

Summary of Recent Plan Design Changes for Various State Plans

		Change	Approach
Contribution Rates	Employer	CO, IA, MN, NJ, NM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Raise contribution rates ▪ Lower contribution rates
	Employee	CO, IA, MN, MO, MS, VA, VT, WY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Raise contributions ▪ Mandate contributions
COLA	New Hires	CO, IL, MI, MN, SD, UT, VA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suspension tied to funding or CPI ▪ Tied to funding percentage ▪ Delay start
	Actives	CO, MN, SD	
	Retirees	CO, MD, MN, SD	
Sponsor Contribution Rules		IA, NJ, VA, VT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional contributions to Annual Required Contribution ▪ Require Annual Required Contribution
Anti-Spiking		AZ, CO, IA, IL, NJ, VA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pensionable compensation ▪ Longer FAS period ▪ Longer vesting periods ▪ Cap compensation growth in FAS period
Multiplier	New Hire	GA, NJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lower multiplier ▪ Reduce longevity multiplier
	Active	VT	
Retirement Eligibility	New Hire	IL, MN, MO, MS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Raise service requirements ▪ Eliminate combined age/service rule ▪ Increase combined age/service rule
	Active	AZ, CO	
Retirement Age	New Hire	MO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Raise normal retirement age ▪ Coordinate with social security normal retirement age
	Active	AZ, CO, VT	
Hybrid	New Hire	GA, MI, UT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Combine defined benefit plan with a lower multiplier with defined contribution overlay ▪ Choice of hybrid or defined contribution
	Active		
Defined Contribution	New Hire	NJ, UT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Part-time workers ▪ Elected officials provided an employer match

Source: National Conference of State Legislators – May 2010