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## Purpose

- Provide an update on a Funding Soundness Restoration Plan (FSRP) for Dallas Police and Fire Pension System (DPFP)
- Continue discussion regarding Cheiron's recommendations, and review DPFP staff recommendation
- Consider City staff recommendations for components of a FSRP ※


## Background

－Pension Review Board＇s（PRB）funding guidelines require that actual contributions should be sufficient to cover the normal cost and to amortize the unfunded actuarial accrued liability and should not exceed 30 years
－As of $1 / 1 / 23$ ，DPFP is projected to be fully funded in 82 years exceeding PRB＇s 30－year requirement
－City and DPFP have been working towards the goal to develop，agree to，and submit a plan to PRB that meets the funding soundness requirements in August or September 2024登行

## Cheiron's Primary Recommendations - 2/8/24

Independent Actuary Selected by PRB and Contracted by DPFP


## Reduce Uniform

Employee Contribution
Rate as Funding Improves

- Current rate is high compared to competitors and as proportion of benefit cost
- As funding improves, grade employee rate down to 50\% of normal cost rate

Reducing employee contributions will increase cost to City. This is not a PRB requirement.

## Provide Some COLA

 Earlier Than Current Provisions Permit- Members are not covered by Social Security, so they have no inflation protection in retirement
- Lack of COLA is likely to create a recruitment and retention issue provision will increase unfunded liability and increase cost to City. This is not a PRB


## PRB Requirements

- PRB requires a Funding Soundness Restoration Plan that will achieve full-funding within 30-years
- Cheiron's first recommendation is focused on achieving full-funding in 30-years
- Staff is fully committed to complying with PRB requirement
- PRB does not require the City to reduce employee contribution rate and does not require changes to current COLA methodology
- Cheiron's second and third recommendation address these areas which are not required by PRB
- If City chooses to address either of these two recommendations, it is above and beyond what PRB requires



## Actuarial Determined Contribution (ADC) Scenarios

- Cheiron presented five scenarios and indicated that all five scenarios are reasonable and meet PRB requirements to be fully-funded in 30-years

1. Traditional ADC
2. Three-year step-up and step-down
3. Five-year step-up and step-down
4. Three-year step-up (with no step-down)
5. Five-year step-up (with no step-down)

- City staff recommends five-year step-up (with no step-down) which allows the City to phase-in increased contributions while managing other budget needs and limitations


## ADC Scenarios

| Fiscal Year | Cheiron Revised Traditional ADC 3/29/24 |  | Year over Year Variance |  | Cheiron Revised <br>  <br> Step-Down <br> $4 / 2 / 24$ |  | Year over Year Variance |  | Cheiron Revised 5-Year Step-Up \& Step-Down 4/2/24 |  | Year over Year Variance |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cheiron Revised } \\ \text { 3-Year Step-Up } \\ 4 / 2 / 24 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Year over Year Variance |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cheiron Revised } \\ 5 \text {-Year Step-Up } \\ 4 / 2 / 24 \end{gathered}$ |  | Year over Year Variance |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 | \$ | 184,733,285 |  |  | \$ | 184,733,285 |  |  | \$ | 184,733,285 |  |  | \$ | 184,733,285 |  |  | \$ | 184,733,285 |  |  |
| 2025 | \$ | 251,429,000 | \$ | 66,695,715 | \$ | 211,545,000 | \$ | 26,811,715 | \$ | 203,084,000 | \$ | 18,350,715 | \$ | 210,645,000 | \$ | 25,911,715 | \$ | 202,120,000 | \$ | 17,386,715 |
| 2026 | \$ | 256,948,000 | \$ | 5,519,000 | \$ | 238,703,000 | \$ | 27,158,000 | \$ | 222,019,000 | \$ | 18,935,000 | \$ | 236,859,000 | \$ | 26,214,000 | \$ | 220,042,000 | \$ | 17,922,000 |
| 2027 | \$ | 262,749,000 | \$ | 5,801,000 | \$ | 267,042,000 | \$ | 28,339,000 | \$ | 241,728,000 | \$ | 19,709,000 | \$ | 264,207,000 | \$ | 27,348,000 | \$ | 238,689,000 | \$ | 18,647,000 |
| 2028 | \$ | 268,804,000 | \$ | 6,055,000 | \$ | 272,208,000 | \$ | 5,166,000 | \$ | 262,469,000 | \$ | 20,741,000 | \$ | 269,303,000 | \$ | 5,096,000 | \$ | 258,315,000 | \$ | 19,626,000 |
| 2029 | \$ | 275,029,000 | \$ | 6,225,000 | \$ | 277,556,000 | \$ | 5,348,000 | \$ | 284,184,000 | \$ | 21,715,000 | \$ | 274,577,000 | \$ | 5,274,000 | \$ | 278,863,000 | \$ | 20,548,000 |
| 2030 | \$ | 281,433,000 | S | 6,404,000 | \$ | 283,095,000 | \$ | 5,539,000 | \$ | 289,889,000 | \$ | 5,705,000 | \$ | 280,042,000 | \$ | 5,465,000 | \$ | 284,434,000 | \$ | 5,571,000 |
| 2031 | \$ | 288,000,000 | \$ | 6,567,000 | \$ | 289,703,000 | \$ | 6,608,000 | \$ | 296,667,000 | \$ | 6,778,000 | \$ | 286,574,000 | \$ | 6,532,000 | \$ | 291,076,000 | \$ | 6,642,000 |
| 2032 | \$ | 294,722,000 | \$ | 6,722,000 | \$ | 296,467,000 | \$ | 6,764,000 | \$ | 303,605,000 | \$ | 6,938,000 | \$ | 293,260,000 | \$ | 6,686,000 | \$ | 297,875,000 | \$ | 6,799,000 |
| 2033 | \$ | 301,667,000 | \$ | 6,945,000 | \$ | 303,456,000 | \$ | 6,989,000 | \$ | 310,772,000 | \$ | 7,167,000 | \$ | 300,168,000 | \$ | 6,908,000 | \$ | 304,899,000 | \$ | 7,024,000 |
| 2034 | \$ | 308,796,000 | \$ | 7,129,000 | \$ | 310,630,000 | \$ | 7,174,000 | \$ | 318,129,000 | \$ | 7,357,000 | \$ | 307,260,000 | \$ | 7,092,000 | \$ | 312,109,000 | \$ | 7,210,000 |
| 2035 | \$ | 316,113,000 | \$ | 7,317,000 | \$ | 317,993,000 | \$ | 7,363,000 | \$ | 325,680,000 | \$ | 7,551,000 | \$ | 314,539,000 | \$ | 7,279,000 | \$ | 319,509,000 | \$ | 7,400,000 |
| 2036 | \$ | 323,647,000 | \$ | 7,534,000 | \$ | 325,573,000 | \$ | 7,580,000 | \$ | 333,452,000 | \$ | 7,772,000 | \$ | 322,033,000 | \$ | 7,494,000 | \$ | 327,127,000 | \$ | 7,618,000 |
| 2037 | \$ | 331,388,000 | \$ | 7,741,000 | \$ | 333,363,000 | \$ | 7,790,000 | \$ | 341,439,000 | \$ | 7,987,000 | \$ | 329,734,000 | \$ | 7,701,000 | \$ | 334,955,000 | \$ | 7,828,000 |
| 2038 | \$ | 339,295,000 | \$ | 7,907,000 | \$ | 341,319,000 | \$ | 7,956,000 | \$ | 349,597,000 | \$ | 8,158,000 | \$ | 337,600,000 | \$ | 7,866,000 | \$ | 342,952,000 | \$ | 7,997,000 |
| 2039 | \$ | 347,425,000 | \$ | 8,130,000 | \$ | 349,500,000 | \$ | 8,181,000 | \$ | 357,984,000 | \$ | 8,387,000 | \$ | 345,687,000 | \$ | 8,087,000 | \$ | 351,173,000 | \$ | 8,221,000 |
| 2040 | \$ | 355,761,000 | \$ | 8,336,000 | \$ | 357,887,000 | \$ | 8,387,000 | \$ | 366,584,000 | \$ | 8,600,000 | \$ | 353,980,000 | \$ | 8,293,000 | \$ | 359,602,000 | \$ | 8,429,000 |
| 2041 | \$ | 364,405,000 | \$ | 8,644,000 | \$ | 366,585,000 | \$ | 8,698,000 | \$ | 375,500,000 | \$ | 8,916,000 | \$ | 362,580,000 | \$ | 8,600,000 | \$ | 368,343,000 | \$ | 8,741,000 |
| 2042 | \$ | 373,366,000 | \$ | 8,961,000 | \$ | 375,600,000 | \$ | 9,015,000 | \$ | 384,738,000 | \$ | 9,238,000 | \$ | 371,495,000 | \$ | 8,915,000 | \$ | 377,402,000 | \$ | 9,059,000 |
| 2043 | \$ | 382,512,000 | \$ | 9,146,000 | \$ | 384,802,000 | \$ | 9,202,000 | \$ | 394,168,000 | \$ | 9,430,000 | \$ | 380,594,000 | \$ | 9,099,000 | \$ | 386,649,000 | \$ | 9,247,000 |
| 2044 | \$ | 392,021,000 | \$ | 9,509,000 | \$ | 394,369,000 | \$ | 9,567,000 | \$ | 403,968,000 | \$ | 9,800,000 | \$ | 390,055,000 | \$ | 9,461,000 | \$ | 396,261,000 | \$ | 9,612,000 |
| 2045 | \$ | 401,862,000 | \$ | 9,841,000 | \$ | 404,268,000 | \$ | 9,899,000 | \$ | 414,108,000 | \$ | 10,140,000 | \$ | 399,847,000 | \$ | 9,792,000 | \$ | 406,208,000 | \$ | 9,947,000 |
| 2046 | \$ | 412,031,000 | \$ | 10,169,000 | \$ | 414,497,000 | \$ | 10,229,000 | \$ | 424,583,000 | \$ | 10,475,000 | \$ | 409,965,000 | \$ | 10,118,000 | \$ | 416,486,000 | \$ | 10,278,000 |
| 2047 | \$ | 422,331,000 | \$ | 10,300,000 | \$ | 424,859,000 | \$ | 10,362,000 | \$ | 435,197,000 | \$ | 10,614,000 | \$ | 420,214,000 | \$ | 10,249,000 | \$ | 426,898,000 | \$ | 10,412,000 |
| 2048 | \$ | 432,889,000 | \$ | 10,558,000 | \$ | 435,480,000 | \$ | 10,621,000 | \$ | 446,076,000 | \$ | 10,879,000 | \$ | 430,719,000 | \$ | 10,505,000 | \$ | 437,569,000 | \$ | 10,671,000 |
| 2049 | \$ | 443,712,000 | \$ | 10,823,000 | \$ | 446,368,000 | \$ | 10,888,000 | S | 457,229,000 | \$ | 11,153,000 | \$ | 441,488,000 | \$ | 10,769,000 | \$ | 448,510,000 | \$ | 10,941,000 |
| 2050 | \$ | 454,805,000 | \$ | 11,093,000 | \$ | 457,527,000 | \$ | 11,159,000 | \$ | 440,760,000 | \$ | (16,469,000 | \$ | 452,525,000 | \$ | 11,037,000 | \$ | 459,723,000 | \$ | 11,213,000 |
| 2051 | \$ | 466,174,000 | \$ | 11,369,000 | \$ | 468,965,000 | \$ | 11,438,000 | \$ | 423,180,000 | \$ | (17,580,000 | \$ | 463,838,000 | \$ | 11,313,000 | \$ | 471,215,000 | \$ | 11,492,000 |
| 2052 | \$ | 477,829,000 | \$ | 11,655,000 | \$ | 436,151,000 | \$ | $(32,814,000)$ | \$ | 404,446,000 | \$ | (18,734,000 | \$ | 475,433,000 | \$ | 11,595,000 | \$ | 482,995,000 | \$ | 11,780,000 |
| 2053 | \$ | 489,775,000 | \$ | 11,946,000 | \$ | 401,403,000 | \$ | (34,748,000) | \$ | 384,512,000 | \$ | (19,934,000 | \$ | 487,320,000 | \$ | 11,887,000 | \$ | 495,070,000 | \$ | 12,075,000 |
| 2054 | \$ | 502,019,000 | \$ | 12,244,000 | \$ | 364,645,000 | \$ | $(36,758,000)$ | \$ | 363,328,000 | \$ | (21,184,000 | \$ | 499,503,000 | S | 12,183,000 | \$ | 507,447,000 | \$ | 12,377,000 |
| 2055 | \$ | 71,007,000 | \$ | $(431,012,000)$ | \$ | 71,007,000 | \$ | $(293,638,000)$ | \$ | 71,007,000 | \$ | (292,321,000 | \$ | 71,007,000 |  | (428,496,000) | \$ | 71,007,000 | \$ | $(436,440,000)$ |

DPFP Staff
Recommendation

| C |
| :--- |

City Staff Recommendation

When comparing the 5-year step-up and 3-year step-up scenarios, City staff's recommendation is lower annual City contributions in FY25, FY26, FY27, and FY28, but higher contributions beginning in FY29.

## Uniform Employee Contributions

- Uniform employees and City both make contributions into DPFP to support pension benefits
- As result of HB3158, contribution rates increased including required contributions by City
- Once DPFP is fully-funded, employee contribution rate is scheduled to decrease to $50 \%$ of normal cost
- Cheiron suggested as funding improves, grade employee rate down to $50 \%$ of normal cost beginning in 2039, and shift more cost to City sooner
- City staff recommends no change to employee contribution rates or HB3158 criteria

| Year |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $(1 / 1)$ | City <br> Contribution <br> Rate | Employee <br> Contribution <br> Rate |
| 2003 | $29 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| 2004 | $31 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| 2005 | $31 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| 2006 | $31 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| 2007 | $32 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| 2008 | $32 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| 2009 | $31 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| 2010 | $29 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| 2011 | $28 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| 2012 | $30 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| 2013 | $29 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| 2014 | $29 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| 2015 | $30 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| 2016 | $33 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| 2017 | $35 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| 2018 | $43 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| 2019 | $43 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| 2020 | $41 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| 2021 | $39 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| 2022 | $39 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
|  |  |  |

## Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) Background

- Prior to HB3158
- Automatic 4\% Simple COLA if hired prior to 1/1/2007
- Ad Hoc Simple COLA up to 4\% if hired after 12/31/2006
- DROP accounts had guaranteed rate of return, but were not included in COLA calculations
- After HB3158
- COLA is subject to Board approval and can only be granted if funded percentage greater than 70\%
- 2023 valuation projects first COLA in 2073
- With revised funding plan, first COLA expected to be paid about 2046
- Ad Hoc Simple COLA that depends on investment returns (not inflation)
- 5-year average return minus 5\%
- Maximum of $4 \%$
- Although COLA is ad hoc and not considered substantially automatic, current assumption of annual 1.5\% COLA beginning in 2046 adds $\$ 128 \mathrm{~m}$ to initial unfunded actuarial liability and increases City's annual

| Year (1/1) | Rate of Return <br> on Market <br> Value of Assets | COLA |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2001 | $-7.8 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2002 | $-12.3 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2003 | $31.7 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2004 | $14.0 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2005 | $10.8 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2006 | $14.6 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2007 | $8.9 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2008 | $-24.8 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2009 | $13.8 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2010 | $10.7 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2011 | $-1.8 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2012 | $9.9 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2013 | $7.7 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2014 | $-5.4 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2015 | $-8.5 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2016 | $6.8 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ |
| 2017 | $4.7 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| 2018 | $2.1 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| 2019 | $6.3 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| 2020 | $-0.4 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| 2021 | $17.0 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| 2022 | $-11.5 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
|  |  |  | cost

## COLA－City Staff Recommendation

－City staff recommends continued compliance with HB3158 that provides ad hoc COLA once DPFP is 70\％funded
－Staff supports modifying the HB3158 COLA methodology
－Current：5－year average return less 5\％，not to exceed 4\％per year
－Current actuarial assumption is $1.5 \%$ per year
－Alternative：based on CPI，not to exceed $1.5 \%$ per year
－No change to current actuarial assumption
－Future adjustment：contingent on City providing significant lump sum contribution or providing additional ongoing source of revenue， City may increase maximum ad hoc simple COLA based on CPI from 1．5\％to 3．0\％
－Since contingent on new funding sources，will not be reflected in current actuarial assumption

## COLA - DPFP Staff Recommendation

- DPFP staff recommends modifying current COLA methodology
- Change ad hoc COLA to automatic COLA
- Implement minimum 70\% Purchasing Power model presented by Cheiron that sets retirees' base pension in 2024
- Provide 1.5\% annual COLA once 70\% funded
- Value of pension will erode over time and as 1.5\% COLA may not keep up with inflation
- Once value of pension is 70\% of base year, provide at least 1.5\% COLA or higher amount based on CPI with no maximum or cap which will ensure that the value of pension does not fall below 70\% purchasing power


## Supplemental Pay - City Staff Recommendation

- HB3158 suspended COLA until DPFP reaches 70\% funding (forecast to be 2046)
- City staff recommends two-part supplemental pay to bridge 2025 to 2046
- Provide 1\% increase to retiree base pension in 2025 (for all retirees as of December 31, 2024)
- Provide additional $1 \%$ per year as $13^{\text {th }}$ check that does not add to retiree base pension, and contingent on DPFP having a positive return (2026-2046)


## Supplemental Pay - DPFP Staff Recommendation

- DPFP staff supports automatic annual $13^{\text {th }}$ check based on $\$ 5 \times$ years of service x years in retirement since 2017, payable until plan is 70\% funded
- While it does not add to base, it increases each year as each retiree has an additional year in retirement
- Cost to City is forecast to be more than three times the cost of City's recommendation for supplemental pay


## Comparison of Recommendations

- City staff recommendation
- ADC with five-year step-up
- Modify COLA based on CPI not to exceed 1.5\%
- Future opportunity to increase COLA based on CPI not to exceed 3.0\% contingent on additional City funding
- Supplemental pay 1\% increase to pension base in 2025
- Supplemental pay $1 \%$ per year as $13^{\text {th }}$ check 2026 until $70 \%$ funded
- DPFP staff recommendation
- ADC with three-year step-up
- Modify COLA based on 70\% Purchasing Power
- Supplemental Pay (\$5 x year of service x year retired since 2017)


# Comparison of Cost 

- City will contribute approximately \$11.2B over 30-year period
- DPFP recommended changes will require City to contribute over \$11.6B over 30-years
- DPFP recommendation costs $\$ 419 \mathrm{M}$ more over 30-year period than recommended by City staff

|  | DPFP Staff Recommendation | Year over Year Increase | City Staff <br> Recommendation | Year over Year Increase | Annual Variance City \& DPFP Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 | \$ 184,000,000 |  | \$ 184,000,000 |  |  |
| 2025 | \$ 215,433,000 | \$ 31,433,000 | \$ 202,509,000 | \$ 18,509,000 | \$ 12,924,000 |
| 2026 | \$ 247,449,000 | \$ 32,016,000 | \$ 221,214,000 | \$ 18,705,000 | \$ 26,235,000 |
| 2027 | \$ 280,885,000 | \$ 33,436,000 | \$ 240,683,000 | \$ 19,469,000 | \$ 40,202,000 |
| 2028 | \$ 286,316,000 | \$ 5,431,000 | \$ 261,176,000 | \$ 20,493,000 | \$ 25,140,000 |
| 2029 | \$ 291,926,000 | \$ 5,610,000 | \$ 282,632,000 | \$ 21,456,000 | \$ 9,294,000 |
| 2030 | \$ 297,706,000 | \$ 5,780,000 | \$ 288,274,000 | \$ 5,642,000 | \$ 9,432,000 |
| 2031 | \$ 304,579,000 | \$ 6,873,000 | \$ 294,993,000 | \$ 6,719,000 | \$ 9,586,000 |
| 2032 | \$ 311,599,000 | \$ 7,020,000 | \$ 301,867,000 | \$ 6,874,000 | \$ 9,732,000 |
| 2033 | \$ 318,876,000 | \$ 7,277,000 | \$ 308,971,000 | \$ 7,104,000 | \$ 9,905,000 |
| 2034 | \$ 326,342,000 | \$ 7,466,000 | \$ 316,262,000 | \$ 7,291,000 | \$ 10,080,000 |
| 2035 | \$ 334,018,000 | \$ 7,676,000 | \$ 323,752,000 | \$ 7,490,000 | \$ 10,266,000 |
| 2036 | \$ 341,937,000 | \$ 7,919,000 | \$ 331,457,000 | \$ 7,705,000 | \$ 10,480,000 |
| 2037 | \$ 350,083,000 | \$ 8,146,000 | \$ 339,379,000 | \$ 7,922,000 | \$ 10,704,000 |
| 2038 | \$ 358,397,000 | \$ 8,314,000 | \$ 347,471,000 | \$ 8,092,000 | \$ 10,926,000 |
| 2039 | \$ 366,956,000 | \$ 8,559,000 | \$ 355,791,000 | \$ 8,320,000 | \$ 11,165,000 |
| 2040 | \$ 375,723,000 | \$ 8,767,000 | \$ 364,322,000 | \$ 8,531,000 | \$ 11,401,000 |
| 2041 | \$ 384,807,000 | \$ 9,084,000 | \$ 373,168,000 | \$ 8,846,000 | \$ 11,639,000 |
| 2042 | \$ 394,230,000 | \$ 9,423,000 | \$ 382,337,000 | \$ 9,169,000 | \$ 11,893,000 |
| 2043 | \$ 403,850,000 | \$ 9,620,000 | \$ 391,694,000 | \$ 9,357,000 | \$ 12,156,000 |
| 2044 | \$ 413,855,000 | \$ 10,005,000 | \$ 401,422,000 | \$ 9,728,000 | \$ 12,433,000 |
| 2045 | \$ 424,215,000 | \$ 10,360,000 | \$ 411,491,000 | \$ 10,069,000 | \$ 12,724,000 |
| 2046 | \$ 434,920,000 | \$ 10,705,000 | \$ 421,896,000 | \$ 10,405,000 | \$ 13,024,000 |
| 2047 | \$ 445,792,000 | \$ 10,872,000 | \$ 432,443,000 | \$ 10,547,000 | \$ 13,349,000 |
| 2048 | \$ 456,938,000 | \$ 11,146,000 | \$ 443,254,000 | \$ 10,811,000 | \$ 13,684,000 |
| 2049 | \$ 468,361,000 | \$ 11,423,000 | \$ 454,336,000 | \$ 11,082,000 | \$ 14,025,000 |
| 2050 | \$ 480,070,000 | \$ 11,709,000 | \$ 465,697,000 | \$ 11,361,000 | \$ 14,373,000 |
| 2051 | \$ 492,073,000 | \$ 12,003,000 | \$ 477,337,000 | \$ 11,640,000 | \$ 14,736,000 |
| 2052 | \$ 504,374,000 | \$ 12,301,000 | \$ 489,272,000 | \$ 11,935,000 | \$ 15,102,000 |
| 2053 | \$ 516,983,000 | \$ 12,609,000 | \$ 501,503,000 | \$ 12,231,000 | \$ 15,480,000 |
| 2054 | \$ 529,908,000 | \$ 12,925,000 | \$ 514,041,000 | \$ 12,538,000 | \$ 15,867,000 |
| 2055 |  | \$ $(457,836,000)$ |  | \$ (443,034,000) | \$ 1,005,000 |
| Total | \$ 11,614,673,000 |  | \$ 11,195,651,000 |  | I 419,022,000 |

## Comparison of Budget Impact (In Million Dollars)

City Staff Recommendation

|  | FY25 | FY26 | FY27 | FY28 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GF Revenues | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 9 1 4 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 9 9 5 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 0 7 6 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 1 6 0 . 5}$ |
| Other Expenses | $1,750.5$ | $1,812.6$ | $1,875.8$ | $1,938.2$ |
| DPFP Expense | 202.5 | 221.2 | 240.7 | 261.2 |
| GF Expenses | $\mathbf{1 , 9 5 3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 3 3 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 1 1 6 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 1 9 9 . 4}$ |
| Surplus/(Shortfall) | $\mathbf{( 3 8 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{( 3 8 . 5 )}$ | $\mathbf{( 4 0 . 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{( 3 8 . 9 )}$ |

DPFP Staff Recommendation

|  | FY25 | FY26 | FY27 | FY28 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GF Revenues | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 9 1 4 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 9 9 5 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 0 7 6 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 1 6 0 . 5}$ |
| Other Expenses | $1,750.5$ | $1,812.6$ | $1,875.8$ | $1,938.2$ |
| DPFP Expense | 215.4 | 247.4 | 280.9 | 286.3 |
| GF Expenses | $\mathbf{1 , 9 6 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 6 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 1 5 6 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 2 2 4 . 5}$ |
| Surplus/(Shortfall) | $\mathbf{( 5 1 . 3 )}$ | $\mathbf{( 6 4 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{( 8 0 . 2 )}$ | $\mathbf{( 6 4 . 0 )}$ |

## Additional Oversight Recommendation

－City＇s current oversight of DPFP is through 6 of 11 board members that are appointed by the Mayor
－Board members have fiduciary responsibility to DPFP not City
－Additional oversight will ensure City can manage pension contribution increases that become a liability of City－examples include：
－City approval required for items that substantially increase City＇s liability including changes to benefits，changes to actuarial assumptions such as discount rate，settling lawsuits，etc．
－In any year，City contributions（in excess of the baseline 30－year UAL schedule） exceeding $+/-5 \%$ will be layered and amortized within the ADC model
－Annually，DPFP and City will separately calculate ADC，and City will make contributions according to DPFP calculation unless a $2 \%$ or greater variance exists in which case an average will be used if not resolved through a reconciliation period

## Additional Funding Strategies for Policy Discussion

- Staff has been asked to research four additional strategies for additional City funding

1. Monetize assets
2. Issue Pension Obligation Bonds (POB)
3. Shift $0.25 \%$ of sales tax rate from DART to City
4. Increase property tax rate with voter approval (tax ratification election) ※

## Additional Funding Strategies for Policy Discussion

1．Monetize assets
－Staff identified 10 initial properties to consider for monetization
－May to September 2024 －engage consultants to value the property and develop recommendations
－October to December 2024 －present findings to GPFM and City Council
－Beginning in January 2025 －implement direction from City Council
－Proceeds from monetization efforts would be transferred to DPFP as lump sum contributions that would reduce City＇s initial 30－year UAL amortization schedule and create additional financial capacity for City

## Additional Funding Strategies for Policy Discussion

2．Issue Pension Obligation Bonds（POB）
－Financial capacity exists to issue \＄400M POB between 2025 and 2029 with additional financial capacity growth in future years
－Bond Counsel has been asked to confirm that voter－approval is required，and that debt service can be paid from the property tax interest and sinking fund
－Consider seeking voter－approval and issuing POB debt once certain triggers are met
－Seeking recommendation from financial advisors on appropriate triggers
－Proceeds from POB debt issuance would be transferred to DPFP as lump sum contributions that would reduce City＇s initial 30－year UAL amortization schedule and create additional financial capacity for City

## Additional Funding Strategies for Policy Discussion

3．Shift $0.25 \%$ of sales tax rate from DART to City
－Current sales tax rate is $8.25 \%$ with $6.25 \%$ going to the State and the $2 \%$ local option being allocated to the City $91 \%$ ）and DART（1\％）
－In FY23，1\％resulted in $\$ 425.5 \mathrm{M}$ for the City（ $0.25 \%$ equals $\$ 106.4 \mathrm{M}$ ）
－Other DART member cities expressed interest in reallocation of sales tax rate from DART to their City
－Reducing the $1 \%$ allocated to DART would at a minimum require DART board approval and may require State legislative and／or voter approval
－For the City＇s 1\％allocation to increase，voter－approval would be required
－Reallocation of $0.25 \%$ of sales tax would provide over $\$ 100 \mathrm{M}$ recurring revenue that could allow for increased contributions to DPFP

## Additional Funding Strategies for Policy Discussion

4．Increase property tax rate with voter approval（tax ratification election
－Staff will recommend a budget that increases City＇s contribution to DPFP to ensure full－funding in 30－years in accordance with PRB requirements
－As an alternative，City Council could consider a separate budget package for additional DPFP contributions that is supported by a property tax rate increase that exceeds the 3．5\％cap（2019 SB2） which would require voter－approval
－November 2024 election must be called by City Council no later than August 14， 2024
－Each 1.0 c property tax rate generates approximately $\$ 20 \mathrm{M}$ revenue
－Increased property tax rate could be recurring revenue that could allow for increased contributions to DPFP

## Summary of City Staff Recommendations

- ADC with five-year step-up
- No change to employee contribution rates
- Continue compliance with HB3158 that requires 70\% funding before ad hoc simple COLA is available
- Modify COLA methodology to be based on CPI not to exceed 1.5\% *
- Increase COLA to not to exceed 3\% contingent on either lump sum contribution or additional revenue stream from the City *
- Offer supplemental pay to bridge 2025 to 2046 (forecast 70\% funding threshold)
- $1 \%$ increase added to retiree base in 2025
- Additional $1 \%$ per year as $13^{\text {th }}$ check contingent on DPFP positive returns (not added to base)
- Strengthen City oversight
- Continue efforts to realize lump sum contribution and/or on-going revenue stream
- Continue work with DPFP staff towards consensus on plan
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## Next Steps

- May 23 - Ad Hoc Committee meeting (DPFP)
- Receive committee feedback on recommendations and receive policy guidance
- June 5 - City Council briefing on pension funding
- June 6 - Ad Hoc Committee meeting (ERF)
- June 12 - City Council action to approve funding soundness restoration plan (first opportunity)
- June 18 - City Council briefing on pension funding
- June 26 - City Council action to approve funding soundness restoration plan (second opportunity)
- August 7 - City Council briefing (if necessary related to November 2024 election)
- August 14 - City Council action to call November 2024 election (if necessary)

The City is fully committed to ensuring the funding soundness of DPFP, and protection of the pension benefits for all City employees and retirees.

# Dallas Police and Fire Pension System: Funding Soundness Restoration Plan Update and Consideration of Recommendations 

Ad Hoc Committee on Pensions May 23, 2024

Jack Ireland Chief Financial Officer

## Appendix

## DPFP - History and Update

Years To Full Funding


As of $1 / 1 / 23$, DPFP is projected to be fully funded in 82 years.

HB3158 requires a funding plan be submitted to PRB by 11/1/24.

PRB requires a FSRP be submitted by $9 / 1 / 25$ that achieves full-funding within 30-year.

## DPFP－History and Update

Assets vs Liabilities（\＄Billions）


> DPFP dropped from $41.1 \%$ funded as of $1 / 1 / 22$ to $39.1 \%$ funded as of $1 / 1 / 23$.

## ADC Core Elements

## Element \＃1－Unfunded <br> Actuarial Liability（UAL）

－Amortize current unfunded liability over 30 years
－Include expected future administrative expenses
－Amortization schedule will be fixed and not change
－Future lump sum contributions will reduce UAL amortization schedule

Element \＃2－Normal Cost
－Ongoing City normal cost
－Reflects value of additional accrued liability of active employees in the plan
－Normal Cost can be forecasted for 30 years，but will be affected by pay increases and changes to other actuarial assumptions， such as Discount Rate

Element \＃3－Additional Layers for Gains／Losses
－As asset or liability experience deviates from assumptions，or assumptions are changed，new gains or losses emerge
－New amortization layers are added for emerging gains or losses
－Will be amortized to 2055 ，or over 20 years beginning in 2036
－Cost of additional layers are not yet known

## Budget Impact Scenarios

|  | FY25 Planned Budget | Police \& Fire \$1,129.7m | Non-Police/Fire \$784.9m | Tax Rate | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Consideration \#1 | 3.5\% - \$39.54m | 3.5\% - \$27.47m |  | \$67m |
|  | Consideration \#2 | 2\% - \$22.6m | 5.7\% - \$44.43m |  | \$67m |
|  | Consideration \#3 | 1\% - \$11.3m | 7.1\% - \$55.73m |  | \$67m |
|  | Consideration \#4 | 0\% - \$0 | 8.5\% - \$67m |  | \$67m |
|  | Consideration \#5 |  |  | 3.25¢ | \$67m |
|  | Consideration \#A | 0.9\% - \$10.17m | 0.9\% - \$7.06m |  | \$17m |
|  | Consideration \#B | 0\% - \$0 | 2.2\% - \$17.3m |  | \$17m |
|  | Consideration \#C |  |  | 0.83¢ | \$17m |

[^0]
## Peer Discount Rate Distribution

Out of 42 Plans in Texas with over \$100M in Assets, DPFP has the 6th lowest Discount Rate Assumption. ERF is tied for 10th highest (with 4 other plans at 7.25\%). The distribution for NASRA State Plans is similar.


## Texas PRB Plans with Assets Over \$100M, Sorted by Discount Rate

| Plan | Discount Rate | Funded Ratio* | Plan | Discount Rate | Funded Ratio* | Plano Retirement Security Plan | Discount Rate | Funded Ratio* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| El Paso Police Pension Fund | 7.75\% | 81.8\% | Fort Worth Employees' Retirement Fund | 7.00\% | 54.8\% | Houston Firefighters' Relief \& Retirement Fund | 7.00\% | 95.4\% |
| El Paso Firemen's Pension Fund | 7.75\% | 82.6\% | Law Enforcement \& Custodial Officer Supplemental Retirement Fund | 7.00\% | 58.6\% | Austin Employees' Retirement System | 6.75\% | 64.1\% |
| Beaumont Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 7.50\% | 55.4\% | Houston Municipal Employees Pension System | 7.00\% | 65.8\% | DART Employees' Defined Benefit Retirement Plan \& Trust | 6.75\% | 84.5\% |
| Lubbock Fire Pension Fund | 7.50\% | 70.8\% | Employees Retirement System of Texas | 7.00\% | 68.9\% | Denton Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 6.75\% | 88.8\% |
| Texas Emergency Services Retirement System | 7.50\% | 84.3\% | San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Retirement Plan | 7.00\% | 71.0\% | Texas Municipal Retirement System | 6.75\% | 89.7\% |
| Texas County \& District Retirement System | 7.50\% | 88.6\% | Lower Colorado River Authority Retirement Plan | 7.00\% | 74.4\% | JPS Pension Plan - Tarrant County Hospital District | 6.75\% | 96.8\% |
| Amarillo Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 7.50\% | 94.8\% | University Health System Pension Plan | 7.00\% | 77.0\% | Plano Retirement Security Plan | 6.75\% | 103.0\% |
| Laredo Firefighters Retirement System | 7.40\% | 59.1\% | Teacher Retirement System of Texas | 7.00\% | 79.0\% | Retirement Plan for Citizens Medical Center | 6.75\% | 115.4\% |
| Austin Fire Fighters Relief \& Retirement Fund | 7.30\% | 86.9\% | Dallas/Fort Worth Airport Board Retirement Plan | 7.00\% | 84.5\% | Dallas Police \& Fire Pension SystemCombined Plan | 6.50\% | 41.1\% |
| Austin Police Retirement System | 7.25\% | 60.1\% | Judicial Retirement System of Texas Plan Two | 7.00\% | 86.2\% | Houston MTA Non-Union Pension Plan | 6.25\% | 64.5\% |
| Dallas Employees' Retirement Fund | 7.25\% | 73.3\% | Dallas/Fort Worth Airport Board DPS Retirement Plan | 7.00\% | 87.2\% | Houston MTA Workers Union Pension Plan | 6.25\% | 70.5\% |
| City of El Paso Employees Retirement Trust | 7.25\% | 80.9\% | Houston Police Officers' Pension System | 7.00\% | 87.5\% | Dallas County Hospital District Retirement Income Plan | 6.00\% | 73.3\% |
| San Antonio Fire \& Police Pension Fund | 7.25\% | 88.6\% | CPS Energy Pension Plan | 7.00\% | 87.6\% | Port of Houston Authority Retirement Plan | 6.00\% | 89.4\% |
| Corpus Christi Fire Fighters' Retirement System | 7.15\% | 63.0\% | Irving Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 7.00\% | 90.8\% | Harris County Hospital District Pension Plan | 5.75\% | 76.1\% |

*Funded Ratio Note 1: For plan funding purposes, the Discount Rate is equal to the Long-Term Expected Rate of Return on Asset assumption.
Note 2: For DPFP, 6.5\% discount rate adds approximately $\$ 450 \mathrm{M}$ to the Unfunded Actuarial Liability compared to a $7.25 \%$ discount rate.

| System | Fiscal Year End | Net Total Assets | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Funded } \\ & \text { Ratio } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Investment } \\ & \text { Return } \\ & \text { Assumption } \end{aligned}$ | 1-Year Net | 3-Year Net Return | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 10-Y e a r ~ N e t \\ \text { Return } \end{array}\right\|$ | SB 322 Total <br>  <br> Indirect <br> Expenses | SB 322 Total Investment Expense | Annual Audit Investment Expense | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 10YR Return } \\ \text { Vs Assumption } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nacogdoches County Hospital District | 6/30/2021 | \$51 | 82.50\% | 4.99\% | 22.63\% | 10.44\% | 8.87\% | N/A | N/A | 0.00\% | 3.88\% |
| Law Enforcement \& Custodial Off Sup. Ret. Fund | 8/31/2022 | \$1,042 | 43.38\% | 7.00\% | -1.59\% | 9.66\% | 8.30\% | 0.85\% | 0.86\% | 0.15\% | 3.85\% |
| Judicial Retirement System of Texas Plan Two | 8/31/2022 | \$566 | 78.65\% | 7.00\% | -1.59\% | 9.66\% | 8.30\% | 0.85\% | 0.86\% | 0.13\% | 2.53\% |
| Houston Municipal Employees Pension System | 6/30/2023 | \$4,072 | 71.46\% | 7.00\% | 6.00\% | 15.52\% | 9.27\% | 1.08\% | 1.16\% | 0.24\% | 2.27\% |
| Amarillo Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$218 | 90.80\% | 7.50\% | -14.66\% | 6.93\% | 9.28\% | 0.28\% | 0.32\% | 0.32\% | 1.78\% |
| Harris County Hospital District Pension Plan | 12/31/2022 | \$821 | 70.46\% | 5.75\% | -16.58\% | 3.23\% | 7.35\% | 0.24\% | 0.30\% | 0.00\% | 1.60\% |
| Guadalupe Regional Medical Center | 12/31/2022 | \$94 | 90.31\% | 6.75\% | -15.09\% | 3.48\% | 8.12\% | 0.19\% | 0.23\% | 0.08\% | 1.37\% |
| Sweeny Community Hospital | 12/31/2022 | \$3 | 82.96\% | 5.75\% | -16.69\% | 1.72\% | 7.08\% | 0.19\% | 0.23\% | 0.09\% | 1.33\% |
| Houston Police Officers' Pension System | 6/30/2023 | \$7,208 | 91.34\% | 7.00\% | 7.80\% | 12.00\% | 8.30\% | 2.20\% | 2.21\% | 0.11\% | 1.30\% |
| Teacher Retirement System of Texas | 8/31/2022 | \$184,186 | 75.62\% | 7.00\% | -6.72\% | 7.73\% | 8.14\% | 1.25\% | 1.34\% | 0.14\% | 1.14\% |
| Citizens Medical Center | 2/28/2023 | \$140 | 108.49\% | 6.75\% | -6.75\% | 7.21\% | 7.81\% | 0.17\% | 0.21\% | 0.08\% | 1.06\% |
| Denton Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$137 | 89.80\% | 6.75\% | -4.62\% | 7.88\% | 7.76\% | 0.14\% | 0.32\% | 0.26\% | 1.01\% |
| Employees Retirement System of Texas | 8/31/2023 | \$34,050 | 70.95\% | 7.00\% | 6.72\% | 9.63\% | 7.99\% | 0.66\% | 0.68\% | 0.11\% | 0.99\% |
| University Health System Pension Plan | 12/31/2022 | \$527 | 71.60\% | 7.00\% | -11.99\% | 5.65\% | 7.92\% | 0.49\% | 0.58\% | 0.29\% | 0.92\% |
| Texas County \& District Retirement System | 12/31/2022 | \$41,969 | N/A | 7.50\% | -5.80\% | 8.29\% | 8.27\% | 0.79\% | 0.82\% | 0.12\% | 0.77\% |
| City of El Paso Employees Retirement Trust | 8/31/2022 | \$908 | 81.20\% | 7.25\% | -5.27\% | 9.10\% | 7.91\% | 0.55\% | 0.60\% | 0.27\% | 0.66\% |
| Houston Firefighters' Relief \& Retirement Fund | 6/3012023 | \$5,109 | 98.87\% | 7.25\% | 4.11\% | 11.61\% | 7.86\% | 0.98\% | 1.16\% | 0.18\% | 0.61\% |
| Plano Retirement Security Plan | 12/31/2022 | \$186 | 92.83\% | 6.75\% | -15.19\% | 3.90\% | 7.29\% | 0.34\% | 0.40\% | 0.22\% | 0.54\% |
| San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Retirement Plan | 9/30/2023 | \$338 | 65.96\% | 7.00\% | 10.10\% | 4.74\% | 7.48\% | 0.44\% | 0.47\% | 0.46\% | 0.48\% |
| Galveston Wharves Pension Plan | 12/31/2022 | \$13 | 79.84\% | 7.25\% | -17.44\% | 2.54\% | 7.72\% | 0.81\% | 0.81\% | 0.52\% | 0.47\% |
| Dallas Co. Hospital Dist. Retirement Income Plan | 12/31/2022 | \$1,427 | 66.11\% | 6.00\% | -13.90\% | 2.97\% | 6.39\% | 0.38\% | 0.42\% | 0.24\% | 0.39\% |
| Travis County ESD \#6 FRRF | 12/31/2022 | \$40 | 81.90\% | 6.50\% | -14.83\% | 3.22\% | 6.81\% | 0.49\% | 0.73\% | 0.33\% | 0.31\% |
| Austin Fire Fighters Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$1,116 | 80.00\% | 7.30\% | -10.78\% | 5.80\% | 7.57\% | 0.60\% | 0.63\% | 0.31\% | 0.27\% |
| Capital MTA Admin Employees | 12/31/2022 | \$48 | 72.42\% | 6.75\% | -14.86\% | 3.32\% | 7.02\% | 0.35\% | 0.62\% | 0.09\% | 0.27\% |
| JPS - Tarrant County Hospital District | 9/30/2022 | \$370 | 86.20\% | 6.75\% | -16.41\% | 2.94\% | 7.01\% | 0.33\% | 0.38\% | 0.10\% | 0.26\% |
| Employees of Brownsville Navigation District | 12/31/2022 | \$9 | 87.76\% | 6.00\% | -12.80\% | 3.94\% | 6.24\% | 1.02\% | 1.02\% | 1.02\% | 0.24\% |
| CPS Energy Pension Plan | 12/31/2022 | \$1,919 | 81.62\% | 7.00\% | -10.51\% | 4.19\% | 7.24\% | 0.63\% | 0.66\% | 0.31\% | 0.24\% |
| Northwest Texas Healthcare System Retirement Plan | 9/30/2022 | \$19 | 86.85\% | 6.00\% | -12.61\% | 4.79\% | 5.95\% | 0.19\% | 0.28\% | 0.28\% | -0.05\% |
| Denison Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$20 | 73.50\% | 7.50\% | -17.61\% | 2.20\% | 7.41\% | 0.22\% | 0.72\% | 0.50\% | -0.09\% |
| DFW Airport Board DPS | 12/31/2022 | \$254 | 82.19\% | 7.00\% | -6.20\% | 5.60\% | 6.90\% | 0.70\% | 0.70\% | 0.65\% | -0.10\% |
| DFW Airport Board | 12/31/2022 | \$587 | 80.11\% | 7.00\% | -6.30\% | 5.60\% | 6.90\% | 0.66\% | 0.66\% | 0.66\% | -0.10\% |
| El Paso Firemen's Pension Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$684 | 75.76\% | 7.75\% | -10.32\% | 5.01\% | 7.45\% | 0.61\% | 0.65\% | 0.28\% | -0.30\% |
| El Paso Police Pension Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$979 | 75.18\% | 7.75\% | -10.32\% | 5.01\% | 7.45\% | 0.61\% | 0.65\% | 0.26\% | -0.30\% |
| Colorado River Municipal Water Dist. | 12/31/2022 | \$6 | 64.81\% | 5.75\% | -15.82\% | 0.70\% | 5.44\% | 0.78\% | 1.45\% | 0.00\% | -0.31\% |
| Port of Houston Authority Retirement Plan | 7/31/2023 | \$201 | 91.84\% | 6.00\% | 7.01\% | 5.87\% | 5.64\% | 0.50\% | 0.66\% | 0.22\% | -0.36\% |
| Inving Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$242 | 82.90\% | 7.00\% | -9.90\% | 2.80\% | 6.60\% | 0.36\% | 0.46\% | 0.14\% | -0.40\% |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| System | Fiscal Year End | Net Total Assets | Funded Ratio | Investment Return Assumption | 1-Year Net | 3-Year Net Return | 10-Year Net Return | SB 322 Total Direct \& Indirect Expenses | SB 322 Total Investment Expense | Annual Audit Investment Expense | 10 YR Return Vs Assumption |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Laredo Firefighters Retirement System | 9/30/2022 | \$180 | 54.60\% | 7.40\% | -16.13\% | 3.32\% | 5.18\% | 0.71\% | 0.79\% | 0.21\% | -2.22\% |
| Galveston Firefighter's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$49 | 58.50\% | 7.50\% | -15.12\% | 1.98\% | 5.25\% | 0.40\% | 0.76\% | 0.54\% | -2.25\% |
| Killeen Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 9/30/2022 | \$54 | 66.22\% | 7.25\% | -14.98\% | 3.54\% | 4.98\% | 0.86\% | 0.96\% | 0.26\% | -2.27\% |
| University Park Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$11 | 39.40\% | 7.25\% | -15.08\% | 1.25\% | 4.97\% | 0.50\% | 0.79\% | 0.79\% | -2.28\% |
| Orange Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$8 | 48.26\% | 7.75\% | -17.19\% | 2.27\% | 5.41\% | 0.53\% | 0.91\% | 0.00\% | -2.34\% |
| Weslaco Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 9/30/2022 | \$15 | 70.20\% | 7.25\% | -12.01\% | 3.16\% | 4.88\% | 0.08\% | 0.64\% | 0.60\% | -2.37\% |
| Waxahachie Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 9/30/2022 | \$19 | 63.00\% | 7.00\% | -23.49\% | -0.05\% | 4.48\% | 0.80\% | 0.93\% | 0.21\% | -2.52\% |
| Brownwood Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$5 | 39.14\% | 7.00\% | -18.92\% | 0.70\% | 4.45\% | 1.22\% | 2.12\% | 0.90\% | -2.55\% |
| Sweetwater Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$8 | 35.06\% | 7.50\% | -15.61\% | 1.03\% | 4.88\% | 0.47\% | 0.87\% | 0.63\% | -2.62\% |
| Odessa Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$44 | 33.97\% | 7.00\% | -12.84\% | 5.55\% | 4.36\% | 1.35\% | 1.50\% | 1.20\% | -2.64\% |
| Longview Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$86 | 59.85\% | 7.50\% | -11.80\% | 3.95\% | 4.79\% | 0.58\% | 0.68\% | 0.58\% | -2.71\% |
| McAllen Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 9/30/2022 | $\$ 53$ | 59.50\% | 7.50\% | -18.14\% | 1.51\% | 4.79\% | 1.56\% | 1.96\% | 0.72\% | -2.71\% |
| Midland Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$81 | 26.89\% | 7.00\% | -10.79\% | 2.20\% | 4.29\% | N/A | N/A | 0.62\% | -2.71\% |
| San Benito Firemen Relief \& Retirement Fund | 9/30/2022 | \$4 | 59.20\% | 7.50\% | -12.85\% | 2.24\% | 4.72\% | 0.79\% | 1.29\% | 1.05\% | -2.78\% |
| Plainview Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$7 | 37.69\% | 7.50\% | -16.22\% | 0.96\% | 4.71\% | 0.46\% | 1.08\% | 0.88\% | -2.79\% |
| Texas City Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$15 | 38.36\% | 7.25\% | -15.49\% | 1.04\% | 4.32\% | 0.39\% | 0.67\% | 0.45\% | -2.93\% |
| Capital MTA Bargaining | 12/31/2022 | \$34 | 53.77\% | 6.50\% | -18.39\% | 2.05\% | 3.55\% | 0.26\% | 0.51\% | 0.37\% | -2.95\% |
| Arlington Employees Deferred Income Plan | 6/30/2023 | \$3 | 99.66\% | 5.00\% | 1.74\% | -1.00\% | 1.93\% | 0.79\% | 0.79\% | 0.00\% | -3.07\% |
| Abilene Firemen's Relief \& Retirement Fund | 9/30/2022 | \$52 | 40.51\% | 7.50\% | -16.63\% | 1.57\% | 4.36\% | 0.48\% | 0.69\% | 0.41\% | -3.14\% |
| Paris Firefighters' Relief \& Retirement Fund | 12/31/2022 | \$16 | 101.39\% | 7.25\% | -16.02\% | 1.04\% | 3.57\% | 0.23\% | 0.31\% | 0.31\% | -3.68\% |
| Dallas Police \& Fire Pension System-Combined Plan | 12/31/2022 | \$1,807 | 34.38\% | 6.50\% | -2.20\% | 1.50\% | 2.00\% | 0.64\% | 0.80\% | 0.48\% | 4.50\% |
| Dallas Police \& Fire Pension System-Supplemental | 12/31/2022 | \$17 | 38.64\% | 6.50\% | -2.20\% | 1.50\% | 2.00\% | 0.65\% | 0.81\% | 0.48\% | 4.50\% |
| The Woodlands Firefighters' Retirement System | 12/31/2022 | \$56 | 102.05\% | 7.00\% | -15.43\% | 4.50\% | N/A | 0.34\% | 0.45\% | 0.28\% | N/A |
| El Paso Firemen \& Policemen's Pension Staff Plan | 12/31/2022 | \$1 | 110.63\% | 7.75\% | -10.32\% | 5.01\% | N/A | 0.62\% | 0.66\% | 0.19\% | N/A |
| Lower Neches Valley | 12/31/2022 | \$12 | 60.47\% | 6.50\% | -16.22\% | 3.00\% | N/A | 0.31\% | 0.31\% | 0.27\% | N/A |
| Supplemental Retirement Plan of University Medical Center | 8/31/2023 | \$5 | 77.25\% | 4.00\% | 1.31\% | N/A | N/A | 0.00\% | 0.24\% | 0.24\% | N/A |


[^0]:    Note: Each $1.0 ¢$ tax rate is equal to $\$ 20.6 \mathrm{~m}$ revenue.

