

•
•
•
•
•
•
•


TEXPERS
One Riverway, Suite 1401
Houston, TX 77056-1904
Phone (713) 622-8018
Fax (713) 622-7022

TEXPERS

Report on the Asset Allocation and Investment Performance of Texas Public Employee Retirement Systems

• • • • • • • • • •

*The Texas Association of
Public Employee
Retirement Systems*



March 2006





Table of Contents

KEY FINDINGS 3

INTRODUCTION 4

TEXPERS COMPOSITE 5

ASSET ALLOCATION 5

INVESTMENT PERFORMANCE 6

Trailing Period Returns - Table 6

Trailing Period Returns - Chart 6

Growth of \$100 7

INDIVIDUAL PENSION SYSTEMS 8

ASSET ALLOCATION 8

INVESTMENT PERFORMANCE 9

FIVE YEAR RETURN VERSUS STANDARD DEVIATION 10

TEN YEAR RETURN VERSUS STANDARD DEVIATION 11

APPENDIX 1 12

INVESTMENT RETURN SURVEY OF TEXPERS DEFINED BENEFIT PLANS 12

APPENDIX 2 13

LIST OF TEXPERS SURVEY RESPONDENTS 13

APPENDIX 3 14

RESPONDENT FUND NUMBER - NAME CROSS REFERENCE 14

TEXPERS®
 One Riverway, Suite 1401
 Houston, Texas 77056-1904
 Tel: 713/622-8018 - Fax: 713/622-7022
 e-mail: texpers@texpers.org

All rights reserved. The text of this report, or any part, may not be reproduced without written permission from the Texas Association of Public Employee Retirement Systems (TEXPERS®).
 ©2006, TEXPERS®

Prepared by:
Fredric D. Richmond, CFA

Key Findings

- Fifty-six percent of surveys mailed to TEXPERS members were returned with complete data, an excellent response percentage.
- Survey respondents had a total market value of \$19.3 billion. The average asset allocation of the survey respondents was 57.9% percent in equity, 28.0% in fixed income, 7.8% in real estate and 6.3% in other asset classes.
- When measuring investment performance for survey respondents as a group over the ten year period ending September 30, 2005 the respondents' composite investment return was 9.5%, compared to the average actuarial investment return assumption of 8.3%.
- For the ten years ended September 30, 2005 survey respondents averaged a 9.5% return, compared to a 9.3% return for the Wilshire Median Public Fund over the same period.
- A \$100 investment in the survey respondents' aggregate portfolio on September 30, 1995 would have grown to \$248.68 at September 30, 2005. This compares to \$220.88 for \$100 growing at the 8.3% average actuarial return assumption for the same period.
- Equity allocations of individual survey respondents range from 38.60% to 74.12% whereas fixed income allocations range from 10.43% to 52.51%.
- Even given the extraordinarily difficult market environment of 2000-2002 the ten year average return of the survey respondents exceeded the average actuarial return assumption of 8.3% by 1.2%.

Introduction

This report reviews the asset allocation and investment performance for local pension systems that are members of the Texas Association of Public Employee Retirement Systems (TEXPERS) for the one, three, five and ten year periods ending September 30, 2005. Both the aggregate TEXPERS and individual systems' asset allocation as well as investment performance will be examined.

The purpose of this report is to document TEXPERS member systems' diversification with respect to the types of assets invested in, and the investment performance of these systems with respect to their actuarially assumed returns, market benchmarks and other public funds. This will demonstrate that local systems are being managed in compliance with the "prudent expert" rule, which requires fiduciaries of the system exercise their duties with the care, skill, prudence and diligence under the prevailing circumstances that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with matters of the type would use in the conduct of an enterprise with a like character and like aims.

Individual pension system data in this report was obtained from a December 2005 survey requesting asset allocation and investment return information from TEXPERS members. A total of eighty-one surveys were sent to TEXPERS members. Fifty-four surveys were completed and returned, a sixty-seven percent response. Forty-five responses, or fifty-six percent, had the five year quarterly return history required for inclusion in the study. Fifty-six percent is considered an excellent response percentage for surveys. The member systems responding represent assets of approximately \$19.3 billion. A copy of the survey is contained in Appendix 1 and a listing of TEXPERS members responding to the survey is contained in Appendix 2. Respondents that agreed to have their name disclosed in this report are listed in Appendix 3.

Thanks to Wilshire Associates, Inc. for providing the market return and peer group comparison data.


TEXPERS Composite

Asset Allocation

Figure 1 illustrates the average asset allocation of survey respondents as a composite group. The equity asset class includes investments such as domestic and international common stocks. Fixed income includes investments such as government and corporate bonds from domestic and international issuers. Real estate includes both publicly or privately traded real estate securities and direct investments in properties. Other includes all assets not falling into one of the previous classes.

Figure 1

Market Value \$19.3 Billion
As of September 30, 2005



The average equity allocation of 57.9% demonstrates that, in aggregate, the respondents have a level of equity investment within the norm for public pension systems, as generally defined by “prudent experts”.

Investment Performance

Trailing Period Returns - Table

Table 1


Annualized Returns for the Periods Ending 9/30/2005	One Year	Three Years	Five Years	Ten Years
TEXPERS Average	16.2	16.8	4.8	9.5
Avg. Actuarial Assumption	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3

Table 1 and Figure 2 compare the survey respondents average investment return over the one, three, five and ten year periods ending September 30, 2005 to their average actuarial investment return assumption of 8.3%. Even given the extraordinarily difficult market environment of 2000-2002 the ten year return of 9.5% exceeds the actuarial return assumption of 8.3%. This demonstrates that TEXPERS members as a group produce long-term rates of return in excess of the average return expectation of the group.

Trailing Period Returns - Chart

Figure 2

Returns vs. Average Actuarial Assumption For Periods Ending 9/30/2005



Growth of \$100

Figure 3




Figure 3 displays the growth of \$100 as if it were invested on September 30, 1995 in the survey respondents' aggregate portfolio. This is compared to \$100 invested in a hypothetical portfolio growing at the 8.3% average actuarial assumption. As can be seen from this exhibit, over the ten years ending September 30, 2005, \$100 invested in the TEXPERS respondents' portfolio has grown to \$248.68 versus \$220.88 in the 8.3% actuarially assumed return portfolio.

TEXPERS member systems as a group have performed in excess of their actuarial investment return assumption over the ten years ending September 30, 2005.

Individual Pension Systems

Asset Allocation

Table 2 details the percentage allocation to the major asset classes by each survey respondent. Equity allocations range from 38.60% to 74.12%, fixed income allocations range from 10.43% to 52.51% and real estate allocations range from 0.00% to 29.63%.

Table 2

	Equity	Fixed Income	Real Estate	Other		Equity	Fixed Income	Real Estate	Other	
Fund 1	63.59%	21.94%	5.57%	8.90%		Fund 24	63.93%	36.07%	0.00%	0.00%
Fund 2	62.93%	37.07%	0.00%	0.00%		Fund 25	61.37%	24.73%	13.90%	0.00%
Fund 3	62.50%	34.08%	0.00%	3.42%		Fund 26	61.77%	27.77%	9.53%	0.93%
Fund 4	63.01%	36.99%	0.00%	0.00%		Fund 27	63.75%	26.32%	5.34%	4.59%
Fund 5	39.47%	10.43%	29.63%	20.47%		Fund 28	61.76%	28.53%	9.71%	0.00%
Fund 6	54.63%	25.03%	0.00%	20.34%		Fund 29	70.87%	24.85%	3.79%	0.49%
Fund 7	43.79%	31.94%	12.37%	11.90%		Fund 30	67.42%	32.58%	0.00%	0.00%
Fund 8	67.83%	26.81%	5.36%	0.00%		Fund 31	66.87%	27.50%	5.56%	0.07%
Fund 9	52.22%	33.57%	0.00%	14.21%		Fund 32	69.20%	30.80%	0.00%	0.00%
Fund 10	57.16%	29.63%	6.95%	6.26%		Fund 33	70.92%	28.23%	0.00%	0.85%
Fund 11	61.72%	25.92%	3.19%	9.17%		Fund 34	54.39%	36.31%	0.17%	9.13%
Fund 12	42.68%	52.51%	0.00%	4.81%		Fund 35	57.15%	37.05%	0.00%	5.80%
Fund 13	70.47%	29.53%	0.00%	0.00%		Fund 36	65.72%	34.18%	0.10%	0.00%
Fund 14	58.54%	27.15%	5.11%	9.20%		Fund 37	59.78%	28.91%	11.30%	0.01%
Fund 15	66.35%	33.65%	0.00%	0.00%		Fund 38	65.69%	33.27%	0.00%	1.04%
Fund 16	55.17%	26.81%	15.08%	2.94%		Fund 39	66.69%	33.31%	0.00%	0.00%
Fund 17	62.82%	22.68%	14.50%	0.00%		Fund 40	68.49%	31.51%	0.00%	0.00%
Fund 18	57.11%	42.89%	0.00%	0.00%		Fund 41	61.21%	26.31%	3.40%	9.08%
Fund 19	65.33%	34.67%	0.00%	0.00%		Fund 42	60.88%	39.12%	0.00%	0.00%
Fund 20	65.44%	32.88%	1.68%	0.00%		Fund 43	70.57%	29.43%	0.00%	0.00%
Fund 21	38.60%	49.48%	11.92%	0.00%		Fund 44	57.83%	39.45%	2.72%	0.00%
Fund 22	74.12%	25.88%	0.00%	0.00%		Fund 45	60.45%	22.96%	7.43%	9.16%
Fund 23	65.13%	34.87%	0.00%	0.00%						

Investment Performance

Table 3 lists investment returns for survey respondents over the one, three, five and ten year periods ending September 30, 2005. For comparison purposes, a benchmark of 60% of the Wilshire 5000 index and 40% of the Lehman Brothers Aggregate index returned 9.9% for the one year, 12.7% for the three years, 2.9% for the five years and 8.8% for the ten years ended September 30, 2005.

Table 3

	One Year	Three Years	Five Years	Ten Years		One Year	Three Years	Five Years	Ten Years	
Fund 1	19.76%	17.04%	7.82%	12.62%		Fund 24	14.46%	13.44%	4.66%	6.71%
Fund 2	8.64%	11.52%	4.37%	8.11%		Fund 25	17.53%	14.38%	3.72%	7.01%
Fund 3	12.52%	9.17%	1.99%	7.47%		Fund 26	11.03%	16.00%	5.22%	10.69%
Fund 4	11.58%	12.91%	4.65%	8.57%		Fund 27	11.56%	12.13%	1.44%	4.82%
Fund 5	19.08%	15.33%	6.22%	10.28%		Fund 28	15.34%	14.77%	5.14%	NA
Fund 6	17.56%	18.52%	5.00%	9.94%		Fund 29	16.04%	12.98%	6.19%	NA
Fund 7	19.55%	17.50%	5.40%	9.29%		Fund 30	11.45%	13.61%	0.91%	NA
Fund 8	14.39%	15.17%	3.55%	9.20%		Fund 31	14.87%	14.81%	5.00%	9.73%
Fund 9	13.42%	13.23%	4.42%	9.81%		Fund 32	12.31%	12.93%	2.74%	11.10%
Fund 10	10.82%	12.97%	2.48%	8.58%		Fund 33	12.38%	12.97%	2.30%	9.58%
Fund 11	17.45%	14.88%	6.36%	10.37%		Fund 34	11.93%	12.71%	3.18%	6.97%
Fund 12	10.96%	8.79%	-0.03%	6.06%		Fund 35	10.55%	12.83%	5.08%	9.53%
Fund 13	11.80%	13.27%	3.59%	8.88%		Fund 36	10.52%	10.54%	4.53%	NA
Fund 14	17.39%	15.58%	6.78%	10.84%		Fund 37	16.43%	17.73%	5.15%	9.43%
Fund 15	15.38%	14.75%	6.52%	9.56%		Fund 38	7.89%	9.54%	-0.10%	8.87%
Fund 16	17.50%	19.30%	4.60%	10.25%		Fund 39	11.23%	13.67%	4.60%	8.21%
Fund 17	20.52%	17.60%	8.28%	7.84%		Fund 40	13.95%	14.20%	4.83%	8.85%
Fund 18	10.36%	12.03%	4.51%	8.61%		Fund 41	17.10%	15.25%	7.12%	11.90%
Fund 19	12.92%	15.25%	2.99%	NA		Fund 42	11.35%	13.20%	3.39%	8.01%
Fund 20	13.24%	13.05%	2.93%	9.63%		Fund 43	12.78%	13.15%	5.04%	NA
Fund 21	11.86%	9.64%	3.85%	7.51%		Fund 44	14.23%	12.51%	1.04%	NA
Fund 22	11.80%	13.27%	3.59%	8.88%		Fund 45	15.56%	17.61%	4.98%	9.46%
Fund 23	11.34%	13.26%	2.95%	NA						

Five Year Return versus Standard Deviation

Figure 4

For the Five Years Ending September 30, 2005




Figure 4 shows the five year return and standard deviation characteristics of the individual TEXPERS survey respondents versus two benchmarks. The first benchmark defines the four quadrants and is the Wilshire Public Funds Universe, provided by Wilshire Associates, Inc., which represents the returns of all Wilshire’s public fund clients. The second benchmark is a combination of 60% of the Wilshire 5000 equity index and 40% of the Lehman Brothers Aggregate fixed income index. Annualized return and standard deviation are based on quarterly returns for the period. Standard deviation is a measure of the dispersion or volatility of the quarterly returns around their average value.

The points representing the performance of the TEXPERS survey respondents are located in all four quadrants of the chart. Fourteen respondents are located in the most desirable northwest quadrant, indicating higher returns with less standard deviation than the benchmark. Twenty-five respondents are located in the northeast or southwest quadrants, indicating reasonable return versus standard deviation trade-offs. That is, they have either a higher return with a higher standard deviation, or a lower return with a lower standard deviation, than the benchmark. Six respondents are located in the least desirable southeast quadrant, where return is lower and standard deviation is higher than the benchmark.

Ten Year Return versus Standard Deviation

Figure 5

For the Ten Years Ending September 30, 2005




Figure 5 shows the ten year return and standard deviation characteristics of the individual TEXPERS survey respondents versus two benchmarks. The first benchmark defines the four quadrants and is the Wilshire Public Funds Universe, provided by Wilshire Associates, Inc., which represents the returns of all Wilshire’s public fund clients. The second benchmark is a combination of 60% of the Wilshire 5000 equity index and 40% of the Lehman Brothers Aggregate fixed income index. Annualized return and standard deviation are based on quarterly returns for the period. Standard deviation is a measure of the dispersion or volatility of the quarterly returns around their average value.

The points representing the performance of the TEXPERS survey respondents are located in all four quadrants of the chart. Seven respondents are located in the most desirable northwest quadrant, indicating higher returns with less standard deviation than the benchmark. Twenty-six respondents are located in the northeast or southwest quadrants, indicating reasonable return versus standard deviation trade-offs. That is, they have either a higher return with a higher standard deviation, or a lower return with a lower standard deviation, than the benchmark. Four respondents are located in the least desirable southeast quadrant, where return is lower and standard deviation is higher than the benchmark.

Appendix 1

Investment Return Survey of TEXPERS Defined Benefit Plans

Fund Name: _____
 Prepared by _____
 Title of Preparer: _____
 Voice/Fax/EMail: _____ / _____
 E-mail Address: _____

Market Value Data (dollars)

Please provide market values as of September 30, 2005. These do not have to be audited numbers as custodial market values are sufficient. However, please do not change asset classes.

Asset Class	Market Value
Equity (incl. US & Non-US, Emerging Mkt.)	
Fixed Income (incl. Global Fixed, STIF, Cash)	
Real Estate (incl. Direct and REITS)	
Other (i.e. Private Equity, Alternatives, etc.)	
Total Plan	

Total Fund Rates of Return (Percents)

All returns must be actual total fund quarterly returns and should not be annualized. The returns must include both income & changes in market value; income yields alone are not sufficient. If your fund WAS in last year's report only the four quarters ending Sep. 30, 2005 are required:

Quarter Ended =>	Mar. 31	Jun. 30	Sep. 30	Dec. 31
2005				-----
2004	-----	-----	-----	

If your fund WAS NOT in last year's performance report, you will need to provide actual (not annualized) quarterly returns for **at least the trailing five years**:

Quarter Ended =>	Mar. 31	Jun. 30	Sep. 30	Dec. 31
2005				-----
2004				
2003				
2002				
2001				
2000				
1999				
1998				
1997				

Actuarial Investment Return Assumption: _____

OK to identify fund by name in the performance report (circle one): YES NO

Appendix 2

List of TEXPERS Survey Respondents

Abilene Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Amarillo Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Ark-Tex Council of Governments Money Purchase Pension Plan *
Austin Employees' Retirement System
Austin Fire Fighters Relief & Retirement Fund
Austin Police Retirement System
Barton Springs/Edwards Aquifer Conservation District *
Beaumont Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Big Spring Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Conroe Fire Fighters' Retirement Fund
Corpus Christi Fire Fighters' Retirement System
Dallas Area Rapid Transit Retirement Plan Defined Benefit
Dallas Employees' Retirement Fund
Dallas Police & Fire Pension System
Dallas Police & Fire Supplemental Pension Plan
Denison Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
El Paso City Employees' Pension Fund
El Paso Firemen & Policemen's Pension Fund
Floresville Electric Light & Power System *
Fort Worth Employees' Retirement Fund
Galveston Employees' Retirement Fund
Galveston Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Galveston Pension Plan for Police
Greater Texoma Utility Authority Retirement Plan *
Greenville Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Harlingen Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Houston Municipal Employees Pension System
Houston Police Officers' Pension System
Irving Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Killeen Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Laredo Firefighters Retirement System
Longview Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Lower Colorado River Authority Retirement Plan & Trust
Lubbock Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Lufkin Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund *
McAllen Firemen's Pension Fund
Metropolitan Transit Auth. of Harris County- Non-Union Pension Plan
Metropolitan Transit Auth. Transport Workers- Union Pension Plan-Local 260, AFL-CIO
Midland Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Odessa Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Orange Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Paris Firefighters' Relief and Retirement Fund
Plainview Fireman's Relief & Retirement Fund *
Plano Retirement Security Plan *
San Antonio City Public Service Pension Plan
San Antonio Fire and Police Pension Fund
Startran, Inc. Retirement Plan *
Sweetwater Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
Temple Firemen's Pension Fund *
Texarkana Firemen's Relief and Pension Fund
Tyler Firefighters Relief and Retirement Fund
University Park Firefighters Relief and Retirement Fund
VIA Metropolitan Transit Retirement Plan
Waxahachie Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund

* Responded, but was unable to provide sufficient data for inclusion in the report.

Appendix 3

Respondent Fund Number - Name Cross Reference

Number	Name
34	Abilene Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
33	Amarillo Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
8	Austin Employees' Retirement System
31	Austin Fire Fighters Relief & Retirement Fund
5	Austin Police Retirement System
39	Beaumont Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
41	Big Spring Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
28	Conroe Fire Fighters' Retirement Fund
4	Corpus Christi Fire Fighters' Retirement System
37	Dallas Employees' Retirement Fund
17	Denison Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
40	El Paso City Employees' Pension Fund
15	El Paso Firemen & Policemen's Pension Fund
45	Fort Worth Employees' Retirement Fund
32	Galveston Employees' Retirement Fund
43	Galveston Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
2	Galveston Pension Plan for Police
12	Greenville Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
11	Harlingen Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
7	Houston Municipal Employees Pension System
6	Houston Police Officers' Pension System
19	Irving Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
38	Longview Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
18	Lower Colorado River Authority Retirement Plan & Trust
20	Lubbock Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
9	McAllen Firemen's Pension Fund
22	Metro. Transit Auth. of Harris County- Non-Union Pension Plan
13	Metro. Transit Auth. Transport Workers- Union Pension Plan-Local 260, AFL-CIO
1	Odessa Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
3	Orange Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
21	Paris Firefighters' Relief and Retirement Fund
14	Sweetwater Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund
29	Texarkana Firemen's Relief and Pension Fund
25	University Park Firefighters Relief and Retirement Fund
35	VIA Metropolitan Transit Retirement Plan
30	Waxahachie Firemen's Relief & Retirement Fund