## City of Franklin Pension Plan Asset Allocation Study August 2016



Russell Truell, Finance Director<br>City of Franklin Pension Plan 109 Third Avenue South Franklin, TN 37964

August 22, 2016

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Attached you will find our asset allocation study for the City of Franklin Pension Plan. In Table 1 the Current Target Mix is displayed with four alternatives. We believe these alternatives may offer moderately better prospects for meeting the actuarial assumption of $7.5 \%$ without drastically altering the City's strategy. The study uses a Monte Carlo simulation to estimate the chance of earning the Plan's actuarial assumption. The goal is to identify alternatives that offer the best possibility of achieving an appropriate tradeoff between return and risk within the specified portfolio limits, and is not intended to identify a single optimal allocation.

We used the actuarial report dated January 1, 2016 to project the next 20 years of cash flows. The model ran different mixes in three return scenarios and against the $7.5 \%$ actuarial assumption. Asset classes and ranges used are in Table 2. Key asset class returns in the three return scenarios are shown in Table 3. Tradeoffs involved in moving the allocation between risk assets and safety assets are shown in Table 4. Detailed results for the current allocation and 11 alternatives are in Table 5.

Modeled return gets the biggest boost by reducing the fixed income allocation from the current $25 \%$ to $20 \%$. If the Trustees are uncomfortable with reducing fixed income, we recommend sticking with the Current Target Mix. If fixed income can be reduced, we recommend consideration be given to Mix 436 and Mix 214. Each implies a different view of the return environment.

Table 1
Current Target and Alternatives

| Asset Mix | Current <br> Target | Mix 444 | Mix 422 | Mix 436 | Mix 214 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Domestic Large Cap Growth | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 5\% |
| Domestic Large Cap Value | 15\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% |
| Domestic SMid Cap | 15\% | 15\% | 5\% | 10\% | 20\% |
| Foreign Developed Market | 15\% | 10\% | 15\% | 15\% | 5\% |
| Foreign Emerging Market | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% |
| Private Real Estate | 5\% | 5\% | 10\% | 5\% | 10\% |
| Timber | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| Fixed Income | 25\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% |
| Total | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Performance Statistics 10-Year Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chance to Beat Assumption | 40.5\% | 43.2\% | 41.1\% | 40.7\% | 45.0\% |
| Mean Return | 7.6\% | 7.9\% | 7.6\% | 7.7\% | 7.9\% |
| Standard Deviation | 13.2\% | 14.0\% | 13.2\% | 14.0\% | 13.2\% |

Statistics shown for the selected mixes in Table 1 are those for the $10-Y e a r$ Return Scenario only. Each of the three return scenarios employed in this study uses different performance statistics. The $10-\mathrm{Year}$ Scenario is intermediate in its return expectations. The percent chance of beating the $7.5 \%$ assumption is higher in the 20Year Scenario but lower in the Projection Scenario across all asset mixes, as indicated in Table 5.

Here is a summary of the changes from the current allocation in the suggested mixes.
Mix 444: 5\% from foreign developed equity and $5 \%$ from fixed income to large cap value.
Mix 422: 10\% from smid cap to large cap value, and 5\% from fixed income to real estate.
Mix $4365 \%$ from smid cap value and $5 \%$ from fixed income to large cap value.
Mix $2145 \%$ from domestic large cap growth and $5 \%$ from fixed income to domestic large cap value.
Criteria used to pick selected mixes are based on the following beliefs about the 3-5 year return environment:

- Value equity is likely to out perform growth equity. Value equity has under performed growth equity since the financial crisis, but out performs over most long time periods.
- Foreign equity, particularly emerging market equity, is attractively valued relative to domestic equity. Domestic equity is now at the top of its historic valuation range; profit margins for domestic companies appear to have peaked.
- Domestic fixed income is unlikely to perform well given current interest rates, which for many classes of government bonds have never been lower.

Beliefs about the return environment are based on educated guesses combining historical returns and current valuation levels.

## STUDY INPUTS

## Cash Flow Projections

Our study began with the Plan's June 30, 2016 market value. We used the latest actuarial report from January 1, 2016 as the source for the contributions, benefit payments, administrative expenses, and the return assumption of $7.5 \%$. We assumed a growth rate of $3.0 \%$ to approximate the effect of inflation on contributions and administrative expenses. The cash flows we calculated with help from the actuary are listed on p.10.

## Asset Classes and Ranges

We used the following asset classes and ranges. Should the Trustees wish to consider additional asset classes or values outside these ranges, we can rerun the study.

Table 2
Asset Classes and Allowed Ranges Used in Study

| Asset Class | Range |
| ---: | :---: |
| Domestic Large Cap Growth Equity | $5 \%-20 \%$ |
| Domestic Large Cap Value Equity | $5 \%-25 \%$ |
| Domestic SMid Cap Core Equity | $5 \%-15 \%$ |
| Foreign Developed Equity | $5 \%-20 \%$ |
| Foreign Emerging Market Equity | $5 \%-15 \%$ |
| Private Real Estate | $0 \%-10 \%$ |
| Timber | $5 \%$ |
| Core Domestic Fixed Income | $20 \%-40 \%$ |

The model runs every possible combination of assets within these ranges in $5 \%$ increments. For example, 20\% domestic large cap growth equity is allowed, but $25 \%$ is not because it exceeds the range, and $17 \%$ is not because it is not a $5 \%$ increment. The model ran almost 850 mixes based on these asset classes and ranges.

The ranges selected have implications for the mixes considered. In general, we did not allow the model to consider any asset allocation we would not be willing to recommend. Should the Trustees wish to see results for values outside these ranges, or for asset classes not included in the study, we would be happy to rerun the model with these changes.

In setting minimum values for asset classes, we forced the model to use certain asset classes it might have further reduced or eliminated based on the various return scenarios.

Fixed income and developed foreign equity are examples of asset classes the model tends not to use. Despite poor return prospects for fixed income, we are reluctant to go below a $20 \%$ fixed income allocation. Fixed income adds stability in an extremely bad year like 2008. Also, using less than $20 \%$ fixed income would place the Fund's allocation outside the norm for public funds. Foreign developed equity has had poor returns since 2007 for a variety of reasons. We believe it is likely to have better relative returns going forward. Also, to eliminate developed foreign equity entirely would violate the principle of diversity explained in the risk section below.

In setting maximum values we have limited the upper end of the range for some asset classes that the model tends to favor. This includes emerging market equity and private real estate. Emerging market equity is extremely volatile and could under perform for long periods of time in certain economic scenarios. An allocation above $10 \%$ for emerging market equity would be outside the norm for a small public fund. Private real estate carries high fees and illiquidity in some economic environments, separate issues not considered in the model. In limiting private real estate to $10 \%$ we are cognizant of what other funds do, and how any asset allocation decision might be viewed by various groups who monitor the Fund's performance.

We believe timber has good valuation prospects as the United States emerges from the financial crisis. Increasing the timber allocation might be another way to improve return if the Trustees were comfortable with the illiquidity that it implies.

## Return Scenarios

The model can call on a variety of return scenarios to select returns for each asset class. We used three return scenarios for this study: the historical $20-$ Year Scenario (actual returns and statistics for the 20 years ended December 2015); the historical 10-Year Scenario (actual returns and statistics for the 10 years ended December
2015); and the Projection Scenario (projected returns for the next 5-10 years, an average of large brokerage and consulting firms representing the current Wall Street consensus).

Returns for three key asset classes in each of the three scenarios are listed in Table 3. We have selected these asset classes to show how the three return scenarios differ. Returns for all asset classes in each return scenario used in this study, plus several others that were not used, are on pages 10-12.

Table 3
Key Differences in Return Scenarios

|  | $\underline{\text { 20-Year Scenario }}$ |  | 10-Year <br> Scenario |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S\&P 500 | $9.9 \%$ |  | Projection Scenario |
| EAFE Equity | $7.0 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ |
| BC Aggregate | $5.4 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ |
| 60/40 Return | $8.1 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ |

The 20-year scenario is the most optimistic, the Projection Scenario the most pessimistic, and the 10 -Year Scenario in between. To emphasize the difference, a simple portfolio of $60 \%$ domestic stocks $/ 40 \%$ domestic bonds has a median return of $8.1 \%$ in the 20 -year scenario and would probably meet the $7.5 \%$ hurdle. However, it only has a median return of $7.3 \%$ in the 10-Year Scenario and therefore slightly less than a $50 \%$ chance of making a $7.5 \%$ assumption. In the Projection Scenario, the median return of $5.4 \%$ means a $60 / 40$ domestic portfolio would likely fall short of the assumption.

Of note, developed foreign equity returns are less than domestic equity returns in the two historical scenarios, but slightly more in the Projection Scenario. Emerging market returns are significantly higher.

## STUDY OUTPUTS

The table below shows output data for a simple portfolio containing two assets, equity (S\&P 500) and fixed income (BC Aggregate). We used the $20-Y e a r$ Return Scenario. (Note: starting value and cash flows are not from this study.) The first mix has more equity and less fixed income than the second. We present these results to show how changes in the asset allocation affect performance statistics.

Table 4
Sample Mix Statistics, 20-Year Scenario

|  | Mix \# | S\&P 500 | BC Agg | Mean | Std. Dev. | Sharpe | Beat \% | 50\% TV | 75\% TV | 95\% TV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mix 1 <br> High Return | 1 | 80 | 20 | 10.6\% | 15.2\% | 0.52 | 70\% | \$94.5mm | \$35.7mm | -\$13.3mm |
| Mix 2 <br> Low Volatility | 2 | 40 | 60 | 8.5\% | 8.0\% | 0.71 | 63\% | \$60.4mm | \$34.9mm | \$6.9mm |

Mix 1/High Return is 80\% S\&P 500 (SP500) and 20\% Barclay's Aggregate (BC Agg). Mix 2/Low Volatility is 40\% SP500, $60 \%$ BCAgg. Note how the performance statistics change. For Mix 1, the mean return is $10.6 \%$ and the standard deviation is $15.2 \%$. For Mix 2 , mean return declines to $8.5 \%$, but the standard deviation declines even more, to 8.0\%.

More broadly, moving money from risk assets (all categories of equity) to safety assets (in this study fixed income, real estate and timber), reduces mean return but also reduces risk as measured by standard deviation. The distribution of returns for Mix 1 has higher highs and lower lows. What we desire in an asset mix is a high mean return and a low standard deviation. But if one mix has a higher mean while the other has a lower standard deviation, how do we choose?

Other statistics help to compare the two mixes based on both measures. We believe the best such statistic is the percent chance that a mix will achieve the actuarial assumption. This is labeled as Beat $\%$ in Table 4.

Mix 1 achieves the actuarial assumption $70 \%$ of the time, Mix 2 only $63 \%$ of the time. We find this statistic most closely correlates with the typical Plan Sponsor's risk, and rely on it above others. Based on that statistic alone we would choose Mix 1 . But that is not the entire story.

The other three statistics are the most difficult to understand but provide a more exact description of the probability distribution of returns. The easiest way to understand them is to think about flipping a coin 10 times. Let's say heads is a good outcome and tails a bad outcome, so you want the cumulative number heads out of 10 flips to be as high as possible. If you flip a coin 10 times there are 11 possible numbers for cumulative heads, from 0 (tails every time) to 10 (heads every time). The most likely outcome is to get heads 5 times (the median). The percentage chance of getting any particular outcome decreases as you move from the median, 5 , toward the extremes (heads or tails 10 times in a row.).

In funding a pension plan we tend to think about the odds differently. We don't think about the odds of getting one particular number. We think about shortfalls, so we ask the question like this: what is the chance of getting heads at least 5 times. The fewer times we need heads, the better our chances. The chance of getting heads at least 5 times means 5 times or more, and this occurs about $50 \%$ of the time. The chance of getting heads at least 3 times is higher, about $75 \%$. The chance of getting heads at least 1 time is very high. The lower we set the threshold for heads, the more we can count on the outcome. We can be pretty sure of getting heads at least 3 times; we can be very sure of getting heads at least once.

That's what the last three statistics do. In the $50 \%$ TV statistics, TV stands for terminal value, the value of the pension fund at the end of 20 years. For Mix 1 , there is a $50 \%$ chance of having $\$ 94.5$ million or more at the end of 20 years. But what can we count on? What can be we certain of? We can't be completely certain of any positive outcome. We could get tails every time. But we can be pretty certain $-75 \%$ certain, to be exact -- that Mix 1 will deliver at least $\$ 35.7 \mathrm{~mm}$ at the end of 20 years. But what does the negative number for the $95 \%$ terminal value mean? The negative number means that, somewhere along the way during those 20 years, in extremely bad markets, the fund can run out of money using Mix 1. And that's where these statistics produce a more precise description of the performance difference between the two mixes. This more precise description provides a rationale for choosing Mix 2 over Mix 1 even though Mix 1 has a higher Beat \%.

Mix 1 dominates Mix 2 through the $75 \%$ confidence level. If you choose Mix 1 , you will have more money than you will with Mix $275 \%$ of the time. The gap between the two increases as the confidence level falls; at $50 \%$, that gap is $\$ 34.1 \mathrm{~mm}$, and at the $25 \%$ confidence level (not shown) it would be even higher. However, shortly after the confidence level rises above $75 \%$, Mix 2 dominates Mix 1 . By the time you get to the $95 \%$ confidence level, Mix 2 has a positive value of $\$ 6.9 \mathrm{~mm}$ while Mix 1 has hit zero.

Mix 1 is better than Mix 2 in $75 \%$ of the outcomes, but in about $25 \%$ of the outcomes, Mix 2 is equal to or better than Mix 1, and those outcomes are the bad ones. If you are willing to sacrifice the upside that you will earn about $75 \%$ of the time to avoid running out of money in a worst case scenario, Mix 2 is a better choice.

## STATISTICS

The following is a simple explanation of the statistics listed above.

| Mean: | average annual return (geometric mean) |
| ---: | :--- |
| Standard deviation: | variation around the mean value, measure of short-term risk |
| Sharpe ratio: | combines mean and standard deviation in one statistic; return per unit risk |
| \% to beat: | chance the mix has to beat the actuarial assumption of $7.625 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ terminal value: | minimum value mix will achieve in 20 years/ $50 \%$ certainty |
| $\mathbf{7 5 \%}$ terminal value: | minimum value mix will achieve in 20 years/ $75 \%$ certainty |
| 95\% terminal value: | minimum value mix will achieve in 20 years/ $95 \%$ certainty |
| RISK |  |

Until now we have described risk in terms of the actuarial assumption. We actually believe risk has four parts.

- Long-term risk, the chance that we will not make the actuarial assumption.

The model captures long-term risk in the Beat $\%$ statistic measured over 20 years, and in the terminal values with different percent certainty. Long-term risk is the greatest concern for most Plan Sponsors.

- Short-term risk, the chance of having a very poor return in any given year.

This is captured in the standard deviation. A short-term decline in portfolio value can place pressure on the Plan Sponsor by increasing the required contribution, even if the Plan recovers in the following year. For a public plan, a single bad year can place strain on the city budget when other needs are most critical. Referring to Table 4, Mix 2 has a much lower standard deviation relative to Mix 1, and therefore a much lower chance of producing an extremely bad outcome in any one year, even though it has a moderately lower chance of making the actuarial assumption over a 20-year period.

- Entity risk, the unique aspects of the Plan Sponsor's situation.

Entity risk is captured in the actuarial assumption and in the funding ratio. An entity that is $100 \%$ funded with an actuarial assumption of $5 \%$ should think differently about risk than one with a $50 \%$ funded ratio and an $8 \%$ assumption. Trustees should also consider the political environment in which the Plan operates, and how the poor performance of an allocation might influence the willingness of the funding source to continue its support.

- Unknown risk.

Not everything that can happen has happened, and that which has not happened may escape the imagination. As an example, the housing crisis of 2008 was not widely understood until after it was well underway. We believe the best way to deal with unknown risk is to prefer diversify to concentration. Equity has out performed fixed income during every 20 -year period on record, but the next 20 years could be different.

## RECOMMENDATION

In Table 5 we have listed selected mixes for the Trustees to consider. We have selected the mix in each return scenario with the best chance of beating the actuarial assumption, and an alternative mix among the better performers with lower volatility. Those are the first six mixes. In each case we show the performance statistics in all three return scenarios. After listing these six, we show four mixes representing variants on the best performing mix in the Projection Scenario. One way to distinguish among the choices is to ask two questions. First, are you willing to reduce fixed income below $25 \%$ ? Second, which return scenario do you view as being most likely over the next $3-5$ years?

The standard institutional portfolio model is $60 \%$ equity $/ 40 \%$ fixed income. In an attempt to reduce fixed income exposure we have already lowered the $40 \%$ fixed income allocation to $35 \%$. We have also taken $10 \%$ of that $35 \%$ and put it into bond substitutes, timber and real estate. Most of the modeled advantage in all scenarios presented comes from taking an additional $5 \%$ from fixed income. If you are uncomfortable with further reduction in fixed income, we are left with the Current Target and Mix 421. The difference is that Mix 421 moves $10 \%$ from smid cap to large cap value in an attempt to capitalize on the anticipated out performance of value. In this instance the differences are so slight we would advise staying with the current allocation.

If you can agree to lower the bond allocation to $20 \%$, then other options are available. The key question then is: which return scenario describes the likely relationship between asset classes over the next 3-5 years (the time until we next do an asset allocation study)? The logic behind using the Projection Scenario as the best guide is: value is likely to out perform growth, foreign equity is likely to out perform domestic equity, and bond returns are likely to be among the worst for any 10-year period on record. If you agree with this logic, we favor Mix 436 as having the best chance for success. If you believe in the more robust returns for domestic equity represented in the 20 -Year Scenario, then Mix 214 appears to offer the best return prospects.

## CONCLUSION

In recommending three mixes - the Current Target, Mix 436, and Mix 214 -- we are trying to increase modeled return while taking risks we believe the city of Franklin will find acceptable. The Trustees may consider other options, and may even wish to consider changing some of the constraints applied to the asset classes. We are happy to do additional modeling. Also, we do not believe this decision needs to be rushed. Following a prudent process is more important than reaching a quick decision.

Sincerely,


Table 5
Selected Mixes

|  | Target | Mix 214 | Mix 50 | Mix 769 | Mix 470 | Mix 183 | Mix 779 | Mix 444 | Mix 422 | Mix 436 | Mix 421 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Current <br> Target | Best Mix 20 Year Scenario | Least <br> Volatile 20 <br> Year Scenario | Best Mix <br> 10 Year <br> Scenario | Least Volatile 10 Year Scenario | Best Mix <br> Projection <br> Scenario | Least <br> Volatile Projection Scenario | High Domestic Equity | High Real Estate | Moderate <br> Small Cap | High Fixed Income |
| ASSET CLASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Large Cap Growth | 10 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Large Cap Value | 15 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 15 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Small Cap Equity | 15 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 10 | 5 |
| Foreign EAFE | 15 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Foreign EM | 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Real Estate | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 |
| Timber | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Fixed Income | 25 | 20 | 40 | 20 | 40 | 20 | 25 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 25 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHANCE BEAT 7.50\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-year scenario | 60.8\% | 72.1\% | 66.5\% | 66.8\% | 63.5\% | 63.1\% | 62.9\% | 64.8\% | 63.9\% | 61.7\% | 59.6\% |
| 10-year scenario | 40.5\% | 45.0\% | 36.6\% | 48.6\% | 39.6\% | 37.9\% | 44.4\% | 43.2\% | 41.1\% | 40.7\% | 38.3\% |
| Projection scenario | 7.5\% | 10.2\% | 1.1\% | 7.6\% | 0.7\% | 12.8\% | 7.4\% | 11.8\% | 12.0\% | 12.9\% | 10.1\% |
| Sum | 108.8\% | 127.4\% | 104.2\% | 123.0\% | 103.9\% | 113.7\% | 114.7\% | 119.9\% | 117.0\% | 115.3\% | 108.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-year scenario | 8.9\% | 9.7\% | 8.6\% | 9.4\% | 8.5\% | 9.0\% | 9.0\% | 9.3\% | 9.1\% | 9.1\% | 8.8\% |
| 10-year scenario | 7.6\% | 7.9\% | 7.2\% | 8.2\% | 7.3\% | 7.4\% | 7.8\% | 7.9\% | 7.6\% | 7.7\% | 7.4\% |
| Projection scenario | 5.9\% | 5.9\% | 5.0\% | 5.8\% | 5.1\% | 6.1\% | 5.9\% | 6.1\% | 6.1\% | 6.2\% | 6.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| STANDARD DEVIATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-year scenario | 11.8\% | 11.6\% | 8.4\% | 12.2\% | 8.8\% | 11.7\% | 11.6\% | 12.5\% | 11.9\% | 12.5\% | 11.7\% |
| 10-year scenario | 13.2\% | 13.2\% | 9.3\% | 13.0\% | 9.3\% | 13.2\% | 12.3\% | 14.0\% | 13.2\% | 14.0\% | 13.0\% |
| Projection scenario | 5.5\% | 6.2\% | 5.0\% | 5.7\% | 4.6\% | 6.0\% | 5.3\% | 6.0\% | 5.8\% | 5.9\% | 5.8\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TERMINAL VALUE @ 75\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-year scenario | \$303.0 | \$353.3 | \$338.8 | \$326.6 | \$327.0 | \$310.4 | \$312.9 | \$316.5 | \$313.8 | \$303.3 | \$298.5 |
| 10-year scenario | \$219.7 | \$236.5 | \$246.5 | \$247.7 | \$255.1 | \$210.2 | \$240.3 | \$224.9 | \$220.0 | \$214.2 | \$215.9 |
| Projection scenario | \$226.5 | \$220.9 | \$195.5 | \$222.0 | \$201.6 | \$233.0 | \$230.9 | \$229.2 | \$235.6 | \$234.5 | \$230.1 |

## Projected Cash Flow

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year (6/30/xxxx) | Beginning Market Value | $\begin{gathered} \text { BMV * 7.5\% GR } \\ \left(B *_{1} .075\right) \end{gathered}$ | Contributions | Benefit Payments | Expenses | Ending Value ( $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{F}$ ) | Net Cash Flow ( $\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{F}$ ) |
| 2016 | \$87,974,458 | \$94,572,542 | \$3,888,628 | (\$3,810,996) | (\$54,716) | \$94,650,174 | \$22,916 |
| 2017 | \$94,650,174 | \$101,748,938 | \$4,250,000 | (\$4,540,000) | $(\$ 56,357)$ | \$101,458,938 | (\$346,357) |
| 2018 | \$101,458,938 | \$109,068,358 | \$4,640,000 | (\$4,830,000) | (\$58,048) | \$108,878,358 | (\$248,048) |
| 2019 | \$108,878,358 | \$117,044,235 | \$5,040,000 | (\$5,310,000) | (\$59,790) | \$116,774,235 | (\$329,790) |
| 2020 | \$116,774,235 | \$125,532,302 | \$5,470,000 | (\$5,660,000) | $(\$ 61,583)$ | \$125,342,302 | (\$251,583) |
| 2021 | \$125,342,302 | \$134,742,975 | \$5,930,000 | (\$6,08o,000) | $(\$ 63,431)$ | \$134,592,975 | (\$213,431) |
| 2022 | \$134,592,975 | \$144,687,448 | \$6,400,000 | (\$6,590,000) | (\$65,334) | \$144,497,448 | (\$255,334) |
| 2023 | \$144,497,448 | \$155,334,757 | \$6,900,000 | (\$7,030,000) | $(\$ 67,294)$ | \$155,204,757 | (\$197,294) |
| 2024 | \$155,204,757 | \$166,845,113 | \$7,410,000 | (\$7,600,000) | $(\$ 69,313)$ | \$166,655,113 | (\$259,313) |
| 2025 | \$166,655,113 | \$179,154,247 | \$7,950,000 | (\$8,140,000) | (\$71,392) | \$178,964,247 | (\$261,392) |
| 2026 | \$178,964,247 | \$192,386,566 | \$8,510,000 | (\$8,660,000) | (\$73,534) | \$192,236,566 | (\$223,534) |
| 2027 | \$192,236,566 | \$206,654,308 | \$9,080,000 | (\$9,240,000) | (\$75,740) | \$206,494,308 | (\$235,740) |
| 2028 | \$206,494,308 | \$221,981,381 | \$9,670,000 | (\$9,810,000) | (\$78,012) | \$221,841,381 | (\$218,012) |
| 2029 | \$221,841,381 | \$238,479,485 | \$10,280,000 | (\$10,250,000) | $(\$ 80,352)$ | \$238,509,485 | $(\$ 50,352)$ |
| 2030 | \$238,509,485 | \$256,397,696 | \$10,890,000 | (\$10,730,000) | $(\$ 82,763)$ | \$256,557,696 | \$77,237 |
| 2031 | \$256,557,696 | \$275,799,523 | \$11,520,000 | (\$11,200,000) | $(\$ 85,246)$ | \$276,119,523 | \$234,754 |
| 2032 | \$276,119,523 | \$296,828,487 | \$12,150,000 | (\$11,720,000) | (\$87,803) | \$297,258,487 | \$342,197 |
| 2033 | \$297,258,487 | \$319,552,874 | \$12,790,000 | (\$12,250,000) | $(\$ 90,437)$ | \$320,092,874 | \$449,563 |
| 2034 | \$320,092,874 | \$344,099,839 | \$13,430,000 | (\$12,840,000) | $(\$ 93,150)$ | \$344,689,839 | \$496,850 |
| 2035 | \$344,689,839 | \$370,541,577 | \$14,070,000 | (\$13,270,000) | $(\$ 95,945)$ | \$371,341,577 | \$704,055 |
| 2036 | \$371,341,577 | \$399,192,196 | \$14,700,000 | (\$13,700,000) | $(\$ 98,823)$ | \$400,192,196 | \$901,177 |

## ASSUMPTIONS:

Cells shaded in gold represent figures that were given by Milliman.
Cells that are shaded blue represent figures that have been extracted from the Fund's corresponding performance report.
Actuarial investment return assumption rate is $7.5 \%$ (pg 10 of the Fund's $6 / 1 / 15$ actuarial report).
Expenses are assumed to increase at a rate of $3 \%$ per annum.

## Statistical Summary of Asset Classes

 Statistics as of December 31, 2015| 20-Year Period Historical Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asset Class | Index Used | Mean | SD | Alpha | Beta | Corr. |
| Large Cap Core Equity | S\&P 500* | 9.930 | 18.270 | 0.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Core Fixed Income | Barclays Capital Aggregate Bond Index* | 5.400 | 3.500 | 0.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Cash | 90 Day US Treasury Bill* | 1.000 | 2.170 | 0.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| PIMCO All-Asset | PIMCO All-Asset | 7.450 | 6.980 | 4.903 | 0.267 | 0.450 |
| Large Cap Core Equity | Russell 1000 | 10.120 | 18.370 | 0.140 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Large Cap Growth Equity | Russell 1000 Growth | 10.130 | 21.900 | -1.380 | 1.160 | 0.970 |
| Large Cap Value Equity | Russell 1000 Value | 9.990 | 16.730 | 1.520 | 0.850 | 0.930 |
| Mid Cap Core Equity | Russell Midcap | 12.120 | 18.970 | 2.770 | 0.940 | 0.910 |
| Mid Cap Growth Equity | Russell Midcap Growth | 11.620 | 23.750 | -0.130 | 1.180 | 0.910 |
| Mid Cap Value Equity | Russell Midcap Value | 12.290 | 18.180 | 4.380 | 0.800 | 0.800 |
| Small Cap Core Equity | Russell 2000 | 9.770 | 18.870 | 1.120 | 0.870 | 0.840 |
| Small Cap Growth Equity | Russell 2000 Growth | 8.910 | 22.930 | -1.700 | 1.070 | 0.850 |
| Small Cap Value Equity | Russell 2000 Value | 10.870 | 18.390 | 4.350 | 0.660 | 0.650 |
| Int'l Equity | MSCI EAFE | 6.980 | 20.160 | -2.150 | 0.920 | 0.830 |
| Emerging Markets | MSCI Emerging Mkts Free | 10.620 | 33.140 | 1.630 | 0.900 | 0.500 |
| Real Estate | NCREIF NFI-ODCE Index | 10.140 | 11.090 | 9.070 | 0.110 | 0.180 |
| Timberland | NCREIF Timberland Index | 7.850 | 6.840 | 7.010 | 0.080 | 0.230 |
| Farmland | NCREIF Farmland Index | 12.920 | 7.240 | 12.830 | 0.010 | 0.020 |
| High Yield FI | CSFB High Yield Index | 9.070 | 14.780 | 3.290 | 0.490 | 0.410 |
| Private Equity | Cambridge US Private Equity Index | 15.090 | 15.190 | 8.430 | 0.670 | 0.810 |
| Int'l Fixed Income | Barclays Global Aggregate Ex USD | 4.130 | 9.100 | -0.730 | 0.900 | 0.350 |

*PLEASE NOTE THAT THESE ARE BASE MARKET INDICES

## Statistical Summary of Asset Classes Statistics as of December 31, 2015

| 10-Year Period Historical Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asset Class | Index Used | Mean | SD | Alpha | Beta | Corr. |
| Large Cap Core Equity | S\&P 500* | 9.130 | 17.990 | 0.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Core Fixed Income | Barclays Capital Aggregate Bond Index* | 4.560 | 2.900 | 0.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Cash | 90 Day US Treasury Bill* | 1.120 | 1.800 | 0.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| PIMCO All Asset | PIMCO All Asset | 4.640 | 10.820 | 0.717 | 0.424 | 0.706 |
| Large Cap Core Equity | Russell 1000 | 9.340 | 18.510 | -0.040 | 1.030 | 1.000 |
| Large Cap Growth Equity | Russell 1000 Growth | 10.650 | 19.480 | 1.030 | 1.050 | 0.970 |
| Large Cap Value Equity | Russell 1000 Value | 8.040 | 18.420 | -1.100 | 1.000 | 0.980 |
| Mid Cap Core Equity | Russell Midcap | 10.660 | 21.960 | -0.220 | 1.190 | 0.980 |
| Mid Cap Growth Equity | Russell Midcap Growth | 11.200 | 23.380 | -0.180 | 1.250 | 0.960 |
| Mid Cap Value Equity | Russell Midcap Value | 9.990 | 20.920 | -0.360 | 1.130 | 0.970 |
| Small Cap Core Equity | Russell 2000 | 8.850 | 19.980 | -0.780 | 1.050 | 0.950 |
| Small Cap Growth Equity | Russell 2000 Growth | 10.460 | 21.870 | -0.170 | 1.170 | 0.960 |
| Small Cap Value Equity | Russell 2000 Value | 7.360 | 18.940 | -1.290 | 0.950 | 0.900 |
| Int'I Equity | MSCI EAFE | 7.510 | 21.180 | -2.510 | 1.060 | 0.890 |
| Emerging Markets | MSCI Emerging Mkts Free | 9.910 | 34.640 | -2.250 | 1.330 | 0.690 |
| Real Estate | NCREIF NFI-ODCE Index | 7.730 | 14.600 | 6.830 | 0.100 | 0.120 |
| Timberland | NCREIF Timberland Index | 7.120 | 6.510 | 7.740 | -0.070 | -0.190 |
| Farmland | NCREIF Farmland Index | 14.570 | 4.760 | 14.570 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| High Yield FI | CSFB High Yield Index | 9.070 | 14.780 | 3.290 | 0.490 | 0.410 |
| Private Equity | Cambridge US Private Equity Index | 12.220 | 13.200 | 6.460 | 0.630 | 0.860 |
| Int'l Fixed Income | Barclays Global Aggregate Ex USD | 3.230 | 5.250 | -2.230 | 1.200 | 0.660 |

*PLEASE NOTE THAT THESE ARE BASE MARKET INDICES

## Statistical Summary of Asset Classes Statistics as of December 31, 2015

| 5 to 10-Year Projection Statistics** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asset Class | Index Used | Mean | SD | Alpha | Beta | Corr. |
| Large Cap Core Equity | S\&P 500* | 7.032 | 16.500 | - | - | - |
| Core Fixed Income | Barclays Capital Aggregate Bond Index* | 3.136 | 5.280 | - | - | - |
| Cash | 90 Day US Treasury Bill* | 1.950 | 1.025 | - | - | - |
| PIMCO All-Asset | PIMCO All-Asset*** | 5.050 | 10.900 |  |  |  |
| Large Cap Core Equity | Russell 1000 | 7.100 | 15.900 | - | - | - |
| Large Cap Growth Equity | Russell 1000 Growth | 7.032 | 16.500 | - | - | - |
| Large Cap Value Equity | Russell 1000 Value | 8.450 | 16.300 | - | - | - |
| Mid Cap Core Equity | Russell Midcap | 5.513 | 18.600 | - | - | - |
| Mid Cap Growth Equity | Russell Midcap Growth | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mid Cap Value Equity | Russell Midcap Value | - | - | - | - | - |
| Small Cap Core Equity | Russell 2000 | 7.715 | 20.450 | - | - | - |
| Small Cap Growth Equity | Russell 2000 Growth | - | - | - | - | - |
| Small Cap Value Equity | Russell 2000 Value | - | - | - | - | - |
| Int'I Equity | MSCI EAFE | 6.817 | 17.500 | - | - | - |
| Emerging Markets | MSCI Emerging Mkts Free | 9.046 | 24.620 | - | - | - |
| Real Estate | NCREIF NFI-ODCE Index | 5.580 | 9.950 | - | - | - |
| Timberland | NCREIF Timberland Index | 4.500 | 5.400 | - | - | - |
| Farmland | NCREIF Farmland Index | 5.000 | 7.500 | - | - | - |
| High Yield FI | CSFB High Yield Index | 4.700 | 10.850 | - | - | - |
| Private Equity | Cambridge US Private Equity Index | 8.916 | 22.200 | - | - | - |
| Int'l Fixed Income | Barclays Global Aggregate Ex USD | 2.080 | 5.633 | - | - | - |

*PLEASE NOTE THAT THESE ARE BASE MARKET INDICES
**PRojection statistics are a blend of those provided by BNY Mellon, JP Morgan, Goldman Sachs, NEPC, and Aon HEwitt
***STATISTICS SHOWN FOR PIMCO ALL-ASSET ARE THE FUNDS STATISTICS SINCE INCEPTION

# 20-YEAR SCENARIO <br> Asset Allocation Charts 

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
20-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time

| \$1,250 mm |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$937.5 mm |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$625 mm |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$312.5 mm |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$0 mm | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 | 2036 |
| 5\% | \$88 mm | \$192 mm | \$335 mm | \$563 mm | \$934 mm |
| 25\% | \$88 mm | \$153 mm | \$242 mm | \$377 mm | \$589 mm |
| 50\% | \$88 mm | \$131 mm | \$192 mm | \$284 mm | \$423 mm |
| 75\% | \$88 mm | \$110 mm | \$151 mm | \$212 mm | \$303 mm |
| 95\% | \$88 mm | \$85 mm | \$106 mm | \$136 mm | \$185 mm |
| 7.5\% | \$88 mm | \$125 mm | \$178 mm | \$255 mm | \$368 mm |

Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $8.86 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 75\% Year-20 Value: | $\$ 303 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 11.80 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.55 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $61 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
20-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $9.65 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $75 \%$ Year-20 Value: | $\$ 353 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 11.64 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.62 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $72 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
20-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time

| \$1,250 mm |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$937.5 mm |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$625 mm |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$312.5 mm |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$0 mm | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 | 2036 |
| 5\% | \$88 mm | \$172 mm | \$287 mm | \$462 mm | \$750 mm |
| 25\% | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | \$146 mm | \$227 mm | \$349 mm | \$541 mm |
| 50\% | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | \$130 mm | \$193 mm | \$286 mm | \$428 mm |
| 75\% | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | \$116 mm | \$162 mm | \$233 mm | \$339 mm |
| 95\% | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | $\$ 97 \mathrm{~mm}$ | \$127 mm | \$171 mm | \$241 mm |
| 7.5\% $\square$ | \$88 mm | \$125 mm | \$178 mm | \$255 mm | \$368 mm |

Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $8.62 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $75 \%$ Year-20 Value: | $\$ 339 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 8.36 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.74 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $67 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
20-Year Scenario

Portfolio Value Over Time

Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $9.35 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 75\% Year-20 Value: | $\$ 327 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 12.18 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.57 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $67 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
20-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time

| \$1,250 mm |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$937.5 mm |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$625 mm |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$312.5 mm |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$0 mm | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 | 2036 |
| 5\% | \$88 mm | \$174 mm | \$289 mm | \$471 mm | \$762 mm |
| 25\% | \$88 mm | \$146 mm | \$226 mm | \$347 mm | $\$ 533 \mathrm{~mm}$ |
| 50\% | \$88 mm | \$129 mm | \$190 mm | \$281 mm | \$416 mm |
| 75\% | \$88 mm | \$114 mm | \$159 mm | \$226 mm | \$327 mm |
| 95\% | \$88 mm | \$95 mm | \$123 mm | \$164 mm | \$226 mm |
| 7.5\% $\square$ | \$88 mm | \$125 mm | \$178 mm | \$255 mm | \$368 mm |

Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $8.52 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $75 \%$ Year-20 Value: | $\$ 327 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 8.78 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.70 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $64 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
20-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time

| $\$ 1,250 \mathrm{~mm}$ |
| :--- |
| $\$ 937.5 \mathrm{~mm}$ |

Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $8.97 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $75 \%$ Year-20 Value: | $\$ 310 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 11.74 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.56 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $63 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
20-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time
$\$ 1,250 \mathrm{~mm} \longrightarrow\left(\frac{1}{2}\right.$


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $8.96 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 75\% Year-20 Value: | $\$ 313 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 11.55 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.57 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $63 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
20-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $9.28 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $75 \%$ Year-20 Value: | $\$ 316 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 12.49 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.55 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $65 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
20-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $9.08 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $75 \%$ Year-20 Value: | $\$ 314 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 11.86 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.56 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $64 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
20-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $9.06 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $75 \%$ Year-20 Value: | $\$ 303 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 12.51 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.53 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $62 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
20-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $8.77 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $75 \%$ Year-20 Value: | $\$ 298 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 11.74 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.54 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $60 \%$ |

# 10-YEAR SCENARIO <br> Asset Allocation Charts 

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
10-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $7.56 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 75\% Year-20 Value: | $\$ 220 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 13.19 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.49 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $40 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
10-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $7.91 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 75\% Year-20 Value: | $\$ 237 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 13.22 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.51 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $45 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
10-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $7.16 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $75 \%$ Year-20 Value: | $\$ 247 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 9.29 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.65 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $37 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
10-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $8.16 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $75 \%$ Year-20 Value: | $\$ 248 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 12.99 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.54 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $49 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
10-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
10-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $7.36 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 75\% Year-20 Value: | $\$ 210 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 13.22 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.47 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $38 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
10-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time

| $\$ 1,000 \mathrm{~mm}$ |
| :--- |

Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $7.77 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 75\% Year-20 Value: | $\$ 240 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 12.30 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.54 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $44 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
10-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $7.87 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 75\% Year-20 Value: | $\$ 225 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 13.99 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.48 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $43 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
10-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $7.59 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 75\% Year-20 Value: | $\$ 220 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 13.16 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.49 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $41 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
10-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $7.66 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 75\% Year-20 Value: | $\$ 214 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 13.98 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.47 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $41 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

Asset Allocation
10-Year Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $7.41 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 75\% Year-20 Value: | $\$ 216 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 13.01 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.48 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $38 \%$ |

# Projection Scenario Asset Allocation Charts 

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

## Asset Allocation

Custom Projection Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time
$\$ 500 \mathrm{~mm}$
$\$ 375 \mathrm{~mm}$

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

## Asset Allocation

Custom Projection Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


## City of Franklin Pension Plan

## Asset Allocation

Custom Projection Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $5.02 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $75 \%$ Year-20 Value: | $\$ 196 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 4.95 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.62 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $1 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

## Asset Allocation

Custom Projection Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time
$\$ 500 \mathrm{~mm}$
$\$ 375 \mathrm{~mm}$

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

## Asset Allocation

Custom Projection Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $5.10 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $75 \%$ Year-20 Value: | $\$ 202 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 4.64 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.68 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $1 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

## Asset Allocation

Custom Projection Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


## City of Franklin Pension Plan

## Asset Allocation

Custom Projection Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


## City of Franklin Pension Plan

## Asset Allocation

Custom Projection Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


## City of Franklin Pension Plan

## Asset Allocation

Custom Projection Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


## City of Franklin Pension Plan

## Asset Allocation

Custom Projection Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


Statistics

| Beginning Value: | $\$ 88 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Mean Return: | $6.15 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $75 \%$ Year-20 Value: | $\$ 234 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Standard Deviation: | 5.92 |
| Required Year-20 Value: | $\$ 368 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Sharpe Ratio: | 0.71 |
| Actuarial Rate: | $7.5 \%$ | Likelihood to Beat 7.5\%: | $13 \%$ |

## City of Franklin Pension Plan

## Asset Allocation

Custom Projection Scenario


Portfolio Value Over Time


