1	CITY Of JACKSONVILLE POLICE AND FIRE
	PENSION BOARD OF TRUSTEES
2	MEETING AGENDA - NOVEMBER 21, 2014
3	RICHARD "DICK" COHEE BOARD ROOM
4	DATE: November 21, 2014
5	TIME: 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
6	
7	PLACE: Jacksonville Police and Fire Pension Fund One West Adams Street, Suite 100 Jacksonville, Florida 32202
8	BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
9	
10	Walter Bussells, Chairman Dr. Adam Herbert, Trustee
11	Asst. Chief Larry Schmitt, Police Trustee Richard Tuten, III, Fire Trustee
12	STAFF PRESENT:
13	John Keane, Executive Director-Administrator
14	Robert Klausner, Esq., Board Counsel Dan Holmes, Summit Strategies
15	Kevin Stork, Controller Debbie Manning, Executive Assistant
16	GUESTS:
17	William Deem, Office of General Counsel
18	Kim Balaskiewicz, Auditor Linda Mendillo, Auditor
19	This cause came on to be heard at the time and
20	<pre>place aforesaid, when and where the following proceedings were reported by:</pre>
21	Cheryl Franzino, RPR, FPR
22	AAA Reporters 233 East Bay Street
23	912 Blackstone Building Jacksonville, Florida 32202
24	
25	AAA REPORTERS (904) 354-4890

1	77 1 01 0014
1	November 21, 2014 9:00 a.m.
2	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: John, remind me if
3	Nat's able to make it today.
4	MR. KEANE: It was my understanding
5	that he was.
6	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Me too.
7	MR. KEANE: We are getting ready to
8	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We have a very full
9	agenda.
10	Let's go ahead and get started.
11	MR. KLAUSNER: Mr. Chairman, since you
12	have guests and other speakers, I was going to
13	recommend to you that you move the closed
14	session to the end of the agenda. That way we
15	don't inconvenience
16	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We'll do the Shade
17	briefing at the end of the meeting. We've got a
18	very full meeting today. And to accommodate the
19	attendees and guests here today, it makes sense.
20	MR. KEANE: Is Mr. Deem here from the
21	General Counsel's office yet?
22	He wants to make a brief presentation
23	to the Board when he arrives.
24	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay.
25	MR. KEANE: It's on the action the

1 | Board took last month.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. He's not here.

MR. KEANE: I have two requests for public speakers.

First, is Mr. Bill Gassett.

MR. GASSETT: Thank you for letting me speak to you again today. What I've passed out here is kind of a summary of things I think need to be looked at as you progress down the street of battle with the city council and the mayor's office.

And I guess what's going on here is this is probably a good example of what we call "stress test" for the city.

What's going on in this battle you're having is much larger than just the pension fund. As I search into things, there's other areas of weakness that the city has.

But the first page is just some questions that should have been asked by the Scheu Commission. They didn't -- not answer these questions. I think it's part of the problem why they're having with -- fumbling around of what to do for the city solutions.

The second page shows an important point here. And, Dan, if you'll do this in the future, it will help this discussion with the city and all that's going on.

We need to speak in twenty-year and thirty-year terms, not five, one, or ten. And the reason being is, if your obligation is to come up with the cash in the twentieth or twenty-fifth or thirtieth year, the bearing on a ten-year program is unimportant other than it just tells you, yes, ten years ago today if somebody put some bucks in the machine, that's what they'd get out today.

So, please, I think it will help the discussion along if we use twenty and thirty years. And I'm glad to report, on the limited analysis that I was able to get to, that the average return on the twenty-year basis has been 7.8 percent which exceeds the seven and-a-half requirement.

The third page -- and this is something I think you need to have a look at here. And what I've -- you've seen this before. But what I've tried to show you here is that part of this -- figure out how much money you need.

It's not just what you need today but looking ahead, based on a seven and-a-half percent calculation.

And if you look at the first column in yellow, for example, that by the year 2014 the Dow Jones has to be at 16,353 for you to make your seven and-a-half percent number. Well, you're there. You've got some surplus.

But if you go down to year 2016, '17, and '18, all of a sudden the numbers change.

And what you have to see the Dow do, between now and those time frames, is go up almost 18 to 19 percent a year. Good luck. You ain't going to make it.

What does that imply? You've got to watch out as you determine the actual bucks you're going to need to fund the liabilities is, do you have a bunch of guys and girls deciding, in the twentieth year, I'm getting out.

That can expand your obligation to the 1.6 billion. It could mushroom to 1.7 billion. I don't know. But that kind of analysis is called forecasting. It needs to be considered by the people that are trying to redesign the pension program.

Just to give you an example, I've bracketed here -- you see 1988, 1983, and 1978, as a matter of history, for those guys who would have retired in the year 2008. When we had a big crash-down, we still made, for the twenty-year amount, our 7.2 percent, 8.2 and 8.2. So the thrust here is to always look at a twenty- to twentyfive- to thirty-year perspective.

Case in point, by the year 2013, the Dow Jones for a twenty-year veteran has to be at over 70,000. I don't know if it's going to get there or not. It should on a seven and-a-half percent number.

Basically, I know the chart may seem confusing at first, but this kind of analysis has to be taken into account to make sure that we don't run into the stress-test problem down the road.

I have a little bit of time left. I'd like to return back to the first page. These are the questions that should have been addressed and, I think, asked. Perhaps you guys could ask -- some other questions could have been asked also. But the Scheu Commission only

did one half the study, and that was offer a solution.

They did not offer -- study the question as to look at the remedy so that you won't be in the same boat five, ten years from now, and that could be a problem based on what they fail to do.

Any quick questions?

Again, Dan, if you would, please help these guys to cast this stuff in a twenty-, twenty-five-, and thirty-year light.

Thank you very much to everybody. And to all, please have a Happy Thanksgiving.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Curtis Lee.

MR. LEE: I think I'll use the podium.

All right. I'm talking mainly about the possibility that you will authorize the Defined Contribution Plan through Mr. Keane today.

Fundamentally, Mr. Keane is already excessively compensated. It's inappropriate for him to have two defined benefit plans, social security and the Defined Contribution Plan.

STENOGRAPHER: You need to speak up a little bit, project your voice.

1 MR. LEE: Sorry about that.

It's inappropriate for Mr. Keane to have two defined benefit plans, social security plus a proposed Defined Contribution Plan.

There's really no precedent for this in the entire City of Jacksonville as far as I know.

Further, his defined benefit plans are not reduced because of his receipt of social security, which would be common in private industry to the extent that private industry offers fine benefit plans.

The reduction concept is called integration. I know about it because I used to deal with it.

The lack of integration makes the inappropriateness of Mr. Keane's two defined benefit plans especially egregious.

Further, think about it this way. Who else would hire Mr. Keane for more than \$300,000 a year?

I don't think he has a market value of anywhere near \$300,000 a year. The bottom line is I would suggest to you it's inconsistent with your fiduciary duties as trustees to continue to

1 overcompensate Mr. Keane in such an excessive 2 manner. Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Did anyone else 4 want to speak and didn't register? 5 So we'll close the public comment period. And when the general counsel arrives, 6 7 we'll let him or her speak, and then we'll 8 resume the agenda. Make sense? 9 MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. 10 Mr. Chairman, the trustees are now 11 going to take up the consent agenda. 12 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: John, let me ask 13 you about the consent agenda, just one point, 14 just to put it in the record. So later today we'll talk about the --15 16 the additional work to validate or not the 17 contention that our -- part of our DROP 18 administration process is not fully consistent 19 with DROP law by one pay period, I think? 20 MR. KEANE: Yes. 21 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And so were that 22 review, that we'll discuss later, to conclude, 23 in some circumstances we may have been off by a

If that same procedure affected anybody

24

25

pay period.

1 on the consent agenda today, then we would go 2 back and make that one pay period adjustment. Would that be accurate? 3 The provision's in the 4 MR. KEANE: 5 Charter for the Board to address any errors or omissions and to correct them. 6 7 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Correct. And that then the Board's 8 MR. KEANE: 9 decision is final, binding, and conclusive on 10 all parties. 11 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I just want to be 12 sure. 13 MR. KLAUSNER: And I was just going to 14 add to that, that the contract that members have 15 for benefit, incorporates within it, in essence, 16 the consent to a correction, that if we underpay 17 or overpay, that you accept the grant of your 18 benefit subject to the right of the Board to 19 correct an overpayment, if so determined. 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Just wanted to be 21 sure. 22 MR. TUTEN: I'll make a motion to 23 accept it. 24 Second. CHIEF SCHMITT: 25 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Any further

1 questions or discussions on the consent agenda? 2 Hearing none, all in favor, say "Aye." 3 (Responses of "Aye.") 4 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Opposed? 5 Same sign. It carries unanimously. The first item of old 6 MR. KEANE: 7 business, Mr. Chairman and Trustees, is a 8 letter, dated October 14th, from the Pension 9 Board consultants concerning the annual retiree 10 bonus in accordance with paragraph 19 of the 11 restated agreement. 12 The actuary certifies that there are 13 sufficient funds available to pay a maximum 3 14 percent bonus to qualified members and their 15 surviving spouses. 16 We asked the actuary to show it in a 17 number of different ways. The historical 3 18 percent bonus, also shown as a level amount that 19 each member would receive, reducing it to 2 20 percent in the level amount each member will 21 receive and 1 percent and the level amount each 22 member would receive. 23 The actuary has certified there are 24 sufficient funds available to make the payments.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: All right.

In

25

part before I -- I think Larry's familiar with all this, as our newest member, but I'll just kind of recount the history of this to frame up the conversation.

So me and others have raised the thought that we should, at least, suspend these bonuses to retirees to accumulate these funds for the potential benefit of members, given the disproportionate impact between members who are not getting pay raises, now going on three or four or five years, and our retirees are getting 3 percent pay raises every year.

And given this is discretionary money, ought we not to be accumulating this for potential use for the members' benefit as long as this unexpected and, in my view, unreasonably damaging financial impact on members as long as the financial crisis continues.

And so we've had that conversation here several times, and so last year this time we continued the historical decision but put everyone on written notice that it might change this year and going forward. And so that's where we are.

And if I may, I'll just say again, my

view is, as before, given the disproportionate impact on our members versus our retirees on annual increases and all the rest of it, I believe we should suspend or stop this bonus to retirees or hold it in the possibility of it being applied to the benefit of our members who were being adversely impacted year after year after year because of the city's financial crisis. And so that's -- that's my thought, to cue up the conversations.

DR. HERBERT: If I could just ask,

John. John, last year I think you indicated to

us that you did send communications out to all

retirees indicating that there was no guarantee

that this payment would be made for this year.

Is that correct?

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. We notified them that it was discretionary at the approval of the board.

CHIEF SCHMITT: And my understanding is the Chapter 175 and 185 moneys require that the funds be paid for enhanced benefits, which would include this, as we call it, a bonus payment.

Doesn't that limit what we're allowed to do with it?

1 Bob, do you want to respond MR. KEANE: 2 to that question? 3 MR. KLAUSNER: I'm sorry, I was 4 reading --5 CHIEF SCHMITT: My understanding of 175 and 185 requires these funds to be spent on 6 7 enhancements which this bonus payment is 8 considered an enhancement. MR. KLAUSNER: Yes. Now, Jacksonville 9 10 is what's called a "deemed to comply plan," 11 meaning that if you're a plan of a certain 12 age -- there were three of them. If you were 13 established before a date in 1939, you're, in 14 essence, grandfathered in on a lot of current 15 practices. So, yes, this would be deemed an 16 enhancement. 17 CHIEF SCHMITT: Okay. And --18 MR. KLAUSNER: It's not an unlawful use 19 of the money, if that's what you're concerned 20 about. 21 CHIEF SCHMITT: Well, no, just the 22 opposite. My concern is if we use it for 23 something other than an enhancement as required 24 by Chapter 175 and 185. 25 MR. KLAUSNER: It says that the Chapter money is supposed to be used for the benefit of the membership. I mean, you couldn't use it, for example, to pay down the city's contribution.

How you use it for enhancements is a very broad definition, but it has to be used for the benefit of the members.

CHIEF SCHMITT: Okay. Mention was made of how we could use this to benefit the current members, and part of that is the nonretiree current members.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. By member, I mean active employee distinct from retiree.

CHIEF SCHMITT: Is there a way for us to be able to do that as an enhancement?

MR. KLAUSNER: You can't change the structure of the multiplier or the retirement age or anything. That all gets decided in that other building, meaning city hall.

The 185.35 and 175.351 say the members can direct the Board to do so, or it can empower the Board to make that decision for itself.

I don't know how you would do it other than, for example, there was some discussion when creating a share plan, and that was part of

the discussions in the meetings, public meetings between Mr. Keane and the mayor's representatives regarding resolution of our current pension litigation.

And that was one of the uses of the Chapter money was to create a share plan, such as many cities have which is, in essence, a defined contribution component.

CHIEF SCHMITT: I agree -- I would like to be able to use this for, not just the retirees, but for the current members. But I don't see how we have the authority to do that under our current limitation with 175 and 185 and the current agreement.

And unless somebody else has some other way to do that, I just don't see how we can.

DR. HERBERT: I thought I heard counsel say that there are some other possibilities.

MR. KLAUSNER: There are other ways to use it. The question is whether you have the authority without consent of the city by amending the plan. I think at most what you can do now is hold the money in reserve.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I believe, in the comprehensive pension reform package and

packages that are now being deliberated by city council, the one that was introduced to council, that's begun the deliberations, included the use of Chapter funds for a period of time integrated into general increases for members, increases in members' contributions funded in part from it.

And there's a lot of moving parts in it, but I believe that Chapter funds on the comprehensive reform introduced to council which is now being deliberated, includes the use of Chapter funds to make the numbers work in total.

John, is that correct?

MR. KEANE: Would use a part of the Chapter funds.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. And it could be all, it could be more, it could be less.

But, actually, Chapter funds are part of what's now before the council for comprehensive pension reform.

That clearly only affects active employees. By definition, retirees cannot be changed. And so my view is, this provides more funding available, if the parties choose, to do comprehensive pension reform that's acceptable to all the affected parties -- the city, the

1 taxpayers, our members.

The retirees are not affected by all this stuff. It was just the active employees. This gives us more funding available, should the parties choose, to get something done that can resume again -- general increases, hopefully, with inflation to members that we've not had open.

You guys would understand that very well because you live it every day. And so that's my thinking. And because if retirees are getting 3 percent a year, the members are getting nothing.

And we have this money that could be going, in effect, to the members through comprehensive pension reform. And my view is we ought to hold it off and accumulate it until this thing is resolved one way or the other.

MR. TUTEN: Well, I agree with what you're saying in principle, Walt, for the most part. Me and Larry are obviously the current members who are part of what you're talking about. I understand all about pay cuts and stuff.

I think -- and one of my points is what

I was going to bring up is what Larry brought up. The problem is there's no mechanism right now to actually do this.

Now, we do know that reform proposal does have certain things in it that allow for such a share plan, et cetera. Some people have what's called Aviva down south. It's just a matter of putting that money into an account for current employees. That's all it is.

The bigger thing -- and I've alluded to this in past years, like last year, is the fact that I understand that current members -- and believe me, I'm one of them -- you know, this, that, and the other -- but there are elderly older firemen and policemen who -- you know, this bonus is a big deal, a real big deal.

Now, it's up to the Board -- and it's discretionary. There's no guarantee that it's coming every year. You know, we don't make promises like, you know, John alluded to.

I wish there was some way -- I'm not against what you're proposing because I do think the current members, especially the younger guys, you know, they need something, you know, because they're getting pay cuts or no pay

1 raises.

We haven't had a pay raise for a long time, in seven years, I guess, in that effect, somewhere in there. And so I would just like the Board to consider some alternative rather than placing all of it to the side for future because right now we really don't have a way to deal with it with current members and, you know, somehow help out, at least, the lower income older retirees.

They didn't get a DROP. They didn't retire, you know, anytime -- you know, I don't know what the average retirement is for some of them, but it's not much, you know, so I don't know. That's just the way I look at it.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: It's accurate to say that every retiree, no matter how long they retired ago, gets 3 percent a year of their -- whatever their base happens to be which would determine when they retired.

Is that generally accurate?

MR. KEANE: For this purpose here?

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: No, no. Set this

aside. Does every retiree get 3 percent a year?

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Now, some space is very low, depending on how far, you know, in the past they've retired and so forth. But everybody gets 3 percent a year no matter when they retire?

MR. KEANE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And then none of the actives get any --

MR. KEANE: And part of that money is the cost of those benefits. It's paid out of the 175 and 185 money that we currently pay over to the city.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And I also understand, on Rich's point, we may not target one group of retirees for it. It has to be everybody is treated equally is the law. So it's kind of on and off, yes or no, I think, by law.

CHIEF SCHMITT: I mean, to summarize my point if we had a mechanism right now to where we had the option of this 3 percent to determine part of it's going to the current employees, part of it's going to the retirees, and we could have that mechanism to shift that to current retirees, I'm a hundred percent on board.

Unfortunately, under this situation, I don't like the idea of we're going to take all this money that by state statute we should be using for enhanced benefits, and we're going to say we're not going to pay you your enhanced benefits even though the statute says we're supposed to, in the hopes that somewhere down the road we're going to have a mechanism to split it a different way.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And to help make my view, comprehensive pension reform work financially for everybody, and this is one more tool that could fit in there.

CHIEF SCHMITT: But we don't have that mechanism to make that happen right now.

DR. HERBERT: But it is the case that there are some options. We just need to explore what those might be, which to me argues very strongly for the proposition that we could not make an allocation this year.

If we spend the next several months observing what's taken place with regard to pension reform, we'll have the dollars in the reserve to use for that, or we can come back in a subsequent year and make an allocation.

You know, if we did a 1 percent, you're talking about \$329 per member. I don't see that as being something that would be a significant loss when you look at the broader option of trying to do something that's fair.

And I must confess that I'm very supportive of the concept of looking at current members, given everything that they've been going through.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me just make a motion so that we can proceed with something on the table.

I move that we not allocate an annual retirement pension bonus for the current year with an understanding that -- and that we put those moneys in reserve for the purpose of looking at a strategy that would provide greater enhancements for all of our -- all of our members in the context of what's being discussed for pension reform.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'll second it for discussion.

CHIEF SCHMITT: And I disagree with that. To me the state statute mandates that we do this unless we have a legitimate reason not

to. It requires it to be paid for enhanced
benefits.

As a trustee, I'm going to follow the state statute and not agree with that option.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Bob, you had your hand up, I think, over there, and I --

MR. KLAUSNER: Well, I just wanted to make sure that the motion said that the money was reserved so that it --

DR. HERBERT: That it be reserved. I'm sorry.

MR. KLAUSNER: Correct. So that if you do decide that you're going to use it in this fashion, that we want to spend it on something else.

DR. HERBERT: Exactly.

MR. TUTEN: Bob, is there anything that prohibits us from saying, looking at the numbers -- you know, and this is an average per dollar amount per member, the 658, but this is obviously an average. In other words, you know, some people are going to get way more. Some people are going to get way less.

Is there anything that prohibits us from issuing like a flat number per retiree for

the bonus, say \$500 per member, or does it have to be a percentage?

MR. KEANE: Just to make sure that you understand what it says on this, if you give 2 percent under the -- let's start with 3 percent.

If you use the current 3 percent formula, this is how much it's going to cost, and the people would get 3 percent.

MR. TUTEN: This is per member? This is not an average?

MR. KEANE: But if you then don't give 3 percent but use 3 percent of the money, each member would get \$987 -- down and down and down, all three things.

MR. TUTEN: Well, I still maintain that the -- and I understand what you're saying,

Adam. And trust me, I do agree. I know a lot of these guys, you know, 329 bucks is not going to make a difference.

But there are a lot of guys that this will make a difference. And how much of its -it would cost us 724 grand out of 2 point
whatever we've got allotted, you know. Or, you know, I would prefer to do it 2 percent rather than a 1.

I just don't want to see -- I know it's easy to say it doesn't affect people, but there are a lot of older fire and police out there that it would make a lot of difference, you know. I just wish we could come to some sort of -- instead of saying either/or, we're going to put it all away just in case somehow we get pension reform or we can come up with something, and the retirees get nothing, I would rather -- or, you know, we're going to give it all to the retirees again and worry about, you know, the current guys next year.

There's something we could do to come up with some sort of compromise to, at least -- you know, a retired captain or a chief lieutenant with a DROP, yeah -- well, you know, it's gas money. But to an old guy that retired in the '80s, you know, something like that where we could agree to it.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We just can't target them though. In our discussions last year --

MR. TUTEN: I agree. That's why I want to make it across the board. Like I said, if it's just a 1 percent bonus across the board,

- you know, it cost us 724 grand. You know, it's still a lot cheaper than the 2.1 million, you
- 3 know.
- We put the rest in reserves. We, you
- 5 know, give something -- you know, give
- 6 something, you know. That's just the way I look
- 7 | at it.
- 8 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Other comments or
- 9 questions?
- 10 MR. STORK: I had one question just --
- 11 | you know, on that level, I was thinking
- 12 | somewhere I read, maybe in the agreement with
- 13 | the city, that it was based on the percentage
- 14 and not a level.
- Can you do a level with our agreement
- 16 with the city?
- MR. KLAUSNER: It depends on what the
- 18 | specific language -- and I think this is in the
- 19 code.
- 20 MR. STORK: Yeah. That's what I was
- 21 | thinking. I read it.
- 22 MR. KEANE: It's in the settlement
- 23 agreement.
- MR. KLAUSNER: It's just in the
- 25 | settlement agreement? I would need the exact

1 language and the settlement agreement in front 2 of me to be able to answer that, which I do not. 3 MR. KEANE: Do you want to defer that 4 and come back to it when we get a copy of the 5 settlement agreement? 6 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: No. This is 7 November and December. 8 MR. KEANE: Talking about just 9 temporarily. 10 MR. KLAUSNER: I just wanted to read 11 the language now to answer his question. 12 Is there a copy handy? 13 MR. KEANE: (To Ms. Manning) Get a copy 14 of the restated settlement agreement. 15 MR. KLAUSNER: But I think the motion, 16 as I understood it, is not -- you're not saying 17 we're not going to not pay it. You're not 18 saying we are going to pay it. 19 You're saying we're going to address 20 the strategy of how this money will be used; and 21 therefore, we are reserving it at the present 22 time. 23 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: What I heard -- and 24 you correct me, this year we're not going to pay 25 it. We're going to keep it in reserve for use,

1 consistent with statute, for enhanced benefits 2 that could include the comprehensive pension 3 reform integrated package we talked about 4 earlier, but that this year we will not pay it. 5 We will keep it back, available for other uses in the future. 6 7 DR. HERBERT: But that was the motion? 8 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. 9 DR. HERBERT: You articulated it better 10 than I did. 11 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I don't know about 12 that, but I had a second shot at it. 13 If I may, Mr. Chairman, MR. KLAUSNER: 14 your question was does it have to be --15 I was thinking it was based MR. STORK: 16 on a percentage. The wording that I remember is 17 based on percentage and not a level, so I don't 18 know if you have that option to go to a level 19 per retiree instead of a percentage --20 MR. KLAUSNER: In other words, 21 everybody getting 3 percent; whereas, the person 22 with the lowest pension would get the 23 smallest --24 Rather than saying MR. STORK: Yes. 25 they can pool the money and dividing it by two-

1 thousand retirees. 2 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Could I say the 3 answer to that question doesn't affect this 4 motion, does it? 5 MR. STORK: When you were discussing -and it may. You were discussing whether you 6 7 could do a level as part of this --8 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I understand that. 9 But the answer to the question doesn't --10 MR. STORK: But a person, whether 11 they're going to vote for or against it, it may 12 have an impact. 13 MR. KEANE: You're correct. The motion 14 is not to pay anything. 15 MR. STORK: Okay. 16 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: But to keep it in 17 reserve for enhanced benefits based on some future decision by the Board. 18 19 Right. That's the MR. KEANE: 20 motion. 21 And I would also note DR. HERBERT: 22 that all the members, all of the retirees have 23 been notified last year that this could very 24 well happen. So it's not something that would 25 come as a complete surprise.

1	MR. KEANE: No, I understand that.
2	MR. TUTEN: I just think we ought to
3	give them something. You just don't yank the
4	rug out from people.
5	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Other questions or
6	comments?
7	All in favor, say "Aye."
8	(Responses of "Aye.")
9	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Opposed, same
10	sign?
11	(Responses of "No.")
12	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So it fails for
13	lack of a majority?
14	MR. KLAUSNER: Yes. It takes three
15	affirmative votes.
16	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'll entertain
17	other motions of whether or not to do anything
18	this year.
19	MR. TUTEN: I'll make the motion that
20	we pay out a 1 percent bonus instead of a 3;
21	therefore, we save an extra I don't know, 1.4
22	million over the 3 percent bonus, what we
23	normally pay out, and we enable people to get
24	something rather than nothing.
25	That way, you know, yes, they

understand that they could have gotten nothing,
but there are a lot of older police and fireman
where \$329 may not be a lot to us, but it will
be a lot to them.

THE COURT: I have a motion. Is there a second?

CHIEF SCHMITT: Second.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Questions or comments?

DR. HERBERT: With regard to that motion, would you feel comfortable once again indicating that there's no guarantee of this going forward?

MR. TUTEN: Yeah. I agree that in the future if there is a reform deal passed and the share plan is part of that deal, and future, you know, 175, 185 moneys are allocated to shoring up the defined benefit plan, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, and if that does not include a retirement bonus because of the reform bill that's passed, then, oh, yeah, I'm fully aware of that. I agree.

But as we stand right now, we don't have a mechanism to help out current members.

I'm not putting the odds of whether or not the

reform package is going to pass. We'll just wait and see.

And as of right today, you know, I think because we can, we ought to help out the older people and still put the majority of it in reserve.

So, yeah. I mean, I understand. The future may not allow us to do this.

DR. HERBERT: I have one other question going back to this. If there is no agreement, does that in effect kill distribution of funds for this year also?

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: My understanding is, yes, every year it requires an action by the board to distribute.

MR. KEANE: And for the education of the Board, we'll read you paragraph 19 if you'd like, Mr. Chairman.

Bob, read 19 to them.

MR. KLAUSNER: "There is hereby established an enhanced benefit to be funded as such, pursuant to the terms of this agreement, which will hereinafter be described as a Post Retirement Enhancement in the form of a biennial retiree bonus payment.

Post Retirement Enhancements are hereby authorized according to the following terms:

Upon certification by the plan actuary, the full biennial actuarial valuation, the benefits can be extended from funds utilized only from the enhanced benefit account without increasing the member contribution rate, the city contribution rate, or the level of base benefits the Board may authorize the retiree bonus.

The biennial retiree bonus (Post-Retirement Enhancement) in the benefits paid to retired police officers and firefighters, the biennial retiree bonus, pursuant to this section, may not be larger than one-half of the percentage by which the consumer price index increased since the latter of October 1, 1989, or the effective date of the last prior enhancement, times the base pension amount of the retiree or surviving spouse.

So that answers your question. It's based on a percentage of each member. So it says the maximum is 3 percent. But the answer is you would need an amendment to the agreement to be able to adjust, for example, paying a less

well-paid retiree more money than a more recent retiree with a bigger benefit.

May I ask a question about the motion because does the motion assume that the remaining -- if it passes, that the remaining 1.4 is reserved in the same manner that we discussed in the prior motion?

MR. TUTEN: Well, let me ask you this then. As part of this motion, should we add in the fact that regardless of pension reform, the board will need to discuss a member share plan if and when the reform doesn't take place.

In other words, to allocate future moneys for current members, we should come up with something that's separate from the reform that for some reason we're here this time next year, there's no reform, you know, we've still got to decide this again. Do we need to add that into the motion?

MR. KLAUSNER: I would just suggest that you use the language that will be reserved for future determination by the Board. That would be the simpler way to do it.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Is there a way to target the subset of all retirees that are in

1 that category as opposed to all the others that 2 they -- if this continues two and a half or 3 three more years, no general increase for 4 actives and retirees 3 percent compounded, the 5 average retiree makes more than the average working police or fireman. 6 7 That's just unacceptable. That's got 8 to be corrected somehow as part of the reform 9 and so forth. And this is part of that to me. 10 CHIEF SCHMITT: And I agree with that 11 concept. I would love to be able to use these 12 funds for current employees. The mechanism 13 isn't there. I'm hoping we can fix that as part 14 of this retirement reform. 15 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And part of this is 16 in the current thing being deliberated. It's a 17 lot of moving parts, but there's Chapter money 18 in the reform and for the council to help fund 19 all this stuff. 20 Any further questions or discussions on 21 Lieutenant Tuten's motion? 22 All in favor of the motion, say "Aye." 23 (Responses of "Aye.") 24

(Responses of "No.")

Opposed?

25

1 MR. KLAUSNER: I'm sorry. Did you have 2 two to two again? 3 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. 4 MR. KLAUSNER: The answer is the money 5 then, by state law, has to be reserved for member benefits or you just not spend. What you 6 7 made was a decision not to make a decision. 8 so, therefore, the money would just remain in the reserve. 9 10 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'm going to come 11 back to Rich's point. If the city council were 12 willing to legislate a targeted one-time payment 13 with Chapter funds for those retirees who, 14 indeed, are in the circumstances that we just 15 described, if the council -- I'm quessing that 16 would have to be the council doing that? 17 MR. KLAUSNER: Because it would require 18 an amendment to the agreement. 19 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. 20 MR. KLAUSNER: So therefore it would 21 take both. 22 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: But that might be a 23 thing we could entertain in the workshop along 24 with the other ideas as an option maybe.

There are a number of

MR. KLAUSNER:

25

plans that provide enhancements to members who have an income below "X" or below the poverty level as defined by the Department of Labor.

Some plans have established a minimum pension. In other words, they took all the people who are making \$300 or \$400 a month and raised them up to a thousand.

A short answer to your question is yes -- targeted payments to lower income retirees are common.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So we'll consider that too.

Okay. Moving on, John.

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. The next item -we have a series of -- the first one was a
resolution from the last meeting. We put it
back on the agenda because the sheriff wasn't
here to sign it.

Mr. Deem is here from the general counsel's office. If we could go to the last item on the agenda: 2014-11-12, approval of the settlement agreement.

Counsel.

MR. DEEM: Where would you like me?

MR. KEANE: Come stand right here.

That way the good court reporter can get down
all your words of wisdom.

MR. DEEM: Good morning, you all.

4 I'mBill Deem from the Office of General Counsel.

We have been involved in litigation under the Sunshine laws.

Essentially, there's been an allegation that -- well, it's really a three-part allegation.

On two occasions Shade meetings were held. This is a couple of years ago. And the formal requisites were not filed. It was nothing underhanded. It's simply we didn't announce a, b, or c.

And then there was a situation in which settlement of litigation was approved, and the settlement approval mechanism did not follow the law.

Those allegations have been made. We've been litigating that case. It's a case that needs to be settled. I believe that the other side is going to prevail.

It's not to say that anybody did anything affirmatively wrong on our end, but mistakes happen. And mistakes happened in this

1 case.

The proposed settlement agreement involves the other side giving up their claim to essentially obviate that settlement that took place. In other words, they're not trying to undo that. That would be a bad thing. And they want to get those Shade meeting transcripts now instead of in a month or three, whenever the current litigation ends, and then they'll be able to get them.

I've spoken with Bob Klausner, who was involved in the Shade meetings before. We don't see significant downside here. It's best just to get this thing resolved now.

It will involve paying the other side's attorney's fees. That's going to happen anyway. I can pretty much guarantee you that. We may be able to quibble about a thousand bucks here or a thousand bucks there, but the attorney's fees are going to be paid.

And, substantially, all the fees that they're requesting are going to be awarded. So I really see no downside to settling.

Now, I'll leave it to you all.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Later today I'm

going to read the instructions that counsel gave
me before we go into the Shade and then when we
come back. So the prior Board did Shade
meetings without --

MR. DEEM: That's right. And they really are highly, highly technical requirements. Some of them are belt and suspenders.

You wonder why anybody would really care about this, but the law is fairly clear.

These are highly technical requirements.

They're important. They have to be followed to the letter.

One, for example, has to do with announcing the members who are going to be present at the Shade meeting.

The statute says in your public announcement, it has to identify the members.

And then it also says when you close the meeting you have to announce who is going to be staying in. Well, we didn't to that second one.

Now, you wonder why do you have to do that because they already have the announcement that says these people are going to be here.

But the courts have said we didn't put this in

there for no reason. You have to follow the law.

You know, this is not hard to do. So,

yes, you would read all of that, and that's what did not happen in the prior time.

MR. KLAUSNER: That's why I gave you that.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: All right.
Understood.

Additional questions for Bill?

MR. KLAUSNER: One of the two Shade meeting transcripts related to a case brought by the Firefighters Union in state court that named the city and the fund as defendants. And in the course of these proceedings, that case was dismissed anyway. So it's over, and we would have to produce that transcript anyway.

MR. DEEM: It's probably a public record anyway.

MR. KLAUSNER: It's a public record anyway. And the second one had to do with the -- one of the -- it was an open meetings case, I believe. And that really got answered later in the "Denton" litigation.

MR. DEEM: Right.

1	MR. KLAUSNER: So it's in the fund's
2	best interest to simply end the litigation, put
3	it behind you.
4	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Any other questions
5	for Bill?
6	CHIEF SCHMITT: Do we have the
7	transcripts?
8	MR. KLAUSNER: Yes.
9	CHIEF SCHMITT: So it won't take long
10	for us to get the
11	MR. DEEM: I can do that.
12	CHIEF SCHMITT: Okay. Great. And if
13	we decide not to settle this, we would just be
14	spending more money on attorney's fees and still
15	lose probably?
16	MR. DEEM: Correct.
17	CHIEF SCHMITT: And it's probably more
18	of a question for you. Do we have a mechanism
19	that's in place now to make sure we're complying
20	with these requirements for all future meetings?
21	MR. KLAUSNER: Yes, we do. There's a
22	specific written protocol which has been
23	provided to the Chairman for today.
24	Essentially what the protocol is, is I
25	have requested of the Chair that we have a Shade

meeting. That's step number one. That already took place. That's why it's on the agenda.

Number two, prior to going into the meeting, the Chairman will read the names of the trustees who are going to be here. Plus, you can have one staff member, and you can have your lawyers present and a court reporter, which you are required to have.

Those names will be read aloud. We will say what time we're starting. At the outset, we'll say what time it is. And then we will estimate the time, and we've estimated the time at 30 to 45 minutes. Personally, I believe it will be less, but I'd rather err on the side of caution.

Then you have a motion to go into the closed session. The court reporter takes down everything. It's transcribed. They always become public at the end of the cases.

So at the conclusion of the Shade meeting, during which you cannot make any motions, there will be a motion -- the only motion is to end the meeting.

Then back in the public meeting, the Chairman will say who's here, and we'll recite

1	the time and that no motions or actions were
2	taken. And then in the public session, you can
3	either if you need to take action as a result
4	of the advice given. So that's the protocol.
5	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Any other questions
6	or comments for the two lawyers on this subject?
7	Could I get a motion?
8	CHIEF SCHMITT: I'll make a motion to
9	end the lawsuit and approve the settlement.
10	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Could I get a
11	second?
12	MR. TUTEN: Second.
13	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Any further
14	comments or questions?
15	All in favor
16	MR. KEANE: The motion is to authorize
17	the General Counsel's Office to settle this case
18	on behalf in the Board.
19	MR. DEEM: And to authorize Mr. Keane
20	to sign.
21	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Does that capture
22	everything you intended to recommend to us
23	MR. DEEM: Yes, sir.
24	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: that motion?
25	I have a motion and a second.

1 Are there any further questions or 2 comments? 3 All in favor say "Aye." 4 (Responses of "Aye.") 5 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Opposed, same sign. It carries unanimously. 6 7 MR. KEANE: Thank you, Bill. Mr. Chairman, the trustees are 8 9 returning to old business. 10 Resolution adopting amendment to Senior 11 Staff Retirement Plan were approved at last 12 month's meeting. And then because of the 13 absence of the Board officers to sign them, we 14 put it back on the agenda today as well as a 15 series of recommendations from the Personnel 16 Committee. 17 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Could I summarize 18 where I think we are on this and see if I'm 19 missing anything or if there's any new or 20 additional information. 21 So growing out of the city council's 22 commission, the Scheu Commission, was the 23 recommendation that we shut down the Senior 24 Management Retirement Plan that was first 25 created, I think, in 1990.

1	MR. KLAUSNER: Correct.
2	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Twenty, twenty-four
3	years ago, now. We had extensive conversations
4	about it, and we had taken earlier action to
5	shut down the Senior Management Retirement Plan
6	to any new members.
7	MR. KEANE: Closed to new members.
8	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Closed to new
9	members. So no one else can join it without an
10	action of this Board. So it's shut down for
11	anybody else.
12	MR. KLAUSNER: Correct.
13	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I believe we have
14	one beneficiary, maybe two?
15	MR. KEANE: Two.
16	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Two. A surviving
17	spouse.
18	MR. KEANE: And retiree.
19	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And a retiree. We
20	have one member.
21	MR. KEANE: Correct.
22	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: John. So that
23	action's been taken. We implemented the Scheu
24	Commission recommendation to shut it down to
25	anybody else in the future.

Now, the question is should we end it for the one member, John. Yes or no?

If the answer is yes, is something put in its place? And so I think that's where we are.

Am I missing anything?

MR. KEANE: That's it.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: It would be helpful, I think, to summarize again the current status of the plan with the one active member, that if he stays in, that is, if we adopted a fund contribution plan for John's successor moving forward and other professional staff -- and that's a separate action or issue, I think.

Were we to allow -- were we to choose for John to stay in, which he may do for his employment contract -- that's in his employment contract -- what the consequences of that are?

With your age and years of service, if you all would not mind briefly summarizing, if that's how this goes forward, what would the options for the one member be?

Could he begin receiving benefits before this contract expires? All those things we think about. And to be sure, we ought to

have a common understanding of if we do "X,"

here's the consequences. If we do "Y," here's

the consequences.

MR. KLAUSNER: May I respond?

As you mentioned, the employment contract that you have with the director says he's going to be in a pension plan. You've had this defined benefit plan for 24 years. You have one retiree. You have one surviving spouse, and you have one active member.

If you were to leave John on the plan, essentially, he would continue to accrue credit service until he left. Because of his age you could allow what's called an in-service distribution.

In 2006, Congress amended the tax law. And it said that if you are over a certain age, you can draw both a pension and a salary if the plan permits it. Your plan does not currently permit in-service distributions.

Were John in the private sector, he'd actually have to start taking the benefit.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Because of his age?

MR. KLAUSNER: Because of his age. But
the tax law also says for a plan sponsored by a

government -- meaning an arm of state or local government, which you are -- that an in-service distribution is permissive but not required until -- the distributions aren't required until the later -- 59 and a half or separation from service. John's 71?

MR. KEANE: Um-hmm.

MR. KLAUSNER: John is 71, so you certainly could permit an in-service distribution. There is a provision in the tax code, Section 415, which sets the maximum amount that a person may receive from a tax-qualified plan.

This originally was run -- when it was established, it was originally run as what's called an "unfunded plan." It has a name, a colloquial name of a "rabbi trust" because the original design came from the Union of American Hebrew Congregations for Clergy 50 years ago. And what essentially you did is you accrued credit and then you funded it at the date of retirement.

Because of changes in state law, though, relating to public plans, you started funding this whenever you did. I wouldn't be

1 | privy to that information.

But you've now funded this plan, so it's no longer a rabbi trust; it's a regular defined benefit plan. Because of that the plan can only pay "X" dollars.

Now, it can pay more than the 415 limit because that's based on age 62. And because John is 71, because when you defer taking it, the limit goes up. And I don't know what the exact number is, but his accrued benefit is, I believe, higher than the 415 limit.

There's case law that says that you have to pay the whole benefit. And the City of Jacksonville, for example, has certain former executives that participate in an excess -- it's called an Excess Benefit Arrangement. It's just a side payment of the difference.

You recover the money because the actuarial cost of the pension benefit is reduced, and you're just simply paying it out of a different part of your budget.

The city uses it. The state has one. In fact, everybody has one. Because of constitutional requirements for public workers to pay the full amount owed, the fact that it

can't be paid because of tax limitations out of this pocket, it gets paid out of that pocket.

And I don't know what the full-funding status is or what the exact amounts are. So your options are to allow John to take an in-service distribution now, or you could create, in essence, a DROP plan, which is just simply deferring the payment.

If you defer the payment until he actually separates, because there's no distribution, there's no 415 Excess Benefit Arrangement which would be implicated until the date he actually left service.

And I know this is a lot of tax stuff. And we ran this past the tax experts and our affiliate in New Orleans that we use and who have done work for a number of our pension plans, including the city employees' plan.

But that's where we stand right now. I mean, if you froze the benefit, then you have a contract question to settle for yourselves about what you're going to do on a pension.

John is in receipt of social security because of his age. Payment essentially becomes mandatory after a certain time. When the plan

was created, I don't think it contemplated anybody staying in the job that long. I mean, at the time of the design, I don't think anybody was thinking 24 years into the future.

And so you are, in my opinion, required to do the Excess Benefit Arrangement. But as I said, it reduces a payment on the pension side, and it comes out of a budgetary allocation on another side.

It doesn't increase the amount of the pension. It just simply divides how it gets paid.

DR. HERBERT: May I ask a question?

MR. KLAUSNER: Sure.

DR. HERBERT: If we opted not to do the in-service distribution and instead put the money into a DROP account, is that the same DROP account that we currently have with the range --

MR. KLAUSNER: You can design it however you want. The current DROP arrangement for the membership, as reflected in the city code, is a member pays a 2 percent contribution while in DROP, and it earns 8-something?

MR. KEANE: 8.4.

MR. KLAUSNER: 8.4 percent interest.

So, in essence, the number gets 6.4 because the 2 percent is going into the plan. Or you could have a DROP -- or you could simply have a deferral of any payments and pay, beginning on the date of separation, the actuarial equivalent of what the value of the deferral would have been.

Those are both options, and I think they're both in the actuary's recommendation to you.

Knowing that this would be on the agenda, I spoke with the actuary to get his thoughts on the matter because the math's outside of my job description.

DR. HERBERT: And my next question is, with regard to John's contract, what specifically does it say with regard to his being able to take part in a plan? That is to say, given the fact that we know we are terminating the plan that's reflected in this agenda item, are we obligated then to create a -- some other kind of plan for him?

MR. KLAUSNER: We're obligated to have some kind of pension benefit for him.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That's per the

1 employment contract? 2 MR. KLAUSNER: Per the employment 3 contract. I don't recall if it specifies the Senior Staff Retirement Plan. 4 5 It says a defined benefit. MR. KEANE: It says a defined 6 MR. KLAUSNER: 7 benefit. The contract would have to be amended 8 to change that. But simply deferring the 9 payment for its value until a later date would 10 not be a change in the contract. So those 11 recommendations of the actuary to that effect 12 would not be problematic. 13 It wouldn't require a contract 14 amendment, nor would it require the creation of 15 a new plan. A stand-alone DC plan was designed 16 with the idea of the next person in mind. 17 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Absolutely. 18 MR. KLAUSNER: And you still have to 19 decide on that one when you hire a new director, 20 what your contribution's going to be. 21 That would probably be a point of 22 negotiation with whoever the successor is you 23 deem it will be. 24 And just for CHIEF SCHMITT:

clarification here, the employee contract

25

1 requires a Defined Contribution Plan?

2 MR. KLAUSNER: No, a defined benefit

3 plan.

CHIEF SCHMITT: I'm sorry, a defined benefit plan.

MR. KLAUSNER: It does. But it doesn't specify the form. That's what it says.

MR. TUTEN: So if we do nothing, in other words, let it rock and roll as it is, basically John's just going to accrue, what, another 2 percent for the year, standard operating business, so we don't have to pay him a retirement.

Because it seems like most of the fuss coming from Mr. Lee in the paper, et cetera, is the fact that John is somehow bamboozling everybody into getting a paycheck as well as social security as well as a fire department pension. And now we're about to pay him his Executive Director pension even though he's still sitting in the same chair and hasn't left because we decided back in August to shut down the official executive pension, whatever they call it.

In other words, we can just let John

continue on what he's doing, keep earning the benefits that he's entitled to. And then when he retires, we just pay him what we owe him.

And the next person that comes in, we're allowed to make a 401(k) or whatever we want to choose to. We will not be offering the next person the same benefit that John is getting.

MR. KLAUSNER: Correct. You've already made a decision not to do that.

MR. TUTEN: Right. But I just want to make sure that we all understand going forward from today with John what the options are because the early disbursal and all that, it seems like the uproar it seems to be that John's now collecting two retirements plus security while still working.

And I admit it's a little, you know, excessive. But we have to have a director because, as you well know, we don't have anybody lined up at the moment. John still wants to work, I'm assuming, and he's doing a good job, so we need to have a director, and we need to pay him. So, you know, that's where we are.

Do we need a motion here to go forward?

1 MR. KLAUSNER: You don't need a motion 2 to keep things as they are. And you can wait on 3 adopting the DC plan until you actually hire 4 someone as a replacement. So if you want to 5 leave the status quo --6 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: On the DC plan, I 7 wonder -- I believe the city has a DC plan for 8 certain managerial or whatever staff, I think. 9 MR. KLAUSNER: Well, actually, when we 10 rewrote -- I worked with the general counsel's 11 office to rewrite the city plan nine years ago, 12 and they created, actually, an elective DC 13 plan. 14 Right. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: 15 MR. KLAUSNER: Because some people 16 would come into the city government, like with 17 the mayor, and only work for a very short period 18 of time, and they would never vest. 19 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Right. 20 MR. KLAUSNER: So there are some people 21 who elected that. It's really targeted to 22 executives. 23 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. 24 MR. KLAUSNER: Although it was open to

any other participant.

25

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So we could, if we chose, collectively, mirror or model the DC for John's successor after that. It seems to be competitive and well accepted.

MR. KLAUSNER: That's what a standalone design looks like.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes.

MR. KEANE: And that's what's further on down the agenda.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: All right. I wonder if we could first address the DC plan for John's successor. It feels like that's relatively straightforward I'm sensing from my conversation here.

I wonder if we could go ahead and see if there's majority support for that, or some motion on that, and then come back to the more complex subject, which is John's employment contract and current arrangement.

MR. TUTEN: The only thing I would say,
Walt -- and before we get into that because I
know when we'd done the pay studies for John a
couple of years ago, it would be best served to
maybe find out how other pension funds have done
this search and benefits package at the same

1 time.

In other words, I just don't know if we can get into all of that today. You know, I'm not opposed to it. I think it's a good idea. I think we need to do it, obviously; but I just don't know if we're not going to go down a rabbit hole, you know, going after more things when, you know, we don't have to do it.

DR. HERBERT: Mr. Tuten, let me also, just in response to that, I did ask Counsel if he would contact the salary folks to get a sense as to what an appropriate salary structure might look like for a new Executive Director.

MR. KLAUSNER: I did. Salary ranges in larger municipal or small state or say county retirement plans ran between the high one-hundreds, say one sixty-five and probably topped out around two-fifty.

Now, most of them were also participants in the actual plan, which they administered. And, in fact, many of them -- I looked at public safety plans, in particular. And even though the staff wasn't public safety officers, the staff was in the plan. And that's really the more common model that I saw.

There were a few that had either a cash balance or a Defined Contribution Plan just for senior staff. A cash balance plan, you fund it like a DC plan. In fact, we set one up for the St. Johns River Power Park.

You fund it like a Defined Contribution Plan, but it gets a guaranteed interest rate each year as opposed to a pure DC which is at risk to the market. And then when the member retires, you take whatever that pot of money is and you annuitize it as if you had purchased a commercial annuity product.

And then the fund bears the mortality risk, meaning if you die sooner than your life expectancy, the plan got a gain. If you outlived it, then you didn't run out of money as the traditional DC plan does, which is its primary criticism.

So that's the model that I saw around the country. I've asked the Segal Company to update, and they've agreed to do it at no cost to us, a survey that they've done for us some years ago, and just plug in the new numbers.

Some of the stuff is not accessible because, unlike Florida, which has a very broad

public records law, believe it or not, some of the salaries were not publicly available in some of the jurisdictions.

DR. HERBERT: I'm not sure whether that helps, but I just want to make sure the Board knows that we have been looking at that as part of the succession process.

CHIEF SCHMITT: So is it accurate to say our least expensive option, the option that's going to cost us the least amount is to remain unchanged?

MR. KLAUSNER: Just leave it. I mean, that is probably the cheapest thing you can do. Leave it alone. You don't have to create a new plan now. You've already decided that when Mr. Keane retires, that's the end of the plan, obviously.

And we also looked at whether we could purchase a commercial annuity for the three participants that we have. Because of their ages, it would cost more money to buy a commercial insurance product than the plan being funded based on its assets.

And it would be very hard, quite frankly, to even -- I couldn't find an insurance

company that was willing to bid on it because of the ages of the participants and the fact that everybody would be in immediate pay status.

DR. HERBERT: So if we do nothing, he would not be drawing down any money from the plan?

MR. KLAUSNER: Because unless you provide an in-service distribution provision, he can't. The only way to draw the money is to leave it.

DR. HERBERT: And under those circumstances, do we still need a motion that we're closing the plan?

MR. KLAUSNER: No, because that was actually to freeze the plan was the motion that's here. I belive you've already --

DR. HERBERT: Done that.

MR. KLAUSNER: You have previously moved to close the plan. You will at the time that Mr. Keane leaves have to adopt a 415 excess benefit arrangement. It's simply a method of paying the part that the funded plan can't pay. And the savings to the funded plan is reflected ultimately back as a savings that pays back the payroll allocation.

1 So you're required to do that under the 2 tax code and the Florida law that governs public 3 plans. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So we substantively 4 5 implemented the Scheu Commission recommendation, 6 I think? 7 MR. KLAUSNER: Yes. 8 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Is there any option 9 that we have not thought about yet of what to do 10 next? And I'm with Larry on least cost would, I 11 think, would be my choice as well. A contract's 12 a contract. You can't change that. 13 Are there any other options we just 14 haven't looked at or thought about that might 15 produce even lower costs but still fit the 16 circumstances required on John's contract? 17 MR. KLAUSNER: Not unless you all 18 agreed to some change in the employment contract 19 terms. 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And that would 21 recall bilateral --22 MR. KLAUSNER: That would require 23 bilateral discussion. 24 Is this right for CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: 25 action today? Do we want to think about it

another month, or do we want to take action today?

I'm looking for a sense of the Board.

And the subject is John's retirement requirement in his contract -- leave as is or move to these other options that have been identified and considered.

CHIEF SCHMITT: I think we've run through a pretty good list of options. The one we haven't discussed is to break the contract, which to me we're already paying it anyhow, and spend a lot of money on attorney's fees. So to me that's not the best alternative.

MR. KLAUSNER: As you know, we have taken exception to anybody that tries to break your contract.

CHIEF SCHMITT: Absolutely.

MR. TUTEN: There's nothing -- you know, John's still working. He still wants to be here. He has a contract. He's got a retirement system.

We've already voted in the future, for the next person, to do away with the plan that he's on now which satisfies not only the pension reform that everybody wanted and certain other areas that are complaining about John's benefits and money.

So there isn't nothing left we can do other than if we want to start with paying him his benefit now, then we've got to jump through a whole other level of hoops.

And on top of that, now, we're paying him a lot more money for doing the same job that he's doing right now, so let's just keep it as is. Rock on, and then we'll work on the specifics for the next guy, you know, with the information that Bob got for Adam. And that's just my recommendation.

MR. KLAUSNER: Mr. Chairman, the reason I would tell you not to adopt a DC plan now -- you've adopted the concept already -- is whoever you hire or get down to, I have a feeling that's going to be part of ultimately your compensation discussion with that person.

So I wouldn't want the Board to restrict itself in terms of its ability to negotiate with a successor director.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I believe I heard a motion from Lieutenant Tuten.

Do I hear a second?

DR. HERBERT: Second.
THE COURT: Any further discussion or
questions?
All in favor say "Aye."
(Responses of "Aye.")
Opposed, same sign. It carries
unanimously.
MR. KEANE: Now, the effect of that
motion is to restart the plan, and my
contributions start flowing back into it;
correct?
CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes.
MR. KLAUSNER: Did your contributions
actually stop?
MR. KEANE: We're holding them in a
MR. KLAUSNER: Yes. You'd have to
tender those contributions.
CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That's what Larry
suggested because that looks like the least
MR. KLAUSNER: Yes.
MR. KEANE: So then just to be in the
right posture, the motion to terminate the plan
last month needs to be reversed then?
MR. KLAUSNER: Well, I thought all you
did was close the plan.

1 Did two things. Back in MR. KEANE: 2 the summer, when the Scheu report first came 3 out, they voted to close the plan to new 4 entrants. 5 MR. KLAUSNER: Correct. 6 MR. KEANE: Last month they voted to 7 close the plan completely. 8 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Like a hundred 9 percent is for me, and a little bit bigger would 10 be --11 MS. MANNING: You have that attachment 12 in your correspondence too. 13 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Can you blow it up 14 maybe like 85 or 90. Just type in 85. Just 15 close that. Hit that little "x" up there and 16 close that side bar. Just go in the box and 17 type in --18 MR. KLAUSNER: Is this from last month? 19 MR. KEANE: Yes. 20 MR. KLAUSNER: Okay. You had last 21 month talked about freezing accrual. And I 22 think the motion was to maintain the status quo, 23 which would have the effect of reversing that 24 prior action.

So, in essence, you're continuing the

25

1 accrual through the end of the tenure of the 2 current director. 3 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Until and unless 4 the parties --MR. KLAUSNER: Unless the parties 5 6 negotiate to the contrary. 7 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Something 8 different. 9 MR. KLAUSNER: Yes. 10 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So that would be a 11 new motion then. 12 MR. KLAUSNER: No, I think Lieutenant 13 Tuten's motion contemplated reversing that prior 14 action. 15 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Leave everything as 16 it is. 17 MR. KLAUSNER: You decided to leave the 18 Senior Staff Plan in an open status -- not open 19 but in a continuing status rather than a terminated status. 20 21 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And no one else can 22 be added to it. 23 MR. KLAUSNER: No one can be added to 24 it unless you -- right. But you've made a 25 policy decision that you're just not going to do

1 that again. 2 MR. KEANE: Just to keep the paperwork 3 flowing, and the minutes should reflect that 4 Lieutenant Tuten made a motion to reconsider and 5 reverse the motion that was adopted last month. 6 MR. KLAUSNER: You had considered last 7 month to simply freeze accruals, so that must be 8 what you voted on. 9 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes, just to keep 10 all the options open. 11 MR. KLAUSNER: Yes, no further service 12 credit -- yes, that is the effect of Lieutenant Tuten's motion. 13 14 MR. KEANE: So for the minutes, the 15 motion is to reconsider 2014-10-11 as adopted at 16 the October meeting. With the adoption of his 17 motion to reconsider, this goes away, and we're 18 back to where we were. Correct? 19 MR. KLAUSNER: Correct. 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So I have a motion. 21 Do we have a second? 22 DR. HERBERT: Yes, I second. 23 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Anymore questions 24 or discussion? 25 All in favor, say "Aye."

1 (Responses of "Aye.") 2 Opposed, same sign. Carries 3 unanimously. MR. KEANE: All right, sir. That would 4 5 then close the rest of the items on the 6 Personnel Committee to be shifted into --7 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: John, I sense it 8 will be timely for a five-minute break. So five 9 minutes, and then we'll resume. 10 (A short recess was taken.) 11 MR. KEANE: We're waiting for the 12 personnel report, Mr. Chairman. 13 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We'll ask 14 Dr. Herbert to talk about the process, the next 15 step in the process to begin the recruitment for 16 John's successor. 17 Members of the Board, one DR. HERBERT: 18 of the things that I think all of us would agree 19 on is that perhaps the most important 20 responsibility that we have is to focus on a 21 leadership team, and within that context, also 22 dealing with a succession plan. 23 Again, I can't think of anything that 24 is as significant as that because it has so many 25 implications for us as we attempt to ensure the

performance of our fiduciary responsibilities on behalf of our members.

So I had a meeting, along with Counsel, to go over the position description for the Executive Director and to take a look at some of the things that are essential as we deal with the recruitment ultimately for his successor.

You have before you 2414-08-1(b), a proposed announcement that we would distribute. You'll note in red a few things that we've added that we think are of particular importance. But I think that what this does is it lays the foundation for what would hopefully be a successful effort to identify a strong successor.

One of the things that I think we're all sensitive to is that John has been essentially doing the work of two people. And we just -- it's not fair to him to continue doing that.

Before hiring a deputy, I think it's important for us to deal with the director position because the skill sets that this person has would then dictate the kind of background that we would want to see in a number two

1 person.

I'd like to present this to the Board as a list of the essential elements for the position and how we would advertise it.

As I indicated a few moments ago, I did ask Counsel to help us with identifying compensation issues. He did mention the salary range, at least initially, so that we have some sense of what we might be looking at.

And so let me just present this to the Board now and see if you're comfortable with this as the basic framework from an HR perspective.

What we did talk about is not going forward and hiring a firm but to utilize the city as the basic recruiter for it. And there are some other people that I think John knows and the council knows around the country.

We would want to do our own outreach efforts in addition to what the city would do. But all of the applications would come back to the city. They would review them and then bring them back to us so that we could make a decision about the total number of people that we would want to interview.

If you like this, we can proceed as quickly as you deem appropriate. It takes a little time to get all of this put together and to get it out. But I think that if we were to start -- if you authorize us to go forward, we can work with the HR folks in the city and begin doing all the paperwork so that we can have this ready, all set to go next month.

MR. TUTEN: Yeah, I think it's a good idea. I mean, there's nothing wrong with having everything lined up, I mean, just in case we may need it.

I do have a question, not just for John's position but the position of deputy director assistant. Any good management -- transition management has to be in place. We don't have anything anywhere.

We don't have a number two. And I noticed in discussions with counsel in other places that most major organizations have a solid number two guy in case something happens to number one. It's just the way they do things.

Do we have anything on that front as far as people applying or how many we've

1 | interviewed or recommendations or --

DR. HERBERT: Well, we started off -unfortunately, we only had two people who were
potential candidates. And then as we were
talking about this, you know, the question is do
you hire someone as a permanent deputy without
that person and we knowing who the director
designate is going to be because, again, the
reality is that this person coming in will have
a set of skills.

And the question is, from a supplemental perspective, who would be a good number two to complement the skills that this person brings to the table. So that's the rationale.

Now, we have the other issue that we discussed, and that is that council did not want us to go forward, as I recall, or raised an issue about funding that would allow us to hire a number two person. So that also was in there.

And I think John was going to be having some conversations with the city about that.

And I forgot all the details on that,

Mr. Chairman.

But, John, you may want to comment on

it as well. But given all of the uncertainty about that, and it seems to me that the key is for us to go ahead and go forward.

What we know is at such time as we identify someone, we have the possibility of John being there to help with that transition process, and then we could immediately begin -- there are two possibilities.

One is if city council and we agree that it's okay to hire someone on an interim basis or do something else to help John, and I think we talked about it previously, our feeling was that he definitely does need some help.

Whether that's a number two person remains to be seen. But there's a lot of stuff that we need to do as part of the transition process.

MR. TUTEN: I'm for agreeing that we need to go ahead with the Executive Director.

I'm just more concerned about right now because

I've actually got a director.

Let me ask John a question. Out of the major entities of Jacksonville, does the Port Authority, and et cetera, how are they structured?

Do they just only have a deputy
director, or do they have an assistant deputy
director?

MR. KEANE: Number two and sometimes

number three.

MR. TUTEN: Now, do they need approval from the city council to hire who they want, or are they independent agencies like we are?

MR. KEANE: They're independent, but they have the budget. That's the problem that we're facing here is that council took the money out of the budget for the position.

MR. TUTEN: Now, has the council ever done that to other agencies before, taken the money out of the budget for assistant directors, or are we the first one?

MR. KEANE: The general counsel has told them that you can reduce the overall appropriation for salaries and benefits, but you can't go in and say we're going to eliminate the chief of engineer or the chief of environmental affairs and things like that. And that was the general counsel's advice to the city council again this year.

MR. TUTEN: Well, it seems that

we've -- you know, rightly or wrongly, we won't
get into that. But we've been under criticism
before of not being managed well, you know,
which I personally think is not true.

But, hey, like I said, well, part of being managed well is to have people in place that can actually do managing. We have one person -- Chuck and the rest of the people here do a great job. We have one person, and that's John.

That's it. Now, Kevin does his thing, but he's more of the financial side. We have no one else. But, yet, at the same time we're being hamstrung and told you're not aloud to have money to hire someone that can help you become more efficient and, quote, "profitable," even though we're a public -- I don't understand the logic.

You can't have what's expected of us without providing us the tools to get that, and that's why we need to focus. And we need some clarity from the council or from whomever to say, look, we -- because we don't know if we can -- we might be able to find an executive director one day.

He might be the number two guy, and he's been here for three years. We just promote him, done -- transition management over with.

But we're not going to find a number one guy if they come here knowing that we can't even figure out how to find a number two guy.

Trust me. Word spreads in the pension world. And if they think that Jacksonville is at the whim, every time they want to do something, of the city council or whomever, then professional people, which both of you are -- not myself, I'm just a fireman -- you know that you're not going to go somewhere, transplant, and move and come here when it's so short.

You know, it just doesn't happen in the professional, quote, "real world," as we like to call it. It just doesn't work that way. So we need to get a few things straight. But to get back to the original thing, yeah, I'm all for this. We need to move forward in getting this going.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'll just give a little context and sort of my point of view too based on what you all were saying.

John's employment contract was done before Adam and I came on the Board. So I've read it, and I know what it says. And it's long term. It runs out in '16?

MR. KEANE: '17.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: '17. So it was a very long-term contract. Everything was laid out year by year by year paid. Everything was locked into contract, so that's it.

We've had appropriate conversations
here in recent months about some health issues
John has. And he's addressing them and dealing
with them, but that's a fact.

And the director's expressed the thought that he would like to retire, but he would like to wait until comprehensive pension reform that's fair to everybody, all the parties, is enacted. And all these things can change, but that's where we are today.

And ideas continue to come forward.

This week there was another set of ideas put

forth by some local citizens that looked pretty

interesting to me.

And who knows if it can attract a majority of support from the council and so

forth. But a lot of smart people are working very hard to find comprehensive pension reform that hopefully everyone can agree with.

So, yeah, it could happen next month or January, in which case he's ready to go. And so I think the work to identify people that would be attracted to our city and this job -- and I agree with you -- so that were it to happen sooner rather than later, we've got a pool of capable, qualified people who already have the new, defined -- who will work out the defined contribution and all that stuff too, and the salary to be competitive but not more, not less.

So I want to go forward. The decision about the budget and the number two versus the number one, -- while John is still here pursuant to his contract, is one we'll face when we get there. But I think we need the option available because if this thing, if it moves, it will move quickly. And we're not doing our job if we don't have a plan, you know, set up in place to --

MR. TUTEN: Well, and I think, too, a point that's lost on some council members --

and, believe me, you know, it's only a few people that seem to be wanting to make life difficult at every turn at this point.

The next director is not going to make the amount of money John makes. So, more than likely, we can probably squeeze two employees into one paycheck.

Now, it's probably not going to be that cheap to be real, but the point is, you know, we can find qualified people. But, like I say, getting back to the employees, it's not the money or the pension plan that's going to scare people away. It's going to be the unsurety of the situation because every day the Pension Board -- its director, its members -- are in the paper as being fill in the blank.

And any executive that's used to a certain standard in his business world is not going to expose himself to that sort of scrutiny for either a paycheck or a benefit package that is just average or lower.

It's just not going to happen. It just doesn't happen. So we have to decide what do we expect, not only of the person but the entire package, and maybe sort of reduce some of the

clutter that's out there. Because we're never as a Board, as we've probably hopefully learned by now -- we're never going to make everybody happy.

There's always going to be somebody mad. And the truth is if we do what's right -if we do what's right by our members, which is our job as trustees -- that's job number one, as Mr. Klausner can attest to, and we do what's legal regardless of what people blame us -- we do nothing illegal. They may not like it, but I've always -- do what's legal and what's right, and then you can go from there.

But right now we're going to constrain to the point of, look, love John to death, but he's been here for a long time. And we keep playing this game of tap dance.

What would happen if something were to happen to John? We're going to come back and have a meeting and say congratulations, Dan, would you like to be the director?

How about Larry? You're a CP, aren't you? You can handle it.

CHIEF SCHMITT: I've got a job.

MR. TUTEN: Well, guys, that's where

we're at. We need to get going, not only on number one but on number two as well.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And so get going now -- we'll identify candidates and their views -- the decision of role, position, when, we'll face that once we have some candidates that look viable, I think.

But the main thing is to get the process started to see what's out there and what it's going to take to have one when we need them. And then these other issues will have to be resolved, just as you're saying. But that can come as well, so we're looking for what's out there.

DR. HERBERT: The availability of a number two position, for example, is extremely important. And whoever it is may have some other thoughts about how all this is structured, so we've got to have the availability to assure that they can fulfill their responsibilities.

You know, John -- we had the benefit, in John's case, of his having all the institutional memory and many couple of decades of experience in all this.

So I'm convinced that we can find some

folks who have extensive experience in the field. But I think you're right that the conditions have to be right, and we have to make sure that we can address those matters.

So what I'd like to do is, if the board is in agreement, to go ahead and work with the city's HR folks to get all this finalized so that we can get it out.

MR. KEANE: Our plan is to make a comprehensive package, telling the story about Jacksonville, the amenities we offer as a city to a perspective employee, about the job, about the fund, and have just a comprehensive solicitation booklet put together.

That's what we've been talking with Dr. Herbert about and working on that. The Scheu Commission recommended that we use a nationwide search firm. Those folks charge six months' salary.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We're going to try the efficient, low-cost method through the city first.

MR. KEANE: And one of the efficient low-cost methods is working through our national organizations and these other things.

I received a telephone call last Friday asking me to apply for a vacant Executive Director's position at a larger police and fire pension fund. And I thanked them for calling me and asked them, please, remove my number from your file. I'm trying to get out, not get further in.

And this is the way it works a lot of times. We could latch-key into finding someone.

DR. HERBERT: And there are some good potential candidates out there. John and I -- we've have talked about it.

So I think that once we get the booklet put together and start making those outreach calls that we'll get some good people.

MR. TUTEN: Well, I hope so. And I think, what's John's reference to his story is -- I've been at it twelve years, and I've been to a few conferences and talked to a few people.

And I think what we're going to find out -- I think we've sort of found out is, with the number two search, when you said I think six people applied, there's a fine line we walk between finding the guy we want qualified and

1 then what we offered them to come here.
2 And I think we are a little hamstrung

as far as being a pension fund. We're not a corporation. We can't offer you stocks here to enhance the benefit package.

So I think what you're doing -- we really need to focus on what we're looking for to attract -- because I think it's going to be harder than we think to not only find a number two guy but to find a director.

Now, we can fill the Chair. That's not going to be a problem, but we want somebody that knows what they're going.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Absolutely. And, Rich, when you say a "guy," you mean a metaphorical guy?

MR. KLAUSNER: Meaning it could be that gender is not a requirement.

MR. TUTEN: Of course. Come on, people.

MR. KLAUSNER: We're teasing.

MR. TUTEN: I don't care. I know what you meant.

MR. KEANE: We'll take a vote on approving the job spec.

1	DR. HERBERT: Is everyone comfortable
2	with this as the basis for our booklet that
3	we're going to be sending out?
4	MR. TUTEN: Yes. I looked at it
5	earlier.
6	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So there's a
7	motion. Did I hear a second?
8	DR. HERBERT: I moved it.
9	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: All in favor say
10	"Aye."
11	(Responses of "Aye.")
12	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Opposed, like sign.
13	Carries unanimously.
14	DR. HERBERT: We'll proceed now to get
15	all this put to get the brochure together,
16	and we'll get it out quickly.
17	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Before we leave
18	legal, and I know we want to have our
19	independent accountants, our outside auditors
20	have a chance to speak with the Board and the
21	Board with them good governance practice.
22	On the subject generally of audits, John,
23	would this be timely to bring up the subject of
24	getting an independent review, working with the
25	Board of the possibility, per the council

auditor's report earlier this year, that our administration of a certain DROP applications is not precisely consistent with the law, and there might be a pay period off or not with the suggestion in the audit?

And, you know, of course, we've invited Kirk Sherman to be with us many times. And, hopefully, at some point he'll be able to make time to come meet with the Board directly on that.

Hopefully, he'll come and actually work with us directly at some point. But I was thinking about -- you know, we have an approach to get that confirmation for the benefit of our members that we're doing it perfectly correctly, or if there's been an error, to have it in the future.

But I think the idea perhaps also having our independent accountants aware of what's going on and also invite the council auditors -- we always do Kirk Sherman -- to be fully involved with it, to be timely.

So it's a long rambling way to say I'd like to go to that item next on the agenda, then our accountants and independent accountants.

And then they can move on because I think we all have stuff to do.

MR. KLAUSNER: At the Chair's request,
I sought out an accounting firm that has
experience in public pension accounting, which
would mean review of benefit calculations as
part of their regular testing.

Goldstein, Schechter, Koch, which is headquartered in Coral Gables, they're a regional firm. They do 40 or 50 public pension funds for audits.

You also wanted an independent legal -I actually have never offered an opinion on this
question. But the idea was to get someone who
has no connection with the fund. So I spoke
with Lee Dehner of the firm of Christianson &
Dehner. They're a small firm in Sarasota that
specializes in public pension work.

Also, they've never done work for the city. They've never done work for us. And of all the lawyers in Florida, who do work on public pensions, they're the only ones who have not worked for the city, aren't suing the city, or have worked for us.

So I spoke with them. Without telling

- 1 them anybody's view, I said my recommended 2 protocol would be you speak to the council 3 auditor and the General Counsel's Office, get 4 their point of view. Speak to our staff over 5 here and see -- go through the calculations that were at issue and some others, as were just 6 7 chosen randomly, and then review the code, the 8 ordinance code, and then render an opinion to 9 us. 10 And I said I don't care what the answer 11 is. I just want the answer. 12
 - CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And quickly.
- 13 MR. KLAUSNER: And quickly.

16

17

18

19

20

- 14 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And have them work 15 directly with the Board.
 - MR. KLAUSNER: Yes. They will report directly to the Chairman, and they will come to a Board meeting or issue a written report, whatever you want.
 - CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes.
- 21 MR. KLAUSNER: They do charge more than 22 I do. But I didn't think you wanted -- it's 23 about eight hours worth of work. I wouldn't 24 haggle --
- 25 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: People that know

the subject, that don't have a conflict with us or the city or Florida, should be able to look at it pretty quickly, compare our practice to the law first and then do the mathematics versus the law and --

MR. KLAUSNER: After explaining -- oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And then you missed this. This was off or not, or everything was perfect or it's way off, or whatever the heck it is, but do it quickly. They should be able to do it quickly.

And by quick, participate, and everyone else, just like you're saying, and then put it to bed, once and for all, for our members' comfort and benefit. There's not going to be some -- there hasn't been some -- it's one pay period, I think, at most. But even that, if there is something, it will be corrected, obviously.

MR. KLAUSNER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: But the members aren't thinking there's something really big going on or a big problem that could affect people. There's not. There could be an error

involving a pay period possibly. And if there is, we'll correct it. And if there's not, we'll know it and have it documented but to do it quickly and put it to bed.

MR. KLAUSNER: I express the importance of expeditious action. They told me at most, given the people that they have to talk to, it's a day's work, so about eight hours of billing which should cost you three-thousand something.

The auditor -- I also suggested the same thing -- speak to the council auditor so that auditors can find out. They can review the code for themselves from an accounting standpoint.

I said that the lawyer will be available to talk to them because I'm going to stay out of this process and that also to talk to our staff.

Within accounting, you sample, based on population or some significance of numbers, and I said you'll check the ones that have been most discussed, plus a representative sample chosen randomly. And do the same thing, and it's got to be quick.

Their hourly rates are comparable too.

So I think that will -- if you'll leave it to me to just shepherd the professionals to get it going and make the contacts. But as I've said, I've not given them my view of the code or the issue.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: But they are experts on Florida public --

MR. KLAUSNER: Yes. I've worked with Christianson & Dehner many times. We've hired them when we had conflicts. We've worked with them when they had conflicts. And they're the only ones who have not done work for either us or the city. I wanted someone who had no proverbial dog in this race.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: It will all be in the Sunshine and quick.

MR. KLAUSNER: Yes. And I told them your report, once you do it, it's public record, and it's going to be delivered in a public forum.

And I said I don't want to know what their conclusions are until they write to the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Thoughts or comments on that? We just need to get him over

1 here and meet with the Board and so forth early 2 in the year. So it needs to be put to bed 3 because, you know, members worry about these 4 things until its clear what's going on. 5 And if there's something here, it's not a lot. But if there's something here, it will 6 7 be corrected. But we just need to get it all 8 out and have experts validate it or not. CHIEF SCHMITT: I think it's an 9 10 excellent idea. Get somebody not involved in 11 it, just state an objective view. 12 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And knows the 13 subject. 14 CHIEF SCHMITT: Right. 15 MR. KLAUSNER: I think a motion would 16 be in order to authorize that. 17 CHIEF SCHMITT: I'll make a motion. 18 DR. HERBERT: Second. 19 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Any further 20 discussion or questions? 21 All in favor say "Aye." 22 (Responses of "Aye.") 23 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Opposed, like sign. 24 Carries unanimously. 25 The words met the motion, MR. KEANE:

and the effect of the motion is authorize the General Counsel to retain a special counsel and an independent auditor to review the findings of the council auditor on those issues and make a written report to the Board in an expeditious manner.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: The December meeting fully involving as much as they're willing and able -- the council auditor, the city General Counsel, and the parties are interested and knowledgeable every step of the way.

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. We've got that -- got the sense of the motion. We've got it.

And now we're to the auditors.

MS. MENDILLO: Good morning. I'm Linda Mendillo of KBLD.

MS. BALASKIEWICZ: And Kim Balaskiewicz with KBLD.

We've met at a couple of the last meetings. I think Linda and I were both here. So Linda Defresne is the "LD" of the KBLD, and she was the partner in charge for the last two years.

I'm putting a fresh set of eyes on it this year. I've done the quality review the last couple of years. So this will be the first year that I'm the primary partner.

Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Have there been any issues or anything arisen that the Board should be alert to or can assist you with, or anything in your audit design and process?

I'm asking you the questions. I'm used to, in my private sector experience in business boards, where the board by good governance has the independent accountants come in and work with the board at the beginning and at the end of the audit, working with staff along the way, but there's that direct communication.

And, of course, here it's all in the Sunshine, which is fine and which is great, but if there's anything that comes up along the way of interest or concern, whatever, work directly with us, and we'll bring it to closure one way or the other, just like it would happen in the private sector in the business world, at the beginning and at the end of the audit engagement.

1 MS. BALASKIEWICZ: We will. And I 2 would just say, from my perspective, that you 3 guys as a board are very involved and go through very detailed agenda items, and that's a good 4 5 sign, from our perspective, that you guys know and are as actively involved in the day-to-day 6 7 management as well. 8 And we get great reports from Kevin and 9 a good amount of detail. You know, we're not 10 having to create it. Kevin is providing it, and 11 then we're able to audit it.

So from our perspective, things are looking -- you know, we'd rather not see the news articles. But, you know, from our perspective things are going well.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So we start field work next week.

MS. MENDILLO: I'm Linda.

MS. BALASKIEWICZ: We've gotten our preliminary information, so.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Any questions for the auditors of the Board members?

MR. KEANE: Mr. Chairman, as you know, all auditors work to get a report to the Board that then goes and interfaces with the city's independent auditor.

We have alerted the city treasurer, fund treasurer and the finance director, again yesterday, that there's an issue that may be material, that we need to have a meeting with them to resolve and that failure to meet in a timely manner could push our audit off some.

And we got a response back from Joey yesterday afternoon that we're going to try and meet as soon as possible.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And as we said always, there's always full communications every step of the way with the city council auditor, Mr. Sherman, and then the administration leaders, Ronnie and Joey, the CFO and treasurer. Every step of the way that coordination is just so valuable.

MR. KEANE: See you Monday.

MS. MENDILLO: Great, see you.

MS. BALASKIEWICZ: Thank you, guys.

MR. KEANE: Moving on down the agenda,

Mr. Chairman and Trustees, budget. Kevin --

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Actually -- I'm sorry. Before we leave legal, would legal be the place to talk about the attorney general opinion to put to rest, finally, the issue of

the budget we talked about earlier, or is there another place in the agenda?

MR. KEANE: No, sir. That would be the place to put it. I spoke with the council president's office yesterday and asked them have they reached a decision. And she called me back yesterday afternoon and said he's still thinking about it.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. So the issue is, for a long time, the general counsel for the city has an opinion about the council's budget authority over this Board.

The general counsel for this board has a different opinion about what Florida law provides in terms of budget authority -- budget control authority.

It persists and comes up every year, and the two general counsels, very qualified people, have dramatically different readings of the relevant agreements and loss.

And so we have this continuing conflict. And so I, for one, would like to try to bring it to closure one way or the other before the budget process starts in the spring.

And I'm advised that for Florida local

governments, when there is a difference of opinion among qualified counsel on an issue like this, you ask the attorney general for the state, and they say here's how to interpret that law, and then that's it.

And it's not a cost to do this. You don't have to pay them. And so my thought was, looking for a way to put it to bring it to closure, is to ask the attorney general to interpret the law for the benefit of us here in Jacksonville and to fully involve the city council leadership, the council president, as well as the council auditor, the city general counsel.

Hopefully, they'll all do it together, but I for one would like to stop having -- I've been through it twice now -- we send the budget over, and our colleagues and friends in the city council say we can decide what to do with this.

You say, "Respectfully, sir, and,
ma'am, no, you can't." And we're obliged to
provide it to you for information to report to
you. It's all in the open. But you can't go in
there and line-item it out. And then they say,
"Well, yes, we can."

1 And so I'd like to bring it -- to put 2 it to bed. And apparently the attorney general 3 for the state, that's part of what they do is, say, local law, this is -- this is how it works. 4 5 Right? 6 MR. KEANE: Correct. 7 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: All I can think of to stop this recurring annual conflict, which I 8 9 think I think would be a good thing --10 apparently past attorney generals have opined on 11 this question already, twice. 12 MR. KLAUSNER: Yes, twice. There are 13 two opinions -- oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. Ι 14 thought you were done.

I'm done. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS:

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KLAUSNER: There are two attorney general opinions specifically on the subject. One was, does the council have the authority -and this is specific to this plan.

The first opinion said, no. The second one says, could we contract a way -- even assuming that they had no control, could we make an agreement with them that we give them control.

And the attorney general said, no, only

the legislature could do that. I mean,

obviously the AG will look at the opinions

issued by her predecessor. Generally, they

don't change their mind unless the law has

changed, and nothing has changed.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: There's case law or something; right?

MR. KLAUSNER: Right. There's no case law -- the opinion has been cited in other attorney-general opinions, but there are no cases on it, and so I'll send her a letter, if that's the will of the Board, and ask her --

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Again, our colleagues in city hall would be there, upon a parallel path, all doing it together. You know, let the chips fall where they may but --

MR. TUTEN: Well, what's the timetable to do this? In other words, if we ask the council president to cosponsor, so to speak, a ruling, and ask if they don't get back to us within "X" amount of days, weeks, we go ahead and do it by ourselves because I don't want to wait around two months waiting.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We began asking a few months ago because, you know, we're getting

1 ready for the budget cycle, so this keeps coming 2 up. So we began asking our friend -- our 3 colleagues. 4 MR. TUTEN: So you need a motion --5 basically, let's just go ahead and send it off 6 to the state attorney regardless or --7 MR. KLAUSNER: Attorney general. 8 MR. TUTEN: Yes, attorney general. 9 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And then to have 10 full communications every step of the way, and 11 everybody knows what's going on and sees it. 12 MR. KEANE: And we understand this is 13 an irritant to the Board. But out of respect to 14 the council president, if we would just wait --15 and tell him, by December we want to get it 16 resolved so we can send it on so it will be 17 resolved by budget time. 18 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And the general 19 counsel for the city. 20 MR. KEANE: Exactly. 21 MR. KLAUSNER: I'm going to speak to 22 them today. As you know we have a cooperate 23 working relationship with them. We argue about

We have a 1:00 o'clock discussion about

some stuff, but we work together.

24

25

1 just some other items, and I'll add that to the 2 list. 3 MR. KEANE: We'll have a definitive resolution for the council president by the 4 5 December meeting. 6 So are you proposing CHIEF SCHMITT: that we wait until the December meeting to 7 8 decide whether we're going to go ahead and send 9 a letter to the attorney general? 10 MR. KEANE: No. You all have already 11 decided to do that. But the only question is, 12 is the city going to cosign the letter, whether 13 it's a joint letter or we're going on. 14 And out of respect to council 15 president, since he said yesterday he's still 16 thinking about it, I'd urge you not to go 17 forward until we give him a chance to finish his 18 thought process. But we will have it revolved 19 by the December meeting.

I'll talk to him again and say, "The Board wants to get this resolved prior to the next budget round."

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So let's start building, you know, the next fiscal year's budget January and February. The process will

1 | start up again. You know how it is.

CHIEF SCHMITT: I would like to set a date that we're going to send this letter.

MR. KEANE: Make a motion to send a letter at the December meeting. I can then tell the council president. You all pick the date.

MR. KLAUSNER: 18th?

MR. KEANE: Yeah, we're going to go forward on that date. Does that sound all right? We don't need a motion. I can tell him that when I speak with him. We've got the sense of the Board.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: All right.

MR. KEANE: Kevin, budget review.

MR. STORK: This is the Police and Fire Pension Fund past budget. It doesn't include the council's changes. But as you can see, I put the note we're under budget mainly due to the -- not hiring the deputy executive director that was in our budget.

So that's the variances. We performed better than anticipated in the -- with our money managers. The cost wasn't much over what I had anticipated, mainly because, in my model, I kept some higher costs.

The money, when we did the repayment, I had those allocated a little bit different than what actually happened. So my budget was based on having more money with higher managers. So that's why the difference didn't show up as being we're over budget at this time.

Of course, when we get the advanced money in December, depending on how it's allocated, that can change. But I just thought that was a little bit nuance that we're so much over -- our investment balance was quite a bit higher, but our money managers -- I'm just explaining that. But everything else is, you know, one month.

MR. TUTEN: Too early to tell.

MR. STORK: That's right. It's too early to tell too much. Don't read a whole lot into it yet.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Any comments on the budget report?

MR. KEANE: Next item is a copy of the news release that they issued that you all just discussed on hiring an outside independent attorney and auditor to look into it. A copy of the news release was issued October 22nd and

1	sent to all members of the city council. And
2	that is ongoing, and we show that received as
3	information.
4	The next item that we have is a
5	memorandum from Dan Holmes on some minor changes
6	to the Baillie Gifford agreement, which has
7	already been approved by the city, and we
8	recommend approval.
9	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Do you need a
10	motion on that?
11	MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.
12	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Could I get a
13	motion?
14	DR. HERBERT: Move.
15	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Can I get a second?
16	CHIEF SCHMITT: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Questions or
18	comments?
19	All in favor, say "Aye."
20	(Responses of "Aye.")
21	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Opposed, like sign.
22	Carries unanimously.
23	MR. KEANE: Okay. Moving on, we're now
24	ready to take up the investment report. We have
25	the Summit Flash Report first, Dan Holmes.

MR. HOLMES: If it pleases the Board, I'd like -- I think things will make more sense if we do the quarterly report first briefly and then add it with the Flash Report if that's okay.

And I'll skip the Capital Market Review in the middle. And so with that said, let me direct your attention to the blue book which shows performance for the quarter.

The economic background for the quarter was one of increased volatility. And so what was going on in the background was kind of a conflict between a number of different things.

First, you had investors anticipating the end of quantitative easing by the Fed at the end of October. In addition to that, you had concerns about geopolitical conflicts. I think there's a few of those going on in the world today.

In addition to that, you had oil prices and other energy -- changes in energy prices.

The bottom line is, September and then into October, you had a lot of volatility in the market.

During the quarter, that took place,

and most risk assets were negative as a result of that. And so on page 2 of the book, you see -- you can see that small cap stocks were off the worst. They were down 8.6 percent for the quarter.

Conversely, real estate was the best performing asset class, up a little over 3 percent. You can kind of see where the various indices kind of wind up between them. So it was very much a quarter of volatility.

Unfortunately, that's the end of the quarter that makes up your fiscal year. But at the same time, strong performance in an earlier part of the year and the latter half of last year has helped keep the total fund performance above the actuarial assumed rate of return for the year.

So with that, let me direct your attention to page 10 of the report. Page 10 shows asset allocation at the end of September and also market value. So, for the record, at the end of September, the market value of the total portfolio was \$1.5 billion, rounded.

Asset allocation shows that you were within policy. U.S. equities were overweight at

the end of the quarter. We continue to be underweighted to real estate. And going forward, hopefully, we'll close that gap.

In terms of -- if you turn over to page -- just flip down the page briefly. Page 11 is showing how your assets are allocated relative to the peer universe, the universe of other public pension plans.

You see that you're a little bit under median in terms of allocation. In terms of domestic equities, over median -- actually, top quartile in terms of being more invested in international equities.

Unfortunately, that was a drag on relative performance for the quarter. And then over on the right-hand side, it says alternative investments.

The alternative investments they've listed here are simply MLPs. You do not have any private equity. You don't have any hedge funds. That's the bucket that that would normally fall in. And some public funds do have that. So that gives you an idea about how you're allocated relative to the peer universe.

Now, if you flip over one more page, to

page 12, you are shown performance not only for the quarter but for also the calendar year to date and the trailing one-year period. And that trailing one-year period is your fiscal year return.

So for the quarter, the portfolio was down 1.3 percent, called 1.4 percent for the aforementioned reasons: Over allocation relative to peers in international equities; over allocation relative to the benchmark in domestic equities; and, basically, risk assets basically trading off across the spectrum.

However, if you look at the return for the fiscal year, fiscal year performance was 11.6 percent. In addition to that, the fund performed in the twentieth percentile.

And again for reference, first percentile is the best. One-hundredth is the worst. So you ranked in the top quartile in the fiscal year in terms of performance.

If you look over to the right-hand side, you can see performance for the last three calendar years. So calendar year '11, you were in the thirty-ninth percentile; calendar year 2012, you were in the thirty-fourth percentile;

calendar year 2013, you were in the twenty-first percentile.

So far this calendar year, you're in the twenty-fourth percentile, and the plan is up 5.2 percent.

Then if you look at the trailing one-, three-, five-, seven- and ten-your time periods, those are all of as the end of September. And in looking at those returns, you can see that over the last five years, the plan has compounded at about 11 percent, approximately 11 percent.

And over the last ten years, that's 7.3 percent. And in all those cases, performance is above median. And in most time periods, it's top quartile.

So pretty good performance on an absolute basis and also on a relative basis.

I will note for the quarter, because of the volatility, the plan underperformed the policy index. That was due primarily to manager underperformance, and I'm going to get into that in a second.

If I -- I will ask you to flip over to page -- page 14. In the past you have asked how

has the plan performed relative to all institutional managers or institutional-type funds rather than just public funds. And that's what page 14 shows.

It's compared against the entire master trust universe. And in looking at that for the fiscal year, again the return doesn't change, but the peer ranking stays in the top quartile, the twenty-third percentile.

So the significance of that is, is that during this time period other institutional funds, like endowments and foundations, corporate pension plans, health care systems, et cetera, you can see that the plan's return continues to rank in the top quartile despite being a public plan versus any of the other types of plans.

And that actually holds true over the various trailing time periods. And the reason for that, over the long time period, has basically been the heavy allocation to equities. In other words, the performance over the last five years has paid off.

I will direct your attention to page 16 now. Page 16, on the top left-hand side, shows

the systems return versus the benchmark and the peer universe over rolling three-year time periods.

And the takeaway here is essentially that coming off the bottom of the market decline from 2008. In other words, if you look at the periods -- it's kind of at the bottom -- where it's shown as 12 of -- December of 2011, that's the trailing three years that incorporate 2009, '10 and '11.

That three-year period -- each dot is a three-year period. You're coming off the bottom. And so you can see that performance in the draw-down was right above -- was right above the median of the peer sample.

It trended down during the draw-down of 2007 and 2008. And then the performance has increased and recovered since then and actually moved up to the top quartile which -- it's the first time since -- well, we inherited the performance that we got when we were hired. It wasn't on the top quartile back then. So the recovery has been very good to the system.

Looking at risk return below that, on the bottom left-hand side, that recovery has

come with a price. And that price has been relative to the peer sample.

The system continues to have higher volatility, and that goes hand in hand with having the higher equity allocation. But I'll also caution you. The statute is fairly restrictive in what you can and can't invest in.

The system basically has had no choice, given its actuarial assumed rate of return and the low investment return -- I'm sorry, the low interest rate environment from bonds.

You basically have not had much of a choice rather than allocate towards the higher volatility asset classes in order to achieve that type of return. But, on the other hand, you anticipated in the recovery.

If you look at page 17, on the lefthand side it shows the ranking for standard
deviation. The takeaway here is, is that over
the last one-, three- and five-year periods, the
volatility of the portfolio has been top
quartile. In other words, it's had more
volatility in the sample than most peers.

Now, if you look next to that, the sharper ratio, the Sharpe ratio, the Sharpe

ratio is a risk-adjusted measure of absolute return.

In looking at that, you can see that the Sharpe ratio remains positive and above median for the last one, three, and five years. So that's a way of saying, on a risk-adjusted basis, you have been paid for taking that extra volatility in the portfolio.

And then the information ratio is a risk-adjusted measure of performance versus the policy index. And you can see that you rank in the top quartile, the top decile, based on your ability to outperform the policy index.

So the bottom line is we still would love to have greater diversification in the portfolio if we had the ability to invest in other asset classes. But given that the equities have paid off, a couple of areas that the fund has diversified into have helped out, particularly the MLPs.

Let me direct your attention and go back to the score card report. We can go through and summarize management performance more quickly here. And that would start on page 4.

Going back to page 4, you can see the line for the U.S. Equity Composite. You can see that for the quarter, it underperformed the benchmark by about one and a half percent, and for the fiscal year, by 3.9 percent, fairly big margin.

The big reason for the underperformance over the fiscal -- well, actually, over both those time periods, has been GAMCO, Gabelli Asset Management, and Brown. The greater magnitude has been Brown, and I will report on that here shortly.

In the international portfolio, international equities, over the course of the fiscal year, returned less than U.S. equities, but your performance was above median and above the benchmark.

All of the active managers in the portfolio are doing well.

Looking at the fixed income composite next, you can see that it underperformed the benchmark and was below median for both the quarter and for the fiscal year.

The big reason there was, first of all, on a sector basis, the TIPS exposure in the

portfolio was a drag, a relative drag on performance. Fortunately, it didn't make up too big of an allocation there, but it still was the lowest returning part of the bond portfolio.

But on a relative basis, Eaton Vance was a drag on the portfolio as well. And I've got a report on them as well here shortly.

Real estate was additive to performance during the fiscal year. It was up over 12 percent. It ranked about median in the open end fund peer sample, and both managers have done fine.

The new manager, Principal, did a little better over the quarter and the near term, the fiscal year. They also had daily liquidity. So I'm glad that they're in the portfolio.

Again, we need to -- as a group, we need to circle back and look at asset -- not only review asset allocation but to continue to look for more ways to get exposure in real estate.

And, finally, the best returning asset class for the quarter -- I'm sorry, strike that -- for the fiscal year was MLPs. MLPs for

your fiscal year added 36 and a half percent in terms of return. The active managers in the portfolio ranked above median.

So the key in the MLP space has been having active management. It's fairly inefficient. The benchmark is not overly well constructed. One can simply outperform the benchmark by not holding anything in the coal MLP sector.

But not only that, but both managers have done a good job of finding good performing managers in that space, or I should say MLPs in that space. So they outperformed the benchmark by almost 7 percent.

MR. TUTEN: Why is the index so inefficient?

MR. HOLMES: It simply is a reflection. The universe of MLPs is not a giant universe. It's not like the S&P 500 where you've got 500 stocks in the index. It's a smaller universe. It's growing though.

There's more MLPs, energy companies, that are being converted to the MLP space, if you will. But the bottom line is, some of the sectors are fairly concentrated, and the

managers have done a fairly good job of finding good MLPs within that space.

And so they're looking at the companies that are CapX. Tortoise, for example, tends to be more conservative and emphasize income from their MLPs. So as a result, they tend to be overweight to long-haul oil and gas pipelines. And so it's just basically a convention of how they select stocks in that space.

MR. TUTEN: Got you.

MR. HOLMES: Okay. I mentioned underperforming managers. Brown and GAMCO have underperformed.

Looking at Brown, first, Brown's -first of all, performance, they've not been in
the portfolio for all that long. Brown's been
in place for, really, since November of last
year.

So in this report they don't have a full year of performance. Despite that, since inception they're under the benchmark by 7 percent -- pretty big magnitude.

First of all, nothing's changed within their firm in terms of team change or nothing in terms of portfolio construction change.

Basically what the issue has been is that performance, really over the last twelve months, has been a big rotation away from growth stocks into more defensive sectors which emphasized more the value style.

Investors moved here heavily starting the beginning of the year for fear over the end of quantitative easing. And so you've got a situation now where the market has really rotated away where Brown is, which is kind of midcap bias and heavy growth bias.

The market has rotated more towards very large cap and value bias. The defensive sectors really have been bid up in anticipation of the market falling after quantitative easing, and they really have not differentiated between high-quality and low-quality stocks.

What Brown believes is that when investors start to differentiate again, in other words, where the market just doesn't all go up, they will realize that the -- higher growth stocks.

And so, for instance, they're buying higher growth stocks with at least 14 percent earnings growth rate, stocks that they

believe -- where the companies can do that on a
sustainable basis.

Those stocks are selling at a fairly cheap price. Investors will, when they believe that the economy can stand on its own two feet, investors will rotate away from the defensive stocks, which are very expensive now, and start to look for stocks of companies that are growing more and are at very cheap prices.

And so their position -- their portfolio's position is to take advantage of that. We've seen them underperfom in the past. They continue to be a high-growth -- or a high tier manager for us.

We're not recommending firing them, but because of the magnitude of performance -- underperformance, I wanted to visit it in case there were any questions.

They've been in our office. Other members of our research staff have been in their office, and so my recommendation to the Board is to hold your nose and be patient.

MR. TUTEN: Dan, I know this is very subjective, so I'm not trying to pin you down. What's the average time that most pension funds,

1 | in your experience, get managers before they --

2 MR. HOLMES: Industry convention seems

3 to be -- you know, kind of general

4 practice seems to be they look at things over,

5 quote-unquote, a full market cycle.

Now, there's no -- the definition of a full market cycle is from peak to trough, but that can range over any kind of big- or short-time period.

As a result, performance tends to be looked at over one- to three- to five-year time periods. Sometimes even three years can be a long time period.

What I wanted to do is nip some concern in the bud a little bit early here. Generally, the practice that we follow is, if we believe that the manager cannot recover without either changing their process, taking excessive risk in order to catch back up to the portfolio or to the point where it's mathematically impossible for them to catch back up, or absent some sort of change in the firm or in the process, then we would recommend a change.

Here we understand the reason for the change. We think their explanation is rational.

1 And as a matter of fact, we've seen this same 2 situation with a majority of large cap growth 3 managers out there. 4 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Again, this is 5 excellent. The data is always first rate. do have a few other matters to attend to. 6 7 MR. HOLMES: Understood. 8 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I just want to 9 address one thing. I will not belabor my 10 colleagues with my talk about flexible, 11 efficient, low-cost index funds. You've heard 12 that from me. And I appreciate the movement 13 we've made to index in the two years. It's been 14 fantastic. 15 But the one you mentioned first, that's 16 been with us over three years, the equity 17 manager, at the next meeting -- it looks like to me they've got to go. Not the first one --18 19 MR. HOLMES: Oh, GAMCO? 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. And replace 21 them with an index fund because that's a big 22 liquid pool; right? 23 MR. HOLMES: Yes. 24 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Not for today but

by December I'd like to have a considered

25

discussion about replacing that one and then replace them with what? Because that's one that they've been with us for a bit, over three years.

And that's an asset class that seems to fit the index world. I'm just expressing my opinion. You all have heard me talk about this a lot; but I think that's ripe for consideration as early as the December meeting, a change there, and two decisions, whether to boot them out and then where to put the money or where to place it.

MR. TUTEN: Yes, I agree. And I think we also need to kind of before we -- you know, and that's kind of the reason I ask because three years can be precarious based on certain factors that happen in the economy throughout the world, et cetera.

And being off in that three-year period by 2 percent is not the end of the world if they're a defensive company. And that's kind of what I need to see is, okay, what's their overall strategy? Why have they done how they've done?

I mean, we've seen it many times where

the minute we fire somebody, or we're about to fire them, it seems like they pop up from the dead, and you're like, I'm glad we didn't do that.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So maybe by December, there might be time to --

MR. HOLMES: I'll get you a report for the December meeting. No problem.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Is there anything else that you want to be sure we talk about today?

MR. HOLMES: A quick update on the flash report, and that would be in your packet. So the blue book ends your fiscal year. The flash report starts your new fiscal year.

As I mentioned, we had risk assets trade off in the last quarter of your fiscal year. Conversely, we saw some recovery in the equity markets during the course of October.

Unfortunately, we also saw a fairly big reversal in MLP during the course of October as well. All I want to do is report, bottom line, is the first month of the fiscal year the plan was up 1.1 percent.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So prediction, when

1 you're back next month, the cold weather the 2 last week, those energy MLPs will be through the 3 roof, Buddy. They are making so much money with the polar vortex thing, it's unbelievable. 4 5 MR. HOLMES: Well, for the first time 6 in a while, we've seen natural gas prices start 7 to go up. 8 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Four-fifty, 9 remarkable. 10 MR. HOLMES: So, hopefully, they have 11 turned around. And so other than that, I don't 12 have anything significant to report, but I will 13 answer your question. 14 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: All right. 15 appreciate it. 16 MR. HOLMES: Okay. 17 MR. KEANE: One more item on that, 18 Mr. Chairman. 19 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: All right. 2014, 11.9 Northern Trust, 20 MR. KEANE: 21 security lending, schedule of borrowers, they 22 have changed a few people they recommenced, and 23 this takes a vote of the Board. 24 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Can I get a motion? 25 MR. TUTEN: Anything out of the

1 ordinary? 2 MR. KEANE: No, sir. It's just a 3 fresh-up cleanup. 4 I'll make a motion. MR. TUTEN: 5 I'll second. DR. HERBERT: 6 MR. HOLMES: The issue is they're 7 closing the pool, the investment pool that you 8 currently use for securities lending. They're 9 changing it to a different form of the pool but 10 with the same guidelines. And they're doing it 11 to comply with the Volcker rule under 12 Dodd-Frank. 13 So all they're doing is changing the 14 form of the pool. The guidelines stay the same. 15 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That lending 16 program of reversing our risk has been just a 17 sweet add-up on --18 MR. HOLMES: I would characterize it as 19 low risk as opposed to virtually no risk, but 20 it's an additive to income. 21 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Very good. That 22 was a very good addition. 23 So I have a motion and a second. 24 All in favor, say "Aye." 25 (Responses of "Aye.")

```
1
               CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Opposed, like sign.
 2
      It carries unanimously.
 3
               MR. KEANE: Okay.
 4
             (Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	
2	
3	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
4	
5	
6	
7	I, Cheryl L. Franzino, a Registered
8	Professional Reporter and Notary Public, in and
9	for the County of Duval, do hereby certify that
10	I was authorized to and did report the foregoing
11	proceedings, and that the transcript, pages 1
12	through 130, is a true and correct record of the
13	proceedings to the best of my ability.
14	Done and dated this 9th day of December,
15	2014, at Jacksonville, Duval County, Florida.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	Cheryl L. Franzino, RPR, FPR
22	Court Reporter
23	
24	
25	