

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 18, 1999 LB 674

that is...that is in the works. It is important to me and I'm sure it is important to you to know exactly what the actuaries tell us the cost of changes that we're proposing are. And it was never my intention to have us incur a cost that we did not know about. If we know what the costs are and still elect to incur them, that's part of our decision-making process, but we...I do not wish to ask you to incur costs that you do not know about. So if you...I would ask you to accommodate myself and Senator Stuhr, Senator Wehrbein, and other members of the committee, if they are still willing to support the bill after this discussion this morning, and move the bill to Select File. I will pledge to you that whatever adjustments may be necessary will be brought before you. I do not intend to cause any General Fund impacts with the proposals that we're bringing to you. So whatever...whatever the actuary tells us after we get better information, we will bring that to you, and if that requires adjustments in the benefits that are proposed in the bill, I'll be the first one or maybe the second one, unless Senator Wehrbein or Senator Stuhr wants to be first, to propose those to you. Senator Wehrbein indicated, quite factually, that even beyond what you see as assets in the patrol plan, what you see as assets in the judges plan, and what you see in the school plan, in terms of actuarial values, are not the full values in the plan, in those three plans, and maybe we should explain that a little bit, but I will give you an example, and I am not giving you this example to encourage you to disregard the actuarial analysis, but it is important, I think, that you understand a component of the plans and how they work. The total value of the assets in the state patrol plan, as of July 1st, 1998, were \$178,156,594, \$178,156,594. The portion of that value, and I will say the portion because not all that value was recognized in the actuarial study; the portion of that value that was recognized in the actuarial study was 151,355...151 million, 355 million (sic), 363 thousand. That is a difference of roughly \$27 million. Almost one-sixth of the value of the assets on hand, of July 1st, 1998, was not used by the actuary in the actuarial report. That is a very, very cautious approach to valuation of the plan's assets and is one that we put in place here a number of years ago. And that was a very sound change that we made in the process for valuing the plans for actuarial purposes. It means always, at least when we have a period of increasing values in plans...