%
IL	Illinois Municipal	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	95%	98%
IL	Illinois SERS	100%	100%	58.8%	31.3%	43.6%	59.6%	77.2%	93.1%	87.5%	86.2%
IL	Illinois Teachers	74.1%	64.3%	64.3%	35.8%	39.8%	60%	75.9%	90.6%	84.7%	74.6%
IL	Illinois Universities	63%	214.1%	47%	27.2%	54.1%	62.7%	63.2%	63.2%	61.4%	73.1%
IN	Indiana PERF	98%	124%	102%	92%	93.5%	104.6%	91.9%	91.9%	70.8%	78.1%
IN	Indiana Teachers	105.3%	68.6%	78.3%	104.3%	101%	101%	101%	93%	93%	90.9%
KS	Kansas PERS	78.9%	74%	72.4%	63.4%	63.9%	65.1%	68%	72.1%	85%	87%



**TABLE 2. PERCENTAGE OF ARC MADE BY LARGE PLANS, 2001-2012 (CONTINUED)**

State	Plan Name	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
KY	Kentucky County	100.6%	102.1%	102.2%	101.2%	101.7%	65.5%	111.8%	110.2%	112%	105.7%
KY	Kentucky ERS	111.2%	77.4%	54.9%	63.1%	49.8%	22.3%	41.3%	44.1%	52.9%	51.1%
KY	Kentucky Teachers	100%	100%	93%	87%	88%	88%	74%	76%	153%	74%
LA	Louisiana SERS	94.1%	95.4%	100.9%	93.1%	97%	115.4%	98.8%	83.8%	82.2%	89.3%
LA	Louisiana Teachers	98%	93%	105.6%	103.1%	106.5%	116.2%	106.4%	83.5%	90.2%	100%
MA	Massachusetts SERS	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%
MA	Massachusetts Teachers	0%					0%	100%	100%	100%	100%
MD	Maryland PERS	92%	89%	83%	82%	81%	89%	84%	84%	69%	69%
MD	Maryland Teachers	92%	89%	83%	82%	81%	89%	84%	84%	75%	75%
ME	Maine Local	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	106.1%	104.8%	103.4%	101.7%	100.1%
ME	Maine State and Teacher	109.4%	112.1%	104.8%	105.7%	105.7%	106.1%	104.8%	103.4%	101.7%	100.1%
MI	Michigan Municipal	125%	109%	122%	107%	92%	110%	110%	105%	111%	108%
MI	Michigan Public Schools	85.6%	71.3%	75.7%	85.7%	90.8%	110.5%	101.1%	84.7%	81.5%	83.4%
MI	Michigan SERS	43%	39.6%	83.2%	73.8%	47.7%	115.5%	97.8%	88.4%	94.8%	71.1%
MN	Duluth Teachers	0%	93.2%	100%	72%	62.1%	65.7%	63.8%	61.2%	61.2%	68.7%
MN	Minnesota PERF	74%	83.5%	76.6%	78.1%	84.4%	81%	86.2%	77.3%	111.1%	99.1%
MN	Minnesota State Employees	96%	76.2%	81.9%	64.9%	70.7%	58.3%	59.6%	49.4%	81.8%	80.7%
MN	Minnesota Teachers	220%	159.5%	153%	134.2%	91.1%	82.6%	67.7%	57.4%	63.5%	66.4%
MN	St. Paul Teachers	97.6%	77%	69.3%	65.2%	54.9%	58.4%	85.6%	72.9%	62%	62.1%
MO	Missouri DOT and Highway Patrol	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
MO	Missouri Local	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
MO	Missouri PEERS	92.6%	80.2%	71.8%	77.5%	77%	86%	88.8%	95.5%	100%	100%
MO	Missouri State Employees	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
MO	Missouri Teachers	94.5%	75.7%	65.5%	70.6%	73.2%	79.4%	84.1%	80.6%	86.9%	92.5%
MO	St. Louis School Employees	101.2%	132%	125.4%	114.9%	129.7%	132.5%	100%	134.4%	0%	118.4%
MS	Mississippi PERS	100%	100%	100%	100%	90%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%
MT	Montana PERS	100%	100%	82.1%	91.5%	100%	110.4%	100%	100%	100%	100%
MT	Montana Teachers	100	100	100	225	130	100	100	98.3	98.3	81.9
NC	North Carolina Local Government	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NC	North Carolina Teachers and State Employees				101.7	101.7	101.7	101.7	101.7	101.7	101.7
ND	North Dakota PERS	93	74	65	69	61	70	69	56	39	42
ND	North Dakota Teachers	100	81.2	68.3	63.9	63.1	76.4	89.3	76.5	68.4	66.5
NE	Nebraska Schools	100	100	100	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	89	100%
NH	New Hampshire Retirement System	100	100	100	100	100	75	75	100	100	100
NJ	New Jersey PERS	0	0	0	60	60	56	48.8	45	46.3	52
NJ	New Jersey Police & Fire	0	17.4	17.4	45	68	81.3	93	65.9	67.3	67
NJ	New Jersey Teachers	0	0	0	8	49.1	44.8	6	1.9	1.4	14
NM	New Mexico PERF	100	100	100	100	100	100	102.8	88.9	85.7	85.7
NM	New Mexico Teachers	100	92.8	81.3	75.5	70.3	79	86.2	87.7	81.6	63.4
NV	Nevada Police Officer and Firefighter	0	86	86	91	91	85	85	91	88	96

**TABLE 2. PERCENTAGE OF ARC MADE BY LARGE PLANS, 2001-2012 (CONTINUED)**

State	Plan Name	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
NV	Nevada Regular Employees	89%	100%	100%	97%	97%	96%	93%	93%	89%	96%
NY	New York City ERS	54.6%	57.3%	80.6%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
NY	New York City Teachers	79.4%	90.6%	94.2%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
NY	New York State Teachers	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
NY	NY State & Local ERS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
NY	NY State & Local Police & Fire	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
OH	Ohio PERS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
OH	Ohio Police & Fire	0%	79%	88%	79%	73%	77%	75%	55%	62%	57%
OH	Ohio School Employees	100%	100%	100%	87%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
OH	Ohio Teachers	100%	95%	96%	96%	83%	100%	89%	52%	51%	41%
OK	Oklahoma PERS	59.1%	51.9%	52.5%	55.3%	58.4%	60.5%	75.2%	66.8%	62.9%	109.4%
OK	Oklahoma Teachers	61.9%	70.2%	56.2%	85.8%	93.1%	101.1%	86.6%	83.6%	77.6%	115.9%
OR	Oregon PERS	97.4%	97.4%	99.7%	100.8%	63.4%	74%	100%	100%	100%	83%
PA	Pennsylvania School Employees	100%	100%	100%	34%	39%	41%	29%	27%	27%	38%
PA	Pennsylvania State ERS	123.4%	100%	46.1%	35.6%	39.3%	39.9%	39.1%	31.4%	42.8%	53.9%
RI	Rhode Island ERS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
RI	Rhode Island Municipal	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
SC	South Carolina Police	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
SC	South Carolina RS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
SD	South Dakota PERS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
TN	Tennessee Political Subdivisions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
TN	Tennessee State and Teachers	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
TX	Houston Firefighters	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
TX	City of Austin ERS	81%	82.3%	65.2%	61.8%	65%	70.2%	57.7%	72%	79.3%	104.4%
TX	Texas County & District	101%	101%	101%	105%	102%	102%	104%	102%	109%	106%
TX	Texas ERS	96.7%	89.3%	85.8%	87.2%	88.9%	90.3%	68.4%	63.4%	58.5%	50%
TX	Texas LECOS	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	62.2%	82.3%	66.5%	66.5%
TX	Texas Municipal	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84.8%	88%	92.1%	101.5%
TX	Texas Teachers	84%	81%	82%	83%	85%	102%	108%	86%	86%	74%
UT	Utah Noncontributory	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
VA	Fairfax County Schools	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
VA	Virginia Retirement Systems	100%	100%	85.3%	89.5%	100%	92.6%	81.3%	66.6%	46.7%	59.6%
VT	Vermont State Employees	0%	0%	0%	96.5%	96.5%	96.5%	96.5%			
VT	Vermont Teachers	0%	58.7%	58.7%	43.2%	43.2%	43.2%	43.2%			
WA	Washington LEOFF Plan 1*	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
WA	Washington LEOFF Plan 2	0%	74%	67%	79%	101%	117%	122%	114%	157%	137%
WA	Washington PERS 1	25%	8%	7%	7%	30%	49%	52%	25%	33%	51%
WA	Washington PERS 2/3	0%	36%	33%	33%	73%	88%	119%	85%	80%	94%
WA	Washington School Employees Plan 2/3	0%	17%	16%	37%	64%	69%	89%	75%	70%	88%
WA	Washington Teachers Plan 1	13%	6%	4%	5%	24%	38%	46%	28%	47%	44%
WA	Washington Teachers Plan 2/3	0%	31%	29%	29%	61%	52%	86%	75%	72%	92%

**TABLE 2. PERCENTAGE OF ARC MADE BY LARGE PLANS, 2001-2012 (CONTINUED)**

State	Plan Name	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
WI	Wisconsin Retirement Systems	100%	100%	100%	104%	105%	105%	108%	108%	108%	108%
WV	West Virginia PERS	104.5%	104.5%	104.5%	100%	100%	102.1%	100%	100%	83.3%	83.3%
WV	West Virginia Teachers	105.4%	105.4%	105.4%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
WY	Wyoming Public Employees	67%	67%	108%	111%	100%	100%	61%	76%	93%	88%

Source: Brainard, K. 2013. Public Fund Survey. Washington, DC: National Association of State Retirement Administrators.

Blank cells indicate information not available.

Some extremely large ARC payments, such as Illinois University in 2004 and Denver Public Schools in 2008, indicate the issuance of a pension obligation bond.

\*Washington LEOFF Plan 1 overfunded, so the ARC itself has been 0 for over a decade.