JACKSONVILLE POLICE AND FIRE PENSION FUND BOARD OF TRUSTEES SPECIAL MEETING

DATE: June 3, 2015

TIME: 3:00 p.m. to 3:56 p.m.

PLACE: Jacksonville Police and Fire Pension Fund

One West Adams Street

Suite 100

Jacksonville, Florida 32202

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Walter Bussells, Board Chair
Nathaniel Glover, Jr., Board Secretary
Richard Tuten, III, Fire Trustee
Adam Herbert, Trustee (via phone)
Larry Schmitt, Police Trustee (via phone)

ALSO PRESENT:

John Keane, Executive
Director-Administrator
Debbie Manning, Executive Assistant
Stuart Kaufman, Board Counsel (via Phone)
C. Ronald Belton, Chief Financial Officer
Joey Greive, Fund Treasurer
Mayor Alvin Brown, City of Jacksonville
William Gulliford, City Council Member

These agenda matters of the special meeting of the JPFPF Board of Trustees came on to be heard at the time and place aforesaid, when and where the following proceedings were reported by:

Marjie, Kline, RPR
AAA Reporters
233 East Bay Street
912 Blackstone Building
Jacksonville, Florida 32202
(904) 354-4789

| | | | Page 2 |
|----|----------------------------------|------|--------|
| 1 | TABLE OF CONTENTS | | |
| 2 | | PAGE | |
| 3 | Mayor Brown | 4 | |
| 4 | Council Member William Gulliford | 5 | |
| 5 | Procedures for DROP Review | 37 | |
| 6 | Police on Pension Forfeiture | 40 | |
| 7 | Certificate of Reporter | 47 | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |

PROCEEDINGS

2 June 3, 2015 3:00 p.m.

- -

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Call the meeting to order.

MR. KEANE: Every one please rise.

Join us 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.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Thank you all for joining us at this special meeting of the Police and Fire Pension Board of Trustees.

Given recent events in legislative process, we wanted to be sure that everyone is up to speed as things progress. And should there be legislative action, that would then involve us, that everyone is fully prepared and understands all of the relevant facts and issues and so forth.

And so the meeting today will be one in which we'll focus on to make sure that we understand what is going on legislatively in the City Council and City Hall currently.

We are honored and pleased to have Mayor Brown with us today to speak with us on the subject. I

understand that Councilman Gulliford may be on the way to speak with us as well since he's taken a leadership role in the legislative process City Council. And then we'll also deal with two other matters that are timely that are just more recurrent business here. But front and center is legislatively for the pension system here in Jacksonville.

2.1

There's Councilman Gulliford. Bill, we just got started.

MR. GULLIFORD: Well, y'all are a good excuse for me to leave ethics training, so if I get in any trouble in the future, it's all your fault.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And so with that, Mr. Mayor?

MAYOR BROWN: First of all, I'm happy to be here. I want to thank the board for its hard work and thank Councilman Gulliford for his leadership.

I think as I always said, we have a tremendous opportunity to solve a problem that's been plaguing the city for many years and we have an opportunity to move forward and get this done once and for all.

I support the plan that the council approved both in the rules and finance committee. We have an opportunity now to continue to move forward with the

leadership of the board and all of us working together. So I'm happy to be here and looking forward to the conversation.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Thank you.

Councilman?

2.1

MR. GULLIFORD: Well, y'all are not in the vacuum. You know what's happened thus far. We passed this through two committees; however, it's worthwhile to note that the three opponents to the legislation have typically been my staunchest allies. So it's a unique experience for me.

But I think that -- I think maybe at least one or maybe two of them will come around because I think it's critical. I've expressed that before and no need to belabor it, that while we've been seeking resolution through the courts we've not been particularly successful on either side on that.

I mean, I've heard terms during the debate and discussion about we're now in the offensive, yeah, until the next appeal goes a different way than where you are. And so I think for us to continue in that direction -- and I understand there is now a new request for an injunction that's come forth -- I think until we get serious about this, and stop trying to get the courts to resolve this thing and

get it done, then it's to everybody's detriment.

is that there's something for everybody to hate in there. And if we get to that point, sure, there are things in there that you know that I don't like one doggone bit. And I know there are probably things that y'all don't like.

Realistically, the definition of a compromise

But let's get it resolved so we can move forward. And that's what I've been trying to do throughout this whole process.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Appreciate it.

John, do you want to kind of guide the conversation? Much of the earlier legislation which did not move forward to the Mayor's desk in a tie vote is being left unchanged in what's passed through rules and finance this week. The things that have been amended so far in the legislative process are few in number, significant in substance.

And so, John, if you could lead us in a discussion to be sure all the Trustees understand the current posture, and until the full council acts, we understand the process from here. So this is a process, not a decision point for our board.

But if you could guide a conversation to be sure we're all on the same place. If we have any

speaker cards today -- do we have any speakers 1 2 today? 3 MS. MANNING: I don't believe so. I did not 4 check. 5 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'm sorry for not having to do that. We probably should have that first before 6 7 we --MS. MANNING: No, sir, I don't see any. 8 9 MR. KEANE: Open and close the public speaking 10 period. Do you want to do that? 11 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'll open the public 12 speaking period. Debbie, are there any speakers 13 today? 14 MS. MANNING: No. 15 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: No speakers. We'll close 16 the public speaking period. 17 MR. KEANE: Mr. Chairman and Trustees, as you 18 know, the council enacted a bill in December that 19 was submitted to the board and the board found some 20 discomfort with some of the provisions and that 2.1 legislation has expired. 22 Subsequent to that, a new piece of legislation, 23 2015-54 was introduced by Mayor Brown and that went 24 through the council process. It had the provisions 25 that the board found objectionable in the previous

legislation removed. That legislation failed to become enacted on a 9 to 9 tie vote, at which time then former Council President Gulliford took the package and made several technical and substantive amendments to it.

Number one, removed from the proposed scope of legislation that's currently before the council is any reference to the senior management retirement program.

Number two, there is a different methodology on the payment of funds to pay down the unfunded accrued actuarial liability, which was a keystone of the Schou commission, citizens commission pension reform task force.

Those are the two central changes. The language that has currently been adopted by -- through the introduction of the bill with amendatory process and the rules committee and the finance committee which is now preparing to go on the City Council agenda meets the previous goals of the board toward comprehensive pension reform.

It removes the two things that -- and amended the length down from 10 years to 7. And other than that, the language I believe is essentially the same bill that the board had expressed approval for in

1 December.

2.1

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'll say, I know in our work --

MR. GULLIFORD: I can expand on that just a little bit. The senior staff retirement plan, I have met with general counsel. I'm trying to seek some outside resolution to that, and I will continue to pursue that until there's a resolution. I've made that commitment.

The other major thing that is tied to this is the fact that, as was mentioned, that we have provided a commitment as to an income stream or contribution stream that would have a match that's comprised of the \$40 million of the 45, roughly \$45 million that was in the stabilization account, but thought there was at least \$5 million in the stabilization account to anticipate maybe future swings with that.

And then, of course, the money that the fund was volunteering to put forward, about 33, \$34 million, something like that. The combination of the those two sources of money would create a matching revenue or contribution for the first three years of 5, 10 and \$15 million followed by the city making contributions of \$32 million a year and the

fund \$8 million, which obviously there's going to be a return. That estimates 7 percent return on investment, that accumulated money, which would cover the entire term of what's projected in the amendment.

2.1

At the same time, we've also attempted -- we understand the concern that the board would have about us living up to our obligations in light of what's transpired in the past. And in prior legislation there was the issue of nothing goes in to effect until y'all find a permanent funding source.

The problem or the difficulty with that is that we continue to bleed until we get the legislation passed. And it really is detrimental to the city as a whole and even to the rank and file because it continues to erode usable dollars that we might have to do a number of things, including pay raises, not just considering -- I mean, we haven't given pay raises across the board to city employees for a number of years now. So there's that consideration.

At some point people are going to be knocking on our door wanting that. But at the same time recognizing that the board and the task force thought that there should be some kind of leverage

placed on the city to make sure that we made some level of contribution.

2.1

We've attempted to at least put some punitive measure in there that says that if we don't meet our obligation in any one year that you-all withhold your side of the contribution for that year.

And anybody that would not recognize that that's detrimental in our financial position to city council and to the city government has to be living in a vacuum. So that's an issue.

At the same time, Councilwoman Boyer is pursuing another idea with the general counsel and may be even more restrictive. You know, understand, of course, our difficulty is that we can't commit a future council to an expenditure, and so you can't carry over an obligation with respect to future funding even though we might -- the consensus on the council right now is we want to force that, we want to lock that in.

And there's still council members that will be carried over, like myself, that still have that strong feeling of whether that was there or not is the responsible and right thing to do, and for the fiscal health of the city and the future it's the right thing to do. We can't ignore the problem.

And then coupled with the fact that we have other problems that are equally, almost equally as bad that we have to address.

So I wanted to make that clear to everybody that we tried our very best to come -- and still may have an answer that would make it even more restrictive of not making those contributions. It was our intent and desire to be as forceful as we could in establishing something to bring attention to that obligation and make some kind of additional commitment to do that.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: John?

MR. KEANE: And to ensure the continued cross participation in it, the funds that are currently in the enhanced benefit account will be merged with all of the funds and the city budget stabilization account less 5 million that will be left behind for future needs. That \$72 million is going to go into a newly created fund called unfunded actuarial payment fund.

As Council Member Gulliford pointed out, the first year, 5 million from the city general fund, 5 million from this new reserve fund.

Second year, 10 million from both sides.

Third year, 15 million from both side.

And then continuing on, the ratio would be 1 to 4; \$8 million from the fund, and \$32 million. And as councilman pointed out, if the city doesn't budget their 32 million, the 8 does not get paid.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And, John, this preserves the establishment of a defined, a new defined contribution plan called a share plan --

MR. KEANE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: -- for -- to be hired in the future members of the fund.

MR. KEANE: For currently active and future.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And the establishment.

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Define contribution for the first time, but funded out of available funds and so forth. That's still in the legislation.

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: As past.

MR. GULLIFORD: But some of my new founded opponents, especially Ms. Boyer, took exception to that being -- and still voiced her heartburn with the fact that you-all could immediately exercise that right or that option, and so that is still out there. You know, I understand the point of it -- not the opposition -- but the point of having that

1 available.

2.1

The other issue that came up Councilman

Crescimbeni raised was, well, what if that -- we

went back and looked at what the revenue stream was

over a period of years, and I don't remember what

year, 2007, something like that, it was what,

\$7 million and it's gone up to 10, well, what

happens if it continues to grow? What happens if

it's at 12 or 14 million? Shouldn't you-all

contribute some share of that to, or some portion of

that because you're going over baseline to -
towards the unfunded additional revenues, to the

unfunded liability if the city would match that?

I don't -- I know it's going to come up Tuesday night. It's going to be another issue as to contention, but I'm just pointing out two things that came to mind as far as, say, potential officers other than the 7 years which is obvious. You read all of that.

So those are the only three things I can think of. Mr. Crescimbeni still has a burr in his bonnet about the definition of expenses, but I think that the council auditors have come up with a reasonable compromise to that and should be acceptable to all parties.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And if those funds are rising dramatically in the future, it's because the economy is booming in Duval County, and that would be a very good thing for all of these issues. And the economy is progressing dramatically in all these, but that will be a great indicator of abundance, by definition.

MR. KEANE: And the solution for increased funds is the split, but that's 50/50. It continues. So if it goes from 10 million to 12 million instead of 5, they're going to get 6. And we might be able to do a little something on part of the growth just as a sweetener if necessary.

But right now, if this legislation was adopted, police and fire members would be -- once the raises are restored and their contribution goes up, they're going to be paying equivalent 14 plus percent of pay and benefits into the pension fund, which is the highest end in the state.

But there's always room -- I took all this stack home last night, worked on it trying to scrape a few more nickels and dimes together, and we're still working on it.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And as the Mayor certainly knows and the councilmen knows, that share plan,

while essential to be competitive to attract and retain great public servants and public safety, is define "contribution" which means no contingent liability, no risk for the taxpayer.

MR. KEANE: Exactly.

2.1

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And that's a remarkable change that continues to be controversial among all the interested parties. But that is a program that all the benefit accrues to the employee, but there's no contingent liability, no risk on the taxpayer for future investment returns or any of that sort of thing. And that's a significant change in the total package of compensation for our public safety employees.

And I'm talking way too much. Let me let my colleagues --

MR. TUTEN: Well, so far -- and I appreciate
Mr. Gulliford showing up and I do appreciate the
work, and I know we're not going to be here all day
so I'll make it quick.

So far the problem that I still have is the fact that while I do like the schedule, it does lighten the load on the city as far as per year, the amount of money to kick in. Once again, we're getting into the same problem we sort of had with

the Peyton administration when Mr. Brown came in.

You know, they had legislation prepared and they

promised to work with you guys as long as we sign

the new deal and, unfortunately, different

administrations have different priorities and so on

and so forth.

2.1

We signed this agreement, we agreed to it, we bind the members to this agreement. Now, I'm not going to get into good, bad or indifferent right now, but there's nothing in here that guarantees that the new administration ever does anything to live up to what we've already passed.

And like John mentioned, as far as the amount of percentage that we -- we're asking the members to put in out of their paycheck, to pay for what I already approved which is, as far as comparing to the State, is an average pension. It really is. There's just no other way to slice it.

It worries me. It worries me. And I don't want to cast aspersions on the next Mayor and the next council, but it worries me that we're going to just assume that our members are going to take the hit, their share of sacrifice, and at the same time with people that we don't know, you know, are going to come in and they're going to have priorities and

they're going to have constituents and districts, and that's the part that concerns me right now.

That's what's always concerned me about any deal is the money, you know. I think I may have been quoted in the paper one time by somebody about that, but I'm not sure who it was.

But in seriousness, that's what worries me, you know. We need to solve this problem. This is half of the problem. The other half is putting the money towards the unfunded and let's be done with it.

That's all.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: John?

MR. KEANE: We believe, and I expressed this to the rules committee on Monday, that our city fathers and mothers that are elected off in the future and are going to take office in July, will not accept the wrath of the citizens, the political infrastructure, the business community and the chamber of commerce to ignore the findings of the Schou Commission and make them stand up there.

Now, while it's not written in stone, sign your name in blood thing, it's about as strong a commitment that you can get from somebody who's going to be facing the electorate --

MR. GULLIFORD: The reason that I structured

the payment stream the way that I did with the 5, 10 and 15 was to give us time to find that permanent funding source that you're talking about. Reality, you may well be aware, that I do have pending legislation that now is waiting on a ruling from the Attorney General on implementation. There's some issues about how we could or would implement that.

2.1

Mr. Jones advanced the idea, which was defeated at rules, and he's going to bring it back up before the council about just bonding it out. The -- I get the point.

The one thing my parents endowed me with that's hard sometimes is a hell of a conscience. And I understand, if I make a commitment I will die to fulfill that commitment. And there are other people on the council right now that are carried over that feel the same way. We get the point you're making.

And I have talked to the Mayor Elect about this whole deal and he understands it and he has been supportive of it, of what we're attempting to do.

I can't tell you any other way that we can guarantee, because as you well know, there're not a lot of guarantees in life, other than we can guarantee to take care of your concern, other than a very strong commitment. That's going to be my

number one priority because I know if we pass this and if you ratify this, our work is not finished.

We're just taking the first step. Now we got to find that permanent funding source.

2.1

And once we do, I think then that your concern, whatever that funding source ends up being, I think that will take care of your concerns about the long-term viability of some kind of contribution amount from the city. I really do.

And if I have my way, we're going to accelerate that. We're not just going to be happy with 32 million or whatever that is, because the quicker we can reduce it, the more burden it lifts off the city finances and the better off we are.

I can't imagine anybody that's sitting on that council, that has any shred of financial or fiscal understanding, can't get where we are.

What's the consequences of us not doing that, not meeting that obligation? I think the severity of it down the road is just inconceivable. So I fully understand. That's, again, why we attempted, why I put that caveat in there that you-all could withhold because I wanted some -- the best stick -- that was the best stick I could find.

And as I said earlier, Ms. Boyer is working on

something that could set it in stone and actually make it mandatory if we can pull it off. I don't know whether we can pull it off, but we're trying to do that.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Sheriff?

2.1

MR. GLOVER: Yeah, I believe the people who we elected will do the right thing. I mean, there's no indication that that will be any different, I mean, historically. So I'm optimistic there.

You might have your renegade that's trying to send a message, but I don't think you'll have a theme such that will be an impedence. So I can get comfortable with that.

I do have a couple questions, John. The enhancement benefit account.

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.

MR. GLOVER: What comes out of that account is bonuses and the cost of living comes out of that?

MR. KEANE: The post retirement enhancement, the paid thing at Christmastime is the only thing that comes out of it on our side. When the money comes in, Sheriff, first it's divided; 50 percent is going to go to the city, and the 50 percent that's left is what is used now for the Peyton plan.

The residual funds is what's accumulated into

dba84efe-eef1-4fb8-b4ab-8657236e5e1a

the enhanced benefit account now that's built into that dollar.

MR. GLOVER: So we should be okay there.

MR. KEANE: Yes.

2.1

MR. GLOVER: I mean, you get another hit.

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.

MR. GLOVER: So you'll be fine.

Now, how about -- I won't discuss the 10 versus the 7, because I do think we compromised significant on that already. And we painfully came to the 10 and now we down to 7. And so I'm still struggling with that, but in the spirit of compromise, I might be able to get there.

Senior management plan, what's the implication now on that with the elimination of that? Any implications that would be obvious to current members?

MR. KEANE: I struggled with that and I believe, as well as these other assertions that have been made, that it's going to be all right. I'm satisfied. We're satisfied with the legal and statutory authority that the board stands on, an enactment of the plan, and when it's finally resolved, it's finally going to be resolved.

So I was willing, and I am the person who would

be most impacted by it, I was willing to, you know, sacrifice that to reach a resolution to this.

2.1

As you know, Sheriff, we've been working on comprehensive pension reform since the second year of former Mayor Peyton's second term. We've been at this for a very long time. It's occupied far too much of our time and talent and treasure.

And going from 15 years left to 10 was a difficult decision that the board embraced, shaving off three more years in the spirit of compromise and recognition that the city is going to be putting up substantial additional sums of money, I think is a prudent step that I strongly recommend the board to do.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Trustees Schmitt and
Herbert are joining us by phone today, which we
appreciate. And I would invite perhaps Trustee
Herbert as the more senior of the two to first speak
and then Trustee Schmitt can speak.

DR. HERBERT: First I just must say that -- and acknowledge my strong feelings that first Mayor Brown, you know, you've been involved in this process for over two years now. You devote an awful lot of time to trying to get this resolved. I was surprised that you are willing to attend all those

meetings that you did. You did listen to us, and I'm just convinced that without the leadership that you provided over that extensive period and the resulting documents that came out of it, we would not be at this point. So I just think that we owe you a great deal of gratitude. Your leadership has been extraordinary in this regard, and I really appreciate it.

2.1

And second to Councilman Gulliford, you also, especially over the past few months, two or three months have been extraordinary. As I told you at the last meeting that you attended, I'm especially proud of what you've done with regard to this issue as one of your constituents, the spirit of compromise that you have demonstrated as well as your leadership, your tenacity of getting all of this through both of the committees is very impressive.

And I think what all of this reveals is the fact that both you clearly understand, as do we on our board, that it is in the best interest, not only of the city, but also our members to resolve all these issues, to resolve them now before we have new leadership and additional time it would take if we can't get this done now, as folks have to learn all

the facts and deal with all of the nuances of these things.

So to both of you, I just want to, again, express my sincere appreciation.

2.1

I feel very good about what I've heard and read about the compromise that Councilman Gulliford has put forward. I just want for the record to indicate that I am very comfortable with the 7-year compromise. I think that that is reasonable. It shows that both of us have gone as far as we could in terms of doing again what is in the best interest of the citizens of the community and also our members.

I think that the matching revenue commitment is reasonable and I must say that the one thing that was especially -- is especially important to me is the share plan for currently and future employed members.

The -- and chairman has talked about this on a number of occasions. I have as well. And we are putting our current members in a position that it will be very difficult for them to even come close to generating the kind of fair retirement income that they should receive.

And so what this does is -- I'm not sure who

said it a little while ago, but the reality is that having this will help us to become a little bit more competitive in the context of trying to retain and certainly attract new policemen. If the new Mayor is serious about hiring over a hundred new police officers, you know, it's clear that we're going to have to have a plan that is competitive.

2.1

And so what I do worry about is are we going to be able to do that. And to the extent that we have the possibility of creating a share plan and potentially other kind of benefits I think is very important.

So I just want, for the record, to say that if city council does approve what you have proffered, Councilman, I would hope that we could get that as soon as possible and act on it. And I think the thing I would love to see most is to have you and Mayor Brown joining us in a signing ceremony to demonstrate that we're all working together. We have worked together and we're going to continue to do so. It may be the last comment.

I'm sensitive to what Trustee Tuten said, but like Trustee Glover, I personally have a lot of faith in the system. I believe that with Councilman Gulliford there over the next couple of years that

he can play a leadership role in making sure that the city follows through on what is -- what is included in this plan. And I think that this has generated so much concern around the city with editorial board comments and citizens writing letters to the newspaper talking about the concerns that they have, that it will be very difficult for future council to say, well, we don't really care about this, when you look at the consequences financially for the city, if it doesn't.

So, again, I'm much more optimistic about the future in my belief and the obligations that the future elected officials will understand.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2.1

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Thank you, Trustee.

MR. GULLIFORD: If I could respond, Dr.

Herbert. I appreciate your comments. I too want to point out the fact that the foundation for this came from the Mayor's efforts as well as the task force, and your suggestion about the signing ceremony had already crossed my mind. I think I had even mentioned that in a brief encounter at an elevator stop, and include the task force as well as whatever council members want to attend, et cetera. And everybody was involved because this will be the

results of a collective effort.

2.1

And that's what -- we've got to stop this mentality that it's us against them. And the situation that we're in, we've got to resolve this thing collectively and then move forward.

Right now the bad thing is that there's so much uncertainty with it. And that uncertainty impacts all of us; the rank and file, everybody is impacted by this uncertainty. And how do you ever get anything done when you've got that cloud of uncertainty hanging over the whole process. It's hurting us on the council. I mean, how do we plan out the future financials.

So thank you for your comments and thanks for never calling me about a constituent issue.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Chief Schmitt?

DR. HERBERT: At least not yet.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Larry? Chief Schmitt?

MR SCHMITT: All right. I will be a little shorter hopefully. Some very good points by the other trustees, and I'd like to add a couple if I could. One is the employee contribution for the police. The police officers took a three percent pay cut, it's supposed to be temporary. In this bill it's restoring only two percent of that three

percent pay cut, and yet increasing their contribution by a full three percent, in effect making it a one percent pay cut for the police.

That certainly doesn't seem equitable for old memberships, and I'd like to see that changed to restore all three percent of that. That's my first concern.

Second concern is more of a question. What happens to the reserve fund for money in the account after 15 years if the city does not make their additional payment over the next 15 years?

MR. GULLIFORD: What happens to the what?

MR. KEANE: The reserve account.

MR. GULLIFORD: The reserve account, pretty much as near as we can tell, based on seven percent return, is over the term of -- that's in the amendment is pretty well depleted at that point.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I think the question was --

MR. KEANE: If the city doesn't pay.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Were the city over that

15 years unable or unwilling to put in all of the
prescribed amounts, so the magic did not go in and
some was still left in the fund.

MR. GULLIFORD: Oh, that's at the discretion of the board. I'm sorry, I misunderstood the question.

2.1

As to

1

That's the discretion of the board.

2

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That's exactly correct.

3

MR. GULLIFORD: And that's the lever.

4

your other point, I understand that --

5

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Excuse me a second.

6

Counsel?

MR. DURDEN:

7

Just to make it clear, assume that no money was used, no matching funds were used, the

8

75 million or so would be in the account, gain seven

9

percent for 14 years, and then it would be up to the

10

11

discretion of the board. And I'm guessing, given

12

the standard rate of return, seven percent times

13

seven for 14 years is, what --

14

150 percent more. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS:

15

Something like that. So it's all MR. DURDEN:

16

your discretion, plus you would have been -- already

17

been getting the -- half of the chapter funds for

18

the 14 years as well, so you would have all of that

19

money for paying unfunded liability or to the share

20

account as it sits now, so it would be in your

2.1

discretion. So to help understand, that's part of

22

this so-called, if you want to call it, hammer or

23 24

incentive to pay because the money is sitting there

for your benefit unless the city uses it to pay the

25

unfunded liability.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Thank you. So Chief Schmitt, Councilor Durden amplified and expanded the answer that John and Bill just gave. Were that to happen, then the funds stay under the discretion of this board.

MR. GULLIFORD: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: For the benefit of the beneficiaries.

MR. GULLIFORD: The other point, I suspect you may see a floor amendment on that other issue the night of the vote. I can't guarantee anything because I'm one of 19, and you know how it works down there. But I understand the reasonableness of that. And possibly we can express that to the affirmative and attempt to resolve that.

MR SCHMITT: And my last point was some of the language that was in section 121.504, basically for the investment committee, some of the language in there makes it seem like they have authority over the board -- rather than an advisory board, they actually have authority over the board. A couple of key words in there I'd like to see corrected to clarify that.

MR. KEANE: In response to that, Chief, we have, in final stages of making that amendment which

we're going to submit over to the leadership to

potentially be included in the floor amendment

that's going to be offered on Tuesday night. That's

the language you and I discussed previously,

correct?

MR SCHMITT: Yes, sir, that is correct.

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir, we have it.

2.1

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That was clearly not the intent of the citizens commission or the council.

MR. GULLIFORD: Exactly. That was not our intent is that we recognized that the final authority, the full authority rests with the board that they were supposed to only be advisory. So if there's a problem with that language and it isn't clear enough, I think we can change that to make it mirror the intent.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And while we've had great success voluntarily implementing the advisory committee and all the other recommendations of the commission as legislation moves along, I think if they did have authority they would then be under the same fiduciary standards these trustees are and we might not be able to recruit anybody as fiduciaries in that role, as a practical matter in the investment profession for all the reasons we're very

1 familiar with.

2.1

MR. KEANE: And as a follow-up on that,
Mr. Chairman, we've had our second potential member
already withdraw.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Because of the legal process.

MR. KEANE: Right. But I told him that we're trying to get this clarified. They didn't want -- they were willing to come help, but they didn't want to --

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Their lawyers won't let them do it.

MR. KEANE: Exactly.

MR. GULLIFORD: We need to get that worked out. Yeah, I understand that. And I think, again, that's the intent.

MR SCHMITT: That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Thank you, Chief.

Anything else, John or Mayor or councilmen that would be appropriate concerning the legislative process that's under way now or that we should be aware of so that as it moves forward, should it be enacted soon, we will gather quickly and be ready to make an informed decision and act based on the will of the majority of the trustees? Anything else we

should be briefing on or be alert to now that should be a consideration?

2.1

MR. GLOVER: I think we need to pay attention to the appeal of the package for new members. We here, Jacksonville's Sheriff's Office, require a college degree for incoming law enforcement officers, and if we don't have an appealing package, we're asking better education and better training personnel to come in on the conditions that might not be as appealing as the market around the state.

So we need to just make certain we keep that on the radar screen, because when you look at what's happening around the country now, I think we are receiving some benefits from other officers being a little more qualified and educated and that kind of thing. So we want to make certain that we don't lose that. So just want to put that on the table, and that's one of the things that I think we need to pay attention to.

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.

MR. GULLIFORD: I think you're absolutely right. And you expressed that last time I was here, and I understand that. I mean, we've got to be competitive. But how do we get to issues like that when we have this huge uncertainty hanging over our

head? How did we as a council make commitments over the future if we have an unknown entity like a huge unfunded liability facing us? You can't do it, and that's why the resolution of this thing is so critical.

And I think, as I said before, this is just the first step of the process. I'm quite, quite aware of the fact that after we get resolutions of this, we've got to find a permanent funding source, and the more we can -- the faster we can accelerate that, the better off I think we are as a city.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And as we all know, the mathematics of the actuarial contribution process, were the city not to continue that, the arc is more than it would have been but for it and creating the physical pain. So it is in some sense a self-regulating process.

It's the cruel mathematics of the actuarial studies if those voluntary contributions are not made jointly, that required pension is higher than it would have been keeping the budget pressure. So it's self-regulation in a sense, once someone understands the way all that works, which takes a few years.

MR. GULLIFORD: Well, what hit me right in the

2.1

face, and Dr. Herbert will appreciate this, was the annexation process for that part of Atlantic Beach when the -- obviously the city and the City of Atlantic Beach struck a deal some time ago to provide fire services, and Councilwoman Boyer brought up the issue, well, maybe we're not getting our real value in this situation because of what we're providing and what we're getting from the City of Atlantic Beach as a payment versus what our cost was. And when we started looking at the cost of the fire protection, it hit you right in the face that the salaries were now exceeded by the pension contribution.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Correct.

2.1

MR. GULLIFORD: And if people don't get a message from that...and as you said the trend isn't in the right direction if it goes unintended. And to that point, anybody that's responsible, again, on the council or in the administration has got to recognize that you cannot let that -- you can't sustain it. You can't let it go on.

I think the difference between now and the Peyton administration, considering it was that council, wasn't nearly as severe. It wasn't nearly as obviously severe as it is currently, and the

projections make it even more severe.

__

So I get your message and I'm on board with that. And I get your message, too, Sheriff, or should I call you president.

MR. GLOVER: Either will work.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Is there anything else on this subject? We just have two other administrative matters to consider since we're together.

Mr. Mayor, again, thank you for your leadership for coming here today. Counsel, thanks for coming.

MR. GULLIFORD: I guess I'll go back to my ethics training.

MAYOR BROWN: I think we have a tremendous opportunity to get this done and everything that's been said, and I think we've all worked hard on this. We know what's at stake. We know it's not sustainable. If we want to have a good quality of life, we got to get it done. And I think that's -- and it's urgent to -- it's, you know, it's -- really, we want to get this done sooner rather than later.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Well said.

MAYOR BROWN: So I want to thank you all for your leadership and commitment to see it through.

MR. KEANE: Thank you, Mayor.

The next item, Mr. Chairman and Trustees, is the discussion on the DROP review procedures.

2.1

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. Chief Schmitt, if you can hear me okay, just what I'd like to do here is we have everything cued up for the independent accountant to perform agreed-upon procedures concerning our administration of the DROP law and regulations over the last 15 years. And what I'd like to do is just quickly discuss the initial agreed-upon procedures for an initial sample review by the independent accountant of DROP applications and files.

And I would like to suggest that we have the independent accountant pick three years at random out of the last 15, to pick 10 percent at random of DROP applications processed in those three years and compare and contrast, if appropriate, the actual administration of those applications versus the provisions in the DROP law.

And, John, if I misspeak on the technicalities, you correct me.

And then bring those results to thee trustees or directly with the board as good governments dictates. And then based on what that initial more limited set of sampling with those limited

agreed-upon procedures shows us in the matter of fact, then we can determine the extent to which additional and agreed-upon procedures would be valuable, useful or important. But something along those lines is what feels like something that would be not too onerous in terms of time and cost but still provide the board independent, credible facts concerning this subject.

And we can then take an informed decision what to do next to go ahead and bring this matter to closure in a very open, transparent, independent matter.

MR SCHMITT: There were at least two and possibly three that were specifically questioned or that I had concerns about. I would like them to do those 2 or 3 for sure in addition to their sampling.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Good idea. I think that makes good sense, Larry. Chief Schmitt, I think that makes good sense. Okay.

MR. KEANE: All right.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: But, now, others, questions or comments on the agreed-upon procedures by the auditors? John, make sense?

MR. KEANE: No. Fine.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay.

2.1

MR. KEANE: What we'll do is we'll send them a 1 2 list for each calendar year of everybody. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And they can just --3 4 MR. KEANE: The entire field and using these 5 parameters you say pick 10 percent. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Plus --6 7 You pick them. MR. KEANE: CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Plus the three that were 8 9 specifically singled out. 10 MR. KEANE: In addition to the three. You pick 11 10 percent, tell us their names, we'll Xerox the 12 files and ship them to you. 13 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yeah. And any three years 14 out of the 15, plus the three individuals that have 15 been unfairly singled out. 16 MR. KEANE: Right. 17 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. 18 And the next item is the policy on MR. KEANE: 19 pension forfeitures. The board has a policy, and 20 I've provided it to you. And attached to that 2.1 policy, behind it you'll find four letters.

are letters we send to people depending on where

the payroll for the filing of criminal charges by

the appointing authority.

they fall in their career when they are removed from

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

22

2.1

23 24

25

The -- we have a sample when someone is eligible for time service; we have a sample when someone is eliqible to vest, and we have a sample for someone who does not have enough time to vest. We notify them that they are not gaining any pension credit. If you resign, you're entitled by statute to a refund of your contributions without interest. If you are eligible to retire and do retire, we will only pay your pension benefit pending the resolution of criminal charges up to the amount of your contribution.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Of the employee's contribution?

Of the employee's contribution. MR. KEANE: And that is the very first letter in the file of individual vested, is getting ready to start drawing, he had 19 years and we told him very clearly, we'll start your pension. You cannot exceed the amount of your contribution. And so we -- this is how we do all of them.

When the operating departments notify us that someone's been removed from the payroll for criminal charges, they get one of these three letters that you see.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So I just wanted to introduce the subject. At a future regular meeting we can discuss whether there's a need or any benefit to consider revising the existing procedure in this regard since there's been some ongoing publicity concerning one or two individuals being charged with the offenses.

And so I just want to get us thinking about it because it's been 13, 12 years since the policy was adopted. It's worked very effectively, very appropriately, very well, but as time passes and things change, is there anything that you might want to consider revising given the current circumstances? I'm not aware of any, but it's important that it attracts the attention of constituents.

MR. KAUFMAN: Stu Kaufman, how are you?

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Hey, Stu.

MR. KAUFMAN: I don't think there's really been any material changes to the forfeiture statute itself, 112.3173 in the last 12 years, and the procedure I think, as is, works fine.

I can give you just an update on where we are on the pending forfeiture matter which you decided that we could refer out to counsel for an independent look. Once we get that -- once we get a

2.1

memo back from him as to whether or not he feels he should proceed with forfeiture proceedings, we would either -- we would bring it before you and you would enter a notice of proposed agency action and put them on notice that we're going to proceed with forfeiture proceedings, if that's the case. If not, then we'll just choose not to proceed in that matter.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. Thank you, Stu.

John, is there anything else commanding the attention of the board today?

MR. KEANE: No, sir.

2.1

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Any other comments or questions from any trustees? Hearing none, we are adjourned.

MR. KAUFMAN: I just have one further item for you.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. KAUFMAN: Just to give you an update as to where we stand on the appeal of the "Lee" matter, we filed a notice of appeal last Thursday. It was timely filed. I think Chairman Gulliford mentioned this morning, when he first opened with his remarks, that a motion was filed by the concerned taxpayers and Mr. Lee for an injunction prohibiting the

council from proceeding with a vote on the most recent ordinance.

I think we have been tasked by you to deal with any impediment to comprehensive pension reform in the matter in which we see fit, and we are going to be required to appear in court to defend against this motion that has been filed and other things that we feel are necessary.

We just got it. It was just served last night, but I just wanted to give you an update that there will be further litigation probably in the next couple of days with regard to the motion for injunction.

MR. TUTEN: Stu, this is Rich Tuten. Is there any way that this inhibits or stops the current proposal with the council?

MR. KAUFMAN: Well, that's what they are seeking. They are seeking an injunction stopping the council from proceeding forward with a vote and basically they're asking for injunctive relief prohibiting the council from taking any action with regard to the ordinance.

So the motion was directed to the city, so I do expect them to respond directly to the motion, but I do believe that it will be some pleadings filed by

our firm as well.

MR. TUTEN: Okay. I guess I should have rephrased it a little more legal. Let me ask you this: Have you seen anything like this before and do judges usually grant it to the plaintiff?

MR. KAUFMAN: Not usually. It is a very high standard to meet in order for there to be an injunction awarded. So we do not believe that their argument has any merit. In fact, their argument is contrary to arguments they have made in the past with regard to collective bargaining which need to be addressed.

And, you know, I think the court would actually be disturbed with regard to the motion that they have brought seeking the injunction.

MR. TUTEN: Okay.

DR. HERBERT: What is the rationale, the legal rationale or policy rationale for the request for the injunction?

MR. KAUFMAN: They are saying that there is no -- that with regard to collective bargaining, the pension fund is an uncertified bargaining agent who cannot negotiate pension benefits with the city and that the committee meetings that have gone on in the past week or so constitute collective bargaining and

| | Page 46 |
|----|---|
| 1 | we cannot collectively bargain on behalf of the |
| 2 | unions. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Remarkable. |
| 4 | MR. KAUFMAN: Which is directly contrary to the |
| 5 | position they've taken in the past. Thank you. |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. Thank you, Stu. |
| 7 | Pardon me for not recognizing you earlier. |
| 8 | So, again, any further matters commanding our |
| 9 | attention? |
| 10 | MR. KEANE: No. |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We are adjourned. |
| 12 | MR. KEANE: Thank you, everybody. |
| 13 | MR. TUTEN: You're welcome. |
| 14 | (The meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m.) |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Marjie M. Kline, Registered Professional
Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large,
do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did
stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and
that the transcript, is a true and complete record of my

DATED this 10th day of June, 2015.

stenographic notes.

Marjie M. Kline, RPR Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at Large

My Commission No. EE 839384 Expires: October 21, 2016