VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

ROBERT F. CARLSON AUDITORIUM

LINCOLN PLAZA NORTH

400 P STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2020 11:20 A.M.

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

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

- Ms. Theresa Taylor, Chairperson
- Mr. David Miller, Vice Chairperson
- Mr. Henry Jones
- Ms. Fiona Ma, represented by Mr. Frank Ruffino
- Ms. Stacie Olivares
- Mr. Jason Perez
- Mr. Ramon Rubalcava

BOARD MEMBERS:

- Ms. Margaret Brown
- Mr. Rob Feckner
- Ms. Lisa Middleton
- Ms. Eraina Ortega
- Ms. Betty Yee, represented by Ms. Lynn Paquin

STAFF:

- Ms. Marcie Frost, Chief Executive Officer
- Mr. Michael Cohen, Chief Financial Officer
- Mr. Matthew Jacobs, General Counsel
- Mr. Scott Terando, Chief Actuary
- Ms. Fritzie, Archuleta, Deputy Chief Actuary
- Mr. Forrest Grimes, Chief Risk Officer

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF:

- Mr. Justin Heeb, Assistant Chief, Operations Support Services Division
- Ms. Pam Hopper, Committee Secretary
- Ms. Arnita Paige, Chief, Pension Contract & Prefunding Programs
- Mr. Julian Robinson, Senior Pension Actuary
- Mr. Kurt Schneider, Supervising Pension Actuary
- Mr. Dallas Stone, Chief, Operations Support Services Division

	I N D E X	PAGE
1.	Call to Order and Roll Call	1
2.	Approval of the September 15, 2020 Finance and Administration Committee Timed Agenda	2
3.	Executive Report - Michael Cohen	3
4.	Action Consent Items - Michael Cohen a. Approval of the April 21, 2020 Finance and Administration Committee Meeting Minutes b. External Manager Request for Proposal - Long-Term Care Fund	4
5.	 Information Consent Items - Michael Cohen a. Annual Calendar Review b. Draft Agenda for the November 17, 2020 Finance and Administration Committee Meeting c. Treasury Analysis and Liquidity Status Report d. Annual Contract and Procurement Activity Report e. Annual Discharge of Accountability for Uncollectible Debt f. Prefunding Programs Annual Status Report 	5 15
6.	Action Agenda Items a. Revised State and Schools Employer/Employee Contribution Rates - Scott Terando, Kurt Schneider b. Asset Liability Management Policy Review - Michael Cohen, Forrest Grimes, Tim Skillman c. Proposed Board Election Regulations - Dallas Stone	5 23 28
7.	 Information Agenda Items a. Annual Actuarial Valuation Terminated Agency Pool - Scott Terando, Julian Robinson b. Pension Contracts Management Program Annual Report- Arnita Paige c. Board 2020-21 Budget - Michael Cohen, Jennifer Harris d. Long-Term Care Valuation - Scott Terando, Fritzie Archuleta, Flora Xiaoge Hu e. Summary of Committee Direction - Michael Cohen f. Public Comment 	56 60 63 66 72 72

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D PAGE Adjournment 73 Reporter's Certificate 74

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I'll call the Finance and Administration Committee meeting to order. It looks like everybody is here. And let's move on to roll call, Ms. Hopper.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Theresa Taylor?

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Henry Jones?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Here.

10 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for

Fiona Ma?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

1.3

14

16

2.2

23

12 ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO: Present.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: David Miller?

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Here.

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: It doesn't appear that

17 | she's -- appear that she's back yet.

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Okay. I show here

19 | in the had meeting.

20 Okay. Jason Perez?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Ramon Rubalcava?

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: It doesn't look like he's

24 here yet either.

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Okay. Madam Chair,

```
I have all but Stacie checking in and Ramon.
1
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Here comes Stacie. I saw
2
3
    her.
          There she is.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
                                          Stacie?
             COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: I'm here.
 5
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: And Ramon Rubalcava?
 6
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I'm still not seeing him.
7
             Okay. Well, it looks like we have a quorum. I'm
8
9
    going to move on to Item number 2, approval of the
    September 15 timed agenda. And I need a motion for that.
10
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Move it.
11
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So moved.
12
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: It was moved by Mr. Jones
13
    and it sounds like seconded by Mr. Miller.
14
             And we need to take a roll call vote to pass it.
15
16
    So, Ms. Hopper.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
                                          Henry Jones?
17
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES:
                                      Aye
18
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for
19
20
    Fiona Ma?
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I didn't hear you, Frank.
21
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO: Oh. Yes.
2.2
23
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: David Miller?
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Aye.
24
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?
25
```

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Aye.

1.3

2.2

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Aye.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Ramon Rubalcava?

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I still don't see him.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Okay. Madam Chair, I have all ayes, with no vote from Ramon Rubalcava, with Henry Jones making the motion and David Miller seconding it.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: All right. Thank you, Ms. Hopper. We -- with that, we'll move on to the executive report.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Thanks, Chair. Everyone good on sound?

Michael Cohen with the CalPERS Financial Office.

I just wanted to circle back to two items I highlighted in April for you. One is the electronic payments program that we had started up in late March. When we met in April, we just had a few hundred thousand dollars worth of comments -- of payments so far. And now, I'm happy to report, that we have over \$4 million in collections to date. So it was really a well-timed project that you guys approved last year that's saving the organization money and improving our member's ability to make payments. And so that was really well timed.

Δ

And then the second note I would make is right after the July off-site, we held our second employer webinar that was to walk all of our member employers through the impact of the final investment returns that you went through yesterday, 4.7 percent. While obviously, they remain concerned about the rising cost, it certainly was much better news than our early webinar when we were sort of sitting at a negative four to five percent look back in the early days of the pandemic.

So with those two notes, I'll turn it back to you, Chair, and we can work through the agenda.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Sounds good. Thank you, Mr. Cohen. Our next item is the action consent items. I need a motion.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: I'll move.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So moved.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. So Mr. Perez made the 19 motion. I've Ms. Olivares seconding the motion.

All those in favor and we need a roll call vote, Ms. Hopper.

Pam?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

20

21

2.2

23

24

Are we having a little trouble with -
COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: I'm sorry, Madam

25 Chair, I didn't unmute myself.

```
CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: That's okay.
1
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Okay. This is for
2
    Items 4a and 4b.
3
             Henry Jones?
 4
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Aye.
5
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for
 6
    Fiona Ma?
7
8
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO: Yes.
9
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: David Miller?
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Aye.
10
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?
11
             COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES:
                                         Aye.
12
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?
1.3
             COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Aye.
14
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Ramon Rubalcava?
15
             COMMITTEE MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Aye.
16
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Madam Chair, I have
17
    Jason Perez making the motion, Stacie Olivares seconding
18
    it.
19
20
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: And motion carries.
             All right. So we will carry on then to
21
2.2
   information consent items. Having received no requests to
23
    remove anything. We will go on to Item 6, agenda Item A,
   Mr. Cohen.
24
25
             CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Yes.
                                                    Thank you.
```

I'm going to turn it over to Scott Terando our Chief Actuary. This item deals with adopting school and State contribution rates, which you'll recall you did in the spring, but there were some changes based on the State budget that require re-adoption of those -- of those rates.

1.3

2.2

So let me turn it over to Scott Terando.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Thank you.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: Good afternoon, Madam
Chair, members of the Committee. Scott Terando from the
Actuarial Office.

This item seeks the adoption of the revised contribution rates for both the State plans and schools pool for the period starting July 1, 2020 through June 30th, 2021. If you remember back in April, the Board did approve rates for these plans, but subsequent to that event, the State came back and they made some revisions on how they wanted the additional \$3.4 billion contribution that they had made earlier. They made some adjustments on how they wanted that handled.

In addition, there were some adjustments that -to some employer and employee contribution rates as well.

Based on these changes, we had to make adjustments for the

final rates. So we're here today seeking your approval of these rates.

And at this point, I'll pass it along to Kurt Schneider who will step through all the details and provide you with those -- that information.

2.2

SUPERVISING PENSION ACTUARY SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Scott, Members of the Board. And that was a very good quick summary, but I want to go through a little built of background to make sure we understand what is going on here today. So let me review a little bit that normal process for implementing employer contribution rate changes for the State plans and the schools pool.

If this were a normal year, the initial results for the June 30, 2019 valuation would have been presented to the Board in April of 2020 and the employer rates for the 2020-21 fiscal year would be approved by the Board.

Now, for the State plans, those rates become part of the State Budget Act and the Legislature appropriates the required funds. CalPERS sends out a circular letter to State agencies, so that the new rates can be implemented by July 1st, 2020, two months ago. The June 30, 2019 valuation is actually finalized later in the summer. Now, the same exact schedule applies to the school employers. They're done in tandem with the State rates.

And the other piece of background that's important to understand here is that in July 2019, the State contributed \$2.5 billion to four of the State plans and \$904 million to the schools pool as advanced payments towards the unfunded liabilities. So these payments represent money that CalPERS would eventually require the employers to contribute, but the employer in this case, was contributing them sooner than CalPERS required. And the reason they do that is because they then anticipate in future careers to be able to save tax dollars.

1.3

2.2

Now, when an employer, no matter how big or small they are, when they make advanced payments toward the UAL, the Actuarial Office works with the employer to determine how those payments will impact future contribution requirements, because remember we have this complex schedule of future UAL payments that stretches out for decades. And when we finalize the valuation and set the contribution rates, we need to first determine which future payments are being satisfied with the advanced payment.

And at the time the payment was made, remember this is the summer of 2019, the State was projecting budget surpluses in the short-term, and they wanted long-term savings. So these funds were applied to future UAL payments in such a way that the contribution

requirements would be slightly lower for many years. We're talking about up to 28 years.

1.3

2.2

And in April of this year when I presented the 2019 valuation results to the Board, the additional payments were reflected -- reflected this long-term savings strategy.

Can we go forward a couple slides.

--000--

SUPERVISING PENSION ACTUARY SCHNEIDER: Now, as everyone knows, earlier this year, the COVID-19 pandemic caused a severe economic slow down. And the State, which had been producing -- projecting budget surpluses was suddenly projecting budget deficits. After the Board approved the employer rates in April, the State Department of Finance requested that we provide options to them that would generate more short-term savings, because that was now a higher priority than the long-term savings and asked if we could do this before we finalized the valuation report.

In May 2020, remember the Governor proposed budget revisions, and those revisions reflected the changes that we're going to talk about here today.

The savings from the additional payments would now be realized over just three years instead of the 28 years. And those new rates for the current fiscal year

that we're in right now need to be adopted by the Board.

So -- and I'll come back to those additional payments in a second, but there's one other change that we're going to talk about here very quickly, and it's also related to the pandemic. The Highway Patrol plan is not one of the plans affected by the additional payment, but employer rate for this plan is being revised. So what's happening here is that the Highway Patrol member contribution rate it had been -- we're talking about member contribution rate, it had been scheduled to increase July 1, 2020. So that's something that had previously been agreed upon.

Now, in June of this year, when this State reached agreements with bargaining units, including Bargaining Unit 5, the Highway Patrol bargaining unit, for a salary reduction, they made other changes. So during the bargaining process, it was agreed upon to suspend the scheduled member rate increase for Bargaining Unit 5. And because the member rate is not going to be what we were projecting, we need to increase the employer rate. And so we'll take a look at those rates now.

Next slide.

--000--

SUPERVISING PENSION ACTUARY SCHNEIDER: Thank

25 you.

2.2

So the first column there -- so these are the State plans. These are the five State plans. And that's top four, we're talking about moving the additional payment and the bottom is the Highway Patrol. So the first column there is the numbers -- the rates that were approved by the Board in April. And remember that had that additional payment amortized over many years.

So first, we had to remove that from the amortization schedule, which for those first four plans is going to actually increase the required contribution, the actuarial determined contribution. And in the third column, you see us applying those funds then to the current fiscal year and we get a revised rate all the way on the far right, which is lower than it was in April.

And for Highway Patrol what's happening is that the employer rate is simply increasing to offset those lower-than-anticipated member contribution rates. There's no additional contribution there on the Highway Patrol line.

And next slide.

2.2

--000--

SUPERVISING PENSION ACTUARY SCHNEIDER: And then what happens -- so there's the actuarial determined rate that we need to collect the normal cost and fund the unfunded Liability, but the State also makes an additional

contribution on top of that. So the State is always actually paying a little more than what we require. And the far column there is the rate that we need to tell the State agencies this is what you need to contribute to Calpers.

Next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

SUPERVISING PENSION ACTUARY SCHNEIDER: Okay. So then the other thing that happened was with the schools pool. Now, there's a slight difference here, because we're not talking about an advanced payment by the employer. In this case, the State made a payment towards the schools pool unfunded liability. The state is not the employer in this case. But a lot of the math works out the same.

So this \$904 million contribution that they gave us last year, last July part of it was to be applied toward the employer payment during that year and this current fiscal year. But most of it, 660 million, was paid towards one of the amortization bases, a very long amortization base, which was going to be -- and what they did this time is through the legislation actually came the legislation of what to do with that \$660 million. It's not being used to un -- to pay down the unfunded liability over a long period. It's being used to supplant they say

the employer contribution for this year and next fiscal year. That allows the school employers to capture all the savings from the additional contribution over a three-year period when they need it the most.

Next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

SUPERVISING PENSION ACTUARY SCHNEIDER: And this is what the rates look like for schools. So in the first column we have what was adopted in April. There is no change to the employer normal cost, the unfunded liability, and then as you see we already had a payment. We're already using part of the \$904 million as an employer contribution in that year. And what's changed is that we've taken the 660 million out of the amortization schedule. That actually increases the unfunded liability rate by 0.25 percent, but there is much more being used to make up the employer contribution amount during this current fiscal year.

So the net effect is that the employer contribution rate that we adopted in April is actually being reduced by 1.98 percent in school employers this current fiscal year are going to be paying 20.70 percent.

And with that, I will take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: It does not appear I have any questions on this.

```
So before we take a vote -- I mean, I want to
1
    take a vote first, but we also have to go back and pull
2
    items from information consent when we're done with that.
3
             So if there are no questions, I need a motion on
 4
   this item as it's an action item.
5
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So moved.
6
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Second.
7
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: It's been moved by Mr.
8
9
   Miller and seconded by Mr. Jones. I need a roll call
   vote. All this in favor?
10
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Henry Jones?
11
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Aye.
12
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for
1.3
   Fiona Ma?
14
             Frank?
15
16
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Where did he go?
             Frank?
17
             All right. Go ahead.
18
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I'm seeing the yellow
19
20
   triangle.
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR:
                                  Oh, yeah.
21
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Okay. David Miller?
2.2
23
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?
24
25
             COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Aye.
```

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Aye.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Ramon -- Ramon

4 Rubalcava?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

COMMITTEE MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Aye.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Madam Chair, I have all ayes with no vote from Frank Ruffino for Fiona Ma with David Miller making the motion and Henry seconding it.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Great. Thank you. So the motion passes.

That is Agenda Item 6a, Revised State and Schools Employer/Employee Contribution. Thank you for the report, you guys.

I have to move back to 5d. Ms. Brown, you wanted to pull 5d. Let's try to do that in order next time, okay?

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you for letting me go back to 5d. I had a question for Mr. Cohen. And my question is I'm looking at -- 5d is the annual consulting and service contract report for \$100,000 or more. And it's come to my attention that some of our consultants are missing from that report. And I'm trying to figure out why or how you determine what goes on this report and what we don't get, specifically Meketa.

25 | There's on Meketa on here for -- for real estate Board

investment consultant, but then we don't have the rest, because I know we've paid Meketa probably more than this amount. Wilshire is missing and then there was also a question about Randle Communications.

And I understand that we heard that some of those costs were rolled into internal staff costs, that I'm trying to figure out why that's going on, and what other consultants are not on this list, and I'd like to know why.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Sure. Let me have Dallas Stone whose team prepares this report give you an answer in terms of what goes on here and what doesn't. And then once he's done, let me follow up on Meketa specifically. I know there were some questions about their circumstances as it relates to the annual CAFR. So I will get that after Dallas gives you a response in terms of kind of the rules of this report.

So Dallas.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Right. Yeah. Meketa and Wilshire as well, right, so...

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Sure, yes.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Great. Thanks.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE:

Thanks, Michael. Can we also promote Justin Heeb

25 as well.

1.3

2.2

CONFERENCE MODERATOR: Okay. Justin should be able to share his audio and video.

1.3

2.2

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE:

Great. Justin Heeb is our Assistant Division

Chief over our contracts and procurement team and I'll -
I'll allow him to talk through how he and his team,

which -- how the port -- the reports were generated and

the information was compiled.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES ASSISTANT DIVISION
CHIEF HEEB: Great. Thanks, Dallas. Thank you for the question, Ms. Brown. So the report is pulled through multiple different groups. And so we pull all contracts over a hundred thousand dollars and put that on the report.

In regards to a Randle type LOE, those are done through purchase orders. And so those would not be pulled out in the contract portion. They're represented in the purchase order portion of that report.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: And is that purchase order portion of the report here?

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF HEEB: The purchase orders are mentioned in the report.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So I'm going to -- I'm going to -- someone who has an accounting and finance

background, a purchase order is a contract. And if it's over a hundred thousand dollars, I believe the Board should be seeing those as well, and -- because, you know, I try and match things up to the cost. And so I'd like to see those from now on. I don't know if the Committee or the Board is going to agree, but for transparency purposes, I'd like to see how much we're spending on all consultants, whether it's an individual contract or a purchase order, which is still a contract. It's a contract for agreement for services or things.

1.3

2.2

I don't want to see all the things we're buying, like a purchase order for paper, but I do want to see any time we have a consultant that's providing services to the staff or to the Board on this report.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF HEEB: Thank you for that. And we do just in the purchase orders for this report, historically, we have just listed the purchase orders and the number on the attachment. But we have not called each individual purchase order for consulting out, but we can take into consideration.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: And not every -- just over a hundred thousand, right?

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF HEEB: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So we're keeping the same -- the same criteria. All right. I appreciate that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Is that your only question, Margaret?

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: No. Now, Mr. Cohen is going to answer about the other contracts that are not included on here. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay.

1.3

2.2

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: In terms of the CAFR how the Wilshire and Meketa contracts were treated, and those are sort of included in, as we'd shared with the Board, a category called investment, personal, and administrative costs. And so, you know, the consulting contracts for the Board are considered administrative costs of the system, and that's why they're included in there. I know there was some confusion regarding Meketa was listed in a separate area of the CAFR for \$74,000. If I recall correctly, that's sort of an anomaly based on the fact that Meketa merged with PCA during the fiscal year, so we had -- those contracts were actually with PCA, but by the time the CAFR was published, the official name of the business was Meketa.

Those were contracts for the Diversity Forum as well as working on the Responsible Contractor Policy. So

that's why that \$74,000 was treated separately than the base Meketa contract that we think about, like Wilshire, as -- in terms of the Board consultants. But those have been in the administrative expense line since 2015-16 within the CAFR. And certain -- certainly, you'll see that again when we bring you, you know, the financial statements in -- at the November FAC meeting.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Okay. I appreciate the explanation. It's -- it's a little -- it's a little less than transparent when we have consultants that are shown as internal staff. And maybe that --

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Well, let me -let me correct you. They're not shown as internal staff.
The category is internal staff and administrative
expenses --

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Right, but I don't think consult --

 $\label{eq:chief_continuous} \mbox{Chief Financial Officer Cohen:} \quad \mbox{Under that} \\ \mbox{category.}$

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I don't believe consultants are administrative expenses under GIPS or under GASB. And so we can debate that and maybe I'll have our auditors take a look at that, but I don't think that's an appropriate way to account for those expenditures.

I'm going to ask you now publicly to break out

those costs for me. I know I showed the three line items. They totaled about 15, 14 million dollars, but I want to know what fees or consultants are within that category what we're paying. I'll ask for that detail.

2.2

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Sure. I believe that was in the material we sent you, but I'm happy to provide any additional detail there.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: There was no de -- there was no detail. It just had the line item like for Board, for INVO, and for IT, but it doesn't say how much of what the consultants were. It was rolled up.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Gotcha.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: It was rolled up.

And then I have another question on the same attachment, page five of five. And this just comes from my little auditing background. It's kind of odd -- we've got a FedEx corporate services. And it's odd that it's just \$180,000. So is that FedEx contract just a flat rate contract for a hundred -- like is it a flat rate or -- it seems odd that we would send FedExes for exactly \$180,000. So whether that's a flate rate contract, or if not, I'd like to see the detail on that as well.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Yeah. Let me turn that one back to Dallas and his team, if they have the answer. Otherwise, we certainly --

22

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yeah, if not, you can just 1 2 give it to me. Yeah, you can just email it to me. CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Sure. 3 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE: 5 I would just add on the FexEx contract I 6 7 believe that's what the total amount of the contract is 8 for, not what the actual spend is. And we could get that exact dollar amount to you Mrs. Brown for that -- for that 9 10 particular contract. BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yeah, because this is 11 supposed to be spend, right? This is supposed to be spent 12 not contract amounts, is that correct? 13 OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE: 14 Justin, do you want to hop in real quick? 15 16 OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF HEEB: Ms. Brown, the contracts that are pulled here 17 are for encumbrance totals, so the total contract amount. 18 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Oh, so it's total contract 19 amount, it's not spent to date? 20 OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES ASSISTANT DIVISION 21 CHIEF HEEB: Correct. 2.2 23 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: That explains that one. 24 Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: All right. Thank you.

Let's move back to 6b, which was our Asset Liability Management Policy review.

2.2

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Thanks, Chair.

You'll recall at the July off-site, we sort of did a session where we walked through the calendar for the ALM this coming cycle. And 2021 calendar year is going to be a very busy year for all of us on ALM. One of the things I highlighted was that the entire process would have plenty of opportunities for stakeholder engagement. Given the environment we're in, we want to make sure that everyone knows what their opportunities are, are up-to-date on the process. So what we're going to do is have a quarterly webinar on ALM starting in 2021, so that everyone is very clear on their opportunities for stakeholder engagement and have a clear understanding of what's going on.

That being said, this item in front of you for action is actually some technical cleanup to the policy that you last adopted in 2017. So let me turn it over to Forrest Grimes to walk through the detail of that for you.

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: Thank you, Michael.

Madam Chair, Committee members, members of the Board,

Forrest Grimes, Calpers team. Item 6b, as Michael

mentioned, is an action item that includes the review of

the Asset Liability Management Policy and proposed

changes.

2.2

The ALM Policy was approved by the Board -- Board of Administration in April of 2017. The revised ALM Policy adds the CEO, the Deputy Chief Investment Officer to the Asset Liability Management Advisory Committee, which we lovingly refer to as ALMAC, and moves the General Counsel from ALMAC member to advisory member. I serve as the Chair of ALMAC at the request of Mr. Cohen, our CFO.

The revised ALM Policy allows ALMAC members to assign additional representatives from the Financial, Actuarial, And Investment, Legal, Communications, and Stakeholder Relations offices to serve ALMAC in an advisory Capacity.

I will say that the revised ALM Policy helps to achieve and maintain consistent ALM governance by providing clearly defined roles and processes.

With that, I will ask that you move to approve the policy changes and certainly welcome any questions. But I do want to take a moment to thank Tim Skillman for doing a really great job of shepherding this through the process as our resident expert of the policy.

Thank you. Back to you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I muted. Thank you very much. So it looks like I have a couple of questions. So I have a question from Jason Perez first.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Good morning, Forrest.

On page -- on attachment two, page one, why the -- why the change from capital "B" to a little "b" on Board?

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: We -- that's a wonderful question and we actually debated that. That is the current style guide of Calpers. And so I -- we just corrected it to comply with Calpers style guide.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: So no change in authority, or delegated authority, or anything?

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: No. You're just as big of a part of the equation as you've always been, Mr. Perez.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Yea.

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: And as silly -- it's a silly question, but I really don't know. Why -- on page two, why is Stakeholder Relations and -- Stakeholder Relations and the PR folks in general involved?

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: That really speaks to Mr. Cohen's point that there is -- we really want input from our stakeholder partners, and so they need to be an integral part of this process to make sure that the word gets out and that there's ample opportunities for our stakeholders to weigh in throughout the process.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Yeah, that makes perfect

sense.

2.2

And no change in the -- in the cycle or the -- or the -- it's still a four-year process, right?

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: Yes, sir.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Okay. Slick. Thank you. I'm -- that's all.

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: I do know that Ms. Taylor had -- oh, it looks like she came back.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: It looks like Henry is next, if Theresa is not back.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: It looks like, yeah, Henry next. Theresa is off, so I'll hand it to Henry.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. Well, while
Theresa is getting back on, I just have one question. Why
was the General Counsel removed?

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: I'm going to let Mr.

Jacobs correct me if I'm wrong, but really the General

Counsel's role is to act as legal counsel. And therefore,

having them be an active member compromises that legal

counsel role. But, Matt, if you disagree, please weigh

in.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I do not disagree. We're just an advisor on this stuff.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. That makes sense to me. So with that, if -- I guess if -- Theresa, you're

```
back yet?
1
             Well, I would like to go ahead -- and, Mr.
2
   Miller, I would like to go ahead and move approve -- move
3
   approval of this item.
 4
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Do we have a
5
   second?
 6
             COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: I second.
7
8
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I'll second.
             Okay. Who was that? Is that Stacie?
9
             Okay. We've got a -- so I'll ask Pam to call the
10
   roll.
11
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Henry Jones?
12
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Aye.
13
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for
14
   Fiona Ma?
15
16
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Davie Miller?
17
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Aye.
18
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?
19
20
             COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?
21
             COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Aye.
2.2
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Ramon Rubalcava?
23
             COMMITTEE MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Aye.
24
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. Vice Chair, I
25
```

have Henry Jones making the motion, Stacie Olivares second it, and I have all eyes for Item 6b.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you, Pam. The motion passes.

So that takes us to Item 6c, Proposed Board Election Regulations. Dallas Stone.

1.3

2.2

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE:

Thank you. All right. Good afternoon, Madam
Chair and members of the Board. Dallas Stone, CalPERS
team member. This agenda item is an action item seeking
the Board's final approval to adopt the proposed
amendments to the Board election regulations and approval
to submit the final rulemaking package to the Office of
Administrative Law.

During the 2020 Board election off-year, CalPERS team members identify and submit regulatory changes to improve and clarify the election process for the next Board election cycle. In addition, during the February Finance and Administration Committee meeting, the Committee requested that regulatory provisions be modified to include an opportunity for candidates to voluntarily provide additional relevant information in their candidate statements. This additional information would pertain to financial solvency, sexual harassment, conflicts of interest, and protection of confidentiality.

To address this request, the existing regulations were modified and presented -- and presented to this community -- Committee back in April. The Committee made a recommendation to the Board to approve the initiation of the regulatory process. The Board's approval initiated a 45-day public comment period, during which CalPERS did not receive any public comments.

If the proposed amendments are approved by the Board, this rulemaking package will be submitted to the Office of Administrative Law for final review, approval, and will take effect January 1st, 2021.

I'm happy to answer any questions you might have at this time.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So I'm going to assume that we all voted on the asset liability management already?

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: And I can't -- I just -- oh, good. For some odd reason, my chat completely cleared after I disconnected. So, Stacie, it looks like has a question right now.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Yes. Thank you,

Madam Chair. I'm wondering how our discussion of

conflicts of interest and potentially how to prevent that
will affect this?

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Do we have a reply.

1.3

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Well, for example, question 8, "Do you have any conflicts of interest that could impact your role as a CalPERS Board member"? As we start talking about holding individual securities and if and -- if we can, and if so, how to hold those. It seems like there's going to be additional detail.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yes, Ms.

Olivares. If we -- if the Board were to adopt that requirement for Board members, then we would have to go through the rule writing process once again and pass a regulation or update this particular regulation.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you, Ms. Frost.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. I don't see any other questions, but I would like to bring up a issue -- oh, Henry. Well, you must have gotten erased with everything else. Henry, you go ahead.

My question was similar to Ms. Olivares. And I -- first of all, I want to thank staff for putting all of those additional provisions in and recognizing that they are voluntary provisions, because many of them we cannot mandate. But I support another review later. I wouldn't want to hold this report up, but to Ms. Olivares question about the -- really about a blind trust for Board members.

I would like us to revisit that at a later time to see whether or not we could also include that going forward as voluntary. I understand that we can't mandate it, because of the Constitutional requirements. But I'd like to maybe treat it like we're doing some of these items in a future discussion.

2.2

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE:

Thank you, Mr. Jones. I noted that and we can

work with our Legal team.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Stacie, go ahead.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you, Madam
Chair. So as I read number seven again, and I didn't read
it this way before, but it says, "Have you ever been
subject to any legal or employment action on the grounds
of discrimination or sexual harassment. If yes, please
explain".

And so as I read this, I'm wondering if that could be misconstrued as somebody who was fired for their sexual orientation, or race, or ethnicity, or gender. And if they would feel then that they had to -- if would then feel compelled that they had to disclose that, because I don't think that's our intent.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE: That's correct.

```
CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: It says, "on the grounds".

It says, "on the grounds", not -- not -- I'm thinking, "on the grounds" means that you were accused of it, but --

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: As I read it, "on the grounds" -- "Have you ever been subject..." -- take out
```

grounds" -- "Have you ever been subject..." -- take out "legal" for second, so "subject to employment action". So is it possible someone could have been fired because they were discriminated against? I just want to make sure -- I guess from counsel I'm understanding the reading of this correctly.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Right.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yes. This is Matt Jacobs. I believe you are reading it correctly, and that the scenario you have posited would not be covered by this provision.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So what she's asking is could it be misconstrued?

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I don't think it's subject -- I mean, you know -- look, I'm a lawyer.

Anything can be construed or misconstrued.

(Laughter.)

2.2

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: But, I mean, I don't think that's the most straight-ahead reading of this

thing. And since this is voluntary, if that was your reading of it and you thought it was unfair or wanted to explain that you thought it was required, but --

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Well, no, I think that what's she's saying is confusing is that it sounds like -- it could sound like someone's been fired --

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Right.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: -- as retaliation for reporting sexual harassment. You see what I'm saying? So that's where the miss --

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yeah, I understand. I just don't think that that's the most natural reading of that provision.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I -- okay. If Ms. Olivares is satisfied, if you have better wording, you might want to send that to Matt.

attorney. I just want to clarify that too, because I think the wording isn't the most clear, but, you know, if that's my -- just reading it as a layperson and other people would read this very clearly as an employment action against someone for discriminating against somebody else, or harassing somebody else, that's different. So I think that's clarified.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. So I --

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I also want to thank
everybody for working on this and getting these action -or these additions into our -- into the candidate
information. But I also wanted to know if I could bring
up something separate? And I see Jason has a comment. We
are going to be holding elections next year. It is my
thought, and I don't know how the rest of the Board feels,
that COVID is not going to be over by the time we're
gathering signatures for next year's election. We've got
two people up for election next year.

LACERA and LACERS have already had problems gathering in-person signatures. And I know it's only 200 or 250 signatures that you have to have, but there was a suggestion -- they didn't have enough time to fix their -- and it might be too short of a time for us as well, but to fix their law -- rules or administrative laws or whatever. What would everybody think about not having to have wet signatures. Like, if we could send it out to folks and get it signed and have it faxed back or scanned back. But it would have to be a change in the administrative rules. We may not have enough time, but I was wondering if we could explore that for possibly doing it in -- with enough time. And that would also require the Board -- the Committee to vote whether or not they agreed that

that (inaudible). So that's just something I would bring up. Does anybody have any feelings?

1.3

2.2

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah. And, Chair Taylor, we also have Mr. Stone available to talk about the emergency provisions of an emergency regulation adoption, if -- if you would like him to do that at some point.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah, go ahead and do that.

And then it looks like I have Mr. Perez and Ms. Olivares.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE:

Yeah. Thank you, Marcie and Ms. Taylor. I know that we've been working closely with the Legal Office in looking at what our options are, if, you know, COVID, you know, created a challenge for us to get wet signatures. What we have learned is that upon our initial review or preliminary review, we do feel that we could do an emergency regulation, which takes anywhere between 15 and 20 days to get adoption. And we could work with, you know, the Office of Administrative Law on an emergency reg to allow us to adjust our current candidate petition procedures in order to receive some type of electronic signature or another way to collect signatures for the candidate petition package.

The other option is that, you know, we could also go to the Governor's office and ask them for guidance as well, because they do have the ability to suspend certain

regulations in order to allow us to continue to conduct business. So again, we would obviously need to work with our Legal team, and look at the options, and the timing, and then move forward appropriately.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: What's the -- and it would be only for emergency situations like COVID. So it wouldn't be something that we would do on a normal basis. And we can make that clear, whether that's with the Governor's office or this emergency legislation, is that correct?

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. What is the Board's appetite for that? And I've got a comment from Jason and Stacie, so start with Jason. I think yours was on something else.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Yeah, mine was -initially was going to be on Stacie's comments, that it
doesn't -- on first reading of number seven, it doesn't
scream at you. But if you read it and answer the question
asked, yes, a victim of harassment could easily feel
compelled to disclose that they've been -- that they've
been the subject of an investigation. So I'm sure Legal
can come with a better way to ask that question and still
get the same -- the intended response.

So that's on 7a. In regards to your -GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Can I just suggest
something on that. Sorry to interrupt you, Mr. Perez.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Go ahead.

Administrative Law will review the regulations for clarity before they become finalized. And if the OAL believes that there's an issue here on the clarity, then they will ask us to fix it. I'm just a little bit reluctant to kind of slow the train that has been going for some time now to get to this point, so that we can get the regulations in place for the next election cycle.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: That works for me.

And then, Theresa, in response to your suggestion, I think that is a profoundly bad idea. I think -- I think we have to get wet signatures for a reason. Elections for us, for the CalPERS Board, is over a year away. And I -- and I'll stop there.

Your off, Theresa.

You're still off, Theresa.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: We have to get wet signatures in March, in 2021 to start the campaign.

They're not a year off, so we will still be in COVID. I'm just letting you -- I just think it's important -- I'm a

little confused as to why you think it's a bad idea, just real quick.

1.3

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Certainly. It is rife, it is a breeding ground for dishonesty.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. So -- okay. I'm not quite clear on that. So you're saying --

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: I can email my State union -- I can email my State union and the State union can send 80,000 ballots to get signed. And that -- I don't think that's the intent of the law at all.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Next, was Ms. Olivares.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you, Madam
Chair. We discussed the electronic voting option before
sometime in early 2020 or late 2019, I don't remember.
It's kind of a blur. I want -- I wanted to know if we
could revisit that before deciding whether or not to move
forward with an electronic voting option, because I think
there was some issue about response rates and things like
that. I would just like to look at that data again.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: The electronic voting option is completely separate from this. This is -- we are required to get 250 signatures to qualify for the ballot before voting even starts.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: And that's what

39

you're talking about getting special -- an exception, so for that, for the qualification for the ballot.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah. Right. Right.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Got it. Okay. Thank

5 you.

1

2

3

6

7

8

13

14

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

25

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Next is Ramon Rubalcava.

COMMITTEE MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Thank you, Madam

Yes, I wanted to speak to the wet signature

9 requirement. In your opening comments, Ms. Taylor, you

10 mentioned LACERA and LACERS. That is my county and

11 | hometown and so I was pretty aware of that. And I think

12 getting wet signatures in this period will help people,

especially be comfortable participating. We don't want to

disenfranchise anybody. And it's a small number,

15 relatively small compared to the voters. So I'm sure

16 | there's a procedure that could be implemented to verify

17 | that these are authentic signatures.

So I know another process is electronic signatures is acceptable through an app and all that. So I would think it's part of one --

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Well, they're not -- they're not electronic signatures. They would be hand --

COMMITTEE MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Oh, that's true.

24 That's true, but still it's -- it's --

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: -- or fax.

COMMITTEE MEMBER RUBALCAVA: It's -- I guess what I'm trying to say, yes, we're in uncertain situations and we need to make adjustments. And I would be in favor of facilitating getting an alternative to wet signatures some other way, through fax or something.

Thank you.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. So I'm not really hearing much of an appetite for it though. I think you and me, Ramon, are pretty much it.

Stacie, go ahead.

Oh, you're still muted.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Technical difficulties. Sorry. I am -- sorry, I'm still trying to understand the issue, because I don't have a lot of information about that, and this is not my area of expertise. Right now, are these signatures only collected in hard copy and then mailed?

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Well, no, we collect them personally. We used to. So sometimes they're mailed. Like, if I can't get -- I can't always be in Los Angeles. I have State workers all over the state, right? So I can't get to Los Angeles and San Diego, so I might send the petitions to people I know, and then they have to be mailed to me. But in my own work sites up here in Sacramento, I would collect them. I would go to a

worksite and collect signatures is what I would do.

2.2

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yes. Ms.

Olivares, a candidate who wants to run for a position on the Board has a requirement to collect 250 wet signatures today. And once those signatures are collected, they get turned into our Elections Coordinator who operates under Mr. Stone. And they will go through and validate in our system that those are legitimate -- those 250 signatures are legitimate, i.e. they're members of the system.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you, Ms. Frost. And how does that -- by turning in, what do you mean by that? Can that be by mail or is that in person?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: I think some candidates --

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE:

I can -- I can hop in.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: -- have done it in person and some candidates have mailed it in, just depending on what part of the state they're from. But most of the candidates, at least that I'm aware of, have turned it in directly into Calpers, hand delivered those.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: And what's our verification process?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Mr. Stone, would you like to go through that?

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE:

Yeah. So once the signatures are submitted to our Board Elections Coordinator, the Board Elections Coordinator, we do ask for other identifiable -- identifiable information on the nomination petition package. And then we will go into our myCalPERS system and we will validate that in fact that the member that did sign the nomination petition package is an eligible member and voter within -- within the election.

1.3

2.2

And then once we have the 250 validated signatures, then they -- we move forward with the -- with the nomination petition process and then eventually the election.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Do we verify that they are, in fact, nominating that candidate? So, for example, do we contact -- send out an email to those 250 asking for verification that they are, in fact, nominating this candidate?

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE:

So on the -- on the main page of each nomination petition package, it -- it is which candidate they are supporting on the main page and then they submit the 250 plus signatures. Therefore -- and like what Ms. Marcie -- Ms. Frost mentioned that the -- the candidate usually submits them in person with their signatures and the other

information that we request from that nomination petition package to our Board Elections Coordinator.

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Right. So we don't verify that they're actually nominating that candidate, because we have this process by which the candidate then turns it in. But if we're looking at a substitute process or an alternative process, perhaps we might need to add a feature by which we are verifying that those nominations are really for that candidate.

think what Mr. Stone was -- and perhaps it would be nice to, when we put this back on the agenda item -- I know there's a couple questions coming -- is that we actually show you some of these forms. But the form that a -- you know, a person who is saying, yes, I will sign for this nominee, they see at the top of that page which nominee they're signing for. So it's within the documentation itself that I'm signing for this particular candidate.

But I'll pause there, because I know we've got a few Board members who have just recently gone through this process who may like to add a little more detail.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Henry.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: There you go.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Having just gone through the process a year ago, yeah, it's correct that my name appeared at the top of every page that it --

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah, it says.

1.3

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES -- 20 lines for people to sign. And they also have to list their last four digits of their Social Security number, so they're verified that that person is qualified to -- as a retiree, to vote.

And by the way, I have left that form with other people who have gathered signatures, and sometimes they are mailed directly into the Election Coordinator's Office. However, the majority of them I personally took in to the Election Coordinator. But there are some forms that are mailed in with those signatures on that same document. But the candidate name has to be on everyone. Matter of fact, your signature has to be on all of those. And then that person signs and put their last four digits of the Social Security number. And if they don't match, then they're not counted towards being eligible for that 250-member threshold.

So it's -- and so -- so if someone can leave a form and have it mailed in by someone else, then I don't see the problem of not being able to accept mail-in documents, because we do mail them in now. So that would be my viewpoint.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Frank.

1

24

25

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO: 2 Thank you, Madam Chair. I've been having technical difficulty. I 3 think we all have, so I'm not sure -- a couple times I was 4 out. But I think COVID has changed -- everything. 5 think it would be prudent to be prepared to make a -- to 6 7 come up with an alternate method or another method to collect the signature. And, you know, the verification. 8 So I -- I think we should be exploring that possibilities. 9 After all, you know, we are now allowing voting by mail, 10 by email. You know, we're allowing, you know -- we're 11 allowing for signature to be accepted during (inaudible) 12 signature, so I don't see us -- I see us to do -- the 13 responsible thing to do is to explore all those 14 15 possibilities, because it could be a real issue, you know. 16 We could probably -- it will be an issue. You know, we 17 could probably -- could not go to a worksite to collect signature, because, for example, right now, all the 18 19 in-person meetings of all organizations have been 20 suspended. So you would not have that opportunity. Anyhow, I believe it would be prudent for us to 21 (inaudible), Madam Chair. Thank you. 2.2 23 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Thank you, Frank.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. I agree with Mr.

Ms. Brown.

Jones that since I'm based in Southern California, signatures can be gathered by mail. And I don't think it's a problem. I don't think we should change the process. It's only 250 signatures. And just like most of us are voting by mail, I think we trust our Post Office to deliver -- deliver the items. And I don't have an issue with them just keeping it -- keeping it the same.

Also, I believe that our agencies are going to start opening up. As we keep getting the numbers down in California, I believe the State offices will start opening up, and school districts will open up, and -- yeah, this is -- it's a little different than say Mr. Jones when he had to get retirees. We have an opportunity with this next election for all members, retired and active. So it's going to be much easier, because there is two -- 1.9 million members. I don't know how many of them are active and voting, but it's going to be much easier to get them. And I really don't want to see us monkey with the regulations.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Sorry. My mute does not want to come off. Henry, did I misunderstand you that you were stating that you thought it was good idea to have faxed signatures or did not like that idea?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yes, I was saying I

think it is a good idea. With the COVID-19, I think we -- CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: -- have to modify our practice.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. And then in addition, I think all you were saying about mailing -- other people were mailing in signatures for you. I always had them send them to me and then I took them in personally. So -- okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And in any event, they're going to be checked with their Social Security number, so you're not going to be able to overcount, because --

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So it's going to be verified. So you're only going to be able to count those members that are actual members.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Great. Thanks. I just wanted to make sure I understand that.

Ms. Middleton.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: Thank you.

I've got a question about the form and how it is used. Is it possible for one name to be on a form and submitted or is it a list of 30, 40 names that has to be on a single form?

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I think it's 20 names to a form.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: And you have to fill out -- provide 20 names on each one of -- each form?

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Not necessarily, no. I don't believe that.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE:

If it was only one name on the form, Ms.

Middleton, we would accept it. If someone, you know,

filled out 20 names, or 15 names, or nine names. We get

it -- again, like Mr. Jones and others have mentioned,

they -- you know, they've allowed other people to take

signatures and then mail them to them. So in whatever

fashion they do come in, you know, we -- we'll take it in

and validate that they are eligible.

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: Okay. And Dallas, thank you for that. So you could get to get the 250 signatures, 250 separate forms and you would accept that?

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE:
Absolutely.

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: Okay. And is there a limit on how many signatures someone can collect in order to collect 250 valid signatures?

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF STONE:
No, there is no limit. And in a lot of

occasions, candidates will, you know, collect more than 250 signatures just to be on the safe side, because, you know, some people might be confused that they're in PERS, or not within PERS, or eligible to vote, or not eligible to vote. So they're -- most candidates usually take well over the 250 just to -- as a precaution.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: Now, if I could comment, as someone who has collected signatures and ran in local city and county, these rules are far more generous to signature gathering than what you will find in most counties where you're going to have to submit a list of signatures on a defined number of documents that's significantly less than the total number of signatures that you need, and there are limits generally on how many signatures you can collect in an effort to get to a valid number of signatures.

So I think we're being very fair with the process, and this -- even in COVID, we can mail documents to supporters. And I just -- I don't see the need to change from wet to electronic. And I know I don't have a vote on this Committee, but I'll offer that.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Margaret, did you have another question or is that just you telling me that you had a question.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: No. No. That's an old one.

It was an old one.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay.

Okay. Mr. Jones.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah. Yeah, I think it's important that we're not talking about -- are we talking about an electronic signature or are we talking about sending out cop -- faxes to -- for people to sign and fax back? That's not an electronic signature.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Right. Right. Exactly. So it's fax or scan.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: All we're doing is saying that we're facil --

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: -- facilitating gathering of the signatures the paper documents by being able to accept faxes, et cetera.

I mean, Ms. Frost, I don't know how do -- if we explore this, we don't have a whole lot of time. So would we have Dallas come back with information and then we could vote on it? It -- I've got -- it sounds like I've got an even number for and even number against. I can't tell for sure.

(Laughter.)

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah. Chair

51

```
Taylor --
1
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yeah, can I make a --
2
             CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Go ahead, Mr.
 3
    Jacobs.
 4
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I'm happy to chime on
5
    this. So we're a little bit jammed for time. And what I
6
    would suggest is that if we wanted to pursue this, we --
7
8
    and we don't have any other problems or issues with what
   has -- is before you, that we send these regulations onto
9
    the OAL so we can get them in place in time, and then we
10
    take up this issue the next time. So we could do a
11
    subsequent regulation on it -- an amendment.
12
             The problem with changing the language now --
13
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Matt -- Matt, we didn't --
14
   we didn't intend that. I do want to go through --
15
16
             CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST:
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: -- and pass C1 --
17
             CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah.
18
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: -- for sure. We -- this
19
20
    would be emergency legislation.
             CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Right. Right.
21
    So Chair Taylor --
2.2
23
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Got it. Okay.
                                                       I'11
    stop talking then.
24
25
             (Laughter.)
```

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: -- my response to your question would be, you know, either based on Committee direction out of this Committee or a motion, however you choose to do that. You could ask management to come back with an option. We could schedule that meeting in November, and come back for an option for you to vote on. And whether that was an emergency regulation process or through the powers of Governor Newsom, depending on the outcome of that particular vote in November. But we could do that based on your direction, the Committee's direction.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So can we do that then?

Let's just -- we can always vote on it later, if everybody disagrees -- or if enough people disagree, then it won't pass. But if we could move that along for November, that would be awesome. Just to explore another option in case -- you know, flu seasons is coming up, I get it. It would be great if everything goes away, but we're -- you know, we just don't know.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: 2020 hasn't been the best of years for us, so...

(Laughter.)

2.2

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Okay. Mr. Cohen will put that down as Committee direction.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Thank you so much.

And then if there are no more questions -- oh,

Jason you had a motion. Did you want to make a motion on
that, Jason?

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Yeah. I motion that we save everyone some time and effort and just keep everything the way it is now.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I already gave Committee, so --

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: And we'll do it for November. It's not going to happen here, so we -- we need to see it first.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: I'm pretty sure it has to go for a second and then or not a second and then it dies.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Is there a second for his motion?

Okay. No second. Thank you very much.

So, Stacie, it looks like you had one more question.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: One more question.

And sorry about this. Just to follow up on Mr. Jacobs comment. I've had to do emergency regs through OAL before. And as he indicated, there are often a lot of

changes and it takes quite a long time. So I imagine by the time we get to the November meeting, we will have some type of update with new text from OAL that we can look at.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I think we're talking about two different things. I think the -- what we're doing here on C is different. We're sending that through and we need to get it done and we will vote on that momentarily.

What I was suggesting was emergency OAL regs just for this specific issue of wet signatures and/or, as Ms. Frost said, something from the Governor's office.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Okay. And that's why I'm getting a little bit confused here, because this wasn't a specific agenda item. So you're saying this -- your direction will be that CalPERS team is going to take a look at that --

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah, they're --

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: -- and then --

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah. So it has nothing to do -- I just brought it up under C, because it is part of the election.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Right.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: That's why I brought it up, but it is separate from ${\tt C.}$

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Right. Okay. Does that make sense?

55

```
COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: That makes sense.
1
   Got it. Thank you.
2
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. So I need a motion to
3
   pass --
 4
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I'll so move. I'll
5
   move 6c.
6
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Thank you.
7
8
             I need a second.
9
             Anybody?
             COMMITTEE MEMBER RUBALCAVA: (Raised hand.)
10
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Mr. Rubalcava.
11
             COMMITTEE MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Yes.
12
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So I have a motion to move
13
    6c, seconded by Mr. Rubalcava.
14
             All those in favor? Ms. Hopper.
15
16
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Thank you, Madam
   Chair.
17
             Henry Jones?
18
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Henry, unmute?
19
20
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for
21
   Fiona Ma?
2.2
23
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: David Miller?
24
25
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Aye.
```

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares? 1 COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Aye. 2 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez? 3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Aye. COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Ramon Rubalcava? 5 COMMITTEE MEMBER RUBALCAVA: 6 Aye. COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Madam Chair, I have 7 8 all ayes. David Miller making the motion, Ramon Rubalcava 9 seconding it for Item 6c. CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. The item passes. 10 Let's move on to 7a, Annual Actuarial Valuation, 11 Terminated Agency Pool. 12 Mr. Cohen. 1.3 CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Yeah, that -- so 14 that concludes our action items. I'll turn this one over 15 16 to the actuaries to walk you through this annual report. SENIOR PENSION ACTUARY ROBINSON: 17 afternoon. Julian Robinson, Actuarial Office. I'm happy 18 19 to present the results of the Terminated Agency Pool this 20 afternoon. (Thereupon an overhead presentation was 21 presented as follows.) 2.2 23 SENIOR PENSION ACTUARY ROBINSON: This was the valuation which we performed as of June 30, 2019. 24

If you can move to the next slide, please.

25

--000--

2.2

SENIOR PENSION ACTUARY ROBINSON: In the valuation, we had 109 plans in the TAP, with five additions in this most recent valuation. The funded status of the pool is 202.8 percent.

Next slide, please.

--000--

SENIOR PENSION ACTUARY ROBINSON: These are a list of the five agencies which joined since the last valuation which was conducted June 30, 2018. In additional -- there's an additional about a million dollars in liabilities associated with these agencies which joined the pool.

Next slide, please.

--000--

SENIOR PENSION ACTUARY ROBINSON: Every year, the discount rate for the Terminated Agency Pool changes. The reason for this is, according to the policy -- the Board policy, we use the government bond rate for the STRIPS to determine what the discount rate is. This matches the investment strategy that's used by the Terminated Agency Pool. We'll talk a little bit more about that in a couple of slides.

Next slide, pease.

--000--

SENIOR PENSION ACTUARY ROBINSON: So here are the numbers in front of you. As you can see, the funded ratio of the TAP, Terminated Agency Pool, as of June 30, 2019 is 202.8 percent. In rough numbers, there's \$300 million in assets, and \$150 million in liabilities. So relative to the size of the whole PERF, this is really a very small plan. It's less than 0.1 percent of the whole PERF, but it is a significant pool which everybody is focusing on. And it's important to present to the Board an update of the funded status.

Next slide, please.

2.2

--000--

SENIOR PENSION ACTUARY ROBINSON: So the investments in the pool are divided into two sections. There's a section called the immunized segment and a section called the surplus segment. The intention of the immunized segment is to buy a portfolio of bounds, and the Investment Office, you know, carries out every year, to match the cash flows of the benefit payments, which come out of the TAP. So every year, the Investment Office goes through a rebalancing of the immunized segment. As, you know, the demographic of -- the demographics of the TAP change, so do the projected cash flows. So the Actuarial Office provides the Investment Office a 50, 60-year projection of what we expect future benefit payments to

do. And the Investment Office produces an immunized portfolio of bonds to match as closely as possible.

Any surplus amounts available are invested with the PERF and the rest of the funds in the system. And as you can see, it's approximately 50/50 breakdown between what's in the immunized segment and what's in the surplus segment. The rate of return that was achieved in the past last fiscal year was 7.2 percent as of June 30, 2019.

The reason why there was -- we saw such a high rate of return was that as bond rates decreased, that increases the value of bonds, that's why the performance of the TAP was very significant.

Next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

--000--

SENIOR PENSION ACTUARY ROBINSON: This -- we have a requirement to test the sensitivity of our results, based on different impacts of changes in mortality. So this slide shows that if the -- under the current mortality, our TAP is -- has 202.8 percent funded ratio. If the mortality rates decreased, it would -- it would drop down to 195.9 percent. And similarly, if the mortality rates increased, it would increase to 209.3 percent.

Next slide, please.

--000--

SENIOR PENSION ACTUARY ROBINSON: And we do a similar impact -- sensitivity impact calculation on the possible changes in inflation. So the inflation rate, which was used in this valuation was 1.85 percent. In the event that inflation was lower, then the funded ratio would be expected to increase up to 230.9 percent.

If the opposite were true, if inflation was one percent higher, then the funded ratio would drop to 194.4 percent. This is a general overview of all the relevant information from the TAP. If you have any further questions, please do.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Thank you, Julian. It looks like I don't have any questions on this.

So we can move on.

1.3

2.2

SENIOR PENSION ACTUARY ROBINSON: Excellent.

Great. I appreciate your time. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Thank you.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: All right, Chair. The next item is also an informational one. Based on the Committee's direction, we revised this report a little bit. But I'll turn it over to Arnita Paige to walk you through sort of our contracts annual report.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

PENSION CONTRACT & PREFUNDING PROGRAMS CHIEF

PAIGE: Good afternoon, Arnita Paige, CalPERS team.

Information item 7b provides our annual program update, which includes the status of contract terminations and collections activity. The form of the full report, provided as Attachment 2, was produced in response to feedback from the Committee in February 2020.

Next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

--000--

PENSION CONTRACT & PREFUNDING PROGRAMS CHIEF
PAIGE: A summary of program highlights for the fiscal
year 2019-20 include resolution of 502 delinquent cases to
maintain a below two percent delinquency rate to meet a
strategic measure; coordination of nine contract closeouts
to assist defunct employers and support benefit
protection; and, providing 30 agencies with -- who became
delinquent on their pension obligations with short-term
payment arrangements ranging up to four months to assist
with temporary financial challenges.

Next slide, please.

--000--

PENSION CONTRACT & PREFUNDING PROGRAMS CHIEF

PAIGE: This slide shows improvements made to enhance

service delivery. We focused on: employer education and

incorporated financial analysis within the review process

for new contracting agencies; streamlined a pension

contract amendment and termination processes to enhance document management functionality in my -- in the my|CalPERS system; and developed employer FAQs for cost-sharing and golden handshake optional benefits to address most frequently answered questions.

Next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

--000--

PENSION CONTRACT & PREFUNDING PROGRAMS CHIEF

PAIGE: Nine agencies cease submitted a final resolution

to terminate their contract with Calpers during the fiscal

year. And there are currently no agencies pending

termination.

Next slide, please.

--000--

PENSION CONTRACT & PREFUNDING PROGRAMS CHIEF

PAIGE: Our collection report show we have 17 active cases

with amounts outstanding of \$393,488 at the end -- fiscal

year-end of 2019-20. On August 26th, nearly -- we've

collected nearly 72 percent of the balance owed. And we

believe the remaining cases are solvable.

Next slide, please.

--000--

PENSION CONTRACT & PREFUNDING PROGRAMS CHIEF

PAIGE: This final slide shows the three agencies

currently on a payment plan. The first two agencies are

paying off their termination unfunded liabilities. And the last agency is paying off their unfunded accrued liability cost.

2.2

This concludes my report and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Arnita, it doesn't look like we have any questions.

PENSION CONTRACT & PREFUNDING PROGRAMS CHIEF PAIGE: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Thank you very much for your report.

And I guess we can move on to Item C -- 7c -- CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Sure, let me give --

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: -- Board 2020-21 budget.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: Yeah. Let me just give you a little bit of framing and then I'll turn it over back to you for discussion.

So you'll recall in July of this year at the offsite, I kind of walked you through the steps we're taking in lowering the CalPERS budget. You'll see that proposal in November for action. This is a discussion item. And whatever sort of comes out of the discussion, we'll integrate into that proposal for November, and you'll have a chance to vote on it then.

Expressed interest in taking a look at its own budget that you adopted in April to determine whether or not you wanted to revise it. Obviously, some revisions will happen on the natural. For instance, the PLPs on State employees, those savings will be integrated already and then obviously the Board members as well aren't doing as much, if any, travel right now. And so those savings willow accrue naturally. But with that, Chair, let me turn it back to you for discussion.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Certainly. Thank you very much. Mr. Jones, I know that had some specific information on this as well. Go ahead.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair. You may recall, as Mr. Cohen indicated when this discussion came up, we asked Board members whether or not they had any ideas about making changes to the overall budget. And I think I received one request. But subsequent to that, looking at the fact that our Board Services Unit staff will be reducing their compensation similar to all other State employees, and also recognizing that we don't know what the new normal is. We know we're saving money, because we're not traveling to Board meetings. We're not traveling to conferences.

So my suggestion is that we don't try to make

additional reductions at this time and we wait till we know how we are going to operate in the new upcoming fiscal year, and then we could talk about some policies based on a new normal of whether it's a reduction in travel costs or whatever the case may be.

2.2

But I think at this stage, the staff has already been -- taken a reduction just as all other staff, in terms of compensation. So I think that that would be my suggestion at this time.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: That sounds like a good suggestion.

Does anybody else have anything they want to add to that. Because as it is, I agree with Mr. Jones, we currently aren't traveling. We aren't eating at the Board. We're not traveling to Board meetings. We're not traveling for Board business. So we -- and all of our Board Services Unit takes the same ten percent pay cut that the State workers took.

So unless anybody has -- okay. Hold on, Jason.

And I think Henry's suggestion is well founded to revisit this at the next fiscal year as we see where COVID takes us. But let me -- go ahead, Mr. Perez. Go ahead.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: I'm just curious if we have an update as for a replacement for Ms. Perkins.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I don't have that

information. 1 2 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Henry, go ahead. COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah. I've talked to 3 Ms. Frost about that and asked for a process to be 4 established for that Mr. Jason -- Perez, rather. 5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Jason is fine. 6 7 (Laughter.) 8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Okay. Can't we just 9 promote inside? COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I mean, of course, 10 they're eligible too, if that, you know, turns out to be 11 the case, yeah. 12 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: It doesn't mean we don't 1.3 backfill. That all depends on what's needed. 14 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: 15 Okay. Thank you. 16 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: The next fiscal year. And we can move on from here. 17 Mr. Cohen, we're on long-term care valuation. 18 You're muted, Michael. 19 20 CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Sorry about that. So I think Don Moulds has cued this up fairly 21 well based on your prior discussions in the Investment 2.2 Committee as well as Pension and Health. 23 The actuaries are going to walk you through their 24

presentation here, so why don't I turn it over to Scott

25

and Fritzie.

1.3

2.2

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: There we go. Good afternoon, Madam Chair, members of the Committee. Scott Terando, Actuarial Office. Just as a quick reminder before we start. This is an information item and we're not seeking any action on this item today.

I think as Don reviewed earlier, both yesterday and today, this item is going to go over the long-term care results valuation this year. And there are some significant changes in the actuarial assumptions being determined this year.

When you look at some of the main drivers, we're looking at changes in the morbidity rate, the lapse rate, and primarily the discount rate. These updates will have a significant impact on the liabilities and possible premium increases depending upon all the other items that are in flux right now that Don has previously talked about.

Joining me today, Fritzie Archuleta will walk us through the valuation results and discuss our analysis. We also have a available today with us our Long-Term Care Actuary Flora Hu, and out an outside consultant Clark Heitkamp who will be available for questions if we need

those answered.

1.3

2.2

And with that, I'll pass it along to Fritzie.

DEPUTY CHIEF ACTUARY ARCHULETA: Good afternoon,
members of the Committee. Fritzie Archuleta, CalPERS
team.

I'm here today to present the long-term care valuation results as of June 30th, 2019.

Next slide, please.

--000--

DEPUTY CHIEF ACTUARY ARCHULETA: Some background information. Each year, an experience study is done on the Long-Term Care Program to ensure adequate funding for the program. We also incorporate experience during -- experience during the year that the valuation is done.

This year, the Actuarial Office recommends revisions to three different assumptions. First, the discount rate is recommending going from five and a quarter percent to four percent. Recall, that the discount rate is the rate at which the liabilities for the program is discounted to the present day. It is also our best estimate of what the portfolio, as it stands today, can be expected to earn in the future.

We have also made recommended changes to the morbidity rates. The morbidity rates shape the future claims costs for the program. And finally, there are

recommended changes to the lapse rate, which are the rates at which policyholders are expected to lapse their policies with CalPERS.

Next slide, please.

--000--

DEPUTY CHIEF ACTUARY ARCHULETA: Because the discount rate has a significant impact on the liabilities of the plan, we will take the next few slides to discuss our development of it.

The Long-Term Care Fund undergoes an ALM process every four years. There is also a mid-year cycle review. ACTO has found that the picture has actually changed dramatically over the last two years.

Next slide, please.

--000--

DEPUTY CHIEF ACTUARY ARCHULETA: As of June 30th, 2017, this was the CMA picture. Please pay special attention to the fixed income line on this slide.

Next slide, please.

--000--

DEPUTY CHIEF ACTUARY ARCHULETA: Two and a half years later, you can see that the outlook is much lower than it was in 2017.

Next slide.

--000--

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

DEPUTY CHIEF ACTUARY ARCHULETA: Two key points that went into our analysis. The court -- the current portfolio is made up of 66 percent fixed income. As you recall from those last two slides, the outlook for fixed income is much lower than it was two years ago. The program is also a closed program, in which the average policyholder age is 75 years old. This means that we anticipate 65 percent of the funding is needed over the next 20 years.

To add extra pressure to the program, the program is experiencing a negative cash flow situation, where more money is leaving from the plan than what it is coming in. We expect this negative cash flow to peak in 2039. For these reasons, ACTO is recommending a four percent discount rate.

Next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

--000--

DEPUTY CHIEF ACTUARY ARCHULETA: Incorporating the new assumptions and the experience during the 2018-19 fiscal year, slide 7 displays the state of the Long-Term Care Program today. You can see that the margins, which is an indicator of whether or not premiums need to be increased, is at a negative 85 percent, and the funded status, which discloses the overall health of the plan is at a 69 percent.

Next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

DEPUTY CHIEF ACTUARY ARCHULETA: This is a reconciliation of the margin from the -- last year to this year. The rows in purple reflect the actual experience of the program during the 18-19 fiscal year. The rest of the rows reflect the long-term changes made to the expected future costs of the program.

As the program stands today, we do not anticipate that the program has enough money to pay all anticipated benefits. Some actions must be taken to correct this. Items were discussed with you at the Investment Committee meeting, as well as the Pension and Health Benefits Committee meeting. I look forward to continuing this conversation with you at the November Board meeting.

This concludes my presentation. I will now open it up to any questions.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Thank you, Fritzie.

Does anybody have any questions?

I'm not seeing any right now. I just want to give everybody a chance.

Okay. It looks like we don't have any questions.

So we'll move on to -- thank you very much for all the reports you guys. I really appreciate all your hard work.

And I'm going to move on to summary of committee direction.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER COHEN: Yes. Thanks,

Chair. I've got two things. First, is we agreed to

provide some additional detail on actual expenditures

regarding the information we've already sent to the Board

as well as FedEx. So we will get you that shortly.

And then second, we will agendize a November item to have further discussion on the elections issue regarding wet signatures and so forth.

So those are the two things that I have.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: And I don't have anything in addition to that. I do appreciate that.

And finally, we're on public comment. And I don't know if we have any, Mr. Fox, Cheree.

Anybody?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

MS. SWEDENSKY: I don't think we have any public comment for today.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. No public comment.

So I'm going to adjourn the Finance and Administration Committee meeting.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Ms. Taylor.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I just want to announce

25 | that we will convene the Board Governance Committee

```
meeting at 1:45.
 1
 2
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: 1:45 it is. That's what I
 3
    was going to ask.
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. Thanks.
 4
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: All right. See you guys at
 5
    1:45. Thank you.
 6
             (Thereupon the California Public Employees'
 7
 8
             Retirement System, Board of Administration,
 9
             Finance & Administration Committee meeting
10
             adjourned at 12:53 p.m.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
```

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, Finance & Administration

Committee 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 21st day of September, 2020.

1.3

fames & Cotto

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 10063