

AMERICAN BENEFITS COUNCIL'S POSITIONS

ON LEADING HYBRID PENSION PLAN REFORM PROPOSALS

[Note: A shaded cell indicates that the version of H.R. 2830 that passed the House on December 15, 2005 (the “Managers’ Amendment”) included changes to the bill originally reported by the Ways & Means Committee and the Education & Workforce Committee.]

ISSUE	CURRENT LAW	ADMINISTRATION ¹	HOUSE (H.R. 2830) ²	SENATE (S. 1783) ³	COUNCIL POSITION
OVERVIEW					
SCOPE OF PROSPECTIVE RULES	With the exception of limited regulatory guidance, current law does not include specific rules governing hybrid plans, such as cash balance plans and pension equity plans (PEPs). Instead, hybrid plans are subject to the rules generally applicable to defined benefit plans.	Provides specific rules for converting to cash balance plans, applying the age discrimination requirements to cash balance plans, and determining minimum lump-sum distributions from cash balance plans. Indicates that similar rules would be provided for other types of hybrid plans.	Modifies the age discrimination rules applicable to all defined benefit plans and provides specific age discrimination rules for certain plan designs (e.g., offset plans). Provides specific rules for determining minimum lump-sum distributions from cash balance plans.	Same as Administration proposal. Also provides interest crediting requirements and special vesting rules for cash balance plans. Indicates that Treasury may provide similar rules for other types of hybrid plans.	The Council supports the House provision. The conference agreement should apply to all defined benefit plans, including cash balance plans, PEPs, and traditional plans.
TREATMENT OF EXISTING PLANS	Over the past 20 years, numerous companies have converted their traditional defined benefit plans to hybrid plans. According to the PBGC, there are more than 1,500 of these plans as of 2003 providing benefits to more than 8 million participants. Although hybrid plans have been repeatedly blessed by the Treasury Department and the IRS and were affirmed as lawful by courts on numerous occasions, in <i>Cooper v. IBM</i> , a federal district court in 2003 held that the cash balance and pension equity plan designs	All elements of the proposal would be effective on a prospective basis only (presumably following date of enactment). <i>No inference language.</i> Provides that “[n]o inference is intended as to the status of cash balance plans or cash balance conversions under current law.”	Effective on a prospective basis for periods beginning on or after June 29, 2005.	Generally effective on a prospective basis for periods after July 31, 2005. <i>No inference language.</i> States that “Nothing in the amendments made by this section shall be construed to infer the proper treatment of cash balance plans or conversions to cash balance plans under [the age discrimination rules] as in effect before such amendments.”	The Council supports comprehensive clarification of the age discrimination rules, both prospectively and with respect to existing plans. If the conference agreement provision only applies prospectively, the “Reasons for Change” language from the Ways and Means Committee should be specifically approved in the conference report.

¹ As part of its budget submissions for FY 2005 and 2006, the Bush Administration released a legislative proposal to address a number of hybrid plan issues.

² H.R. 2830, The Pension Protection Act of 2005, was approved by the full House on December 15, 2005. The final House-passed language was a managers’ amendment that merged and amended versions of the bill previously reported by the Education & Workforce Committee in June, 2005 and the Ways & Means Committee in November, 2005.

³ S. 1783, The Pension Security and Transparency Act of 2005, was approved by the full Senate on November 16, 2005.

ISSUE	CURRENT LAW	ADMINISTRATION ¹	HOUSE (H.R. 2830) ²	SENATE (S. 1783) ³	COUNCIL POSITION
	<p>were age discriminatory because pay credits to younger participants' accounts had more years to earn interest. The <i>Cooper</i> decision is on appeal and oral arguments have been scheduled for February 16, 2006.</p>				
STEADY STATE					
BASIC DESIGN	<p>The Internal Revenue Code (the "Code"), Employee Retirement Income Security Act ("ERISA") and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA") provide that a defined benefit plan is age discriminatory if the rate of a participant's benefit accrual declines on account of age.</p>	<p>Provides that a cash balance plan satisfies age discrimination requirements if the rate of pay credits for older participants is not less than the rate of pay credits for younger participants.</p>	<p>Provides that a defined benefit plan is not age discriminatory if a participant's entire accrued benefit, "as determined as of any date under the formula for determining benefits as set forth in the text of the plan documents," would be equal to or greater than that of any similarly situated, younger individual.</p> <p>States that a plan may calculate accrued benefits "as the present value of accrued benefits projected to normal retirement age, as an account balance, or as the current value of the accumulated percentage of the employee's final average compensation."</p>	<p>Provides that a cash balance plan that satisfies vesting and interest rate requirements, described below (a "qualified cash balance plan"), does not violate age discrimination requirements merely because the period of time over which interest credits may be made to a participant's account is longer for a younger versus an older participant, provided that the rate of pay and interest credits does not decrease by reason of the attainment of any age.</p>	<p>The Council supports the House provision (with technical modifications), but recommends that the PEP rule not be limited to final average pay designs. Also, the conference agreement needs to apply to the ADEA, in addition to the Code and ERISA.</p> <p>It is important to clarify that optional forms of benefits, ancillary benefits, and other plan features are subject to a separate age discrimination test based on availability (determined on a good faith basis until regulations are issued).</p>
INTEREST CREDITING RATES	<p>No specific provision.</p>	<p>No specific provision.</p>	<p>No specific provision.</p>	<p>Provides that a qualified cash balance plan must provide interest credits at a rate (i) not less than the applicable Federal mid-term interest rate and (ii) not greater than the rate of interest on long-term corporate bonds, as determined on an annual basis.</p> <p><i>Special Effective Date.</i> The interest rate requirements would be effective for plan</p>	<p>The Council opposes limiting plan flexibility with respect to interest crediting rates.</p>

ISSUE	CURRENT LAW	ADMINISTRATION ¹	HOUSE (H.R. 2830) ²	SENATE (S. 1783) ³	COUNCIL POSITION
				years beginning in 2007, unless the plan sponsor elects to apply the requirements in 2006.	
VESTING	An employee must have a nonforfeitable right to his accrued benefit under a defined benefit plan equal to either (i) 100% of his accrued benefit after five years of service or (ii) 20% of his accrued benefit after three years of service, with such percentage increasing by 20% for each additional year of service up to 100% after 7 years of service.	No specific provision.	No specific provision.	Would require full vesting after 3 years of service under a cash balance plan. <i>Special Effective Date.</i> The new vesting rule would be effective for plan years beginning in 2007, unless the plan sponsor elects to apply the requirements in 2006.	The Council does not believe that hybrid plans should be subject to a special accelerated vesting schedule.
LUMP SUMS	Current law provides that the amount of a lump sum benefit paid from a defined benefit plan must be no less than the actuarial equivalent of the normal retirement benefit determined using the statutorily prescribed interest rate and mortality assumptions. In Notice 96-8, the IRS stated that in calculating the amount of a single sum distribution under a cash balance plan, the balance of the participant's hypothetical account must be projected to normal retirement age using the plan's interest crediting rate (if interest credits do not depend on continued employment) and then discounted back to present value using the statutorily prescribed rate. If the rate used	Permits the value of a lump-sum distribution under a cash balance plan to be determined as the amount of a participant's hypothetical account balance so long as the plan does not provide interest credits in excess of a market rate of return. The Secretary of Treasury is authorized to provide safe harbors for market rates of return.	Same as the Administration proposal, but authorizes the Secretary of Treasury to provide rules governing the calculation of a market rate of return and permissible methods of crediting interest to participant accounts (including fixed or variable interest rates).	Permits the value of a lump-sum distribution under a cash balance plan that satisfies the vesting and interest credit rates requirements to be determined as the amount of a participant's hypothetical account balance.	The Council supports the House provision, subject to the points raised below and subject to certain technical modifications and clarifications. The Council supports fixing the whipsaw problem with respect to <u>distributions after</u> the effective date of the legislation. If the problem is addressed for <u>benefits accrued after</u> the effective date, the whipsaw problem will continue for a long period. Moreover, if the latter effective date applies, the funding bills would <u>create</u> a whipsaw problem for all cash balance plans with respect to older participants' existing benefits. This would occur because the new lump sum discount rate - - <u>i.e.</u> , the

ISSUE	CURRENT LAW	ADMINISTRATION ¹	HOUSE (H.R. 2830) ²	SENATE (S. 1783) ³	COUNCIL POSITION
	<p>by a plan to project forward exceeds the statutory discount rate, the present value of the accrued benefit will exceed the participant's account balance. If the plan pays only the account balance, some courts have concluded that this is an impermissible forfeiture. This is often referred to as "whipsaw."</p>				<p>effective yield curve interest rate - - for older participants would be lower than the participants' interest crediting rate under the plan.</p> <p>In addition, under the House provision, it is important that a variable crediting rate not be treated as above market solely because of a reasonable floor on the crediting rate.</p> <p>Anti-cutback relief is needed with respect to plans that have had to reflect whipsaw in their terms.</p>
CONVERSIONS					
MANDATES	<p>Although conversions are done in a variety of ways, a typical conversion involves assigning a participant an account balance under the new cash balance plan based on the value of the participant's benefit under the traditional pension plan. On a going forward basis, participants in the cash balance plan receive pay credits and earn interest on their entire account. Some participants in certain conversions, typically older or longer-service participants, have expressed concern that they will receive a pension benefit that is less than they expected under the traditional defined benefit plan formula.</p> <p>Current law does not protect employee expectations but does provide participants with</p>	<p>For the first five years following conversion to a hybrid plan, benefits earned by all participants must be at least as valuable as the benefits participants would have earned under the traditional defined benefit plan had the conversion not occurred.</p> <p>The five-year transition requirements would not be required if plans either "grandfather" all current participants at the time of conversion under the traditional formula or provide that all participants may choose between the traditional defined benefit plan formula and the cash balance formula.</p> <p>Failure to follow the conversion rules will not result in plan disqualification.</p>	<p>No provision. The current law notice requirement and prohibition against reductions in accrued benefits would, however, apply to conversions.</p>	<p>Provides that a defined benefit plan that is converted to a hybrid plan must satisfy one of the following three transition requirements:</p> <p>1. <i>The Five-Year Transition Requirement:</i> The plan must prohibit wear-away for all participants with respect to normal and early retirement benefits <u>and</u> provide either: (i) that for the first five years following conversion, benefits earned by all participants must be at least as valuable as the benefits that would have been earned under the traditional defined benefit plan formula, or (ii) in the case of participants who, at time of conversion, were at least age 40 and had combined age and service of at least 55, the plan provides participants with (a) the greater</p>	<p>The Council opposes benefits mandates based on employee expectations. If employee expectations become legally protected, it will undermine companies' commitment to providing pension benefits, and could cause companies to rethink the provision of other benefits. Companies need flexibility to address business crises and competitive pressures; if benefit plans are subject to mandates that eliminate flexibility, there will be fewer plans.</p> <p>Even if there are no benefit mandates, two provisions are needed in order to permit employers to continue providing transition benefits in the context of conversions to hybrid plans. First, it needs to be clarified that if participants</p>

ISSUE	CURRENT LAW	ADMINISTRATION ¹	HOUSE (H.R. 2830) ²	SENATE (S. 1783) ³	COUNCIL POSITION
	two protections. First, ERISA section 204(h), which was strengthened in the 2001 tax act, and Code section 4980F require comprehensive advance notice of a reduction in the rate of benefit accrual. Second, both ERISA and the Code provide that a participant's accrued benefit for services already performed may not be reduced.	However, the plan sponsor is generally subject to a 100-percent excise tax imposed on any difference between required benefits and benefits actually provided as a result of the conversion. The amount of the excise tax cannot exceed the plan's surplus assets at the time of the conversion or the plan sponsor's taxable income, whichever is greater.		<p>of the benefits determined under the old or new formula or (b) the right at the time of conversion to elect benefits determined under the old or new formula;</p> <p>2. <i>The Greater of/Choice Approach:</i> Provide that all participants who were covered under the traditional plan formula at the time of conversion with (a) the greater of the benefits determined under the old or new formula, or (b) the right to elect at the time of conversion benefits determined under either the old or new formula; or</p> <p>3. <i>The Equivalence Approach:</i> Provide additional credits or additional opening account balances in amounts substantially equivalent to the benefits that would be provided in complying with the Five-Year Transition Requirement or the Greater of/Choice Approach.</p> <p><i>Effective Date.</i> Effective for conversions pursuant to a plan amendment adopted and effective after July 31, 2005, although employers could elect to apply S. 1783 to conversion amendments adopted before July 31, 2005 and effective after such date.</p>	<p>are entitled to the "greater of" two or more benefit formulas, that does not violate the backloading rules. The Senate bill seems to do this, but clarification would be helpful.</p> <p>Second, many transition benefits – such as choice or greater of – can create problems under the Code section 401(a)(4) nondiscrimination rules because the employees receiving the transition benefits tend to be higher paid after several years. The Senate bill partially addresses this issue with respect to transition benefits that are required under the Senate bill. This issue needs to be addressed in order to protect the transition benefits of older participants.</p>
SPECIAL RULES FOR CHOICE	No specific provision.	No specific provision.	No specific provision.	If a plan chooses a conversion method which provides a participant with a choice between plan formulas, the	The Council opposes benefit mandates, such as mandated "choice".

ISSUE	CURRENT LAW	ADMINISTRATION ¹	HOUSE (H.R. 2830) ²	SENATE (S. 1783) ³	COUNCIL POSITION
				<p>plan must do the following:</p> <p>1. <i>Notice.</i> The plan must provide notice of the right to make the election, and such notice must include information (1) which permits the participant to project benefits under the formulas and “model the impact of such choice,” and (2) which states those circumstances under which a participant may not receive the projected accrued benefits.</p> <p>2. <i>Subsequent Changes.</i> The plan must provide that if, during the 5 years after a participant’s election, a plan amendment results in a significant reduction in the rate of future accruals, the accrued benefit of the participant is determined as if the participant had made the election which would have resulted in the greatest accrued benefit.</p> <p>3. <i>Anti-Conditioning Rule.</i> Provides that a plan shall not be treated as complying with the conversion requirements if any other benefit (e.g., enhanced defined contribution plan contributions) is directly or indirectly conditioned on a participant’s election.</p>	
<p>BENEFIT PLATEAUS (AKA “WEAR-AWAY”)</p>	<p>A benefit plateau or “wear-away” results where a participant does not accrue additional benefits under the defined benefit plan until the hypothetical balance under the</p>	<p>Prohibits benefit plateaus of normal and early retirement benefits in connection with a conversion to a cash balance plan. As with a plan’s failure to follow the five-year conversion</p>	<p>No specific provision.</p>	<p>Provides specific provisions addressing conversions to cash balance plans, some of which prohibit benefit plateaus. Generally permits benefit plateaus in connection with</p>	<p>The Council opposes benefit mandates, such as benefit plateau prohibitions.</p>

ISSUE	CURRENT LAW	ADMINISTRATION ¹	HOUSE (H.R. 2830) ²	SENATE (S. 1783) ³	COUNCIL POSITION
	<p>cash balance plan exceeds the participant's frozen accrued benefit under the traditional formula. Benefit plateaus generally arise in conversions (1) when the opening account balance under the cash balance formula is based on the normal retirement benefit and a participant has accrued (or will accrue) an early retirement subsidy under the traditional plan formula or (2) when a sponsor translates the previously accrued benefit under the traditional defined benefit formula into an opening cash balance account using an interest rate higher than the rate used for purposes of determining minimum lump sum values.</p>	<p>rule, failure to follow the wear-away rule would not result in plan disqualification. However, the plan sponsor would generally be subject to a 100-percent excise tax imposed on any difference between required benefits and benefits actually provided.</p>		<p>conversions that use the Choice approach.</p>	
<p>INCLUSION OF EARLY RETIREMENT SUBSIDIES</p>	<p>To help address the expectations of some participants regarding the retention of early retirement subsidies under the prior traditional plan, some sponsors have chosen to include some or all of the value of early retirement subsidies in employees' opening hybrid plan account balances. Some regulators have suggested that including early retirement subsidies in the opening account balance is problematic under the pension age discrimination rules because younger workers who are early retirement eligible often have more valuable early retirement subsidies than older workers.</p>	<p>Including the value of early retirement subsidies in opening account balances in connection with a conversion would be permitted.</p>	<p>Provides that "the subsidized portion of any early retirement benefit (including any early retirement subsidy that is fully or partially included or reflected in an employee's opening balance or other transition benefits) shall be disregarded" in applying the age discrimination requirements.</p>	<p>Provides that if any early retirement benefit or retirement-type subsidy is not included in the initial account balance in a conversion, the plan has to credit such amount when a participant retires and becomes entitled to such benefit or subsidy.</p>	<p>The Council supports the House provision with a clarification that a reasonable approximation of the subsidy may be used.</p>

ISSUE	CURRENT LAW	ADMINISTRATION ¹	HOUSE (H.R. 2830) ²	SENATE (S. 1783) ³	COUNCIL POSITION
BEYOND HYBRIDS					
	Some have suggested that, for the same reasons hybrid plans were found to violate the pension age discrimination rules in <i>Cooper</i> , certain other plan designs that incorporate a time value of money feature may also run afoul of the pension age discrimination rules. In this regard, for example, questions have arisen about the legality of certain floor offset plans, plans that provide for pre-retirement indexing of benefits, and contributory plans.	No specific provision.	Provides safe harbor rules under the age discrimination rules of ERISA and of the Code for defined benefit plans that provide for certain “allowable offsets” (e.g., Social Security), plans that satisfy the requirements of section 401(l), and plans that provide for retirement indexing. Indicates the indexing cannot result in a decline in a participant’s accrued benefit and defines indexing to mean the periodic adjustment of a benefit by means of a recognized investment index or methodology.	No specific provision.	The Council supports the House provision with certain technical modifications.

IRS CIRCULAR 230 NOTICE: Any tax advice contained in this document was not intended or written by Davis & Harman LLP to be used, and cannot be used by the recipient or any other person, for the purpose of avoiding any Internal Revenue Code penalties that may be imposed on such person. Recipients of this document should seek advice based on their particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.