MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION OPEN SESSION

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

FECKNER AUDITORIUM

LINCOLN PLAZA NORTH

400 P STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2025 9:04 A.M.

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

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS:

Theresa Taylor, President

David Miller, Vice President

Malia Cohen, represented by Deborah Gallegos

Michael Detoy

Monica Erickson, represented by Nicole Griffith

Fiona Ma, represented Frank Ruffino

Lisa Middleton

Jose Luis Pacheco

Kevin Palkki

Ramón Rubalcava

Yvonne Walker

Mullissa Willette

STAFF:

Marcie Frost, Chief Executive Officer

Stephen Gilmore, Chief Investment Officer

Michael Cohen, Chief Operating Investment Officer

Douglas Hoffner, Chief Operating Officer

Stephenson Loveson, Chief Information Officer

Kim Malm, Deputy Executive Officer, Customer Services & Support

Donald Moulds, PhD, Chief Health Director

Michele Nix, Chief Financial Officer

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF:

Brad Pacheco, Deputy Executive Officer, Communications & Stakeholder Relations

Scott Terando, Chief Actuary

Michelle Tucker, Chief Human Resources Officer

Prashant Yerramalli, Special Advisor

Danny Brown, Chief, Legislative Affairs Division

Kelli Aoki, Chief, Member Account Management Division

ALSO PRESENT:

Steven Alari

Dan Crowley, K&L Gates

Willine Davis

Al Darby, Retired Public Employees Association

Sara Granda

John Holden

Willette Jacobs

J.J. Jelincic, Retired Public Employees Association

Karishma Page, K&L Gates

Bobby Roy, Service Employees International Union, Local 1000

Charlie Solt

INDEX PAGE 1. Call to Order and Roll Call 1 2. 2 Pledge of Allegiance - Theresa Taylor Board President's Report - Theresa Taylor 2 Chief Executive Officer's Report (Verbal) -Marcie Frost 8 Action Consent Items - Theresa Taylor 13 Approval of September 17, 2025, Board of Administration Meeting Minutes Board Travel Approvals b. Approval of November 19, 2025, Board of C. Administration Timed Agenda 14 6. Information Consent Items - Theresa Taylor Board Meeting Calendar a. Draft Agenda for February 18, 2026, Board of Administration Meeting General Counsel's Report d. Communications and Stakeholder Relations 2024-25 Fiscal Year-End Compensation for Statutory Positions f. Board Education Program - Education Activity Report 7. Committee Reports and Actions Investment Committee (Verbal) - David Miller 14 b. Pension & Health Benefits Committee (Verbal) - Ramon Rubalcava 15 Finance & Administration Committee (Verbal) -Kevin Palkki 17 d. Performance, Compensation & Talent Management 21 Committee (Verbal) - Mullissa Willette Risk & Audit Committee (Verbal) - Malia е. 22 Cohen Board Governance Committee (Verbal) -24 Theresa Taylor 8. Action Agenda Items Proposed Decisions of Administrative Law 28 Judges - Theresa Taylor Jessica Hernandez-Garnica Bernice Garza Valeriu Iosif AKA Valerio Josif

INDEX CONTINUED PAGE Jeffrey McGlone 5. Alicia R. Deal Angela Y. Logan re: Thomas G. Lee (dec.) 7. Reginald Dalton 8. Joshua Young 9. Savanna Dambacher b. State Legislative Proposal: Discontinuation of Actuarial Equivalent Reduction for Service Credit Elections and Other Technical Amendments - Danny Brown 28 C. Board Fiduciary Counsel RFP - Renee Salazar 62 9. Information Agenda Items State and Federal Legislative Update - Danny a. 67 Brown Summary of Board Direction - Marcie Frost b. 8 4 Public Comment 85 C. 96 10. Adjournment 97 Reporter's Certificate

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Good morning, everybody. 2 Welcome to the CalPERS Board of Administration meeting. 3 am -- with that, I'm going to have the roll call called, please. 5 Theresa Taylor. BOARD CLERK ANDERSON: 6 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Here. 7 8 BOARD CLERK ANDERSON: David Miller. VICE PRESIDENT MILLER: Here. 9 BOARD CLERK ANDERSON: Deborah Gallegos for Malia 10 11 Cohen. ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: Here. 12 BOARD CLERK ANDERSON: Michael Detoy. 13

PROCEEDINGS

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GRIFFITH: Good morning.

18 BOARD CLERK ANDERSON: Frank Ruffino for Fiona

BOARD CLERK ANDERSON: Nicole Griffith for Monica

19 Ma.

Erickson.

14

15

16

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

20 ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: Present.

BOARD MEMBER DETOY: Here.

BOARD CLERK ANDERSON: Lisa Middleton.

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: Present.

BOARD CLERK ANDERSON: Jose Luis Pacheco.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Present.

BOARD CLERK ANDERSON: Kevin Palkki.

BOARD CLERK ANDERSON: Ramón Rubalcava. 2 BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Good morning. Here. 3 Present. 4 BOARD CLERK ANDERSON: Yvonne Walker. 5 BOARD MEMBER WALKER: Here. 6 BOARD CLERK ANDERSON: Mullissa Willette. 7 8 BOARD MEMBER WILLETTE: Here. PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Dr. Gail Willis. 9 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Oh, excused. I'm sorry. 10 All right. I'm going to start with some of the 11 President's talking points right now. So I'd like to 12 begin by reminding everyone one that Veterans Day was last 13 week Tuesday, November 11th, which our nation observed. 14 This is a moment for us to appreciate the courage, 15 16 sacrifice, and service of the men and women who have

served our country, including the many CalPERS members,

retirees, and team members who are veterans. On behalf of

the Board, I want to extend our deep gratitude for their

commitment to protecting our freedoms and strengthening

BOARD MEMBER PALKKI: Good morning.

1

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

our communities.

In that spirit, I'd be honored to introduce
Alyssa Albright from our Stakeholder Relations team.
Alyssa is a Captain in the U.S. Air Force Reserve and has proudly served our country for nine years. Alyssa, thank

you for your service. Thank you for being us today. And I'd like -- now like to invite you to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Everyone stand.

1.3

2.2

(Thereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you Alyssa.

So next, it is my pleasure to introduce the CalPERS chorus made up of our talented members of the CalPERS team. They help bring us together through music and remind us of the sense of community that defines us in this organization. Please join me in welcoming the CalPERS chorus to perform for us this morning. Thank you very much.

(Applause).

(CalPERS Chorus sings.)

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: So I do want to thank the CalPERS Chorus for joining us this morning. That was great, so we do appreciate that.

Before we move on to the rest of our agenda, I'd like to take a moment of personal privilege to recognize the Board service of two of our valued colleagues. So first, I want to recognize Eraina Ortega for her service on the Calpers Board of Administration. Eraina joined our Board in 2019 as an ex officio member when she appointed

direct -- was appointed the Director of the California Department of Human Resources by Governor Gavin Newsom.

2.2

She's been a valuable voice representing State employers in our discussions, drawing on her deep knowledge of public policy and always brings a thoughtful, solutions-oriented perspective to the table. She served this system with integrity and dedication, earning the respect of our colleagues and stakeholders. And she stepped up to serve as Vice Chair of the Performance, Compensation and Talent Management Committee from 2019 to 2022.

Eraina has had a distinguished career in State government, including roles at the Department of Transportation, the Department of Finance, and now with her September 2025 appointment by Governor Newsom to the Public Employment Relations Board. So, Nicole, you want to join me on stage?

So is it on. Hello.

Okay. It is my honor to -- on behalf the CalPERS Board of Administration, to present this resolution for you for the -- for Eraina. And Nicole is accepting on her behalf as her delegate, for the many contributions and outstanding services. We wish you the very -- or we wish her the very best.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GRIFFITH: We do.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Hopefully we will see her again.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GRIFFITH: Yes.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All right. Thank you.

(Applause).

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

So with that, I'd also like to PRESIDENT TAYLOR: recognize the service of Jose Luis Pacheco. Jose Luis has served honorably on the CalPERS Board of Administration since 2022. He has been a passionate champion for our mission, for ensure that our members understand how vital their serve -- their service is to California's communities. During his tenure, Jose Luis has devoted himself to his Board responsibilities, including service as Chair of the Performance, Compensation and Talent Management Committee, and Vice Chair of Pension Health and Benefits Committee. He's been a strong advocate for the diversity, and equity, and inclusion for improving access to health care for all people, and for expanding outreach by supporting translation of CalPERS educational materials into other languages.

So Jose, would you like to join me?

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: May I have a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: After we do this.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Thank you.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: So Jose, on behalf of the Calpers Board of Administration and your fellow Board members, the staff, we present you with this resolution recognizing your many contributions and outstanding service to our members, employers, and stakeholders. And there you go. And I would -- thank you very much.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Thank you.

(Applause).

2.2

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Congratulations. Good luck in your future endeavors.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: If I can have a point of personal privilege

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Jose has requested a point of personal privilege. And here you go. There you go.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Thank you. Thank you, Madam President Taylor.

You know I took this seat on the CalPERS Board, I didn't see it as just an elected position, I saw it as vocation, a calling to serve the people who spend their lives service California. Every Vote I've taken, every question I've asked has come from that place, protecting the retirement security and the health benefits of our active and retired members, and honoring the trust they placed in us.

I am very proud that we have done -- we have done

that together, strengthening our governance, asking harder and smarter questions about risk and returns, and pushing for transparency and keeping long-term sustainability at the center of our decisions. And we've leaned -- we've leaned into complex issues in investments, health care and benefits with the mindset that we are stewards of these assets.

2.2

I especially want to recognize CalPERS staff.

Your professionalism, technical expertise, and awesome, awesome dedication are the backbones of this system.

Whether you are managing billions in assets, negotiating health care contracts, answering member calls, or keeping the operations humming, you do it with competence and all heart. You make it possible for Board members to do our fiduciary work and I am genuinely grateful to that.

To my fellow Board members and colleagues, I have deep, deep, deep respect and affection for all of my colleagues. We always -- we don't always agree, but we share a common purpose to do right by our members and by the people of California. It has been an honor to debate with you, to learn from you, and to stand shoulder to shoulder with you in this work.

And to our members, active and retired, you are the reason I serve. Thank you for allowing me the privilege to represent you for these last four years.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Pacheco. (Applause).

1.3

2.2

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: So -- and we wish you the best in your future endeavors and hope to see you back here some time at a Board meeting maybe.

With that, I'd like to have Marcie Frost do her executive report. I'll throw it over to you.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Good morning, everyone and thank you President Taylor. On behalf of the leadership team here at CalPERS, I'd also like to extend our thank you to Eraina and Jose Luis. Jose Luis, thank you for the kind words to the team. We really appreciate that. And really thank you also for your contributions to CalPERS and for being excellent partners with us.

So I know you'll have new adventures awaiting you, so we wish you the best on whatever you decide to do.

So moving on to some of the work that we did this week listening to those team presentations and then the deliberations this week, did remind me of why I'm really proud to work at CalPERS. Every decision that we make here is to ensure the retirement security of almost 2.4 million members of this system. This week, you voted to adopt a total portfolio approach to investing. This means that going forward, our Investment team will work even more closely together to identify the best investments to

make on behalf of the overall health of the fund, and that is rather than sticking to allocations to particular asset classes that are set every four years.

1.3

2.2

Our goal, as always, is to deliver the best possible returns for the fund and also to continue our work on transparency. And per Committee direction, Mr. Ruffino, during the two-year ALM review, we'll include an agenda item to check in on how the governance practices are working as we move from a pure strategic asset allocation to the total portfolio approach.

The highly skilled investment professionals, who previously focused mostly on the performance of their own asset class will be asked to make decisions for the overall health of the fund, even if it means that investment will be in someone else's purview. It is a significant shift in thinking that we believe will improve our funded status and our returns over time. Those are obviously linked.

We are also the first major pension fund in the U.S. to do it. And we look forward to that leadership role and to share our experiences as we move forward to a July 1 implementation.

To prepare for the shift, we have spoken to you about the work on cultural norms for the Investment Office to support the kind of collaboration that TPA will

require. This is a body of work that has been underway since 2022 when the Talent and Culture team was created, knowing that our people are the very best assets that we have. The team set out to more fully understand the areas improvement necessary for a cross-functional and high performing team.

1.3

2.2

Early changes address onboarding of new team members, what they fondly call the welcome mat, how we bring new team members into the Investment Office. It included some additional social outings, so people get to know one another outside of the office as well as inside of the office.

We also wanted to normalize a set of leadership behaviors, which encourages open and transparent communication, and no question is off the table. There are several more culture efforts underway to recruit and retain top talent, such as the associate programs you heard about this week.

Two significant recruitments are underway, including the head of our Total Fund with first-round interviews completed, and also the recruitment for the Deputy Chief Investment Office for Private Markets.

You also heard this week about our progress in building the climate solutions portfolio. Today, we sit at 60 billion, well on our way to the hundred billion by

2030. Our commitment is not only to renewable energy, but also to technologies that will allow our society to transition and adapt. Renewable energy, such as solar and wind, is now faster and cheaper to bring to market than many conventional power sources. The growth of AI will place additional burdens on the grid, a burden that can't be powered solely by those conventional sources.

2.2

As with the total portfolio approach, our sustainable investment strategy could not succeed without an expert team finding those investment opportunities.

I'm proud to note that in a climate where many large institutional investors were cutting employment in sustainable investments, we were building ours. Our Sustainable Investments team has grown from 8 to 18 people, with two additional positions to be filled.

Climate, Peter Cashion gave you a briefing on this in his item on Monday, but it is a mega trend that is here to stay, regardless of what you might read in the newspapers or the headlines, regardless of the political whims of the moment. And we have built a team that will allow CalPERS to lead for years to come.

People are also at the core of the success of the private equity team. In the past three years, we have focused on promoting from within and focusing the team on selecting the right managers. That strategy shift, as

well as moving our position and markets, has shown early positive results and the team has received industry recognition as a result. In October, Pensions and Investments reported that for the last fiscal year, our private equity book outperformed all 74 other large pension funds in the U.S. with a return of 14.3 percent.

2.2

We are also developing talent not only inside CalPERS, but also among the investment partners that we rely on to offer us the best opportunities first. We allocated more than 6.6 billion to diverse investment managers in the last fiscal year, and 2.2 billion to emerging managers.

So I've talked a lot about the investment team already. But as we leave here, I'd like to end with a note of gratitude for all of our teams here at CalPERS. Every person here contributes to our mission, to members and to employers. They are dedicated public servants who are passionate and positive about their work. You heard the chorus this morning, again another moment of pride, I think, for this organization.

In the last year, that work has included not only the four-year evaluation of the assets and liabilities, but multiple RFP solicitations, major contract negotiations, outreach events to members and employers, stakeholder briefings, comprehensive reports, upgrades to

member-facing services, Board meeting presentations, and so much more. I'm really grateful for this team that always finds ways to serve our members in the way that they expect with respect, with accuracy and with responsiveness.

A special note of recognition for our Contact Center. This is a team that has a lot of change in their day-to-day volume -- call volumes, and there are many spikes that happened over this last 12 months. They stayed completely focus on the member. And I also want to appreciate the leadership of that team as well. Every time those spikes happen, the leadership is going into the queue and taking those calls as well.

So on behalf of the executive team, I'd also like to wish everyone a Happy Thanksgiving. And back to you President Taylor, I'm happy to take any questions or comments.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you, Ms. Frost. I'm not seeing any questions from the Board.

So with that, we're going to move on to agenda item 5, the action consent items.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: I'll move approval.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I have a motion by Mr.

24 Pacheco.

1.3

2.2

VICE PRESIDENT MILLER: Second.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I have a second from Mr.

Miller. With that -- we don't have to do a roll vote.

With that, all those in favor say aye?

(Ayes.)

1.3

2.2

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All those opposed?

Any abstentions?

All right. The item passes.

Moving on to our information consent items. I have not received any requests to remove anything to talk about on this particular item, so we will move on to our action agenda items, and that's committee reports. That's action -- or our Agenda Item 7. I'm going to -- I need you to -- yeah. Start with Investments, Mr. Miller.

VICE PRESIDENT MILLER: The Investment Committee met on November 17th, 2025. The Committee approved the following:

Agenda Item 5a, the Committee approved the asset liability management Public Employees' Retirement Fund recommendations.

The Committee received reports on the following topics: Quarterly Chief Investment Officer report; Total Fund Portfolio Management and Sustainable Investments annual program reviews; diversity in the management of investments AB 890, Responsible Contractor Policy annual review; and a consultant review of CalPERS divestments.

The Chair directed staff to provide a one-time governance review to the Board within two years of implementing the total portal approach.

1.3

2.2

The Committee heard public comment on the following topics: Climate-related investments, Tesla, total portfolio approach, private equity, Labor Principles, emerging and diverse managers, and CalPERS divestments.

At this time, I would like to share some highlights of what to expect at the March Investment Committee meeting: CalPERS trust level review and consultant report; Total Fund Policy review, first reading; Asset Liability Management, first reading, affiliates recommendation; and proxy voting and corporate engagements update.

The next meeting of the Investment Committee is scheduled for March 16th, 2026 in Sacramento, California, and that concludes my report Madam Chair.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Miller. With that, we're going to move on to 7b, and Mr. Rubalcava.

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Thank you, Madam President.

The Pension and Health Benefits Committee met on November 18, 2025. The Committee recommends and I move the Board approve the following:

One -- these are for changes for plan year 2027.

One, product change, Blue Shield Medicare Advantage PPO.

Two, service area expansions. Blue Shield EPO expansion into zip codes that do not have an HMO offering and Kaiser HMO expansion into northwest Nevada.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Any discussion on the motion?

Seeing none. All those in favor say aye?

(Ayes.)

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All those opposed?
Any abstentions?

Motion passes.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Thank you for the vote. The Committee received reports on the following topics: The Committee received a CalPERS Health Benefits Program annual report for plan year 2024; the Committee received public comment asking the Board to acknowledge a prior agreement regarding a member's care, request for more accessible and affordable health plan options in Amador county and a member certain over inaccurate COVID vaccine coverage and counseling.

The Chair directed staff to create and provide Board members with high level talking points to use regarding the rate development process.

At this time, I would like to share some highlights of what to expect at the March PHBC Committee

meeting. The Committee will review the health open enrollment results, receive a report on retired members cost of living, and get an update on the pharmacy benefits manager transition.

1.3

2.2

The next meeting of the Pension and Health
Benefits Committee is scheduled for March 17th, 2026 in
Sacramento, California. Thank you, Madam Chair.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you, Chair Rubalcava.

With that, we'll move on to 7c, Finance and Administration Committee. Mr. Palkki.

BOARD MEMBER PALKKI: Thank you, Madam President. The Finance and Administration Committee met on November 18th, 2025.

The Committee recommends and I move the Board approve the following:

Agenda Item 3c, approve the November 25 prospective report of solicitations, contracts, purchase orders, and letters of engagement.

Agenda Item 3d, approve an additional one-year contract term extension for the Investment Office contracts without a defined duration listed in Attachment 1 provided.

Agenda Item 5a, approve a 237.6 million mid-year budget increase for a revised budget of 2.978 billion.

Agenda Item 5b, approve the draft CalPERS '24-'25

basic financial statements.

1.3

2.2

Agenda Item 5c, adopt new actuarial assumptions as presented in the experience study report to be effective with the June 30th, '25 actuarial valuations. Contribution rates due to changes in assumptions for the State and schools will be impacted in fiscal year '26-'27. Contribution rates for public agencies will be impacted in fiscal year '27-'28 and use the recommended assumptions -- assumption changes in all affected members' calculations effective as follows: for service credit purchase applications postmarked on or after November 20th, '25 and for retirement applications dated on or after November 20th, 2025.

And Agenda Item 5d, approve the annual discharge of accounts receivable.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Wow. On the motion from Committee. All those -- any discussion?

I'm sorry.

BOARD CLERK ANDERSON: You do have a public comment as well.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: We'll get there. We'll get there. Okay.

So I guess we'll take first. And you said move approval and we have --

VICE PRESIDENT MILLER: Move approval.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Jelincic.

J.J. JELINCIC: J.J. Jelincic, Director of Health Benefits been RPEA.

First, I'd like to congratulate Mrs. Miller, Johnson, and Brennand on their election victories.

1.3

2.2

RPEA takes no position on whether you should adopt the financial statements. Although we represent beneficiaries, whose money you are managing, we are outsiders and have to rely on the staff and the auditors for confidence in financial statements.

While I know the Board is aware of it, I want to point out the following quote from the auditor's report. I do so for the benefit of the beneficiaries, the employers, the taxpayers, any press that may be paying attention, and municipal bond investors who rely on those financial statements to assess risk. BDO has written quote, "The other information comprises the introductory investment, actuarial, and statistical sections listed in the accompanying table of contents, but does not include the basic financial statements and our auditor's report thereon. Our opinion on the basic statements do not cover the other information and we do not express an opinion or any form of assurance thereon," unquote.

In other words, the financial reports reflect the book of records, but the use of the investment information

```
is at your own risk. I thank you.
1
             PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Jelincic.
2
             With that, we have a motion by Committee.
 3
             Any discussion on the motion?
             All right, Mullissa.
 5
             Ms. Willette. Oops, that didn't work.
 6
             BOARD MEMBER WILLETTE: That's for later.
7
             PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Oh, it is for later. Okay.
8
9
             Seeing no discussion on the motion, all those in
    favor say aye?
10
11
             (Ayes.)
             PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All those opposed?
12
             Any abstentions?
1.3
             Thank you.
14
             Moving on.
15
16
             BOARD MEMBER PALKKI: No, I've got more.
             PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Oh, yes, you do. It's way at
17
   the bottom. Go ahead. You should be on.
18
19
             BOARD MEMBER PALKKI: Thank you.
20
             PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I didn't turn it off.
             BOARD MEMBER PALKKI: No, I turned it off for
21
   public comment.
2.2
23
             PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay.
             BOARD MEMBER PALKKI: The Committee received
24
25
   reports on the following topics: Semi-annual health plan
```

financial report, modernizing investment data and technology update.

The Chair directed staff to identify the reasons for the peace officers rate increases from the Actuarial Office.

At this time, I would like to share some highlights on what to expect at the February Finance and Administration meeting: treasury analysis and liquidity staff report; pension contracts management program reports; review of Committee delegation; 2026 CalPERS Board of administration, State, school, and special retired member notice of election.

And the next meeting for the Finance and Administration Committee is scheduled for February 17th, 2026 in Sacramento, California.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Palkki.

With that, we will move on to 7D, Performance,

Compensation and Talent Management Committee. Ms.

20 Willette. Maybe. Maybe not. There you go.

BOARD MEMBER WILLETTE: Thank you.

The Performance, Compensation and Talent
Management subcommittee met on October 30th, 2025 and
interviewed three firms for the Board's primary executive
and investment compensation consultant. The Committee

recommends and I move that the Board approve the following:

1.3

2.2

Agenda Item 3a, which is the Board's primary executive and investment compensation consultant Request for Proposal Finalist interviews and selection, and approve the award of the contract to Global Governance Advisors as the highest ranking finalist subject to final negotiations and satisfaction of all requirements, and direct staff to begin contract negotiations for the contract with Global Governance Advisors. If staff, in its discretion, concludes that negotiations are unsuccessful, staff should begin contract negotiations with Mercer U.S., the next highest scoring finalist, and so on.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: On motion by Committee. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Hearing none, all those in favor say aye?
(Ayes.)

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All those opposed, say nay?
Abstentions?

All right. Motion carries.

Moving on to the Risk and Audit Committee. And hold on, Deborah. There you go. Ms. Gallegos.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: Great. Thank you.

The Risk and Audit Committee met on November

18th, 2025. The Committee recommends and I move the Board approve the following:

Agenda Item 5a, independent auditor's report for the fiscal years 20 -- 2024 and 2025, and Agenda Item 5b, review of the independent auditor's management letter.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All right. On motion by Committee. Any discussion on the motion?

Hearing none, all those in favor say aye?
(Ayes.)

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Any opposition?

All right. Any abstentions?

Motion carries.

Moving on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

17

18

21

2.2

23

24

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: Great. Thank you.

At this time, I'd like to share some highlights

of what to expect at the February 2026 Risk and Committee

Meeting. The 2025 and 2026 Enterprise Compliance and Risk

| Management mid-year plan update will be reviewed. The

19 Committee heard public comments on the following

20 | topics: -- actually, there were no public comments.

Thank you very much Madam Chair.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: You've got one more line.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: The next Committee

meeting for the Risk and Audit Committee is scheduled for

25 | February 26th[SIC] in Sacramento, California.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank yo very much.

2.2

With that, we're moving on to Board Governance. And as the Chair of Board Governance, we didn't have a meeting this month, unless somebody had something they wanted to say. I don't know.

Okay. I have a public commenter. I have a public commenters Sara Granda if you want to come on down.

SARA GRANDA: Take your time. And then we need to know how much additional time you're requesting. I can give you one more minute.

Ms. Granda, do you know how much extra time you wanted, because --

SARA GRANDA: Well, usually I just do like the double time that I had for like the State bar exam and then every other exam that I've had to apply for accommodations for. That's all. Whatever your giving me.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: So let's do five.

SARA GRANDA: Okay.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: That's almost double.

SARA GRANDA: All right. I've got to get my mom over to surgery.

All right. You ready? I've got five minutes.

So I tried to give handouts. Did we give the handouts. Okay. So you guys could follow.

So good morning, everyone. I'm sure you remember

me. My name is Sara Granda. I'm a CalPERS member, quadriplegic attorney and the plaintiff in litigation involving CalPERS's self-funded plans. So before I go further, I must acknowledge a structural reality.

2.2

CalPERS's administration of its self-funded plans are -- there's only two left, are opaque, internally inconsistent, and a labyrinth of their own even for those of us trained in administrative and health law. This was my whole life and professional trajectory, right?

Otherwise, I probably wouldn't know it.

So when a legal right depends on navigating a system so opaque that one party cannot meaningfully understand it, the law becomes inherently prejudicial. A system that cannot be understood cannot be accessed. So the law is either the law or it's not, right?

So I appear today only to address the portions of the agenda related to litigation and statements from, I think, Acting General Counsel Renee Salazar. Renee and I know each other. We've met.

So 18 months ago, there was this federal order for this TRO, and later this motion to compel. And I faced an ongoing risk of significant harm, including possible death. These orders require immediate implementation of 24-hour skilled nursing care, RN oversight, and care coordination. To date, none of these

have been implemented. I'm implementing them all on my own. So because of that, I remain medically unstable. I'm still ventilator-dependent. Without skilled coverage, and unable to access the court, because the Eastern District court doesn't have an ADA coordinator, this has placed me in a legal and medical stalemate that no individual, disabled or not, could navigate.

2.2

So the recent conduct that's escalated is a retaliatory, defamatory voicemail from a disgruntled nurse involving vaguely charged threats in references to litigation that she's suing me, even though she can't. The misrepresentations and admission by CalPERS counsel regarding my conduct, including false claims of my PRA requests, of public comment demonstrating unwillingness to settle. I just really need to like get on with my life, because my mom is downstairs. I have to take her to this cancer-like treatment. So alterations are omissions of public comment transcripts, contradictory litigation positions, now cross over into criminal exposure, which is not great, including the California Penal Code sections as documented in my CHP referral and legal analysis that I have submitted.

I'm not here to argue the litigation. I'm here because the agenda today includes fiduciary counsel, legal oversight, and governance assurances. Yet, real world

implementation of court orders does not align with CalPERS's stated fiduciary commitments. If CalPERS is unwilling today to implement the TRO and order to compel, then I ask the Board to direct staff or at least comply -- staff to at least comply with these federal order requirements that CalPERS meet with me and my father, plaintiff also, Jose Granda. This is the smallest, narrowest, most basic element of the order and it has not occurred.

So, in closing, I will just close as I began, a legal system that's so opaque it cannot -- it can be used against the person it governs is no legal system at all. If CalPERS's self-funded plan is structured in a way that even its own counsel struggles to explain, then it's application becomes inherently prejudicial, especially to a ventilator-dependent beneficiary whose life depend on the clarity and execution of those obligations.

At some point, the law must be the law or it ceases to function as such. Today, I simply am asking CalPERS to choose the former. Thanks.

Look I made it.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you.

(Applause).

1.3

2.2

SARA GRANDA: Thanks guys. Okay.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: With that, I'm going to call

```
on Mr. Miller to do our summary of recommended actions.
1
    So hold on a second. There we go.
2
             VICE PRESIDENT MILLER: There we go. I move to
 3
    adopt the proposed decisions at Agenda Items 8al through
 4
    8a9 with the minor modifications argued by staff to Agenda
5
    Items 8a4 through 7, and Agenda Item 8a9.
6
             BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: I'll second it.
7
             PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All right. I was just going
8
9
   to ask for that.
             The motion has been made by Mr. Miller, seconded
10
   by Mr. Pacheco.
11
             All those in favor say aye?
12
             (Ayes.)
1.3
             PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All those opposed?
14
             And any abstentions?
15
16
             With that, the motion carries.
             Thank you, Mr. Miller.
17
             All right. I'm -- we are on 9?
18
             Yeah, that's what -- so then I'm on 9b, correct?
19
20
             VICE PRESIDENT MILLER:
                                     8b.
             PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Yeah, 8b. No, it's 9b, isn't
21
2.2
   it?
23
             Yeah. Please 9b. Go ahead, State Legislative
   proposal. All right. It looks like I can describe all of
24
    this, but I'll let you do it.
25
```

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: Good morning, Madam President, Calpers Board members. Danny Brown, Calpers team member.

2.2

This is an action item asking the Board to sponsor legislation to discontinue the actuarially equivalent reduction, also known as AER, for any new elections for service credit purchases, tier conversions, and redeposits of withdrawn contributions that occur on or after January 1st, 2027. Currently, when a member makes an election to purchase service credit, they can either pay the cost with a lump sum payment or choose installment payments over 180 months.

If the member still has an outstanding balance at the time of retirement, they can either pay that off in a lump sum or have their benefit actuarially reduced. They AER allows the member to receive a retirement benefit, including the total years of service credit purchased by paying the remaining balance through a permanent benefit reduction in the monthly retirement allowance using annuity factors, based on the member's age at retirement, assumed interest rate, and mortality assumptions.

This proposal would eliminate the AER option and instead at the time of retirement, the member can either payoff the outstanding balance with a lump sum, or receive prorated service credit based on the amount paid ensuring

that the service credit is paid in full at the time of retirement.

1.3

2.2

We added the AER option in 2020, in lieu of allowing members to continue to make installment payments into retirement. This change was meant to reduce the complexity of having to track installment payments into retirement, and in some cases, having to collect delinquent payments.

However, we have found that the AER option has created its own unintended results and calculation complexities. To address these issues and align CalPERS business practices with other pension systems, the team is proposing to discount the AER option for any new service credit purchase, tier conversion, and redeposit of withdrawn contributions effective January 1st, 2027.

And I think it's important to point out that this will not impact anybody that has made a purchase prior to that date. And with that, I'll stop and answer any questions.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: What was the start date of it, January?

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: January 1st of 2027.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: 2027. Okay. And what's the unintended results that we had when we are getting the

payments through the retirement check? What's the unintended results?

2.2

mean, some of them was just the complexities of having to track the calculations, you know. And there's also -- I think we have found that it kind of resulted in people waiting longer to purchase service credit. I think we would prefer people to purchase service credit as soon as possible, when it's the cheapest, rather than waiting and having to pay more interest. So I think, you know, we're looking to have people by it sooner.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Is there anything in it that says maybe you should do it five years before retirement, or 10 years before retirement, or have a cutoff date that, you know, if you haven't applied for it -- of course, people sometimes don't know when they're going to retire.

I mean, there's nothing in the -- in the proposal -- or in the language. I mean I think it's our -- if you look at our publications, we talk about and encourage people to purchase earlier. And I think as part of this proposal, the team will be looking at ways to communicate earlier and trying to let people know that they have -- if they have this option available to them that to take advantage of it as soon as possible.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. I have a question from Mr. Miller. Go ahead.

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

24

25

VICE PRESIDENT MILLER: Yeah. Question and comment. I think if we eliminate this option, this -- I would call it a benefit that our members currently have, can they still do a payment plan into their retirement?

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: No.

VICE PRESIDENT MILLER: Okay. So my concern is, like for me example, when I looked at these decisions, when people you're -- in their careers, they often just don't have the wherewithal to say, okay, I'm going to -- I know it's going to cost me money, but I just don't have the cash flow to do this now, and I'm going to, you know, elect it later. And the ability to have that payment stream into retirement, I just -- all the away, around it's -- I think people view it as having the option, having the benefit, and it's up to me as a member or any of our members to decide what's the best timing and what works best for them. And now, not having that option of either the airtime or the payment plan into retirement, because we want to push them to make, you know, what we feel is, in our judgment, a better decision for them, seems a bit out of place.

The other thing is I would hope -- I mean I have full confidence that our actuarial team can do this in a

way that's not disadvantageous to us and our fund. If we have not had that experience, we might need to adjust our approach to how we do those actuarial analysis. I would think that some people are -- sometimes it's going to be to our advantage. We can't really totally predict, you know, what -- how long people are going to live and whether those payment streams require us to do collections or whatever the case may be there, so...

2.2

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Go ahead, Mr. Terando.

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: Sure. Scott Terando,
CalPERS team member. So in terms of when we set the
actuarial reduction, you know, it's based on, you know,
estimated lifetime, you know, in our actuarial
assumptions. But you do run into the issue that when
people make the selection, there could be some -anti-selection can occur, because the people are making
the decisions themselves. They push off the decision to
end and then we could run into some losses on the system.

And so there is a little bit of higher potential in terms of anti-selection happening. When we set the reduction, it does work out for the system, but we have the potential of losses when people, you know, make that election.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: So there is a potential based on -- so I guess maybe I'm thinking -- so is it -- I want

to add on to his question. So are we reducing -automatically just reducing the retirement payment to the
member or are we taking it out of it and recording it that
way, as if it were a withdrawal from their paycheck?

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: We make a permanent

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: We make a permanent reduction in --

2.2

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Permanent reduction. So does that -- is that why it makes it harder to track?

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: It makes it harder to track, but it also -- you can think about it this way.

It's kind of like giving them a free loan. You know, they owed, you know, say \$20,000, and basically you're fronting the loan to them for the \$20,000 up front, because there's no really charge that we're assessing.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: And then if -- I -- okay. I see.

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: And then if -- you know, if they were to die a little bit -- ahead of time, we don't recoup everything.

VICE PRESIDENT MILLER: So I guess my follow-up to that would be I'm a little unsure that -- so what -- in terms of the number of people that we expect this will likely affect, in terms of our experience of, you know, how many people do this, and how many people this has affected historically going forward, how many people would

be impacted, and how much money would we be saving in the future, and why couldn't we anticipate that and build that into our assumptions for how we cost this or address this as whatever kind of calculation it is to determine what people need to be paying or having deducted from their retirement?

1.3

2.2

MEMBER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF AOKI:

Thank you, Mr. Miller. Kelli Aoki, CalPERS team member. In terms of the number of people that its impacted, when we look back over the last 10 years, we've had 88,000 -- approximately 88,000 service credit purchase selections. Of those elections, we have 51,000 that have a retirement date. And of that, only 11 percent have elected AER. Seventy percent of them -- more than 70 percent their status currently is paid in full.

VICE PRESIDENT MILLER: And how many of those have we had this adverse consequence of not having, you know, guest rights about what it would cost us?

MEMBER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF AOKI:

We'll need to do some additional calculations on that to determine the outcomes. Some of them we're not going to know because they're still living. And so we're not going to know. And my understanding is that the balance due is amortized from their date of retirement until the mortality assumption. So I think that's like 85

years. So if somebody were to retire at the age of 60, then it's getting amortized over 25 years.

2.2

VICE PRESIDENT MILLER: A lot of ifs. Yeah, I guess my final thing is it just seems like this -- you know, if this is the threshold for us to be proposing legislation, I think there's a lot of things we can think of that we might want to propose legislation, if we're going to go to that effort, so -- yeah, I'm -- I think at this point, I'm probably a no on this.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: We have lots of comments, so Mr. Pacheco.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Well, I would like to defer just until the end. Is that -- would that okay?

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: No. Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Okay. No problem.

Thank you for the comments here. I also have hesitation about this as well. I feel this is not giving -- not giving the -- because, you know, our responsibility is to provide the members all the choices they can have, as many choices as possible. And I feel that this piece of legislation would provide -- would not -- would actually limit that in the end. But if you can clarify that for me I would be -- if you can educate me more that, it would be really helpful, Scott, or anybody.

1 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I think you kind of did.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Yeah.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All right. So I'm going to leave it at that.

Mr. Palkki.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER PALKKI: Thank you. I'm trying to rethink a question here, because I think Scott already answered it. I understand we need to create a sustainable fund, and obviously the percentage of this is low. I'm trying to think of a scenario where somebody may be slightly short and fall under a scenario of having to use their power of attorney. In scenarios like that, would an individual be able to -- they wouldn't be able add to their service credit, if this were to pass, right?

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Say that again?

BOARD MEMBER PALKKI: Yeah.

MEMBER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF AOKI:

So Mr. Palkki, in that situation, are you talking about somebody who --

BOARD MEMBER PALKKI: So I'm thinking if -- like nobody tries to worry about the future so much. And if the future comes faster than expected, is there a possibility that that individual would be able to buy a service credit just to help them out a little bit more due to their early retirement?

MEMBER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF AOKI:

So that's something I'd have to check with me team with, like if a power of attorney were to be able to file -- or apply for service credit purchase on behalf of a member. But if somebody were to have purchased service credit and they're like in installment payments, then, in that situation, when they go to retire, it will be an option of either paying it in full or taking a proration.

We do have a generous installment payment plan for members while they're active. And so I understand that your situation that you're asking about is if somebody han an unexpected retirement, in that case. They also do an evaluation with the service credit purchase also, in terms of if it were to be a disability retirement, whether or not the service credit purchased would enhance — improve the benefit or not. So if benefit doesn't get approved with the service credit purchase, then they discontinue that service credit purchase, because on a disability retirement, it's based on other factors.

BOARD MEMBER PALKKI: Thank you.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Palkki.

Mr. Rubalcava.

Oh, wait a minute. It didn't work.

There.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for the presentation. And it's -- I read -- on the memo, it identifies one adverse select -- one adverse impact to the member. He could outlive his -- not outlive his benefit, but if he beats the mortuary table and he lives beyond 85, let's say he goes to 99 or 100, he will be living with a reduced benefit that shouldn't have happened. He's being short-changed. So I think the purchase of additional credit is a very good benefit, very favorable. And all the systems allow that, whether it's for military service or other kind of service, and provide -- and so the question is what kind of loans or payment options you provide. We provide many, just like the other systems do. Rollover your 457 or something like that.

2.2

So that's a good thing. And I think under the proposed legislation, there is a solution. I mean, if you don't pay it off before you retire, your benefit just is prorated. You get whatever you pay for. And I think that's the best of fairness. I think it would be unfair to make all these -- it would -- we do have a duty -- fiduciary duty includes the whole thing about reducing unnecessary expenses. And I think staff time and computations is an expense that we can perhaps mitigate and encourage, provide the incentives for members to be

reasonable. I mean, we want everybody to get their additional service credit. It's their right. They should do it, if they can afford. If not, we have loan provisions, if they cannot do it. And it's up to the date of retirement.

2.2

But I would hate for people to feel they -- well, I can always do it. I'm one to procrastinate, so I'll probably -- you know, so I can -- that's why I'm speaking from experience and wait till the last minute, and then they continue living, and living, and living past their mortality table, and they get a reduction that they shouldn't have had. So I think it's better for us to be proactive, encourage them to use all the available resources, get counseling from our Contact Center, or what have you, and do it.

So I'm in favor of the legislation. But I do have a question. Nobody else does that. What drove us in 2020 to implement this actuarial reduction? What's it called? Actuarial -- AER. Why did we do it in 2020? Isn't that when it was implemented?

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: Yes. So, yes, it was -- it was passed in legislation in 2018 and it had kind of ramp-up implementation date. Again, I think it was just looking at a -- you know, I don't think at the time it was actually the original suggestion that

came from the team, but I think it was kind of a way to soften taking away the installment payments into retirement, so not -- and so that I think that we came up with this other solution that we thought would work with this AER option. But I think as the item pointed out is as we -- after we've implemented and have dealt with it for five years, it kind of created its own complexities, you know, and we went away from the installment payments to reduce complexities of administration and this created its own.

2.2

And, as you know, you know, we try to automate as much stuff as we can. And every time we kind of provide something extra, it requires manual intervention a lot of times. Folks have to get involved and it kind of delays processing of death benefits for these members who have chosen AER. They have multiple beneficiaries or a beneficiaries and this carries on. And so I think it's just added complexity that we didn't necessarily foresee when we provided this option back in 2018 to start in 2020.

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: The memo talks about a study that was done in 2017 that surveyed all the other pensions. And the result was that nobody else had the system. Everybody else allows you to pay up to your retirement date. And after that, they make some

adjustment. So did that report -- did that study suggest any variance or any other system that did something -- I'm trying to understand the genesis of this why we thought it was a great and now we realize it isn't.

2.2

MEMBER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF AOKI:

So with that study, there is no other system that we had surveyed that allows payments to continue into retirement. Nobody else has an actuarial equivalent reduction option. What we found were systems varied in terms of how long of an installment payment plan they could have while they're active. We and one other system - and I apologize. I can't remember off the top to of my head - have the longest payment plans of 15 years. There's other systems that have plans where if you bought three years, you had three years to pay. And there's other systems that you have to pay it off in one year or it's just lump sum.

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Thank you. I also want to make an analogy to the 457 Plan, which has some IRS consequences of course, which is a pre-tax program. You can get loans out of the 457 or 401(k) plan --

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Yeah, you can.

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: -- but you're required to pay it right before you retire. And if you don't they just give you a 1099 or something. It was basically, you

know, pre- -- you pay taxes on it.

So I think in comparing that, this proposal makes sense. And I think we -- it still allows people to -- rightly so, to purchase previous credit, and -- but the only requirement would be that they pay their service prior to retirement. And if they can't, their pension is proportionally reduced. So it's like paying back a loan. And that's what it is, it's paying back a loan for your purchase of credit. So it's a service agreement, right, which is like a loan document, so it makes sense to me.

And why should we, for a minority of people, try to -- who are -- I mean, I think it's -- yeah, I mean, we shouldn't be trying to be big brother and make sure people make the right decision, but we should have the right incentives, I think, and allowing a loophole to somebody to lose money in the long term, I don't think is a good suggestion.

 $\label{eq:solution} \mbox{So I'm supportive of the proposed legislation.}$ Thank you.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Rubalcava.

Ms. Gallegos.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: Sorry, I think Yvonne was before me, no?

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: No.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: Okay.

```
PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I'm doing it in line.
1
             ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: Great. So maybe
2
    I'm misunderstanding, but are -- is the proposed
3
    legislation to remedy these items or to remove the option
 4
    entirely?
5
             (Zoom interference.)
6
             ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: I'm think
7
8
    they're --
9
             (Laughter).
             (Zoom interference.)
10
             PRESIDENT DOLAN: Is that Chiraq?
11
             (Laughter).
12
             ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: Somebody
13
    accidentally hit a -- hit a switch.
14
             PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Oh, my goodness.
15
16
             So the -- it was. Go ahead, Deborah.
                                                     Sorry
    about that.
17
             ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: So is the proposed
18
    legislation to remedy the issues that we're having with
19
20
    the proposed -- probable losses in the event somebody is
   not able to meet their obligation or is it eliminate the
21
    option entirely?
2.2
23
             LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN:
                                                         It's
   to eliminate the AER option entirely for any new purchase
24
25
    elections after the enactment of the legislation, which
```

would January 1st of 2027. So it doesn't affect anybody that's in the pipeline --

1.3

2.2

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: Right.

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN:

-- that has chosen or has chosen AER, it's just for new elections going forward.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: And is there a way to keep the AER, but modify it, so that people -- so that we resolve these technical issues and reduce the risk to the system?

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: The only option would be to get -- have a shorter defined period and go back to post-retirement options -- or post-retirement installment plans of like say five years or a short period where, you -- both -- you don't have -- you don't have -- you don't have concerns of the runoff both before the expiration of the -- you know, the period or people living longer. It's taken care of up front.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: I guess I would say that I'm in favor of reducing the risk to the plan -the potential losses to the plan, something that we -- an unintended consequence of the benefit, but it is a benefit, and it's not an uncommon one. There are companies that provide loans all the time to their employees. There are ways, as Mr. Rubalcava mentioned, to

if you -- if you retire and you happened finished paying off. So I feel like I need more information before making a decision on this item, which I'm not sure we're going to be able to have today, because of some of the data that's missing.

2.2

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah. I'm going to ask Robert Carlin to come up, but I was mentioning that at least in the state, it's actually prohibited by law to give a loan to an employee or to member, but --

SENIOR ATTORNEY CARLIN: Yeah, we're not allowed to use the trust assets in the form of a loan to provide that kind of a benefit over and above --

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: I'm just using the phrase that was used earlier, which was it's akin to providing a loan, so we're not providing a loan, but this is the benefit that we're offering.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: So is it possible for us to look into this, because somebody said - I don't remember if it was you guys - that some of -- some systems allow it after retirement, but for a year, or two years, or three years.

MEMBER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF AOKI:

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: We're the only ones. PRESIDENT TAYLOR: We're the only ones. I

thought I heard -- okay.

1.3

2.2

MEMBER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF AOKI:

No, the example -- I apologize for the confusion. Those examples were payment plans prior to retirement. So when they elect their service credit purchase, they can elect a payment plan and the different systems have various durations for that.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. So we have this benefit. I think Ms. Gallegos is kind of asking for more information. Maybe the information is can we shorten the time, make it a requirement, instead of taking it away entirely, making it a requirement that they must have it paid off in X amount time of retirement.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: And also identify a little bit more the risk to the system, so --

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Oh, please, and how much -how much that actually is. I was thinking that myself. I
wrote down, can you come back with the actual monetary
risk that we're facing right now? And then I've got more
people, so here we go. Ms. Walker. You were done, right?

ACTING BOARD MEMBER GALLEGOS: Yes.

PRESIDENT DOLAN: So sorry.

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: Thank you. And so I thought I was -- knew exactly where we were and then my colleagues chimed in, and then I got a little confused, so

I just want to make sure I'm understanding. So in 2018, we proposed this. We thought it was going to be a good thing. And then in 2020, we said that they could -- so prior to 2018, they had to pay off before they retired or go into and AI -- AER?

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: I'll see if I can re-summarize it again.

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: Thank you.

2.2

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: So prior to 2020, so even though the legislation passed in 2018, it ramped --

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: It took two years to get it going.

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: To implement it.

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: Okay. Okay. That's where I got confused.

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: Yeah. So prior to 2020, if a -- if a member had not paid off their service credit at the time of retirement, they had the option of paying a lump sum or they can continue with their installment payments. So if they chose 180 months and they had paid 100 months, and they owed 80, then they would just continue the 80 months into your retirement. And then when it was paid off, it was paid off.

And so in 2020 is when we stopped -- for new elections, we stopped that installment payment into retirement, and instead allowed for this AER reduction, if it was not paid in full. They still had the option to pay it off in a lump sum, if they wanted to at the time of retirement or they could choose the AER

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: Okay. And then I saw something here, another complication complexity, whatever we're calling it, was if the member dies before it's paid off, they've got their beneficiary or their beneficiary has to then pay this off. And then because of new changes, if they have another beneficiary, then both beneficiaries, or three beneficiaries, or however many others got to pay that too. So it's more people that you have to add into the mix, is that correct?

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: Um-hmm.

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: So that was one that wasn't necessarily anticipated?

MEMBER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF AOKI:

So one of the complexities with that, as you mentioned, is if somebody were to retire and they have more than one ongoing beneficiary, that reduction amount has to get split up amongst all of those beneficiaries and applied to their benefit payment, so --

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: Yeah, but I'm thinking in terms of -- because I know this has come up in the last few years of, you know, somebody is retired. They've married somebody else, right? And the first person they were married to has their retirement, and now is it going to be split again as so. It just -- it does start to be, I think, complex, right, and especially if you're the first wife or husband, whatever.

2.2

And then it's not going to impact -- you know, we are moving the legislation now. It's going to take time, but it's -- anybody that's doing it now, that's just it.

We're going to just deal with whatever we have to deal with. But we're just saying anybody who wants to do it from the -- from '27 on, they -- we have two years to provide education on doing this and why, right, before adding new people onto this program.

And then my last question is have we talked to the employee organizations about this change and where -- what have they said? Have they said -- are they opposed to it? Have they said thinking or --

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: We have discussed it with, yes, the employee organizations and the employer organizations. No one has raised objections or said that they were going to oppose it. So I think they understand and of -- the change and the

rationale for the change.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: Okay. So, you know, at this point, I am supporting it, but it's where we at.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you, Ms. Walker. With this, I'm going to move to -- Mr. Palkki, you have already spoken, so Mr. Ruffino.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. It's a little confusing. It could be quite confusing as can all attest to it, but I understand why CalPERS is proposing the legislation.

Inherently, it's for the best interest of our members. I think overall, it's for the good of the beneficiaries. I think the positive outweighs the potential hardship for a small number of people.

From a fiduciary standpoint, and I'm not a fiduciary counsel, but I believe it's clean. Ultimately, ultimately, it's good governance. Some member would lose a flexible payment option. They will still receive however full credit for what they have paid. And as Board Member walker just mentioned there is a long runway before it takes effect in 2027. So I urge support of the proposal.

Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Ruffino.

Mr. Palkki.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER PALKKI: Yes. No, I appreciate the conversation. I sort of asked my question at the beginning, but I have a better understanding, so I appreciate everybody's thoughts. Looking at this, this is only one option out of many that are provided by the PERL. And so knowing that and making sure that we have a sustainable fund, I am okay with making the motion to move forward and sponsor the legislation to discontinue the AER option --

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Go ahead and read the whole thing.

BOARD MEMBER PALKKI: -- the option for any new elections for service credit purchases tier conversions, redeposits of withdrawn contributions that occur on or after July 1st, 2027.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: I'll second.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Motion has been made by Mr. Palkki. It's been seconded by Mr. Pacheco. Sorry Lisa. But I do have a public comment on this. So I'm going to down Willine Davis, J.J. Jelincic, and then we have somebody on the phone.

So after we vote on it, is that what you're saying?

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: Yes.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay

Right over here.

So you will have three minutes once you start.

WILLINE DAVIS: Okay. So where do I hit this

little. Which one?

2.2

Good afternoon, morning. Ladies and gentlemen, I am a retired correctional officer. I retired on an industry disability in 1997. In 1996, I entered into a buyback contract to buy back previously withdrawn contributions. I had a nine-year buyback. I paid back every dime of the contributions within that nine years, '97. I'm now 71 years old and I have yet to receive the annuity from my buyback contract, as a peace officer.

Retired on an industrial disability, I received 50 percent entitlement. That's fully funded by the employer through Social Security contributions, refunded to the CalPERS every July 1st. You guys are the first ones to get a check, because the State doesn't have enough money to pay disability benefits for those officers and other State employees retired on an industry disability.

My problem is in that buyback, I bought back eight years of service, which would have maxed me out at 30 percent plus the 50 percent. I didn't get that. What I am getting is a small annuity from my miscellaneous buyback service of \$85 for 5.8 years of service. Clearly,

that is not a two percent buyback, which is what I purchased was a two percent buyback for each year of service, and as an officer, 2.5 percent. So when you — in '27 when you eliminate other people from being able to buy back credit, that's what will happen. They can't buy back unless they pay the full amount from what I'm understanding on the conversation.

2.2

But what about those of us who have already paid back the loan -- or it wasn't a loan. I had to pay two hundred and eighty something dollars out of my retirement every month for fine years, until the money was paid back. And I again state, I am not receiving my peace officer annuity that I bought back for. And my miscellaneous was reduced based on my age at retirement of 42, instead of my beneficiary amount of 2.5 and 2 percent.

So I've been deprived of 4.5 percent annuity for the last 28 years. And all of that is due to me, because under 20164, I just have to establish the system owes me money. And the Board, having already ruled in Davenport, that I -- my money cannot be used to fund the entitlement. This is what I was told, 16 percent of my peace officer money is being used to fund the entitlement. All of that is in writing. But if you look at my account, my account was closed on July 1st, 1997 and my years of service was written off at the same time.

So my money requests for CalPERS is not going to the State Controller to pay me the correct amount from this date from 1997, March 1st to current. And so that's what I have a right to receive. So when we talk about taking and preventing people from buyback, I'm not even getting the buyback contract. So hopefully we can get this resolved. Thank you.

Any questions for me?

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: No, ma'am.

Mr. Jelincic.

2.2

J.J. JELINCIC: J.J. Jelincic, speaking for myself. One of the more interesting points of the original presentation was the discussion of unintended consequences, one of which was identified as having to track whose -- who owes us money. I can understand that that may be a little difficult, but it certainly should not have been unintended. If you're going to set up a payment program, you ought to expect that you're going to have to track who owes you money.

The discussion has come up about the actuarial reduction and some people dying early, and so the fund losing money. Well, I will point out that some people will die later than they're supposed to and the fund will gain money. The actuaries are pretty bright people. You pay them to figure out what are the odds, and so they're

going to underestimate in some cases, overestimate in others. But if it is an actuarial sound decision and a sound reduction, the net-net should be a wash for the system. So the funding status of the system should not be part of the discussion.

2.2

You know, you may decide you want to eliminate this benefit anyhow, but don't do it to protect the financial solvency of the fund. Thank you.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Jelincic.

I believe we have one phone call.

CALPERS STAFF: Yes, President Taylor, we have Steven Alari here to speak on 8b. Steven, you are now live and can proceed with your comments.

STEVEN ALARI: Thank you. Madam President and members of the Board, my name is Steven Alari. I'm speaking as an individual.

Back in 1999, SB 400 was adopted by the Legislature. CalPERS supported the legislation and this option was one of the options for paying back. People could retire and take it out of their checks. So it's been a long time benefit to our members since back -- at least since then.

A comment was made by one of the Board members that this is a long runway. Well really, I would recommend that at least you have an effective date of

1-1-28, because if the legislation gets adopted, it goes through the legislative process, the Governor -- it can go all the way through where the Governor signs it in September, 2026. So the members who are looking at retiring in the next two, three years, they really only have a few months to make that decision, oh, I've got to retire now, so I don't have to pay back all right up front.

2.2

So you might want to have a longer runway, because, like I said, the legislation, if adopted by the Legislature and signed by the Governor, it's only going to be a short window for those who are employed and want to use this option. It is definitely a benefit for the members. I encourage the Board to look at that longer runway at least. Thank you.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Alari.

I have one more phone call.

CALPERS STAFF: Yes. Next we have Bobby Roy with SEIU Local 1000 to comment on 8B. Bobby, you are now live and can proceed with your comments.

BOBBY ROY: Thank you. Good morning. This is
Bobby Roy with SEIU Local 1000. I'm calling -- you know,
maybe it was a misspeak by the presenter, but my
understanding when I spoke with Daniel Schoorl in our
political department was that SEIU was now in the process

of scheduling a check-in with the PERS Legislative

Director on this. And I don't -- I cannot confirm that we have actually met with staff on this item and would love the opportunity to do so before the Board make a -- made a recommendation on this. Thank you.

1.3

2.2

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Roy.

I heard one of our -- go ahead, David. I heard one of our commenters in terms of a longer runway. We could possibly do that if the Board -- if that's the pleasure of the Board. Did you want to talk now or after the vote, Yvonne?

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: After the vote.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: After the vote. Okay.

Mr. Miller.

VICE PRESIDENT MILLER: I just -- I just want to clarify, because I'm not -- I'm haven't talked to everybody, but I'm not aware of any labor support officially for any of this. And part of the reason I'm raising this is because I've heard concerns from folks. I don't sit on the board of a union anymore, but I'm pretty sure the union that I was sitting on a board with is not in support or hasn't even met with anybody about it. And I know that some concerns were shared with me by a number of different bargaining unit folks. So who's actually supporting this as of now are the same folks that

supported the legislation in 2017 that established the AER, and where are those folks in regard to their support fort this?

1.3

2.2

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Miller. Well, let me just clarify. I -- if I misspoke, I don't believe any unions will be supporting this. What I -- we've met with --

VICE PRESIDENT MILLER: That's what I thought.

meet with a number of -- had meetings with union folks in there. No one has raised concerns with me about the bill or about the proposal but it's been discussed with them. I don't necessarily expect them to officially support it, but no one has said that they were going to oppose it or have raised concerns.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah. Mr.

Miller, we have standing quarterly meetings with the employer representatives, and then the labor representatives, and then retiree representatives. And this agenda item was brought forward to all three groups. And saying they're in support, that's not how I would describe the comments, but they were more neutral. They understood the why of why this was maybe important to us to move forward. They didn't say whether they would support it or oppose it, if it became legislative, but we

didn't -- we sensed more neutrality on it and that they didn't see it as a big issue, at least in this meeting. And I can just tell you who the composition of that meeting group is.

VICE PRESIDENT MILLER: Thank you.

2.2

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. What's the pleasure of the Board moving forward? We do have a motion. Okay.

SENIOR ATTORNEY CARLIN: Ms. Taylor, I did just want to clarify on the motion. I may have misheard, but I thought I heard Mr. Palkki say July 1st, rather than January 1st, '27. I think that was his intention. That's the staff recommendation, so --

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: July sounds good. No, I'm just --

SENIOR ATTORNEY CARLIN: So for January 1st going forward. Just wanted to clarify that for the record and for the audience.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Mr. Detoy.

BOARD MEMBER DETOY: Thank you. As a new person here, when is the date for '26 for last -- for bills to be submitted. Do we have time for the next Board meeting to kind of find some of this information?

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: The deadline for bills to be introduced is February 20th. The deadline to have language to leg counsel is mid-January.

I don't know the date off the top of my head. 1 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Oh, so yeah. 2 BOARD MEMBER DETOY: Okay. Thank you. 3 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: You need a motion for that. 4 All right. So with that, we have a motion on the floor. 5 I'm going to call for the vote. All those in favor say 6 7 aye? 8 (Ayes.) PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All those opposed? 9 10 (Nays.) PRESIDENT TAYLOR: 11 Okav. Any abstentions? 12 So the motion carries as is. Thank you very much 13 for all of -- answering all of our questions. We really 14 15 appreciate it. Thank you. Comment from 16 Yes, go ahead. Hold on a second. Ms. Walker. Go ahead. 17 BOARD MEMBER WALKER: So I would just like to ask 18 going forward, if it's something like this, if we could 19 20 get previous to the meeting, the -- you know, what it is, the different points, the groups you've met with, what the 21 responses are, because I think also it takes time to 2.2 23 process something like this, rather than just reading it. And I don't remember seeing anything prior to this 24

concerning this. And so this is a lot to do just off the

25

top of our heads. And I think we should have a longer time. And we would have probably had better questions, and comments, and things like that.

2.2

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I agree. It was -- sort of surprised us.

I am on 9. I'm sorry 8c, which is Board Fiduciary Counsel RFP. And Renee, this is all you.

You're -- just push the button. There you go.

DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL SALAZAR: Good morning,
Board members. Renee Salazar, CalPERS Legal Office. So
the current contracts for the pool firms -- for the pool
of firms that were selected in the last Board fiduciary
counsel Request for Proposal are expiring in October 2026.
So this agenda item is brought to seek your approval to
conduct an RFP to select multiple firms to serve in a new
pool as the Board's fiduciary counsel for the next cycle.

The scope of services, competitive selection process, and estimated time frame are in the agenda item and associated attachment.

That concludes my prepared remarks and I am happy to take questions -- any questions that you may have.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I do have a question. Hold on. Mr. Pacheco.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Thank you, Madam President and thank you for the comments. In terms of the -- of the

pool, is this going to be -- this is part of the spring 1 board vendor pool that --2 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Spring-fed. 3 Spring-fed pool. DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL SALAZAR: BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Spring-fed. 5 Sorry, spring-fed. 6 DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL SALAZAR: It's a legal 7 8 services contract, so it's not quite exactly that, but it is a pool just like the pool that you've had previously 9 that we're currently under. 10 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: And every -- and we -- and 11 every -- how may times do we have to fill the pool again 12 revise or revisit this? 1.3 DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL SALAZAR: That contracts 14 15 generally go for five years. So the last time this was 16 brought was in 2020. BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: And how many -- currently, 17 how much fiduciary counsels do we have in the -- in this 18 19 spring -- sorry, spring --20 DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL SALAZAR: In the pool? BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: -- spring-fed? 21 spring-fed pool? 2.2 23 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Not exactly, not for this. 24 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Okay.

DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL SALAZAR: It is a pool.

25

64 There are currently three. 1 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: There are currently three. 2 Okay. And we anticipate if we were to go through this 3 process, we would get more maybe or have more selections? DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL SALAZAR: It depends on, 5 you know, the proposers, but it could be more than three. 6 7 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: But the contracts are up. 8 That's why. BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Okay. No, I just wanted 9 to -- I wanted to understand the process and how that --10 how it works and so forth. Thank you so much. That's all 11 I wanted to know. 12 DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL SALAZAR: You're welcome. 13 Thank you. 14 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All right. So you need a vote 15 16 to approve --BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: I'll move it. 17 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: -- getting the RFP out? 18 DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL SALAZAR: Yes, I do. 19 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. It's been moved by Mr. 20 Pacheco. 21 BOARD MEMBER PALKKI: Second. 2.2 23 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Seconded by Mr. Palkki. Sorry. I got you both at the same time. 24

All those in favor say aye?

25

(Ayes.) 1 2 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Any opposition? Abstentions? 3 Seeing none, the motion passes. You'll let us know if we need anything or you 5 need anything else from us? 6 DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL SALAZAR: I will. 7 Thank 8 you. PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you. 9 Ms. Walker. 10 BOARD MEMBER WALKER: I'm sorry. It just came to 11 me again. I would like to ask that as we have our members 12 that come and testify before the Board that we just 1.3 remind -- we're -- it would be very frustrating for me, if 14 15 I were to come and then, you know, make a case or a 16 presentation, and they just -- you know, just see us staring at them, instead of, you know, like acknowledging, 17 yes, we've heard you, but we're not able to respond to 18 you, because it frus -- I think it's frustrating and I 19 20 think it should be a reminder at the start of every public comment, because it -- you know, it's not a good luck for 21 2.2 us. 23 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Reminder of what? SENIOR ATTORNEY CARLIN: I wouldn't -- I would 24 25 just -- Robert Carlin from the CalPERS Legal Office.

would just add that silence, as the default, is actually the appropriate posture for the Board to take with public comment. It's -- I'll -- let me -- I'll let you go ahead, Ms. Walker. Sorry.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: I am not arguing that we should not be silent. What I'm saying is for somebody who's coming in, they don't come to all of our meetings, they might not understand the process. So they're passionate about what they're saying. It is very important to them. We know we have silence and we know why. They don't. So there should be a disclaimer, or whatever, before people start, so that then, you know, it doesn't -- you know, they don't feel like they're, you know --

SENIOR ATTORNEY CARLIN: Disregarded.

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: -- talking to a wall.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Got it.

SENIOR ATTORNEY CARLIN: I think that would be perfectly appropriate. We could provide language like that that would make it clear that the Board is unable to provide a response, but they welcome the public comment and look forward to hearing it.

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: And we hear you.

SENIOR ATTORNEY CARLIN: Yeah. We could

25 definitely put something together like that for the

Chairs.

1.3

2.2

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: That's fine. So I won't say anything for the next commenters then, but I think they can hear us, so I appreciate that.

So we just passed 8c, which means we're moving on to 9a and that is Mr. Brown for our State and federal legislative updates.

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: Good morning again. Danny Brown, Calpers team member.

This is the State and federal legislative update. The first year of the two-year legislative session has just ended. And all the bills that have passed the Legislature have either been signed or vetoed by the Governor. So there's not a lot to discuss this time of year. You can find the details of all the tracked bills in your written report.

I will just point out two bills the Board supported. Senate Bill 351 regarding the codification of the corporate practice of medicine, and Senate Bill 853, the 2 -- the 2025 Retirement Omnibus bill. Both of these were signed by the Governor.

The Legislature is scheduled to reconvene on January 5th. And then there will be an initial flurry of activity as the Legislature takes up the two-year bills that need to get out of the house of origin by the end of

January. After that, as I mentioned earlier, the next important date is February 20th, when new bills need to be introduced. So by the next Board meeting in February, we should have a better sense of what's in store for 2026.

2.2

And with that, I will turn it over to Dan Crowley and Karishma Paige who will provide the federal update.

DAN CROWLEY: Thank you, Danny. Karishma, do you want to kick us off?

the Board. Thank you so much for the opportunity to be with you today. Dan and I wanted to provide a quick update on federal policy matters. I'm going to start with a brief update on what has been happening in Washington D.C., and Dan will then dive into some of the details on issues that are impacting the investment policy space.

So let me just start with the current state of the funding of the federal government, which is just, as of last week, there was the ending of a record for 43-day shutdown. So Congress came together after what has been one of the longest shutdowns in history, along with the White House to pass an agreement that reopen the government. It allowed for three full year FY 2026 appropriations bills on issues related to military construction, agriculture, and Legislative Branch activities, and then a continuing resolution for the

balance of the government that runs through January 30th, 2026.

1.3

2.2

Back Pay was provided for furloughed workers and reinstatement of those that were laid off. And one of the key aspects of negotiation during the shutdown was the issue related to the extension of the enhanced ACA premium tax credits. There was no extension as part of the final agreement to reopen the government, but there was a commitment to allow for a Senate vote on the ACA premium tax credits extension in mid-December.

So where we are right now is that we do have a funded functioning federal government. And the question is what comes next? And a cup different touchpoints that I wanted to talk a little bit about and then sort of just general atmospherics of what's driving the agenda as we move into 2026.

One is that this January 30th deadline is on the one hand two months away, on the other hand, right around the corner. And that is going to be I think the subject of negotiation as we move into the balance of the year, into early next year. There is — there are some negotiations that are ongoing, but we could very well be in a scenario absent an agreement on bipartisan bicameral basis that we could be facing another shutdown at the end of January, be it a partial one. So that is certainly

within the realm of possible.

2.2

Besides that, there is discussion right now starting up again about a potential reconciliation measure. And a reconciliation measure is a measure that typically has revenue or budgetary consequences that allows for expedited review on the Senate side. That bill was -- or that measure -- or that process was the measure by which we passed HR 1, which was the recent Tax Cuts and Jobs Act extension bill, along with a number of health care provisions earlier this year.

So there is discussion about a potential second reconciliation bill, including aspects on the health care side. But again, that's very early stages and there will need to be a real understanding of what the scope of that is, and I think again significant party discipline on the Republican side to move that forward, where the majorities are pretty slim on both the House and Senate.

Beyond that, there -- while we've sort of passed the shutdown and are still negotiating other issues like the next appropriations measure and the next National Defense Authorization Act, which is an authorization that occurs on an annual basis, it is a moment where there's a lot of discussion around bipartisan priorities. So work is being done on a whole host of items. Some must-dos, some aspirational, including issues such as the Farm bill,

which includes topics such as digital assets and the CFTC reauthorization. There are discussions around potential bipartisan retirement legislation. The Senate Health Committee is doing a hearing tomorrow on this topic and continued interest in issues such as health care disclosure and transparency.

1.3

2.2

So behind the scenes, there are a number of members that are working on learning about proposals and seeing what could be -- could be proposals to work on down the road. But again, the vehicle -- or vehicles for these remain quite open.

Beyond that, one final comment before I turn it over to Dan is that there -- the oversight that Congress is undertaking continues apace and we will continue to see that move forward, especially we move into 2026, which is another election year. There are a variety of topics that are currently under consideration, but that's another area where we do anticipate we will see some activity in the going-forward months.

So with that, Dan, I'll turn it over to you to talk further about some of the issues that we're watching from a financial services perspective.

DAN CROWLEY: Sure. Thank you, Karishma. That was a great overview macro level. I'm going to get a little down into the weeds a little bit and talk about

some of the policy issues we've talked about with the Board a couple of different times this year just to sort of level set.

2.2

The Trump team has been focused, for most of the year, on dismantling the Biden administration legacy. And as we've discussed that basically falls into two buckets, social justice on one the hand, climate change on the other. Toward that end, they've issued hundreds of Executive Orders. To date, there have been 49 Executive Orders on DEI initiatives, but only two Executive Orders on ESG. One of them -- one of the very first Executive Orders on January 21st directed repeal of all of the Biden administration Executive Orders on climate change.

The second one basically directed the Department of Justice to investigate discrimination by the states against oil and gas companies. We think that was targeted primarily at the California climate risk disclosure laws. But, you know, they really have not been focused on ESG. We are currently getting both rumors and press reports -- excuse me -- of two pending Executive Orders.

One of them will be targeted at the ESG guidance on -- by DOL that we've talked about off and on over the years as it's become a political football starting with the Obama administration. Trump 1.0 tried to put the toothpaste back in the tube with the pecuniary standards

requirement. Of course, the Biden administration went the other way and opened up the consideration more broadly.

The Trump team would very much like to close that door. I think they're going to have trouble doing it, which is why they've had -- why the Executive Order has not been issued yet.

1.3

2.2

The second Executive Order and this was reported in the Washington -- in the Wall Street Journal a week or so ago. We'll be focused on proxy advisors. This question of whether they're violating antitrust laws and the question of whether the so-called massive passives, the big indexed institutional funds like Vanguard, BlackRock, State Street and so forth, looking into their proxy voting policies and whether it's appropriate to be voting proxies on behalf of beneficial owners that they may not even know. So that's coming down the pike.

I think the focus on the proxy advisors, which is obviously of critical importance to CalPERS, is really driven by a number of things starting with the decline in IPOs. We have roughly half the number of publicly traded companies that we had 25 years ago. And rightly or wrongly, the proxy advisors are being vilified as the reason for the decline in IPOs.

My own view is that they have very little responsibility for that. The reality is that it costs

somewhere between four and five million dollars a years to be a publicly traded company, because of the compliance obligations, the SEC reporting requirements, and so forth. Proxy advisors really have played no role in that, but for whatever reason, they have been vilified

2.2

It -- to me, it's a proxy war. It's not really about proxy advisors, so much as it is about shareholder rights. And so we've been talking to Danny and his team about ways to push back on that. We've been in touch with our allies at the Council of Institutional Investors and so forth. I actually met with the folks from ISS on Monday to discuss strategy.

You know, on the other side of the ledger, you've got the Chamber of Commerce, the exchanges, and other folks who represent or stand to benefit from favoring issuers and their CEOs over the shareholders. And that's a issue that's just simply going to continue. We're going to have to engage in. The California climate laws, as you know, today it was reported that Ninth Circuit has allowed the case to be stayed. SB 261, which would have required issuers with a presence in California to adopt climate risk transition plans, has been stayed. That would have taken effect at the end of the year.

SB 253, which requires greenhouse gas emissions will presumably be allowed to continue to move forward.

That takes effect in June of this year. There is a Supreme Court case pending that both the U.S. Chamber and ExxonMobil have filed suits to try to stop those laws, but we're watching those developments closely.

2.2

The related effort is to establish a global baseline for sustainability disclosures for investors. We continue to support ISSB adoption around the world. So far, 36 jurisdictions have adopted International Accounting Standards Board standards. The issue now is what Europe is going to do with respect to their Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive, and the corporate sustainability due diligence directive. CSDDD is a particular target of the administration is a violation of our corporate governance laws and undermining the fiduciary duty of corporate boards.

CSRD is caught up in the omnibus process. And the real question is whether Europeans are going to adopt ISSB as the foundation, the base load, below which disclosures will not be allowed to fall or whether they're going to create their own standards through the European Sustainability Reporting Disclosure directive. And the fear is that if they go off in a different direction, that will make it more confusing for investors, less efficient for issuers, and create the need to file separate types of disclosures, depending on the jurisdiction. So again,

we're working to try to create a global baseline of one standard for the benefit of investors.

2.2

With that, I will stop and Karishma and I would be very happy to take any questions.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Mr. Pacheco, go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Thank you. And is it on? Yes, it's on.

Mr. Brown, thank you very much for your -- and thank you for the comments from KL Gates as well. That's very informative.

I wanted to go back to the -- your bills in terms of -- first of all, I wanted to compliment staff and their expertise and their advocacy for SB 351, the private equity and health facilities. Really appreciate what you did to make sure that that went through the whole process and the Governor's process and forth. And I just wanted your comment -- wanted your comments that after we had done the support on that in -- I believe we did it at the off-site, how was it -- how did it go through? I mean, if you can give us a rundown of the process.

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: Well, thank you for the comments, Mr. Pacheco. And I think once it, you know, went through, you know, we communicated our -- the Board's support to the California Medical Association and the California Dental Association. And I

think they were happy to receive our support. You know, the bill, you know, kind of went through the Senate and the Assembly. I think there was a few more amendments they took. But at the end, I think they got the bill to a place where I don't think there was really any opposition, but I think that -- I think they were happy to have the Board's support.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: I really appreciate that, because, you know, as I think I made comments about it in -- at the off-site, that it provides guardrails for the first time in terms of making sure that we prohibit private equity and hedge funds from putting -- keeping their -- keeping the general partners in their lane and keeping the medical doctors in their lane, so that everyone does what they're supposed to do, and there's no one -- there's no overlap. So that's a really good bill in terms of that.

The second -- the second item that I would like to ask is you mentioned the status another bill, AB 1383 on the PEPRA one. And I'm just wondering it's going to be -- is it going to be reintroduced, because it's a two-year bill?

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: Yeah.

As a two-year bill, they don't need to necessarily be reintroduced. It's still alive. It's in the Assembly

Appropriations Committee. So in January, all the bills that were introduced in 2025 that haven't made it through their House of origin will be taken up, if the author wants to move forward with them, and they have to get out by the end of the month.

2.2

So at some point in mid-January, the Assembly Appropriations Committee will hear AB 1383 and either move it forward or hold it in the Committee.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Similarly with another bill, AB 1439, Garcia, the Labor Standard Protection Mandate on California development projects, in terms of that as well, would it have to also go through the same Assembly, is it, Rules Committee or sorry --

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: No.

It just has to go through -- it will -- it will go -- be heard in the -- if the author decides to move forward, it will be heard in Assembly PERS Committee sometime in early January. And if it gets out of that Committee, it will go through the process and go to Assembly Appropriations, and then to the Assembly floor. And all that has to happen in the month of January.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Excellent then. And I -- and I brought the question again in the -- in the Investment Subcommittee in terms of how that -- the bill is in -- it's on a two-year bill, but we also are doing

our market focused -- sorry our labor focused market study. And I'm just wondering, you know, just making sure that we're in line to provide the information to the -- to the appropriate stakeholders, if that's -- if that may be possible. Just curious.

2.2

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Marcie, do you want to address that.

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN: Well,
I mean, I did kind of hear the conversation on Monday. I
think, you know, a lot will depend on the timing of the
report. Obviously, we will keep the author, sponsors,
Committee members informed of the process, as we're moving
along, as to whether or not the final report is done to
inform them. I mean, I will defer to the Investment
Office.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: That's what -- and that's what I wanted to allude to you that you would keep -- you're going to keep everybody in check and keep them in -- up to date and on what's happening, because it is an important study and it would help with the analysis.

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN:
Correct.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Go ahead, Marcie.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah, that is -- that is our commitment. We've already met with the

sponsor's team. We've met with the PERS Assembly Chair on this, but there's no guarantee that we can align all the time frames.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: Right.

2.2

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: But what we can commit to is making sure to keep everyone informed of the progress.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: And that's -- and that's --

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: We have made that commitment.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO: And that's fair, keeping everyone informed and keeping the communications channels open. I think that's a fair assessment at this point.

Thank you so much. And those are my comments. Thank you, Sir.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you. I just had a couple of questions for K&L Gates myself and nobody else is asking questions. So the ESG guidance from the Department of Labor, and I remember when it passed under the other Trump administration, but you said that they might have trouble doing it. So I was a little curious as to what that trouble you thought was, that would prevent them from repassing the pecuniary standards, which I can never pronounce correctly.

DAN CROWLEY: Well, Madam President, it's a -it's a great question. You'll remember that rolling back
the DOL ESG guidance was the top policy priority of the
Trump transition team in 2016. Despite that, they -- it
took them four years to finally come up with a proposal.
They actually issued it after the election when it was
clear that they were going to be departing the White
House. Eugene Scalia, the Secretary of Labor, issued
revised guidance that said ESG can only be considered to
the extent that it impacts pecuniary considerations. And
they thought they had solved the puzzle. The problem is
that in their own discussion of pecuniary standards, they
acknowledged that ESF factors could impact pecuniary
returns over time.

2.2

And so they essentially inadvertently validated 90 percent of what the Obama administration had said. And that was it. They spent four years trying to put the toothpaste back in the tube and came up with the pecuniary standard. What we've seen more recently, whether it's red state AGs, or State Finance Officers Association, or letters that have come from some Republicans on the Hill, is an attempt to make it an either/or proposition, a binary choice between focusing on returns on the one hand or ESG considerations on the other.

I think they're going to try to make it a binary

determination. We've seen that in some of the red states, where if you're focused on ESG, you're not focused on long-term returns. Well, as we know from the years that we've been discussing it, the reason CalPERS cares about sustainability factors is precisely because of the impact it could have on long-term risk-adjusted returns to the portfolio. So that's why I say it's going to be difficult for them.

1.3

2.2

I anticipate that they're going to try to double down on the pecuniary standard and distinct push it from sustainability. But again, their own language in the 2020 release makes that difficult to see how they're going to be successful.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: So you -- do you foresee just a longer time frame before we see what they're planning, basically on how they're planning it?

DAN CROWLEY: I do know that they're working on it.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay.

DAN CROWLEY: We have friends in the administration, including former associates and colleagues in key positions. So we do know they're working on it, but it's a challenge for them to come up with something that is legitimate and effective. Right now, we're still in the political discussion phase, where it's easy to

be -- it's easy to be against ESG, because it sounds like something, you know, a tree hugger in California came up with, but the reality is that these consideration are importantly -- or increasingly important, particularly to long-term investors, because what is material in the next calendar quarter can be very different when you're looking at returns for employees entering the workforce today that are going to work over the next 40 years.

2.2

When you have a 40-year investment horizon, I think it fundamentally changes the perspective and changes the nature of the fiduciary duty. So there is this political effort to revisit ESG and the guidance coming out of DOL. I frankly wonder or question their ability to be effective in that. I think they're focused too much on the politics and not enough on the substance.

And to sort of drill down on that a little more, if you look at the change in rhetoric between the Obama administration Trump 1.0 and Biden, you would think that the policy changes were dramatically different. In fact, the regulatory changes were de minimis, but the political rhetoric shifted 180 degrees. So I think they're going to have trouble reconciling the political statements with the reality of the guidance to fiduciaries, but it will be interesting to see what they come up with.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Right. And the reality on the

ground as institutional investors, and fiduciaries and what we have to do.

1.3

2.2

My second question -- and thank you for that answer, and I really appreciate your -- K&L Gates work in that space for us -- was the proxy voting process. I wanted to congratulate you on working really hard with CII and ISS to do some pushback on this other position of theirs, the right right now that is basically working to take away investor rights, I think. And you said that in your presentation, but I do want to thank you very much for doing that. So I guess it wasn't a question. It was more of a statement. Thank you very much.

DAN CROWLEY: Thank you.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Danny, anything else?

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF BROWN:

Nothing else from me. Thank you.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All right. With that, any questions from the Board?

All right. I am on 9b, which Summary of Board Direction.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: I noted two. So one is to create language for the Board President and Chairs of committees to declare at the beginning of each of the meetings around public comment that the Board has a silent posture on public comments. And then second, also

from Ms. Walker was on Agenda items that are as significant as an action item, that they -- we treat them like other policy items, where there's a first reading before we get to an action item, and we give more detail on the stakeholder engagement processes and feedback from stakeholders as we've talked to them in advance of these proposals.

2.2

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I appreciate that. I thought we had sort of fixed that early on, but sort of happened again. So we would like that.

Thank you very much that summary of Board direction.

Next is public comment. And I do have four public commenters starting with Charlie Solt, Al Darby, And Willette Jacobs.

CHARLIE SOLT: Good morning.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Good morning.

CHARLIE SOLT: My name is Charlie Solt. So I am just non-PERS member of the public, proud citizen of the state of California. And so I became aware that someone that I was -- I'm familiar with PERS by virtue of my career. But I became aware of a situation where someone that was a PERS retiree had passed away and the checks kept coming. And there was -- the family of that individual was still spending the money. And it wore on

me, you know. And so I decided I needed to do something, so I came down to the office, and I explained the situation.

2.2

And I was met with some -- a little resistance, because a lot of excuses as to why, what we can't do it, what we can't do, what we can't do. But I'm pretty persistent and they did ultimately made some phone calls and agreed that a letter would be sent to this individual to prove whether or not they were alive.

So my initial request is to say if there's -- I know guys can't do anything, but maybe there's somebody out in the audience from PERS that could meet with me to kind of let me know, if that ever went forward.

But separate from that -- so that was a big issue. Here's, you know, Charlie Solt, a no name here in California, hearing about a retiree -- PERS retire out in, you know, Kansas that's still collecting the money. That may be a bigger problem, you know.

And so I personally am the recipient of three retirement plans, three defined benefit. And each one of those plans requires me to either report to an office and sign a document confirming that I'm alive. That's -- it's not what they say. They -- it has to do whether I'm working in the industry, because if I'm working in the industry, I might not be getting -- should be getting my

retirement, but it serves both purposes, right? It shows I'm not working in the industry, but it also shows I'm alive. And so I either have to come into an office or I have to send -- get a statement that's been -- I can't ever remember the term, but you go to the bank and get it done. Notarized.

So I understand PERS doesn't do that. It really would probably be a good approach. So my request is maybe somebody could follow up with me.

And my second request is there's a lot of fraud going on, folks. You know, it's a different generation. I don't know if it's generational, but it's a shame. And I think there's -- that might be a reasonable approach to it moving forward for PERS.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Solt.

I will have one of our staff members follow up with you. They want to get your name today.

Mr. Darby, go ahead.

1.3

2.2

AL DARBY: Good morning, Madam Chair, Board members. Al Darby, Vice President, RPEA.

I heard references to transparency several times during the various meetings this week. I only wish that they were true around PRA requests from stakeholders.

Myself and other RPEA leaders have made requests, but lately we have experienced many unresponsive answers or

outright denials to provide answers.

1.3

2.2

I recently asked for specific information about the details of CalPERS loans to companies and individuals whose credit rating doesn't meet bank requirements. While CalPERS has attempted to make details about these loans secret, no legislation to that effect has been successful. So with no privacy limits, this information -- PRAs that requests this information should be honored in full to provide the information requested.

The response I received to my PRA was unresponsive just recently. The information provided did not address the data points I requested. It is not unreasonable for stakeholders to know the identity of borrowers, the terms of the loan, and the performance of the loan. In other words, are we getting double digit interest? Are the loans being repaid on schedule? Are the -- are they cash pay or are they in-kind repayments?

Financial publications and financial experts have depict -- are depicting the current overexuberance in the private loan market as similar to the 2007-2008 situation just before the financial meltdown. With CalPERS ambition to increase private loan allocation to five billion, caution may be prudent.

One bright spot here is CalPERS junk bond commitment. It is an ETF that makes it liquid private

equity asset perhaps. I hope we can look forward to an improvement in the content of responses and all requests for information are honored in our PRAs. But if they are delayed or denied, a reasonable explanation should be provided.

One final note that, Ms. Walker, several times there have been reactions to public comments by usually the Board President, but I do recall an amendment to a motion was actually proposed after public comment. I had a response to my public comment to it from staff. So there are times when there have been exceptions.

BOARD MEMBER WALKER: Thank you.

AL DARBY: Thank you.

PRESIDENT DOLAN: Thank you, Mr. Darby.

Ms. Jacobs.

1.3

2.2

WILLETTE JACOBS: Good morning. First I want to give honor to God and I'm so grateful that I'm here once again to speak before this honorable record. In July of -- November of last year, I presented a issue before this Board regarding my money being used to fund the employee entitlement. And I'm going to address that really quick and then I'm going to move on to Ms. -- no, let me deal with her question and the Board's responsibility.

Government Code section 20160 states, "Subject to

subdivision (c) and (d), the Board may in its discretion upon any terms it deems just, correct the errors or omissions of any active or retired member or any beneficiary of an active or retired member." The only opportunity that a beneficiary of this system has to speak to the Board is at the Board meetings. We don't have any other access to you. So to shut us down here is unreasonable or the system needs to create a system upon which a beneficiary can address the Board to where they can get their questions answered or their benefits corrected.

2.2

Number two, Government Code section 20164, "The obligation of this system to the members continue throughout their respective members and the obligation of the system to respect to retired members continue throughout their lives of the respect of retired members, and thereafter until the obligation of the respective beneficiaries under optional settlements have been discharged. The obligation of the system — the obligation of any member to this system continues throughout his or her membership and thereafter until all the obligations of this system to or in respect to him or her have been discharged. In cases where the system owes money to a member, the beneficiary, the period of statute of limitations shall not end."

It was the -- I came here asking for my money and you instructed Marcie -- Marcie Frost? Yeah. I'm sorry, Marcie. Marcie Frost to address the issue. I didn't hear from her and it's been another year. So what I did was I requested a refund of my money.

2.2

I received a letter from CalPERS, which states after -- "Your application has been received by CalPERS. After review of your account, you are a vested and eligible for to receive a lifetime benefit from CalPERS. To receive an estimate of your lifetime benefit, you can log into myCalPERS. Should you choose to apply for retirement instead of taking a refund, please contact us within 10 days from the date of..." -- I contacted CalPERS. I canceled my refund request. I asked for my benefit to be paid under Government Code Section 21418, which states, "The disability retirement allowance for peace officer State safety, peace offer State industrial or local safety member retired because of disability shall be derived from his or her cumulated normal contribution and contribution of the employer"

My money was taken. It was given back. I asked for it. They had 30 days to get me my money. Then the State Controller had 10 days to give me my money. It didn't happen. It's been 60 days. And I'm concerned, because the responsibility of the fiduciary, the

California Public Employees's Retirement System, is to ensure that benefits are paid when they become due and payable.

2.2

Now, I'm unsure as to why they did not request my benefit, because under government — under this particular code, all it requires — and I'm going to read it really quick, "For figuring your disability retirement allowance, it's 8.8 — 9 years of service, benefit factor 2.5, 22.248 percent of \$3,214.13. My unmodified allowance, which I was given the option to get, after the Davenport case, is \$715.07. I didn't get it and the responsibility of this system is to request the \$715.07 from the Constitutionally mandated State Controller's Office to pay the warrant.

I've done everything I can do. I don't even know what else to do, other than to go down to Benefit

Services, and see why it was not requested. And what is the policy and the procedures for this -- for the

California Public Employees' Retirement System for requesting benefits from the State Controller when they become due and tay -- due and payable, once your -- once you have been deemed eligible for the benefit under

Workers' Compensation and I'm retired on industrial disability, entitled to that disability retirement allowance.

So I'm just like -- I don't know. It's been 60

days. It's been a year then 60 days from when I requested the refund and I elected not to get the refund, because I'm entitled to the life -- it says, "After review of your account, you are vested and eligible to receive a lifetime benefit from CalPERS."

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Ms. Jacobs, you have exceeded you time. I will have --

WILLETTE JACOBS: I think you for listening to you -- to me.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Yeah. I'll have someone take a look at it for you.

WILLETTE JACOBS: I really appreciate it.

Please. Thank you so much.

2.2

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All right. So with that, is there any other public comment? We do have one on the phone. That's right. Oh, there is. One on the phone.

Go ahead.

CALPERS STAFF: Yes, President Taylor. We have John Holden to comment on 9c. John, you are now live and can proceed with your comments.

JOHN HOLDEN: Hello. Thank you. Good morning to the Board. My name is John Holden. I'm a native of San Francisco. I would like to thank Marcie Frost and Brad Pacheco for following up on my public comments in September regarding the GGTARP plan attempt to merge into

CalPERS. This is the Golden Gate Transit Amalgamated Retirement Plan that's severely underfunded and has significant breach of fiduciary responsibilities and duties.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

We have to obtain legal counsel. But I have put a Freedom of Information Act request in July. That was denied. And I was told that they were really skeptical of this GGTARP plan taking it on and was going to follow up with a letter stating the facts of this plan. My concern is we do participate in the CalPERS Health Department Health Plan. As you can see with the Amador situation, I going to comment in the Risk Management Audit Committee, but it went so long yesterday, that I think it's more appropriate to comment there regarding CalPERS taking on these sinking ships that everybody is running to safety. And as you can see, you know, October 1st, the Amador plan health plan and it's already 45 days later and there's huge issues regarding the funding and where that money is going to come from.

So with the GGTARP plan, that would have to funded by somebody. Nobody really has taken responsibility for the plan, but there are concerns that federal money that's earmarked for other things would make it into the Calpers plan.

So my concern is, you know, I've known Malia

Cohen and Fiona Ma when they were supervisors here in San Francisco. I sat on the Recology Pension Board. And so my concern is to the retirees and to the overall health of -- and the producer responsibility of the Board members that they do retain counsel. And these are more political considerations than financial or fiduciary considerations.

2.2

So I would caution you to do your due diligence and I would also like to go on the record to say retain all correspondence and documentation from the GGTARP plan, which will probably be making it into discovery on a legal issue.

Thank you so much to all of you and have a good Holiday season. Thank you.

PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you very much. We appreciate it.

With that, we will adjourn the open session and go into closed session for items 1 through 3 from the closed session agenda. We will receive the General Counsel's update on pending litigation. After the closed session, we will reconvene in open session. However, we get a 15-minute break. So I'll see everybody back at 11:35.

(Off record: 11:19 a.m.)
(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

25 | (Thereupon the meeting recessed

into closed session.) 1 (Thereupon the meeting reconvened 2 open session.) 3 (On record: 12:05 p.m.) 4 5 PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All right. Welcome back into This adjourns this month's Board of open session. 6 Administration meeting. The Board of Administration 7 8 Education Day is scheduled for January 20th, 2026 and the 9 Stakeholder Forum is scheduled for January 21st, 2026. And then after that, we will have our February Board 10 meeting. Thank you all for coming. Have a good 11 afternoon. 12 (Thereupon, the California Public Employees' 13 Retirement System, Board of Administration 14 meeting open session adjourned at 12:06 p.m.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 2.2 23 24

25

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 open session meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, 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 26th day of November, 2025.

1.3

fames 4

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 10063