**Item Name:** Proposed Decision – In the Matter of the Appeal of Mandatory Contribution Adjustment to Retirement Account of CHARLES P. RABAUT, Respondent, and DEPARTMENT OF STATE HOSPITALS, COALINGA SECURE TREATMENT FACILITY, Respondent.

**Program:** Member Account Management Division

**Item Type:** Action

**Parties’ Positions**

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

Respondent Charles P. Rabaut’s (Respondent Rabaut) position is included in Attachment C, if any.

**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**

CalPERS determined that Respondent Rabaut’s retirement account was underfunded because his retirement contributions were reported to CalPERS at a reduced rate of 3% for the period of September 27, 2004, through March 15, 2007, instead of at the correct 8% rate. Respondent Rabaut submitted an appeal for Mandatory Contribution Adjustment to his retirement account. The matter was heard by the Office of Administrative Hearings on July 31, 2017. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) upheld CalPERS’ determination and a Proposed Decision was issued on August 8, 2017, denying the appeal.

**Alternatives**

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

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees’ Retirement System, pursuant to Government Code section 11517 (c)(2)(C) which authorizes the Board to “make technical or other minor changes in the proposed decision,” hereby modifies the Proposed Decision, by amending the date of October 1, 2014, to October 1, 2004, in the second sentence of paragraph 6, page 5, of the Proposed Decision, and hereby adopts as its own Decision the Proposed Decision dated August 8, 2017, as modified, concerning the appeal of Charles P. Rabaut;
RESOLVED FURTHER that this Board Decision shall be effective 30 days following mailing of the Decision.

B. 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 August 8, 2017, concerning the appeal of Charles P. Rabaut; RESOLVED FURTHER that this Board Decision shall be effective 30 days following mailing of the Decision.

C. 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 August 8, 2017, concerning the appeal of Charles P. Rabaut, 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.

D. 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 August 8, 2017, concerning the appeal of Charles P. Rabaut, 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.

E. 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 Charles P. Rabaut, 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 Charles P. Rabaut.

Budget and Fiscal Impacts: Not applicable
Attachments

Attachment A: Proposed Decision
Attachment B: Staff’s Argument
Attachment C: Respondent(s) Argument(s)
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