From:	ray.fair@yale.edu
To:	"Nurse-Goodison, Margaret"
Subject:	FW: CHRO meeting
Date:	Wednesday, October 15, 2025 4:40:41 PM

From: nordhaus <william.nordhaus@yale.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 5:56 PM
To: ray.fair@yale.edu
Subject: Re: CHRO meeting

We can talk if you want early next week.

Here are short answers:

A. The "code" for suspending contributions goes through several steps. The most important are that all of the following are necessary but not sufficient:

1. Having reached normal retirement age (70)

2. Years of service

3. Calculated replacement rate > target.

The calculation of 1 and 2 are from you. The third is where the "hypothetical" comes in. Actually, the correct word is "formulaic" in the sense that a general formula is used rather than one that is specific to you. That is, the calculation of the replacement rate is based on the AAUP salary (not yours) and the yield of a particular portfolio (50:50 TIAA/CREF) not yours.

In some cases, the final condition is age (my case). In others, it was #2 or #3 (I think yours was #2 but not sure). However, that is a distraction because all three are necessary. But use of #1 is unlawful under CT and US law.

B. I don't think there is any point in bringing up why Yale restarted because that is speculation and of no relevance for the earlier discrimination.

C. ANother way to put it is that if you had satisfied #2 and #3 but were 63 years old, your benefits would NOT have been suspended, which shows the impact of age discrimination. That was my case (although not 63).

Bill

On 4/10/2024 4:34 PM, ray.fair@yale.edu wrote:

Bill,

I have a CHRO meeting next Wednesday. Is the main point that age was used when Yale started to consider stopping contributions? Is the complicated way Yale using hypotheticals decided to stop not really relevant or necessary to bring up? Should I bring up that Yale probably decided to begin contributions again because it likely realized that it was engaging in age discrimination? Any other things to bring up?

Ray