

BARTEL SSOCIATES, LLC

City of San Fernando

Retiree Healthcare Plan June 30, 2015 Actuarial Valuation

Final Report

August 18, 2016

Bartel Associates, LLC 411 Borel Avenue, Suite 101 San Mateo, California 94402

Phone: 650/377-1617 Fax: 650/345-8057

www.bartel-associates.com

Email: mbredding@bartel-associates.com



On June 21, 2004, the Governmental Accounting Standards Board approved Statement No. 45 (GASB 45), Accounting Standards for Other (than pensions) Post Employment Benefits (OPEB). This report is based on the financial reporting standards established under GASB 45. The City implemented GASB 45 for its 2008/09 fiscal year.

On June 2, 2015 the GASB approved Statement No. 75 (GASB 75) which will change employer accounting for OPEB benefits effective for the 2017/2018 fiscal year. Upon implementation of this standard, the ARC (Annual Required Contribution), AOC (Annual OPEB Cost) and NOO (Net OPEB Obligation) will no longer be applicable. GASB 75 amounts and disclosure will be based in part on current measures of plan assets. This valuation report does not include any results in accordance with GASB 75.

The City's funding policy is to continue funding benefits on a pay-as-you-go basis.

This valuation includes implied subsidy as required by Actuarial Standards of Practice No. 6 (ASOP 6)

Results from the April 1, 2013 valuation were prepared by Bickmore and are included for comparative purposes only.

VALUATION RESULTS

Funded Status: The funded status of the plan is equal to the percentage of Actuarial Accrued Liability currently funded by Plan Assets. The following table summarizes the Plan's funded status for the current valuation:

	(Dollar amounts in 000's)				
	April 1, 2013 (Bickmore)	June 30, 2015 (Bartel Associates)			
■ Discount Rate	4.00%	4.00%			
■ Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL)					
• Actives	\$ 15,161	\$ 16,880			
 Retirees 	<u>17,813</u>	<u>20,170</u>			
• Total	32,974	37,050			
■ Plan Assets	_	<u></u>			
■ Unfunded/(Overfunded) AAL	32,974	37,050			
■ Funded Status	0.0%	0.0%			

Normal Cost (NC): The Normal Cost represents the portion of the present value of benefits expected to be earned (on an actuarial, not actual, basis) in the coming year. Only active employees have Normal Cost, as the benefits of retirees are fully accrued at their retirement date. The following chart lists the 2015/16 Normal Cost and numbers of active employees for each employee group.

2015/16 Normal Cost by Group (Dollar amounts in 000's)

-	<u>SFMG</u>	<u>SFPCA</u>	<u>SFPEA</u>	<u>SFPOA</u>	<u>SFPMU</u>
■ Normal Cost	\$ 157	\$ 115	\$ 543	\$ 473	\$ 58
Active Count	16	15	60	24	3

Annual Required Contribution (ARC): GASB 45 does not require an agency to make up any shortfall (unfunded liability) immediately or take an immediate credit for any excess assets (surplus). Instead, the unfunded liability or surplus is amortized over time. An agency's Annual Required Contribution is simply the current employer Normal Cost plus an amortization of the unfunded liability or less an amortization of the excess assets. In other words, the contribution is the value of benefits earned during the year plus an amount to keep the plan on track for funding. For the City's June 30, 2015 valuation, we calculated the 2015/16 ARC as the Normal Cost plus a 23-year¹ closed period amortization (as a level percent of pay) of the June 30, 2015 Unfunded AAL. The Actuarially Required Contribution for 2016/17 was calculated as the Normal Cost plus a 22-year closed period amortization (as a level percent of pay) of the projected June 30, 2016 Unfunded AAL.

(Dollar amounts in 000's)

	April 1, 2013 Valuation (Bickmore)		June 30, 2015 Valuation (Bartel Associates)		
■ Fiscal Year	2013/14	<u>2014/15</u>	<u>2015/16</u>	<u>2016/17</u>	
■ Normal Cost	\$ 1,085	\$ 1,120	\$ 1,347	\$ 1,391	
■ UAAL Amortization	<u>1,512</u>	<u>1,641</u>	<u>1,812</u>	<u>1,976</u>	
■ Annual Required Contribution (ARC)	2,597	2,762	3,159	3,367	
■ Estimated Payroll	7,492	7,736	8,675	8,957	
■ ARC as a percent of estimated payroll	34.7%	35.7%	36.4%	37.6%	

GASB 45 allows up to a 30-year amortization.

Net OPEB Obligation (NOO): An agency's Net OPEB Obligation is the historical difference (from implementation) between actual contributions made (or benefits paid to or on behalf of retirees) and the Annual Required Contributions. If an agency has always funded the Annual Required Contribution, then the Net OPEB Obligation will always equal zero.

Annual OPEB Cost (AOC): GASB 45 requires the Annual OPEB Cost equal the Annual Required Contribution except when an agency has a Net OPEB Obligation at the beginning of the year. When that happens, the Annual OPEB Cost will equal the ARC, adjusted for expected interest on the Net OPEB Obligation and reduced by an amortization of the Net OPEB Obligation. The purpose of this adjustment is simply to remove amortizations included in the ARC for amounts already expensed but not funded. The amortization period is the same as used in the calculation of the ARC. The following table shows a calculation of the estimated Annual OPEB Cost:

		(Dollar amounts in 000's)						
	<u>April 1, 201</u>	3 Valuation	June 30, 201	5 Valuation				
	CAFR	CAFR						
■ Fiscal Year	<u>2013/14</u>	<u>2014/15</u>	<u>2015/16</u>	<u>2016/17</u>				
 Annual Required Contribution 	\$ 2,597	\$ 2,762	\$ 3,159	3,367				
■ Interest on Net OPEB Obligation	298	364	415	493				
■ Amortization of Net OPEB Obligatio	n <u>(337)</u>	(429)	(534)	(656)				
Annual OPEB Cost	2,557	2,697	3,040	3,204				

The following illustrates the City's estimated Net OPEB Obligation (NOO):

	(Dollar amounts in 000's)					
	April 1, 201	3 Valuation	June 30, 2015 Valuation			
	CAFR	CAFR				
■ Fiscal Year	2013/14	<u>2014/15</u>	<u>2015/16</u>	<u>2016/17</u>		
■ Beginning of Year NOO	\$ 7,446	\$ 9,104	\$ 10,916	\$ 12,883		
Annual OPEB Cost	2,557	2,697	3,040	3,204		
Contributions						
• Cash Benefit Payments ²	899	885	930	990		
• Implied Subsidy Benefit Payments ³	-	-	143	130		
• Trust Contributions						
• Total	899	885	1,073	1,120		
■ End of Year NOO	9,104	10,916	12,883	14,967		

The City's actual Net OPEB Obligation may differ from the above because actual contributions may be different from those estimated.

Implied subsidy (IS) benefit payments listed here should be used for financial reporting.

Expected benefit payments listed. Actual cash benefit payments should be used for financial reporting.

Schedule of Funding Progress for Required Supplementary Information:

			(Dollar amou	ints in 000's)		
Valuation Date	Actuarial Value of Assets	Entry Age Actuarial Accrued Liability	Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability	Funded Ratio	Covered Payroll	UAAL as Percentage of Covered Payroll
4/1/2013	\$ -	\$ 32,974	\$ 32,974	0.0%	\$ 7,256	454.4%
6/30/2015	-	37,050	37,050	0.0%	8,402	441.0%

Projected Benefit Payments: Following is a 10-year projection of benefit payments:

(Dollar amounts in 000's)

Year	Cash Benefit Payments	Implied Subsidy Benefit Payments	Total Benefit Payments
2015/16	\$ 930	\$ 143	\$ 1,073
2016/17	990	130	1,120
2017/18	1,044	115	1,159
2018/19	1,136	132	1,268
2019/20	1,245	176	1,421
2020/21	1,336	211	1,547
2021/22	1,425	244	1,669
2022/23	1,497	257	1,754
2023/24	1,582	299	1,881
2024/25	1,675	338	2,013

BASIC DEFINITIONS

Present Value of Benefits (PVB): When an actuary prepares an actuarial valuation, (s)he first gathers participant data (including active employees, former employees not in payment status, participants and beneficiaries in payment status) at the valuation date (for example June 30, 2015). Using this data and actuarial assumptions, the actuary projects future benefit payments. (The assumptions predict, among other things, when people will retire, terminate, die or become disabled, as well as what salary increases, general (and healthcare) inflation and investment return might be.) Those future benefit payments are discounted, using expected future investment return, back to the valuation date. This discounted present value is the plan's present value of benefits. It represents the amount the plan needs as of the valuation date to pay all future benefits – if all assumptions are met and no future contributions (employee or employer) are made. The City's June 30, 2015 retiree healthcare Present Value of Benefits is \$51.9 million using a 4.00% discount rate, with \$20.2 million of this for former employees who have already retired.

Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL): This represents the portion of the present value of benefits that participants have earned (on an actuarial, not actual, basis) through the valuation date. The City's June 30, 2015 retiree healthcare Actuarial Accrued Liability is \$37.1 million using a 4.00% discount rate, with \$20.2 million of this for former employees who have already retired.

Plan Assets: This includes funds that have been segregated and restricted in a trust so they can only be used to pay plan benefits. As of June 30, 2015, the City's plan assets are \$0.

Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability (UAAL): This is the difference between the Actuarial Accrued Liability and Plan Assets. This represents the amount of the Actuarial Accrued Liability that must still be funded. If the Plan Assets exceed the Actuarial Accrued Liability, the plan has Surplus Assets. As of June 30, 2015, the City's Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability is \$37.1 million.

Normal Cost (NC): The Normal Cost represents the portion of the present value of benefits expected to be earned (on an actuarial, not actual, basis) in the coming year. The City's 2015/16 retiree healthcare Normal Cost is \$1.3 million (15.5% of payroll) using a 4.00% discount rate.

Actuarial Cost Method: This determines the method in which benefits are actuarially earned (allocated) to each year of service. It has no effect on the Present Value of Benefits, but has significant effect on the Actuarial Accrued Liability and Normal Cost. The City's June 30, 2015 retiree healthcare valuation was prepared using the Entry Age Normal cost method. Under the Entry Age Normal cost method, the Plan's Normal Cost is developed as a level percent of payroll throughout the participant's working lifetime.

Implied Subsidy: An implied subsidy exists when the premium for a group of early retirees is determined by aggregating their experience with active employees. GASB 45 requires that the implied subsidy for retirees be included in the AAL and the ARC for plans that are not community rated. After March 15, 2015, Actuarial Standards of Practice require the implied subsidy be included for community rated plans such as PEMHCA. We valued the implied subsidy for the City's retiree healthcare plan.

SUMMARY OF RETIREE HEALTHCARE BENEFITS

	P							
Benefit Summary								
■ Eligibility	■ Service or disability retirement directly from the City under CalPERS (age 50 with 5 years of service for most employees ⁴)							
■ Retiree Medical	■ Benefit Tier:							
Benefit	SF	MG / SFPCA	/ SFPEA	SFPOA /	SFPMU			
		$ed \le 6/30/15 \& ired \le 6/30/15$		Hired $\leq 6/30/$	08			
		$ed \le 6/30/15 \& ired \ge 6/30/15$		Hired $\geq 7/1/0$ Hired $\leq 6/30/0$				
	Tier 3 Hir	$ed \ge 7/1/15$		Hired $\geq 7/1/1$	5			
■ Surviving Spouse	 ■ Benefit: Tier 1 & 2: Retired ≤ 12/31/12: 100% paid for employee and eligible dependents Retired ≥ 1/1/13: 100% paid for employee and eligible dependents, excluding PERSCare⁵ Tier 2 participants subject to 10-year CalPERS service vesting requirement⁶ Tier 3: PEMHCA minimum (\$122/month in 2015, \$125/month in 2016, \$128/month in 2017) ■ Available to surviving spouses of retirees currently receiving 							
Benefit	benefits.							
■ Dental, Vision & Life	■ None							
■ Sample Medical	■ Pre-65 Montl			<u>, </u>				
Premiums		2014	2015	2016	2017			
	PERSCare LA	\$ 624.59	\$ 647.11	\$ 666.91	\$ 715.88			
	Kaiser LA	541.79	521.18	543.83	573.89			
	PORAC 634.00 675.00 699.00 699.00							
	■ Post-65 Sing	e Premium:		,				
		2014	2015	2016	2017			
	PERSCare LA	\$ 327.36	\$ 368.76	\$ 408.04	\$389.76			
	Kaiser LA	294.97	295.51	297.23	300.48			
	PORAC	397.00	402.00	442.00	464.00			

⁴ Expected benefit payments listed. Actual cash benefit payments should be used for financial reporting.

City contributions capped at next highest premium for PERSCare participants.

Tier 2 participants with less than 10 years of CalPERS service receive PEMHCA minimum.

ACTUARIAL METHODS AND ASSUMPTIONS

Actuarial Methods

The actuarial cost method used for this valuation is the Entry Age Normal ("EAN") cost method. Under the EAN cost method, the Normal Cost for each participant is determined as a level percent of payroll throughout the participant's working career.

The June 30, 2015 Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability was amortized as a level percent of pay over a fixed, closed 23-year period. Individual UAAL bases are not maintained.

The Plan is assumed to be ongoing for cost purposes. This does not imply that an obligation to continue the Plan exists.

Actuarial Assumptions

Under GASB 45, an actuary must follow current actuarial standards of practice, which generally call for explicit assumptions - meaning each individual assumption represents the actuary's best estimate.

Actuarial Assumptions		June 30, 2015 Valuation						
Discount Rate	•	4.00%						
General Inflation Rate	•	• 3.00% per year						
Aggregate Payroll Increases	•	• 3.25% per year						
Pay Merit and Longevity Increases	•	Sample Annual Increases – Miscellaneous (Rates for Safety differ)						
(C-IDEDS 1007 2011		Years of			Entry	y Age		
(CalPERS 1997-2011 Experience Study)		Service	< 25	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	≥ 45
Experience Study)		1	6.9%	6.7%	6.2%	5.6%	5.0%	4.7%
		10	1.6%	1.5%	1.2%	1.0%	0.8%	0.7%
		15	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%	0.6%	0.4%
		20 0.9% 0.9% 0.7% 0.5% 0.4% 0.3%						
		25	0.7%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%
		30	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%

Actuarial Assumptions			J	une 30, 20	15 Valuati	on		
Mortality	• Sample	• Sample Annual Rates – Miscellaneous (Rates for Safety differ)						
(CalPERS 1997-2011		Age	Pre-Ret Male	Pre-Ret Female	Post-Ret Male	Post-Ret Female		
Experience Study)		50	0.16%	0.11%	0.53%	0.49%		
		55	0.24%	0.15%	0.64%	0.46%		
		60	0.35%	0.22%	0.82%	0.53%		
		65	0.51%	0.33%	1.06%	0.75%		
		70	0.71%	0.47%	1.77%	1.26%		
		75	0.96%	0.67%	2.98%	2.19%		
		80			5.28%	3.69%		
		85			9.43%	6.67%		
		90			16.19%	12.34%		
		95			25.31%	20.85%		
		100			34.55%	31.88%		
• Disability (CalPERS 1997-2011 Experience Study)	 Post-retirement mortality projected fully generational with Scale MP-2014 modified to converge to ultimate rates in 2022 Sample Annual Rates - Miscellaneous(Rates for Safety differ) Age Male Female 27 0.02% 0.01% 37 0.07% 0.11% 							
			47	0.20%	0.23%			
			57	0.22%	0.16%			
• Termination		Annua	ıl Rates -	Miscellan	eous(Rates	for Safety	differ)	
(CalPERS 1997-2011	Years of			CalPEl	RS Entry A	ge		
Experience Study)	Service	< 25	5 25-2	29 30-3	4 35-39	40-44	≥ 45	
Emperionee study)	1	15.19		9% 13.8			11.75%	
	10	6.30	6% 5.5	6% 4.7	5% 3.949	% 0.65%	0.48%	
	15	4.72		4% 3.1:		% 0.19%	0.10%	
	20	3.3		7% 0.13			0.01%	
	25	1.90		9% 0.02			0.01%	
	30	0.03		0.0			0.01%	
	35	0.0	1% 0.0	0.0	1% 0.019	% 0.01%	0.01%	

Actuarial Assumptions			June 30	, 2015 Va	luation		
Service Retirement	Sample Ann	• Sample Annual Rates – Miscellaneous 2% @ 55 benefit formula					
(C-IDED C 1007 2011		Years of Service					
(CalPERS 1997-2011 Experience Study)		Age	10	20	30		
		50	1.8%	2.5%	3.1%		
		55	6.1%	8.8%	11.7%		
		60	8.6%	12.3%	16.4%		
		65	19.7%	28.5%	38.6%		
		70	16.5%	24.0%	32.3%		
	Sample Annual Rates – Miscellaneous 2% @ 62 benefit formula						
			Yea	ars of Serv	ice		
		Age	10	20	30		
		52	1.3%	1.9%	2.4%		
		55	5.6%	8.0%	10.4%		
		60	7.8%	11.2%	14.6%		
		65	16.4%	23.4%	30.4%		
		70	16.0%	22.8%	29.6%		
	Rates for other benefit formulas differ						
Participation at	100% participation if active medical coverage						
Retirement	• 50% particip	• 50% participation if waived					
• PEMHCA Administrative Fee	Not included	d					

Actuarial Assumptions	June 30, 2015 Valuation						
Medical Plan at Retirement	• Future Retirees: Based on average (see below)	election for	current retirees				
	Current Retirees:						
	 Currently Pre-65: Same as currelection for Post-65 retirees up Currently Post-65: Same as currently 	on reaching	65 (see below)				
	Average Election for Current Reti	irees					
	Miscellaneous:						
		Pre-65	Post-65				
	Blue Shield Access+	25%	20%				
	Kaiser	35%	25%				
	PERS Choice	25%	0%				
	PERSCare	15%	55%				
	PORAC	0%	0%				
	Safety:	Safety:					
		Pre-65	Post-65				
	Blue Shield Access+	10%	5%				
	Kaiser	25%	35%				
	PERS Choice	0%	0%				
	PERSCare	25%	45%				
	● Beginning 2016, non-Kaiser HMO participants are assumed to elect UnitedHealthcare upon reaching 65						
	Beginning 2017, Blue Shield NetV to elect Blue Shield Access+	alue particip	oants are assumed				
Medical Trend	• Increases from prior year:						
	Year Non-Medica	re Medica	<u>re</u>				
	2015 Actual 201	5 Premiums					
		6 Premiums					
		7 Premiums					
	2018 6.5%	6.7%					
	2019 6.0%	6.1%					
	2019 6.0%	5.6%					
Spousal Coverage	• Future Retirees: 70% at retirement demographics	5.0% t based on cu	rrent				
	• Current Retirees: Same as current	election					
• Surviving Spouse Participation	Surviving Spouses assumed to cor	ntinue covera	ge				

Actuarial Assumptions		Ju	ine 30, 2015	5 Valuation		
• Family Coverage Participation	• Future Retirees: 30% of future retirees under 65 will have family coverage					
	Current Retirees: Same as current election until 65					
	No family coverage upon reaching 65					
Affordable Care Act Excise Tax	• 2% increase in cash subsidy liability as an estimate					
• Sample Monthly 2015/16	• PERSCare Los Angeles Area medical plan					
Claims Costs		Age	Male	Female		
		50	\$ 625	\$ 628		
		55	741	717		
		60	890	823		
		64	1,064	971		
		65	366	384		
		70	349	372		
		75	394	410		
		80	407	423		
	Kaiser Los Ang	geles Are	a medical p	lan		
		Age	Male	Female		
		50	\$ 488	\$ 532		
		55	629	636		
		60	803	751		
		64	976	881		
		65	284	264		
		70	268	256		
		75	335	300		
		80	359	319		

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT DATA

Participant Statistics

	April 1	1, 2013	June 3	0, 2015
Statistic	Actives	Retirees	Actives	Retirees
■ Count				
• < 65	102	38	118	39
● ≥65	0	_55	0	<u>64</u>
• Total	102	93	118	103
■ Average Age	43.4	69.2	43.5	69.3
■ Average City Service	13.4	n/a	12.5	n/a
■ Average Service Retirement Age	n/a	n/a	n/a	56.9
■ Payroll				
• Total (000's) ⁷	\$ 7,256	n/a	\$ 8,402	n/a
 Average 	73,787	n/a	71,207	n/a

Active Members

	City Service							
Age	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	≥30	Total
< 25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25-29	8	1	-	-	-	-	-	9
30-34	9	10	2	-	-	-	-	21
35-39	5	5	4	1	-	-	-	15
40-44	3	4	6	5	2	-	-	20
45-49	2	4	5	3	1	1	-	16
50-54	1	-	3	2	5	7	3	21
55-59	-	1	1	4	1	1	2	10
60-64	1	1	1	-	2	1	-	6
≥ 65	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	29	26	22	15	11	10	5	118

⁷ Covered payroll from 6/30/15 CAFR.

Retirees

			Surviving	
Age	Retiree	Disabled	Spouse	Total
< 50	-	3	-	3
50-54	5	6	1	12
55-59	2	5	2	9
60-64	9	5	1	15
65-69	14	5	1	20
70-74	11	1	1	13
75-79	5	1	1	7
80-84	4	4	2	10
Over 85	7	-	7	14
Total	57	30	16	103

Retiree Medical Plan Coverage % Miscellaneous

Plan	Pre - 65	Post - 65	Total
Blue Shield Access+	27%	19%	21%
Blue Shield NetValue	0%	3%	2%
Kaiser	33%	24%	27%
PERS Choice	27%	3%	10%
PERSCare	13%	51%	40%
PORAC	0%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Retiree Medical Plan Coverage % Safety

Plan	Pre - 65	Post - 65	Total
Blue Shield Access+	10%	5%	7%
Blue Shield NetValue	4%	0%	2%
Kaiser	24%	35%	29%
PERS Choice	0%	0%	0%
PERSCare	24%	45%	35%
PORAC	38%	15%	27%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Retiree Medical Plan Coverage Miscellaneous: Pre-65

Plan	Region	EE	EE+1	Family	Waived	Total
Blue Shield Access+	Los Angeles	1	2	1	-	4
Blue Shield NetValue	Los Angeles	-	-	-	-	-
Kaiser	Los Angeles	1	1	2	-	4
	Out of State	-	-	-	-	-
	Sacramento	1	-	-	-	1
	South	-	-	-	-	1
PERS Choice	Los Angeles	-	1	-	-	1
	Out of State	2	-	-	-	2
	South	-	-	1	-	1
PERSCare	Los Angeles	1	-	-	-	1
	Out of State	1	-	-	-	1
	Sacramento	-	-	-	-	-
	South	-	-	-	-	-
PORAC		-	-	-	-	-
Waived		-	-	-	2	2
Total		7	4	4	2	17

Retiree Medical Plan Coverage Miscellaneous: Post-65

Plan	Region	EE	EE+1	Family	Waived	Total
Blue Shield Access+	Los Angeles	2	5	-	-	7
Blue Shield NetValue	Los Angeles	-	1	-	-	1
Kaiser	Los Angeles	6	2	-	-	8
	Out of State	-	-	-	-	-
	Sacramento	-	-	-	-	-
	South	-	1	-	-	1
PERS Choice	Los Angeles	-	-	-	-	-
	Out of State	1	-	-	-	1
	South	-	-	-	-	-
PERSCare	Los Angeles	6	5	-	-	11
	Out of State	4	2	-	-	6
	Sacramento	-	1	-	-	1
	South	1	-	-	-	1
PORAC		-	-	-	-	-
Waived		-			1	1
Total		20	17	-	1	38

Retiree Medical Plan Coverage Safety: Pre-65

Plan	Region	EE	EE+1	Family	Waived	Total
Blue Shield Access+	Los Angeles	-	1	1	-	2
Blue Shield NetValue	Los Angeles	1	-	-	-	1
Kaiser	Los Angeles	-	1	3	-	4
	Out of State	-	1	-	-	1
	Sacramento	-	-	-	-	-
	South	-	-	-	-	-
PERS Choice	Los Angeles	-	-	-	-	-
	Out of State	-	-	-	-	-
	South	-	-	-	-	-
PERSCare	Los Angeles	1	1	1	-	3
	Out of State	1	1	-	-	2
	Sacramento	-	-	-	-	-
	South	-	-	-	-	-
PORAC		1	3	4	-	8
Waived		-	-	-	1	1
Total		4	8	9	1	22

Retiree Medical Plan Coverage Safety: Post-65

Plan	Region	EE	EE+1	Family	Waived	Total
Blue Shield Access+	Los Angeles	-	1	-	-	1
Blue Shield NetValue	Los Angeles	-	-	-	-	-
Kaiser	Los Angeles	2	2	-	-	4
	Out of State	1	-	-	-	1
	Sacramento	-	-	-	-	-
	South	2	-	-	-	2
PERS Choice	Los Angeles	-	-	-	-	-
	Out of State	-	-	-	-	-
	South	-	-	-	-	-
PERSCare	Los Angeles	1	4	-	-	5
	Out of State	1	3	-	-	4
	Sacramento	-	-	-	-	-
	South	-	-	-	-	-
PORAC		1	2	-	-	3
Waived		-	-	-	6	6
Total		8	12	-	6	26

ACTUARIAL CERTIFICATION

This report presents the City of San Fernando Retiree Healthcare Plan ("Plan") June 30, 2015 actuarial valuation. The purpose of this valuation is to:

- Determine the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 45 June 30, 2015 Benefit Obligations,
- Determine the Plan's June 30, 2015 Funded Status, and
- Calculate the 2015/16 and 2016/17 Annual Required Contributions under GASB Statement No. 45.

The report provides information intended for reporting under GASB 45, but may not be appropriate for other purposes. Information provided in this report may be useful to the City for the Plan's financial management. Future valuations may differ significantly if the Plan's experience differs from our assumptions or if there are changes in Plan design, actuarial methods or actuarial assumptions. The project scope did not include an analysis of this potential variation.

The valuation is based on Plan provisions and participant data provided by the City as summarized in this report, which we relied on and did not audit. We reviewed the participant data for reasonableness.

Results from the April 1, 2013 valuation were prepared by Bickmore and are included for comparative purposes. We did not review those results and this certification does not apply to those prior results.

To the best of our knowledge, this report is complete and accurate and has been conducted using generally accepted actuarial principals and practices. Additionally, in our opinion, the actuarial methods and assumptions comply with GASB 45. As members of the American Academy of Actuaries meeting the Academy Qualification Standards, we certify the actuarial results and opinions herein.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Elizabeth Redding, FSA, MAAA, FCA, EA

Vice President

Bartel Associates, LLC

August 18, 2016

Tak Frazita, ASA, MAAA, EA

Associate Actuary

Bartel Associates, LLC

August 18, 2016