JACKSONVILLE POLICE AND FIRE PENSION FUND

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

DATE: October 21, 2016

TIME: 9:04 to 10:47 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 Chairman Richard Patsy, Secretary Willard Payne, Trustee Chris Brown, Trustee

STAFF PRESENT:

Timothy Johnson, Executive Director,
Plan Administrator
Debbie Manning, Executive Assistant
Beth McCague, Consultant
Devin Carter, Chief Financial Officer
Paul Daragjati, Board Counsel
Dan Holmes, Summit Strategies Group (via teleconference)

CITY REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:

Joey Greive, City Fund Treasurer Steve Durden, Office of General Counsel Anna Brosche, City Council Liaison

GUEST:

Brian Smith, FIAC Chairman

These matters came on to be heard at the time and place aforesaid, when and where the following proceedings were reported by:

Denice C. Taylor, FPR
AAA Reporters
stenoz@comcast.net
904.354.4789

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	חא כידי
2		PAGE
3	Public Speaker, Bill Gassett	4
4	Consent Agenda	9
5	Executive Director's Report	12
6	Consultant's Report	30
7	Counsel Report, Steve Durden	35
8	Counsel Report, Paul Daragjati	40
9	Summit Strategies, Dan Holmes	53
10	Old Business	66
11	New actuary	66
12	External audit letter	85
13	Director's recap of meeting	92
14	Certificate of reporter	98
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 BOARD MEETING 2 October 21, 2016 9:04 a.m. 3 4 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Call the meeting to order. 5 Mr. Director. 6 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Good morning, everyone. 7 I wanted to make mention that we're honored to have the chairman of the FIAC here. You all 8 know Brian Smith. 9 Good morning, Brian. 10 MR. SMITH: Good morning. 11 12 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: All right. The meeting has been called to order. If you'll open your 13 board book, you'll see the agenda. I'm on page 14 2. And there is a moment of silence that needs 15 to be observed for the following deceased 16 17 members: Charles Joyeusaz, who is a retired police officer; William G. Dearborn, also retired 18 police officer; Richard A. Caldwell, an active 19 police officer; George R. Blackwell, retired fire 20 21 lieutenant; and Vernon M. Evans, retired police officer. 22 23 (Pause) 24 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Thank you. 25 Item III on the agenda is public speaking.

Is there anyone in the audience who would 1 like to speak to the Board this morning? 2 3 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We have Mr. Bill Gassett. DIRECTOR JOHNSON: We're familiar with Bill. 4 5 Come on over here, Bill. Yeah, I want to do it 6 over here so everybody can see you. 7 Bill and I have been fast friends. Bill has been to my office since the last meeting and we 8 had a great conversation yesterday afternoon. 9 MR. GASSETT: My name is Bill Gassett, 10 Jacksonville, Florida. 11 I speak to you because last month at this 12 time, standing over there, I made a statement 13 that from an investment standpoint, we need to 14 15 look at things from the Armageddon standpoint, and I threw out some numbers, and I didn't want 16 17 it to leave a bad taste in your mouth that I was 18 giving a rant or a rave. And so what I did, I did some number 19 crunching back here, and you have the thing in 20 21 front of you. And what we first determined was that the -- you've been using 7 percent as your 22 23 approach to how to justify investments, et

cetera, et cetera.

24

25

But in our study going back the last -- up

to 25 years on an average weighted annual basis, you only come in about 6.2. What that means is if on the 7 percent, if you had held to that, yes, the fund would have run out of money in 12 years.

Now, I appreciate the fact that whenever we added this kind of stuff, but you're only as good as the knowledge you have at the time using the published data, the actuary report from fiscal '15 as well as the CAFR report that was put out too.

If you -- what that means is if you're at 6 percent, you would be running out of money in 11 years. Even if you raised it to 9 percent, you would run out in 14 years. So use the age 82 as the new number for actuarial life expectancy.

Now, I want to say something irrespective of how much money we save using that. These percents can be used whether you are funded or not. And what's critical here is the fact that you've only averaged 6 percent when you've been running your thing against 7.

I will also tell you that the 9 percent, we did a side-by-side analysis and found out in a simpler investment strategy, that that kind of

return, going back to the comparable 21 years, would give you a 9 percent analyzed net rate of return.

What the implications of all this is, if you continue with a bad strategy of 6 percent you'll need to drop in, Counselor -- sorry, Lady Councilwoman, an additional 500 million bucks to get you through the 17 years.

And if you look at the fourth page, I think, of our handout, you will see we made a mistake there -- yeah, fourth year, fourth page, it should be 17 years is how long the applicable approach. You know, it's what you're going to have to be committing to it just to make sure that you make it -- again, to repeat myself -- if you do the current investment strategy.

One thing that's got us a little bit concerned also is that given the current rate of strategy, you've actually lost money for over 15 of the last 21 years. You cannot sustain that kind of investment results and not go to the City Council and taxpayer and say, hey, drop in a couple hundred million bucks every couple years.

Let me leave as a closing point, if I may. When you get the September numbers, as of

September 30, our side-by-side readily available 1 to the American public investment strategy is 2 3 14.3 percent net. Underscore the word net. 4 So when Dan comes -- I guess, what, does he 5 have anything to give you today, Mr. Chairman? I have not looked. 6 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I don't 7 think he has a --DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Dan's report is contained 8 in the Board book. 9 10 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yeah, okay. MR. GASSETT: My bottom line is look at the 11 net number, not the gross. 12 13 So, again, the whole thrust here is, please make a change in the investment strategy. I know 14 15 you've been given some kind of allocation requirement, but typical confused allocation with 16 17 diversification. They aren't the same animal. 18 They can be overlapping. You do much better on 19 the diversified report. 20 Two things we determined. I said this the 21 first time I met before you back September three years ago, what are you doing in bonds? 22 23 Another thing I want to say to you from our 24 report, and challenge on this, is that you never

should have been in international stocks.

25

International stocks have not given sustained 1 requirement that you folks need on a 2 3 year-end/year-out basis. 4 With that, I'll be glad to answer a quick 5 question. If not, I'll be glad to say thank you 6 very much. 7 I will be back next month. I know you'll be sitting on the edge of your chairs, and I will 8 make a presentation on cash management, because 9 it's really three parts here: Investment 10 11 strategy, cash management strategy, and 12 government strategy. 13 Thank you very much. 14 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Thank you, Bill. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Thank you, Bill. 15 16 We don't have any more speakers, I don't 17 think. Do we? No. Okay. 18 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Is there anyone else who 19 has a statement to make? 20 (No response.) 21 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: So Debbie just reminded me that we did not pledge our allegiance to the 22 23 I didn't see it on the agenda, so I apologize. We should do that. We should stand 24

and pledge allegiance to the flag.

25

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the
United States of America, and to the Republic for
which it stands, one nation, under God,
indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Thank you.

Item IV on the agenda is the Consent Agenda. You'll see that it includes a copy of a meeting transcript from our last meeting, October 12.

Disbursements, which are also copied behind your disbursement tab in your book, that includes both accounts as well as disbursements related to benefits.

Also, all benefit applications and DROP participation, survivor benefits, time connections, have all been reviewed by the advisory board at its October meeting.

So, Mr. Chair, we need a motion to accept the Consent Agenda.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I got a quick question for you, Mr. Director. Application for Vested Retirement here on page 4, down at the bottom. Vesting 2024. Are these two police officers, were they -- did they leave to go to another department, or did they leave or do we know the circumstances behind why?

1	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I don't know.
2	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Does anybody know?
3	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Debbie, do you know the
4	circumstances?
5	MS. MANNING: I do not know. Do you want me
6	to check with Chuck?
7	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: We can find out the
8	circumstances.
9	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, no. I was just
10	curious to see if they left to go to another
11	department, is what I was looking for.
12	MR. BROWN: Selzer did not, I can say
13	definitively. I don't know about the other one.
14	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. Gotcha.
15	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Your point is Selzer did
16	not leave to go to another department?
17	MR. BROWN: Correct.
18	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I got it. Yes.
19	MS. BROSCHE: And I have a question as well.
20	On page 3, underneath the table it says, "All
21	calculations and dollar amounts have been audited
22	in accordance with accepted procedures."
23	What does that mean?
24	MS. MANNING: Devin, we have a question from
25	Ms. Brosche.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: It's on page 3 of the 1 agenda, Devin. If you don't have it, I'll show 2 me on mine. 3 MR. CARTER: About the payments? 4 5 MS. BROSCHE: What does it mean when it says 6 that everything's been audited in accordance 7 with --MR. CARTER: It's been reviewed and 8 recalculated. 9 MS. BROSCHE: Been reviewed and 10 recalculated? 11 MR. CARTER: Uh-huh. 12 MS. BROSCHE: I think audited carries a 13 different meaning to different people and 14 indicates, you know, certain procedures done by 15 outsiders. So we might want to be more specific 16 than reviewed and recalculated. 17 18 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: So noted. We'll make 19 that change. 20 MS. McCAGUE: And just to note, 21 Mr. Director, just so you know, when our auditors, external auditors, come in on an annual 22 23 basis, they do check not every -- they do samples of all of these distributions that have been 24 25 made.

1 MS. BROSCHE: Yes. DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Any other questions 2 3 related to the consent agenda? 4 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Do I have a motion to 5 accept to from somebody? MR. BROWN: I'll make a motion. 6 7 MR. PAYNE: Second. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We have a motion and a 8 second. Any questions, discussions? 9 10 (No responses.) CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All in favor? 11 12 (Responses of "aye.") CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All opposed? 13 14 (No responses.) DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Motion carries. Thank 15 16 you. So let's go to item V, and you'll this is 17 the Executive Director's Report. There's also a 18 19 tab headed Executive Director's Report. I will 20 be brief. I have another meeting this morning. Bill Clinton is in town. He'll be at the library 21 this afternoon at 1:00, and he'd like a private 22 23 meeting and an update on the status of Jacksonville Police and Fire. 24 25 That's a joke.

(Laughter)

MR. BROWN: I was laughing, but I didn't know, you know . . .

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I've never met the president. But everybody wants to know what's going on with Jacksonville Police and Fire. I wouldn't be surprised.

MR. PAYNE: You did a good job.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: All right. So you'll see my report. It begins with the dashboard. The dashboard, as you can see, is a work in progress. So at this point we're at the end of the fiscal year. You'll see that the top dashboard is a summary of the benefit transactions that have been performed by staff, things like payroll, refunds, applications for new benefits, reclamations.

Under that are retirement statistics. For the prior month, that means that these statistics are for the month ended September. As we move into next month, you'll now begin to see this thing develop. So you'll actually have the month and statistics. And you'll also have cumulative statistics.

So the Board will not only be able to see

what the staff has done in that month that just preceded, but also through that month, including every prior month. So this is coming together. It's going to get stronger as we move forward.

You'll also see under the category of

Investments that we've taken action on the

liquidation recommendation that was made by the

Board last month.

And under the Budget, you'll see that we're about 21 percent under budget at the end of September. There obviously are some bills that are outstanding. So next month we'll true that up. You'll actually see a fiscal year-end budget total, and you'll also see a total for the first month of the new fiscal year. So we will have two budget updates next month.

I always like to give you updates on my activity in terms of the long-term goals I have for the plan, which are Governance, Solvency, Transparency, Education and Outreach. I'll just highlight one or so items from each one of these categories.

You'll see first a functional chart and an Annual Cycle of Work diagram. This is the way -- if you take a look at this chart, you'll see the

way that I've structured my relationships with various professional service providers, and just so you know who I'm working with and how they relate to the operation of the fund.

Next, there's a draft of the 2016-17 Annual Cycle of Work. I'm not going to go into detail with this other than to tell you that I've met individually with staff, which is the Administration column, the FIAC under Brian Smith and also the advisory board so that have an understanding of some of the priorities that are going to be coming to those committees, the timing of their work. It will eventually lead to recommendations that will be made to this Board for ratification.

One of those recommendation will be coming from Brian later in the meeting related to actuarial services.

So next, let me hit a couple of highlights.

Under Solvency, the chapter funds have been received for 2016. They total \$10,680,624.05.

50 percent of that money goes to the city to apply to its yearly pension contribution.

The remainder is distributed by this Board as either, 1, holiday bonus; 2, share plan; or,

3, to pay down the unfunded liability.

You should note that in 2015 this Board voted to allocate \$2 million to Option 1 and 3 million to Option 2.

The chairman has decided that we don't need to move a vote on this item until next month. So I'll get through the balance of my report. If the chairman wants to call a motion in regard to how to allocate \$5.3 million in funds for this year, he can do that at his discretion.

Under Transparency, you'll see that I've added public record requests to the dashboard. So if you look at the prior page, you'll see that there were nine requests made in September and there were nine requests completed in September. So you will see that highlight every month going forward.

In terms of Education, I'm very proud to tell you that we have our first scheduled DROP retirement workshop on the 26th at 10 a.m. It's here in this room, and we're at capacity crowd. Our capacity is 40.

MR. BROWN: That's great.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: They filled up that thing quick, which shows you the demand that there is

out there for education about this pension fund. 1 Our members are desperate to learn more about how 2 3 to prepare for a secure retirement. We're going 4 to be doing that quarterly, and you're all 5 welcome to attend. 6 Under Outreach, under the opinion roundup, I 7 was interviewed by the editorial board at Florida Times-Union, and a copy of that article is 8 attached to my report. 9 And then, finally, this building was secure 10 despite Hurricane Matthew. Staff came in on the 11 day before the storm hit. They removed all the 12 computers. They wrapped them in cellophane. All 13 of our member files were protected. 14 15 sandbagged the entrances. Fortunately, there was no damage to the building. 16 17 So that's the extent of my report. If there's any questions, I'll entertain those now. 18 19 All right. Hearing none, Mr. Chairman --Tim --20 MR. PATSY: 21 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: All right. Sorry. MR. PATSY: -- I've got two questions on 22 23 this flow chart. 24 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Yes, sir. 25 MR. PATSY: Okay. At the very bottom line,

```
1
         you've got a lobbyist and a public relations.
         Those are two functions that, to a certain
 2
 3
         degree, we don't do right now.
 4
             DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Well, right now we do
 5
         have a lobbyist.
 6
             MR. PATSY: We do?
 7
             DIRECTOR JOHNSON: We do. The firm --
             MR. PATSY: A fully paid lobbyist?
 8
             MS. McCAGUE:
 9
                            Yes.
             DIRECTOR JOHNSON:
10
                                 Yes.
             MR. PATSY: Outside entity?
11
12
             DIRECTOR JOHNSON:
                                 Yes.
             MR. PATSY: Who is that?
13
             MS. McCAGUE: Governance Services.
14
15
             DIRECTOR JOHNSON: It's Governance Services.
16
         Correct. Correct.
17
             MR. PATSY: And we have public relations as
         well?
18
             DIRECTOR JOHNSON:
19
                                We don't.
20
             MR. PATSY:
                          Okay.
21
             DIRECTOR JOHNSON: But it's part of my --
22
         it's part of my long-term plan to improve our
23
         image and our relations with the public. So I'll
24
         be talking about that later on.
25
              MR. PATSY:
                          Okay.
```

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: The lobbyist had been used 1 mostly for Tallahassee-type issues over there 2 3 with the state legislature. 4 MR. PATSY: It just seems kind of -- I mean, 5 we are a governmental entity, but yet we're 6 hiring a lobbyist. To me, that's a bit of a 7 contradiction. It may have been a practice that we've done for a long time --8 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I'll send you a copy of 9 the contract. 10 MR. PATSY: -- I don't know that, but 11 it's -- I don't know. Kind of rubs me the wrong 12 13 way. DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Well, we'll talk about 14 15 it. I'll send you a copy of the contract. it's something the Board wants to act one, we can 16 17 do it at a future meeting. MR. PATSY: Do we -- how much benefit do we 18 19 get from it and in what shape or form? DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I can't tell you how much 20 21 benefit we've gotten in the last 11 weeks that I've been here, but we can put it on a future 22 23 agenda and talk about it. 24 MR. PATSY: Yeah, that would be good because, obviously, I need some education on it, 25

given the fact I didn't know we had one. Yeah, that would be helpful.

And same thing, if we could put the public relations on there so you can go into more depth as far as what you're -- and, trust me, I get it. I get it. You know, every entity, particularly somebody like us, can use good public relations.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Yes. I'll tell you where I'm going with that. I won't be engaging in contracts that don't get approved by the Board. So I don't want you to be surprised if that contract exists, because it doesn't.

Also, in November I would like to suggest to the Board that after my first 90 days on the job, it might be good to designate a subcommittee of the Board to look at my plan and to make sure that I'm on the right track.

MR. PATSY: Sure.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: So I'll be bringing that recommendation to the Board in November. When I do sit down with that subcommittee, if the Board decides that's the way it wants to go, one of the things I'll be talking about is branding and public relations. All right?

MR. PATSY: All right. Good. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Tim, this is fantastic to bring
all this together and actually be able to see it,
the 10,000-foot perspective of everything and how

it all plays in. Thank you for doing this.

Two quick questions.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. BROWN: The October 26th workshop -- I see there's several dates here. You've got the October 26th workshop and you've got a couple of dates in November. That 26th workshop, is that for all members that are going into the DROP or just anyone interested in it?

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: That's a great question.

So for the 26th, what we're trying to capture are those people that have any interest in the DROP program. So instead of just meeting one-on-one with people that are going into a class, they're about to enter the DROP, we've expanded this to, really, anyone who has an interest or a curiosity about the DROP.

So you could have ten years in the plan and you're planning your retirement security strategy, you might want to learn more about that DROP right now. So I think that's where the interest is, if the people are curious

about it and now they don't have to wait until 1 they're about to enter it. 2 And this PowerPoint 3 MR. BROWN: 4 presentation, is this the one that's going to be 5 given? 6 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: This is the actual 7 PowerPoint. MR. BROWN: And what are those dates in 8 November, the JFRD and JSO dates? 9 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: So we're also doing a new 10 member orientation. 11 MR. BROWN: 12 Okay. 13 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: We think it's really important that relationships with new members of 14 the plan, both police and fire, get established 15 16 when they're hired. That way they can learn the 17 details of the plan. If they have questions, 18 they know who to go to. And I think we can do a 19 better job of anticipating what they want to know 20 about and giving them that data. 21 So our plan is to not only do a new member 22 orientation, which we've just begun -- we did the 23 first one for the fire department this week, and 24 the one we're doing on the 26th is going to be

for police -- but we're also going to be doing a

25

vesting workshop so that when people get to the point of their vest and at that point they're entitled to new benefits, it will be another opportunity for us to touch them and talk about the benefits.

MR. BROWN: Great. Okay.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: So that's what's going on. Going forward, we're going to market it the way we have been, which is on the website and through the news letter. So that, again, new members, vested members, or members that are considering the DROP will all have an opportunity to get good information.

MR. BROWN: Good. Thank you for that.

And the holiday bonus. I saw that it's on the agenda for next month. So that's enough time. We'll discuss it next month, vote on it, and then it can be implemented in December.

I've just been asked a couple -- by a couple members about that.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Truly at the discretion of the Chair.

In my report, I was suggesting that now that you have knowledge of it, which you have a month to consider it, but you-all have been through

1 this before, and the Chair may want to ask for a recommendation on it today instead. So we'll 2 3 see. 4 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, yeah, I'm sure you've 5 gotten calls about it. It seems like firemen are 6 really adept at knowing when they're supposed to get money. 7 8 (Laughter) CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I think that's everybody in 9 general. 10 You know, usually what we do is just send 11 it -- make sure the actuary does a quick little 12 write-up, make sure everything is good, works, 13 which it will. We already know the dollar 14 amount. What we have to decide is basically how 15 16 do we want to split it up. Do we want to do it like we did last year? 17 18 MR. BROWN: What was it last year? I think 3 million went to 19 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: 20 the share plan and 2 went to the retirees. 21 MR. BROWN: Okay. 22 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Something like that. 3 to 23 2. 24 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: It's in the report. 25 MR. BROWN: Oh, okay. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yeah. I mean, it's up to the Board. Really, the only thing we need to do is make a motion to approve the amount as far as the breakdown, approve that we sent it to the actuary and make sure they do their study, and then we give Tim and the office the permission to, you know, write everybody a check and make the deposits whenever we're supposed to make the deposits for the share accounts.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: So for the record, 2 million went to the holiday bonus, 3 million went to the share plan. And we have about the same this year. It's \$5,300,000.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: So any calls to the Board, do you want to get it rolling now or --

MR. BROWN: That would be -- I think it would probably be better to go ahead and do it now. Because of the interest that the members are showing, might as well go ahead and start the process and say -- you know, we can wait until next month, but I don't see any reason to.

MR. PAYNE: The sooner the better.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Do you want to do it now?

MR. PATSY: Yeah. The sooner the better, I

think.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: So the motion will be to take the money we have that's available for the enhancement and the share plan, run the numbers by the actuary just to make sure everything is good, and then once that's done, based on our final decision on how we want it allocated, we'll go ahead and give you guys permission to go ahead and take care of it as far as sending out the checks and all that.

Richard?

MR. PATSY: We're going to do this in November, right?

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, the checks, yeah.

Usually it would come out -- well, we could, but it would be probably more prudent to do it now. That way, make sure it gets done in time. I'm not saying anything is bad or whatever, but it still has to go to the actuary. We need them, you know, to actually do their little thing.

It doesn't take long, but they still need to make sure that the numbers work and all that.

Get it back from them, then -- what we're going to do essentially is approve how much we're going to allocate to the share plan versus the retiree

enhancement bonus.

And then once everything checks out everywhere else, it comes back here, we start the checks.

MR. PATSY: How much are we going to recommend to pay down the unfunded liability?

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, half of the -usually we get about a little over \$10 million.
Half of that is already going to the city to pay
down the unfunded liability. That was part of
the deal, the pension reform.

MR. PATSY: We used to get the full 10 million?

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yes, sir. We used to get the full 10, and that went into -- that used to go into the Christmas bonus, and then the rest of it we put into the -- basically a savings account.

And when we made the reform deal, we gave the city 80-something million bucks or whatever out of that savings account. And then going forward, half will go for the next ten years, eight years. Half will go to the city to pay down the unfunded, and then the other half comes to the members, whether it's a retiree or current

members.

So in my humble opinion, we're already giving half to the city to pay down the unfunded, or whatever they choose to pay it with, the pension lady. You know what I'm saying?

So I think the other half -- I don't think it's unfair to give it to the members since they were getting all of it before.

MR. PATSY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Kind of a give-and-take type thing with the whole situation. You know what I'm saying, Rich?

MR. PATSY: I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I mean, whatever you think we got to do with the money, that's what --

MR. PATSY: I wasn't aware of that. I didn't -- you know --

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I gotcha.

MR. PATSY: -- I wasn't here when we made that decision last year, and it wasn't clear to me. So I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yes. So does anybody -- do you want to stick with what we did last year, or do you want to up it for one group, lower it for another?

How do -- we used to do a 3 percent bonus for retirees. And the biggest thing with that was -- in my opinion, was always there's still quite a considerable number of people out there, they didn't retire with the DROP. They retired in '82. They're making about 1,200 bucks a month in pension benefits. This is a big deal to them.

Anybody that's retired in the last ten years, this is not a big deal to them.

MR. PATSY: Right.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: But according to the IRS, you have to divide it up fairly and equally between all the members.

MR. PATSY: I got it.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: So there's no -- you know, we can't help anybody out more than others. So we have to decide on, you know, you've got the current guys whose pension is obviously not as good as mine is, you know, and the share plan will help them out considerably down the road and balance that out with, you know, the old folks.

MR. PATSY: I understand. I got it. I understand.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: So I think that's what we came up with.

Do you want to do it the same way we did 1 last year? 2 MR. BROWN: I make a motion to do it the 3 4 same way we did last year. 5 MR. PATSY: I'll second. 6 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We have a motion and a 7 second. Any more discussion? 8 (No responses.) CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All in favor? 9 (Responses of "aye.") 10 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All opposed? 11 12 (No responses.) 13 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: None. DIRECTOR JOHNSON: All right. We will take 14 care of that. 15 16 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Thank you, sir. 17 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Thank you. 18 If there are no more questions about my report, Beth, our consultant, is here. Her 19 20 report follows mine. So if you look right behind 21 my report, you will see the Consultant's Report 22 to the Board dated October 21, 2016, and I'll 23 turn it over to Beth. 24 MS. MCCAGUE: Thank you. I'll just give two 25 quick updates.

Number 1: I am working with Tim regarding the direction he wants to go putting together a plan that can restore confidence in the operations of the fund at the member level, at the city level, at the community level.

But the most urgent thing happening next week is the last item, which was added to my list of things to do before I left here, and that is help arrange for the appointment of a new external pension counsel.

That date for interviews is scheduled for Tuesday. I hope everyone has that on their schedule for -- come at 12:30, please, so we can get started right at 1:00.

We'll have three attorneys presenting to us. In your packet behind my comments, you will see a summary of the three firms. You'll see the time line that we're following in this selection process.

But we have three great firms that we are interviewing. We have -- we did a directed RFP, if you remember, to those firms which we agreed with Jason Gabriel at OGC would be -- have the appropriate level of expertise.

We have their proposals in. They're all

very good. And we will look forward to interviewing them and then having your decision at the November meeting. And then we'll be working with Jason to put the contract in place, and our new attorneys should -- with pension expertise will be in place December 1st.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Yes.

MS. BROSCHE: I have a question.

So there were four RFPs issued and these are the three that responded?

MS. McCAGUE: Yes. The fourth one was issued to the Klausner firm, although the Klausner firm had told us back in March that when their contract came due, that they would ask us to find another attorney.

MS. BROSCHE: Got it.

MS. McCAGUE: So our policy is always that we include an RFP to a long-term vendor who has been working with us. So we included the Klausner firm.

Klausner did respond, saying they would not be biding on the general business. They would stay available to offer special pension advice when called on, and they also restated that they would continue to handle securities litigation for us if we chose to do that. In return, they would provide us with 50 fee hours of legal services a month, which we could take in any number of ways.

So securities litigation was not part of our RFP to these three firms. So we only have three firms presenting.

MS. BROSCHE: Okay. Thank you.

MS. McCAGUE: Is that clear?

MS. BROSCHE: Uh-huh.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: You were kind enough to put this on my desk last night. We haven't had a chance to talk about it.

Is it your plan that we would have this ready and emailed to the Board members before the interviews, or would they receive this after the interviews?

MS. McCAGUE: Tim has begun packages, as you know, in preparing everybody for the work that they were going to do. And so what he is holding is, is a document which contains what you're looking at in this package.

The last couple of pages in this package, the time line, the summary of the three firms, and also a list of proposed questions and an

evaluation matrix that you would use.

And, yes, what we're going to do is have this for you in book form when you come in on Tuesday, and we will get this to you, if you would like it, electronically. We can get that to you today so you could be reviewing it over the weekend.

Also, if anyone would like to see the full proposals, I will be glad to get that to you. They're each, you know, six or eight or ten pages. Mostly what they contain is the background and everything that the attorneys have done and the résumé, including whether or not they were on moot court when they were in law school. But I'll be happy to get that to you if you would like.

MS. BROSCHE: I would like that, please.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: So we're going to do it for everyone. So today you'll get all the things that Beth mentioned, along with electronic copies of the -- their initial submission.

MS. McCAGUE: And that's my report.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: That's your report.

Excellent. All right.

If there's no other questions about the

consultant's report, we'll turn it over to our first counsel report. Our internal counsel is Steve Durden. I believe I saw Steve this morning.

Hello, Steve. Come on up. Tell us what's going on.

MR. DURDEN: Actually, I don't know that we spoke about this beforehand. Stephen Durden here.

So I'm not sure -- other than the litigation which has begun, you got a letter that I believe has been sent now to Mr. Sheppard, representing Mr. Keane and the other couple that -- you can read the letter.

It's just briefly, Sheppard sent a letter to Tim, directed at him, saying, pay us our money or we're going to sue you and ask for damages and attorney's fees and triple damages, or something like that.

So we responded, basically saying, you're not entitled to win and we'll talk to you later. I've forgotten the exact language, but it's fairly -- fairly generic, kind of return letter to someone who files a threat to the city. I don't know that there was anything else.

I've gotten a few reports regarding a couple 1 of things, but I don't think there's anything 2 3 else that you wanted to talk to me about unless 4 that was --5 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: No. There's a copy of the letter in the Board books. 6 7 MR. DURDEN: Yes. DIRECTOR JOHNSON: So the Board has had a 8 chance to see that. 9 MR. DURDEN: It's a very brief, no, you're 10 not going to win, but we'll talk to you. I think 11 that's a fair way of putting it. 12 13 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Does anyone have any 14 questions for Stephen? CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yeah, I've got a question 15 for Steve. I've read the letter. 16 17 Has there been a lawsuit filed yet? 18 MR. DURDEN: No, sir, not as far as I'm 19 I would probably be aware of it, but I 20 don't think. No. 21 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I've never been deposed 22 before or to make a statement. So I'm curious. 23 If we get deposed by the attorney for the other 24 group, do we bring, like, you with us when we 25 make sworn affidavit statements, or how does that

work?

MR. DURDEN: Yes. Okay. The way it works, civil cases go, there are often depositions. And we don't know for sure whether there would be a deposition in this case. If the Board members were called, I have a feeling one of the first things we'd look at is whether we believe that Board members should be allowed to testify at all.

But assuming that there was a deposition,
Mr. Sheppard, or whoever he chooses, would come
to a room like this, some sort of conference
room. The plaintiffs may or may not be there.
They don't have to be there, but they can be
there.

The lawyer for the plaintiff, or who is calling the deposition, whoever that may be, will ask questions. For the most part, the questions are pretty much things that -- you pretty much answer almost any question asked.

There's -- because -- because depositions are not necessarily geared to finding evidence that is actually admissible in court, but may lead to evidence admissible in court, so there's a broader range of questions.

But there will be a lawyer for you, for the Board, to say -- if there's an objection that's necessary, any question that you would have at any time, a client would be recommended to say, I'm not sure I understand the question; I want to talk to my lawyer, all those sorts of things.

It's -- most of them, they can be very contentious or they can be very polite. And that just depends on the personalities involved of the lawyers.

I mean, our lawyers know the Sheppard lawyers quite well. I don't have any reason why it would be contentious in the sense of personal animosity with the lawyers, which sometimes happens. So it would be a very -- it would be a casual but stressful question-and-answer session.

And then after Mr. Sheppard, or whoever he has, asks -- were to ask questions, whoever was representing the Board would be able to ask their questions in response to sort of clarify something you may have said.

You know, you've said that the sky is green, and they clarify it be saying, well, you know, I meant by that at sunset on a specific day, there is this what's called a green flash for sunset.

So you weren't really saying the sky is always green.

In other words, you -- your lawyer helps clarify -- may help you clarify the answer. Some depositions last an hour. Some depositions last days. So that, I can't tell you. There's no predicting that kind of stuff. There's a possibility.

I would expect that if any Board member were called for a deposition, while I don't know this for sure, it would not be uncommon for the lawyers to say, why is it that you need to call the Board members? We want to prove that they were on the Board, in which case the lawyers may say, look, we'll stipulate they were on the Board. Or something like that.

In other words, sometimes depositions are avoided because the lawyers can agree on whatever information the deponent would have.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Is it too early for me to declare the Fifth, or do I have to wait until I get there?

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, was anyone else on the Board at that time?

MR. DURDEN: Anyway, does that help? And if 1 you'd like to talk to me more about it later --2 3 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I was just curious. 4 forward to it. 5 (Laughter) 6 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: All right. Stephen, 7 thanks. MR. BROWN: Always appreciate your 8 explanation, Steve. 9 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: All right. 10 Paul Daragiati is also here. His written 11 report is contained in your Board book. And he 12 might have some highlights or want to entertain 13 some questions. 14 MR. DARAGJATI: Sure. Just to remind the 15 Board, pursuant to the Wyse settlement, we have 16 17 to submit an annual status report to the federal 18 district court each year. We did that this past 19 month. A copy of the report is in your binder. 20 And, basically, it just says that everyone 21 is following the terms of the settlement 22 agreement, and nothing new to report on that. 23 The court accepted it and hasn't issued an 24 order. Probably will not, other than just

stating that the court is aware that the report

25

was issued.

In regards to securities litigation and any matters that I was assigned to work on since the last meeting, I assisted your chief financial officer in completing the Valuation Support Services Agreement. That was resolved and submitted.

In terms of securities litigation, NII has been settled. You already knew that from last month, but the court granted final approval on that one. A settlement was issued as far as the order, and the securities litigation firm is working with Devin right now to fill out the proper documents so that Jacksonville gets its share of the settlement.

Just to -- I do want to also put this out there in the public sphere because there's always a lot of talk about the settlements in these things.

In this particular issue, the court recognized that there were 39,000 hours of attorney hours involved in this particular case amongst all the plaintiffs' counsel and set a fee of \$19.2 million, yet the court cut that fee in half. The court has every right to do so.

So I just want to make sure that that's out 1 in the public, that it's not a windfall for the 2 3 attorneys in these cases, that they do put in a 4 lot of work and they don't always get paid as 5 much as they want for them. MR. PATSY: Wait a minute, Paul. So the 6 7 legal -- the law firms that are involved are going to get 19.2 million? 8 10. The court cut it 9 MR. DARAGJATI: No. in half. 10 11 MR. PATSY: Okay. MR. DARAGJATI: And that's five different 12 firms that are splitting that. 13 MR. PATSY: And the class members, the 14 pension funds involved are going to get how much? 15 Approximately 30 million. 16 MR. DARAGJATI: 17 MR. PATSY: Divided among how many? I don't know the answer to 18 MR. DARAGJATI: 19 that. 20 MR. PATSY: So you don't have a quesstimate of what Jacksonville Police and Fire --21 MR. DARAGJATI: I do not. We can work --22 23 see, it all depends on how many of the class 24 members are actually going to apply for that 25 fund.

See, I got a problem with law 1 MR. PATSY: firms -- no question you probably earn your 2 3 money. But each law firm is going to get roughly \$2 million. If you take five firms and divide 4 5 it. Okay. That's a lot of money per law firm. Where, what I saw from what Jacksonville 6 7 gets, every time we're a class action member, it's -- it's thousands of dollars. 8 MR. DARAGJATI: Uh-huh. 9 MR. PATSY: So are we doing this to benefit 10 our plan participants, given the payout that 11 we're getting, or are we doing this strictly to 12 benefit the law firms that represent us? 13 MR. DARAGJATI: 14 Sure. MR. PATSY: And that's -- that's -- I got a 15 problem with that. 16 17 MR. DARAGJATI: And that's the philosophical 18 debate around these types of cases. 19 The response, the generic, general response, is that the law firms that bring these cases take 20 21 all the risks, all of the risks. You took a loss by owning this stock to your 22 23 detriment because you were given false 24 information in purchasing that stock. The stock 25 took a dive.

1 2

The law firm took all of the risks in bringing that case, all of the costs involved in it, because if the case gets dismissed by the court, they take all that loss. And in the end --

MR. PATSY: Yeah, but you wouldn't have a case if you didn't have the class action members. So I get that. I understand that, and to a certain degree -- when I look at some of these cases, particularly the Men's Warehouse case, I got a problem with them. So I don't mind suing them, okay? Because I got a problem with them.

(Laughter)

MR. PATSY: But some of these other ones, like they're good -- they're companies. They're going concerns. And in some instances we still own the stock.

So, you know, as owners, we're talking money out of our pocket, dividing it up amongst all our class action, plus our law firms, and in essence we're taking money out of our own pocket and @ recompensating everybody else involved in the deal.

I've got a problem with that.

MR. DARAGJATI: As an owner of the firm, if

your accountant or your CFO or your director lied 1 to you about a cost or about some function of the 2 3 firm, and you relied on their advice to take a 4 business decision, what would you do when you 5 found out they lied to you? You'd fire them. 6 You might sue them. And that's basically what 7 you're doing here. MR. PATSY: I'd sell the stock. 8 MR. DARAGJATI: But that's basically what 9 10 you're doing here. MR. PATSY: But the payout is so small for 11 us, you know? I just -- I saw the number from 12 previous cases. 13 14 MR. DARAGJATI: Right. When you look at -individually, as an individual member of a class, 15 but as the class as a whole, the payout is much 16 17 larger than what the attorneys get. 18 MR. PATSY: I've still got a problem with 19 it. 20 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I understand what you're 21 saying, Richard. We had a former trustee that took your position quite often in these cases. 22 23 I think some of this has to be looked at 24 from our perspective. It doesn't cost us 25 anything to get that money back.

Now, I understand what you're saying, and I think it's more in the realm of, you know, law firm out there doing what they're doing, trying to -- you know, maybe some of these cases aren't exactly worthy of doing what other -- ambulance

chasing is what you're thinking. I understand.

But at the same time you have to look at the deterrent. How much of a deterrent is it in the future for some of these people? Maybe, maybe not. But these people -- you know, even if we still own their stock, the problem is, you lied, you cheated, whatever you did, regardless --

MR. PATSY: Then they ought to be out of business. We ought to -- we ought to -- I mean, we're going in, we say, okay, we'll settle on this one. Like the ambulance chasers, they find out what the minimum your policy covers and they go for that. In most instances, \$50,000 and they're happy, if they can get it, and they go away.

And that's almost what we're doing here with securities litigation. We're not -- if a firm really needs to go out of business, we're not pursuing that. We're finding some lower amount that will make all parties happy. And that's --

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I agree. But at the end of 1 the day, you've got to get back to what we do as 2 3 far as -- you know, even if it's -- say our 4 payout amount is 50 grand. Well, that's still 50 5 grand more than we had. It didn't cost us 6 anything to get it. And, you know, in today's 7 world where every budget, every dime is being scrutinized here at the pension fund --8 MR. PATSY: But that \$50,000 is a small 9 portion of the 30 million that was part of the 10 settlement, and that 30 million is real dollars 11 to the company. 12 13 And in many instances, as I see it, the issues are not that large as far as whether the 14 company should be out of business. 15 It's -- you 16 know --MR. BROWN: What about the notion of it 17 18 being -- I understand it. In some cases it isn't 19 as significant as in others. But, I mean, that could be a large way to justify such suits. 20 21 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: At some point too, when you look at this, there's one, two, three -- three --22 we have how many cases out right now, Paul, 23 24 three?

I believe -- well, NII is

MR. DARAGJATI:

25

done now. Other than NII, we have three, 1 2 correct. 3 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: How many would you say can you remember we've had, say, in the last ten 4 5 years? Do you know, Beth? 6 MS. McCAGUE: Yes. We had to produce a 7 great deal of information for a special subcommittee of the finance committee which 8 Councilmember Brosche chaired. And I believe the 9 number was five, including NII and Tower 10 11 Insurance. And you're right. The payments come in 12 13 dribbles over years. You just don't get a check, even though the case has settled. 14 15 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right. MS. McCAGUE: They come in small increments 16 17 over years. And the average, if I remember, that 18 we got on those cases over time was maybe 19 \$23,000. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yeah. So it's -- like I 20 21 said, our former trustee, I won't name her, but she was the same way, like it was almost a waste 22 23 of time to do it, in other words. 24 But at the end of the day, it doesn't cost

us anything. And maybe, who knows? Maybe one

25

day we may get somebody that really needs to get caught. You know, that's my fear, is somebody -- I don't like the fact that these people think they can do this stuff with impunity.

Yeah, \$30 million is a lot of money to them.

Of course, we don't see much of it. But at the end of the day, they still have to pay a price for doing something illegal. That's just me, you know.

MR. PATSY: I agree. I'll work on my argument.

(Laughter)

MR. DARAGJATI: This case -- this issue actually came in front of the Supreme Court about three years ago, the very philosophical argument you're having right now. There's a challenge to a fraud-on-the-market theory that all of these cases are based on.

And the court kind of split along the lines that you would expect it to, but they kept -- they kept the theory intact, which allowed these cases to continue.

MR. GREIVE: Mr. Chair, not to belabor this point, but what my friend, Rick Patsy, knows, he's not the only one out there on a limb on this

issue.

My thoughts on this topic do tend to lean a little more towards Rick's comments than, you know, our practices over time. Not that there's not some reason to do it. You know, you keep people honest by serving as a check and balance against them. Get your counsel to do it. Maybe you feel you have -- you can do a better job at it than some other Board that's out there.

It does -- my observation, you know, from reading *Pensions and Investments* and seeing things transpire around the country, and maybe Tim's seen this too, given that he's a professional in this industry, it does seem that public safety pension funds, you know, tend to carry this pitchfork more often than nonpublic safety funds.

But, you know, there may be some sense to that too. There's counter-arguments to all this stuff, and if these cases do go to trial and you're a public safety fund, you may get a little more sympathy or empathy from a jury in that you can make the case that, you know, my guys are running into burning buildings, getting shot at, and here you are, you corporate fat cats, you

know, stealing our money from our guys that are risking their lives. So there are, you know, counter-arguments to all this.

At the GEPP and Corrections, we tend to just participate as a class member more often than we take lead in a case. In fact, I don't think in the six years I've been here we've taken lead in a case, because there is staff time. You know, there are some costs just in time of having to cooperate.

You know, those are just my thoughts on the topic. You know, I completely understand, like Trustee Patsy does, you know, why we may feel compelled occasionally to take a case. But I've tended to lean the other way and just serve as a participant.

If I got fired up about something, maybe like I bought Wells Fargo stock not knowing about their retail scandal, and then I sold it and lost money, maybe I'd want to -- which, I don't know. Has anybody started a case like that yet? I'm sure somebody is working on it.

MR. DARAGJATI: I heard something in California is going on.

MR. GREIVE: Yeah, yeah.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I'm sure that's going to get fired up.

MR. GREIVE: Yeah, stuff like that. I'm sure someone is going to get fired up on that.

MS. McCAGUE: So just to correct a statement I made earlier when you asked the question,
Mr. Chairman, how many of these cases have we been involved it, it's more than five.

There were five where there were favorable outcomes, and there were several that we filed to be primary lead and did not get that privilege.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right. And it's like I say, though, at the end of the day where every budget, every line, everything we do here, people are inspecting our finances, every single thing we do -- and, hey, if it takes three years, if it takes eight years and if it's only a \$50,000 check, that's still \$50,000 more than that we had yesterday.

And no one can come back and say, well, why haven't you guys fought to get back that money you lost from X-Y-Z Company or -- because I can promise you, they would say it if they knew it. That's just the world we live in.

But I'm like you. I don't think -- and we

1	don't chase every ambulance that comes down the
2	road. But I think if it doesn't cost us anything
3	and it makes us some money, hey, that's more
4	money than we had yesterday. But that's just me.
5	MR. PATSY: I agree.
6	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Work on your argument,
7	Rich.
8	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: All right. Paul, do you
9	have anything else?
10	MR. DARAGJATI: Nothing further of substance
11	for the Board.
12	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Very good. Thank you for
13	that report.
14	All right. Next up we have Dan Holmes from
15	Summit. Dan should be on the there he is.
16	Hey, Dan.
17	MR. HOLMES: Good morning. Can you hear me
18	okay?
19	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Yes, we can.
20	MR. HOLMES: And can you see me okay?
21	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Yeah, we've got you on
22	the Jumbotron. You look great.
23	MR. HOLMES: Well, thank you. I appreciate
24	it. I have three things to cover today.
25	First, the Monthly Economic and Capital

Market Review; second, the monthly Flash Report and preliminary results for the fiscal year; and, third, a small rebalancing recommendation.

So I'll jump right into it unless there's any questions.

Okay. First, the highlight with regard to the Economic and Capital Market Review.

September was a relatively quite month for both the economy and the capital markets. The fed didn't raise interest rates, so that helped keep things rather quiet.

At the end of September, the market was implying a 60 percent rate -- I'm sorry, 60 percent chance of a rate hike by the fed in the month of December. It sounds like they're going to remain quiet in both October and November going forward.

We saw the labor market have some positive news during the course of the month. A significant number of jobs were added. That's the 72nd consecutive month where there was a job add to the overall payrolls.

It was a little bit less than what was expected, but the bottom line is, is that wage inflation is going up. Wages rose over 2.6

percent for the last 12 months. It's the wage inflation that is driving the fed towards considering raising rates.

The unemployment rate went up to 10 basis points at the end of the month because the labor force participation rate went up as well. So at the end of September, unemployment was at 5 percent. Not a big -- not a big change.

On positive news, GDP, the real GDP, rose
1.4 percent annualized rate. That's the final
print for the second quarter. That was up from
1.2 percent.

On the other side of the equation, it's also another month where we're below 2 percent. So right now consensus is, is that we're going to be -- it's going to be kind of hard for GDP for the end of the year to come in much more than 2 percent.

We're still -- the economy is still considered to be in a growth mode, albeit a very slow growth mode. The ISM, Nonmanufacturing Purchaser's Index, remained above 50 percent. As a matter of fact, it took a little bit of a jump, up from 53 to 57 percent. The 53, we think, was a little bit more of an abnormality -- actually,

it was 51, not just 53. So it jumped up to 57 at the end of September.

So, really, anything above 50 percent shows that the economy is in an expansionary mode. So that's all good news.

Now, let's translate that to the results in terms of the capital markets. As I mentioned before, basically it was a pretty quiet month for September, but now we're also -- we're coordinating the results for the fiscal year. And what you'll see is that large -- domestic large-cap stocks were basically flat for the month, but for the calendar year -- I'm sorry, for the fiscal year, they're up over 15 percent.

So you'll expect results accordingly in your portfolio. Small-cap stocks were up a little over 1 percent for the month and, more importantly, 9 percent for the quarter. But, again, up over 15 percent for the fiscal year.

International developed stocks were up a little over 1 percent for the month. They were up less for the fiscal year. They had started off slow, started to come back, then at the end of June Brexit hit. They had to recover from Brexit, and now they're back up for the fiscal

year about 6 1/2 percent. That's offset by emerging market results.

You see emerging markets were the leader, one of the leaders for the fiscal year, up over 16 percent. And, again, it's still positive at the end of September as well for the month.

Other growth assets. MLPs' high-yield debt were also fairly strong as well, emerging market debt. So for the fiscal year, emerging market debt was up over 17 percent. High-yield was up over almost 13 percent, and then MLPs up almost 13 percent as well. So exposure to those drill assets helped in the portfolio.

Looking at the bottom side for the month, bonds, domestic investment-grade bonds were also flat, off about 10 basis points but up about 5.2 percent for the -- for the fiscal year.

Corporate bonds led the way along with 9 US bonds as the dollars weakened during that time period.

The only other thing I'll mention, we don't have any particular exposure to long treasuries, but with the decline in interest rates earlier this year, you saw that bond treasuries also rallied during the course of the year.

That's the economic and capital market

backdrop for your fiscal year returns. Let me stop and see if there's any questions.

Okay. Hearing none, hopefully it's not because my speaker's out, we'll move on to the Flash Report.

Following in the deck you should have the Flash Report. Let me caution. These are preliminary returns. We've got the first print of accounting statements from the custodian. There may be some adjustments between now and the November full quarterly return, but this should be fairly accurate. Sometimes the real estate returns lag a little bit, but this should be a pretty good approximation.

So the first thing I'll point out is at the end of the quarter and fiscal year, market value was up at 1 -- approximately \$1.6 billion.

That's where our market value added.

The asset allocation was within the investment policy range that's permitted in the investment policy. They were overweight in equities and a little bit in fixed income and also MLPs. There was underweight in real estate by about 3 percent, all within the policy range.

So if you turn to the first page, we'll

note -- and I'll give you both gross and net of 1 fees number on returns. 2 3 On a gross basis, the total fund was up 4 almost 11 percent for the fiscal year. On a net 5 basis, it was up 10 1/2 percent. 6 MS. McCAGUE: Excuse me. Dan --7 MR. HOLMES: To be precise, 10.48 percent. 8 MS. McCAGUE: Dan --9 MR. HOLMES: Yes, ma'am. Hi, it's Beth. I just want 10 MS. McCAGUE: you to repeat that net number again. 11 MR. HOLMES: 10.48 --12 13 MS. McCAGUE: Thank you. MR. HOLMES: -- or approximately 10.5 14 15 percent on a net-net basis. 16 MS. McCAGUE: Thank you. 17 MR. HOLMES: Okay. The returns for all the 18 asset classes were also strong for the fiscal 19 year. So in domestic equity, the domestic equity 20 portfolio was up approximately 13 1/2 percent on 21 a gross basis, approximately 13 percent on a net basis. 22 23 The international equity portfolio was up 24 over 12 percent on a gross basis and 11.6 percent 25 on a net basis.

Fixed income was up 5.7 percent approximately on a gross basis and 5.6 percent net.

And then finally both real estate and MLPs. Real estate was up 8.8 percent net, 9.8 gross. And then MLPs were up 14.5 percent on a gross basis and 13.7 on a net basis. So putting it in perspective, what we saw was that MLPs were the highest performing asset class in the portfolio. That's a significant turnaround over 2015. We saw after that domestic equity, international equity, real estate, and then finally the fixed income portfolio.

In addition to that, I'd say that all exceeded our long-term capital market expectations. There are specific reasons for that in a number of asset classes, primarily recovery of prices relative to fundamentals.

So examples of that would be in the MLP portfolio. MLPs came back with the price of oil coming back, but they continue to appreciate from there, given where both yields were and also the underlying fundamentals in that sector. Both your managers performed fairly well.

In the international, international equities

were led by emerging markets. The emerging markets manager was up over 16 percent. So MLPs and emerging markets were two areas that were down last year and they've had a sharp turnaround so far this year.

Couple other things to note. In the domestic equity portfolio, large-cap managers, the active large-cap managers by and large underperformed during the course of the year.

We've got ongoing discussions with the Financial Investment Advisory Committee about that.

Eagle had an issue earlier this year running a concentrated portfolio. We believe that's a short-term issue and will correct itself. Their performance did start to come back this most recent quarter.

And then in addition to that, the two large-cap growth managers, we believe the issue with regard to large-cap growth is more structural, and we're going to have conversations with the Financial Investment Advisory Committee on those issues at the beginning of next month.

That's it. With regard to formal comments, I want to kind of keep it -- unless there's any questions. DIRECTOR JOHNSON: No, Dan. You can go right ahead. You have a recommendation you wanted to make too with regard to rebalancing.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah. I actually -Mr. Johnson, thank you. I appreciate it.

One thing I was also going to mention in terms of turnaround issues, in this day and age where information is produced almost minute by minute, we look at performance on literally a daily and a monthly basis, but these assets are adjusted for the long term. It's important to kind of keep that long-term investment perspective.

The reason I mention that is, again, in terms of turnarounds, Baillie Gifford was the manager last year that was down significantly both in terms of underperforming their benchmark and then negative returns on an absolute basis. They are one of the best performing managers so far this year. So, again, I want to try to keep and maintain that long-term perspective in terms of judging performance.

So that's the last comment I'll have about performance. I have a memo included in the package regarding a rebalancing recommendation.

The rebalancing recommendation, one area where we can rebalance at this time is emerging markets and international. The emerging markets manager and composite was under its benchmark weight -- that's the target weight -- by about \$7 million. Our recommendation is to take that from the EAFE Index Fund and move that into the emerging markets -- the emerging markets part of the portfolio, specifically, Acadian.

The reasons behind it is, is that although emerging markets has had a good, strong performance run so far this year, we believe that that will continue. We also believe that the expected return for emerging markets is higher than developed markets, both international and US. And we also believe that emerging markets remain relatively cheap compared to those other areas of equity. Therefore, our recommendation is to rebalance and bring that up to target.

I'll stop there to see if there's any questions.

MR. PATSY: Dan, this is Rick.

Last spring we approved a couple of fixed income managers. Can you give us an update on how we're doing as far as when we might be

reallocating towards them?

MR. HOLMES: Sure. Contracts were under review for Neuberger Berman. I have successfully finished negotiating investment policy with them. Recall that they are a commingled fund, and what we needed to do was go through what they were going to put in the commingle fund and make sure that there was statutory support for every single type of security that they were going to hold because it was a fund. They don't have the ability to not hold something because it's a fund. So we've finished that and forwarded that on to counsel for contract review.

Today at 12:30 my time, I hope to finish the same negotiations with Loomis. It's been a little bit more difficult negotiating with Loomis in terms of getting them to review the statute on a security-by-security basis in terms of what's permitted, and I hope to have that put to bed this afternoon.

MR. PATSY: Okay. And when are you going to make -- when are we going to make -- well, assuming you get everything signed, sealed and delivered in the next few days, first of November, are we going to make the move?

MR. HOLMES: As soon as contracts are signed, we can start the transition. It will take about a week to get the transition done. It will take the managers probably a couple weeks to right-size the portfolio.

Our intention is to transfer in kind.

There's no need to use a transition manager. The managers receiving assets in kind would go out and receive basically three bids and take the best bid for securities they don't want to hold. A transition manager would do the exact same thing. So there's no reason to spend the cost for that middle third-party, if you will.

MR. PATSY: Okay. Both of these managers are pretty big on the fixed income side in that in cost-trading where they might be able to use those securities internally, is there any provisions as far as the transition on that?

MR. HOLMES: Well, the idea would be transfer all the assets in kind. The new managers can keep what they want, and then they can -- they can liquidate the rest of the portfolio that they don't want to hold.

MR. PATSY: Okay. That's it.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All right. We need a

```
motion to approve the transfer of the $7 million
 1
 2
         into Acadian.
              MR. PATSY: I'll make the motion.
 3
 4
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Make a motion. We got a
 5
         second?
              MR. BROWN: I'll second.
 6
 7
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Any questions? All in
         favor?
 8
              (Responses of "aye.")
 9
10
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN:
                               Opposed?
11
              (No responses.)
12
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN: It passed.
              DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Motion carries.
13
              Hey, Dan, thank you very much.
14
              MR. HOLMES: Okay. Thank you. Everybody
15
16
         have a good weekend.
17
              MR. BROWN: You too.
                          Thanks, Dan.
18
              MR. PATSY:
              DIRECTOR JOHNSON: The next item in your
19
         Board book is Old Business. This Old Business is
20
21
         related to the Financial Investment Advisory
22
         Committee recommendation with regard to the
23
         selection of a new actuary.
              And I'll turn it over to Brian. Hello,
24
25
         again.
```

MR. SMITH: Hello.

The Financial Investment Advisory Committee, one of our charges is to help advise the Board of Trustees on investment issues, but also actuarial issues.

So I put together a report for you, but just to summarize, we had an opportunity as a committee to interview the top three actuaries that had made presentation to us with their RFPs. Of the three that we interviewed, two of them really did their homework and quickly rose to the top. The one who didn't perform as well was not familiar with the recent tax that had passed and House Bill 1297. That was cause for concern for us because that's a big issue to address coming forward.

So that left us with two firms that were very, very close. One was GRS and the other was Nyhart. And, actually, when we went around and polled after hearing presentations, we're kind of split.

The general consensus was that either one would be a great actuary, but we couldn't pick both. We had to pick one. So I want to point you to a document that's actually under Tim's

report, under Executive Director Report.

The page isn't numbered, but if you start at the beginning of his report and go in six pages, you'll see a report look looks this. It says Evaluation Matrix.

On the Evaluation Matrix we had five criterion that we were looking at, and you can see them at the top. We wanted to know did they have experience working with public plans, did they demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate actuarial principles and so on.

We gave 20 percent weight to each of those areas. And if you look at the bottom, you'll see where it says Final Score. We had eight evaluators which were members of the Financial Investment Advisory Committee who were present at the meeting and also several Board of Trustee members there, in addition to Tim and Beth and Devin and Joey.

You can see the scoring. If you go to the bottom you can see that GRS came in with the highest score at 92.25, and Nyhart came in at 86.

Above that you'll see their pricing. I know, for instance, personally, Nyhart, I scored them lower in the pricing area because they were

the highest in terms of their bidding among the three.

So GRS won the scoring. But I remember having a feeling after the presentations that even though I scored GRS higher because of pricing, I know I personally felt a little bit more comfortable with Nyhart at the time, and there were other people that felt that way as well. So we did some additional digging.

At our meeting we actually got on the phone and we called Nyhart and GRS to ask some additional questions that we had, and it was also a little bit of a test on, are they going to pick up the phone when you call? And to both of their credit, the lead actuary who had made the presentation, both of them got on the line right away and answered all of our questions. So it was very, very close.

If you'll go back to the Old Business section where my report is, I outlined the top six things that we felt helped GRS have the edge in the presentation.

One was GRS was a larger firm. They have more resources at their disposal. And these we came up with -- I actually asked the committee.

I said, I'm making a presentation to the Board of Trustees. Tell me why you as a committee have picked GRS so I can accurately make that presentation.

Two: We were impressed with GRS's actuarial software that they had -- they actually had two sets of software. One: They had a proprietary actuarial software that they felt was even better than the leading actuarial software out there, which is called ProVal. The two other companies talked about ProVal. ProVal is the best software out there. It's the best third-party software out there, but GRS had the resources to actually create their own.

So we like ProVal. We use ProVal. If you want us to use ProVal, we will. But we actually use ProVal more for a transitioning tool and as a check and balance on our own actuarial software which we feel will give you more and better data than even the ProVal software can provide.

GRS also spent a lot of time in their presentation to us discussing several funding scenarios related to House Bill 1297, and they did it in even greater detail than the other firms.

8 9

You know, one of the questions is, when the sales tax kicks in in 2030, how is the funding going to happen? Is it going to be an even thing? Is it going to be done different on each particular year? And they showed us a number of those scenarios.

The lead actuary at GRS, Pete Strong, had indicated that because of the size of our fund, that we would be a top priority. I know there was a concern. He said, I have 22 pension funds that I'm the lead actuary on. And I remember thinking, that's kind of a high number. He said, well, actually, many of these are much smaller funds. They don't take as much as my time, but I will transition — if you select us, I will transition some of those funds out of my portfolio to another actuary so that we'll make sure that you get the service that your fund would expect from our firm.

He also said, you'll have my cell phone number. You can call me anytime. You can reach me at the office. If you can't get me in the office and you want to catch me after hours, you can call me on the cell phone.

GRS also had more software resources. They

provided a software called GRS Advantage. They said it was no additional charge. It allowed for performance benchmarking of our fund in terms of performance versus other pension funds out there. And I think the GRS Advantage, if I'm not mistaken, also included a Social Security death check feature to it. We felt like that that wasn't -- that we had ways to check that, but it was something that they threw in.

And, finally, GRS had the best pricing on their annual actuarial valuation report and their experience study.

Now, if you go back to the other page, you'll see that their hourly rates for special projects are higher. I'm sure that's something we can discuss with them on their hourly rates. And they had mentioned that typically they give a 10 to 15 percent discount of posted hourly rates anyway.

So both of them were excellent firms. We felt GRS had the edge.

MS. BROSCHE: I have a question. And thank you for that report, Brian.

The information in the Executive Director's Report is actually really helpful, and I was

having a hard time reconciling the lowest price with the highest rates listed.

And I guess based on everybody's involvement -- and I applied a consistent methodology to kind of take the rates to the total fee that's listed, and it shows that GRS is performing at about 40 percent less hours than Nyhart.

So if based on what you-all have interviewed, you feel that that's accomplishable through leverage to staff or you feel like you're getting what you need to, I just wouldn't want it to seem like they're putting forth less effort than somebody else and the effort that you need.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. That's a good point and certainly something that we thought about, considered and addressed, because there's a lot of important work for our next actuarial firm in the coming years. And we feel confident that this firm had the resources to do that.

MS. BROSCHE: Did either -- any of them provide a blended rate?

MR. SMITH: It was hard to do a blended rate because -- and I'll ask you to help me out on this, Rick, because there are special studies and

special projects that you'll ask them to do.

Could you share --

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, just like, for today, for example, with the Christmas bonuses, et cetera, how long does it take? Not long. But what are they going to charge -- I mean, when we interviewed them, with GRS, Nyhart, I kind of caught them off guard because they were by far the most expensive. But their hourly rates -- and that's what's going to happen with a lot of our stuff. It's not a full-blown actuary study.

It's, okay, we're going to do this, we're going to do that. We've got the annual audit stuff we send off to people for the state. We have to use the -- the Christmas bonus -- oh, what was the other one? I had my notes here.

MR. SMITH: Well, doesn't it come up in the union negotiations where you have to go to the actuary and say --

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, that's the bigger unknown we have going forward. You've got two unions, police and fire. They're both negotiating pension benefits along with paychecks.

Okay. Now, let's say the unions agree to

something. Well, before, they can -- you guys can vote on it as a council to approve or disapprove it, it's got to come back here. It's got to go to our actuary. They've got to run the numbers to make sure that everything that's being promised on the city side, the fire side, the police side want all that good stuff, it's going to have to be run through -- and that's a full That's not just a two- or three-page report. That's going to be a full, long-term, blurb. okay, we're going to give X amount of people X amount of raise. It's going to affect them for X amount of years. I mean, stuff like that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And that's going to happen, hopefully not, but it could happen every three years because it's negotiated as part of a contract these days, which is going to increase our costs with the actuary quite a bit from what we normally have, which is one or two -- one big report, the annual report, and then a couple here and there.

I don't know how much that's going to cost.

I'll be honest with you, full disclosure, I rated everybody 100. If they're wondering who that was, that was me, simply because as far as -- (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: -- as far as actuaries go,

I think they're all more than competent to do

number crunching, you know.

The difference between the other two, it seems like, which I found interesting because I've never seen it with actuaries, they seem like they're providing more services to go along with just the basic actuary function, you know.

And whether that's good or bad, I have no opinion. I don't see myself logging online and running numbers because I have so much free time to do that kind of stuff, but it doesn't hurt. You know, it's nice to know.

But the bottom line is, is really -- the biggest question I have is how much are they going to charge us, and that's just for the usual stuff, but now because we have the negotiations every three years, what if -- okay, the first go by, we agree it to, the city agrees to it. But let's say the council says, look, I think that benefit or whatever you-all have agreed to is too much or too little.

Well, guess what, now we have to run all that back to the actuary, and just a little tweak, but -- the only thing that concerned me

with GRS, and I think I mentioned it to them in the interview was the fact that -- I think you made the comment that, well, that would not be something that we would do for the senior consultant. That would just be somebody on staff. In other words, it would be cheaper.

MR. SMITH: Well, also what they had indicated -- because I had a concern. I know when you look at that, you go, wow, they come in with a low bid, right, and then they're just going to eat us alive on the hourly charges. That was a concern I had.

They said, look, we show you these hourly rates, but typically we do flat-rate pricing. You said, hey, this is a special project, this is what we need done, what is it going to cost, so that you have a fixed cost and a fixed understanding of the specific report or work that you're asking them to do.

MS. McCAGUE: The other thing that they mentioned is that Nyhart -- both of them had good software. Nyhart's software was not available to the staff, much less the members. GRS was.

And Nyhart, when questioned about that, Nyhart said, well, we use our software to help

our consultants, our experts, consult with you; whereas, GRS says, we make that available so you can run your own scenarios, what ifs. You don't need us for that. You can do that on your own if you choose to.

So what they're saying is that you can use our software and we're not charging you our time by the hour, versus Nyhart would say, you can use our software, but we will do the work for you and we will be charging you by the hour.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: And I think that's -- I think that's something -- getting back to the contract side of it, that would be something that the unions, if they wanted to come and say, look, we've got some proposals, can we run some numbers maybe just to see what the impact would be, that would be awesome as part of the package. No problem. That would be great.

Nyhart, I think, like you said, not only were they extremely more expensive than everyone else, but they really didn't have any sort of -- you know, anything else to offer other than the actuary, which is fine. I thought they would be fine. You know, I thought everybody would be fine as an actuary.

I don't know -- GRS, if I can remember my 1 notes correctly, I think GRS was -- I believe 2 3 they were the one that I would pick. You know, I 4 can't say for sure because I don't have my notes, 5 but I know it wasn't Nyhart. Just something 6 about them was too -- too limited, in my opinion, 7 but that's just me. So I have no problem with the GRS recommendation from you guys. 8 I always have a bias going with 9 MR. PATSY: 10

the lowest cost provider because sometimes you get what you pay for.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right.

MR. PATSY: I spent the early part of my career as an aviator with the US Navy, and I didn't take great comfort in knowing that my aircraft was made by the lowest bidder.

(Laughter)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PATSY: But I have experience with GRS and they've proven themselves to be a straight-shooter, apolitical, which I value highly in something like an actuary. They've always done a good job for us.

But were you able or did you have anybody check references?

MS. McCAGUE: Yes.

The staff checked references. MR. SMITH: 1 Can we get a report on that? 2 3 MR. PATSY: To me, that would be helpful because all the presentations were really nice. 4 5 But, you know, are they walking their talk. 6 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Devin, are these the 7 references, or do you want to comment on it? MR. CARTER: This right here is your 8 evaluation score here. So I brought that just in 9 case. But as far as references, I did check, 10 and, of course, for references, you can't go 11 wrong with either of the two. 12 So checking Miami, St. Petersburg, also Fort 13 Lauderdale. 14 MS. McCAGUE: And you also confirmed with 15 the Division of Retirement Services --16 MR. CARTER: The Division of Retirement 17 Services --18 19 MS. McCAGUE: -- the quality of these two firms. 20 21 MR. PATSY: And they were all favorable? MR. CARTER: Everyone was favorable. 22 23 MR. PATSY: Okay. One of the firms, I think 24 it was Nyhart, had just been hired by St. Pete? Uh-huh. 25 MR. CARTER:

1	MR. PATSY: Were you able to check that one?
2	MR. CARTER: Yes. Everything was great.
3	Said the transition was smooth, the time limit,
4	and they're satisfied with the service so far.
5	MR. PATSY: That's good. Thank you.
6	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Do we need a motion to
7	approve the recommendation of the FIAC?
8	MR. PAYNE: So moved.
9	DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, do you want
10	to call that?
11	MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman
12	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Oh. Let me read this real
13	quick. Yeah.
14	Okay. We need a motion to accept GRS and
15	hope for the best. All right. We need a motion.
16	MR. PAYNE: So moved.
17	MR. BROWN: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We have a motion and we
19	have a second. Any further discussion on GRS?
20	Quick pause. Does GRS work for CSX?
21	MR. PATSY: They do not.
22	CHAIRMAN TUTEN: They do not. Okay.
23	MR. PATSY: I worked with them 15 years ago.
23 24	MR. PATSY: I worked with them 15 years ago. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Do you have any personal

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Any conflict here?

MR. PATSY: No. There's no conflict whatsoever.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Just checking, pal.

MR. PATSY: Now, I will bring up one point.

I was a little disconcerted. Segal is the City's actuary. And I asked. Segal didn't apply. And I was a little disconcerted by that because I thought, the economy's to scale, you know. We could benefit from that, the same way we do with Summit and some of our investment managers.

And the response I got as to why they didn't apply, they were concerned about a potential conflict of interest. And I found that a little disconcerting because here's a third party, theoretically, independent entity that works for the city that was concerned that there could be a potential conflict of interest going down the road if they worked with us.

And I didn't delve into it more deeply because we weren't going to reconsider them or anything like that, but I was throwing that out there as something that I found a little disconcerting, that that entity found that they might have a conflict of interest while other

entities do not seem to think they would have a conflict of interest.

MS. McCAGUE: And just to clarify. I gave Rick that information. He asked me the question.

That's speculation on our part, and I think Joey indicated that to me.

MR. GREIVE: Yeah. You know, just like in the audit world, which Councilmember Brosche could probably, you know, enlighten us on.

But there's conflicts of interests and there's perceived conflicts of interests. And I think their concern was more in that perceived conflicts-of-interest bucket.

I don't think there would have been a conflict, but there could arise a situation down the road that could cause a potential or perceived conflict. And I think that's -- they wanted to err on the cautious side when making their decision. So I think -- I mean, that was their thinking when deciding whether or not to bid.

Milliman. Clear conflict. They absolutely cannot bid on this business. Segal, it was more of a perceived-as-potential type question.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yeah. I think too having a

separate one -- because, you know, we do these reports and these studies, and the city has their actuarial numbers. We have ours. We come back, and most of the time they don't quite mesh up so we have to let them figure it out. So I think it's good to have it separate.

MR. PATSY: Well, to a certain degree it's disconcerting to me because now we're going to have to -- if we want to get any kind of perceived additional benefits from a shared relationship, we're going to have to wait at least three years before we get to that point.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I think that what's more concerning is the fact that, like you said, a supposed private-sector independent entity would say there might be a conflict of interest for simply doing the same job for two different public-sector entities when it's just numbers coming in and numbers going out --

MR. PATSY: Yeah, yeah.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: -- and there should not be -- unless, of course, someone were to tell you to maybe do something a little different with those numbers than should be done. Not saying anything further.

We have a motion. We have a second. 1 for the vote. All in favor? 2 3 (Responses of "aye.") 4 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Any opposed? 5 (No responses.) 6 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: No. G -- who is it? GRS 7 it is. 8 MR. SMITH: GRS, yes, sir. Fingers crossed. 9 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: DIRECTOR JOHNSON: And I think Rick 10 clarified. The only thing I was going to make 11 clear is that we're approving this based on 12 three-year pricing as submitted in their fee 13 schedule. Very good. 14 All right. There's only one more tab left 15 on the book. I really appreciate your patience. 16 That tab relates to the external audit of the 17 18 plan. This is awarded on an annual basis with 19 KBLD. I'd like the Chair to entertain a motion 20 21 that we engage KBLD for the September 30, 2016 22 audit, and that you would give us the latitude of 23 signing that contract after it's been reviewed by the Office of General Counsel. 24 25 In other words, I don't want to wait until

1 November to approve this. Give me the approval 2 now --3 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. You want the OGC to, 4 what, review the letter? 5 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: They've already got --6 they've already reviewed it and they sent their 7 changes to KBLD for acceptance. So rather than waiting another month --8 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: What were the changes as 9 far as -- is there anything the Board needs to be 10 concerned about as far as the changes? 11 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Our attorney is here. 12 Let's find out. 13 14 Stephen, were you prepared to talk about the review of the KBLD? 15 16 MS. MANNING: That was actually John Sawyer. MR. DURDEN: Yeah. I -- I did not -- I 17 18 enjoy coming here and doing the things I do, but 19 I am not going to review contracts because we 20 have contracts lawyers. I apologize. I did not 21 have that to review. If you would like, I can 22 give a call to John --DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Well, let me jump in on 23 24 this. 25 This is something that I've instituted,

Mr. Chairman. I would like there to be consistency in the review of the agreements that we make with vendors. So for my own signature, I'm requiring review of the Office of General Counsel before I put my name to it.

So this is just a quality check to insure consistency in our engagements. If there was anything substantive, I would have brought it back. I don't believe it is. I believe it's just to form.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. Well, the -- the Board's the final responsibility. So anything we sign off on, we're responsible for. I don't know -- I've got the letter here.

Is there something different about this letter or something in this engagement letter that's in the contract that the OGC didn't like or changed?

MR. DURDEN: I can add this, without talking to John specifically. His role would solely be to do what you have asked Mr. Johnson to do, correct things.

Like, for example, if there was a -- there's a -- not everybody is aware, probably most people know by now, there's now a provision that has to

go -- the state statute provides that there's now a provision -- our state statutes now require provision regarding public records, I think, in every public contract. So it's finding stuff like that.

If there was something in there that required -- let's suppose that your vendor had in a form contract, we hereby demand that each Board member be personally liable for anything that would ever happen. And our lawyer would look at that and go, oh, no, no, no. We don't make those kind of promises.

It would be that kind of -- to make sure that you're getting what you expect to get consistent with fair contract terms. I have little doubt that -- in fact, in speaking with Mr. Johnson, where there's a concern, that's what Mr. Sawyer is there for. He understands and he does contracts in a lot of different areas. We have a number of contracts lawyers who's concerned about the big picture of what city contracts should look like, not about the substance, not about the amounts, not about anything that's -- that changes the deal, just simply to make sure that there's not a promise in

there that -- that shouldn't be there or that you're making to a vendor that should not be there.

And that would be the kind of stuff -- anything like that, I guarantee, goes to Mr. Johnson.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yes, I believe you, Steve.

DIRECTOR JOHNSON: If there was a change, I would have brought it back.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, how about this? We don't need -- in the future, anything changed like this, not that I don't take Steve's word for it, but we've had disagreements with the city.

Now, I know this is something relatively minor, doesn't add up to anything. But it's more -- appearance is more a procedure as far as, do you know what's in the contract?

You know, we've done it a certain way for a very long time, and the contracts haven't changed. I'm not saying they changed it or altered it to the point where it -- you know, I would need to be worried about it.

But at the end of the day, our signatures go on that bottom line as far as this is a report that's required for the state. You know, all I

want to do is just see, Tim, what the changes 1 were from the OGC, and then we'll move on from 2 3 there. MR. DURDEN: All right. I do have --4 5 fortunately, I've been given this, the note from 6 John to Debbie regarding the contract. 7 It's adding the benefit of certain city code required terms as well as insurance and 8 indemnification from KBLD to the Board. 9 And that's it. 10 MR. CARTER: Have you seen it, Devin? 11 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I saw it yesterday or the 12 MR. CARTER: Yes. 13 day before. Spoke with KBLD about the changes. The only small thing I had a question about, 14 which was insurance, which was up to 5 million. 15 I talked to John about it, which he told me that 16 17 could be negotiated, given the fact that they have 2 million. 18 So everything should be okay. It's the fact 19 that we're just asking for approval so we can 20 21 start on the engagement based upon the acceptance of the changes by OGC, and more than likely both 22 23 parties will agree to it. 24 MS. MANNING: Well, and it's my

understanding that the engagement letter itself

25

1 that you see in the book, there's no changes to 2 that. MR. CARTER: There's no changes to that. 3 4 MS. MANNING: What they did is, they have a 5 separate contract that the city uses for all 6 agreements that has the wording about insurance 7 and everything in there. So it's actually a separate document, and this is an addendum to 8 that. 9 10 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. MS. MANNING: But what you see here is what 11 they've given us previously. It's just the city 12 is adding this extra step to go a little further. 13 Okay? 14 Okay. All right. 15 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: So now that Devin is on the record 16 17 officially as my out --18 (Laughter) CHAIRMAN TUTEN: -- what do you need from 19 20 us, Tim? Just to make a motion to approve or do 21 you just --22 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: That's all I need, just a 23 motion to approve. 24 MR. BROWN: I make a motion to approve this 25 letter.

MR. PATSY: Second. 1 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: And a second. Any further 2 discussion? 3 4 (No responses.) 5 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Good. All in favor? 6 (Responses of "aye.") 7 CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Any opposed? 8 (No responses.) DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Excellent meeting. 9 want to make sure we're all on the same page. 10 You-all took action on eight items, as I see 11 it. We're going to administer \$5.3 million for 12 the holiday bonus and the share as we did last 13 14 year. We're going to add language as related to 15 the benefits that reads, "The calculations have 16 17 been reviewed in accordance to accepted procedures." 18 Our attorney interviews are October 24th, 19 and all these members will receive electronic 20 21 materials today. 22 Actually, October 25th. MS. MANNING: 23 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: What did I say? 24 MS. MANNING: 24th. 25 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: I apologize. The 25th.

I will forward a copy of the lobbyist 1 contract to all the members. 2 3 We approved the recommendation of the FIAC 4 to engage GRS for audit services. That's three 5 years at the stated pricing. 6 We've approved the external engagement 7 letter for the audit with KBLD for fiscal year September 30. 8 Approved a \$7 million rebalancing 9 recommendation by Summit. 10 I think that's everything. We've been busy. 11 MR. PATSY: One point. 12 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: 13 Yes. MR. PATSY: Bill, going through this --14 15 MR. GASSETT: Yes, sir. 16 MR. PATSY: -- you used 3 percent inflation? MR. GASSETT: Excellent. I forgot to 17 18 mention that point. Yeah. You've got to make a net 4 above the 19 20 3 to make your numbers for the current retirees' accounts. And I think the state came out and 21 22 said you had to do a 7.4 number, or something 23 like that. Is that correct, Tim? 7.4, 7.5. 24 DIRECTOR JOHNSON: Our discount rate is 7 25 percent.

MR. GASSETT: Yeah. It's got to be 10 in this case because they do not take into account any (inaudible) that, you know, you may have in your contract.

And based on the update, forgive me for going longer than I should, I'm glad to announce that for the 15 of the last 22, you've only lost money, but for 3 versus -- I'm sorry -- 19 years, the alternative investment strategy, which is available for sale in my office, made money 19 times, and yours only did it 3 times.

Please, I didn't mean to be angry, but, gosh, darn it. Real quick. How much is the difference here in terms of bucks? Try \$50 million.

That goes a long way towards meeting that schedule that you guys have got to make up. Let me back up -- three years ago that we adopted, the payment scope, the 1.6 billion.

MR. GREIVE: Just to -- I don't want to get into too much back and forth on public comment, but one huge problem with the approach is that it requires you to be in almost all stocks, I'm sure, as Mr. Gassett has lobbied for no fixed income exposure in our pension fund.

For those who are quick in math, you know, 1 had we been in all stocks in 2008 and '9, we 2 would have lost hundreds of millions of dollars. 3 4 MR. BROWN: 25 percent, 30 percent. 5 MR. GREIVE: So if we ever want to consider 6 upping our stock exposure, we should do so not at 7 a market peak like we're at today. If you look at a 30-year chart on the stock 8 market when you get home or back to your offices, 9 you'll see three distinct peaks in S&P 500: 10 year 2000, 2001, tech bubble and burst; the year 11 2007 and '8, with the financial crisis; and now 12 whatever you want to call today. 13 I'm not saying that today is going to end in 14 a disaster, but, you know, I would -- I would see 15 another peak if you look today. 16 So just be very careful with recommendations 17 18 and suggestions like this. We pay our 19 consultants a lot of money. We put a lot of thought to this kind of stuff. And, you know, 20 21 we --Florida law would not allow 22 MR. DARAGJATI: 23 you to be in all stocks. 24 MR. GASSETT: And I agree with what you're 25 saying, but my cross is to change investment

strategy. This is one example.

I will go head to head with anybody in this room on who's down on a year-by-year basis, because you're in this for the long haul, not to make a quick buck here in emerging markets next year.

And we went back and did the same kind of analysis that he did, including the peaks, going back to 1996. And the alternative strategy basically was -- I don't want to debate with you on that.

MR. GREIVE: Yeah.

MR. GASSETT: You're quite right. The law states that. And what does that tell you we should do here? Is get in your dad-gum cars and go up to the governor and say, damn it, it's because of you we have this problem.

MR. PATSY: But fiduciary liability is, to a certain degree, different by the prudent man.

MR. GASSETT: This is very prudent.

MR. GREIVE: We can adjourn and keep talking.

MR. BROWN: That's good. I would recommend doing that.

MR. GASSETT: How do you make the prudent

```
decision? Do you make a buck --
1
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We'll adjourn real quick
 2
         and then Bill can -- anything else? Anybody?
 3
         Liaison?
 4
              MS. BROSCHE: No. All good.
 5
              CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Meeting adjourned.
 6
              (The Board meeting adjourned at 10:47 a.m.)
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, Denice C. Taylor, Florida Professional Reporter, Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, the undersigned authority, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings, pages 3 through 97, and that the transcript is a true and correct computer-aided transcription of my stenographic notes taken at the time and place indicated herein. DATED this 7th day of November, 2016. Denice C. Taylor, FPR Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at Large My Commission No. FF 184340 Expires: December 23, 2018