

October 26, 2020 (sent via email)

Mr. Douglas Drysdale, CPA City Manager City of Riverview 14100 Civic Park Drive Riverview, MI 48193

Dear Mr. Drysdale:

We are enclosing the following:

Financial Review Report

Budget 2020-21 - OPEB Contributions

Attachment 1 - Councilman Towle Memos

Attachment 2 - City Manager Memo (January 2019) Measures

Attachment 3 - Pension and OPEB Comparison

Attachment 4 - DEA Analysis

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you further questions or needs. We appreciate the opportunity to be of service.

Respectfully yours,

REHMANN LLC

Mark Kettner, CPA, CGFM

Financial Review

Following are the items that Rehmann was requested to review, verify and/or compare (in bold type) along with the results, observations and/or suggestions (in blue type) related thereto:

 Verify for accuracy the figures included in the two memos prepared by Councilman Towle related to the "Review of Financial Report 2019" and "City of Riverview Retiree Health Program Projection Required by Public Act 202 of 2017".

Except as highlighted in Attachment 1, the figures cited in the two memos are accurate. The errors or unverifiable figures do not seem to be of a nature/extent that they would diminish the significant of the area being emphasized by the author.

2. Evaluate for reasonableness and feasibility and provide feedback on the memo related to the "Landfill Closure Financial Plan" document dated January 1, 2019 prepared by City Manager Drysdale.

See Attachment 2 (which is a schedule that rolls up the potential replacement revenues and compares that to the amount needed to be replaced). While the replacement revenues may cover about 80% of the general fund portion of the lost post-closure revenues (as well as not covering the annual capital improvements allocation), these replacement measures come with the added challenge of voter-approved property taxes increases (along with a tax levy for rubbish service). Fortunately, the City likely has five to ten years (+/-) to effect the change and possibly identify other sources.

Generally, we would conclude that the City Manager's memo is reasonable and feasible, but certainly challenging (especially in these unprecedented times) and does not seem to fully cover the lost revenues.

3. Compare the City's pension and OPEB funded status to up to 10 comparable communities in the region based on similar population and geographic location (including Woodhaven, Trenton, Southgate, Wyandotte).

See Attachment 3, starting with a summary page and then four detailed multiyear schedules: two for pension (one comparing communities in the immediate vicinity of Riverview and the other comparing communities in the state of similar size) and two for OPEB (following the same approach). Overall, this comparison shows the City of Riverview is in relatively good to great condition with its pension plan and not so good condition with its retiree healthcare benefit (although, in a similar position to comparable communities... of little consolation, though, that "misery loves company").

We understand there has been conversation about reopening the defined benefit pension plan to new hires. While an admirable and likely well-intended notion, it would be a measure that adds costs, unpredictability and risk to the plan for decades beyond the current plan horizon. For this reason, we would highly discourage reopening a door that was previously closed for good reason. If the City is having difficulty in attracting new hires, we would suggest consideration of other approaches such as higher current compensation (where the costs are immediate and known) or a new class of compensated absences (in the vain of "use it or lose it" so as not to accumulate to an unmanageable cost).

4. Prepare a schedule of revenues and related expenditures of the DEA fund to evaluate the profitability of participating in this program for the last 10 years.

See Attachment 4. Without including vehicle costs and using a fringe rate of 50% (to cover all payroll taxes, insurance and other benefits, particularly pension contributions) and an indirect cost rate of 5% (to cover payroll preparation and department administration), both of which are likely on the low side, the analysis shows that costs far exceed revenues. Based on this, if profitability is the motive behind participation, then the City should exit the program; if there is another motivation (doing good and fighting evil) and the revenue reasonably offsets the cost, then the financial result is still on the short end for the City. Especially so if the fringe rate is higher.

5. Evaluate for reasonableness and feasibility and provide feedback on the "Form 5597 CAP Retirement Health Care" document dated August 22, 2019 prepared by the City.

The prior actions taken by the City (section 3 of the form) are good and important first steps in getting the OPEB costs to a manageable (and possibly attainable/sustainable) level. These measures are not enough, though, as the City clearly understands. However, limiting the prospective actions (section 4 of the form) to planning to negotiate contract language to move the age at which a retiree can receive medical benefits from 55 to 60, while another good measure, is simply not enough.

When it comes to reducing OPEB costs (short of unilaterally eliminating or slashing the benefit in an Emergency Manager type situation), there is no silver bullet; instead of doing one thing 100% better/different, it is necessary to do 100 things 1% better/different. To this end, the City should go through an exercise to identify a wide range of prospective actions, to consider their impacts and then implement as many of them as practicable. Whether the present value of the liability is \$45 million or something less through a change in the discount rate or other actuarial assumptions (say \$30-35 million), the fact of the matter is that the City and its citizens cannot afford this benefit (for the good of the many) and must do all that it can to rein it in.

To conclude, the actions in the Form 5597 are good first steps (and are indeed reasonable and feasible) but are not enough to solve the problem.

Rounded OPEB Contribution 2019/2020	General Ledger	Fund	Portion of \$200,000	OPEB Deposit
44,670.00 13,850.00 27,960.00 48,070.00 20,380.00 493,870.00 22,570.00 64,260.00 11,730.00 14,680.00 32,040.00 15,260.00	101-172-725.950 101-209-725.950 101-215-725.950 101-253-725.950 101-270-725.950 101-301-725.950 101-336-725.950 101-441-725.950 101-442-725.950 101-443-725.950 101-751-725.950 101-800-725.950	General Fund	2.4% 0.7% 1.5% 2.6% 1.1% 26.5% 1.2% 3.4% 0.6% 0.8%	4,792.30 1,485.86 2,999.61 5,157.06 2,186.41 52,983.52 2,421.36 6,893.96 1,258.42 1,574.90 3,437.33 1,637.13
7,300.00	243-535-725.950	Cable & Telecom	0.4%	783.16
16,380.00	271-790-725.950	Library	0.9%	1,757.28
95,330.00	584-542-725.950	Golf	5.1%	10,227.22
9.300.00	585-542-725,950		0.5%	997.73
104,730.00 114,870.00	592-527-725.950 592-536-725.950	Water & Sewer	5,6% 6.2%	11,235.68 12,323.52
706,990.00	596-526-725.950	Land Preserve	37.9%	75,847.53
	680-851-725.950 731-851-725.950		100.0% \$	200,000.00
1,864,240.00	. 51 052 725050			

Doug - Phank Monan check Proside a copy of budget

I want to give you a cursory review of two documents both of which are posted on the City Website. The first is a review of the 2019 Year End Statement and the second will be City of Riverview Retiree Health Program Projection Required by State of Michigan Public Act 202 of 2017 if OPEB [Retiree Health Care] is not at least 40% funded.

First, I will give a Review of Financial Report 2019

## Land fill Transfers Pg. 19

Landfill transferred \$2,775,855.00 to the General Fund, Trash Fund and Capital Improvements Fund which is a taxable equivalent of 9 mills.

The amount of transfers was reduced from 3.5 million budgeted in 2019/2020 to \$2,775,855.00 primarily because the \$500,000.00 budgeted for Capital Improvements was not expended in addition that the General Fund transfer were \$200,000.00 less than anticipated because of some property tax assessments corrections.

# Page 23 / Pension Contributions Employer / Employees

The employees' contribution based on payroll deductions to their pension totaled \$120,874.00 and the City contributed \$1,140,203.00 to keep it adequately funded for year ending 2019. For every 1 dollar the employee contributes to the pension fund the city contributes \$9.50 \$9.44 cents. In fact, based on a previous pension projection from 2020 to 2030 the City will be required to contribute \$9,250,870.00 as compared to the employee's contribution of \$262,701.00 to be fully funded.

Page 39/Landfill

Employee contribution should be \$1,067,032 (wrong amount was picked up from the actuary projection schedules.

Remaining airspace will be totally utilized by 2027. In short, the landfill is expected to close 2027.

# Page 47/ Defined Benefit Program

We currently have 103 retirees and beneficiaries currently receiving pension benefits.

In summary we have a total of 142 Employees covered by the defined benefit pension program

## Pg. 49 / Pension Plan Rate of return

the landfill closes in 2027.

The annual money-weighted rate of return on the pension plan investments, net of pension plan investment expense, was 5.9 percent.

Pg. 51 & 52 / OPB Health Care Expense for our retirees

pay-as-you-go (PAYG) expense
OPEB expense for 2019 was \$1,521.552.00. In addition to this our
current employee health care cost was \$1,237,213.00. These 2 costs
total \$2,758,765.00 which does not include costs for prescriptions care
for our employees. In short, the income from the landfill currently falls
\$17,090.00 short of meeting just the
Care costs and other funds/operations share in
Employees and Retirees. My concer

These costs, it would certainly strain remaining GF
resources without the landfill subsidy. A City-

is included.

prepared schedule of the distribution of OPEB costs

a/85 current retirees receiving health care benefits

Pg. 53/ OPEB unfunded liability for post-employment Health care benefits for city employees is \$45,332,137.00 based on a discount rate of 3.13 percent.

Page 54- Unfunded Liability for Local 324 Operators at the landfill is \$5,893,815.00

This is addition to the unfunded liability of the City Employees' Pension Plan which is \$6,339,937.00

Page 60/ The City Contribution to the Defined Benefit program for our city employees in 2019 was \$1,140,203.00 as compared to \$1,477,292.00 in 2014.

Page 63/ The City's contribution to the defined benefit program for landfill operators in 2019 was \$457,730.00 as compared to \$101,246.00 in 2010.

# 2<sup>nd</sup> Document I want to review is City of Riverview Retiree Health Program Projection Required by Public Act 202 of 2017.

If you review the projection of the funding required submitted to the State of Michigan for the OPEB funding, you will see that it will not be 40% funded until 2049.

A/ City of Riverview Retiree Health Program {Summary of proposed funding policy} submitted and approved by the State of Michigan. Its posted on the City Website. So, the residents can better understand the underfunded Status of OPEB which is cost for providing health care benefits to our retirees. This plan is required by law if OPEB funding is less than 40%. As of this year our funding is 0 that is why the city was required to submit a plan to show how the city plans on funding these commitments.

b/ If you look at year ending 2028 the projected OPEB Contribution is \$2,750,370.00. That does not include the cost of Health Care for current employees which was budgeted at \$1,237,213.00 in 2019 budget. If you project the cost of health care for our current employees will increase at an annual rate of 5% our cost in 2027 cost our health care costs for our current employees will be approximately

\$1,670,237.00. In short that means that our total cost for health care for our retirees and active personnel in 2028 would be approximately \$4,427,607.00. Off by \$7,000... s/b \$4,420,607.

This reflects a 35% increase (7 yrs x 5%)... doesn't consider compounding... s/b \$1,740,883 w/ compounding.

Some of our city labor units have negotiated contracts that allow its members to retire at age 50 or 55 years with no cost sharing for health care benefits which means that we will paying the cost of health care for those employees until they qualify for Medicare at age 65.

I believe we must adjust the age that an individual is entitled to receive health care benefits contained in our existing labor agreements to reduce these projected costs or be prepared to substantially increase the millage to fund those commitments.

In short when the landfill closes in 2027 how will be able to meet these funding requirements.

I recommend that any resident concerned about the financial stability of our community review these documents

Recap of City Manager Memo Measures (Memo dated January 2019)

#### **BACKGROUND**

Land	Preserve	Tansfers
Lanu	FIESCIVE	1 01131513

2018 taxable value	\$ 3	305,449,984	
Revenue from 1.0 mill	\$	305,450	(b)
Transfers from Land Preserve fund: General fund (25% of operating budget) Rubbish fund Capital improvement fund	\$	2,600,000 351,000 500,000 3,451,000	[1]
Equivalent number of mills from transfers (a/b)	····	11.3	

#### **Debt Payments**

4.22 mills could potentially come off tax bills between now and fiscal 2025-26 for maturing debt issues, although certain of those expiring or maturing items could be repurposed (such as for other road projects, fire department and so forth).

#### **Pension Contributions**

General fund cost savings from reduced pension contributions is not a reliable financial projection. There is too much uncertainty to expect long-term growth in the investment portfolio to reach 100% funding.

#### **OPEB Liability**

The comments are partially correct (i.e., the higher discount rate can be used for the number of years that trust assets are available to fund benefits then revert to the lower federal funds rate). However, the more important driver here is the required contributions that will be current fund expenditures, primarily for the general fund.

OPTIONS	GF I	mpact Amt
Library Millage & Transfer		
Elimate current GF transfer to Library	\$	325,000
Roads Millage		230,000
Eliminate current GF transfer to Local Streets		230,000
Rubbish Fund		
2.4 mill rubbish levy allowed under PA 298 (voter approval not		
required)		733,080
1044		
Additional 2.0 mill voter-approved levy in event that landfill closes		
would have no financial impact as new expense would absord tax		, <del>-</del>
Renewable Gas Revenues		
Revenues to OPEB trust; depending on level of success, this could		
mitigate additional OPEB contributions (of at least \$200k annually)		
from other GF resources.		-
Headlee Override		
Voter-approved rollback to maximum allowed levy; revert		1,119,413
to 20.0 mills from 16.3352 mills (or 3.6648 mills increase)		1,119,413
Residential Development		
No specifics to reliably estimate		-
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
	\$	2,407,493 <b>[1]</b>

**Comparison Summary** 

			Pension		
	Pensio	n	Ave Return	OPE	В
	Vicinity	Size	on Invest *	Vicinity	Size
Melvindale (Police/Fire)	138.1%		9.46%	246.9%	
Riverview	82.6% **		7.42%	0.0%	
Woodhaven	80.9%		7.63%	0.0%	
Allen Park	73.7%		5.27%	4.7%	
Trenton (Police/Fire)	72.9%		6.45%	18.2%	
Brownstown Twp (MERS)	70.0%			12.4%	
Wyandotte	69.7%		4.93%	2.1%	
Southgate (Police/Fire)	62.8%		7.62%	4.4%	
Southgate (MERS)	61.0%			8.8%	
Grosse Ile Twp (MERS)	57.3%			0.2%	
Trenton (MERS)	56.1%			n/a	
Flat Rock (MERS)	44.0%			0.0%	
Ecorse (MERS)	38.7%			3.2%	
Melvindale (MERS)	36.2%			0.0%	
Lincoln Park (Police/Fire)	31.4%		6.05%	0.0%	
Lincoln Park (MERS)	21.9%			0.0%	
MERS (5-year)			6.73%		
-					
Clawson (MERS)		94.6%			0.0%
Clawson (Fire)		87.6%			0.0%
Escanaba (Police/Fire)		86.9%			n/a
Riverview		82.6%			0.0%
Woodhaven		80.9%			0.0%
New Baltimore (MERS)		76.7%			41.9%
South Lyon (MERS)		63.9%			0.0%
Coldwater (MERS)		63.3%			n/a
Rochester (MERS)		62.4%			111.8%
Sault Ste. Marie (MERS)		62.4%			n/a
Fenton (MERS)		61.6%	-	_	0.0%
Escanaba (MERS)		59.9%			n/a
Sault Ste. Marie (Police/Fire)		48.4%			n/a
East Grand Rapids (MERS)		46.3%			37.6%

<sup>\*</sup> Based on number of years presented (per GASB 68 implementation date) in detailed schedule.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Based on the current closed plan; reopening the plan would have a significant impact on lowering the funding level (with increased contributions).

**City of Riverview** Comparison of Pension Data (geographic vicinity)

Average	7.42%	5.27%
2014	\$34,693,094 6,079,727 82.5% 1,477,292 488 119	
2015	\$ 35,572,621 6,131,797 82.8% 1,377,176 492 111	\$103,656,634 17,819,462 82.8% 2,028,314 633 72 \$ 39,863,191 25,057,952 37.1% 1,602,541 2,630 168
2016	\$ 35,806,056 7,314,550 79.6% 1,227,038 587 99	\$106,709,566 24,140,479 77.4% 2,699,151 858 96 \$ 41,803,250 28,463,926 31.9% 2,429,229 2,988 2,988
2017	\$ 36,270,078 6,126,643 83.1% 1,092,653 492 88 9.9%	\$108,031,121 24,622,581 77.2% 2,641,242 875 94 5.7% \$ 41,661,704 25,927,451 37.8% 4,684,468 2,722 2,722
2018	\$ 37,919,236 6,767,673 82.2% 1,018,391 543 82 83	\$109,961,494 17,535,644 84.1% 2,659,008 623 94 16.0% \$ 41,430,127 24,597,284 40.6% 2,809,524 2,809,524 2,809,524 2,582
2019	\$ 38,225,121 6,639,937 82.6% 1,140,203 533 92 5.7%	\$ 112,448,284 29,581,102 73.7% 2,646,084 1,051 94 -5.9% \$ 40,975,076 25,101,212 38.7% 3,378,304 2,635
[1] Population	12,456	28,146
	Riverview  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	Allen Park  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Investment return  Ecorse (MERS) Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)

<b>\</b> 0
~
•
in
·
_
~

Average		6.05%	9.46%
2014		\$73,476,403 55,169,402 24.9% 3,363,725 1,452 89 13.4%	\$ 7,903,394 2,808,650 64.5% 536,993 262 50
2015	\$ 22,666,782 11,015,372 51.4% 650,534 1,116	\$ 78,727,564 61,336,463 22.1% 3,464,682 1,614 91 2.8% \$ 39,855,575 32,131,226 19.4% 2,043,176 846	\$ 7,657,867 2,722,680 64.4% 742,179 254 69 2.6%
2016	\$ 24,114,104 13,141,777 45.5% 734,717 1,331	\$ 79,389,933 61,393,278 22.7% 5,475,223 1,616 144 0.6% \$ 41,452,996 34,772,959 16.1% 3,082,910 915	\$ 6,521,556 1,488,488 77.2% 771,280 139 72
2017	\$ 24,956,391 13,425,363 46.2% 794,184 1,360 80	\$ 80,257,718 58,666,135 26.9% 6,937,765 1,544 183 10.6% \$ 41,054,720 33,636,562 18.1% 3,744,948 885	\$ 5,663,708 (228,252) 104.0% 808,813 (21) 76 20.9%
2018	\$ 25,837,297 13,334,488 48.4% 1,011,342 1,351	\$ 80,403,636 56,712,844 29.5% 6,027,815 1,493 1,493 5.2% \$ 40,056,718 31,476,114 21.4% 3,621,661 828	\$ 5,025,540 (498,749) 109.9% 799,821 (47) 75
2019	\$ 26,877,960 15,049,068 44.0% 911,101 1,524	\$ 79,853,442 54,753,303 31.4% 6,050,163 1,441 159 3.7% \$ 39,295,359 30,683,315 21.9% 3,835,370 808	\$ 4,720,086 (1,797,830) 138.1% 899,523 (168) 84
[1] Population	9,872	37,996	10,702
	Flat Rock (MERS)  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	Lincoln Park (Police/Fire)  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident) Investment return Lincoln Park (MERS) Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	Melvindale (Police/Fire) Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)

	[1] Population	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	Average
Melvindale (MERS)  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident)	10,702	\$ 41,334,324 26,360,902 36.2% 2,039,729 2,463	\$ 41,671,222 24,967,600 40.1% 1,639,882 2,333	\$ 41,012,348 24,914,191 39.3% 1,502,796 2,328	\$ 41,468,567 25,693,988 38.0% 1,585,014 2,401	\$ 39,047,554 21,977,136 43.7% 1,410,579 2,054		
Southgate (Police/Fire)  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Investment return  Southgate (MERS) Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	29,977	\$ 74,537,531 27,738,271 62.8% 4,328,200 925 144 1.4% \$ 29,728,949 11,601,789 61.0% 896,716 387	\$ 73,582,366 26,800,318 63.6% 4,321,173 894 144 12.0% \$ 29,043,059 9,027,011 68.9% 843,022 301	\$ 72,513,577 29,262,682 59.6% 3,244,840 976 108 12.6% \$ 29,164,527 10,445,238 64.2% 973,239 348	\$ 68,489,438 28,917,390 57.8% 2,580,266 965 86 -3.0% \$ 28,886,716 11,232,002 61.1% 569,014 375	\$ 67,664,363 24,533,874 63.7% 2,604,211 818 87 6.9% \$ 31,804,627 13,122,196 58.7% 969,014 438	\$66,641,598 20,720,242 68.9% 2,649,082 691 88 15.8% \$29,661,895 9,800,957 67.0% 882,147 327	7.62%
Trenton (Police/Fire)  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	18,816	\$ 69,386,899 18,805,675 72.9% 1,734,037 999 92	\$ 68,940,470 17,248,243 75.0% 1,579,481 917 84	\$ 69,879,009 17,621,436 74.8% 1,479,258 937 79	\$ 67,484,939 18,675,868 72.3% 1,424,943 993 76	\$ 67,022,681 14,060,838 79.0% 1,411,401 747 75 0.6%	\$66,133,890 10,397,863 84.3% 1,329,445 553 71 15.4%	6.45%

	[1] Population	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	Average
Trenton (MERS)  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	18,816	\$ 45,383,263 19,903,326 56.1% 3,134,240 1,058	\$ 45,208,676 18,328,884 59.5% 2,165,454 974	\$ 45,670,671 20,760,728 54.5% 1,799,934 1,103	\$ 45,682,435 21,926,490 52.0% 1,553,688 1,165	\$ 43,352,596 17,552,005 59.5% 1,384,206 933 74		
Woodhaven Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	12,856	\$ 29,218,437 5,578,300 80.9% 946,206 434 74	\$ 28,469,996 5,465,312 80.8% 951,463 425 74 8.5%	\$ 27,871,621 5,877,455 78.9% 897,613 457 70	\$ 27,273,880 6,771,338 75.2% 1,026,763 527 80 -1.7%	\$ 27,039,661 5,540,209 79.5% 1,020,364 79 79	\$25,689,929 4,543,561 82.3% 984,496 353 77	7.63%
Wyandotte  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	25,801	\$ 94,000,110 28,438,188 69.7% 4,136,191 1,102 160 3.8%	\$ 94,609,967 28,408,158 70.0% 4,269,848 1,101 165 6.3%	\$ 94,331,393 29,175,187 69.1% 3,774,885 1,131 146 8.3%	\$ 94,435,562 31,755,378 66.4% 3,699,614 1,231 143 8.4%	\$ 93,863,755 32,616,499 65.3% 3,565,840 1,264 138 -2.5%	\$83,727,938 17,230,835 79.4% 3,458,902 668 134 5.3%	4.93%
Brownstown Twp (MERS)  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	31,910	\$ 31,494,635 9,452,295 70.0% 866,604 296	\$ 29,544,700 6,982,216 76.4% 825,037 219 26	\$ 27,336,209 7,787,284 71.5% 817,797 244	\$ 25,847,178 8,646,914 66.5% 847,414 271	\$ 21,994,136 5,126,144 76.7% 793,910 161		

	[1] Population	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	Average
Grosse lle Twp (MERS)	10,158							
Total liability		\$ 34,782,629	\$ 33,145,551		\$ 31,055,849			
Unfunded liability		14,867,004	11,937,344		13,579,136			
Funded ratio		57.3%	64.0%		26.3%			
Annual contribution		1,185,669	1,092,334	1,037,700	948,535			
Unfunded (per resident)		1,464	1,175		1,337			
Contrib (per resident)		117	108	102	93			

Valuation dates are generally one year earlier than fiscal year end. [1] 2010 census

**City of Riverview** Comparison of Pension Data (population)

	[1] Population	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
Riverview  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	12,456	\$38,225,121 6,639,937 82.6% 1,140,203 533 92 5.7%	\$37,919,236 6,767,673 82.2% 1,018,391 543 82 83%	\$36,270,078 6,126,643 83.1% 1,092,653 492 88 9.9%	\$35,806,056 7,314,550 79.6% 1,227,038 587 99 -0.4%	\$35,572,621 6,131,797 82.8% 1,377,176 492 111 5.2%	\$34,693,094 6,079,727 82.5% 1,477,292 488 119 15.8%
Sault Ste. Marie (MERS)  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	14,160	\$30,880,505 11,617,517 62.4% 701,009 820 50	\$30,290,740 9,057,717 70.1% 622,125 640	\$29,833,182 9,977,094 66.6% 553,169 705 39	\$29,315,514 10,501,538 64.2% 527,540 742 37	\$27,186,503 6,926,328 74.5% 470,377 489 33	
Sault Ste. Marie (Police/Fire) Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident) Investment return	14,160	\$32,469,315 16,758,739 48.4% 1,453,326 1,184 103	\$31,723,188 16,466,561 48.1% 1,449,806 1,163 102 0.0%	\$28,367,680 14,024,023 50.6% 1,369,975 990 97	\$27,815,598 12,753,434 54.2% 1,317,356 901 93	\$27,066,293 11,449,757 57.7% 1,341,995 809 95 0.0%	

3 2017 2016 2015 2014	(830,589)       \$21,751,481       \$21,418,144       \$20,038,155         (659,083)       7,902,744       8,401,246       6,097,418         (69,5%)       63.7%       60.8%       69.6%         712,556       598,218       533,424       487,578         524       621       660       479         56       47       42       38         50       0.0%       0.0%       0.0%	,979,664 \$16,201,705 \$15,495,234 \$14,273,518 ,441,021 3,107,467 3,543,309 1,958,300 85.6% 80.8% 77.1% 86.3% 315,119 302,807 273,278 269,423 202 257 293 162 26 25 23	469,996       \$27,871,621       \$27,273,880       \$27,039,661       \$25,689,929         465,312       5,877,455       6,771,338       5,540,209       4,543,561         80.8%       78.9%       75.2%       79.5%       82.3%         951,463       897,613       1,026,763       1,020,364       984,496         74       70       80       79       77
2019 2018	\$22,616,302 \$21,830,589 8,494,428 6,659,083 62.4% 69.5% 849,360 712,556 668 524 67 56	\$17,807,342 \$16,979,664 4,154,488 2,441,021 76.7% 85.6% 323,039 315,119 344 202 27 26	\$29,218,437 \$28,469,996 5,578,300 5,465,312 80.9% 80.8% 946,206 951,463 74 74
[1] Population	Rochester (MERS) 12,720  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	New Baltimore (MERS) 12,084  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	Woodhaven  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)

	[1] Population	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
Clawson (Fire)  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	11,840	\$ 4,237,659 526,843 87.6% 90,217 44	\$ 3,855,662 181,502 95.3% 77,550 15	\$ 3,685,493 137,289 96.3% 73,000 12 6	\$ 3,546,135 192,805 94.6% 15,000	\$ 3,410,529 (156,853) 104.6% 12,612 (13)	
Fenton (MERS)  Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)	11,719	\$17,788,188 6,828,444 61.6% 1,082,740 583	\$16,959,624 5,649,680 66.7% 814,116 482 69	\$16,755,322 6,666,621 60.2% 550,985 569 47	\$16,074,018 6,682,300 58.4% 510,110 570 44	\$14,594,945 4,709,309 67.7% 471,992 402	

Valuation dates are generally one year earlier than fiscal year end. [1] 2010 census

Comparison of OPEB Data (geographic vicinity)

	[1]		
	Population	2019	2018
Riverview	12,456		
Total liability		\$ 45,332,137	\$47,199,141
Unfunded liability		45,332,137	47,199,141
Funded ratio		0.0%	0.0%
Annual PAYG expense		1,521,552	1,601,972
Unfunded (per resident)		3,639	3,789
Contrib (per resident)		122	129
Investment return		n/a	n/a
Allen Park	28,146		
Total liability	20,140	\$ 49,818,813	\$51,047,973
Unfunded liability		47,452,483	49,310,045
Funded ratio		4.7%	3.4%
Annual contribution		3,137,395	2,942,993
Unfunded (per resident)		1,686	1,752
Contrib (per resident)		111	105
Investment return		6.3%	7.9%
mvestment recum			
Ecorse	9,526		
Total liability		\$ 18,637,815	\$18,514,277
Unfunded liability		18,047,157	18,262,108
Funded ratio		3.2%	1.4%
Annual contribution		1,329,230	1,407,088
Unfunded (per resident)		1,895	1,917
Contrib (per resident)		140	148
Investment return		3.1%	7.7%
Flat Rock	9,872		
Total liability	۵,۵. ـ	\$ 22,290,728	\$22,252,052
Unfunded liability		22,290,728	22,252,052
Funded ratio		0.0%	0.0%
Annual PAYG expense		633,922	578,941
Unfunded (per resident)		2,258	2,254
Contrib (per resident)		64	, 59
Investment return		n/a	n/a

	[1] Population		2019	2018
incoln Park	37,996			
Total liability	,	\$	10,554,262	\$ 4,074,570
Unfunded liability		-	10,554,262	4,074,570
Funded ratio			0.0%	0.0%
Annual PAYG expense			730,638	528,100
Unfunded (per resident)			278	107
Contrib (per resident)			19	14
Investment return			0.0%	0.0%
Melvindale (Police/Fire)	10,702			
Total liability	<b>,</b>	\$	1,120,481	\$ 1,946,376
Unfunded liability		7	(1,646,067)	
Funded ratio			246.9%	130.9%
Annual contribution			2 10.570	-
			(154)	(56)
Unfunded (per resident)			(134)	(30)
Contrib (per resident) Investment return			14.8%	-2.6%
Melvindale (MERS)	10,702			
Total liability	,	\$	35,501,432	\$48,315,401
Unfunded liability			35,501,432	48,315,401
Funded ratio			0.0%	0.0%
Annual PAYG expense			807,303	1,131,977
Unfunded (per resident)			3,317	4,515
Contrib (per resident)			75	106
Investment return			,,	
Southgate (Police/Fire)	29,977			
Total liability	•	\$	58,691,273	\$53,036,528
Unfunded liability			56,094,240	50,819,336
Funded ratio			4.4%	4.2%
Annual contribution			2,334,678	2,389,916
Unfunded (per resident)			1,871	1,695
Contrib (per resident)			78	80
Investment return			0.4%	0.0%
Southgate (MERS)	29,977			
	-	\$	34,897,272	\$31,783,860
-		•	31,820,713	28,971,736
Total liability			31,020,113	20,012,100
Total liability Unfunded liability				8.8%
Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio			8.8%	8.8%
Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution			8.8% 1,098,233	8.8% 936,674
Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio			8.8%	8.8%

	[1] Population	2019	2018
Trenton	18,816	ć ca 756 080	ČED DEE EAO
Total liability		\$ 63,756,989 52,146,018	\$63,355,548 53,018,649
Unfunded liability		18.2%	16.3%
Funded ratio Annual contribution		3,478,826	2,797,561
		2,771	2,737,301
Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident)		185	149
Investment return		5.4%	7.0%
Woodhaven	12,856		
Total liability		\$ 37,768,854	\$34,227,572
Unfunded liability		37,768,854	34,227,572
Funded ratio		0.0%	0.0%
Annual PAYG expense		866,199	911,279
Unfunded (per resident)		2,938	2,662
Contrib (per resident)		67	71
Investment return		n/a	n/a
Wyandotte	25,801	4400 004 007	¢00 457 005
Total liability		\$102,931,937	\$88,457,885
Unfunded liability		100,802,646	86,234,161 2.5%
Funded ratio		2.1% 3,689,633	3,679,182
Annual contribution		3,069,033 3,907	3,342
Unfunded (per resident)		143	143
Contrib (per resident) Investment return		3.7%	5.5%
Provinctown Township	31,910		
Brownstown Township  Total liability	31,510	\$ 26,865,270	\$24,531,543
Unfunded liability		23,534,891	21,784,087
Funded ratio		12.4%	11.2%
Annual contribution		684,221	638,878
Unfunded (per resident)		738	683
Contrib (per resident)		21	20
Investment return		22.7%	-5.5%
Grosse Ile Township	10,158		
Total liability		\$ 14,518,669	
Unfunded liability		14,484,995	
Funded ratio		0.2%	
Annual contribution		614,409	
Unfunded (per resident)		1,426	
Contrib (per resident)	•	60	
Investment return		0.0%	

Valuation dates are generally one year earlier than fiscal year end. [1] 2010 census

Comparison of OPEB Data (population)

	[1] Population	2019	2018
Riverview Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident) Investment return	12,456	\$45,332,137 45,332,137 0.0% 1,521,552 3,639 122 n/a	\$47,199,141 47,199,141 0.0% 1,601,972 3,789 129 n/a
Sault Ste. Marie Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident) Investment return	14,160	HSA defined co	ntribution plan
Rochester Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident) Investment return	12,720	\$10,640,890 (1,260,399) 111.8% 395,480 (99) 31 5.7%	\$11,886,286 630 100.0% 448,038 0 35 10.6%
New Baltimore Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident) Investment return	12,084	\$ 7,016,979 4,077,468 41.9% 271,136 337 22 0.0%	\$14,144,735 11,218,050 20.7% 239,485 928 20 0.0%

	[1] Population	2019	2018
Woodhaven Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident) Investment return	12,856	\$37,768,854 37,768,854 0.0% 866,199 2,938 67 n/a	\$34,227,572 34,227,572 0.0% 911,279 2,662 71 n/a
Coldwater Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident) Investment return	13,593	No OPEB	
Escanaba Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident) Investment return	12,606	No OPEB	
East Grand Rapids Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual contribution Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident) Investment return	10,704	\$ 3,797,950 2,370,946 37.6% 112,437 222 11	\$ 3,491,484 2,147,143 38.5% 226,255 201 21
South Lyon Total liability Unfunded liability Funded ratio Annual PAYG expense Unfunded (per resident) Contrib (per resident) Investment return	11,327	\$ 545,542 545,542 0.0% 13,622 48 1	\$ 464,775 464,775 0.0% 9,000 41 1

	[1]		
	Population	2019	2018
Clawson	11,840		
Total liability		\$14,531,259	\$14,295,221
Unfunded liability		14,531,259	14,295,221
Funded ratio		0.0%	0.0%
Annual PAYG expense		749,254	769,341
Unfunded (per resident)		1,227	1,207
Contrib (per resident)		63	65
Investment return		n/a	n/a
Fenton	11,719		
Total liability		\$ 6,709,643	\$ 6,297,090
Unfunded liability		6,709,643	6,297,090
Funded ratio		0.0%	0.0%
Annual PAYG expense		347,273	312,286
Unfunded (per resident)		573	537
Contrib (per resident)		30	27
Investment return		n/a	n/a

Valuation dates are generally one year earlier than fiscal year end. [1] 2010 census

City of Riverview

DEA Assistance - Revenue and Expense Analysis

			Net	(778 07)	(1,0,07)	(39,711)	(12,795)	35,890	40,184	34,120	(26,367)	(10,199)	(60,452)	(42,871)	20,256	37,415	42,660	(2,747)
				·	}													\$
		Wage	Differential	(156 85/1)	(tco'oc) +	(56,373)	(53,740)	(50,052)	(47,561)	(54,306)	(56,921)	(52,599)	(54,159)	(53,159)	(59,299)	ľ	I	\$ (595,023)
	Patrol Wage	with Fringes/	Indirect	¢ 72 055	CCC,21 ¢	74,447	74,447	72,967	72,967	72,967	74,447	75,192	76,701	77,471	79,090	ı	1	\$ 823,651
Expenses	Average	Patrol Wage	2088 Hours	930.47	41,000	48,030	48,030	47,076	47,076	47,076	48,030	48,511	49,484	49,981	51,026	1	1	\$ 531,388
Exp		2%	Indirect	707	/0T/4 ¢	4,220	4,135	3,968	3,888	4,106	4,238	4,122	4,221	4,214	4,464	1	1	\$ 45,763
		20%	Fringes	71 077	4T'0/4	42,200	41,351	39,684	38,880	41,056	42,377	41,223	42,213	42,139	44,642	ţ	ı	\$ 457,639
										q			Ü			ю	a.	111
		Assigned	Wages	07 7	\$ 83,/48	84,400	82,701	79,367	77,760	82,111	84,753	82,446	84,426	84,277	89,283	,	,	\$ 915,272
			Revenue	, c	\$ 22,078	34,736	61,652	108,857	113,151	107,087	48,080	64,993	16,249	34,600	99,346	37,415	42,660	\$ 820,904
			Fiscal	11	7007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
			Year	,		7	ĸ	4	2	9	7	∞	6	10	11	12	13	

a - no officer assigned.

b - used average of three officers.

c - used average of two officers.

Payroll taxes
Workers compensation
Health insurance
Other insurance (life, dental, optical)
Uniform allowance
Pension
OPEB?
Compensated absences

Total	83,748 84,400 82,701 79,367 77,760 246,332 84,753 82,446 168,851 84,277 89,283	Average 22.54 22.99 22.54 22.54 22.54 22.54 22.54 22.99 23.22 23.23 23.69 23.69 23.69
2016-18 O'Neil	81,389 84,277 89,283	48 months 28.64 29.22 29.22 27.40 27.40 27.40 27.40 29.22 29.22 29.21 30.10 30.40
2013-16 McClendon	77,066 84,753 82,446 87,462	36 months 25.52 26.03 26.03 24.41 24.41 24.41 26.03 26.03 26.29 26.29 26.32
2013-13 Sowards	83,066	24 months 22.41 22.85 22.85 21.43 21.43 21.43 22.85 23.08 23.78 23.78
Calendar or Fiscal Year? 2006-09 2010-13 Gentry Troup	82,701 79,367 77,760 86,200	12 months 19.31 19.70 19.70 18.47 18.47 19.70 19.00 20.30 20.50
Calendar or 2006-09 Gentry	83,748	Start 16.83 17.16 17.16 16.10 16.10 17.16 17.33 17.86 17.86
Calendar	2008 2009 2010 2011 2013 2013 2014 2015 2015 2016	Fiscal year 2007-08 2008-09 2009-10 2010-11 2011-12 2012-13 2013-14 2014-15 2014-15 2016-17

City of Riverview

DEA Assistance - Revenue and Expense Analysis

		Net	\$ (77,731)	(96,084)	(66,535)	(14,162)	(7,377)	(20,186)	(83,288)	(62,798)	(114,611)	(06,030)	(39,043)	37,415	42,660	\$ (597,770)
Expenses	5%	Total	\$ 129,809	130,820	128,187	123,019	120,528	127,273	131,368	127,791	130,860	130,630	138,389	ī	r	\$1,418,674
		Indirect	\$ 4,187	4,220	4,135	3,968	3,888	4,106	4,238	4,122	4,221	4,214	4,464	ı	ı	\$ 45,763
		Other	ı	ı	ı	t	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	ı	ı	
		$\circ$	↔													ş
	20%	Vehicle	ı	1	1	1	1	1	•	•	t	1	1	1	1	3
			↔													   
		Fringes	\$ 41,874	42,200	41,351	39,684	38,880	41,056	42,377	41,223	42,213	42,139	44,642	,	1	\$ 457,639
		ı						q			ပ			Ø	В	
		Wages	\$ 83,748	84,400	82,701	79,367	77,760	82,111	84,753	82,446	84,426	84,277	89,283	1	i	\$ 915,272
Revenue			\$ 52,078	34,736	61,652	108,857	113,151	107,087	48,080	64,993	16,249	34,600	99,346	37,415	42,660	\$ 820,904
Fiscal			2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
		Year	$\leftarrow$	7	ĸ	4	Ŋ	9	7	∞	6	10	11	12	13	

a - no officer was assigned.

b - used average of three officers.

c - used average of two officers.

Payroll taxes
Workers compensation
Health insurance
Other insurance (life, dental, optical)
Uniform allowance
Pension
OPEB?
Compensated absences

	18    Total	83,748	84,400	82,701	79,367	77,760	246,332	84,753	82,446		77 84,277	83 89,283	ı	t
	2016-18 O'Neil									81,389	84,277	89,283		
	2013-16 McClendon						77,066	84,753	82,446	87,462				
	2013-13 Sowards						83,066							
Calendar or Fiscal Year?	2010-13 Troup			82,701	79,367	77,760	86,200							
Calendar o	2006-09 Gentry	83,748	84,400											
	Calendar year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020