California 2021 Funding Assumption Survey Updated April 2021

2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2011	2010	2009	PLAN SPONSOR	Assumed Investment Return (a)	Base Wage Growth (b)	Assumed "Excess" Return (a) - (b)	Amortization Period	Valuation Asset Corridor	Asset Smoothing (vears)	5 Year	Trailing Retu 10 Year 15 Yo (market perce	ar 20	Year	
1	2	3	4	5	5	5	4	7	10	11	15	City of San Diego 5	6.50%	3.05%		% 7-declining and part layered ;G/L layered 15. most level \$\$	Y: 80-120	4	6.1				
2	3	2	2	6	6	6	5	3	- 4	5	5	CalPERS - Judges System II 1.3	6.50%	2.75%		% 20: G/L 20 lavered with some ramping: level \$\$	N/A (market)	N/A					
3	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	2	9	9		San Mateo County	6.50%	3.00%		% 3 - declinina: G/L 15 lavered	Y:80-120	5 with offsets	4.9	8.0			
4	5	5	5	2	4	- <u>+</u>	23	17	3	7		City of San Jose (Safety)	6.625%	3.00%		% most G/L 15 layered	Y: 80-120	5					
5	9	7	z	16	12	12	31	29	33	34	40	City of San Jose (General) 9	6.625%	3.00%	3.625	% most 19 - declining: most G/L lavered 20	N	5	3.8	5.5			
6	6	8	8	7	8	8	8	5	6	8	7	LA Department of Water & Power	7.00%	3.25%		% G/L 15 - lavered Level \$\$	N	5	6.38	7.89			
7	18	16	15	29	29	30	32	30	36	27	8	Mendocino County	6.75%	3.25%		% 19-declining: G/L 18 lavered	Y: 75-125	5	5.73	8.27			
8	17	13	12	31	30	28	29	25	25	24	29	Sacramento County	6.75%	3.00%		% Most 15 - declinina: G/L 20 lavered	Y: 70-130	7	6.36	8.43			
9	7	30	30	30	21	26	20	14	15	6	6	University of California	6.75%	3.25%		% 20-declining, G/L 20 layered Level \$\$	N	5	9.5	8.3			
10	8	6	6	3	2	2	2	4	5	4	4	Contra Costa County	7.00%	3.25%	3.75	% 3 - declining; G/L 18 layered	N	5	6.67	8.11			
11	10	9	19	18	17	22	22	31	30	29	30	San Diego County	7.00%	3.25%	3.75	% 5-rolling: G/L 20 lavered but not less than 5	N	5 10	5.26	7.49			
12		10	11	10	14	14	12	13	14	13	11	Sonoma County	7.00%	3.25%		% 8-declining: G/L 20 lavered	N	5	7.32	8.94			
13	12	11	9	8	11	11	10	22	20	22	24	Fresno County	7.00%	3.25%	3.75	% 13-declining: G/L 15 lavered	Y: 70-130	5	4.55	7.18			
14	13	14	13	11	15	15	13	33	32	31	32	City of Fresno (Safety)	7.00%	3.25%		% G/L 15-lavered: (100+% FR): surplus over 110%-30	N	5	5.42	8.94			
15	14	15	14	12	16	16	14	34	31	32	33	City of Fresno (General) 6	7.00%	3.25%	3.75	% G/L 15 layered (100+% FR); surplus over 110%-30	N	5	5.41	8.94			
16	15	12	10	9	20	20	16	18	18	30	31	Santa Barbara County	7.00%	3.00%	4.00	% most 10-declining: G/L 19 layered and ramped	N/A/market)	N/A	5.5	7.3	5.4	5.0	
17	16	26	24	13	7	7	6	8	11	37	36	Alameda-Contra Costa Transit 4	7.00%	3.00%	4.00	% 8-declining: G/L 20 lavered	Y: 80-120						
18	19	17	16	19	18	17	17	12	34	33	35	Orange County	7.00%	3.25%		% 14-declining: G/L 20 lavered	N	5	6.82	7.13			
19	20	18	17	21	24	19	15	9	21	21	14	Marin County 4	6.75%	2.75%	4.00	% 10-declining; G/L 24 layered and ramped	N/A (Market)	N/A	6.5	9.2			
20	21	19	18	15	10	10	9	6	12	12	16	San Bernardino County	7.25%	3.25%	4.00	% 2-declining; most G/L layered 20	N	5	4.35	6.61			
21	23	21	21	20	19	18	18	23	22	15	17	Imperial County	7.00%	3.25%	3.75	% 11 - declining: G/L 15 lavered	Y: 70-130	5	5.85	7.87			
22	22	20	20	24	23	21	25	16	17	16	19	Los Angeles Fire & Police	7.00%	3.25%	3.75	% most 17-declining; most G/L 20 layered;	Y: 60-140	7	6.45	8.78			
23	25	23	22	28	28	27	28	24	23	17	20	Alameda County	7.00%	3.25%	3.75	% 12 - declining : G/L 20 lavered	Y: 60-140	5	9.74	8.32			
24	24	22	25	14	9	9	7	11	13	10	12	Ventura County	7.25%	3.25%	4.00	% G/L 15 - lavered	N	5	6.44	8.26			
25	27	25	26	22	22	36	35	37	39	39	38	Stanislaus County	7.00%	3.00%	4.00	% 16 - declaina	Y: 80-120	5	5.0	81	61	5.7	
26	29	27	27	25	27	25	27	21	35	35	28	San Luis Obispo County	6.875%	2.75%		% 20- declining: G/L 20 lavered	N	5	4.4	5.1	0.1		Note: SLO Based on Actuarial value)
27	28	29	29	23	31	31	21	15	16	14	9	Merced County	7.00%	2.75%		% 13- declining: G/L 24 lavered Both with ramping	N/A(market)	N/A	6.5	8.4	5.7	5.0	
28	31	31	31	33	32	32	30	26	26	20	22	City of Los Angeles	7.00%	3.25%	3.75	% most 22-declining : G/L 15-lavered	Y: 60-140	most 7	5.87	8.41			
29	32	32	32	37	37	29	24	19	19	19	21	Tulare County	7.00%	3.00%	4.00	% 14-declining: G/L 19 lavered	Y: 70-130	10	4.4	6.9			
30	33	33	34	32	34	34	35	36	40	40	39	East Bay Municipal Utility	7.00%	3.25%	3.75	% Pre-2012 layered 30; Otherwise G/L-20 layered	Y: 70-130	5	6.24	9.31			
31	26	24	23	27	25	24	26	20	24	23	25	Kern County	7.25%	3.25%		% 15.5 - declining; G/L 18 layered	Y: 50-150	5	5.14	7.04			
32	34	34	33	36	36	37	37	35	29	28	26	CaISTRS	7.00%	3.50%	3.50	% 26 years with some laddered increases of 0.5%	N	3	6.82	9.31		5.77	
33	35	35	37	26	26	23	19	28	28	25	23	San Joaquin County 7	7.00%	3.00%	4.00	% 13-declining: G/L 15 lavered	Y: 80-120	5	5.3	6.5	4.3	4.8	
34	36	37	36	35	35	35	34	27	27	26	27	Los Angeles County	7.00%	3.25%		% most 18- declining: G/L 20 lavered	N	5	6.05	8.14	4.5	4.0	
35	37	36	35	34	33	33	33	32	37	38	37	CalPERS ³	7.00%	2.75%		% pre-2019 G/L 30: G/L 20 level \$\$ with certain ramping	N/A(market)	N/A	5.8	9.1		5.8	
36	30	28	28	17	13	13	11	10	8	3	3	City & County of San Francisco	7.40%	3.25%		% most 13-declining; G/L 20 layered	N	5					
												NOTES:				Bold indicates change from previous surve	ny.						
												1: This does not reflect the Judges I sys	tem closed in 199	H: feature	is include pa	ry-as-you-go funding and a 3% assumed investment return							

1 This does not reflect the Judges I system channels in space fractional 1964. Natures include pays as yourso floating and a 3% assumed beastmest return.
2 Load assement determines our by the investment payment as gardies of the transmission of the approximation of the approximati

Effective with the 2013 survey, the number of entities was reduced from 40 to 37, alminating three small closed systems. Effective with the 2021 survey, the number of entities reduced to 36 to reflect omission of another closed system. The amorization periods for assumption changes are often longer than for GL and are not shown here. Often, there is a separate amorization policy applicable to benefit changes.