

(Test) SCPP Merger Study

**Q5 If the Legislature proposed a plan merger, what GENERAL COMMENTS would you have?**

Answered: 955 Skipped: 466

#	Responses	Date
1	see above.	8/30/2016 6:37 PM
2	1) It would appear that the LEOFF 1 Pension pool would be put at risk by propping up the TRS 1. Obviously the state has a problem. 2) I'm vested in the system as it was designed and in place when I retired. I see "no" benefit for LEOFF 1 members. 3) LEOFF 1 has been doing just fine and does not need to be exposed where our benefits may be put at risk in the future. 4) Why not just fix what is wrong with TRS and leave our pension system alone. 5) Govt. is just looking for a pool of available resources (someone else's pension system) to fix a problem they have known about for years. Find another way.	8/30/2016 2:21 PM
3	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention	8/29/2016 4:05 PM
4	I accepted my job and planned my retirement around what would be my retirement plan. Now we need to brace up other plans? Why, LEOFF 1 seems to be functioning.	8/29/2016 2:57 PM
5	LEOFF 1 has persevered for so long for good reason. It was designed for specific personnel with great reasons. It need not change.	8/26/2016 1:05 PM
6	What are you thinking??? Who is responsible for the TRS1 system failure? Give us the names so that we can vote these people out of office!	8/19/2016 11:52 AM
7	LEOFF 1 monies cannot be raided for another's shortfall.	8/17/2016 9:28 PM
8	This is bad legislation for the stakeholders. 1. The merger would deprive those in LEOFF1 of fair representation. The 7,870 LEOFF1 members would put in \$5.5 billion while the 35,825 TRS1 members would contribute \$6.4 billion. LEOFF1 would put in 46% of the funds and get only 18% representation. LEOFF1 and TRS1 are disparate groups with generally different concerns, views and experiences. 2. While LEOFF1 is fully funded at present and TRS1 is underfunded, by joining the two would create a larger underfunded pension fund with disproportionate representation for the former LEOFF1 members. 3. In the past an attempt was made to appropriate from the surplus of LEOFF1. This attempt failed but had it been successful given the decline in the markets of 2007+ I believe LEOFF1 would have been underfunded. The mention of a \$5,000, one time payout to LEOFF1 members as remedy to our concerns pales in value when weighed against security, fairness and independence.	8/15/2016 5:22 PM
9	The LEOFF1 members/retirees/beneficiaries have a right to the money in the fund, not other public employees/retirees and their beneficiaries. The Legislature should stop trying to raid the LEOFF1 pension fund. Retired law officers and firefighters should not have to spend their retirement years continually defending the right to keep their pension system intact. For people who spent their careers serving the community and risking their lives, it's disrespectful to say the least. Are you hoping that eventually we will all be too old (or dead) to know or care about the latest effort to dismantle our system? TRS1 should be properly funded, but not by LEOFF1. Money in the LEOFF1 system that is currently above what's needed to provide benefits should be kept as a cushion against future losses, or used to increase benefits and/or help the cities and counties pay for large medical expenses (i.e., long-term care) that may not be covered by insurance. If you start messing with a solvent retirement system, who's to say in 10 years it won't be like the other systems in trouble. Don't mess with something that isn't broken.	8/9/2016 10:50 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

10	DON'T DO IT!!! The TRS 1 plan is un-solvent! Don't kick the can down the road by making a money grab at the LEOFF 1 system and bankrupting it also. All this will do is essentially create two bankrupt retirement systems in the future where someone else will have to figure out how to fix it! The combination of like systems such as TRS 1 and TRS 2 or LEOFF 1 with LEOFF 2, makes sense because they share the same funding source, participants & employers. Combining totally different systems like the proposed TRS 1(in-solvent) and LEOFF 1(solvent) does NOT make sense because they share nothing in-common; different funding sources, different participants and different employers.	8/8/2016 10:52 AM
11	It is the obligation of the State to fund TRS1, not the police and firefighter's pension to do it. Our pension funds are protected by Fed and State laws. This raid attempt stems from a lack of doing your job. Buck up and do your job and leave our pension alone.	8/5/2016 5:57 PM
12	I am opposed to making pension changes to balance the biennial state operating budget. Pensions are a long term investment that require consistent inputs along the way. Using pensions to balance state budgets introduces instability into the pension system.	8/5/2016 10:21 AM
13	Please leave our pension alone. We are the ones who paid into the pension plan along with our employers, not teachers. In the event of my death my wife will be relying on my pension. What you are attempting is what the federal government did in the past taking money from social security to help balance the budget. It is not our fault that TRS1 is not properly funded.	8/5/2016 8:59 AM
14	The Legislature is attempting to avoid its fiscal responsibilities of properly funding pension funds & providing K-12 education needs by not raising business taxes.	8/4/2016 5:21 PM
15	Does this change follow state and case law for merging funds? While I understand that the state has certainly had some funding issues for TERS1 I don't see where any funds from another system which is 50% funded by those workers in Leoff should be moved or threatened to fix a plan that should be first fixed by the plan members and responsible parties.	8/3/2016 7:20 AM
16	If they want to fully fund TRS 1 FIRST, then we could consider our options. To take a fully funded plan and merge it with an underfunded plan and leave all participants totally underfunded doesn't make sense.	8/2/2016 2:52 PM
17	LEOFF funds must remain only with LEOFF plans	8/1/2016 9:45 PM
18	Don't do it!	8/1/2016 11:02 AM
19	DO YOUR JOBS as the people of this STATE voted you in to do. BALANCE the budget and don't overspend on pork belly items.	7/31/2016 7:45 PM
20	LEOFF-1 should be allowed dental, vision and spousal benefits prior to ANY merger consideration. When all members of LEOFF-1 expire, then and only then, would all remaining funds in LEOFF-1 be transferred to our comrades in LEOFF-2. Police and Fire have nothing in common with teachers, if they want our pension, become a cop or fireman.	7/30/2016 12:37 PM
21	This merger seems like an escape of responsibility by the state in unfunding TRS 1. Why do retired firefighters and law enforcement officers have to take in this responsibility?	7/30/2016 10:12 AM
22	Against it! Our plan is fully funded and has not yet been raided by the state. Keep it that way. We make less retirement than current officers and we earned the benefits. We qualified for food stamps for several years before our pay became a livable wage	7/29/2016 6:28 PM
23	Don't jeopardize the security of a successfully funded program. Rather, take steps to meet the legislative obligation that they are contractually obligated to do. Seriously look at cutting some pet projects and take care of the teachers without taking from the Law enforcement and Firefighters community.	7/29/2016 5:20 PM
24	same as number 4	7/29/2016 3:39 PM
25	They have no right to do that as it is our money. The State does not have the authority to just take our money.	7/28/2016 1:47 PM
26	The problem with TRS 1 was caused by the state, not active and retired police and fire service personnel. The obligation is upon the state to fix this issue, and raiding LEOFF 1 passes the buck on to police and fire service men and women. Legislators speak of accountability, but where is their accountability for maintaining a balanced budget (or the inability to do so in the past)? The only plan that makes sense for a LEOFF 1 merger is to merge LEOFF 1 and LEOFF 2. Such a merger should adhere to the following 10 principles as resolved by the WSCFF: 1. Must not reduce LEOFF 1 member benefits. 2. Cannot put the funding for LEOFF 1 benefits at risk. 3. Cannot affect LEOFF 1 disability boards. 4. Cannot affect LEOFF 1 member or employer contributions. 5. Cannot modify LEOFF 1 governance. 6. Must receive IRS approval before the effective date of the bill. 7. Must follow state laws and case law protecting pension benefits and funding. 8. Must ensure the new merged fund is protected from future state underfunding. 9. Cannot modify LEOFF 2 governance. 10. Cannot increase LEOFF 2 member or employer contributions.	7/28/2016 12:04 PM
27	I am adamantly opposed. Our money is our money.	7/27/2016 8:37 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

28	How dare you consider taking someone else's, fully funded, benefits away to satisfy mistakes you've been making with the educational system all these years.	7/27/2016 6:01 PM
29	I believe LEOFFII or LEOFF3 employees should have an independent system which is funded by the city and current and employees not the LEOFF 1 system retirees.	7/27/2016 5:42 PM
30	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed.	7/26/2016 4:24 PM
31	Keep it as it is ~ separate ~	7/26/2016 1:37 PM
32	Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. It's interesting Microsoft and Boeing can get any breaks needed. Try taxing them instead, you clowns.	7/26/2016 10:09 AM
33	The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. This plan merger is an incredible failure of our legislatures.	7/25/2016 2:33 PM
34	Any funds left over after LEOFF1 is done should stay in the LEOFF family and go to LEOFF2.	7/25/2016 2:12 PM
35	Is there any basis for this other than that one has a surplus and the other is in the hole?	7/25/2016 10:54 AM
36	Don't do it.	7/24/2016 8:04 PM
37	There is no reason for a merger by us.	7/23/2016 6:04 PM
38	If there is a merger we should all receive a good cash out settlement	7/23/2016 12:10 PM
39	The Underfunded Liability in TRS 1 is an Obligation of the State, not of our Retired Firefighters and Cops. Do not Rob Peter to Pay Paul!	7/23/2016 10:23 AM
40	LEOFF 1 has been resisting money grabs by the legislature since 2000. Had we not, when the crash came in 2008 we would have ended up severely underfunded. Nothing in this proposed merger benefits the members of the LEOFF 1 retirement system. It is just another attempt by the legislature to avoid their responsibility to properly fund TERS1 at the expense of LEOFF 1. The proposed "gift" of \$5000. to each LEOFF 1 member is both an insult (since you would be taking over a billion dollars from us) and an attempt to circumvent Ice-Miller	7/22/2016 3:58 PM
41	Just don't do it, it is not in the best interests of anyone. The retirement systems are not a solution to any financial problem created by some other system or decision of the legislature.	7/22/2016 2:34 PM
42	As a Leoff1 retiree I am totally against this underhanded plan.	7/21/2016 11:34 PM
43	I am against it. You need to get our teacher fund build up but not with leoff 1 funds	7/21/2016 10:02 PM
44	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can't actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/21/2016 6:30 PM
45	Our entity would be opposed to the LEOFF 1 and TRS 1 merger. Our entity is not responsible for the TRS retirees and we do not want our funding to be used to fund a system where we do not have a liability.	7/21/2016 4:07 PM
46	LEOFF 1 should merge with LEOFF 2	7/21/2016 10:49 AM
47	This stinks. Rob Peter to pay Paul.	7/20/2016 10:20 PM
48	Would make more since for LEOFF 1 to merge with LEOFF 2. At least they are both the same career fields.	7/20/2016 9:58 PM
49	Don't do it!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!1	7/20/2016 2:48 PM
50	Don't change the LEOFF 1 system in any way shape or form. If this merger takes place, are we to cover other systems that are being under funded? This to me is just the so called slippery slope of raiding retirement systems. I can envision our system being raided, the markets going south and the LEOFF 1 members losing everything. Losing everything in my retirement years that is caused by another system is .....	7/20/2016 2:16 PM
51	SEE ABOVE	7/20/2016 12:54 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

52	Is this legal? isn't my pension protected and guaranteed?	7/20/2016 12:47 PM
53	I will not support any legislature who votes in favor of this merger or for that matter any merger of the leff1 system. I will actively campaign against them .	7/20/2016 10:39 AM
54	If any merger occurs is should be LEOFF1 & LEOFF2	7/19/2016 7:18 PM
55	It's a bad idea. Because one group didn't plan ahead doesn't make it right to take from someone who did,.	7/19/2016 2:13 PM
56	Opposed to merger, do not underfund out plan	7/19/2016 12:39 PM
57	What is the goal of the merger?	7/19/2016 9:47 AM
58	Increase TRS and employer contribution rates of contributions	7/18/2016 11:43 PM
59	Why? What are the real issues underlying these continual attacks on LEOFF1. Who is lobbying for such a merger?	7/18/2016 10:04 PM
60	The State is wrong to claim the LEOFF 1 pension as it's own to spend the money as they want to. It's not the State's money. It belongs to LEOFF 1 members.	7/18/2016 7:48 PM
61	As a LEOFF1 memeber, I am 100% against any merger of any kind. This is OUR retirement money. TRS1/2/3 or LEOFF2 have no right to be trying to merge with our group or use our money	7/18/2016 4:55 PM
62	Show all the numbers associated with each plan and clearly indicate if one plan would be assisting the other due to such a merger.	7/18/2016 3:18 PM
63	We would not have nearly the funding problem in any of the plans had previous legislatures fully funded the plans. We can not jeopardize future generations ability to retire with security and predictability that only a defined benefit pension can provide. Solving problems created by our inadequate state revenue system by cutting public employee benefits in any way is unacceptable.	7/18/2016 2:24 PM
64	LEOFF1 provisions were created for appropriate reasons. There have been abuses of the system. There have also been abuses such as retire/rehire provisions of other state pension systems. When the LEOFF1 provisions were changed the pendulum swung too far with the LEOFF2 provisions. Residuals in the LEOFF1 pension system when no longer needed should go into the LEOFF2 program. Fire and Police careers are dangerous, contribute to structural and medical ailments larger than the general population. Comparing such issues with teachers careers/pension considerations is insulting on its face.	7/18/2016 1:20 PM
65	As a retired LEOFF 1 firefighter with 35 years in service I am very opposed to ANY merger. When LEOFF 1 was created We were promised that the benefits would never be taken away only added to. ALL LEOFF 1 members paid into the system as well a did the various employers. WE PAID INTO LEOFF 1 NOT TRS 1 The STATE needs to keep the promises made to us. DO NOT MERGE LEOFF 1 WITH ANY OTHER SYSTEM. Keep it my itself and solvent.	7/18/2016 11:25 AM
66	I am totally against it!	7/18/2016 10:36 AM
67	1. the under funding of TRS1 is an obligation of the state not the retired officers and firefighters. 2. this is a firefighters/ police officer pension if anything it should stay with those folks in plan 2 if any excess funds should become available.	7/18/2016 8:59 AM
68	To me it seems almost anything the Legislature does only helps their cause and screw-ups not the people of this state.	7/18/2016 8:26 AM
69	Cannot increase LEOFF 2 member or employer contributions.	7/17/2016 9:01 PM
70	There are too many legal issues that have been raised, but no answers to them prior to the legislature proposed time frame, too many unknowns, no facts. Legislature needs to find a better and legal way to fund the unfunded Public Pension Plans, then takeaway from LEOFF 1 or LEOFF 2. This is nothing more than income shifting! Close some of worthless tax loopholes that have been passed in our state, for the big business, and generate revenue from that. Include all of the 10 principles passed by the Last WSCFF Convention, and	7/17/2016 4:33 PM
71	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention	7/17/2016 4:27 PM
72	This is just a money grab. It would be a theft and every LEOFF 1 member would be a victim of the theft. It's our plan and our money. The Legislature should leave our plan alone.	7/17/2016 2:40 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

73	The LEOFF1 people are entitled to this for the rest of their lives due to the the low wages they were paid. They shouldn't have to fund another pension plan because the LEOFF1 plan made wise investments.	7/17/2016 2:22 PM
74	How can a fund surplus be determined on an active pension plan? Shouldn't a surplus be determined AFTER all LEOFF 1 members are out of the system? This was a TRUST FUND for firefighters. Aren't trust funds suppose to be protected by the federal government?	7/17/2016 1:58 PM
75	This must have IRS approval, cannot effect LEOFF 1 governance or employer contributions and must ensure the new merged fund is protected from future state underfunding.	7/17/2016 11:39 AM
76	This seems to be a temporary solution, a quick fix to a much larger problem of under funding the TRS1 system. Given that the laws that created the TRS1 were sound to collect funds and that the long term pay out decisions were sound, how is it that the TRS1 system is so underfunded and how is that it was left this long to create such a large underfunded system? To steal from Peter (LEOFF1 Members) to pay Paul (TRS1 Members) is unacceptable.	7/16/2016 6:34 PM
77	This would be such a one sided issue that is trying to correct a plan that was very poorly handled.	7/16/2016 6:29 PM
78	I would support a law suit against it.	7/16/2016 4:18 PM
79	How would LEOFF 1 be better than it is currently?	7/16/2016 3:06 PM
80	The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/16/2016 1:01 PM
81	The unfunded liability in TRS I is an obligation of the State not retired firefighters and law enforcement. Any proposed merger must not: 1. Reduce LEOFF I member benefits. 2. Put funding of LEOFF I benefits at risk. 3. Affect LEOFF I disability boards. 4. Affect LEOFF I member or employer contributions. 5. Modify LEOFF I governance. Legislator must receive IRS approval prior to effective date of the bill. Must follow state laws and case law protecting pension benefits and funding. Must ensure the new merged fund is protected from future State underfunding. Cannot modify LEOFF 2 governance. Cannot increase LEOFF 2 member or employer contributions.	7/16/2016 11:13 AM
82	Combine LEOFF one and two. Leave us out of different plans	7/16/2016 7:54 AM
83	With respect this is bad idea and bad governance!	7/15/2016 9:50 PM
84	The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? If this were to happen, their needs to be law written saying this is a one time event never to happen again. Otherwise hayseed republicans will continue to steal money rather than attempt to balance a budget using the funds they have.	7/15/2016 7:14 PM
85	Our government is not yet a socialism. I think the legislature should be looking else where to make the TRS1 plan work. Our money is our money period.	7/15/2016 6:05 PM
86	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. •Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. •While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can't actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. •The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? •Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention	7/15/2016 4:58 PM
87	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This "merger" raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed because they affect the hardworking people earning these pensions deliberately. Tax loopholes cost taxpayers billions per year, however you have no problem taking money from a trust established to protect hardworking police and fire fighters in their retirement after giving so many years to their communities.	7/15/2016 4:35 PM
88	Under state and federal laws, pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected. This raises a number of serious legal issues that need to be addressed.	7/15/2016 3:36 PM
89	Do not do it. The LEOFF I system money was smartly invested and because of that don't cause it to be in the same shape as the other system.	7/15/2016 3:09 PM
90	1. It seems this is a strange place to marry funds while there are many, many loopholes which are going untouched. 2. Why is this an issue for a group which has met all it's own obligations?	7/15/2016 2:43 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

91	My greatest concern is that once allowed play with pension funds, the legislature would eventually ruin the pension system, not just LEOFF 1.	7/15/2016 1:03 PM
92	The combining of LEOFF 1 and LEOFF 2 is in the better interest of the state and firefighters.	7/15/2016 12:31 PM
93	No merger would be good	7/15/2016 10:35 AM
94	Don't do it!	7/15/2016 10:07 AM
95	LEOFF 1 employers have the unfunded mandate of providing medical benefits to all active, disabled and retired members. The plans were created with provisions specific to the needs of the members of the occupation they covered. Those needs have not merged. The return to membership rules in TRS1 are specific to the needs of educational institutions and teachers. The LEOFF 1 rules are specific to the needs of law enforcement and fire fighters. The benefits for TRS 1 and LEOFF 1 members vary greatly. Employers of TRS members are not usually employers of LEOFF members and vice versa.	7/15/2016 7:25 AM
96	Whatever the Legislature does, LEOFF 1 cannot trust what they will do if a merger occurs. I was told back when Governor Dan Evans was in office, the state borrowed \$200,000.00 from LEOFF 1's surplus, and that money has never been replaced. Is that true? LEOFF 1 does not gain anything from the merger, and has the potential to lose a lot with a merger. That surplus is there for the protection of LEOFF 1 so LEOFF 1 never gets into a position like TRS 1 is in now. LEOFF 1 membership will continue to get smaller as the years go on and become gone eventually. TRS 1 membership is way larger than LEOFF 1, and would put a large drain on LEOFF 1's surplus, and it's protection for the future. Why should LEOFF 1 help the legislature bail out TRS 1, when legislature is the one that got TRS 1 in the position they are in now. AGAIN, THE MERGER DOES NOT BENEFIT LEOFF 1 AT ALL !!!!!	7/14/2016 10:35 PM
97	They just want the cream off the top! CROOKS!	7/14/2016 10:11 PM
98	Leave my money alone...It's not yours!!!!!!	7/14/2016 9:19 PM
99	Keep public safety employee and employer retirement contributions and the resulting investment gains within the public safety environment.	7/14/2016 8:31 PM
100	You need to find another job because you aren't very good at being a politician and balancing budgets!	7/14/2016 7:36 PM
101	The money invested in the LEOFF system should stay in the LEOFF system. If there is a surplus in LEOFF 1 it should support the employees playing into LEOFF 2 who have benefits inferior to LEOFF 1.	7/14/2016 4:00 PM
102	I believe this to be in effect a way for the Legislature to not fund a plan (TRS1) that they promised to fund by exploiting LEOFF1!	7/14/2016 2:48 PM
103	The future liability has been funded by employer and employee contributions. Without much more information and data on this topic, it does not seem fair to take contributions made on behalf of LEOFF 1 employees to cover a shortfall in another plan. It seems like reducing employer and employee contributions in LEOFF 1 would be appropriate and increase contributions for TRS 1 employees and employers to make up the shortfall. How did this situation happen?	7/14/2016 1:55 PM
104	The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/14/2016 1:26 PM
105	we worked for low pay looking toward our retirement pay and should be left solvent as we planned	7/14/2016 12:23 PM
106	I want my pension benefits left alone and protected as I believed them to be in my contractual agreement for 25 years.	7/14/2016 11:45 AM
107	I am totally opposed to this, because it is my belief that if not now, at some time in the future our pension and benefits would be at risk.	7/14/2016 11:23 AM
108	I worked a full-career as a police officer in the service of my community, and during that time a portion of my earnings went to fund my pension. I rely entirely on this pension, and nothing else, for my current income and my medical needs. I am past the age of finding or being able to work to otherwise support myself. I am very upset that our legislators are evening considering taking this irresponsible and disrespectful action.	7/14/2016 11:17 AM
109	Stop taking from plans that are doing well. This makes pension workers look bad to the public when legislators rob from one plan to feed another and then that plan has some poor investment years and gets behind.	7/14/2016 11:15 AM
110	It just isn't right. Either keep leoff 1 whole or if you have to merge, merge it with leoff 2	7/14/2016 10:50 AM
111	not looking to bail out the teachers retirement, needs to be managed properly	7/14/2016 10:06 AM
112	My thoughts and comments cannot be printed....#/*#-%#	7/14/2016 9:30 AM
113	Get a real job.	7/14/2016 7:01 AM
114	see above	7/14/2016 4:51 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

115	I've stated them in the first answer.	7/13/2016 11:11 PM
116	1. As I understand, pension funds are held in trust accounts which are legally protected by state and federal laws. This proposed merger raises a number of serious legal issues that will need to be addressed. 2. The legislature and Legislators have a long history of not closing worthless tax loopholes that cost taxpayers billions of dollars per year. However, the Legislators hardly hesitated for a split second to take money from a trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. This serious and the Legislators need to reevaluate their priorities. 3. Although it may be within in guidelines to use a "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, those "smoothed" assets can be spent. There is at least \$200 million dollars less in the LEOFF 1 trust account than this proposed merger is based upon. 4. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state and not an obligation of retired law enforcement officers and firefighters. 5. Legislators seem to have a long history of talking about accountability when it applies to others, but when the Legislators fail to balance a supplemental budget without taking money from the LEOFF 1 pension trust, where is the accountability for the Legislators?	7/13/2016 10:21 PM
117	Please leave our retirement system alone. The Leoff 1 system is vibrant and sound. Don't merge with any other system.	7/13/2016 8:50 PM
118	Merging LEOFF 1 and TRS 1 is simply a means for legislatures to raid the trust account of police and firefighters in order to take care of the states obligation to address the unfunded liability of TRS 1. Police and firefighters are not responsible for, and should not be held accountable to, the states obligation to address the TRS 1 liability.	7/13/2016 8:48 PM
119	You don't use pensions that hard working LEOFF 1 employees have paid in to for the Legislature to use as gambling money...which this would be...a gamble.	7/13/2016 7:57 PM
120	See the answer to questions 3 and 4!!!	7/13/2016 6:43 PM
121	Merge LEOFF 1 with LEOFF 2	7/13/2016 6:33 PM
122	I am opposed to funding a retirement system that was not setup or controled such as the Leoff 1 system.	7/13/2016 6:06 PM
123	It's not right to take police and fire fighter money away from police and fire fighters to bail out the teachers plane. Not our problem the teachers was miss managed	7/13/2016 6:02 PM
124	After you take away OUR surplus why should we have confidence that our system will not go broke?	7/13/2016 4:15 PM
125	The legislature needs to deal with financial problems of TRS1 and other issues, such as education, without sacrificing the benefit of another group of individuals. This is poor business and financial oversight.	7/13/2016 4:02 PM
126	Are they aware that we have no social security ?	7/13/2016 3:59 PM
127	The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/13/2016 3:48 PM
128	See above	7/13/2016 3:48 PM
129	That Leoff 1 should be reserved for leoff 2	7/13/2016 3:29 PM
130	In general, they're robbing Peter to pay Paul.	7/13/2016 3:11 PM
131	I oppose the merger per the above concerns	7/13/2016 2:49 PM
132	The approx. 11% overfunding of the LEOFF 1 system should be returned to the employers to offset future medical costs.	7/13/2016 2:31 PM
133	see Q3	7/13/2016 2:05 PM
134	This is a terrible idea and in the future could have huge impacts on LEOFF 2.	7/13/2016 1:48 PM
135	LEOFF 1 members have paid their dues and have long since earned the right to continue to be protected within the confines of the LEOFF 1 RCW's	7/13/2016 11:21 AM
136	I was a pre-LEOFF employee. As I understand it the state assumed the pension, but left the medical provision in the care of the communities. If my pension was still with the community, would the state have the right to merge it into another system? Would the City have the right to rob from it to fund AFSCME pensions?	7/13/2016 10:29 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

137	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can't actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/13/2016 10:27 AM
138	This seems like robbing from peter to pay paul. The Teachers pension fund should be made solvent, along with all the other educational funding issues we face in WA, but not at the expense of our first responders pension. The actual numbers published regarding the value of the firefighters pension fund should not include the "smoothed" assets that can be spent. I request that the state include all of the 10 provisions adopted by and submitted on behalf of the WSCFF at our 2016 convention.	7/13/2016 9:06 AM
139	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. •Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. •While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. •The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/13/2016 9:00 AM
140	If the LEOFF1 plan members wanted to merge with anyone they would have done so without State intervention. Leave LEOFF1 alone	7/13/2016 8:38 AM
141	Rather than merge the plan, perhaps any surplus could go for long term care of LEOFFI retiree's.	7/13/2016 8:26 AM
142	That nothing in the LEOFF1 system would change	7/13/2016 7:56 AM
143	Expect my phone call. And volunteer hours with a sign.	7/13/2016 6:48 AM
144	Do not allow it to happen,	7/13/2016 5:07 AM
145	The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? Must receive IRS approval before the effective date of the bill. Cannot increase LEOFF 2 member or employer contributions.	7/12/2016 9:59 PM
146	I don't believe it fair to just take our funds to help balance another retirement. This is setting precedence for the future. Legislators need to be accountable for their failure to balance the supplemental budget. Robbing Peter to pay Paul is not the answer	7/12/2016 9:21 PM
147	Do not do it!	7/12/2016 8:57 PM
148	Do not bother trying to negotiate a ratio less than 50-50 with LEOFF 1 personnel receiving less than 50% of surplus funds.	7/12/2016 8:55 PM
149	Don't do it. How about we start taking funds from any sort of retirement and benefits that our legislature receives to help out the plans they happily underfunded	7/12/2016 7:52 PM
150	Do not merge these plans! Pension funds should be reserved for their stakeholders and not merged with other funds.	7/12/2016 7:23 PM
151	It is wrong and likely illegal and will result in a protracted legal challenges which the State will most likely lose.	7/12/2016 6:57 PM
152	I would hope that the legislature would, now and in the future, leave our pension system alone. If the other plan isn't doing as well as it should, then you might have to increase employee and employer contributions for those plan members. The legislature needs to keep their hands out of pensioners pockets.	7/12/2016 5:08 PM
153	The state has mismanaged there budget and moving money from our pension to fix their mistakes is not an option.	7/12/2016 4:47 PM
154	Come up with a new plan. This is one that smells of complete disregard for a plan that was promised us when we retired.	7/12/2016 4:35 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

155	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed.</li> <li>• Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities.</li> <li>• While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon.</li> <li>• The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?</li> </ul>	7/12/2016 1:57 PM
156	They are robbing Peter to pay Paul	7/12/2016 1:55 PM
157	Stop raiding the plans for state spending. PAY your bills first, just like everyone of us do each month. Our retirement funds are not YOUR rainy day funds.	7/12/2016 12:42 PM
158	Don't!!!!	7/12/2016 12:38 PM
159	Do not raid our fund. Instead go with the current plan to solve the TRS1 under funding problem.	7/12/2016 12:11 PM
160	No, don't do it. Robbing a well funded and well run program to support shortfalls in other areas, or to fund pet projects is counter to the intent of LEOFF 1 & 2	7/12/2016 11:23 AM
161	<p>Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can't actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention</p>	7/12/2016 11:08 AM
162	<p>This would seem to have a serious legal impacts since pension funds are trust accounts and legally protected. Legislators seem to be looking for ways to find funding without looking more closely at tax loopholes and even looking at their own pensions. They need to protect the retirement security of law and fire officers. The economic future is uncertain and taking from one fund to fund another fund puts both at risk. The underfunded liability of TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not the retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. If you must move forward, do so by ensuring all 10 principals of the Washington State Firefighters be included as passed last week at the convention to gain their support.</p>	7/12/2016 10:32 AM
163	Put them with current LE and Fire	7/12/2016 10:16 AM
164	<p>1 - Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. 2 - Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. 3 - While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can't actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. 4 - The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?</p>	7/12/2016 9:44 AM
165	I think this is wrong to use a well funded plan to bail out another plan that the state has not managed well.	7/12/2016 9:22 AM
166	As I stated, the only possible merger should be with LEOFF 2. LEOFF members shouldn't be penalized due to the poor budgeting of the legislators regarding funding agreements required of TRS1.	7/12/2016 9:06 AM
167	The ONLY plan merger should be LEOFF 1 and LEOFF 2. That is all!	7/12/2016 8:56 AM
168	Under no circumstances should Leoff one be merged with any other fund.	7/12/2016 8:34 AM
169	Not to merge plans.	7/12/2016 8:23 AM
170	Put your funds in the pot too and raid yours along with everybody else.	7/12/2016 7:47 AM
171	The TRS 1 unfunded liability is a Washington State obligation, not the responsibility of the LEOFF 1 Pension Plan and the retired Firefighters and Police Officers.	7/12/2016 7:44 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

172	LEOFF moneys were earned by Police and Firefighters in a system that has been managed and fought for for many years. At the least extra moneys from LEOFF1 should be utilized to secure the LEOFF2 system and not removed for a totally different retirement system. After all LEOFF1 and LEOFF 2 are both pensions governed under 41.26.	7/12/2016 6:01 AM
173	None. LEOFF 1 belongs to the LEOFF 1 people and no one else.	7/12/2016 12:00 AM
174	Fix the problem without robbing the members that put in the time and service. The earned that right and you should not take it away due to your not able to come up with a fix without robbing firefighter and police	7/11/2016 11:35 PM
175	Any Legislature who votes for this proposal better start looking for a new career because every LEOFF 1 and most of LEOFF 2 members will actively campaign against them come re-election time.	7/11/2016 11:31 PM
176	I do not trust the motives of the politicians.	7/11/2016 11:04 PM
177	It would not be right to take our funds to spend on schools or other general projects. And by the way, the correct terms would rob/plunder.	7/11/2016 9:46 PM
178	The teachers did not want any part of LEOFF 1 in the beginning. They got their separate fund and they mismanaged it. Who should take the heat for their lack of foresight and management expertise? Firefighters and police, who made sure they had responsible trust fund managers? This idea, the merger of LEOFF 1 and TRS-1, doesn't pass the smell test. If a contract means nothing to the current bunch of legislators pushing this, if it is no more than "something to be broken," is it reasonable to expect me to trust them with my retirement income and benefits? No. It is reason to give them the boot at the election booth. This is how our best and brightest solve problems? I reject the reasoning. I suspect it is ideologically driven to shut down government and break the backs of the police and fire unions. I do not think it is an honest effort at fiscal responsibility. I will work hard to spread the word and make sure these legislators are not reelected.	7/11/2016 9:44 PM
179	The LEOFF I retirement system cannot be sustained by a "promise" from an outside actuary. The TRS1 is a good example of the State's lack of responsibility for properly funding.	7/11/2016 9:29 PM
180	Do not weaken the system and do not plan to pay earned benefits out of tax revenues.	7/11/2016 9:04 PM
181	I am opposed to a plan merger.	7/11/2016 7:43 PM
182	Why are we paying for the State not doing its job and keeping the TRS funded.	7/11/2016 7:43 PM
183	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention	7/11/2016 6:50 PM
184	The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is the State's obligation, not our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Please don't raid their pension money to clean up deficiencies elsewhere.	7/11/2016 4:33 PM
185	There shouldn't be a merger. If the teachers need more retirement funds then let the current teachers pay for the increase. Just because the law enforcement and firefighters have money is no reason for the state to give it away or use it for any other purpose. If the Leoff II group needs more funding we would be willing to discuss it at that point.	7/11/2016 4:29 PM
186	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed! The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/11/2016 3:44 PM
187	Don't do it.	7/11/2016 3:02 PM
188	What impact would potential benefit reductions have on retirements of our state legislatures? Will these changes be legal on both a state and federal level, and who will be accountable for the decisions that are made? Tax loopholes being what they are, why can't they be addressed to help secure these funding issues? Why is robbing from Peter to pay Paul seen as okay?	7/11/2016 2:56 PM
189	It would be appropriate to offer LLEOFF1 a 1 time bonus based on their years of service or retirement monthly amount. If there is so much money in that account why would those that have not paid in receive the benefits	7/11/2016 2:43 PM
190	Unsure	7/11/2016 2:14 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

191	Legislature should strongly consider what the voters next move might be	7/11/2016 2:12 PM
192	Let teachers fund their own plan. Don't take monies away from some one else that did it right in the first place.	7/11/2016 2:02 PM
193	I am vehemently opposed to ANY merger with the LEOFF 1 pension system	7/11/2016 1:59 PM
194	All I can say is look at other ways to balance some items. Wait until the last recipient of leoff 1 is gone then have a party.	7/11/2016 1:48 PM
195	What goes up can go down and does so leave it alone. This is just another Republicans plan to balance the budget on the little guy and leave the huge loopholes for the wealthy.	7/11/2016 1:33 PM
196	Don't raid LEOFF1 to fund a failure by the Legislature to address issues with the TRS1 pension system.	7/11/2016 1:27 PM
197	Stop robbing Peter to pay Paul. Meet your financial obligations within the means you have.	7/11/2016 1:05 PM
198	It does not seem right; the two plans were never meant to be merged.	7/11/2016 1:01 PM
199	These retirement programs are not entitlements. They are, in fact, contractual agreements that have been paid for in advance by the recipients. Government, obviously, (as demonstrated in numerous examples) has no qualms about breaking contracts to diminish that which has been EARNED by Citizen Employees of the state. Such actions are despicable and will engender determined opposition, hopefully with pronounced political ramifications for those who choose to dishonor legal contracts.	7/11/2016 12:42 PM
200	The lines between the retirement plans for teachers and retirement plans for law enforcement and firefighters should not be blurred. They are paid by separate taxing entities and should be kept separate.	7/11/2016 12:22 PM
201	LEOFF 1 is sound why change it's financial stability to make 2 funds that would be under funded.	7/11/2016 12:19 PM
202	Not in favor.	7/11/2016 12:17 PM
203	Keep your greedy, slimey, money mismanaging hands off of our pension system.	7/11/2016 12:12 PM
204	Allow Firefighters to strike like teachers who hold the education of children hostage so they get their wages increased. Stop robbing Peter to pay Paul in what world are TRS members exposing their lives to injury and death like L2 members? L2 members are treated horribly when retiring and especially if disability is involved.	7/11/2016 11:47 AM
205	This proposal is a robbing of peter to pay paul	7/11/2016 11:40 AM
206	I believe this is a bad plan, as the LEOFF systems have been well managed and fully funded correctly. Using them to save a poorly funded program is not only wrong but a slap in the face of all LEOFF members.	7/11/2016 11:39 AM
207	In my opinion, these constant short term fixes to budget deficits by raiding pension funds are probably illegal and absolutely wrong. They will not solve long term problems anyway.	7/11/2016 11:38 AM
208	Don't do it. Don't use a merger to try to get around ,your not funding it in the first place.	7/11/2016 11:21 AM
209	Can you legally take money from me and give it to the teachers?	7/11/2016 11:13 AM
210	Definitely oppose any merger with any other retirement group.	7/11/2016 11:08 AM
211	The ONLY place Firefighter pension funds belong is with their fellow Firefighters! LEOFF2 members are still paying the price for the abuse by LEOFF1 members. I strongly feel those funds should stay within the LEOFF system.	7/11/2016 10:57 AM
212	It is my belief that pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This proposal raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Instead of attempting to solve your budget issues on the back of police an firefighters why will you not look at taking action to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year?, The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? If any merger is to take place the following principals need to followed. 1. Must not reduce LEOFF 1 member benefits. 2. Cannot put the funding for LEOFF 1 benefits at risk. 3. Cannot affect LEOFF 1 disability boards. 4. Cannot affect LEOFF 1 member or employer contributions. 5. Cannot modify LEOFF 1 governance. 6. Must receive IRS approval before the effective date of the bill. 7. Must follow state laws and case law protecting pension benefits and funding. 8. Must ensure the new merged fund is protected from future state underfunding. 9. Cannot modify LEOFF 2 governance. 10. Cannot increase LEOFF 2 member or employer contributions.	7/11/2016 10:46 AM
213	will there be an over-site committee to make sure the funds are spent as intended	7/11/2016 10:45 AM
214	Typical bureaucratic leadership. A retirement fund that was planned and executed to succeed, robbed to backfill a fund that was poorly managed. How do you people sleep at night?	7/11/2016 10:42 AM
215	don't do it	7/11/2016 10:37 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

216	Vote out all the actors proposing such a merger. Get rid of them. They failed to properly funding the Teachers plan. Now they propose Raiding ours	7/11/2016 10:21 AM
217	This seems like a bailout of politicians not doing their job and funding pension systems according to their commitments. it is also a failure on the teacher's part by not watch-dogging their pension system properly. It seems like you are using the LEOFF system to bailout other's incompetence.	7/11/2016 10:16 AM
218	I would prefer they not do anything with the plan right now. They should look at using the excess for LEOFF 2.	7/11/2016 10:15 AM
219	The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/11/2016 10:06 AM
220	Leave leff pension alone	7/11/2016 10:04 AM
221	LEOFF funds should be reserved for law enforcement officers or fire fighters. Excess funds should be used to increase services for both LEOFF 1 & 2.	7/11/2016 10:03 AM
222	Leoff 1 retirement was given to us in good faith. Legislature needs to just leave Leoff 1 retirement alone.	7/11/2016 10:01 AM
223	What additional plans/ protections are in place to make sure there is no reduction in benefits	7/11/2016 9:54 AM
224	It is wrong to dig into another career fields retirement to get another one out of the hole. Maybe you should learn from the ones that are successful and teach the ones that aren't instead of taking. These careers and their duties are totally on different scales, but both are very important	7/11/2016 9:53 AM
225	There must be a long range plan to correct the funding problem prior to the merger.	7/11/2016 9:50 AM
226	See both above comments	7/11/2016 9:18 AM
227	What would be the reason for the merger anyway?	7/11/2016 9:14 AM
228	Don't do it. It seems that merging the two plans would result in two under funded liabilities (LEOFF I & TRS I)for the State rather than only one (TRS I). Find another way to provide the promised benefits to TRS I and leave LEOFF I alone. Now and forever.	7/11/2016 8:58 AM
229	These two Systems have nothing in common with each other. Leoff 1 would become the underdog based on membership numbers between the two I see no benefit to LEOFF1 and a big gain for TRS and the State.	7/11/2016 8:52 AM
230	Why? This looks like taking from Peter to pay Paul. A quick fix which could at a later time become devastating to all employee's receiving	7/11/2016 8:34 AM
231	There is no paid medical for retirees. LEOFF 1 addresses this issue and it should be a benefit for the LEOFF 2 officers	7/11/2016 8:14 AM
232	As a LEOFF I plan member I am opposed to any change that takes benefits or money away from Plan I. This is only pension fund that is fully funded no thanks to the legislature.	7/11/2016 8:04 AM
233	Quit trying to fund your obligation to pension funds by raiding one for the other. Millions of dollars are available from worthless tax breaks the legislature has already given to big corporations. Use that money for teachers' pensions.	7/11/2016 8:01 AM
234	Make sure there is an iron-clad guarantee that a minimum of current benefits in the LEOFF I system are maintained until the last recipient is deceased.	7/11/2016 7:04 AM
235	It is important to build firewalls for LEOFF 1 employers and retirees to the maximum extent practicable.	7/11/2016 6:47 AM
236	Why should a fully funded LEOFF 1 plan be underfunded to bail out the TERS retirement system. As for the offer of a \$500.00 buyout per memeber, I. Felt that was a slap in the face!	7/11/2016 6:39 AM
237	Fight it until the bitter end. How many years have they been after our money? They can't stand to see a successful system. They will screw it up for sure.	7/11/2016 6:30 AM
238	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed.</li> <li>• Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities.</li> <li>• While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon.</li> <li>• The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?</li> <li>• Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention</li> </ul>	7/11/2016 6:29 AM
239	TRS 1 plan should be remodeled using the current LEOFF 1 and LEOFF 2 plan, using an oversight board made up of representatives from the plan and DES.	7/11/2016 5:43 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

240	Older LEOFF 1 folks paid into the fund during every day of our working lives, unlike the younger folks who got a free ride for years, yet now receive far larger pensions based on a higher salary from which no pension payments were deducted. Now we are being expected to fund the State & employers obligation to TRS 1. Our annual increases don't seem to match even 80% of the COL increases. If we have so much excess money in our retirement system, why are we not receiving larger pensions increases? ...	7/11/2016 4:57 AM
241	The IRS must approve this merger and if they do not approve, what options are left to the legislature?	7/10/2016 10:12 PM
242	Pension funds are trust accounts, this proposal raises legal concerns that must be addressed before moving forward. Don't continue to allow worthless tax loopholes, while considering raiding our retirement security. The state made an obligation to fund TRS, don't hurt police and firefighters to cover your failures in meeting your obligations.	7/10/2016 9:51 PM
243	Fight it! It is a slippery slope. What can they raid next?	7/10/2016 9:29 PM
244	The TRS 1 needs its own funding so that its principle and interest can compound. Don't balance the budget on what took LEOFF 1 members 25 to 30 or more years to build up.	7/10/2016 8:45 PM
245	What is wrong with the Legislature, cannot they figure a way for other pension systems to become solvent with out robbing ours? Why do they always take the easy way out?	7/10/2016 8:31 PM
246	Stop trying to take moneys from leoff1 to pay for their mistakes. We you have leoff1 because we .worked very hard to obtain it. It was passed.	7/10/2016 8:19 PM
247	I am totally against any merger of leoff1 into an other retirement system.	7/10/2016 8:12 PM
248	terrible idea. dishonest!	7/10/2016 7:48 PM
249	Don't use the LEOFF 1 funds. They don't belong to the Legislature. To my knowledge, the state never put any funds into it.	7/10/2016 7:40 PM
250	All the above. What compensation for retired officers. Would current retired officers be gran fathered with all benefits we have now. i	7/10/2016 7:31 PM
251	1. Must not reduce LEOFF 1 member benefits. 2. Cannot put the funding for LEOFF 1 benefits at risk. 3. Cannot affect LEOFF 1 disability boards. 4. Cannot affect LEOFF 1 member or employer contributions. 5. Cannot modify LEOFF 1 governance. 6. Must receive IRS approval before the effective date of the bill. 7. Must follow state laws and case law protecting pension benefits and funding. 8. Must ensure the new merged fund is protected from future state underfunding. 9. Cannot modify LEOFF 2 governance. 10. Cannot increase LEOFF 2 member or employer contributions.	7/10/2016 7:26 PM
252	This is a money grab.	7/10/2016 7:22 PM
253	See above	7/10/2016 7:21 PM
254	do not jeopardize our benefits for the disabled	7/10/2016 7:04 PM
255	1. I am a TRUSTEE of a TRUST. I have a fiduciary responsibility to protect the funds of the trust. I am legally bound by State and Federal laws to protect the funds of this trust. If I do not protect these funds, I would be breaking State and Federal Laws. What allows the legislature to be above the law. These laws can not be ignored or circumvented. This planned merger raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. 2. Legislators should evaluate how and why TRS1 is underfunded. The right thing to do is find out what went wrong and correct it. If that means negotiating with Employers and Employees, then that is what has to happen. I can not believe the legislature is even thinking that someone else (LEOFF1) should step in and take care of a problem that they had no responsibility for. The Legislature and TRS1 participants are the ones who created the problem and they must correct it like ADULTS. Do not go around our backs and rob from us what we negotiated through labor contracts!	7/10/2016 7:00 PM
256	Our legislature should show their appreciation for first responders and quit trying to raid their hard earned retirement.	7/10/2016 6:56 PM
257	Stop finding "creative" ways to try a take the funding away from LEOFF 1 retirees and their beneficiaries. Leave it alone!	7/10/2016 6:55 PM
258	Vote them out and find someone that can do the job correctly!	7/10/2016 6:54 PM
259	Pension funds are legally protected by the stat and federal government. The legal issues this idea brings up would need to be addressed.	7/10/2016 6:51 PM
260	How legal is this planned plundering of our pension funds	7/10/2016 6:38 PM
261	It sounds as though the 'fix is in'. But is shameful that our own government cannot face up to its own malfeasance.	7/10/2016 6:30 PM
262	Why should the TRS 1 take the money which the LEOFF 1 members earned and saved?	7/10/2016 6:12 PM
263	see comments in question 4. leoff-1 & leo ff-2 are plans made and funded for firefighters and cops. we have paid in what was asked for and depended on that pension to be there. don't screw with it!	7/10/2016 6:11 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

264	If a plan merger is enacted, then ensure that all ten principals proposed by the Washington Sate Council of Fire Fighters are adherred to in the new plan.	7/10/2016 6:05 PM
265	the men and women who have earned their retirement should not be impacted by any changes	7/10/2016 5:44 PM
266	If any plan is unfunded or underfunded, we should not think it proper to "borrow" or "merge (aka pilfer)" funds from another plan to prop it up.	7/10/2016 5:36 PM
267	MUST Follow state laws and case law protecting pension member benefits and funding.	7/10/2016 5:22 PM
268	Above	7/10/2016 5:09 PM
269	Don't agree with a merger. Another attempt by the state to take advantage of a responsibly funded pension plan by firefighters FOR firefighters!!	7/10/2016 5:09 PM
270	Again, the major concern is loss of benefits at some later date	7/10/2016 5:07 PM
271	I would want to see concrete insurances built in to the merger that would insure the solvency of the LEOFF pension system.	7/10/2016 5:05 PM
272	Why merge? Why under fund two plans?	7/10/2016 4:39 PM
273	Pension funds are legally protected and the state recognize this. Instead of trying to fix Legislative mistakes by robbing peter to pay paul the Legislators need to fix existing tax loop-holes that would more than take care of their underfunding issues. Be accountable and do what is right. Personally I am against the merger even if the WSCFF's 10 principles are adopted. The LEOFF 2 plan is working and funded. A 2% multiplier is hardly enough when we have to purchase 100% of our medical insurance coverage but it is what we have contributed for our entire careers. Do not jeopardize a working system by merging LEOFF 1 with a broken system. Fix the broken TRS.	7/10/2016 4:37 PM
274	Pension plans are Trust accounts which are legally protected under State and Federal Laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed.	7/10/2016 4:37 PM
275	Don't merg	7/10/2016 4:34 PM
276	We as firefighters depend on this for our livelyhood. Also our wives depend on It when we're gone	7/10/2016 4:30 PM
277	I am highly against any planned merger.	7/10/2016 3:59 PM
278	same as above	7/10/2016 3:33 PM
279	1. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is not the responsibility of retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. 2. Pension funds are trust accounts and promises to members for reasonable benefits after retirement, which members count on as compensation for doing dangerous work. Other entities which have raided pension funds have left members with little or nothing after decent retirement for services rendered.	7/10/2016 3:32 PM
280	If you were a member of LEOFF 1, would you seriously vote in favor or this proposed merger. That would be similar to you voting to share your pension plan with the Teachers or LEOFF 2 members.	7/10/2016 3:23 PM
281	Don't do it. Fix the weak plans leave the strong alone,.	7/10/2016 3:08 PM
282	Legislators, instead of taking money from a trust fund for the retirement of Law Officers and FireFighters, why don't you close ANY of the worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year. Reevaluate your priorities.	7/10/2016 3:05 PM
283	Why should I as a retired LEOFF 1 pensioner pay for another system that is supposed to be funded by the State and retirees in that system?	7/10/2016 3:03 PM
284	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. •Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention.	7/10/2016 3:01 PM
285	This is an attempt at outright theft of LEOFF1 Pension funds. There is nothing in TRS to contribute to a merger.	7/10/2016 2:52 PM
286	Do not do this.	7/10/2016 2:42 PM

## (Test) SPCP Merger Study

287	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/10/2016 2:30 PM
288	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/10/2016 2:23 PM
289	If the TRS 1 plan had been properly funded then it would have a surplus also.	7/10/2016 2:15 PM
290	1) Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. 2) Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. 3) While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. 4) The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/10/2016 2:13 PM
291	The unfunded liability in TRS1 is an obligation of the state NOT of my RETIREMENT MONEY which comes from the trust fund established to pay for my family's security after putting my life on the line for thirty years of firefighting! The Legislature should reevaluate their PRIORITIES!	7/10/2016 2:06 PM
292	bad ida	7/10/2016 2:02 PM
293	There has to be something in it for the members other than just a attaboy..If we had to merge I would rather see this merge with LEOFF 11, at least they are a part of our team.	7/10/2016 1:59 PM
294	I think this out and out theft. I suggest the legislature back off.	7/10/2016 1:53 PM
295	stop them	7/10/2016 1:46 PM
296	The State is responsible for underfunding TRS. It should not raid the Police and Firefighters' pension fund to make up for their failure to act earlier.	7/10/2016 1:36 PM
297	The funding of the merger would be at the expense of LEOFF 1	7/10/2016 1:27 PM
298	The Legislature should find other sources to fund Trs 1.	7/10/2016 1:23 PM
299	Leave it alone !!!!!	7/10/2016 1:23 PM
300	Why should the retired firefighters and law enforcement officers be made responsible for the state's failure to meet its obligation to properly fund TRS1. It's reported that there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF1 account than the proposal is based on. That along with the over estimating of market returns causes great concern for the financial future of the merged plans.	7/10/2016 1:13 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

301	Obviously, this is a very controversial issue. Most LEOFF 1 members believe the money (read: surplus) in that system belongs to them as individuals and they will die fighting for it. Nonetheless, so long as their retirement benefits are not compromised in any way, the question of what to do with the surplus in this retirement fund. I do not believe that any of the members should receive any form of cash windfall. It sets a horrible precedent and begs the question as to why all stakeholders, who have ever contributed to that system, shouldn't they also be entitled to a windfall? Obviously, it doesn't feel very good for the LEOFF I system to have to prop up another retirement system that has been poorly managed by the legislature and the state. But eventually something will have to be done with the surplus in the account. Ensure promised benefits to all LEOFF I retiree and liquidate the surplus by putting it to good use in another retirement system.	7/10/2016 1:00 PM
302	You currently have one plan that is underfunded and you have one plan with a surplus, based on todays current market conditions. If you merged both today, you will have one plan, and it would be underfunded.....how does that benefit the retirees under both current plans?	7/10/2016 12:57 PM
303	I have one general comment. I have a budget at home that I am willing to share with the state to show them that I budget in order to live within my means. I don't borrow money like the state and Federal Government.	7/10/2016 12:54 PM
304	Where is the money coming from? Who's pocket is the Legislature picking? Why not leave the LEOFF I alone cause these guys and gals earned this and guess what? Another 10 years, come back and revisit this cause most of these firefighters and cops are ages about 70 and above.	7/10/2016 12:52 PM
305	The goal of a pension fund is to have enough funds to pay the pensions of it's members. The idea of taking money from a trust fund for purposes other then what it was intended for is wrong and Illegal. Take all legal measures to prevent the LEOFF ! trust fund from being used for anything other than what it was intended for.	7/10/2016 12:50 PM
306	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention	7/10/2016 12:48 PM
307	I am absolutely opposed to a merger. When the very last survivor of LEOFF I benefits is gone, then if anything remains they could consider a "merger"	7/10/2016 12:40 PM
308	Leave it alone	7/10/2016 12:37 PM
309	The legislature has a responsibility to fund Ters 1 by making payments from the general fund, not by stealing funds from Leoff 1. They need to do the right thing and stop this merger talk.	7/10/2016 12:36 PM
310	Leave it alone	7/10/2016 12:27 PM
311	Come up with something else. Something like this has been tried before. Several of the legislatures are no longer in office that backed it then. The same will happen again.	7/10/2016 12:25 PM
312	This proposed plan to merger two pensions plans is a terrible financial plan, a breach of contract between all the parties involve with the LEOFF 1 and TRS 1 retirement plans, and is a criminal act. This merger plan will consolidate all the Washington State retirement plans, except the retirement plan for the legislatures, to organize and block any kind of stealing of pension funds.	7/10/2016 12:21 PM
313	I would be against any merger that would negatively impact the LEOFT1 pension.	7/10/2016 11:58 AM
314	NO!	7/10/2016 11:53 AM
315	Taking from Paul to pay Peter	7/10/2016 11:35 AM
316	Why create new laws to avoid breaking the law to do a merger? Almost as good as creative math!	7/10/2016 11:34 AM
317	the legislators that are considering a this are ignorant, ill-informed, and deserve to be voted out of office immediately. In addition, the major newspapers in the state need to be notified right now of the actions that the legislature has been considering	7/10/2016 11:34 AM
318	1. It bothers me a great deal that the legislature provides tax breaks to Boeing and others, consistantly overspends, then attempts to fix their failure to fund TRS by raiding the LEOFF system. 2.Pension funds are legally protected. Don't count on LEOFF 1 members laying down while the legislature raids our pension to fix their own failure to fund the commitments made.	7/10/2016 11:33 AM
319	That we should legal action	7/10/2016 11:30 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

320	I would be concerned that there would multiple plans be presented and that it would be complex and not fairly treat all LEOFF 1 members.	7/10/2016 11:24 AM
321	Vote against it and find a proper way to fund the Teachers fund properly without taking from ours.	7/10/2016 11:17 AM
322	Don't do it!! It should not be legal to take away something as solvent as this and all because we were SMART enough to plan for our future.	7/10/2016 11:05 AM
323	I am concerned that the Pension plans are not being properly managed and plans that are secure are rescuing plans that are in trouble. The unfunded liability in TRS1 is an obligation of the state, NOT retired police and firefighters. The state needs to be accountable for this shortage. NOT a healthy plan.	7/10/2016 11:05 AM
324	It is not legal.	7/10/2016 11:05 AM
325	This is a bad idea in any way, shape, or form.	7/10/2016 10:57 AM
326	It's not the responsibility of a funded pension system to prop up an underfunded system. Who's not minding the TERS investments?	7/10/2016 10:52 AM
327	Unfunded liability of TRS is a state obligation, not ours. Legislators like to talk about accountability, where then is their accountability for their failure to balance a supplemental budget with out raiding money from retired police and firefighters?	7/10/2016 10:44 AM
328	This is a Raid on Pension Benefits for LEOFF 1 members. Legislature needs to step up TRS1 contributions and make it solvent. Not Steal!	7/10/2016 10:37 AM
329	Do not think it is right to use the LEOFF 1 funds to bail out another retirement system because the legislature has not done its job.	7/10/2016 10:34 AM
330	First we give OUR lives to protect everybody and then OUR LEGISLATORS put a knife in our back!	7/10/2016 10:20 AM
331	This would reflect poorly on your ability to manage the state budget. Prioritize educators for sure, but look at the state budget as a whole. Raiding Leoff2 to fund Ters is a shell game, not a long term fix. I look forward to hearing alternate means of funding education from leaders with vision.	7/10/2016 10:09 AM
332	This is a Fire/Law benefit plan. Our brothers and sisters paid into this pension and it should stay to support Firefighters and Law Enforcement pensions now and in the future. This money should be used to strengthen LEOFF programs and pensions. So that in the future our pensions remain in good standing and reduce the risk of LEOFF 3.	7/10/2016 10:00 AM
333	The retirement systems have different terms/principles. How will a merged system protect the different interests of the individual beneficiaries?	7/10/2016 9:49 AM
334	I would not vote for any legislator in any future elections that support this terrible idea.	7/10/2016 9:38 AM
335	We have an abundance of tax incentives that benefit companies who our continuing to move work out of Washington. Close some of those loopholes to improve funding, rather than manipulate the contractually and legally required accounts to pay for retiree benefits. There appears to be \$200M missing from the 'smoothed' values. Where has that money gone? Is it, or has it, been spent? LEOFF retirees paid for their pensions through work and their own pocketbooks. The state has made errors in funding the teachers retirement system. Putting the onus on retired firefighters to cover the state's error is absurd. Find ways to bring revenues in to the TRS system by increasing contribution rates from teachers to improve their retirement system.	7/10/2016 8:52 AM
336	I was at the Capital 3 weeks ago when this merger came about in front of the Committee	7/10/2016 8:05 AM
337	The members of the Senate and House for years have created this problem. They are concerned for about spending money on problems they created so then they can boast to their constituents how much money they spent on them. Unfortunately the State of Washington will never have enough money, because any surplus monies will be spent on another get me reelected scheme or solving a problem that does not exist, or invent one to solve, or exaggerate a problem to crisis proportions. Remember every penny the state spends had come out of someone else pocket first.	7/10/2016 7:35 AM
338	The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers.	7/10/2016 7:35 AM
339	Instead of robbing my pension, study our success and clean up the failures in TRS. You politicians can't keep robbing Peter to pay Paul. STOP.	7/10/2016 7:05 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

340	I am sorry that past legislatures have failed to adequately fund LEOFF 2 and TERS 1. Regarding TERS 1, I would like to see current legislators find a way to fund that plan to provide for the needs of the plan without a merger. Regarding LEOFF 2, this an OPEN system and contributions continue to flow in. If these contributions are insufficient then some adjustment in the amounts contributed needs to be addressed. LEOFF 1 has and is managed in a positive way. LEOFF 1 is a CLOSED system and, while some members are still active and contributing, generally, what funds are there are all that is available to keep this plan solvent. All financial studies have concluded that LEOFF 1 is fully funded to meet expected obligations. To merge this plan with insolvent or possibly struggling plans is completely irresponsible. Additionally, there exists substantial case law that supports LEOFF 1 positions that this plan is not, should not, and can not be merged with anyone without total approval of LEOFF 1 members. The potential costs of litigation, should that occur, could be much more beneficial used to improve TERS 1 and LEOFF 2.	7/10/2016 3:23 AM
341	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF1 account the this proposal is based on. The unfunded liability in TRS1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/9/2016 11:27 PM
342	Everyone of the legislators involved in this plan is risking the alienation of firefighter support. I can assure you if this goes through the WSCFF will not support any members involved.	7/9/2016 9:26 PM
343	I don't want lack of planning by the government to destroy my retirement.	7/9/2016 9:20 PM
344	Same answer as #4	7/9/2016 9:16 PM
345	Once raiding of assets begins where does it end? It's a slippery slope where only disaster awaits.	7/9/2016 9:16 PM
346	What additional protections will be included to ensure pension benefits are not reduced?	7/9/2016 8:53 PM
347	Legal action would need to be taken to insure that such a merger never happened.	7/9/2016 8:44 PM
348	See above	7/9/2016 8:43 PM
349	How can this be legal and what are our potions to stop this	7/9/2016 8:38 PM
350	No	7/9/2016 7:32 PM
351	Guarantee no change in the LEOFF pensions payouts. Guaranteed funding and defined Benefits for LEOFF 2	7/9/2016 7:18 PM
352	If you merge the fund, it should be allocated to its initial intended personnel (i.e. Law Enforcement Officers and FireFighters LEOFF) and not some slush fund for the states shortfalls.	7/9/2016 6:29 PM
353	I strongly oppose the state trying to raid leoff 1 retirement to pay for other expenditures. That is a retirement plan that many hardworking people have contributed to, they have earned and depend upon for their financial security. It is wrong for the state to assume that it's their money upon the death of the last leoff 1 member when it is the employers and members who have contributed to and made it a sustaining fund through proper investing and sound financial decisions. The surplus from leoff 1 is not nearly as large as the state legislators state it is, and it should not be used as a way to balance the state budget or to offset the deficit in another state retirement because of their lack of funding that they are obligated to pay.	7/9/2016 6:24 PM
354	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed.</li> <li>• Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities.</li> <li>• While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon.</li> <li>• The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?</li> </ul>	7/9/2016 6:14 PM
355	Why wasn't the current TRS plan fully funded from beginning to end?	7/9/2016 6:03 PM
356	This is not the first time the State has tried to literally rob our LEOFF 1 Pension System in order to bail out their inability to correctly plan ahead. When will these attempts finally stop? I did not work for the Spokane City Fire Dept for 41 years to help the State meet its inability to live up to the obligations it owes to the citizens of Washington State!!!!	7/9/2016 5:39 PM
357	The city's employees should not have to suffer because proper planning didn't happen.	7/9/2016 5:20 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

358	THIS SCHEME has a lot of serious legal issues that need to look at and ruled on by the courts these funds are trust accounts that are governed by state and federal law.	7/9/2016 5:11 PM
359	With an extremely poor past track record The State of Washington has wasted, over spent and spent money on pet projects. And when they come up short in the long run the Legislatures put their hand out to correct their failures by taking from one to correct the other.	7/9/2016 5:11 PM
360	NO	7/9/2016 5:10 PM
361	Vote democrat.	7/9/2016 4:58 PM
362	Any plan other than merger with leoff plan 2 would not work..	7/9/2016 4:37 PM
363	I want to make sure that all legal aspects are checked off before continuing. Legislators need to be responsible for their actions and not take or use those who are doing well, for example the LEOFF. This must have no reduction or affect any part of the LEOFF1/2 plan and be approved by the correct agencies.	7/9/2016 4:35 PM
364	Leave Leoff 1 alone until last person is gone.	7/9/2016 4:23 PM
365	If the legislature wants to use our money to balance the budget why aren't they first looking to close billions of dollars in loopholes that are outdated and not needed?	7/9/2016 4:06 PM
366	If you must take the excess funds, give each member \$50k. Then give the employers a contribution earmarked for medical reimbursements. The Legislature can have the the rest of the excess money to give to whoever they want. Just leave the language the same as it is now.	7/9/2016 2:57 PM
367	Please please please fulfill your responsibilities in funding and maintaining funding for hard working pension plan members!	7/9/2016 2:38 PM
368	How to best stop the plan and if enacted how to revert back.	7/9/2016 2:27 PM
369	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed.</li> <li>• Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities.</li> <li>• While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon.</li> <li>• The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?</li> <li>• Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention</li> </ul>	7/9/2016 12:57 PM
370	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention	7/9/2016 12:48 PM
371	The market has had a very positive year, so why the shortage?	7/9/2016 12:36 PM
372	This will set a precedent for all union workers in that the money they've set aside for their future may not be there. I am nervous that the same thing could happen down the road with MY retirement money. We as WSCFF have done our part to be fiscally responsible and also to be accountable, it is an outrage to take that away from us.	7/9/2016 12:22 PM
373	Where do I sign up to get them out of office.	7/9/2016 12:06 PM
374	1. I would remind the legislators that pension funds are trust accounts that are legally protected under state and federal laws, and that they represent a promise made to Firefighters and Law Enforcement Officers by the State of Washington. Any attempt to "raid" these funds--no matter what reasoning is used to get there--represents the legislature's (and, ultimately, the State's) abrogation of this promise. The State of Washington and it's Legislature should keep their collective hands off these funds.	7/9/2016 11:57 AM
375	The money for the retiree's go to them. This should net be allowed to go to the state general fund.	7/9/2016 11:39 AM
376	No go	7/9/2016 11:30 AM
377	DON'T DO IT	7/9/2016 11:18 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

378	This is criminal and unethical.	7/9/2016 11:11 AM
379	How dare you steal my contributions to LEOFF1 to cover your lack of funding for TRS1?	7/9/2016 11:02 AM
380	I think they are looking for a way out of their screw ups.	7/9/2016 11:00 AM
381	I think the Legislature needs to look at consolidation of all Public Safety Plans. Take all the Benefits of each plan and incorporate them into one.	7/9/2016 10:37 AM
382	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention	7/9/2016 10:15 AM
383	I am opposed, please stop the merger!	7/9/2016 10:04 AM
384	I don't like the idea of even considering a merger. We LEOFF 1 retirees have a solid retirement plan whereas TRS 1 has been on the rocks for several years. I recall hearing recently that the COLA that was given to TRS was the first one in several years.	7/9/2016 10:01 AM
385	The State has an obligation to both pensions, their poor planning should not effect that.	7/9/2016 10:00 AM
386	I am adamantly opposed to this merger. This is not how the system is designed to work and the burden is being shifted from the responsibility of the legislature and onto the backs of the working people that funded LEOFF.	7/9/2016 9:27 AM
387	These funds are legally protected under state and federal laws. This potential merger raises serious legal issues that need to be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention: 1. Must not reduce LEOFF 1 member benefits. 2. Cannot put the funding for LEOFF 1 benefits at risk. 3. Cannot affect LEOFF 1 disability boards. 4. Cannot affect LEOFF 1 member or employer contributions. 5. Cannot modify LEOFF 1 governance. 6. Must receive IRS approval before the effective date of the bill. 7. Must follow state laws and case law protecting pension benefits and funding. 8. Must ensure the new merged fund is protected from future state underfunding. 9. Cannot modify LEOFF 2 governance. 10. Cannot increase LEOFF 2 member or employer contributions.	7/9/2016 9:15 AM
388	This seems like a money grab.	7/9/2016 9:12 AM
389	Follow mandates of the people for teacher pay raises and school funding and make them happen WHEN THE REFERENDUM IS PASSED, not down the road sometime or raiding retirement funds the fire fighters have paid for.	7/9/2016 9:06 AM
390	Do their job and fund the TRS without robbing our funds.	7/9/2016 8:51 AM
391	This is absolutely a poor, poor way to solve problems. Stop wasting money on the fluffy things and fund the important things properly, again without raising taxes & fees. The State receives plenty of money already to do the right things!	7/9/2016 8:33 AM
392	This pension is actually a trust account and is protected by state and federal laws. This merger plan raises some serious legal issues.	7/9/2016 8:30 AM
393	The law enforcement officers and firefighters who contributed to this plan over many years worked hard to support the fiscal responsibility of the fund. They placed their earned benefit into this fund to support other law enforcement officers and firefighters, not to allow the state to shore up budget deficits of their own making. Using the fund for anything other than the support of law enforcement officers and firefighters is morally unconscionable.	7/9/2016 8:19 AM
394	It is not the responsibility of the Firefighters of Washington State to fund the pension of the teachers, that is the responsibility of the State, which it has failed to do. The legislature has continuously failed to take action by closing tax loopholes and thus creating greater revenue, yet they want the LEOFF Trust to address their funding problems.	7/9/2016 7:55 AM
395	Why have they chosen to not fund trs over the years? And now need the funds from leoff to fix their problem they created	7/9/2016 7:48 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

396	don't do it. figure out how to manage those other pension funds so they are solvent.	7/9/2016 7:08 AM
397	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. It's a contract you made with us and just because we have managed our money well and have a surplus now you want to take it from us. It's not right. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. I'm tired of doing all the heavy lifting for this issue. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/9/2016 6:56 AM
398	TRS 1 is operated by the state. Not by myself, "I'm a firefighter. Not a teacher". Fix your budget problem. Don't touch police officer and firefighter pensions.	7/9/2016 6:39 AM
399	I am fully opposed. Take the plan you have to restore the proposed combined plan's funding and apply it to TRS1. It is the state which is solely to blame for its current deficit.	7/9/2016 6:28 AM
400	SHAME ON YOU!!!!	7/9/2016 5:00 AM
401	I would be addimantly opposed to this and would vote against anyone who voted for it	7/9/2016 4:24 AM
402	why mess with a plan that is working as it was designed I feel a merger would put the plan in jeopardy just like the SOC system has been	7/9/2016 1:53 AM
403	Un doing what was hard won in creating the leoff 2 board being un done to raid the assets is not the solution to what ever problem it is supposed to help.	7/9/2016 1:11 AM
404	Vote NO.	7/9/2016 12:31 AM
405	LEOFF 1 employees earned their retirement benefits including medical. They did not invest their time and money to fund other state programs.	7/8/2016 11:26 PM
406	I oppose this, and feel the people who were suppose to properly fund TRS1 in the first place need to be held accountable!	7/8/2016 10:52 PM
407	How about a medical benefit for LEOFF 2 members funded from the LEOFF 1 excess?	7/8/2016 10:37 PM
408	Paying for an underfunded pension system with another is NOT acceptable!	7/8/2016 10:21 PM
409	Laughable proof of the legislatures inability to properly manage state programs in an ethical fashion. Good luck	7/8/2016 10:12 PM
410	I will staunchly oppose any attempt to rob our system or "merge" as it's commonly solicited.	7/8/2016 10:07 PM
411	Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters	7/8/2016 9:51 PM
412	I would want to know why they continually are not fiscally responsible.	7/8/2016 9:50 PM
413	Why jeopardize the firefighters and police officers because of your short sightedness for the teachers? The teachers did not contribute to LEOFF!	7/8/2016 9:41 PM
414	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/8/2016 9:35 PM
415	Leave our retirement alone.....we have a good retirement system because we depend on it, traditionally firefighters do not live as long as most of the population. Don't take away our main perk.	7/8/2016 9:35 PM
416	Big mistake	7/8/2016 9:33 PM
417	How will it be funded into the future?	7/8/2016 9:22 PM
418	A promise from the State of WA that they will keep the current benefits and that the State will not see any overages in the LEOFF system like they wanted to do with the LEOFF 1 system when it was overfunded.	7/8/2016 9:12 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

419	No merger, Leoff 1 made the surplus, It's ours, leave us alone!	7/8/2016 9:06 PM
420	The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of OUR retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for THEIR failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/8/2016 8:50 PM
421	I would only support a LEOFF 1 and 2 merger; and only if it meet the stakeholder parameters, as adopted by the WSCFF.	7/8/2016 8:02 PM
422	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? I support a merger of LEOFF 1 and LEOFF2, and any merger proposal must have the following to gain my support: Must not reduce LEOFF 1 member benefits. Cannot put the funding for LEOFF 1 benefits at risk. Cannot affect LEOFF 1 disability boards. Cannot affect LEOFF 1 member or employer contributions. Cannot modify LEOFF 1 governance. Must receive IRS approval before the effective date of the bill. Must follow state laws and case law protecting pension benefits and funding. Must ensure the new merged fund is protected from future state underfunding. Cannot modify LEOFF 2 governance. Cannot increase LEOFF 2 member or employer contributions.	7/8/2016 7:34 PM
423	Focus on strengthening benefits and documenting language that protects and ensures said benefits for those in which they are intended.	7/8/2016 7:26 PM
424	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention	7/8/2016 7:26 PM
425	Compare the numbers of LEOFF 1 retirees to the numbers of LEOFF 2 and Prs 1 retirees. You'll see the numbers are heavily weighted away from the LEOFF 1 retirees many of whom including myself contributed to LEOFF 1 for over 30 years. I strongly believe that our retirement money should be left in place until the last of our ranks are no more.	7/8/2016 7:24 PM
426	How is this a benefit for leoff 1?	7/8/2016 7:22 PM
427	The best idea here is to merge LEOFF 1 & 2	7/8/2016 7:05 PM
428	GOP has no business using this money set aside for firefighters and law enforcement- NONE.	7/8/2016 7:03 PM
429	No merger	7/8/2016 6:54 PM
430	Stop trying to take OUR funds. It is meant for our retirement for years of service to the community.	7/8/2016 6:40 PM
431	It should not be the responsibility of retired firefighters and police officers to bail the state out of their failure to be responsible to teachers retirements. It's time the state stop playing a shell game with funding retirement plans that they created and workers did their part in contributing. The state must do their part as well	7/8/2016 6:30 PM
432	LEOFF 1 pension funds are supposed to be protected, so how can the State legally use the funds for anything other than LEOFF 1? LEOFF 1 members certainly can't be held responsible for the underfunding of TRS 1.	7/8/2016 6:29 PM
433	It should stay in the Leoff system to fund enhancements agreed to in law in 2008	7/8/2016 6:22 PM
434	The basic idea is dishonest. The Legislature refuses to support teachers - so they can steal from firefighters to pretend they are giving teachers what they already earned?	7/8/2016 6:17 PM
435	I am opposed to the merger and feel the legislature should seek funds and resources through a traditional method as opposed to taking away from a separate fund.	7/8/2016 6:15 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

436	Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention.	7/8/2016 6:14 PM
437	Why does the state want to place their burden on the back of retired LEOFF members to supplement another retirement fund when the state did not meet their obligation.	7/8/2016 6:10 PM
438	No	7/8/2016 6:10 PM
439	Mixing funds earmarked for specific purposes should not be allowed. As far as the LEOFF system goes there are no differences between the fires fought in 1977 an 1978. But the State determined that the workers in the profession should accept a lesser pension system in 1978. Flash forward to today, the science and data readily available supports that the nature of our work today is far more hazardous than in 1977. The members of today's LEOFF system respond to a much wider range of emergencies than the types of 911 calls that occurred in 1977. We are required to be more technically proficient, educated, and must conform to a higher professional standard. LEOFF pension surplus monies should be kept in the LEOFF system and used to support and secure the public pensions for our State's first responders and emergency managers which the public relies on daily, and has an ever present expectation of response when a solution is not readily available to the challenge at hand.	7/8/2016 6:09 PM
440	Do not decrease benefits for the LEOFF Plan 2 members.	7/8/2016 6:08 PM
441	The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/8/2016 6:08 PM
442	Opposed	7/8/2016 6:03 PM
443	I am disappointed that the state would want to take money from LEOFF 1 members in a solvent plan to bail out the state after it intentionally neglected funding for TRS 1. Cops and firefighters dont have anything in common with regards to working conditions so why would the state merger these 2 different plans after the state created them separately.	7/8/2016 5:55 PM
444	Get your state budget in order before you come knocking on our door to solve your problems.	7/8/2016 5:55 PM
445	Other existing plans to solve the issues with TRS1 should be exercised first. This should be a bi-partisan solution and should not be done by compromising other plans.	7/8/2016 5:51 PM
446	No thank you, we have done a fine job managing our pension and don't need your help diapering it to state coffers.	7/8/2016 5:49 PM
447	Firefighters and Police officers have been the primary payers into the LEOFF. We and our board should always have the majority of say in our pension changes. We must take time to make sure this we'll run system will not go bad from politicians trying to steal what is not there's to have! You have many unnecessary tax loop that could be closed to gain needed revenue for state needs.	7/8/2016 5:42 PM
448	No No Hell No.	7/8/2016 5:40 PM
449	It is the obligation of the state, not the retired police officers and firefighters to properly fund pensions system like TRS 1...PLEASE, DO NOT RAID FUNDS FROM A PROPERLY FUNDED SYSTEM JUST BECAUSE PAST LEGISLATORS DID NOT DO THEIR JOBS!!	7/8/2016 5:38 PM
450	The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/8/2016 5:26 PM
451	Please consider consolidation of LEOFF PLANS and continue to fulfill prior state obligations to fund TERS	7/8/2016 5:25 PM
452	Have the legislature quit taking money from the pension systems to fund other state programs.	7/8/2016 5:17 PM
453	Absolutely not.	7/8/2016 5:15 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

454	These funds are a trust account. Legally protected by state and federal law. This idea is a bad one and seeks to fix an underfunded plan with a plan that is currently healthy. Republicans refuse to close tax loopholes but don't hesitate to try to steal away from the trust fund established to care for the retirement security of our firefighters and police. Your "smoothed" value is bogus! There's at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account that you say there is. The underfunded TRS 1 is the obligation of the state of Washington, not the firefighters and police of Washington. Balance your damn budget without raiding firefighter's and police benefits!	7/8/2016 5:14 PM
455	The State is looking to fund a retirement account (TRS) that they have continually underfunded by taking money from an account that has been contributed to and managed responsibly and is one of very few that can meet its own obligations to the retired Police Officers and Firefighters it serves. Raiding the LEOFF 1 account to make up the Legislature's failure to properly fund TRS is shameful. If LEOFF 1 is indeed over-funded and this can be guaranteed, then any "merger" of plans should include, if not exclusively, the LEOFF 2 plan, which would keep the funds dedicated to the future retired Police and Firefighters AS THE FUND WAS INTENDED!	7/8/2016 5:11 PM
456	From what I understand TRS plan is already in trouble- why take them on ?	7/8/2016 5:09 PM
457	Don't do it. Fix the problem another way.	7/8/2016 5:07 PM
458	I am against merging the two systems as they are very different and it would likely make it much harder to hold parties accountable for their actions or inactions regarding the the LEOFF retirement system.	7/8/2016 5:01 PM
459	Retired members should not be punished for the past sins of the legislature.	7/8/2016 4:55 PM
460	Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities.	7/8/2016 4:49 PM
461	Why are you going after retired Firefighter and Police Officer benefits? Are you going after their pensions to cover for your shortcomings? They have done their jobs and earned their benefits, please do yours.	7/8/2016 4:44 PM
462	Guarantees in writing that funding will be 100%	7/8/2016 4:44 PM
463	The unfunded liability of TRS is a legislative problem they created in the first place. The legislature needs to fix that without effecting other pension plans. Merger plan shall not decrease/change LEOFF 1 benefits.	7/8/2016 4:37 PM
464	Fix the problem that got you here.	7/8/2016 4:36 PM
465	See above	7/8/2016 4:36 PM
466	This is a very bad idea. The Legislature is proposing a merger of the LEOFF I system that is currently solvent to bail out other retirement funds that are not. The Legislature should do its job and properly fund the other retirement systems in a manner that makes them solvent. The LEOFF I fund should be left alone until the last LEOFF I member has passed.	7/8/2016 4:32 PM
467	SUING in court to keep it out of their hands & voting them out of office no matter what party they belong to !!!!!	7/8/2016 4:31 PM
468	NO	7/8/2016 4:29 PM
469	This is typical political insanity. Take two well funded plans and drag them into arrears. How obtuse can you get?	7/8/2016 4:28 PM
470	More than a comment I would still defer to why? What is the Legislature's intent? Weakening a successful plan just to by time, but not fixing the real problem isn't going to work.	7/8/2016 4:27 PM
471	They have more important issues, education, mental health and a long list of other things	7/8/2016 4:27 PM
472	Pension plans are Trust accounts and are protected under state and federal laws and the state constitution this seems like a "scheme" to avoid reducing big tax breaks to properly fund state obligations. It is my understanding that the amount of LEOFF 1 money this plan is based on is grossly overstated.	7/8/2016 4:26 PM
473	Must not reduce LEOFF 1 member benefits. Cannot put the funding for LEOFF 1 benefits at risk. Cannot affect LEOFF 1 disability boards. Cannot affect LEOFF 1 member or employer contributions. Cannot modify LEOFF 1 governance. Must receive IRS approval before the effective date of the bill. Must follow state laws and case law protecting pension benefits and funding. Must ensure the new merged fund is protected from future state underfunding. Cannot modify LEOFF 2 governance. Cannot increase LEOFF 2 member or employer contributions.	7/8/2016 4:23 PM
474	Don't do it. Leave it alone! Do your job and fund the teachers pension system. Government pension systems all over the U.S. have been underfunded or raided and resulted pensions being dismantled or cut. Start today to adequately fund the pension systems and quit giving tax breaks to the rich on the backs of working people	7/8/2016 4:22 PM
475	If the state has promised the teachers a better retirement than is funded, use monies from discretionary spending programs.	7/8/2016 4:22 PM
476	NO WAY!!!!!!	7/8/2016 4:22 PM



## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

497	why not take back the funds from the general budget and restore the lottery funds back to schools as promised. That is how you sold the state lottery to the the public years ago. The funding was promised to schools. the the state got greedy and used it for your little pet projects	7/8/2016 3:39 PM
498	Stop playing politics with the benefits we worked for and earned. Write a check from your own bank account, or better yet, imagine doing your job, per the statute and court order. But we know doing your job is not a priority to you; stealing benefits earned by others and staying under the radar seem to be your priorities.	7/8/2016 3:34 PM
499	Not in favor. The TRS system should bail out the TRS system not LEOFF.	7/8/2016 3:31 PM
500	IF IT IS DONE WHEN WILL YOU PAY THE MONEY BACK TO THE LEOFF FUND?	7/8/2016 3:31 PM
501	• The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/8/2016 3:29 PM
502	Fix what they have let go before using another's to make up the deficit, it is stealing in my mind regardless of what political spin is put on it.	7/8/2016 3:27 PM
503	• Pension funds are trust accounts which are legally protected under state and federal laws. This scheme raises a number of serious legal issues that must be addressed. • Legislators refuse to close any number of worthless tax loopholes which cost taxpayers billions per year, but they didn't hesitate for a second to take money from the trust fund established to pay for the retirement security of law enforcement officers and firefighters. They should reevaluate their priorities. • While it may be proper to use the "smoothed" value of assets for some actuarial funding purposes, you can actually spend smoothed assets. We know there is at least \$200 million less in the LEOFF 1 account than this proposal is based upon. • The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money? • Inclusion of any of the 10 principles adopted at the WSCFF Convention	7/8/2016 3:26 PM
504	LEOFF employees are not teachers, their contributions are more and should stay with LEOFF members of plan 1 or plan 2.	7/8/2016 3:20 PM
505	The unfunded liability in TRS 1 is an obligation of the state, not of our retired firefighters and law enforcement officers. Legislators like to talk about accountability when it applies to others, but where's the accountability for their failure to balance the supplemental budget without raiding retired cops' and firefighter's pension money?	7/8/2016 3:19 PM
506	You are stealing from a group of employees that serve the public at great cost, the monies place in the LEOFF system should stay in that system to ensure there will always be enough funds to take care of thar took care of the people the served.	7/8/2016 3:19 PM
507	No	7/8/2016 3:18 PM
508	Not only no but hell no.	7/8/2016 3:17 PM
509	Legislators who vote to pay for TRS 1 unfunded liabilities and otherwise steal every cent of the LEOFF 1 "surplus" to pay for other state obligations are irresponsible and deserve to be replaced. A plan merger in itself is not necessarily a bad idea, but not structured the way Senate Republicans did it in 2016.	7/8/2016 3:17 PM
510	The firefighters and police officers have strong legislative pacs. Be very aware of that	7/8/2016 3:17 PM
511	Stop stealing from something in and thousands of others have worked hard to build and maintain	7/8/2016 3:15 PM
512	Assuming this is being proposed to shore up a broke TRS 1 system, what other alternatives have been explored?	7/8/2016 3:14 PM
513	Find other ways TRS to fund their pension and not steal funds from LEOFF I. Move funds to LEOFF II or enhance LEOFF I.	7/8/2016 3:14 PM
514	If anyone has access to the LEOFF 1 funds it should be the LEOFF 2 board, and not until AFTER all LEOFF 1 eligible plan members have passed away. TRS members should not be bankrolled by our hard work and judicial financial planning.	7/8/2016 3:13 PM
515	Don't take money from pensions to balance a budget.	7/8/2016 3:08 PM
516	This is illegal, unethical and not necessary! Or, at least it wouldn't if the State had met their promises to the teachers and leoff 2 officers	7/8/2016 2:58 PM
517	I believe the first persons to benefit from the merging or sharing of any of the excess LEOFF I funds, should be the parties that contributed them. As such, the employers left with the lifetime responsibilities for these retired civil servants should be assisted with the growing and increasingly expensive medical costs. As this plan ages, so do the members and the cost of their care is soaring, leaving cities and counties on the verge of bankruptcy to care for these individuals. It affects police and fire department budgets, at a time when we need even more officers.	7/8/2016 12:42 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

518	As a share holder I am against the plan to merge 'any' two plans.	7/8/2016 9:44 AM
519	Seems like a money grab.	7/8/2016 9:35 AM
520	Do not do it.	7/8/2016 7:57 AM
521	State retirement plans should be well funded on their own. If more is needed to fund them. Then provisions for members still employed to increase their contributions if necessary.	7/8/2016 7:32 AM
522	Fund the required benefits of the LEOFF 1 retirement plan first. That includes the long-term medical costs of these retirees.	7/8/2016 7:27 AM
523	TRS 1 should have better managed their retirement system. I fear their merger will adversely affect LEOFF 1.	7/8/2016 12:00 AM
524	As a wife of a retired member of LEOFF 1 I am opposed to any merger as I believe my benefits would go away. My husband served 30 years, was shot at by two different criminals, and I fully supported him through all these years that he put his life on the line to safeguard citizens. In my mid-60s I shouldn't have to worry about my financial future when I trusted LEOFF 1 would provide for me and my husband to the end of our lives.	7/7/2016 8:48 PM
525	Do do it.	7/7/2016 8:06 PM
526	I do not think it would be safe for all concerned	7/7/2016 7:58 PM
527	I am completely against any merger with any retirement system except LEOFF 2.	7/7/2016 6:12 PM
528	Both systems need to be left in a financial viable position.	7/7/2016 5:09 PM
529	Find another way to bail out TERS and LOEFF 2.	7/7/2016 4:24 PM
530	LEOFF1 members should not have to use their well managed funds to bail out other plans. Distribute excess funds among its members. I believe Alaska chose this approach.	7/7/2016 3:50 PM
531	The employers (cities) that paid into the fund for the LF1 retirees need to be protected from having any type of additional contributions required or the surplus should not be shared with any other entity other than those that made the contributions to the fund. These were funds dedicated to LF1 employees and should remain dedicated to LF1 employees.	7/7/2016 3:19 PM
532	This entire subject matter is total nonsense.	7/7/2016 3:09 PM
533	It's wrong to take money from my LEOFF 2, half of which the employee pays, and give it to another group!	7/7/2016 2:51 PM
534	I do not feel it is ethical to repurpose LEOFF 1 monies to fix TRS issues at the expense of LEOFF1 members.	7/7/2016 2:39 PM
535	The fact is that LEOFF members kept their contribution rates higher when times were good while TRS did not. Our responsible actions should enhance our members and not those who were not as responsible.	7/7/2016 2:07 PM
536	I would not want to see an over-funded plan supplement an underfunded one without clear explanations	7/7/2016 1:33 PM
537	FUCK NO!!!!!!!!!!!!	7/7/2016 1:32 PM
538	It seems similar to social security being raided. The monies acquired by participants should remain viable FOR INTENDED PARTIES. When there are NO beneficiaries, including widows, the assets are then an option for other uses.	7/7/2016 1:28 PM
539	A merger of LEOFF 1 and LEOFF 2 makes more sense.	7/7/2016 1:23 PM
540	Work on TRS 1 to repair it and bring it up to its proper standards. There are other financial areas (wasteful spending) that can be trimmed.	7/7/2016 10:33 AM
541	They make NO gaurentee of keeping Our benefits. Intent & intentions mean Nothing... this is just a Raid on Our money..	7/6/2016 11:19 PM
542	I believe it is illegal and uses my pension to bail out another system that the state failed to properly fund.	7/6/2016 7:38 PM
543	There will be a very large law suite if this is implemented.	7/6/2016 7:15 PM
544	Do not reassign funds from a previously created pension system that made very specific promises, and was properly funded for a very specific group of contracted employees. Fulfill those promises, and when all of the specifically entitled members of LEOFF 1 are no longer in need of the promised services, then the funds may be reassigned as necessary.	7/6/2016 3:47 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

545	The savings to the state by by not paying their share of the TRS 1 contributions by merging the 2 plans does not justify the merger; as the same funding issues by the state will need to be addressed at a later time; while having a negative impact on the LEOFF 1 Plan. The legislature changed the LEOFF system and created LEOFF 2, which is a failure and provides unequal benefits for Line of Duty injuries and LODD to LEOFF 2 members than it does to LEOFF 1!! LEOFF 1, police and fire, city and county and local fire districts from both the East and West side of the state needs to be equally represented on any governance board of a merged plan. Retiree LEOFF 1 members shall be allowed to be on the governance board, as well as LEOFF 2 retirees and active members of each plan.	7/6/2016 3:43 PM
546	This would appear to be bad policy, will certainly result in litigation, and represents another example of a State effort to pass its own expenses on to local government.	7/6/2016 1:58 PM
547	Don't do it - cities need any excess LEOFF I dollars to pay for the monstrous medical costs of retirees.	7/6/2016 1:41 PM
548	The City would be open to paying for a medical plan for retirees, but not any out-of-pocket if the decision is not up to our boards.	7/6/2016 1:38 PM
549	Probably a bad idea.	7/6/2016 11:26 AM
550	I think kit is just another plan to take our reserve.	7/6/2016 11:22 AM
551	leave our plan alone, you and the other planes have messed those systems up so fix it yourself	7/6/2016 10:43 AM
552	I don't trust the legislators in keeping their promises.	7/6/2016 9:52 AM
553	There should be no shifts of resources from one plan to the other. There should be no blending of the resources of the two plans. The members, entities and tax-payers that contributed the existing resources should not be subsidizing someone who did not provide services to the respective communities.	7/6/2016 7:44 AM
554	Please don't merge LEOFF1 benefits with TRS 1. Please merge LEOFF1 & LEOFF2 benefits together so they stay in with Law Enforcement Officers.	7/6/2016 7:42 AM
555	Are they prepared for a legal battle if this proposal goes further that "a-look-see" phase? Why are you looking only at LEOFF1 for money? There are several other areas that can and should be considered... Finally, is this a "Political motivated" agenda?	7/5/2016 8:45 PM
556	It would not be possible without a loss of benefits to myself or spouse.	7/5/2016 7:39 PM
557	No, no, no. Leave it like it is, don't mess with a paid for plan, that is solid. Don't screw it up.	7/5/2016 7:38 PM
558	While I am not an attorney I believe that there are Federal and State Laws that would prevent this from occurring and would urge any LEOFF 1 personnel to not approve any merger.	7/5/2016 3:53 PM
559	If it doesn't improve our Plan, then I would be against it.	7/5/2016 3:47 PM
560	Completely opposed.	7/5/2016 3:29 PM
561	TERS1 is in a 2.9 billion deficit and LOEFF1 has a 1.1 billion surplus. The LEOFF 1 pensioners are VERY concerned about being bundled into a combined plan that would be in deficit. There was also some traction to study combining LEOFF1 and LEOFF2, both of which are fiscally sound - so that the LEOFF2 participants would potentially benefit from the LEOFF 1 surplus since the two plans are so disparate and the beneficiaries are the same. LEOFF1 members were opposed to that merger too.	7/5/2016 2:10 PM
562	The Legislature to please the voters will continue to balance the budget as the State Constitution requires by taking funds, not funding schools (as you are doing now)and not funding the other State obligations,	7/5/2016 1:25 PM
563	Do not affect the members of these plans. Since they are in Plan1 - they are most likely to be elderly and possibly living on a fixed income. They do not need to have more change. In fact, I think that the merger of the plans would include an increase for the members. They deserve it.	7/5/2016 12:59 PM
564	LEOFF 2 is running well now. If this merger will have a negative impact on our public servants...don't do it.	7/5/2016 12:58 PM
565	If there is to be a plan merger, I would prefer a blending of LEOFF plans 1 and 2. I suspect those entities are financially healthier than TRS plans due to numbers and demographics of participants. I suspect it would be in the best interest of the city and county governments and their employees paying into LEOFF plans 1 and 2, to stay together and avoid the unfunded debt obligations of the far larger TRS plans.	7/5/2016 10:56 AM
566	This is rush job to hurry the package into the merger with very little notice unlike other legislation of this magnitude that can take years to complete. The sponsoring parties/ people should be ashamed of their methods to diminish our funds.	7/5/2016 10:48 AM
567	Hands off. We all know what happens once specific funs, are placed into the "General Fund." There designation is at the whim of the legislators, many of which have there own personal agenda. That has always been the way of legislative bodies, as it is all too easy to spend monies that aren't yours.	7/5/2016 9:21 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

568	I feel that the legislature is constantly coming after the LEOFF 1 system due to their failure to properly fund the other retirement plans. I feel our governing body is to far removed from the working people and are just looking for an easy, quick fix to a problem that they have created over a long period of time. You should be looking at other ways to prop up the other plans.	7/5/2016 7:37 AM
569	Current Leoff 1 members should be allowed to have say so I where the money goes.	7/4/2016 9:00 PM
570	Lack of trust in the legislature doing what they should have been doing for years, funding the other retirement systems as they were required to do, for years....and here we are again trying to use LEOFF 1 funds in a feeble attempt to offset underfunding in other systems. I was appalled at the lack of information, facts and history at the meeting last year not only by the Senators in the hearing, but a State employee who testified. None of the Senators were in office in 1970. I was there in 1970 At the time all LE agencies in the state had their own retirement systems or had some type of State retirement if they were smaller agencies. Those monies were put into LEOFF when it was formed in March of 1970 and people at the time were given options, keep their existing or go to LEOFF depending on their time of service. LEOFF was not underfunded at this time and this is the reason the State did not make contributions until 1975 despite that agreement when LEOFF was approved. In addition, the average percentage of State contributions from 1975 to 2000, was 40.4%, not 77% as testified to by this State accountant. There was no rescue of LEOFF1 because it was underfunded in 1970 as testified to by the accountant. The State stopped contributing in 2000, and we have a "surplus" that the state now wants to use to fund other systems....the original commitments by the state were not honored at the inception of LEOFF 1. Most of the contributions were by the employees and employers. Sadly, no one at that hearing presented facts which are readily available.	7/4/2016 5:44 PM
571	Please, NO. If you make it better fine, but I don't think you can.	7/4/2016 2:41 PM
572	Have the Legislature's merge their Pension with TRS 1 and leave ours alone!!	7/4/2016 1:41 PM
573	I'm now 68, it's late in life to start back to work. My current and future financial picture were formed around current benefits of LEOFF 1, and other investments. I'm not the least bit interested in a buy out, any more tax liability, nor diminished benefits of any kind. Please don't make me go back to work. LEOFF Plan 1 is a stellar example of a well run and administered system. The membership is dwindling, not expanding, let it run its course then take the remaining funding to fix what ever needs fixing. I don't have any facts available as to why TRS 1 is in such bad shape, but someone at the state level should be able tell you. No sob stories, I kept my part of the bargain when I worked nearly 30 years and retired on a time in service retirement, now I ask that you keep your end of the bargain. I like local control instilled in the LEOFF 1 system.	7/4/2016 1:21 PM
574	NO	7/4/2016 12:47 PM
575	I am against the merger. It is a grab for money that should stay where it is and the legislature should look elsewhere and get more creative to fund projects.	7/4/2016 11:05 AM
576	I would be opposed to any merger. The legislature has not kept it's promises to fund pension plans adequately. The legislature has a history of "closing" pension plans and then creating new ones to their benefit. They have not supported those in place.	7/4/2016 9:43 AM
577	Make sure all the t-s are crossed and eyes. R dotted	7/3/2016 8:55 PM
578	I DON'T THINK THE LANGUAGE I WOULD WANT TO USE TO DESCRIBE HOW I'D FEEL ABOUT THAT IS APPROPRIATE IN THIS FORUM. MAKE YOUR BEST GUESS.	7/3/2016 4:09 PM
579	I am against it. Why can't LEOFF1 be left alone until we are all dead then the state can have any money left over as the law states.	7/3/2016 12:07 PM
580	Let's change legislators, actively recruit common sense thinking persons.	7/3/2016 11:23 AM
581	It is not a wise move for on group to pay for their poor cousins.	7/3/2016 11:15 AM
582	Keep these pension plans separate. Leoff plan1 is unique and defined and will face judicial scrutiny if there is a proposed merger. Our medical benefits and Leoff Plan 1 would be in jeopardy with any merger that changes it's construction as outlined in the RCW's.	7/3/2016 10:59 AM
583	Leave Loeff 1 as it is because it is financially stable. Stop trying to get in to Leoff 1 finances every year because it is solvent!	7/3/2016 10:40 AM
584	Another money grab by the State. This is not to help TRS1, it is to have the funds available for the State to use.	7/3/2016 9:15 AM
585	AGO AND RELATED ABOVE ARE THE LAW...NO CHANGES WHATSOEVER MOVE FORWARD.ANY PERSONS PUSH LAW THROUGH ARE SUBJECT TO SAME HEAVY SANCTIONS,NO MAN IS ABOVE LEGISLATIVE AND DECADES OF APPLIED CASE LAW. PENSION BOARD SHOULD HAVE 2 LEOFF1 MEMBERS ,SORRY ENTIRE BOARD TESTED FOR DEMENTIA.VOTING MEMBERS AT LARGE CHOSEN SHOULD HAVE SAME BODY COUNT. IF LEOFF1 HAS ONLY 5000 MEMBERS, THEN 5000 OF EACH PENSION ALLOWED TO VOTE, A TRUE DEMOCRACY	7/3/2016 5:49 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

586	Would there be a process for appealing that proposal, or could some kind of an injunction be raised to thwart it..??	7/3/2016 12:40 AM
587	COLA reinstated for PERS 1 members be worked into the cost of the merger.	7/2/2016 10:23 PM
588	Shame on the legislator. TRS 1 is a failing system. The money should go into LEOFF 2 and provide additional benefits for those Firefighters and Police who are in the profession. They are not teachers!!! We out our lives on the line every day. Not the same.	7/2/2016 9:50 PM
589	Fund the other retirements out of the general fund as was initially intended.	7/2/2016 9:14 PM
590	The LEOFF 1 plan is fully funded. Why mess with it and take a chance that it will become underfunded at a later date. Leave the system alone and allow the LEOFF 1 people to live out their lives as well as their designated spouse.	7/2/2016 9:13 PM
591	they should not even be thinking about doing this	7/2/2016 7:42 PM
592	See #4	7/2/2016 5:34 PM
593	1. I would invest in support of candidates who would protect LEOFF 1 members interest and become very politically vocal. 2. I would be very involved in contacts with the legislators. 3. I would be a prolific LTE and blogger writer. I would tell all how I had NO benefits for the first 5 years of my career and why LEOFF 1 became a law in the first place. There also should have never been a LEOFF 11 as it was the biggest insult every made to those who put their life on the line. Thats Risk!	7/2/2016 5:14 PM
594	This stinks of thievery. LEOFF 1 has surplus that the thieves are attracted to to balance their overspending in massive other areas. How about cut spending? How about do your jobs like we did ours and leave our pension alone?	7/2/2016 5:14 PM
595	It just makes no sense to merge and have a larger, unfunded system. What seems more practical is the TRS 1 members contributing from their retirement to shore up their system. I'm not sure what percentage of their pay that they contributed during their working years; but, it's probably safe to say that they contributed far less than LEOFF 1 members.	7/2/2016 4:51 PM
596	This is an example of the legislators lack of common sense when they create a problem then create other problems when correcting the original problem...and in this case their lack of concern for the LEOFF 1 members.	7/2/2016 3:33 PM
597	I would not be in favor unless all the questions are answered in favor of LEOFF 1 members and I would lobby my reps to vote no if it was not.	7/2/2016 3:25 PM
598	The Legislature needs to Stop messing with LEOFF plan 1. Every time they screw with a plan it gets worse.	7/2/2016 3:19 PM
599	LEOFF should stay LEOFF by merging 1 and 2 the membership stay similar and both LEOFF systems are healthy. Merging with TRS would weaken LEOFF 1	7/2/2016 2:23 PM
600	In the past, the court has ruled against this kind of action. When I went to work for the Clallam County S.O. part of my pay went into the LEOFF Ret. System. I qualified for food stamps but didn't apply for them because we didn't know about them. When I was shot in the line of duty and was unable to continue working for the department, the money we received, even though a small amount, was a life saver for our family. The medical was really helpful as I needed ongoing medical appointments. If the two unlike systems are merged, will I still be covered, or will I lose that benefit?	7/2/2016 2:18 PM
601	Teachers and Law Enforcement Officers should remain separate.	7/2/2016 1:36 PM
602	Leave our funds alone. We will be gone soon.	7/2/2016 1:08 PM
603	I feel a merger is not a good idea. Why take one healthy, and one sick, and make two sick? The LEOFF 1 plan is closed, and in a few years there will be no beneficiaries to pay. At that time the money will revert back to the state. Be patient. The state will get the money soon enough.	7/2/2016 12:42 PM
604	Don't even consider it.	7/2/2016 12:34 PM
605	We know that this merger or any merger, is another attempt by the Legislature to attach its self to the excess money in our system. LEOFF1 stockholders should not have to worry about their retirement system being manipulated by the government. We kept our part of the deal.	7/2/2016 11:23 AM
606	Maybe its time for a fight. This merger nonsense is never going to go away.	7/2/2016 11:21 AM
607	Leave our retirement fund alone.	7/2/2016 11:11 AM
608	why	7/2/2016 10:34 AM
609	The teachers already screwed up their system, I wouldn't want them to screw up ours also if they got involved.	7/2/2016 10:31 AM
610	not room to list them all	7/2/2016 10:27 AM
611	When LEOFF 1 was funded, the legislature did a good thing. Will this merger be as good?	7/2/2016 10:03 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

612	The teachers should solve their own problems without stealing money from us. We earned our retirement, we cannot give part of it away to moochers!	7/2/2016 10:01 AM
613	You simply cannot be trusted.....too much double talk.....Leave us alone, we will all be dead in a matter of a short time and you can take what you want.....simply leave us alone!! We are tired of having to step up every year to protect that which is ours....you have obligations....see to them....do what you are obligated by law to do.	7/2/2016 9:06 AM
614	Would they fully fund, which they have not done over the years, which is why TERS 1 is in such bad shape.	7/2/2016 8:33 AM
615	Don't do it. Leave our retirement system alone! Our retirement system has always worked and never required a bail out by the State.	7/2/2016 6:42 AM
616	his is just like the Federal ri-off of Social Security fundin. Just play money to them.	7/2/2016 6:31 AM
617	Leave the LEOFF 1 alone.	7/2/2016 6:28 AM
618	How can you trust politicians to ever keep a promise?	7/2/2016 5:19 AM
619	Solve TRS 1 insolvent problems with tax increases & business long terms deductions prior to taking on the administration of so far prudently & well managed pension fund.	7/2/2016 1:59 AM
620	In 1970 I signed on as a police officer and served over 27 years. I could have left the police service many times for a higher paying job but stuck it out because of the LEOFF 1 retirement benefits. Please don't disrupt our retirement that we signed on for those many years ago because of political mistakes.	7/1/2016 8:19 PM
621	Need to see merger plan..	7/1/2016 7:43 PM
622	No merger !	7/1/2016 7:04 PM
623	What are you going to use the unused funds when all LEOFF 1 members are no longer with us?	7/1/2016 5:56 PM
624	1-In the sad event Leoff1 should have control af any new boards. 2-All local Leoff 1 pension boards should stay intact 3- Leoff 1 representation at all planned meetings by the committee 4-Leoff 1 and2 are merged they are both fully funded. I see no advantage here except a move by Leoff 2 to control Leoff1. This should never be allowed. Since Leoff 2 is full funded merge it with the Teachers1 and leave Leoff1 alone. 5-Again according to your actuary Teachers1 will be fully funded from contributions and investments in ten years. Don't seem that they need a merger. Sounds like an attempt by the legislature to grab the money and put it into the general fund.Should not be allowed to happen. That's pension money. 6- If this merger is made and the legislature tries to peice off the Leoff1 stakeholders with \$5000 asthey previously did, no one should accept that. Try \$100,000 That would probably work and would still leave a lot of money for the Teachers fund. Again , NO MONEY TO GENERAL FUND. 6-No Reduction of Leoff1 benefits	7/1/2016 4:42 PM
625	I am HIGHLY OPPOSED to merging with any other retirement group. But especially opposed to merging with one with such a different employment background. This seems to be only a money grab. LEOFF 1 is overfunded and I do not support merging with another ground that has such a fiscal liability.	7/1/2016 4:08 PM
626	I am opposed to any merger of the LEOFF 1 system.	7/1/2016 3:21 PM
627	No merger, period.	7/1/2016 2:38 PM
628	Why go from 1 fund being funded 100% to two funds that are under funded. Doesn't make sense.	7/1/2016 1:22 PM
629	Don't do it. The probable loser if this happens are the Leoff 1 retirees.	7/1/2016 1:10 PM
630	If you do this, in violation of existing law, next will be the IRS exemption for line-of-duty retirees, then taking away our medical boards and ultimately gutting our medical.	7/1/2016 11:14 AM
631	It is my understanding that here is no legal basis for this kind of action. It does not seem to solve the States problem with the under funded TRS 1. It just creates more problem in different areas.	7/1/2016 10:39 AM
632	I am against any merger.Leave our pension funds alone.	7/1/2016 10:11 AM
633	None. I'm against any merger.	7/1/2016 10:10 AM
634	Don't rob our system to fund a underfunded one.	7/1/2016 10:07 AM
635	Without hesitation, I MOST STRONGLY OPPOSE any attempt of ANY merger or ANY change in wording of the LEOFF1 law. See survey questions 3 and 4. Anyone with common sense knows the legislature can not nor will not accomplish those concerns in questions 3 and 4. I am MOST STRONGLY OPPOSED to ANY merger.	7/1/2016 9:52 AM
636	A substantial reduction in retirement benefits for active LEOFF 2 members may encourage members to look at employment options in other states at a time when finding qualified Officer candidates is already difficult.	7/1/2016 9:33 AM
637	I think that the state is looking for money to fund other programs. The state would benefit from the merger but it would be greatly detrimental to LEOFF1 in the long run. Both systems would be underfunded and create a much bigger funding problem for future legislation.	7/1/2016 8:54 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

638	ACTUAL insurance to LEOFF 1 members of the ongoing solvency of our retirement plan.	7/1/2016 8:48 AM
639	The legislature promised to fund TRS1 sometime ago and failed to do so. It is wrong to attempt to fund TRS1 with funds from LEOFF!. Any attempt to do this will be in litigation for years to come, causing the unnecessary expenditures of millions of dollars.	7/1/2016 8:41 AM
640	You have no idea how angry I am about this going on every year. I have worked very hard all my life and now I have a good retirement it all is threatened.	7/1/2016 8:29 AM
641	I am not in favor of a merger of these funds.	7/1/2016 8:19 AM
642	Merging these plans would underfund LEOFF 1 and member cuts would have to be made. Cities, Counties, and Law officers paid their required percentage . The Legislature DID NOT	7/1/2016 7:52 AM
643	I do not support this merger and will not support those who do. Legislature have been unable to properly fund and operate the other retirement systems so leave LEOFF 1 as and use it as an example of success.	7/1/2016 6:38 AM
644	LEOFF 1 is not responsible for the shortfall in the TRS pension plan why should we have to support it not LEOFF2.	7/1/2016 6:24 AM
645	I hope we LEOFF 1 members collectively sue the hell out of the state and hold up any proposed changes in the legal system. The terrible part is the only thing that will be accomplished is a tremendous waste of the aggrieved members money and that of Washington's taxpayers.	6/30/2016 10:59 PM
646	DO NOT DO IT!!!! THIS FUND IS FOR OUR RETIREMENT AND SHOULD NOT BE SHARED!!!	6/30/2016 9:21 PM
647	why put two Retirement plans in the minus, TERS1 plan is being fixed by 2027. Put the Legislatures retirement in TERS1	6/30/2016 8:58 PM
648	See above	6/30/2016 8:44 PM
649	I am OPPOSED TO A MERGER	6/30/2016 8:33 PM
650	What are the legal ramifications that affect the merger. What changes are proposed to change RCW 41.26 and how will it affect each one of its 50 sections. On what legal authority are the changes proposed? Who benefits from these proposals?	6/30/2016 7:41 PM
651	Again why are we bailing out another pension plan	6/30/2016 7:10 PM
652	This is a very poor idea, Please look very close at this plan and do not pass!	6/30/2016 7:07 PM
653	That it is a bad idea for LEOFF 1 members and we should not do it. It is simple economics. Money from a thriving retirement system should not be used to save a failing retirement system in a completely different profession.	6/30/2016 6:25 PM
654	To what end; why do the merger?	6/30/2016 6:18 PM
655	How did you let TRS get so low on funds. It seems I recall that the legislature a few years ago provided early retirement and benefits to teachers and allowed them to return to the classroom for pay.	6/30/2016 6:15 PM
656	See my comments above, and do not do this.	6/30/2016 6:05 PM
657	Yes	6/30/2016 4:55 PM
658	See the above.	6/30/2016 4:35 PM
659	Proceed very, very slowly.	6/30/2016 4:34 PM
660	What is the purpose? I see none.	6/30/2016 4:29 PM
661	Insanity: Doing the same thing over and over with the expectation of a different results. Politics at it's best.	6/30/2016 4:26 PM
662	Each plan was set up as an individual and separate plan. It should stay that way. Members of LEOFF 1 are not obligated to help financial situations for the state legislature	6/30/2016 4:21 PM
663	Please do not merge the LEOFF I Pension Plan with any other plan until the last LEOFF I beneficiary has died. To do otherwise would be breaking a promise that the State of Washington made over four decades ago to Seattle police officers and firefighters, many of whom are now deceased, leaving their widows or widowers dependant upon those benefits. My late husband, a Seattle police officer who retired as a Lieutenant after 30 years, went out for service when he could have retired for medical disability. Having witnessed the large numbers of LEOFF I disability retirements he chose to accept a lower monthly benefit. When he passed away 18 months ago my husband knew that the pension he worked three decades for would take care of me after his death. Please do not merge the LEOFF I plan with any others. Please do not disturb these funds. Please don't break the promise you made over four decades ago.	6/30/2016 3:56 PM
664	There should be clear caveats that any payout of funds to retirees or employers be conditioned on the final legal approval of a merger by the IRS and that if the merger was overturned by legal action that the payouts would also be overturned. Additionally, no funds should be merged without full legal vetting and IRS approval.	6/30/2016 3:55 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

665	I am totally against the merger.	6/30/2016 2:32 PM
666	If it isn't better for LEOFF1 RETIREES, then I don't feel that you have any legal right to change it.	6/30/2016 2:23 PM
667	read 1 & 2	6/30/2016 1:49 PM
668	I am totally opposed. We worked for this retirement and we deserve it. The legislature in the past has decided not to fund our plan.	6/30/2016 1:12 PM
669	Vehemently opposed to any merger. These funds belong to LEOFF1 members only and it is reprehensible to even consider a merger with any other retirement entity.	6/30/2016 1:11 PM
670	opposed	6/30/2016 12:55 PM
671	Unethical and unlawful avoidance of fully funding TRS 1. Clearly an attempt to rob Peter to pay Paul mentality.	6/30/2016 12:52 PM
672	This is bad legislation that will just kick a funding problem down the road for others to deal with later.	6/30/2016 12:20 PM
673	Keep your hands off the LEOFF I funds. This is not a slush fund for the Legislature to use because they can't budget our money in the first place.	6/30/2016 12:15 PM
674	Please find a way to fund medical benefits for LEOFF II retiree's	6/30/2016 12:15 PM
675	You made a contract with me and my contemporaries. We upheld our portion by serving faithfully, paying our share of the retirement plan, and basing our entire lifelong futures on your promises and your word. Simply, why can't you honor your word? You agreed, we agreed. And now that most of us are far and away too old to do anything else you re changing conditions. Honor your promise and leave us alone. Take whatever funds are left after we are gone and give them to the other law enforcement officers and fire fighters who also contracted with you based upon your promises.	6/30/2016 11:53 AM
676	Keep us informed of what the benefit and drawback this merger would create.	6/30/2016 11:46 AM
677	Don't do it leave our retirement alone.	6/30/2016 11:16 AM
678	LEOFF I has worked hard over the years to preserve and manage our funds in a responsible way. A merger with TRS 1 appears to be an attempt by TRS 1 to access our LEOFF I funds to bail them out of their own financial crisis. I am totally against ANY raid on our LEOFF 1 funds. As	6/30/2016 11:04 AM
679	Leave our fully funded LEOFF 1 plan alone!	6/30/2016 10:39 AM
680	is there a befit to LEOFF2, or is this to stream line the systems and save money overall.	6/30/2016 10:34 AM
681	Same as above	6/30/2016 10:27 AM
682	What is in it for me??	6/30/2016 10:27 AM
683	The under funding through poor fiscal management on the part of the state appears to be the reason for this merger and I oppose strongly any attempt to use LEOFF 1 as a resource to solve this problem	6/30/2016 10:23 AM
684	Why should I pay for plan/s that you failed to fund? Its like the Rapid Transit taxes that I have to pay when I don't get any benefit.	6/30/2016 10:10 AM
685	Don't merge!	6/30/2016 10:01 AM
686	DON'T CHANGE THE PLAN.	6/30/2016 9:58 AM
687	I am opposed to any alteration of the Leoff1 plan. I do not trust the legislature to keep any promises made to our members.	6/30/2016 9:27 AM
688	Do not do this, don't jeopardize two pensions, just fix the TRS1 and show the voters that positive things can be done in Olympia.	6/30/2016 9:14 AM
689	I do not want to see any mergers with my LEOFF 1 plan. Leave it alone!	6/30/2016 9:13 AM
690	unknown at this time.	6/30/2016 9:05 AM
691	I am against it.	6/30/2016 9:02 AM
692	Opposed to merging with TRS 1. LEOFF 1 and LEOFF 2 should be merged. These are funds that should properly be dedicated to LEO's.	6/30/2016 8:51 AM
693	If the merger proceeds, LEOFF 1 should proceed with legal action in court.	6/30/2016 8:48 AM
694	I would not be in favor of any merger with Leoff 2 a	6/30/2016 8:47 AM
695	LEOFF 1 and TRS 1 members are all approaching 70 or older. I see no reason to further endanger their ability to spend retirement in comfort.	6/30/2016 8:46 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

696	Any deficits in the TRS system should not be covered by funds in the LEOFF system.	6/30/2016 8:44 AM
697	Merge LEOFF 1 and LEOFF 2 and don't try to take the funds of first responders to cover TRS, or shortfalls due to McCleary, or some other issue not related to the original purpose of those retirement accounts.	6/30/2016 8:42 AM
698	I am against any merger and will support those who agree with me. Protect Leoff1.	6/30/2016 8:41 AM
699	what ensures that leoff1 \$\$ will remain available and protected rather than "i.o.u's" being left as in Social Security	6/30/2016 8:38 AM
700	Provide for Medical Coverage for retired LEOFF 2 Employees.	6/30/2016 8:34 AM
701	Hang everyone involved in the theft of our pension!	6/30/2016 8:16 AM
702	The legislature is stealing LEOFF1 FUNDS which should not be legal. LEOFF1 system is a closed system will a little over 7,000 members all of which are old and retired. I believe when we are gone, the state will automatically get the remains of our fund, they should be allow to steal our funds.	6/30/2016 8:07 AM
703	I would ask the Legislature to treat the LEOFF 1 fund and its members as they would want their parents' fund and hard work treated.	6/30/2016 8:04 AM
704	I would like the LEOFF1 merged with LEOFF2 because both systems have been responsible with their members moneys and would remain with like service members.	6/30/2016 8:03 AM
705	Leave it as is. If it is not broken do not fix it.	6/30/2016 7:56 AM
706	LEOFF 2 and TRS 1 are both under funded. Taking funds from LEOFF 1 to shore up these plans will only create another under funded retirement plan.	6/30/2016 7:40 AM
707	Only to be merged with Leoff 2, keep your fingers out of the Leoff account, it's not yours	6/30/2016 7:22 AM
708	In general the legislature is robbing Peter to pay Paul due to their inability to follow the laws and fund individual systems. The LEOFF1 pension was forced upon police and fire depts. and cities and counties by the legislature in the late 60's. The two thirds of those pension funds were from those agencies. The state legislature was sued a number of times due to the lack of required funding required by law. The state lost each lawsuit and were forced to fund their portion. Now the state is attempting to basically steal that money to fund another system that they also failed to properly fund as required by law. I am ademently opposed to this attempt and will take legal action to prevent it.	6/30/2016 7:15 AM
709	I would be opposed to any merger. The funds in the LEOFF 1 system belongs to LEOFF 1 members.	6/30/2016 7:06 AM
710	Combine LEOFF1 and LEOFF2 and not TRS1	6/30/2016 7:04 AM
711	Do not rob one plan to pay another. Fully fund all plans .	6/30/2016 6:52 AM
712	wa legislature trying to steal money to fix their mistakes--again.	6/30/2016 6:37 AM
713	Based on Legislative history and attempts in the past. I see this merger as just another attempt to dilute LEOFF 1 benefits.	6/30/2016 6:25 AM
714	Who are they merging their retirement with?	6/30/2016 12:09 AM
715	1. I will no longer trust any legislation or information that comes from state legislators! They will have chosen to renig on their original promise to LEOFF 1 stakeholders in favor of solely benefiting TRS 1 stakeholders who are a strong union with state political clout. 2. Why pass any legislation if it can be changed on a whim?	6/29/2016 11:16 PM
716	I oppose it. The retirement systems promised to our first responders for their years of service should not subsidize a failing teachers pension. They are VERY different professions. Leave my pension alone.	6/29/2016 11:14 PM
717	Leave us alone if the other plans run out of money that is so sad to bad.	6/29/2016 11:07 PM
718	Absolutely nothing good can come of a merger for LEOFF 1 retirees.	6/29/2016 10:55 PM
719	I would want full disclosure on changes and side by side comparisons.	6/29/2016 10:45 PM
720	find some other fund to raid.	6/29/2016 10:17 PM
721	I think it would benefit all members as we look at the future for LEOFF retirees	6/29/2016 10:17 PM
722	Why not fix the other plan instead of merging a good plan with a failed plan ? ? ?	6/29/2016 10:11 PM
723	It would demonstrate to me that our legislature has no interest in backing its promises to the people.	6/29/2016 9:49 PM
724	Not a good idea. LEOFF1 should remain as it's own individual retirement system. The State should fulfill it's obligations to fully fund the other retirement systems not sacrifice the stability of LEOFF1.	6/29/2016 9:41 PM
725	I am very concerned that this merger would be illegal in it's entire process.	6/29/2016 9:41 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

726	This is all about money! There is no other reason for this proposed merger. LEOFF 1 is the only actuarial sound plan in the State, leave it alone. One big downturn in the Stock Market and the surplus will disappear, just as it has in the past.	6/29/2016 9:26 PM
727	The legislature pays 20% of the contribution but controls 100% of the plans. That needs to change. The systems all have been screwed up over the years by poor management by the legislature. When they need money they decrease contribution rates and steal money from plans that are overfunded and when the market underfunds the plan the legislature blames public employees for the alleged lucrative benefits they are supposed to receive after decades of dedicated service.	6/29/2016 9:25 PM
728	I would initiate a law suit against the state of Washington!!!!!!!!!!	6/29/2016 9:20 PM
729	None	6/29/2016 9:19 PM
730	I'm concerned that it is a funding diversion and money grab that risks the solvency of the system. Such diversions, underfunding and delayed funding is exactly what faces many systems around the country. Chicago's police pension system is an example. As someone who will retire soon, I don't want the system to be at any risk. I don't trust the legislature, because after the gain sharing inducement to get TRS 1 and 2 members to move to TRS 3' the legislature took gain sharing away.	6/29/2016 8:46 PM
731	Our Leoff 1 has been carefully paid into by men and women who have put their lives on the line and taken care of by very competent overseers. In fact, it is one of the most healthiest retirement programs with prospective coverages for our retirees and their spouses as they need care up to their last days. Why in the world would we want to add another retirement program, muddled with debt and is on life support itself? I wish those other systems and elected officials would keep their hands off our hard-earned assets known as Leoff1	6/29/2016 8:38 PM
732	It is a well known fact Law Enforcement Officers and Firefighters are relatively healthy as well as good money managers. Therefore the Legislature fully intends to take money from the LEOFF 1 System to fund LEOFF 2 and TERS 1, which the Legislature has failed to fund. It is a false economy to "rob Peter to pay Paul." Also the money I contributed to the pension system should no be made available to other pensions systems.	6/29/2016 8:32 PM
733	None	6/29/2016 8:31 PM
734	I am totally opposed to this merger or any merger at all. Leave us alone. We have paid for our retirement and should not have to go thru this every year.	6/29/2016 8:29 PM
735	It should not be done. It would only end up under funding LEOFF 1 too. LEOFF 1 members have earned the current benefits that they receive and those benefits should not be altered. The Legislature has a bad record of managing money and they should leave LEOFF 1 alone. They should just do their jobs and get their money spending problems under control without robbing Peter to pay Paul.	6/29/2016 8:24 PM
736	The Legislature again dodges the implications of its failure to fulfill its responsibility to fund programs put in place by the Legislature. Someone else has to surrender something, to patch the hole left by the Legislature. SB 1630 - Same song, second verse.	6/29/2016 8:19 PM
737	no way would I support anr merger	6/29/2016 8:04 PM
738	Only active and retired members of the plans should vote on whether to merge.	6/29/2016 8:03 PM
739	I believe one underfunded plan is enough. This sets a very bad precedent	6/29/2016 7:27 PM
740	If the Legislature makes this change what are they going to do next	6/29/2016 7:26 PM
741	Don't do it! Wait until all LEOFF 1 officers are no longer around, then give it to the LEOFF 2 officers	6/29/2016 7:15 PM
742	It is not leoff 1's fault that TRS 1 is not fully funded. With the merger, TRS 1, would still not be fully funded.	6/29/2016 7:12 PM
743	If it ain't broke, don't try to fix it. Fix the one which is broke.	6/29/2016 7:11 PM
744	Money in the fund should stay in the fund.	6/29/2016 7:08 PM
745	This merger plan is to correct a deficit by TERS. If this is truly a deficit then why not increase their pension payroll deductions to fix it. This was done when LEOFF II was created. 6% for LEOFF I and 7.25% for LEOFF II.	6/29/2016 7:03 PM
746	Would be furious. These two entities have no commonality. Firemen and policemen share nothing. The daily risks taken by leoff 1 professionals are enormous and critical. While teachers are noble and commendable, the scope of their benefits should in no way be compared. It is wrong and a blatant money grab by the legislators who propose this mendacious manouvering. They should be ashamed	6/29/2016 6:54 PM
747	No if my pay will be reduced	6/29/2016 6:43 PM
748	Stand by for a law suit.	6/29/2016 6:38 PM
749	Don't	6/29/2016 6:31 PM

(Test) SCPP Merger Study

750	I WORKED 29 YEARS AND PAID 6% OF MY WAGES TO ENJOY A PROPER RETIREMENT AND YOU WANT TO STEEL IT FOR YOUR PET PROJECTS. GO GET YOUR OWN NEST EGG. TERS WOULD BE IN GOOD SHAP IF THEY HAD BEEN FUNDED BY YOUR BROTHERS AND SISTERS IN OFFICE. DON'T DO IT ON OUR BACKS!!	6/29/2016 6:14 PM
751	That the legislature is taking money from a self supporting plan and merging it with one that cannot and will not be self supporting.	6/29/2016 5:57 PM
752	Don't screw up my good system (LEOFF 1) to make a poor system (TERS 1) a little better!	6/29/2016 5:50 PM
753	LEFF 1 is fully funded why merge with a nother plan that is not fully funded	6/29/2016 5:33 PM
754	See above.	6/29/2016 5:22 PM
755	Keep all money in LEOFF system it would be better to merge LEOFF 1 and LEOFF 2, not with TRS 1.	6/29/2016 5:17 PM
756	VERY POOR IDEA!	6/29/2016 5:09 PM
757	None at this time.	6/29/2016 5:04 PM
758	Some one is alwas trying to tap our funds.It stinks of politics.	6/29/2016 4:44 PM
759	Leave our leoff 1plan alone. They just can't help themselves stealing our money. This isn't the first attempt and I sure it will not be the last time they to steal our money to fix trs1 that they bankrupted.	6/29/2016 4:43 PM
760	It appears that this merger would rob one pension fund only to temporarily prop up an unfunded pension fund.	6/29/2016 4:39 PM
761	Balance your own budget without our money.	6/29/2016 4:39 PM
762	It seems like a responsible and appropriate thing to do without any down side that I've been made aware of. The challenge of implementing such a plan may be resource intensive.	6/29/2016 4:32 PM
763	I will ask the groups involved if they would file a class action Law suite against the State of Washington and the members the two state houses.	6/29/2016 4:31 PM
764	If this goes to a committee for development, such a group would benefit from having representatives from both plans.	6/29/2016 4:28 PM
765	Just because LEOFF1 founders had the foresight to protect the members who willingly choose to give the public the protections of a safe and tranquil life, why should that provision be shared with those that did not have the fortitude to face the dangers of public safety.	6/29/2016 4:27 PM
766	DON'T DO IT.	6/29/2016 4:20 PM
767	Leoff 1/2 merger makes the best sense and is mutually beneficial to both programs	6/29/2016 4:12 PM
768	Don't burden LEOFF 1 with the TRS1 problem completely	6/29/2016 4:05 PM
769	Generally I would want someone to be accountable for the sin of over spending.	6/29/2016 3:52 PM
770	Maintain the current LEOFF 1 system as is.	6/29/2016 3:44 PM
771	I will do my best to oppose any elected official involved in this action.	6/29/2016 3:33 PM
772	That LEOFF 1 gets as much say about managing the funds as anyone else on a board to oversee spending, only for TRS1 aand not the general fund.	6/29/2016 3:30 PM
773	The Legislatures track record has been dismal in the past towards pension plan funding. Although this merger would get TRS 1 get closer to being fully funded both the LEOFF 1 and TRS 1 would be under funded after the merger. What is the Legislature going to do to get both of these pension funds to be fully funded?	6/29/2016 3:28 PM
774	I am vehemently opposed to a merger of LEOFF 1 & TERS 1. I am vehemently opposed to a merger of LEOFF 1 & LEOFF 2. See #3 above	6/29/2016 3:20 PM
775	That this is case of the State not meeting its obligations to support the TRS 1 plan and that it sees a well funded plan that can be "raided" to offset the failure of the State.	6/29/2016 3:16 PM
776	Stop kicking the trs1 can down the road	6/29/2016 3:12 PM
777	Sharing the money I paid Into my retirement for 33 years.	6/29/2016 3:10 PM
778	That it makes no sense to change the system, LEOFF I, that has no financial problems.	6/29/2016 3:10 PM
779	Do not do this the LEOFF 1 plan is fully funded and I fear that would not be the case and more would go to the bigger union.	6/29/2016 3:08 PM
780	I prefer that LEOFF-1 be seperated from all proposed mergers.	6/29/2016 3:03 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

781	Concerned that the other funds are fully funded at the time of the merger and that no terms of LEOFF 1 are being changed	6/29/2016 3:02 PM
782	Just leave leoff 1 alone	6/29/2016 2:54 PM
783	AGAIN, IT IS JUST AN ATTEMPT FOR SOMEONE TO GET THEIR HANDS ON THE MONEY IN THE LEOFF1 RETIREMENT SYSTEM	6/29/2016 2:45 PM
784	This is wrong and legally questionable.	6/29/2016 2:34 PM
785	The proposal is absolute theft of monies dedicated and set aside for the benefit of LEOFF 1 members.	6/29/2016 2:27 PM
786	I am opposed to any merger that would jeopardize my retirement that I and King County paid in to. It is, in my opinion, our money.	6/29/2016 2:18 PM
787	I totally disagree with any proposed merger plan. I would imagine that if you wanted to merge two legislative districts into one and one of them was heavily Democrat or Republican, the Democrat or Republican would object as well.	6/29/2016 2:15 PM
788	What is currently broken and how s the merger going to fix it	6/29/2016 2:14 PM
789	I would urge all leoff 1 members to file a law suit to stop any action and would donate to that fund.	6/29/2016 2:06 PM
790	1) be ready for a lawsuit by leoff 1	6/29/2016 2:04 PM
791	Will any of our retirement funds be reduced, ever?	6/29/2016 2:01 PM
792	Not only "NO" but "HELL NO!" If this should come to pass I hope we tie you up in court for years to come with a large lawsuit.	6/29/2016 1:48 PM
793	The two groups have nothing in common, other than money. Why should the merger even be considered.	6/29/2016 1:39 PM
794	I took an oath in 1968 to give my life to protect you and your families. In 1972 the State made a promise to me. I kept my promise to you. Will you now break your promise to me?	6/29/2016 1:33 PM
795	Leave Sam e	6/29/2016 1:33 PM
796	don't do it	6/29/2016 1:32 PM
797	The problem exists because funding of the TRS1 was insufficient to start with. A merger creates a larger unfunded liability down the road. A merger puts extra money to help with immediate shortfalls but creates an even larger shortfall down the road. It does nothing to solve the problem that the TRS1 is and will be underfunded.	6/29/2016 1:28 PM
798	I would not support any legislator that voted in favor of a merger, being TRS 1 or LEOFF 2. Deal with funding TRS1 and PERS 1 individually.	6/29/2016 1:07 PM
799	Would the Legislature be willing to merge with TRS?	6/29/2016 1:06 PM
800	Don't forget these Leoff 1 Officers put their life on the line for 25yrs. plus. They deserve a fair shake on their pension...not a knife in the back by politicians.	6/29/2016 1:04 PM
801	It seems that this is a way to use our funds for purposes that it was not intended.	6/29/2016 1:03 PM
802	This is a complete money grab from a successful, well-managed plan, to fund plan[s] that are poorly structured and managed, and will continue to be poorly structured and managed AFTER any merger.	6/29/2016 1:02 PM
803	Why take a retirement plan that the state has not contributed to, only the Police and Firefighters and Cities have, which has been very successful and combine it with bankrupt systems, which would then bankrupt both systems??	6/29/2016 1:00 PM
804	What are the advantages in commingling benefits	6/29/2016 12:52 PM
805	don't rob from those who have earned the pension	6/29/2016 12:40 PM
806	See #4	6/29/2016 12:38 PM
807	Leoff I is not large enough to bail out trs I If we merge with any group it should be Leoff 2	6/29/2016 12:29 PM
808	Continue to fund TRS 1 at levels necessary to maintain benefits.	6/29/2016 12:20 PM
809	No merger	6/29/2016 12:20 PM
810	DON'T DO IT unless you are cutting into your pension programs too...	6/29/2016 12:10 PM
811	The benefits for members of Leoff 1 should not be effected or changed and that the TRS system needs to be monitored more closely in the future and no further bail outs for the state or the TRS system	6/29/2016 12:10 PM
812	See you in court	6/29/2016 12:10 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

813	Why should LEOFF 1 suffer because of poor planning on the part of other retirements systems	6/29/2016 12:04 PM
814	Ill conceived, short term fix which means pay more later. It destroys the funding of a sound plan.	6/29/2016 12:02 PM
815	Our plan is employer and self funded with no funds from the state so it is not yours to take.	6/29/2016 12:02 PM
816	do not	6/29/2016 12:00 PM
817	#3 and 4	6/29/2016 11:53 AM
818	Why?	6/29/2016 11:51 AM
819	This is our retirement. It should not be taken due to Trs 1 mismanagement. I don't remember any teachers working with me on Christmas Eve on midnight shift. Oh by the way, I don't remember getting three months summer vacation every year. But I do remember working holidays seeing carnage with the only praise being "you have a retirement". Nothing ever said about teachers taking it.	6/29/2016 11:50 AM
820	That the merger be immediately contested in court by the LEOFF1 stake holders.	6/29/2016 11:46 AM
821	Keep fire plan 1 and roll it over to fire plan 2	6/29/2016 11:44 AM
822	"If it ain't broke, don't fix it!"	6/29/2016 11:40 AM
823	I'll vote against and work against any legislature that tries to take our plan away. We have a well managed system. DON'T TAKE OUR MONEY AWAY BECAUSE YOU MISMANAGED OTHER SYSTEMS!!	6/29/2016 11:33 AM
824	Stop messing with our retirement.	6/29/2016 11:18 AM
825	I would like to see the members of this plan to have the ability to "vote" on the merger, it is our plan, not the Legislatures.	6/29/2016 11:14 AM
826	A merger should not be proposed. LEOFF 1 is not broken. Isn't a merger with LEOFF 1 illegal? I became a cop because of the LEOFF 1 system. I was told it was secure and would not be changed.	6/29/2016 11:13 AM
827	It really gets old year after year trying to fend off the money grabbers from the other retirement systems. These new proposals are the same as the ones that have been turned down year after year and it is a great waste of time and money having to fend them off all the time.	6/29/2016 11:12 AM
828	Why is leoff 2 so intent on raiding leoff 1 funds .	6/29/2016 11:12 AM
829	I am sure the leoff 1 members would be ok if you would give every member \$259,000 and have enough left in fund for every member and spouse till 100 years old. I am now paying \$300 a month to the fund for my spouse. That money is our money and should not go to the teachers or leoff 2.	6/29/2016 11:11 AM
830	NO!!!!	6/29/2016 11:11 AM
831	NONE	6/29/2016 11:09 AM
832	As the population of the LEOFF1 members decreases with time, their political importance will also decline. Who will watch out for their needs when there are only hundreds left in the system? An actuarial surplus is not something to be spent - it is a reserve, there to protect against future market downturns. Spending it down in advance of bad market returns is reckless.	6/29/2016 11:07 AM
833	LEOFF 1 should be left alone and let all the other plans merge. Any merger should have matching funds equal to the fund with the most from the others, only fair.	6/29/2016 11:05 AM
834	The legislature should repay "borrowed" money that was taken from TRS 1.	6/29/2016 11:01 AM
835	LEOFF 1 has very view active members to contribute to the plan. LEOFF 1 active members were allowed th contribute at a lower rate than my time in service	6/29/2016 10:56 AM
836	I do not think it is a good deal period.	6/29/2016 10:55 AM
837	Would my current benefits be guaranteed in writing that they would not change in anyway?	6/29/2016 10:54 AM
838	Negative	6/29/2016 10:48 AM
839	DON'T DO IT! It is illegal, unethical, a theft of LEOFF 1 members hard earned dollars. Fix the problems you the legislature has created. If you have to raise taxes to fund the legislatures obligations, then don that. Merging LEOFF 1 and TRS 1 or Merging LEOFF 1 with the LEOFF 2 plan is an unfair tax on LEOFF 1 members. We contributed a lot to make sure the LEOFF 1 plan was solvent. Why is that not also the responsibility of the other retirement plan members and their employers?	6/29/2016 10:47 AM
840	No way in hell.	6/29/2016 10:47 AM
841	If LEOFF 1 and LEOFF 2 merged, would LEOFF 2 then close and a LEOFF 3 be implemented?	6/29/2016 10:47 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

842	Leave our pension alone, and work on the ones needing it and not by taking money from leoff1	6/29/2016 10:42 AM
843	This is a bad idea, no matter what comments are received.	6/29/2016 10:40 AM
844	It is a bad idea.	6/29/2016 10:36 AM
845	Why were the funds from TERS 1 taken in the first place and not returned?	6/29/2016 10:30 AM
846	That it is a very big mistake. Using the LEOFF funds to bolster a failing plan will create 2 instead on 1 underfunded plan and if the Legislature is incapable of funding 1 (TRS) what will it be like with 2.	6/29/2016 10:02 AM
847	DON'T DO A MERGER!	6/29/2016 10:00 AM
848	YOU FOLKS ARE VOTED INTO OFFICE TO FAIRLY REPRESENT EVERYONE..... SIMPLE TASK, RIGHT ????. NOW YOU CHOOSE THE HIGH-DOLLAR PENSION FUND TO ATTACK WITHOUT ANY CONSIDERATION.... that we know of.... TO INCLUDE OTHER PENSION FUNDS EQUALLY. LIKE SO MANY STATE LAWS AND REGULATIONS WE ALL ARE EXPECTED TO SHARE. JUST TAKE EQUAL AMOUNTS FROM ALL PENSION FUNDS !!! EVERYONE IS A WINNER AND YOU-ALL WOULD BE HEROES.	6/29/2016 9:56 AM
849	Those who vote for it without sufficient compensation will be opposed at the ballot box. A contract was entered when I joined and it didn't include "if you fund yours and it works well we can take it."	6/29/2016 9:46 AM
850	LEAVE MY PENSION ALONE!	6/29/2016 9:41 AM
851	Opposed to any planned attack on our pension. This appears on the surface to be a money grab and that is a crime. plain and simple.	6/29/2016 9:28 AM
852	The Legislature should not have control over my money	6/29/2016 9:25 AM
853	I am opposed to a merger.	6/29/2016 9:08 AM
854	There are tens of thousands of members and beneficiaries of leoff 1 that are entitled to benefits from this fund for many years to come. Address the issue of funding for trs 1 on its own merits, don't threaten the stability of our fund by this merger	6/29/2016 8:55 AM
855	If your going to merger plans why waste time merger all the retirement plans to one policy make it equal to all state workers regardless of duties	6/29/2016 8:43 AM
856	No matter what promises the legislature makes re keeping LEOFF 1 benefits intact, this is an uncertainty. Also, LEOFF 1 members would numerically be in the minority and risk losing representation.	6/29/2016 8:36 AM
857	It appears that a merger would cause both funds to be underfunded.	6/29/2016 8:27 AM
858	Leave LEOFF 1 alone!	6/29/2016 8:20 AM
859	That the LEOFF1 system must stay intact as is and no mergers in the future that would impact our current benefits.	6/29/2016 8:19 AM
860	Don't do it!	6/29/2016 8:10 AM
861	This is absolutely stupid.	6/29/2016 8:02 AM
862	No plan merger	6/29/2016 7:59 AM
863	They get more than anyone else I would get at least another \$2000 per month based on my best 5 years.	6/29/2016 7:48 AM
864	Why are you doing this now? The Legislature should have been more diligent about paying into there pension fund for TRS-1. Then we wouldn't have this problem....	6/29/2016 7:47 AM
865	why are they doing it	6/29/2016 7:46 AM
866	I oppose any merger.	6/29/2016 7:45 AM
867	If there is excess money in the system, it should be used for the benefit of those who earned it.	6/29/2016 7:38 AM
868	Leave the LEOFF funds with the LEOFF system. Do not use the money to shore up the legislatures mistakes of raiding the TRS system to fund other items. Improve the medical for LEOFFII retirees.	6/29/2016 7:32 AM
869	Tell those Republican dummy to fund these systems properly and they wouldn't have this problem. Pretty soon they are going to run out places to steal from.	6/29/2016 7:28 AM
870	LEOFF1 was set up for law enforcement retirement; not teachers. The LEOFF1 system had exceptional management early on and that is why everyone wants a piece of it now to plug the holes that other systems kept kicking down the street for someone else to take care of it.	6/29/2016 7:25 AM
871	When is the legislature going to raise revenue to make up for all the payments to the plans that were skipped?	6/29/2016 7:23 AM
872	Opposed!	6/29/2016 7:21 AM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

873	It's not broken, so don't fix it.	6/29/2016 7:14 AM
874	As a first responder I never let anyone down when called, I can't say the State respects what I sacrificed for them.	6/29/2016 7:07 AM
875	If changes made ensure benefits are not reduced.	6/29/2016 7:06 AM
876	A LEOFF I and LEOFF II merger makes the most sense.	6/29/2016 7:01 AM
877	Leave my plan alone until there are no mote people in the plan.	6/29/2016 6:55 AM
878	What right does the Legislature have to propose a merger program with funds that aren't theirs ?	6/29/2016 6:54 AM
879	You should NOT take away the benefits of workers that at this time, would primarily already be RETIRED. There should be NO downgrade of promised benefits (if there is an issue w/ manipulation of the intent by some in LEOFF - deal directly with that!...ie Chiefs & Sheriffs taking medical retirement for "stress", etc., padding hours - except you are probably too late - LEOFF 1 is mostly retired)	6/29/2016 6:49 AM
880	This is a bad idea	6/29/2016 6:44 AM
881	It is stealing from one group to pay for another which was managed poorly by the state. If not successful this time, you will try again. Why do we have to keep going thru this every year? It is all about money. What happened to the legality? Why exclude various persons with the background knowledge? How can you make general proposals like this without all the information? Sameful government practice.	6/29/2016 6:35 AM
882	When I was an active member, and we were negotiating wages, we were told that because of our wonderful pension (Which it is) we would have to make less in the short term. We have had other plans and legislators grabbing at our fund for years...we should be able to retire in peace instead of being on alert everytime the legislature is in session. The golden years are not so golden! We all are mature citizens and would appreciate it if you staged the fight after all of us are gone!	6/29/2016 6:27 AM
883	police/fire and educators have different cultures, serve entirely different constituents and except for breathing the same air, have nothing in common	6/29/2016 6:02 AM
884	Wouldn't the proposed merger eventually be decided in court	6/29/2016 5:46 AM
885	I have been retired for almost 30 years and our Pension Plan has served us well. I see no benefits for our LEOFF 1 Retirees with a merger.	6/29/2016 5:43 AM
886	This totally goes against the well-being of the LEOFF1 members and their EARNED retirement!	6/29/2016 5:27 AM
887	Fix yours and don't mess with ours!	6/29/2016 5:19 AM
888	I do not support it, LEOFF 1 should stand alone and no changes should be made until there are no longer members drawing benefits.	6/29/2016 5:19 AM
889	LEOFF 1 would be better severed spending our money on lawyers to fight this, then just to give it to the TRS 1 and the state!	6/29/2016 5:13 AM
890	I would want to see an AG opinion that this is legal and not just a pension raid and that I will fight this in court.	6/29/2016 3:46 AM
891	I'm totally against it, I was involved when LEOFF1 was first started. We, Law enforcement Officers, funded it ourselves for 5 years. Now you want to take from us, what we have worked hard to earned and was promised.	6/28/2016 11:48 PM
892	Why	6/28/2016 11:42 PM
893	Bad Idea ... typical ... but a bad idea any way.	6/28/2016 11:15 PM
894	It had better be for legitimate reasons.	6/28/2016 10:29 PM
895	For many years LEOFF1 has worked very well for our members. I see nothing that could possibly enhance LEOFF1 by merging with anyone. Totally opposed of merger.	6/28/2016 10:11 PM
896	I am opposed to a merger.	6/28/2016 10:01 PM
897	I am not in favor of it as there likely is no guarantee that promises made will be promises fulfilled. Frankly, this is the sordid history of our elected officials.	6/28/2016 9:57 PM
898	I see this as another attempt to take funds from a solvent retirement fund to make upfor poor fiscal policy on the part of the legislature.	6/28/2016 9:24 PM
899	It would be unfair to those covered under the Leoff I plan.	6/28/2016 9:24 PM
900	I see no reason to combine the systems. when this scheme was hatched the last time, it was basically an attempt by LEOFF II to increase their benefits and get into LEOFF I'm funds.	6/28/2016 9:22 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

901	This it a bad idea. You have a fund that is very stable, why would anyone want to put it in jeopardy. Look at the history of the legislature and other groups trying to get there hands on this fund. Sometimes to balance the budget and other times to bail out funds that are marginal. Once all LEOFF 1 members and there spouses have died then the remainder of this fund should be available to other state retirement systems. But not until that time.	6/28/2016 9:20 PM
902	My comment is simple: Don't do it!	6/28/2016 9:05 PM
903	Please stop trying to raid LEOFF 1 to fund other pension funds that most likely were never funded properly.	6/28/2016 8:53 PM
904	Don't merg leoff 1 and trs 1. It would be OK to merg leoff 1&2	6/28/2016 8:39 PM
905	Will the merger affect our COLA each year?	6/28/2016 8:29 PM
906	Bad idea all the way around.	6/28/2016 8:23 PM
907	The fact that they mismanaged the teachers retirement is not our problem to solve.	6/28/2016 8:04 PM
908	The only reason the LEOFF I pension fund enjoys a surplus today is because the courts prevented raiding or underfunding many years ago. The LEOFF 1 pension law provided specific promises to the members of the system. Those commitments written into law backed up our financial planning and acquired standard of living throughout our careers. I am not advocating that LEOFF I members divvy up the surplus or that we add new benefits funded with the surplus. I simply want the pension left alone and intact until the last members die. This merger plan was not proposed to do anything good for LEOFF I members. It is our money that is the focus and the earlier proposal to give us a few bucks to keep us out of the way was an insult. I have certain belief that corners will be cut, and rules bent if that is what it takes to shore up the failure of previous legislatures and administrators to fully fund TERS I	6/28/2016 7:58 PM
909	Taking something that does not belong to you is STEALING !!!!!	6/28/2016 7:50 PM
910	Do not do this !!!	6/28/2016 7:39 PM
911	Keep your hands off our retirement system and solve the problems that TRS 1 has, for whatever reason become bankrupt.	6/28/2016 7:39 PM
912	Do not merge, leave us alone	6/28/2016 7:39 PM
913	This should NEVER happen!!!	6/28/2016 7:35 PM
914	Adamantly opposed to this merger under any circumstances	6/28/2016 7:27 PM
915	No	6/28/2016 7:19 PM
916	theft from a retirement plan that people eared over entire work life time	6/28/2016 7:16 PM
917	The only benefit I see to such a merger is to provide a bailout for TRS1 at the expense of LEOFF1 retirees, and a blatant attempt to raid our funds to make up the failure of TRS1 to adequately fund its plan.	6/28/2016 7:09 PM
918	Bad government begins with bad planning! Do what you were elected to do.	6/28/2016 7:07 PM
919	You are using your legislative power which we the people granted you to steal from Firefighter an police officer!	6/28/2016 7:05 PM
920	No merger	6/28/2016 7:04 PM
921	See answer to question 3...	6/28/2016 6:37 PM
922	Leoff 1 should merge with leoff 2, to pay the skipped obligations of the past and enhance benefits such as added medical insurance, like the judicial retirement plan, or a higher multiplier.	6/28/2016 6:32 PM
923	Don't do it. Leave it alone.	6/28/2016 6:26 PM
924	Why do they expect LEOFF retirees (cops and fire fighters) to fix the mess the government caused in the TERS plan due to their incompetence by borrowing against the TERS plan. Why not other plans to also help solve the TERS mess.	6/28/2016 6:25 PM
925	This appears to be nothing more than the latest attempt to raid LEOFF1 funds to prop up less financially secure state pensions systems due to the Washington State legislature`s failure over a number of years see that those systems were adequately funded due to their insatiable greed to lay hold on other peoples money in violation of public trust.	6/28/2016 6:22 PM
926	They would be following other democratic states & cities, (Chicago, Detroit, Newark, Cleveland, Camden, etc etc..who failed to control & oversee the pension systems that were in place.	6/28/2016 6:13 PM
927	It's our money, leave it alone!!!!	6/28/2016 6:11 PM
928	You will receive A LOT of dissension from the LE and Firefighters statewide.	6/28/2016 6:06 PM

## (Test) SCPP Merger Study

929	The merger plan appears to be simply a bail out of TRS 1 and will not result in any increased efficiency of the LEOFF 1 pension. Will the present legislature be informed that a billion (?) dollars was already appropriated and removed from LEOFF 1? That the required contributions to LEOFF 1 were frozen without consulting LEOFF 1 members?	6/28/2016 5:58 PM
930	I will contribute to fund a law suit. Have before will again.	6/28/2016 5:54 PM
931	Terrible idea! Please explain the benefits to LEOFF 1 recipients	6/28/2016 5:48 PM
932	The reason this is being proposed	6/28/2016 5:45 PM
933	What is in it for the investors??????????????	6/28/2016 5:41 PM
934	See above	6/28/2016 5:38 PM
935	Do not pass it.	6/28/2016 5:37 PM
936	I still have a vote and I'll sure use it when my Rep needs reupping.	6/28/2016 5:32 PM
937	Why the merger ? TR 1 is underfunded and if merged with LEOFF 1 the state now has 2 underfunded retirement systems. If the stock market does not achieve the performance level the State believes it will what will happens then? Will the State move in and reduce benefits?	6/28/2016 5:30 PM
938	Leave LEOFF 1 alone	6/28/2016 5:30 PM
939	JUST DON'T DO IT. This is a band aid because the state let the TRS I plan get out of hand years ago. Now they've seen that the LEOFF I plan is well funded so let's steal from them. No TRS I members paid into the LEOFF I plan so why are they entitled to it? It doesn't make sense.	6/28/2016 5:28 PM
940	See above comments, also LEOFF1 members will most likely see the state in court if a move is made to hijack our system.	6/28/2016 5:24 PM
941	The state never funded the LEOFF 1 system in the manner required by the law. Why don't they do that first or put those funds into the TRS 1 system if they need the money.	6/28/2016 5:21 PM
942	Juswt say no... we ( the leoff 1 members made this system balanced. Leave it alone	6/28/2016 5:07 PM
943	Please leave this alone. Try to fill whatever your money gaps you are filling in another way and leave LEOFF 1 alone. Thank You	6/28/2016 5:05 PM
944	You're fired	6/28/2016 4:59 PM
945	I will spend every dime I have to vote the scum out of office who want to mess with my retirement plan..	6/28/2016 4:55 PM
946	I will fight it with the six electeds in our two districts in the N W. #40 and #42	6/28/2016 4:55 PM
947	I oppose any merger of LEOFF1. It is a solvent system that should be left to the people it was designed for.	6/28/2016 4:50 PM
948	Generally opposed to the whole idea. Previous proposal offered a 5,000.00 one-time payment to LEOFF1 members as incentive to support the merger. If that's on the table, it should be significantly more.	6/28/2016 4:50 PM
949	If a merger for LEOFF II is a must, then those getting hired on now can go to the different plan. Existing LEOFF II members can move voluntarily, or can stay with the additional plan.	6/28/2016 4:18 PM
950	None.	6/28/2016 3:55 PM
951	medical coverage for retire police officers.	6/28/2016 3:44 PM
952	Keep all monies within same work groups . Eg leoff, pers,trs etc	6/28/2016 3:33 PM
953	If the legislature would have properly funded TERS 1 (and all retirement accounts) in the first place, we would not be in this pickle. I would not support any merger unless companion legislation was passed that REQUIRED WITHOUT EXCEPTION, the funding of all state retirement plans at 100% actuarial value.	6/28/2016 3:21 PM
954	It is better merged with LEOFF 2 and NOT TERS 1.	6/28/2016 3:01 PM
955	There should be a better effort made to educate members, citizens, and plan members about the original source of the funding into the LEOFF 1 plans (city, member, and state contributions made) and the future maximum obligation of the plan to the current members.	6/28/2016 2:53 PM