

W. G. Blodgett, Executive Secretary

Maine State Retirement System

May 18, 1976

Donald G. Alexander, Deputy

DGA/ec

Attorney General

Participating District Personnel Rules and Applicability under M.S.R.S.

Your memorandum of April 29, 1976, poses two questions regarding potential statutory conflicts with local personnel rules.

Question 1: Is there any statutory conflict between the retirement law and a local district proposing a personnel rule which would make retirement mandatory at age 55 for employees of the local district? There would appear to be a conflict between a local requirement compelling employees to retire at 55 and the retirement law. Pursuant to the retirement law a member in normal service could not begin receiving payments until age 60. The result of forcing a person to retire at age 55 would be a fiveyear gap before that person was eligible to receive benefits under current law (5 M.R.S.A. § 1121-1). If these benefits were the only retirement benefits available to the employee, the mandatory 55-year retirement age would create a rather unconscionable result for the enployee. By the provisions of 5 M.R.S.A. § 1092, local districts join the M.S.R.S. on the state's terms. One of those terms is a 60-year retirement age. Thus, the first question is answered in the affirmative.

Question 2: Is there any statutory conflict with a local district adopting a personnel rule which excludes employees from membership in the Maine State Retirement System until attainment of age 25. Title 5 M.R.S.A. § 1092-5 specifically requires that all employees of a participating local district, except those exempted for certain limited reasons, be members of the Maine State Retirement System. Considering this provision, a local district cannot exclude employees of any age from membership in the Maine State Retirement System solely on the basis of age.

> DONALD G. ALEXANDER Deputy Attorney General