JACKSONVILLE POLICE AND FIRE PENSION FUND BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

DATE: January 16, 2015

TIME: 9:00 to 10:58 a.m.

PLACE: Jacksonville Police and Fire Pension Fund

One West Adams Street

Suite 100

Jacksonville, Florida 32202

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

John Keane, Executive Director-Administrator Debbie Manning, Executive Assistant Paul Daragjati, Board Counsel Kevin Stork, Controller

GUESTS:

Linda Mendillo, Senior Auditor with KBLD, LLC

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

Denice C. Taylor, FPR
AAA Reporters
233 East Bay Street, Suite 912
Jacksonville, Florida 32202
904.354.4789

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	January 16, 2015 9:00 a.m.
3	
4	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I call the meeting to
5	order.
6	MR. KEANE: All rise, please. Join us in a
7	moment of silence for our following deceased
8	member, Rembert F. Arnold, retired firefighter,
9	who died since our last meeting.
10	(Pause)
11	MR. KEANE: Amen.
12	Please remain standing and join me as we
13	pledge allegiance to the flag of the United
14	States of America, and to the Republic for which
15	it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible,
16	with liberty and justice for all.
17	Thank you very much.
18	Mr. Chairman and Trustees, we have the
19	advisory the consent agenda. I'm sorry.
20	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: John, I have the public
21	speaking.
22	MR. KEANE: Oh, I'm sorry.
23	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I have one request.
24	Bill.
25	MR. KEANE: I didn't see Bill over there.

MR. GASSETT: In yesterday's meeting I offered John a proposition, if he would give me \$25, I wouldn't speak this morning. Seriously, though, thank you for letting me speak.

I attended the meeting yesterday held by the city legislature. And I've just got to tell you guys, from my perspective, the sword has been drawn and the blade has been sharpened.

But it was made apparent that our under-funded liability equals 10 percent of the whole state's unfunded liability.

The other problem I had with that whole meeting was as I listened to the comments and speech from the councilmen and stuff like that, I got the impression that they just don't get it. They don't understand what's going on.

We have a -- I know you have to look at the cooperation, but look at -- you know, the mayor's group is its own silo, the city council is its own silo, and you guys are your own silo. And, yes, you need to work together.

But by the same token I would like to suggest that don't be overly cooperative. And what I mean by that is I think the time has come that you need to take a more proactive stance in

preparing yourself to fight what could come down from the state legislature, because they were walking out of there breathing of fire.

Surprisingly, some of the folks on the state legislature penal were not unfriendly towards us, towards the citizens of Jacksonville. They were, I felt, a little bit discourteous toward

Mr. Keane, but that's, you know, my perspective.

Some of the speakers, as a matter of fact, were kind of understanding on behalf of the pension fund. But I would like to ask that you begin to give some thoughts to forming perhaps a subcommittee or two and say, okay, let's get ready to answer quickly and dramatically the questions that will be asked by these people.

I would also like you to consider disassociating yourself with my kind of thinking that please the city council, chart your own future from here, because that way at least you'll have control and steer what may be coming down the pike over the next several weeks and several months.

Thanks very much.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Public speaking period is closed.

John. 1 The next item on the agenda, 2 MR. KEANE: 3 Mr. Chairman and Trustees, is the consent agenda, 4 items 1 through 10. 5 MR. TUTEN: I make a motion we accept. 6 MR. SCHMITT: Second. 7 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: John, is there anything unusual or out of the ordinary in the consent 8 9 agenda? No, sir. This is one of our 10 MR. KEANE: longer consent agendas because we have all the 11 DROP information on there. That's why there's so 12 many pages. It's the people that are dropping as 13 well as the people that are making their 14 distribution elections. 15 16 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: On the new DROPs, John, 17 are you confident that the administrative details and such are consistent with a ordinance and 18 19 everything? 20 Yes, sir. We think that once we MR. KEANE: 21 can get something passed, we believe that there's 22 going to be quite a slow down in the rush for the 23 door. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And then the issue that 24 25 we're looking at separately about the exact day

1	or week to begin the process, these fit within
2	the letter of the ordinance and all that?
3	MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.
4	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: All right.
5	MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.
6	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Any questions?
7	MR. KEANE: Just while we're at that one
8	point there, do you want to address that
9	independent review a little bit later or you want
10	to talk about it right now?
11	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: No, let's wait.
12	MR. KEANE: Okay.
13	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Any other questions or
14	comments?
15	All in favor, say "aye."
16	(Responses of "aye.")
17	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Opposed, like sign.
18	(No response.)
19	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Carries unanimously.
20	MR. KEANE: Under Old Business, Mr. Chairman
21	and Trustees, I request that you deviate from the
22	agenda. We have our independent auditor here.
23	We could take up the draft of the audit.
24	Linda, do you want to move up to here? It's
25	item 2015-1-2.

MR. TUTEN: It's got the clip on it. 1 in the back. 2 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Kevin had emailed that 3 4 out to us in advance of the meeting. I've have a 5 chance to read it. Is it Linda? 6 7 MS. MENDILLO: Yes, sir. Linda Mendillo. 8 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Very good. I just wanted to be sure. 9 Questions, comments for the independent 10 accountant? 11 Rich. 12 MR. TUTEN: Yeah, I was just going to ask, 13 how long does it take to actually do this? 14 MS. MENDILLO: It depends. In all honesty, 15 if we have all the information, it doesn't take 16 17 very long. We -- Kevin is usually waiting on transfers from the city and for them to close 18 19 their books. That was a little delay this year, but it wasn't --20 21 MR. TUTEN: I'm not being -- I mean, more like a -- a month, two? How long -- once you get 22 23 all your information from us, how long does it 24 take your guys to do it? 25 MS. MENDILLO: I would say about a month to

six weeks. I mean, honestly, depends -- you
know, we have to do tests. We have to get
confirms back. Confirms back from certain people
takes longer. And that was -- we got one on
Friday.

MR. TUTEN: Right.

MR. STORK: We're running -- you know, we're

MR. STORK: We're running -- you know, we're running things all the time, and then they do confirmations, you know. But the length of time is delayed depending on what you're waiting for and -- and I made some -- trying to get some things early. I made some estimates on some things the city usually does, and I told the city, well, when you get your stuff in November -- they usually make those in November. So I did them in October so I could get the statements there.

But, you know, if it's far off, we'll see -MR. KEANE: Turn this way, Kevin, so the
court reporter can hear you.

MR. STORK: It's a thousand- or two-thousand dollars, you know, difference. That's not material, so we move on with the estimate there.

MR. TUTEN: That's fine. I was just -- well, and the reason I ask was because some of

the things we do or in the process of doing, you know, relies on the city for them to get stuff done, and I'm just kind of up here, you know, trying to put things together.

MR. STORK: Well, this year I did estimates rather than waiting on the city for their things. Next year we'll have the GASB 68 where they have to do -- look at pension liability next year.

But we also get part of that because we have five individuals that run through the city pension. And so we'll be part of that.

So I'm real concerned about next year, how to do that. And, you know, I've already talked to them about doing an estimate. They're kind of balking a little bit of me doing an estimate.

So this way I said, well, I can't wait until December to get your finalized numbers, if you get them then. I talked to the city yesterday about how they were doing on their GASB 67 for the general employees, and they haven't gotten them from the actuary yet.

Yet we're done now, and we have to, you know, submit by January, but yet they haven't even got their parts. So if they don't get that next year, you know, until later, here it is

January. We -- unless I do an estimate, we can't make the deadlines.

MR. TUTEN: Are estimates valid with the state, John, as far as submitting this to them?

MR. KEANE: No. We just use their estimates so they can start doing their work until the paperwork catches up. But we're going to talk about 2015 next year. We need to get back on this one right here.

MR. STORK: Right. Well, we have a couple of things that -- we had a transposition, made a difference of 27,000 we'll have to correct, and things that we did in our final review yesterday and a couple little wording things. So we'll fix that up, but I wanted to get this out because otherwise it would be another month.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So, Linda, your opinion letter will be dated sometime in January, next week or whatever --

MS. MENDILLO: It will be as soon as, you know, we get a heads-up, because in form, this is -- it's complete. We're finished with our audit work. So as soon as -- I've sent Kevin some minor changes, some grammatical changes or what have you. I've sent those to him. He's

seen them. He hasn't had time to review 1 everything. 2 3 MR. STORK: Right. We're looking for 4 approval with the caveat with the scrivener's 5 things, and that way we can date it today -- get 6 to reviewed today and get it dated today. That 7 way we'll finalize, get the final report sometime next week, but it will be dated today. 8 9 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I noted that -- go ahead. 10 MR. SCHMITT: Just to summarize, this is a 11 clean opinion, no material misstatements? 12 MS. MENDILLO: Yes, sir, it is. 13 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I mentioned to John when 14 15 I read it when Kevin sent it out to us, our senior executive retirement plan, according to 16 the disclosure, was created in 2000 and amended 17 18 in 2009. I had in my mind that it had been created in '90 or '91. 19 20 MR. STORK: Well, they had a -- I think they 21 had a DC plan before they had this DB, but the DB was 2000. 22 23 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. 24 MR. KEANE: Current plan was in 2000. 25 previously had two different types of plans.

Every time they kept rolling forward into the new 1 plan. 2 3 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. So the pre-2000 4 plan was a defined contribution plan. It was a defined contribution 5 MR. KEANE: 6 plan, money purchase plan, and it was a problem 7 with the fees. 8 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So the current plan, the DB plan started in 2000? 9 MR. KEANE: Correct. 10 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: All right. 11 MR. KEANE: When Mr. Cohee was hired, part 12 of his contract required a retirement plan that 13 replicates the Florida Retirement System, and 14 that was what we used. 15 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: All right. Anything out 16 of the ordinary in your work, Linda, anything we 17 should be alert to that we can be of assistance 18 19 in proving or strengthening or changing in terms 20 of our processes and systems, procedures and 21 such? 22 MS. MENDILLO: No. You have a clean 23 opinion. Internal controls are there. Kevin is 24 easy to work with. All of the staff is, 25 actually. Everybody is forthcoming. The only

issues we have are just, you know, typical delays 1 with, you know, getting information in or those 2 3 kinds of things. 4 You know, you've implemented new GASB 67, and so that took a little more time. It took 5 6 time throughout the whole year for Kevin and I to 7 look at that stuff, but everything went off without a hitch. 8 MR. GLOVER: That was my question. 9 MS. MENDILLO: 10 Okay. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Any other questions or 11 comments for the accountants? 12 All in favor of accepting the 2014 audit, 13 say "aye." 14 (Responses of "aye.") 15 MR. GLOVER: Did you get a motion? 16 Make a motion. 17 MR. KEANE: 18 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'm sorry. Could I get a motion on the 2014 audit? 19 20 MR. GLOVER: I move --21 MR. TUTEN: I just have one question. 22 Did you say that we needed to take into 23 account some of those changes that need to be 24 made in the motion? 25 MR. STORK: Well, I think we're going to

```
1
         have to make a few minor changes, scrivener's.
              CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS:
                                  I'm asking to -- so the
 2
 3
         ideal motion would be to accept it and delegate
 4
         the staff the authority to make immaterial
 5
         adjustments and final changes.
 6
              MR. STORK:
                          Right.
 7
              CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: As long as they're
 8
         agreed to.
              MR. GLOVER: Nonsubstantive changes.
 9
10
              CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS:
                                  Nonsubstantive changes.
              As long as they're agreed to by the
11
12
         independent accountant as well.
              How does that sound? Was that your motion?
13
              MR. GLOVER: Yes.
14
              CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Can I get a second?
15
16
              DR. HERBERT:
                            Second.
17
              CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Any further questions or
18
         comments?
              All is favor, say "aye."
19
20
              (Responses of "aye.")
              CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Opposed, like sign.
21
22
              (No responses.)
23
              CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Carries unanimously.
24
              MS. MENDILLO: Thank you again for letting
25
         us be here.
```

MR. TUTEN: John, do we post this on the web 1 after we get the final version? 2 3 MR. KEANE: Sure do. We send it to the city 4 and lots of other people, and then in March it 5 goes over to Tallahassee. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Kevin, I think the 6 7 city's audit opinion is usually dated February. March. 8 MR. STORK: CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Oh, even later? 9 MR. STORK: Hopefully March, yeah. 10 Sometimes we hit February. 11 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So we're faster. 12 MR. STORK: Yeah. I have an earlier 13 14 deadline component. We're a blended component 15 unit. But the component units have an earlier deadline, and that's -- that's today. But 16 17 sometimes we don't make that. But they shoot for 18 February, but it's usually the end of March. 19 Last year they went into April. They had to 20 get --21 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Really? 22 MR. STORK: -- they had to ask for -- that 23 was mainly due to a couple things, but that's on 24 the city side. 25 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay.

MR. KEANE: Regular order of business, 1 Mr. Chairman. Old business, Budget Review. 2 3 Kevin. 4 MR. STORK: Budget Review. That's the big 5 sheet. In December we were running a little bit 6 7 ahead on the money managers, but the fees were less than estimated. That's due to the mix and 8 where Mr. Holmes recommended placing those 9 dollars we got from the city to different places 10 where I had estimated they go. And so we're 11 lower -- earnings are a little bit more. The 12 price we paid is a little bit less. I'm accruing 13 an estimate on that. 14 Staff salary and benefits are under because 15 of the deputy executive director position is 16 unfilled. 17 18 I do have -- I moved up from the other less 19 than 40, moved it up to the 40 and over months 20 for the judgment and claims, and they're over That was due to that lawsuit settlement 21 budget. that the Board voted on last month. 22 23 And so overall we're under budget by 63,000. 24 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Ouestions or comments on

the budget report? All right. Let's move on.

MR. KEANE: Received as information?

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Received as information.

MR. KEANE: Next item.

Mr. Chairman and Trustees, we electronically sent you the 2014 Actuarial Valuation prepared by Pension Board Consultants. Our goal -- I discussed it with the Chairman. The goal was to get a document in front of you to receive it formally this month and to act on it next month when we can have Jarmon either on the phone or here in person. So the purpose of it being on the agenda today, Mr. Chairman and Trustees, is to receive it as information.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: All right. Investment Report.

MR. KEANE: We have the -- the December

Flash Report is in your folder. Page 3, I

believe it is. That's the summary of the

performance for the -- as of December. You'll

see we're above our total fund policy all across
the board right now for ten years.

There are issues, of course, that the Board is familiar with. The market is done substantially this week. Price of crude oil is now stabilized; however, it's caused an increase

in international tensions because of our alliance 1 with Saudi Arabia. 2 3 The total impact of the falling oil prices 4 on Europe has not been recognized yet, but 5 hopefully it won't be as bad as some people think it's going to be. 6 7 Our MLP portfolio, as you'll see at the bottom, have very, very strong returns 8 continuing. 9 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: You know, I think our 10 MLPs are primarily like pipelines --11 MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. 12 13 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: -- not production, 14 right? They're pipelines. 15 MR. KEANE: Right. 16 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That's good. The 17 pipelines ought to be, if anything, better 18 because there will be more product moving because 19 it's cheaper. Yes, sir. 20 MR. KEANE: 21 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We'll see how long it 22 lasts. 23 MR. KEANE: Yeah. 24 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Natural gas was back 25 below 3 bucks a decatherm the last few weeks,

which is remarkable. And I'll get back on topic 1 now with the agenda. I'll just observe, in the 2 3 world of energy, that's remarkably good. 4 Well, John, Fixed Income just keeps on 5 making money too. 6 MR. KEANE: It does. 7 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Interest rates just keep 8 going lower. It's remarkable. It's remarkable. Housing --9 MR. KEANE: interest rates for housing as of yesterday, 10 lowest since the mid-early 2000s, both on 30 and 11 15. We, of course, would like to reduce our 12 fixed exposure with the proposals that were 13 contained in the agreement that are incorporated 14 in the new legislation that the mayor's office is 15 working on. We will be able to do that. 16 17 Bill spoke to the delegation yesterday and told them if they're thinking about any changes 18 19 in the state law, repeal the requirement to have 20 percent fixed. 20 21 Show the Summit Investment Report is received as information? 22 23 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. Any further

questions or comments on the investment report to

date? So far this looks good.

24

MR. GLOVER: Looks like our MLPs is mostly 1 transporting energy through pipelines. Natural 2 3 gas is something that wouldn't hit us too hard 4 one way or another. 5 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I think it will be good 6 for us because the usage in natural gas keeps 7 climbing in the U.S. for a variety of reasons. And so the pipes just get more and more used. 8 And so the fee income to the pipe owners keeps 9 going up. I think it's good for the pipes. I 10 think it's good that we've invested in pipes, in 11 my view. 12 MR. KEANE: And the House has approved the 13 pipeline from Canada, and it's going over to the 14 Senate. It faces a presidential veto and an 15 uncertain future, but it's moving on. 16 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. America has more 17 18 natural gas than any country in the world. 19 MR. TUTEN: A ton of it. 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That's good. We'll also show that --21 MR. KEANE: MR. GLOVER: We're mostly a fossil fuel use 22 23 in this county. And this whole notion of natural

gas, we still have people who are somewhat

apprehensive about it because they're a little

24

afraid of it. 1 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: The fracking and all 2 3 that. 4 MR. GLOVER: Yeah. 5 MR. KEANE: All right. The next item, Mr. Chairman and Trustees, is the Summit Monthly 6 7 Economic and Capital Market Update. Without objection, we'll show that received 8 as information. 9 Under Administrative, the deputy executive 10 director's position. 11 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We've earlier processed, 12 with Dr. Herbert's leadership, the job 13 description, the process, the procedures for this 14 essential position and authorized the 15 commencement of recruitment maybe a couple of 16 17 meetings ago -- I'm going from memory, which I should not do -- did we not? And so I'm eager 18 for us to begin the recruitment process. And I 19 just want to know the status because we --20 21 Actually, as I recall it, the DR. HERBERT: director position was one thing, and the deputy 22 23 position, I thought city council had told us that

we couldn't move forward.

MR. KEANE:

The city council took it out of

24

the budget, but we're working on having that resolved.

DR. HERBERT: So the question is, should we go forward notwithstanding that; and if so, then we can proceed right away. Simultaneously we have talked about the director position. And Mr. Klausner isn't here today, but I asked him to talk with the firm about the study of salaries.

Have you heard anything about that?

MR. DARAGJATI: No.

DR. HERBERT: John?

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. I talked to Bob earlier this week and told him that it was going to be on the agenda. He's got some information from two of the sources that he discussed with us, NASRA, the National Association of State Retirement Administrators, as well as from the Segal people who did our previous salary survey. He's got that. He's working on a report that we'll have here for next month.

DR. HERBERT: And is the way that he's submitting that, is that consistent with the wording in the agreement that we submitted back to city council?

MR. KEANE: The wording in the agreement

1 says there's going to be a salary survey, and Segal is the recognized company to do that. 2 3 DR. HERBERT: Okay. 4 MR. KEANE: So their work can then be 5 adopted by the committee to recommend to the Board. 6 7 DR. HERBERT: Okay. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the critical issue there is, should we go 8 forward with the deputy position? We're all set 9 with regard to the director position. It's just 10 a question of --11 MR. TUTEN: I was going to ask you, Adam, we 12 already have the qualification set? 13 DR. HERBERT: 14 Yes. 15 MR. TUTEN: Okay. 16 DR. HERBERT: We've approved all that. I didn't want to start the 17 MR. TUTEN: 18 search if we're still trying to round out all that kind of good stuff. 19 20 DR. HERBERT: Everything has been approved. We met with --21 22 The city. Rhonda Charlotte with MR. KEANE: 23 the city. 24 DR. HERBERT: So all of that is ready to go 25 for both the director and the deputy director

positions.

MR. TUTEN: Okay. So are we going to advertise just for the deputy first and then --

DR. HERBERT: Well, it's a question of what the Board's preference is. The key thing is that we can't proceed with the director position until we have the salary survey.

MR. TUTEN: Okay.

DR. HERBERT: So my hope is that we'll have that at our next meeting.

MR. KEANE: We will.

DR. HERBERT: And so the advertisement stuff, we've already developed that. And, again, we have position descriptions for both.

MR. TUTEN: Yeah. I mean, since we're having a little bit of a down time meeting today, which is rather pleasant, obviously, I think the focus ought to be, do we really want to entertain deciding on two different people for two different position at the same time.

You know, I mean, is that how you're thinking about doing it? Do you want -- I mean, I'm up for anything, but to me it would seem like it would be a little less hectic, stressful, et cetera, if we focused on one or the other.

MR. GLOVER: Well, let me interject here.

One of the things that we created far down

the road in vetting -
MR. KEANE: Sheriff, could you speak up?

MR. GLOVER: Yeah.

We're pretty far down the road in vetting that deputy's position. And, of course, we had eliminated a couple of candidates and had gotten down to looking at Bobby. And some things came up in the public media, and we thought under the circumstances we need to revisit thought or at least pause, I think.

So, I mean, I'm -- when I look at a transition period, I'm looking for stability. I'm looking for some sense of continuity. I'm looking at trying to make certain that we don't have this hitch that sometimes takes 18 months in a learning curve for people to come in. So you've got the controversy there, and this is a good time to discuss this.

So are we still saying -- because if we're going to put it back out and come back to the same thing -- are we still saying that's too rocky a road to consider?

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Let me briefly give my

view on what Rich asked about, and then that will tie right back into that.

MR. GLOVER: All right.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: My thought is to go looking for a deputy with the thought we're going to find somebody who could then succeed John when he retires.

So my thought at least is we're looking for someone who can do important, valuable work immediately, and then subject always to performance, would be the logical successor. So we don't then have to go have another transition period as was being addressed now.

So at least my thought was that in some ways that's the most important of the two right now.

One of the most important things fiduciaries do is succession planning and make sure we've got everything set up where you don't have a gap or something. And so to me at least the deputy is the more important recruitment.

But looking for somebody who could do important, valuable work for the fund, and then subject to their performance, would be the logical successor when John retires.

So that's my -- that's my thought on it.

MR. GLOVER: That would make sense. That would make sense. And we should not be hiring anybody as a deputy that we couldn't live with as the person in the first place. So, I mean, that's low-hanging fruit and I agree with that. I guess that's a long way of saying I agree with you.

But I think my question still is that this whole notion of this particular individual whom I think is eminently qualified, and, of course, we've got to look at the whole terrain, and the time, which will begin now, is it something that's too -- just too stormy a road to travel? And I just want to kind of openly discuss that.

MR. SCHMITT: And I think you've hit on both the issues. The controversy of that selection.

Is that the best thing for the fund?

Two: You brought up the selection of the deputy director transitioning into the executive director position when John retires. Does he meet those qualifications? I don't know.

MR. TUTEN: Well, that's I think the hard part in any of this. We've run into this on the fire side, in the fire department, with guys that I've tried to explain to them how the real world

worked as far as, you know, just because you have a degree doesn't mean you're a smart guy. It means you completed a degree.

But, then, again, you must -- there are certain parameters and qualifications everyone must process when you attain a certain position. That said, I agree with Sheriff Glover to a certain extent as far as Bobby doesn't have the degree, but he's been around for God knows how long. You know, and he understands how the Board works, the fund works, et cetera, et cetera.

So, yeah, that's something that if everybody wants to continue to talk about, we can. My question is, okay, going forward, I think Bobby is 60, something like that. Bobby's not going to be the guy here, you know. That's not a long-term solution. It's a medium to short term. That's fine.

Going forward, though, because I know the problems we had with the last search, I think what people -- what you're saying, Walt, as far as if they understand that this is possibly just a step to the head guy, we may be able to entice more people.

But the problem, I think, once again, and I

personally think we need to get the salary survey done first before we do anything, because at least we'll know how much money we're willing and able to put out there to attract people, because I think the problem people are going to have is they see \$1.5 billion pension fund, they see 20-something hundred members, police and fire, Jacksonville, Bold New City of the South, and then when they find out how much money they're going to make, wait a minute, that's not what I -- you know, first thing they're going to say is, well, how much did John make? And I know John's been around a long time and he's a special circumstance.

But you're going to see the interest go from here to (making sound) just like last time. So I think the first thing we need to do is get the salary survey done, get the language maybe tightened up to where they knew specifically what they're expecting when they get here before they even make the interview, because a lot of people, I just don't think they're going to come if they're thinking they're going to make, you know, 2/3rds of what John's making or half of what John's making.

And then we say, no, that's not quite what 1 you're going to make. And then they go, well, 2 3 why would I leave where I'm at, because chances 4 are they're probably making that kind of money 5 anyway. DR. HERBERT: Well, the survey will 6 7 definitely tell us that. In terms of the preliminary conversations that I had with 8 Mr. Klausner, we are significantly above most of 9 the comparable funds --10 MR. TUTEN: 11 Right. DR. HERBERT: -- you know, and that's a 12 function of how long John's been here and the 13 fact that he has held multiple hats 14 simultaneously. 15 16 MR. GLOVER: Right. DR. HERBERT: But we're well over the 17 18 marketplace in terms of the initial feedback, but 19 we need to have hard numbers in our report in order to be able to address issues that are 20 21 appropriately raised. 22 MR. GLOVER: I don't think salary will be a 23 deal breaker, really. I just -- I think we'll

get into the requirements in case you happen to

get a star that you can -- that you can consider

24

that.

But I think we needed to discuss this, and I agree with Chief, too. We needed to discuss this and get this issue on the table so we can articulate it, ask about it. And when you look at the climate and you look at the timing, and maybe it would be something that, you know, we don't sweep it under the rug.

We can say, look, in the best interests of what we're dealing with now, this may not be the right circumstances as you look at the broader issue to proceed. And I think that's a position we can all live with, you know.

You can win the battle and lose the war in the long run, and we've got to try to do what's best for the membership.

DR. HERBERT: Can I respond to that, but first ask a question of John?

John, in the submission that we gave back to council in response to their proposed ordinance, I think I recall that there was a section in there that spoke specifically to the issue of the director. Am I wrong on that?

MR. KEANE: There is.

DR. HERBERT: And am I correct that that

particular provision does specify a college 1 degree? 2 3 MR. KEANE: It does. 4 DR. HERBERT: And it did not provide for an 5 exception? MR. KEANE: Well, it says that the Board can 6 7 consider it, but the way it's worded, it's definite that we want -- the Board wants someone 8 that holds a degree. 9 DR. HERBERT: Okay. I ask that question 10 because I know when we had the conversation about 11 it, we did indicate that there might be unusual 12 circumstances, but the question from me then is, 13 does the ordinance make that point moot because 14 it does require the college degree, which is what 15 we had talked about with the possibility of the 16 17 exception? Requires a college degree for 18 MR. KEANE: the executive director, not for the deputy 19 director. 20 I understand for the executive 21 DR. HERBERT: director. 22 MR. KEANE: I believe we need to do two 23 24 things here, if you would permit to speak here. 25 One, we're going to finish the salary

survey. But the second part, you need to decide about this retirement thing. The recommendation back to the city council was that the new people would go in either the general employees pension fund or a DC plan that the Board creates. Before we can even advertise it, we're going to at least need to have that DC plan authorized.

Now, previously the Board authorized that and it's a little bit further down on the next thing, but that was then scrapped. I would recommend that you recreate the shell for the DC plan so at least we can have that as an option for the person.

That then gives the city council the option, when they take up the mayor's next proposal, that, you know, they've got to go ahead and amend the general employees pension plan to let these people in. I just wanted to bring that up because we're right here at that time.

DR. HERBERT: And in terms of your experience as you look at what's happening around the country and around the state in terms of other funds, what is the pattern? That's the thing I don't know, is whether or not the firm is going to be addressing that issue.

MR. KEANE: Well, the patterns are certainly changing to DC environment now because of the mobility of the executive directors. They're

We had -- just one example. The lady that has head of the Colorado Police and Fire, she retired from there. She went to Fort Worth, stayed almost five years, and now she's up in Wyoming running the state system there.

four to five years and move on to the next spot.

The guy that's running NASRA, he came from Kansas, and prior to that he was in a city plan. But there's a lot of moving around. They don't have a lot of long tenure like we have here.

But we definitely need to have that as a tool in the tool box to put in our add that they could have this option.

DR. HERBERT: Mr. Chairman, what I would like to do is to ask the firm to give us a recommendation on that so that we can vote on all that at one time, both the salary range and the establishment potentially of a DC plan that would apply to the new director.

MR. TUTEN: Well, part of that, Adam, when they do these salary surveys, can they also list the benefits included in this position? In other

words, you know, all that. In other words, let's 1 just get the whole kit and caboodle as far as all 2 3 that, whatever. I don't know. 4 DR. HERBERT: Yes, exactly. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes, let's do that. 5 6 MR. KEANE: We'll get that done. 7 MR. SCHMITT: The entire pay package, not 8 just salary. MR. TUTEN: Yeah, the entire compensation. 9 MR. KEANE: As soon as I get the 10 information, I'll call you and we'll notice a 11 workshop of the personnel committee, if that's 12 okay. But we will definitely have something in 13 writing for the full Board at the next meeting. 14 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. And then my 15 recollection was, and it's not important what my 16 recollection was, but was that we approved the 17 creation of the DC plan but not you being in it. 18 But to create it for the succession plan 19 versus (indiscernible) 20 21 DR. HERBERT: Correct. MR. KEANE: Correct. 22 23 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: If the Board needs to 24 take some further action for that to progress, 25 tell us. And I'm going to come back to the

qualifications and kind of my view and so forth 1 I hadn't forgotten what you told me there. 2 too. 3 Do we need to do anything else for you to have that created for our consideration? 4 5 MR. KEANE: Well, we've called the company. 6 They sent us one. We just need to adopt it as 7 the Board's plan. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. So you'll put 8 that before us for further action --9 MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. 10 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: -- at the next meeting. 11 That will be at the next 12 MR. KEANE: meeting, we'll have that. And it differs from 13 the city plan in that the city plan, you only 14 vest in it at 20 percent a year. This plan here 15 has an immediate vesting. So if the person stays 16 two years at least, they take their money and are 17 18 gone. 19 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That's the way a DC 20 works. 21 It should. I agree with that. MR. KEANE: 22 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Oh, yes, it should. 23 MR. KEANE: Right. But we'll have that for 24 the personnel committee and that will be part of 25 the all-encompassing recommendations to come back to you.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: In terms of -- and not to speak about it individually, but on that general subject, my thoughts are these, and others have already said much of this.

Looking ahead 10 or 15 years, the role of the person sitting in that seat is going to be less politic and lobbying and public communication because the setting of the benefit formula is going to systematically move to elected officials. It's just how long it will take.

So I think that significant investment management expertise and then significant administrative expertise in processes and systems to serve the members, both members and beneficiaries, and then to manage the funds for the best risk adjuster returns, those are the two things I think that are most important going forward.

And someone that has the technical experience in both subjects is particularly important, I think, going forward.

And I think in the long-term best interest of the fund, sort of a fresh start is valuable,

all things considered. And so if you hear what I'm saying, that's what I would be thinking would be the ideal deputy going forward.

MR. TUTEN: You know, there's always going to be a fresh start every four to eight years anyway. You're going to have your politicians and they're going to come through the door and it's just going to be --

MR. GLOVER: What I think Walt is saying, we should have kind of a theme on what we're looking for that is going to be consistent right down the line. And it makes sense.

I guess the older I get the more restricted our -- I kind of resist in the sense that when you -- when you say something like you've got to have a college degree, no exceptions. I just -- I just generally feel a little uncomfortable with that.

I also -- I also look closely at local talent generally because I know we always seem to be generally impressed with people coming in from out of town, like they've got some magic, you know. I think you do that only when you don't have anything in town.

So it's just two of my philosophies that I

found that pretty much have worked well. 1 then that's why we've got a Board, you know. 2 3 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I always want someone 4 with roots and connections to my hometown. 5 MR. GLOVER: Yeah, yeah. 6 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: If I can -- that's 7 always what I want first. If we just can't find the right technical skills, every once in a 8 while, well, somebody will come in and then we'll 9 expect them to grow roots here and be committed 10 11 to us. But I always want to start with somebody 12 that's got roots --MR. GLOVER: Well, it's a learning curve. 13 14 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'm with you on that. 15 MR. GLOVER: It's a learning curve, and sometime the fallout on the curve you have to 16 17 recover from and all of that, you know. So --18 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Just a brief thing I 19 will say, as time goes on, it's like, well, come 20 on, you've got to do it. 21 MR. GLOVER: You got to do it. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: You know, if you're 22 23 serious about something, you've got to do it. 24 MR. GLOVER: And I agree with that, but 25 we're smart enough to figure out you should have

done it. And if you didn't do it, well, that's it. Go home. I got you.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: It's tedious and everything. And I'm not speaking ill of higher education. But you've got to punch the ticket, you know. It's just the way the world is now days.

DR. HERBERT: And I must confess, I've been really persuaded on all this by my favorite former sheriff who talked and convinced me that it was really important for police officers to have college degrees in terms of those who were going to be hired.

And so he was so convincing to me on that and that really impacts my assessment of these kinds of positions.

MR. GLOVER: And to my mentor --

MR. TUTEN: Sounds like they were waiting on you. Almost sounds like they saw you coming.

MR. GLOVER: To my mentor, I'm very, very concerned about that here in Jacksonville. I think we've got a model of the future here in Jacksonville, and I don't want to see that roll back, you know, because we bit the bullet and we've got it engrained. We've created a culture.

We've bled, fought, and got it, and I don't want 1 to see us go back on that. 2 MR. KEANE: We show that item deferred and 3 4 the personnel committee will make a 5 recommendation. 6 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And have everything 7 ready to go at the next meeting --8 MR. KEANE: Ready to go. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: -- to be able to make a 9 decision about how and when to move forward. 10 MR. KEANE: We'll have the information here 11 for you-all to approve the salary range supported 12 by the surveys and the city's recommendations so 13 we're ready to put the ad in the paper. 14 15 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And the industry --16 MR. KEANE: Yeah. Industry trade papers. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: John, remind us, when 17 18 you entered into your current employment 19 agreement three or four years ago, its term is 20 2016, next year? 21 MR. KEANE: 2017. 22 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: 2017. Okay. And what 23 month in 2017? 24 MR. KEANE: December 31st. 25 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So that's 36 months from

1 now. MR. KEANE: 2 Yes. 3 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Was that a six-year 4 employment agreement, in effect? 5 MR. KEANE: It seems like it was. They kept 6 using the same one. They just kept adding term 7 years to the end. As we sit here today, I can assure you I will not be sitting here on this end 8 in December of 2017, unless we're having a lunch. 9 I will not be here in this capacity. 10 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We understand. 11 That's why I work moving this forward timely. 12 13 MR. KEANE: Correct. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: It's time to move this 14 forward. 15 16 MR. KEANE: The next item on the agenda, Mr. Chairman and Trustees, is the senior 17 18 employees retirement plan. 19 As you know, the Board has previously voted 20 to close the plan to new entrants. There is only 21 one active person in the plan now and that's 22 myself. 23 In our previous agreements with the city, it was agreed that the plan would close completely 24 25 in August of last year and that I would be moved

over to a DC plan, or money purchase plan or something.

As we started down that process in the summer to do that, the newspaper wrote a story that, lo and behold, the pension plan -- the pension board created another pension plan for Mr. Keane. Well, it wasn't another. It was a replacement.

But, nevertheless, because of that furor, that idea of establishing a DC plan was dropped. My employment agreement requires that I have a DB plan. I'm willing to work to some degree to modify it, but I'm not going to be the only person in the entire city that doesn't have a pension benefit.

So the plan is -- the latest Board action plan is now open and I'm contributing. The deductions being made from my check, we have not transferred it to the pension fund yet. We're accruing it, because once it goes over, it can't come back. And we'll see what winds up out of this.

Notwithstanding what the Board previously did and told the city in our last agreement, they have come back with this new agreement, got some

wrong words again, and in just a minute we'll get to that. We have a recommendation on that.

But the update on the senior management plan is it's now open and I'm continuing to contribute, but it's not open to new people.

MR. TUTEN: What are we trying to solve here, John? Because I know at the meeting we kind of -- I thought we kind of solved all this as far as -- you know, the city wanted us to shut it down for you. We said, well, that's fine, but now that he's 70.5 years old, the IRS says we have to start paying him a retirement.

So rather than paying him a retirement for doing the job he's doing right now and earning the jack, why don't we just keep him in the retirement plan, full well knowing that we closed it down to future guys.

The future guy's going to have a DC plan, if he wants one. He doesn't have to get anything he doesn't want. But, I mean, are we back to, well, now we're going to debate whether or not we're going to give you a retirement check and shut yours down or --

MR. KEANE: Oh, no, there's no debate that I'm going to get retirement. There's no debate

on that. I agreed to that part, you know, sooner or later when I retire. Now, I'm not trying to get any money right now. I'm not trying to do anything.

MR. TUTEN: I understand that.

MR. KEANE: I'm trying to reserve the rights that we have. And one of the options, of course, is to start a distribution. All that's going to do is cause more unfavorable publicity and distract from the mission at hand. I think the Board reiterates its position. The plan's closed to new entrants. I'm the only one in. It'll keep going until I leave.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I asked John to put this on the agenda because I just learned recently of the suspension of cash transfers to the plan since August because of, in John's mind, this open question.

And so technically I think we're out of compliance with the contract of your employment, which is unacceptable. We cannot have that.

MR. KEANE: Right.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So I asked John to put it on the agenda. I also thought it was squared away and we knew what we were going to do, but

```
it's not, at least, in John's mind. So I wanted
 1
         to bring it back up and square it away and not
 2
 3
         have any confusion about what we're doing and
 4
         why.
 5
             MR. TUTEN:
                          The suspension of payments is
         from whom?
 6
 7
              CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: From John's paycheck
         into the --
 8
             MR. TUTEN: But who -- who -- the city?
 9
             MR. KEANE: No, no. They're taking the
10
         money out of my check --
11
             MR. TUTEN:
                         Right.
12
             MR. KEANE: -- and it's sitting here.
13
                                                     It's
         just not been transferred into the pension plan.
14
                          So the city's not transferring
15
             MR. TUTEN:
         it into the --
16
17
             MR. KEANE:
                          No. The city doesn't have
18
         anything to do with it.
             MR. STORK: John's got me on hold. I've got
19
         it in a reserve.
20
21
             MR. TUTEN: Oh, okay. I was just assuming
         we're starting everything back up again.
22
23
             MR. KEANE:
                          No, no, no.
24
             MR. STORK:
                          Well, we did get in the latest
25
         ordinance, on this pension reform they've popped
```

back to August 26th. So there's still confusion. 1 And so we need to --2 MR. TUTEN: Well, okay. That's a 3 separate -- are we going to talk about that? 4 5 MR. KEANE: In just a minute. Okay. 6 MR. TUTEN: 7 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Larry. MR. SCHMITT: My recollection was we vetted 8 this all out. 9 Right. 10 MR. KEANE: The option of continuing to 11 MR. SCHMITT: have John in the current defined benefit plan was 12 the least expensive option, and we decided to 13 remain as is, mainly for that reason. 14 15 MR. TUTEN: I agree. 16 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That's what I thought we did as well, John. 17 18 MR. KEANE: Correct. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. So, therefore, to 19 20 me, unless I'm missing something here, your 21 contribution deduction should be going in with 22 the plan, not being held in reserves. 23 MR. STORK: Okay. 24 MR. KEANE: So to clarify the Board's policy 25 for the record, the plan is continuing to be open

for me. I've continued to make the payments. 1 The accumulated payments since August will be 2 3 transferred into the plan immediately, and future 4 payment deductions from the biweekly paycheck go 5 straight into the plan. 6 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Just as had been the 7 case before. MR. KEANE: 8 That's right. That's the Board's policy, in conformance with my employment 9 contract and long-term policy. 10 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I agree with Larry. I 11 thought that's what we had moved and approved 12 earlier, a few months ago. 13 There's what I assumed we --14 MR. TUTEN: 15 everything was going back to the way it was. MR. GLOVER: So why are we discussing it 16 17 again? 18 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I learned recently that 19 there was a question in John's mind and he had been discussing it with our counsel. And he has 20 21 had Kevin withhold his payroll deductions for his share of the pension cost and not putting it in 22 23 the SERP plan itself. 24 To me, that is at least a technical 25 violation of the employment agreement and

unacceptable. And so because there was -- John 1 having that thought that there was somehow an 2 3 open issue, I wanted to bring it back up again, 4 be sure there's no open issues, and we don't have 5 the substance or appearance of not being in 6 compliance with your contract with the Board. 7 That's unacceptable. MR. SCHMITT: If I'm hearing correctly, some 8 of that doubt came in because of some of the 9 language that was included in 386. 10 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'm not sure where it 11 came from. 12 MR. KEANE: The confusion came from 386. 13 14 MR. SCHMITT: Right. That's what caused that. 15 MR. KEANE: 16 MR. SCHMITT: So we resolved the issue, and 17 then language showed up in 386. But it's still resolved as far as I'm concerned. 18 MR. GLOVER: I think we're still legally 19 20 obligated. 21 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. 22 No question about it. MR. KEANE: 23 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We are and John is as 24 well for his contribution plan --25 MR. KEANE: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: -- as well as the employees. I agree with you. That's where we --

MR. DARAGJATI: I wanted to express to the Board that your position is legally supported. There's a series of cases out of Miami that state that an entity can't contract with Party A to the detriment of Party B, which they have already contracted with.

It happened with the -- in the sense of collective bargaining agreements. Although John's not a collective bargaining agreement, it's still a contract that he has with the Board.

This Board can't -- it's not legally supported for this Board to enter into an agreement with the city that would infringe on John's contract rights, because this way this language is now that came back to us from the city, it's saying there's no more accruals after August of 2014, which runs contrary to the contract this Board with John. So I'm just saying your position is legally supported.

MR. TUTEN: Yeah. Well, since that -- and how ever many agreements are over there at this point, I can't keep track anymore. That's not technically legal yet regardless, correct?

MR. DARAGJATI: Correct. 1 The agreement that we came to 2 MR. TUTEN: 3 here was, in essence, top to bottom, to support 4 John's contract. As he signed it, we agreed to 5 it, et cetera, et cetera. So do we need to make a motion to authorize 6 7 the payments to go in, or are we just getting it on the record? 8 MR. KEANE: No. We're just getting it on 9 the record that the Board's position is, the plan 10 is open. I continue to make my contribution, 11 busy as usual. 12 13 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'm going to be very 14 precise, and then I'm going to say it the way I understand on each point. And then you correct 15 or revise if I'm missing something or 16 17 misunderstanding something. 18 The SERP plan is closed to any new members. 19 MR. KEANE: Correct. 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: There is one active member --21 22 MR. KEANE: Correct. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: -- who will continue to 23 24 contribute. 25 MR. KEANE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: -- and the employer will 1 continue to contribute. 2 3 MR. KEANE. No. No employer requirement. 4 Fully funded. So they don't have to make a contribution. 5 6 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. So they are 7 currently at zero? 8 MR. KEANE: Zero. So I'm the only one 9 paying. 10 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: The employer still has the legal obligation --11 12 MR. KEANE: Right. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: -- but the actuarial 13 calculation currently produces zero. 14 15 MR. KEANE: Right. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And will continue to 16 have it deducted from his pay and transferred to 17 the fund timely every pay period. 18 19 Did I say that right? 20 MR. KEANE: That's right. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And the escrowed funds 21 22 since August will be transferred to the fund promptly, immediately. 23 24 MR. KEANE: Correct. Today. 25 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Today. All right.

MR. KEANE: Yes. That's the Board's 1 position. 2 3 DR. HERBERT: I just want to ask one 4 question. There was an issue, I thought, about 5 the excess plan in the context of IRS rules. 6 that applicable in this time frame we're talking 7 about? 8 MR. KEANE: That's goes when I start taking a distribution of the excess benefit plan. 9 That's next down the line. 10 DR. HERBERT: Okay. I just wanted to make 11 sure. 12 MR. KEANE: We understand the Board's policy 13 as described by the Chairman. That is the policy 14 and that's what we're going to continue to 15 16 operate under. 17 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Right. 18 MR. GLOVER: So you're sure we don't need to 19 vote now? 20 No, sir. No, sir. We just MR. KEANE: 21 reiterated the Board's policy and clarified it. 22 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I would say we reaffirm 23 and clarify the action the Board took some months 24 ago on this subject, two or three, four months 25 ago, whenever it was.

MR. GLOVER: Okay. 1 MR. DARAGJATI: The Board has already voted 2 3 on this issue. It's just a matter of carrying 4 through administratively, and the Board is just 5 ordering the administrative personnel --6 MR. GLOVER: But we had an interruption in 7 the funding of it. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That's true. 8 MR. GLOVER: And I did --9 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yeah, let's put it in a 10 motion. 11 12 MR. KEANE: Yeah, yeah. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So I just made motion. 13 Can I get a second? 14 15 DR. HERBERT: Second. 16 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Any further questions or 17 comments? All in favor, say "aye." 18 (Responses of "aye.") 19 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Opposed, like sign. 21 (No responses.) CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Motion carries. 22 23 MR. GLOVER: Now you can refer to that and 24 we've got a landmark. 25 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Right.

MR. KEANE: The next item is pension reform 1 draft from the city council, which fits right in 2 3 with what we're just talking about. 4 I have sent the proposed new ordinance and 5 agreement to Jarmon Welch. I spoke with them 6 again this morning. I have his email. 7 "As requested, Kelly and I will immediately 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

begin work on the actuarial impact statement for this proposed agreement. We'll work over the weekend and send it to you by Tuesday."

So we cannot get it any quicker than that.

On the agreement, the proposed agreement, in the provision of the staff plan -- let me back up a little bit.

The forward marching orders dealing with the city on this new version pension agreement are the same as if the end of the last one. If I say that, then what you-all agreed to previously will still be agreed to. What you amended previously, we're going to say, the Board wants this amended, and what you rejected previously, will still be rejected.

MR. TUTEN: Catch me up. Are we talking about the latest proposal from the mayor?

> MR. KEANE: That's what we're talking about.

MR. TUTEN: Do you have a copy of that, 1 John, or can you email us a copy of what the 2 3 mayor put in the proposal that's different at 4 least than what we have? 5 MR. KEANE: This one doesn't have the --MR. DARAGJATI: 6 I have a copy. 7 MR. KEANE: Do you have a copy of the changes on it? 8 MR. DARAGJATI: With the city stuff, yeah. 9 Okay. Good. Give him a copy. 10 MR. KEANE: So we're talking about the 11 MR. SCHMITT: latest draft that we know of that was sent from 12 the mayor's office to the city council? 13 14 MR. KEANE: It's not gone there yet. They tried to introduce it Tuesday night, they 15 wouldn't do it. 16 MR. SCHMITT: Gotcha. 17 18 MR. KEANE: They're working on putting a new 19 thing together. The bill that we worked on in 20 our workshops and our last meeting, that's gone. 21 That's forgotten. Did not become enacted. Ιt was repealed. 22 23 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Let me say -- let me 24 describe the posture I believe we're in and then 25 invite you-all to expand, extend or correct my

description.

So at our workshop where we did not take action, binding action, but at our special meeting recently, whenever that was, we voted item by item. Our position, including in some cases a rejection of the council position and the extension of a counterproposal in its place, and in one significant -- I think only one significant issue we rejected the council position and did not offer a counterproposal, that being the remaining term for active members.

And we delegated to our staff and our general counsel the authority to work with the city's general counsel in refining, drafting, correcting, immaterial nonpolicy, nonsubstantive matters jointly for the introduction to the city council of the revised ordinance that this fund has approved if enacted by the city council.

I think that's where we are.

MR. KEANE: Correct. Right.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And our counsel has been extensively interacting with the city's counsel in that drafting work.

MR. DARAGJATI: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay.

MR. KEANE: And as an outgrowth of that and those discussions, a new draft was circulated Tuesday night, Wednesday morning. And in that draft they have the words that the senior staff will be frozen and closed as of August the 15th, and no further benefits will accrue under the senior staff plan. That's why we put that just in front of this.

So we're trying to make sure that our marching orders, as we continue to interact with the general counsel and the mayor's staff are, Board's position is as described in our communication to you of last Thursday. The Board supports these in total. The Board recommends an amendment to these, and these two things the Board did not accept. And one of them is the senior staff plan.

MR. TUTEN: How many more changes to what we submitted to the council are in the mayor's proposal, John, as far as, are there any of the financial numbers as far as the DROP, this, that or the other?

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Pardon me. Just for context, we're talking about the current general counsel draft.

MR. TUTEN: Right. 1 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Not yet submitted but 2 3 needs to be submitted, I think, next Wednesday 4 for the normal two-week cycle of introducing 5 legislation. 6 MR. KEANE: Right, right. 7 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So they're still active back and forth on negotiations between our 8 counsel --9 MR. KEANE: Discussions. 10 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: -- and general counsel 11 to get the language right or, failing that, we 12 will need to proffer an expression of 13 disagreement on this point or that if we cannot 14 come together, our counsel and the general 15 counsel, between now and Wednesday. 16 17 MR. DARAGJATI: That's an accurate 18 statement. That's what we're trying to do. 19 MR. KEANE: 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I just want to be sure, 21 because this is moving quick and it's complex and 22 important. 23 MR. KEANE: And to keep it moving when it 24 gets to the council, our goal is to get the words

right before it gets introduced. Then that way

25

there's not the furor and confusion at the 1 committee level. 2 3 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Absolutely. That's what 4 we're working on now. Absolutely. 5 MR. KEANE: Now, one thing they've changed is the senior staff thing. And the second is the 6 7 amount of money that they want the pension fund 8 to put up. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Now, let's go back to 9 the first one. And so I'm going to state what I 10 believe is our position for our counsel to 11 express to the general counsel to seek to resolve 12 So I'm going to say what I think where we 13 it. are, and then let everybody revise or correct. 14 Because it is illegal by ordinance to change 15 a preexisting contract, this provision should be 16 modified. 17 18 MR. KEANE: Correct. 19 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That's our position. 20 MR. KEANE: Correct. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That for this to be 21 22 introduced and recommended to the city council, 23

introduced and recommended to the city council, knowing that it is illegal because of the preexisting contract, will just be a fundamental error in law for the general counsel to be party

24

25

to that. I'm exaggerating.

MR. KEANE: That's all right.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And so, therefore, that must be revised to not, on its face, be illegal in our state, in Florida.

MR. DARAGJATI: We have some recommended language that basically captures what you're saying. And we're going to counter them and simply state that the Board shall adopt rules to effectuate this provision consistent with state law and Internal Revenue Code.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And so this is important. It has symbolic significance way in excess of the substantive significance.

And I would suggest that we -- and I know we're sort of negotiating with ourselves here, but we also proffer a deadline date that the Board will cause that to happen no later than 90 days after the effective date of the ordinance, so it's not open-ended because they will, you know, with some merit say, well, you can just take forever and never do it. Right?

I mean, that's the way people -- this is so legalistic, this process, back and forth, I suggest we put that in there. You know, a

reasonable period to sort it out and work it out. 1 MR. TUTEN: Has the mayor's office talked to 2 3 you, John, about any of this? 4 MR. KEANE: No. I think, in answering your 5 question, most of this was drafted by one of the 6 newer employees who was here the other day. 7 I spoke with her yesterday briefly, and she said she's just trying to pull documents from all 8 places and put enough together to make it work. 9 And I said, well, you know, there's a couple 10 things in there that aren't correct. 11 She said, that's why in this drafting --12 that's why we're going back and forth. And that 13 was why, because of the action the Board just 14 15 took, we can reiterate to them, you've got to 16 make this change. 17 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: But here's why. 18 MR. KEANE: And here's why. 19 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And then here's a solution that is legal and affects the -- I think 20 21 the intent of both us and them on this point. But it's done in a way that's legal. 22 23 MR. DARAGJATI: Yes. 24 MR. KEANE: And what they're trying to do, 25 they're trying to side-step this head-on

collision with part of the people over there.

And we're agreeing to that as long as they do the right thing.

MR. SCHMITT: Richard, I think you brought this up at the last meeting. I am very uncomfortable not seeing the draft before it is sent to the city council, because that draft has basically our Board approval on it, and I haven't even seen the final draft. I'm not comfortable sending in that final draft without at least reading it.

MR. TUTEN: Well, yeah, I agree. I think like Walt was saying, you know, in matters like this where it's language -- you know, my biggest concern obviously if we're talking about money or benefits and people that we sat here and hashed out and whatever for hours, if it's something to do with this, the problem is this is just as important as that, because basically in essence it kills everything from going forward.

Now, I agree with Larry. The fact that, okay, I would like to know, first of all, for the mayor, why they feel the impetus to do this, number one, after we've talked to them and the counsel and each other now for who knows how

long.

Secondly, at least before they submit -- and I guess we could get a copy of it before it goes to the council. At least we can see. And my question, along with Larry, is how does that affect what we've agreed to? In other words, are we just basically saying, look, we gave you the authority to straighten out this kind of mess, that's what you're doing, so we don't really need to review it before it goes to the council?

Because --

MR. KEANE: Don't say that.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Let me ask this. Would it be possible for us to get a redline version of what the current status as between you and Bob's work with the general counsel's office and perhaps -- and blacklined from a redline, and then annotated on the points where you-all have not agreed, subject to the usual caveats of final review by this Board and city council of open issue?

And this would be an illustrative example.

If we had that redline before us -- if we had the redline right now, I would want to see an annotation on that provision that says, we do not

agree with this, this must be changed, or we recommend not approving this point.

So the ones that don't make sense to you or you've not reached agreement with the general counsel, to see those highlighted to help our review. And I too would like to read -- and I recognize it's redlined and it's a process through the week and Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday. I'd like to read where it is now and see what's been agreed to so far.

There's been lots of refinements and typos and scrivener's errors and things. And then what are the open issues that we could read. And then if we need to get together, you know, notice of special meeting by teleconference or some other efficient method before that deadline next week to stay on cycle, then that's what we'll do.

MR. TUTEN: Have they tried to change the actual ordinance code that we submitted or is it just the highlighted version of the agreement?

MR. KEANE: They have not made any substantive changes to the benefits section. There's two sections that they changed contrary to what the Board had previously agreed to.

MR. TUTEN: Okay.

MR. KEANE: And one of them is the senior 1 management plan. And the other is, in our 2 3 discussions with Mayor Brown and his staff back 4 in the spring, we agreed -- I agreed on asking 5 the Board to put up over a period of time \$107 That was based on the 2013 numbers. 6 million. 7 That number -- we now have more money. And what they're providing in this agreement is to 8 take all of the money, plus seven years of 9 chapter funds, which means we would be giving 10 them -- transferring about 156 million. 11 agreement originally was on 107 million. 12 13 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: To be precise, seven years of chapter funds less an annual holiday 14 bonus, subject to the 80 percent trigger. 15 16 MR. KEANE: Correct. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So it does not eliminate 17 18 the option for an annual holiday bonus. 19 MR. KEANE: No, sir. 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Those funds are reserved for the Board. 21 22 MR. KEANE: They're reserved, yes, sir. 23 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And what's left over 24 after that for no more than seven years will flow

into the unfunded liability.

25

That's right. 1 MR. KEANE: CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. I just want to be 2 3 sure. 4 MR. KEANE: In our previous discussions, all 5 those were the parameters, but the amount was 6 capped at \$105 million. And they've taken that 7 105 million out, and now it would be substantially more because we've had two more 8 years of accumulations of extra chapter money. 9 10 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: One more year. Is it 11 two more years? MR. KEANE: Two more years. You have '12 12 and -- '13 and '14, or '12 and '13, whichever way 13 you want to look at it. They were using the old 14 actuarial numbers. 15 16 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: My recollection from our 17 last meeting was the original one was the balance 18 at 10/1/13. 19 MR. KEANE: Correct. 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Which we agreed to at 21 the negotiating table in the spring and summer of 2014. 22 23 MR. KEANE: Correct. And we had the number 24 in there. They left that number out, the maximum 25 number.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So it's one more year. 1 MR. KEANE: 2 Right. 3 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. Not two. 4 MR. KEANE: One more year. Right. 5 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And then roughly half of 6 the total is truly -- and, you know, these words 7 get misunderstood and misconstrued by the media -- but city money --8 9 MR. KEANE: Correct. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: -- because for all --10 not by design by but the formulary method the 11 city elects to do it, they put in -- they sent 12 more money to our fund than are required --13 14 MR. KEANE: Right. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: -- and so this 15 additional balance of 10/1/14, at least half of 16 17 it is city money sent in excess of what we 18 required. 19 MR. KEANE: No question about. No question about it. 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And so what's at issue 21 is a piece of chapter money for 12 months. 22 23 MR. KEANE: That's right. 24 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I just want to be sure 25 that I'm saying the same thing.

MR. KEANE: And the amount of chapter money 1 that -- the total amount of chapter money that 2 3 we're going to be committing to them. So that's 4 one issue. 5 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Do you take issue with 6 the way they've written the seven years, less the 7 holiday bonus with an 80 percent trigger? Do you disagree with how they've written that? 8 MR. KEANE: Only to the standpoint of what 9 they're going to do with the money. 10 11 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Just one thing at a time, John. 12 All right. 13 MR. KEANE: CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Do you disagree with how 14 they've written the use of chapter funds less the 15 16 holiday bonus every year with the 80 percent 17 trigger stopping it, if it occurs before seven 18 years? 19 Have they written that in a way that matches 20 what you think you agreed to at the negotiating 21 table last spring? 22 MR. KEANE: No. And that's because they did 23 not put the maximum in there. The money we came 24 to was, they're going to do their 400 million,

we're going to do 105 million. This combination.

25

Now, we're not talking about using all of their money and saving a lot of the chapter money. I'm not talking about doing that.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Let me stop you. I never recall discussing a cap on the seven-year chapter money less the holiday bonus. I never recall a number capping what that could be. Seriously.

MR. SCHMITT: And I do recall that because that was our trigger for the share plans, and that was a selling point to the members. Look, we don't have to wait for the city to do what they're responsible for doing. We hope they will, but if they don't, here's our trigger to where we start the share plan.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I agree with the trigger, but my recollection of the trigger was, the earlier of seven years or 80 percent. Once we hit that, all the chapter funds and the holiday bonus would be go towards (indiscernible).

MR. TUTEN: Well, there was a trigger in the agreement too as far as if they didn't live up to their expectations, if you remember me going off on my little tangent there.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Oh, on the 400 1 million --2 MR. TUTEN: -- and we would take the share 3 4 plan and start it right then. 5 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That's a separate issue. 6 MR. KEANE: That's fine. 7 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: The 400 million, let's separate that. It's important and we've got to 8 deal with it, but let's keep that separate from 9 this thing. 10 MR. KEANE: So we can live with this seven. 11 I mean, it's just an issue. But they are 12 providing that they can use the money, not to pay 13 down the unfunded, but they can use it to 14 supplement their contribution. So that's -- and 15 that's what they want to do. 16 17 The main thing they've changed in here is 18 what the Board agreed to the last time, that Bob Klausner recommended, if they fail to make a 19 20 payment, that payment will be rolled over to next 21 year and part of the ARC, and they took that out. 22 If they miss a payment, it would be then 23 rolled forward and part of the ARC for the 24 following year. They've taken that out. 25 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. So let's do that

after they we do -- let's stay on that first thing first.

MR. KEANE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: The arithmetic of the funds flows, I believe, is such, the way it's written, that whether they characterize for this limited period the use of those funds for normal costs within the ARC for unfunded liability recovery in the ARC, that regardless of how it's characterized, it doesn't change the total funds flows in, when they have to occur, and what we're going to get as a result.

MR. KEANE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Then why do we care about the words on this point?

MR. KEANE: We care about the words,
Mr. Chairman, because if they take our money in
this hand, and we're marching towards an 80
percent goal, and instead of putting their money
in with this hand together, they take our money
and put it in this hand and they say, here's the
contribution.

It will take longer to get to the 80 percent goal because they could essentially not -- they could reduce their contribution by the amount

we're giving them.

MR. SCHMITT: And I think what you just said is -- I don't think is -- it does make a difference on how much comes into the fund.

Because if they're allowed to use this pot of money, so to speak, for their payment, then they're not going to make an additional -- they're not required to make an additional payment towards the ARC or towards the unfunded liability portion.

That can use that payment for one or the other and still meet their obligations under this language. Under the language that I understood it is they're required to use those funds for the unfunded liability and their ARC is totally separate. They cannot use those funds for their ARC.

MR. KEANE: That's what we originally discussed.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: When I say -- when I use the acronym ARC, my understanding of what that means precisely from Jarmon and others is, for this year, that's how much money has to go into the fund to be over the 30 years eliminating any unfunded liability plus funding the normal costs.

1 MR. SCHMITT: For current year. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: One year at a time. 2 3 MR. SCHMITT: Right. 4 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: It counts every year. 5 It used to be every third year and that was a 6 problem. We'll do it every year now, but that's 7 right. So the ARC is a single number. 8 It's a percent of payroll. It's a single number. And 9 whether you parse the number in terms of 10 components, it doesn't change the amount of money 11 the city's got to send over here to the fund. 12 13 MR. SCHMITT: For the current year. 14 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: One year at a time. 15 It's capped each year. 16 MR. SCHMITT: Right. So it's 1/30th or 17 1/27th of whatever the 30-year payment is. And I 18 agree with that. That's with your understanding 19 of the ARC. That's my same understanding. 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. MR. SCHMITT: What I think the issue as I 21 see it is, they're now saying they can apply 22 23 these funds, these reserved funds, not towards 24 the additional unfunded liability, but to pay 25 their current year obligation.

MR. TUTEN: 1 what they've always done, which is take money 2 3 from the general fund or another account to pay 4 their annual required contribution, which is the 5 ARC. Instead of saying, no, we're going to pay 6 our normal bill and we're going to take this 7 extra money that the pension fund gives us and pay down the unfunded, what they're trying to do 8 is take that money, skip over the unfunded, put 9 it in the ARC account.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And basically if they take 25 million from us, that gives them 25 million extra in the general fund they don't have to pay towards the pension. And that's how we got here.

What they're doing in essence in

MR. SCHMITT: Right. So the unfunded liability will not be decreased.

> MR. TUTEN: Right.

MR. SCHMITT: Because they're using that portion that we're saying should go towards the unfunded liability and they're using it for their current year portion only of that unfunded liability.

MR. GLOVER: Yeah. We did discuss a lot of that because -- and I do remember too. And it wasn't a tangent. I mean, he was on point.

now I see how important it was he was on point about that and what the discussion was. They didn't use our contribution to supplement their contribution because it took a long time -- longer time to get to the 80 percent funding layer.

So I do remember it like that as well.

MR. TUTEN: Well, if you remember too, the first of the very onset of negotiations with the mayor, there were similar ideas of doing the same thing with the budget.

In other words, the mayor was in a hurry to get it done because he's going to take 61 million, I think, or 60 million and basically help with the budget for that year, that year.

Of course, the councilmen kind of balked and stuff.

So this is literally going back to that line of thinking but on a much bigger scale. Instead of a one-year type of a bonus from the pension to the budget, now they're trying to apply it to the ten-year term of the deal. And that's just not what we talked about.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I understand the arithmetic differently, and it's important to me

and I think it's important to us, because if we're going to pick a fight with them on these words and it doesn't change the results for our members, we ought not to do it.

So I'm not saying I'm a hundred percent sure, but I'm just not persuaded on how the arithmetic works. Let me say this.

Would you agree that the amount that's going to come to us until we're at 80 percent every year is going to be the ARC that our actuary calculates and brings to us before it's sent to them for the budget every year, plus 40 million a year, until they get 400 million over the ARC, unless we hit 80 percent sometime before that happens; is that correct?

MR. KEANE: ARC plus 40 million.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So what I said is correct.

MR. KEANE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Arithmetically, where ARC comes from I don't think changes one penny how fast our fund recovers and gets to 80 percent. I'm not -- I'm trying to understand, but I don't see it, why it makes a different, what words we apply to a dollar.

MR. SCHMITT: Okay. But we're talking 1 accounting versus cash flow. From a cash flow 2 3 perspective, what we're saying is the ARC is the 4 amount that the city is required to pay net, what 5 the city's required to pay for 1/30th of whatever 6 is due in the unfunded liability. 7 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Plus normal costs. MR. SCHMITT: Plus normal costs. Right. 8 So take that number -- and now what we're 9 saying is in this agreement, the city has agreed 10 to pay that ARC plus an additional \$40 million, 11 infusion of additional \$40 million in cash. 12 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Right. 13 MR. SCHMITT: Under this wording, this new 14 wording, as I understand it, their proposal is 15 the ARC amount is calculated, but instead of 16 infusing an additional \$40 million, they're using 17 18 this other \$40 million and counting it as their \$40 million. 19 20 Okay. Well, that's CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: 21 different than what I was thinking before. 22 MR. SCHMITT: So that's my understanding of 23 their new language, which is what all the 24 contention was about last time, is counting

that -- it's not -- they're proposing not an

25

infusion of an additional \$40 million. 1 They're requesting to use that \$40 million that's already 2 3 there and apply it to their ARC. 4 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. I would agree 5 with that. So is the language as written now, they 6 7 could take the chapter funds, less the holiday bonus, subject to the 80 percent trigger, and 8 count it toward 40 million? 9 MR. KEANE: Yes. 10 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That's what that 11 language says to you? If that's what that 12 language says, I agree on that point, that is not 13 the deal. 14 That's correct. 15 MR. KEANE: 16 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I don't read the 17 language that way, but if it's unclear, I agree with you on that, that does make a difference. 18 That does make a different. 19 MR. SCHMITT: And from the statements that 20 21 I've heard from the mayor and chief of staff, 22 that is their interpretation of what this 23 language would be, which I don't agree with. 24 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yeah, that was not the

deal. So if we say chapter funds may not be used

25

for the 40 million, I agree with that.

MR. TUTEN: Right.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: But I have to say chapter applied to ARC, I don't think it makes a difference to us, just on -- and, yeah, I'm ignoring accounting principles --

MR. TUTEN: I know -- I know what you're getting at, Walt. Look, it's a bill and we're paying it down, regardless of what we say it's due for, it's still going towards the same bill, that's fine.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: But using chapter funds for the 40 million, that was not the deal. I agree with that, and that -- that does make a different.

MR. TUTEN: The difference is in seven years that will expire. In other words, say they are using the chapter funds for helping them pay down the ARC or whatever, it's still going to the same pot, I understand. But that 40 million is still good for ten years. You know, that's not going to -- that's need to come above and beyond all this other stuff.

MR. KEANE: It's on page 32. And it's the "Additional Unfunded Liability Payments." One

talks about the first --1 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: What section is it? 2 MR. KEANE: D. It's called "Additional 3 4 Unfunded Liability Payments." 5 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yeah, but is it, 1, 2, 3, 4? What number? 6 7 MR. KEANE: We're going to start out with number 1. It says we're going to give them this 8 money. And then number 2, the city is going to 9 do this \$40 million. 10 And the amounts -- if you look at the 11 sentence there, the second sentence, "The amounts 12 applied in paragraph 1 shall count toward any 13 amounts required by this paragraph." 14 MR. SCHMITT: So they're not making any 15 additional amount. There's no additional \$40 16 million infusion. 17 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Well, the chapter less 18 bonuses, like 8 or 9 million bucks. They've got 19 to put something in there, right? That's 20 21 currently; is that right? Chapter today less holiday bonus --22 23 MR. KEANE: \$8 million. MR. TUTEN: John, can we back up? And 24 25 Walt --

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Just real quick, Rich. 1 So I agree that that language we never 2 3 agreed to, including in our Board meeting. 4 that does make a difference cash-on-cash to how 5 fast our fund gets healthy and was not the deal. 6 I agree with that. 7 MR. KEANE: And the real difference comes in in paragraph number 3, which talks about our 8 continuing payments, that we're going to make 9 these payments with left-over money, dah, dah, 10 dah, dah, dah, dah. And the city can 11 substitute that money for their contribution. 12 So they're reducing their 13 MR. SCHMITT: current year contribution by the chapter funds. 14 Okay. If you're going to do that, then you have 15 to infuse an additional \$40 million somewhere. 16 17 MR. KEANE: Correct. 18 MR. SCHMITT: You can't count it for both. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: 19 I agree with that. Yeah. 20 21 But in this paragraph 3, that MR. KEANE: the language the Board agreed to on January the 22 23 5th, that if the city did not make their 24 \$40-million payment or a part of their 25 \$40-million payment, it would roll over into the

next year's ARC.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: But paragraph 3, as written now, is okay with us. Would you agree with that?

Well, we need to add in, if you didn't do it, you've got to roll it over and it goes into ARC. But as written, is 3 objectionable to us? I thought 3 was the deal.

MR. KEANE: Well, was it says is the money, "including without limitation, to fund the base benefits, to reduce the unfunded accrued actuarial liability, or to mitigate the city's annual required contribution to the plan."

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. So we need clarification: Is the city's annual contribution to the plan inclusive of the extraordinary 40 million a year or exclusive of it?

If it's exclusive, I believe mathematically it's okay with us. If it's inclusive, it's not because that was not the deal when using chapter funds. Does that make sense?

MR. KEANE: Yes.

MR. TUTEN: Well, I got a problem with the third line in D with "a total of seven fiscal years." Because if drop down, "used as described

above, " dah, dah, dah, but why doesn't it
say "seven consecutive"?

In other words, there needs to be a
parameter on that seven years because -- and I'm

sure I'm going to read through most of this other stuff. With the other agreement, the problem I had with the city was, okay, if they missed a payment, they could bounce it to the next year.

Well, are they going to turn around and say, well, that's seven fiscal years; we just meant every other year for 14 years. But we're going to use the seven fiscal years when we want to use them.

MR. KEANE: The seven fiscal years applies to our payment right there.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I think Rich is suggesting putting in the word "consecutive."

MR. TUTEN: Yeah. Seven from the effective date -- ends in seven years after the effective date starts.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Instead of the intent.

MR. TUTEN: I'm not saying what they're do. I'm just saying they just don't use it against us, or try to.

MR. KEANE: Okay. Add the word

"consecutive." 1 MR. SCHMITT: I think that should not be 2 3 rejected by anybody. 4 MR. KEANE: Right. For our discussions with 5 them, I'm going to try to translate some of that 6 language you just said into -- the Board agrees 7 to transfer this money. It's to be used to pay down the unfunded. It's not to be used to 8 supplement their payment. Is that correct? 9 Is that the way you said that? You used two 10 different little words there. 11 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I would say it 12 13 differently. I would say --MR. KEANE: Excuse me just a minute. Make 14 sure to get these words down. 15 Go ahead. 16 17 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: The chapter funds may 18 not be used for the 40-million payment obligation 19 of the city. 20 MR. KEANE: Okay. 21 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: That solves it, I 22 believe, mathematically and practically every 23 other way. 24 MR. GLOVER: And there was a lot of discussion about that. 25

Oh, yeah. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: 1 MR. GLOVER: And sometimes I think my seat 2 3 mate here is a little suspicious of the city 4 fulfilling their obligations, but he's on point 5 now that we've spent 30 minutes to talk about 6 this thing. We cleared it up here. 7 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: But, as you know, this is real money and important. And I missed 8 earlier chapter for the 40. Well, of course, I 9 haven't read this. 10 MR. KEANE: No, no, no, and I know. 11 also need to put the rollover language in there 12 that the Board previously agreed to. If they 13 don't pay, it rolls over. 14 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: If the city fails to 15 make its complete annual 40-million payment or 16 its present value equivalent, any such amount 17 18 will be added to the next succeeding year's ARC. 19 MR. DARAGJATI: We had that language in there when we sent this to them and they took it 20 21 out. 22 They took it out. MR. KEANE: 23 MR. DARAGJATI: We'll send back the same

language and say, that is what, this is what we

24

25

agreed to.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And we don't agree with that. So that's material and it goes to the core of the deal. That's all the shared sacrifice stuff. This is their side of shared sacrifice.

MR. TUTEN: Yeah. Just scanning over paragraph 1 and then you fast forward down to paragraph 2, it almost -- if I'm correct, just by looking at this it's basically saying they can take the entire donation that we give them in paragraph 1 and apply it towards their \$40 million for ten years, if I'm not mistaken.

MR. SCHMITT: Right. The way it reads.

MR. KEANE: We'll got that fixed.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Just so you know, we're running over what we expected the meeting time to be.

Are there other issues that you need a vote on or that might be -- we might need to dialogue about to see where we are on this subject?

MR. KEANE: No, sir. I believe that -- just to reiterate, the action the Board took at the workshop on January the 5th is the Board's position going forward. And that will then clarify this issue we just talked about, plus the rollover amount and all the issues we talked

about.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We're going to be very prescriptive here. So -- because when you say the position we took on the 5th, I would -- we might have a comment or we might not have a comment or memory of the salient points.

I think we should restate the salient points, because the one that I think might still be open in our minds is the October 1, '14 balance or the October 1, '13 balance.

MR. KEANE: Right. Okay.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Right?

MR. DARAGJATI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Because I thought we were okay with -- you know, whatever it is, it's already in there. Half of it or so is their over contribution above ARC anyway and the earnings on it. There are some additional chapter funds that have accumulated, no doubt about that less, but it's less than 15 percent.

MR. KEANE: Right.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I thought if it closed the deal, we were okay. I could be mistaken, but I thought we were okay with that. So it's kind of sunk cost, so to speak. It's water over the

dam, water under the bridge.

MR. TUTEN: Well, John, another thing to point out to is their language of net present value as far as their contributions. If it was me, I would like to see them -- I think that's part of the reason we get into it that one time, you know.

There's a lot ambiguous language here as far as, well, when are they going to count -- are we counting net present value year one and then applying it to the rest of the years, or are we going to come back in year two when the balance has gone up or our unfunded has gone way down, so we're only going to do, you know, based on that number, which will help us?

I mean, how -- what's the parameters with this thing? That's what I want cleared up with the city. There should be no ambiguity whatsoever.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'll say what I think we agreed to what the deal is.

Let's say that they do the 40 million a year for the first three years, and then for the beginning of year four they say, let's go ahead and pay it off, the rest of it.

It would be the present value of -- if I can 1 do it in my head -- 280 million for seven years, 2 3 present value to a number at that point in time. 4 Because they already put 120- in. They left 280-5 to go seven years. So the PV of 280- for seven years is what our deal was. 6 7 MR. TUTEN: Sure. The present value on the 8 MR. KEANE: remaining --9 10 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So making that clear would be a good thing. 11 MR. TUTEN: 12 Right. 13 MR. KEANE: The present value on the remaining obligation, of the remaining \$400 14 million initial obligation. 15 16 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. 17 MR. KEANE: We got that. 18 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I think that would be a 19 good clarification. I agree with that. 20 MR. KEANE: Fine. And that concludes our 21 discussion on the basic agreement here, but we do 22 want to tell you one other thing. 23 The Board has talked about the budget and 24 the authority of the budget and it's also in this 25 agreement here, and they've reworded that a

little bit. We have not received the answer back from the council president. So the letter has been sent to the attorney general saying, what about the budget? They're ruled twice. We're just asking what their current position is, and everybody will be bound by it when it gets back.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay.

MR. KEANE: That concludes this.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: And then I'll mention just a couple of other things just real quick and we'll be done with the business that needed to be done today.

Some months ago we had agreed to have our general counsel go find a legal expert practitioner on Florida public sector pension law and then an expert CPA-auditor type on public sector pension in Florida who had not earlier worked for either us or the city so there would be no appearance of conflict, and have them come in and do an agreed-upon procedure on the administration, the precise administration of DROP procedurally versus what law and regulation specifies. And if there are any gaps, to have those identified and quantified, directly working with the Board.

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

16

15

18

19

17

20 21

22 23

24

25

And so our general counsel identified the two firms. I've had a chance to talk to both of them now, the CPA and the lawyer, legal firm. Both seemed extremely well-qualified to me. could do this very efficiently. We just need to get the lawyer down in, I think, Sarasota-Tampa area, Southwest Florida.

MR. KEANE: Mr. Deaner.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Deaner. Lee Deaner. Lee's just got to make some time very quickly to read the relevant ordinance or statute, whatever, on this very technical subject so he can then give the agreed-upon procedure task to the CPA to pull a statistical sample of DROP applications and processing, and then report directly to us, just like we have with the independent accountant, what they found.

Full compliance or not. If there appears to be a deviation, very specifically what is it and quantify it for us. And then once we have that, hopefully before the next meeting, if action is appropriate, we'll take it. If none is required, we will then post the actions we took to leave no stone unturned that this has been according to Hoyle on the website and (indiscernible).

We can never get the city council lawyer to come meet with us, unfortunately, to process it with them. But that's their choice.

MR. TUTEN: So, Walt, basically what we're doing is we're inspecting the way we handle our DROP as far as the sign-up, et cetera, et cetera, the time periods, from an outlaw firm, outside law firm besides Bob's. And they're going to compare our procedure on top of how we do everything around the state?

MR. KEANE: No. With the ordinance code.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Our ordinance code for us. It will be like the independent accountant subject matter expert providing a review of our financial reporting and financial statements that staff does, and then giving us an opinion it's correct.

MR. TUTEN: Okay. Simply an opinion based on state law and how we enforce the ordinance code.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: On this narrow, specific subject, since it has been controversial, since the auditor raised it as a possibility of perfect compliance. So it will be like that, so accounts would follow agreed-upon procedures.

MR. TUTEN: Has the city or the general 1 counsel that have claimed that we're not doing it 2 3 the correct way, have they cited any sort of outside facts or examples or precedent, or are 4 5 they basically stating in their opinion they 6 think we're not doing it the right way? 7 MR. KEANE: They say in their opinion there's multiple ways to do it, and they think 8 that we're not doing it the way they would like 9 us to do it, even though they admit there's 10 multiple ways to do it. 11 MR. TUTEN: Okay. So they've never 12 13 specifically said that what we're doing is illegal? 14 15 MR. KEANE: No. But this is the way to put it to bed. 16 Well, I'll say that 17 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: 18 council operative report that came out -- it's 19 been a year timewise, maybe 12 months --Yeah, oh, yeah. 20 MR. KEANE: 21 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: -- and we couldn't get them to come meet with us and process it. 22 23 going from memory, which I should not do, but on 24 that point, in Kirk Sherman's report, it didn't 25 say is illegal or is out of compliance.

1 believe it says it may be or it should be further reviewed. 2 It appears that the actual administrative 3 4 process is providing DROPing members a couple of 5 more weeks or months of benefits that they are 6 not due with the strict interpretation of the 7 ordinance. That's what I recall. It just said, may be 8 or should be looked at, not, it is. 9 MR. KEANE: 10 Right. They could not conclude 11 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: based on their evidence that it is, but they said 12 13 maybe. 14 MR. KEANE: Right. CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: But they raised it, and 15 16 so, you know, we'll put it to bed. 17 MR. GLOVER: But even if they hadn't raised 18 it, it would be good governance to look at it and 19 just kind of -- you know, as a Board, anyway. 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yeah. It's a lot of 21 money. 22 MR. GLOVER: Yeah, yeah. Now, that's what 23 you would have to weigh, the old saying, is it 24 worth it? 25 These guys can do this, CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS:

I think, in five or six days. This is pretty straightforward. Easy for me to say, but it's pretty straightforward stuff.

MR. KEANE: The main objection that the council auditor had was, assume we're going to have a DROP class, get in four times a year, have to sign up in November for the January class, and if you were going to have your time January 5th, January 19th, we'd let you sign up you. You couldn't get in the DROP until you had 20, but we let you sign up just because of the mass number of people.

They said that we -- they said that any loss was negligible, but they said there could be a loss. So we fixed that. Nobody can sign up now until they have at least 20 years. So they have to work a whole extra quarter. But now they're going to go back and look at everything else.

MR. TUTEN: John, do me a favor. When we get this opinion or maybe the outside firm, based on the auditor's report to us as far as what could be, might be, sort of any disagreement they have, bullet point style, however you want to do it, point, counterpoint, I think it would be easier to understand, this is their issue, this

is what our auditor found, or lawyer. This is 1 their issue. This is what we found. 2 3 MR. KEANE: Sure. 4 MR. TUTEN: In other words, a 5 paragraph-after-paragraph report. I personally would rather have it just in a point, this is 6 7 what -- in other words, we can follow it a lot easier, and I think the public and the general 8 counsel's office can follow it a lot easier too. 9 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yeah. It's sort of like 10 what we just went through with Linda, although 11 12

not that lengthy. But, you know, their finding, succinct, one page. We did this; here's what we found.

And then if somebody wants to get into some of the details or look at what, you know, cases they pulled at random or statistically to test and have the testing done, they can look at all the details. But the answer -- question, answer, based on that.

MR. TUTEN: Sure.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Couple of quick other things.

So the annual election of officers needs to I suggest we do that next month. So

you-all be thinking about that. We need to do that.

John, I'm pretty sure this is the cycle we do that on.

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I want to take a few minutes, if we could, and talk about our records structure, procedures, organization, efficiency in which, for good and proper reason, there is a lot of staff time and work going into now, led by Debbie. I hear very good things about the work. I sense it is massive, complex, and there's a lot to be processed and updated, revised. I'm choosing my words carefully here.

But just, you know, from the history and so forth. So that our records and their accessibility and indexing and no redundancy and all is -- is really set up well so that as we're thinking about succession planning in due course, a new leader comes in, they're not having -- because they won't know where that thing from 1973 was or '87. John could go pick it out of a stack because he was here then, but the next one won't be able to.

And I hear great things about your work,

Debbie, kind of on point in leading this. But if you could talk about that with us, and then, in addition, if we could -- and, John, you too, of course.

If we can provide, you know, part-time or special or whatever resources so this can be completed timely -- it's the basic stuff, but it's so important, so valuable that the records be in perfect order and indexed -- you know, just tell us. And I think we'll be supportive of it. We want to be efficient, but we'll be supportive of getting you what you need as you identify the need to do it. I'm talking too much. I'll shut up.

MR. TUTEN: Can I ask a question, Walt? Are you looking at organizing basically the documents, paperwork, et cetera, as far as being able to retrieve it for somebody else as far as what's laying around, like, in John's office?

In other words, what are we defining as what we're going to try to retrieve one day?

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'll give you an example. And I've said this before. And, you know, I'm a management type. I can't help it.

But when I go in our conference room or

John's office, it terrifies me. 1 MR. TUTEN: Well, sure. I understand that. 2 3 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Okay. And so if somebody says, you know, I want to see all the 4 5 attorney general opinions we've ever asked for or 6 gotten on DROP --7 MR. TUTEN: Right. 8 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: -- and DROP administration, if somebody goes to an index, you 9 know, on their little thing, AG opinions or, you 10 know, A, B, C files, subject 1, 2, 3, and then 11 can go to an electronic folder or in some cases 12 and/or physical folder and get it, and not have 13 to think, where the hell did I put it, you know, 14 and all that stuff. 15 MR. TUTEN: Right. 16 17 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: So that's what I'm 18 thinking. And it's efficiency and effectiveness, 19 but I lean more towards the efficiency, particularly the thing about succession planning 20 21 over the next year or so. MR. KEANE: And so in concert with that, 22 23 when Debbie took over for Robby, Robby was a 24 librarian and she filed things one way. 25 Different people found it --

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Was she really a 1 librarian? 2 3 MR. KEANE: Yes, she was. 4 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I didn't realize that. 5 MR. KEANE: She was a trained librarian. 6 So Debbie has started with the corner filing 7 cabinet and started reworking all of this stuff so that it's now reindexed and it's easy to find. 8 As the Chairman says, come to my office and 9 want to know something, I say, it's over there in 10 that third pile. If he walked in there by 11 himself and tried to find it, he would be still 12 looking tomorrow. 13 But Debbie has done a great job. You know, 14 she's very meticulous from the times you've 15 worked with her and she's working hard on this. 16 17 We've got some inquiries with the state. have tons, literally tons, of old records that we 18 want to discard. 19 20 Dick Cohee, as the Chairman, was an 21 accountant. He thought you ought to save every piece of paper, and we did. And we did. 22 We've 23 got lots of it. But in today's electronic age, 24 we're trying to narrow that down. 25 We just lost 500 square feet of storage

space with the arrival of Hertz out here in our front yard here. So it's working close in with Debbie to get all of this done.

And it's massive, isn't it, Debbie?
MS. MANNING: Huge.

MR. KEANE: Well, tell them.

MS. MANNING: Well, it is huge because you had Dick with his own filing system and, of course, he passed away and left everything, you know, disrupted. Same thing with Robby. You pretty much move in and have no idea how she filed and what have you. So huge task.

So basically what you're saying is you want to go more on the electronic side of it instead of -- I mean, we kind of have to get, I guess, everything organized at this point because I've got stuff in the file room over here, I've got Robby's office, I've got Dick's, the conference room, John's office. And, you know, like you said, duplicate copies of a lot of stuff.

So it is massive. I think Kevin said that he had worked with some of that before, so Kevin might be a good ally to work with me.

CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Larry, I know you direct a massive record-keeping operations with

1	enormously stringent legal and other
2	requirements.
3	MR. SCHMITT: Right. And one of the biggest
4	ways we do that is try to go paperless.
5	MS. MANNING: Right.
6	MR. SCHMITT: And there are systems out
7	there
8	MS. MANNING: That you can go paperless.
9	MR. SCHMITT: Right. You know, simple copy
10	machines now are scanners
11	MS. MANNING: Right. And we are scanning a
12	lot of the stuff now and I'm trying or organize
13	it. But it's primarily in my filing system, in
14	my drive, not in G drive, for anybody to access.
15	MR. SCHMITT: Right. And there are actual
16	stand-alone software systems that will allow you
17	to do those things far more efficiently than
18	scanning it in your own file.
19	MS. MANNING: In G drive. I mean, in my
20	drive. Yeah.
21	MR. SCHMITT: And then dragging and dropping
22	all that stuff. Yeah.
23	MS. MANNING: Because I'm the only one that
24	has access to that.
25	MR. SCHMITT: Right. Which kind of creates

the same problem in electronic format. 1 MS. MANNING: Exactly. 2 MR. SCHMITT: But if we -- if there's a 3 4 product out there -- and, again, I'm more than 5 happy to assist in trying to find something like 6 that -- that will allow you to organize all those 7 records so that you only have to handle them one time in a paper format --8 MS. MANNING: Right. 9 MR. SCHMITT: -- and whenever you need to 10 find them, you can search electronically and find 11 them, it's way easier. 12 MS. MANNING: Right. Way easier. 13 I think the Board would be 14 MR. SCHMITT: supportive of getting whatever you need to help 15 do that. 16 17 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Absolutely. MS. MANNING: But we still have to retain 18 19 some original documents. I know when I worked in 20 insurance, you still have to maintain, you know, certain documents for that. 21 22 MR. SCHMITT: Yeah. And those requirements 23 have lessened a lot as people have gotten use to electronic documents. 24 25 MS. MANNING: Right.

MR. TUTEN: I think, Debbie -- believe it or 1 not, in a previous life I had microfiche 2 3 documents at the machine. So I could tell you it 4 takes about -- a trained monkey could do it. I 5 did. 6 Debbie, I think the goal for you is to get 7 the main organization done. We can find somebody to come in behind you, take a stack of papers and 8 slide --9 MS. MANNING: And scan it in and do the 10 paper part, yeah. I need to find out what all 11 we've got everywhere. You know, when somebody 12 asks for something, you know, we're looking in 13 five different directions. 14 MR. TUTEN: Right. I think if we have it 15 organized to the point where we can hire temps 16 for a week to come in and do nothing but, take 17 18 this stack, put it in that machine, put it back. 19 MS. MANNING: Right. 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I think I here what 21 you're saying, Debbie and John. Job one is, see what all we've got. 22 23 MS. MANNING: Right. Because it's massive. 24 And a lot of it's duplicate. 25 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Because there's

extensive files. And then think about how to 1 organize it in an efficient manner. 2 3 MS. MANNING: Yes. 4 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Job two would be 5 systematizing it for accessibility and updating 6 the management going forward. And maybe you 7 ought to go see Larry for a day. MS. MANNING: Yeah, really. I could do 8 that. 9 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: I'm sure there will be 10 some very good learning insight on that. 11 I'll put you to work on my 12 MR. SCHMITT: public records requests. 13 MS. MANNING: No, I have plenty of those 14 already. That's sort of what we did with the 15 16 others. MR. GLOVER: We are under the state 17 18 retention requirement, right? 19 MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. 20 CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: All right. So we 21 appreciate the massiveness and importance of the 22 task. You-all tell us where we can help, all 23 right, any time. I'm confident we'll find a way 24 to do it because it's just essential work that 25 has to be done.

1	MS. MANNING: Right.
2	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: We appreciate it. We
3	appreciate how hard it is and what a good job
4	you're doing. People praise you behind your
5	back, whether you know it or not.
6	MS. MANNING: Well, that's always good to
7	hear. Always good to hear.
8	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Well, I'm telling you.
9	And it's important to us. So whatever we can do,
10	you tell us now and we'll get you what you need.
11	MR. KEANE: And work with them getting some
12	of this newer technology that they're familiar
13	with that we don't ever see.
14	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Yes. Maybe just
15	piggyback and you'd get a discount on the
16	software or something.
17	MR. KEANE: All right, sir.
18	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: John, have I missed
19	anything?
20	MR. KEANE: No, sir. I believe we've
21	covered it all.
22	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Is there anything else
23	commanding the attention of the Board?
24	MR. KEANE: No, sir.
25	CHAIRMAN BUSSELLS: Hearing none, we're

1	adjourned.
2	(The meeting adjourned at 10:58 a.m.)
3	
4	
5	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
6	
7	I, Denice C. Taylor, Florida Professional
8	Reporter, Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, do
9	hereby certify that I was authorized to and did
10	stenographically report the foregoing proceedings, and
11	that the transcript, pages 2 through 107, is a true
12	and correct computer-aided transcription of my
13	stenographic notes taken at the time and place
14	indicated herein.
15	DATED this 6th day of February, 2015.
16	
17	Denice C. Taylor, FPR
18	Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at Large
19	My Commission No. FF 184340
20	Expires: December 23, 2018
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	\mathbf{I}