# JACKSONVILLE POLICE AND FIRE PENSION FUND

# BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

DATE: July 21, 2017

TIME: 9:05 to 11:27 a.m.

PLACE: Jacksonville Police and Fire Pension Fund

One West Adams Street

Suite 100

Jacksonville, Florida 32202

# BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Richard Tuten, III, Board Chair Richard Patsy, Board Secretary Chris Brown, Trustee

William Scheu, Trustee (via telephone) Willard Payne, Trustee (via telephone)

# STAFF PRESENT:

Timothy Johnson, Executive Director-Plan Administrator Stephen Lundy, Assistant Plan Administrator Lawsikia Hodges, Office of General Counsel Pedro Herrera, Fund Counsel Dan Holmes, Summit Strategies Group Pete Strong, Fund Actuary

### CITY REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:

Anna Brosche, City Council President Greg Anderson, City Council Liaison Joey Greive, City Treasurer

Denice C. Taylor, FPR
AAA Reporters
233 East Bay Street, Suite 912
Jacksonville, Florida 32202
stenoz@comcast.net
904.354.4789

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		PAGE
3		
4	Recognition of City Council Liaison, Anna Brosche	3
5	Consent Agenda	6
6	Executive Director's Report	6
7	Investment Consultant's Report	52
8	Personnel Committee	84
9	Certificate of Reporter	139
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	BOARD MEETING
2	July 21, 2017 9:05 a.m.
3	
4	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All righty. Call to order.
5	Let's do our pledge of allegiance first.
6	I pledge allegiance to the flag of the
7	United States of America, and to the Republic for
8	which it stands, one nation, under God,
9	indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.
10	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All righty, then. Let's
11	have a quick moment of silence for the following
12	deceased members: William Parks, Jr., retired
13	fire chief; Ronald Reonas, active police officer;
14	and Troy E. Senterfitt, retired firefighter
15	engineer.
16	(Pause)
17	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All right. Thank you.
18	We have the public speaking period. We
19	don't have anybody to speak. No. Moving on.
20	Lovely.
21	City Council Liaison recognition.
22	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Yes, sir.
23	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Director Johnson, would you
24	like to take it from here.
25	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: You know, I could, but if

you'd like to, I'm fine with that.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I will. We're here to recognize Ms. Annie Brosche here -- the now current City Council President -- that is correct, yes -- for her outstanding work as the liaison during the dark periods here on the Board.

(Laughter)

MS. BROSCHE: I'll take credit for that.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: You held up well. You were very nice. Very pleasant to deal with. We have -- where's the award? All righty.

Director Johnson, would you like to come up?

Anybody wants to take a picture.

"In recognize and appreciation of dedicated service to the Jacksonville Police and Fire Fund Pension Board, Fiscal Year 2016-2017."

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Anybody want to take a picture? Get it tight, Rick. Come on.

MS. BROSCHE: Well, I just want to say that it has been a pleasure to work with you and to be a part of it. And I had shared with my colleagues that, as we know, that not everything ends up making its way into the media. And so

5 what really happens in meetings, it's really nice 1 to be there and experience it and get the real 2 stuff. 3 4 And so you-all have always been very 5 gracious and supportive and helping explain. And 6 I appreciate the opportunity to contribute to 7 moving us forward. And so thank you all very much. And you are 8 in good hands with Mr. Anderson. 9 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you. 10 Thank you for all that you did. 11 MR. BROWN: And, honestly, just providing that perspective 12 and the common sense, I've said it multiple times 13

MR. BROWN: Thank you for all that you did.

And, honestly, just providing that perspective and the common sense, I've said it multiple times in the last year, when you get up there and you speak, it really does convey the spirit of what's going on here instead of, you know, any misinterpretation that ends up happening from talking, you know, amongst people.

MS. BROSCHE: Very good. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We appreciate it, Anna.

And what we have, unfortunately taken a severe step down.

MR. ANDERSON: You are right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Laughter)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We will miss your smiling
 1
         face, but we will enjoy yours.
 2
 3
             MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.
 4
             MS. BROSCHE:
                            Thank you.
 5
              (Ms. Brosche exits the Board meeting.)
 6
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All righty, then. What do
 7
         we have here?
             DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Consent Agenda, item VI.
 8
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All righty. We have a
 9
         motion to approve the Consent Agenda?
10
             MR. BROWN: I make the motion.
11
12
             MR. PATSY: Second.
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN: And a second. Okay.
13
                                                     Call
         for questions, concerns?
14
15
              (No responses.)
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All in favor?
16
              (Responses of "aye.)
17
18
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Any opposed?
19
              (No responses.)
20
             CHAIRMAN TUTEN: No. All righty.
21
              Executive Director's Report.
22
             DIRECTOR JOHNSON: All right.
23
              I want to call your attention to tab 3,
24
         titled "Executive Director's Report."
25
              There are several items I'm going to hit on.
```

Obviously you have my report in front of you so you can read it and ask me any questions. But if you follow the agenda, you'll see there's a handful of items that I wanted to highlight.

So the first is Board action to support an FIAC recommendation that we extend our contracts from Northern Trust, our custodian, and also Summit Strategies, our investments consultant.

These two contracts currently expire

September 30th of this year. It was part of our initial plan for 2016-17 to put all professional service contracts out for rebid.

We did that with the actuary. That's how we got GRS and Pete Strong. We did that with the attorney. That's how we got Sugarman & Susskind. Pedro Herrera is here representing that firm.

The intent was to put out custody as well as investment consulting when those contracts expire.

But in the meantime, we had a little thing called pension reform. It's changed the landscape. The job we have to do of administering these reforms requires that we not change horses in midstream. It's not the time to do an RFP that will be very detailed, very

time-consuming, and could potentially change the players.

It's also important to note that we're not changing the players because there's any dissatisfaction with these two professionals. They're doing a fine job. I'd love it if they were to continue. But it was just the will of the Board that we put these contracts out for rebid.

So I recommended to the FIAC that we extend both contracts one year so that we can administer the newly enacted pension reforms. We would come back in 2018 and then put these out for RFP at that time.

So my first request is that the Board support that recommendation from me and a motion from the FIAC to extend the Summit Strategies contract and the Northern Trust contract for one year, all other terms being the same, to expire September 30th of 2018.

MR. BROWN: I make a motion.

MR. PATSY: Second.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. We've got a motion and a second. Any discussion?

(No responses.)

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I will say one thing, 1 Director Johnson -- I'm sorry --2 3 MR. ANDERSON: No, no, no. 4 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Putting out an RFP, and I 5 won't be here next year when you-all do that, but 6 change for change's sake doesn't make much sense 7 in our business, you know. We've got a lot of money involved, a lot of 8 people involved, a lot of experience involved, 9 and without making Northern Trust and Summit's 10 job seem automatic, because it's not, yet, you 11 know, we've had Northern Trust forever and, you 12 know, custodians do a certain job. 13 As long as they do that job to a certain 14 satisfactory level, we don't -- we're just going 15 to get the same thing somewhere else. 16 17 With the advisory, you know, consultant, Summit does a good job. Do we agree with Dan on 18 19 everything? Do I agree with Dan on everything? Obviously not. I think we've been down that 20 21 road. But as long as it's performing the way it 22 23 should be --24 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Sure. 25 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: -- and it's sound advice,

you know, put out the RFP if you want to, but I 1 think we're just -- we're getting the same cat of 2 3 a different stripe, you know. 4 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Well, I want to give the 5 Board peace of mind. 6 I won't initiate the RFP independently. So 7 when the time comes to do it -- the FIAC is recommending we get started in April of 2018 --8 I'd come here first. And if it's the will of the 9 Board to put an RFP on the street, then we'll do 10 it. If the Board doesn't want to do it, then we 11 12 won't. 13 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. Perfect. Councilman, did you have anything? 14 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you. Just a --15 Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. And I'm happy 16 to be here. I know it's a downgrade --17 18 (Laughter) MR. ANDERSON: -- and I'm perfectly willing 19 20 to accept that. 21 Just really quickly, it seems to me that the Board would have purview over this decision --22 23 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Yes. 24 MR. ANDERSON: -- without any subsequent 25 approval by the City Council. I just wanted to

confirm that with Ms. Hodges. 1 MS. HODGES: That's correct. 2 3 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you very much. 4 MS. HODGES: Through the Chair, if I may, 5 and Tim and I just had this brief discussion. 6 He said that historically -- and this is 7 more legal technical -- the Chair has executed documents on behalf of the Board, and I know we 8 have another motion that's coming up. 9 In my quick discussion with him -- and you 10 can certainly give whoever you want the authority 11 to actually sign contracts on behalf of the Board 12 to bind the Board. I know in your current 13 14 operating procedures, that should be your executive director. At least, that's how you 15 list it. 16 17 And that's really typical because the executive director is here every day instead of 18 19 having to track you down to sign things. So if you wanted to grant Tim that express 20 21 authority, now would be the time to do that, to just roll it into this motion that you're making 22 23 right now. 24 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. Well, we're 25 approving it. Wouldn't that be better maybe to

do it next year? 1 In other words, we're approving the Board to 2 3 sign -- to do the contracts now anyway. Do we 4 have any other contracts coming up? DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Well, there will be an 5 amendment to this contract. 6 7 And so to Lawsikia's point, I've gotten into a habit of bringing all the contracts to the 8 Chairman for signature. 9 MS. HODGES: And you can do that. 10 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: But the authority is 11 there for me to sign the contracts. All she's 12 suggesting --13 14 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right. DIRECTOR JOHNSON: -- is that when we do 15 this amendment, if you approve it, I'll sign the 16 17 amendment. 18 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. So you want to 19 approve the original motion --20 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I want to approve a 21 one-year extension for Northern Trust and Summit 22 Strategies. 23 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. And then give you the right --24 25 MS. HODGES: To execute --

1	MR. HERRERA: And authorize Tim Johnson, as
2	the executive director, to go ahead and execute
3	those agreements.
4	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, we got that down.
5	You got that down? All right.
6	MR. BROWN: So the motion is amended to
7	include that authority given to Tim Johnson to
8	sign on behalf of the Board.
9	MR. HERRERA: If the maker and the second
10	are okay with that, then yes.
11	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Perfect.
12	MR. PATSY: I second it.
13	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: And a second. All righty.
14	Any further discussion? Anybody on the
15	phone, Willard, Bill?
16	MR. SCHEU: No discussion.
17	MR. PAYNE: I'm okay.
18	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All righty. All in favor?
19	(Responses of "aye.")
20	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Any opposed?
21	(No responses.)
22	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Perfect.
23	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: All right. Item 2
24	involves the external auditor's engagement
25	letter.

The firm of Carr, Riggs & Ingram currently

performs external auditing services for the City

of Jacksonville. You-all will recall that back

in May, we got notice from KBLD that they would

not be engaging in another year of external

audits.

There was a retiring member and the firm was getting smaller because one member was running that business. And then unfortunately, there was an untimely passing of that second member. So KBLD is no longer doing our external audit.

I reached out to the city, to the auditor's office to find out who they engage. They engage the firm, CRI. I contacted CRK. They've given us an engagement letter. They're willing to perform all the duties that were done by KBLD and match the price that KBLD offered us as well.

The timing of this is perfect too because the city is reupping its contract the Carr, Riggs & Ingram at the same time.

So I would like to recommend to the Board that for the 2017-18 audit, we engage Carr, Riggs & Ingram, a one-year contract, for \$30,000.

MR. PATSY: Is it 17-18 or 16-17?

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: It would be for the

1 fiscal year-end in '17. For the fiscal year-end, September 30th of 2017. 2 MR. PATSY: Okay. Got it. I'll make the 3 4 motion. 5 MR. BROWN: And I'll second. 6 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. We have a motion and 7 a second. Any questions, comments? MR. HERRERA: Tim, just for clarification, 8 they're going to be issuing -- they're issuing 9 their opinion letter to us, to our Board, right? 10 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: There's no -- let me say 11 it a different way. You're right. 12 There will be opinion letter and it will be 13 issued to our Board. Even though they have a 14 contract with the city, the opinion letter will 15 16 come to us. Correct. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. All in favor? 17 18 (Responses of "aye.") 19 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Any opposed? 20 (No responses.) 21 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: No. Okay. Good job. 22 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: And just so we're clear, 23 I included a copy of that engagement letter in your Board book. 24 25 And the Councilman Anderson, we do this all

by Board book. You'll get this about a week in advance. You'll have a chance to read it.

I'll execute that contract.

Lastly, I've included a report with regard to the upcoming elections. So there's two sheets that you will see in your Board book. The first sheet has some yellow highlights on it. It's at the back end of my report. And it's an update of all of the terms of our acting body.

So it's the Board of Trustees, the Advisory Committee and the FIAC, which is at the bottom.

Now, the two bodies that are in play are the Board and the Advisory Committee. You will see that there are two terms that are expiring December 31st, 2017.

This is the representative of the fire department and the representative for police. So it's Richard Tuten, our chairman, and Chris Brown. That's why they're highlighted.

You had seen an earlier report that suggested that these terms expired in October. That was an erroneous report and, unfortunately, it was read into the minutes of the last election because the elections were consolidated. They were done that way for efficiency purposes back

in 2013.

And erroneously the records show that the terms expired based on the date of the election, not on the expiration of the term, as it's written in council ordinance. Does that make sense to you? They did the terms based on the election, not based on the ordinance.

So the true expiration of the term is the end of December 2017. Under that is the Advisory Committee. All of those members expire at the same time. They too are on a four-year term and they all expire at the end of 2017.

So this is to inform the Board that we will be doing an election, one election. It will be an electronic election where we will have three ballots. We'll have ballots for police and fire with active members. We'll have a ballot for the Advisory Committee for police and fire. And then we'll have a ballot for the retiree representative, who right now is Rick Townsend, that will be sent to all of the retired members.

On the back side is a timeline for that election. So if you wouldn't mind turning the page, you will see that October 9th we'll be sending out the qualifying notice. This is to

inform people that there are elections coming up and to attract any potential candidates.

On the 20th of October will be the deadline for submitting your qualification. On the 25th of October there will be a candidate announcement. It will announce who is qualified for the ballot.

November 15th, the voting begins. This will be electronic voting for active members. So they will be voting by email, and they will have two weeks to vote.

On November 30th, we will have the unofficial results from the firm that will do the tabulation. And then on December 6th, we will have certification of the final results from the Office of Elections.

That is the timeline for the election we're going to perform. That means that Mr. Tuten's term expires at the end of the year. Chris Brown's term expires at the end of the year, and depending on their desire to re-up, we will find that out when we send out the qualifications. We may see them again in 2018.

Do you-all have any questions about that?

I'll entertain those right now.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Have you gotten any feedback -- I mean, I've already made it publicly known. In that case, I'll do it now, that I'm not running again. That will be my last day, December 31st. 14 years is plenty.

But have you gotten any feel for the

Advisory Committee as far as people that might

want to run as far as, like, calling in and

inquiring or anything like that? Because I'll

tell you, it's -- it might not be as easy. I

mean, we're replacing literally the entire

Advisory Committee at one time. You know, that's

a lot.

I was just curious if we've had anybody -MR. BROWN: There was a discussion about
staggering those, but I think we're restricted?
DIRECTOR JOHNSON: They're not.

MR. BROWN: They're not. Yeah.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I mean, we could propose that they stagger, but they're not staggered now, and it's not likely we're going to be able to get that through council in a few months.

But to answer the Chairman's question, I've got every indication that the seven current members of the Advisory Committee are going to

1 re-up. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: 2 Okay. That still remains to be 3 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: seen because they're going to have to qualify for 4 5 the ballot. They could change their mind. 6 at this point, I haven't heard from anybody who's 7 told me that they don't intend to run again. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. I was just curious. 8 MR. PATSY: But having potentially all of 9 the Advisory Committee turning over at the same 10 time is a bad thing. 11 MR. BROWN: 12 Yes. Okay. So fixing this is -- I 13 MR. PATSY: don't know how we fix it, but --14 MS. HODGES: You can submit --15 MR. PATSY: -- if we could fix this, that 16 would be good. And I don't like the fact that 17 18 these two guys will potentially turn over at the 19 same time. That's, to me, not a good thing 20 either. 21 MS. HODGES: Through the Chair, you 22

MS. HODGES: Through the Chair, you definitely can recommend changes to your ordinance code. And this is a provision that's stemming from your ordinance code, not your charter.

23

24

So I would be happy to circle back with some 1 folks in my office and propose something maybe at 2 3 our next meeting. 4 MR. PATSY: Great. 5 MS. HODGES: And then you could file it and 6 get it in the hopper and we can just fix it. 7 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, the easiest thing would be to simply do -- get people elected, and 8 then either, A, shorten the term to make it sort 9 of an odd term, or lengthen it a year to make it 10 an odd, and then from there. Because that's 11 essentially what we did with the trustees. 12 It used to be a two-year term, and it got to 13 the point where there was turnover and it got to 14 be chaotic. So they made it a four-year. 15 way there was more, you know, stability. 16 17 MR. SCHEU: I'm not sure you can change 18 their term after they've been elected. Lawsikia 19 would know the answer to that. If you could get it through the council between now and the 20 21 election. If Anna is still there, maybe that's a possibility. Greq and Anna. 22 23 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. I'm here. 24 MS. HODGES: Yeah, we could, definitely.

could certainly get it through by the election

time. 1 It's really ministerial, yeah. 2 MR. SCHEU: 3 MR. ANDERSON: So you think that would require council approval? 4 5 MS. HODGES: Yes, right. Because they're reading from 121.103, which is the Advisory 6 7 Committee. And it just -- normally in our ordinances you'll see staggered four-year terms. 8 Specifically it gives that directive. 9 I mean, if you guys are okay with "let's 10 just change this to make it staggered, " you can 11 do that. You can make this motion today. And 12 this is -- I'm not even sure this is something 13 you need to see because you can give me specific 14 direction to fix the staggering, to allow for the 15 staggering, and I can, you know, run with that. 16 17 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, we can -- yeah. 18 That's not the problem. The problem is going to 19 be the length of the term --MR. BROWN: Well, if we could fix it ahead 20 21 of time, it will create -- certain elections will be for one year, two years, three years. 22 MR. SCHEU: 23 Right. For the first time, 24 that's right.

MR. GREIVE: And I guess where Tuten was

going possibly, and correct me if I'm wrong, would be, you know, when you advertise these elections, you have to advertise maybe half the spots as two-year terms and half the spots as four-year terms.

MR. PATSY: But -- but at some juncture, that has to be the first term is a two-year term, and all subsequent terms after that are three-year terms.

MS. HODGES: Right.

MR. PATSY: So that you can stagger. That's kind of a problem with the FIAC. You've got the first two members as two-year terms to stagger it, and the other three members are three-year terms. But there's no indication here that that -- those first two, they have a two-year term. All subsequent terms after that are three-year terms.

MS. HODGES: Okay.

MR. PATSY: Okay? That's --

MS. HODGES: So it's kind of the same thing.

MR. SCHEU: What you could do is have two of the six be two years, two of the six be four years, and two of the six -- well, I guess you don't want six-year terms.

So you could do two, three and four, and 1 have -- that way you'd have some continuity --2 3 MS. HODGES: Right. 4 MR. SCHEU: -- and after that it's all four 5 years. And then you'd break it up into three classes. 6 7 MS. HODGES: Yeah. And that's very typical in many of our ordinances. So if you are okay 8 with that, we could even file it on a one-cycle 9 10 emergency. What do you think about that, Council Member 11 Anderson? Do you think the council would be 12 amenable to that? I mean, let's just do the 13 timeline. 14 MR. GREIVE: It's just good governance, you 15 16 know. MR. ANDERSON: Well, first of all, I would 17 recommend that the Chairman create a subcommittee 18 with whoever you believe should be included to 19 craft this language. The language then would 20 21 need to be approved by this Board before it would be submitted to council. 22 23 And I'm never really in favor of a one-cycle 24 emergency, even though it makes a lot of sense. 25 It just -- it just causes people to say, why is

this an emergency? And we've seen that year 1 after year. And it's just -- I'm not in favor of 2 3 it, although I'm your liaison and I will do my best to get it approved. 4 5 But I would recommend that we go ahead and craft the language, do it all at one time, and 6 7 then submit it on a regular cycle once the Board has approved --8 MR. BROWN: Would it be acceptable in lieu 9 of a subcommittee to direct General Counsel to 10 11 craft up something that we can approve next 12 month? MS. HODGES: So, yeah, definitely. 13 14 MR. ANDERSON: However you want to do it. MR. BROWN: I think that would be the most 15 efficient way to do it. 16 MR. PATSY: Yeah. It would have to be an 17 accelerated time. 18 MR. SCHEU: Or could we direct her now --19 20 MS. HODGES: Yes, so --21 MR. SCHEU: -- to just -- the lawyers just carry it out. If we could vote now and ask her 22 23 to draw the appropriate legislation to create 24 staggered terms of one, two and four year, 25 whatever we decide. And that way we'd save a

month. I don't think we need a subcommittee just to do that.

MS. HODGES: Right. Through the Chair, so just to kind of just clarify. I mean, this is really a ministerial change.

If you direct to me -- you know, we've got seven members. You tell me how many is two years, how many is three, how many is four.

That's very specific. I'm not going to veer from that.

All the other substance in this section is going to remain the same. This is only the terms.

So you could today authorize me to draft that and the legislation because that's so narrow and that's so specific. That's one way to do it. And I move forward. I file that. This action has given me that authority to do that. That's one way.

Or you have some time. I mean, you do have an August meeting. I can come back at the August meeting with some proposed language, which is what the council member is recommending, and you could see it, and then I could move a hundred miles an hour from that point.

MR. BROWN: Okay. My recommendation is we 1 have seven members: 2 3 One of the police, two-year; one police 4 three-year; one police four-year; one fire, 5 two-year; one fire, three-year; one fire, 6 four-year, and the retiree a four-year term. 7 And I think that takes care of everything, and then when those terms are over, they would 8 be --9 MR. SCHEU: I second the motion and 10 authorize the General Counsel to prepare it and 11 to file it. 12 MR. PATSY: So that's -- that's initial term 13 for --14 MR. BROWN: All subsequent terms will be 15 16 four years. MR. PATSY: -- and all subsequent terms 17 18 become three-year terms. MS. HODGES: Right, exactly. 19 20 MR. BROWN: So we can repeat that --21 MS. HODGES: So I get that. So we have three police --22 23 MR. BROWN: Two, three and four. MS. HODGES: Exactly. Two, three, four. 24 25 Same with the fire, and the retiree is going to

1 be four years. And then you're right, after that --2 3 MR. PATSY: And that perpetuates the 4 staggering, but we also need to do something with 5 the FIAC, something along those lines. 6 MS. HODGES: Okay. 7 MR. PATSY: So I think if you just add the language that the initial term is as stated, and 8 all subsequent terms are three years. 9 MR. SCHEU: The FIAC, I think, has to be 10 approved by the council, whereas -- under the 11 reform legislation, whereas the Advisory 12 Committee does not. 13 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, the only thing I 14 15 worry about when you've got two even numbers, eventually they're going to catch up to each 16 17 other. 18 Why not just make it simple, odd and even, three and four initially for the election. You 19 20 know, that way you don't have to come up with 21 something two years from now. And, you know, you'll always have a permanent staggered schedule 22 on those two. 23 24 MR. SCHEU: It's just if you stagger it 25 more, you break up the staggering with doing it

with three.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I prefer the longer because you get people trapped, Rick, and they can't leave after two.

MR. PATSY: They can. They can.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, they can, but they don't usually. You want to keep them in there as long as you can. So three or four, or even a four and a five would be perfect.

MR. BROWN: And to bring in a point that was made by the fire union president dealing with the issue you brought up about the police and fire, because there's a new person that will be coming in to replace Rich since he's declared he's not running again, that term for this one-time only could be two years and you create a stagger there naturally as well.

MR. PATSY: Okay.

MR. BROWN: I think if you can take care of both of these things in one -- you know, one write-it, it just makes sense.

But now you've got staggered police and fire trustee positions and you've got fully staggered advisory positions.

MR. PATSY: That's a good recommendation.

I agree. I'd keep the FIAC out 1 MR. SCHEU: of it for the moment because that's under the 2 3 ordinance or charter. I think they have to be --4 the election of those has to be approved by the 5 City Council, whereas on the others, it does not. 6 MS. HODGES: Through the Chair, so, Trustee 7 Scheu, the Advisory Committee, I mean, that's also in your ordinance. The FIAC is stemming 8 from the ordinance. So any changes to any two is 9 going to require City Council. 10 What were you thinking? 11 MR. SCHEU: No, I know. No, I'm saying the 12 election of the members of the financial 13 committee --14 15 MS. HODGES: Oh, I see. Those are --MR. SCHEU: -- they've got to be approved by 16 the council. 17 18 MS. HODGES: That's correct. 19 MR. SCHEU: So I would take that up later. You've got some time on them. 20 MR. BROWN: I don't think we were -- were we 21 talking about that, the financial? 22 23 I think the changes we're recommending, 24 Bill, are just for the Advisory Committee and the 25 trustees right now because there's a natural

staggering that can take place with these terms 1 coming to an end. 2 3 MR. SCHEU: Yeah. No, I agree with that. I 4 thought somebody brought up wanting to deal with the Financial Investment Advisory Committee too. 5 6 MR. PATSY: While we're at it, we might as 7 well fix the FIAC too. Let's do it all in one fell swoop. 8 MR. SCHEU: Well, if you look at the chart, 9 that's already staggered, the 2018, 2019. 10 you've got some time, because that has got to be 11 more thoughtful because the City Council has got 12 to weigh in on the election process, not just the 13 amendment of the charter. All right. It really 14 doesn't -- I guess it doesn't really matter. 15 MS. HODGES: Well, what am I -- what's the 16 motion? 17 18 MR. BROWN: So I think -- let me do this, that way it kind of simplifies things. 19 I make a motion that General Counsel draft 20 21 up a proposed change to the elections for the Advisory Committee. As we discussed, there would 22 23 be an election for a two-year, three-year and 24 four-year term for the police advisory committee 25 members.

There would be an election for the two-year, 1 three-year and four-year term for the fire 2 3 advisory committee members, and for the retiree 4 member, that would be a four-year term. 5 Every subsequent term would be four years so 6 you would have a staggered election cycle. 7 For the trustee positions, I am recommending that for this one-time election for the fire 8 trustee, it be for two years only. That would 9 create a staggered four-year-term cycle. 10 Is that -- that's kind of the motion in 11 full. 12 That's right. And just to --13 MR. PATSY: 14 and the subsequent term would be a three-year term for the --15 16 MR. BROWN: No three years. 17 MR. PATSY: -- fire? 18 MR. BROWN: No three years. No. If he has 19 a two-year term now, it would put him, you know, 20 two years off of the police trustee. So there would be a natural --21 22 MR. PATSY: Yeah, but every six years --23 MR. SCHEU: And then it's four years after 24 that because we have four-year terms now. 25 MR. BROWN: But I'm saying one time only,

let the fire trustee be two years, and then that 1 creates a natural stagger at that point. 2 3 MR. PATSY: Don't we have to say the 4 subsequent term be four years? 5 MR. BROWN: Yes. 6 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right. 7 MR. BROWN: Yeah. All subsequent terms after these special elections here would be four 8 9 years. 10 MR. PATSY: Got it. That would be my motion. 11 MR. BROWN: 12 MR. PATSY: And I'll second that. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. I'll make an 13 amendment that Director Johnson work with the 14 General Counsel to sort all this stuff out. 15 16 MR. BROWN: I just want to make sure that the math is clear on that. 17 18 MS. HODGES: Are we bringing this back in 19 August? 20 MR. BROWN: We would approve it --21 MS. HODGES: Okay. Yeah, let's do that. 22 MR. SCHEU: I would like to suggest that the 23 motion means you're authorized to file it. 24 MR. PATSY: Just one question. And we're 25 not going to do anything with the FIAC at this

1 point? 2 MR. BROWN: Not yet. MS. HODGES: 3 I didn't hear that in the 4 motion. 5 MR. PATSY: Because March 2018, two of these 6 people come up for -- the two-year term ends. 7 MS. HODGES: So can I propose this? Only because --8 MR. PATSY: Yeah, but every sixth year --9 Through the Chair, since -- in 10 MS. HODGES: August we would still have some time to get that 11 through. It will come out probably the first 12 meeting in September. Is that going to work with 13 your timing? It would come out --14 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Well, my timing is 15 October 9th, so as long as this is done by 16 October 9th, my time doesn't get jeopardized. 17 18 MS. HODGES: Let me suggest this. So then since we have some time and this 19 20 member is concerned about the FIAC, can I just 21 draft some language and come back with all three, 22 the Trustee Board, the FIAC and the Advisory 23 Committee, and let you take a look at it. By that time I would have been able to 24 25 circle and make some recommendations that's more

1 thoughtful than what we're kind of doing now? 2 MR. BROWN: So I add to my motion that third 3 directive, that she work on a staggered election 4 cycle for the FIAC, and then bring back all of 5 that for our approval next month. 6 MS. HODGES: Yes. Okay. 7 MR. PATSY: Second. MR. BROWN: Good, Bill? 8 MR. SCHEU: Yeah, that's fine. 9 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All righty. We have a 10 motion and a second. Any further discussion, 11 12 comments? Rick, you look like you want to say 13 something. 14 MR. PATSY: No. Getting ready to raise my 15 hand. 16 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All righty. All in favor? 17 (Responses of "aye.") 18 19 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Any opposed? 20 (No responses.) 21 MR. ANDERSON: In the past -- so in this 22 case you will file -- the Office of General 23 Counsel will file the legislation on behalf of 24 the Board; is that correct? 25 MS. HODGES: No. The Board can file the

legislation. 1 MR. ANDERSON: The Board can file it. 2 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We'll file it. 3 4 MS. HODGES: Yes, sir, the Board can file. 5 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. So you'll file it directly. And what I've done in other council 6 7 liaison positions is work with the attorneys and we'll go around and make sure that all the 8 council members understand what's going on. 9 So what I want to make sure that we do is 10 just answer all the questions up front so that 11 when it comes out of committee, that we don't get 12 into some big discussion there over a ministerial 13 kind of an issue. 14 And I think -- let's make sure we all do 15 that. Does that make sense? 16 MS. HODGES: That's make sense. 17 That's 18 great. 19 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Because I'll be the 20 one who will shepherd it through council. DIRECTOR JOHNSON: All right. So do we need 21 22 a vote? 23 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We already voted. 24 MS. HODGES: No, we just did. 25 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All in favor. Five, zero.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: So for the record, this 1 election timeline will now be predicated on the 2 3 passage of these amendments. 4 So if it's necessary, I can adjust the 5 timeline because we've got until the end of 6 December to get this done. So it's possible that 7 this won't be the final timeline. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I don't know, Tim, that 8 even if for some reason something happens, we 9 have a hurricane or lose the computer whatever, 10 we still have the election, I'm not sure that you 11 can't adjust these terms after people are 12 elected. 13 14 In fact, I'm almost positive that you can. In other words, you're elected for two. 15 Congratulations, it's now three, you know, 16 because of whatever. 17 18 MR. BROWN: That doesn't -- that doesn't 19 smell right. I don't know that you can do that. If people --20 21 Yeah, I don't think you can do MR. SCHEU:

that.

22

23

24

25

MR. BROWN: -- voting for a specific amount of years for you to serve, for somebody to be able to come along and just add a year, I just

don't think --

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, that's not the purpose of it. The purpose of it is to do what we're doing now. If we can't get it done in time, you have to do it sooner or later, you know, unless you want to wait another whole cycle and do it then.

And I don't think people are going to have a problem with anybody serving longer. If the person's fine with serving longer, I don't think you're going to have a problem.

MR. BROWN: No, I don't think you'll have a problem in spirit, but I think just from a legal standpoint --

MS. HODGES: Yes.

MR. BROWN: -- I just want to make sure we're doing it the right way.

MS. HODGES: Yeah, so I'll work on that --

MR. SCHEU: That's right. I don't think it's legal.

MR. PATSY: So if we come back in August with your recommendation, you believe we'll have enough time to get it through City Council and approved before this cycle, correct?

MS. HODGES: Okay. So let's be really

1 exact. So, Tim, when is your -- when is the August 2 3 meeting? That's going to be the third week in 4 August? 5 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I think it's the 18th of 6 August is the August Board meeting. 7 MR. GREIVE: What's the final deadline for that cycle? 8 MS. HODGES: All right. All right. All 9 right. Because if you're not approving it until 10 the 18th, then you're missing the August. 11 Well, is it possible to have a special 12 meeting? Can we do that? 13 MR. ANDERSON: Can I make another 14 recommendation, Mr. Chairman? 15 16 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yeah. MR. ANDERSON: Go ahead and file -- I would 17 say let's go ahead and file it, like one of the 18 trustees suggested, and then just know that if 19 we've got to make any amendments to it, then 20 21 those amendments will be approved by this Board. I'll make the motion on the floor to amend it if 22 you choose to amend in any way. And that way you 23 get in cycle. 24

Remember, what's going on right now is the

25

council is getting ready to go into budget 1 2 process --3 MR. BROWN: Yes. 4 MS. HODGES: Oh, yeah. 5 MR. ANDERSON: -- and all the air gets 6 sucked out during that process. 7 MR. SCHEU: I knew there was some reason why Greg would be a good counsel liaison. 8 So we authorize it now, and I'll move to 9 amend the motion to do that. That makes a lot of 10 sense and gets us on down the road. 11 MR. BROWN: And I'll second that amended 12 motion to include that direction for her to 13 automatically file it. 14 (Members conferring.) 15 16 MS. HODGES: Yeah. He's a participating 17 member. We have a quorum that's here. So you 18 have a physical quorum. These two members, the 19 Board is okay with these two members 20 participating by telephone, so they can 21 participate and vote. 22 MR. BROWN: Okay. So I made -- I seconded his motion. So we'll need to vote on that 23 24 amendment that just incorporated what the City Council liaison recommended. 25

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. You're making a 1 motion based on the councilman's recommendation? 2 3 MR. BROWN: We amended the motion. 4 did. I seconded it. We're ready for a vote on 5 that. 6 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. Any questions? 7 (No responses.) CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All in favor? 8 (Responses of "aye.") 9 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Any opposed? 10 11 (No responses.) 12 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Perfect. You got all that, Director Johnson? 13 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I have all that. All 14 right. So let's get back on track. 15 Very briefly, the Chairman last month asked 16 17 me to do an analysis of the attendance record of the members of the Financial Investment Advisory 18 19 Committee. 20 I did that analysis. I sent a report to the 21 Chairman. I've met personally with the Chair of 22 the FIAC, and we placed the discussion of 23 attendance on the agenda of the FIAC meeting 24 which occurred last Friday. 25 Attendance has been sporadic. It has

created a bottle neck in that there are actions that we couldn't take here because they hadn't been properly vetted by the FIAC first.

Those members have committed to a stronger attendance. In the instance where they're unable to attain a meeting, they're going to give me as early notice as possible so that a potential rescheduling can occur, because there have been several meetings which we've had two of the five members and we just couldn't do business.

If we had known earlier that the third member wouldn't be there to create a quorum, we could have rescheduled.

And I find that they are far more engaged.

I think a big part of it was just acknowledging the fact that attendance was a problem.

So I thank the Chair for bring that up. I think we're going to see a much stronger attendance from the FIAC members going forward.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Director, let me ask you something.

Do they run their meetings the same way we do with ours? In other words, it's the third, whatever, whatever?

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Yes, they do.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: So the members know in 1 advance every month when their date is? 2 3 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: That is correct. 4 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: And do we send them out an 5 email with a little -- Lundy does with an X or 6 check, you know? If you respond, you're going to 7 be there. If you're not going to be there. DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Yes, sir, he does. 8 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. And it's just a 9 matter of people either not responding or not 10 notifying you, hey, something's come up, I can't 11 make it, the day before? 12 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I think -- I think a 13 number of the meetings we due to the fact that we 14 15 only had four members up until about 60 days 16 ago --17 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right. 18 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: -- when Tracey Devine was 19 approved. So you had to create a quorum of three members with only four members. 20 21 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right. Now that Tracey's on, we 22 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: 23 have five members. It's a little bit easier to create a quorum. So I do think that was part of 24 25 it.

I also think part of it was the fact that during reform, we were advised by the Office of General Counsel the necessity of reviewing certain actions in the FIAC before coming here.

And as you all well know, in the March and April time frame, there were several meetings that were not regular meetings of that body.

And so they've had a lot of pressure on them. But I do think we have turned a corner, and going forward we're going to see stronger attendance.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We have given them a little handbook of what's expected of them?

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: You know, that was one of the recommendations that came out of that meeting, is that I do an orientation this fall.

So Dan and I had an opportunity to talk about that yesterday after the working group on reform administration, and Lawsikia and I have talked about it earlier, because they'd like to be trained on fiduciary, ethics and public records' responsibilities.

MS. HODGES: Right.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: So we're going to be doing -- a quick answer to your question is,

we're going to be doing a two-part orientation that will cover investment policy, our annual cycle of work, as well as the fiduciary, ethics and public records training. They wanted that. I think that will help engage them more.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: From my limited interaction with them, I think there's two things here.

Number 1. I don't think they really understand what they need to do.

And, Number 2, I don't think when they signed up they truly appreciated the gravity of the situation. In other words, what fiduciary really means and that these decisions are long term and they're involving ten of -- hundreds of millions of dollars.

And that needs to get through to them because if they're not comfortable making those decisions, as we saw at the one meeting, you know, then there's no shame in saying, look, this is way more than I wanted to step in; I'm going to resign. We'll find somebody else.

But they need to understand that they're here, they need to do their job, and they need to understand the gravity of the situation. And they need to do it quickly, not what we saw.

Just putting it bluntly, brother. I mean, I 1 just -- you know, I don't think they understood 2 3 what was involved and that there's going to be 4 cameras and mayors and council people and hundreds of millions of dollars and long-term 5 6 projections. I think they thought it was more of 7 a -- I have no idea what. Is somebody wrestling a cat? 8 (Laughter) 9 MR. ANDERSON: The cat's winning. 10 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Willard, Bill, what is 11 that? 12 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: We're getting some 13 background noise. 14 Willard, Bill, can you hear us? 15 MR. SCHEU: We were having trouble, at least 16 I was. It was like it was crackling, like 17 18 somebody's moving the phone or something. 19 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: All right. 20 The last item is really quick. We had the 21 working group meeting for a reform administration 22 yesterday. Pedro, Pete, Dan came in early to 23 participate. We also had Randy Wyse; the 24 treasurer, Joey Greive; and the representatives, 25 Officer Holderfield for the Advisory Committee

and Brian Smith for FIAC.

We had a robust discussion about how we implement the reform ordinances. I'll be preparing kind of a summary of my notes. I'll share that with the Board next month. There's no action that's required.

But we want to hit the ground running. That reform takes effect October 1st, and we want to have all of our ducks in a row before we get there for the benefit of our members and all stakeholders.

It was a great meeting, and I just wanted to acknowledge the people that were here that participated. Rick Patsy represented the Board on that committee.

That's my report, and I'll answer any other questions.

MR. BROWN: I have none.

MR. PATSY: It was a good meeting. It was constructive. We did talk about, you know, doing an asset liability study to take into consideration the changes and what kind of impact it can have on the fund. I forget the timeline on that. I'm not sure if we actually laid that out.

MR. HOLMES: We didn't lay out a timeline 1 2 yet. 3 MR. PATSY: Do we need to direct Summit to 4 do that? 5 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Yes. 6 MR. PATSY: Can we do that today? 7 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I mean, we're going to do it, so it's up to you. We can do it now or you 8 can wait a month. 9 MR. PATSY: I will make that motion that we 10 direct Summit in conjunction with GRS to conduct 11 an asset liability study based on the changes 12 that are going to come down the road October 1st. 13 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Now, are you looking at it 14 more from just the different benefits that are 15 involved, or are you talking about more of an 16 open-plan, closed-plan type of study? 17 Do you understand that I'm saying? 18 In other 19 words, are we talking about strictly the changes that were involved --20 MR. PATSY: I think more from a benefit 21 perspective because it will be a while before the 22 23 closed plan functions -- well, I don't think you 24 can do them in isolation. I think you have to do 25 them in conjunction with each other.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, that's what I was 1 thinking. I couldn't -- I didn't really 2 3 understand what you were asking for. 4 MR. PATSY: Yeah. But it will be awhile 5 before the closed plan side of the equation 6 really impacts the plan, because the liability is 7 still, you know, the traditional plan. going to be in the pension business for a lot 8 longer than some of the folks think we're going 9 to be. 10 Right. I'm just more of 11 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: the income side of the stream there as far as 12 incoming from new members and, you know, city 13 contributions, how that's going to affect our 14 15 plan, you know, long-term assets. 16 MR. PATSY: So, consequently, to get back to my motion, that we direct Summit in conjunction 17 18 with GRS to conduct an asset liability study. 19 MR. BROWN: And I second it. 20 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All right. We have a 21 motion and a second. Any questions, comments? 22 Pedro? MR. HERRERA: I don't know if this was 23 24 discussed yesterday. Do you want to get a cost for that before 25

you authorize it, or do you want to put a 1 not-to-exceed number or anything like that? 2 MR. HOLMES: 3 The cost from our perspective 4 is zero. It's included in our flat fee. 5 MR. PATSY: As part of the retainer package? 6 MR. HOLMES: Yes. 7 MR. STRONG: Our assistance will be based on our discounted hourly rates, which probably won't 8 be that much because we're going to be providing 9 inputs to them and then they're going to be doing 10 the core asset liability work. 11 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Perfect. 12 MR. HOLMES: Through the Chair. 13 14 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yes. MR. HOLMES: One suggestion would be we wait 15 until the next valuation is finished so we get a 16 17 true picture of what the liabilities look like going forward -- if we use the last valuation. 18 19 So there's going to be a time delay. And then a rough estimate of how long it takes is 20 21 anywhere from two to three months, depending on when we receive all the information from the 22 23 actuary. So just to lay out expectations for 24 timeline. So the valuation should be 25 MR. PATSY:

1 complete January? MR. STRONG: We should have a draft by the 2 3 end of November. But, yeah, the final report in 4 January. 5 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: That's fine. 6 MR. PATSY: So we can -- I can take that 7 motion off the table and we'll bring it back up as we get closer. 8 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Or you can pass it and 9 I'll just wait until the valuation is done. 10 MR. PATSY: Okay. Let's do that --11 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Because I was going to 12 bring it back anyway. So we might as well handle 13 it now. 14 MR. STRONG: We should be able to provide 15 inputs once we have the data finalized. And we 16 17 just recently sent out our census data request 18 because we collect census data as of July 1 for the October 1 valuation. 19 20 So once we get the census data, we can 21 actually start the process of getting the inputs 22 sent to Dan probably by October. 23 MR. HOLMES: Excellent. 24 MR. STRONG: Yeah. 25 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: All right.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: That's fine. 1 Okay. We still have a motion and a second. Any 2 3 questions? 4 (No responses.) 5 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All in favor? 6 (Responses of "aye.") 7 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Any opposed? 8 (No responses.) 9 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Good. It passed. That's my full report. 10 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: It's a little longer than I thought it would be, 11 but I appreciate your patience. 12 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Always, Director Johnson. 13 What do we have? Investment 14 Okay. 15 Consultant Reports. Mr. Dan Holmes. 16 MR. HOLMES: Yes. Good morning still. So I'm not -- I don't have a formal report 17 18 other than the Flash Report. I came down for 19 yesterday's meeting and thought I'd stay over and cover Flash while I was here in town. 20 21 This is a preliminary -- first of all, we have two reports together, the Economic and 22 Capital Market Update, and then the Flash Report 23 24 after that. 25 So the bottom line is on the Flash Report,

this is through June 30th, the big picture take-away without going through all the points are as follows:

First of all, what we saw through the end of the quarter was continued economic growth, which basically helped risk assets continue their strong returns through the quarter.

So the economic conditions, especially in Europe, you had Central Bank continued easing there. You've got stronger consumer sentiment there and here in the US. So that helps the equity markets reach gains seems like every other week. Or, I'm sorry, all time highs, if you will, every other week.

For the month of June, we saw more job growth. Basically what we've seen is unemployment is hovering around 4.2 to 4.3. It ended June at 4.3. But job growth continues positive.

More importantly, we see wage inflation. That wage inflation continues to run at an annualized rate at 2 1/2 percent through June, and that's good for the economy.

Real GDP grew at a 1.4 percent rate for the first quarter. The second quarter -- that was

revised up from the previous estimate at 1.2 percent. And then basically the Atlanta Fed has forecast the second quarter to come in at about 2.7 percent. So we're expecting second quarter to be stronger, and then we'll see where the third quarter goes from there.

In terms of the PMI indices, which are leading economic indicators, the good news is the manufacturing side, the economic indicators are picking up. So they had basically been flat.

The service sector had always been above 50, which is an indication that the economy was growing, but for -- I think it's the seventh consecutive month, we've seen the manufacturing side pick up, and that's definitely a positive.

In terms of bonds, we've seen rates go up on the short end so far this year a little bit, but now appreciably.

So how does that translate into returns?

Basically we saw flat equity returns for the month kind of modestly positive in some spaces, but, more importantly, for the quarter we saw stronger returns.

So on page 2 of that report, just to kind of put some numbers on it, where you see on the

right-hand side, the blue bar is the month; but, more importantly, the green bar is the quarter and the purple bar is the last 12 months.

So just for the quarter, to put some numbers on it, the S&P was up 3.1 percent, small cap stocks up 2 1/2 percent measured by the Russell 2000.

As I mentioned before, internationally, the international equity returns have been stronger so far this year and that continues. So you can see that the EAFE Index was up over 6 percent for the quarter as well as emerging markets as well.

You'll note that the only thing in terms of growth assets that was negative for the quarter were MLPs. I've got more comments on that here shortly, but you can see that the MLP index was down about 6 1/2 percent for the quarter.

And then on the fixed income side, if you turn one page over very quickly, as I mentioned, we've seen modest or flat returns for the month, but, more importantly, some modestly positive returns for the quarter.

So the aggregate was up. The Bloomberg market was aggregate -- which is a measure of the investment grade universe for the US -- it was up

1.4 percent.

You can also see that the Bloomberg Barclays Global Aggregate Index for the quarter was up 2.6 percent. The declining dollar was the main determinant and the difference there. The dollar has been declining so far this year, which has given an added boost to international equity and fixed income returns.

So that's the quick economic backdrop. Let me pause for questions, and if not, I'll go into the Flash Report.

MR. ANDERSON: Any sense of long-term rate movements are just continued sort of the trajectory that the fed has kind of outlined?

MR. HOLMES: Recent comments basically included the fact that they're not adhering to hard and fast targets. What they're doing is kind of watching for the trend.

The idea is they don't want inflation to get out of hand, and they're trying to raise rates to slow that down. At the same time, if they raise rates too quickly, it has the potential to stall off the economy.

And so in Janet Yellen's last testimony, basically her comments were that they're holding

off on another rate increase, not doing it immediately. They'll look towards more at the end of the year for that.

Again, they're going to look at where unemployment and labor growth -- labor wage rates are and decide whether or not to raise that. And the market rallied that particular day on that news.

MR. ANDERSON: And market consensus is a quarter a point?

MR. HOLMES: Yes.

MR. ANDERSON: And then, finally -- thank you, Mr. Chairman, any sense of tax reform and how that plays into the equity markets? We've heard different things through the media outlets.

MR. HOLMES: I'm laughing because we were talking about the exact same thing last night.

Our view is, is that the equity -- the US equity market continues to be overvalued. And so we were kind of talking about why it continues to kind of go up.

And so kind of the term that has been used is the Trump Bump post-election, that the equity markets have continued their upward rise in terms of its trend. The market has kind of discounted

or baked in the news that either tax reform or healthcare reform or both will be passed.

The consensus seems to be that if one of those, specifically, tax reform, is not enacted before the end of the year, then that would produce more uncertainty with regard to growth rates and the equity markets could trade off.

Now, how does that translate into action?

This Board has never really engaged in trying to do tactical asset allocation, trying to guess where the market is going to go over a short-term time period. But we are cognizant of where valuations are.

As an example, last month the Board approved rebalancing. So what we did is we've been overweight to domestic equities relative to target. So what we did is we took that overweight off by selling it and moving it into other asset classes.

So trying to sell off what has appreciated. So it's kind of the methodology that we've used to deal with that. Okay?

MR. ANDERSON: Gotcha. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HOLMES: Thank you for the good

1 questions. Next on the agenda is the Flash Report. 2 3 MR. BROWN: Can I just ask you a quick 4 question on the -- there's a year market implied 5 inflation -- or ten-year market implied inflation 6 expectations. 7 Discuss possibly, if you could, the most recent number on inflation. It's 2016. 8 Has that been firmed up now six months into this year what 9 the rate of inflation was last year? Was it 10 under 2 percent as measured by, like, the CPI 11 basket of goods or --12 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. I'm trying to remember 13 where -- forgive me because I can't remember 14 where it came in, the final came in for 2016. 15 Rick, but do you recall by any chance? 16 17 Joey? MR. PATSY: 18 No, it's from six months ago --19 MR. BROWN: So it seems like I call it being 20 quite low --MR. PATSY: You're right --21 22

MR. BROWN: -- I thought it was under 2, but I guess my question would be -- and I know it's very early on. We really don't even have six months of information yet with things not being

23

24

25

solidified, but are we on track to have a higher 1 rate of inflation this year? 2 3 MR. HOLMES: No. 4 MR. BROWN: No. 5 MR. HOLMES: No. As a matter of fact, part 6 of the corollary to the Trump Bump is -- it's now 7 being known in our office as the Trump Thump. And so that's basically what happens -- you 8 know, the market took off in anticipation of a 9 number of policies being enacted. The thought 10 is, okay, some of those may not come to fruition 11 and what would be the result in different sectors 12 of the market. 13 And so one thing that we have observed is 14 15 that inflation has not been as strong as what was originally anticipated, getting to your point. 16 17 I'd have to go back and see. The ten-year 18 break-even is just basically where the markets 19 implying for inflation over a ten-year period. And that's determined between the rate on the 20 21 ten-year TIPS versus the treasury -- and so right now it's implying something less than 2. 22 MR. BROWN: 23 Okay. 24 MR. HOLMES: Actually, at the end of June, 25 it was 1.7.

MR. PATSY: Do you have any statistics to 1 show how accurate that has been in the past? 2 3 MR. HOLMES: Not very. It's -- I mean, 4 within one standard deviation --5 MR. PATSY: That's a problem. MR. HOLMES: -- I mean, it's within one 6 7 standard deviation. The Philadelphia Feds estimate is within one standard deviation. 8 Right now our ten-year assumption for 9 inflation is two for the next ten years. But it 10 kind of -- it seemed stronger at the beginning of 11 the year. It slowed down. 12 13 Depending on what happens in the second half of the year, it could come back up higher. And 14 15 so, you know, we review it quarterly, but we don't necessary have to change it quarterly. 16 17 MR. PATSY: Okay. That makes sense. 18 MR. HOLMES: Turning to the Flash Report, I will note on the cover of the Flash Report it's 19 20 marked Preliminary. 21 The reason it's marked Preliminary is when we sent this out last week for the FIAC meeting, 22 23 we still had not received market value and return 24 information from the real estate managers. That

takes a little bit longer for them to pull their

25

information together.

So my anticipation is, is that the official return for the quarter will probably be slightly higher. So turning to page 1, the take-aways are as follows:

First of all, if you look at the bottom left-hand side of the page, market value at the end of the quarter grew to \$1.9 billion. As I mentioned before, when you get over that \$2 billion mark, I'll bring a cake and we'll celebrate it --

(Laughter)

MR. BROWN: For the week that it will be over \$2 billion.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah. As long as we go over, that's fine. I can't get guaranteed 2 billion candles, but we will have a cake.

No, all humor aside, we've been very fortunate in terms of growth assets for last year, and this year have done fairly well.

Patience at the Board level in allowing underperforming managers to come back has also paid off in terms of returns above benchmarks.

And then so the bottom line is, we've enjoyed --we're in our second year of good steady growth.

So hopefully market value -- by the end of the year, market value reaches in the \$2 billion mark.

So turning to our returns, page 2 of returns, we show composite returns on a gross-of-fees basis. Page 3 is on a net-of-fees basis, but I'll use page 2 and its comment on the net.

So for the quarter on a gross-of-fees basis, the fund was up 3 percent net. That translates into 2.95 percent. So far this calendar year, as I mentioned before, the calendar year has been fairly strong, especially on the equities side.

One thing I failed to mention is, is that we've had a turn-around since last year where we see growth assets, both large cap and small cap, doing better than value assets. And to some extent that's also extended into international equities as well. And the majority of that is coming from the technology sector.

For the fiscal year so far, the fiscal year-to-date, on a gross basis, the plan is up over 10 percent. On the net basis it's about 9.8 percent.

And then, finally, I can read the -- I can

read a score card with the best of them, can't I?

So far this year we're up -- for the trailing one-year period, up approximately 14.9 percent, and on a net basis that's 14.5 percent -- on a net basis for that trailing four-month period.

So what's kind of the story behind those returns, those strong returns? Basically it's if you break down the attribution on an absolute basis, it's equities and primarily international equities. International equities have been your strongest returning sector.

And then on a relative basis, relative to benchmarks, again, it's international equities and fixed income. Both have been fairly strong relative to their benchmarks.

In international equities, although your plan is limited to no more than 25 percent in international securities, that would include international corporate bonds, or I should say non-US corporate bonds.

The bottom line is, is that the allocation has remained right around 20 percent. At the end of the quarter, it was at 20.27 percent. We can always use more in international -- especially in

this market environment, more international would 1 be preferable. 2 3 But state statute limits you to 25 percent, 4 and we've kind of kept the buffer there to make 5 sure that we don't go over state statute when you 6 look through and you look at non-US corporate 7 bonds in the two core-plus portfolios. MR. PATSY: Dan, we allow our fixed income 8 managers to allocate tactically to non-US bonds? 9 MR. HOLMES: They are allowed -- not all of 10 The two core plus managers, Neuberger 11 Berman and Loomis. 12 MR. PATSY: Okay. And we cap their limit --13 14 MR. BROWN: To make sure it doesn't get over 25. 15 16 MR. HOLMES: They cap their limit by their 17 internal process. 18 MR. PATSY: Right. But we're telling them, 19 hey, you can't go over X amount --20 MR. HOLMES: Right. And forgive me, because 21 I can't -- if memory serves, I believe it's 20 percent for Loomis and it might be something a 22 23 little bit less for Neuberger Berman. 24 MR. PATSY: And they're both about 2 25 percent?

MR. HOLMES: Bear with me for one second. 1 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Oh, yeah, we're trying to 2 3 figure out how --4 MR. BROWN: There's no possible way that 5 could get over 25. 6 MR. HOLMES: No, no. That's where we're 7 going. No, Loomis is at 5 percent and Neuberger Berman is at 8. 8 MR. PATSY: So how are we monitoring --9 MR. HOLMES: Quarterly I look through at the 10 weight to the non-US bonds. Add that to the 11 weight to non-US equities and make sure we stay 12 under 25 percent. 13 MR. PATSY: So who's doing it, Summit --14 MR. HOLMES: Me. 15 MR. PATSY: -- or is it Northern Trust --16 17 MR. HOLMES: Summit. MR. PATSY: Okay. 18 MR. HOLMES: That is based on Northern 19 Trust's custodian statements. 20 21 MR. PATSY: Okay. 22 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Dan, does this allocation, 23 the 20.27 percent right now, that's including the 24 bonds that --25 MR. HOLMES: No.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: That's not? 1 MR. HOLMES: No, that's just equities. 2 3 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. So how much wiggle room do we have under 25 percent in reality, give 4 5 or take? In other words, counting the bonds plus the stock --6 7 MR. BROWN: If they were to max out their ability to invest in non-US bonds. 8 MR. HOLMES: I'd have to go back and do the 9 math. I'd have to pull the investment policy. 10 MR. PATSY: Back of the envelope, it's less 11 than 25 percent. 12 MR. HOLMES: Yeah --13 14 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: And the reason I asked, I'm glad you brought it up, because I was thinking 15 about this, looking at all this stuff. 16 17 You know, there's always other things to 18 invest in, but for people like us, we're starting to hit that limit as far as how we can squirrel 19 away money. And like you said, we've got 5 20 21 percent window here, you know, at least with the state, you know. We can always change our 22 23 investment policy. I mean, but I didn't realize, 24 you know, the international bonds counted. 25 MR. HOLMES: International, or non-US Yes.

1 bonds. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Non-US bonds. So I guess 2 3 we need to figure out how much wiggle room we 4 have. MR. PATSY: Clarify. That's non-US 5 denominated as opposed to dollar denominated? 6 7 MR. HOLMES: Correct. And it is only applicable to -- my reading is that it's only 8 applicable to corporate securities --9 MR. PATSY: Okay. So if --10 MR. HOLMES: So non-US governments, in my 11 reading, would be exempt, but we don't have an 12 official legal opinion on that. 13 MR. PATSY: Okay. That makes sense. 14 So Neuberger Berman is like 8 percent. 15 So 20 percent of that is 1.6 percent. And Loomis 16 is --17 MR. HOLMES: Call it 20 as well. They're at 18 19 520. Yeah. So we've got -- we're definitely 20 within that band. We still have some more wiggle 21 room, and we're rebalancing and putting some more into international as part of that rebalancing. 22 23 MR. PATSY: International equities? 24 MR. HOLMES: Equities. 25 MR. PATSY: Okay.

MR. HOLMES: Okay? 1 MR. PATSY: Yeah. 2 3 MR. HOLMES: So, yeah. I failed to 4 mentioned that it doesn't apply to --5 MR. PATSY: Just my experience, we probably 6 have a much higher allocation in international 7 equities than our peers in the public pension arena. But that's not a bad -- obviously that's 8 not a thing based on the way it performed for the 9 six months. 10 MR. HOLMES: I think you're slightly higher 11 than median, but I don't think you're off the 12 charts. But I'd have to go back. 13 I've seen it rising relative in the public fund space, but I'd 14 have to go back and -- well, I'll show you at the 15 16 quarter. We'll show the quarterly report. 17 MR. PATSY: All right. That's good. 18 MR. HOLMES: Okay. 19 Couple other take-aways. So we know what 20 the source of returns are. What we've also 21 noticed or what you can see in terms of results 22 for the calendar year-to-date and fiscal 23 year-to-date, all the asset classes are above their benchmarks. 24 And then on both a net- and a gross-of-fees

25

basis, on a fiscal year-to-date basis, the only area that is not above the benchmarch fiscal year is MLPs where it's only 2 basis points below the index. So basically call it flat.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Now that we're there,

Dan --

MR. HOLMES: So not -- okay. Go ahead.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, we know my love affair with MLPs, but let me ask you a question, though.

With oil being the price that it's been, I know there's other factors involved, but what's it going to take for MLPs to get back over the hump again? I mean, because you can see from the three-year -- the five-year, 6.9, not bad. You know what I mean? Not the end of the world by any means, but you start looking at the three and then the one.

You know, three years is sort of the beginning of a trend, you know. That's three years in a pretty good stretch to be sort of floundering. And I'm just kind of curious as to what you think or what needs to happen in the energy sector for them to start picking up again.

MR. HOLMES: Great -- I appreciate the

question.

Just as an informational point, the MLP index was up 5 percent last week. So we had MLP day at Summit a couple weeks ago. We invited in -- we brought our research to the table. Most of the research folks related to that were at the meetings and a number of consultants as well.

Our CIO was there as well.

We had a number of managers in, including some long-short managers as well. I found it very interesting that the long-short managers who have the ability on a net basis to go anywhere from 20 net long to 85 percent net long were at 84 percent right now.

MR. PATSY: Where?

MR. HOLMES: 84 percent long. Yeah.

So this is -- and it was amazing because they're all looking at information on a positive and negative basis. And the information and the discussions were fairly similar. And so the story goes like this.

We expect more volatility this year because of the supply and demand in balance and more rigs coming on, and then also the -- this is with regard to the price of commodities. And then

the -- and then continued production in the shale areas and also Canada as well.

What is interesting is that shale now -because of innovation and technology, shale now
can be profitable with the price of oil in the
40s.

So before it was in the 50s. Now even in the 40s it could be profitable. 50, obviously, is better. But when you think about it -- and Councilman Anderson, forgive me, are you familiar with the energy MLP sector?

MR. ANDERSON: No. I mean, I know broadly what you're discussing.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah. And so the master limited partnership is a closed-end fund. It trades on the New York Stock Exchange like any other equity security.

And if you're familiar with REITs, being a security backed by a portfolio of buildings or apartments or shopping malls or real assets, this is a security that's backed by oil and gas pipelines, long-haul pipelines, transfer facilities, holding storage facilities, the hard assets behind the -- what's called the midstream space in the energy chain.

And so basically end-users, or participants in this energy chain, have to get the commodity processed, you know, from pulling it out at the wellhead, getting it processed, made into whatever the end product is and holding that and transferring it to where it's going to go. So essentially they're paying rent for use of these types of facilities.

So the idea that the price of oil would affect the rental rate, it really isn't there. What adjusts the rate and what -- how profitable these MLPs are is how much product is flowing through.

Unfortunately, a lot of the investors in the MLP space, I still say the majority, are retail investors. They use the MLPs for tax advantages in some of their investments. They see the price of oil goes down, they get out of MLPs and it puts artificial pressure there.

So in answer to your question, what's it going to take? A couple weeks, hopefully a couple months of stable energy prices where the investors see the yield on these is about 7 percent. So you get the retail space to realize, okay, the price of oil is not fluctuating that

much. There's a 7 percent yield. They need more capital and you'll see more money go back to the space. That is -- that's what would help out in the short term.

Longer term, the consensus across all the managers we've talked with is 2018 and 2019 should be much better. They are anticipating more distribution growth. They're still significantly undervalued relative to what that distribution growth should be.

They see better debt situation, and so that's why, for instance, that the long-short manager was net long.

And so we see continued volatility for the remainder of this calendar year, but we see a better picture going forward starting in 2018.

Make sense?

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yeah. Just curious.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah. You know, it's something that we are looking at. Now, because of that retail, the more retail sentiment, the correlation of MLPs, which traditionally had been very low, they didn't act like equity securities or they didn't -- you know, they didn't move in tandem with the equity market. That correlation

has been steadily rising since mid-2014, 2015.

And, unfortunately, so the diversification benefit near term is dropping. So it's still a return enhancer, if you will, but it's more -- it's getting more correlated to equities than it once was.

Yes.

MR. PATSY: Dan, about a year ago we were at 10 percent, then we cut it to 6 percent. Do you envision us going back -- do you envision somewhat recommending that we go back to 10 percent --

MR. HOLMES: No.

MR. PATSY: -- or are we just going to play it out in the asset liability sector and see where it plays out?

MR. HOLMES: Well, right now the target -yeah, 5 1/2 percent. No, I think given -- well,
I'll tell you what. Let me answer it this way.

When we conduct the asset liability study, we will look at what we think expected returns in volatility for that asset class will be, like we would any other asset class.

And our view, our philosophy is, is that markets tend to be micro-efficient and

macro-inefficient. And so translated, we're -the decision of whether to buy Ford or GM has a
lot less to do with future success as opposed to
what our weights are in the various asset
classes.

And so what we like to do is, instead of -when we do our research, instead of classifying
the asset classes according to traditional
stocks, bonds, et cetera, what we like to do is
look at -- we take a risk-first approach and look
at the contribution to volatility that each asset
class or strategy can add.

So in other words, equities obviously go in a growth bucket, but because high-yield bonds or emerging market debt has a lot of volatility as well, we would classify those alongside assets and other strategies in the growth bucket.

So what we want to do is avoid 2008, where traditionally you thought that you were well diversified by having a little bit in all these different areas, and then when correlations all go to one, you realize, hey, wait a minute. These bonds that I thought diversified me over here are acting like these equities.

So we want to avoid that type of risk. So

we're looking at what they bring in the way of 1 risk to the portfolio first, and then what we 2 3 want to do is create the best risk return 4 tradeoff by making those asset classes basically 5 compete for self space in our asset allocation. And so we'll look at what it looks like on a 6 7 forward-looking basis when we do the A-L study. MR. PATSY: Right. But we don't have 8 dedicated allocations to high-yield in the 9 emerging market debt. 10 MR. HOLMES: Not anymore. No, it's 11 opportunistic in the -- permitted by the core 12 13 plus managers, correct. MR. PATSY: Okay. So how would you -- how 14 do you -- I guess you can't factor that into the 15 asset liability study, can you? 16 17 MR. HOLMES: What, MLPs? 18 MR. PATSY: No. High-yield and emerging market debt if we don't have an allocation to 19 them. 20 21 MR. HOLMES: We could do it two ways. Well, first of all, we consider that when we 22 23 come up with our core plus assumptions --24 MR. PATSY: Okay. Okay. I got it. 25 MR. HOLMES: So core plus is modeled

differently than, say, a core manager would be, just investment grade. Or we can do a carve out and basically approximate what the core plus bond manager holding, allocate that accordingly and just allocate the rest of the bonds as core.

MR. PATSY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Dan, in the interest of time, buddy, I'm not trying to cut you off, but how about just hit the high points, and maybe you want to talk about some managers that you're keeping an eye on.

MR. HOLMES: Sure. I've kind of covered the high points with things progressing so far this year. I've talked about MLPs. That's one area that we're keeping an eye on.

Another manager that I'm keeping an eye on is Wedge. I met with Wedge about three weeks ago in our office to review the portfolio.

As you'll see, they're a little bit under the benchmark since inception. It's been a very short time period. The big penalty or the penalizing factor for them has been an underweight to financials. That's according to their particular process. So the process hasn't changed. The team still is in place.

But given the fact, because of the Trump

Bump, financials have basically taken off. Their

short-term underweight has been a relative

penalty on terms of performance.

I'm not worried about them. They continue to be a good manager. Long-term returns continue to be very strong.

Sawgrass I'll talk about here in a second under the next bullet point. But basically Sawgrass came in, made a presentation to the FIAC. They're consistent with their style. You can see when things turn negative, they tend to protect. A single data point is the return for the month.

But the bottom line is, is that they're consistent with their style. If you look one year ago, they were above the benchmarch over all the time periods since inception. What's happened is, is that we've had extremely strong growth market. That's part of the reason why Brown turned around and is above the benchmark on a calendar year-to-date basis.

So Pinnacle has done very well. Eagle has done very well. They're both above the benchmark by almost 7 percent for both of them. And that's

really about it.

Would you like for me to continue on to the last bullet point -- or the last item, Number 3, on my agenda?

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Sure.

MR. HOLMES: So two months ago Sawgrass came in to discuss their underperformance with the Financial Investment Advisory Committee. They made a presentation. At this month's meeting we discussed it, and the goal of the FIAC was basically to keep them in the portfolio, not terminate then.

The committee found the presentation helpful. They noted that it's a lower beta strategy. It's there to help protect on the down side. If equity markets do start to deteriorate, we expect them to hold up better and protect capital, and they also found that they're sticking with their particular style and process.

So that is the recommendation of the committee. Does that cover it?

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: That's very good. Yeah. This is one of those instances where we couldn't bring the recommendation to the Board last month because we didn't have a quorum. We had that

quorum with FIAC in July. 1 You'll see a copy, I believe, of Dan's 2 3 recommendation relative to Sawgrass in your --4 it's the next item in your Board book. 5 And so we just need a motion to accept the recommendation that the fund maintain its 6 7 allocation to Sawgrass. MR. PATSY: I have a question for you, Dan. 8 On page 8 of the Sawgrass presentation, 9 you've got the correlations that shows the 10 relationship between Sawgrass and other equity 11 managers. You don't have Loomis in here. 12 MR. HOLMES: It's -- if memory serves, I 13 think it's 0.24. This was an older version. 14 Τ did have our staff run it versus Loomis, and it's 15 still sufficiently low. 16 MR. PATSY: So it's 0.24. 17 MR. HOLMES: I believe that was the number. 18 MR. PATSY: Okay. 19 20 MR. HOLMES: But I did check, and it is --21 it's low. If you want, I can call and get the 22 exact number. 23 MR. PATSY: No, that's good. That's good. 24 Okay. 25 Do you want to make a motion, MR. BROWN:

Rick? Do you believe in that motion? 1 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We need a motion and a 2 3 second we keep Sawgrass? 4 MR. BROWN: I have much greater questions 5 about Brown than I do Sawgrass, because as it's 6 been presented to us, six months, is that, you 7 know, Sawgrass's strategy is to protect against the downside, which obviously in this market, you 8 know, is going to mean they're ahead. 9 Brown is still here, but I guess there's a 10 timeline for their release based on what we voted 11 for. 12 MR. PATSY: Loomis is replacing Brown, 13 14 right? MR. BROWN: Completely, altogether? 15 16 MR. HOLMES: Yes. 17 It's just a roll-off the MR. BROWN: 18 timeline. Okay. So they will be -- they will be 19 completely removed at some point as the timeline transitions? 20 21 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, it -- Pedro, do you mind if I steal your thunder? 22 23 MR. HERRERA: No. Please go ahead. 24 MR. HOLMES: Pedro has been working hard 25 with Loomis to finalize an acceptable contract.

And I think Lawsikia has been involved as well. 1 I don't mean to minimize your involvement there. 2 3 And so my understanding is, is that Pedro 4 and Lawsikia have come to agreement with Loomis, 5 and then we should be ready to execute a contract 6 here shortly. 7 MR. HERRERA: We'll do it today actually. MR. HOLMES: See, I said shortly. 8 So we'll execute the contract, and then I'll 9 work with -- well, with the Board's permission, 10 I'll work with Tim and staff to go through a 11 transition and get the monies transferred over to 12 Loomis. 13 14 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: So we've got a motion and a 15 second to approve the Advisory Committee, keep 16 Sawgrass. MR. BROWN: Rick's going to make the motion 17 18 and I'll second it that we keep Sawgrass. 19 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. Perfect. Any 20 questions, comments? 21 (No responses.) CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All in favor? 22 23 (Responses of "aye.") CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Any opposed? 24 25 (No responses.)

Thank you, Okay. Perfect. 1 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Dan. 2 3 Personnel Committee. Rick, you were there, 4 Buddy, weren't you? 5 MR. PATSY: Yes. 6 Chris and I met with Tim. We met through --7 because this is a first evaluation for him, first year, to renew the contract, we do have to go 8 through his contract. We do have to come to a 9 consensus of his evaluation today so that we can 10 get it approved and through the system, I think, 11 by July 31st, Lawsikia? 12 MS. HODGES: Yes. Yes. 13 14 So we put together a simple MR. PATSY: performance evaluation, first year, in theory. 15 Got a lot to go on. I don't envision us getting 16 17 much more in-depth in the evaluation going forward. But this does give us something to work 18 with. 19 20 What we did was we sent out the performance 21 evaluation to each member. The expectation is they were going to complete all these, get them 22 23 back in today. 24 MR. BROWN: Did you do your homework? 25 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I did, and I left them at

home, but I --

consensus.

MR. PATSY: There is one in the package.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, it doesn't matter.

They all said yes. Tim has done a great job. I

MR. PATSY: And this is the general

don't think I need to write it down.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yeah. That's the general.

Yeah, I don't think there's going to be any

question of whether or not Tim --

MR. PATSY: My only comments are, Tim, first year, challenging year with pension reform, learning a new system, all that coming together at the same time, he hit the ground running with little or no necessary guidance from the Board.

I think when you look back at the kind of things we look for when we went through the vetting process, we're looking for a good communicator, somebody who was going to help us build bridges with City Hall and City Council. Tim has done an excellent job of that.

MR. BROWN: Tim has done a good job of, from a political perspective, I think, winning back some of the opinions of the public that, to no fault necessarily to anybody that came before,

the opinions have kind of, you know, dropped just based upon the political climate.

But also the massive, monumental changes that he had to navigate this organization through and around, I find it very impressive what he did the first year. I don't even know that he was aware of what he was getting into.

What came out of that meeting is actually the need, though, to formalize a performance plan for him with clear objectives, you know, three, five, whatever, however many objections, that kind of drive what he's supposed to do over the next year.

That was supposed to happen with that contract last time and there wasn't one made, but over the year we have let our expectations be known and he's done a good job of keeping us updated with the six-month review and all that.

So we kind of did an ad hoc, if you will, performance eval from this last year based on the performance benchmark we kind of set informally and he adhered to, but this Board needs to come up with some official performance plan for the next year.

Not going to get done today, but we'll work

with Lawsikia to try and figure out something standardized that he can have to guide his next year. I think that's kind of a separate issue.

I guess the evaluation last year, there's really two things that we need to do, are, one, based on the evaluations that we are submitting, which is a binary, you know, yes or no, does he met or exceed these expectations, we need to vote on whether or not to extent his contract for another year, and then what any changes or amendments to that contract would be made.

So I think that's kind of where we're at right now, what we need to do today, since his contract expires in two weeks.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I agree. Anybody on the phone want to speak up? Bill?

MR. SCHEU: I would just like to say that I think Tim has done a superb job. And as Chris just mentioned, the governance -- the increase in the positive relationship between particularly the council and the board, I think, has been a lot driven by Tim, and I think he's worked hard to establish relationships.

So I just want to commend him on a great first year.

MR. PAYNE: Am I on? This is Willard.

MR. BROWN: You are on, Willard.

MR. PAYNE: Okay. As I indicated in my performance review, Tim came in at a tough position there, and to do what he's done as smoothly as he has made a difference, I think, to the police and firemen and for the city and everything.

So I certainly am glad that I can recommend that we extend the contract and that we do whatever we can in terms of a raise or what have you. That's my position.

MR. BROWN: So my thought was -- because I think we all now have expressed that we agree he's done -- he's worked in mastery fashion over the last year, really, the one amendment to the contract would be salary compensation. I think everything else is pretty standardized when it comes to health benefits and such.

A natural floor would be, you know, a cost of living adjustment. I'm not quite sure what the ceiling would be for us to consider.

A side note, I think we need to establish a range that we need to look at going forward each year that based upon if he hits his benchmarks,

he's kind of here, standardized a little more.

But as far as last year, with the floor being, you know, COLA, which to our earlier discussion, looks to be around 2 percent inflation rate for this last year, you know, maybe a natural ceiling of 6 percent. I don't know.

But I do think he should be compensated and he should receive a raise, but we just need to figure out what that looks like.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, I'll be the last to speak.

I think Tim has done an excellent job. I've talked to Tim, as many of you know, probably many times on the phone concerning various topics. I had one reservation when we hired him simply because he wasn't from here. Not because he wasn't from Florida. It's just he had no familiarity with the system, with the Florida Retirement system, with Jacksonville.

And I kind of wondered if maybe he didn't come from a smaller place that maybe wasn't quite as exciting as this one. But I warned him and he came anyway.

(Laughter)

1 2

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: So he's done an excellent job. I think the performance evaluation part, I've been down this road. It's a fluid situation with a director. I mean, we can put in some, you know, make-people-happy-type parameters, like, you know, smiles at the public and shakes babies' hands or kisses the babies. Whatever you want to do.

He's got a basic job. He does it. He's going to do it. You know, things are going to come up that don't fit that criteria. We're going to have a manual this thick one day of all the things we expect him to do, because that's what this job is. It's crazy.

That said, we can come up with something.

That's fine. I think he's passed the evaluation for the year. Everybody seems to think he did a great job. I think he did a great job.

So let's just get down to what we need to get down to, which is the money part. I mean, I'll make the first comment that I think when we hired him, he didn't make enough money.

I don't think \$197,000 a year, knowing people that I know in the private sector that make way more than that, is commensurate with the

job that he does. He's proved himself.

You know, two things I think we need to do is, is give him a bigger raise besides 3 percent, and we need to extend his contract to a minimum, in my opinion, of three years, simply because it gives him security. It gives us security. We don't want him walking off the job hopefully to go somewhere else right in the middle of another reform agreement, because I can promise you, you haven't seen the last one.

And so me, personally, I think he was underpaid from the start. I think he ought to get at least a 10 to 20 percent jump today to put him in line with what he should be making.

I will ask the question. I don't know the answer. How much does Sam Mousa make a year?

MR. ANDERSON: Well, you need to ask Sam

that.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Does he make 300, I think it was? How much does Weinstein make?

Well, my point is this: They're not responsible for nearly the amount of people and benefits and retirees that that man is, and he does every bit of the political work, PR work, media work, et cetera work, liaison, that they

do. 1 So if they can justify their salary, I think 2 3 this Board should be able to justify his salary. I don't say we go to 300,000 today. Obviously, 4 5 that might be a little steep. 6 MR. BROWN: So what -- a three-year 7 contract. Lawsikia, is that -- everything good with offering something like that or --8 MS. HODGES: \$300,000? 9 No, no. Three-year contract. 10 MR. BROWN: MS. HODGES: Yeah, absolutely. You can 11 totally control the term. And per the contract, 12 he's making 190-. I thought you said 197- --13 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, I couldn't remember. 14 I know it was somewhere around 200. So 190 --15 MS. HODGES: Right, right. And I'd --16 17 MR. SCHEU: I'd like -- I'm sorry, Lawsikia. 18 When you-all take comments, I'd like to chime in 19 on that. Lawsikia, I'm sorry I interrupted you. 20 MS. HODGES: No, no. Go ahead. 21 I was just looking for 22 MR. BROWN: 23 confirmation from her that a three-year contract is fine. 24 Sounds like it is. The ability for us

to offer Tim a three-year contract.

25

MR. PATSY: I got a question on the three-year contract, though.

If we give him -- increase his compensation this year, if we lock him into a three-year contract, does that prohibit us from readdressing his compensation in each of those three years?

MS. HODGES: So through the Chair, so currently the way that the contract reads, it states -- this is your contractual terms that I would recommend that you, you know, adhere to your contract.

But it says, "The Board will evaluate the executive director each year. The evaluation will be based on a performance plan with ascertainable and reasonable goals established by the Board at the beginning of each contract year."

So that's all it says about evaluation, and then you have a salary that's set at \$190,000. So right now you don't have any connection to performance and increase in compensation. So you could -- you know, extending it three years wouldn't stop you from coming back next year after you do your performance evaluation --

MR. PATSY: Okay.

MS. HODGES: -- and tinkering with his compensation. But just know that, you know, city employees are governed -- when I say -- I'm sorry. Public employees, not city employees.

Public employees in general are governed by Florida Statutes. So this concept of bonuses, you can absolutely do, but there's some things you've got to put in place, which are really the things that Trustee Brown was taking about.

You know, you've got to have a plan that talks about bonuses that not only addresses the executive director, but it addresses all your other employees here so that they also have a chance. It's got to be a set policy with some measurables, you know, some clear descriptives.

Now, that's a separate -- I mean, so that's compensation for performance. I mean, so during the given year, you're doing so great the Board wants to compensate you for that, whatever that amount may be.

That's separate from his salary. And when we did the 2015 Reform Agreement, you had language in the code that was placed in that addressed this sort of making sure that you did a market study analysis when you hired this new

executive director.

And some of you were at the table. I wasn't. I don't know if that was already performed or not. At least it should have been, by ordinance. So presumably the salary that you're at was based on some analysis.

But long story short, today you can increase his compensation however you'd like.

MR. BROWN: Was there a market study done to determine what his salary should look like based on peers?

MR. PATSY: We did that --

MR. BROWN: Because I came in -- I was elected -- I don't know if it was the month of or the month -- I think literally my first meeting we were making that final decision on that.

MR. PATSY: Right. We were also taking into consideration some of the optics from his predecessor.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, if we did that with John when the whole salary thing came up and everybody -- you know, there seems to be this preconditioned notion that because you're the director of a pension fund, that somehow you're supposed to take less money out of the goodness

of your heart because you're dealing with retirees.

Well, the JTA's director, hey, we're transporting people in the public. We're helping people get from one place to the other. Why isn't he taking a pay cut?

In other words, we've been down this road.

I can tell you, fellows, the salary study will come back and do nothing but bolster his case. I can promise, you know --

MR. SCHEU: I would like -- could I chime in when you-all are through?

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, the fallout is going to be, you know, the media. All that was basically a campaign against John and the pension at the time for the whole reform thing, et cetera, et cetera.

People should be paid what they're worth.

It doesn't matter who they're working for. You know, if you want to do the average salary of all the directors of the independent agencies, be my guest. But I can promise you, fellas, it's not going to be come back nearly as cheap as people think.

MR. BROWN: Right. I think that's obvious,

1 too. 2 MR. PATSY: So I like what Lawsikia is 3 talking about in regards to extending his 4 contract for one year, address the level of 5 compensation for this year --6 MR. BROWN: Okay. 7 MR. PATSY: -- and then come back and do the 8 study --9 MR. BROWN: Sure. -- and put together a three-year 10 MR. PATSY: contract --11 12 MR. SCHEU: That's what I support. MR. BROWN: Okay. 13 Mr. Chairman, I really disagree 14 MR. SCHEU: that the whole reform thing was just about John. 15 Greg Anderson and I and others spent almost 16 two years working on that, and a lot of it was 17 the community's feeling that, rightly or wrongly, 18 19 that things had gotten out of hand --20 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: No, I wasn't referring to the --21 MR. SCHEU: Let me finish. Let me finish. 22 Let me finish. 23 24 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: No, Bill. I wasn't 25 referring to the reform process as far as the

people involved.

I was talking about the fact that the salary John made was part of the media and certain politicians' plan to go attack the pension fund because they made such a big deal out of his salary. As you can see, they took away half his pension because they didn't like it. Of course, we're being sued for it. But still --

MR. SCHEU: Mr. Chair, if I could just finish.

John was a -- was the face of a lot of that, but also part of the reform, we -- I remember talking about -- on the committee of the manner of which the salary was determined, which was the average of the other authority members, which from the perspective of the task force, we thought that was a little unusual.

So I think what I would like to see, and as I've said, I think Tim has done a great job, but I think for lots of reasons, including our improved public relations with the public and with the council, that I think we ought to do a comparison market study with our peers, be they in Florida or whatever. Rick would be much more competent than I to determine where that is.

I just would be very uncomfortable in giving 1 a significant raise. I don't mind making it 2 3 retroactive once we're done, but I do think we 4 ought to -- we owe an obligation to the public to 5 do some sort of study. 6 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: But didn't we already do 7 one when we hired Tim? Didn't we do that when we hired him, get a salary range? 8 MR. SCHEU: Well, whether we did or not, you 9 said you want to give him a substantial increase, 10 and I would vote against that without a market 11 study because I would like to see where the other 12 funds are now. 13 MR. BROWN: It does seem a little arbitrary 14 to just come up with a number without any sort of 15 16 comparison. 17 MR. PATSY: Right. 18 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, here's the thing --19 MR. BROWN: But I also recognize time limits 20 is an issue. 21 So, Lawsikia, based on what Bill was talking about, in a retroactive manner, is that a 22 23 reasonable -- reasonable move on the Board's part 24 to commission this study, look at that knowing

that a couple months down the road we'll get the

25

results, and then vote on whatever that raise 1 would look like and then allow it to go 2 3 retroactive to August 1? I don't --4 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Let me ask you -- let's 5 back up for a second. Let's ask the man himself. Director Johnson, what do you want, sir? 6 7 Start with the contract itself. DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I'll tell you what I 8 want. I want a three-year contract --9 MR. BROWN: 10 Okay. DIRECTOR JOHNSON: -- and I want a 10 11 percent increase. 12 13 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Perfect. 14 Is there any support you would MR. BROWN: put for the 10 percent? I mean, you've done a 15 16 phenomenal job. We're not going to be able to 17 pay you what you're worth, and I'm not saying 18 that in a seminal fashion. You really have done 19 a phenomenal job in the way you've handled your duties and things beyond that. 20 21 But anything to support that 10 percent? DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Well, you know, I was 22 23 recruited through a national outfit, and that 24 national outfit, I would imagine, although I did 25 not engage them, worked to put together a

competitive salary for the position they were recruiting for.

In response to the initial contract that I was offered, I asked for a three-year contract and a 10 percent higher salary. The money was in the job to begin with. And it was told to me at that time that, you know, I'm a new guy, just like the chairman said, coming down from Pittsburgh. There's a lot going on. Let's see how this first year goes and maybe we'll revisit that.

So the first year is up, and I'm requesting the same thing that I requested when I initially accepted the job. That was a three-year contract and a 10 percent higher salary.

MR. BROWN: A one-time 10 percent pay increase, which you're requesting, with three years of that salary. Is that -- of the currently salary increased by 10 percent for three years is what you're asking?

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: No. I'm asking for a 10 percent increase today.

MR. BROWN: Right.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Going forward, compensation will be based on performance, but a

three-year contract. All other terms of the 1 agreement would be the same. There are 2 3 sufficient termination clauses in it now, I 4 think, to protect both parties. 5 MR. SCHEU: I agree with that. 6 MR. PATSY: With the three-year contract, 7 with the re-eval, as you said, compensation based on performance evaluated on a annual basis. 8 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Correct. 9 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Now, with the contract 10 itself, the way its written, whether three years 11 and the current one, might go into your --12 performance evaluation, but there has to be 13 clauses in there for -- moral clauses, you know, 14 doing the right thing, you know. Termination, in 15 other words. For cause, not just for without 16 17 cause. That's in there. 18 MR. SCHEU: That's in 19 there. 20 MS. HODGES: That's in there. You have that termination --21 22 MR. HERRERA: It's in paragraph 5. 23 have it as part of your contract term. 24 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. 25 Well, I think part of this -- and the 10

percent I don't think is out of control, because 1 personally I think that puts him up to the level 2 3 where he should have started off in the 4 beginning. MR. SCHEU: Mr. Chairman, could we get the 5 advice of the council liaison, if he's still 6 7 there? 8 MR. BROWN: He's here. MR. SCHEU: Greg, given our past history, 9 what's your judgment about doing this without any 10 kind of market backup? 11 MR. ANDERSON: Well, gee, Bill, thank you. 12 I know. You get the big bucks. 13 MR. SCHEU: Actually, you get paid to be on the City Council. 14 I do. So thank you, Bill, 15 MR. ANDERSON: for that question. 16 Number 1, Director, I was telling Joey that 17 the level of professionalism that is in this 18 19 meeting and -- that I saw during some very difficult discussion through pension reform, 20 21 really, you brought to the table. And so from my standpoint, I think you've 22 23 done a really wonderful job. 24 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Thank you. 25 MR. ANDERSON: I think you have created an

opportunity to continue what I think is a much healthier relationship with elected officials, both the mayor's office and also the City Council.

So I'm in the camp of, Tim, you've done a great job. Thank you for being here. Thank you for accepting this job. So thank you.

Two: His request seems reasonable to me.

Okay. It seems reasonable. But I do agree that

Mr. Scheu has a good point, given the history,

given the history. And the best way to make sure
that that doesn't come back in a way that could
be perceived as being less than transparent is to
do a study.

And so one of the suggestions that you might consider would be to go ahead and approve this motion now as requested, but with the understanding that if the study does not come back and validate those numbers, that the director would be willing to make an adjustment.

So that would be one way to handle it.

The other way would, of course, be just to wait for two months and have it all done at one time.

So with that, that's my thought. And I

would turn it back over to the Chair. 1 MR. PATSY: So based on that, I'll make a 2 3 motion that we award Tim an increase in salary of 4 10 percent for the next fiscal year, construct a 5 three-year contract to extend his term here, as 6 well as looking at or re-evaluating his 7 performance and compensation on an annual basis, and to do a compensation study going forward. 8 And if we determine that his compensation is 9 below the market, we will adjust it accordingly. 10 MR. BROWN: Well, let me ask you this on 11 that. Who would conduct this study, typically? 12 Lawsikia is that --13 MS. HODGES: Right. I mean, it says here --14 and just to make sure we're talking about the 15 right study, and this is in the ordinance. 16 17 "Market analysis of comparably sized public 18 pension plans." So we're not comparing independent authorities. 19 20 MR. BROWN: Right, right. 21 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Lawsikia, I want to disagree with you. And I know everybody gets 22 23 tired of me ranting and raving, but I don't care.

Here's the bottom line, though. This is an

independent agency of Jacksonville, as the

24

25

1	General Counsel likes to remind us when they're
2	telling us what to do, you can't have it both
3	ways.
4	MR. BROWN: Rich, that's apples and oranges.
5	You cannot compare this organization to JTA,
6	JEA just you can't.
7	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I'm not comparing the
8	organization. I'm comparing the leaders.
9	MR. BROWN: You can't compare the job
10	responsibilities of that person with this.
11	That's totally different
12	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Take away the title,
13	though, Chris
14	MR. SCHEU: Point of order. Point of order.
15	Point of order.
16	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: if it's a good leader of
17	an organization, what difference does it matter
18	who's leading?
19	MR. PATSY: But
20	MR. SCHEU: Point of order. The Chairman is
21	the moderator.
22	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Go ahead, Rick.
23	MR. PATSY: I do agree with Chris. I think
24	comparing this agency to other public pension
25	plans and the compensation that their executive

directors get, I think that's a very reasonable approach.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I do too. But I also think it's reasonable to compare to the other independent agencies of this city. And saying because -- I'm looking more at the leader and his responsibilities to the job. I don't care who he's leading.

MR. PATSY: Right.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: He's either good or he's not.

MR. PATSY: I think we can consider that information in the package, but to me the more pertinent comparison is to other public pension plans.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: That's fine. I mean, I'm not saying we don't do that either, but I want --

MR. SCHEU: Mr. Chair, could I make an amendment, which may go down to flaming defeat, but I would like to propose that we do work toward -- that we renew the contract but we change it to a three-year term, that we wait to adjust the salary until our August meeting, during which time a subcommittee of Mr. Patsy and Mr. Brown will communicate with other Florida

pension funds to determine what their 1 compensation levels for their directors are and 2 3 then report back so we can make a decision on the 4 compensation part at the August meeting. 5 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yeah. I don't have a 6 problem with that, Bill. I think what we're 7 going to have to do, though, unless you guys feel like calling every pension fund, is we're going 8 to have to find somebody to do the consulting. 9 MR. PATSY: There's a consulting firm 10 called -- I forget the exact name of the firm 11 that does this kind of thing. 12 13 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. MR. PATSY: Public pension plans use them 14 15 extensively. I'll get the name. I'll come back --16 It's not rocket science. 17 MR. SCHEU: All we want is the salaries of those -- of maybe the ten 18 19 largest Florida funds, plus the Florida 20 Retirement System. Well, and I'm going to 21 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: 22 forewarn everybody again. This is the same thing 23 we're going to run into before. 24 Certain retirement systems and the directors

have certain titles. They don't necessarily do

25

the same thing. That's the problem we've always 1 had is, how do you quantify someone who has eight 2 3 different titles versus one guy who is a 4 director --5 MR. BROWN: You are right in that regard. 6 Absolutely. 7 And I know for a fact that Director Johnson does take on more responsibilities than a lot of 8 the directors do. In fact, I know some of the 9 funds around the state, a lot of the -- there's 10 responsibilities he takes on now have been, you 11 know, delegated to another position or positions 12 There's more of a staff. I mean, what 13 created. he's able to accomplish with the small staff he 14 has here is pretty incredible. 15 16 But I would think that a study would 17 incorporate an analysis of the job description. 18 I would think. I don't know, though. MR. SCHEU: Yes. And we can take that into 19 account when we make our decision. 20 21 And it wouldn't be just Florida MR. PATSY: pension plans. 22 23 MR. HERRERA: I was going to say the same 24 thing, because you guys are one of the -- you 25 guys are either the largest or the two top, maybe

three, in the state. So you're not going to have 1 a whole lot of comparison -- you will, but the 2 3 other similarly sized funds are going to be -there's a big drop off, right, between the top 4 5 two or three and the majority of the other pension funds here. 6 7 So I would agree with the comment of also looking at, you know, on a national level larger 8 pension funds. 9 10 MR. SCHEU: I agree. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. So salary-wise, are 11 we approving the increase now until we get -- are 12 you going to continue --13 14 MR. SCHEU: I move that we -- my motion is 15 to defer that, the salary component till August, but that has not received a second. So it may go 16 17 down to flaming defeat. 18 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. I'm just trying to 19 line up the whole contract thing as far as --20 MR. PATSY: Right, right. 21 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. So we're just going to extend it for now until August, until the next 22 23 meeting, at the current salary level? 24 MR. BROWN: Lawsikia, can I ask a question? 25 MS. HODGES: Yes.

MR. BROWN: If we were to give him the 10 percent increase now, what provision could be written in there to where that would be undone if this study brings out a great difference?

You know, let's say the study is commissioned. We find, you know, a number of directors that do something similar to what he does, and then adjust it for -- which I think is another thing to look at. You remember cost of living differences around the country.

Once there's some adjustments made, if we find that 10 percent was excessive, what can be done?

MS. HODGES: Right. Yeah. I mean, so it seems like you ought to be able to, if you want, approve the 10 percent contingent upon that 10 percent being in line with the study. But you wouldn't want -- I mean, it would just be cleaner for it to be a retroactive raise as opposed to you start paying him August 1 with this 10 percent that you don't know is in line or not.

So you can certainly do a motion where you authorize the 10 percent, you authorize the study. The 10 percent is effective, you know, subject to the market analysis, you know, backing

up that it's line with other comparable public 1 pension plans. 2 3 MR. BROWN: What happens if those are out of 4 line? What happens if they don't agree? Do we have to come back and rediscuss the numbers? 5 6 MS. HODGES: Well, if it doesn't agree, then 7 he wouldn't get the 10 percent. You see --MR. SCHEU: If we're just going to do this 8 in August, I don't understand the angst about 9 that, because -- and we make it retroactive to 10 August 1, but we do it in August. I'm not saying 11 we go through some elaborate process that's going 12 to take months. 13 MR. BROWN: Bill, I don't know if we can get 14 15 all this done by the August meeting because we're asking somebody to look -- not just at salaries, 16 17 but there's a few other points of analysis 18 they're going to have to make. I just don't know 19 that we'll be able to get all that done. 20 MR. PATSY: Yeah. My concern is if it --21 you know, you've got to put an agreement in place. It could take six months before we get 22 23 the results of a study back. 24 MR. BROWN: And I don't think he should be 25 penalized because we haven't -- the Board didn't

do it earlier.

MR. PATSY: Right. My gut feeling is it's going to come back and justify -- it's going to support what we did. So I don't have the problems with, A, giving him the increase in compensation either August 1st or October 1st, however we want to agree to that.

I don't have a problem with doing a three-year contract. I don't have a problem doing a salary.

MS. HODGES: Okay. So just as long as you understand, if Tim understands, if in six months you get the market analysis back and it's out of line or it's too excessive, now you're just talking about undoing that, or are you not talking about -- is the intent that you want to make sure that the 10 percent is in line with the market? So either it is and it's not, and if it's not, he's going to have to give that increase back?

MR. SCHEU: You'd have to claw it back. That's correct.

MR. PATSY: 10 percent is not going to change his -- I mean, it's a meaningful raise.

Don't get me wrong. I don't see it being that --

if it is outside the bounds of what -- the 1 results of the study, it's not going to be hugely 2 out of the bounds. 3 4 And if we do see that it is, well, you know, 5 next fiscal year we may not give Tim a rise. Yeah, I think we can adjust it 6 MR. BROWN: 7 that way, because I will tell you, I mean, we know with the loss of one employee here, he's 8 taken on more duties than the average director is 9 going to have. So I think there needs to be a 10 natural weight placed upon that too. 11 MR. HERRERA: Just for numbers purposes, you 12 guys are -- you know, with a \$19,000 raise, it's 13 about -- what is it, \$1,500 a month? So it's 14 about 350 bucks, 360 bucks a week. That's what 15 you're talking about. 16 17 MS. HODGES: Okay. So then you're not really talking about a claw back then. 18 You want 19 to authorize the 10 percent, but you still want to get the market study done. That's what I'm 20 21 hearing. 22 MR. PATSY: Right. 23 MR. BROWN: Yes, it is. 24 MR. PAYNE: This is Willard Payne. 25 If we have Tim indicating what he'd like to

do and we've all agreed that he's doing such a fantastic job, why are we having this less expense?

MR. BROWN: We're just trying to get right, Willard. I think just looking -- we want to make sure that it's not viewed by the public as the Board, you know, just handing off some -- you know, a large chunk increase without justifying it with some sort of research or, you know, other justification. I think that's it.

We all agree he deserves a raise. We all agree he's done a phenomenal job. We just want to make sure, not just in our responsibility as fiduciaries, but making sure the public doesn't think that there's, you know, anything inappropriate.

MR. PAYNE: Well, what happens if the information comes back and it's less than what he would be making? Are we going to take that away from him?

MR. BROWN: I think Rick indicated that we just would use that information, you know, months later when we evaluate him, you know, for this upcoming fiscal year and perhaps adjust things there.

I think we've already indicated that right 1 away he's doing more responsibilities than a 2 3 typical director does, and that isn't going to really be captured, I don't think, in a study. 4 5 So I think part of this justification for an increase now is we know he is taking on 6 7 responsibilities of somebody who has left the organization several months ago. Right away, 8 that can be your justification for the following 9 year. I mean, at least my thought is on that. 10 Do you-all disagree? 11 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: No, I don't disagree. 12 MR. BROWN: I mean, he's doing more --13 MR. PATSY: 14 Yes. MR. BROWN: -- than we even hired him to do. 15 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Oh, I know he has. 16 it's -- like I said, I've been down this road. 17 18 And I look at it strictly from an organizational 19 standpoint. We have an organization to run. 20 doesn't matter who they are or what they do, you 21 need a leader. And if you have a leader that does a good job that is underpaid, you need to 22 23 take care of that. 24 MR. BROWN: Here's my recommendation.

I'm going to make a motion that we offer Tim

25

a three-year contract with a 10 percent increase in his salary, but we also commission this study that will drive our determinations for future fiscal years as to how much he'll get then.

But I do think based upon, not just his performance this last year, but the additional responsibilities he's taken on, I think he's earned the 10 percent regardless of what comparable directors are making.

But I do think we can use that information, what we get out of that study three to six months from now, and we can include that information in our annual assessment going forward.

That's my motion. I don't know if that jibes with what you were talking about, Bill, or if you want to take a shot at amending that.

MR. SCHEU: No. I think it's clear where you-all want to go. I'm going to vote against the motion. So you-all do what you want.

But I just think we've come a long way and I hate to see us go backwards. And that's nothing against Tim. And I hope Tim and I have a close enough relationship that he understands that.

But I just think we're going in the wrong direction.

MR. BROWN: Because you think that the 10 percent is just an arbitrary number not supported by research?

MR. SCHEU: Well, I don't know whether it's supported or not because, you know, this has been effectively -- well, this is something we've had no background on in preparation for this meeting.

It was moved at this meeting. I have no statistical comparison. And so I just think our relationship with the public is very important and with the council. I just think this is a mistake. That's all right. It doesn't hurt my feelings. It's just a matter of principle. That's what it is. You-all do want you want to do.

MR. BROWN: I mean -- and I actually understand where he's coming from, and I think that was part of my, you know, initial talk is that we are fiduciaries for the fund, but we have come a long way in the public's eyes.

I don't want there to ever seem like there's something we're doing -- I want everything that we're doing to appear above board. And getting, you know, councilmen's perspective on this is important.

I'm torn. I think that if we -- if we get 1 this study back, I think we can make those 2 3 adjustments in the following years, like Rick said. I think you can accomplish it either way, 4 5 but I don't know if what I'm suggesting is ideal. 6 I don't know. 7 MR. PATSY: I don't know if there is an ideal. We're talking about 8 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Rick has touched on the 9 problem. The problem is -- this ain't going to 10 get done in a month. The problem is it's going 11 to take three, four, five months --12 13 MR. BROWN: That's my concern, is that will be delayed by a number of months. He's been 14 15 penalized enough --CHAIRMAN TUTEN: -- and, you know, if --16 17 look, if the study comes back, Bill, and it's 18 whacked, and the average salary is 120, Tim, we've got to have a talk. You know, this is the 19 way it is. But chances are it's not going to 20 21 come back this way. MR. BROWN: I think Councilman Anderson has 22 23 something --24 MR. ANDERSON: So what you might be able to 25 do, listening to the conversation, is talk about

1 effective date.

So when are you talking about in terms of effective date for the salary? What would be the effective date?

MR. BROWN: That's a good point.

You know, the contract can start, but an effective date of an increase could happen, you know, a month or two down the road.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, I would prefer to do
the fiscal year since we're getting everything
lined up here today with meetings and members and
stuff. I mean, to me, the end of July, unless
somebody else is opposed to it, I would like to
do something --

MR. BROWN: Offer him a 15-month contract this time --

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: You know, it lines up perfectly with the fiscal year. Everything, blah, blah, blah. It lines up with our contract. Lines up with everything else.

MR. BROWN: Right. Or a 39-month contract if you want to -- because I think we all agree, a long-term contract is better for everybody. A 39-month contract could get us on a fiscal year.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yeah. We've got -- yeah,

36 plus with July, August, September. So we've got what, a little over two months until October

1? So, yeah, that would be fine with me. Make it a 39-month contract, whatever we need. Eight months?

MR. BROWN: I think a 39-month contract

MR. BROWN: I think a 39-month contract would get us in line with the fiscal year and let him have that longevity he's seeking.

We all want -- I think the question here is, really the only thing we have to resolve is, do we go with the pay increase now, knowing we're going to get a study in the future, or do we wait for the study?

My concern on waiting on that study is we could be penalizing our director, who we want to reward and I think has demonstrated that he deserves to make more than what he's making, given all the duties he's taken on.

My concern by waiting is I don't know how long that will take. And we've already heard from Lawsikia that the retroactive thing really isn't a good idea.

MS. HODGES: No, no, no.

Through the Chair, what I was simply getting at was you wait for the study to come in, you can

approve authorizing the raise, but it's just a 1 pay that's retroactive. You know, we get this 2 3 all the time. 4 So whenever the study comes back in, three 5 months from now, he'll get a three-month worth of raise, you know, starting --6 7 MR. SCHEU: Yeah. That's not a bonus. That's a raise. She's talking about bonuses 8 earlier. 9 10 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: In other words, you're saying go ahead --11 MS. HODGES: No, no. To raise. 12 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: -- approve the rate and 13 make it retroactive until we get the study --14 15 MS. HODGES: Until -- yeah. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: -- that way we don't have 16 17 to pay him money and then take it back, or we're 18 way off in this and that. I don't have a problem with that. 19 20 MR. SCHEU: That's what I was saying from the beginning. Make it retroactive. 21 MR. BROWN: Okay. Bill, do you want to put 22 23 all this in an adjusted motion? Mine just died, 24 I think. 25 No, I think your motion is fine, MR. SCHEU:

except that the pay increase would be subject to 1 receipt and consideration of an appropriate 2 3 study --4 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Retroactive to July 31st or 5 August 1st? 6 MR. SCHEU: -- and any raise that was then 7 voted on would be retroactive to October 1st, the beginning of the fiscal year. 8 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yeah, but he doesn't have a 9 contract between July 31st and then. 10 MR. BROWN: He's out of contract at the end 11 of the month, Bill. That was one of the other 12 issues here. 13 MR. SCHEU: Oh, I know. Yeah, I'm all 14 aboard on that, that we extend that for 32 months 15 or whatever, but that the pay raise be effective 16 upon review of a market study, and any raise 17 would be retroactive, as I think the Chairman 18 19 said, to October 1st of 2018, to be consistent 20 with the fiscal year. 21 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I think the contract ought to go for three years, up until October 1st of 22 23 2020, or whatever it's going to be. And this 24 contract should start August 1st, after this

current one ends at that new pay rate we

25

1 approved. He'll stay under the current pay rate he's 2 3 at now until after the study, as long as it 4 justifies the number that we have agreed upon. 5 Back pay, retro pay him back to August 1st --6 MS. HODGES: Right, right. 7 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: So he'll basically have a three-year and two-month contract. 8 MR. BROWN: Okay. I think that's probably 9 the absolute best way to get all of our desires 10 into one. 11 MR. SCHEU: I agree with that. If what 12 you're saying, we wait to pay it until we get the 13 14 study. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We pay him the rate --15 MR. SCHEU: -- but it's retroactive, right. 16 MS. HODGES: And the end date of the 17 18 contract would be September 30th, 2020, right? That's right. It would be a 19 MR. BROWN: 20 39-month contract. MR. PATSY: And there's no issue with 21 retroactive pay? 22 23 MS. HODGES: No, we get it all the time. 24 MR. BROWN: Okay. Great. So any further 25 clarification needed on that motion? I know that

```
1
         was kind of a Frankenstein of phrases --
             MS. HODGES: No, I know what you're saying.
 2
 3
             MR. BROWN: Perfect. I just want to make
 4
         sure. Okay.
 5
             MS. HODGES: Right.
             MR. PATSY: Right. So the motion is a
 6
 7
         contract to expire September 30, 2020, to have a
         study to evaluate and assess compensation for the
 8
         executive director. And based on the results of
 9
         that study, we will assign any kind of adjustment
10
         to compensation. Is that accurate?
11
             MR. BROWN: Bill.
12
             MR. SCHEU: Which will be retroactive to the
13
         commencement of the 2017-18 fiscal year.
14
             MR. PATSY: Okay. Just add that retroactive
15
16
         piece to it.
17
             MR. BROWN: Retroactive to August 1 or
         October 1?
18
             MR. SCHEU: I thought Rick wanted to do it
19
         as of October 1.
20
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, this is going to be
21
22
         August --
23
             MR. BROWN:
                          I would say August 1 because
24
         that's when the contract will start.
25
             MR. PATSY:
                          Yes.
```

I have no objection to that. 1 MR. SCHEU: MR. BROWN: Okay. 2 3 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: But we're still approving 4 the 10 percent raise retroactive, right? 5 MR. SCHEU: No. 6 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Are we going to wait --7 MR. SCHEU: I think --MR. BROWN: No. We're waiting for the study 8 9 as --MR. SCHEU: Well, I think we ought to give 10 the benefit -- yeah, it would be to Tim's benefit 11 to see if it comes in higher, you know. 12 percent, we don't have to decide that. 13 14 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. MR. SCHEU: Now, the question is, is this 15 16 okay with Tim? I mean, there's two parties to this contract. 17 18 MR. BROWN: Tim, do you want to weigh in? DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Well, I think I made my 19 case. I -- the competitive salary was determined 20 when I was recruited. That's when that study was 21 done. 22 In other words, the national outfit offered 23 24 a salary that it felt was necessary to attract 25 the talent that they were looking for.

So I don't support this notion of doing a
competitive salary analysis every year. That
doesn't make a lot of sense to me.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: What was the salary then,
Tim? Do you remember?
DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Well, as I said, I asked
for 10 percent more at that time because there
was 10 percent available.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right.
DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Secondly, I think the
question for this first year seems to be how much
of an increase is palatable by the public?
It doesn't sound like the question is how
much of an increase is deserved.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right.
DIRECTOR JOHNSON: That's what I'm hearing
from you guys.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right.
DIRECTOR JOHNSON: We started off at cost of
living, 2 percent. That probably would have
worked. You had a cap of 6
MR. BROWN: It's ambiguous. It's just of
assuming that.
DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Well, I'm assuming you
would have supported 6.

MR. BROWN: Yeah. 1 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: So it's somewhat about 7, 2 3 8, 9, 10 where it starts to get uncomfortable. 4 So what I think we're doing here is 5 determining whether 7, 8, 9, 10 percent is 6 palatable by the public, by City Council. And we 7 need a study to back that up. I believe the performance supports it. 8 This has been an incredible year from my standpoint. 9 Absolutely. 10 MR. BROWN: DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Going forward, what I 11 believe we're going to do is we're going to 12 create some performance criteria so we will know 13 at the beginning what the compensation is going 14 to look like at the end if certain performance 15 measures are met. 16 17 So truly this first year -- and I think the 18 question is, is 10 percent justified? I think it 19 is. 20 And I think it is. MR. BROWN: 21 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: And if a study comes back and says other directors aren't getting 10 22 23 percent increase, I don't know --24 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I don't think it's -- Tim, 25 it's not --

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: -- how you compare what

other people have gotten -
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Everybody knows where I'm

at. It's not --

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: -- in exchange for what we've accomplished here. It me it seems like apples and oranges --

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: You're getting paid like a football player gets paid. You're getting paid for past performance, not going forward.

They get paid for being a Pro Bowl ten years in a row even though they're in year 11. You've earned the 10 percent, the salary range what it was, but, unfortunately, not everyone is fearless of the public and/or the press --

MR. BROWN: It's not about that. It's about showing the public that we're not doing something just completely, you know, whimsical and saying, you know -- but I will say, listen, study or not, it's not going to incorporate all of the stuff that he has done and these extra duties, because I would challenge anyone to find a director of a pension fund that is on our scale that does all that Tim does.

I'm telling you, there's going to be more

positions than there's places that will do that.

So I don't even know how you would adjust for that.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: But, see, Chris --

MR. BROWN: This is where it's subjective, and I think he does deserve the pay increase based on his job description.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I agree, buddy, and I had this same conversation back in 2008 and '12 and '9, with a different director.

In other words, it's the same thing that plays out every time. You're going to have certain people complain that certain person makes a certain amount of money, when truthfully nobody really understands the job as well as we do on this Board and deals with it on this Board.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: But they will use certain factors like if the pension plan -- you know, I'm just personally -- look, 10 percent. That puts him at 209-. For the job that he does, thousands of people that he leads, I don't think that's crazy.

MR. SCHEU: Tim, there's one thing to clarify. I'm not saying the study would show

whether a 10 percent raise is what is, quote, 1 normal, unquote --2 3 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: That's fine. 4 MR. SCHEU: -- but whether the pay level to 5 which that would take you would be appropriate. 6 That's all. That's the only difference. 7 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We have the motion and the 8 second. MR. PATSY: Wait a minute. The motion --9 MR. BROWN: Let's make sure we clarify. 10 To be honest with you, I agree 11 MR. PATSY: with Chris. I think the 10 percent increase 12 makes sense to me. 13 14 MS. HODGES: Okay. MR. BROWN: Outside of comparing, I think 15 his duties and responsibilities have increased. 16 17 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I agree. 18 MR. PATSY: I've been in this business long 19 enough to know that whatever study we do is going to come back and verify and substantiate what 20 21 we've done. I get it. MR. BROWN: And I don't know where we're at 22 23 on the motion thing. But I -- look, I'm going to reiterate what I said earlier. 24 25 39-month contract with a 10 percent raise,

1	but commission commission this comparison that
2	we can use in the future for when we revisit his
3	salary.
4	MR. PATSY: I'll second that. I agree with
5	that.
6	MR. BROWN: All right. So that's what's out
7	there.
8	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. We've got a motion
9	and a second. We're moving forward.
10	Bill, got any comments, concerns?
11	MR. SCHEU: I'm just going to vote. We'll
12	vote like we want.
13	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. Willard, you still
14	there?
15	MR. PAYNE: I'm here. I'm certainly for
16	doing whatever we need to do (indiscernible)
17	because as we said, Tim has done an excellent
18	job. And many places, you can't be comparative.
19	He's done a job come here, the whole city had
20	problems, and we've smoothed them in a great way,
21	I think.
22	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. We have a motion and
23	a second. We've discussed it ad nauseam.
24	Any further questions or comments before I
25	call the vote?

```
1
              (No responses.)
 2
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. Everyone in favor,
 3
         say aye.
 4
              (Responses of "aye.")
 5
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN:
                               Everyone opposed?
              (One response of "aye.")
 6
 7
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. We have a 4-to-1
 8
         vote.
              Congratulations, Director.
 9
10
             DIRECTOR JOHNSON:
                                 Thank you.
11
             CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I'm assuming you'll have
12
         Lawsikia officially draw up your official
         thingamajig?
13
             DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Uh-huh.
14
             CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Personnel Committee, are we
15
16
         still doing the study?
17
             MR. PATSY:
                          Yes.
18
             CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. Are you all two
         handling that, Personnel Committee?
19
             MR. PATSY: Yes. We'll coordinate with Tim
20
         and Lawsikia.
21
             CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Perfect.
22
23
             MS. HODGES: Through the Chair -- oh, I'm
24
         sorry. Go ahead.
25
              MR. ANDERSON: I just want to make sure.
```

So I've seen this on other boards, that it seems to work, that the Personnel Committee would actually make the recommendation to the full Board.

And so these things, Tim's a veteran. He's been around, so he understands that these are not fun discussions. It's just in the public eye you've got to do it this way. But one of the ways that I've seen other boards handle it is the Personnel Committee to make a recommendation to the full Board to be voted up or down or amended at that time.

And I think going forward --

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. ANDERSON: -- based on what you-all have just been through and what you're getting ready to put in place, that might be something for the Chair to consider.

MR. PATSY: Going forward.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Hey, I don't want to be the you-know-what guy at this meeting. But when we're debating over whether or not to give the man how much money we're giving him, \$19,000 a year? The school board just said they couldn't figure out where \$21 million went. Please put

that on the record. 1 So I don't worry about such trivial matters 2 3 or what people think, because the truth of the matter is there's enough money being blown on a 4 5 daily basis in this town to dad-qum blow up a 6 ship at Blount Island. 7 MR. BROWN: Well, I stand by what I said earlier. I don't think we can pay -- I don't 8 think we pay Tim enough. 9 Lawsikia was going to say something, I 10 think. 11 MS. HODGES: Yes. I just wanted to make 12 13 sure, are you going to take the lead on working on the --14 (Simultaneous speech) 15 THE REPORTER: I'm not hearing this --16 17 MR. BROWN: Rick, her question was if I'm going to take the lead on the measurables for the 18 19 following year. Honestly -- I'm -- I'm just not really qualified in that area. I don't mind 20 21 doing the research. But if we can use something that currently exists elsewhere or just --22 MS. HODGES: Okay. 23

MR. BROWN: -- a standardized process, I would lean on whomever could give us that.

24

25

MR. PATSY: Right. 1 MR. BROWN: I don't want to reinvent the 2 wheel. 3 4 MS. HODGES: Okay. 5 MR. BROWN: I don't -- because I don't 6 really know as far as evaluating a director what 7 are really good standard categories for that. MS. HODGES: So let me get that information 8 and maybe I can give it to you --9 MR. BROWN: Yes, to the subcommittee --10 MS. HODGES: -- and then you can have a 11 meeting, yes. 12 That will work. 13 MR. BROWN: Okay. MR. PATSY: Good. Okay. We'll talk. 14 15 MS. HODGES: Okay. 16 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: And just as a point of reference, you know, you might want to be able to 17 check the archives with Tim and you -- at least 18 to kind of get an idea of where they check from 19 the last study we did with JJ, you know. 20 21 Right, right. MR. PATSY: 22 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I think Siegel did that, 23 though. 24 MR. PATSY: Well, Tim's correct. ELF did an 25 analysis --

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right. 1 MR. PATSY: -- and they came back and said, 2 we think that this level of compensation is 3 4 appropriate, and we went with that. 5 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right. MR. PATSY: And so that's -- that was an 6 7 input. I don't remember -- I don't throw anything away, so I know I have it someplace. 8 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: God help us. 9 MR. PATSY: But I don't know where. So if 10 you can go through your archives and see if you 11 can find that, or call EFL. They ought to have 12 13 it. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, call Siegel too and 14 ask them to do the one -- because that will help 15 16 show you at least which pension plans they looked 17 at. Director Johnson, do you have anything else 18 19 further for the meeting? 20 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I have nothing else. 21 Do we have anything else, Stephen? 22 MR. LUNDY: That's it. 23 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Everybody done? Anybody 24 else? 25 MR. ANDERSON: Just really quickly.

I want to thank you-all for allowing me to be Council Liaison. I look forward to working with you. I don't know if you know my background, but I've been in banking my entire life. I work for a company called Everbank, now TIAA -- used to be CREF but now it's TIAA. I am in my sixth year on council. I've been Council President, chaired Finance, and been intimately involved in this issue for many, many years. And so I look forward to working with each of you. MR. BROWN: Glad to have you, Greg. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Thank you, sir. Glad to have you. You'll love it. Meeting adjourned. (The Board meeting concluded 11:27 a.m.) 

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	I, Denice C. Taylor, Florida Professional
4	Reporter, Notary Public, State of Florida at Large,
5	the undersigned authority, do hereby certify that I
6	was authorized to and did stenographically report the
7	foregoing proceedings, pages 3 through 138, and that
8	the transcript is a true and correct computer-aided
9	transcription of my stenographic notes taken at the
10	time and place indicated herein.
11	DATED this 3rd day of August, 2017.
12	
13	
14	Donico C. Torrior EDD
15	Denice C. Taylor, FPR Notary Public in and for the
16	State of Florida at Large
17	My Commission No. FF 184340 Expires: December 23, 2018
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	