

FITCH: PATH TO IMPACTFUL U.S. PUBLIC PENSION REFORMS PAVED BY COURT DECISIONS

Fitch Ratings-New York-21 June 2018: The legal backdrop for U.S. state and local pensions has played a key role in reforms adopted by some states in 2018, although pensions in general still face an uphill climb to improve their funding levels, according to Fitch Ratings.

Worries over the long-term sustainability of pension obligations and the rising budgetary burden of annual contributions remain front and center for states in 2018. Many states' legislatures passed, and governors signed, reforms in 2018 legislative action to date, with some of the most interesting emerging in Colorado, Minnesota and Illinois. For these states, past state court decisions validating or rejecting earlier reform efforts, particularly on cost-of-living adjustments (COLAs), delineated how far their 2018 reform packages could go. However, as seen with other states like Ohio, the presence of legal flexibility and the identified need for further reform is not always enough to sway legislatures to act.

Colorado and Minnesota both adopted comprehensive reforms in 2018 covering their major statewide plans following long roads to building consensus. In Colorado, SB 18-200 temporarily freezes COLAs for current retirees, delays COLAs for new retirees, caps all future COLAs at 1.5% annually instead of the previous 2%, modifies age and salary requirements for future employees, and expands eligibility for its defined contribution plan, among other changes. It also raises employee and employer contributions and requires an annual lump sum, \$225 million state contribution for 30 years.

Similarly, Minnesota H.F. 3053/S.F. 2620 adjusts COLAs downward for current and future retirees depending on the plan. For most, future COLAs are held between 1% and 1.5% annually, with COLAs for future retirees delayed until normal retirement age. The reform package also lowers the state plans' funding discount rates to 7.5% (from as high as 8.5% before the reform), modifies actuarial assumptions and raises age and salary requirements. The Minnesota bill also raises employee and employer contributions, with most of the higher contributions borne by employers.

The Colorado and Minnesota bills were not the first rounds of reform adopted by the two states since the great recession exposed their pensions' funding weaknesses. Insofar as both bills reduce COLA provisions for existing retirees, they capitalize on court rulings (*Justus vs. State of Colorado*, in 2014 and *Swanson v. Minnesota*, in 2011) that validated past statutory changes lowering promised benefits.

In both of those decisions, less generous COLA provisions in the states' reforms were challenged and ultimately upheld, with courts viewing COLAs as being outside the contractual (in Colorado) or contract-like (in Minnesota) protections afforded to their core pension benefits. Reducing or eliminating COLAs, including for retirees and current employees, is one of the few pension reforms that can materially lower the accrued liability immediately. The net effect for both Colorado (not rated by Fitch) and Minnesota (IDR AAA/Stable) was to give them more tools for managing their accrued pension burdens without having to rely solely on raising employer contributions, shifting more of the contribution burden to employees, or waiting for newer, lower benefit tiers to achieve savings. The benefit for both states is also likely to be felt by local governments, schools and other public entities participating as employers in the state-administered plans.

Illinois also adopted pension measures in 2018, although the context of these actions is different and the trade-off of savings vs. costs remains uncertain. As part of its fiscal 2019 budget, Illinois

among other pension changes established two buyout programs that sunset in fiscal 2021, targeting budget savings by lowering accrued liabilities associated with employees hired before 2011. The first offers retiring state, university and teacher plan members an upfront payment equal to 70% of the difference between their promised 3% COLA and a reduced 1.5% COLA; the second provides a 60% lump sum to vested, inactive members of the same plans in exchange for all future benefits. Assuming that approximately 20%-25% of eligible members participate in the buyouts, lower accrued liabilities could lower state contributions approximately \$400 million, a figure that will be partly offset by debt service on state GO bonds to be issued to fund the buyouts. Notably, the timing of rollout will be lengthy and the precise fiscal impact will only be known upon conclusion of the program and could vary significantly from the initial estimates.

Like Colorado and Minnesota, Illinois' more limited 2018 actions were informed by past court precedent. A 2015 state Supreme Court ruling (*In re: Pension Reform Litigation*) rejected a 2014 pension reform law (Public Act 98-599) that lowered benefits for employees hired before 2011 as violating the explicit contractual protection of retirement benefits embedded in Illinois' 1970 constitution. The high hurdle imposed by this constitutional provision has left Illinois with few and costly options for reducing accrued benefits.

Fitch notes that the contractual constraints faces by Illinois (IDR BBB/Negative) would have been less likely to emerge as a fiscal problem had the state not consistently avoided making full actuarial contributions for its pensions. The state has yet to rectify this longstanding problem, which Fitch considers a form of deficit financing.

Reform efforts stalled in some other states in 2018, regardless of the degree to which their legal environment supports changes to accrued benefits. This speaks to the political challenge of making changes to pensions.

In Ohio (IDR AA+/Stable), a bill (HB 413) that would lower COLAs in the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System (OPERS) from 3% to the annual change in CPI capped at 2.5%, among other adjustments, never received a vote in committee after several hearings and has been shelved, according to press reports. The bill would have improved the plan's funded status while making it likelier that the statutorily fixed contributions OPERS receives would be sufficient to support funding progress under more adverse future circumstances.

Ohio's pension plans have generally benefited from strong contribution practices and the willingness of both the legislature and pension boards to revisit decisions on benefits, assumptions and funding practices. Like a handful of other states, Ohio protects accrued benefits as property rights, rather than as contracts, and thus has greater discretion in theory to adopt reforms affecting accrued benefits of current members and retirees.

As examples of this leeway, 2012 reforms narrowed age and service requirements for OPERS benefits, including for some current employees, and COLA changes have been a part of reforms for several other Ohio statewide systems in recent years. However, even with a demonstrated record of trimming existing benefits, Fitch views more significant benefit rollbacks in Ohio beyond the recent examples as being politically unpalatable, leaving participating Ohio governments obligated to covering the unfunded liability over time.

Even with recent reform efforts like the aforementioned legislated changes, Fitch believes funding improvement for many major pensions may not materialize any time soon. Funding discount rates upon which accrued liabilities and actuarial contributions are based for virtually all major plans remain above the 6% level that Fitch views as reasonable. Although the average funding discount rate for major plans has fallen steadily since 2009, when it was 8%, Fitch calculates it at about 7.4% as of fiscal 2017. Demographic pressures likewise mean more retirees than ever are drawing benefits from funds, making improved funded ratios harder to achieve. Finally, the current

economic expansion, even with recent gains, has been weaker than past expansions, and arguably is closer to its end than its beginning. This means pensions may soon be absorbing another round of recessionary weakness that further raises contribution pressure, without having fully recovered from the last downturn.

Contact:

Douglas Offerman
Senior Director
+1-212-908-0889
Fitch Ratings, Inc.
33 Whitehall Street
New York, NY 10004

Laura Porter
Managing Director
+1-212-908-0575

Media Relations: Sandro Scenga, New York, Tel: +1 212-908-0278, Email:
sandro.scenga@fitchratings.com.

Additional information is available on www.fitchratings.com

ALL FITCH CREDIT RATINGS ARE SUBJECT TO CERTAIN LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS. PLEASE READ THESE LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS BY FOLLOWING THIS LINK: [HTTPS://WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM/UNDERSTANDINGCREDITRATINGS](https://www.fitchratings.com/understandingcreditratings). IN ADDITION, RATING DEFINITIONS AND THE TERMS OF USE OF SUCH RATINGS ARE AVAILABLE ON THE AGENCY'S PUBLIC WEB SITE AT WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM. PUBLISHED RATINGS, CRITERIA, AND METHODOLOGIES ARE AVAILABLE FROM THIS SITE AT ALL TIMES. FITCH'S CODE OF CONDUCT, CONFIDENTIALITY, CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, AFFILIATE FIREWALL, COMPLIANCE, AND OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ARE ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE CODE OF CONDUCT SECTION OF THIS SITE. DIRECTORS AND SHAREHOLDERS RELEVANT INTERESTS ARE AVAILABLE AT [HTTPS://WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM/SITE/REGULATORY](https://www.fitchratings.com/site/regulatory). FITCH MAY HAVE PROVIDED ANOTHER PERMISSIBLE SERVICE TO THE RATED ENTITY OR ITS RELATED THIRD PARTIES. DETAILS OF THIS SERVICE FOR RATINGS FOR WHICH THE LEAD ANALYST IS BASED IN AN EU-REGISTERED ENTITY CAN BE FOUND ON THE ENTITY SUMMARY PAGE FOR THIS ISSUER ON THE FITCH WEBSITE.

Copyright © 2018 by Fitch Ratings, Inc., Fitch Ratings Ltd. and its subsidiaries. 33 Whitehall Street, NY, NY 10004. Telephone: 1-800-753-4824, (212) 908-0500. Fax: (212) 480-4435. Reproduction or retransmission in whole or in part is prohibited except by permission. All rights reserved. In issuing and maintaining its ratings and in making other reports (including forecast information), Fitch relies on factual information it receives from issuers and underwriters and from other sources Fitch believes to be credible. Fitch conducts a reasonable investigation of the factual information relied upon by it in accordance with its ratings methodology, and obtains reasonable verification of that information from independent sources, to the extent such sources are available for a given security or in a given jurisdiction. The manner of Fitch's factual investigation and the scope of the third-party verification it obtains will vary depending on the nature of the rated security and its issuer, the requirements and practices in the jurisdiction in which the rated security is offered and sold and/or the issuer is located, the availability and nature of relevant public information, access to the management of the issuer and its advisers, the availability of pre-existing third-party verifications such as audit reports, agreed-upon procedures letters, appraisals, actuarial reports, engineering reports, legal opinions and other reports provided by third parties, the availability of independent and competent third-party verification sources with respect to the particular security or in the particular jurisdiction of the issuer, and a variety of other factors. Users of Fitch's ratings and reports should understand that neither an enhanced factual investigation nor any third-party verification can ensure that all of the information Fitch relies on in connection with a rating or a report will be accurate and complete. Ultimately, the issuer and its advisers are responsible for the accuracy of the information they provide to Fitch and to the market in offering documents and other reports. In issuing its ratings and its reports, Fitch must rely on the work of experts, including independent auditors with respect to financial statements and attorneys with respect to legal and tax matters. Further, ratings and forecasts of financial and other information are inherently forward-looking and embody assumptions and predictions about future events that by their nature cannot be verified as facts. As a result, despite any verification of current facts, ratings and forecasts can be affected by future events or conditions that were not anticipated at the time a rating or forecast was issued or affirmed.

The information in this report is provided "as is" without any representation or warranty of any kind, and Fitch does not represent or warrant that the report or any of its contents will meet any of the requirements of a recipient of the report. A Fitch rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a security. This opinion and reports made by Fitch are based on established criteria and methodologies that Fitch is continuously evaluating and updating. Therefore, ratings and reports are the collective work product of Fitch and no individual, or group of individuals, is solely responsible for a rating or a report. The rating does not address the risk of loss due to risks other than credit risk, unless such risk is specifically mentioned. Fitch is not engaged in the offer or sale of any security. All Fitch reports have shared authorship. Individuals identified in a Fitch report were involved in, but are not solely responsible for, the opinions stated therein. The individuals are named for contact purposes only. A report providing a Fitch rating is neither a prospectus nor a substitute for the information assembled, verified and presented to investors by the issuer and its agents in connection with the sale of the securities. Ratings may be changed or withdrawn at any time for any reason in the sole discretion of Fitch. Fitch does not provide investment advice of any sort. Ratings are not a recommendation to buy, sell, or hold any security. Ratings do not comment on the adequacy of market price, the suitability of any security for a particular investor, or the tax-exempt nature or taxability of payments made in respect to any security. Fitch receives fees from issuers, insurers, guarantors, other obligors, and underwriters for rating securities. Such fees generally vary from US\$1,000 to US\$750,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent) per issue. In certain cases, Fitch will rate all or a number of issues issued by a particular issuer, or insured or guaranteed by a particular insurer or guarantor, for a single annual fee. Such fees are expected to vary from US\$10,000 to US\$1,500,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent). The assignment, publication, or dissemination of a rating by Fitch shall not constitute a consent by Fitch to use its name as an expert in connection with any registration statement filed under the United States securities laws, the Financial Services and Markets Act of 2000 of the United

Kingdom, or the securities laws of any particular jurisdiction. Due to the relative efficiency of electronic publishing and distribution, Fitch research may be available to electronic subscribers up to three days earlier than to print subscribers.

For Australia, New Zealand, Taiwan and South Korea only: Fitch Australia Pty Ltd holds an Australian financial services license (AFS license no. 337123) which authorizes it to provide credit ratings to wholesale clients only. Credit ratings information published by Fitch is not intended to be used by persons who are retail clients within the meaning of the Corporations Act 2001

Fitch Ratings, Inc. is registered with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission as a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization (the "NRSRO"). While certain of the NRSRO's credit rating subsidiaries are listed on Item 3 of Form NRSRO and as such are authorized to issue credit ratings on behalf of the NRSRO (see <https://www.fitchratings.com/site/regulatory>), other credit rating subsidiaries are not listed on Form NRSRO (the "non-NRSROs") and therefore credit ratings issued by those subsidiaries are not issued on behalf of the NRSRO. However, non-NRSRO personnel may participate in determining credit ratings issued by or on behalf of the NRSRO.