# LD 258 

February 10, 2023

> Senator Rotundo, Representative Sachs, Members of the Appropriations Committee; Senator Tipping, Representative Roeder, Members of the Labor and Housing Committee.

> My name is Harold Booth, I live in Hallowell, and I'm a retired state employee, retiring in 1996.

It's no secret that this country has experienced higher-than-normal inflation over the past year or two way higher than the $3 \%$ cap currently imposed on the COLA granted to State retirees and teachers as a result of legislation passed in 2011, reducing the cap from $4 \%$ to $3 \%$. I won't go into the motivations behind that legislation, let's just say that it was done without much concern for the retirees involved.

I'm coming up on 27 years as a retiree. Over those years, there have only been three times when my COLA has been greater than $3 \%$ - all while the cap was $4 \%$ [2001, 2007, 2008] - all while the cap was $4 \%$, see the table of COLAs at the bottom.

That happy circumstance, of the COLA keeping up with inflation, ended in 2021 when inflation hit 5.4\%. The COLA that year, capped at $3 \%$, left me $2.4 \%$ behind. There was a legislatively granted increase of an additional 1\%, leaving me 'only' 1.4\% behind. As you doubtless all know, inflation in 2022 was much worse. There were also years, right after the 2011 legislation, when there was no COLA at all, despite there being some inflation.

Everyone who gets Social Security automatically receives an inflation-adjusted COLA every year - no cap, just whatever inflation is that year. The only people in the state who get left behind are state retirees and teachers, whose COLA is limited by that $3 \%$ cap. My question for you is: Why does the State allow its direct and indirect employees to suffer from inflation as retirees while those on Social Security do not?

Over the years there have been many studies, comparing the costs associated with the existing State Retirement System vs. moving to having the state join the Social Security system. Those studies unfailingly show that moving to Social Security would be much more expensive, no the change is not made.

Since it is the State's choice to continue with MePERS, the State should also ensure that its retirees do not suffer, relative to those receiving Social Security, as a result of inflation higher than that 3\% COLA cap by making its retirees whole by legislatively granting an inflation-matching COLA onto the base.

The current administration seems to be fond of offering ad-hoc adjustments for inflation in-excess of the $3 \%$ COLA cap - quick money now, but nothing on the base for long-term relief. I'm outraged at the cynicism implicit in such an 'offering'. Do they think that inflation is also ad-hoc? If you look at the Accum[ulative] COLA column you will see how rapidly small annual increases result in 'real money' over time.

Note: These percentages are based on my calendar-year income tax information on the size of my pension, not the actual percentage-increase of the COLA. The accumulative increase shown for years 2012 - 2013, when there was no actual COLA, are probably due to differences in the tax-rate on my pension.


The chart Bold, italic, and highlighting is to provide easier reading, no other significance.

These are the actual CPI-U changes over the same period - calculated on the CPI change as of June [the way the State does it.]

|  | Actual <br> CPI \# <br> \# | CPI-U | Change |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1996 | 156.7 | Annual | Accum. |
| 1997 | 160.3 |  |  |
| 1998 | 166.2 | $1.7 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| 1999 | 172.4 | $3.0 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ |
| 2000 | 178 | $3.2 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ |
| 2001 | 179.9 | $1.1 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ |
| 2002 | 183.7 | $2.1 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ |
| 2003 | 189.7 | $3.3 \%$ | $18.3 \%$ |
| 2004 | 194.5 | $2.5 \%$ | $21.3 \%$ |
| 2005 | 202.9 | $4.3 \%$ | $26.6 \%$ |
| 2006 | 208.6 | $2.8 \%$ | $30.1 \%$ |
| 2007 | 218.8 | $4.9 \%$ | $36.5 \%$ |
| 2008 | 215.7 | $-1.4 \%$ | $34.6 \%$ |
| 2009 | 218 | $1.1 \%$ | $36.0 \%$ |
| 2010 | 225.7 | $3.5 \%$ | $40.8 \%$ |
| 2011 | 229.5 | $1.7 \%$ | $43.2 \%$ |
| 2012 | 233.5 | $1.7 \%$ | $45.7 \%$ |
| 2013 | 238.3 | $2.1 \%$ | $48.7 \%$ |
| 2014 | 238.6 | $0.1 \%$ | $48.8 \%$ |
| 2015 | 241 | $1.0 \%$ | $50.3 \%$ |
| 2016 | 245 | $1.7 \%$ | $52.8 \%$ |
| 2017 | 252 | $2.9 \%$ | $57.2 \%$ |
| 2018 | 256.1 | $1.6 \%$ | $59.8 \%$ |
| 2019 | 257.8 | $0.7 \%$ | $60.8 \%$ |
| 2020 | 271.7 | $5.4 \%$ | $69.5 \%$ |
| 2021 | 296.3 | $9.1 \%$ | $84.8 \%$ |
| 2022 |  |  |  |

If you compare the two accumulated columns, you can see that they track almost exactly through 2010, but starting with 2011 - after the change to the retirement system in 2011 - you can see that my retirement increase lags behind the actual inflation so that by 2020 , l'm $4.8 \%$ behind [ 56.0 vs 60.8 ]. By 2021, it's worse [58.2 vs 69.5], and 2022 it's $19.8 \%$ [65.0 vs 84.8].

To assure you that I didn't make up the CPI-U numbers. Below is a screen-shot of those figures that I found on-line. I have added a rectangle that isolates the June figures. The figures from the chart showing the retirees' COLA are from a spreadsheet that I maintain for my own fiscal analysis. The figures are from my 1099-Rs. I would be happy to bring documentation to the work session.


