BEAUMONT-CHERRY VALLEY RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT (BCVRPD)
BOARD OF DIRECTORS SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, July 16th, 2026
Special Meeting: 5:30p.m.
Noble Creek Regional Park Clubhouse
650 W. Oak Valley Parkway,
Beaumont, CA 92223

This meeting is being held in person.

REGULAR SESSION:

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
   - 1.1 Roll Call
   - 1.2 Invocation: Director Linnemann
   - 1.3 Pledge of Allegiance: Treasurer Diercks

2. **ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:**

3. **INFORMATIONAL UPDATES/DISCUSSION:**

4. **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

5. **ACTION ITEMS/BIDS & PUBLIC HEARING/REQUESTS:**
   - 5.1. Consideration and Possible Approval of a Letter of Support for the California Special Districts Association (CSDA) Regarding the Proposed Changes to the CalPERS Retirement Formula.

6. **ADJOURNMENT:**

Any person with a disability who requires accommodation to participate in the meeting should telephone Kaylee Fuerte at 951-845-9555, prior to the meeting to make a request for a disability-related modification or accommodation.

DECLARATION OF POSTING: I declare under penalty of perjury, that I am employed by Beaumont-Cherry Valley Recreation and Park District, and the foregoing agenda was posted at the District office and District website July 15th, 2026.

Kaylee Fuerte
Kaylee Fuerte, Clerk of the Board

July __, 2026

____
____
____
____

RE: **AB 1383 (McKinnor) Public Employees' Retirement Benefits.**
OPPOSE *(As Amended July 1, 2026)*

Dear Chair ______,

The __________________ writes to inform you of its respectful opposition to Assembly Bill (AB) 1383. This bill would make several significant changes to public employees' retirement benefits, which would ultimately lead to increased pension liability for state and local agencies.

The Public Employees' Pension Reform Act (PEPRA) was passed in 2012, and most of its provisions went into effect Jan. 1, 2013. PEPRA was designed to address a wide range of issues involving public employee pensions and was a major step in helping public agencies better manage future pension costs and prevent the California Public Employees Retirement System from sliding into insolvency. AB 1383 would upend many of the reforms put in place in 2013 by PEPRA.

Specifically, this bill would:

- Increase the pensionable compensation cap;
- Reduce the retirement age for public safety from 57 to 55 prospectively;
- Add a 4th safety tier that is 3% @ 55, prospective and subject to bargaining; and,
- Allow local agencies to adjust their local formula in a prospective manner.

Through these changes, the bill would dramatically increase state and local pension obligations and undo critical pension reform.

PEPRA has been in place since 2013, and we have had the opportunity to see its impact on pension funds and local agencies. According to a 2024 estimate, for the state, schools, and public agencies in CalPERS, PEPRA had already led to $5.8 billion in savings. As years go by and the public sector force skews towards more new members, those savings will increase dramatically. Over the next ten years, PEPRA is expected to result in $26.5 billion in cost savings for CalPERS members[1]. These data do not include the public agencies that maintain their own pension system, including twenty counties. The critical savings from PEPRA help support budgetary stability which supports operational and workforce stability.

---

[1] CalPERS 2024 Annual Review of Funding Levels and Risk (published November 2024)

AB 1383 increases mandated costs without a way for public agencies to absorb them. The potential cost of this bill comes at a time of fiscal uncertainty. Much like the state, local agencies are facing budget challenges, as the costs of delivering services increase, and new mandates are implemented. Some local agencies are currently considering significant budget cuts across all departments. AB 1383 would cause increased benefit costs and new cost pressures, leading to serious cost increases for local government.

According to CalPERS, given the current discount rate of 6.8%, **AB 1383 is expected to increase the required contributions of employers and PEPRA members and increase the present value of future benefits (PVB) by <u>$4.8 billion</u> across State, Schools, and Local Agency plans.** In addition to the change in PVB, CalPERS estimates that the **change to the accrued liability to be <u>$233 million</u>** across State, Schools, and Local Agency plans. Additionally, AB 1383 further proposes that employers may increase their PEPRA formula to 3% at age 55 through individual agency collective bargaining. The benefit for this formula will be limited to 90 percent of final compensation. The increase in the normal cost due to this change could lead to increased annual normal cost contributions of $353 million in the first year and increase the present value of future benefits by $3.4 billion.

The CalPERS analysis does not include estimates for non-CalPERS pension systems, including for the twenty county-operated pension systems. Additionally, these costs are based on a snapshot of current compensation for public employees and could be heightened significantly if compensation increases rise and exceed the current compensation cap.

As of June 30, 2026, the Public Employees Retirement Fund (PERF) was 85% funded. If CalPERS misses its investment return mark of 6.8%, local agencies in CalPERS and the State have to pay the difference. Again, this bill would compound costs for local governments and the State and do nothing to offset the costs.

While this bill may be prospective, agencies have already been authorizing salary increases since the passage of PEPRA under the assumption that the cost of benefits would remain in line with current PEPRA law. The prospective costs would likely cause an immediate financial strain on impacted agencies, especially those with a large number of PEPRA safety employees.

Local government decision makers and public agency department heads have been implementing innovative ways to try to boost recruitment and retention and would welcome additional state support and resources for these efforts. However, adding another unfunded mandate on public agencies will not solve the problem of retention and recruitment. It is critical that our pension policy offers sustainable retirement benefits to public agency employees while at the same time ensuring that public agencies have solid retirement benefits to attract and retain highly talented employees.

By increasing the cost of these benefits, AB 1383 would result in less money for salary increases, which could therefore harm future recruitment efforts. Additionally, the changes in this bill could result in labor unrest by furthering the equity issues between safety and non-safety employees. Additionally, according to CalPERS, AB 1383 would increase the total normal cost for the affected plans and as a result PEPRA employee contribution rates increases could increase as well to reach half of the new normal cost. This would mean that some PEPRA employees making under the pensionable compensation cap may have to pay more to CalPERS out of their check while not seeing a benefit from the increased pensionable compensation cap.

Unfortunately, pension costs for many California public agencies continue to be a challenge, threatening the delivery of basic public services, compromising general fund budgets and, indeed, posing a long-term fiscal challenge to the State itself. That is why it is increasingly important that any change to the system be sustainable, fair to taxpayers and employees, and provide long-term financial stability. Any change to PEPRA must protect the fiscal integrity of public agencies and retirement for public employees.

Our agency is committed to ensuring competitive benefits for public servants while maintaining the fiscal integrity of critical local services. However, this bill would not protect the fiscal integrity of public agencies and would send public agencies and our pension funds in the wrong direction.

For these reasons, our organization is respectfully opposed to AB 1383. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us directly.

Sincerely,

CalPERS

ACTUARIAL COST ANALYSIS
Assembly Bill 1383

I. Executive Summary

This is an actuarial cost analysis of Assembly Bill 1383.

This cost analysis was prepared by CalPERS as part of its assessment of AB 1383 in its current version as of May 13, 2026. If an amended version of AB1383 is passed, this cost analysis is subject to change. Further, this cost analysis does not attempt to address design, implementation, administration or legal issues that may exist. It only attempts to estimate the financial impact for employers whose pension plans are currently administered by CalPERS i.e. the State of California plans, the Schools Pool for non-teaching school employees and the more than 3,000 local agency plans.

The proposed changes lower the maximum retirement benefit factor age from age 57 to age 55 for all Safety PEPRA retirement formulas and also redefine the compensation cap established under PEPRA for Miscellaneous and Safety PEPRA members. The new proposed PEPRA cap is increased to the amount specified in Section 430(b) of Title 42 of the United States Code (i.e. $184,500 for those whose service is included in the federal system and $249,075 for those whose service is not included in the federal system for 2026). Per Section 7522.44 Prohibition of Retroactive Benefit Increases, these changes can only be applied prospectively. AB 1383 specifies that these changes would apply to service earned on or after January 1, 2027. All PEPRA benefits earned from January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2026 would be based on current benefit provisions.

As these changes will increase the total normal cost for the affected plans, it is likely that PEPRA employee contribution rates would need to increase to reach half of the new normal cost. However, this cost analysis only provides an estimate of the change in the total normal cost and does not split the cost between the employer and employee portions.

Overall, AB 1383 is expected to increase the required contributions of employers and some PEPRA members by varying degrees. The increase to the present value of future benefits (PVB) is estimated at $4.8 billion for all State, Schools, and Local Agency plans. This disclosure models prospective only benefit enhancements. However, due to the nature of the amendment involved and CalPERS actuarial cost methods, there is also an impact to the portion of the PVB allocated to past service or accrued liability. We estimate the change to the accrued liability to be $233 million for all State, Schools, and Local Agency plans. As a result, this $4.8 billion increase to the PVB would be funded through a combination of increased annual normal cost contributions for future service over the remaining future working lifetime of the employees who were active as of June 30, 2024, and increased amortization payments to pay down the resulting increase in unfunded accrued liability. Consistent with the normal cost sharing provisions, these additional contributions would be shared between employers and PEPRA employees. This is modeled in scenario 3 of this disclosure.

II. Valuation Basis

Valuation Date: 06/30/2024

Valuation Group:

State			Public Agencies
[X] Miscellaneous Tier 1	[X] Schools		[X] Miscellaneous
[X] Miscellaneous Tier 2	[ ] JRS I		[X] Safety
[X] Industrial	[ ] JRS II		[X] Fire
[X] Safety	[ ] LRS		[X] Police
[X] POFF			[X] County Peace Officers
[X] CHP			[X] Lifeguards
[ ] Other (Specify)			[ ] Other (Specify)

Data used: This cost analysis was based on data used for the June 30, 2024 actuarial valuations.

Methods and Assumption: This cost analysis uses the methods described in Appendix A of the June 30, 2024 actuarial valuation and assumptions included in the November 2025 CalPERS Experience Study and Review of Actuarial Assumptions. Please see calpers.ca.gov for more details.

III. Results and Analysis

The proposed changes in AB 1383 are intended to improve retirement benefits for current active and future PEPRA members. It is expected that these improvements will increase costs to CalPERS employers and likely PEPRA employees in order to fund the improved benefits.

We have performed individual costings for the four following scenarios:

1. Increase to the PEPRA compensation limit for all plans to the amount specified in Section 430(b) of Title 42 of the United States Code for 2026
    a. One hundred percent for a member whose service is included in the federal system, $184,500
    b. One hundred thirty-five percent for a member whose service is not included in the federal system, $249,075
2. Improve benefit formula for PEPRA Safety members
    a. 2% at age 57 to 2% at age 55
    b. 2.5% at age 57 to 2.5% at age 55
    c. 2.7% at age 57 to 2.7% at age 55
3. Scenarios 1 and 2 combined, i.e. increase the compensation cap for all PEPRA members and improve benefit formula for PEPRA Safety members
4. In addition to scenario 3, further improve benefit formula for PEPRA Safety members to 3% at age 55 and the benefit limit shall be 90 percent of final compensation

As specified in AB 1383, the 3% at age 55 formula is a further improvement that can only be achieved through collective bargaining and would not become automatically effective January 1, 2027.

Scenario 1

AB 1383 proposes in Section 7522.10(c)(2) that the pensionable compensation limit will be increased to the dollar limit established by Section 430(b) of Title 42 of the United States Code (i.e. $184,500 for those whose service is included in the federal system and $249,075 for those whose service is not included in the federal system for 2026). For reference, the 2026 compensation cap for PEPRA members is $159,733 for members whose service is included in the federal system and $191,679 for those whose service is not included in the federal system. Increasing the compensation cap ultimately increases the future retirement benefit for PEPRA members who earn more than the existing cap. An estimate of the impact of this change to the normal cost, the present value of benefits and accrued liability is displayed in the tables below.

State & Schools Plans

Plan	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for PEPRA Members Only	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for Entire Plan	Increase to Present Value of Future Benefits (millions)	Increase to Accrued Liabilities (millions)
State Miscellaneous	0.41%	0.21%	$914.9	$36.6
State Industrial	0.20%	0.10%	22.5	(0.3)
State Safety	0.23%	0.10%	136.6	15.0
State Peace Officers & Firefighters	0.19%	0.09%	82.9	7.2
California Highway Patrol	3.79%	1.36%	309.5	6.9
Schools	0.11%	0.06%	284.7	35.6

Local Agency Pooled Plans

Plan	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost	Increase to Present Value of Future Benefits (millions)	Increase to Accrued Liabilities (millions)
Miscellaneous Pool – 2% at age 62	0.31%	$159.4	$8.5
Safety Pool – 2% at age 57	0.70%	6.5	0.2
Safety Pool – 2.5% at age 57	1.66%	3.8	0.0
Safety Pool – 2.7% at age 57	1.61%	362.1	9.2

Scenario 1 (cont'd)

Local Agency Non-Pooled Plans (>100 active members)

Plan		Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for PEPRA Members Only	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for Entire Plan	Total Increase to Present Value of Future Benefits (millions)	Total Increase to Accrued Liabilities (millions)
Miscellaneous	Low	0.00%	0.00%	$925.6	$58.2
	Median	0.22%	0.11%		
	High	1.16%	0.65%		
Safety – 2% at age 57	Low	0.17%	0.00%	6.3	0.3
	Median	0.42%	0.09%		
	High	0.89%	0.43%		
Safety – 2.5% at age 57	Low	N/A	N/A	10.6	0.5
	Median	2.43%	1.35%		
	High	N/A	N/A		
Safety – 2.7% at age 57	Low	0.01%	0.01%	991.3	22.8
	Median	2.24%	0.95%		
	High	3.30%	1.62%		

The increase in the normal cost due to increasing the compensation limit would result in an increase to annual normal cost contributions of $241 million in the first year and increase the present value of future benefits by $4.2 billion.

There are plans where the estimated impact to the normal cost is zero. The reason for this is that there are plans which currently do not have any active members near or above the current PEPRA compensation limit and increasing the limit would not impact their future benefit.

Scenario 2

AB 1383 proposes in Section 7522.26 that on or after January 1, 2027 Safety Plans will offer new formulas which lower their current maximum benefit factor age from age 57 to age 55. Lowering the maximum benefit factor age means that employees will be able to retire with the same benefit factor two years earlier than they are currently able. The tables below provide an estimate of the increase to normal cost, present value of benefits and accrued liabilities associated with the formula change only.

State Plans

Plan	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for PEPRA Members Only	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for Entire Plan	Increase to Present Value of Future Benefits (millions)	Increase to Accrued Liabilities (millions)
State Safety	0.22%	0.12%	$42.0	$1.1
State Peace Officers & Firefighters	0.45%	0.22%	153.9	7.5
California Highway Patrol	0.67%	0.24%	40.6	2.4

Local Agency Pooled Plans

Plan	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost	Increase to Present Value of Future Benefits (millions)	Increase to Accrued Liabilities (millions)
Safety Pool – 2% at age 57	0.33%	$2.2	$0.0
Safety Pool – 2.5% at age 57	0.51%	0.8	0.0
Safety Pool – 2.7% at age 57	0.66%	101.3	6.1

Local Agency Non-Pooled Plans (>100 active members)

Plan		Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for PEPRA Members Only	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for Entire Plan	Increase to Present Value of Future Benefits (millions)	Increase to Accrued Liabilities (millions)
Safety – 2% at age 57	Low	0.32%	0.00%	$3.4	$0.2
	Median	0.46%	0.22%		
	High	0.56%	0.30%		
Safety – 2.5% at age 57	Low	N/A	N/A	1.8	0.1
	Median	0.52%	0.29%		
	High	N/A	N/A		
Safety – 2.7% at age 57	Low	0.55%	0.20%	214.2	16.0
	Median	0.69%	0.31%		
	High	0.81%	0.42%		

The increase in the normal cost due to the formula change would result in an increase to annual normal cost contributions of $38 million in the first year and increase the present value of future benefits by $560 million.

Scenario 3

The tables below provide an estimate of the increased normal cost, present value of benefits and accrued liabilities associated with the formula change and increase in compensation cap.

State Plans

Plan	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for PEPRA Members Only	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for Entire Plan	Increase to Annual Normal Cost Contributions (millions)	Increase to Present Value of Future Benefits (millions)	Increase to Accrued Liabilities (millions)
State Miscellaneous	0.41%	0.21%	$48.1	$914.9	$36.6
State Industrial	0.20%	0.10%	1.5	22.5	(0.3)
State Safety	0.45%	0.22%	15.5	$179.6	$16.0
State Peace Officers & Firefighters	0.64%	0.31%	14.5	237.2	14.7
California Highway Patrol	4.56%	1.64%	18.2	358.7	9.1
Schools	0.11%	0.06%	19.0	284.7	35.6

Local Agency Pooled Plans

Plan	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost	Increase to Annual Normal Cost Contributions (millions)	Increase to Present Value of Future Benefits (millions)	Increase to Accrued Liabilities (millions)
Miscellaneous Pool – 2% at age 62	0.31%	$11.5	$159.4	$8.5
Safety Pool – 2% at age 57	1.03%	0.5	$8.8	$0.2
Safety Pool – 2.5% at age 57	2.20%	0.2	4.7	0.1
Safety Pool – 2.7% at age 57	2.31%	24.9	473.6	15.1

Scenario 3 (cont'd)

Local Agency Non-Pooled Plans (>100 active members)

Plan		Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for PEPRA Members Only	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for Entire Plan	Increase to Annual Normal Cost Contributions (millions)	Increase to Present Value of Future Benefits (millions)	Increase to Accrued Liabilities (millions)
Miscellaneous	Low	0.00%	0.00%	$63.9	$925.6	$58.2
	Median	0.22%	0.11%			
	High	1.16%	0.65%			
Safety – 2% at age 57	Low	0.73%	0.01%	0.6	9.8	0.5
	Median	0.75%	0.40%			
	High	1.38%	0.66%			
Safety – 2.5% at age 57	Low	N/A	N/A	0.7	12.6	0.7
	Median	3.01%	1.68%			
	High	N/A	N/A			
Safety – 2.7% at age 57	Low	0.71%	0.33%	62.4	1,234.3	38.1
	Median	3.01%	1.27%			
	High	4.00%	2.02%			

The increase in the normal cost due to the increasing the compensation limit and improved benefit formula would result in an increase to annual normal cost contributions of $282 million in the first year and increase the present value of future benefits by $4.8 billion.

Scenario 4

AB 1383 further proposes that employers may increase their PEPRA formula to 3% at age 55 through individual agency collective bargaining. The benefit for this formula will be limited to 90 percent of final compensation. The tables below provide an estimate of the increased normal cost, present value of benefits and accrued liabilities associated with further increasing the retirement formula to 3% at age 55 for Safety Plans.

State Plans

Plan	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for PEPRA Members Only	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for Entire Plan	Increase to Present Value of Future Benefits (millions)	Increase to Accrued Liabilities (millions)
State Safety	10.02%	5.51%	$1,136.3	$200.5
State Peace Officers & Firefighters	4.50%	2.18%	846.7	159.7
California Highway Patrol	3.17%	1.14%	130.0	14.6

Local Agency Pooled Plans

Plan	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost	Increase to Present Value of Future Benefits (millions)	Increase to Accrued Liabilities (millions)
Safety Pool – 2% at age 57	8.72%	$48.0	$4.6
Safety Pool – 2.5% at age 57	3.71%	6.4	1.1
Safety Pool – 2.7% at age 57	2.22%	371.0	79.5

Local Agency Non-Pooled Plans (>100 active members)

Plan		Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for PEPRA Members Only	Estimated Increase to Total Normal Cost for Entire Plan	Increase to Present Value of Future Benefits (millions)	Increase to Accrued Liabilities (millions)
Safety – 2% at age 57	Low	5.80%	0.09%	$41.7	$7.9
	Median	6.59%	3.14%		
	High	7.65%	3.18%		
Safety – 2.5% at age 57	Low	N/A	N/A	11.5	2.0
	Median	3.12%	1.74%		
	High	N/A	N/A		
Safety – 2.7% at age 57	Low	1.76%	0.62%	775.5	193.1
	Median	2.13%	0.96%		
	High	2.58%	1.44%		

The increase in the normal cost due to the formula change to 3% at age 55 and 90% benefit limit would result in an increase to annual normal cost contributions of $353 million in the first year and increase the present value of future benefits by $3.4 billion.

Notes:

- **All estimated costs were calculated using CalPERS current actuarial assumptions and methods that were approved by the Board in November 2025.**
- In cases where the estimated impact to the normal cost is zero, this is due to the fact that these plans currently do not have any active members near or above the current PEPRA compensation limit and increasing the limit would not impact their future benefit. Actual costs could occur in these cases should compensation for future active members exceed the current compensation limit.
- Retirement assumptions for these proposed formulas were left identical to the retirement assumptions for existing PEPRA formulas. To the extent these proposed changes alter retirement patterns, actual costs would vary from those provided.
- Altering the compensation limit only benefits employees who are currently above the cap or will potentially be above the cap in the future. However, all employees will share the cost of increasing the compensation limit through higher member contributions.
- Increasing the compensation limit will increase the pensionable payroll for employers and employees who are earning more than the current compensation limit. For employers, not only is the normal cost increasing, but so is the total payroll to which the normal cost rate will be applied. For members earning above the current compensation limit this means that a larger portion of their wages will be subject to member contributions. Additionally, the PEPRA member contribution rate in some cases will increase to reach half of the new normal cost.
- The impact to plans that have blended normal cost rates (a blend of normal cost rates for Classic and PEPRA members) will depend on the plan's composition of active Classic and PEPRA members. Plans with larger PEPRA populations may see a larger impact to their normal cost compared to plans with lower PEPRA populations.
- Future actuarial measurements may differ significantly from the current measurements presented in this document due to such factors as the following: plan experience differing from that anticipated by the economic or demographic assumptions; changes in economic or demographic assumptions; changes in actuarial policies; changes in plan provisions or applicable law; and differences between the required contributions determined by the valuation and the actual contributions made by the agency.
- Examination of the impact of possible alternate future scenarios on results, such as variations in future investment returns, demographic experience, or changes in actuarial assumptions is provided in Attachment 1 of this document. This information provides a more complete assessment of the possible financial implications of this Bill.
- With this proposed amendment, a greater number of PEPRA members could potentially be impacted by the IRC Section 415 limit. While a member's retirement benefit may be subject to limitation under their individualized IRC Section 415 limit, members who first become CalPERS members on or after January 1, 2013 are not eligible to receive a replacement benefit.

Certification

The actuarial cost analysis of the impact of AB 1383 was based on data extracted from the my|CalPERS database as of June 30, 2024. The analysis has been performed in accordance with standards of practice prescribed by the Actuarial Standards Board, and the assumptions and methods are internally consistent and reasonable for this analysis. The undersigned include actuaries who satisfy the Qualification Standards for Actuaries Issuing Statements of Actuarial Opinion in the United States with regard to pensions.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Sensitivity Analysis
Attachment 2 – Estimated Impact to Normal Cost

NINA RAMSEY, ASA, MAAA
Supervising Actuary
CalPERS Actuarial Office

DAVID CLEMENT, ASA, MAAA
Supervising Actuary
CalPERS Actuarial Office

SCOTT TERANDO, ASA, EA, MAAA, FCA, CFA
Chief Actuary
CalPERS Actuarial Office

GLOSSARY OF ACTUARIAL TERMS

Accrued Liability *(Actuarial Accrued Liability)***:** The portion of the Present Value of Benefits allocated to prior years. Based on CalPERS funding policies, the accrued liability is the target level of assets on any valuation date.

Actuarial Assumptions: Assumptions made about certain events that will affect pension costs. Assumptions generally can be broken down into two categories: demographic and economic. Demographic assumptions include such things as mortality, disability, and retirement rates. Economic assumptions include discount rate, salary growth and inflation.

Actuarial Methods: Procedures employed by actuaries to achieve certain funding goals of a pension plan. Actuarial methods include cost method, amortization policy and asset valuation method.

Actuarial Valuation: The determination as of a valuation date of the Normal Cost, Accrued Liability, and related actuarial present values for a pension plan. These valuations are performed annually or when an employer is contemplating a change to their plan provisions.

Amortization Bases: Separate payment schedules for different portions of the Unfunded Accrued Liability. The total Unfunded Accrued Liability of a rate plan can be segregated by cause. The impact of such individual causes on the UAL are quantified at the time of their occurrence, resulting in new amortization bases. Each base is separately amortized and paid for over a specific period of time. Generally, in an actuarial valuation, the separate bases consist of changes in UAL due to contract amendments, actuarial assumption changes, method changes, and/or gains and losses.

Amortization Period: The number of years required to pay off an Amortization Base.

Classic Member (under PEPRA): A classic member is a member who joined CalPERS prior to January 1, 2013, and who is not defined as a new member under PEPRA. (See definition of new member below.)

Discount Rate: This is the rate used to discount the expected future benefit payments to the valuation date to determine the Projected Value of Benefits. The discount rate is based on the assumed long-term rate of return on plan assets, net of investment and administrative expenses. This rate is called the "actuarial interest rate" in Section 20014 of the California Public Employees' Retirement Law.

Entry Age: The earliest age at which a plan member begins to accrue benefits under a defined benefit pension plan. In most cases, this is the age of the member on their date of hire.

Entry Age Actuarial Cost Method: An actuarial cost method designed to fund a member's total plan benefit in a level manner over the course of his or her career. This method yields a total normal cost rate, expressed as a percentage of payroll, which is designed to remain level throughout the member's career.

Fresh Start: A Fresh Start is when multiple Amortization Bases are combined into a single base and amortized over a new Amortization Period.

Funded Ratio: Defined as Market Value of Assets divided by Accrued Liability. It is a measure of how well funded a rate plan is. A ratio greater than 100% means the rate plan has more assets than the target established by CalPERS funding policies on the valuation date and the employer need only contribute the Normal Cost. A ratio less than 100% means assets are less than the funding target and contributions in addition to Normal Cost are required.

GASB 68: Statement No. 68 of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, the accounting standard governing a state or local governmental employer's accounting and financial reporting for pensions.

New Member (under PEPRA): A new member is an individual who becomes a member of a public retirement system in the State of California for the first time on or after January 1, 2013, was not a member of another public retirement system prior to that date and is not subject to reciprocity with another public retirement system.

Normal Cost: The portion of the Present Value of Benefits allocated to the upcoming fiscal year for active employees. The normal cost plus the required amortization of the UAL, if any, make up the required contributions.

Pension Actuary: A business professional proficient in mathematics and statistics who performs the calculations necessary to properly fund a pension plan and allow the plan sponsor to disclose its liabilities. A pension actuary must satisfy the Qualification Standards for Actuaries Issuing Statements of Actuarial Opinion in the United States regarding pensions.

PEPRA: The California Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013.

Present Value of Benefits (PVB): The total dollars needed as of the valuation date to fund all benefits earned in the past and expected to be earned in the future for *current* members.

Unfunded Accrued Liability (UAL): The Accrued Liability minus the Market Value of Assets. If the UAL for a rate plan is positive, the employer is required to make contributions in excess of the Normal Cost. A UAL that is negative is also called the surplus.

Sensitivity Analysis

This attachment provides a more complete assessment of the possible financial implications of AB 1383. It includes the examination of the impact of possible alternate future scenarios on results, such as variations in future investment returns, demographic experience, or changes in actuarial assumptions.

All sensitivity analysis was performed based on Scenario 3 of the actuarial cost analysis. The following date, methods and assumptions were also used:

Valuation Date: 06/30/2024

Data used: This cost analysis was based on the data used for the June 30, 2024 actuarial valuations.

Methods and Assumption: This cost analysis uses the methods described in Appendix A of the June 30, 2024 actuarial valuation and assumptions included in the November 2025 CalPERS Experience Study and Review of Actuarial Assumptions . Please see calpers.ca.gov for more details.

Discount Rate Sensitivity

The discount rate assumption is calculated as the sum of the assumed real rate of return and the assumed annual price inflation, currently 4.30% and 2.50%, respectively. Shown below are various valuation results as of June 30, 2024 modified to reflect the estimated impact of May 13, 2026 version of AB 1383, and provided under alternate discount rates. Results are shown using the current discount rate of 6.8% as well as alternate discount rates of 5.8% and 7.8%. The rates of 5.8% and 7.8% were selected since they illustrate the impact of a 1.0% increase or decrease to the 6.8% assumption.

The following tables indicate the sensitivity of key valuation results to changes in the discount rate.

	Estimated Valuation Results Reflecting AB 1383		
As of June 30, 2024	**1% Lower Real Return Rate (millions)**	**Current Assumptions (millions)**	**1% Higher Real Return Rate (millions)**
Discount Rate	**5.8%**	**6.8%**	**7.8%**
Price Inflation	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Real Rate of Return	**3.3%**	**4.3%**	**5.3%**
State Miscellaneous			
a) Total Normal Cost	23.61%	18.48%	14.60%
b) PVB	212,378	181,393	157,315
c) AL	169,839	150,945	135,176

As of June 30, 2024	1% Lower Real Return Rate (millions)	Current Assumptions (millions)	1% Higher Real Return Rate (millions)
Discount Rate	**5.8%**	**6.8%**	**7.8%**
Price Inflation	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Real Rate of Return	**3.3%**	**4.3%**	**5.3%**
State Industrial			
a) Total Normal Cost	23.80%	18.88%	15.14%
b) PVB	9,755	8,216	7,034
c) AL	7,517	6,595	5,839
State Safety			
a) Total Normal Cost	29.29%	23.77%	19.52%
b) PVB	29,981	25,425	21,890
c) AL	22,530	19,862	17,661
State Peace Officers & Firefighters			
a) Total Normal Cost	41.01%	32.01%	25.27%
b) PVB	95,331	80,727	69,473
c) AL	76,643	67,312	59,683
California Highway Patrol			
a) Total Normal Cost	44.24%	34.09%	26.50%
b) PVB	25,909	21,968	18,919
c) AL	21,198	18,604	16,484
Schools			
a) Total Normal Cost	22.12%	17.47%	13.99%
b) PVB	194,676	164,850	141,841
c) AL	152,502	134,199	119,092
Miscellaneous Pool – 2% at age 62			
a) Total Normal Cost	20.67%	16.46%	13.25%
b) PVB	7,866	5,881	4,487
c) AL	2,525	2,055	1,692
Safety Pool – 2% at age 57			
a) Total Normal Cost	33.08%	26.91%	22.16%
b) PVB	260	193	147
c) AL	60	49	40
Safety Pool – 2.5% at age 57			
a) Total Normal Cost	35.59%	27.69%	21.76%
b) PVB	74	53	38
c) AL	14	11	9
Safety Pool – 2.7% at age 57			
a) Total Normal Cost	39.60%	31.42%	25.23%
b) PVB	7,836	5,784	4,350
c) AL	1,892	1,531	1,252

As of June 30, 2024	1% Lower Real Return Rate (millions)	Current Assumptions (millions)	1% Higher Real Return Rate (millions)
Discount Rate	**5.8%**	**6.8%**	**7.8%**
Price Inflation	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Real Rate of Return	**3.3%**	**4.3%**	**5.3%**
Miscellaneous Non-Pooled Plans			
a) Total Normal Cost - Median	23.34%	18.41%	14.70%
b) PVB	217,926	185,563	160,491
c) AL	175,068	155,047	138,077
Safety Non-Pooled Plans 2% at age 57			
a) Total Normal Cost - Median	38.02%	29.89%	23.77%
b) PVB	3,860	3,329	2,909
c) AL	3,315	2,930	2,613
Safety Non-Pooled Plans 2.5% at age 57			
a) Total Normal Cost - Median	43.72%	34.14%	27.00%
b) PVB	1,322	1,134	989
c) AL	1,130	997	889
Safety Non-Pooled Plans 2.7% at age 57			
a) Total Normal Cost - Median	42.83%	33.37%	26.55%
b) PVB	107,256	91,037	78,503
c) AL	86,485	76,053	67,518

Mortality Rate Sensitivity

The following tables look at the change in the June 30, 2024 plan costs under two different longevity scenarios, namely assuming post-retirement rates of mortality are 10% lower or 10% higher than our current mortality assumption adopted in 2025. This type of analysis highlights the impact on the plan of a change in the mortality assumption.

The following tables indicate the sensitivity of key valuation results to changes in the post-retirement mortality rates.

	Estimated Valuation Results Reflecting AB 1383		
As of June 30, 2024	**10% Lower Mortality Rates (millions)**	**Current Assumptions (millions)**	**10% Higher Mortality Rates (millions)**
State Miscellaneous			
a) Total Normal Cost	18.79%	18.48%	18.19%
b) PVB	185,455	181,393	177,674
c) AL	154,511	150,945	147,686
State Industrial			
a) Total Normal Cost	19.19%	18.88%	18.60%
b) PVB	8,378	8,216	8,067
c) AL	6,732	6,595	6,469
State Safety			
a) Total Normal Cost	24.12%	23.77%	23.44%
b) PVB	25,909	25,425	24,979
c) AL	20,268	19,862	19,488
State Peace Officers & Firefighters			
a) Total Normal Cost	32.38%	32.01%	31.67%
b) PVB	81,999	80,727	79,550
c) AL	68,431	67,312	66,277
California Highway Patrol			
a) Total Normal Cost	34.47%	34.09%	33.73%
b) PVB	22,309	21,968	21,653
c) AL	18,908	18,604	18,324
Schools			
a) Total Normal Cost	17.75%	17.47%	17.21%
b) PVB	168,321	164,850	161,665
c) AL	137,199	134,199	131,451
Miscellaneous Pool – 2% at age 62			
a) Total Normal Cost	16.75%	16.46%	16.18%
b) PVB	5,988	5,881	5,784
c) AL	2,095	2,055	2,019
Safety Pool – 2% at age 57			
a) Total Normal Cost	27.34%	26.91%	26.52%
b) PVB	196	193	191
c) AL	50	49	48

As of June 30, 2024	10% Lower Mortality Rates (millions)	Current Assumptions (millions)	10% Higher Mortality Rates (millions)
Safety Pool – 2.5% at age 57			
a) Total Normal Cost	28.02%	27.69%	27.38%
b) PVB	53	53	52
c) AL	11	11	11
Safety Pool – 2.7% at age 57			
a) Total Normal Cost	31.83%	31.42%	31.04%
b) PVB	5,859	5,784	5,715
c) AL	1,552	1,531	1,512
Miscellaneous Non-Pooled Plans			
a) Total Normal Cost - Median	18.72%	18.41%	18.11%
b) PVB	189,406	185,563	182,035
c) AL	158,397	155,047	151,974
Safety Non-Pooled Plans 2% at age 57			
a) Total Normal Cost - Median	30.24%	29.89%	29.56%
b) PVB	3,389	3,329	3,273
c) AL	2,985	2,930	2,879
Safety Non-Pooled Plans 2.5% at age 57			
a) Total Normal Cost - Median	34.50%	34.14%	33.80%
b) PVB	1,154	1,134	1,117
c) AL	1,015	997	981
Safety Non-Pooled Plans 2.7% at age 57			
a) Total Normal Cost - Median	33.81%	33.37%	32.99%
b) PVB	92,544	91,037	89,645
c) AL	77,388	76,053	74,823

Funded Status – Low Default Risk Basis

Actuarial Standard of Practice (ASOP) No. 4, *Measuring Pension Obligations and Determining Pension Plan Costs or Contributions*, requires the disclosure of a low-default-risk obligation measure (LDROM) of benefit costs accrued as of the valuation date using a discount rate based on the yields of high quality fixed income securities with cash flows that replicate expected benefit payments. Conceptually, this measure represents the level at which financial markets would value the accrued plan costs and would be approximately equal to the cost of a portfolio of low-default-risk bonds with similar financial characteristics to accrued plan costs.

As permitted in ASOP No. 4, the Actuarial Office uses the Entry Age Actuarial Cost Method to calculate the LDROM. This methodology is in line with the measure of "benefit entitlements" calculated by the Bureau of Economic Analysis and used by the Federal Reserve to report the indebtedness due to pensions of plan sponsors and, conversely, the household wealth due to pensions of plan members.

As shown below, the discount rate used for the LDROM is 5.58%, which is the Standard FTSE Pension Liability Index[1] discount rate as of June 30, 2025, net of assumed administrative expenses

	Estimated Valuation Results Reflecting AB 1383	
As of June 30, 2024	**Current Assumptions (millions)**	**LDROM Discount Rate (millions)**
Discount Rate	**6.8%**	**5.58%**
State Miscellaneous		
PVB	181,393	220,378
AL	150,945	174,491
State Industrial		
PVB	8,216	10,154
AL	6,595	7,747
State Safety		
PVB	25,425	31,158
AL	19,862	23,193
State Peace Officers & Firefighters		
PVB	80,727	99,120
AL	67,312	78,973
California Highway Patrol		
PVB	21,968	26,928
AL	18,604	21,846
Schools		
PVB	164,850	202,410
AL	134,199	157,038
Miscellaneous Pool – 2% at age 62		
PVB	5,881	8,410
AL	2,055	2,645

As of June 30, 2024	Current Assumptions (millions)	LDROM Discount Rate (millions)
Discount Rate	**6.8%**	**5.58%**
Safety Pool – 2% at age 57		
PVB	193	278
AL	49	63
Safety Pool – 2.5% at age 57		
PVB	53	79
AL	11	15
Safety Pool – 2.7% at age 57		
PVB	5,784	8,399
AL	1,531	1,985
Miscellaneous Non-Pooled Plans		
PVB	185,563	226,299
AL	155,047	180,709
Safety Non-Pooled Plans 2% at age 57		
PVB	3,329	3,995
AL	2,930	3,411
Safety Non-Pooled Plans 2.5% at age 57		
PVB	1,134	1,370
AL	997	1,163
Safety Non-Pooled Plans 2.7% at age 57		
PVB	91,037	111,457
AL	76,053	89,088

Estimated Impact to Normal Cost

This attachment provides a list of the estimated impact to the normal cost for Local Agency Plans due to AB 1383. Consistent with the normal cost sharing provisions, these additional contributions would be shared between employers and PEPRA employees.

As stated below, this cost analysis is based on data as of June 30, 2024. If passed, AB 1383 will become effective January 1, 2027. The actual change to the normal cost will be calculated based on the most recent available data which could be significantly different from the data used in this cost analysis which will impact these normal cost changes.

The listing below corresponds with Scenario 3 of the actuarial cost analysis. The following date, methods and assumptions were also used:

Valuation Date: 06/30/2024

Data used: This cost analysis was based on the data used in the June 30, 2024 actuarial valuations.

Methods and Assumption: This cost analysis uses the methods described in Appendix A of the June 30, 2024 actuarial valuation and assumptions included in the November 2025 CalPERS Experience Study and Review of Actuarial Assumptions. Please see calpers.ca.gov for more details.

Estimated Impact to Total Normal Cost for Pooled Plans	
Pool	**Change to Total Normal Cost**
Miscellaneous Pool – 2% at age 62	0.3%
Safety Pool – 2% at age 57	1.0%
Safety Pool – 2.5% at age 57	2.2%
Safety Pool – 2.7% at age 57	2.3%

Estimated Impact to Normal Cost for Non-Pooled Plans			
Employer	**Plan Name**	**Change to PEPRA Normal Cost**	**Change to Total Normal Cost**
Alameda Alliance for Health	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.5%
Alameda County Fire Department	Safety	3.7%	1.3%
Alameda County Water District	Miscellaneous	1.0%	0.5%
Alta California Regional Center, Inc.	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Antelope Valley Schools Transportation Agency	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Bay Area Air Quality Management District	Miscellaneous	1.0%	0.6%
Cal Poly Corporation	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.2%
Central Contra Costa Transit Authority	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%

Estimated Impact to Normal Cost for Non-Pooled Plans			
Employer	**Plan Name**	**Change to PEPRA Normal Cost**	**Change to Total Normal Cost**
Central Valley Regional Center, Inc.	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
City and County of San Francisco	Safety	0.8%	0.0%
City of Alameda	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.4%
City of Alameda	Safety	3.8%	2.0%
City of Alhambra	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Alhambra	Safety	3.0%	1.4%
City of Anaheim	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of Anaheim	Safety Police	3.4%	1.4%
City of Anaheim	Safety Fire	3.5%	1.4%
City of Antioch	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Arcadia	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Arcadia	Safety	3.3%	1.2%
City of Azusa	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Bakersfield	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of Bakersfield	Safety Fire	1.8%	0.8%
City of Bakersfield	Safety Police	1.1%	0.6%
City of Baldwin Park	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of Banning	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of Benicia	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Berkeley	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of Berkeley	Safety Fire	3.4%	1.3%
City of Berkeley	Safety Police	3.7%	1.4%
City of Beverly Hills	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Beverly Hills	Safety	4.0%	1.7%
City of Brea	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Brentwood	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Buena Park	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Burbank	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of Burbank	Safety Police	3.8%	1.8%
City of Burbank	Safety Fire	3.6%	1.4%
City of Burlingame	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Camarillo	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of Campbell	Miscellaneous	0.7%	0.4%
City of Carlsbad	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Carlsbad	Safety	3.0%	1.6%
City of Carson	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Cerritos	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of Chico	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Chico	Safety	1.5%	0.8%

Estimated Impact to Normal Cost for Non-Pooled Plans			
Employer	**Plan Name**	**Change to PEPRA Normal Cost**	**Change to Total Normal Cost**
City of Chino	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
City of Chula Vista	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Chula Vista	Safety	2.5%	1.4%
City of Claremont	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
City of Clovis	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Clovis	Safety	2.7%	1.2%
City of Colton	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of Commerce	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of Compton	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of Concord	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Concord	Safety	1.4%	0.4%
City of Corona	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Corona	Safety Police	2.4%	0.9%
City of Coronado	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Costa Mesa	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Costa Mesa	Safety Police	3.4%	1.9%
City of Covina	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Culver City	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Culver City	Safety	3.5%	1.5%
City of Cupertino	Miscellaneous	0.7%	0.3%
City of Daly City	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of Daly City	Safety	3.5%	1.9%
City of Davis	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Downey	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Downey	Safety	3.1%	1.4%
City of El Cajon	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of El Cajon	Safety	2.3%	1.1%
City of El Centro	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of El Monte	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of El Monte	Safety	3.7%	1.1%
City of El Segundo	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Encinitas	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of Escondido	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Escondido	Safety	2.0%	0.9%
City of Eureka	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of Fairfield	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Fairfield	Safety	3.4%	1.5%
City of Folsom	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Folsom	Safety	2.3%	1.2%

Estimated Impact to Normal Cost for Non-Pooled Plans			
Employer	**Plan Name**	**Change to PEPRA Normal Cost**	**Change to Total Normal Cost**
City of Fontana	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Fontana	Safety	2.6%	1.2%
City of Foster City	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.2%
City of Fremont	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.3%
City of Fremont	Safety	3.5%	1.7%
City of Fullerton	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Fullerton	Safety	3.0%	1.4%
City of Galt	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Garden Grove	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of Garden Grove	Safety	2.9%	1.1%
City of Gardena	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Gilroy	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Glendale	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Glendale	Safety	3.6%	1.2%
City of Glendora	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of Hanford	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of Hawthorne	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of Hayward	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.3%
City of Hayward	Safety Fire	3.4%	0.9%
City of Hayward	Safety Police	3.4%	1.5%
City of Hemet	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Hemet	Safety	1.8%	1.1%
City of Huntington Beach	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Huntington Beach	Safety	3.3%	1.5%
City of Indio	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Inglewood	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Inglewood	Safety	2.9%	1.0%
City of Irvine	Safety	3.9%	1.5%
City of Irvine	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of La Habra	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of La Mesa	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of La Mesa	Safety	2.2%	1.0%
City of Laguna Beach	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Lakewood	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
City of Lancaster	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Livermore	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.2%
City of Lodi	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.3%
City of Lodi	Safety	2.7%	1.4%
City of Lompoc	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%

Estimated Impact to Normal Cost for Non-Pooled Plans			
Employer	**Plan Name**	**Change to PEPRA Normal Cost**	**Change to Total Normal Cost**
City of Long Beach	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of Long Beach	Safety	3.5%	1.4%
City of Lynwood	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
City of Madera	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
City of Manhattan Beach	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Manteca	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Menlo Park	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.3%
City of Merced	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of Merced	Safety	2.0%	1.1%
City of Milpitas	Miscellaneous	0.7%	0.5%
City of Milpitas	Safety	3.4%	1.5%
City of Mission Viejo	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of Modesto	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Modesto	Safety	2.0%	1.0%
City of Monrovia	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Montebello	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Montebello	Safety	2.9%	1.8%
City of Monterey	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Monterey Park	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Monterey Park	Safety	2.9%	1.2%
City of Moreno Valley	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Morgan Hill	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.3%
City of Mountain View	Miscellaneous	0.8%	0.4%
City of Mountain View	Safety	3.1%	1.0%
City of Napa	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.3%
City of Napa	Safety	3.5%	1.5%
City of National City	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of National City	Safety	2.5%	1.3%
City of Newark	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.3%
City of Newport Beach	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Newport Beach	Safety	2.4%	0.8%
City of Norwalk	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Novato	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.2%
City of Oakland	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.3%
City of Oakland	Safety	3.6%	2.0%
City of Oceanside	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Oceanside	Safety	2.2%	1.1%
City of Ontario	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Ontario	Safety Fire	3.9%	1.9%

Estimated Impact to Normal Cost for Non-Pooled Plans			
Employer	**Plan Name**	**Change to PEPRA Normal Cost**	**Change to Total Normal Cost**
City of Ontario	Safety Police	3.6%	1.7%
City of Orange	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Orange	Safety	3.3%	1.6%
City of Oxnard	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Oxnard	Safety Police	2.2%	0.9%
City of Pacifica	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.3%
City of Palm Desert	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Palm Springs	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Palm Springs	Safety	2.3%	1.0%
City of Palmdale	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Palo Alto	Miscellaneous	0.8%	0.4%
City of Palo Alto	Safety	3.0%	1.3%
City of Pasadena	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Pasadena	Safety	3.4%	1.5%
City of Paso Robles	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Petaluma	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.3%
City of Petaluma	Safety	3.0%	1.6%
City of Pico Rivera	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Pittsburg	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of Pleasanton	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.2%
City of Pleasanton	Safety Fire	3.8%	1.6%
City of Pomona	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Pomona	Safety	2.9%	1.1%
City of Porterville	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
City of Poway	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Rancho Cucamonga	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Redding	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Redding	Safety	2.2%	1.0%
City of Redlands	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Redondo Beach	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Redondo Beach	Safety	2.9%	1.4%
City of Redwood City	Miscellaneous	0.8%	0.4%
City of Redwood City	Safety	3.4%	1.4%
City of Rialto	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Rialto	Safety	2.6%	1.2%
City of Richmond	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of Richmond	Safety	3.8%	1.6%
City of Riverside	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Riverside	Safety	3.1%	1.2%

Estimated Impact to Normal Cost for Non-Pooled Plans			
Employer	**Plan Name**	**Change to PEPRA Normal Cost**	**Change to Total Normal Cost**
City of Rocklin	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Rohnert Park	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Roseville	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Roseville	Safety	2.6%	1.2%
City of Sacramento	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Sacramento	Safety	3.0%	1.4%
City of Salinas	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Salinas	Safety Police	3.6%	1.6%
City of San Bernardino	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of San Bernardino	Safety	3.0%	1.7%
City of San Bruno	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of San Buenaventura	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of San Buenaventura	Safety	3.1%	1.5%
City of San Clemente	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of San Leandro	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of San Luis Obispo	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of San Marcos	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of San Mateo	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.3%
City of San Mateo	Safety	3.6%	1.8%
City of San Ramon	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Santa Ana	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Santa Ana	Safety	3.8%	1.8%
City of Santa Barbara	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Santa Barbara	Safety Police	3.3%	1.6%
City of Santa Clara	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.1%
City of Santa Clara	Safety	2.6%	0.6%
City of Santa Clarita	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Santa Cruz	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Santa Fe Springs	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Santa Maria	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Santa Monica	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Santa Monica	Safety Fire	3.6%	1.2%
City of Santa Monica	Safety Police	3.8%	1.5%
City of Santa Rosa	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Santa Rosa	Safety Fire	3.3%	1.4%
City of Santa Rosa	Safety Police	3.6%	1.9%
City of Simi Valley	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Simi Valley	Safety	1.5%	0.6%
City of South Gate	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%

Estimated Impact to Normal Cost for Non-Pooled Plans			
Employer	**Plan Name**	**Change to PEPRA Normal Cost**	**Change to Total Normal Cost**
City of South Lake Tahoe	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of South San Francisco	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.3%
City of South San Francisco	Safety	3.7%	1.4%
City of Stockton	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Stockton	Safety	1.8%	0.9%
City of Sunnyvale	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.3%
City of Sunnyvale	Safety	2.9%	1.1%
City of Temecula	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Thousand Oaks	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Torrance	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Torrance	Safety Fire	4.0%	1.5%
City of Torrance	Safety Police	3.6%	1.2%
City of Tracy	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Tracy	Safety	3.2%	1.6%
City of Tulare	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Turlock	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Tustin	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Ukiah	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
City of Union City	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
City of Ud	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Vacaville	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Vacaville	Safety	3.7%	1.9%
City of Vallejo	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
City of Vallejo	Safety	3.4%	1.7%
City of Vernon	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.1%
City of Victorville	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Visalia	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
City of Visalia	Safety	1.8%	0.9%
City of Vista	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Walnut Creek	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.3%
City of Watsonville	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of West Covina	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of West Covina	Safety	3.0%	1.3%
City of West Hollywood	Miscellaneous	0.9%	0.4%
City of West Sacramento	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Westminster	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Whittier	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
City of Whittier	Safety	3.4%	1.8%
City of Woodland	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%

Estimated Impact to Normal Cost for Non-Pooled Plans			
Employer	**Plan Name**	**Change to PEPRA Normal Cost**	**Change to Total Normal Cost**
City of Woodland	Safety	1.4%	0.6%
City of Yorba Linda	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
City of Yuba City	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
Coachella Valley Water District	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
Coastal Developmental Services Fdn DBA Westside Regional Center	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Conejo Recreation and Park District	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
Cooperative Personnel Services	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
Cosumnes Community Services District	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
Cosumnes Community Services District	Safety	2.1%	1.0%
County of Amador	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Butte	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Butte	Safety	1.5%	0.7%
County of Calaveras	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
County of Colusa	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
County of Del Norte	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
County of El Dorado	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
County of El Dorado	Safety	1.3%	0.6%
County of Glenn	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Humboldt	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Humboldt	Safety	0.7%	0.4%
County of Inyo	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
County of Kings	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Kings	Safety	0.8%	0.4%
County of Lake	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Lake	Safety	1.0%	0.5%
County of Lassen	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
County of Madera	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Madera	Safety	1.0%	0.5%
County of Mariposa	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Modoc	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
County of Mono	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
County of Monterey	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
County of Monterey	Safety	1.9%	0.8%
County of Napa	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.3%
County of Nevada	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
County of Placer	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
County of Placer	Safety	1.7%	0.6%
County of Plumas	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Riverside	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%

Estimated Impact to Normal Cost for Non-Pooled Plans			
Employer	**Plan Name**	**Change to PEPRA Normal Cost**	**Change to Total Normal Cost**
County of Riverside	Safety	0.8%	0.3%
County of San Benito	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
County of Santa Clara	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
County of Santa Clara	Safety	3.1%	1.4%
County of Santa Cruz	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
County of Santa Cruz	Safety Sheriff	2.9%	1.4%
County of Santa Cruz	Safety	1.3%	0.6%
County of Shasta	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Shasta	Safety	0.7%	0.4%
County of Siskiyou	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
County of Solano	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
County of Solano	Safety	1.4%	0.7%
County of Sutter	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Sutter	Safety	1.2%	0.6%
County of Tehama	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Tehama	Safety	0.8%	0.4%
County of Trinity	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Tuolumne	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Yolo	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
County of Yolo	Safety	1.5%	0.7%
County of Yuba	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
County of Yuba	Safety	0.8%	0.5%
Cucamonga Valley Water District	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
East Bay Regional Park District	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
Eastern Municipal Water District	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.1%
El Dorado Irrigation District	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
Far Northern Coordinating Council on Developmental Disabilities	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Fresno City Housing Authority	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
Fresno County Housing Authority	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Gold Coast Transit	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.3%
Hayward Area Recreation and Park District	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
Helix Water District	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.2%
Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
Housing Authority of the County of Kern	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Inland Counties Regional Center, Inc.	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Inland Empire Health	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.2%

Estimated Impact to Normal Cost for Non-Pooled Plans			
Employer	**Plan Name**	**Change to PEPRA Normal Cost**	**Change to Total Normal Cost**
Inland Empire Utilities Agency	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.3%
Irvine Ranch Water District	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
Los Angeles County Development Authority	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
Los Angeles County Office of Education	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.2%
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 2	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.2%
Los Angeles Unified School District	Safety	1.4%	0.4%
Marin Municipal Water District	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.3%
Merced Irrigation District	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Miscellaneous	1.2%	0.6%
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Miscellaneous	0.8%	0.3%
Monterey Regional Waste Management District	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.3%
Monterey-Salinas Transit District	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Nevada Irrigation District	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
North Bay Regional Center	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
North County Transit District	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
North Kern-South Tulare Hospital District	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
North Los Angeles County Regional Center, Inc.	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
North of the River Recreation and Park District	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Northern California Power Agency	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.2%
Oakland City Housing Authority	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
Omnitrans	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
Orange County Health Authority	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
Otay Water District	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
Padre Dam Municipal Water District	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
Placer County Water Agency	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
Public Transportation Services Corporation	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.3%
Rancho California Water District	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
Rancho Simi Recreation & Park District	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Regional Center of Orange County	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
Regional Center of the East Bay	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
Riverside Transit Agency	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
Sacramento City Housing Authority	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.2%
Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District	Safety	3.3%	1.5%
Sacramento Municipal Utility District	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.3%

Estimated Impact to Normal Cost for Non-Pooled Plans			
Employer	**Plan Name**	**Change to PEPRA Normal Cost**	**Change to Total Normal Cost**
Sacramento Public Library Authority	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
San Andreas Regional Center, Inc.	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
San Bernardino County Housing Authority	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
San Diego Association of Governments	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
San Diego County Office Of Education	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.1%
San Diego County Water Authority	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.2%
San Diego Trolley, Inc.	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.3%
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District	Safety	3.1%	1.4%
San Mateo County Transit District	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.2%
Santa Clara County Central Fire Protection District	Safety	3.3%	1.1%
Santa Clara County Housing Authority	Miscellaneous	0.4%	0.2%
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.3%
Santa Clara Valley Water District	Miscellaneous	1.1%	0.6%
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
Santa Margarita Water District	Miscellaneous	0.2%	0.1%
Sonoma County Library	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.1%
South Central Los Angeles Regional Center for Developmentally Disabled Persons	Miscellaneous	0.1%	0.0%
Southern California Association of Governments	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.3%
Southern California Regional Rail Authority	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.4%
State Bar of California	Miscellaneous	0.5%	0.3%
Sweetwater Authority	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
Town of Los Gatos	Miscellaneous	0.6%	0.3%
Tri-Counties Association for the Developmentally Disabled	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Union Sanitary District	Miscellaneous	0.9%	0.4%
University Enterprises, Inc.	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%
Valley Mountain Regional Center, Inc.	Miscellaneous	0.0%	0.0%
Water Employee Services Authority	Miscellaneous	0.3%	0.1%