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October 19, 2015

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It's 1:30. We will call the meeting to order.

MR. KEANE: Everyone please rise and join me in a moment of silence for our following deceased members: Winferd J. Jolly, retired police lieutenant; James A. Wright, retired police officer; Peter W. Knox, III, retired police officer.
(Moment of silence.)
MR. KEANE: Amen. Please remain standing and join me as
(All in unison) We pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: First item on the agenda is the public speaking period. We have one.

MS. MANNING: Curtis Lee.
MR. LEE: Hello, my name is Curtis Lee. My address, 7124 --

MR. HAZOURI: Will you talk a little louder, Curtis?

MR. LEE: All right. My name is Curtis Lee.

My address is 7124 Claremont Creek Drive, Jacksonville, Florida 32222.

First I had asked you earlier to post the Summit Flash Reports instantly upon your receipt of them, in other words, within the first few days of each month for the prior months. The public should have this information as soon as you do, in other words, without any delay.

Secondly, I pass out five documents, one for each trustee. These are new public record requests. As should be quite obvious to all by now, I am very unhappy with the status quo regarding the responses to public records requests. There has been many delays and violations of the law. It is not just me saying that; the courts agree.

Henceforth, I am submitting public records requests to you five trustees personally so that you are jointly and severally and personally liable for delays in violations.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: That will close the public speaking period.

Next item we have is the consent agenda items.

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.
The normal items: Minutes, disbursements, pension distributions, calculations, time service connection, application for membership, clear and unrestricted. Under Trustee Rule 13.3, application for survivor benefits, application for vested retirement and refund of pension contributions, drop participant termination of employment, drop distributions.

And that concludes the consent agenda, Mr. Chairman and Trustees, all the regular items.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And the motion to --
MR. TUTEN: I'll make a motion we accept the consent agenda.

MR. GLOVER: Second.
MR. SCHEU: Since I'm new, the procedure for this, it goes through the staff and it's all completed. We can rely on the staff to do that?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.
MR. SCHEU: That would not be appropriate for the Board to get into.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: These are the regular daily administrative functions basically, what the pension fund staff does every single day. The
disbursements are reviewed with internal controls in place and any items that would be deemed irregular would come to the Board's attention. MR. SCHEU: Thank you.

MR. KLAUSNER: Mr. Scheu, I think what distinguishes them is payments of benefits. Refunds of contributions are all ministerial acts. And whereas, for example, later on today you have a grant of a disability. That's a discretionary act. That is why that would be taken as a separate item. MR. SCHEU: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any further discussions?
All in favor, Aye.
(In unison) Aye.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Opposed?
Ayes pass unanimously.
MR. KEANE: Old business, Mr. Chairman.
Retirement Leave Account Annual Payout.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: We have the retirement leave payout calculation in 2015-10. We had received this, I think, at the past meeting. If there are any questions on the calculation, Devin Carter is here, the controller, to answer any questions you might have.

MR. HERBERT: Could you just discuss it
briefly to make sure we know exactly what we are looking at here?

MR. CARTER: Pretty much we are looking at, this is Mr. Keane's annual leave that he accrued over his period. As far as the attachment that is behind it, $I$ show that his accrual rate was like 15.38 hours per pay period, and that was in accordance with his contract.

Then also if you notice on the right-hand side where you see the comp time in, that is the comp time that he earned which, of course, he would not be reimbursed for that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: That is in the right column on the --

MR. CARTER: Yes, which the total is 317 hours.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: So he earned an additional 317 hours in comp time, but he will not be paid any of that.

MR. CARTER: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And this calculation -Devin also got with the previous controller to look over the calculations, kind of make sure there was a separate set of eyes on it. Although I was able to look at it, it was consistent with our previous
payouts have been calculated and tied to the payroll.

Any further discussion on any of the questions?

MR. SCHEU: You probably need a motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Do we have a motion to make a payout?

MR. TUTEN: You need a motion? I will make it.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Second?
MR. GLOVER: Second.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Discussion.

MR. SCHEU: I am really grateful you-all deferred it to this time because it gave us some time to look at it. I went back and looked at the employment agreement and all of the amendments. I couldn't do the calculations. I assume the calculations are right.

MR. CARTER: Yes, that is why I put the chart behind it based on number of years to show how much would be accrued per year.

MR. SCHEU: That was very helpful.
MR. CARTER: So that facilitated the process as far as going through all the amendments and whatnot because $I$ did the same thing you did.

MR. SCHEU: I did go through mine; also asked the general counsel's office. In looking at some of those, I had questions about some of them from a legal perspective. I made my own conclusions about them, and I asked Steve Durden to take a look at it. And I asked Steve Durden to be here today just to confirm that.

And we have concluded that the employment agreement is an agreement -- doesn't matter what we think about it but it is a binding agreement, and so I'm going to vote in favor of this.

But we did dig through the research necessary to make that conclusion. I know you-all had all done that ahead of time, but $I$ thought that was important.

MR. GLOVER: Well, I landed on the same point that you landed on that it was -- it was an agreement. It was properly voted on and passed. And I know we had different, differing opinions but then it's clear that when that happens, it comes here to the government being the board. And being that what it may -- personal feelings, I think you have to set aside.

And so I appreciate your diligence
because, with that being in the record, we will probably satisfy some people but we agreed on it and we should do exactly what I hope we're about to do here and that is approve based on the prior agreement.

MR. SCHEU: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any other discussion?
MR. HERBERT: Mr. Chairman, after we take action, $I$ want to make a comment but afterwards.

MS. MANNING: Who made the first? Scheu or -CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Tuten made the motion.

MS. MANNING: I had Tuten -- I didn't hear a second.

MR. GLOVER: I did second. It was on the floor for discussion.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any further discussion?
All in favor?
(In unison.) Aye.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Opposed?
Passed unanimously.
MR. HERBERT: I think one of the lessons that we learned from this is that it's important to have a deputy. The practical reality is that John has not been able to take off in part because we had to have some senior leadership here, and I think this
just reinforces the importance of having both an executive director and a deputy so it is possible for both of them to take off.

And I know that we didn't take action at one point because counsel asked us not to but again it seems to me that it wears out the leader. The leader needs to have that time away. And so $I$ just hope that we learn a lesson about the importance of having both of those positions filled so that we do have that added depth. And also it is an opportunity for both the director and the deputy to take time off to get refreshed.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I will add some comments to that as well. We are seeing here the effects of delaying hiring a deputy director. We don't have a deputy director in place to have learned however many months that we had an opportunity to bring them up to speed for John's departure.

And I want to say further that doesn't apply just to the executive director and deputy director position. There are other positions within the police and fire pension fund administration that $I$ think we need to take a look at as a board and take a look at filling
some of those other positions that are needed to make this a more effective and efficient -public records being one of those -- where we just don't have the staff to fill those efficiently at this point.

MR. HERBERT: I agree.
MR. SCHEU: That leads me to say that I would hope that going forward we are in the period of transition. And I hope some of these policies --you-all may have compared them with the city and corporate and private sector and all that but carrying over leave for a long period of time, how long is the carryover appropriate?

This is a contract we lived by, but I hope we will look at all of those policies so we can get something that is consistent with what the city and private sector is doing. And I do think that we may have too small a staff. This is very interesting today at these interviews that we really are a small knit organization. CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Important but still small.

MR. HAZOURI: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask, and it may not be proper or it may not be -but just two things. On the conflict between the general counsel and here -- just what I read in the
paper and $I$ haven't inquired -- is that ongoing or is that moving in a positive direction? I don't know if we're free to talk about that, counselor. MR. KLAUSNER: Yes is your answer.

MR. HAZOURI: Yes? Well, nothing has changed from 30 years ago in your answer. What's -- as much as you can say, I just want to make sure that --

MR. KLAUSNER: We are making progress.
MR. HAZOURI: -- we are making progress. And you-all are meeting again?

MR. KLAUSNER: Yes, we are making progress and it's been collegial, and in diplomatic-speak, we have had frank discussions.

MR. HAZOURI: The second one, and I don't know if it was brought up in finance today, but $I$ am curious about -- to avoid any legalities of it, subpoenas and all, where are we on you-all submitting the forensic report? Any discussions on that?

Is that -- John, that should be pretty much public information. MR. KEANE: I can answer that. Everything he asked for, we have given him over a month ago is the answer to the question.

MR. HAZOURI: There's nothing else. I am not the lawyer here asking, but there's nothing else they are going to be asking. I want to make sure that everything is still transparent because I think as John departs and as you-all, the new members, come on board and new director comes, that everything is, you know, not a fresh start but a continuation of positive communication between the council, between the mayor, between the pension board and, of course, those you-all represent.

I didn't know -- I didn't want to see something stopped in the middle of, you know, debates on who got what.

MR. KLAUSNER: We are in those discussions. MR. HAZOURI: That is part of your discussions?

MR. KLAUSNER: Clear the decks of all remaining issues.

MR. HAZOURI: Good. I appreciate that because I would like to feel comfortable to know everything is moving along and not just getting stifled somewhere. And six months down the road when we try to fund the pension and do some of the things, these things aren't stifling us from moving forward.

MR. KLAUSNER: That is exactly the plan. MR. HAZOURI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I would like to reiterate from the Board's perspective, we want them to have all the documents they want to have. We have nothing to hide. Whatever documents they are requesting, if we can find them, they can have them.

MR. HAZOURI: I wasn't questioning that. I wanted to make sure that things were moving, and they have got this and they have got this. What you read is not necessarily what you get, except for yesterday. And if I -- you know, just to make sure that everything is moving along and then by the time the end of the year comes with the new members, we are in good shape.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I am glad you are here in person because a lot of times what you read is not what actually has happened.

MR. HAZOURI: Yesterday was pretty much accurate between the mayor and $I$, but other than that --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: But yes.
MR. HAZOURI: Glover says, Oh, no.
MR. GLOVER: No.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: You can bring your message back to council members.

MR. HAZOURI: I will do that.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Whatever we can do to help that process along, we are more than willing to do. And the knowledge $I$ have is there's nothing that we are holding up that they have asked for.

MR. HAZOURI: I appreciate that. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any other discussion on those items?

MR. HAZOURI: Thank you.
MR. KEANE: Next item is Budget Review, Mr. Chairman and Trustees. Devin?

MR. CARTER: On your attachment you will see the fiscal year '15-'16 budget. We just start October 1st so we don't have too many expenditures, but I want to reiterate the full budget for this year. And you will see where I broke out professional services showing how much we had budgeted for this year.

Also you will notice on line 3 which is terminal leave, which is 110,000 that right there pretty much will be for John's leave. But since it's for last fiscal year, it will be paid out of last fiscal year budget. So that
is 118,000.
So this line item here will be pretty much reduced so you won't see any actual there because you have got the previous year.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: That was already included in last year.

MR. CARTER: Yes, for 118. I didn't include last year's budget due to the fact $I$ am in audit. So next meeting I will have it finalized almost.

MR. HERBERT: I am not sure I understand. The 118,589, is that what you are talking about the pension contribution?

MR. CARTER: No, it's terminal leave, annual leave payout.

MR. HERBERT: It's 108?
MR. CARTER: It is 110 this year, but last year we budgeted $\$ 118,000$. So what I am saying this leave that we just approved will be paid out of last year's budget for it is for that period.

MR. HERBERT: Not this, no.
MR. CARTER: So you won't have any actual that period unless someone plans on leaving. So what I'm trying to say is you can pretty much realign the budget or use that for something else accordingly as needed.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any other questions or comment on it. Mr. Scheu?

MR. SCHEU: Given the realignment from the reform and, not to put my good friend, Mr. Klausner, on the spot but --

MR. KLAUSNER: It's okay.
MR. SCHEU: But with a budget of 400 --
MR. KLAUSNER: That is based on last year's numbers.

MR. SCHEU: Last year. So you can expect a significant reduction.

MR. KLAUSNER: If you look at the bills over the last -- most of our litigation is gone. The Weiss case is set for a final hearing in a week, and that is an hour over with the judge. There's one appellate case we have going on which I told the Board I would do on a contingent basis. If we win, $I$ would get paid. If we don't win, $I$ don't get paid and save us a lot of money.

And there is one other case that is sitting in the Florida Supreme Court awaiting discretionary review. All of the briefing is done so there's nothing on that. And if you look at our hours over the last six months have declined.

MR. SCHEU: I appreciate that. And I know you have been working with general counsel to help shift a lot of that work.

MR. KLAUSNER: I have because, you know, one of the generating a lot of the costs was public records. To the extent that you get a public record request, we send them over to the OGC -- and I keep drawing blank on the name of the woman who is responsible for.

MS. MANNING: Alexis.

MR. KLAUSNER: Alexis. We got one the other day. I told Debbie, send it over to Alexis. And if we get a legal question, $I$ will review it just to keep up to speed, but we let the work be done by the OGC.

Same thing if we have what I call non-pension related commercial matters like collections and overpayments and things like that, we have also engaged their office to do it. It is easier. My expertise is in the area of pensions, and the whole idea is that's what I would be doing for the Board and the OGC do other stuff.

MR. SCHEU: That was certainly the way it was intended.

MR. KLAUSNER: I was fully supportive of that. That's actually what we do in the course of my practice. I work with a lot of either in-house counsel, attorneys general, city attorneys, county attorneys in other places around the country. The same division of labor, if it's what I would call a pension, matter of some pension expertise, it comes to me. If it's a general business of the business matter, it goes to either the in-house or the municipal lawyer.

MR. SCHEU: Thank you.
MR. HERBERT: Can $I$ follow up, if I might, with regard to the requests such as this for example that we got today. So explain to me given the conversation you had --

MR. KLAUSNER: Can I see it? I haven't seen this one, I don't think.

MR. HERBERT: So we get these to Steve, and Steve will take care of them?

MR. KLAUSNER: What I would do is give this to Alexis to take care of and -- because there is nothing on here that $I$ have. I would give this to Alexis, and I would also send a copy over or you can hand it to Steve Durden -- give a copy while he is here because their office can shepherd it
through.
MR. HERBERT: Because the issue was raised, does each individual trustee need to do that?

MR. KLAUSNER: No.
MR. HERBERT: Can it be done on behalf of the trustees?

MR. KLAUSNER: When you get them, you pass them on by email so there's some record that you did that. But send them all to Debbie and she should pass them on to the City.

Some things that are requested don't exist. I mean, sometimes we get a request for a record, there is no such record. So in that case the correct response is there is no document responsive to your request. If there is a document, then we have engaged the City -it's been more than a year; right?

MR. KEANE: Yes.
MR. KLAUSNER: -- about a year ago to start handling those requests simply because we don't have the staff to address it.

MR. HERBERT: As individual members, we don't necessarily know whether --

MR. KLAUSNER: That's why your responsibility is fulfilled if you send it to Debbie with a
request to send it to the appropriate city official for processing.

MR. HERBERT: Debbie, I'm going to give you mine today.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Part of this topic I am going to ask Steve for a little clarification. I was going to do it later in the agenda, but related to the budget and to this issue of legal counsel. Mr. Klausner covered that, but a little bit more in depth.

MR. SCHEU: Can I ask him just on this specific issue? In fairness to, particularly to Mr. Lee and Bob, we adopt it as a policy last time that we are going to refer these to the general counsel.

MR. KLAUSNER: That is fine.
MR. SCHEU: Because their staff knows what to do. But in fairness to him, he is entitled to a response. So implicit in that is the general counsel's office provides us a response that then can be delivered by the staff to Mr. Lee so that we have dotted the i's and crossed the t's. It doesn't just go over there and sit in limbo. But the law does require a response even, as you say, if there is no document.

MR. KLAUSNER: Correct.
MR. SCHEU: So as quickly as that can be done. that would be helpful.

MR. KLAUSNER: That way if you can get something physically, either mail it, deliver it, scan it and email it to Debbie, and I know she will transmit it directly to Alexis. And I would just copy me and the OGC on any of those.

MR. KEANE: Steve Durden wants to comment on that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Mr. Durden.
MR. DURDEN: Thank you.

Just so you will know, Steve Durden, General Counsel's Office. So the board members understand, I have been working with your chair, Alexis, Lambert, Debbie, Martha Foote and others. We are trying to get to the point where everything funnels in one, two, three, seven, ten different requests for the same stuff. We are trying not to send more than once.

We are trying to make sure they are coordinated so that if we sent something, we can refer to where it's been sent. We are doing what we can to streamline it. It might
be better to talk to Debbie to make sure -either me or Debbie, we make sure it goes through the same process so that we do get the response back in a timely fashion. We are working on -- you have a very -- sometimes not always, of course, have a very enormous number of public records requests. And for the size of your organization, sometimes it takes a little time to get things done.

We are working on a process that makes sense for the board, for the staff, and for all the public -- members of the public that want to get this information. We know it is important to them. We know it is important to you. We have been -- we are doing what we can to create a process that makes sense for everybody. It can't be a process of the last one in is the first one out, that sort of stuff.

We have got to work out something. It is not fair for us to drop everything for today's request. We need to do things in an orderly fashion. It doesn't mean we won't make a mistake, but the goal is to create a very orderly fashion so you can be comfortable that
the requests are being done as requested, that your interests are taken care of.

I know you want the documents -- the only thing I have heard from you guys is get the documents to the people that want them. Get them there as quickly as you can. Get them there as efficiently as possible, and that is what we are trying to do. There may be some hiccups as we try to get this thing in a system that works, but that is absolutely what our goal is.

And if you have any questions, don't hesitate to call me. There is a good chance I may have you talk to Alexis, but we are going to make sure that you don't worry about these requests. Now, obviously if it is something, a personal request of you -- I don't mean like personal business but it might be -- I don't know what every public record request requires, but almost everything I've seen the custodian of the records is essentially the administration.

The records are here in the building. You don't have them. You don't own them. You don't possess them. What we are doing is
making sure they can be found if they're paper. They can be found if they're electronic. We are going to get them. So we want to make sure you guys are comfortable. If there is any concern about what is being done, please don't hesitate to get in touch. This is an important priority for our office to get you guys to feel comfortable that this process works for you.

MR. TUTEN: If somebody makes a request and we send it to you, do you acknowledge that request or that person? We have got your request. We're working on it, or you just try to get to it as fast.

MR. DURDEN: We are going to work that out to see which one makes the most sense. We don't want to create more paper or electronic than necessary, but I will probably talk to you guys. You all may have a preference. I will talk to Alexis who been had working on public records requests for an awful long time to see what process makes the most sense for everybody involved.

Again both we are concerned about the public and we are concerned about the Board and we are concerned about the staff to make sure everything is the most efficient while still
complying with the law.
MR. TUTEN: The reason $I$ ask that is I think sometimes some people might get a little frustrated if it's not moving as fast as they perceive it should. But it might be like you're at the DMV with number 8097, and they are only on 85. It's not our fault.

But let me ask you another question: On certain documents being of a certain age, is there a statute of limitations on how long? Like for records here in the office, say we had a trustee meeting in 2000, is that document somewhere around still, the agenda?

MR. KLAUSNER: It depends. Some documents we are required to keep forever, like minutes.

MR. TUTEN: Okay.
MR. KLAUSNER: Money manager reports, you are required to keep for like three years. Everything, there is a schedule that is actually in the Florida Administrative Code. It's created, the Public Records Destruction Schedule is actually dictated by statute by the Division of Archives which is part of the Secretary of State's office. They have a long list of what you have got to keep forever and what you have got to keep for 75 years and what
you have got to keep for 10 years and some for five.

That is why most agencies have engaged in imaging of their documents because it is no matter. It's on a server somewhere, and then you are allowed to ditch some originals.

We learned some very important lessons in Fort Lauderdale after Hurricane Wilma. Some of the documents were out in the bay. And learned that same lesson in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina when all of the real estate records for the last 100 years happened to be in the basement of the city hall. And I didn't even know it had a basement until after the storm.

So that's really what -- that would be a project for our next administrator to look at imaging every single thing we have. And other than original applications, you know, that require an original signature, I would look to going paperless. And that's what most pension funds are doing.

MR. TUTEN: Would listing something like that on the website, and $I$ know it is probably dreadfully boring, but it seems like it may at least put a perspective when somebody requests a
document like that, they understand this is something that's not -- we may have a copy laying around, and if we do we'll be more than happy to give it to you. But understand that because of the way recordkeeping has been in the past -- this document is now 25 years old, more than likely we don't have it.

Therefore, just to not, you know have them perceive us as trying to hide something or destroying evidence or whatever you want to call it, it would maybe head off at the pass somebody's suspicion that we may not be on the up and up just because it is the way it was.

MR. KLAUSNER: In the last legislative session, Senate Bill 172 and House Bill 534 encouraged agencies to put more information on their websites. For example, once the Board adopts its budget, it's supposed to stick it on the website.

MR. CARTER: It is there.
MR. KLAUSNER: If you look at how our website has grown -- remember the City hosts our website. How our website has grown over time. In the City's website, I found, at least the City Council is very efficient. You can find a lot of data there. You
have got to look, but you can find it.
And the more data that we have which is accessible electronically on our website, then you can just direct someone to the link and then you have fulfilled your public records responsibility. So if it's available electronically, that is the best way these days to provide information.

MR. SCHEU: Your question is a great question, and I think we ought to adopt if we haven't already a document to structure a schedule pursuant to the statute.

MR. KLAUSNER: I think we adopt whatever the Secretary of State has, but it wouldn't hurt to be more specific.

MR. SCHEU: Not today, but somebody said something for the new administration. So we have got a document request for some document from 1990. Well, under our permitted document destruction policy, that is gone. The newspaper might have it. Go ask them, so I think that would save us a lot of aggravation.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: We have started this process of looking at document imaging system. Unfortunately, they are extremely expensive to go
back and scan all documents especially going back 25 years. But it is something we are looking at.

And I am glad you brought up or whoever brought up the website. Debbie has done a great job of current records being posted to the website in a very reasonable amount of time. That has helped immensely with getting the information out to the public.

MR. HERBERT: Debbie, how are we doing? I know we allocate up to $\$ 250,000$.

MS. MANNING: We have another appointment, I believe it is next week -- next Tuesday. They are giving us a bid. We have talked. We have had several appointments in between so it's not been totally abandoned. We are still working on it.

It's a slow process. You know, we have to locate these companies and they have to come in and see what our needs are and explain it. And then they come back with the different departments and give us another bid. This one sounds very hopeful so it's not been forgotten.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Some of the ones that have come in, their systems they can make work for what we need. We want the company that has the system that will work for what we need.

MR. SCHEU: Just because of Debbie and other members of the staff, we heard -- and I want to ask Steve this, Lee or Bob, we had a request today from Mr. Lee that we immediately post the Flash Report on the website, but that requires staff to meet and drop everything else. Is there some -- we want to be -- we want to fulfill what the public needs, but do we have to drop everything instantly? Was there some sort of process to follow legally?

MR. DURDEN: You certainly have a right to create a process that makes sense, and that there is no black letter or line in the sand that if it takes more than 30 seconds or 30 days that either is or isn't valid or invalid. One of the things you work on is figuring out what makes the most sense.

As far as posting on the website, I am not saying we have done this. But it certainly might be that the most efficient way to post things on the website is first figure out what you want to post because you don't want to post everything for a variety of reasons. Sometimes you are posting too much. What does this have to do with anything?

So you have to figure out what is going to
be posted, and then you sort of categorize that. And it is -- for the moment we will assume Debbie is supposed to do that, to make an unfair assumption for Debbie. That's what we are going to do, and she may work out a schedule where she is going to post documents every week, every Thursday or Monday, Wednesday, Friday and something less than once a year, let's hope.

So the idea is, yes, you get a process that makes sense. I mean, if you had all the money in the world, you might find out that every time you had a document you were going to post, it was posted instantly. That would be great, but $I$ imagine that would be really, really expensive so to do this.

So the idea if I might -- if you will forgive me intruding a little bit, the suggestion is you-all will be finding a long-term administrative leader for this board. And it may be that, whoever she or he is, has an idea of what makes sense for the public records request processes, document destruction processes, all of those things.

Rather than make a final determination of
those sorts of things what you want, you might want to get a suggestion from your next administrator. That person who is going to be helping administer it, overseeing the administration will have his or her ideas on what to do that makes the most sense, both on past experiences, talking to board members and talking to the administrative staff here. What makes sense? What have you got? How can we get stuff? How can we do stuff timely?

So, no, I don't believe the public records law requires when you get a request for public records, everybody drops everything they do while they scurry through the basement to find stuff in old city hall because we actually have old documents in the old city hall with mold. You can smell it.

MR. GLOVER: I think at this level -- and you used the right word. We just need to make certain it is reasonable. We can really get bogged down in the day to day and say we need to make certain that it is reasonable and we are not going to implement any policy or procedure that would be so focused that it's not done in good faith, you know. And so as long as we are consistent there, that would be
fine.
I am curious about our own destruction and archive policy. Are we looking at trying to extend it beyond the state requirements or just be consistent with the state requirements? We certainly can't, you know, do anything that would violate the state requirement. So our own destruction policy, what would that do? I mean, why would we want to do that?

MR. TUTEN: I just want we do what the state requires. I mean, we have a state -- I mean like at Rogers Towers --

MR. GLOVER: It is consistent with what the state requires.

MR. TUTEN: -- we have a document retention/destruction policy. And so I think we ought not to be expected by the public at large to keep documents for 50 years. I think that's not something that is reasonable.

MR. KLAUSNER: I think the best example are financial reports. You receive asset manager reports and you receive reports from your consultants. They are outdated by the time -almost by the time you get them. And most retirement systems keep a running one year and
that's it because all of the performance prior to that is either reflected in a consultant's report or it is reflected in the actual year evaluation which shows performance.

And so when you have someone like Summit, for example, they have all the empirical data going back at least 10 years. So if you say to Summit, What was our performance in the third quarter of 2006? They can tell you, and they will know what manager had it. But for you to keep the individual paper copies, you multiply into infinity.

And the biggest problem that I have observed with retirement systems -- I had a talk with another fund yesterday about it -- is there's information and data. We are overwhelmed with data, but that doesn't necessarily mean it translates into useful information. So that's why record destruction schedules were kept because people were simply running out of warehouse space.

MR. KEANE: That is us.
MR. KLAUSNER: As you are. You have been in business a long time.

MR. GLOVER: Yes.

MR. DURDEN: If I might, I'm not saying you should keep anything longer than the state requires, but perhaps, let's say you got a handwritten note -- not you, but the Board did, administrator, thanking you for some work you did. You may decide you want to keep stuff like that, You don't have to.

What I'm getting at is when you make your policy, you may have your own policies -- and that is why I mention the new administrator. That person may say this kind of document we get, we don't have to keep but I recommend we keep it because whatever that reason might be.

MR. GLOVER: That's reasonable.
MR. DURDEN: No, we just want to follow the state law. That is really your, your role.

I just wanted to make it clear that you may have a reason to keep a document that the state doesn't think you have a reason. And the reason may be because the way you believe business should be done that you think it's better to do it.

I am not saying that exists, but it is your discretion. It is your choice to create a system that makes the most sense for you guys,
consistent with state law, of course.
MR. GLOVER: But you do know, as you attorneys put it, once you make your exceptions, that opened the door for argument; right? You can argue it; right?

MR. DURDEN: Well --

MR. GLOVER: Yes or no.
MR. SCHEU: It generates compensation.
MR. KLAUSNER: There is an exception to that point.

MR. DURDEN: If you go to a few council meetings, you will find out that council demands yes and no from me and Howie. And I said, well, maybe. I do what I can to "maybe" as much as I possibly can.

MR. HAZOURI: Mr. Chairman, just an observation -- one of the things I wanted to do when I -- first day I got on the council, and we are working with Sam Mousa in procurement and the attorney that deals with procurement now and with our IT people and data processer is -- this is not going to get down to the minutia that may be asked you -- the little note you may have written, that kind of thing.

But I wanted to see all contracts that the
city has -- I'll use the courthouse as an example -- from day one under data dashboard, although it won't be done that way. Tomorrow I will find out to what extent they are doing it without having to pass an ordinance, hopefully. But if we do need to -- just sort of like you hear, I think -- who is our secretary from Jacksonville, cabinet officer, that says he has transparency of all their contracts?

And that's what $I$ want to see happen to us. It could happen the same way. I would encourage you-all -- I mean, they are not the enemy -- to talk to Sam and let them see what they have been doing and see what information they have, what kind of equipment they have, software, without having to go out -- they may still have to buy some.

But you can go from day one -- this is the courthouse, and go all the way through to where they are, how much they have spent, all of the details that others may ask. And it will cut back on a lot of public requests because it will already be there and not hard to find. And that's the most important part.

So we can know, if I'm looking up
something that you-all may have done and a contract you-all have with an existing organization that's bigger than some of the other stuff you-all are talking about, it is more broad. But they can just go online and they will see it right there in a timely basis.

And I think if you can kind of carry that forward and look and see how much they can do with the City for you. And I think its general counsel is going to house all these documents anyway, and I would think that would be the place for everything to go to. And if they need anything, they just go up there and they can locate it for you.

And that would be something I would give some serious thought to see if you can tie in -- I don't know how you want to be attached to the City, but you still are, and to be able to get some things done through their data processing with Greg over there because he was so -- you know, we have to buy this and buy that, you got all this parade of horribles out there, but yet we do have the software available to do some of the things, if not all of it, that we wanted to do to provide
transparency to the public.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: That was one of our first calls.

MR. CARTER: I was going to say the contracts are housed in OGC and also in accounting, but if you want to trace a contract or appropriation, you have to have another ordinance code.

Now as far as tracking contracts, whatnot, accordingly there is an in-house system that we use to track it. Sometimes they give a CT, a contract number and sometimes it has an ordinance number, but anytime you want to find out what vendor provided what, we can search by the vendor and the year.

MR. HAZOURI: How much and who bid and that kind of thing.

MR. CARTER: Well, as far as within the bid, that is in the substance. Within procurement that they utilize for themself, there is no connection as far as overall contract.

MR. HAZOURI: No. I said that's in addition to.

MR. CARTER: That is in addition to.
MR. HAZOURI: That's what I'm saying. That is a piece of it. I'm not saying everything is going
to be in one piece, but the thing is you can do all these things and whatever area they are in, whether it's dealing with recreation or whether it is transportation or whatever it might be, or public works, then it's there for you.

MR. KEANE: Resources.
MR. CARTER: Yeah.
MR. HAZOURI: That's one of the things we missed out on. It really has hurt in providing something quicker even for us to look up and it's not there. You have to go back in the archives and do what you-all are talking about right now.

MR. CARTER: Yeah.
MR. HAZOURI: That it's not necessary to do. So that is just a suggestion, one little liaison giving some food for thought to take back --

MR. GLOVER: Yes. Good call.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right.
MR. HAZOURI: -- to hit the wall and burst.
MR. KEANE: Next item on the agenda, Mr .
Chairman and Trustees is the Summit Flash Report on September 30, 2015. Hopefully, Dan Holmes will be here at the November meeting to have a full discussion on our one-year performance.

The next item, Mr. Chairman and Trustees, is Disability Application of Eric B. Rice, firefighter. He is on temporary disability since September 25. We have a letter from the medical director.

Dr. Baker says, I have reviewed the paperwork submitted in reference to Eric B. Rice. After a thorough review, I agree Mr. Rice is 100 percent totally and permanently disabled and not capable of even light duty.

Advisory committee recommends approval of the application.

MR. TUTEN: Make a motion --
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Go ahead.
MR. TUTEN: I make a motion to approve it.
MR. GLOVER: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Discussion. Just some additional information, the advisory committee reviews all of the files related to disabilities. They are able to ask clarifying information, get additional documentation before they come up with their decision that they passed on to the full board.

MR. KLAUSNER: I just want to add something for Mr. Scheu's benefit. The Advisory Committee is
our fact-finder. They act as a master would in some of the civil cases you see in the courthouse. We accept their factual findings, their interpretation of the pension ordinance or applicable statute is a recommendation that falls to the board.

In this particular case, it's a factual determination that he neither had any disqualifying preexisting condition and he is incapable of continued service as a firefighter. So on the basis of our ordinance code provisions and the state statutes that govern us, he is eligible for disability.

MR. GLOVER: Of course, cardiovascular imply heart problems. No injury or anything, just deterioration of heart.

MR. KLAUSNER: The Advisory Committee reports that he did have objective findings related to the cardiovascular system, and it disabled him while on duty.

MR. KEANE: Cerebral hemorrhage.
He's doing a little bit better, but he's out. So the motion would be, Mr. Chairman and Trustees, to approve his disability application as recommended by the Pension Advisory

Committee effective September 25, the day he left the active payroll.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Further discussion?
MR. HERBERT: Is that your motion?
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All in favor.
(In unison) Aye.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Opposed. Passed unanimously.

MR. KEANE: The next item, Mr. Chairman and Trustees, is a requested amendment to the contract, one of our MLP providers. You have the paperwork before you from Dan Holmes. They're making the same recommendations to the city for their contract for Tortoise Capital Advisors.

Originally, they were limited in the number of IPOs that they participated in. They have requested approval to change it. They want to go up between 15 and 30. Dan Holmes has recommended approval of this proposed amendment.

We need a motion authorizing us to sign.
MR. TUTEN: Can we -- okay. Now we are talking about IPO and securities, but they are the same but two separate issues. Are they wanting to participate up to 30 IPOs a year?

MR. KEANE: In this space.
MR. TUTEN: Right.
MR. KEANE: Only in this space.
MR. TUTEN: In other words, we limited them to 12, one a month previously no matter how many IPOs came out. Now we are going to basically say you can get up to 30 .

MR. KEANE: 15 to 30.
MR. TUTEN: Okay.
MR. HERBERT: Have you had a conversation with Joy about this relative as to what the City?

MR. KEANE: I did. Dan Holmes is recommending the same thing to them.

MR. HERBERT: Do you have a sense of where he is coming out on this?

MR. KEANE: They are going to do it.
MR. HERBERT: Is there a down side about doing this from an investment perspective?

MR. KEANE: The only down side would be if they say they are not going to work for us anymore. These are professionals and this is their recommendation.

MR. TUTEN: The only question I have, and I would prefer it from Dan is to understand. I understand that more IPOs are coming onto the
market. Naturally, you want to give a bigger range to buy more. The only question $I$ have is especially with MLPs doing the way they are doing in the last year or so, the motivation behind all these IPOs coming onto the market right now. Usually IPOs come onto the market when a certain sector is doing really good and people want to piggyback, whether tech or something onto that fever. You don't usually get a lot of IPOs when whatever sector is doing really bad, which is what MLP has done.

I'm just kind of curious as to what the motivation is for Tortoise or whomever to want to get in on IPOs because IPOs are notorious for actually going down once they have been on the market for a little bit, once they get over that initial fever. Not saying that these they picked will, but I'm just kind of curious as to what Dan thinks about the motivation behind it is.

MR. KEANE: His email says, I have been working on a number of these requests from Tortoise over the past week. We are in agreement. Since the number of securities in the MLP space has increased, it makes sense to allow broader
diversification. I recommend a change in the language.

That is what he says.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Basically, he wants diversification within the MLPs.

MR. KEANE: Right.
MR. TUTEN: But that goes back to my initial point of --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Now whether we should be investing in MLPs is a different question.

MR. KLAUSNER: That's a matter to take up with the consultant at your coming November --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Next meeting.
MR. TUTEN: Do we limit Tortoise to a total of 12 securities in their portfolio?

MR. KEANE: 12 to 15.
MR. TUTEN: So in other words, we are not talking about IPOs being in the portfolio. We are just talking about an increase in IPOs.

MR. KLAUSNER: Increase.
MR. TUTEN: It's not clear.
MR. KEANE: They want to go from 12 to 15 to 15 to 30.

MR. TUTEN: I got you.
MR. SCHEU: I'm totally confused then because
what the letter says, Investment Advisory Agreement currently has the following investment guideline: Advisor will manage a portfolio generally consisting of between 15 and 30 securities. The guidelines request we notify you of any changes. As such, we recommend either removing upper limit or increasing it to 40.

Then you look at the proposed amendment, and all it does in paragraph one is remove the limitation.

MR. KEANE: Correct.
MR. SCHEU: It does not put in a new limitation so they could invest in a hundred of them without any limitation. So I don't know that that amendment is accomplishing what we think it's doing.

MR. TUTEN: Well, I think the example they are trying to make, and it's sort of like you said mishmash. They're using the example there is a lot more IPOs on the market now. Therefore, instead of just having a maximum of 12 like we have because of the limited nature, we have a lot more -- there is a lot more stocks to invest in so can we up our --

MR. SCHEU: Oh, I get that. But what it doesn't say -- the existing one doesn't say 12 to
15. According to the document, it says 15 to 30. We are taking that limitation off so we are saying there will be no limitation is the way $I$ read the document.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I'm going to make a recommendation. Dan will be here at our next meeting.

MR. KEANE: Defer it to Dan.
MR. SCHEU: Do you see what I mean?
MR. TUTEN: I agree.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I think their communication
is unclear. We have more questions than we have answers.

MR. HAZOURI: We are going to let Dan. That is that what we pay him for to answer those questions.

MR. KEANE: Show that deferred.
Mr. Chairman and Trustees, next item on the agenda is the adoption of Board Rule 23. As part of the recommendations of the Pension Reform Task Force, we have developed a rule, Restriction on employment of relatives. We patterned this after the language in the Florida Statutes. We recommend adoption.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Mr. Klausner, if I can --

MR. KLAUSNER: It's about hiring your relatives.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: We can't influence any of our vendors to hire any relatives is basically what this says.

MR. KEANE: That's right.
MR. KLAUSNER: Correct.
MR. KEANE: It is about calling the manager and saying my son or daughter just graduated from college. He needs a job. Put him on the payroll, and we are going to give you some more money to manage.

MR. KLAUSNER: That has a historical reference in Jacksonville.

MR. HAZOURI: Not in my administration.
MR. KLAUSNER: Not in your administration.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: We need a motion.
MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. This is adoption of Board Rule 23. And we send this all out to all of the investment managers as part of their amendment to their agreement.

MR. HERBERT: I move adoption of Board Rule 23.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And a second by Sheriff Glover.

Any further discussion?
All in favor.
(All in unison) Aye.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Opposed. Passes unanimously.

MR. KEANE: Next item that we want to add to the Chairman and Trustees before we adjourn. Sheriff Glover?

MR. GLOVER: Thank you. Thank you, John.
Let me just say I was impressed -- I really have a letter here that I am going to submit to the Chair. I have impressed on many occasions the need for me to leave the Board of Trustees due to increase in time demands as president of Edward Waters College. With the adoption of the pension reform legislation, the time for me to step aside has arrived. And, therefore, upon the completion of this meeting, when the Chair says this meeting is adjourned, I resign as trustee of Police and Fire Pension Fund.

Let me just also add that if it has been a high honor and a privilege for me to have been selected by the fellow board members to serve and protect the financial future for members of
the Police/Fire Pension Fund to serve and protect this city. It has been actually one of the highlights in my life and career, and been able to work with fine people and on some various serious issues, and I feel now the time for me to transition. It is with regret but it is necessary.

So with that, Mr. Chair, I submit this letter indicating my resignation.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I can tell you from me personally serving on this board has definitely been one of my highlights of my public service, not only having worked with you or for you when you were my sheriff, but also on this board having learned a great deal from you: Leadership, wisdom, guidance, calmness. You brought to this board some assets that, quite frankly, I don't think we could have gone through many of the things that we have gone through as successfully without you being here.

So I really appreciate the time you have taken and the dedication you have given to serve us on this board and set an example for the rest of us to follow. Thank you very much.

MR. GLOVER: Thank you.

MR. HERBERT: I just want to say in many respects you have personified throughout your career including your service here what it means to be a dedicated public servant. And it's been a real pleasure for me to have the opportunity to work with you in this context as well as in others. You have served with a great deal of distinction.

We all deeply appreciate everything you have done. And I know that it's been a lot of personal sacrifice for you with all of the other demands on your time, and I definitely understand what being a university president entails and all of the demands associated with that.

So we are just very grateful for all you have done. You have been a wonderful role model as well as public servant, and like so many others, $I$ am very grateful for all you have done for us not only as sheriff but in this context as well.

MR. GLOVER: Thank you, Adam.
MR. SCHEU: I would just like to say too all those years we have known each other when we started meeting at the Catholic church, a super event, coach for a better Jacksonville, you have
been a hero to a lot of people in Jacksonville. I've been new to this but everything you have done for this City has been selfless. For that reason, $I$ intend to move that we defer motions for a judge -- for adjournment ad infinitum.
(Laughter.)
MR. HERBERT: If we don't adjourn, we don't have to accept. Only an attorney could come up with that one.

MR. GLOVER: Just for the record, if I have to call a question, I will call it.

MR. SCHEU: But thank you.
MR. TUTEN: Sheriff, you are a good man. You're an honest man. I consider you a friend. And just as a curiosity, how long did it take to type that letter?

MR. GLOVER: You have got to defer to the staff.

MR. TUTEN: Oh, curious. I just wondered. No reason.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Mr. Klausner.

MR. KLAUSNER: I also wanted to thank the sheriff for his service. And your service to the public is not done. There is a lot of work to be
done at Edward Waters College to continue to grow and build that important historic institution here in Jacksonville. The sheriff has got me involved in it and it's been rewarding for us as well.

I think you got the best tribute that you could get from Trustee Tuten when he says you are a good man.

MR. GLOVER: Thank you.
MR. KLAUSNER: An honest man.

There's a Jewish word that's the highest compliment that one person can pay to another. And the word is a mensch. A mensch literally translates to be a human being. So Sheriff, you are a mensch.

MR. GLOVER: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you all for the kind remarks. And Mr. Chair, as I said earlier, I have been honored to serve.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Thank you.
MR. KEANE: I want to amend to show, Mr. Chairman and Trustees, that Mr. Klausner handed out a legal opinion dated October 19 just so we can get that into the record.

MR. KLAUSNER: I will take up any questions at the next meeting.

MR. SCHEU: Yeah, I would like to refer this
letter to the Office of the General Counsel.
MR. KLAUSNER: I gave them a copy.
MR. SCHEU: Good. I figured you would because this is the heart of the dispute. So it would be nice to have them both here to just give us their thoughts about it.

MR. KLAUSNER: Sure.
MR. KEANE: Right.
MR. KLAUSNER: All part of the sharing process.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: One last item. With Sheriff Glover's resignation, do we have any motions for an appointee to replace him as the fifth member on the board?

MR. KLAUSNER: It requires the presence of the four of you to do so. Secondly, the only requirement to be the living member is to be 18 years old and breathing.
(Laughter.)
MR. SCHEU: That sums it all up.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: After all that.
(Laughter.)
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: You did much better.
MR. KLAUSNER: I couldn't resist.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Can a recommendation come
from any -- the chairman?
MR. KLAUSNER: The recommendation can be from any trustee.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I would like to recommend Rick Townsend. He retired as a chief from the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office. He has management experience. He has been involved in the Police and Fire Pension Fund Advisory Committee for at least 10 years, maybe longer. He understands the issues. He followed the whole process through all the commissions. He is well versed in the issues that have gone on within the Police and Fire Pension Fund. He was a member of the pension fund and is a retiree so he understands it from that perspective as well.

I think his experience within the sheriff's office as an administrator, his involvement with the Fire and Pension Fund, on the Advisory Committee, and his understanding of all of the issues we have gone through the last several years would make him an asset to the Board.

MR. HERBERT: Let me just say that I don't know him, and before we make any definite decisions, $I$ would like to have a chance to talk
with whoever the folks are that we might want to consider.

And another question is, are there other candidates that we would want to take a look at? We don't have time today to deal with that but before making a decision, I think it's important for all of us to have a chance to talk with whoever the nominees are just so -we can do that individually, but $I$ think it is important before we cast that kind of vote to make sure that we are comfortable with each other.

MR. SCHEU: He may be just great, but I would like to get to know him too. And I've tried hard to think of people. I'm getting old and sort of slower now. So just to hold it open for a while until we see that we can handle it. You may have some --

MR. TUTEN: I mean, I know we need to kind of do it in a timely manner.

MR. KLAUSNER: The state law and the city charter actually say that the sheriff continues to serve until his replacement is seated.

MR. TUTEN: Excellent.
MR. GLOVER: You didn't make that up?

MR. KLAUSNER: No, I didn't.
MR. SCHEU: Move we adjourn.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: You are saying we have got a month?

MR. SCHEU: Adam is going to be gone.
MR. KEANE: Mr. Chairman and Trustees, you need to bear in mind Dr. Herbert is going to be gone.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: For a month.

MR. TUTEN: When do you leave?
MR. KEANE: Very close on a quorum issue here.
MR. HERBERT: Next Tuesday morning.
MR. KLAUSNER: When will you return?
MR. HERBERT: I will be back in the country the 25 th of the November.

MR. KLAUSNER: I probably wouldn't schedule a November meeting until after because you are going to be down.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: That is the issue we are going to run into. Timewise we need to have enough members to be here present as a quorum, especially through this transition period when we are trying to hire an executive.

MR. SCHEU: It seems to me that December would be the logical time to get the whole thing taken care of.

MR. KLAUSNER: You are not required to meet monthly. What you may want to do is wait until Dr. Herbert comes back and schedule a meeting in early December because at the end of November, you are dealing with Thanksgiving. And towards the end of December you are dealing with end of the year holidays as well.

So state law only requires you to meet once a quarter so unless there is some -- if some matter of urgency arises, the administrator, you know, can seek or the chair actually can call for a meeting. But you may not want to schedule a regular meeting in November so that we make sure we have four people here.

MR. KEANE: When are you leaving, Mr. Scheu? MR. SCHEU: I'm back and forth. I will be here this week, be gone next week, be back the week of the $9 t h, ~ I t h i n k$ it is, and then be back that -I have got actually jury duty on December -- on November 30.

MR. KEANE: If we can get a meeting set up between you and Rick Townsend, and maybe with Dr. Herbert and Rick Townsend before he leaves, just so
you get a chance to know him and see where -MR. SCHEU: I will be here all week. MR. KEANE: You will recognize him from the task force meetings. He was at every one of them. MR. SCHEU: His name is very familiar.

MR. KEANE: He was at every one of them.
MR. HERBERT: Yeah.
MR. KEANE: It is critical though.
CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And especially through -again we are trying to hire an executive director and we're telling them we don't even know who the board members are. It makes that process that much more difficult. If we can have -- at least have our board set so the interviewees know who they are going to be working for.

MR. KLAUSNER: There is no problem with the trustees individually meeting with Mr. Townsend. The only limitation is the two of you can't talk to each other about anything that was said.

MR. SCHEU: So if we met in early December rather than November, Adam would be back. We will have met him and maybe some additional names will come in and we decide.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Do you want to try to set a meeting date now? Everybody look at their calendars.

MR. KEANE: Mr. Chairman, we have the next applicant coming. Maybe we should administratively try and work that out with everybody.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. We can do that.
MR. KEANE: We have got two waiting.
MR. HERBERT: I just have one other question. This is of Trustee Glover. If by some chance there is an emergency issue that needs to come up, and given what Mr. Klausner just said, would you be willing, notwithstanding your resignation, to attend a meeting so that there could be a quorum?

MR. GLOVER: I have no choice according to the good --

MR. KEANE: We'll send the Sergeant-at-Arms for you.

MR. KLAUSNER: Your resignation will become effectively immediately upon the selection and seating of your successor.

MR. GLOVER: That's easy. We are fine. CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: No further business? MR. KEANE: That's all. CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: This meeting is adjourned. (The meeting was concluded at 2:40 p.m.)
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