MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

PENSION & HEALTH BENEFITS COMMITTEE

OPEN SESSION

ROBERT F. CARLSON AUDITORIUM

LINCOLN PLAZA NORTH

400 P STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2016 9:46 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER LICENSE NUMBER 10063

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

- Ms. Priya Mathur, Chairperson
- Mr. Michael Bilbrey, Vice Chairperson
- Mr. John Chiang, represented by Mr. Grant Boyken
- Mr. Rob Feckner
- Mr. Richard Gillihan, represented by Ms. Katie Hagen
- Ms. Dana Hollinger
- Mr. Henry Jones
- Ms. Betty Yee, represented by Mr. Alan Lofaso

BOARD MEMBERS:

- Mr. Richard Costigan
- Mr. J.J. Jelincic
- Mr. Ron Lind
- Mr. Bill Slaton

STAFF:

- Ms. Anne Stausboll, Chief Executive Officer
- Mr. Matt Jacobs, General Counsel
- Ms. Donna Lum, Deputy Executive Officer
- Mr. Doug McKeever, Deputy Executive Officer
- Mr. Alan Milligan, Chief Actuary
- Ms. Mary Anne Ashley, Chief, Legislative Affairs Division
- Dr. Kathy Donneson, Chief, Health Plan Administration

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF:

- Mr. Gary McCollum, Senior Life Actuary
- Ms. Renee Ostrander, Chief, Employer Account Management Division
- Ms. Karen Pales, Assistant Chief, Health Policy Research Division
- Ms. Cheree Swedensky, Committee Secretary

ALSO PRESENT:

- Mr. Tim Behrens, California State Retirees
- Ms. Beth Capell, Health Access California
- Ms. Sara Flocks, California Labor Federation
- ${\tt Ms.}$ Megan Gamble, Californians Against the Misleading ${\tt Rx}$ Measure
- Mr. Rand Martin, AIDS Healthcare Foundation
- Ms. Teresa Stark, Kaiser Permanente
- Dr. Richard Sun, Medical Consultant to the Board

	I N D E X		
		PAGE	
1.	Call to Order and Roll Call	1	
2.	Executive Report(s)	2	
3.	Consent Items Action Consent Items: a. Approval of the May 17, 2016, Pension and Health Benefits Committee Meeting Minutes	7	
4.	Consent Items Information Consent Items: a. Annual Calendar Review b. Draft Agenda for September 20, 2016, Pension and Health Benefits Committee Meeting c. Federal Health Care Policy Representatives Update d. Federal Retirement Policy Representatives Update e. 2017 Association Plan Rates	8	
Action Agenda Items			
5.	Approval of the 2017 Health Maintenance Organization Plan Rates	8	
6.	Approval of the 2017 Preferred Provider Organization Plan Rates	11	
7.	Legislation a. Senate Bill 1010 (Hernandez) Prescription Drug Cost Transparency	13	
Information Agenda Items			
8.	State Annuitant Contribution Formula	19	
9.	Long-Term Care Third-Party Administrator Procurement Strategy	20	
10.	Drug Price Relief Act	22	
11.	Financial Literacy Update	3 4	
12.	The California Public Employees' Pension Reform Act - An Update Since Implementation	41	

INDEX CONTINUED	PAGE	
13. Summary of Committee Direction	51	
14. Public Comment	52	
Adjournment	5 4	
Reporter's Certificate		

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Good morning, everyone. I'm going to call the Pension and Health Benefits Committee open session to order. First order of business is roll call.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY SWEDENSKY: Priya Mathur?

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: I'm here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY SWEDENSKY: Michael Bilbrey?

VICE CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Good morning.

10 | COMMITTEE SECRETARY SWEDENSKY: Grant Boyken for

John Chiang?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

16

18

19

23

12 ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER BOYKEN: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY SWEDENSKY: Rob Feckner?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Good morning.

15 | COMMITTEE SECRETARY SWEDENSKY: Katie Hagen for

Richard Gillihan?

17 ACTING BOARD MEMBER HAGEN: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY SWEDENSKY: Dana Hollinger?

COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Here.

20 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SWEDENSKY: Henry Jones?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Here.

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SWEDENSKY: Theresa Taylor?

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Excused.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SWEDENSKY: Alan Lofaso for

25 | Betty Yee?

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER LOFASO: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: And please also note for the record that Mr. Jelincic, Mr. Slaton, and Mr. Lind are in attendance.

All right. Let's move on to Agenda Item number 2, the Executive Reports.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: Thank you,
Madam Chair, members of the Committee. Doug McKeever,
Calpers staff. Before I make mine, Donna would like to
make a few opening comments as well.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Good morning, Ms. Lum.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUM: There we go. Good morning. Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the Committee. Donna Lum, CalPERS staff. I have 2 brief items that I'd like to give you an update on this morning. The first is related to our on-line health plan statement and our open enrollments. If you recall each month, I provided a brief update on the status and the engagement that we've had to ensure that our members are receiving communication about the changes. We continue to partner with our retiree stakeholders to prepare our members for this year's open enrollment, as well as the on-line health plan statements. And just for reference, open enrollment this year runs from September 12th through October 7th.

membership regarding the changes. And just to give you some insights of some of the more recent communications, we have a dedicated website -- webpage on our website, which has had over 4,000 members view the new changes since it went on-line during the first month. We've also had 7 social media updates since July 1st. And more recently, we had one on June 3rd. We have 7 additional social media updates planned before July 1st.

In addition, RPEA, one of our retiree organizations has done 5 social media posts on the on-line health plan statements to date, and our other partner, CSR, has included an article about it in their May newsletter. This month we had a message of the month on the retiree warrants at the bottom of the warrants reminding them of the July 1st deadline to opt in to mail. And as of last week, we've had about 87,000 subscribers, or 13 percent, of our subscribers opt to mail.

Next month, we'll be sending out a colorful brochure mailer to all of our members who will receive their health plan statement on-line to remind them how to access their information on-line. It will have all of the information to do so. And in the fall edition of PERSpectives issued in September, we'll also then provide additional information on open enrollment.

So again, things are progressing smoothly.

Again, we continue to look at various ways and options to engage and ensure that the members are receiving this information.

The second update is related to our CalPERS
Benefit Education Event, which was held on May 20th and
21st in Redding. And once again, this was a very well
attended event. At the same time that the event was
taking place on Friday the 20th, we had an executive
employer visit. Several of the executive staff were
meeting with employers in the northern area. And during
that meeting, they expressed their thanks and appreciation
to CalPERS for bringing the CBEE event up into the Redding
area.

Our executive staff were able to stop by and visit with the staff and mingle with the members at this CBEE. And it's always enlightening to see how engaged our staff are during these events with our members.

The Redding CBEE was the last of the events for this fiscal year. However, the next one will be held in July. Last month, during Board and Committee meetings, we provided an update indicating that the July CBEE, which is being held in Los Angeles, was scheduled for July 22nd and 23rd, those dates were incorrect. The actual date for the Los Angeles CBEE is July 15th and 16th.

We've ensured that all the communication that is

promoting the CBEE in Los Angeles has the correct dates, and we've taken some additional efforts to push out information to employers and members within those -- that area to ensure that they have the corrected dates.

So those are the two brief updates that I wanted to provide. And I'm available to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you, Donna. And thank you for -- to RPEA and CSR, our partners, around getting the word out to our members around open enrollment. So thanks for all those efforts.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: Thank you,
Madam Chair. I have just two updates for the Committee
this morning. Obviously, we have a very lengthy agenda
today. And there's some pretty important items on there,
so I'm going to be brief in my comments today.

The first is that I'm extremely pleased to announce that we've hired Sherry Little, as our new Chief for the Health Policy and Research Division, which was my former position. Sherry comes from us -- comes to us from the greater Sacramento Area Economic Council. She brings over 10 years of executive level experience working for a very diverse 57-member board. So if you thought we had challenges with 13, you can imagine what she's been -- has dealt with with 57. She oversees the organization

6

```
1
    strategic planning, policy development, data analytics,
    and finance and marketing divisions. She also has worked
 2
 3
    for the State of California in several areas, including
 4
    budgets, program management, and legislation.
5
    begins officially with us on July the 27th, but she was
6
    kind enough to show up this morning, so that we could
7
    introduce you to her. So with that, Sherry, if you'd
8
   please stand.
9
             CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Welcome, Sherry.
10
             (Applause.)
             DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: Ms. Lum just
11
12
   noted that for the record I may have said July 27th.
                                                           It's
13
    actually June 27th.
14
             CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Great. We're having a
15
    little trouble with --
             DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: Sherry, did
16
17
   you take note of that?
18
             (Laughter.)
             DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: You don't get
19
20
   an extra month.
21
             (Laughter.)
22
             DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: Lastly, Madam
23
    Chair, I want to mention we seem to be in procurement
24
    season all the time. As you know, we just completed our
```

solicitation for the pharmacy benefit manager.

25

mentioned last month in a report by Ms. Donneson, we're launching one for long-term care. And today, I'm bringing to your attention, we are now launching a third solicitation, and that is for our Health Care Decision Support System, better known as our data warehouse.

So again, I just wanted to call this out for the Committee's awareness that we'll be launching that particular process. The current contract ends in 2018, and so we're going to be starting that process in earnest. We're going to use the same solicitation process that we used on the PBM because it was so successful. And certainly, as we roll this out, we'll be bringing more information to the Committee for its awareness.

Madam Chair, that concludes my comments for this morning.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Okay. Thank you. I have no requests from the Committee, so we will move on to Agenda Item number 3, the action consent items, approval of the minutes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Move approval.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Second.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Moved by Bilbrey, seconded by Jones.

Any discussion on the motion?

25 | Seeing none.

2.4

All those in favor say aye?

2 (Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: All those opposed?

4 Motion passes.

Agenda Item 4 are the information consent items.

I've had no requests to take anything up.

So we'll move on to Agenda Item number 5, Approval of the 2017 Health Maintenance Organization Plan Rates.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Again, Doug McKeever, CalPERS staff. Before I pass this on to Kathy, I just want to make a couple of opening comments relative to the 2017 rates that are before you this morning for your approval. It has been a lengthy process since we began this early in 2017, January to be specific. So this is a very lengthy process that we go through as you all know on a regular basis. A lot of work has been done to go into this process. And we're pleased with where we are at relative to moving into '17.

I do want to note that we did run out of copies in the back of the room. And so for those in the audience who were not able to get a copy, we are having those made, and hopefully we'll have those back in the back of the room shortly.

And then secondarily, for those who are unable to

attend this morning, we have posted, or they are being posted right now, to the web the agenda items, so folks who either are viewing this on the web or could access it via our on-line systems will have the agenda items for their use and their review.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Great. Thank you.

Ms. Donneson.

HEALTH PLAN ADMINISTRATION DIVISION CHIEF

DONNESON: Madam Chair, members of the Pension and Health

Benefits Committee, Agenda Item number 5 provides the

Committee with the final Health Maintenance Organization

premiums for calendar year 2017 for the Anthem Blue Cross,

Blue Shield of California, Health Net, Kaiser Permanente,

Sharp Health Plan, and UnitedHealthcare basic HMO plans

and Kaiser and United Medicare Advantage plans

single-party rates, as well as the basic and Medicare

rates for the contracting agencies.

These recommended rates include the following:

Members in the Blue Shield NetValue plan will automatically be enrolled into Access+, since Blue Shield will not be providing the NetValue plan in 2017. Members may opt out or opt to change plans during open enrollment.

Approve the health plan request for HMO specific county expansions as outlined in the agenda item; adopt the following benefit designs or changes; implement the

Centers for Disease Control Diabetic Prevention Program, which is recommended by the California Department of Health Care Services.

This clarification to the existing contract requirements will come at no additional cost to CalPERS. Authorize Kaiser to offer a dental benefit rider to contracting agency members enrolled in the Medicare plan, which the member can purchase directly from Kaiser; add the Silver and Fit benefit to the Kaiser Medicare Advantage Plan.

This concludes my presentation. I'm happy to answer any questions, after which we request the Board take action on the HMO premiums and related requests contained in Agenda Item number 5.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you very much, Ms. Donneson.

Any questions from the Committee?
Mr. Bilbrey.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Thank you, Madam
Chair. Again, I want to thank the staff for all the hard
work on putting this together for this year. While it is
a significant improvement, we still have much work to do,
as we have discussed previously. But with that, I want to
move that the Pension and Health Benefits Committee
approve the proposed 2017 Health Maintenance Organization,

```
1
   HMO, rates for Anthem Blue Cross, Blue Shield of
    California, Health Net of California, Kaiser Permanente,
 2
    Sharp Health Plan, and UnitedHealthcare and Medicare
 3
 4
    Advantage rates for Kaiser Permanente and
5
    UnitedHealthcare.
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER BOYKEN:
6
                                               Second.
7
             CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Motion made by Bilbrey,
8
    seconded by Boyken.
9
             Any discussion on the motion?
10
             Seeing none.
11
             All those in favor say aye?
12
             (Ayes.)
13
             CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: All opposed?
14
             Motion passes.
15
             Agenda Item 6.
16
             HEALTH PLAN ADMINISTRATION DIVISION CHIEF
17
               Madam Chair and members of the Pension and
   Health Benefits Committee, Agenda Item number 6 provides
18
    the Committee with final 2017 Anthem Exclusive Provider
19
20
    Organization basic plan premiums and the final 2017 PERS
21
    Choice, PERS Select, and PERSCare basic and supplement to
22
   Medicare plan premiums. Both State and contracting agency
23
    rates are provided. Staff requests that the Board approve
24
    the following benefits:
```

Continue the Castlight on-line health care

25

pricing transparency tool for the CalPERS basic PPO plans, continue the Welvie on-line tool for the PPO plans.

This concludes my presentation. I am happy to answer any questions, after which I respectfully request approval of these rates.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you.

Mr. Bilbrey.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I move the Pension and Health Benefits Committee, approve the proposed 2017 rates for the Anthem Exclusive Provider Organization, EPO, PERS Choice, PERS Select, and PERSCare Preferred Provider Organization health plans as contained in this agenda item.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER BOYKEN: Second

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Motion made by Bilbrey,

17 | seconded by Boyken.

Any discussion on the motion?

19 Seeing none.

All those in favor say aye?

21 (Ayes.)

22 CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: All opposed?

Motion passes. Thank you very much, Ms.

24 Donneson.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

18

20

23

25

Okay. That will bring us to Agenda Item number

8 -- I'm sorry, number 7, Legislation. Ms. Ashley, good morning.

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF ASHLEY: Good morning. Good morning, Madam Chair, and members of the Committee. Mary Anne Ashley, Calpers staff. I'm presenting Agenda Item 7a, which is an action item. The complete and detailed analysis of SB 1010 is included in your Board materials, so I'm going to highlight a few of the provisions that are included in the bill.

SB 1010 by Senator Hernandez would require health plans and health insurers that report rate information to the Department of Managed Health Care the California Department of Insurance to also include specified information relating to prescription drug spending, including the 25 most frequently prescribed drugs, the 25 most costly drugs by total plan spending, and the 25 drugs with the highest year over year increase in spending.

The measure requires the Department of Managed
Health Care and the Department of Insurance to compile the
submitted information into a report for the public and the
legislature that demonstrates the overall impact of drug
costs on health care premiums, to publish the report on
its website, and to include the report as part of the
public meeting required under the existing large group
rates review law.

Additionally, SB 1010 requires large group health plans as part of their annual filing of information for rate changes to include information on the share of premiums and increases in premiums that are attributable to prescription drug costs, and the specialty drug tier formulary list.

The measure also imposes specified notice and justification requirements on drug manufacturers, including requiring drug manufacturers to notify each State purchaser, health care service plan, health insurer, PBM, and various State legislative committees in writing when increasing the wholesale acquisition cost of a branded prescription drug by more than 10 percent or by more than \$10,000, when increasing the wholesale acquisition cost of a generic prescription drug with a wholesale acquisition cost of \$100 or more per monthly supply, or by more than 25 percent during any 12-month period; and when introducing a new prescription drug to market, at a wholesale acquisition cost of \$10,000 or more annually or per course of treatment.

The measure imposes additional reporting requirements for drug manufacturers as specified regarding price increases or new high cost drugs coming to the market. Drug manufacturers not in compliance with the notification requirements would be assessed a \$1,000 per

day fine for failure to report the required information within the specified time frames.

And the measure also requires the legislature to conduct an annual public hearing regarding aggregate trends in prescription drug pricing. CalPERS currently contracts with the PBM, which negotiates with drug manufacturers to secure the most favorable drug prices and rebates. And CalPERS already receives some of the proposed reporting information required by the bill to be disclosed.

The Bill requires the disclosure of pricing and utilization data on drug prices to purchasers, policymakers, and public to enable policymakers to better evaluate possible cost-containment measures and efforts in the future. And if enacted, SB 1010 could provide CalPERS with additional information and provide more transparency in drug costs, and the resultant impact on health care premiums and affordability.

Staff is recommending a support position on this measure, and I am happy to answer any questions.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you.

Are there any questions from the Committee at this time?

We do have several members of the public who wish

to speak on this item, so I'll call them now.

Beth Capell, Sara Flocks, and Teresa Stark. If you could please make your way up here to the 2 seats on the left. The mics have been turned on, and you will have -- if you could please identify yourself and your affiliation for the record, and you'll have 3 minutes in which to speak.

MS. CAPELL: Of course. Beth Capell on behalf of Health Access California. We're pleased to co-sponsor this measure with the California Federation of Labor, and to have the support of a long list of other organizations, which your analysis reflects.

As your staff has accurately reflected the bill, it would provide advanced notice before the price of an existing drug went up 60 days, so that you would have the opportunity to plan for your budget, and also adjust your formulary, take other steps. You and other purchasers would have that opportunity.

And it also builds on a series of bills that you have supported in the past to provide additional disclosure about increases in prescription drug costs.

And for that reason, we would -- are pleased to support the staff's recommendation.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you, Ms. Capell.

Ms. Flocks.

MS. FLOCKS: Madam Chair, members, Sara Flocks from the California Labor Federation. We represent 1,200 affiliates that both negotiate and purchase health benefits for 2 million union members in the State. And we see SB 1010 as giving purchasers another tool, just one more tool that we can use in order -- in our ongoing strategies to try to contain health care costs.

This is part of an ongoing series of bills that we have sponsored and we've been pleased to have CalPERS support into increased transparency, specifically for those of us that need -- have to negotiate with various parts of the health care industry, so that we can contain costs and keep down premiums for our members. And we support the recommendation, ask for your support, and thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you very much, Ms. Flocks.

Ms. Stark.

MS. STARK: Thank you, Madam Chair and members. Teresa Stark on behalf of Kaiser Permanente. We are in strong support of SB 1010, and we support the staff recommendation today and very much appreciate you considering the item today. I will echo the comments of my colleagues. This bill is a modest step to help us

begin to understand what is driving the price increases in pharmaceuticals. As you well know, Kaiser Permanente is very concerned about the impact of pharmaceutical costs on our affordability imperative, and we hope that this is a first step to begin to understand and provide some information, so that purchasers, public and private purchasers, can better manage those costs and plan and prepare for the trend that we are seeing.

And I will note we are part of this remarkable coalition. We don't always -- as you well know, we don't always agree with the individuals who were here before, but we are very pleased to be in agreement with them today and urge your support of the staff recommendation.

Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you very much, Ms.

16 Stark.

Mr. Feckner.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Is a motion in order,

Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Yes, please.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Then I will move that the Committee take a -- recommend a support position to the full board on Senate Bill SB 1010, because it will provide greater transparency on prescription drug costs.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you. Motion made by Feckner, seconded by Bilbrey.

I think that that is yet another important step in our efforts -- our ongoing efforts to shine sunlight on an area of health care which is a significant driver of the costs for our members. And its -- this is an area that we're going to continue to have focus on in our own internal efforts, but this is an important bill that helps the entire health care purchaser arena.

Okay. With that, I see no further requests to speak. So on the motion, all those in favor say aye?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: All opposed?

Motion passes. Thank you very much.

We'll move on to Agenda Item number 8, State Annuitant Contribution Formula. Ms. Donneson.

HEALTH PLAN ADMINISTRATION DIVISION CHIEF

DONNESON: Madam Chair, members of the Pension and Health

Benefits Committee, Agenda Item number 8 provides the

State Annuitant Contribution Formula.

The State annuitant contribution amounts are proposed for the 2017 premium rates and are provided in the attachment to this agenda item. Government Code 22871 sets forth that the employer contribution for health benefits for State employees and annuitants shall be based

on the principle of a weighted average of the premiums of the 4 largest health benefit plans.

The 4 largest health benefit plans for 2017 are Kaiser Permanente, Blue Shield Access+, UnitedHealthcare, and the PERS Choice Preferred Provider Organization.

With that, I ask you to -- or this is an information item. With that, I conclude my remarks and I'm happy to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you very much.

Any questions from the Committee?

Seeing none.

We can move on to Agenda Item number 9, Long-Term Care Third-Party Administrator Procurement Strategy.

HEALTH PLAN ADMINISTRATION DIVISION CHIEF

DONNESON: Agenda Item number 9, Madam Chair and members
of the Committee, outlines the solicitation and
competitive negotiation approach for the long-term care
procurement strategy. On March 16th, a Request for
Information for a long-term care third-party administrator
was released to solicit information from current long-term
care third-party administrators about the services they
plot -- provide currently or in contemplating providing in
the future.

CalPERS specified areas of interest and received responses from 8 companies, which are identified on page 2

of this agenda item, and a summary of the responses is provided as Attachment 1.

Within this agenda item, we outlined the long-term care solicitation and competitive negotiation approach, which is Similar to what we just accomplished with the pharmacy benefit management solicitation. A competitive negotiation permits the consideration of price, technical expertise, past performance, management, or other factors in assessing the most cost effective proposals.

The solicitation requires proposers to submit an offer that provides evidence of their ability to meet CalPERS requirements, to meet minimum qualifications, and technical, and financial requirements.

The structure and process is explained in attachment 2 of this agenda item. The anticipated release of phase 1 of the solicitation is mid-June, and phase 2 would be released in August with solicitation offers due in November 2016.

The process, staff procurement milestones, and timeline is further described in attachment 3 and 3a of this agenda item. The 5-year contract is effective January 1, 2018, and expires on December 31st, 2022. This concludes my presentation and I'm happy to answer questions.

```
1
             CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you. Any questions
    from the Committee?
 2
 3
             It seems like you're on the right path.
             Thank you.
 4
             HEALTH PLAN ADMINISTRATION DIVISION CHIEF
5
 6
    DONNESON:
               I believe I'm done now.
7
             DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: You are.
8
             (Laughter.)
9
             HEALTH PLAN ADMINISTRATION DIVISION CHIEF
10
   DONNESON:
               Thank you.
11
             CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you so much, Ms.
12
   Donneson.
13
             We'll move on now to Agenda Item number 10, Drug
14
    Price Relief Act.
15
             DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: Madam Chair,
16
    As Ms. Pales and Dr. Sun come up to the table, let me just
17
    set this up for you all. The initiative is on the
18
   November 2016 ballot. So just for any of you who might be
19
    aware of where it is or isn't, I just want to make sure
20
    that you're aware that it already has qualified and is
21
    going to be on the ballot. We thought it was important to
22
    bring for your attention today our analysis relative to
23
    the initiative and some of the good things about the
24
    initiative and some of the things that we'll point out to
```

you are tremendous challenges relative to implementation.

25

So the intent again today is to provide you with just that update, and certainly ask and entertain any questions that you may have. So with that, I'll turn it over to Ms. Pales.

HEALTH POLICY RESEARCH DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF PALES: Good morning.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: If you could turn on your microphone, please and move the mic in front of you.

HEALTH POLICY RESEARCH DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF PALES: Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the Committee. Karen Pales, Calpers staff.

As promised at last month's Pension and Health Benefits Committee meeting, we're providing an information item on the Drug Price Relief Act, which is an upcoming statewide initiative that will be part of November 2016 ballot.

This initiative aims to lower the price that

State agencies pay for prescription drugs by prohibiting
them from paying more than the U.S. Department of Veterans
Affairs pays for the same drugs.

Any attempt to lower drug prices that would have a positive impact on our overall drug spend is attractive, and the initiative's approach might possibly provide cost savings.

However, some of the potential outcomes, should

the initiative pass and become law, are difficult to predicts. CalPERS shares the Legislative Analyst's Office view that the overall fiscal effect is uncertain because it's unclear if the VA drug prices are publicly available, and how drug manufacturers might respond in the market if this measure were to be enacted.

In our agenda item, we provide a discussion of these uncertainties and also address other concerns and questions as well as these following items:

How might drug prices actually be impacted? What could this do to pharmacy benefit manager and health plan administration contracts? Will access to drugs be impacted? In what ways might we be challenged when trying to comply with the law's requirements and timelines?

The item discusses these possibilities in great detail. So for today, we'd like to share some specific thoughts about how the initiative might affect CalPERS members and CalPERS business processes in more tangible ways, and discuss how the initiative could create challenges for CalPERS contracts and provide a brief example of how the initiative might potentially affect CalPERS drug formulary design, and members access to certain drugs.

I'd like to introduce my colleague, Dr. Richard Sun, who will present these issues.

DR. SUN: Good morning. I will touch on contracting and formulary issues.

Potential effects on contracting.

We may need to amend contracts with Kaiser, Blue Shield, and OptumRx in response to the Act. For example, as stated in the agenda item, their confidential net price data would need to be transmitted quote, "to DHCS for comparison with the lowest net price paid by the VA", unquote. That process may take a few months after November 8. If all goes well, the less expensive drugs will start flowing to our members next year.

However, CalPERS staff predicts a rocky road ahead. It is our opinion that it is unlikely that the health plans and PBM can obtain the VA prices for all drugs, in which case CalPERS must obey the following provision in the Act: Quote, "The responsible State agency shall enter into additional agreements with drug manufacturers for further price reductions", unquote.

CalPERS has never done this before. Because of the phrase quote, "responsible State agency", unquote, we cannot simply ask our sister agencies, such as the Department of General Services, to do the agreements on our behalf. To negotiate directly with drug manufacturers, we would need to hire additional staff or divert staff from other parts of CalPERS to meet the quote

"No later than July 1, 2017" deadline.

Another hurdle is that the Act does not require manufacturers to enter into agreements with CalPERS to establish the VA pricing. If a drug manufacturer does not enter into an agreement with CalPERS, then CalPERS would not be in compliance with the Act. The Act is silent on what would happen in this circumstance. It merely states that the State entities required to implement and comply with the act no later than 7-1-17 and can adopt rules and regulations to implement its provisions and may seek waivers of federal law, rule, or regulation necessary to implement its provisions.

It is unlikely that such rules, regulations, and waivers could be completed by a 7-1-17 deadline. This creates an unknown risk to CalPERS.

Potential decreased access to drugs.

The Act does not compel manufacturers to offer VA prices to CalPERS. And as stated in the agenda item, this situation quote, "could cause difficult formulary choices", unquote.

Imagine this scenario, we or our health plans or PBM on our behalf requests that Novartis give us the lowest VA price for Afinitor, a tablet that is used for several cancers, including advanced breast cancer. This is, of course, assuming that we know the lowest VA net

price, which could be lower than the price that we can see on the VA website of about \$6,000 a month.

Novartis refuses. To avoid not being in compliance with the Act, we remove Afinitor from our formulary. Therefore, a member with advanced breast cancer, for whom Afinitor is medically necessary, may not have access to this drug through their Calpers coverage.

In conclusion, the stated purposes of the Act, such as quote, "To enable significant cost savings", unquote are noble and commendable. However, should the Act become law, CalPERS staff is concerned that compliance would be very difficult. Furthermore, the law may have adverse effects, not only for CalPERS members, but also for entities such as the Veterans Administration.

We're happy to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you very much.

Mr. Jones.

2.4

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair. What, if any, penalties may be forthcoming if we were not in compliance by the due date?

DR. SUN: There are no penalties specified in the law. However, it could subject us to lawsuits, for example.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And those lawsuits from the manufacturers, or from members, or from where?

DR. SUN: That is unknown. It is possible it could be all 3 sources.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: Mr. Jones, it could also be from the proponents of the initiative by which, if it were to pass, then they would say that we're out of compliance with the initiative. So it could also stem from some of those individuals and groups as well.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And the waiver process, you said it is unknown at this time?

DR. SUN: The Act would allow us to seek waivers. However, the chance of the federal government approving such waivers staff feels is low.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Thank you.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: Yeah. Mr. Jones, I think it's important to note that this is a statewide California Initiative, so there isn't anything that would require the federal government to either support and/or not support this particular initiative. And that's what makes this so challenging for us. And it's not just Calpers who's impacted by this, there are other State entities who find themselves in a similar situation, whereby the initiative's intent is genuine, as we've mentioned. If we can lower drug costs for our members, we're all for it. The implementation challenges are what are really perplexing to us and others. And

those were also called out in the LAO report that we included in the agenda item.

One final point that I would like to make on this is part of our due diligence. We did reach out to the Veterans Administration and had a conversation with them about the initiative in general terms. We didn't ask whether they're in support or opposition. We didn't feel that that was our place to ask them that particular question. But we did want to understand from their viewpoints some of the -- some of the impacts that they might get out of this, if it were to pass.

And I think what's instructive to note, which is also included in the agenda item, was back in 1990 when a budget bill was passed, which would have given certain other governmental entities the best price available from the manufacturers to any wholesaler or retailer of drugs, what happened with that is the manufacturers actually increased those drugs, and so the VA saw their prices actually go up, rather than go down. And in our conversations with them, they're concerned that a similar situation may result, if this initiative were to pass.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you. We do have 2 members of the public who wish to speak. Ms. Megan Gamble and Mr. Rand Martin, if you could please make your way to

the front to these 2 seats here on my left. The mics will be turned on for you. And if you could identify yourself and your affiliation for the record. You will each have 3 minutes to speak.

MS. GAMBLE: All right. I will go ahead.

Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Go ahead, Ms. Gamble.

MS. GAMBLE Thanks. Is my --

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Your mic is on.

MS. GAMBLE: Okay. Hello. My name is Megan Gamble, and I'm with the Californians Against the Misleading RX Measure. I'm here on behalf of a coalition that is diverse, including labor unions, patient advocacy organizations, health care, seniors, and other groups opposed to the prescription purchasing measure.

And as you have concerns, many of these organizations are concerned with prescription prices. However, they have taken a look at this initiative and looked closely and have found that it won't deliver on its promises. We thank your staff for their thoughtful analysis. And, you know, just wanted to repeat that the Legislative Analyst's Office has also found concerns with the measure as well, and came to similar conclusions.

They -- you know, this measure is going to be unworkable, and it could actually increase prescription

costs and reduce access to medications.

So thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you for your comments.

Mr. Martin.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Chair and members, Rand Martin on behalf of the AIDS Healthcare Foundation, the proponents of the Drug Price Relief Act.

Needless to say, we're pretty disappointed in the analysis. We find it is pretty one-sided. It starts off very well talking about how the initiative is very attractive and might probably -- or possibly generate cost savings, but that's the last nice thing that's said about the initiative for the remainder of the 5 pages.

It goes on in 2 primary paths relative to their reaction to it. Number 1 is relative to what might happen if the drug companies actually follow through on the threats that they've been making the last few months relative to this initiative, such as leaving the State of California, such as trying to raise drug prices at the VA, which, by the way, to finish the story that you just heard from the conversations with the VA, that 1990's situation ended up with Congress stepping in and protecting the VA. We believe that the drug companies cannot unilaterally go to the VA and increase the drug prices without going through Congress first.

Some of the other challenges that we've heard from staff are issues of implementation, not issues of policy, issues about the July 1st deadline for emergency regulations. There are always ways to deal with problems like that. If that's one of the biggest problems that the Calpers staff has, then I think we can find a way to work around deadlines, as long as the objective here is to get drug prices down.

The talk about limiting drugs on formularies, that would be a unilateral decision on the part of a State agency to use that as a way to affect the measure. And with all due respect to, you know, this very wonderful organization, we're really concerned that the response is more about the hard work that it would take to restructure what CalPERS does and how it implements its drug pricing strategies. We recognize that there are unique ways that this entity operates. But if the voters of California believe that the prices of drugs statewide are too high, that they're impacting the State of California and the ability of the State of California to actually provide fiscal -- responsible fiscal stewardship, then it's up to CalPERS and the other agencies to find ways to make that work.

We are so used to, in this state, legislators and others crafting very detailed laws. What we have done

here is actually putting forward to the voters a policy matter, a policy decision, and leaving it up to the State of California to figure out how to implement it.

2.4

The goal has been noted is worthy, and we think that you should be partnering with us to achieve that goal, rather than finding excuses for not -- for not implementing it.

I want to point out 2 quick things at the end.

One is that there's a provision in the measure that says,

"Only to the extent permitted by federal law". So if

there are problems with federal law, the initiative does

give the State some out --

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: I'm sorry your time has expired. Thank you for your comments.

We do have one member of the Committee who wishes to speak. Mr. Jelincic.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Can the first speaker restate her affiliation.

MS. GAMBLE: Sure. We are the Californians Against the Misleading Rx Measure. It's a coalition opposed to the initiative.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GAMBLE: Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you.

Any further discussion by the Committee or the

Board members?

Seeing none. I thank you. Thank you all for your presentation.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Okay. That brings us to Agenda Item number 11, Financial Literacy Update.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUM: Good morning again, Madam Chair, members of the Committee. Donna Lum, Calpers staff.

Agenda Item number 11 is an information item.

And today, I'm pleased to share with you our plans to enhance the education that we offer to our members related to financial literacy, and retirement security. So financial literacy is important, because it impacts the knowledge that may improve financial behaviors that are necessary for individuals to make sound financial decisions.

As you've no doubt scene, CalPERS offers quite a significant amount of information to our members regarding the benefits of our system. However, PEPRA brought changes to CalPERS benefit package, both in terms of what members pay into and what they expect to receive from the system.

Furthermore, our membership is changing. We've her a lot about the different generations and what generation -- what the different generations need in terms

of their ability to plan for their retirement. And younger members balance their careers and lives differently, and change is continuous as they oftentimes move jobs more frequently as well.

CalPERS is not alone in recognizing the need to raise financial awareness. In April of 2016, the Department of Treasury released its strategy to increase awareness of and access to effective financial education. Our plan is nicely aligned with this strategy. Here at CalPERS, we want to advance the conversation about what it takes to be ready for the golden years, and also raise our member's awareness of financial concepts, so that they can decide whether or not they need to save more money to achieve their financial goals and retirement.

This includes suggesting our members begin to consider potential new expenses going into retirement, things such as insurance, elderly parents, and when setting retirement goals in thinking about ways to protect quote, "their nest egg".

Staff has engaged external stakeholders, including representatives from active schools, State employees, peace officers, engineers, and retired associations. And we got quite a lot of feedback to consider as we go forward in our implementation.

Some of the feedback that we received is the need

to engage the early and mid-year career workforce. They also suggested that we develop specific events focused on financial awareness for younger members, and something that we can consider incorporating in our CBEEs. In addition to that, they strongly encourage that we use all of the methods of delivery -- delivering education that we use today, which includes on-line tools, instructor-led training, publications, as well as compute-based training.

We plan to do this over the next year by leveraging all of the existing outreach channels that we have, including social media, to educate our members on basic retirement plan information, including our defined benefit plan, our supplemental saving options, Social Security, and retirement health care.

We've also incorporated the financial literacy initiative into our 2015-17 business plan. And so future updates on this initiative will be included in the business plan updates that are provided to the Committee.

Before I conclude, I just wanted to take a moment to thank all of the staff that have been involved in the research and the planning for the implementation and roll-out that will begin in July of 2016. This was a widespread cross-divisional effort. Representatives from many different divisions came together and did a lot of research, looked at a lot of best practices, engaged with

our sister partner agencies, including CalHR and CalSTRS to look at and review what they've been doing in this area, and again to pick up best practices.

So again, I just wanted to take a moment to thank the staff that have been involved in this. And with that, I am available to answer any questions that you have.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you very much, Ms. Lum.

Mr. Boyken.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER BOYKEN: Thank you. Thanks for the update, Ms. Lum. A couple of years ago, you, or I think it might been Stacie Sormano's research group came out with this paper that showed for post-PEPRA employees kind of what they would need to do to catch up to the same benefit level as classic members. And I thought that was really great, and I like the work you're doing.

But I was wondering, in terms of our own supplemental income plans, have we thought about how to build features, you know, calculators that educate members, or even -- I mean, this is -- there's probably many barriers to this, but, you know, thinking about automatic enrollment or other features that can give people the nudge to save more?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUM: Yes. Those are

very good questions. And, in fact, that's part of the research that we're going to continue to do. We recognize that there are many financial institutions that have calculators that we could possibly link to and provide information to our members, so that they can go to these providers as needed for financial advice, which is not what we're providing this initiative. Just to be really clear, what we're providing is access to financial awareness -- or financial awareness.

We also are looking at the possibility of leveraging our partnership with our existing SIP vendor, as we know that they have partnered with other agencies to be able to provide some of the education and advice as well.

So those are all the things that we will continue to look at. Our immediate interest is taking the materials that we currently have and enhancing them by adding additional information that will lead to greater awareness. We do believe that there are additional tools that we can consider implementing in the feature. And it will just take some additional time and research to do that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you.

Mr. Costigan.

BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: Thank you, Madam

President -- or Madam Chair. I just want to say a shout out to CalHR. And I think, first of all, this is fascinating what you guys are doing. One is, I -- CalHR and the new Savings Plus website has a lot of this information on it. Part of it is understanding it. And I really do wish, and I commend this Committee and you, Ms. Lum, on trying to get ahead of this. Because as you approach retirement and as you start looking at savings, you don't realize what you should have been doing 20 or 25 years ago.

And I will have to say, on like the CalHR and the Savings Plus website, it's fascinating, but you're still a little bit of doing it yourself. And because I work and get to work with great people, I now understand it more. And I think as we're working towards financial literacy, it's really trying to understand.

Just one quick point. I was having a conversation. There's a radio talk show host, third most syndicated, who talks about financial planning, don't be in debt and all this. And he's always throwing out, oh, yeah, you should be able to get 7 percent. And sometimes I wish people would challenge him, because that is very difficult to achieve, particularly for an individual investor. And so I just, again, Ms. Mathur just want to praise you and Ms. Lum and CalHR, this is very important,

because I do think, as we've talked before, this is a pending crisis that's coming. People are not paying attention.

Every day I stress over the fact that the Schwab rule of withdrawal 4, earn 5, and I'm sitting there struggling figuring out how to earn 5, and not withdraw 4, and watch Mr. McKeever deal with rates, and suddenly you're really struggling. So I think this is a great, great priority. I just wanted to chime in.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you. Thank you.

I also agree that this is a very important effort. And it is very challenging to try to reach the younger generation who's just starting out their career. And I can't say that I have the answer for how to do that, but the earlier you start thinking about this -- we all know, the earlier you start thinking about this, and start planning, and acting, the easier it is in a way. So it's a very important effort, and I appreciate all the work that your team is doing.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUM: Thank you. One of the things that I would add is as part of our transformation, we've done a lot of work with regards to, what we call, event-triggered events, where we are proactively reaching out to different members at different

age groups to provide information that they should consider at various points in their career.

And one of the things that we've really taken note of during the CBEEs, the CalPERS Benefit Education Events, this past fiscal year is we had a very large attendance of, what we would call, our mid-career members. And so I think the efforts that we've undertaken to really reach out and to promote information, education, retirement planning to all level -- all age levels in our membership is really starting to payoff.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Terrific. Thank you very much. I see no further requests.

Okay. Let's move -- we'll move on to Agenda Item number 12, the California Public Employees' Pension Reform Act -- An Update Since Implementation.

Mr. McKeever.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: Good morning, Madam Chair, Members of the Committee. Doug McKeever, Calpers staff. Mr. Milligan and I will cover this particular information item, which is the last one of the day for us.

So by way of background, the Public Employees
Pension Reform Act of 2013 was signed into law by the
Governor back in September of 2012, within an effective
date of January of 2013.

We thought it would be helpful to review what has happened since the passage of the Act. So I'll cover some of the initial efforts that were undertaken by CalPERS to implement, Alan then will cover some of the data on PEPRA, and then I'll close by summarizing the 3 areas that we need to close the loop on relative to the Act itself.

So what is it that we undertook to ensure implementation of PEPRA since the passage was aligning our processes to meet all of the requirements of the Act itself. Included in that was extensive communication efforts to our stakeholders, in particular employers, to ensure that we would use multiple venues to get that message out to them, so that they would understand what the impacts are, what the system changes needed to be to account for the new formulas.

As part of the new formulas, we had to modify our systems internally to do that. And so staff spent a great deal of time modifying our systems to ensure that those formulas were inputted, that we could start to account for those new formulas and the rates themselves.

We introduced regulations to clarify some of the areas in the statute, such as our scope and authority to administer those definitions of new terms, and calculation processes. One regulatory effort specific to pensionable comp did not get submitted to the Office of Administrative

Law and is one of the 3 items that I will highlight after Alan goes through some of the analysis that we've conducted to date.

So with that, I'll pass it over to Alan.

CHIEF ACTUARY MILLIGAN: Thank you and good morning. It's been 3½ years since PEPRA came into effect. And in that time, we've actually seen a considerable portion of our membership covered under the new PEPRA formulas. At this point, PEPRA is fully implemented with the 3 exceptions that Doug will go into a little bit later. And about 29 percent of our -- of the member -- our membership is -- of our active members are already covered by the new benefit formulas.

This may be surprising to some, because the early communication on PEPRA really stressed -- a lot of the press stories really stressed how long this Act was going to take before it fully -- was fully implemented. In fact, the level of take-up is maybe a bit higher than we had anticipated. And I think that was attributable to the fact that local government employment was suppressed at the time PEPRA was passed, the economy rebounded a bit, and some, I think, local governments may have rehired some of their staff that they had let go during the recession. So the take-up was probably a little bit higher than we had anticipated.

But I think really the point I would like to make is that the membership has -- a good portion of the membership has turned over already, and probably significantly higher than many were -- would have expected.

With all of the other provisions of PEPRA, this is beginning to bend the cost curve. I'd like to point -- I'd like to mention that the savings for the new members covered under PEPRA generally range from 1% percent of payroll to 5.1 percent of payroll for the State plans. And this is for the new members covered under the PEPRA formulas, about 1.7 percent savings for school members. There is more variation in the level of savings for local agencies because they have much more diverse benefit formulas, or at least they had much more diverse benefit formulas.

But we generally believe that the savings for local public agencies will be higher than the savings for the State. And the reason for this is that the State had actually taken some actions prior to the passage of PEPRA to control pension costs in particular. State members were already -- new State employees were already coming in under the 2 percent at 60 benefit formula, instead of 2 percent at 55, which had been the standard for State employees before.

And certainly, the State never got to the -- some of the AB 616 formulas for miscellaneous members. So that offered more room for savings for local agencies.

And also, the State moved to a 3-year final average -- final earnings calculation for all new hires prior to the implementation of PEPRA, so the -- that did suppress the amount of savings that the State was able to get. They got the savings. They just got them -- we just can't attribute it to PEPRA because they had already acted to address that.

Some of the other provisions of PEPRA also have an impact on cost. The prohibition on picking up member contributions is something that we are not really able to quantify, because we generally do not -- did not know if employers were picking up employer contributions.

So since we didn't know if they were to start with, the fact that they're not doing it now, we still don't know what the level of that is. But certainly, that resulted in -- has resulted in savings and will continue to result in savings for employers.

In addition, PEPRA did provide more ability to negotiate cost sharing with employees. And so that will be having an impact on the cost as well. So, in short, PEPRA is almost fully implemented. About 29 percent of the members are already under the new benefit formulas.

And PEPRA is beginning to bend the cost curve and will continue to do so for many years.

With that, I'm going to pass it back to Doug.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: Thank you,

Alan.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Could we -- Doug, could we pause for a question here?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: Certainly.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you.

Mr. Jelincic.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Alan, you mentioned that 29 percent of the active members are now covered by PEPRA. And I share your kind of surprise at that. But is that 29 percent equally distributed across the State schools and public agencies, or is there a difference between those 3 groups?

CHIEF ACTUARY MILLIGAN: I'm not sure -- I'm not sure, but I believe Renee has the answer.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: She always does.

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF

OSTRANDER: Good morning. Renee Ostrander, CalPERS staff.

It's fairly equally distributed, but there is a little more weight in the schools area.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you.

1 All right, Mr. McKeever.

Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Jones had a question as well. COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Yes. Alan, you mentioned that the progress is greater than anticipated. And so my question is do you see the progress that's being made in the forecast to continue to gain momentum having an impact on our ALM process in a couple years?

CHIEF ACTUARY MILLIGAN: The progress that has been made will certainly impact the ALM process, and, in fact, has already impacted some of the results in the ALM process. It won't be that visible to you as a Board member, because it will be built in incrementally, as we do each of these things. But certainly, that will be one of the factors that helps us get those risk considerations under control.

It's not, I don't think, sufficient in and of itself to really address that, but it will mean that down the road, we will get their a little bit sooner than we would have without the implementation of PEPRA.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And originally the assumption was we would get there in 30 years? And so now, it will be shorter?

CHIEF ACTUARY MILLIGAN: It's going to take, you know, really a full working lifetime before all members

are under the PEPRA benefit formulas. So the rate of new members coming in under the benefit formula will slow down. And that's partly because some of the turnover that we will experience in the future will be from people who are already under PEPRA, and that will obviously not generate new PEPRA members, so that will tend to slow down.

In terms of the impact on getting to a level of risk characteristics that we -- we would be more comfortable with, we may well get there a little bit sooner than we were previously projecting. And it may be that -- it may be that it just -- we get to -- we may not have to go to quite as low a volatility on the investments, if the PEPRA turnover continues to be at a higher rate than we were anticipating. But most of that turnover was already built into the ALM. So I would caution you not to expect too much.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: And for the benefit of the audience, ALM is the asset liability management study that we do every four years now in conjunction with the Investment Office and the Actuarial Office and the CFO's office.

All right. Was that your point, Mr. Jelincic?
BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Okay. Okay. Now, Mr. McKeever.

2.4

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: All right.

Thank you, Madam Chair. So to conclude the item, there are 3 items remaining to be implemented in PEPRA. The first is to provide an updated regulatory package to this Board for consideration on pensionable comp. The second is to provide a new regulatory package to address the excessive liability statute. And this is employer specific. And as an example, this is when an individual leaves an agency to go to another one, they've left to now get a substantial and significant upgrade in their compensation, but yet the prior employer is responsible for the benefit. And then the third resolution is on the transit worker members.

And so that -- those are the 3 items that we're going to be working on. I think what's important to note, relative to those 3, and the first two in particular, is the absolute active engagement that will have with our stakeholders to discuss these with them, best approaches moving forward, before we bring them back to the Committee for consideration.

And that concludes our report.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you.

Mr. Boyken.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER BOYKEN: Thank you. Thanks for the update.

2.4

Alan, you kind of referred to this, but in the steady drum beat for pension reform that continues post-PEPRA, one of the criticisms of PEPRA is that the savings are far in the future. And year when you give us the State and the school's rates, you show what the reduction is based on higher than expected number of employees covered under the PEPRA formula. And you just told us that 29 percent of active members now fall under the PEPRA formula.

And then also with the -- as more and more employers move toward equal cost sharing, I'm sure there's savings there. It's immediate. It's significant. So if there's anyway -- and I'm sure it's difficult because we have so many different agencies, but if there's anyway you can quantify what the savings year over year are, you know, I think that would really help to say these are real numbers, and it's -- there's immediate savings now.

CHIEF ACTUARY MILLIGAN: I will have some discussions with my colleagues, both within the Actuarial Office, also within our Retirement Research Planning Division to see whether or not there's anything that we can do to address that.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER BOYKEN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: I wonder if some of the public agency affiliate groups, you know, the county groups or the city groups, if they are collecting some of this data. They might also be looking at this issue.

CHIEF ACTUARY MILLIGAN: To get the -- to get any sort of estimate on some of the issues like no longer picking up member contributions, or the level of cost sharing, we would almost certainly require -- have to partner with some of the employer associations to survey their members to find out what level of activity has happened.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Yeah. Okay. Well, I'm just thinking back to when PEPRA was adopted and what our staff had 3 to 4 months to implement PEPRA. And I just think back to how -- to our staff's dedication, the knowledge that they brought to the table, and their problem-solving skills that really got us to a place where we were able to implement it in a timely way. And I really credit our staff with that. That was a yeoman's job. So thank you, everyone.

Okay. I see no requests to speak on this item from the public, so that brings us to Agenda Item number 13, the summary of committee direction.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER McKEEVER: Madam Chair,

I don't believe that there was any direction provided this

morning.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: I don't believe there was either. And so that brings us to Agenda Item number 14, public comment. We do have one member of the public who has requested to speak.

Mr. Behrens, if you would please make your way up to the mics here. The mic is on. If you could identify yourself and your affiliation for the record. And you will have 3 minutes to speak.

MR. BEHRENS: Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the Committee. Tim Behrens, President of the California State Retirees.

California State health benefits committee submitted a question to the PBM procurement team about 3 weeks ago, after discovering in media articles that the new Optum 5-year contract was for about \$4.9 billion. The current CVS contract over a 5-year period cost 58 million. CalPERS staff has confirmed that rather than having price control structures alone, as is customarily done in PBM contracts, that they actually included the total cost of the drugs as well.

The contract authorizes nearly 1 billion per year for drugs. This seems extraordinarily high, since the PBM contract only covers 486,000 members, or about one-third of the 1.4 million covered members. And since the highest

annual total cost for drugs for all 1.4 million members has been reported by CalPERS to be 1.8 billion. We understand a written response to our inquiries will be sent to the chair of our health benefits committee by the end of this week, and we're looking forward to getting that information.

Along with that, I'd also like to speak about the new Optum contract. I was around 5 years ago when we awarded the contract to CVS. CVS promised to have a seamless change from the old contract to the new contract. And having been a CVS person, that was right in the middle of that, they had promised to move our prescriptions right over into CVS from our old vendor.

That didn't occur. There was a 2-week lapse between January 1st and the time we got our cards from CVS, so we could go into CVS and get our drugs. So I'm looking forward to partnering with CalPERS staff and trying to overcome some of these issues that occurred 5 years ago.

We had a meeting yesterday with staff, and they were very diligent in listening to all of our questions. We had many questions, and I'm sure we'll have more questions. We want to make sure that we actually have a seamless change to Optum this time, and that our members know if they have to go back to their doctor and get new

prescriptions, that they do that 30 to 60 days before the changeover happens, so nobody will go without their drugs.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Well, I thank you Mr. Behrens and your organization for your partnership on this. It's an important issue.

Okay. That brings us to the end of the agenda.

I see no further -- nobody is waving their hands wanting to comment publicly, so the open session is adjourned.

(Thereupon the California Public Employees' Retirement System, Board of Administration, Pension & Health Benefits Committee open session meeting adjourned at 10:53 a.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing California Public Employees' Retirement System,
Board of Administration, Pension & Health Benefits

Committee open session meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California;

That the said proceedings was taken before me, in shorthand writing, and was thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by computer-assisted transcription.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 20th day of June, 2016.

James & College

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 10063