

#### Via Electronic Mail

March 20, 2025

Representative Chuck Kopp House District 10 Alaska House Majority Leader

Re: Estimates of the Impact of HB 78

Dear Representative Kopp:

At your request, Cheiron has prepared estimates of the projected costs of HB 78. The purpose of this letter is to present the results of our analysis and to provide a summary of the information we relied upon and the methods and assumptions employed in our analysis.

In preparing our estimates, we relied on information (some oral and some written) supplied by the Alaska House of Representatives and Gallagher/Buck. Information provided by the Alaska House of Representatives included the benefit provisions contained in House Bill 78, namely:

- 1. HB 78 Summary Table
- 2. HB 78 Version A
- 3. HB 78 Sectional Analysis

Information provided by Gallagher/Buck included detailed worksheets for four scenarios, used for their analysis of SB 88 in 2024, as follows:

- 1. Scenario 1A 100% of current DC members and future hires join the DB plan, using the DB retirement/turnover assumptions
- 2. Scenario 1B 0% of current DC members and 100% of future hires join the DB plan, using the DB retirement/turnover assumptions
- 3. Scenario 2A 100% of current DC members and future hires join the DB plan, using the DC retirement/turnover assumptions
- 4. Scenario 2B 0% of current DC members and 100% of future hires join the DB plan, using the DC retirement/turnover assumptions

The data underlying the Gallagher/Buck scenarios was the June 30, 2023 census data, which was used for their June 30, 2023 actuarial valuations.

The provisions of HB 78 generally mirror SB 88 from the 2024 Session, with the following notable changes that impact our cost estimates:

1. Safety members will receive HRA contributions of 4% instead of 3%.

2. We removed the 50% reduction for the PRPA COLA for members who move outside of the State of Alaska.

Our methodology initially involved reviewing and verifying the Gallagher/Buck results for the four scenarios. We then made adjustments to the Gallagher/Buck scenarios in order to estimate the impact of the HB 78 benefit design changes noted above.

The results of our analysis of the four scenarios are summarized in the table below, which presents the present value as of July 1, 2025 of total State cost increase/(decrease) over the current plan for fiscal years 2026 through 2039.

Present Value of Cost										
		% Transfer	ansfer Increase/(Decrease							
<b>Scenario</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>	to DB		FY 2026-2039						
1A	DB	100%	\$	583.7						
1B	DB	0%	\$	467.3						
2A	DCR	100%	\$	(124.7)						
2B	DCR	0%	\$	85.5						

We have attached a table which breaks down the cost impact in greater detail.

### **Actuarial Assumptions**

- 1. The assumptions used in this analysis are the same as those underlying the Gallagher/Buck Scenarios, which are outlined in their SB 88 Fiscal Note Analysis letter dated April 15, 2024. These are generally reasonable and are the same assumptions used in the Gallagher/Buck June 30, 2023 State of Alaska Actuarial Valuations, except for modifications made to the turnover and retirement assumptions. With respect to those modifications, we are unable to verify their reasonableness, which is why we present four scenarios with varying turnover and transfer rates.
- 2. Assumptions required for our estimates of the impact of the HB 78 benefit design changes are the same assumptions used in the preceding paragraph.

## **Economic Impact**

Our analysis was limited to the potential actuarial impact of HB 78 on the State's retirement plan costs. It is important to recognize that HB 78 will also have a significant economic impact on the State. For example, if one believes that the passage of HB 78 will not impact membership turnover,



Rep. Chuck Kopp March 20, 2025 Page 3

then it is most likely that the pension cost impact will be a savings to the State close to those shown in Scenario 2A. If one believes that HB 78 will impact membership behavior, then the likely pension cost of the Bill would be closer to (but less than) the cost impact shown in Scenario 1A. If that were to occur, then by definition, there will be significantly more plan members that remain longer in State employment, which as we understand, is one of the goals of HB 78. (Attached are some slides prepared by the National Institute on Retirement Security (NIRS) which indicate that Alaska's turnover experience has been much higher than other states,)

In order to quantify the economic impact, a qualified economist should be retained to:

- examine the trends in Alaska's turnover since the DB plan was closed, comparing it to states maintaining DB plans,
- explore the economic costs of recruitment and training due to increased turnover,
- estimate the potential savings from retaining experienced employees,
- review academic literature on how DB plans affect employee satisfaction and productivity,
- examine case studies from other states that have either reinstated or maintained DB plans, and
- model the long-term fiscal and economic impacts of reinstating a DB plan in Alaska.

#### **Disclosures**

The estimates in this report are dependent upon future experience conforming to these assumptions. To the extent that future experience deviates from the actuarial assumptions, the true cost of HB 78 could vary from our results.

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 a credentialed actuary, I 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. I am not an attorney, and our firm does not provide any legal services or advice.

This report was prepared exclusively for the Alaska House of Representatives 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 such other users.

The results provided herein for the four Scenarios are estimates of the impact of HB 78. We understand that these estimated results will be replaced by the Gallagher/Buck HB 78 Fiscal Note analysis, which is expected to become available in late April. It is our understanding that the Gallagher/Buck Fiscal Note costs will be based on updated census data as of the June 30, 2024 census and could potentially include different assumptions than were used for their SB 88 analysis in 2024.



Rep. Chuck Kopp March 20, 2025 Page 4



Rep. Chuck Kopp March 20, 2025 Page 5

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding our analysis.

Sincerely, Cheiron

Gene M. Kalwarski, FSA, EA Principal Consulting Actuary

Attachment

cc: Brodie Anderson

Julia O'Connor

Michael Moehle, Cheiron



# **ATTACHMENT**

			Summary	of Results	Based or	ı Ju	me 30, 2023	<b>Valuation</b>		
			Projected C		ns from	FY	2026-2039	(\$ Millions)		
	Current	HB 78	Inc/(Dec)	Current	HB 78	Ir	ıc/(Dec)	Current	HB 78	Inc/(Dec
			Scenario	1A - DB A	Ssumpti	ons	and 100%	Transfer		
Additional	State Contribu	tions (PERS	S and TRS)						-	
		PERS*			TRS				State Costs FY 20	
Total	1,779.6	2,184.4	\$ 404.7	2,699.7	2,716.9	\$	17.2	10,575.6	11,654.7	\$1,079.
State-as-an	-Employer Co		(PERS/PERS D	CR)						
		DB			DCR				Value as of July	
Total	4,487.9	6,154.7	\$ 1,666.8	1,608.3	598.8	\$	(1,009.5)	6,324.0	6,907.6	\$ 583.
			Scenari	o 1B - DB	Assump	tion	s and 0% T	<b>Transfer</b>		
Additional S	State Contribu	tions (PERS								
		PERS*			TRS			Sum of S	State Costs FY 20	26-2039
Total	1,779.6	2,196.3	\$ 416.7	2,699.7	2,772.2	\$	72.5	10,575.6	11,507.9	\$ 932.
State-as-an	-Employer Co	ntributions	(PERS/PERS D	CR)						
		DB			DCR			Present	Value as of July	1, 2025
Total	4,487.9	5,591.4	\$ 1,103.5	1,608.3	947.9	\$	(660.4)	6,324.0	6,791.2	\$ 467.
			Scanario	24 - DCR	Assumn	tion	s and 100%	Transfor		
Additional S	State Contribu	rtions (PERS		ZA - DCK	<u> </u>	, ()	s and 100 /	o iransici		
		PERS*	s unu 11us)		TRS			Sum of S	State Costs FY 20	26-2039
	1,779.6	1 0 4 2 0		2 (00 =						
Total		1,843.0	\$ 63.4	2,699.7	2,466.5	\$	(233.2)	10,575.6	10,502.4	\$ (73.
	,	-,		,	2,466.5	\$	(233.2)	10,575.6	10,502.4	\$ (73.
	,	-,	\$ 63.4 (PERS/PERS D	,	2,466.5 DCR	_	(233.2)	.,.	10,502.4  Value as of July	· ·
	,	ntributions		,	,	_		.,.	,	· ·
State-as-an	-Employer Co	ontributions DB	(PERS/PERS D \$ 1,146.6	CR) 1,608.3	DCR 558.4	\$	(1,049.9)	Present 6,324.0	Value as of July	1, 2025
State-as-an	4,487.9	DB 5,634.5	\$ 1,146.6	CR) 1,608.3	DCR 558.4	\$		Present 6,324.0	Value as of July	1, 2025
State-as-an	-Employer Co	DB 5,634.5	\$ 1,146.6	CR) 1,608.3	DCR 558.4 R Assump	\$ ptio	(1,049.9)	Present 6,324.0 Transfer	Value as of July 6,199.2	1, 2025 \$ (124.
Total  Additional S	4,487.9	ontributions of DB 5,634.5  utions (PERS	\$ 1,146.6  Scenario S and TRS)	1,608.3 2B - DCR	DCR 558.4 R Assump	\$ ptio	(1,049.9) ns and 0%	Present 6,324.0 Transfer Sum of S	Value as of July 6,199.2	1, 2025 \$ (124. 26-2039
Total  Additional S	4,487.9 State Contribu	ontributions  DB  5,634.5  Itions (PERS*  PERS*  1,960.2	(PERS/PERS D \$ 1,146.6 Scenario S and TRS) \$ 180.6	1,608.3 2B - DCR 2,699.7	DCR 558.4 R Assump	\$ ptio	(1,049.9)	Present 6,324.0 Transfer	Value as of July 6,199.2	1, 2025 \$ (124.
Total  Additional S	4,487.9 State Contribu	ontributions  DB  5,634.5  Itions (PERS*  PERS*  1,960.2	\$ 1,146.6  Scenario S and TRS)	1,608.3 2B - DCR 2,699.7	DCR 558.4 R Assump	\$ ptio	(1,049.9) ns and 0%	Present 6,324.0  Transfer  Sum of S 10,575.6	Value as of July 6,199.2	1, 2025 \$ (124. 26-2039 \$ 252.

