VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

PENSION & HEALTH BENEFITS COMMITTEE

OPEN SESSION

ZOOM PLATFORM

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2021 1:16 P.M.

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

## APPEARANCES

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Rob Feckner, Chairperson

Ramon Rubalcava, Vice Chairperson

Margaret Brown

Henry Jones

David Miller

Eraina Ortega

Theresa Taylor

Betty Yee, represented by Ms. Karen Greene-Ross

#### BOARD MEMBERS:

Fiona Ma, represented by Mr. Frank Ruffino

Lisa Middleton

## STAFF:

Marcie Frost, Chief Executive Officer

Matt Jacobs, General Counsel

Donald Moulds, PhD, Chief Health Director

Anthony Suine, Deputy Executive Officer

David Cowling, Assistant Chief, Health Plan Research and Administration Division

Kelly Fox, Chief, Stakeholder Relations

Pam Hopper, Committee Secretary

Renee Ostrander, Chief, Employer Account Management Division

	APPEARANCES CONTINUED
ALSO PRESENT:	
Wisam Altowaiji	
J.J. Jelincic	

	<u>INDEX</u> <u>P</u>	PAGE
1.	Call to Order and Roll Call	1
2.	Approval of the September 14, 2021, Pension & Health Benefits Committee Meeting Timed Agenda	3
3.	Executive Report - Don Moulds, Anthony Suine	4
4.	Action Consent Items - Don Moulds a. Approval of the June 15, 2021, Pension & Health Benefits Committee Meeting Minutes b. Minimum Standards for Health Benefit Plans - Amendment of Regulations	16
5.	<pre>Information Consent Items - Don Moulds a. Annual Calendar Review b. Draft Agenda for the November 16, 2021,     Pension &amp; Health Benefits Committee Meeting</pre>	27
6.	Action Agenda Items  a. Proposed Regulation for the Definition of Limited Duration Employment - Renee Ostrander  b. Health Care Decision Support System (HCDSS) Contract Terms - David Cowling	27 44
7.	1	50 51
Adjournment		5 4
Reporter's Certificate		55

# PROCEEDINGS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Everyone, we'd like to call the Pension and Health Benefits Committee meeting to order. And the first order of business will be to call the roll please, ms. Hopper.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Rob Feckner?

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Good afternoon.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Margaret Brown?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Hello.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Henry Jones?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: David Miller?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Ramon Rubalcava?

VICE CHAIRPERSON RUBALCAVA: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Theresa Taylor?

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Shawnda Westly?

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Excused.

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Karen Greene-Ross

23 | for Betty Yee?

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENE-ROSS: Here.

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. Chair, I have

all in attendance with the exception of Shawnda Westly being excused.

2.2

Brown.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Very good. Thank you.

Before I move us into closed session. I see a request from Ms. Brown to pull Item 4d and 4f. I don't have a 4d and 4f on my agenda. Am I reading something incorrectly?

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. Chair, there is no 4d or 4f on Pension and Health Benefits.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: I didn't think so.

Want to try another committee, Ms. Brown?

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: You're muted, Ms.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: I said I think it's going to be Finance and Admin. We're just running behind. So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: All right. So we're now going to recess into closed session for items one through three on the Board closed -- on the Committee closed session agenda. At this time, the Board members will exit this open session meeting and connect to the closed session meeting.

For the members of the public watching on the livestream, the open session of Pension and Health Benefit Committee meeting will reconvene following closed session. We'll be back before too long. We thank you, but let's

3

```
move to closed session now, Committee members.
1
             (Off record: 1:19 p.m.)
2
             (Thereupon the meeting recessed
 3
             into closed session.)
             (Thereupon the meeting reconvened
 5
             open session.)
 6
7
             (On record: 1:53 p.m.)
8
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Welcome back to the open
9
    session everyone. Have we all made it yet? Not quite.
    We'll give everybody a minute or two.
10
             It looks like I think we're good now. So let's
11
   move on to the open session. Item 2, approval of the
12
1.3
   timed meeting agenda. What's the pleasure of the
14
   Committee?
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Move approval.
15
             COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Move approval.
16
17
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Second.
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Moved by Miller, seconded
18
19
   by?
20
             COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN:
                                       Brown.
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Brown.
21
             Any discussion on the motion?
2.2
23
             Seeing none.
24
             Ms. Hopper, please.
25
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Margaret Brown?
```

4

```
COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN:
                                      Aye.
1
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Henry Jones?
2
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES:
                                      Aye.
 3
                                         David Miller?
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER:
 5
                                      Ave.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega?
 6
7
             COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA:
8
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Ramon Rubalcava?
             VICE CHAIRPERSON RUBALCAVA: Aye.
9
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Theresa Taylor?
10
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Aye.
11
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Shawnda Westly?
12
             COMMITTEE MEMBER WESTLY: Aye.
1.3
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Karen Greene-Ross
14
    for Betty Yee?
15
16
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENE-ROSS: Aye
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. Chair, I have
17
    all ayes, motion being made by David Miller, second by
18
   Margaret Brown for Agenda Item 2, approval of the
19
20
    September 14, 2021 Pension and Health Benefits timed
    agenda.
21
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you.
2.2
23
             Brings us to Item 3, Executive Report.
   Moulds.
24
             CHIEF HEALTH DIRECTOR MOULDS: Great.
25
                                                     Good
```

morning, Mr. Chair and Vice Chair, members of the Committee. Done Moulds, Chief Health Director.

1.3

2.2

For my remarks today, I wanted to remind the Committee and our members that open enrollment starts next Monday, September 20th and runs through October 15th.

This is the annual time of year our members can enroll in and make changes to their health plans and add or remove dependents. To help members explore their choices, health plan statements are now available in myCalPERS and in the mail for members who have requested that. We have updated the website with a wealth of open enrollment information, including the health benefits summary, each plan's evidence of coverage documents, the plan changes taking effect in 2022, and the required forms to make a plan change.

I want to highlight for our members the addition of lower cost HMO options in many areas, as well as expanded Medicare Advantage plans that will be available next year. I encourage members to visit our website and log in to their myCalPERS account to view their health plan options and other important open enrollment information. A lot of communication planned for members and employers over the course of the next month.

That includes -- concludes my remarks and I'm happy to take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you.

1.3

2.2

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, members of the Committee. Anthony Suine, Calpers team member. It's great to be with you again to share some important points about our Customer Service and Support Branch's trends and accomplishments.

Seeing no requests to speak, I'll do Mr. Suine.

As I've mentioned before, while our regional offices remain closed across the state, we have been able to successfully deliver services to our members through virtual appointments and education. And since the start of the pandemic, our member counseling appointments have been conducted primarily via the phone and our members were quick to adapt and steadily utilize that new channel with over 5,000 appointments transact -- transacted monthly.

A few months into our virtual appointment deliveries, we began to offer our members an option to transition from a phone call into face-to-face interactions over WebEx. This allowed for a more personal interaction, but required the member and our retirement counselor to exchange emails to link via meeting notice.

Leading up to July of this year, we had approximately 30 to 40 members take advantage of those face-to-face appointments per month. However, on July 9th

of this year, we adapted our virtual appointment scheduling system to allow members to choose a phone appointment or video appointment via their member self-service account, which then provides an electronic confirmation with instructions for the member to prepare for the counseling session.

2.2

In our first partial month after that implementation, we had over 400 face-to-face virtual counseling appointments and we nearly reached 1,000 of those appointments in the month of August.

While we know there will remain a demand for in-person visits when we reopen our offices, these appointments are extremely popular with our members and allow us to share screens and provide even better service than strictly the phone appointments.

In addition, the wait time for a virtual face-to-face or phone appointment has been between one and three days, so we are addressing our members' counseling needs on a timely basis.

For our education purposes, we are planning our next virtual CalPERS Benefit Education Event for December 8th and 9th. Once again, we will host several classes and a virtual ask-the-experts hall for members to ask their individual questions face-to-face with our team members and partners. The class schedule on December 8th includes

evening sessions offering our members even greater flexibility to accommodate their calendars. Our website currently encourage members to check back for more details in October, when event details and a registration link will be available. This will be our fourth virtual CBEE for our members and I'm proud of how our team has continuously looked for ways to improve the member experience.

1.3

2.2

To help members prepare for retirement, we recently released our annual member statements to 1.2 million members in their online accounts. The annual member statement is generated for all active and inactive members of CalPERS. It provides the accrued service credit for a member, as well as their contributions, retirement formula, if they are eligible for retirement, and their post-retirement lump sum death benefit. It can be printed and used by the member as a resource to verify CalPERS membership as well. If members do not have an online account, they can establish one, or they can contact our 888 number to receive a printed copy.

We have also recently enhanced our online systems and website to serve our employer communities. We partnered with our Policy Research and Data Analytics team to analyze compensation data and identify problem areas that can be addressed prior to a member's retirement.

As a result, updated edit and audit parameters were added to the myCalPERS system to help ensure non-compliant compensation will be reviewed at various stages before retirement.

2.2

We also enhanced our review process for compensation language in MOUs to improve compliance and provide our employers written confirmation of our analysis. We have seen a dramatic uptick in the employers utilizing our review process, as we have nearly tripled the number of reviews over the last year from 300 to 900.

Additionally, as a companion to the new process, we created a webpage to provide guidance on compliance, sample language, a special compensation reportability table, and many more resources to educate all who are interested.

I did want to share some retirement trends and a few observations about what's been happening with retirement inceptions in recent months. We are seeing an increase in retirements of about eight percent for the months of January through June comparing this year to last. Schools are up 11 percent and public agencies are up 16 percent. And those are driving the overall increase in retirements, while State retirements have been down slightly, about four percent. We'll keep tracking these trends and update you further as we know more.

Unfortunately, I'm again updating you on our team's latest efforts to assist disaster victims. We are working proactively to assist those affected by the hurricanes and the local fires during these uncertain times. We are monitoring Post Office closures and identifying which retirees receiving paper checks might be impacted. Then we'll reach out to those to assist them with various payment options. We did identify approximately 20 retirees impacted by the hurricanes and over a hundred impacted by the wildfires.

1.3

2.2

The hurricane victims have been difficult to reach, but we have attempted contact with each one of them. We were able to reach a majority of the wildfire victims and provide options for their September 1 benefit checks that were issued. While many said they would obtain access to their checks as they are redirected to other post offices, we did have a handful switch to direct deposit, and we were able to work with SCO to pull checks and redirect a few to relocated addresses for the retirees to gain expedited access to their funds. We continue to monitor and are equipped to assist those in need upon request.

In closing, we continue to perform well in our remote environment and meet our customers' needs. We right now are focused on open enrollment and ramping up

the Contact Center to mitigate wait times as much a -much as possible during this busy time. I'd like to
extend my appreciation to the team for their continued
hard work and dedication assisting our members and
employers.

1.3

2.2

And this concludes my report and I'm happy to take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you, Mr. Suine. And I, too, want to, on behalf of the Committee, thank you, and your staff, and your team for reaching out to all those folks that have been dealing with this stress during the disaster. This helps take one more thing off their plate. So thank you.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUINE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: I have a question -- a comment from Ms. Brown.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Feckner.

Mr. Suine, nice to talk to you again. I -- for the CEO and everyone else's information, Mr. Suine has been very helpful as I had published my phone number in some campaign materials and my phone has been ringing off the hook. And in turn, I tried to give them the 888 CalPERS number. And when they don't like that, I get ahold of Mr. Suine who's been very, very responsive for a lot of these retirees and members that have questions and

concerns.

2.2

I have to tell you, Mr. Suine, though, the question I constantly get is where is my pay stub? And I try to do what you have said, which is to direct them to go into myCalPERS and if they don't know their log-in to, you know, call the number. But for some of them they don't have computers or they don't feel confident doing that. So when do we think the SCO is going to start mailing those pay stubs for the people who opted in to still receiving those stubs, because I got -- I was at a meeting, CSR Chapter 2 yesterday, and I got -- one woman asked the question and then about 10 people bum-rushed me -- not bum-rushed me -- senior-rushed me at the end of the meeting asking me that -- telling me that they needed their pay stubs. So what rabbit can you pull out of the hat for us on that, Mr. Suine.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Mr. Suine, don't answer that question, please. We're going to have Ms. Karen Greene-Ross answer it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Oh.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUINE: Great. Thank you.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENE-ROSS: I don't -- Ms. Brown, I don't have a date certain. I can just tell you that our payroll staff is meeting constantly. And we

have a very great working relationship with Mr. Suine's staff from our Payroll Division. And we're being very proactive to anticipate all these issues and get the payroll out.

2.2

The long term, we are following the State's PAL process to get a new payroll system up and running. And we have an executive team of Calhr, and Finance, and everybody to work on a new improved system, but we are doing all we can. We are on a -- we have an antiquated payroll system that has had one failed procurement. And we're going carefully and prudently through the PAL process very successfully. We've completed -- it's a four-phased process and it -- it's not immediate. It's not going to be finished during the Controller's term, but we have great staff, and we're coordinating, and making the joint project with Calhr, because that system that we have now was developed before there was bargaining. It's that old.

So again, the working groups meet several times a month to address and get on top of the problems. And we both have great, dedicated staff trying to do it. So I can't give you any specific dates, but know that we're proactively trying to do all we can to anticipate issues like this and especially for the people who have just suffered disaster to get them paid efficiently and

quickly, and get more people to do direct deposit, the better.

1.3

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Oh, well, and I do agree that the more people to do direct deposit the better. My understanding, and maybe I didn't understand this, I thought the reason they stopped the pay stubs going out was because of COVID-19 and the lack of manpower. And so it doesn't sound like that's the reason why the pay stubs stopped going out.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENE-ROSS: We, like every department, have done all we can to do whatever we can online and, you know, not having to require people to come in, but we have to print checks for all kinds of vendors, and the pay stubs, and the tax receipts. So those folks have been coming in throughout the pandemic in person.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Well, I appreciate that and I hope that we can, for those who opt out and want the stub, I hope we can continue to get the system fixed, and get it out to them. But thank you for that detailed explanation.

And then one more comment. Mr. Suine, on the -in terms of the retirement for schools and public
agencies, you said 11 percent for schools, 16 for public
agencies, and what is that for State?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUINE: It's decreased about four percent.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Okay. So -- and what -- can you give me a total number of retirees that you've processed what last fiscal year or...

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUINE: Yep. The -- so there's -- you know, looking at the calendar year.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Okay, calendar. Sure.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUINE: Yeah. So so far this year we're on pace to about equal last year's retirements. And there's been about 18,000 retirements so far this year and there was 35,000 total retirements last year. So halfway through the year, we're about there. We have some slow months coming up. And then obviously, December is about triple the number of retirements that we have in any other given month.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Yeah. I know that, because I tried to retire one time in December and realized how --

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: -- that it was problematic. All right. Well, I appreciate what you and the team are doing and the exceptional effort. I do know coming from schools that a lot of school employees did not want to come back to the classroom or come back to work,

16

```
you know, among students who were not vaccinated, so --
1
   but I -- and so I understand why people are retiring at a
2
    greater -- at a greater percentage. But keep up -- keep
 3
    up the good work and tell your team thank you very much.
             DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUINE:
5
                                               Thank you.
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER:
                                   Thank you, Mr. Suine.
 6
7
    Thank you, Ms. Greene-Ross.
8
             Seeing no other requests, we're going to move on
9
    to Item 4, action consent items. I do have a request to
10
    pull Item 4. Ms. Brown was bound and determined to pull
    August off the consent calendar and she finally found it.
11
    So I'm glad that we're able to pull that off and then Mr.
12
    Jelincic could then have his comments. So Item 4a is an
1.3
    action item. What's the pleasure of the committee?
14
15
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES:
                                      Move approval.
16
             COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN:
                                       Second.
17
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Moved by Mr. Jones.
    Seconded by Ms. Brown?
18
19
             COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN:
                                       Yes.
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you.
20
             Any discussion on the motion?
21
             Seeing none.
2.2
23
             Ms. Hopper, please?
24
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Margaret Brown?
```

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN:

25

17

```
COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Henry Jones?
1
2
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: David Miller?
 3
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
 5
                                         Eraina Ortega?
             COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Aye.
 6
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
7
                                          Ramon Rubalcava?
8
             VICE CHAIRPERSON RUBALCAVA: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Theresa Taylor?
9
10
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Shawnda Westly?
11
             COMMITTEE MEMBER WESTLY:
12
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Karen Greene-Ross
13
    for Betty Yee?
14
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENE-ROSS:
15
16
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. Chair, I have
    all ayes, motion being made by Henry Jones, seconded by
17
   Margaret Brown for Agenda Item 4a, approval of the June
18
    15, 2021 Pension and Health Benefits Committee meeting
19
20
   minutes
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you. That brings us
21
   to Item 4b, Minimum Standards for Health Benefit Plans.
2.2
23
   Mr. Moulds, I think you have a question from Ms. Brown.
             COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Yes. Mr. Moulds, I'm
24
25
    looking at Attachment 1, page 14. And I just want to get
```

an understanding. I'm looking at the cross-section one, the one that's crossed out. And we're taking out, it looks like, average health risk characteristics and we're adding in, which -- it looks like we're changing the definition of --

(Phone ringing.)

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: I'm sorry. That's my other phone.

It looks like we're changing the definition of risk adjustment, because, you know, years ago when we had risk adjustment and then it was pulled, because of issues with that, and now we have a new definition of risk adjustment, which is causing us to do this regulatory action. But it says that it's based on expected resource use. Can you -- so can you or someone on your staff explain to me what exactly that means? It's very -- it's very convoluted for me.

CHIEF HEALTH DIRECTOR MOULDS: Sure. I can -- I can do that. So expected resource use -- so we had talked when we had the Milliman folks in and the Mercer folks who are doing the evaluative work ahead of time, they talked about a number of different models for risk mitigation.

We had in the -- in the iteration that the Board voted to remove, we did back-end risk mitigation, which basically meant looking at plan use over a calendar year, and doing

back-end transfers of dollars across plans.

2.2

What we had proposed as an alternative is the -is the MARA Risk Adjuster, which you all adopted in
November of last year, which is a prospective risk
mitigation model. It's used by Washington State and other
large employers. And that uses predictive analytics to
basically translate membership in these plans with likely
health risk. It's -- and so you -- instead of having -you avoid having to do back-end risk transfers in that
way, and you're using the analytics to make projections
about likely use.

It's -- it is a -- you know, as we talked about when we adopted the model, it's a well-established model for risk mitigation. And that's the -- that was the one that we had transitioned to.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: So you said well established, but you only said Washington. So who else is using it?

CHIEF HEALTH DIRECTOR MOULDS: I can -- I can certainly give you a list, but there are -- there are many other large employers that are using it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Yeah. So what essentially does this -- does this do? So we're saying it's not based on health risk characteristics. Instead we're going to project what the costs are going to be or

what we think they're going to use and based upon that, we're adjusting?

1.3

2.2

CHIEF HEALTH DIRECTOR MOULDS: Correct. And then -- and then as we -- and then we compare that with experience and make adjustments to the model going forward. So it's a self-improving mechanism, but accurate in the assessment of likely risk. There are a number of different characteristics that are looked at in determining risk.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: And is this what caused like Kaiser to go up and all the non-Medicare, sorry, but is that what cased these to go up is because we switched from this risk adjustment on health risk characteristics to expected resource -- we're using expected resource use?

CHIEF HEALTH DIRECTOR MOULDS: When we applied the model and did the analytic work, we made a risk assessment of each plan. Some of them -- some of them were below average risk and so their premiums were adjusted upwards. Some of them were above-average risk and their premiums were adjusted downward.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Okay. And that risk assessment we did, that was based on the expected resource use not the health risk characteristics, is that correct?

CHIEF HEALTH DIRECTOR MOULDS: It is a risk -- it's -- it is looking across the population and making an

2.1

assessment about the overall risk assigned to the population.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: And the reason why I'm confused is I thought when we -- when you guys assigned the number one point whatever or point whatever to say that we needed to increase the rate or decrease the rate, is that we were looking at health risk characteristics. That's what I thought we said we were doing. I voted no, by the way, but now it looks like we're doing it based on -- it just seems like we're changing the definition of what risk adjustment is. And we are, but it sounds like we're changing it and it's not what we discussed back in November or whenever we last discussed this.

CHIEF HEALTH DIRECTOR MOULDS: All right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: So I just have a

16 concern. Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you.

Seeing no other requests, Mr. Fox, can you please invite Mr. Jelincic?

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: I actually had a comment.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: All right. Just a minute then. Ms. Taylor, you're first.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Sorry about that. As I understood it when you talked to us about this before, Mr.

Moulds, you had told us it's not the same risk adjustment that we were doing before Ms. Brown got on. And it wasn't -- so it wasn't strictly on age and health, which is how you came to this I believe. And I kind of remember you describing this as a different methodology. Is -- wasn't it also -- I don't know if this is true or not. Is this the one that's also more in line with what CMS does?

CHIEF HEALTH DIRECTOR MOULDS: So CMS uses something that's -- that is -- CMS uses something that's different from this. This is closer to, as I mentioned, what Washington state is doing. You know, we looked -- we looked at and brought forth the CMS model as one proposal and this was a better fit for what is largely a commercial population.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you.

I have Mr. Rubalcava.

1.3

2.2

VICE CHAIRPERSON RUBALCAVA: Thank you, Mr.

Chair. Mr. Moulds, just to clarify, so we can make sure
we understand -- we're on the same page. So isn't this a
better -- the risk mitigation, isn't one of the intents to
take advantage of the vast database that we have because
we're a big purchaser?

CHIEF HEALTH DIRECTOR MOULDS: (Nods head.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON RUBALCAVA: And isn't it also

the system a way to prevent the health insurance carriers from gaming the system, so they -- they're priced based on value, not so much trying to underprice and attract the I think the example that was pointed out lowest risk? before was -- well, it depends on how you want to look at it. But Health Net Mas -- Salud y Más, which was very priced had a significant increase percentage-wise by a dollar amount, but because it was priced so much lower than the -- than its actual value to the members. also wasn't there also like a phase-in period that would allow the carriers and our members to adjust to the change with the outlook that this will stabilize prices in the long run -- well, not that long, in the medium run, I would say, and also deliver better quality and price to our members, is that correct, or can you comment on -expand on that please, Mr. Moulds.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHIEF HEALTH DIRECTOR MOULDS: Yeah. All of -- all of the things that you just clipped off are true. This is -- this is -- I would add to that that, you know, this is -- this is a tool that will promote competition based on cost and quality rather than attracting young, healthy members. So we're trying to get away from that model and having our carriers investing their time and trying to figure out how to attract risk, and instead trying to do a better job on cost and quality.

It was also the most transparent model that we discussed and it was attractive for that reason as well.

2.2

VICE CHAIRPERSON RUBALCAVA: Thank you for the clarification.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: All right. Thank you.

Now seeing no requests to speak, Mr. Fox, please bring in Mr. Jelincic.

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS CHIEF FOX: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JELINCIC: You have read and rejected the comments made by RPEA and myself. Given that you have denied in court that you are a State agency, I am not surprised. Nevertheless, the comments are part of the regulatory record if and when you get sued.

The proposed regulation is loaded with problems. But since I only have three minutes, I will focus on one. The proposed amendment to CCR 599.508, subdivision (a)(8), "Subject to the Board's authority to risk adjust health benefit plan premiums, and upon its approval to exercise this authority, participate in the risk adjustment a body of methods, rules, and postulates employed by a discipline approved by the system. The system will select a risk adjustment body of methods, rules, and postulates employed by a discipline that is consistent with the industry best practices and similar to those used by the United States

25

```
Department of Health and Human Services, and other State and federal agencies. The body of methods, rules, and postulates employed by a discipline will be provided at least 90 days prior to a public announcement of premiums for the next plan year".
```

You might argue that I am misreading the regulation. However, the only thing I did was replace methodology with its definition for purposes of clarity. The result is gobbledygook. Methods and methodology are different words for a reason. Please at least read the regulation before adoption. I also urge you to rejoin DHS in considering health characteristics in your risk adjustments.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you.

Mr. Fox, anyone else?

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS CHIEF FOX: No, Mr. Chair.

18 There will be one more for public comment.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Very good. Thank you very much.

So we need to take an action on Item 4b. Is there a motion from the Committee?

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Move approval.

VICE CHAIRPERSON RUBALCAVA: Mr. Chair, I would

25 | have approval.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

19

20

21

2.2

23

```
CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Moved by Mr. Rubalcava.
                                                             Ιs
1
    there a second?
2
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Second.
                                                Second.
 3
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Seconded by Mr. Miller.
             Any further discussion on the motion?
 5
             Seeing none, Ms. Hopper, please.
 6
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
7
                                          Margaret Brown?
8
             COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: No.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Henry Jones?
9
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Aye.
10
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: David Miller?
11
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Aye.
12
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega?
1.3
             COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA:
14
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Ramon Rubalcava?
15
             VICE CHAIRPERSON RUBALCAVA: Aye.
16
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Theresa Taylor?
17
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Aye.
18
19
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Shawnda Westly?
20
             COMMITTEE MEMBER WESTLY: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Karen Greene-Ross
21
   for Betty Yee?
2.2
23
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENE-ROSS: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. Chair, I have
24
25
    seven ayes, one no made by Margaret Brown. Motion being
```

made by Ramon Rubalcava, seconded by David Miller on Agenda Item 4b, Minimum Standards for Health Benefits Plan Amendment of Regulations.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you. Brings us to Agenda Item 5, information consent items. Having no requests to remove anything, we'll move to Item 6, action agenda Item 6A, the Proposed Regulation for the Definition of Limited Duration Employment.

Ms. Ostrander.

1.3

2.2

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF OSTRANDER: Good afternoon, everyone.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Good afternoon.

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF OSTRANDER: Renee Ostrander, Calpers team member.

Today, we are bringing forward to you an action item to approve draft language to define limited duration in regulations, so it -- hold on. All my screen went dark. I apologize.

There we go. All right.

We're bringing forward to you an action item to approve the draft language to define limited duration in regulations, so it may be released for a public comment.

The term limited duration is utilized multiple times in the PERL and associated regulations without any additional context to aid employers, members, retirees,

and other stakeholders in the meaning of the term. By moving this forward, it will provide clarity and uniformity in its application amongst all parties involved. This term shows up in two different contexts within the member and retiree appointments.

1.3

2.2

The first use of the term is related to post-retirement employment. A retiree is hired to perform work of limited duration. The second use of the term is related to temporary upgrade pay, a type of special compensation used when an employee temporarily steps into another role to those duties instead of their own.

The proposed regulation in both instances defines limited duration as 24 months per appointment with an option of two 12-month extensions that can be submitted to CalPERS for approval when retired annuitant have not yet concluded.

In reviewing our own data for the past few years, over half the retired annuitant appointments are concluded by the end of the 24-month period with another approximate quarter of them closed within what would now be the extension time period. For the temporary upgrade pay reporting, over 99 percent of those are included within the 24-month period.

In developing this draft language, we utilized several inputs. As mentioned earlier, we reviewed our

internal data from past years. In addition, we conducted surveys with our California retirement system peers. And finally, we met with many stakeholders to obtain their feedback. As the language was developed, modifications were made during this process to address their concerns.

If approved by the Committee and Board, this draft language will be released for a 45-day public comment period. After the public comment period is complete, and responses have been provided to any or all commenters, the final version of the language will be brought back to this committee for approval for submission to the Office of Administrative Law for review and ultimate publication.

That concludes my presentation and I'd be happy to answer any requests you may have.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you.

I have Ms. Ortega.

1.3

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My questions and comments are entirely related to the retired annuitant portion. I don't have any concerns with the temporary upgrade pay portion. I do want to provide a little bit of context for the amount of questions or concerns that I have. So the section around limited duration employment, as it relates to retired annuitants, has been in place since the sixties. And with -- today,

there is essentially no limit on the amount of years that a person might be in a retired annuitant appointment. There are limits on the number of hours that they can work and there are restrictions on how quickly they can retire and become a retired annuitant. And that was added in PEPRA as I'm sure you all know.

2.2

The memo describes this as a definition of limited duration employment in order to clarify and standardize how these appointments are understood. But, in fact, the actual draft creates an entirely new scheme of restriction on retired annuitants that wouldn't have existed before.

So as I read it, retired annuitants could not serve past 48 months any longer, the 24 months being the first period and then two additional 12-month periods.

That is a huge departure from where we are today. And I'm in particular concerned when the number of people who are being used as retired annuitants in the Department of Public Health and our public safety offices responded to the pandemic. I definitely don't think this is the time to put this kind of restriction in place. You mentioned that you talked to stakeholders. I know this is the first that the State has seen of this. And I certainly don't have data on every single retired annuitant that is being used in State service.

I only see the ones that have the exemption to the 180-day sit-out period. But I would need to have a lot more time to do some research into how this would impact State departments before I think that it's ready to be even going out for public comment.

2.2

I think that this would also have pretty significant impact on local agencies. I'm sure many of you know there's been an Executive Order to provide more flexibility on the use of retired annuitants during the pandemic. So I just have major, major concerns and really think we need to do a lot more work on what the impact of this is before we put it out.

You know, I would start with kind of like what is the problem that we're solving in terms of -- in term of the use of retired annuitants. But then if there is, in fact, a problem as it relates to the pension fund, then what is the appropriate time frame and what type of process might be in place to look at that over time.

So I'll stop there. I've sent some very specific questions to Ms. Frost if we, you know, want to get into it in that -- in that level of detail, but I'll let others comment.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUINE: I could chime in here and maybe add some context, Ms. Ortega. You know, the main impetus behind this defining limited duration was

from a 2019 audit of the retired annuitant application of the laws. And they found that limited duration was not well defined and that the law required -- so you said there is no limit right now. Technically there is, there should be. It's just extremely subjective. And I think that's what the audit was pointing out that this limited duration is not well defined and we needed to pursue regulation or statutes to better define limited duration.

2.2

So that's where we -- that kind of drove us to come up with some options. We worked with our policy and data analytics team to look at all the retired annuitant appointments that were in the system to see the range of appointments and how long they were working. And the two to four years seemed to be sort of the sweet spot there. I think Renee covered some of this. But more than 85 percent of the appointments are terminated within four years across all three sectors. Within the State, it's about 82 percent are resolved within four years. So they don't work beyond the four years.

I'm trying to touch on some various aspects of that question. So that's where we came up with the two, plus one, plus one. And then we vetted it with our employer stakeholders, our labor stakeholders, and then also the retirees just to make them aware. And we took some feedback from each of them about certain things being

too long, certain things not being long enough. And that's where we ultimately brought them back the language around two, plus one, plus one.

2.2

There will still be some subjectivity about moving across appointments and what constitutes, you know, leaving one appointment and joining another. You know, we have seen that in our own workforce where somebody has the skills to be a retired unit in our Contact Center, but also has the skills to work on a special project that may come up or help reduce a backlog. So there can be varying roles that they serve that would be clearly delineated by different appointments into those four years.

The Governor also has the ability to create an Executive Order at any time, like you've mentioned we've seen here with the pandemic, where they can exempt retired annuitants from the rule. So if we get into critical situations like we are today, he's -- he was able to exempt the 960-hour rule and also the 180-day wait period, to name a couple, to allow those to be relieved for a specific disaster.

So there -- there are the ability to counteract this regulation in times of an emergency.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Thank you. The context for the audit is helpful. It would have been good to see that in the -- in the agenda item and maybe have a little

more information on it. I don't think though that that addresses my concerns and I'm strongly recommending we not move this forward today. The issues around the 18 percent who are working more than four years, the types of examples that I'm aware of in the state are attorneys who are coming back as retired annuitants to continue to serve as the expert on a particular case that, you know, a department has been, you know, dealing with through the court for many, many years. There are tax audits and tax specialists who again are working on very specific cases. There are engineers on the federal water project that are really -- they have very specific skills. And I don't even think that they're working many hours in the year. It's just that they're the -- they are the expert on something that has been a very long-term project for the State, and they come in to act in this capacity. And I'm just not clear that they would be allowed to continue, even in a, you know, very limited short-term bursts of time beyond the 48 months. So that I just need to understand a little more about -- I don't think we're going to ask the Governor to, you know, have an Executive Order to address one-off circumstances where we need that person to work more than 48 months.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

The other thing, you brought it up, is this language in here about work that is substantially

different from the work the retired person performs after retirement. I'm really unclear what that -- what that is getting at, because to your point, yes, of course, retired annuitants can come in and do additional work. And a lot of times their experience is used in a different capacity within a department. But if you're attempting to limit the -- them being able to use the exact skills that they were using in the job they retired from, that's in large part what their -- what their need is, in particular in the short term when you have someone who decides to retire unexpectedly and they're allowed to come in as a retired annuitant to train their replacement. There are lots of reasons why they, in fact, are doing the same thing that they were doing before they retired.

2.2

So again, I would have liked to have spent more time hearing -- having employers give some input into this language as well, because I really do think this is a major change for employers.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: All right. Thank you.

I have Ms. Greene-Ross.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENE-ROSS: So on behalf of a large employer in the State, I -- if Ms.

Ortega is making a motion, I would second it. The second part is, from our own experience here, we have had to quickly hire retired annuitants as retired annuitants

right when they're retiring to keep them on crucial projects they've been working for. And so I was concerned about the Board's role and the timing of having to get Board approval. And I was going to ask if since we're in the regulatory process, if we had to wait till we got through the approval or we could fix the regs before we sent it to OAL to not have the Board have -- take up the time to have to approve these, if they're -- if and when you finally get clear on what the best solution is for clearing -- making this more clear that accommodates CalhR's concerns which we share.

2.2

Can -- I do think that we need to have a process where staff know what those requires are and can quickly process, because there are times when employers have to quickly hire these retired annuitants and waiting for the next Board meeting and having the Board have a role and say on it might not be the most efficient way when you're in need to promptly deploy a retired annuitant.

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF
OSTRANDER: Thank you, Ms. Greene-Ross. So to address
your concerns, although it does say the CalPERS Board
would approve, it is a delegated or it would be a
delegated function. So it would not be required to wait
for the Board to act.

And the intention is as long as the items that

are in there are met and they provide that information, that it would be approved. So that is -- so they, you know, provide the information that's required and then it would automatically be approved.

1.3

2.2

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENE-ROSS: Okay.

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF

OSTRANDER: And it has not -- so this is the very first step -- also, in a way to address your concerns as well, this is the very first step. So this would be the step where the Committee would be approving it and moving it to the Board for approval to put out for public comment. So it has not -- this is the very first step in that process. So it's still quite a ways away from Office Administrative Law.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENE-ROSS: That's good. On that question, I just wasn't clear. I didn't know about the delegation already. So I'm sorry then. Thank you for clarifying. I didn't know that if you -- we had to get it all the way approved and then we would worry about the delegation, so that was -- that part of that question.

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF OSTRANDER: Yeah, no problem.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENE-ROSS: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you.

Mr. Rubalcava.

1.3

2.2

VICE CHAIRPERSON RUBALCAVA: Thank you.

My question is actually the other place where limited duration is used and that's the temporary upgraded positions. And so I appreciate how there's more clarity, how it's supposed to be for a position that was vacant because it used to be filled, and there's an expectation that since it's a permanent position, it will be filled. But I guess my question is more like what kind of guidance is given to the employer? I know our concern -- at least the concern for the temporary upgraded position is to make sure it's reported to Calpers for pension purposes and that should be Calpers concern. I mean, it is Calpers concern.

But what role does CalPERS have in something like this in ensuring that the employer understands what the intent of the regulation is or -- I mean, I know that we've not -- we don't want to step into the employer's practices, but we do want to -- employment practices, but we do want to make sure that anything that's reportable should be reported.

So, Ms. Ostrander, if you could explain how that works. Thank you.

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF OSTRANDER: Yes. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON RUBALCAVA: How it works now and how this would change it, if you implemented it. Thank you.

1.3

2.2

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF
OSTRANDER: Yeah, so currently -- so I think -- I think
the basis of your question is how would we make sure that
the employers are adequately educated in order to report
properly? And one of the pieces of this that comes closer
to the end is the education piece. So, you know, we -- if
we were to go through the process, this is approved. It
goes -- it goes through public comment, et cetera, et
cetera. It goes to the Office of Administrative Law, and
if the Office of Administrative Law were to approve it for
publication, there is a period of time that happens
between their approval and the publication that happens.

And what we would then gear up at that point was a large education and communication campaign with our employers. So that would include doing circular letters. We would have specialized webinars to talk about it. And then as you're mentioning, I know you're talking more about -- at least from my understanding is the temporary upgrade pay side of it versus the retired annuitant, and so we would be doing --

VICE CHAIRPERSON RUBALCAVA: That's correct.

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF

OSTRANDER: -- educations -- yeah, thank you -- that tie all of it together, because you have whether or not it should be reported as temporary upgrade pay. There's also a component of this that has to do with the prior bill, AB 1409, I believe it is -- 1487, which is the reporting if they're not -- if they utilize someone in a temporary upgraded position for longer than 960. And then this would be another component on top of that. So there's a lot to understand in the temporary upgrade pay space. And so we would be focused on multiple channels of education to ensure that the employers have the proper tools to report properly.

VICE CHAIRPERSON RUBALCAVA: Thank you very, very much. Appreciate it.

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF OSTRANDER: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you.

Ms. Taylor.

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Yes. Thank you.

So I was trying to figure out what we were fixing for. I think I got an answer. But I remember -- and just as Ms. Ostrander was talking about the bill, I remembered that, because I remember I was talking about that quite often before it had passed. So what -- Ms. Ostrander, are you saying this is just another portion of that or just

regulations to go along with that, is that what you're saying?

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF

OSTRANDER: It's regulations to explain the terms that are used in statute --

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Okay

1.3

2.2

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF OSTRANDER: -- since the term is vague. These are to explain what does that term mean --

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Okay.

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF

OSTRANDER: -- so that all of our employers can apply it uniformly throughout our system.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Okay. So do we know -it sounds to me -- and I don't feel comfortable moving
forward if CalHR feels like they haven't been notified.

Do we know the State was called in as one of the
employers, because it sounds to me like maybe they
weren't. Do we know that, anybody?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUINE: Yeah, I don't believe -- you know, they don't participate, I don't believe, in our employer roundtable discussion. So they -- Ms. Ortega is correct that, you know, the State wasn't reached out to independently. So we can definitely do that and have those further discussions.

that is a problem, because this does impact State employees. And while this kind of employment is a problem for those of us who, you know, represent employees, because they don't put -- pay into their union dues or anything like that. But I will agree, I think Ms. Ortega was actually highlighting a case that's being handled right now at the Franchise Tax Board, where we had to call some attorneys back. So I do understand what you're talking about there. And I don't know how long those cases take, but this particular case has been going on for almost 30 years.

In any event, if -- I'm fine with delaying this, until there's more of an update for CalHR. I don't know how anybody else feels, but if we need to make that motion, let me know.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you.

Mr. Jones.

1.3

2.2

You're muted, Henry.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yeah, I was also listening to the concerns that were raised by Ms. Ortega. And I -- you know, they were pretty straightforward from my perspective, so I would support delaying this to do a review of the concerns that she has raised and see that they are addressed before

1 moving forward.2 CHAIRPERS

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

2.2

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you.

Ms. Ostrander, Mr. Suine, either of you -- does it cause any angst by having a delay?

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF OSTRANDER: No. That's -- that is completely fine. We will do that.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUINE: Yeah, more than happy.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Very good. Well, then I don't believe we need a motion. That will just be the direction of the Chair is that we postpone it until we get all of the players involved and get the answers they need.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah. And, Chair Feckner, we would just notify Audit that management is accepting this particular risk until additional stakeholder work has been completed.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Very good. Thank you.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20 CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: All right. Thank you, Ms.

Ostrander. Anything else on this topic?

EMPLOYER ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF

23 OSTRANDER: No, thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: All right. Brings us to

25 | Item 6b, Health Care Decision Support System, contract

terms.

1.3

2.2

Mr. Cowling.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

HEALTH PLAN RESEARCH & ADMINISTRATION ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF COWLING: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, Committee members. David Cowling, Calpers team member.

I bring you today Agenda Item 6b, which is an action agenda item. It concerns our health care decision support system court.

Next slide.

--000--

HEALTH PLAN RESEARCH & ADMINISTRATION ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF COWLING: So we're currently on our fourth generation Health Care Decision Support System. CalPERS uses our data warehouse to manage health care data for analytical reporting, business processes, and decision-making. Specifically, this includes things like negotiating health plan rates, analyzing cost drives, supporting policy decisions, and conducting research and evaluation of our health programs.

So currently, we're in our five-year contract that expires in May 2023. Given the extended amount of time for an overlap of our contractors and the length of time for a solicitation, the GEN5 data warehouse solicitation has already started. However, we are -- we

are requesting to extend the current contract for up to a year. We would like to take this time to identify and research further enhancements and improvements and put them into the solicitation. We've been working with Calpers IT and other divisions on technical capabilities and these enhancements.

Also, we're working with our internal health care team to improve the current use cases and expand our ability to produce analyses that are easy to obtain and use. These enhancements could include things like having artificial intelligence tools within the data warehouse itself that could say better identify pre-diabetics to further understand that population and possibly design better outreach strategies.

The concept here is just to have some more specificity around CalPERS needs and ensure that we are looking far enough into the future for these enhancements. I should note that this extension to the existing contract would not add any additional cost, other than the single year at the existing cost per year.

Next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

HEALTH PLAN RESEARCH & ADMINISTRATION ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF COWLING: So in addition to extending the current contract, we were asking for the next generation

Health Care Decision Support System contract term to be a five year, one year -- five-year contract with one year renewals, at CalPERS' discretion after that.

1.3

2.2

This will allow us to focus on improving the Health Care Decision Support System rather than focusing on efforts of a new solicitation in five years, and that's if the contractor is meeting our needs. The intent here is to minimize our disruptions in the future, because CalPERS does incur financial, personnel, and resource costs if we're transitioning the data warehouse to a new vendor. This is partially due to the need to have a nine-month overlap of contract terms -- nine-month overlap of contracts, such that we can ensure that the data from the old data warehouse matches the new data warehouse.

To ensure that we're still getting quality product and up-to-date technology in five years, CalPERS team members and a third party would conduct market checks every year before extending these one-year renewals.

So if we'd go to the next slide.

--000--

HEALTH PLAN RESEARCH & ADMINISTRATION ASSISTANT
DIVISION CHIEF COWLING: This is what that future contract
term would look like. It's that five-year initial
contract and then those one-year extensions, at Calpers
discretion, after conducting those market checks.

And if we can go to the last slide.

--000--

HEALTH PLAN RESEARCH & ADMINISTRATION ASSISTANT
DIVISION CHIEF COWLING: So our next steps, we're seeking
approval of extending the current Health Care Decision
Support System up to one year as we update the
solicitation with these novel ideas and enhancements that
will make the data warehouse more usable, functional, and
meet our needs going forward.

Also, if the Board approves, we will include this five-year and then the five one-year renewals for the new GEN5 solicitation. And that will allow -- and that will allow us to also schedule those market checks.

Thank you. And this includes -- concludes my presentation, and I'm here for your questions.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Very good. Thank you.

Seeing no requests and no comments, we will move on to Item 7. 7a, Summary of Committee Direction. Mr. Moulds, Mr. Suine, either of you?

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. Chair, this is Pam.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: We need to vote.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Just a second.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Should there be a

25 roll call vote.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: You are correct. I'm 1 sorry. That was not information. It's a -- what's the 2 decision -- what's the pleasure of the Committee? 3 CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Mr. Jones. 4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Move approval. 5 COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Henry wants to talk. 6 7 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Feckner. 8 CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Mr. Jones. COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Feckner, I have a 9 10 request to ask a question in the chat box before we vote. CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Okay. I don't see it, but 11 go for it. 12 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. I see it here. 13 Anyway, the question is recognizing that these 14 kinds of platforms are always improving or enhancing their 15 16 capacity and capabilities, when you enter into these contracts, do you have provisions that include the right 17 of refusal for enhancement -- enhancements on these 18 19 platforms, so that you have the decision to accept those 20 going forward with minimal cost?

HEALTH PLAN RESEARCH & ADMINISTRATION ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF COWLING: Yes, we would build that into the contract, so we'd be able to do that.

21

2.2

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: All right. Thank you. So

```
what's the pleasure of the Committee?
1
2
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Move approval.
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Second.
 3
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Moved by Taylor, seconded
 4
   by Jones.
5
             I have a request from the public to speak.
6
7
             Mr. Fox.
             STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS CHIEF FOX: Thank you, Mr.
8
9
   Chairman. On the phone we have Mr. Wisam Altowaiji.
             MR. ALTOWAIJI: Yeah. Hello?
10
             STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS CHIEF FOX: Go ahead.
11
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Hello. Is this on 6b or
12
    7b, sir?
1.3
             MR. ALTOWAIJI: This is public comments or --
14
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: No. We'll come back to you
15
16
   in a moment.
                  Thank you.
             MR. ALTOWAIJI: Oh, okay.
17
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: All right. Seeing no other
18
   discussion on the motion, what's the -- Ms. Hopper, please
19
20
    call the roll.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Margaret Brown?
21
             COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Aye.
2.2
23
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Henry Jones?
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Aye.
24
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: David Miller?
25
```

```
COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER:
                                      Aye.
1
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega?
2
             COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA:
 3
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
                                          Ramon Rubalcava?
             VICE CHAIRPERSON RUBALCAVA: Aye.
 5
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Theresa Taylor?
 6
7
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Aye.
8
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Shawnda Westly?
             COMMITTEE MEMBER WESTLY: Aye.
9
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Karen Greene-Ross
10
    for Betty Yee?
11
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENE-ROSS: Aye.
12
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. Chair, I have
13
    all ayes, motion being made by Theresa Taylor, seconded by
14
    Henry Jones on Item 6b Health Care Decision Support
15
16
    System, HCDSS, Contract Terms.
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you.
17
             Now, it brings us to Item 7a, Summary of
18
   Committee Direction. Mr. Moulds, Mr. Suine.
19
20
             CHIEF HEALTH DIRECTOR MOULDS: Mr. Chair, I
    didn't record any. Mr. Suine may have.
21
             DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUINE: Yes.
                                                     To work
2.2
23
   with CalHR on vetting through the limited duration
    regulations and bring them back at a later date.
24
25
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Very good. I didn't hear
```

```
anything else other than that myself, so thank you.
1
             Now, we're to public comment. Mr. Fox.
2
             STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS CHIEF FOX: My apologies,
 3
   Mr. Chair. We have Mr. Wisam Altowaiji on Item 7b.
 4
             MR. ALTOWAIJI: Hello.
5
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Yes, sir. Your turn.
 6
7
             MR. ALTOWAIJI: My turn. Okay.
8
             My name is Wisam Altowaiji. I'm retired from
9
    CalPERS. And I'm in the health plan. And I always think
    highly of CalPERS and the team and all of that. And I
10
    think they did a great job when they created the three
11
   plans for the PPO and allowed a lot of people to get into
12
    health care plan at lower cost, especially the Select.
1.3
    And I find recently that you are changing that and moving
14
    to two plans -- and consolidating in two plans instead of
15
16
    three. And I think that was wrong and that was -- it
    seems like you are subsidizing the expensive plan,
17
    PERSCare, into this one.
18
             So my major -- this is done and next year is
19
    going to happen and so forth. But my main comment on the
20
    rate for the Medicare I just --
21
             (Conversations in the background.)
2.2
23
             MR. ALTOWAIJI: Hello? Can you hear me?
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Yes, sir. I can hear you.
24
25
    Somebody is unmuted. Please mute yourselves.
```

MR. ALTOWAIJI: Okay. My point on the Medicare -- I just enrolled in the Medicare a month ago and I find that the premium for the Medicare, whether the current plan or the consolidated two plans in the future, there is a big discrepancy between the prices that you have set up and between what's available on the market. It was brought to my attention by people that are aware previously in Calpers Medicare and they opt out of it to go to the market for close to zero cost and a few dollars for the prescription.

2.2

It seems like your plan right now currently 350 for PERS Select and PERS Choice. And if you go on the market for Blue Cross Medicare plan, it's -- the best plan is about 150 or so. And the -- even if you add the most expensive plan on the prescription is about \$50. So there is at least \$150, if not more, savings in that.

So I don't understand how the Board or the team got all of this. And I tried to contact your member with customer service and all of that. Nobody knows what it is going on. Finally, I reached out to Ms. Green, supposed to be the expert, and she gave me a generic answer by email. And I ask her to talk to me in person and I need to schedule appointment with her in person and I haven't heard back from her. She went on vacation. And when she came back, she didn't contact me. And I contacted her

```
last week again and I haven't heard back.
1
             So there is a big change in the market.
2
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: I'm sorry, sir your time is
 3
    allotted.
 4
             Sir, your allotted time has expired. We thank
5
   you for your call.
 6
7
             MR. ALTOWAIJI: So, look into that. You guys are
8
    looking for our --
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Sir, your time has expired.
9
    I appreciate your comments. I will say that although Ms.
10
    Green has not met with you, we are not doing in-person
11
   meetings right now anyway, so she wouldn't be setting one
12
    up --
1.3
             MR. ALTOWAIJI: On the phone.
14
15
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: -- with you in person.
16
             MR. ALTOWAIJI: On the phone. On the phone.
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER:
17
                                   Excuse me?
             Oh, on the phone.
18
19
             MR. ALTOWAIJI: On the phone is what I requested.
             CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Okay. You said in person,
20
    so I'm sorry. When she gets back, I'm sure she'll set
21
    that up.
2.2
23
             Mr. Moulds, any comment?
             CHIEF HEALTH DIRECTOR MOULDS:
24
                                            No.
                                                  Except, you
25
    know, we do our best to keep our Medicare prices low and
```

you benchmark them to plans that are similarly comprehensive. They do well. A lot of the plans that are on the open market involve cost sharing that is not part of the Calpers Medicare plan.

MR. ALTOWAIJI: That is not true. Look at it and compare.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Sir, your time is up. Thank you.

MR. ALTOWAIJI: Please compare.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: Thank you. All right. Seeing no other requests, this meeting is going to adjourn. We thank everybody for being here today and we will see you next time.

Finance begins at what time?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Say fifteen minutes.

16 Take a 15-minute break and come back at, what, 3:15, 3:16.

CHAIRPERSON FECKNER: 3:15 for Finance. Thank you, Mr. Miller. Thank you all for being here. Enjoy the rest of your day.

(Thereupon California Public Employees'
Retirement System, Pension and Health Benefits
Committee open session meeting adjourned
at 3:01 p.m.)

1.3

2.2

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

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

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing California Public Employees' Retirement System, Board of Administration, Pension and Health Benefits Committee 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 20th day of September, 2021.

James &

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR Certified Shorthand Reporter License No. 10063