



Board of Administration Agenda Item 8k

December 21, 2016

Item Name: Proposed Decision – In the Matter of the Calculation of Final Compensation of PAUL E. DAVENPORT, Respondent, and CITY OF CLAREMONT, Respondent.

Program: Employer Account Management Division

Item Type: Action

Parties' Positions

Staff argues that the Board of Administration should adopt the Proposed Decision.

Respondent Paul E. Davenport (Respondent Davenport) argues that the Board of Administration should decline to adopt the Proposed Decision.

Strategic Plan

This item is not a specific product of either the Strategic or Annual Plans. The determination of administrative appeals is a power reserved to the Board of Administration.

Procedural Summary

Respondent Davenport retired for service effective November 20, 2009, and has been receiving his retirement allowance from that date. In November 2012, Office of Audit Services (OAS) completed a Public Agency Review of City of Claremont ("City") and found that City had reported compensation to CalPERS that failed to qualify as "compensation earnable." Therefore, the compensation used in Respondent Davenport's retirement benefit calculation was incorrect. By letter dated March 5, 2014, respondent Davenport and the City were notified of CalPERS' determination. Respondent Davenport appealed this determination and the matter was heard by the Office of Administrative Hearings on October 18, 2016. A Proposed Decision was issued on October 26, 2016, denying the appeal.

Alternatives

A. For use if the Board decides to adopt the Proposed Decision as its own Decision:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System hereby adopts as its own Decision the Proposed Decision dated October 26, 2016, concerning the appeal of Paul E. Davenport; RESOLVED FURTHER that this Board Decision shall be effective 30 days following mailing of the Decision.

B. For use if the Board decides not to adopt the Proposed Decision, and to decide the case upon the record:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, after consideration of the Proposed Decision dated October 26, 2016, concerning the appeal of Paul E. Davenport, hereby rejects the Proposed Decision and determines to decide the matter itself, based upon the record produced before the Administrative Law Judge and such additional evidence and arguments that are presented by the parties and accepted by the Board; RESOLVED FURTHER that the Board's Decision shall be made after notice is given to all parties.

- C. For use if the Board decides to remand the matter back to the Office of Administrative Hearings for the taking of further evidence:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, after consideration of the Proposed Decision dated October 26, 2016, concerning the appeal of Paul E. Davenport, hereby rejects the Proposed Decision and refers the matter back to the Administrative Law Judge for the taking of additional evidence as specified by the Board at its meeting.

- D. Precedential Nature of Decision (two alternatives; either may be used):

1. For use if the Board wants further argument on the issue of whether to designate its Decision as precedential:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System requests the parties in the matter concerning the appeal of Paul E. Davenport, as well as interested parties, to submit written argument regarding whether the Board's Decision in this matter should be designated as precedential, and that the Board will consider the issue whether to designate its Decision as precedential at a time to be determined.

2. For use if the Board decides to designate its Decision as precedential, without further argument from the parties.

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, hereby designates as precedential its Decision concerning the appeal of Paul E. Davenport.

Budget and Fiscal Impacts: Not applicable

Attachments

Attachment A: Proposed Decision
Attachment B: Staff's Argument
Attachment C: Respondent's Argument

DONNA RAMEL LUM
Deputy Executive Officer
Customer Services and Support

