

Russell, Lindsey

From: Gloria Smith <mamaglo123@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 3, 2023 6:49 PM
To: Office State Actuary, WA
Subject: Plan 1 COLA

CAUTION:External email.

Dear Select Committee on Pension Policy Members,

Through attending the SCPP in the past few years, I learned that a goal adopted by the SCPP in 2005 was to “increase and maintain purchasing power of retiree benefits in Plans 1 TRS, PERS, to the extent feasible, while providing long-term benefit security to retirees.” And, of course, then I wondered why Plan 1 is the only plan without equity after 17 years with that goal.

I would like to see an annual, up to 3% COLA (without a cap of \$110/month), including the “banking option” that Plan 2 has, written into statute this legislative session.

Let’s compare a retiree in Plan 1 and Plan 2, who recently retired with 38 years of service.

Plan 1

$\$110,000 + 108,000 = \$218,000$ (last two years salary combined)
 $\$218,000$ divided by 2 = $\$109,000$
 $\$109,000 \times .60$ (maximum of 30 years count) = **$\$65,400$** retirement salary

COLA of 3%

$\$65,400 \times .03 = \$1,962$
 $\$1,962$ divided by 12 months = **$\$163.50$** , but with a cap of **$\$110/\text{month} = \$110/\text{month}$** with a loss of **$\$53.50/\text{month}$** .

Plan 2

$\$110,000 + \$108,000 + \$106,000 + \$104,000 + \$102,000 = \$530,000$
 $\$530,000$ divided by 5 = $\$106,000$
 $\$106,000 \times .76$ (38 years counted) = **$\$80,560$** retirement salary

COLA of 3%

$\$80,560 \times .03 = \$2,416$
 $\$2,416$ divided by 12 months = **$\$201/\text{monthly}$** .

As you can clearly see, if you compare a Plan 1 member with a Plan 2 member, assuming they retired with the same number of years of service, the Plan 1 member starts with a lesser amount of money as a retiree, and then gains a lesser amount of money for a COLA. Also, keep in mind, that is assuming a Plan 1 member gets a COLA at all, as there have been more years without a Plan 1 COLA than there have been with a Plan 1 COLA, even though Plan 2 is guaranteed a COLA up to 3% based on the CPI, and is allowed to bank any amount over 3%.

Then, take into account that there is also a cap on a Plan 1 COLA. To my knowledge, there are no other pensions in Washington state where a cap on a COLA at \$44,000 is implemented.

And, by the way, let's look at what happens to the same Plan 1 member the next year when the capped COLA happens.

The Plan 1 member above earned \$65,400 per year and would add \$110/month COLA this year.

$$\$65,400 + 1,320 = \$66,720$$

$$\$66,720 \times .03 = \$2,001$$

\$2,001 divided by 12 = **\$166.75, but with a cap of \$110/month = \$110/month, with a loss of \$56.75 per month.**

So, in effect, what that means is the percent of the COLA actually goes down every year! So, Plan 1, again, is losing ground every year.

Therefore, I repeat, I would like to see an annual, up to 3% COLA (without a cap of \$110/month), including the "banking option" that Plan 2 has, written into statute this legislative session.

Thank you for allowing me to submit this document!

Sincerely,

Gloria Smith
Plan 1 Retiree

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Legislature. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.