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CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We'll call the meeting to order.

MR. KEANE: Everyone please rise and join me as we pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the

Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Thank you very much.
Please be seated.
Mr. Chairman and Trustees, we can
indulge who we'd like to -- we'll deviate from the agenda for just a moment and take up the consent agenda with some time connections that Debbie has to process for the meeting tomorrow.

MR. TUTEN: I'll make a motion we accept.

CHIEF SCHMITT: Second.

MR. BUSSELLS: Questions or comments? All in favor, say "aye."
(Responses of "ayes.")
CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Opposed, like sign, carries unanimously.

MR. KEANE: Mr. Trustees and Chairman,
we're on the regular agenda. This is a public hearing for three minutes of discussion from the public on Ordinance 2015-304.

We have a list of speakers, and each trustee has a copy of the ordinance as amended. The purpose is to give the testimony and hear the discussion from the people. And we're ready to start.

MR. BUSSELLS: Steve Amos.

MR. AMOS: Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you this afternoon. My name is Steve Amos, and I am the president of the Fraternal Order of Police 5-30 in Jacksonville.

I represent the men and women of the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office that are members of the Police and Fire Pension Fund.

And with regards to the current Pension Reform Bill, I first wish to acknowledge the hard work that's gone into this product by Council Member Gulliford and the fund's executive director, John Keane.

I also wish to thank the elected trustees for their diligence and dedication to the members of this fund.

To the trustees, I'm here today not only as a member of the fund but as a representative for the many concerned police officers enrolled in this fund.

The fund and its members have made substantial contributions and concessions over the past decades for the sustainability of this current plan.

We are all familiar with the old adage, "Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me."

We are now here for the third time where legislation could be handed down to us to make further concessions to the members, commonly referred to as "shared sacrifice" in the media.

After the first concessions, the city never paid above the ARC, the unfunded liability minimum payments, nor did they after the second round of concessions were made.

And now they're asking members to pay even more to go towards reducing the unfunded liability cost as a result of poor fiscal practices.

As a result, here we are many years
later, giving tens of millions of dollars to essentially pay down the city's past obligations to the fund. The effects of this legislation will be to further perpetuate the problem with officers leaving and going to other agencies, seeking better and more sustainable employment with better pension plans.

Since 1996, when the two-tiered pay system was implemented, the starting salary for a working police officer was lowered nearly $\$ 6,000$. It takes six years for that officer to reach the same pay level as the police officer who was hired prior to 1996.

Today, we are currently 198, for the starting salary, out of 367 agencies in Florida. We have the highest qualifications of any of those agencies, including the requirement of a bachelor's degree.

There have been no across-the-board increases since the 2006 contract. And additionally, in 2012, we took a voluntary 3 percent pay cut to save further layoffs from happening.

We do not believe that this will stop the bleeding. On the contrary, it could very
well open the flood gates if we're not cautious. But with normal attrition and the loss of many officers to other agencies, the unfunded actual liability is only going to grow.

In closing, we, the members of the fund, ask the trustees to reject this proposal and continue to work towards ensuring that we receive the benefits that we were promised.

Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Randy Wyse.
MR. WYSE: Thank you.
Gentlemen, as you know, a long drawnout situation we've been going through for seven years. It's just only a few at this table that have actually been going through it that long. So I think brothers and sisters that have fought through this for that long have a different perspective of it.

As we've always said -- and I've never wavered -- that we would support any agreement reached between the Police and Fire Pension Fund and the City of Jacksonville, and we will stand by that.

I feel like, again, that the shared sacrifice has gone a little too far. I hope you
take that into perspective as you make these decisions and that there is a conversation about it, that the pendulum swung a little too far. But we know that you will ultimately make a decision that's based on what's best for the members.

As you know, the statute says that, and we know that you take that very seriously. And, again, speaking to each one of you individually that I have, you understand some of the issues that we have with it.

But, again, we wish it to -- to really do what's right for the members. And we know that it's important that we have a future that -- you know, that those benefits are sustainable and that we keep those going. And we understand that's how that decision-making process goes to your head after speaking to each of you.

So, again, always remember the men and women that are risking their lives out there depend on this and that there's been some promises made, and there's been sacrifices made, and I know I've expressed those sacrifices to each one of you.

And please keep that in your mind as you make that decision. And, again, we'll support you after the fact. Thank you.

MR. BUSSELLS: Nelson Fernandez.
MR. FERNANDEZ: Good afternoon. I would like to start off by thanking all the board members and Director Keane for allowing me this opportunity to voice my concerns about the proposed Pension Reform Bill that's before you which was submitted by Councilman Gulliford and for seriously taking into consideration what every plan participant, that's not in the DROP yet or hasn't reached 20 years, will sacrifice if it's approved by you.

And speaking of sacrifice, there has been a lot of rhetoric at city hall about us needing to share in the sacrifice. That's an unfortunate mischaracterization of the real situation that's been going on here.

As police officers and firefighters, we're all too familiar with what it means to sacrifice. To sacrifice is inherent in our professions. We accept that fact.

We'd be in some other career field, probably making substantially more money if we
hadn't agreed to undertake these sacrifices.
For the citizens, we've sacrificed time away from our families in order to care for and protect their families when we put on that uniform and badge.

We've paid for our sacrifices with our health and sometimes with our lives for the benefit of the people that expect and rely on us to respond to their emergencies, many times without regard for our own safety.

Sacrificing for total strangers, that's what we do. And for the city, we've sacrificed pay raises for the last nine years in order to do our part to help out the city during the downturn in the economy.

We sacrificed our health benefits, through astronomically higher premiums and drastically reduced coverage, in order to do our part to help the city cut costs.

We've continually been asked to cut operating budgets and staffing to increase services with fewer resources and to endure other operational hardships that I can assure you are not of our making.

We have made concessions for the city
time and time again. Now, they're expecting us to sacrifice our pension benefits to share in the sacrifices and to do our part.

Gentlemen, we have shared in the sacrifices, and we have done our part. It seems that we're the only ones that ever have to hold up our end of the bargain.

Now, ask yourself this. When was the last time the city sacrificed anything for us? I think you all know the answer to that.

In closing, I implore you to vote "no" on the proposal before you, especially if you're a beneficiary of the very agreement that you might be considering to change. Of all people, you should know how important the security of preserving what has been promised to us is for our retirements.

I ask that you amend this agreement to exclude existing employees from benefit reductions. Any cost savings attained by diminishing benefits for existing employees needs to be achieved some other way. And there are other ways that have yet to be explored.

Please do not forget that there are people here that have earned what we have been
promised to us. If the city won't do their part, we ask that you do yours for our sake. Thank you.

MR. BUSSELLS: R. T Weeks.
MR. WEEKS: Good afternoon. There's a lot of things $I$ really wanted to talk about, and three minutes is going to give me nowhere close. I'm going to address this a little bit differently today.

I'm not going to really talk a lot about the details and what's on the table because I feel that there's this big ball in motion, kind of like the first "Raiders of the Lost Arc" movie.

It's going to keep rolling, and there's nothing right now we can do to stop it; but we need to take a look at what's going on in the community, in the city right now with our police officers and our firefighters.

Morale, all time low. Ask a normal city what they think about a police officer, their job, what they get, money, retirement -there's not a lot of trust right now. There's not a lot of good faith, but we still continue to do our job.

This deal is going to rip apart both agencies more than anything we've ever seen in the history of our agency. Officers are going to continue to retire at a degrading retirement. Our new hires are going to be in a constant with current employees over scraps of a retirement.

Seven years will be here in two weeks.
We'll be at the table with a huge unfunded liability like we are right now. I don't feel this deal addresses that. And I feel that by pushing this deal through, we're driving the stake in any kind of boost of morale, any type of unity that could come and benefit both of our agencies.

If this is going to go through, if this deal is -- you all are a lot more smarter than I am. The information at this table is far better than $I$ could ever offer at an individual level. I'm asking -- I'm asking you to revisit what's being offered new hires.

And if the very best that can be offered to current employees with the reduction in the DROP, with the reduction in interest rates for our COLA, I'm asking you to at least look at pushing the term out longer than seven
years.
Give the city more time to pay back what they owe, lock them in to help hopefully funding that unfunded liability; and we've got to do something about our new hires. I'm asking for those two things.

Vote "no" on this deal. If you want to keep the concessions at -- the general structure is 20 years you get this; the COLA is set at Social Security; the DROP is a fluctuating interest rate.

Okay; I'm good with that. You need to push this term out, and you need to revisit what they're offering new hires. Thank you.

MR. BUSSELLS: Cecil Hoskins.

MR. HOSKINS: Well, good afternoon.
Thank you for your hard work. But I want to tell you, this contract won't impact me at all. I'm set to leave in six months.

It's actually good for me. It secured the few things I wanted. But the problem is, it's bad for everybody else in the world in this city.

Okay. When I say that, first of all, on page 2 , it says that we're to accept this in
good faith. We've accepted too much garbage in good faith with these politicians. They cannot be trusted.

Second of all, on page 7, Article D doesn't list any designated funding resources. Even Gulliford said recently on the news that they'd have to raise property taxes or a halfcent sales tax to fund this thing properly.

So basically we're buying a house with no money coming in. While they do designate four different accounts for money to go into, they don't tell you where that money's coming from. That's a real issue to me.

How many of you would go out and buy a home right now with no money coming in? We can't trust them there.

Third, if an individual retired before 25 years, he cannot draw a pension until he's 62. What if my wife was diagnosed with cancer when I'm 59, and I retired and want to stay home and take care of her for three years?

I can't draw a dime to take care of her. Do you think that's fair? Do you? It's a fair question to ask.

It appears, on page 14 , the city's
contribution is reduced to 7 percent while the employee's contribution is increased to 10 percent on page 12. Why are we reducing theirs? They haven't been paying in the past.

Any increase in benefits could increase employee contributions, page 16, Article D.

Page 21 turns negotiations over to the unions. The problem I have with that, that means every time we open up a contract to negotiate, pension benefits can change. That means at least ten times, in a thirty-year career, your pension benefits could change.

Now, the man who leaves or the lady who leaves at 25 years is jeopardized multiple times. They can't do a DROP. They can't draw until they're 62, and they get a reduction in how much they draw. Where is that fair?

Do any of the politicians accept that type of deal for themselves? No.

Now, this morning, whenever I walked in this station, I did a poll. There were five minorities there. All five minorities will have lesser benefits than their white male counterparts.

Have any studies been done to see how
this will impact the minorities on the job, whether Arican-American, whether female, whether Asian, or anything else?

This opens a Pandora's Box for a lawsuit for the city and for the pension fund if it discriminates unfairly against them.

And, final, is right where we started. Why should we trust these politicians?

They're the ones that they were only partially responsible for a $\$ 500$ million mis-accounting in pension and in budgeting for the city. They're untrustworthy. I don't trust them now. Thank you.

MR. BUSSELLS: James -- is it Burnet? MR. BURNET: Yes. Good afternoon, Board Members. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is James Burnet. In addition to being a retired JSO member, I'm a local attorney.

I wholeheartedly endorse the comments that have already been made to you. I think you are all well aware of the issues that are inherent here.

What I came for today is to let you know that I've been approached by a group of
both firefighters and police officers who are extremely disgruntled about this agreement, and more specifically, about the COLA provisions in that agreement.

The reason they're disgruntled is this was a quid pro quo agreement that resulted in, as you've already heard today, a two-tier pay scale that went into effect at both agencies in late 1996 that has resulted in every employee that's been hired since then receiving less pay during their first six years of work until their six-year anniversary when they're equalized with other similarly situated employees.

That was given up in return for a guaranteed 3 percent COLA which is now proposed to be taken away. It's unfair to the employees that are currently on the job that have suffered from that lower pay for the last nineteen years.

These people are upset about it. They've approached me with regard to legal action in that regard. We're still exploring those options. I'm not coming here today to say that that's going to be the case, but I want you to understand that these people are frustrated, okay.

They don't see a lot of support coming from the board, although certainly we all recognize the hard work that you've put into this. But please understand that you've got these employees out here who feel like they've been -- well, their needs have not been well guarded by the city, and to a lesser extent, this board.

The main issue I'm dealing with here today again is the COLA. Take that into consideration when you consider this agreement. If there's a way to amend just that portion, that might be acceptable, although I don't think the agreement's favorable to any current employees. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Michael Taylor.
MR. TAYLOR: Good afternoon. Thank you for letting me speak.

Michael Taylor. I've been on the force 17 years. I hear all this about shared sacrifice. I've shared. I've given enough.

2001, while protecting this city, I was shot twice in the line of duty. I almost lost my life. I gave up a lot.

In the end, I ended up losing my family
over this whole thing. So when people sit in a meeting and say shared sacrifice, ask how many people have been shot on their job and has lost their family. I venture to say very few.

My point being with all this is -- in 2001, again, $I$ was shot. I got hired in 1998. I was promised certain things in 1998. I went out and did my job, tried to protect the citizens of Jacksonville, and in the process again, getting shot.

Sheriff Glover came to my house. He should remember that. He sat down with me. He spoke with me. I got through it. Unfortunately, again, I did lose my family over this, but $I$ did make it. My point again with this is that you guys promised me certain things as far as the city, promised me certain things in 1998 when $I$ got hired on, I did everything I was supposed to and lost almost everything that I had.

And now that I'm at the time of my retirement, for them to turn around and say, "You know what, just because you don't have three more years, you don't get what everybody else got. Even though you sacrificed more than
anybody else in this department, you don't get what they get. We're going to give you what the same guy got who's got a year on," which I don't think's fair, okay.

If the new guys come on after us, if they sign up for a new agreement, then so be it. Let those people choose that.

I promise you this, if you took this same predicament and went to the public, to a public job, went to EverBank or went to BellSouth, and you try to do the same contract change that you're doing here, you'd have mass exodus. Everybody in that building would walk out and say I'm not doing it.

I put 17 years in here, and all of a sudden you want to change it. Nobody would agree to that. Unfortunately, for police and firemen, we can't go on strike, okay; so, therefore, we do our job. We continue to work hard and do what we should by protecting the citizens of Jacksonville.

And we say, you know what, city leaders and you guys will do the right thing and make the right decisions and keep us guys out here happy and working.

I've got plenty of guys that work for me right now that have less than six years on. They went to the job fair, the FOP. Guess what they're wanting to do? They're wanting to leave.

And, truthfully, it's hard for me to keep telling them to stay here when you get a better benefit somewhere else. You get 70 percent retirement at 20 years, not 60 percent. You don't have them after your pension or after your retirement.

You know, it's a kind of like your child. If your child does good, you reward them. You don't punish them and take their phone from them because guess what happens if you do, they rebel against you. And that's what the policemen are going to be doing here; they're going to be leaving. They're going to be gone.

The piggyback on James Burnet's comments about 3 percent COLA, again, a policeman -- when I started, I barely made $\$ 30,000$ a year, okay. For me to give up my four- and six-year step raise, that's pretty huge. But the only reason we gave it up is
because we were promised that we would get our 3 percent COLA at the end of retirement.

All right. Again, I'm just speaking upon myself, 17 years on. If you change it now, what can I do? I have no other retirement. I've got to go work another job, plain and simple. I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Thomas Thomas.
MR. THOMAS: I'm Thomas Thomas, and I've followed all these meetings all of last year. I'm not going to speak about all of the problems in personnel. I'm looking at it as a taxpayer as to where the next $\$ 40$ million is going to come from.

And I'm not sure that even in the past year that the city contributed $\$ 40$ million. All I'm saying to this, back in 2008, when Ernie Isaac was chairman of the board with JEA, that was the time that they went to Tallahassee to get a 3 percent added to your electric bill.

They got approval from the legislature to do so, but it was also on the condition that if anytime in the future they wanted to increase the 3 percent to 6 percent, they did not have to go back to Tallahassee. They could unilaterally
increase it to 6 percent.
And I'm saying that this is available to be done. I've talked with Ernie Isaac, who I know personally, and I'm just going to leave it at that, but your next problem's going to be the $\$ 40$ million. And I don't think the city put a dime in in the last year and three months which would be $\$ 50$ million. Thank you.

MR. BUSSELLS: Paul -- is it To-kar-ek? OFFICER TOKAREK: Yes, sir.

Good afternoon. I'm Officer Tokarek. I'm in almost 20 years, one month away. So, of course, I'm concerned like everyone else.

I'm going to go from a different angle. We can go on numbers and all that stuff, but you guys are a lot smarter than me as far as that goes, so I'm not even going to go there.

When I was hired, a family member, my grandmother once told me, when I'm a police officer, be has as honest as the day is long. Every supervisor, every sheriff I've had is do the right thing by your people. Treat family members and treat other people, the citizens of Jacksonville, like you would yourself.

Well, I've done my part. The police officers have done their part. The firefighters have done their part. So now I'm up here, along with everybody else, to ask you guys to do your part, and that's basically look out for us like family because pretty much, at the end of the day, that's what we are.

I wish there were more people out to voice their opinion here, but unfortunately, they pretty much, who I've talked to, the deal was done. Over 20 years, I've seen they're going to do what they want to do. You guys might make your decision, think about your vacation, some said, so it's a done deal.

I know there's a lot of concerns about maybe it might go to court. We might lose if that goes to that. A few of you were concerned about the COLA, DROP, and all that stuff. Well, we lose in the COLA.

However, we all know that in three years, they might come back and do this all over again. We don't know what's going to happen with the city, like I said, underfunded, don't even have a funding source.

How are they going to come up the
money? If they can't do it with the other contract, how are they going to come up with the money now? So it's a big concern for all of us.

Another thing is -- my big thing is I just don't believe that current employees should be touched. It's really just that simple. If you're vested, you should be -- this should be with new employees.

I'm just saying, unfortunately, I don't want them to get the raw end of the deal either with this new agreement because, of course, I'm going to jump on the back of the other person who said, "Who's going to want to come here?"

I know I wouldn't if you promise me this, and I come here, and all of a sudden it's gone. So my big thing is, to you, the Board, you took an oath to do -- you're our voice. It's to do the right thing.

To do the right thing, especially for current employees, is to reject, send it back to them. At least stand your ground on something. Hey, stand the ground on the 3 percent COLA, or stand with this one, or stand on the 8.4 , or something like that, but stand on something instead of giving into everything, it seems
like, because we know we're going to be back in a few years. I know it, before I retire.

So I'm just asking you, what I've been told over and over again, and that's, you know, do the right thing on two accounts. Make sure they have a funding source before you guys sign it and leave current employees vested.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Brian Mock.
MR. MOCK: Brian Mock. I've been a police officer for about 14 years. The last few years I feel like we've had to listen to a lot of half truths from the local politicians and local media.

It's a lie that we have an egregious pension that's bankrupting the city. The truth is the problems the city's having is the fact that they haven't funded city services properly for years, and the underfunding of our pension is just one example of how that's come home to roost.

The new plan for new hires that has been negotiated, even though people say, you know, it's competitive with the -- well, some people from the mayor's office say it's competitive with what's out there. It's not.

If you look at what a police officer in Tampa makes, their maximum salary, $\$ 78,000$ plus; and in 20 years they get a $\$ 49,000$ plus pension.

In St. Petersburg, $\$ 68,000$ plus; and in 25 years they get $\$ 51,000$ in pension, both with the COLA. And in Orlando $\$ 72,000,20$ years with a $\$ 50,000$ pension with a COLA.

In Jacksonville, our max salary is $\$ 62,400$, and our pension is $\$ 37,400$. We are not anywhere near competitive right now with any other agency, but you want to cut it for new hires.

I don't think it's fair. I think that you have to stand up for what we've paid for with our reduced salaries and the money that's been paid in out of our salaries into the pension, plus out of our Chapter 185 and 175 moneys, and defend it. That's it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That is all the speaker forms I have. Does anyone else want to speak?

You want to speak?

OFFICER PREVOST: I'm Officer John Prevost, Jacksonville Sheriff's Office.

Today is my 19th-year anniversary.

I've been here 19 years today. We have a lot of officers talking about how we took the pay cut. I am one of the first that took the pay cut. I took a $\$ 6,000$ pay cut two weeks after they hired me. I sacrificed for 19 damn years.

I work hard. I do my job like other officers in this department, and now we're at the end of our careers. Officer Tokarek spoke up. He's got three months left. So we're three months short of 20 years. I'm 365 days short of 20 years.

And now at the end of my career, when I was promised all these things for 19 years, you're going to say no. I just think it's unfair. And I think you need to consider all these officers that are doing their job and everything that we've given up.

Like some of these officers have said, it's not fair that we've been waiting all these years for something that was promised us 20 years ago, or 19 years ago, and now the rug's being pulled out from underneath us again. And it's just a sad agency that we're dealing with all this stuff, and it's going on and on and on. And it's not a good place to work.

And I don't blame any of these guys
that just pack their bags and go to another agency because if I wasn't 50 years old, I would. But I'm hoping in 365 days to not worry about your DROP because I want to leave like many other officers will.

So I feel sorry for this city and this agency. But you guys need to do the right thing like they keep saying. It's only fair. We've done our time. We've worked hard for it, and now it's not there. I just don't think it's fair. Thank you very much.

MR. BUSSELLS: Say your name, if you would, just for the record.

MR. COYLE: William Coyle. Good afternoon. My name is William

Coyle, and I've been working for the Jacksonville Fire and Rescue Department for a little over seven years.

I'm not here to talk to you about what's fair or what's right or what's been promised because let's face it, none of that really matters.

What really matters is where we're at right now and the decisions we make to carry
forward. As much as I'd like to think of myself and my colleagues as heroes, I realize that we are public servants and, therefore, subject to political theatrics.

So instead of using my heart and moral compass to make this decision, I chose to rely on logic. To me, logically, it makes sense that since a judge has already struck down our current agreement and declared that we must collectively bargain every three years, it also stands to reason he would also strike down this new seven-year agreement.

As I'm sure you're well aware, our new reduced benefit package would be the new starting point for future negotiations. So should this proposed agreement pass, we would be weakening our position by voluntarily lowering our own bar of expectations.

I've heard the argument, "What if we get a worked deal, then what?" My response to that is, "What if we don't get a worked deal?"

What if we appeal the decision and allow the courts to settle this matter? What about the recent Illinois Supreme Court pension reform ruling? What about the city of Chicago?

I'm not inclined to make another deal with the city that they potentially can't afford.

Now, Jacksonville is the eleventh largest city by population and largest by square miles. We are a military town with a strong economic base that only continues to grow as people continue to migrate here.

The court system will ensure that we are both bargaining in good faith by opening the books and ensuring that we reach a reasonable solution. If it turns out that the city can afford to uphold our current agreement, then I think they should because our job is dangerous, and it is stressful, both emotionally and physically, and they did make a promise.

However, promises, a signed contract or not, I do not want the city to go bankrupt because I plan on retiring here. So if they can't afford it, then the courts will make sure a reasonable solution's reached.

In closing, I recognize the tremendous burden on all your shoulders, and I do not envy you. I don't suspect you're taking this decision lightly, and I also don't suspect any
of you will derive satisfaction from reducing our benefits.

Guys and gals, I'm not a greedy
fireman. To be honest, if I honestly believed the city wasn't financially stressed, I wouldn't be standing here before you.

Sadly, like all governments do, any money saved from a reduction in our benefits will be used to enforce more unnecessary regulations or simply be paid to the friends and family members of the city council members for city-wide construction projects.

So, yes, I do want what's best for the city, but I'm not convinced voluntarily reducing our benefits is the answer.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

MR. BUSSELLS: We'll now close the public speaking period.

MR. KEANE: Mr. Chairman and Trustees, we have no other further business to bring before the Board of Trustees at this meeting.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: John, you just want to maybe touch on -- I know that the chief and lieutenant have been out speaking about the
specifics of what's going on and what the facts are, and so forth.

Is there anything there that might be useful to touch on today? I know it's been well received because of the candor and completeness and thoroughness of those sessions, and I appreciate you all making time to go do that, that hard work.

But is there anything that we might learn from that, or is worthy of any further consideration?

MR. TUTEN: Well, John and I this morning went to the union hall, and we had a question and answer with the people.

Did you see the questions and answers?

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes.

MR. TUTEN: We printed that out. I sent them to John. John and Bob worked on them -- maybe even Paul there -- and sent them out. And since then, I mean, it went from up here to literally down here, from my side, as far as people, you know, kind of wondering what this meant, what that meant.

I'm not necessarily assuming they're any happier, of course, but that seems to be --

I mean, I don't know the reason why it's calmed down -- I've gotten a few emails here and there -- but it is precipitous as far as the drop-off goes once we send out that -- a copy of the bill and a copy of the questions; because, truthfully, most people's questions are centered around COLA, the DROP.

You know, is it still 20 years? Is it
25? That kind of thing -- the numbers basically. You know, we've all focused on all the other stuff too that comes into play. But for the most part, my members seem to be focused on the numbers, and rightly so; but that's just kind of where we are.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We put that on the website, I think, John?

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Chief.
CHIEF SCHMITT: One of the -- I guess the biggest aspect of this for the officers, and a lot of questions that I've fielded, has to do with how we got here. You know, thirteen years in a row the city lowered the millage rate.

Thirteen years in a row our funding percentage went done. No matter what deal would
get proposed, they can't be happy with it. It's less than what we were promised. So that's a big mental and emotional hurdle to overcome. It's not right; but unfortunately, it's where we are.

Hopefully, the city will do what's right, unlike the past two agreements. But that's the biggest challenge that I've faced, and there's no good answer for that.

How do you tell them we know where we are because of the underfunding, mainly from the city, but this time they're going to do different.

The flip side of that is if we don't do anything, we're going to keep heading in the same direction which is even worse than where we are.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Well said.
Anything else for the workshop today?
MR. GLOVER: No.
CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So we'll meet at 9:00 a.m. in the morning for the regular monthly board meeting and then take up acts on this and the other business to move forward.

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Meeting's
adjourned.
(Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)
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