1 2	PUBLIC MEETING BETWEEN
3	CITY OF JACKSONVILLE
4	AND
5	JACKSONVILLE POLICE AND FIRE PENSION FUND
6	
7	
8	
9	MODERATOR,
LO	RODNEY WARREN SMITH, Esquire Avera & Smith, LLP
LO L1	2814 Southwest 13th Street
	Gainesville, Florida 32608
L2	
L3	DATE TAKEN: May 12, 2014 TIME: 9:03 a.m 10:51 a.m.
L4	PLACE: City Hall St. James Building
L5	Lynwood Roberts Room 117 West Duval Street
L6	Jacksonville, Florida 32202
L7	
L8	reported by: Karen Adair Ruiz
L9	Florida Professional Reporter
20	Registered Merit Reporter
21	
22	
23	RILEY REPORTING & ASSOCIATES, INC.
24	1660 Prudential Drive, Suite 210 Jacksonville, Florida 32207
25	(904)358-1615 info@rileyreporting.com
	_ _ _

```
Page 2
 1
                        APPEARANCES
 2
     MAYOR ALVIN BROWN
     City Hall
 3
     Office of the Mayor
     St. James Building
117 West Duval Street
     Jacksonville, Florida 32202
     CHRISTOPHER JOHN HAND, Esquire
     Chief of Staff
 7
     Office of the Mayor
     St. James Building
117 West Duval Street
 8
     Jacksonville, Florida 32202
 9
     CINDY A. LAQUIDARA, Esquire
10
     General Counsel
     Office of the General Counsel
     117 West Duval Street,
11
     Jacksonville, Florida 32202
12
     DERREL Q. CHATMON, Esquire
13
     Chief Deputy General Counsel
     Office of the General Counsel
     117 West Duval Street, Suite 480
     Jacksonville, Florida 32202
15
        RONALD BELTON
     Chief Financial Officer, City of Jacksonville
16
     St. James Building
117 West Duval Street, Suite 300
17
     Jacksonville, Florida 32202
18
     PATRICK GREIVE
     Treasurer, City of Jacksonville St. James Building
19
20
     117 West Duval Street, Suite 300
     Jacksonville, Florida 32202
21
     JOHN KEANE
22
     Executive Director-Administrator
     Police and Fire Pension Fund
     One West Adams Street, Suite 100
23
     Jacksonville, Florida 32202
24
25
```

THE MODERATOR: All right. Good morning, everyone. Let's pick up where we -- I hope everybody had a great Mother's Day. And let's get back to our work this morning.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The first thing I have in front of us from the City -- I had asked -- and if you can put that up, please. I think we now have -- and I just want to make sure that we have in front of us the early retirement calculation number. Everybody should have a copy. That was just given to me.

John, you've got a copy of this?

Okay. That's the one that we had looked at last week. That's the one that I think was a -- it's a little bit of a change from what was agreed on last fall.

If you remember, we took, John, and used the two and a half percent rate, the accrual rate, and applied the accrual rate, and that became also the discount rate, if you will, so that we kind of evened that out so there wasn't -- but we -- but we started counting from the -- I think your term was we started counting from the bottom.

We have a floor that I think is slightly lower than the floor was before, but the -- but

1 the accrual in the last two years ultimately was
2 about, I think, in the last year, 70 percent and
3 65 percent or one-half of -- one-half of -4 one-half of 1 percent difference, is what I think
5 it is.
6 MR. HAND: Uh-huh.

7 THE MODERATOR: So, Joey, thank you for 8 putting this together in the format that we had

9 looked at it before.10 With that, I th

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With that, I think that -- I understand -- and I'll repeat this, as I do at every meeting for everybody's comfort zone -- but realizing that everything is temporarily agreed to, based on where we ultimately end up. Everybody in agreement that this is what we had agreed to and that these are the numbers we will use if we're able to reach an agreement in this?

18 MR. KEANE: Correct.

MR. HAND: Yes.

20 THE MODERATOR: Chris?

All right. Thank you.

Secondly, what I had done today is I had put together -- but I -- before I kind of get to it -- before I kind of get to it, I want to go to the -- remind everybody where we were because, if you're

Page 5

like me, a weekend is a year.

Where we were before is that we had kind of put out here a proposal between us. And I'll kind of reiterate that No. 1 would be the Financial and Investment Advisory Committee. No. 2 was the ethnics, certifications, disclosure requirements for investment managers and advisers. No. 3 was not yet agreed upon, but it had to do with the use of the general counsel. And we're still working with that language.

And, John, I understand you have some language this morning that we will be looking at again.

No. 4 would be -- no longer would be included, and No. 10 would no longer be included.

No. 4 being -- if you recall, No. 4 was -- would have been the -- what I'll call the fifth member issue. No. 5 would be as it was written except that, in light of No. -- if No. 4 was omitted, the mayor language would be omitted. Six has -- would be accepted. Seven would be accepted, except that -- no, seven would be accepted. Eight, I think the only issue in eight, then, would have been regarding how we use the language of the 2014. And then I think eleven and twelve would

```
Page 6
     then be agreed upon. Ten would be omitted.
 2
     twelve would be the last thing. Of course,
 3
     thirteen was no longer required by either side.
 4
          Now, I know that nobody had signed off on
5
    that because, essentially -- and you guys correct
 6
    me if I'm wrong -- I had sent that over to both of
7
     you to take -- to look at, and I know we were
8
     talking about language, but I think at the heart
9
     of the agreement is whether or not the City is
10
     prepared to now -- the potential agreement would
11
     be whether the City has reached some comfort
12
     level, with the omission of Item 4 -- omission of
13
     Item 4 and whether or not we can reach some
14
     language that we can all live with as to Item 3.
15
          Remember, I had a proposal that was the
16
    moderator's proposal as to Item 3, but I know that
17
     you have some language on your way over, John,
18
     No. 3, and we'll take a look at that.
19
          So let's talk about Item 4. Where are we
20
    from the City's --
21
          MR. HAND: Senator --
22
          THE MODERATOR: -- perspective on that?
23
          MR. HAND: -- just to clarify real quick --
24
    and -- because I think there are now four of the
25
     governance provisions that are off the table.
```

```
Page 7
     Thirteen, because the PFPF indicated that was not
2
     a priority or an interest of --
 3
          THE MODERATOR: Correct.
          MR. HAND: -- theirs, so that sort of
 4
5
    disappeared --
6
          THE MODERATOR: Correct.
          MR. HAND: -- removed from any consideration.
 7
8
    And I believe we already have agreement on three
9
     of the task force recommendations. That's No. 1,
    which is Financial and Investment --
10
11
          THE MODERATOR: Correct.
12
          MR. HAND: -- Advisory Committee; No. 2,
13
    which is ethics, certification, and disclosure
14
    requirements --
15
          THE MODERATOR: That's correct.
16
          MR. HAND: -- and No. 6, which is --
17
          THE MODERATOR: Correct.
18
          MR. HAND: -- actuarial standards,
19
     transparency, and disclosure. So --
20
          THE MODERATOR: That's right.
21
          MR. HAND: -- those four, by one means or
22
    another, are now either off the table or agreed
23
     to --
24
          THE MODERATOR: That comports with my
25
    recollection of it, yes.
```

```
Page 8
          MR. HAND: I will tell you the City is likely
 1
     to have a counterproposal to what the moderator
     first advanced and the PFPF also advanced. We do
     not have one first thing this morning because
 5
     we're still going over some language. So we are
 6
     going to bring that back to the table. We do not
     have it ready this morning.
 8
          THE MODERATOR: I understand that. Now --
 9
     and I understand that as to Item 3, which is the
     general counsel issue, that you have some language
10
11
     that's either on its way or being put together
12
     right now?
13
         MR. KEANE: On its way over.
14
          THE MODERATOR: Okay. Thanks.
15
          MR. KEANE: Fast as they can get here.
16
          THE MODERATOR: I know. And I take some
17
     blame on that because I know I had that language
18
     that I was -- that I had looked at Friday, and
19
     then somehow I have managed to lose it in
     cyberspace, which has been my rule since last
20
21
     Friday with my phone, which has twice been looked
22
     at. I don't know what the problem is.
23
          With that, I'd like to move, then -- because
24
     it seems like we're very close on these issues,
25
    but we'll let this kind of percolate for a minute.
```

Page 9 And I want to go to the next kind of general category of subjects. And that is what I think --3 MAYOR BROWN: It just came. 4 THE MODERATOR: Is that the three? If I 5 could look at that first. 6 Yes. Okay. Pass that out. 7 MR. KEANE: There's one for you and one for 8 the court reporter. 9 I meant to try to get this paper toss over the weekend, and I know I can get that one, good 10 11 chance of that one. 12 Derrel, let's see if you can get airmail 13 there. 14 MR. CHATMON: I got that. 15 THE MODERATOR: If you would date this, guys, so that we kind of keep these -- because this is, 16 17 like, the fourth proposal. So let's make this 18 the --19 MR. KEANE: 5/12. 20 THE MODERATOR: -- 5/12 of '14. If you 21 would, pencil at the top of that 5/12/14 so that we can keep this -- because I think this is our 22 23 third or fourth proposal on this. I realize for

the City this is slightly different language, but

not dramatically different, but I would ask that

24

Page 13

the City take a look at this.

2

3

4

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

22 23

Cindy, particularly, I know you'd want to focus on it. And I know you haven't had a chance to see it.

Page 10

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

5

12

5 The charter and the State law empower the 6 Board to retain its own counsel, to use the Office 7 of the General Counsel, or both. The parties 8 agree that the OGC is a proper source to handle 9 daily legal business for the fund, for example, 10 open records, open meetings, issues not requiring 11 specialized pension or investment law experience. 12 The fund's counsel and the OGC shall consult on a regular basis to ensure the Board is provided 13 14 legal services in an efficient and cost-effective 15 manner. The management of legal services for the 16 Board shall be consistent with the provisions of 17 Sections 175.061, 185.06 of Florida Statutes. The 18 parties agree that the current legal counsel 19 structure and fees are fair and appropriate.

That is a -- kind of putting this in order, you'll remember that we have the original offer that you-all had made, a response, then a use of the Office of General Counsel provision the moderator had included, and then discussions last week and then -- now, this would be the proposal

back from the -- from the fund -- for the Board, 2 excuse me. And I'd like to talk about that a 3 little later this morning. 4

Do we have questions about that now, or would you like a few minutes, or, Cindy, you --MS. LAQUIDARA: Yeah. You know, overall, I think the subtext of us using -- the Police and

8 Fire Pension Fund using the General Counsel's 9 Office in the manner that every other agency does, which is for our expertise and to save expenses, 10

is fine. 11

> I don't know why in a mediation provision there's a position taken that is contrary to what my reading is because it -- we're either compromising or we're not.

THE MODERATOR: Where is that one?

17 MS. LAQUIDARA: Well --

18 THE MODERATOR: Which one? 19

MS. LAQUIDARA: -- in accordance with Chapters 175.061 and 185.06, we do not agree with that interpretation. And so there's no need to write it down; okay? They can maintain their position it applies; I can maintain my position it

24 doesn't. But if we're going to mediate this, then 25

let's not each grab parts of it that we think are

to our advantage because the real issue is resolved in the text of this.

3 THE MODERATOR: Is that sentence the only 4 thing objectionable to you in there?

MR. HAND: Well, I have, actually --

6 MS. LAQUIDARA: Well, but first --

MR. HAND: -- a question before we even get to that. This question is for Mr. Keane.

Mr. Keane, you had essentially advanced a proposal on governance that sort of took the moderator's sort of proposed compromise and made some tweaks to it and forwarded that. I believe it was on Thursday when we last got together. Are you now modifying that proposal? And in that proposal you had indicated that you would accept the moderator's language on Recommendation No. 3. I believe that's correct.

And, again, not saying this pejoratively, I just want to make sure I'm clear. This now essentially modifies that proposal so that, as to Issue No. 3, which is the use of the general counsel, this is the language the Board is now forwarding --

MR. KEANE: Yes. That is correct.

MR. HAND: Okay.

25 Page 11

> THE MODERATOR: Yeah. Let me -- let me kind 1 of correct -- I say correct. I don't know if it's the right term. The use of the general counsel 4 language that I had --

MR. HAND: Right.

6 THE MODERATOR: -- was -- reproduced was this 7 one.

8 MR. HAND: Correct.

9 THE MODERATOR: Actually, they came back after that with a very short use --10

11 MR. HAND: Got you.

THE MODERATOR: -- of the general counsel --

13 MR. HAND: Okay. This is the latest proposal 14 they have, but there hasn't yet been a rejection 15 of -- and I -- and we may still end up working off of language that is contained in No. 3 of the 16

17 moderator's proposal. But all of these, I think,

18 highlight -- and I think Cindy's response is, 19 "Look, I think we ought to make this workable. To

20 make this workable, let's put down the language 21

that will work for both sides."

Either one -- neither is going to concede their legal position, but that there's a workable middle ground here without their conceding their legal position, but the most objectionable part of

22

23

24

Page 14 that, as I heard you say, was the sentence about

175 and 185 of the most recent proposal.

2

2

4 5

6

7

21

22

23

24

25

3 MS. LAQUIDARA: Yes. So the first -- if one 4 deleted the first sentence and then the 5 sentence -- the penultimate sentence, then -- and 6 essentially retained the exact body of what

7 Mr. Keane's saying, we're fine because it just 8 states what we're going to do. And there's no

9 reason to state why we're going to do it. I think 10 that would preserve both parties, their position, 11 and let us get on with it.

12 THE MODERATOR: Let me go back, then, just 13 for a moment and take a look at No. 3 as the Board 14 had.

15 MS. LAQUIDARA: I like Mr. Keane's. I think 16 he's come -- really puts -- really captured where 17 we are in this amendment, and so -- in the one 18 he's handed out today. And I think just those two 19 changes really lets us leave it alone and gets his exact language without asking him to concede 20 21 anything. We're not asking -- I think that 22 preserves all rights for Mr. Keane to argue those 23 points later.

24 THE MODERATOR: And, of course, we do have --25 we will have a record of these proceedings, that,

Page 15 if we were to reach that language, it would be that both parties were maintaining their legal position, but for purposes of agreement, would be finding language that they think would be workable, hopefully, to avoid this issue in the future.

MS. LAQUIDARA: Uh-huh.

8 THE MODERATOR: Now, I think where I was 9 going next, folks -- because I know the City hasn't come back with the critical issue of No. 4. 10 11 And when I say the critical issue, I mean, I 12 think -- I think the Board has made very apparent 13 at this table how important that issue, No. 4, is 14 to them. I think that an awful lot hinges on 15 that. Where we are now is I'd like to move to have a discussion this morning about -- and I want 16 17 to hear whether or not there is or will be a 18 counter on the issue of current employees.

19 John, the Board made, in their initial 20

presentation --MR. HAND: You mean the City? THE MODERATOR: The Board. I'm sorry. The Board received, in the initial presentation from the City -- made, I guess, a week ago -- made the proposal, and the proposal had many components,

Page 16 but one of the components that I think was

different than what we've been calling the MSA,

3 the mediated settlement agreement, was the

treatment of current employees. And the mediated

5 settlement agreement had some treatment of current

6 employees of -- not dramatic, but there were some 7 changes in the treatment of current employees.

8 This would be more. For a starting point, if 9 I could go back to the City, I want you to just kind of explain again what differences your 10 11 proposal has for current employees than that which 12 was contained in the mediated settlement

14 MR. HAND: Right. So the changes would be --15 Carol, do you have that on the PowerPoint still, 16 the presentation we made --

17 THE MODERATOR: That would be May 6.

18 MR. HAND: Page 22, May 6.

13

19

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

21

25

agreement.

THE MODERATOR: Yes. City Proposal No. 2.

20 Page 39 of the task force report is also part 21 of this.

22 MR. HAND: Put that on the board for 23 everybody.

THE MODERATOR: I'd like you to put up the proposal because I want to start that this

Page 17

morning. We've got to get kind of refocused on 1 2 this issue for a moment while we --

3 MR. HAND: It's Page 21.

THE MODERATOR: Before I leave this -- and I know that you have all the time you want on this, within the constraints of what we've outlined as our schedule. Do you expect the City today to have a response to Issue No. 4 in the governance?

MR. HAND: I would say at the latest we expect to have one at the very beginning of tomorrow morning.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. HAND: I can't promise there will be one today.

THE MODERATOR: I understand.

MAYOR BROWN: Yeah. We, you know --

17 THE MODERATOR: I got it.

MAYOR BROWN: It may be at the end of the day. It may be, but definitely by tomorrow.

20 THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MAYOR BROWN: I just --

22 THE MODERATOR: Just -- we're on a tight 23 schedule, and I think that is a linchpin of whether or not we get that governance put to bed. 24

MR. KEANE: Today's a short day too.

Page 18

THE MODERATOR: And today's a short day. Everybody knows that.

3 MAYOR BROWN: No. I get that.

THE MODERATOR: All right. Go ahead.

MR. HAND: All right. So as to current employees, obviously, we talked about that no benefits earned as of the date of plan implementation would be impacted. Because the plan would be implemented as of October 1st, 2014,

we moved the recommendations from the Retirement Reform Task Force and indicated the proposed term of those benefit changes would be from October 1,

2014, through September 30th, 2017 -- also talked about making future pension benefit determinations

through the collective bargaining process.So just to kind of -- as a refresher

So just to kind of -- as a refresher on what the proposed benefit changes would be -- and, again, these are the Retirement Reform Task Force recommendations for current employees. For current employees who have greater than ten years of service right now, on a going -- right now there is a guaranteed 3 percent COLA starting as early as three months after retirement. The proposal would be to cap the COLA at 1.5 percent, make the COLA the lesser of that, and CPI, as

measured by the Social Security COLA, starting that the third January after retirement.

For those employees with less than ten years of service, again, moving from the guaranteed 3 percent COLA to 1 that is capped at 1.5 percent, starts the third January after retirement, but starts no earlier than Age 55. So there would be an age floor, an activation floor, at Age 55 for current employees.

For the DROP, Deferred Retirement Option Program, the current system has a guaranteed 8.4 percent rate of return. Under the task force proposal, which we moved as our current employee proposal, this would change that to the actual rate of return with a rate floor of zero and a rate cap of 10 percent.

The employee contribution right now is 7 percent. I know Mr. Keane's had some commentary on other sources of contributions, but the amount coming out of an employee's paycheck right now is 7 percent. Our proposal, which mirrors the task force proposal, would be to raise that from 7 percent to 10 percent, 8 percent immediately upon plan implementation, from 7 to 8, and then from 8 to 10 when the previous pay cuts taken by police

and fire employees are restored. So, again, that would go from 7 percent to 10 percent in an effectively two-stage process.

And then, finally, the issue of final average compensation period, this would apply to employees with less than ten years of service. Currently it's based on the last 24 months of employment. This would now move it to a period of time that's based on the last 60 months of employment, with the caveat that that amount could not be less than the 24-month amount that would be in place as of the date of plan implementation, so October 1st, 2014. So for whatever the -- whatever the two-year number it would be as of October 1, 2014, that would essentially serve as a floor.

THE MODERATOR: Go back and remind me, guys. When we did the MSA, as to the issue of the employee contribution, if I recall the MSA correctly, there was a 1 percent -- had it been implemented, there would have been a 1 percent contribution that was being made by the Board on an interim basis.

MR. KEANE: We're doing it now, 4 percent.

THE MODERATOR: There would have been one additional percent?

Page 19

MR. KEANE: Something like that.

THE MODERATOR: Yeah. If I remember right, it would have been one additional percent --

4 MR. HAND: It was for a one-year period or 5 for a two-year period into base benefits, but

6 really was not -- at least from my memory of the 7 MSA, was not tied to the employee contribution.

8 What we agreed on that -- what we agreed on that

9 last year was an increase from 7 percent to 9 10 percent of pay that was -- that would be activated

11 following the restoration of the pay cuts; in 12 other words --

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. HAND: -- once the pay cuts were restored, portions of any future pay increases after that would go to increase the employee contribution from 7 percent to 9 percent, so it would not be as immediate as what's being proposed here.

THE MODERATOR: What you're proposing here would be that there would be an immediate additional 1 percent out of the employee --

23 MR. HAND: Correct.

THE MODERATOR: -- pay that would go to 10 percent, but that would only go to 10 percent when

Page 22 the pay cuts, which were 2 percent --2 MR. HAND: 2 percent. 3 THE MODERATOR: -- are reinstated? 4 MR. HAND: Correct. 5 THE MODERATOR: Though you are currently 6 negotiating with, I think, FOP and then the -- I 7 mean, is it FOP or --8 MAYOR BROWN: Local 122. 9 THE MODERATOR: -- PP -- FOP. 10 MR. HAND: Yeah. 11 THE MODERATOR: And then the firefighters is 12 one year behind. 13 MR. HAND: It is. Now, just to be clear, we 14 have come back to the table with the firefighters. 15 They effectuated a waiver as it related to 16 collective bargaining of pension benefits. 17 There's always the possibility of coming back to 18 the table a year earlier with fire. Right now the 19 only one that's on schedule is the FOP. Their current contract expires on September 30th. 20 21 THE MODERATOR: And how again does the -- did 22 the MSA address -- did it retain the last 24 23 months for calculation purposes? 24 MR. HAND: It did not. It did -- the MSA, on 25 these other matters, did not affect current

1 employees. 2 THE MODERATOR: At all? 3 MR. HAND: Correct. Yeah. The only change for current employees on this list was --4 5 THE MODERATOR: No. 4. 6 MR. HAND: -- the treatment of the employee 7 contribution --8 THE MODERATOR: Right. 9 MR. HAND: -- the way we've just described. THE MODERATOR: All right. With that kind of 10 11 reopening this conversation, John, I'd like your 12 reaction to it. First of all, is the Board going 13 to make a proposal in this area? And if not -- I 14 mean, you're not compelled to. Does the Board 15 have a reaction to this? And I want to -- I want to hear the Board's reaction to where we are on 16 17 this. And I want to try to search for ways to see 18 if we can move in this area at all. 19 MR. KEANE: Well, first we want to make it 20 clear that the City proposal does not follow in 21 toto the mediated settlement agreement. We hear a 22 lot of times, the proposals we advance, they keep 23 referring to, "Well, that's not what you 24 agreed" -- "in the mediated settlement agreement." 25 Well, the mediated settlement agreement has

Page 24 been rejected. It was a good start, a good effort 2 on everybody's part, but it's rejected. It's --3 THE MODERATOR: Rejected by counsel? 4 MR. KEANE: -- rejected. 5 THE MODERATOR: Right. I understand. 6 MR. KEANE: Right. So we oppose any 7 significant changes for current employees. They 8 were hired with a benefit structure. They have 9 paid into -- to contributions to support the 10 benefit structure.

Four percent of the chapter funds that would otherwise be allocated to the individual employees have been paid into the fund to support this benefit level, and to take that away from them, we don't think is proper, probably not lawful, and certainly contrary to a sense of fairness and justice. So, you know, we want the current employees to remain where they're at for that.

19 THE MODERATOR: Let me ask a question, back 20 to the City. How was the ten-year line arrived 21 at?

MR. HAND: And I don't want to speak verbatim for the task force, but as best I can recall, the task force wanted to recognize that there was a distinction between -- in other words, that all

Page 25

current employees should participate in some meaningful way in retirement reform, but that there was a distinction between employees who were closer to retirement versus those who were sort of 5 earlier in their careers and had more time to plan 6 for retirement. 7 So that ten-year, I think, the fact that 8 9 are less than ten years of service was a

there were some enhanced changes for employees who recognition of the fact that they're earlier in their careers, have more time to plan for retirement, and there's also more impact the changes to those employees has on the overall kind of financial state of the -- of retirement issues for the City.

THE MODERATOR: Conversations -- and I know that I'm kind of plowing what -- but not everybody here was part of that. One of the conversations that we had during the mediated settlement, that I recall, was kind of a persistent discussion of the idea of people make a job decision, a career decision, and they say, "I'm going with the City of Jacksonville, and I'm going to the City of Jacksonville for these reasons," a package. And they make that evaluation, just as they -- "That's

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

23

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 23

why I prefer Jacksonville over Orlando," or "I prefer Jacksonville over Tampa, is because I've looked at the entire package."

And they've made this decision. And they've been here for -- this situation, they will have worked -- if they came at 22, which is the age we've been -- the task force used and I'm comfortable with, and Joey tells me is within the realm of reason, if it's -- if they came at 22, under what the task force recommended -- and I've read the recommendations and don't disagree or agree. It doesn't matter.

What I -- what would be happening now is that a 31- or 32-year-old guy -- or when I say guy, male or female, obviously -- is now faced with a changed set of circumstances. They've put in ten years, almost. Let's say they're nine years, plus. They've put almost ten years -- the package -- which in retirement is a significant decision when you're going somewhere in police and fire because that's typically a career line that lasts a long time, I guess, as your chiefs and assistant chiefs here started at some point in time on a ladder truck.

What do you say to the guy that says, "Okay.

You're 31 years old" or "32 years old, and you made a decision to come to" -- "and now the rules of the game are changing. And the guy who came in in the class ahead of you, they're not changing for him or her"? Kind of a response to that -- MR. HAND: Sure.

THE MODERATOR: -- because -- and I'm not throwing this out as my argument. These are -- MR. HAND: Sure.

THE MODERATOR: -- the discussions we had, and I want to get these discussions back in front of us because I think they're at the heart of the decisions that we have to make on this subject.

MR. HAND: Sure. I would say several things. Number one, first, we've all got a stake in making sure we've got a stable retirement system. Everyone needs to play a role in that; two, that retirement benefits are part of the overall compensation package, not the entire compensation package; three, I think it's important to kind of take into account that -- and I think it's sort of what the overall landscape is on pensions, and that's what sort of this next chart shows, as well. These types of changes that we're

recommending for current employees are, frankly,

Page 28 very consistent with changes that are happening in other jurisdictions and, frankly, some of those

same jurisdictions that compete with the City of Jacksonville.

5 So, for example, as you know, the FRS ended 6 its COLA for all service for special risk 7 employees after July 1st, 2011. As you can see, 8 for example, in the category of employee 9 contribution, there are other cities who are 10 significantly higher than what we're recommending.

At present, the City of Tampa charges 13.26 percent contribution for its police and fire members. Now, interestingly, they've tied theirs to the performance of the plan. So as the plan's performing not as well, the employee contribution goes up, and vice versa. The City of Miami is 10 percent for their fire employees, 13 percent for their police employees.

But I think the other key issue -- and Derrel might want to speak to this a little bit -- the argument's been advanced that, "Well, we don't want to have two people on the same equipment who have two different benefit packages."

That happens already. I mean, that's already the case right now, that you have multiple

Page 29

employees on the same equipment or on the same shift who have different levels of contribution, whether it's because of step raises or because of some of the other factors that go into the overall compensation package, so that the idea that we're going to somehow impact morale because there's a little bit different level of benefit between two employees -- as I understand it, Derrel, that's --

10 MR. HAND: -- the case as it is right now.
11 MR. CHATMON: Without question. The point
12 that Chris is addressing is something that
13 Jacksonville has experienced for years. We have

different leave plans. We have different compensation levels that separates us.

MR. CHATMON: Right.

The idea that you have two people on the same apparatus which may have different benefits because it's part of the package has been going on since Jacksonville has existed. It's just a matter of when the implementation takes place and the changes that occur.

Now, understanding Mr. Keane's point is that he's looking at retirement as a totality, but as Chris's point points out, this is compensation overall for the entire package, both the dollars

Page 30

that go into their pockets from wages, as well as retirement.

MS. LAQUIDARA: And if I could briefly -because the other matter that we brought up at the
mediation, which I think is key to why these are
so difficult here -- look at -- Chris has and
Derrel has the nature of those. This is the
issue. It's to the trust's benefit to increase
the financial solvency of the trust. And so
negotiating for something that does not bring more
money into the trust is against the interests of
the existing retirees.

And so that's the difficulty that this 30-year position put Mr. Keane in. He's negotiating to say, "Well, we should pay a guaranteed 8 percent, even if the fund returns four." And that is attacking the very corpus that the trustees are supposed to be increasing.

So I think the recognition of that principle was one that led us to, you know, really looking at the minor issues on the -- on new employees but by hitting those that were consistent with other jurisdictions.

24 THE MODERATOR: John, kind of --25 MR. KEANE: Sure. Sure.

Page 31
THE MODERATOR: I'm kind of turning it around back to you and -- kind of make the same argument.
When I read the task force -- what I see the task force addressing is they say, "Look, this is for overall fund health."

MR. KEANE: Uh-huh.

THE MODERATOR: "We think the overall fund is healthier if we do" -- "make these changes and will be healthier over the long term by making these changes."

And, admittedly, ten years is not a magical time period, but it was one that was essentially the first one-third of employment, meaning that two-thirds -- presumably, those who are past one-third of their employment won't be affected at all by this. The people who are in the first, roughly, one-third of their employment in a 25 to -- I mean, what is a 30-year plan -- again, react to this and tell me the Board's reaction and also what role you think the Board -- where the Board fits into this issue of contribution by the employee, especially linking that to wage reinstatement.

MR. KEANE: Okay. Well, let's start with the last point that Mr. Chatmon made, that there are

different leave plans. The leave plan was changed for people that are going to be coming. No one that was here had the leave plan changed, yanked out from underneath them. It was established for future employees; is that correct?

MR. CHATMON: That would be correct, but the two people would still be on the same apparatus.

MR. KEANE: It doesn't matter whether they're walking or riding. The leave plan was changed for new people. Nobody that was here had their leave plan changed; correct?

THE MODERATOR: Which this plan has done -- would already do.

14 MR. KEANE: We proposed to do --

15 THE MODERATOR: We agree that new employees 16 are going to be on a different --

17 MR. KEANE: Exactly.

18 THE MODERATOR: Different --

MR. KEANE: This is --

20 THE MODERATOR: -- plan --

21 MR. KEANE: This is --

THE MODERATOR: -- already.

23 MR. KEANE: This is changing current people,

24 which is not the case in the illustration

25 Mr. Chatmon made. And to Chief Hand, that's an

Page 33 interesting note up there that -- he talks about the FRS. Well, the FRS contribution is 3 percent

from the employee. Now, you know, do we want to put the new people in FRS? Is that -- are we not

5 even going to talk about that? I don't want to do

6 it, but we keep bringing FRS in here.

So -- and the Tampa people and the Miami people, the 4 percent that we currently put in --because people keep saying the people only pay 7 -- and Tampa and Miami, 4 percent goes into their individual share accounts. Now, you can't have it both ways. You can't say in Tampa they pay 13.26 and they get a share plan, which they don't say, or you say in Jacksonville they pay 7. They don't have a share plan, but 4 percent is used.

Now, if we're going to put the numbers up, we ought to put the numbers up which are reflective. The pension fund receives, for our current employees, 7 percent from their salary and 4 percent of the chapter money. Seven and four is eleven. And it's more than Miami.

THE MODERATOR: Now, in the MSA we did address that issue. Am I incorrect that there was some interim additional funding that the Board --

Page 34 remind me and tell me how that fits into what's being proposed here.

MR. KEANE: We agreed to make some additional contributions, but in the MSA we also --

THE MODERATOR: But, now, that would apply to everybody from --

MR. KEANE: Correct.

THE MODERATOR: All current employees?

MR. KEANE: Correct. Because the funds -source of funds we were going to use is
accumulated chapter funds that were accumulated
for the current employees. The 4 percent from the
chapter fund that is paid into the base benefit
fund on behalf of the current employees is to
provide for some of these benefits that at the
time were enhanced benefits. The City has since
provided those same level of benefits to the
general employees and correctional officers.
They're no longer enhanced benefits.

THE MODERATOR: Once again, I wasn't over here -- I only know what I read in the newspaper, and due respect to our audience, that may or may not be accurate. I said may or may not, which is better than what I would say privately.

My view on this was that one of the

concerns -- and the task force addresses this in the report, not explicitly but I think implicitly in the report -- is that the Council -- that we're here because the Council did not pass -- did not accept what we had as the MSA. Now, I can't tell you what any one person who wasn't reporting that way -- and I'm -- and I haven't gone back -- and I'm not going to go back and read transcripts, and

But what I'm getting at is, let's talk about kind of the practical aspect here. What's your view of what role current employee contribution or current employee participation in the changes play in likelihood of the success of any agreement we reach?

I don't know what they would tell me, anyway.

In other words, if we sit down and we reach something on governance and we reach something on addressing the unfunded liability, which we'll talk to some today, but we -- and we've done what we've done, which I think is we've moved new employees and -- that's out of the equation. Current employees seem to have been, from the task force rendition -- and I want to ask both sides to comment on this. How important were additional

changes in current employees in your mind to --

Page 36

because if this is going to work at all, as you
say, it's got to be, not only agreed here, it's
got to be agreed to around the hallway here. Tell
me what you think, if any, current employee
contributions play in the likelihood -- if there's
not something else done on current employees, can
we get the Council to agree to this, in the
Board's view, or does that matter to you?

MR. KEANE: Well, there's two things -- sure, it matters. The charter says that all pension benefits have to be enacted by the City Council. Because of press reports that inaccurately reflect the situation, some of our citizens believe that the Pension Board created the pension benefit structure we have.

Nothing could be further from the truth, as everybody at this table knows. City Council created every, single pension benefit that we have, and we're thankful for that. We have agreed, in our earlier discussions, to make a significant additional contribution from the enhanced benefit account reserves.

23 THE MODERATOR: Was -24 MR. KEANE: New employees -25 THE MODERATOR: Was that the --

Page 35

Page 37

MR. KEANE: New employees --

THE MODERATOR: Just remind me. When you say that, was that the 20 million?

MR. KEANE: It was at the time the 20 million.

New employees who are getting a significant lower benefit level, we're not going to pay 4 percent for them. It's just unrealistic. You can't do it, you know?

THE MODERATOR: And the reason being because you don't think that's -- because they're not receiving the same enhanced benefit?

MR. KEANE: They're not receiving the enhanced benefit. And they're going to get a chance to vote on the benefit structure. And, you know, the statute is clear. The chapter funds are for enhanced benefits.

And if you've lowered somebody's benefit, no amount of lowering can -- take lower benefits and convince anybody that they're getting more. It just don't work that way. And we wouldn't even try that. So, while we're strongly committed to comprehensive pension reform, it has to be comprehensive pension reform.

THE MODERATOR: Well, tell me -- and by the

way, I say this to both sides. Whenever I -- and 2 I've been doing this right at 40 years now, sadly. 3 Whenever people tell me the statute is clear, if the statute is clear, we'd never have disputes. 5 We have lots of them, and sometimes not only are 6 they not clear, the rulings aren't clear. 7 But -- so tell me, as to current employees, 8 what does the Board -- does the Board have any 9 recommendation? And if not, how does that impact the likelihood of getting Council approval, given 10 11 what the task force has recommended, which I think 12 this reflects? And you -- I know you follow this very closely in terms of your job. What's the 13 14 likelihood of getting an agreement if we don't 15 have some current employee change approved by 16 Council? 17 18 do is, on the sheet music that you're going to 19

MR. KEANE: Well, the first thing you have to present to the Council, you ought to have the true facts. Quit talking about 7 and talk about 11. And make it clear that on behalf of the current employees 11 percent of the rate of pay is going into the pension fund. And quit this devious deception. You know, the actuarial report -- wait a minute. If that was too strong, let me withdraw

MAYOR BROWN: Okay.

MR. KEANE: -- on the current members' behalf to supplement their current contribution as already supplemented. We could transfer some additional 175 and 185 funds to preserve these benefits.

MAYOR BROWN: Anything else that you think the Board would consider?

9 MR. KEANE: I think they would consider that, 10 yes, sir.

MAYOR BROWN: In addition to what you just said, the 175, 185, anything else that they would consider?

MR. KEANE: No. There's not much else to consider. As the lawyer from Tallahassee who came over here, Mr. Linn, told the task force, we have an agreement between the Pension Board and the City, and that's what governs our conduct and relationship. And so we want to make the necessary amendments to have a productive pension plan going forward, but that does not include dismantling what our members gave up along the way.

In 1996, the members took a -- the new members took a 25 percent reduction in their

Page 39

Page 38

1

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

14

15

16

17

18

19

23

24

25

Page 41

2 MR. HAND: It's not only too strong; it's 3 entirely inaccurate, but, you know --

MR. KEANE: This is inaccurate up here. Chief, this is inaccurate.

MR. HAND: Yeah. Yeah.

MAYOR BROWN: So let me -- can I -- can I just --

9 THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

20 21

22

23

24

25

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

that.

MAYOR BROWN: So -- just so we can get back in focus here, John, what is it that you -- that you think from the Board perspective would contribute to the current employees helping to make sure that the Board's fiduciary responsibility would be to make sure that the retirement reform is comprehensive and secure? MR. KEANE: Uh-huh. MAYOR BROWN: Are there any variables that

you can just tell us --

MR. KEANE: Right.

MAYOR BROWN: -- that would be things that the Board would consider, maybe not -- just consider. Can you just talk about that for a few --

MR. KEANE: An additional contribution --

starting salary to help stabilize the pension

2 fund. And the City contribution at the time, when

they needed this stabilization, was 3.9 percent.

But they reduced the salary for future police

officers and firefighters by 25 percent, but they 5

had an ARC where after seven years they would 6

7 begin to catch back up. So there's lots of ways

8 to do it. We could make a supplemental

9 contribution over a period of years that, with the 10 enhanced City contribution and strong market

11 returns, we would then see the benefit of the

12 reduction in City contributions. 13

Now, in the previous charts that were put up there that show how the City contribution increased since you have become mayor, there were two main driving forces for that, of course, that we know that our friends behind us may not know. And one was the directive from the Division of Retirement to lower the actuarial assumed rate of return from 8.5 to 7.75. That increased the City

20 21 contribution by about \$40 million, that one thing 22 alone.

And then the recommendation -- Middleman -to lower the assumed rate of return to -- they recommended 6.9. The Board went with 7. That

```
Page 42
     cost another almost $40 million.
2
          Those two things -- because market
 3
    performance, since you've been in office, has been
 4
     very good, not only for us, but for institutional
5
     investors nationwide. So we're making some strong
 6
    returns and making up for lost ground, but,
7
    nevertheless, we've got a lot of catching up to
8
     do.
9
          THE MODERATOR: What does the -- because I'm
10
     trying to catch this, and I know I want to be
11
     clear. What do you believe as to current
12
     employees -- as the Board, what do you believe
13
     ought to be done, and if done, would result in an
14
     acceptable -- a plan that would be acceptable to
15
     the Council? What are you saying that the Board
16
     thinks ought to be done?
17
          MR. KEANE: Well, it's going to wind up being
18
     a package, so we've got to get all the pieces
19
    here.
20
          THE MODERATOR: Okay.
21
          MR. KEANE: You know, we've got the pie
22
     shell. We need to decide what the filling's going
23
     to be before we can serve it. So we need to know
24
     all the pieces.
```

25 THE MODERATOR: Everybody knows that this is Page 43 all part of -- but I'm talking about now what is 2 the Board's suggestion. The City has said, "This 3 is what the task force said. These are the changes we want to make." They've used the 4 5 ten-year differentiation. 6 Respond to that. What do you think about the 7 idea of a plan that has different -- that 8 recognizes a differentiation at the earlier third 9 of your career, as opposed to the later parts of 10 your career? 11 MR. KEANE: For our current employees, it's 12 imminently unfair because they have been paying on 13 the higher schedule for their ten, nine, eight, 14 seven, six, five, four, three, two, one tenure, 15 wherever they're at. So that's an issue. And to overcome that issue, we would recommend to the 16 17 Board the increased use of chapter funds. 18 THE MODERATOR: All right. 19 MR. KEANE: We don't want to pull the rug out 20 from under our employees. 21 THE MODERATOR: So --22 MR. KEANE: Not going to. 23 THE MODERATOR: So in lieu of that proposal, 24 you're suggesting that there be greater

contribution made to the plan by the Board?

25

```
Page 44
1
         MR. KEANE: Right. If that has an actuarial
2
    reduction of X percent, you apply that same factor
    and then it's a wash.
4
         THE MODERATOR: Questions on this side?
5
    Whoever.
6
         MAYOR BROWN: I just want to say --
7
         THE MODERATOR: Go ahead, Mr. Mayor.
8
         MAYOR BROWN: One point, let me make a point
9
    here --
10
         THE MODERATOR: Yeah.
11
         MAYOR BROWN: -- that -- one of the things
12
    you said earlier about Council rejecting the
    original plan, which you agreed to, even though
13
14
    they rejected it --
15
         MR. KEANE: Uh-huh.
16
         MAYOR BROWN: -- but then the issue of
17
    fairness and justice. So I want to be clear. I
18
    want to be fair to the City employees, police and
19
    fire, and I believe in justice. I believe it's
20
     just and noble and I think it's morally right for
21
    a City to provide a retirement plan for its men
22
    and women who serve and protect us every day. I
23
    think that's very important.
```

MR. KEANE: We absolutely agree with you, Mayor.

25 Page 45 MAYOR BROWN: I'm going to be fair and I 1 believe in justice. And so I just, you know -but we have a -- I mean, we have a plan up here that I think the task force did a great job in 5 putting together, an opportunity for us to solve this problem. And I think -- and, yes, we'll have 6 7 a package, but you have variables within those 8 packages to make a whole package. And I'm trying 9 to get -- to figure out what else other than what 10 you just named that we can talk about. 11 So Mr. --12 MR. HAND: Okay. May I ask a question or --13 THE MODERATOR: Go back to Chris. 14

MR. HAND: Okay. May I ask a question or -THE MODERATOR: Go back to Chris.
MR. HAND: -- two? Sure. Just to sort of be
specific on some of the aspects we brought up, as
to, for example, the DROP proposal, is it the
Board's position that it would not consider any
change in what is right now a guaranteed 8.4
percent rate of return? In other words, setting
aside for a moment the issue of COLA and going to
DROP, the Board's position is that DROP should
continue with the guaranteed 8.4 percent rate of
return and not change that to the actual rate of
return for current employees?
MR. KEANE: I haven't addressed that yet,

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 46 1 Chief. We --2 MR. HAND: Okay. 3 THE MODERATOR: Well, let's --4 MR. KEANE: We talked about --5 THE MODERATOR: Okay. I understand. 6 MR. KEANE: -- two other things. 7 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Well, let's talk about 8 that for a moment, just see where we -- let's talk 9 about the proposed DROP. And I remember these discussions in the MSA. So let's talk about the 10 11 proposed rate. What right now is -- that there is 12 a -- there is a maintained rate. We all agree on 13 that. 14 And this proposal says that we would replace 15 the maintained rate, but we would have a range 16 within -- it would perform -- you wouldn't -- you 17 couldn't drop below the floor, and you couldn't 18 rise above the cap, but that we would take actual 19 performance in that. Tell me what you think about 20 that idea. 21 MR. KEANE: It's certainly worthy of 22 additional review and discussion. The --23 THE MODERATOR: So your answer on that is 24 iust not --25 MR. KEANE: Well, we haven't resolved that

Page 47 1 yet. 2 THE MODERATOR: I understand. 3 MR. KEANE: But on the guaranteed 8.4 percent rate of return, a lot of misinformation circulates 4 5 on that too. 6 THE MODERATOR: Sure. 7 MR. KEANE: The DROP money, for accounting 8 purposes, is held in a separate account. And so 9 when you apply the fund earnings to that segment, now you have some money over here that we use to 10 11 pay 8.4. Like last year, we made significantly 12 more than 8.4. And so it's sitting over there to 13 help pay in when we made less than 8.4, but, you 14 know, it's not ever been presented that way to the 15 people, but folks here at the table know that. THE MODERATOR: Right. We talked about that. 16 17 And one piece of good news is that this year 18 numbers are better than last year's numbers --19 MR. KEANE: On track to be much better, 20 thankfully. 21 THE MODERATOR: Yeah. Right. 22 Chris, other questions you had about this? 23 So we -- so the DROP conversation is an open 24 conversation? 25 MR. HAND: Right.

Page 48 1 MR. KEANE: Correct. 2 THE MODERATOR: You've --3 MR. HAND: We've gotten some perspective on 4 the employee contribution. What about on the 5 issue of COLA, which is sort of the -- you know, 6 of the four tranches of benefits, here is another one that we've moved some significant proposals 7 8 on. 9 And I will tell you, just to answer Senator Smith's earlier question as to current employees, 10 11 I think City Council's made it pretty clear, 12 especially those who did not vote in favor of last 13 year's agreement, that that's very important to 14 them, that there be -- to use their term, there be 15 some additional shared sacrifice by current 16 employees in the overall retirement benefit. 17 So, again, that's no mystery. That's been 18 reported in the newspaper and in other outlets. 19 They've been very clear. And, of course, the task 20 force was equally clear on that as a part of the 21 overall retirement package. 22 THE MODERATOR: Back to you on COLA. 23 MR. KEANE: On COLA, a reduction -- I believe 24 the task force had a different cutoff date for 25 affecting the new people -- the current people on

3 MR. KEANE: You-all have a 14-year --16-year, something like that, for people on the 5 COLA --6 MR. HAND: This is exactly what the -- was in 7 the task force report, so --8 MR. KEANE: Okay. 9 THE MODERATOR: All right. Tell me what your reaction is to the -- to the COLA proposed change. 10 11 MR. KEANE: It could well be acceptable as 12 part of an overall --13 THE MODERATOR: I understand. 14 MR. KEANE: -- package. 15 THE MODERATOR: So the COLA -- now, so that I 16 make sure that I'm clear on this so we later don't 17 have any argument, for purposes of the COLA, would 18 you -- is the ten-year differentiation 19 appropriate? 20 MR. KEANE: Oh, yes. 21 THE MODERATOR: Okay. MR. KEANE: That people have already paid, 22 23 our current people, is a big hangup, but there can

be ways to work some of these proposed changes

into a new pension benefit structure.

MR. HAND: This is exactly --

24

25

1

2

that change.

Page 50 THE MODERATOR: So as to the COLA and as to 2 the DROP proposals that are there --3 MR. KEANE: Uh-huh. 4 THE MODERATOR: -- those are within the realm 5 of --6 MR. KEANE: Subject to meaningful change. 7 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Without going to the 8 exact number, if there is an increase in employee 9 contribution, you agree that the sense of it was that fairness dictated that that employee 10 11 contribution increase, at least in part, be linked to the reinstatement of the -- what I'll call the 12 13 rollback in salary that happened, I think, 2 -- it 14 was a 2 percent rollback. It was two years before 15 the MSA, I think, so --16 MR. HAND: 2010 for fire --17 THE MODERATOR: Right. 18 MR. HAND: -- and 2012 for police. 19 THE MODERATOR: Right. I mean, that was kind of the conversation, is that that would 20 21 happen in the context of --22 MR. KEANE: First. 23 THE MODERATOR: -- a rollback wouldn't go 24 into effect until a reinstatement of the lost 25 benefits went --

5 THE MODERATOR: All right. 6 MR. HAND: There was a -- there would be the 7 restoration and then --THE MODERATOR: Then the additional kick-in 8 9 of the contribution --MR. HAND: -- after that --10 11 MR. KEANE: Going forward with future 12 increases. 13 THE MODERATOR: All right. 14 MR. KEANE: We're prepared to make additional 15 contribution to help get over this temporary rough 16 spot in the road. 17 THE MODERATOR: And that's what I was getting at. As I understand what the Board's suggesting, 18 19 is that you would put in an additional pool of 20 money -- if I use the word incorrectly -- you 21 would -- you would offset the immediacy of that 22 contribution by putting in chapter funds until 23 such time as that employee contribution kicks in, meaning that if it happened next year, you guys 24 25 would bridge the gap in the year between or --

MR. KEANE: Right.

THE MODERATOR: -- into effect.

MR. HAND: Correct. Yeah.

City remembers it that way also?

1

3

4

Page 52 whatever the number turns out to be. You guys know what your -- when the -- when the reinstatement's going to take place. My sense of it is that that may be in next round of negotiations, from what I'm reading and hearing. 6 MR. KEANE: We would have a definite time 7 period. It's not going to be forever and ever. 8 THE MODERATOR: But you'd have -- you would 9 be willing to put in some funds for an interim contribution --10 11 MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. 12 THE MODERATOR: -- until such time as the 13 employee -- and to offset the immediate impact on 14 the employees? 15 MR. KEANE: That's correct. 16 THE MODERATOR: All right. Now, let's go to 17 the fourth thing up there, which is the final 18 average compensation. 19 MR. HAND: And can I just --20 THE MODERATOR: I'm sorry. Go ahead. 21 MR. HAND: I just -- it'd just be helpful to 22 clarify that, John. So the Board would be willing to put in, I guess, part of what is currently 23 24 going to enhanced benefits, roughly the half of 25 the chapter funds that are currently going into

Page 53 that, to help sort of bridge the gap until such time as employee pay was restored to match whatever increased contribution was required; is that -- am I interpreting that correctly? 5 MR. KEANE: You're interpreting that correctly, with the limitation that --6 MR. HAND: Sure. 7 8 MR. KEANE: -- we're not going to sit here 9 and say, "We're going to wait six years before" --10 MR. HAND: Of course. 11 MR. KEANE: -- "we give them a raise." 12 MR. HAND: Of course. Yeah. But that --13 but, in fact, that would -- those would be 14 inextricably linked, so to the extent employees 15 were to receive at some point a restoration of 16 that previous pay cut, that additional Board contribution would end at that time; is that --17 18 MR. KEANE: Right. 19 MR. HAND: Is that right? 20 MR. KEANE: I believe it's when, not if, 21 though; right? 22 MR. HAND: Well, I don't want to prejudge

MR. HAND: I'm not here to cut his legs --

Mr. Chatmon and the work he does.

MR. KEANE: Right.

23

24

25

Page 51

```
Page 54
                                                                                                            Page 56
1
          MR. CHATMON: One --
                                                           1
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: All right. Now, let's go
 2
                                                           2
          MR. HAND: -- out from under him --
                                                              to --
 3
          MR. CHATMON: One side of the table.
                                                           3
                                                                   MR. HAND: Of course, the --
 4
          MR. HAND: -- but I just want to be clear on,
                                                           4
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: -- where I was --
5
     in your mind, mechanically --
                                                           5
                                                                    MR. HAND: And, of course, the City's
 6
          MR. KEANE: Yes.
                                                           6
                                                               financial position is going to depend a lot on how
 7
          MR. HAND: -- how that would work.
                                                           7
                                                               much progress we're able to make in these
          MR. KEANE: That's how --
8
                                                           8
                                                               discussions --
9
          THE MODERATOR: But to make that fair, even
                                                           9
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: Sure.
    back when we were having the MSA, the discussion
                                                          10
10
                                                                    MR. HAND: -- so --
11
     was there would be a point in time in the
                                                          11
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: Sure. And by that, to make
12
     foreseeable future when the economy and the other
                                                          12
                                                               it kind of clear, the better you do on some of
    kinds of things, the savings that have taken
13
                                                          13
                                                               these things equates to the better position,
14
    place, that the -- it was never contemplated that
                                                          14
                                                               financial position, in terms of contribution that
15
     the employee rollback would be forever, that
                                                          15
                                                               you have to make. Therefore, employees have an
16
    everybody realized that was an -- not an
                                                          16
                                                               interest in seeing the contributions by the City
                                                               not be such that they are in lieu of other kinds
17
                                                          17
     emergency, but it was something that was
18
     necessary. Both the employees and the City knew
                                                          18
                                                               of money that would be available; am I right?
19
     that there were things that had to be done a
                                                          19
                                                               Everybody got that?
     couple of years ago that were critically
                                                          20
                                                                    MR. HAND: Any dollar saved through pension
20
                                                          21
21
     important, given where the budget was.
                                                              reform --
22
          MR. CHATMON: Senator, I will just interject
                                                          22
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: Got it.
23
                                                          23
                                                                   MR. HAND: -- is a dollar --
    one point. Since neither the police and fire --
24
     since only the police and fire is here and neither
                                                          24
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: All right.
25
     are the FOP or Local 122, it's kind of hard to
                                                          25
                                                                    MR. HAND: -- that can be invested somewhere
                                                  Page 55
                                                                                                            Page 57
    make that --
                                                               else, but --
1
                                                           1
2
                                                           2
          THE MODERATOR: I agree with you. I
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: Now, my question was, final
 3
     understand that. I'm just saying that the
                                                               FAC, final average compensation. Right now
     conversation was -- I think what John's saying is
                                                               it's -- last 24 months, the proposal is five -- or
 4
5
                                                               60 months -- I'm sorry -- with the caveat that
     "We're not going to do this" --
                                                           5
6
          MR. CHATMON: Forever.
                                                               there is a seal -- excuse me -- the law would
          THE MODERATOR: -- "forever, and we're not
 7
                                                           7
                                                               require that you couldn't go below what somebody
                                                              had already earned, but what did we do about this
8
    going to do this for a time that is unreasonably
                                                           8
9
                                                           9
     lengthy."
                                                               in the MSA, folks?
10
                                                          10
          Once again, everybody here realizes you have
                                                                    MR. KEANE: Agreed to it.
11
     to collectively bargain with them and they have to
                                                          11
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: To the 60 months?
12
     collectively bargain with you for those issues,
                                                          12
                                                                    MR. KEANE: (Nods head).
13
    but what I think he's saying is the clock won't
                                                          13
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: That's what I remember.
14
     run forever. I think -- but I -- but as I say,
                                                          14
                                                                    MR. HAND: For new employees, right.
15
    when we were having the MSA, the conversation was
                                                          15
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: For new employees.
                                                          16
16
     that way. It wasn't anticipated it would run --
                                                                    MR. HAND: Uh-huh.
                                                          17
17
          MS. LAQUIDARA: Well, it was --
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: Now, what did we do as to
18
          THE MODERATOR: -- forever.
                                                          18
                                                               current employees? We didn't do it?
19
                                                          19
                                                                    MR. KEANE: (Shakes head).
          Yes?
20
          MS. LAQUIDARA: It was two years in the MSA.
                                                          20
                                                                    MR. HAND: Right.
21
          THE MODERATOR: Yeah. I'm -- we had a --
                                                          21
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: All right. Talk about
                                                               current employees at any level. This says ten
22
         MS. LAQUIDARA: So we did negotiate a
                                                          22
23
    number --
                                                          23
                                                               years of service. The recomputation, is there a
24
                                                          24
                                                               point at which it is reasonable to say that's
          THE MODERATOR: Right.
```

25

early enough in a career that they can more than

25

MS. LAQUIDARA: -- certain.

Page 58 make it up because they've got 25 years left or 20 2 years left in this case, or maybe not at all? 3 What are your thoughts? 4 MR. KEANE: Well, you know, we had 94 hours 5 of meetings down there last year and --6 THE MODERATOR: Yes, sir. 7 MR. KEANE: -- we agreed to leave current 8 employees out of the mix. I've asked the actuary 9 to give us a cost factor of the reduction in cost 10 on these changes, and we hope to have that ready 11 this afternoon. That's what -- things I'm going to be doing this afternoon --12 THE MODERATOR: Okav. 13 14 MR. KEANE: -- is having conference with our 15 actuary. And then we'll have a cost factor on all 16 of the other proposals, not only from this page, but from Page -- I believe it was -- where is the 17 18 other page? 19 THE MODERATOR: We're looking now at their 20 proposal or --21 MR. KEANE: Yeah. 22 THE MODERATOR: -- the actual task --23 MR. KEANE: Yeah. 24 THE MODERATOR: -- force --25 MR. KEANE: Yeah. Page 59 1 THE MODERATOR: -- report?

2 MR. KEANE: Yeah. 3 MAYOR BROWN: Proposal. MR. KEANE: Yeah. City proposal too. 4 5 THE MODERATOR: What page? MR. KEANE: We've got to get a -- it's here. 6 7 City Proposal 2 is --8 THE MODERATOR: Okay. 9 MR. KEANE: Yeah. So we're going to have the actuary report, hopefully, this afternoon so that 10 11 we can have a better indication of what -- if you 12 make a concession and the City costs go down 10 13 percent, you know, that's significant. 14 THE MODERATOR: Right. 15 MR. KEANE: That's shared sacrifice, as the 16 term is applied. 17 THE MODERATOR: Right. 18 MR. CHATMON: Senator? 19 MR. KEANE: That's what we're trying to do. 20 THE MODERATOR: Go ahead. 21 MR. CHATMON: The shared sacrifice, I think, is an important discussion, which is why we're 22 23 really all at the table, but with that having been said, there was one concern I had, just making 24 25 sure we all understand what the elements are.

Page 60 1 And, Mr. Keane, to be clear, let me make sure 2 that I understand and I'm stating this correctly. Employees contribute currently 7 percent to the 4 pension fund as far as from their salaries? 5 MR. KEANE: From their salary. 6 MR. CHATMON: Okay. The supplement, however, 7 that you mentioned before, that's where the 4 8 percent comes from, and that's from the fund 9 itself? 10 MR. KEANE: That's from the chapter funds, 11 yes. 12 MR. CHATMON: Okay. So, in essence, when 13 we're talking about shared sacrifice, are we not 14 speaking -- when you are addressing 15 supplementation, you're really speaking --16 coming -- bringing funds from the fund itself, the 17 chapter funds and investments? 18 MR. KEANE: No. We're talking about from the 19 chapter funds. 20 MR. CHATMON: Okay. Just the chapter funds. 21 THE MODERATOR: Right. And I think what -- a 22 percentage of that being that that -- in essence, that enhanced -- that they were willing to treat 23 24 that as an enhanced benefit and, therefore, use those monies because, actually, the employee's not

25 Page 61 having to make up what they would to make this 2 work, what the employee would have otherwise had 3 to make up out of individual contribution. Am I -- have I missed -- is --5 MR. HAND: I took it as the fund saying they want to try and hold employees harmless in terms 6 7 of the impact on their paycheck --8 MR. KEANE: Exactly. 9 MR. HAND: -- is that accurate? THE MODERATOR: Correct. All right. Now, so 10 11 as to the COLA, you guys are open to this, the 12 Board? 13 MR. KEANE: Open. 14 THE MODERATOR: And as to the DROP, you're open to the proposal of having a range based on 15 16 performance, within limits, down and upward? 17 MR. KEANE: It's open for discussion, both of 18 them. 19 THE MODERATOR: And the contribution rate, 20 you're open to increasing employee contribution 21 linked to reinstatement of benefits -- wages? 22 MR. KEANE: No. No. No. 23 MR. HAND: Linked to holding the employees

24

25

harmless, I think --

MR. KEANE: Yeah.

Page 62 1 MR. HAND: -- would maybe --2 MR. KEANE: Yeah. 3 MR. HAND: -- be the way --4 MR. KEANE: Yeah. 5 MR. HAND: -- to put it. 6 THE MODERATOR: All right. I got it. 6 7 7 MR. HAND: Uh-huh. 8 8 THE MODERATOR: But the mechanics would be 9 9 the one --10 10 MR. HAND: Right. 11 THE MODERATOR: -- that I was --11 12 MR. KEANE: Right. 12 13 THE MODERATOR: Okay. I got it. 13 14 MR. HAND: I just don't want to confuse this 14 15 with --15 16 THE MODERATOR: And the final compensation, 16 17 17 you're going to look at actuarial impact? 18 MR. KEANE: Exactly. 18 19 THE MODERATOR: But, again, would you --19 would you do that on the ten-year basis, as 20 20 opposed to -- so it would be --21 21 22 MR. KEANE: Right. 22 23 THE MODERATOR: So there would be -- for 23 24 those who are within the first ten years, it is 24 25 25 possible that the Board would be willing to do --Page 63 make some of these changes? 2 MR. KEANE: Correct.

THE MODERATOR: As part of an overall

MR. KEANE: Correct.

MR. KEANE: Beyond.

THE MODERATOR: Right.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. With --

MR. KEANE: Or in concert with.

the term I was using, whatever the right term

is -- increase employee contribution by people

currently working in the first third of their

MR. HAND: Well, what I would say is the task

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

package?

settlement?

that, yes.

career?

2 3 4 5 THE MODERATOR: All right. And those would all be things that we have done that you would do 7 here that were beyond what we did in the mediated 8 9 10 11 12 13 MR. KEANE: And some of each and a pinch of 14 15 THE MODERATOR: Okay. With that, back to 16 you, Chris. Those changes, if those changes were 17 to be made, would those -- could those meet what 18 the City's goal has been, to show increased -- and 19 I use the term "shared sacrifice" because that's 20 21

Page 64 force sort of framed up what it viewed to be the significant issues for current employee involvement, shared sacrifice. We have moved those. To the extent that those are the issues we're now discussing, I think we're heading in the right direction. Obviously, everything's a question of specifics, but the task force framed up what the key issues are for current employee involvement. We're still talking about those issues, so we're, I think, headed in the right direction. THE MODERATOR: John, will you, tomorrow morning, have a comprehensive proposal after you talk to your actuaries, back to the current employee pension design? MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. THE MODERATOR: And you anticipate it being along the lines we've just discussed? MR. KEANE: Anticipate, yes, sir. It's a good word. THE MODERATOR: I understand. Nobody is locked into anything. Okay. And you anticipate that part of the way we would offset the immediacy of the contribution will be that the Board will maintain

or increase or enhance, whatever term you guys want to use and arrive at yourselves, for some set period of time? MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. THE MODERATOR: Realizing that that set period of time does not necessarily link itself to a -- but everybody's going to know what that set period of time is as they go into their -- okay. MR. KEANE: Those that know will know. THE MODERATOR: Okay. I got it. All right. Back to the City, though, for a moment. We're on No. 3. We know we've still got some -and we know on No. 4 for the governance. Now we've got this. What I'd like to do is -- because it seems to

me, guys, that there's a generalized acceptance of the idea of some availability of some additional things being done for current employees beyond what was in the MSA. Those things which have been stated would be additional.

Now, with that, I'd like to see us have a quick discussion this morning, realizing today is a short day, of where we are on the unfunded liability issue. This is the design issue. Let's go to the unfunded liability issue, and I'd like

22

23

24

Page 66 to hear -- I'm sorry? 2 MR. HAND: I suggest we break for about five 3 minutes and then do the --4 THE MODERATOR: We'll take a five-minute 5 break. 6 John, any problem with that? 7 MR. KEANE: Oh, no. 8 THE MODERATOR: Five-minute break. 9 (Recess from 10:10 a.m. to 10:20 a.m.) THE MODERATOR: Madam Court Reporter, show 10 11 we're back on. Thank you. 12 Chris, we're prepared to go. I know the mayor had some other stuff, apparently, to go to. 13 14 MR. HAND: Sure. 15 THE MODERATOR: So I'm ready to go forward. 16 What I wanted to do now -- because I think we 17 have -- everybody kind of knows we've got several 18 things now that are getting much closer to a 19 potential resolution. One of the things obviously talked about, both -- last time when we all 20 21 talked -- clearly addressed in the -- both in the 22 summary and in the actual body of the

Page 67 the issue of kind of what I call kind of Silo 2 No. 4, which is the unfunded liability issue. 3 And I'd like -- I think what I would like you to do is reiterate -- because it's been a week --4 5 MR. HAND: Sure. 6 THE MODERATOR: -- since we touched on it, 7 I'd like the City to open that conversation, 8 Chris. 9 And then I'd like -- John, I want your -kind of where the Board is on this. And I know 10 11 that the Board itself has some ideas addressing 12 issues of decreasing the liability exposure. And

so I want to hear where we are on that

deliberations and recommendations -- excuse me --

about in the deliberations of the City Council, is

recommendations of the task force, also talked

23

24

25

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

conversation, please. MR. HAND: Sure. Just to reiterate what the City sort of proposed in unfunded liability last week -- there we go. We obviously talked about the growth in the unfunded liability over time. It's increased by more than \$1.2 billion since approximately October 2003.

The task force made several recommendations as it relates to unfunded liability. One, obviously, the City continue to pay its ARC, its actuarially required contribution, each year, also recommended that the City make a supplemental

payment each year of the difference between the ARC and 200 million, which is about -- between 40 and 60 million annually, until the fund reaches an 4 80 percent funded status, and that the dedication 5 of half -- the half of the chapter funds that 6 currently go to enhanced benefits go to unfunded

7 liability until the fund reaches an 80 percent 8 funded status.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

So we moved this proposal on unfunded liability, basically saying the City will make an additional payment -- unfunded liability payments, subject to appropriation, until the plan is at least 80 percent funded, if the parties agree on Proposals 1, 2, and 3, in other words, if we've got agreement on new employees, current employees, and governance, and if the PFPF agrees to dedicate its half of State chapter funds. And that's the amount which is approximately \$4.5 million right now that currently goes to enhanced benefits, if they would agree to dedicate that half of State chapter funds to an additional unfunded liability payment, again, until the plan is 80 percent funded.

So if the City is roughly putting in \$40 million extra a year, the fund would agree to put

in its additional four and a half million dollars 1 2 each year, with those two combined streams of 3 funding continuing until the plan reaches an 80 percent funded status, which under the current 5 projections is projected to be in about Fiscal 6 Year 2028, 14 years from now, given an assumed 7 return of rate of 7.0 percent. 8

THE MODERATOR: Let me interrupt you because I know it came up the other day and we passed over it because it really wasn't as critical then as it is right now in my mind. It's all in the language, I know, but you have a provision here that says: Payment subject to appropriation.

I know you discussed, well, you can't -- and I'm paraphrasing -- and, Cindy, correct me if I'm paraphrasing incorrectly -- but you can't lock future commission appropriations into -- lock them into appropriation decisions or some such idea.

On the other hand, you have: Subject to appropriation. What happens -- I just want to hear what everybody's --

22 MS. LAQUIDARA: Sure.

> THE MODERATOR: -- idea would be. What happens if the appropriation isn't made for one or more years? What happens to the fund, and what

Page 70 happens to obligations of both employees and the 2 Board? 3 MS. LAQUIDARA: Okay. 4 THE MODERATOR: So --5 MS. LAQUIDARA: Could I --6 MR. HAND: Yeah. 7 MS. LAQUIDARA: Because on --8 MR. HAND: Sure, on the --9 MS. LAQUIDARA: -- the particular --MR. HAND: On the legal issues. 10 11 MS. LAQUIDARA: -- issues of legal, I'm --12 THE MODERATOR: And, actually, somebody sent 13 me an opinion on this --14 MS. LAQUIDARA: Okay. 15 THE MODERATOR: -- to look at. 16 MS. LAQUIDARA: Okay. And first let me 17 reiterate that, of course, the City and the fund 18 would be following the law by just meeting the 19 ARC; okay? So I don't want any issue that neither 20 the City nor the fund, post ARC, would be 21 violating the law. Second is it's not just that, but the issue 22 23 of binding future councils. It's a fact that we 24 have outstanding bond obligations. We have no 25 dedicated source of revenue. If we did, we

Page 71 wouldn't be here; right? I mean, we were broke; 2 that's why we're here. 3 And so you can't jump the other bond issues, 4 which are covenants to pledge legally available 5 revenues with a firm commitment that can't be 6 broken because you can see where, if you're a bond 7 holder and you're looking to pay and you have a 8 rating based on that -- so it's that combination 9 of binding and the fact that you have existing debt that makes you have to look each year and see 10 11 what you have. 12 And then Chris has the substance of, "Okay. 13 Let's say it is a tough year" --14 THE MODERATOR: Okay. 15 MR. HAND: Sure, but let me --THE MODERATOR: Then let's -- I think that's 16 17 a reasonable question --18 MR. HAND: Sure. 19 THE MODERATOR: -- that's been raised to me 20 by --21 MR. HAND: Sure. 22 THE MODERATOR: -- any number of people. 23 What happens if "subject to appropriations" --24 MR. HAND: Let me --25 THE MODERATOR: -- doesn't happen --

MR. HAND: -- address that. And what I think is -- John raised an entirely reasonable point last -- or when we first --MS. LAQUIDARA: Uh-huh. MR. HAND: -- did this, is, well, what happens if the City doesn't put in the extra money in a particular year because we're in an economic downturn or trough and otherwise there's pressure on the finances? Let me just be clear. Where we say here the parties agree on Proposals 1, 2, and 3, those sort of amount to prerequisites for the City to agree to put in any extra money each year in terms of --THE MODERATOR: "Extra" meaning above the ARC? MR. HAND: Above the ARC, in terms of paying down unfunded liability. Where I think there is some accountability for both sides is -- let's just assume for the sake of argument we're able to reach agreement on the City putting in extra money each year and the fund putting in those enhanced benefits each year. I think, as with any contract, for any given year that the City is not able to put in its extra money toward the ARC, the

fund would therefore be relieved of its obligation

Page 73 to put in those extra monies toward the -- paying 2 down the unfunded liability, as well. 3 So to the extent that John raised the issue of, you know, well, what happens to us if you 5 can't appropriate those extra monies in one particular year, again, there's a dual obligation 6 7 here. And the obligation on both parties to put 8 in the extra funding would disappear if the City 9 were not able to appropriate the extra money toward unfunded liability in a given year. So the 10 11 answer to that question is -- how do we kind of 12 have accountability on both sides? I think it's 13 in that extra unfunded liability payment, if that 14 answers your question. 15 THE MODERATOR: Okay. John, give me your --16 this is a -- the proposal that was presented last 17 week -- and I know you've had a little -- a little 18 time, but we haven't really focused much on it. 19 I'd like your kind of -- I'd like to hear from the 20 Board as to their -- lack of an artful term -- gut 21 reaction. And then also do you have ideas 22 separate and above this for addressing issues of 23 unfunded liability? I know you had -- you had talked during the MSA about some ideas that you --24 25 that the Board wanted to look at.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

24

7

10

tones.

MR. KEANE: The answer is yes to all three of those questions, Senator.

3

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

THE MODERATOR: Okay. MR. KEANE: One, as the learned general counsel just pointed out, she's talking about bond covenants and things that we've got to pay. During the task force discussions, one of our senior distinguished citizens, Mr. Cannon, he said over and over again we have to have a mechanism to hold the City's feet to the fire to make sure they make these appropriations and -- he said at least half a dozen times, if not more. And we have the chairman back here, who is nodding affirmatively.

While we don't believe the City would engage in untoward conduct, we look around us, and in -pension reform in New Jersey last year required the employees to make an additional contribution, and the State was going to make an additional contribution in this year's budget. They took the money from the employees, and the legislature decided not to appropriate the money.

Now, the suggestion that the chief just advanced, if the City doesn't do it, then we quit paying that, that's -- you know, that's possibly one thing. We're not looking for an escape hatch.

We're looking for the hammer on the -- on the nail 2 to get this money in to get this problem resolved. 3 We currently have a contract with the City. It runs until 2030. So we can amend that and have 4 5 this language in there that would then -- you 6 know, when the dump truck of money backs up and 7 dumps it out, it could start being apportioned, 8 you know, first to the bondholders. You know, 9 something's got to go into payroll and -- "Look here, we" -- "this is the wad we have to give to 10 11 police and fire. Let's get that in a sack and get 12

it out of here and get it over to them." But there's -- in the budget, our City fathers and mothers have great leeway to decide what they want to fund and what they don't want to fund. And if you don't have a requirement that they fund this, it will -- it will wind up -- if you believe that history repeats itself, it will wind up like a lot of projects --THE MODERATOR: Well --MR. KEANE: -- not only here in Jacksonville,

20

21 22 but in other places.

23 THE MODERATOR: Let me -- I want to -- I want 24 to advance a question for you, but I want you to 25 react, first of all -- tell me about the -- .3,

Page 76 which would -- in the event that one, two, and

three were agreed upon, and in the event the

additional funding -- "subject to appropriation"

4 language, there was a -- it's kind of a

5 correlative of "you don't pay, we don't pay"

6 situation. Assume all that for a moment. Is the

Board prepared to dedicate half of the chapter

8 funds to the unfunded liability payment until the

9 plan is 80 percent funded?

MR. KEANE: Not right now.

I'd like to ask Chief Hand -- in the City proposals, did Middleman give you-all the actuarial savings on all the proposals that you-all advanced?

MR. HAND: Yes.

MR. KEANE: Would you send them over to me? I can send them up to -- and that will --

MR. HAND: Uh-huh.

MR. KEANE: -- speed him on in his thing.

20 MR. HAND: Sure. After consultation with

21 counsel, sure, we'd be happy to talk about that.

22 THE MODERATOR: Okay. If we could do that, 23 guys -- you know we've got kind of a tight

schedule here, so let's try to get -- but when you

25 say, "Not right now," I also don't see you

categorically saying "We're unwilling to do that."

2 If that -- if our guys say it can be done, it's

something that the Board would consider?

4 MR. KEANE: In searching for comprehensive

5 pension reform, we never say never about anything.

6 You know, we're willing to --

THE MODERATOR: That's music to my ears.

8 MR. KEANE: -- have all -- oh, it's great 9

THE MODERATOR: All right.

11 MR. KEANE: We're able to have lots of 12 discussions.

13 THE MODERATOR: On Proposals 1, 2, and 3, 14 what are your reactions? And those are 1, 2, and 15 3 on Page --

16 MR. HAND: Well, these are -- these are 17 the -- these are the subjects, obviously, we've 18 already talked about.

19 THE MODERATOR: Yeah. 1, 2, and 3, I'm going 20 to --

21 MR. HAND: Okay.

22 THE MODERATOR: That would be --

23 MR. HAND: New employees.

THE MODERATOR: -- new employees --

MR. HAND: Current employees.

24

```
Page 78
                                                                                                            Page 80
1
          THE MODERATOR: -- current employees --
                                                           1
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: Okay.
 2
                                                           2
          MR. HAND: Governance.
                                                                    MR. HAND: And, John, is this the issue of
 3
          THE MODERATOR: New employees we've reached
                                                               investment authority?
 4
     agreement. Governance and current employees.
                                                           4
                                                                    MR. KEANE: Yes.
5
          MR. HAND: Current employees.
                                                           5
                                                                    MR. HAND: Yeah. Okay.
 6
          THE MODERATOR: Got it. All right.
                                                           6
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: Right. Can we talk about
 7
          MR. HAND: So that is a -- reaching
                                                           7
                                                               that and get that --
 8
                                                           8
                                                                    MR. KEANE: Sure.
     agreement, mutually satisfactory agreement, is a
9
     prerequisite before the City would agree to put
                                                           9
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: -- on the table and --
                                                          10
                                                                    MR. KEANE: We're looking to have --
10
     in --
11
          THE MODERATOR: I got it.
                                                          11
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: -- explain what your position
12
          MR. HAND: -- additional dollars --
                                                          12
                                                               is on investment authority?
          THE MODERATOR: I got it.
13
                                                          13
                                                                    MR. KEANE: Certainly. We want the same type
14
          MR. HAND: -- into the unfunded liability.
                                                          14
                                                               of investment authority that the Florida
15
          THE MODERATOR: But if we could reach
                                                          15
                                                               Retirement System, the number four -- fourth
16
    agreements on those, could this be done?
                                                          16
                                                               largest retirement system, public retirement
17
          MR. KEANE: Well, we, in substance, reached
                                                          17
                                                               system, in the world, has. And if we had this
18
     agreement --
                                                          18
                                                               increased investment authority, we would have had
19
          THE MODERATOR: On one.
                                                          19
                                                               increased returns at a lower risk model, and part
20
          MR. KEANE: -- on one.
                                                          20
                                                               of this problem would have been solved.
21
                                                          21
                                                                    We've asked the City Council for a number of
          THE MODERATOR: Yep.
22
          MR. KEANE: And --
                                                          22
                                                               years, not only for the Police and Fire Pension
23
          THE MODERATOR: Long way on two.
                                                          23
                                                               Fund, but the general employees has sought to have
24
                                                          24
                                                               increased investment authority. And they have a
          MR. KEANE: Long way on two. And we're in
25
     intense, good-faith discussions on No. 3.
                                                          25
                                                               uniform answer.
                                                                                "No."
                                                  Page 79
                                                                                                            Page 81
          THE MODERATOR: And you think you'll have a
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: Let me -- let me understand a
1
                                                           1
2
    reaction to that tomorrow?
                                                               couple of things. First of all, on the additional
 3
          MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.
                                                               investment authority that you seek, is that
          THE MODERATOR: And then you guys will be
                                                               something that the City Council itself has, or
 4
5
     prepared to respond to him tomorrow from their
                                                           5
                                                               does that have to go farther than that --
6
    proposal as it relates to that which I guess we're
                                                                    MR. KEANE: (Shakes head).
                                                           6
7
     calling No. 3?
                                                           7
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: -- because that -- are you
8
          MR. HAND: Sure.
                                                           8
                                                               satisfied that the Council has the ability to give
9
                                                           9
          THE MODERATOR: Okay. John, you had also
                                                               additional investment authority?
     talked before. And so this is a two-way street.
                                                          10
10
                                                                    MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.
11
     Are there other issues you're going to want
                                                          11
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: All right. What specific
12
     considered, proposals that you're going to advance
                                                          12
                                                               authority are you going to be seeking?
13
     to address the issue of unfunded liability?
                                                          13
                                                                    MR. KEANE: The use of increased alternative
14
          MR. KEANE: Exactly.
                                                          14
                                                               investment vehicles.
15
          THE MODERATOR: All right. Tell us -- I know
                                                          15
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: Okay.
16
    you --
                                                          16
                                                                    MR. KEANE: Exactly what the Florida
17
                                                          17
                                                               Retirement System does. We would wind up hiring
          MR. KEANE: Investments.
18
          THE MODERATOR: All right. Tell me -- I know
                                                          18
                                                               probably some of the same managers they use for
19
                                                          19
                                                               the State Board of Administration, or other
     you don't have that in front of you right now.
20
     Will you have that with you tomorrow?
                                                          20
                                                               well-qualified managers after review by the new
          MR. KEANE: Oh, yes, sir.
21
                                                          21
                                                               financial advisory council.
                                                          22
                                                                    THE MODERATOR: What do you perceive is the
22
          THE MODERATOR: Okay. Are you prepared to do
23
    that, to give a copy of that to them today before
                                                          23
                                                               advantage of that?
24
                                                          24
                                                                    MR. KEANE: The advantage of it? It broadens
    we end?
```

25

the investment base and reduces the risk and

25

MR. KEANE: I don't have it with me.

```
Page 82
 1
     increases returns.
 2
          THE MODERATOR: All right.
 3
          MR. KEANE: Every major consultant recognizes
     this and has recommended it elsewhere where it has
 4
5
    been adopted, including the learned members of the
 6
    Florida Legislature adopted it for FRS. It's not
7
     something new. We're not --
8
          THE MODERATOR: Generally --
9
          MR. KEANE: -- into alchemy or anything --
          THE MODERATOR: Yeah. I understand. No.
10
11
     Generally speaking, the -- one of the concerns
12
     that I remember from earlier conversations,
     generally speaking, is -- is concerns about -- you
13
14
     say reducing risk. I think anytime you -- the
15
     perception has been anytime you give additional
16
     investment authority, the question is does it
17
     reduce risk or does it, in fact, increase risk.
18
          And I shouldn't speak for the City on this,
19
    because I -- but I do remember the conversation
     briefly. Could I hear kind of you-all's response
20
21
     to the conversations regarding increased
22
     investment authority to the Board as part of
23
    unfunded liability?
24
          MR. HAND: Well, just to be clear --
25
          THE MODERATOR: Response?
```

```
Page 83
         MR. HAND: -- on the history of this, so the
1
2
    task force decided ultimately not to make a
3
    recommendation on that point --
4
         THE MODERATOR: One way or the other.
5
         MR. HAND: -- wanting to leave that sort of
6
    recommendation ultimately up to the new Financial
7
    and Investment Advisory Committee once it was
8
    constituted.
9
         Just so I'm clear -- because I think we have
    a fairly good sense of what your -- are these the
10
11
    changes that are memorialized in what I believe is
12
    Councilman Schellenberg's bill before the City
13
    Council right now, John? There is legislation
14
    pending that would impact the investment
15
    authority. Are these those changes --
16
         MR. KEANE: I think they will be --
17
         MR. HAND: -- as far as you know?
18
         MR. KEANE: -- yeah. I know his --
19
         MR. HAND: Yeah.
20
         MR. KEANE: -- thing has been cut up several
21
    times.
22
         MR. HAND: Got you. As far as you know.
23
         MR. KEANE: As far as I know.
24
         MR. HAND: Yeah. And I think at one point
25
    you made a presentation to the task force which
```

```
Page 84
    laid out some recommendations on authority
    changes. It would be those -- not trying to pin
    you down. I'm just trying to make sure I'm clear.
4
    It would be essentially those changes.
5
         MR. KEANE: That's correct.
6
         MR. HAND: Yeah. Okay.
7
         MR. KEANE: And the task force was moving
8
    along towards supporting that. And then with the
9
    adoption of the financial --
10
         THE MODERATOR: Investment committee?
11
         MR. KEANE: They decided --
12
         THE MODERATOR: Advisory committee?
         MR. KEANE: They decided to wait for them.
13
14
         THE MODERATOR: All right.
15
         MR. BELTON: Senator?
16
         THE MODERATOR: Yeah. Yes. Absolutely.
17
         MR. BELTON: One of the things, John, I want
18
    you to be cautious of, having investment authority
19
    versus having investment knowhow is a very
    significant difference. Having the ability to
20
21
    invest in all kinds of things don't mean you
22
    invest in all of them. You've got to deal with it
23
    based on what the market is showing, based on what
24
    your actual policies are about, what you're trying
25
    to do, and protect your monies.
```

So if you look at it, your fund, as well as 1 2 the general employees, did better than the State. 3 And they had more opportunity to buy different 4 things than you had. 5 So I don't think that is a real, real strong 6 stance for you to talk about in terms of -- if 7 you've got proper investment professionals and 8 they're doing the job for you -- because you don't 9 have a certain category to put your money in, there's no significance. If you're making the 10 11 money in the thing that you're investing in with 12 reduced amount of risk, why concern yourself with 13 having this whole array of things that you can 14 use? 15 At various points they may have an advantage 16 to you, but that does not drive your numbers. It 17 didn't -- didn't hurt your numbers. 18 THE MODERATOR: Well, let me -- if I remember 19 the conversation we had about this -- and I 20 just -- I want to see how you'd react to this. 21 MR. BELTON: Uh-huh. 22 THE MODERATOR: The conversation we had was,

one of the ideas of a broader investment

authority, what made it attractive was, yes,

they're absolutely years in which you could have

23

24

Page 86 very narrow authority, but if those are the years

- 2 in which that narrow authority performs
- 3 particularly well -- and I think in this case the
- market's returns within the silos that -- using
- 5 the term -- within the area of authority that the
- 6 Board now has, this has been a -- just as we
- 7 felt -- just as we, meaning you guys, felt the
- 8 dive disproportionally because of some narrowness
- 9 of our investment authority, we have also, of
- course, felt the recovery, but the idea of 10
- 11 increased investment authority is trying to spread
- 12 out, okay, what happens in those years when the
- particular areas that we have are -- because, 13
- 14 you're right, you could very well have a very
- 15 narrow authority outperform a broad authority in
- 16 any given year.
- 17 But over time I think the idea from the
- 18 Board's perspective is that this would allow us to 19
- be immunized against some of the broader -- and
- I'm not staking your case. I'm kind of repeating 20 21 the case as you explained it earlier. I mean, is
- 22 it -- is it fair to look at a particular year, or
- 23 are there times when broader authority might
- 24 insulate you against -- just your thoughts.
 - MR. BELTON: Sure. Well, if you look at it,

- broader authority versus the use -- we've got the 2 authority to invest in certain things right now --
- 3 THE MODERATOR: Right.
- MR. BELTON: -- and we aren't. 4
- 5 THE MODERATOR: Sure.
 - MR. BELTON: Okay. So you've got the
- 7 authority. So the authority is not the issue.
- 8 The issue is: What are you selecting? What are
- 9 you doing?

25

6

10

16

- If you look at the performance on both of the funds over the last five years, we've gone from
- 11 12 somewhere, like, in the sixty-fourth percentile in
- 13 performance all the way up to the first percent --
- 14 fifth percent for -- first five. We're number 15
- one --
 - THE MODERATOR: Right.
- 17 MR. BELTON: -- in a lot of them. And
- because of -- the size of theirs is the only 18 19
- reason they wouldn't rank in that top -- so it's a 20 matter of performance from the managers that
- 21 you've got. And those are the folks that we're 22 paying.
- 23 The actual ability to invest in all kinds of
- 24 things, that's not -- they can actually say, "By 25
 - buying anything you want, just anything you want

Page 88

- to do." You can do that. But why do that? What
- you want to do is -- you're graded on what you actually invest in.
 - THE MODERATOR: Sure.

4

7

8

10

16

25

1

5

6

12

13

19

23

24

- 5 MR. BELTON: Can you make money in these 6 particular things? And that's how we set this
 - whole criteria up for the managers that we bring in.
- 9 THE MODERATOR: Sure.
 - MR. BELTON: And so we've got the same
- 11 consultant. So what we're talking about is 12 performance from those things that are working.
- 13 THE MODERATOR: What's the downside to
- 14 broader authority in your -- I'm sorry. Cindy?
- 15 MS. LAQUIDARA: If I could --
 - THE MODERATOR: Yeah. Yeah. Sure.
- 17 MS. LAQUIDARA: Because there was a lot of
- 18 agreement in this, but Pew Research had identified
- 19 a distinction between FRS and the Police and Fire
- 20 Pension Fund. I have no skill set in this area.
- I just recall -- the distinction, for what it was 21
- 22 worth, was that, given the size of FRS, they could
- 23 manage hedge funds and -- in a financially capable
- 24 way -- that any firm, no matter how excellent the
 - managers are, were not going to be equal to one of
 - Page 89
 - the top largest public pension plans in the
- country. And so it was Pew's recommendation that
 - one line of that additional authority, which my
 - recollection was hedge funds, was not in. So --
 - THE MODERATOR: It was hedge funds that we're talking about with Pew?
- 7 MS. LAQUIDARA: Right. And so I just note
- that, for what it's worth. Again, I have no 8
- 9 financial expertise, but in front of the task
- force, that was the issue that people were focused 10
- 11 on, one part of what the PFPF wanted.
 - MR. HAND: I think one of the --
 - THE MODERATOR: Back to you.
- 14 MR. HAND: One of the concerns is -- I know
- 15 that's been expressed -- and, again, not --
- 16 certainly not my skill set, either -- is that some
- 17 of the alternative investments carried with them
- 18 some more risks. So while there is certainly the
 - potential for more reward, there's also the
- 20 potential for more risk.
- 21 Some of those investments are ones that did
- not perform particularly well during the recent 22
 - downturn. So that's the main concern I've heard, I think. And I don't know if you agree with that,

 - John, but that concern's been voiced, that there

Page 90 is some increased potential reward, and that 2 carries with it some increased potential risk. 3 THE MODERATOR: But, again, that -- if you 4 have the authority, I think the point you're 5 making is it's really not just authority, is the 6 issue. It's also management. And, obviously, 7 that's the responsibility of the Board in their 8 hiring and in the people that they hire. 9 But react to the idea that somehow what you're seeking would increase risk to the fund and 10 also react -- that the fund -- that the fund has 11

12 actually outperformed some of the -- some of the 13 counterparts that you -- like the FRS, at least in 14 the recent past. And then, finally, I did read in 15 the materials, obviously, the task force and the 16 task force members had some real concerns about --17 and I think it was based on a Pew report on hedge 18 funds. But go ahead and kind of give the Board's 19 view on all that and what you -- what you think that would -- how you think that would impact the 20 21 success of the fund.

22 MR. KEANE: Having the authority to invest in a wide range of investment options doesn't 23 24 necessarily mean you're going to do it; you know? 25

THE MODERATOR: Right. As you pointed out,

you have authority right now for things you're not doing.

MR. KEANE: That's right. But the general employees, for example, they can buy bonds that are rated B. We cannot. Now, that's just one little step down, but there is a significantly incremental larger return for that step down.

Bonds right now, most people wander around thinking bonds are safe. Bonds are the worst possible investment right now. But we're trapped into them because we can't go to some of these other places. And so that's what we have long sought and that's what we want.

14 THE MODERATOR: Okay.

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. HAND: And I think -- just to clarify, I know some of the major new authorities would be, not only the -- in terms of the ratings of the bonds, also some areas like the ability to increase or maybe diversify international investments, and also investments in things like private equity and, to use the term of art, hedge funds --

23 MR. KEANE: Right.

MR. HAND: -- some of those leveraging kind 24 25 of entities; is that -- is that, generally

speaking --

1

10

2 MR. KEANE: We're not much interested in 3 hedge funds --

MR. HAND: Right.

5 MR. KEANE: -- because they come in. They 6 open their briefcase. They put your check in it. 7 And they say, "We'll give you some reports 8 somewhere down the line."

9 MR. HAND: Right.

MR. KEANE: We're not interested in that.

11 MR. HAND: Right.

12 MR. KEANE: We're on the J. Edgar Hoover plan 13 there. "Watch the border."

14 MR. HAND: Right.

15 MR. KEANE: "Don't let them get into the 16 So we don't want -- not interested in border." 17 hedge funds.

18 THE MODERATOR: I would remind you this is in 19 the Sunshine.

20 MR. KEANE: That's fine.

21 THE MODERATOR: Okay.

22 MR. KEANE: Fine with me.

23 The private equity, as Chief Belton has 24 pointed out, we share the same investment 25 consultant. Their recommendation is -- their

Page 91

4

Page 93

long-range view is that private equity is going to have the largest return going forward in the next 3 ten years. We have exactly zero invested in that.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

5 MR. KEANE: And the general employees was 6 interested in getting into private equity also. 7 In 2011-399 --

8 THE MODERATOR: Will you have -- will you 9 have a proposal specifically tomorrow on the increased investment authority? 10

11 MR. KEANE: Generally, yes, sir.

12 THE MODERATOR: Okay. I want to kind of 13 recap where we are, then, see that -- so that I 14 kind of give everybody their marching orders for 15 tomorrow morning because we have a morning session tomorrow and an afternoon session tomorrow. 16

17 Everybody understands that?

MR. HAND: Ten to twelve and two to, I think, five.

THE MODERATOR: Everybody understands that? Okay. So I'd like to go back and -- one of the things we're going to revisit tomorrow is governance. I still am looking for -- and I will work -- I will dedicate myself to finding a way out of the Category 3 problem. What I -- what I

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

think is that everybody is saying "I want 2 something I can live with by which we don't 3 sacrifice" -- or "we don't concede the other side is correct on certain issues, but we're all 5 willing to kind of live in the kind of -- PFF that 6 we've had on this issue, that we could all live 7 with." 8 So I'm going to try to focus on having 9 something -- I may come back and use my own 10 moderator's -- having read all these plans and 11 having read Klausner's recent one, heard your responses, and see if I can come up with something 12 13 that you can -- guys, that ought to be something 14 you can fix. 15 We're still back on you. Tomorrow we would 16 like to hear from you more specifically about --17 MR. HAND: Governance. 18 THE MODERATOR: -- governance. And the heart 19 of governance right now is four. Ten, I don't

think, was a big deal. Ten, I think, was just an agreement, that that really probably was language that was superfluous and caused more -
MR. HAND: No. The City -
THE MODERATOR: -- problems than it was worth.

1 MR. HAND: The City will have a 2 counterproposal on governance tomorrow. 3 THE MODERATOR: New employees is kind of your turn -- I mean, current employees is kind of your 4 5 turn tomorrow on the new proposal that they put in front of us. And you saw the -- and you can add 6 7 anything or -- I mean, anything you want to do, 8 but I need to get that out in front of everybody 9 tomorrow because these two hinge on each other.

And then I need your reaction to the unfunded 10 11 liability, realizing that one, two, and three --12 one is already done. Two and three are much 13 closer than we've been before -- and particularly 14 the willingness to pay the chapter fund -- and 15 with realizing -- I think everybody's in agreement 16 that the "subject to appropriation" will be some 17 sort of bilateral provision by which -- in any 18 time in which the appropriation were -immediately the other obligation -- the obligation 19 20 of the other would terminate for that particular 21 funding period. 22 MR. HAND: In other words, the obligations

23 are tied together. 24 THE MODERATOR: They're tied together. You

25

THE MODERATOR: They're tied together. You don't make the "subject to appropriation"; they

Page 96 don't pay their -- whatever their agreed-upon end.

2 And then you want to bring in a proposal 3 tomorrow about increasing investment authority.

Is that where we are, ladies and gentlemen?

MR. KEANE: It is. And --

Page 94

1

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 95

6 MR. HAND: Yes. That sounds correct. Yeah.

MR. KEANE: -- we'll get the --

8 THE MODERATOR: And we start at ten in the 9 morning.

MR. KEANE: Middleman.

THE MODERATOR: I'll have a Paragraph 3 proposal to start us on. I'll have that, get that out of the way. Getting that out of the way, then four, we'll turn to you.

Then when we get off of that, I'm going to go back to unfunded liability, John, which will come to you; all right?

Everybody think that's a reasonable way to go?

20 MR. HAND: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: All right. Anything else that I haven't brought up today for the good of the order that you think would advance us?

Madam Court Reporter, make sure that it reflects that tomorrow we start at ten o'clock.

Page 97

Ladies and gentlemen, make sure that we post the times appropriate. Tomorrow is a ten o'clock and a two o'clock start. We're scheduled to go tomorrow until, I think, five.

The next two days, we have the possibility of going later evenings. I'm hoping we don't even have to have those. I'm optimistic.

And then Friday I am absolutely unavailable because I'm -- my son is graduating from law school after some difficult travails in his health, which our family is all going to be there for that occasion, come hell or high water. And none of you are paying what the divorce would cost me if I did not attend.

So with that, show that we are concluded for this morning's session.

17 (The meeting was concluded at 10:51 a.m.)

- -

	B	
1	Page 98	
2	STATE OF FLORIDA)	
3	COUNTY OF ST JOHNS)	
4	I, Karen Adair Ruiz, Registered Merit	
5	Reporter, Florida Professional Reporter, certify that I	
6	was authorized to and did stenographically report the	
7	foregoing meeting and that the transcript is a true and	
8	complete record of my stenographic notes.	
9	I further certify that I am not a relative,	
10	employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties,	
11	nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'	
12	attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am	
13	I financially interested in the action.	
14	Dated this 25th day of May, 2014.	
15		
16	Foren Oldair Kuiz	
17	KAREN ADAIR RUIZ Registered Merit Reporter	
18	Florida Professional Reporter	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	2011 28:7	5/12 9:19,20	accepted 5:21,22	adoption 84:9
\$	2011-399 93:7	5/12/14 9:21	accordance 11:19	advance 23:22
\$1.2 67:19	2012 50:18	55 19:7,8	account 27:21	75:24 79:12 96:23
\$4.5 68:18	2014 5:25 18:9,		36:22 47:8	advanced 8:3 12:9 28:21 74:23 76:14
\$40 41:21 42:1 68:24	20:13,14 2017 18:13	6 7:16 16:17,18	accountability 72:18 73:12	advantage 12:1 81:23,24 85:15
1	2028 69:6	6.9 41:25	accounting 47:7	advisers 5:7
1 5:4 7:9 18:12 19:5	2030 75:4 21 17:3	60 20:9 57:5,11 68:3	accounts 33:11 accrual 3:18,19 4:1	advisory 5:5 7:12 81:21 83:7 84:12
20:14,19,20 21:22 68:14 72:11 77:13,	22 16:18 26:6,9	65 4:3	accumulated 34:11	affect 22:25
14,19	24 20:7 22:22 57:4	7	accurate 34:23 61:9	affected 31:15
1.5 18:24 19:5	24-month 20:11	·	activated 21:10	affecting 48:25
10 5:15 19:16,23,25 20:2 21:24,25 28:16	25 31:17 40:25 41:5	7 19:17,21,22,24	activation 19:8	affirmatively 74:13
59:12	58:1	20:2 21:9,17 33:10, 14, 38:20 41:25 60:3	actual 19:14 45:23 46:18 66:22 84:24	afternoon 58:11,12 59:10 93:16
10:10 66:9 10:20 66:9	3	7.0 69:7	87:23	age 19:7,8 26:6
10:20 66:9 10:51 97:17	3 5:7 6:14,16,18 8:9	7.75 41:20	actuarial 7:18 38:24 41:19 44:1 62:17	agency 11:9
11 38:20,22	12:16,21 13:16	70 4:2	76:13	agree 10:8,18 11:20
122 22:8 54:25	14:13 18:22 19:4 33:2 65:12 68:14	8	actuarially 67:24	26:12 32:15 36:7 44:24 46:12 50:9
13 28:17	72:11 75:25 77:13,	9 40:00 04 00:40	actuaries 64:14	55:2 68:13,20,25
13.26 28:11 33:13	15,19 78:25 79:7 93:25 96:11	8 19:23,24 30:16	actuary 58:8,15 59:10	72:11,12 78:9 89:24
14 9:20 69:6	3.9 41:3	8.4 19:11 45:18,22 47:3,11,12,13	add 95:6	agreed 3:15 4:13,15 5:8 6:1 7:22 21:8
14-year 49:3	30-year 30:14 31:18	8.5 41:20	addition 40:11	23:24 34:3 36:2,3,20
16-year 49:4	30th 18:13 22:20	80 68:4,7,13,22 69:3	additional 20:25	44:13 57:10 58:7 76:2
175 14:2 40:5,12	31 27:1	76:9	21:3,22 33:25 34:3	agreed-upon 96:1
175.061 10:17 11:20	31- 26:14	9	35:24 36:21 39:25 40:5 46:22 48:15	agreement 4:15,17
185 14:2 40:5,12	32 27:1	<u> </u>	51:8,14,19 53:16	6:9,10 7:8 16:3,5,13
185.06 10:17 11:20	32-year-old 26:14	9 21:9,17	65:17,20 68:11,21 69:1 74:17,18 76:3	23:21,24,25 38:14 40:17 48:13 68:15
1996 40:24	39 16:20	94 58:4	78:12 81:2,9 82:15 89:3	72:20 78:4,8, 88:18 94:21 95:15
1st 18:9 20:12 28:7	4	Α	address 22:22	agreements 78:16
2	4 5:44 40 40 0:40 40	a.m. 66:9 97:17	33:24 72:1 79:13	agrees 68:16
2 5:5 7:12 16:19	4 5:14,16,19 6:12,13, 19 15:10,13 17:8 20:23 23:5 33:8,10,	ability 81:8 84:20 87:23 91:18	addressed 45:25 66:21	ahead 27:4 39:9 44:7 59:20 90:18
22:1,2 50:13,14 59:7	15,20 34:12 60:7	absolutely 44:24	addresses 35:1	airmail 9:12
68:14 72:11 77:13, 14,19	65:13 67:2	84:16 85:25 97:8	addressing 29:12 31:4 35:18 60:14	alchemy 82:9
20 37:3,4 58:1	40 68:2	accept 12:15 35:5	67:11 73:22	allocated 24:12
200 68:2	5	acceptable 42:14 49:11	Administration 81:19	alternative 81:13 89:17
2003 67:20	5 5:18	acceptance 65:16	admittedly 31:11	amend 75:4
2010 50:16			adopted 82:5,6	amendment 14:17

amendments 40:20 aspects 45:15 begin 41:7 break 66:2,5,8 carries 90:2 beginning 17:10 **amount** 19:19 assistant 26:23 bridge 51:25 53:1 case 28:25 29:10 20:10,11 37:19 32:24 58:2 86:3,20, behalf 34:14 38:21 briefcase 92:6 assume 72:19 76:6 68:18 85:12 40:2 assumed 41:19,24 **briefly** 30:3 82:20 annually 68:3 **catch** 41:7 42:10 69:6 **Belton** 84:15.17 bring 8:6 30:10 88:7 **answers** 73:14 85:21 86:25 87:4,6, catching 42:7 attacking 30:17 96:2 17 88:5,10 92:23 anticipate 64:17,19, categorically 77:1 attend 97:14 **bringing** 33:6 60:16 **benefit** 18:12,14,17 23 category 9:2 28:8 attractive 85:24 24:8,10,14 28:23 **broad** 86:15 anticipated 55:16 85:9 93:25 29:7 30:8 34:13 audience 34:22 broadens 81:24 anytime 82:14,15 36:14,18,22 37:7,12, **caused** 94:22 authorities 91:16 14.15.18 41:11 broader 85:23 apparatus 29:17 cautious 84:18 48:16 49:25 60:24 86:19,23 87:1 88:14 32:7 authority 80:3,12, caveat 20:10 57:5 **broke** 71:1 14,18,24 81:3,9,12 **benefits** 18:7 21:5 apparent 15:12 22:16 27:18 29:17 certification 7:13 82:16,22 83:15 84:1, broken 71:6 apparently 66:13 18 85:24 86:1,2,5,9, 34:15,16,17,19 certifications 5:6 11,15,23 87:1,2,7 36:11 37:17,19 48:6 brought 30:4 45:15 applied 3:19 59:16 50:25 52:24 61:21 chairman 74:13 88:14 89:3 90:4,5,22 96:22 68:6,19 72:22 applies 11:23 91:1 93:10 96:3 **BROWN** 9:3 17:16. **chance** 9:11 10:3 big 49:23 94:20 apply 34:5 44:2 47:9 availability 65:17 18,21 18:3 22:8 37:15 39:7,10,18,21 40:1, bilateral 95:17 average 20:4 52:18 apportioned 75:7 **change** 3:15 19:14 7,11 44:6,8,11,16 57:3 23:3 38:15 45:18,23 bill 83:12 appropriation 45:1 59:3 49:1,10 50:6 avoid 15:5 68:12 69:13,18,20, **billion** 67:19 **budget** 54:21 74:19 24 76:3 95:16,18,25 changed 26:16 75:13 awful 15:14 binding 70:23 71:9 32:1,3,9,11 appropriations business 10:9 bit 3:15 28:20 29:7 69:17 71:23 74:11 changing 27:3,4 В **buy** 85:3 91:4 32:23 **blame** 8:17 approval 38:10 **buying** 87:25 **chapter** 24:11 33:21 back 3:5 8:6 11:1 **board** 10:6,13,16 approved 38:15 34:11,13 37:16 13:9 14:12 15:10 11:1 12:22 14:13 approximately 43:17 51:22 52:25 16:9 20:16 22:14,17 C 15:12,19,22,23 67:20 68:18 60:10,17,19,20 68:5, 24:19 27:11 31:2 16:22 20:21 23:12, 17,21 76:7 95:14 35:7,8 39:10 41:7 14 31:20,21 33:25 ARC 41:6 67:23 68:2 calculation 3:10 45:13 48:22 54:10 36:14 38:8 39:12,22 Chapters 11:20 70:19,20 72:15,16, 22:23 63:16 64:14 66:11 40:8,17 41:25 42:12, charges 28:11 89:13 93:21 94:9,15 call 5:17 50:12 67:1 15 43:17,25 52:22 area 23:13,18 86:5 96:16 53:16 61:12 64:25 **chart** 27:23 calling 16:2 79:7 88:20 67:10,11 70:2 73:20, **backs** 75:6 **charter** 10:5 36:10 Cannon 74:8 25 76:7 77:3 81:19 areas 86:13 91:18 bargain 55:11,12 82:22 86:6 90:7 **charts** 41:13 cap 18:24 19:16 argue 14:22 bargaining 18:15 46:18 **Board's** 23:16 **Chatmon** 9:14 29:9, argument 27:8 31:2 22:16 31:19 36:8 39:14 11 31:25 32:6,25 capable 88:23 49:17 72:19 43:2 45:17,21 90:18 53:23 54:1,3,22 55:6 **base** 21:5 34:13 capped 19:5 59:18,21 60:6,12,20 argument's 28:21 81:25 **body** 14:6 66:22 captured 14:16 **check** 92:6 array 85:13 **based** 4:13 20:7,9 bond 70:24 71:3,6 61:15 71:8 84:23 career 26:21 43:9, 74:5 chief 32:25 39:5 arrive 65:2 90:17 10 57:25 63:24 46:1 74:22 76:11 bondholders 75:8 arrived 24:20 92:23 basically 68:10 careers 25:5,11 **bonds** 91:4.8.9.18 art 91:21 **chiefs** 26:22,23 basis 10:13 20:22 **Carol** 16:15 border 92:13,16 artful 73:20 62:20 **Chris** 4:20 29:12 carried 89:17 bottom 3:23 aspect 35:11 bed 17:24 30:6 45:13 47:22 63:17 66:12 67:8

71:12 collectively 55:11, confuse 62:14 **corpus** 30:17 critically 54:20 12 Chris's 29:24 consideration 7:7 **correct** 4:18 6:5 7:3, current 15:18 16:4, combination 71:8 6,11,15, 12:17,24 5,7,11 18:5,19,20 considered 79:12 **Cindy** 10:2 11:5 13:2,8 21:23 22:4 19:9,11,13 22:20,25 69:15 88:14 combined 69:2 consistent 10:16 23:3 32:5,6,11 34:7, 23:4 24:7,17 25:1 **Cindy's** 13:18 comfort 4:12 6:11 28:1 30:22 9 48:1 51:4 52:15 27:25 32:23 33:19 61:10 63:2,5 69:15 34:8,12,14 35:12,13, comfortable 26:8 constituted 83:8 circulates 47:4 84:5 94:4 96:6 22,25 36:4,6 38:7, circumstances comment 35:24 constraints 17:6 15,21 39:13 40:2,3 correctional 34:18 43:11 45:24 48:10, 26:16 commentary 19:18 consult 10:12 correctly 20:19 15,25 49:23 57:18, **cities** 28:9 53:4,6 60:2 22 58:7 64:2,9,14 commission 69:17 consultant 82:3 65:18 68:15 69:4 citizens 36:13 74:8 88:11 92:25 commitment 71:5 correlative 76:5 77:25 78:1,4,5 95:4 consultation 76:20 **City** 3:7 6:9,11 8:1 cost 42:1 58:9.15 committed 37:22 cut 53:16,25 83:20 9:24 10:1 15:9,21,24 contained 13:16 97:13 16:9,19 17:7 24:20 **committee** 5:5 7:12 **cutoff** 48:24 16:12 cost-effective 25:15,22,23 28:3,11, 83:7 84:10,12 cuts 19:25 21:11,14 34:16 36:11,17 10:14 contemplated compelled 23:14 22:1 40:18 41:2,10,12,14, 54:14 costs 59:12 20 43:2 44:18,21 compensation cyberspace 8:20 context 50:21 48:11 51:3 54:18 council 35:3,4 36:7, 20:5 27:19 29:5,15, 56:16 59:4,7,12 continue 45:22 11,17 38:10,16,19 24 52:18 57:3 62:16 D 65:11 66:25 67:7,16, 67:23 42:15 44:12 66:25 compete 28:3 23,25 68:10,24 80:21 81:4,8,21 continuing 69:3 70:17,20 72:6,12,20, 83:13 components 15:25 daily 10:9 23 73:8 74:14,23 16:1 contract 22:20 Council's 48:11 date 9:15 18:7 20:12 75:3,13 76:11 78:9 72:23 75:3 comports 7:24 48:24 80:21 81:4 82:18 Councilman 83:12 contrary 11:13 83:12 94:23 95:1 comprehensive **day** 3:4 17:19,25 councils 70:23 24:16 37:23,24 39:16 18:1 44:22 65:23 City's 6:20 56:5 **counsel** 5:9 8:10 64:13 77:4 contribute 39:13 69:9 63:19 74:10 10:6,7,12,18,23 60:3 days 97:5 compromise 12:11 clarify 6:23 52:22 12:22 13:3,12 24:3 contribution 19:17 91:15 compromising 74:5 76:21 deal 84:22 94:20 20:18,21 21:7,17 11:15 **class** 27:4 Counsel's 11:8 23:7 28:9,12,15 29:2 debt 71:10 concede 13:22 31:21 33:2 35:12 **clear** 12:19 22:13 counter 15:18 deception 38:24 36:21 39:25 40:3 14:20 94:3 23:20 37:16 38:3,4, counterparts 90:13 41:2,9,10,14,21 decide 42:22 75:14 6,21 42:11 44:17 conceding 13:24 43:25 48:4 50:9,11 48:11,19,20 49:16 counterproposal decided 74:21 83:2 51:9,15,22,23 52:10 concern 59:24 54:4 56:12 60:1 95:2 84:11,13 85:12 89:23 53:3,17 56:14 61:3, 72:10 82:24 83:9 19.20 63:22 64:25 **counting** 3:22,23 decision 25:21,22 84:3 concern's 89:25 67:24 74:17,19 26:4,20 27:2 country 89:2 **clock** 55:13 concerns 35:1 contributions decisions 27:13 couple 54:20 81:2 82:11,13 89:14 **close** 8:24 19:19 24:9 34:4 36:5 69:18 90:16 41:12 56:16 court 9:8 66:10 **closely** 38:13 decreasing 67:12 96:24 concert 63:12 conversation closer 25:4 66:18 dedicate 68:16,20 covenants 71:4 concession 59:12 23:11 47:23,24 95:13 76:7 93:24 50:20 55:4,15 67:7, 74:6 concluded 97:15, COLA 18:22,24,25 14 85:19,22 dedicated 70:25 **CPI** 18:25 17 19:1,5 28:6 45:20 conversations dedication 68:4 48:5,22,23 49:5,10, conduct 40:18 created 36:14,18 25:16,18 82:12,21 15,17 50:1 61:11 74:15 **Deferred** 19:10 criteria 88:7 convince 37:20 collective 18:15 conference 58:14 definite 52:6 critical 15:10,11 22:16 copy 3:11,12 79:23 69:10

deleted 14:4 dive 86:8 elements 59:25 entities 91:25 exposure 67:12 deliberations diversify 91:19 eleven 5:25 33:22 equal 88:25 expressed 89:15 66:23,25 Division 41:18 emergency 54:17 equally 48:20 extent 53:14 64:4 depend 56:6 73:3 divorce 97:13 **employee** 19:13,17 equates 56:13 **Derrel** 9:12 28:19 20:18 21:7,16,22 **extra** 68:25 72:6.13. dollar 56:20,23 equation 35:21 29:8 30:7 23:6 28:8,15 31:22 14,20,24 73:1,5,8,9, dollars 29:25 69:1 33:3 35:12,13 36:4 equipment 28:22 design 64:15 65:24 78:12 38:15 48:4 50:8,10 29:1 determinations 51:23 52:13 53:2 F downside 88:13 equity 91:21 92:23 18:14 54:15 61:2,20 63:22 93:1,6 downturn 72:8 64:2,9,15 **devious** 38:23 **FAC** 57:3 89:23 **escape** 74:25 employee's 19:20 dictated 50:10 faced 26:15 dozen 74:12 60:25 **essence** 60:12,22 difference 4:4 68:1 fact 25:7,10 53:13 dramatic 16:6 employees 15:18 essentially 6:5 84:20 70:23 71:9 82:17 16:4,6,7,11 18:6,19, 12:9,20 14:6 20:15 dramatically 9:25 20 19:3,9 20:1,5 differences 16:10 31:12 84:4 factor 44:2 58:9,15 drive 85:16 23:1,4 24:7,12,18 differentiation established 32:4 factors 29:4 25:1,3,8,13 27:25 43:5,8 49:18 **driving** 41:16 28:7,17,18 29:1,8 **ethics** 7:13 facts 38:20 difficult 30:6 97:10 30:21 32:5,15 33:20 **drop** 19:10 45:16,21 ethnics 5:6 fair 10:19 44:18 45:1 34:8,12,14,18 35:21, 46:9,17 47:7,23 50:2 difficulty 30:13 54:9 86:22 22,25 36:6,24 37:1,6 evaluation 25:25 61:14 38:7,22 39:13 42:12 direction 64:6,11 **fairly** 83:10 dual 73:6 evened 3:21 43:11,20 44:18 directive 41:18 fairness 24:16 45:24 48:10,16 due 34:22 evenings 97:6 44:17 50:10 53:14 54:18 56:15 disagree 26:11 **dump** 75:6 event 76:1,2 57:14,15,18,22 58:8 fall 3:16 disappear 73:8 60:3 61:6,23 65:18 everybody's 4:12 **dumps** 75:7 **family** 97:11 68:15 70:1 74:17,20 disappeared 7:5 24:2 65:7 69:21 77:23,24,25 78:1,3, 95:15 farther 81:5 Ε disclosure 5:6 4,5 80:23 85:2 91:4 7:13,19 everything's 64:7 Fast 8:15 93:5 95:3,4 **earlier** 19:7 22:18 discount 3:20 exact 14:6,20 50:8 **fathers** 75:14 employment 20:7,9 25:5,10 36:20 43:8 31:13,15,17 discussed 64:18 excellent 88:24 44:12 48:10 82:12 favor 48:12 69:14 86:21 empower 10:5 excuse 11:2 57:6 fees 10:19 discussing 64:5 66:23 early 3:10 18:23 enacted 36:11 feet 74:10 57:25 discussion 15:16 existed 29:19 end 4:14 13:15 felt 86:7,10 25:20 46:22 54:10 earned 18:7 57:8 17:18 53:17 79:24 existing 30:12 71:9 59:22 61:17 65:22 96:1 female 26:15 earnings 47:9 expect 17:7,10 discussions 10:24 **ended** 28:5 fiduciary 39:14 ears 77:7 27:10,11 36:20 expenses 11:10 engage 74:14 figure 45:9 46:10 56:8 74:7 economic 72:7 experience 10:11 77:12 78:25 enhance 65:1 **filling's** 42:22 economy 54:12 experienced 29:13 dismantling 40:22 enhanced 25:8 **final** 20:4 52:17 **Edgar** 92:12 expertise 11:10 34:16,19 36:22 57:2,3 62:16 disproportionally 89:9 effect 50:24 51:2 37:12,14,17 41:10 86:8 **finally** 20:4 90:14 52:24 60:23,24 68:6, expires 22:20 effectively 20:3 disputes 38:4 19 72:21 finances 72:9 explain 16:10 80:11 effectuated 22:15 distinction 24:25 **ensure** 10:13 **financial** 5:4 7:10 25:3 88:19,21 explained 86:21 efficient 10:14 25:14 30:9 56:6,14 entire 26:3 27:19 81:21 83:6 89:9 distinguished 74:8 explicitly 35:2 29:25 effort 24:1 financially 88:23

finding 15:4 93:24 fine 11:11 14:7 92:20,22 fire 11:8 20:1 22:18 26:21 28:12.17 44:19 50:16 54:23, 24 74:10 75:11 80:22 88:19 firefighters 22:11, 14 41:5 firm 71:5 88:24 Fiscal 69:5 fits 31:21 34:1 five-minute 66:4,8 fix 94:14 floor 3:24,25 19:8, 20:15 46:17 Florida 10:17 80:14 81:16 82:6 focus 10:3 39:11 94:8 **focused** 73:18 89:10 folks 15:9 47:15 57:9 87:21 **follow** 23:20 38:12 **FOP** 22:6,7,9,19 54:25

force 7:9 16:20 18:11,18 19:12,22 24:23,24 26:7,10 31:3,4 35:1,23 38:11 40:16 43:3 45:4 48:20,24 49:7 58:24 64:1,8 66:24 67:21 74:7 83:2.25 84:7 89:10 90:15,16

forces 41:16

foreseeable 54:12

forever 52:7 54:15 55:6,7,14,18

format 4:8

forward 40:21 51:11 66:15 93:2

forwarded 12:12 forwarding 12:23 fourth 9:17,23 52:17 80:15

framed 64:1,8

frankly 27:25 28:2

Friday 8:18,21 97:8

friends 41:17

front 3:6,9 27:11 79:19 89:9 95:6,8

FRS 28:5 33:2,4, 82:6 88:19,22 90:13

fund 10:9 11:1,8 24:13 30:16 31:5,7 33:19 34:13,14 38:23 41:2 47:9 60:4,8,16 61:5 68:3, 7, 69:25 70:17,20 72:21,25 75:15,16, 17 80:23 85:1 88:20 90:10,11,21 95:14

fund's 10:12

funded 68:4,8,13,23 69:4 76:9

funding 33:25 69:3 73:8 76:3 95:21

funds 24:11 34:9, 10,11 37:16 40:5 43:17 51:22 52:9,25 60:10,16,17,19,20 68:5,17,21 76:8 87:11 88:23 89:4,5 90:18 91:22 92:3,17

future 15:6 18:14 21:15 32:5 41:4 51:11 54:12 69:17 70:23

G

game 27:3

gap 51:25 53:1

gave 40:22

general 5:9 8:10 9:1 10:7,23 11:8 12:21 13:3,12 34:18 74:4 80:23 85:2 91:3 93:5

generalized 65:16 generally 82:8,11, 13 91:25 93:11

gentlemen 96:4 97:1

get all 42:18

give 53:11 58:9 73:15 75:10 76:12 79:23 81:8 82:15 90:18 92:7 93:14

goal 63:19

good 3:2 9:10 24:1 42:4 47:17 64:20 83:10 96:22

good-faith 78:25

governance 6:25 12:10 17:8,24 35:17 65:13 68:16 78:2,4 93:23 94:17,18,19 95:2

governs 40:18

grab 11:25

graded 88:2

graduating 97:9

great 45:4 75:14 77:8

greater 18:20 43:24

ground 13:24 42:6

growth 67:18

guaranteed 18:22 19:4,11 30:16 45:18, 22 47:3

guess 15:24 26:22 52:23 79:6

gut 73:20

guy 26:14,25 27:3

guys 6:5 9:15 20:16 51:24 52:1 61:11 65:1,16 76:23 77:2 79:4 86:7 94:13

Н

half 3:18 52:24 68:5, 17,20 69:1 74:12 76:7

hallway 36:3

hammer 75:1

hand 4:6,19 6:21,23 7:4,7,12,16,18,21

8:1 12:5,7,25 13:5,8, 11,13 15:21 16:14, 18,22 17:3,9,13 18:5 21:4,14,23 22:2,4, 10,13,24 23:3,6,9 24:22 27:6,9,14 29:10 32:25 39:2,6 45:12,14 46:2 47:25 48:3 49:2,6 50:16,18 51:4,6,10 52:19,21 53:7,10,12,19,22,25 54:2,4,7 56:3,5,10, 20,23,25 57:14,16, 20 61:5,9,23 62:1,3, 5,7,10,14 63:25 66:2.14 67:5.15 69:19 70:6,8,10 71:15,18,21,24 72:1, 5,16 76:11,15,18,20 77:16,21,23,25 78:2, 5,7,12,14 79:8 80:2, 5 82:24 83:1,5,17, 19,22,24 84:6 89:12, 14 91:15,24 92:4,9, 11,14 93:18 94:17, 23 95:1,22 96:6,20

handed 14:18 handle 10:8

hangup 49:23

happen 50:21 71:25

happened 50:13 51:24

happening 26:13 28:1

happy 76:21

hard 54:25

harmless 61:6,24

hatch 74:25

head 57:12,19 81:6

headed 64:11

heading 64:5

health 31:5 97:11

healthier 31:8,9

hear 15:17 23:16,21 66:1 67:13 69:21 73:19 82:20 94:16

heard 14:1 89:23 94:11

hearing 52:5

heart 6:8 27:12 94:18

hedge 88:23 89:4,5 90:17 91:21 92:3,17

held 47:8

hell 97:12

helpful 52:21

helping 39:13

high 97:12

higher 28:10 43:13

highlight 13:18

hinge 95:9

hinges 15:14

hire 90:8

hired 24:8

hiring 81:17 90:8

history 75:18 83:1

hitting 30:22

hold 61:6 74:10

holder 71:7

holding 61:23

Hoover 92:12

hope 3:3 58:10

hoping 97:6

hours 58:4

hurt 85:17

I

idea 25:21 29:5,16 43:7 46:20 65:17 69:18,23 86:10,17 90:9

ideas 67:11 73:21, 24 85:23

identified 88:18

illustration 32:24

immediacy 51:21 64:24

immediately 19:23 95:19

imminently 43:12

immunized 86:19 impact 25:12 29:6 38:9 52:13 61:7 62:17 83:14 90:20 impacted 18:8 implementation 18:8 19:24 20:12 29:20 implemented 18:9 20:20 implicitly 35:2 important 15:13 27:20 35:24 44:23 48:13 54:21 59:22 inaccurate 39:3,4,5 inaccurately 36:12 include 40:21 included 5:15 10:24 including 82:5 incorrect 33:24 incorrectly 51:20 69:16 **increase** 21:9,16 50:8,11 63:22 65:1 82:17 90:10 91:19 increased 41:15,20 43:17 53:3 67:19 80:18,19,24 81:13 82:21 86:11 90:1,2 93:10 increases 21:15 51:12 82:1 increasing 30:18 61:20 96:3 incremental 91:7 indication 59:11 individual 24:12 33:11 61:3 inextricably 53:14 initial 15:19,23 institutional 42:4 insulate 86:24

intense 78:25

interest 7:2 56:16

interested 92:2,10,

interesting 33:1 interestingly 28:13 interests 30:11 interim 20:22 33:25 52:9 interject 54:22 international 91:19 interpretation 11:21 interpreting 53:4,5 interrupt 69:8 invest 84:21,22 87:2,23 88:3 90:22 invested 56:25 93:3 investing 85:11 investment 5:5.7 7:10 10:11 80:3,12, 14,18,24 81:3,9,14, 25 82:16,22 83:7,14 84:10,18,19 85:7,23 86:9,11 90:23 91:10 92:24 93:10 96:3 investments 89:17, 21 91:20 investors 42:5 involvement 64:3,9 **issue** 5:18,23 8:10 12:1,21 15:5,10,11, 13,18 17:2,8 20:4,17 28:19 30:8 31:21 33:24 43:15, 44:16 45:20 48:5 65:24,25 67:1,2 70:19,22 73:3 79:13 80:2 87:7.8 89:10 94:6 **issues** 8:24 10:10 25:14 30:21 55:12 64:2,4,9,10 67:12 70:10,11 71:3 73:22 79:11 94:4 **Item** 6:12,13,14,16, 19 8:9 J Jacksonville 25:23, 24 26:1,2 28:4

16 93:6

75:21 **January** 19:2,6 **Jersey** 74:16 job 25:21 38:13 45:4 85:8 **Joey** 4:7 26:8 **John** 3:12,17 5:11 6:17 15:19 23:11 30:24 39:11 52:22 64:12 66:6 67:9 72:2 73:3.15 79:9 80:2 83:13 84:17 89:25 96:16 **John's** 55:4 July 28:7 **jump** 71:3 jurisdictions 28:2,3 30:23 justice 44:17,19 45:2 Κ

29:13,19 33:14

Keane 4:18 8:13.15 9:7,19 12:8,9,24 14:22 17:25 20:23 21:1 23:19 24:4,6 30:14,25 31:6,24 32:8,14,17,19,21,23 34:3,7, 36:9,24 37:1, 4,13 38:17 39:4,17, 20,25 40:2,9,14 42:17,21 43:11,19, 22 44:1,15,24 45:25 46:4,6,21,25 47:3,7, 19 48:1,23 49:3,8, 11,14,20,22 50:3,6, 22 51:1,11,14 52:6, 11,15 53:5,8,11,18, 20,24 54:6,8 57:10, 12,19 58:4,7,14,21, 23,25 59:2,4,6,9,15, 19 60:1,5,10,18 61:8,13,17,22,25 62:2,4,12,18,22 63:2,5,10,12,14 64:16,19 65:4,9 66:7 74:1,4 75:21 76:10, 16,19 77:4,8,11 78:17,20,22,24 79:3, 14,17,21,25 80:4,8, 10,13 81:6,10,13,16,

24 82:3,9 83:16,18, 20,23 84:5,7,11,13 90:22 91:3,23 92:2, 5,10,12,15,20,22 93:5,11 96:5,7,10

Keane's 14:7,15 19:18 29:22

key 28:19 30:5 64:9

kick-in 51:8

kicks 51:23

kind 3:20 4:23,24 5:2.3 8:25 9:1.16 10:20 13:1 16:10 17:1 18:16 23:10 25:13,17,20 27:5,20 30:24 31:1,2 35:11 50:20 54:25 56:12 66:17 67:1,10 73:11, 19 76:4,23 86:20 90:18 91:24 93:12, 14 94:5 95:3,4

kinds 54:13 56:17 84:21 87:23

Klausner's 94:11

knew 54:18

knowhow 84:19

L

lack 73:20 ladder 26:24 ladies 96:4 97:1 laid 84:1 landscape 27:22

language 5:10,12, 20,24 6:8,14,17 8:5, 10,17 9:24 12:16,22 13:4,16, 14:20 15:1, 4 69:12 75:5 76:4 94:21

LAQUIDARA 11:6, 17,19 12:6 14:3,15 15:7 30:3 55:17,20, 22,25 69:22 70:3,5, 7,9,11,14,16 72:4 88:15,17 89:7

larger 91:7

largest 80:16 89:1 93:2

lasts 26:22

latest 13:13 17:9 **law** 10:5,11 57:6

70:18,21 97:9 **lawful** 24:15

lawyer 40:15

learned 74:4 82:5

leave 14:19 17:4 29:14 32:1,3,9,10 58:7 83:5

led 30:20

leeway 75:14

left 58:1,2

legal 10:9,14,15,18 13:23,25 15:2 70:10,

legally 71:4

legislation 83:13

legislature 74:20 82:6

legs 53:25

lengthy 55:9

lesser 18:25

lets 14:19

level 6:12 24:14 29:7 34:17 37:7 57:22

levels 29:2,15

leveraging 91:24

liability 35:18 65:24, 25 67:2,12,16,18,22 68:7,10,11,21 72:17 73:2,10,13,23 76:8 78:14 79:13 82:23 95:11 96:16

lieu 43:23 56:17

light 5:19

likelihood 35:14 36:5 38:10,14

limitation 53:6

limits 61:16

linchpin 17:23

lines 64:18

link 65:6 major 82:3 91:16 measured 19:1 **model** 80:19 76:6 linked 50:11 53:14 mechanically 54:5 **make** 3:9 9:17 moderator 3:2 4:7, money 30:11 33:21 13:19,20 18:25 20 6:22 7:3,6,11,15, 47:7,10 51:20 56:18 61:21,23 mechanics 62:8 72:6,13,20,24 73:9 23:13,19 25:21,25 17,20,24 8:2,8,14,16 linking 31:22 27:13 31:2,8 34:3 mechanism 74:9 9:4,15,20 10:24 74:20,21 75:2,6 Linn 40:16 36:20 38:21 39:14, 11:16,18 12:3 13:1, 85:9,11 88:5 mediate 11:24 15 40:19 41:8 43:4 6,9, 14:12,24 15:8, list 23:4 monies 60:25 73:1, 45:8 49:16 51:14 mediated 16:3,4,12 22 16:17,19,24 17:4, 5 84:25 live 6:14 94:2,5,6 54:9 55:1 56:7,11,15 23:21,24,25 25:19 12,15,17,20,22 18:1, 58:1 59:12 61:1,3 months 18:23 20:7, 4 20:16,24 21:2,13, 63:8 **Local** 22:8 54:25 63:1 67:25 74:10,11, 20,24 22:3,5,9,11,21 9 22:23 57:4,5,11 mediation 11:12 17,18 83:2 84:3 88:5 23:2,5,8,10 24:3,5, lock 69:16,17 morale 29:6 30:5 95:25 96:24 97:1 19 25:16 27:7,10 locked 64:22 30:24 31:1,7 32:12, morally 44:20 meet 63:18 **makes** 71:10 15,18,20,22 33:23 long 26:22 31:9 meeting 4:11 70:18 **morning** 3:2,5 5:12 34:5,8,20 36:23,25 making 18:14 27:15 78:23,24 91:12 8:4,7 11:3 15:16 97:17 31:9 42:5,6 59:24 37:2,10,25 42:9,20, 17:1,11 64:13 65:22 long-range 93:1 85:10 90:5 25 43:18,21,23 44:4, meetings 10:10 93:15 96:9 7,10 45:13 46:3,5,7, 58:5 longer 5:14,15 6:3 male 26:15 23 47:2,6,16,21 morning's 97:16 34:19 member 5:17 48:2,22 49:9,13,15, manage 88:23 Mother's 3:4 looked 3:13 4:9 21 50:1,4,7,17,19,23 members 28:13 managed 8:19 8:18,21 26:3 51:2,5,8,13,17 52:8, **mothers** 75:14 40:22,24,25 82:5 12,16,20 54:9 55:2, management 10:15 lose 8:19 90:16 move 8:23 15:15 7,18,21,24 56:1,4,9, 90:6 members' 40:2 20:8 23:18 lost 42:6 50:24 11,22,24 57:2,11,13, managers 5:7 15,17,21 58:6,13,19, moved 18:10 19:13 memorialized lot 15:14 23:22 42:7 81:18, 87:20 88:7,25 22,24 59:1,5,8,14, 35:20 48:7 64:3 68:9 47:4 56:6 75:19 83:11 17,20 60:21 61:10, manner 10:15 11:9 88:17 moving 19:4 84:7 memory 21:6 14,19 62:6,8,11,13, marching 93:14 lots 38:5 41:7 77:11 16,19,23 63:3,6,11, men 44:21 **MSA** 16:2 20:17,18 13,16 64:12,17,21 market 41:10 42:2 21:7 22:22,24 33:23 lower 3:25 37:7, mentioned 60:7 65:5,10 66:4,8,10,15 84:23 34:4 35:5 46:10 41:19,24 80:19 67:6 69:8,23 70:4, Miami 28:16 33:7, 50:15 54:10 55:15, market's 86:4 lowered 37:18 12,15 71:14,16,19, 10,22 20 57:9 65:19 73:24 22,25 72:14 73:15 **match** 53:2 lowering 37:19 middle 13:24 multiple 28:25 74:3 75:20,23 76:22 materials 90:15 77:7,10,13,19,22,24 music 38:18 77:7 Middleman 41:23 M 78:1,3,6,11,13,15, matter 26:12 29:20 76:12 96:10 mutually 78:8 19,21,23 79:1,4,9, 30:4 36:8 87:20 million 37:3,5 41:21 Madam 66:10 96:24 15,18,22 80:1,6,9,11 88:24 mystery 48:17 42:1 68:2,3,18,25 81:1,7,11,15,22 made 10:22 12:11 matters 22:25 36:10 69:1 82:2,8,10,25 83:4 15:12,19,24 16:16 Ν 84:10,12,14,16 mayor 5:20 9:3 mind 35:25 54:5 20:21 26:4 27:2 85:18,22 87:3,5,16 17:16,18,21 18:3 69:11 43:25 47:11,13 88:4,9,13,16 89:5,13 **nail** 75:1 22:8 39:7,10,18,21 48:11 63:18 67:21 minor 30:21 90:3,25 91:14 92:18, 40:1,7,11 41:15 named 45:10 69:24 83:25 85:24 21 93:4,8,12,20 44:6,7,8,11,16,25 minute 38:25 94:18,24 95:3,24 **narrow** 86:1,2,15 magical 31:11 45:1 59:3 66:13 minutes 11:5 66:3 96:8,11,21 main 41:16 89:23 narrowness 86:8 meaning 31:13 moderator's 6:16 **mirrors** 19:21 51:24 72:14 86:7 maintain 11:22,23 nationwide 42:5 12:11,16 13:17 misinformation 64:25 meaningful 25:2 94:10 nature 30:7 47:4 50:6 maintained 46:12, modifies 12:20 necessarily 65:6 missed 61:4 means 7:21 90:24 modifying 12:14 mix 58:8 maintaining 15:2 meant 9:9 needed 41:3 moment 14:13 17:2 45:20 46:8 65:11

negotiate 55:22 open 10:10 47:23 parties 10:7,18 41:3,5 44:2 45:19,22 plan's 28:14 61:11,13,15,17,20 14:10 15:2 68:13 47:3 50:14 59:13 negotiating 22:6 **plans** 29:14 89:1 67:7 92:6 72:11 73:7 60:3,8 68:4,7,13,22 30:10,15 94:10 69:4,7 76:9 87:13,14 **opinion** 70:13 parts 11:25 43:9 **play** 27:17 35:13 negotiations 52:5 percentage 60:22 opportunity 45:5 pass 9:6 35:4 36:5 news 47:17 85:3 percentile 87:12 passed 69:9 pledge 71:4 newspaper 34:21 oppose 24:6 perception 82:15 past 90:14 plowing 25:17 48:18 opposed 43:9 62:21 percolate 8:25 noble 44:20 pockets 30:1 pay 19:25 21:10,11, optimistic 97:7 perform 46:16 14,15,24 22:1 30:15 nodding 74:13 **point** 16:8 26:23 89:22 33:9,13,14 37:7 **Option** 19:10 29:11,22,24 31:25 **nods** 57:12 38:22 47:11,13 53:2, performance 28:14 44:8 53:15 54:11,23 **options** 90:23 16 67:23 71:7 74:6 note 33:1 89:7 42:3 46:19 61:16 57:24 72:2 83:3,24 76:5 95:14 96:1 order 10:20 96:23 87:10,13,20 88:12 90:4 number 3:10 20:14 paycheck 19:20 orders 93:14 performing 28:15 pointed 74:5 90:25 27:15 50:8 52:1 61:7 55:23 71:22 80:15, 92:24 original 10:21 44:13 performs 86:2 21 87:14 paying 43:12 72:16 points 14:23 29:24 73:1 74:24 87:22 period 20:5,8 21:4,5 Orlando 26:1 85:15 numbers 4:16 97:13 31:12 41:9 52:7 33:17, 47:18 85:16, **outlets** 48:18 65:3,6,8 95:21 **police** 11:7 19:25 payment 68:1,11,22 17 26:20 28:12,18 41:4 outlined 17:6 73:13 76:8 persistent 25:20 50:18 54:23,24 outperform 86:15 0 payments 68:11 person 35:6 75:11 80:22 88:19 outperformed payroll 75:9 perspective 6:22 policies 84:24 90:12 objectionable 12:4 39:12 48:3 86:18 pejoratively 12:18 **pool** 51:19 13:25 outstanding 70:24 **Pew** 88:18 89:6 pencil 9:21 portions 21:15 obligation 72:25 90:17 overcome 43:16 73:6,7 95:19 pending 83:14 position 11:13, **Pew's** 89:2 13:23,25 14:10 15:3 obligations 70:1,24 P **pension** 10:11 11:8 **PFF** 94:5 30:14 45:17,21 56:6, 95:22 18:14 22:16 33:19 13,14 80:11 36:10,14,18 37:23, **PFPF** 7:1 8:3 68:16 occasion 97:12 package 25:24 24 38:23 40:17,20 89:11 possibility 22:17 26:3, 27:19,20 29:5, occur 29:21 41:1 49:25 56:20 97:5 18,25 42:18 45:7,8 **phone** 8:21 60:4 64:15 74:16 October 18:9. 48:21 49:14 63:4 possibly 74:24 77:5 80:22 88:20 pick 3:3 20:12,14 67:20 packages 28:23 89:1 post 70:20 97:1 pie 42:21 offer 10:21 45:8 pensions 27:22 potential 6:10 **piece** 47:17 office 10:6,23 11:9 paid 24:9, 34:13 89:19,20 90:1,2 penultimate 14:5 42:3 49:22 pieces 42:18,24 Powerpoint 16:15 **people** 25:21 28:22 officers 34:18 41:5 paper 9:9 pin 84:2 **PP** 22:9 31:16 32:2,7,10,23 offset 51:21 52:13 Paragraph 96:11 33:4,7,8,9 38:3 pinch 63:14 practical 35:11 64:24 47:15 48:25 49:4,22, paraphrasing place 20:11 29:20 23 71:22 89:10 91:8 prefer 26:1,2 **OGC** 10:8.12 69:15,16 52:3 54:14 perceive 81:22 prejudge 53:22 omission 6:12 part 13:25 16:20 places 75:22 91:12 24:2 29:18 43:1 percent 3:18 4:2,3,4 prepared 6:10 omitted 5:19,20 6:1 **plan** 18:7,9 19:24 48:20 49:12 50:11 18:22,24 19:5,12,16, 51:14 66:12 76:7 20:12 25:5,11 28:14 one-half 4:3,4 52:23 63:3 64:23 18,21,23 20:2,19,20, 79:5,22 31:18 32:1,3,9,11, 80:19 82:22 89:11 23,25 21:3,9,10,17, one-third 31:13,15, 12,20 33:13,15 prerequisite 78:9 22,25 22:1,2 24:11 17 participate 25:1 40:21 42:14 43:7,25 28:12,17 30:16 33:2, prerequisites 44:13,21 45:3 68:12, participation 35:13 one-year 21:4 8,10,15,20,21 34:12 72:12 22 69:3 76:9 92:12 37:8 38:22 40:25

present 28:11 38:19 proposals 23:22 raised 71:19 72:2 recall 5:16 20:18 reflects 38:12 96:25 48:7 50:2 58:16 73:3 24:23 25:20 88:21 presentation refocused 17:1 68:14 72:11 76:12, 15:20,23 16:16 **raises** 29:3 recap 93:13 77:13 79:12 **reform** 18:11,18 83:25 receive 53:15 range 61:15 90:23 25:2 37:23,24 39:16 **proposed** 18:11,17 presented 47:14 56:21 74:16 77:5 21:18 32:14 34:2 rank 87:19 received 15:23 73:16 46:9,11 49:10,24 refresher 18:16 receives 33:19 rate 3:18,19,20 preserve 14:10 40:5 67:16 regular 10:13 19:12,15,16 38:22 receiving 37:12,13 proposing 21:20 preserves 14:22 41:19,24 45:19,22, reinstated 22:3 23 46:11,12,15 47:4 recent 14:2 89:22 press 36:12 protect 44:22 84:25 61:19 69:7 90:14 94:11 reinstatement provide 34:15 44:21 pressure 72:8 31:23 50:12,24 **rated** 91:5 **recess** 66:9 61:21 provided 10:13 **pretty** 48:11 rating 71:8 recognition 25:10 34:17 reinstatement's previous 19:25 30:19 **ratings** 91:17 52:3 41:13 53:16 provision 10:23 recognize 24:24 69:12 95:17 reiterate 67:4,15 reach 4:17 6:13 15:1 principle 30:19 35:15,16,17 72:20 recognizes 43:8 70:17 provisions 6:25 priority 7:2 78:15 82:3 10:16 rejected 24:1,2,3,4 private 91:21 92:23 reached 6:11 78:3, recollection 7:25 44:14 **public** 80:16 89:1 93:1.6 17 89:4 rejecting 44:12 **pull** 43:19 privately 34:24 reaches 68:3,7 69:3 recommend 43:16 rejection 13:14 purposes 15:3 reaching 78:7 problem 8:22 66:6 recommendation 22:23 47:8 49:17 related 22:15 75:2 80:20 93:25 12:16 38:9 41:23 react 31:19 75:25 put 3:7 4:22 5:3 8:11 relates 67:22 79:6 83:3,6 89:2 92:25 problems 94:24 85:20 90:9,11 13:20 16:22, 17:24 recommendations relationship 40:19 proceedings 14:25 26:16,18 30:14 33:4, reaction 23:12,15, 7:9 18:10,19 26:11 8,17,18 41:13 51:19 16 31:19 49:10 relieved 72:25 66:23,24 67:21 84:1 process 18:15 20:3 52:9,23 62:5 68:25 73:21 79:2 95:10 **remain** 24:18 72:6,13,24 73:1,7 productive 40:20 recommended reactions 77:14 85:9 92:6 95:5 26:10 38:11 67:25 remember 3:17 professionals 85:7 read 26:11 31:3 82:4 6:15 10:21 21:2 46:9 **puts** 14:16 Program 19:11 34:21 35:8 90:14 57:13 82:12,19 recommending **putting** 4:8 10:20 94:10,11 85:18 27:25 28:10 progress 56:7 45:5 51:22 68:24 reading 11:14 52:5 remembers 51:3 72:20,21 recomputation projected 69:5 ready 8:7 58:10 57:23 remind 4:25 20:16 projections 69:5 66:15 34:1 37:2 92:18 Q record 14:25 projects 75:19 real 6:23 12:1 85:5 removed 7:7 records 10:10 90:16 promise 17:13 question 12:7,8 rendition 35:23 recovery 86:10 24:19 29:11 45:12 realize 9:23 proper 10:8 24:15 48:10 57:2 64:7 reopening 23:11 **reduce** 82:17 85:7 realized 54:16 71:17 73:11,14 repeat 4:11 reduced 41:4 85:12 75:24 82:16 proposal 5:3 6:15, realizes 55:10 repeating 86:20 16 9:17,23 10:25 reduces 81:25 questions 44:4 realizing 4:12 65:5, 12:10,14,15,20 47:22 74:2 repeats 75:18 22 95:11,15 reducing 82:14 13:13,17 14:2 15:25 replace 46:14 16:11,19,25 18:24 quick 6:23 65:22 realm 26:9 50:4 reduction 40:25 19:13,14,21,22 41:12 44:2 48:23 quit 38:20, 74:23 report 16:20 35:2,3 reason 26:9 37:10 23:13,20 43:23 58:9 38:24 49:7 59:1,10 87:19 45:16 46:14 57:4 90:17 58:20 59:3,4,7 61:15 R referring 23:23 reasonable 57:24 64:13 68:9 73:16 reported 48:18 reflect 36:12 71:17 72:2 96:18 79:6 93:9 95:5 96:2, raise 19:22 53:11 reporter 9:8 66:10 12 reasons 25:24 reflective 33:18 96:24

reporting 35:6 review 46:22 81:20 22:19 43:13 76:24 **share** 33:11,13,15 somebody's 37:18 92:24 revisit 93:22 scheduled 97:3 reports 36:12 92:7 something's 75:9 **shared** 59:15,21 reward 89:19 90:1 Schellenberg's reproduced 13:6 son 97:9 60:13 63:20 64:3 83:12 require 57:7 riding 32:9 sort 7:4 12:10,11 **sheet** 38:18 **school** 97:10 25:4 27:21.23 45:14 required 53:3 67:24 rights 14:22 **shell** 42:22 48:5 64:1 67:16 74:16 seal 57:6 rise 46:18 72:11 83:5 95:17 shift 29:2 requirement 75:16 search 23:17 **sought** 80:23 91:13 risk 28:6 80:19 **short** 13:10 17:25 requirements 5:6 81:25 82:14,17 searching 77:4 18:1 65:23 sounds 96:6 85:12 89:20 90:2,10 Sections 10:17 **show** 41:14 63:19 **source** 10:8 34:10 requiring 10:10 risks 89:18 66:10 97:15 **secure** 39:16 70:25 Research 88:18 road 51:16 Security 19:1 showing 84:23 **sources** 19:19 reserves 36:22 role 27:17 31:20 seek 81:3 **shows** 27:23 speak 24:22 28:20 35:12 resolution 66:19 82:18 seeking 81:12 **side** 6:3 44:4 94:3 rollback 50:13,14, resolved 12:2 46:25 **speaking** 60:14,15 90:10 sides 13:21 35:23 23 54:15 82:11,13 92:1 75:2 38:1 72:18 73:12 segment 47:9 rough 51:15 special 28:6 respect 34:22 signed 6:4 selecting 87:8 roughly 31:17 68:24 specialized 10:11 respond 43:6 79:5 **Senator** 6:21 48:9 significance 85:10 round 52:4 specific 45:15 response 10:22 54:22 59:18 74:2 significant 24:7 81:11 13:18 17:8 27:5 rug 43:19 84:15 26:19 36:21 37:6 82:20,25 rule 8:20 48:7 59:13 64:2 specifically 93:9 send 76:16,17 responses 94:12 84:20 94:16 rules 27:2 senior 74:8 significantly 28:10 specifics 64:8 responsibility rulings 38:6 sense 24:16 50:9 47:11 91:6 39:15 90:7 52:3 83:10 **speed** 76:19 run 55:14,16 restoration 21:11 **Silo** 67:1 **sentence** 12:3 14:1, **spot** 51:16 51:7 53:15 runs 75:4 4,5 **silos** 86:4 **spread** 86:11 restored 20:1 21:15 **single** 36:18 separate 47:8 73:22 S stabilization 41:3 53:2 sir 40:10 52:11 58:6 separates 29:15 result 42:13 stabilize 41:1 64:16,19 65:4 79:3, **sack** 75:11 September 18:13 retain 10:6 22:22 21 81:10 93:11 **stable** 27:16 22:20 **sacrifice** 59:15.21 retained 14:6 sit 35:16 53:8 **stake** 27:15 60:13 63:20 94:3 serve 20:15 42:23 retirees 30:12 **sitting** 47:12 staking 86:20 44:22 **sadly** 38:2 **situation** 26:5 36:13 retirement 18:10, **service** 18:21 19:4 stance 85:6 **safe** 91:9 18,23 19:2,6,10 20:6 25:9 28:6 57:23 standards 7:18 **sake** 72:19 25:2,4,6,12,14 26:19 **services** 10:14,15 sixty-fourth 87:12 27:16,18 29:23 30:2 start 16:25 24:1 salaries 60:4 39:16 41:19 44:21 size 87:18 88:22 **session** 93:15, 31:24 75:7 96:8,12, **salary** 33:20 41:1,4 48:16,21 80:15,16 97:16 25 97:3 skill 88:20 89:16 50:13 60:5 81:17 **set** 26:16 65:2,5,7 **started** 3:22, 26:23 slightly 9:24 satisfactory 78:8 return 19:12.15 88:6,20 89:16 **starting** 16:8 18:22 41:20,24 45:19,23, **Smith's** 48:10 satisfied 81:8 **setting** 45:19 41:1 24 47:4 91:7 93:2 Social 19:1 **save** 11:10 settlement 16:3,5, starts 19:6,7 returns 30:16 41:11 **solve** 45:5 12 23:21,24,25 **saved** 56:20 42:6 80:19 82:1 86:4 state 10:5 14:9 25:19 63:9 **solved** 80:20 25:14 68:17,20 **savings** 76:13 revenue 70:25 **shakes** 57:19 81:6 74:18 81:19 85:2 solvency 30:9 schedule 17:7,23 revenues 71:5

stated 65:20 system 19:11 27:16 terminate 95:20 tones 77:9 31:6 39:17 44:15 80:15,16, 81:17 50:3 57:16 62:7 72:4 **states** 14:8 terms 38:13 56:14 top 9:21 87:19 89:1 76:18 85:21 61:6 72:13,16 85:6 stating 60:2 toss 9:9 Т 91:17 ultimately 4:1,14 status 68:4,8 69:4 totality 29:23 83:2,6 text 12:2 table 6:25 7:22 8:6 statute 37:16 38:3,4 toto 23:21 unavailable 97:8 thankful 36:19 15:13 22:14,18 Statutes 10:17 touched 67:6 underneath 32:4 36:17 47:15 54:3 thankfully 47:20 59:23 80:9 understand 4:10 step 29:3 91:6,7 tough 71:13 thing 3:6 6:2 12:4 5:11 8:8,9 17:15 takes 29:20 streams 69:2 38:17 41:21 52:17 track 47:19 24:5 29:8 46:5 47:2 74:25 76:19 83:20 talk 6:19 11:2 33:5 **street** 79:10 tranches 48:6 49:13 51:18 55:3 85:11 35:10,19 38:20 59:25 60:2 64:21 strong 38:25 39:2 39:23 45:10 46:7,8, transcripts 35:8 81:1 82:10 **things** 27:14 36:9 41:10 85:5 10 57:21 64:14 39:21 42:2 44:11 transfer 40:4 understanding 76:21 85:6 strongly 37:22 46:6 54:13,19 56:13 29:22 transparency 7:19 58:11 63:7 65:18,19 talked 18:6,13 46:4 structure 10:19 understands 66:18,19 74:6 81:2 trapped 91:10 47:16 66:20,21,24 24:8,10 37:15 49:25 93:17,20 84:17,21 85:4,13 67:17 73:24 77:18 travails 97:10 87:2,24 88:6,12 **stuff** 66:13 79:10 unfair 43:12 91:1,20 93:22 treat 60:23 **subject** 27:13 50:6 talking 6:8 38:20 unfunded 35:18 thinking 91:9 43:1 60:13,18 64:10 68:12 69:13,19 **treatment** 16:4.5.7 65:23,25 67:2,16,18, 71:23 76:3 95:16,25 74:5 88:11 89:6 23:6 thinks 42:16 22 68:6,9,11,21 72:17 73:2,10,13,23 **subjects** 9:2 77:17 talks 33:1 trough 72:8 thirteen 6:3 7:1 76:8 78:14 79:13 substance 71:12 Tallahassee 40:15 truck 26:24 75:6 thoughts 58:3 82:23 95:10 96:16 78:17 86:24 **Tampa** 26:2 28:11 true 38:19 uniform 80:25 subtext 11:7 33:7,10,12 throwing 27:8 trust 30:9.11 unrealistic 37:8 **success** 35:14 task 7:9 16:20 Thursday 12:13 trust's 30:8 unreasonably 55:8 90:21 18:11,18 19:12,21 tied 21:7 28:13 24:23,24 26:7,10 trustees 30:18 untoward 74:15 suggest 66:2 95:23,24 31:3 35:1,22 38:11 truth 36:16 unwilling 77:1 suggesting 43:24 40:16 43:3 45:4 tight 17:22 76:23 48:19,24 49:7 58:22 51:18 turn 95:4,5 96:14 **upward** 61:16 time 17:5 20:8 25:5, 63:25 64:8 66:24 suggestion 43:2 turning 31:1 11 26:22,24 31:12 67:21 74:7 83:2,25 74:22 V 34:16 37:4 41:2 84:7 89:9 90:15,16 turns 52:1 51:23 52:6,12 53:2, summary 66:22 tells 26:8 tweaks 12:12 17 54:11 55:8 65:3, variables 39:18 Sunshine 92:19 temporarily 4:13 6,8 66:20 73:18 twelve 5:25 6:2 45:7 86:17 95:18 superfluous 94:22 93:18 temporary 51:15 vehicles 81:14 times 23:22 74:12 supplement 40:3 two-stage 20:3 ten 6:1 18:20 19:3 verbatim 24:22 83:21 86:23 97:2 60:6 20:6 25:9 26:16,18 two-thirds 31:14 versa 28:16 today 4:22 14:18 supplemental 41:8 31:11 43:13 57:22 two-way 79:10 17:7,14 35:19 65:22 62:24 93:3,18 94:19, 67:25 versus 25:4 84:19 79:23 96:22 20 96:8,25 97:2 87:1 two-year 20:14 21:5 supplementation today's 17:25 18:1 ten-year 24:20 25:7 60:15 type 80:13 vice 28:16 43:5 49:18 62:20 told 40:16 supplemented view 34:25 35:12 types 27:24 40:4 tenure 43:14 36:8 90:19 93:1 tomorrow 17:11,19 typically 26:21 64:12 79:2,5,20 term 3:22 13:3 18:11 **support** 24:9,13 viewed 64:1 93:9,15,16,22 94:15 31:9 48:14 59:16 supporting 84:8 U violating 70:21 95:2,5,9 96:3,25 63:20,21 65:1 73:20 97:2,4 supposed 30:18 86:5 91:21 voiced 89:25 **Uh-huh** 4:6 15:7

vote 37:15 48:12 worst 91:9 worth 88:22 89:8 W 94:25 worthy 46:21 wad 75:10 write 11:22 wage 31:22 written 5:18 wages 30:1 61:21 wrong 6:6 wait 38:24 53:9 84:13 Υ **waiver** 22:15 walking 32:9 yanked 32:3 wander 91:8 year 4:2 5:1 21:9 22:12,18 47:11,17 wanted 24:24 66:16 51:24,25 58:5 67:24 73:25 89:11 68:1,25 69:2,6 wanting 83:5 71:10,13 72:7,13,21, 22,23 73:6,10 86:16, **wash** 44:3 Watch 92:13 year's 47:18 48:13 74:19 water 97:12 years 4:1 18:20 19:3 ways 23:17 33:12 20:6 25:9 26:17,18 41:7 49:24 27:1 29:13 31:11 week 3:14 10:25 38:2 41:6,9 50:14 15:24 67:4, 73:17 53:9 55:20 57:23 58:1,2 62:24 69:6,25 weekend 5:1 9:10 80:22 85:25 86:1,12 well-qualified 87:11 93:3 81:20 you-all 10:22 49:3 wide 90:23 76:12,14 willingness 95:14 you-all's 82:20 wind 75:17,19 81:17 Ζ withdraw 38:25 women 44:22 **zone** 4:12 word 64:20 words 21:12 24:25 35:16 45:19 68:14 95:22 work 3:5 13:21 36:1 37:21 49:24 53:23 54:7 61:2 93:24 workable 13:19,20, 23 15:5 worked 26:6 working 5:9 13:15 63:23 88:12 world 80:17