



916 859-4900 916 859-7167 fax GS www.keenan.com License No. 0451271

February 23, 2018

SJVIA Board Meeting: Consultant's Report on Loan Repayment

In accordance with the direction received at the December 15, 2017 SJVIA Board meeting, Keenan has updated the schedule to equally fund, over time, the loan repayment to the County of Tulare (\$4,000,000) and the loan repayment to the County of Fresno (\$5,000,000), the SJVIA required IBNR reserve, and the SJVIA Claims Stabilization Reserve. The updates include:

- Applying the impact of the SJVIA plan experience through December 31, 2017;
- Reducing the deficit position by the prescription drug rebates, audit returns, and other adjustments; and
- Smoothing the impact of the "All Other Group" over the County of Fresno, County of Tulare, and the City of Marysville.

In preparing the loan repayment schedule consideration was given to deficit levels, IBNR requirements, and stabilization reserve projections for each entity.

While the SJVIA will build reserves in 2018 via the Kaiser coverage of approximately \$1 million, reserve accumulation in the self-funded medical program has not been designated for loan repayment. The 2018 rates include reserve accumulation for the change in IBNR claim reserve requirements and a 3.0% margin for claim stability. Please note that in the actuarial certified IBNR report a 15% margin is recommended. This differs from the 2018 renewal which included 3.0% margin.

Keenan recommends that the loan repayment, and reserve accumulations to fund the IBNR and stabilization reserve commence no earlier than January 1, 2019 and be implemented over a three-year period through December 31, 2022. The following table summarizes the total dollars required:

| 36 Month Repayment Schedule | R | Loan epayment | Required IBNR | | Required Stabilization | | Total | |
|-----------------------------|-----|------------------|------------------|--------------|---------------------------|-----------|------------------|--|
| County of Fresno | \$ | 8,195,028 | | 3,464,122 | \$ | 3,945,125 | \$ 15,604,275 | |
| County of Tulare | \$ | 739,782 | | 2,160,198 | \$ | 1,904,457 | \$ 4,804,437 | |
| City of Marysville | \$ | 65,190 | | 78,903 | \$ | 75,548 | \$ 219,641 | |
| Total | \$ | 9,000,000 | \$ | 5,703,223 | \$ | 5,925,130 | \$ 20,628,353 | |
| County of Fresno | \$ | 54.60 | \$ | 23.08 | \$ | 26.29 | \$ 103.97 | |
| County of Tulare | \$ | 7.28 | \$ | 21.27 | \$ | 18.75 | \$ 47.30 | |
| City of Marysville | \$ | 35.51 | \$ | 42.98 | \$ | 41.15 | \$ 119.64 | |
| Total PEPM | \$ | 35.51 | \$ | 22.50 | \$ | 23.38 | \$ 81.39 | |
| Illustrative Adjusti | nei | nt to the ado | pte | ed 2018 Rate | es | | | |
| County of Fresno | | 5.1% | | 2.1% | | 2.4% | 9.7% | |
| County of Tulare | | 0.9% | | 2.8% | | 2.4% | 6.1% | |
| City of Marysville | | 2.0% | | 2.4% | | 2.3% | 6.8% | |

Please note that the IBNR and stabilization reserve will change as plan experience and actual enrollment are realized. Keenan recommends an update to this repayment schedule every six months. Additionally, Keenan recommends the updates occur based off plan experience through June and December. The June update will allow any adjustments to be worked into the renewal. The December update will allow us to measure variance from the projected target.

If the 36 Month Repayment Schedule is utilized, the additional PEPM cost to the adopted 2018 rates would be 9.7% for the County of Fresno, 6.1% for the County of Tulare, and 6.8% for the City of Marysville.

It is observed that the City of Marysville calculation is no longer based on the All Other Group deficit position but rather the average cost to all three entities.

Please note, this repayment schedule does not include the IBNR reserve runout claims that will be realized for the City of Ceres and City of Waterford starting January 1, 2018. The IBNR runout is projected to be \$635,889 (which includes 15% margin).

As an alternative, Keenan has also provided 48 month and 60 month repayment options.

| 48 and 60 Month Repayment Schedule Options | Re | Loan payment | Required IBNR | | Required Stabilization | | Total | |
|--|-----|-----------------|------------------|--------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|---------------|
| 48 month option | | | | | | | | |
| County of Fresno | \$ | 40.95 | \$ | 17.31 | \$ | 19.71 | \$ | 77.97 |
| County of Tulare | \$ | 5.46 | \$ | 15.95 | \$ | 14.06 | \$ | 35.47 |
| City of Marysville | \$ | 26.63 | \$ | 32.23 | \$ | 30.86 | \$ | 89.7 <u>2</u> |
| Total PEPM | \$ | 26.63 | \$ | 16.88 | \$ | 17.53 | \$ | 61.04 |
| Illustrative Adjustn | nen | t to the ado | pte | ed 2018 Rate | s | | | |
| County of Fresno | | 3.8% | | 1.6% | | 1.8% | | 7.3% |
| County of Tulare | | 0.7% | | 2.1% | | 1.8% | | 4.6% |
| City of Marysville | | 1.5% | | 1.8% | | 1.8% | | 5.1% |
| 60 month option | | | | | | | | |
| County of Fresno | \$ | 32.76 | \$ | 13.85 | \$ | 15.77 | \$ | 62.38 |
| County of Tulare | \$ | 4.37 | \$ | 12.76 | \$ | 11.25 | \$ | 28.38 |
| City of Marysville | \$ | 21.30 | \$ | 25.79 | \$ | 24.69 | \$ | 71.78 |
| Total PEPM | \$ | 21.30 | \$ | 13.50 | \$ | 14.03 | \$ | 48.83 |
| Illustrative Adjustn | nen | t to the ado | pte | ed 2018 Rate | s | | | |
| County of Fresno | | 3.1% | | 1.3% | | 1.5% | | 5.8% |
| County of Tulare | | 0.6% | | 1.7% | | 1.5% | | 3.7% |
| City of Marysville | | 1.2% | | 1.5% | | 1.4% | | 4.1% |

If the 48 Month Repayment Schedule is utilized, the additional PEPM cost to the adopted 2018 rates would be 7.3% for the County of Fresno, 4.6% for the County of Tulare, and 5.1% for the City of Marysville.

If the 60 Month Repayment Schedule is utilized, the additional PEPM cost to the adopted 2018 rates would be 5.8% for the County of Fresno, 3.6% for the County of Tulare, and 4.1% for the City of Marysville.

It is observed that the City of Marysville calculation is no longer based on the All Other Group deficit position but rather the average cost to all three entities.

Please note, this repayment schedule does not include the IBNR reserve runout claims that will be realized for the City of Ceres and City of Waterford starting January 1, 2018. The IBNR runout is projected to be \$635,889 (which includes 15% margin).

Update of SJVIA Deficit Position

Keenan reported at the December 15, 2017 SJVIA Board meeting an update on the deficit accumulation which is summarized in the table below.

| Adjusted Change | County of Fresno | (| County of Tulare | 1 | All Other Group | Total |
|-----------------------|---------------------|----|---------------------|----|--------------------|---------------|
| 08/31/17 Position | \$ 14,574,746 | \$ | 1,538,999 | \$ | 814,976 | \$16,928,721 |
| Allocation of HMO YEA | (\$2,895,972) | | (\$68,315) | | (\$133,749) | (\$3,098,036) |
| Adjusted Balance | \$ 11,678,774 | \$ | 1,470,684 | \$ | 681,227 | \$13,830,685 |
| | | | | | | |

The position was based on reserve requirement adjustments and premiums received versus expenses realized and was adjusted for the SJVIA annual year end accounting for the Anthem HMO. Please note that the 2017 year-end accounting for the Anthem HMO will occur in 2018 and allow a further adjustment to the deficit position.

Based on data through December 31, 2017, the chart has been updated to:

| Adjusted Change for HMO YEA | County of Fresno | (| County of Tulare | All Other Group | | Total | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|----|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|--|
| 12/31/17 Position | \$ 13,700,480 | \$ | 1,466,646 | \$ | 811,646 | \$15,978,772 | |
| Allocation of HMO YEA | <u>(\$2,895,972)</u> | | (\$68,315) | | <u>(\$133,749)</u> | (\$3,098,036) | |
| Adjusted Balance | \$ 10,804,508 | \$ | 1,398,331 | \$ | 677,897 | \$12,880,736 | |
| | | | | | | | |

SJVIA Staff requested Keenan include the prescription drug rebates, audit recoveries and other adjustments to the deficit position. The SJVIA staff provided the following recovery report.

| Date Rc'd Vendor | Check # | Amount | Description |
|--------------------------------|---------|----------------|---|
| 7/2/2013 Catamaran | 0256053 | \$ 495.26 | made out to SJVIA for a refund for funds held after the claim runout period is closed. |
| 10/2/2013 Catamaran | 000892 | \$ 6,201.15 | Pay to SJVIA Invoice #P0000137508 |
| 10/2/2013 Catamaran | 000933 | \$ 62,069.75 | Pay to SJVIA Invoice #P0000137549 |
| 10/25/2013 Catamaran | 001361 | \$ 87,946.50 | Pay to SJVIA Invoice #P0000139891 |
| 12/6/2013 Catamaran | 0304816 | \$ 6,337.82 | Made out to SJVIA |
| 12/23/2013 Catamaran | 001907 | \$ 6,077.60 | Pay to SJVIA Invoice #P0000146053 |
| 1/13/2014 Catamaran | 002315 | \$ 177,786.00 | Pay to SJVIA Invoice #P0000148390 |
| 7/9/2014 Centene (US Script) | 312194 | \$ 464,961.43 | US Script Generic Rx reimbursement check |
| 5/21/2015 Centene (US Script) | 341858 | \$ 61,649.38 | Prescription Reimbursement for performance guarantees and contract pricing for 2014 plan year |
| 5/21/2015 Centene (US Script) | 345180 | \$ 6,250.00 | Prescription Reimbursement for performance guarantees and contract pricing for 2014 plan year |
| 9/28/2015 Centene (US Script) | 363544 | \$ 61,817.45 | Prescription Reimbursement for performance guarantees and contract pricing for 2015 plan year |
| 5/31/2016 Centene (US Script) | 115748 | \$ 5,000.00 | Performance Guarantees for Contract# 9584 |
| 08/02/2016 Centene (US Script) | 127514 | \$ 30,123.20 | 2016 Q2 Phr Audit Recoveries |
| 10/04/2016 Centene (US Script) | 135938 | \$ 17,137.71 | 2016 Q3 Phr Audit Recoveries |
| 06/20/2017 Centene (US Script) | 181744 | \$ 513,721.35 | Rebate payments Collected through 3/31/2017 |
| 06/30/2017 Centene (US Script) | 185212 | \$ 19,501.76 | 2017 Q2 Phr Audit Recoveries |
| 09/13/2017 Centene (US Script) | 196712 | \$ 235,806.85 | 2017 Q3 Phr Audit Recoveries |
| 11/21/2107 Centene (US Script) | 208154 | \$ 15.00 | Refund for pharmacy claims initially processed incorrectly |
| 12/14/2017 Centene (US Script) | 211551 | \$ 247,346.10 | 2017 Q4 Phr Audit Recoveries |
| Total | | \$2,010,244.31 | |

These amounts were applied based on the year paid. An allocation to each entity was made based on the percent of paid claims or premium the annual Rx amount represented in a given year. Based on the percentages developed, the annual amounts were distributed by entity as shown in the following table.

| % of Premium / | County of County of Fresno Tulare | | All Other | Total | Dollars | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|---------|-----------|--------|---------------------|--|
| Claim Cost | Fresno | I ulare | Group | | Reported | |
| 2010 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | \$0 | |
| 2011 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | \$0 | |
| 2012 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | \$0 | |
| 2013 | 70.5% | 25.3% | 4.2% | 100.0% | \$ 169,128 | |
| 2014 | 65.5% | 24.9% | 9.6% | 100.0% | \$ 642,747 | |
| 2015 | 63.7% | 34.1% | 2.2% | 100.0% | \$ 129,717 | |
| 2016 | 59.6% | 38.3% | 2.1% | 100.0% | \$ 52,261 | |
| 2017 | 57.9% | 39.7% | 2.3% | 100.0% | \$ 1,016,391 | |
| Total | | | | | \$2,010,244 | |

This resulted in the following distribution by dollars:

| RX Rebates, Audits | County of | County of | All Other | Total | |
|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------------|-------------|--|
| and Adjustments | Fresno | Tulare | Group | | |
| 2010 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 2011 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 2012 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 2013 | \$119,192 | \$42,856 | \$7,080 | \$169,128 | |
| 2014 | \$421,053 | \$160,103 | \$61,591 | \$642,747 | |
| 2015 | \$82,654 | \$44,241 | \$2,822 | \$129,717 | |
| 2016 | \$31,140 | \$20,008 | \$1,112 | \$52,261 | |
| <u>2017</u> | \$588,62 <u>6</u> | \$403,962 | <u>\$23,803</u> | \$1,016,391 | |
| Total | \$1,242,665 | \$671,170 | \$96,410 | \$2,010,244 | |

Applying the allocation above resulted in the following adjustment to the deficit accumulation:

| Adjusted Change | County of Fresno | County of Tulare | All Other Group | Total |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 12/31/17 Adjusted Position | \$10,804,508 | \$1,398,331 | \$ 677,897 | \$12,880,736 |
| Allocation of RX rebates, Audits, Adj. | <u>(\$1,242,665)</u> | <u>(\$671,170)</u> | <u>(\$96,410)</u> | <u>(\$2,010,244)</u> |
| Adjusted Balance | \$ 9,561,844 | \$ 727,161 | \$ 581,488 | \$10,870,492 |

Repayment Methodology

The \$9 million loan repayment schedule was developed based on the adjusted deficit position calculated.

| Loan Repayment Allocation Update | Deficit Position | % of Deficit | R | Loan epayment | Enrollment | Month payment |
|--|---------------------|--------------|----|------------------|------------|------------------|
| County of Fresno | \$ (9,561,844) | 88.0% | \$ | 7,916,531 | 4,169 | \$ 52.75 |
| County of Tulare | \$ (727,161) | 6.7% | \$ | 602,038 | 2,821 | \$ 5.93 |
| City of Marysville | (\$581,488) | 5.3% | \$ | 481,431 | 51 | \$ 262.22 |
| Total PEPM | \$(10,870,492) | 100.0% | \$ | 9,000,000 | 7,041 | \$ 35.51 |
| | | | | | | |

Per SJVIA Board direction, the City of Marysville loan repayment was adjusted to reflect their proportionate share, as opposed to the All Other Group accumulation. See the chart below for the revised loan repayment.

| Loan Repayment Allocation All Other Adjustment | | | | Enrollment | 36 Month Repayment | | |
|--|--|---|----|------------|-----------------------|----|-------|
| County of Fresno | | | \$ | 8,195,028 | 4,169 | \$ | 54.60 |
| County of Tulare | | | \$ | 739,782 | 2,821 | \$ | 7.28 |
| City of Marysville | | | \$ | 65,190 | 51 | \$ | 35.51 |
| Total PEPM | | | \$ | 9,000,000 | 7,041 | \$ | 35.51 |
| | | *************************************** | | | | | |

The funding of the IBNR reserve was calculated based on applying the required IBNR reserve to enrollment and funding over 36 months.

| Projected IBNR | Required | Enrollment | 36 Month |
|--------------------|--------------|------------|-----------|
| (12/31/18) | IBNR | Linomitent | Repayment |
| County of Fresno | \$ 3,464,122 | 4,169 | \$ 23.08 |
| County of Tulare | \$ 2,160,198 | 2,821 | \$ 21.27 |
| City of Marysville | \$ 78,903 | 51 | \$ 42.98 |
| Total | \$ 5,703,223 | 7,041 | \$ 22.50 |
| | | | |

Ideally a 3-month stabilization reserve is accumulated over time and should be a goal for the SJVIA. However, over the 36-month repayment period, Keenan recommends the SJVIA target a one-month stabilization reserve.

| Stabilization Reserve | Projected Claims PEPM | Enrollment | 1 Month | 3 Month | 6 Month |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| County of Fresno | \$ 946.30 | 4,169 | \$ 3,945,125 | \$ 11,835,374 | \$ 23,670,748 |
| County of Tulare | \$ 675.10 | 2,821 | \$ 1,904,457 | \$ 5,713,371 | \$ 11,426,743 |
| City of Marysville | \$ 1,481.34 | 51 | \$ 75,548 | \$ 226,645 | \$ 453,290 |
| Total | \$ 858.69 | 7,041 | \$ 5,925,130 | \$ 17,775,390 | \$ 35,550,781 |
| | | | | | |

The following table illustrates the development of a one-month reserve.

| Projected Stabilization | Required Stabilization | | Enrollment | 36 Month Repayment | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|------------|--------------------|-------|
| County of Fresno | | 3,945,125 | 4,169 | \$ | 26.29 |
| County of Tulare | \$ | 1,904,457 | 2,821 | \$ | 18.75 |
| City of Marysville | \$ | 75,548 | 51 | \$ | 41.15 |
| Total | \$ | 5,925,130 | 7,041 | \$ | 23.38 |
| | | | | | |