

CONSIDERATION OF SB 105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 1/21/00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Mary Mathis
ADDRESS 1303 N County Rd - Apt C
CITY Merrill STATE WI ZIP 54452
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY LHS-DOC

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF SB 105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2/21/00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Scott Scholt
ADDRESS 105 N Scott St
CITY Merrill STATE WI ZIP 54452
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY LHS DOC

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF 105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2-21-00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Sue Holt
ADDRESS N5333 Rice Ln
CITY Gleason STATE WI ZIP 54435
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY SPEIC

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF 105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2/21/00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Cassie Yeaton-Janecke
ADDRESS PO Box 306
CITY Wales STATE WI ZIP 53183
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY EAS

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF SB 105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 22-feb 00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME John A Scocos
ADDRESS 30 W. Mifflin Street
CITY Madison STATE W2 ZIP 53701
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY WISCONSIN Dept of Veterans Affairs

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF SB 105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2-21-00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Michael Senn
ADDRESS 10698 Rainbow Dr
CITY Merrill STATE WI ZIP 54452
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY WFAC

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF SB105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2-21-00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Ray Decker
ADDRESS 507 N. Prospect Street
CITY Merrill STATE WI ZIP 54452
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY Council 1 WEAC

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF 105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2/21/00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Jean L. Grossman
ADDRESS W8987 Hilltop Road
CITY Portage STATE Wisc. ZIP 53901
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY SPEIC Council #1

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF SB105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2/21/00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Daniel W. Holzman
ADDRESS E 12196 County U
CITY BAAABOO STATE WI ZIP 53913
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY Teacher

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF SB 105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 02-21-00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Mary Turnbull
ADDRESS 4651 N. 129 St.
CITY Butler STATE WI ZIP 53007
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY SPEIC - Council 1, WEAC

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF SB105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2/21/00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Karla Kammer

ADDRESS 2025 E Mohawk

CITY Tomahawk STATE WI ZIP 54487

ORGANIZATION, IF ANY _____

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF 105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2-21

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Ken Pickett

ADDRESS W6847 Joe Snow RD

CITY Merrill STATE WI ZIP 54452

ORGANIZATION, IF ANY S.P.F.I.C.

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF SB 105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE _____

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME George J. Smullen
ADDRESS 306 W. Brown Street
CITY Waupun STATE WI ZIP 53963
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY _____

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF Senate Bill 105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2-21-00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Senator Robert Wirth
ADDRESS 22nd Senate District
CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY _____

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF SB 105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2/21/00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Michael Bressee
ADDRESS N7571 Deer Path Rd
CITY Fond du Lac STATE WI ZIP 54935
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY SPERC Council #1 (WEAC)

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF SB 105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2-21-00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME RICHARD L. Rastall
ADDRESS N19728 Kamprud Lane
CITY ETHRICK STATE WI ZIP 54627
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY _____

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF SB105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2-21-00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Kim Bills
ADDRESS 6874 Coon Rock Rd
CITY Areha STATE WI ZIP 53503
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY Council 1 WEAC

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF SB105
(BILL NUMBER)

DATE 2-21-00

JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

NAME Nevin Webster
ADDRESS ~~P.O. Box 234~~ 120 N. Madison St.
CITY Waupun STATE WI ZIP 53963
ORGANIZATION, IF ANY SPEIC - Council #1

WOULD LIKE TO TESTIFY (APPEAR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE)

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER

IN FAVOR OPPOSED INFORMATION

PRELIMINARY

1999-2000

LRB-1711/1

STATE OF WISCONSIN

APPENDIX TO 1999 SENATE BILL 105

REPORT OF JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

(Introduced by Senators Wirch, Moen, Burke, Roessler, Drzewiecki, Breske, Erpenbach and Panzer; cosponsored by Representatives Musser, Kaufert, Gronemus, Kelso, Plouff, Bock, Ryba, Ziegelbauer, Boyle, Albers, Pohan, Meyerhofer and Hundertmark.)

An Act to renumber and amend 40.02 (48) (am) and 40.02 (48) (c); and to create 40.02 (17) (n), 40.02 (48) (am) 22., 40.02 (48) (c) 18. and 40.65 (4w) of the statutes; relating to: classifying certain teachers employed by the state as protective occupation participants under the Wisconsin retirement system.

EXTRACT OF COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION ON THIS BILL

The Joint Survey Committee on Retirement Systems finds that Senate Bill 105 [represents good public policy, and the Committee recommends its passage] [does not represent good public policy, and the Committee does not recommend its passage].

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Under current s. 40.02 (48) (a), Stats., a "protective occupation participant" for purposes of the Wisconsin Retirement System (WRS) is any participant whose principal duties are determined by the participating employer to involve active law enforcement or active fire suppression or prevention, provided the duties require frequent exposure to a high degree of danger or peril and also require a high degree of physical conditioning.

Under s. 40.02 (48) (am), Stats., protective occupation participants include conservation wardens, conservation patrol boat captains, conservation patrol boat engineers, conservation pilots, conservation patrol officers, forest fire control assistance, members of the state patrol, state motor vehicle inspectors, police officers, fire fighters, sheriffs, undersheriffs, deputy sheriffs, state probation and parole officers, county traffic police officers, state forest rangers, fire watchers employed by the Wisconsin Veterans Home, state correctional-psychiatric officers, excise tax investigators employed by the Department of Revenue, special criminal investigations agents in the Department of Justice, assistant or deputy fire marshalls and persons employed under s. 61.66 (1), Stats. (combined protective services departments for villages).

If a person is classified as a protective occupation participant, his or her normal retirement age is lower than those of other participants and the percentage multiplier used to calculate his or her formula benefit retirement annuity is higher than for general employees.

If a person wishes to contest a determination by an employer that he or she is *not* a protective occupation participant and contends that his or her duties, in fact, do require a frequent exposure to a high degree of danger or peril and also require a high degree of physical conditioning, the employe may appeal to the Department of Employee Trust Funds (DETF) Board by filing a written appeal with the board. [See s. 40.06 (1) (e) 1., Stats.]

Participating employers and state agencies are required to notify the DETF of persons classified as protective occupation participants. [See s. 40.06 (1) (d), Stats.]

Under s. 40.06 (1) (dm), Stats., each determination by a department head regarding classification of a state employe as a protective occupation participant is reviewed by the Department of Employment Relations (DER) and the DER must certify that determination.

Also, the DETF may review any determination by a participating employer to classify an employe who is not a state employe as a protective occupation participant and may appeal the determination to the DETF Board. [See s. 40.06 (1) (em), Stats.]

This bill amends the enumeration in s. 40.02 (48) (am), Stats., to specifically include as a protective occupation participant a *teacher* or *librarian* employed at: (1) a state correctional institution; (2) a secured correctional facility; (3) a mental health institute; (4) the Wisconsin Resource Center; or (5) a secure mental health unit or facility. It also adds these positions to the definition of protective occupation participant for purposes of the duty disability program under s. 40.65, Stats.

The bill provides that these persons will not be entitled to duty disability benefits for injuries or disease that occurred before the effective date of the bill which takes effect on the January 1 of the calendar year beginning after its publication as a state law.

No creditable service as a protective occupation participant will be granted for service that was earned before the effective date of the bill.

ACTUARIAL EFFECT

This bill will have no actuarial effect on the WRS since the costs of services rendered after the bill becomes law will be paid for by increases in contribution rates.

PROBABLE COSTS

The Department of Corrections indicates that the bill would affect 344 employes, representing a payroll of \$13,030,000 in 1999. The Department of Health and Family Services indicates that the bill would affect employes representing a payroll of \$1,080,000 in 1999.

The additional employers' costs generated by the bill is the total payroll of \$14,110,000 times the 2.2% difference between the WRS contribution rates for general and protective employees. The initial cost in 1999 would be \$310,420.

In addition, 3.3% of payroll contributions would be payable to the s. 40.65, duty disability program, costing an additional \$465,630 in 1999. Thus, the total retirement system-related cost of the bill would have been approximately \$776,050 in 1999 and is estimated to be approximately \$813,300 in 2000.

It is also estimated that the initial costs would increase at a rate of approximately 4.8% annually.

The DETF fiscal estimate states that they will be able to perform any tasks related to changes in individual records to reflect the law with existing staff and resources. A potential increase in duty disability claims is expected but the number and fiscal impact are indeterminate.

PUBLIC POLICY

Protective occupation participants have a higher benefit formula (2% for protective occupation participants with Social Security and 2.2% for those without) and an earlier normal retirement date than general employees (age 54 for employees with less than 25 years of service and age 53 with those with more than 25 years).

This bill changes the employer certification process relative to the determination of protective status under the WRS. Rather than allowing the employer to make the determination of whether these positions' duties require a frequent exposure of high degree of danger or peril and require a high degree of physical conditioning, the teachers and librarians would become protective occupation participants.

RECOMMENDATION

The Joint Survey Committee on Retirement Systems finds that 1999 Senate Bill 105 [represents good public policy, and the Committee recommends its passage] [does not represent good public policy, and the Committee does not recommend its passage].

2/21/00



ROBERT WIRCH

STATE SENATOR SECOND DISTRICT

**Testimony in Support of Senate Bill 105
By Senator Robert Wirch
Joint Survey Committee on Retirement Systems
February 21, 2000**

Chair Vrakas and members of the Committee, thank you for this opportunity to appear before you today to speak on behalf of Senate Bill 105. SB 105 gives protective status to teachers and librarians employed at state correctional institutions, secured correctional facilities, and at Mendota and Winnebago Mental Health Institutes. This also applies to the Wisconsin Resource Center and any other and other facilities for sexually violent persons.

SB 105 changes the employer certification process related to determining their protective status under WRS. Rather than allowing the employer to make the call as to whether teachers and librarians' duties require a frequent exposure to a high degree of danger or peril and require a high degree of physical conditioning, these individuals would become protective occupation participants under the law.

Being granted the designation of protective status allows these WRS participants to enjoy a higher retirement benefit, and enables them to retire at an earlier age.

Obviously, the motivation to reward teachers and librarians in these facilities with a better retirement plan is because of the degree of danger they face on a daily basis.

Inmates who often do not have a care for the consequences of their actions can pose a

State Capitol, P.O. Box 7882, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7882 • 608-267-8979

Toll-Free Office Hotline: 1-888-769-4724

Email: Sen.Wirch@legis.state.wi.us • Website: www.legis.state.wi.us/senate/sen22/sen22.html • Fax: (608) 267-0984

Home: 3007 Springbrook Road, Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin 53158 • (262) 694-7379

♻️ Printed on Recycled Paper

-2-

tremendous risk to the individuals who staff our correctional and mental health facilities.

It is estimated by the Department of Corrections that about 344 employees will be affected by this legislation.

The individuals affected by this legislation must deal with aggressive, violent and unpredictable people every day. I believe the stress of that alone is grounds for them to have protective status. These people are every bit as much at risk as those who currently have the protective designation.

I urge you to look favorably on SB 105 and declare it good public policy so it can be debated by the full Legislature without delay. Thank you for this opportunity to speak on behalf of SB 105. I would welcome any questions at this time.

STATE OF WISCONSIN
JOINT SURVEY COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2000
11:00 A.M.
ROOM 417 NORTH (GAR), STATE CAPITOL BLDG.

A G E N D A

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.
 2. Consideration of the Minutes of the January 24, 2000 Meeting.
 3. **Assembly Bill 9** relating to granting creditable service under the Wisconsin retirement system for service in the federal peace corps or VISTA public service programs or in any national service program under the federal National and Community Service Act of 1990.
 4. **Assembly Bill 124** relating to creditable military service under the Wisconsin retirement system.
 5. **Senate Bill 88** relating to creditable military service under the Wisconsin retirement system.
 6. **Assembly Bill 145** relating to granting creditable service under the Wisconsin retirement system for service in the federal public health service.
 7. **Senate Bill 105** relating to classifying certain teachers employed by the state as protective occupation participants under the Wisconsin retirement system.
 8. **Senate Bill 211** relating to classifying certain nurses employed by the state as protective occupation participants under the Wisconsin retirement system.
 9. **Assembly Bill 388** relating to the normal retirement date under the Wisconsin retirement system for individuals employed by certain school districts.
 10. **Assembly Bill 426** relating to death benefits provided under the Wisconsin retirement system and making an appropriation.
 11. **Assembly Bill 455** relating to establishing a presumption for employment-connected disease for state and county fire fighters.
 12. **Assembly Bill 656** relating to granting creditable service under the Wisconsin retirement system to certain assistant district attorneys formerly employed by Milwaukee County and making an appropriation.
- (An Executive Session may be held during or immediately following the public hearing on the above and/or any other items pending before the Committee)*
13. Other Matters.
 14. Adjournment.

BILLS OF IMMEDIATE INTEREST

A.B. 9 – Pension Credit for Service in the Peace Corps, VISTA, etc.

Data has been requested from the Peace Corps to enable estimation of this bill's cost. A source for VISTA data is being sought. We will also need to identify other federal programs that might also be covered by this bill. The cost estimate will be easy to make once we have the data, and basic data in summarized form should be sufficient.

A.B. 309 – Excluding Part-Time, Seasonal and Contractual Employees from Social Security

-Plate -Shibilsky

The general effect of this would be to save the State 7.65% of the payroll for employees currently covered by Social Security who elect the alternative money purchase plan to be provided for them in lieu of Social Security coverage.

There are two questions to be answered in order to estimate the cost savings to the State under this bill:

1. **The Data Question:** How many employees and how much payroll would be affected? We may also have to get some idea of their relative ages, as explained below.
2. **The Election Question:** What percentage of employees at different pay levels would be likely to decline Social Security in favor of the private retirement plan offered to them?

I would think that older low paid employees would be inclined to prefer Social Security over the 7.5% money purchase plan, if they realized that Social Security uses a front-loaded benefit formula that greatly favors the lower paid. Also, Social Security benefits are not (yet) fully taxable, while pension benefits are. Younger employees with more years to go until retirement would seem likelier to choose the money purchase plan. Also, younger people seem to have little faith in the survival of Social Security.

Ideally, we would like to get data on election rates from another state that has already implemented this. If we cannot get data this way, then we will have to try to get age information and make some educated guesses as to rates of election of the alternate plan.

We have "absolute coverage" agreement w/ feds

S.B. 119 – Joint & Survivor Death Benefit Beneficiary No Longer Must Be a Dependent

Information needed to estimate the cost of this bill can probably all be obtained from ETF. I would need some information about the election of lump sums by those eligible for the J&S benefit, and also it might help to have the active life data that ETF gave the actuaries for the 1998 valuation. With this, it would require from 1 to 3 days of work (2 to 6 working days) for me to prepare the fiscal estimate -- depending on whether I could find a way to estimate it by hand, or had to adapt spreadsheets that I developed for the ORP study.

A.B. 245 – Physical Examinations Required for Duty Disability

There are three conditions for a protective participant to be eligible for duty disability:

1. Injured or sickened in the line of duty, and
2. The disability is likely to be permanent, and
3. It causes him/her to retire, to be given light duty, or to lose chance of advancement.

This bill would require periodic medical examinations to determine whether the disability has continued. If not, then the disability benefit would be terminated. It might be helpful to define more carefully to what degree the disability must have persisted -- e.g., if the doctor no longer thinks that it seems likely to be a permanent condition, then has the disablement ended?

Note that the final paragraph of the bill is not enforceable against the former employer. There is no way to assure that an employee who has recovered from disability will get his or her former job back -- or for that matter, that the individual will be able to secure a similar job anywhere. If the recovered employee cannot secure a similar job, then he or she might have to accept a new line of work in order to find employment.

For such employees, this legislation would, in effect, be imposing *after the fact* the same strict definition of disability as non-protective employees are subjected to by 40.63(1)(b) *before the fact* (i.e., before they are granted disability benefits) -- namely, that the ability to perform any substantial gainful activity is enough to disqualify them from disabled status.

From here it is only a small step of logic to ask why the law should not be changed to apply to protective participants the stricter 40.63(1)(b) definition of disability in the first place. If this seems too harsh a policy to apply to police, etc., then a smaller partial duty disability benefit could be defined to fill the gap. Other police plans have this. (Just a thought.)

Employer contribution rates for the Section 40.65 disability insurance program are now about 3.3% of protectives' \$710 million payroll. Therefore, the full cost for duty disability is running at about \$23.5 million annually. If, for example, one in four future disabilities would be terminated under this bill, then the ultimate savings (in current dollars) would be somewhat less than one-fourth of the full \$23.5 million now being spent -- that is, somewhat less than 0.8% of payroll or \$6 million annually.

It would not be a full one-fourth of the total disability cost because (1) ETF would bear some expense for the medical examinations, and (2) each person disqualified for benefits would have drawn some benefits before being disqualified. For this example we can roughly estimate that the actual cost savings to the employers from this bill would be about 75% of the potential savings, which is about 0.62% of payroll or \$4,400,000 annually (in current dollars).

This much savings would not be realized immediately, but would be the limit of a pattern of increased savings each year over a period of time. This is because much of the current 3.3% of payroll contribution is needed to pay for those currently disabled, who are less likely to lose their benefits under this bill than are those who will become disabled in the future.

The assumption that one in four disabilities might be terminated under this bill is for purposes of example only. Further research would have to be done to learn what level of recovery might indeed be expected. "One in four" is a subjective impression that I have based on my previous experience with the West Virginia State Police, and it may or may not be a good assumption to use for a WRS estimate.

NOTES ON OTHER BILLS

A.B. 48 & S.B. 142 – Protective Status for County Jailers

Fiscal note has been sent out.

A.B. 124 / S.B. 88 – Allows Pre-1974 Military Service & "Double-Dipping"

I have the necessary data for costing out the addition of pre-1974 military service. The "double-dipping" part of the bill may prove to be more problematical. It will take a couple of working days to estimate the former. I should have a better idea of the latter once I've done the former.

S.B. 88 also allows "double-dipping", so it will be estimated along with A.B. 124.

A.B. 145 – Pension Credit for Public Health Service Work

I should have the fiscal note done in a couple of days. Very minimal cost to WRS.

A.B. 916 – Social Security/Part-Time Employees

This is similar to A.B. 309. *SS admin. won't want to do this (ETF has concerns also)*

S.B. 105 – Corrections Teachers Getting Protective Status

We will send this fiscal note out today or tomorrow. Pension cost is about \$300,000. These teachers don't satisfy the physical part of the definition for protectives, according to someone over at Corrections.

S.B. 127 – Retroactive Death Benefits to 1/1/97

Should not be too hard to estimate, but this is a bad idea. Why draw the line at 1/1/97?

Scott's calendar:

May 18: Coalition of Annuitants meeting
May 19: DER class
May 20: DER class
May 26: DER class
May 27: DER class
June 17-July 5: Vacation
Jul 8: Dental appointment
Jul 26: Dental appointment

Debra Breggeman's bad days (when she can't stay late):

June 2, June 9, June 16.

Other considerations:

Norm should have the variable annuity study done around June 15 thru the end of June.

As soon as we get into the new fiscal year he can begin his study of benefit increase bill(s) [A.B. 260, A.B. 323, S.B. 131, maybe others?].