## Virginia Retirement System 2011 Fiscal Impact Statement

1.	Bill Number:	HB21	.02			
	House of Origin	X	Introduced	Substitute	Engrossed	
	<b>Second House</b>		In Committee	Substitute	Enrolled	
2.	Patron: Bu	ulova				
3.	Committee: A	ppropr	riations			
4.			•	em; benefits for loes in certain locali	ocal law enforcement, c ities.	orrectional,
5.	retirement bene employees beca statutory amoun retirement allow	efits to ause th nt, to p wance d on o	local law enfo ne locality's and provide all of the (i) to all employ r after July 1, 2	rcement, correction until retirement allo ne other statutory by yees eligible for such the color. The additional colors is the color of	providing all of the special and, and emergency responsible for such employed enefits except the statute such benefits or (ii) only the all costs of providing the	onse es exceeds the ory annual to eligible

- 6. Budget Amendment Necessary:
- **7. Fiscal Impact Estimates:** Below we present a summary comparing the current benefits and the proposed enhancements for these members.

	CURRENT PLAN 1 PROVISIONS	CURRENT PLAN 2 PROVISIONS	PROPOSED BY HB2102  Age 60 with at least 5 years of service			
Normal retirement eligibility	Age <u>65</u> with at least 5 years of service	Social Security "normal retirement" age with at least 5 years of service				
Early retirement eligibility	Age 50 with at least 10 years of service, or age 55 with at least 5 years of service	Age 60 with at least 5 years of service.	Age 50 with at least 5 years of service			
Unreduced early retirement benefits eligibility	Age 50 with at least 30 years of service	Sum of age and years of creditable service equal 90	Age 50 with at least 25 years of service			
Early retirement reduction			Benefit reduced for each year retirement age is before age <u>60</u> or for each year service at retirement is less than <u>25</u> , whichever provides greater benefit			
Annual supplement from date of retirement to Social Security normal retirement age	No (Provided by locality)	No (Provided by locality)	No (Provided by locality)			

**7a. Expenditure Impact:** In the tables below we present the estimated cost increase of the benefits provided by this bill under two scenarios: (1) if a 1.70% multiplier is elected; and (2) if a 1.85% multiplier is elected. The increases shown are based upon the City of Fairfax's payroll. The City's current contribution rate to VRS (including the 5% member contribution) if no benefit changes are made is 18.64% of the total City covered payroll. The increase in the contribution rate would be 3.29% of payroll for a 1.70% multiplier and 4.40% of payroll if the 1.85% multiplier were elected.

	FY12 Cost		FY13 Cost		FY14 Cost		FY15 Cost		FY16 Cost		FY17 Cost	
				3.00%		3.00%		3.00%		3.00%		3.00%
State - General Fund	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
SPORS - General Fund		-		-		-		-		-		-
VALORS - General Fund		-		-		-		-		-		-
JRS - General Fund		-		-		-		-		-		-
Teacher - General Fund		-		-		-		-	_	-		-
TOTAL General Fund	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
State - Non-General Funds	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
SPORS - Non-General Funds		-		-		-		-		-		-
VALORS - Non-General Funds		-		-		-		-		-		-
TOTAL - Non-General Funds	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Teacher - Local Funds	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Political Subs - Schools		-		-		-		-		-		-
Political Subs - Fairfax City												
(1.70% multiplier)		868,000		894,000		921,000		949,000		977,000		1,006,000
TOTAL Local Funds	\$	868,000	\$	894,000	\$	921,000	\$	949,000	\$	977,000	\$	1,006,000
Grand Totals	\$	868,000	\$	894,000	\$	921,000	\$	949,000	\$	977,000	\$	1,006,000
	F	Y12 Cost		FY13 Cost		FY14 Cost		FY15 Cost		FY16 Cost		FY17 Cost
				3.00%		3.00%		3.00%		3.00%		3.00%
State - General Fund	\$		\$	_	\$	-	\$		\$	_	\$	_
SPORS - General Fund		-	_	-		-		-	Ė	-	Ė	-
VALORS - General Fund		-		_		-		-		-		-
JRS - General Fund		_		_		_		-		-		_
Teacher - General Fund		-		_		-		-		-		-
TOTAL General Fund	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
State - Non-General Funds	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
SPORS - Non-General Funds		-		-		-		-		-		-
VALORS - Non-General Funds		-		-		-		-		-		-
TOTAL - Non-General Funds	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Teacher - Local Funds	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Political Subs - Schools		-		-		-		-		-		-
Political Subs - Fairfax City												
(1.85% multiplier)		1.161.000		1,196,000		1.232.000		1.269.000		1.307.000		1,346,000
		1, 10 1,000										
TOTAL Local Funds	\$	1,161,000	\$	1,196,000	\$	1,232,000	\$	1,269,000	\$	1,307,000	\$	1,346,000

- **8. Fiscal Implications:** See expenditure impact above.
- **9. Specific Agency or Political Subdivisions Affected:** VRS, State Compensation Board, and the City of Fairfax
- 10. Technical Amendment Necessary: No
  - **11. Other Comments:** HB 2102 would allow the City of Fairfax to elect to enroll all its hazardous duty employees, or just those hired on or after July 1, 2010, in a version of hazardous duty benefits (LEOS) that provides for unreduced retirement at 50/25 but without the hazardous duty supplement normally provided to hazardous duty (LEOS) retirees. The City could then allow these employees to retire from VRS potentially five years earlier at

50/25 and still furnish its locally provided supplement. (The City of Fairfax already provides a supplement to these employees which exceeds that which is provided through VRS.)

The bill would also allow the City to elect a retirement multiplier for the affected employees at the rate of either 1.70% or 1.85% as is available under LEOS to all other localities.

VRS believes that only the City of Fairfax would be eligible for the provisions of this bill. The bill is optional, leaving the new benefit structure to be triggered only when the City notifies VRS of intent to enroll its hazardous duty employees in the new benefit structure.

The VRS has determined that the added costs of HB 2102 would be borne by the City of Fairfax. The Compensation Board would incur no increase in cost as a result of this legislation. The City of Fairfax already receives reimbursements from the Compensation Board at the maximum rate allowed. Consequently, while increased retirement costs for deputies would normally impose new costs on the Compensation Board, they won't in this case.

SB 848 is identical to this bill.

Date: 01.27.2011

Document: HB2102.doc