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P R O C E E D I N G S
September 25, 2015 9:00 a.m.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Call the meeting to order. MR. KEANE: Everyone please rise. Join me in a moment of silence for our following deceased members: Walter H. Farewell, Retired Fire Rescue Captain; Paul F. Galloway, Retired Fire Lieutenant and the Senior Retired Firefighter; Douglas Haqq, Retired Firefighter Engineer; Lewis M. Franklin, Retired Police Officer; Ronald Davidson, Retired Police Officer; and Ailene Schmitt, mother of our Board Chairman, Larry Schmitt.
(Pause)
Amen. Please remain standing and join me as we, Pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MR. KEANE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Trustees. Please be seated. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Director, we have two people that want to speak today. Mr. Lee, you're up first. You have three
minutes. Start the clock.
MR. LEE: Thank you. My name is Curtis Lee. My address is on file.

I'm sure you've all read the most recent Times-Union article.

The first issue I wanted to say is that the trustees with greater than two years of service should be personally sued for the violations of fiduciary duty; likewise, Mr. Klausner should be sued.

He violated the law in January 2010, causing the Police and Fire Pension Fund losses of about 400,000. This is in connection with my oldest lawsuit. Yet this law firm pocketed that money.

The main topic is another related abuse: Mr. Keane's use of 407,000 frequent flyer points in late 2012 for his personal benefit.

These points were accrued on his business AmEx card, which was used for Police and Fire Pension Fund travel. They are not his to spend or cash in.

What did he buy for himself? Did he pay tax on this? These are issues $I$ do not know because Mr. Keane refused to provide the related records.

You are hereby on notice. Take a look again
at my public records requests and provide the records by October 9th. Those requests have been pending for many, many months. If not, I will retain counsel with a view towards litigating. When it comes to litigation, $I$ have a successful track record against the Police and Fire Pension Fund. So I urge you not to spend more money to conceal Mr. Keane's abuses. Do the right thing and provide documents.

Regarding the Senior Staff Voluntary Retirement Plan, when the city sues, do the right thing. Do not cover Mr. Keane's legal costs. He's the beneficiary of that plan, more than $\$ 2$ million worth. The City Council already declared it illegal. Please start showing common sense and ethics and stop defending Mr. Keane.

Lastly, in connection with future public records requests, when Mr . Keane is gone on his retirement, who do you consider the Senior Police and Fire Pension Fund official once Mr. Keane retires? Is it Mr. Carter? If not, why not? I need to know who to hold responsible among the Police and Fire Pension Fund staff.

So please respond on that issue shortly. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Next we have Bill Gassett.
(Councilman Tommy Hazouri enters the Board meeting.)

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: How you doing, brother? COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Mr. Sheriff, how are you doing?

Mr. Keane.
MR. KEANE: Good morning.
MR. GASSETT: My name is Bill Gassett. I'm from Jacksonville, Florida. I speak to you today as a businessman, as a private citizen, but I would like to say I would like to pay tribute to Mr. John Keane for his handling of the pension reform efforts the last couple of years.

I've also been involved, as you know, so I have some firsthand experience of what's going on. He's had to deal with seemingly constant change of data while trying to forge a response to protect the Board and its retirees.

He has had to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune and to take arms against the sea of trouble while defending the Board and the trust.
(Trustee Adam Herbert enters the Board meeting.)

MR. GASSETT: And in this process has had to operate and the Board itself with what some might consider a more hindering press rather than a helpful one.

I am glad that Mr. Keane has decided to stay on as a consultant because -- in helping institute -- implement this new reality that is going to be facing the Board, and the next couple of years will be quite trying.

As far as Mr. Hazouri's addition to the Board, I'm very glad that he's on board. I've known Mr. Hazouri going back to 1987. One thing I can say is he can be trusted, and that's very important, you know, coming from the politicians I heard yesterday.

And, secondly, he does bring to the Board an awful lot of wealth of experience in his prior years of service in government and in private affairs.

But, again, Mr. Keane, I think you deserve some round of applause for your successful efforts in the last two years.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Thank you, Bill.
That's it for the speakers.
MR. KEANE: Close the public speaking
period.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We'll close public speaking.

All right. We'll take up the consent agenda next.

MR. KEANE: Mr. Chairman and Trustees, the concept pension, items 1 through 8, are regular items, disbursements, pension distributions, refunds, application to the DROP.

We note that one applicant has withdrawn their participation in the DROP and will remain an employee.

Distribution of DROP benefits. We've had one rescission of DROP participation because the individual has accepted an appointment from the sheriff.

And that concludes the consent agenda, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Do I have a motion to accept?

DR. HERBERT: Move approval.
MR. GLOVER: Second.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Been moved and second.
Call the question.
All in favor?
(Responses of "aye.")
MR. KEANE: Under Old Business, we have the final report concerning certain aspects of the DROP from our outside, independent CPAs. This is in addition to the CPA firm that does the independent audit. This is a different firm.

The Board had referred the audit performed by the City Council auditor to them for review. Their report is before you. They conclude that the calculations and operation of the DROP plan are in accordance with the ordinance code, and that there were no exceptions. No one got special consideration.

The report is in your packet. This is the front page of their report. It's got this checkerboard-looking thing on it.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Has this been delivered to the council?

MR. KEANE: Received it this week. Once it's received by the Board, I'll refer it to Mr. Sherman.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Do I need a motion?

MR. KEANE: Yes.
DR. HERBERT: What would the motion be regarding accepting this?

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion to accept the report.
DR. HERBERT: I move that we accept the report.

MR. GLOVER: Second.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All right. Been moved and second. Any discussion?

DR. HERBERT: So, John, are there any issues in here that we need to be aware of? Obviously you summarized it in a very positive sense, but are there any matters that we need to be mindful of going forward?

MR. KEANE: No, sir. As we had reported to the Board previously, we had permitted people to enroll in the DROP when they had 19 years and 11 months, and then they go in the next DROP class, but they all had 20 years when the DROP started.

Council auditor said that that -- they viewed that as improper, although they admitted it was actually a savings to the city because the guy was in a little bit smaller thing.

But we're going to change the way we do the DROP, and you must have 20 years when you apply. The key to the operation of the DROP plan under the terms of the ordinance code is the date you apply, the date of election.

And the chart that is in their report here, and it's on page 5, at the bottom of page 5, it says, "Years of Credited Service at Time of Election. 20 but plus less than 30."

You can go in for 130 bi-weekly pay periods. We were letting people with 19 years and 11 months get in because the election period is before the DROP starts just for requirements of the administrative processing. It has to go from here to the advisory committee, to the operating department, to city hall, and then back to here. But we will fix that.

DR. HERBERT: Again, when you say fix it, I just want to be very clear. So what does fix it mean?

MR. KEANE: Fix it means you have to have 20 years to even make the election.

DR. HERBERT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. KEANE: They reviewed a selection of people that they randomly picked. We sent them a list of every single person who enrolled in the DROP, and they -- using their random number generator, they picked some people. But they also were directed by the Board to specifically review Richard Barrett, Bobby Deal and Richard

Lundy.
And as a result of that extensive review, they concluded that there was nothing wrong with the way we handled it.

MR. SCHEU: I'm new, so I don't know the procedures. But this -- these exhibits really didn't come to us before now. In other words, they weren't attached to the emails.

MR. KEANE: Right.
MR. SCHEU: So it would be helpful if we could get them ahead of time. It would take longer to read this. I read the opinion, which is next, the legal opinion, and I think I understand it real hurriedly. But it would be helpful to have it ahead of time so that we can digest it and then ask questions.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: You're looking for the amounts they actually were compensated for, the DROP amounts or --

MR. SCHEU: No. I would just like to be able to read the report before I get to the meeting.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Oh, okay.
MR. SCHEU: It would be helpful, and then if I've got a question, I can call John.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, we had like an informal a couple months ago. They came and spoke, sort of laid out what was in the report before you got here.

MR. SCHEU: So that was before I got here. Okay. Thanks.

MR. GLOVER: But I hear your question. On other things that you would need to review so that you will be able to intelligently digest them and be able to ask intelligent questions.

Generally we get that kind of information, but we can be more sensitive, particularly to the new members and make sure that happens.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Mr. Chairman, do I get to talk?

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Sure.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: I mean, I didn't mean it like that. I don't want to interfere with the members. I just want to -- just to piggyback on what Mr. Scheu said.

I want to be able to catch up. I know that Richard Clark, during the process of all the negotiations and all, the pension bill, probably didn't come to a lot of the meetings.

I plan on doing that because I really want
to try to create a relationship between the Board and the council, and then sometimes I may have questions separate from what the council may ask, but anticipating what some of those questions may be down the road, I would like to also -- the agenda is really important.

I know I didn't get one. I guess it's online, but $I$ would sure like to have it a day or so ahead of time. I know I liaison with JTA and we get the whole book and the whole agenda, this whole thing, ahead of time, several days ahead of time.

Maybe you-all can't do that, but so I can kind of look at it and see if there's some questions I need to ask our council auditor, Joey or someone, so it can be an intelligent question.

You know, I chaired this committee in the legislature for like 10 years, and so I understand what you-all are going through. I just want to make sure that $I$ can get a handle on what I can share with my colleagues.

Communication is the biggest key that I saw since I've been on it for three months, and the lack of communication. And I think if we improve that -- I can't help with the press, but I can
help with the council, and that's what I want to do because I don't want misinformation going back and forth, and to know what the process is.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: John, do you want to speak to that?

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Does that make sense you to, John?

MR. KEANE: Sure. Two points on that.
Our administrative assistant who normally sends this out, she's on vacation this week. So it's been -- we're trying to catch up.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Okay.
MR. KEANE: So we apologize for the oversight in failing to send you the agenda, but in compliance with our Board policy, we did have it on the website. But we will make sure we send it to you.

And responding to Mr. Scheu, what we used to do, we take all those exhibits and put them on a disk.

MR. SCHEU: That would be fine.
MR. KEANE: And then we'll send them out to you in a pdf.

MR. SCHEU: Sure.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Like I say, Debbie is
on vacation this week. She scheduled this long in advance when we thought the Board meeting was going to be last Friday. When the meeting got change, she couldn't change and I told her don't worry about it. We're lagging a little bit this week, but we'll make sure that's all fixed by the next meeting.

MR. SCHEU: Thank you.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Thank you.
MR. GLOVER: Gentlemen, let me go back to -kind of piggyback on Dr. Herbert's question about this report. And you're right. We got a heads-up on this a couple of meetings ago. So we knew it was coming down.

But so I can understand, obviously the process, the administrative process, of how we were deciding the classes, and of course they apply a little early with the class -- effectuate a little bit down the line and that kind of thing. This has survived prior audits, right? MR. KEANE: We've been doing it for years this way. And the reason is because of the -and the ordinance code anticipated that, and there's three or four places in the ordinance code, you know, as the Board adopts procedures to
handle or for administrative processing and reasoning.

By letting the people apply, it's like early voting. As the former Supervisor of Election, you're well familiar with it.

People can come down there and sign the thing. Did they vote that day or did they vote on Election Day? It's clear they voted on Election Day.

So we let the people sign up. The council auditors that came over here and looked at that, they decided that was one thing they could make a beef about, so they did. But, hey, look, we can fix that.

But on the other end, they went to great lengths to try to stretch and saying, Well, maybe they wanted to use the date of election for the people at the bottom, so we let me them elect too early; but then on the top end, they didn't want to use that date, you know.

This report says that everything we did, we did consistently. You can take issue that it was interpreted wrong, but it was interpreted wrong from 1999 all the way until now. It wasn't interrupted wrong for you and a different way for
him and somebody -- another way for them.
So that's what this report says. They said that we consistently applied the rules of the Board.

MR. SCHEU: Just to follow on that. It crosses over into $B$, the legal opinion. I read the legal opinion very hurriedly, but what it seemed to be saying is, notwithstanding the date of election, the DROP period was only the maximum period. You didn't get the extra time. MR. KEANE: That's correct.

MR. SCHEU: And that was the important thing to me, that you weren't getting -- double dipping into it.

MR. KEANE: Correct.

MR. SCHEU: All right. Thank you.
MR. KEANE: So the report from GSK and the report from Cypen \& Cypen were two special reports that the Board commissioned in response to the council auditor's report.

As you know, Mr. Scheu, we tried to get the council auditor to come over here. You even tried to get him to come over. They refused to come to talk about their audit.

So when Mr. Bussells was the chairman, he
just said, Go to outside people that never worked with the city before, never worked for the board, send them all the information and find out what's going on, and we did.

DR. HERBERT: I call the question.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Anymore discussion?
(No responses.)
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All right. Call for the vote. All in favor?
(Responses of "aye.")
MR. KEANE: And that was an adoption of A and B. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

DR. HERBERT: That's correct.
MR. KEANE: Pension Reform, Phase 2, Pension System Enhancement. You have an attachment, Mr. Chairman and Trustees. We have been working with the ITD folks to make changes in the pension management and payroll management system to accommodate the changes.

It's a -- this document here covers 39 pages, and those are projects that are being worked on right now to fix the logic and the thought process in the computer system to recognized the changes made by the pension reform ordinance.

I'll show that received as information. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Do they have a time table of when they're going to have all this in place? MR. KEANE: This part has to be in place by the December pay period because of the calculations that are going to be required for DROP.

When the pension reform ordinance was enacted, it said on the effective date, which is now June the 9th. It's been suggested to the City Council that some more amendments to that to avoid these getting down to the daily calculation of the interest rate, Social Security rate.

All these are annual rates, and if you don't move to a common time frame -- but that's under consideration over at City Hall. We'll show this received as information.

Next item, Mr. Chairman and Trustees --
DR. HERBERT: John, help me. So what exactly do we need from council again?

MR. KEANE: The ordinance code is going to inquire an amendment for clarity.

DR. HERBERT: I'm asking partly because Councilman Hazouri is here, and I think it's important for him to understand what the issue is
that we need to have addressed.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Please.

You're talking about the pension ordinance? MR. KEANE: Yes.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Another amendment?

MR. KEANE: Yes.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Do you have some languages that you want to submit?

MR. KEANE: Peggy Sidman has the language. COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Herbert.

DR. HERBERT: Do you want that sent to you also?

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: If you don't mind. I mean, Peggy will have it. Just so I can know what she's getting.

Let me ask you, basically, the ordinance, can you just tell me simply what it's going to say?

MR. KEANE: Okay. We take COLA, for example.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Okay.
MR. KEANE: People got COLA. The rate changes on June the 9th under the literal interpretation of the ordinance code.

You know, we have suggested to the City Council Finance Committee chairman that that be changed so it becomes an annual thing since the COLA is annualized.

If not, every single person, when they go to retire, they're going to have different dates and so it's going to take hundreds of manual calculations, which then leads to the problem of human error.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: So you want a common date.

MR. KEANE: Right. We met with Mr. Gulliford and the council auditor on this some time ago and discussed it as soon as we started working with IT and saw the issues.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: And, Steve, I guess you know. You're following all that too.

MR. DURDEN: I have not contributed anything.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Okay. You're here because you're here?

MR. DURDEN: I'm here.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Just as a general
counsel representative?
MR. DURDEN: Yes.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Okay. I got it. Thank you. I'm sorry. I just wanted to make sure I knew what his role is today.

MR. KEANE: He's just a long-time friend over here, I think. I think he's just a long-time friend over here to see us.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: And his dad and his sister, they used to live across the street from me on Church Street, his father did, by Central Grammar. Just a little history here.

MR. SCHEU: He was just a mere lad when I first got here.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: I know. He had black hair and full-blown -- I can give you one to make it even look better.
(Laughter)
MR. KEANE: All right. Mr. Chairman and Trustees, the next item is medical reports for new hires.

We received a request from the sheriff's office to consider extending the validity date of preemployment medicals. They are currently valid for six months.

The sheriff's office report that sometimes they've encountered difficulties in getting the
whole class organized in time, and they have to then sometimes provide new medical tests. We sent the request out to the fund's medical director. This has been discussed with him before and the Board. And the doctor said he believes that six months is the maximum time that he would be comfortable with still certifying the people in good health without having them reexamined.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Now, this is six months once they're on the job?

MR. KEANE: No. It's six months from the day they take the medical exam.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Gotcha. I mean, what's the sheriff saying, as far he thinks the six months is just not enough time?

MR. KEANE: Well, the sheriff didn't say that. One of his staff people -CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Administrative staff, gotcha.

MR. KEANE: -- asked for a longer period of time, because if they enter into an issue and they have to defer hiring a class, then the medicals are going to expire and they're going to have to reexamine them.

DR. HERBERT: What is the proposal?
MR. KEANE: They asked would we change it from six months to a year. The medical director recommends that we retain six months.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: So in other words, this is basically, once they take the medical exam, just to make it good for a year if they delay hiring them or hire them at eight months or nine months.

MR. KEANE: Yes.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. I gotcha.
MR. KEANE: But the medical director
recommends that we not accede to that request.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right.
MR. KEANE: So with nothing, it's still six months. You don't have to doing anything. If you want to change it, it's going to take a vote. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, if the sheriff's administration or somebody else has some sort of proof of hardship as far as their hiring process and shows how they've been affected, you know, and it's an inordinate number, it's disproportionate to what's going on, that might be one thing.

But, I mean, has it been a problem, John? MR. KEANE: Not that we're aware of.

DR. HERBERT: I don't see enough information on the table to have a vote on anything. This is strictly for discussion.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right.
MR. KEANE: We'll show it received as information?

MR. GLOVER: John, if they want to make a case on this, $I$ think we would need some background information.

MR. KEANE: We'll contact them.
MR. GLOVER: And someone should come and make a presentation that would either give us more information convincing enough for us to look at modifying it. Otherwise, I agree. We just --

MR. KEANE: We'll contact the staff out at the academy.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: John, just as a side note to that, though, if something, let's just say hypothetically, was changed for the police. We would automatically have to change it for the fire, correct?

MR. KEANE: Right.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay.
MR. KEANE: All right. Next item,
Mr. Chairman and Trustees, is update to the
budget.
Devin.

MR. CARTER: Okay. So your attachment, pretty much I got the investment report as of August at 1.5 billion, but as of today, it's about 37 million less than that, based on current market conditions, pretty much which have been unfavorable overall.

Down below we've got the expenses. Pretty much anything that's over has an explanation out to the side pretty much.

We haven't hired a deputy executive director. That's why we're under budget there. We're over a little bit on some expenses based on the fact that we had pension reform.

Then also these numbers here based on year-end, which is just next week, will include September, all expenses as we get all the invoices in.

So next month you will see two reports for the previous fiscal year and this current fiscal year.

Yes, sir.
MR. SCHEU: Just a couple questions again. I hadn't seen this before. So just for my
edification, the budget period is like other city agencies, October 1 through September 30?

MR. KEANE: Correct.
So this is just showing the budget. Okay. MR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. SCHEU: Okay. And as I see the money manager fees, I tried to do a rough calculation, and it looks like those fees are about 50 basis points. Is that about right?

MR. CARTER: Yes.
MR. SCHEU: Good. Okay. That was one of the concerns of the task force, that we would examine that. Thank you.

MR. KEANE: Okay. Received as information.
We're ready to get Dan Holmes on the telephone.

MR. SCHEU: Could I just ask another question?

MR. KEANE: Sure.
MR. SCHEU: When do we adopt a budget for next year, or has that already been done?

MR. KEANE: It's been done.
MR. CARTER: It's been done.
MR. KEANE: In June. We're required to submit it to the city by July 1st.

MR. SCHEU: Could you send me a copy of that?

MR. KEANE: Sure.

DR. HERBERT: I think it would be helpful also for Councilman Hazouri as well so that he knows what's going on.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: I think I was supposed to have gotten background of some of you-all's formal minutes, but this -- these up-to-date ones would be better for me.

MR. KEANE: Sure.
MR. SCHEU: Related to this, just a question.

What caught my eye on this, thinking it was a proposed budget, on the legal, one of the suggestions or observations of the task force was that we ought to be -- that the fund ought to be using the General Counsel's Office much more, which I think you-all had agreed to and that was in the legislation.

What's the budget for legal and the allocation to the general counsel for next year? I don't need to know that now, but I would like to know because it would seem to me that would drop considerably.

MR. KEANE: I'll send that.
MR. SCHEU: Thanks.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: What were you referring to?

MR. SCHEU: The budget for legal. It's $\$ 400,000$ this year and the allocation to the general counsel of 40,000.

MR. CARTER: It's 40,000 next year also.
MR. SCHEU: And what's the legal for next year?

MR. CARTER: 40,000 for OGC. And pretty much external, I'll have to get that number back to you. I think it's wrapped up in professional services.

MR. SCHEU: Okay. It just seems to me it ought to drop considerably if we're going to use the General Counsel's Office.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Just so I can understand this --
(Telephone ringing.)
MR. KEANE: Go ahead, Mayor. We're getting our consultant on the phone. Go ahead, Mayor.

Don Holmes, you there?
MR. HOLMES: I am. Good morning.
MR. KEANE: Good morning. Hold on just a
minute.
MR. HOLMES: Okay. I'll hold on.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: My thing is, if this is you-all's budget, you-all are going to use the general counsel from now on?

MR. KEANE: On some things.
MR. KAUFMAN: It's going to be for public records suits or --

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Well, let me ask you something that's really on point, then.

Through this legislation we just passed, on the mediation, trying to resolve this before this issue goes to court, where would those dollars come from if -- while you're mediating it or if you pursue it in the court? Where would these dollars from here -- I know where our dollars come from.

MR. KEANE: Out of the budget.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Out of the budget, outside of what you just said? You would have an outside attorney, like Klausner or somebody? MR. KAUFMAN: You're talking about the senior staff?

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Excuse me?
MR. KAUFMAN: You're talking about the new
issue?
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: The last issue that we just passed, you know, about the legality or not based on Laquidara's interpretation and binding opinion.

So that funding, that's really important. That was a big question for us. The funds would come from your budget, which is still our tax dollars, obviously. And outside of what --

MR. SCHEU: It comes straight from -- it's all part of the budget because it affects the amount that comes out of the fund. So effectively it affects the unfunded liability.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Right. Of course. And so none of these dollars would go to the general counsel because that wouldn't be something they would be defending while they're defending us, or representing us.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's correct. That would be a conflict.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: So potentially. Please settle somehow.

MR. SCHEU: Again, I've got a proposal to make as it relates to what the council did at the appropriate time.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Looking forward to it. MR. KEANE: All right, Dan. You ready? COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Yes.

MR. KEANE: Monthly Flash Report, Trustees. And it's the report -- we have -- Mr. Scheu is with us today, our new trustee, Dan, and also our new City Council liaison, former state representative, former mayor, former school board member, Tommy Hazouri. Councilmember Hazouri is here.

MR. HOLMES: Good morning to both of you. I look forward to meeting both of you. COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Good morning. Which one do you want to meet?
(Laughter)
MR. SCHEU: There you go.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: I didn't mean that. I'm talking about which cap you want me to wear. MR. HOLMES: Taken tongue and cheek. I understand.

Okay. In front of you, you should have two pass-outs for review. First is entitled "Monthly Economic and Capital Market Update." I'm going to touch very briefly on that to give you a background for what's happened in the market over
the month of August.
MR. KEANE: We did not put that in --
MR. HOLMES: -- and then I'll spend a little more time on the Flash Report.

MR. KEANE: Dan, we did not hand out the monthly capital report.

MR. HOLMES: Okay. Well, then, orally, I'll just give you the big picture.

It's probably old news now because everybody has been paying close attention to what is going on in THE market. I think after the sell-off in China, everything knows that the Shanghai Index opens at 3 a.m. Eastern Time, for those paying so close attention to it.

The bottom line was August was a very ugly month, especially for the stock market. In terms of the US economy, US economy continues to grow at a modest pace.

Consumer spending and the housing market have accelerated, and that's provided a nice balance against the head wind coming from the news from China.

In August, unemployment showed continued job expansion. And, conversely, wage inflation continued to be below expectation and below what
the fed is targeting, and as a result, we've seen no move by the fed. No move by the fed has been translated into uncertainty.

The equity markets hate uncertainty. As a result, equity returns continue to trade off during the month of September.

Real GDP rose in the second quarter. The second estimate is 3.7 percent, which is stronger than the first estimate and also helps offset this low number for the first quarter.

So as like last year, the fed predicted a stronger second half of the year, and that's starting to happen this year as well.

In terms of yields, basically real yields rose slightly during the month of August, but the bottom line is we saw across the board equities down and bonds basically flat for the month.

So with that as background, I'll get into the Flash Report unless there's any questions.

MR. KEANE: Proceed.
MR. HOLMES: Hearing none, I'll ask you to turn to the first page of the Flash Report. Flash Report's first page shows Asset Allocation.

The bottom line is, at the end of the month, at the end of August, the system had 1.579
billion in assets. So 1,579,255,000 in assets. Asset Allocation was in line with targets, the target range. At the end of the month, you can see that it's remained for the fiscal year primarily overweight in US Equity, a little bit underweight in international, a little bit overweight in fixed income, and underweight in real estate.

MLPs and energy-related investments also have been less than a percent under target.

In terms of return, returns for the composite level are shown on page 2. At the top of page 2, we show returns -- and I'll concentrate on the one month, the calendar year and fiscal year basis, and then more importantly per the investment policy, over rolling threeand five-year periods.

So as I mentioned, it was an ugly month. Really no place to hide other than the real estate in the asset allocation that is approved by the system -- or by the Board. Stocks were down and bonds were basically flat, as I had mentioned.

In terms of total return for the system, down 4.2 percent for the month, a little bit
below the policy index. We'll get into that in a second.

For the calendar year, it's down about 2 percent. Again, about 29 basis points below the policy index.

So far for the fiscal year-to-date, the system is essentially flat. It's down about 0.1 percent, but it's above the benchmark, the policy index, by 0.66 percent.

Breaking down the composites, we see for the month domestic equity was down 5.9 percent. That was a little bit above the benchmark.

More importantly, the international equities were down 8 percent. That came primarily from the underperformance of emerging markets. And also to some extent the underperformance of one of the managers on a relative basis.

Fixed income we saw basically flat, down 23 basis points, in line can with the aggregate index. And then real estate remained positive.

One thing I will caution is that in looking at the real estate, these are preliminary numbers and the real estate returns are net of fees.

And then, finally, looking at MLPs, MLPs continue to trade off in -- during the course of

August at negative 5 and $1 / 5$ percent.
At least the one positive in the MLP space is that the yield is now above 7 percent. There's a 5 percent yield spread to ten-year treasuries.

Historically when the yield spread in treasuries has gotten to over 5 percent, the succeeding 12 -month return has averaged above 30 percent, somewhere around 50 percent.

Now, admittedly, a lot of that was skewed by 19- -- I'm sorry, by 2008, 2009, but even without that, it's still ahead of the average to above 30 percent.

So we're looking for more traction there and a better return going forward, but with the -still the 7 percent yield is a nice buffer against volatility.

In terms of the composites, what happened in US equity, basically Brown and Sawgrass have come back. We've seen the market rotate as we talked about last year from value to growth.

The market has recognized that with the end of quantitative easing. We've seen investors recognize that they were paying expensive prices for dividend and -- dividend paying and defensive sector stocks.

The market has started to rotate back around to what in their eyes are very cheap, sustainable growth companies. And as a result, Brown's performance has made a very strong comeback over the last 12 months. But still behind since inception, but they're staying true to their style and the comeback is fully what we've expected.

Over the course of the month, Sawgrass picked up a little bit of running room against their benchmark.

On the value side, Eagle continues to do fairly well versus their benchmark over long time periods. They're a little behind for the month.

We continue to have GAMCO on the watch list. They're catching back up to their benchmark on a fiscal year-to-date basis, but given the returns from smaller names, the comeback of smaller names in the market, we would have expected their performance to be a little bit better.

So our research team is meeting with them and getting additional information. We'll report back at the quarterly meeting.

On the small-cap side, one other manager
that's under a bit of stress, which is Pinnacle, over the fiscal year-to-date, Pinnacle has underperformed their benchmark by a fairly wide margin.

We've seen this before. They tend to have higher highs and lower lows, but their information ratio is generally fairly high. Translated, they're getting -- they're getting paid for the volatility that's part of their -part of the residual of their process.

There's some stock-specific reasons why they have underperformed thus far -- so far this year, but long-term we believe that they're still a great manager and they're a top-tier manager for us.

On the international side, emerging markets has been the biggest detractor from performance. Emerging markets over the course of the month were down over 9 percent.

Your emerging markets managers outperformed that, but the one manager that $I$ had mentioned before as bringing down the composite return is Baillie Gifford. Two issues with Baillie Gifford.

First: Growth has come back. If you look
at the benchmark returns between Baillie Gifford, on a fiscal year-to-date basis, their benchmark is down 72 basis points; whereas the value index that we use to measure Silchester is down over 6 percent, 6.8 percent, on a fiscal year-to-date basis.

So it shows, like the US, a fairly wide disparity in the performance between growth and value stocks.

What really would penalize Baillie Gifford is their exposure to emerging markets within that all-cap portfolio. That's been a real drag on relative performance.

Again, longer term, they've performed well. They're above the benchmark since inception, and we expect them to do well -- better going forward.

The two emerging markets' portfolios, both above the index for the month. Longer term, Acadian has done well, and we'll happy about that as well. They remain closed to new business.

Any questions on the equity managers?
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Hey, Dan, Rich, here, buddy. I've got a quick question for you, two things.

First thing. On these managers, can we get a performance evaluation on the upside and downside capture for these managers compared to the index? In other words, when the index went up 100, what do they usually get out of that, 90 , 95; and on the downside as well, because I know a long time ago we used to kind of get that and -or sporadically from Merrill and --

MR. HOLMES: Yes. Rich, we traditionally have provided that in what has affectionately been known as the manager-score-card kind of report. We typically have done that and reviewed the managers before the contract -- the end of the contract period when we have to renew contracts. I can provide that to you at the next quarterly meeting.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. We're actually, I think, going to vote on renewing the contracts today, so that's fine. But, yeah, give it to me as soon as you can. It's just something I like to look at because when you follow the numbers as far as their index goes, it sort of -- it gets a little tedious.

The second thing, with the MLPs, Dan, I mean, the Middle East, Saudis, OPEC, they're --
it's a race to the bottom with them. They're not worried about the price of oil.

And long-term, I mean, do you see the MLPs in this country for transporting especially oil and fuel, I mean, are these going to bounce back from this, or is this something they're going to have to wait, you know, five, ten years to get out of. And if so, should we be looking maybe to ease up on the MLPs for a while?

MR. HOLMES: You know, Rich, our view is that the MLP space will recover. I think right now what you're seeing is the short -- the results of a short-term supply-demand imbalance.

Even with Iranian oil coming on, that makes up a very small part of the oil share. We don't expect it to have much of an impact.

OPEC is going to -- at least for the foreseeable future, keep their spigot open. We've seen some pressure in some of the shale drilling companies. We're starting to see some layoffs.

We fully expect there to be a few -- a few distressed, especially debt -- on the debt side, the stress debt situations, where some of the US companies, not necessarily the MLPs -- but, you
know, the oil and gas that's being produced still has to get from the upstream to the downstream consumer.

And the MLP construct for oil and gas pipelines, storage facilities, transfer facilities, et cetera, there is still demand for that. Plus there's inflation escalators in their contracts.

So we do believe that they will -- the market will eventually recognize that the MLP space is paying fairly high dividends and they're fairly cheap right now, and the market will rotate back around to those securities.

Longer term. So I guess one other thing to take away is, longer term, the correlation of the performance of MLPs relative to the price of oil or natural gas has been lower correlation.

In other words, the price of the commodity has not affected the performance of MLP securities.

When you have a DROP in the price of oil of this magnitude, over 60 percent, in such a short period of time, the entire sector has gotten painted. The entire energy sector has gotten painted with a broad brush.

When the market takes a step back and realizes that MLPs, the fundamentals of MLPs are solid and not directly tied to the price of oil and natural gas, I think you'll see the start of a comeback.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Dan, I'm really not concerned about the price of oil. I mean, that's part of it. But to me it's more of the supply and demand aspect of it.

I mean, with China and everybody else slowing down, or somewhat slowing down, you know, the demand for oil -- in other words, that's going to affect our production. That's what you see with the fracking and all that and the guys off the coast being laid off is because the demand is not there.

If the demand is not there, then obviously they don't need as much of our oil from here, which is going to directly affect the MLPs as far as transporting it.

That's what I'm -- is there any sort of metric that you have where you can measure that demand for a certain amount of oil or natural gas or whatever it is and how it affects MLPs, because that's what $I$ see going forward. Could
be wrong.
MR. HOLMES: My point is, is that that supply-demand equilibrium over the long term does not affect the price of MLPs.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, let me ask you this, then, Dan. What is the biggest affector of MLPs, then?

MR. HOLMES: Right. Long term, the bigger affector -- or the biggest effect or determination of MLPs are basically they're long-term fundamentals relative to bonds and relative to stocks.

So what would raise warning signs for us for MLPs? First of all, there was a big unexpected spike in interest rates. That would be a drag on MLPs.

Some unexpected -- some unexpected -- let's see. Right now my biggest fear is a big unexpected spike in interest rates to MLPs. I think that's the biggest issue.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yeah. I don't want to worry about that too much right at the moment, because, you know, I think the fed's sort of jittery at best.

Okay. Well, that was it. I mean, I know

I've been kind of giving you a hard time about MLPs for a while now, seems like. But I'm just -- to me I see a supply and demand issue, and if the demand is not there, both here and abroad, you know, if people aren't asking for oil and gas, then you're not going to put it in a pipe to take it somewhere, you know.

And I just kind of -- we don't have a lot in there compared to the rest of the fund, but still it's losing money big time, and $I$ just want to make sure that, you know, we watch it.

MR. HOLMES: And I appreciate the concern. We're still a little bit below target there. There's why I haven't moved it back up to target when we see traction. Yeah, we think it's getting to be a buying opportunity. And when we see a little bit of traction, then we'll come back and make a recommendation and rebalance.

But over the short term, I think I passed out at the last meeting -- I think there was a five-page pass-out on MLPs. I can send that back out again.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: That's fine. Yeah, I remember. That's fine. I'm good, Dan. If the other trustees want to get it, that's fine. You
can send it to them.
MR. HOLMES: I'll send it to John for distribution.

MR. KEANE: That would be good.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay.
MR. HOLMES: Very quickly, back to the composite report.

As I mentioned, basically interest rates and faxed income managers over the course of the month, basically real rates increased, fixed income managers were either flat to slightly negative during the course of the month. The fixed income composite was down about 20 basis points.

Looking at the fixed income managers behind that composite, we basically saw the Thompson Siegel basically in line with the index.

Credits in the portfolio has basically driven performance, and they're above the benchmark overall for the time periods shown.

The chips were down more with the -- getting in line with the rise of the real interest rates. They were down about 70 basis points.

With low inflation and -- with low inflation continuing and with the rise in real yields, we
are recommending using the TIPS money to repay the city. That's part of the rebalances recommendation.

And, finally, on the leveraged loan, the bank debt portfolio, the manager was basically in line with the benchmark for the month. Fiscal year, it's slightly below. The longer term is slightly below. And we'll talk about that more at the quarterly meeting.

Real estate remains positive, as I mentioned before. It was up over 1 percent, and on the fiscal year-to-date, it's the bright, shinning star in the portfolio. It's over -- it's up over 13 percent and significantly above the benchmark, and both managers continue to do well. JP Morgan and Principal are performing as expected.

Adding Principal to the portfolio has been very helpful. They've done very well over the fiscal year and basically since inception. They had an element of valued add in their process which helps diversify the portfolio and also pick up returns relative to the benchmark.

And we've already kind of talked about MLPs. Both managers, relative to the index, continue to do well, but it's that entire space that is
traded off.
And so even with the tradeoff over the last 12 months in terms of performance, I mean, we're basically at the one-year mark where energy started to trade off. Even with that, since inception, both managers are up over 13 and 14 percent respectively.

So that's the Flash Report in a nutshell. I'll entertain any questions.

MR. KEANE: Dan, is Principal -- are they still closed for new investments?

MR. HOLMES: I'm sorry. Say that again.
MR. KEANE: Principal Realty Advisors. Are they still closed for new investments?

MR. HOLMES: Yes. There's a queue to enter both managers' portfolios.

MR. KEANE: Okay.
MR. HOLMES: And I can -- I periodically touch base with them, get an idea where the queue is.

But Pinnacle's was shorter than -- I'm sorry, not Pinnacle. Principal's was shorter than JP Morgan's. But still it was almost a year, if not a year, the last time I checked.

MR. KEANE: All right. Thank you.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Dan, this is Tommy Hazouri. I just wanted to ask you -- and I could ask them.

Is your portfolio conservative, aggressive, moderate overall for what they are investing in? Is this -- the whole pension portfolio, do you have a category that it's in, moderate, aggressive --

MR. HOLMES: No, sir; no, sir. That's usually -- that's usually -- that parlance, if you will, usually kind of falls in the retail part of the market.

But compared to other institutional investors, $I$ would say that it is fairly -- I would say moderate to slightly conservative, and to qualify that, what $I$ mean is, because of state statute, international equities are below 20 percent of assets.

Usually we see more in international. In terms of the fixed income, probably about 4 to 5 percent higher than what we usually see in fixed income.

But -- and then in real estate, it's probably about a little bit higher than what we would see in the institutional marketplace, but
we've kept that higher to offset the decline in yields for fixed income.

And it's just simply, we don't want to add more volatility to the portfolio by adding more to equities.

Right now we believe that US equities are overvalued, and I would rather have money in real estate now. We do pay attention to how expensive real estate is. We saw the cap -- we saw the cap rate spread to treasuries starting to get squeezed in the beginning of 2014. That has stopped.

Net operating income has gone up with leasing power, but it's something we monitor on a regular basis. And if we see that changing, we would come back to the Board and recommend taking money out of real estate.

So I would say it's basically moderate, if I had to put it in those terms.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Thank you, Dan.
MR. HOLMES: Sure. Sorry for the long-winded answer.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: That's even more helpful. Thank you.

MR. KEANE: Dan, before we let you go, the
next item on the agenda is the contract renewal for our investment managers, and as we had previously discussed and again reviewed at last month's quarterly meeting, it's your recommendation that pending the further reallocation of assets due to pension reform, that we retain all of our current managers. Is that correct? MR. HOLMES: Yes, sir. And that's not to say that everybody gets a pass, because there's a couple managers, like I said, we're keeping an eye on. But any contract that you have with managers is terminable with 30 days' notice.

So if we make a decision to terminate managers and reallocate, you can do that and not worry about it having a long-term locked-in contract. Everything is liquid. MR. KEANE: All right. DR. HERBERT: May I ask a question of Joey? CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Sure. DR. HERBERT: Joey, with regard to the two plans that you work with for the city, are you renewing all of these contracts, for the ones that you have in your portfolio?

MR. GREIVE: So, through the Chair, to answer Dr. Herbert, we operate a little bit differently in that we don't renew our investment manager contracts every year. We have different terms. We have staggered terms with our investment managers. More just for operational burden, but that's by no specific design.

If we hire a manager today, when we think about the context in which we're hiring them, the segment of the portfolio, and we'll structure a term usually of three years with two two-year renewals, or a five-year term with a two-year renewal.

We review them continuously and we always reserve the right, just as you do, to terminate at your discretion. You can typically terminate with or without cause $30,60,90$ days, depending on how you structure.

I think we've got 30 days in most of our contracts. And I think -- well, I'll defer to John.

MR. KEANE: Ten.

MR. GREIVE: Ten days for you also. Just a different way to do it. Not -- you know, right or wrong, just a different way to do it.

DR. HERBERT: Are there any managers on here that you see that have generated concerns for your portfolio?

MR. GREIVE: Well, you know, the same -- the same that Dan talked about being on the watch and, you know, being that we share eight money managers now -- actually, nine, in common, I do keep pretty close tabs on several of them: Eagle, Brown, Pinnacle, who we've got, you know, in our watchful eye too.

Baillie Gifford, Silchester and Principal, and then the two MLP managers, you know, we have in our portfolio too.

MLPs. Just as Trustee Tuten has been tooting the horn on MLPs for quite some time -no pun intended -- we have too over at the General Employees and Correctional Officers' Plan.

We used the cash rebalance that we needed to come up with to pay the city back a year ago as our opportunity to take about 40 percent of our exposure to MLPs off the table.

In hindsight, that was not a tactical play. That was just a rebalance. We've made so much money so fast in MLPs, just as you-all have in
the same time period, that we pulled some off the table.

As Dan said, you-all are still slightly short of your target with MLPs. I would not suggest pulling or reducing from MLPs now. Now, there may be a time to do that, but I don't think that's now, as Dan was saying.

Had we done that a year ago, it would have been good. But, you know, hindsight is 20/20. I would say that, you know, we monitor them.

Dan can certainly bring us recommendations to use this as a buying opportunity, as he said. But, you know, we've already got $\$ 100$ million in exposure. So you do have to think about how much exposure do we want? So the two MLP managers merit, you know, constant review.

The couple of areas of opportunity that I see for the portfolio, Mr. Chairman, if I may, I I'll keep this very brief.

I agree with Dan that you-all are positioned moderate to moderately conservative. And the reason $I$ say that is within fixed income, you don't have as much as Core Plus type exposure, you know, investment group credit, high yield, stuff like that, as some plans do.

We've got a little more high-yield-type stuff than you guys do. Now, there are certain considerations in Chapter 175 and 185 that we need to be careful of in considering that.

But, also, within real estate, your two managers that you have are Core, meaning that they are typically high-grade properties in desired areas, like Atlanta, New York, Chicago, Boston. And it's all the high-quality stuff.

Being that that's the high-quality stuff, that's where most people have chosen to fly over the last year or two, and it's created these big backlogs of people wanting to invest money in them.

When there's a huge supply of capital chasing few assets, those assets get priced up and the opportunity kind of the goes away.

So we're investing in a very methodical, slow manner to throttle up the Core real estate, as John indicated.

But an area that $I$ see that we can focus on going forward is Core Plus real estate. So maybe value add where you buy -- you hire a manager who buys something that maybe needs a little work to it, let them fix it up, and then they can raise
rents and make it look pretty and create value.
So a couple of areas of opportunity for the portfolio over the next year or two that I think we could look at.

But, you know, I work with Dan pretty closely on the investment managers. And I think we do need to keep a close eye on Pinnacle, because we've got exposure there too on the city's side. I agree with what Dan said with them, though. They're just a -- they're a volatile manager. They're going to do really well when their strategy is working and they're not going to do so well when the strategy is not working.

MR. GLOVER: Bill, through the Chair, the decision to add the Investment Advisory Board, was that based on anything other than the return track record? Because if you look at the return, all the returns over the last, let's say, three and five and ten years, they've been pretty good, I mean, with the process.

Was there any conversation in the task force that they could have been better, so we're going to add the Advisory Board, or was it more or less, We just think this would enhance it?

MR. SCHEU: I think it's the latter. We did discuss returns we compared with others, but I think the real point of it was, if you look at the Board, we're people that have expertise in lots of different areas, but not necessarily in investments.

So the task force felt that if you could give advice to the Board by a group of people that that's what they did for a living, that they really were investment professionals, that would enhance the ability of the Board itself to make those decisions.

And John was very helpful in that part of it because he kept insisting it was the Board that was the fiduciary, and the Board should not be bound by a recommendation of the Investment Advisory Committee, but it should -- it would be helpful to have that come to the Board for advice.

That's the reason for it. It's more of an enhancement nature.

MR. GLOVER: It certainly can't hurt.
DR. HERBERT: I'd like to follow-up on that.
John, in term of this process for the next year and looking at the contract renewals, would
you envision these recommendations going first to that committee before coming to us? MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. DR. HERBERT: Okay. I just want to make sure.

So the question before us now is, Should we approve the renewal of these contracts for the time period designated?

MR. KEANE: It's going to be in next item. Yes, sir.

MR. SCHEU: I think my recollection is that the role of the Investment Advisory Committee, they must be consulted in certain places, not that their decision is binding. But there are some places --

MR. KEANE: Selection.
MR. SCHEU: Selection. Right.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Are these outside?
Where do they come from, the investment advisors?
MR. SCHEU: I think it's five people from the First Coast area. COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Oh, it is? They're from here, then? MR. SCHEU: Right, right. And they're volunteers. And none of their firms have any
business with the Board.
MR. KEANE: One is them is Mr. Gassett there. Bill Gassett.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Oh, that's right. I knew that. I forgot. The Lord be with you. MR. SCHEU: They haven't been approved. COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: They have been approved?

MR. KEANE: Have not.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: When does that take place, and who does that, you-all?

MR. KEANE: The Board is going to do it and then send it to City Council for confirmation. COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: So we approve it, even the advisory board?

MR. SCHEU: I think they do confirm, as I call.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: That kind of transparency really --

MR. SCHEU: That makes you fiduciaries in liable.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: That's all right. We're liable for everything. You know, the new phrase is "unintended consequences." I said, I want to start passing things with intended consequences.

MR. KEANE: Anything else with Dan?

MR. GLOVER: Are they meeting in the Sunshine?

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Do you want to call for a vote on that?

MR. SCHEU: They also -- and Pugh was particularly helpful in saying some of the things that they need to do.

MR. KEANE: We can tell Dan good-bye.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Dan, you still there?
MR. HOLMES: I apologize. I was on mute. I apologize. I was typing. I didn't want to have you hear my clicking of keys.

What I've done is I've pulled up the MLP research piece to which I previously referred, and I just emailed it to John. So if anybody wants a copy, they can get it right after the meeting.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All right. Thank you, Dan.
Anybody have anything else for Dan?
Dan, we appreciate it, Big Guy. We'll talk to you next time.

MR. HOLMES: My pleasure.
Just to put things in context, you were
talking about longer-term performance. One last parting note.

You know, I know that the returns over the last month and fiscal year-to-date had been pulled down because there's really been no place to hide in equities or fixed income.

But if you look at longer-term performance, the system continues to rank in basically the top portile over the 1-, 3-, 5-, 7-, and 10-year periods.

So longer term it's done fairly well and we'll endeavor to keep it there.

I hope you all have a good weekend.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Thank you, Dan. Nice meeting you on the phone.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Thank you, sir.
MR. SCHEU: Thank you.
MR. KEANE: Mr. Chairman and Trustees, the next item on the agenda is the money managing contract renewals that we just had the discussion on.

DR. HERBERT: I move adoption of the contract renewals from October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2017, as outlined in the agenda. MR. SCHEU: Second.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We have a move and second. Discussion?
(No responses.)
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Seeing no discussion, all
in favor?
(Responses of "aye.")
MR. KEANE: The next item, Mr. Chairman and
Trustees --
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Mr. Chairman, could I just ask?

On what Joey was saying earlier, the ones that he's kind of monitoring, are you-all doing the same thing that he is?

MR. KEANE: Oh, yeah.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: The same way? So you-all kind of coordinate? MR. GREIVE: Yeah. We share the same investment consultant.

MR. KEANE: Dan Holmes works for them too. COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: What?

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: The consultant on the phone.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Oh, very good.
MR. SCHEU: They have an overall manager, and then he --

MR. KAUFMAN: But not all the managers are exactly the same.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Thank you.
MR. KEANE: New Business. Addendum to the Security Lending Authorization Agreement that is attached. We're changing from one security lending trust fund to another fund.

DR. HERBERT: Which item is that?
MR. KEANE: The Northeastern Trust Security Lending Agreement. 93.

DR. HERBERT: Oh, there it is.
Can you just highlight briefly what the addendum is?

MR. KEANE: We're just changing from the Northern Trust Core USA Fund collateral pool to the Northern Trust Collective Security Lending short-term, moving into a different account.

Some of the people that participate in the account we're leaving from, we no longer want to loan the securities to. We're tightening who can borrow our securities.

MR. SCHEU: This is a cash account?
MR. KEANE: No. This is the security lending. We lend our securities out, and the money comes back to us.

MR. SCHEU: Okay.
MR. KEANE: But we're reducing the pool of people that we can lend securities to. This is a revenue source for the fund.

MR. KAUFMAN: And it's on recommendation of the investment advisor?

MR. KEANE: Yes.
MR. SCHEU: I'll move it.
DR. HERBERT: I second.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Moved and second. Any discussion?
(No responses.)
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All in favor?
(Responses of "aye.")
MR. KEANE: The next item, more good news from Northern Trust in our discussions with them for renewing our account. They agreed to lower the fees on two of our accounts, that EAFE index and the S\&P 500 index. So we're going to save a few dollars there.

We'll show that received as information, Mr. Chairman and Trustees.

The next item on the agenda is the analysis of DROP enrollment statistics. We're happy to note several things in this class here. The
class is much smaller, only 14 people, which tends to reflect the stability within the workforce because of the result of the elections.

The apprehension and who is going to be here and who is going to get run off is mostly taken care of now. So we only had 14 people go into this DROP class. Their average whole year of service is 21, which is a slight improvement from the past. They're also a little bit older.

So the interaction of those three things helps in the long-term unfunded. People stay here an extra year and they're also a year older. So when they do retire, they'll have one less year in retirement. So all in all, that's good news in that.

MR. GLOVER: I suspected you would have reduction in the number of $D R O P$ when we settled the pension, when we signed off on the pension. MR. KEANE: Yeah. Well, that's what this -that's part of it too.

I wanted to attribute it to the election and good leadership.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: And outstanding council members.

MR. KEANE: Sure. New council members.

MR. GLOVER: I don't know how I missed that. COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Well, you did. MR. KEANE: We'll show that received as information.

The next item, Mr. Chairman and Trustees, is the memo that we received that we've been working on. We've briefed the Board previously.

The first four pay periods last year in October and November, the city did not contribute the correct amount. After many discussions, and we've been working on this several months, the money was transferred, and we're up to date with the city. The city is up-to-date with us, is the correct way to say that.

We'll show that received as information. DR. HERBERT: John, Mr. Chairman, going back to the financial side, we approved the rebalancing of our accounts. Has all that been done? And when does the check go to the city for the $\$ 102$ million?

MR. KEANE: September 29th. DR. HERBERT: So the rebalancing has occurred? MR. KEANE: As of yesterday, settling today. DR. HERBERT: Great.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: What account does that go in, Joey?

MR. GREIVE: So the Police and Fire Pension Fund will wire that to our local bank. We then use that cash, just cash, to -- and we combine it with other cash we have to make our 10/1 debt service payment as a city.

We've got about $\$ 180$ million in principal and interest that we need to pay on October 1st, which is why it was so important that I thank this Board for being timely in paying the city back.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Me too. Me too.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We always pay on time.
MR. GREIVE: Yeah, you always do. You
always do. And it's a good process. You know, over time, it works. There are the occasional year, like this one, where it does not work as well as we would like it to. But over time, it's a good process, and I think we should continue it.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: See, that's what it's about when you work together, good things happen. MR. GREIVE: That's right. Team work. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: A team. That's what I've
been saying from the start, we're a team.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: We're going to have a team here.

DR. HERBERT: John, I'm just very pleased that you addressed that on an expedited basis and we'll have all that taken care of.

MR. KEANE: Oh, yes. Everything's been identified and sold. Cash is going to be swept into our paid receipts account on Monday. The fed wire goes out Tuesday morning by 10:00. The city has the money by noon on Tuesday.

MR. GREIVE: I get to keep it for one day. COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: You told me you handled a lot more than that.

MR. GREIVE: Oh, yeah.
MR. KEANE: The next item on the agenda, Mr. Chairman and Trustees, is update on security litigation matters.

Stu.
MR. KAUFMAN: Sure. Good morning.
At the suggestion of the Chair, let me
introduce myself first for the new council committee members.

Stu Kaufman from Klausner Kaufman. We've been serving as counsel for the Board for, I
think, over 25 years now.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: I remember you well. Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN: Long time. Long time.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: You were just 12 when $I$ was in the legislature.

MR. KAUFMAN: Mr. Klausner is a Jacksonville native and has been fortunate enough to work with John for over 25 years now.

Upon suggestion of the Chair, we thought it would be a good idea just to go over the securities litigation policy that the Board has had in effect for the last 15 years.

As you probably know, whenever there's a class action lawsuit brought pursuant to Section 10b-5 of the SEC rules, Securities Fraud, usually an institutional investor is the largest institutional shareholder that has the biggest loss in the case.

And in those instances, they apply for lead plaintiff, because whoever has the biggest loss in the case is entitled to participate as lead plaintiff in a securities lawsuit.

So we have participated over the years in several securities class lawsuits. I think we've
recovered over 2 billion over the last 15 years on behalf of class members that held a particular stock that we were -- that the lawsuit was suing the company over.

Just for your information, the policy is that whenever there is a decision to be made, counsel, in conjunction with the executive director, makes the decision whether to participate or file as lead plaintiff in the lawsuit. And then it's reported to the Board as to the progress of the litigation.

Most recently we have reached a settlement in a case called the Tower Group. It's set for the final hearing in -- originally October. It was just reset for November 23rd.

So at that time the law firm that is representing us in that case, Bernstein, Litowitz, Bergman \& Grossman, a huge securities law firm from New York, will petition the court to approve the final settlement and to approve the attorney's fees to Bernstein Litowitz.

Our firm acts as co-counsel in the case with whoever the securities' firm is, and we receive a portion of that fee, up to 5 to 10 percent of the fees awarded to the securities' law firm that's
handling the case.
The fund does not come out of pocket at all. Everything is on a contingency-fee basis, and any and all time expended by staff, such as deposition time, attendance at mediations, is reimbursed to the fund as administrative costs.

So if John is spending hours responding to discovery requests or if they want to take his deposition or he needs to attend a mediation, we submit to -- as part of the settlement, reimbursement of the administrative expenses at John's hourly rate of pay.

So the Board does not come out of pocket -the fund does not come out of pocket at all during these cases.

Just to advise. There's a couple of other cases going on right now. In fact, John and I are attending a deposition next week on one of the cases that Bernstein Litowitz is representing us in.

But in addition to Bernstein Litowitz, we have a number of other law firms that represent us in these types of cases as well. The vast majority of these cases we do not participate in, and we have made recommendations that we not even
file for lead plaintiff status.
And there's a threshold minimum loss that we have to have in order to even consider filing for a lead plaintiff. So if we have less than a six-figure loss, we're not even going to bother applying for lead plaintiff status.

It has to be a case in which we have a substantial interest in in order for us to get involved in those cases. So we just wanted to update you on the policy for that.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Stu, where was this Tower Company out of? Where were they located?

MR. KAUFMAN: I think -- I'm not sure where they're located. The suit took place in the Southern District of New York. So we sued them in federal court in New York.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Oh, really? Isn't there a Tower -- maybe I'm thinking of Tower Hill.

MR. KAUFMAN: The Tower Group was a -- it's an insurance company. And the fraud was based upon material misrepresentations made by the Board of Directors of the Tower Group as to their earnings.

DR. HERBERT: So, John, you're being deposed on the $29 t h$ in New York City?

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir. I'm going to New York on Monday to meet with the security litigation counsel. Stu Kaufman is going to be there.

We will have a deposition set for Tuesday, seven hours. I think it starts at 8:30 in the morning and is scheduled to run until 5 or $5: 30$.

MR. KAUFMAN: On Monday we'll go up and we'll do the deposition prep, get John ready for his deposition.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Excuse me. How many -that's just you-all's deposition?

MR. KAUFMAN: It's our deposition as the lead plaintiff because John has the most knowledge on behalf of the fund.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Right. No, I'm not questioning that.

How many more are there out there doing the same thing?

MR. KAUFMAN: At pension funds?
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Yeah. I mean, that's some of that class action.

MR. KAUFMAN: Most -- most large institutional --

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Right. Have sort of the same cap that you-all have?

MR. KAUFMAN: Whoever has the biggest lost files for the plaintiff.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: So this thing could go on -- like you get things in the mail --

MR. KAUFMAN: Go on for two or three years. Well, at the end of the case, you'll get a class action notice saying that if you want to participate in the settlement, you have to file your notice of proof of claim by a particular day.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Is this potentially is a long-term process?

MR. KAUFMAN: Could be. I mean, sometimes the company will just turn around and settle right away. Sometimes we have to suggest we go to mediation right away and we're able to reach a quick resolution. Sometimes the cases drag on for years.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Does this use additional funds outside of what you-all would normally be getting, and from surplus funds that you-all would be getting from this?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes. Well, it's making up for any losses we suffered as a result of holding the stock.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Right.
MR. KAUFMAN: So, I mean, you know, we're not going to get a hundred cents on the dollar, but we'll get back something on the dollar. And there will be some recovery to us and every other shareholder of the company.

You know, institutional funds are probably in the best positions to drive the litigation. MR. KEANE: And my expenses for Monday that are covered, and then they send us a check at the end of the litigation. If $I$ have to go a second time or a third time or go to the trial. How many ever days and hours, we get that money back. COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: That's great.

MR. GLOVER: But I thought his question asked something that I'm kind of curious about.

If you've got a class action suit and you've got a lead plaintiff, John, if we were lead plaintiff, of course, we'd go up for a seven-hour deposition and that kind of thing.

But if there are 50 people in the class or 50 funds in the class, will all of them have to go up at one time or another --

MR. KAUFMAN: No. It's just whoever is appointed as lead plaintiff.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Oh, that's what I was asking a while ago.

MR. KAUFMAN: Such as in the Tower Group, we are co-lead plaintiff along with the Kansas City Employees Retirement System. So the depositions would be --

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: I guess that's the question $I$ meant.

MR. KAUFMAN: Gotcha.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: That's why I said, will it be protracted, because there are going to be all these people doing that. But you-all are the lead -- or co-lead?

MR. KAUFMAN: We are the lead. And, you know, the questions they'll ask him, Why did we invest in the stock?

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Right.
MR. KAUFMAN: And the answer is that, We don't have discretion over what stocks we invest in. That is up to the investment manager.

So then they might want to call our
investment manager to give a deposition saying, Why did you purchase the stock; why did you sell the stock?

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Yeah. When I heard you
say seven hours, I said, if all of them are doing that -- that's why I said, is it going to be protracted to the next --

MR. KAUFMAN: You know, I think it will less
than seven hours, but they have the ability to take the deposition for seven hours.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: You get paid by the hour. Talk slow.
(Laughter)
MR. KEANE: We -- as Stu has pointed out, we've been very successful. We were co-lead plaintiffs when we sued United Health. And it was a derivative action, to recovery money from the company.

Money came from the former CEO, the former general counsel. We got money from the auditors for the company, this Tower operation here. We're getting money from the auditors.

There's another one out in California that we're about to wrap up that we're managing to collect money and recover for the class.

It's been good for investors overall, and generally as part of these settlements, we get new corporate governance reforms installed to prevent future shenanigans and abuses.

MR. GLOVER: Through the Chair, I'm going to have to leave. We're leaving with a quorum, of course, but if there's something we need to vote on before I leave. Do you need my presence?

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, $I$ think we need to -well, the director -- the Chair, Mr. Schmitt is off today too.

So is there anything anybody wants to bring up?

DR. HERBERT: I have something.
MR. SCHEU: I do too.
DR. HERBERT: This ties -- first I just want everyone to know that I continue to communicate with our HR partner. And my hope is that by the end of next week or the following Monday, we will be able to get from her a list of the names of candidates for the executive director position.

Going back to our last meeting, my understanding is that what we agreed on is that as far as the Personnel Committee, Trustee Glover and I will go through those, screen through them, as our assumption was you don't want to look at 40 or 50 applicants.

So we'll go through those, try to identify the top candidates with a view toward then
bringing those back to the Board for interviews and final decisions.

The one thing that $I$ think does stand out that we have to deal with is, I have not had conversations about -- with John about possible a contract to help us out in a 1099-kind of fashion.

So it seems to me that the Chairman really ought to do that as opposed to me, although I'm willing to do it. But $I$ think that the Chair really ought to do that.

But I have -- going back to our meeting last week -- is to look at some of those areas where we need to develop a contingency plan, recognizing that John's retirement is effective after his trip to New York; that is, the 30th is his last day.

So I would like to make a proposal. Until we can sort things out and have a much clearer sense as to what's going to happen after that date, I had a conversation with the chief financial officer for the city, Mike Weinstein.

And we talked about the fund's investment management challenges and our needs arising from John's retirement on the 30 th, to assure that we
don't have any slippage there. We had a very good conversation.

And one of the things that he indicated was that -- and I was pleased that he said this, that, We're all in this together, and he would like to help us out during this transition period.

So, specifically, until we select our next executive director and CIO, or we come up with another strategy for dealing with some of these matters, what $I$ would like to propose -- let me back up and say this.

That what the CFO has offered is for Joey Greive, who serves as city treasurer, to assist our Board with investment management aspects of our fund, much like he does for the General Employees and Corrections pension plans.

Mike discussed this relationship in the context that Joey's current role as city and fund treasurer would remain. He would authorize the city attorney to advise and direct the custodian and the investment consultants as to management decisions that we, as a Board, have approved.

So this again is the same role that John has performed for us and that Joey currently performs
for the other city pension fund.
So if we accept this offer, it would include granting of Joey signatory authority with Northern Trust, with the understanding that those powers would be limited to investment matters only; and our Board will continue to be the deciding entity; and Joey would implement our investment decisions, advise us on strategic investment options, and also work with our investment consultants.

I did indicate to Mike that $I$ would bring this to the Board this morning, again, recognizing that we have to have something in place definitely for the 1st of October.

So if the Board shares my belief, that this really is an ideal offer that helps us to assure the fulfillment of fiduciary responsibilities, I would like to make three related motions.

But, first, are there any questions, or do you want to hear the motions that $I$ would like to make for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Anybody got any questions?
MR. SCHEU: I think that's great.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: May I ask one?
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Sure. Go ahead.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: So you-all haven't considered -- and Joey is outstanding, and I know John will participate in whichever way he can with his background -- you-all didn't consider an interim director?

DR. HERBERT: We're still looking at that. I've been asking for names of folks. As we get names, my intent is to share those with the trustees through the executive director.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Somebody seems like they need to -- if we want to call somebody or if we need to be in touch with somebody besides calling you or any member of the Board, and Joey, of course, we contact with every day -- but, I mean, I would say Joey, but of course he works for the city too.

DR. HERBERT: Right. Actually, I have -- it seems to me that there are two different issues here and I'm trying to separate them. COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Right. DR. HERBERT: One is the investment side, to make sure that we don't have any slippage there. And there are just so many things that have to be addressed, that $I$ want to make sure that we don't slip up and have problems for ourselves.

So since Joey has been working closely with John, we have -- we can share the management -money management --

MR. SCHEU: Investment advisor.
DR. HERBERT: -- the investment advisor. We have many of the same funds. It just seems to me that we have very little slippage there until we figure out what we're going to do.

If, in fact, we're able to identify a candidate for the permanent position, they can start sometime in November, then we're in great shape. If it goes until -- if a person can't come until December, then we have another issue.

So with regard to investments only, that's my proposal to us.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Right. I understand.
DR. HERBERT: And maybe I should just read the -- I wrote down the motions that I would like to make:
"That the Police Fire and Pension Fund Board of Trustees accepts the offer of the city's CFO, that Joey Greive, the city treasurer, will assist our Board with the investment management aspects of the Police and Fire Pension Fund as we continue our search for a new executive director
and CIO."
Second: "We authorize the city treasurer to advise and direct the custodian and the investment consultant as to investment decisions that we, as a Board, have approved, effective October 1, 2015."

Third: "That effective October 1, 2015, the Board grants Joey Greive signatory authority with the Northern Trust with the understanding that those powers will be limited to investment matters only."

And, finally: "Our Board will continue to be the deciding investment entity. And effective October 1, 2015, Joey Greive is authorized to implement our investment decisions, advise us on strategic investment options, work with our investment consultants, and other related duties."

So, basically, again, this focuses solely on the investment side. It is for a time frame certain, that is, until we have a new executive director and CIO and/or until we make other decisions about an interim executive director if it looks like that's the direction in which we're going to go.

So those are the motions that I would like to make.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: What I'm feeling -- what I'm afraid of, Dr. Herbert, is we're going to -this is going to be something that's a long discussion. And I don't feel comfortable on the Board without Larry being here. He's the Chair. He's a trustee. You know, this is kind of an important decision.

I have questions to ask Stu about this as well because we have -- you know, with our legal counsel, there's a reason we have a separate lawyer versus the general counsel. It's not because we don't like them It's just the way the state is set up.

I don't understand -- can he still be the city treasurer and handle these types of duties for us without any sort of conflict, that kind of the thing?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes. You know, I do not believe that there would be any inherent conflicts that would arise. Of course, Joey would have to follow our investment policy.

You know, as long as he's informed and up to date on our investment policy and follows our
guidelines as opposed to the city's or the general employee's guidelines, I don't think we have any issue with it.

I think the charter actually provides that the treasurer of the city serves as our treasurer. So I think it's inherent and a good idea that Joey actually take this role, if, in fact, it's something that he wants to take on.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay.
MR. SCHEU: I don't have any -- I think this is a good decision and it's short term that we have to get it. Unless you want to have a special meeting, this needs to get in place.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I mean, to me, in principle, $I$ understand what you're saying and I'm not against it, per se.

But I just -- Stu tells us everything legally. And $I$ know it's only short term, et cetera, et cetera.

I just don't feel personally comfortable voting on something that -- this is an important issue, just like voting for the director. Things like that, you know, I would just rather call a special meeting next week.

When does Larry -- do we know when he's
coming back?
MR. KEANE: Coming back Sunday, over the weekend. He'll be here Monday.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. When are you coming back?

I mean, this sounds like we -- because to me there's another part to this as far as interim director we need to discuss, as far as what our plan is, the time table is, and all that kind of good stuff.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: And I'm not on the Board. I'm thinking long-term for you-all and for me and the council, he's great. I mean, and whatever you-all decide to do. Someone who is a good investor, it would be Joey.

My concern is there's a lot of things on the table right now with this potential suit that's going forward, with the forensic review that's going forward, that somebody's got to be in charge.

And even if it's on -- however -- you said -- you know, I've been through -- and you have is too, Adam, with the school superintendent and all, it could take several months.

And there's two people looking at a bunch of
names, and it's tough. You know, it's not easy. And you're going to have to interview and go through this long process. I suppose you-all are doing all that in public. I guess it's obviously going to be in the public.

I just -- I just think it's imperative so that we know -- and I'm not -- I can't speak for the council, but I'm speaking as a councilman and then as your liaison.

My observations of what's going on in the past, not just here, but in general, that you-all need an interim director as soon as possible.

And whether it's one of your members or what, because there's too many things down the road that need to be resolved and hopefully sooner than later.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, part of my point with Dr, Herbert was, like you said, I'm not saying no or anything like that, but the problem is -COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Right. That's what made me bring it back up. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: -- this sort of -- what you mentioned. We're sort of now branching off into this whole -- we've got a big problem here; this is part of it, obviously.

And if we can solve it, great. But I don't feet comfortable without Larry here, and we're not voting for something simple here.

But other than that, you bring up a good point, that we can, you know, also delve off into this other stuff while we're there.

DR. HERBERT: Right. And as a matter of fact, I do have a proposal with regard to the management side as well, but that does involve Larry and he is not here.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay.
DR. HERBERT: And I'm not sure I want to put that out there and he reads in the paper as opposed to our being here to discuss it.

The thing I'm concerned about is that we have to have a decision made before October 1st. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Correct.

DR. HERBERT: So either we do that or the Chairman needs to negotiate a contract with John to do something --

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Correct.
DR. HERBERT: -- on a more extended basis. But one way or another, we have to do something before the 1st. And I just don't want us to ignore our fiduciary responsibilities, but by not
having someone who is at least on top of the financial thing, I do think that the Chairman can play a roll on that management side short-term. But he has to be willing to do that. The sheriff has got to agree with that; not that he would come out of his current duties. We'd have to work out something where he has some assistance to do those things. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Right.

DR. HERBERT: But I think we're absolutely on target with regard to that. But we just can't afford to go to October 1st and not have someone who is dealing with these investment issues.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Let me ask -- John, before we get to the whole contract thing, do you have terms of your agreement that you would agree to if we were to put you on a contract short-term, $3,6,9 ?$

MR. KEANE: Well, I could do anything to work with you.

But back to this particular issue. When the overall operation of the investment portfolio -we've worked with Dan -- looking in the rear-view mirror, worked with Dan and Joey all the time. When we make decisions, the information we
bring to the Board, the recommendations, it's a consolidated opinion of all three of us. So that's not an unheard of operation.

But I don't mind -- I'm going to retire on September 30th. My application is getting ready to come up. So if the Board desires me to continue on a temporary role -- because another thing I'm getting ready to hand out is a list of current and projected projects that's ten pages long, and some of them, people got to tend to.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, me, personally, John, this part that you're bringing up, Adam, the financial part, that's the part that I'm least worried about.

Mr. Council has brought up just one thing. There's also a lot of other things that are coming up, not to mention the lawsuit or the -- I don't know what it's even called. Inquiry from City Council as far as, you know, your retirement plan.

There's a lot of things that, you know -that are still yet to be resolved, and I really wish they were. But, you know, I think we need to definitely have a special meeting for the ideas you were talking about as well with
everybody here.
If it has to be at your house on Tuesday night, great. Whatever.

I mean, in other words, it's got to be -it's got to be soon, but we need to -- I want everybody there to do their thing, make their statement, and let's get it over with.

MR. SCHEU: Just for timing of -- Monday is the 28th, Tuesday is the 29th. The 30th, I'll be in Mayo all day. So those are the only two days that I could be personally here for a special meeting.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I'm fine with whatever.
MR. GLOVER: I'm out of town Monday.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: When is the 1st again?
MR. KEANE: Thursday.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, we got Tuesday, Wednesday. What you got?

MR. KEANE: Mr. Scheu, did you say you're available?

MR. SCHEU: Tuesday is the only day for me. I mean, I can do it Monday or Tuesday.

MR. GLOVER: I can call in, maybe even leave late. But Monday isn't good.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, my biggest concern is
throughout the history of being on this Board, what I've noticed, when we get into situations like this, what will happen. It's just like we've had with the councilman.

This thing -- inevitably we lead down two or three different roads. They'll all be related. We'll all need to consolidate.

And rather than have six special meetings on interim director, Joey, lawsuits, this, that, why don't we just go ahead and knock, at least the foreseeable future out of the way at one time, and then that will be that.

Like I said, me, personally, I don't feel comfortable -- you know, if you guys want to call the vote, we can call the vote. I just don't feel comfortable voting on something like this when one of our trustees is not here. That's just me.

MR. SCHEU: I don't mind voting on the investment side, because I think Joey is virtually doing that now. That's an easy one.

MR. GLOVER: I think it will be easy to do that.

MR. SCHEU: And I'll move those three motions -- second your motion.

MR. GLOVER: But the interim director and the director is the one that $I$ wouldn't even -we shouldn't even consider without the Chair.

DR. HERBERT: Okay. So if you have a motion.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Do we have a motion?
MR. GLOVER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Second it?
MR. SCHEU: Second.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? I made my statements on why.
(No responses.)
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All in favor?
(Responses of "aye.")
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All opposed?
(One response of "no.")
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Does he get extra dollars for doing that?

MR. KEANE: It comes out of the general fund.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I'm not planning on voting for a budget proposal.

DR. HERBERT: In fact, when I talked with the CIO, he did say that there's no charge to
this. It's actually part and parcel of his responsibilities.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We'll put it in the budget if we need it. Don't worry about that. We'll get it from somebody here at the table, him or him. I don't know which one.

MR. GREIVE: Through the Chair, to the Chair, don't create that problem for me. I'll do it for free.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: You-all got a deal here.

DR. HERBERT: Mr. Chairman, should we shoot for next Tuesday?

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: That's fine with me. Go ahead.

DR. HERBERT: If President Glover is going to be in town on Tuesday, $I$ can do it. I have one meeting, but I'll cancel it, if necessary. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I have a doctor's appointment Tuesday morning sometime, but we'll figure it out.

MR. SCHEU: I've got a lunch that I can change, and I've got a Board meeting at 5:15. DR. HERBERT: What about doing it -- the doctor's appointment you have is when?

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: It's in the morning, early. DR. HERBERT: What about noon on Tuesday? CHAIRMAN TUTEN: In the afternoon? What time?

DR. HERBERT: At noon.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Oh, at noon. Yeah, it should be over by then.

DR. HERBERT: Will that work for everybody?
MR. KAUFMAN: Let me just advise that Mr. Keane and I will be in New York.

MR. KEANE: That's right. We don't need to be here for that.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. That's fine.
DR. HERBERT: Does that work for you, Trustee Glover?

MR. GLOVER: Doesn't work, but I'll make it work. I'll take one for the team here.

MR. SCHEU: Before Trustee Glover leaves, I've got a proposal I want to make with regard to the council action.

The task force, as it was doing its work, one of the things as it related to the use of the general counsel, was that we felt that there ought to be more use of the general counsel instead of outside counsel because of the fee
arrangements, et cetera, et cetera.
But in making that examination, we also came to the realization that the JPFPF is, despite its independence, a board or agency of the city. And as such, under our consolidated form of government, it is bound by opinions of the general counsel.

And we've got our own counsel, and that's been a cause for the conflict here. The City Council has passed a resolution authorizing the general counsel -- instructing the general counsel to file suit against the Board, and I presume against the members of the special plan. I don't know how that will all fall out.

But it seems to that me we can save the taxpayers a lot of money, we can save a lot of time, preserve our rights, if we design our own questions and facts, set up the -- the hypothesis for the general counsel and ask the general counsel, taking into account the facts and the law, to give us an opinion on how we should act with regard to going forward on this.

That means we don't have to have anybody file any lawsuits. We save money. We preserve our rights.

Under the charter, the General Counsel's opinion is binding, but can be challenged either by an appeal to the attorney general or by filing suit in circuit court. So that right is preserved, but yet -- and there are efforts to try to resolve it, as $I$ understand it.

This would help -- it seems to me it would help us pose the questions that Cindy's opinion overlooked; that is, was John eligible, since he was not a city employee, as I understand it, and what about the others; and also the conflict between Chapter 16 and Chapter 22 of the charter is which one -- I think it's 22, in reading Bob Klausner's opinion -- there's a supersession clause that says if there's anything in conflict between the two, 22 controls. 22 is the one that gives us the power to have the compensation.

It just seems to me that we could move quickly and save a lot of angst by requesting an opinion that we draft the -- the opinion.

So it's not -- Cindy's was a two-page opinion that really didn't deal with any of the facts. All it said was that the City Council was the only entity that has the power to set a pension for city employees.

Left unsaid was whether or not John was a city employee and what happens then. So it seems to me we can raise all the issues and save the money on both sides, because we're paying the fees on both sides as taxpayers.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Well, I know.
MR. SCHEU: So I would like to make that proposal and see if we would be willing to proceed in that way.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: We've already kind of -John, would you like to speak on that as far as what -- I mean, the fund, we've already been -we had -- Bob came in one time and broke it down and explained.

This was before you were here, Bill. But as far as what the rationale and the reasoning was before, why, when it came about, when it was, quote, unquote, invented.

The City Council got that report, didn't they? Or they were informed of --

MR. SCHEU: I read that opinion.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Okay. Right.
MR. KEANE: It all started when the former general counsel said that they wouldn't represent us anymore and told us to go get our own lawyer,
which we did.
MR. KAUFMAN: I mean, that was way back. There's a potential conflict --

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, as far as it relates to your plan and Dick and now Debbie, I mean --

MR. KEANE: Well, that's how we've -- that's how Article 22 came about. And it was enacted by the legislature.

And in October of 1990, right after I came over here, the city entered into a financial service agreement with the Board, codifying the things they were going to do.

And one of the things they said they would not do was issue me a paycheck. And they said, We don't consider you a city employee; we will not pay you. They paid the other staff members off the city payroll system. We put the money in. They paid it. But for -- to start with, just the administrator, refused to make the payment.

When Dick came over, it was amended and they said, The administrator and the deputy administrator.

Now, revisionists to history like to say, Well, he should have been in the General

Employees Pension Plan. Well, they wouldn't let us in the General Employees Pension Plan. In fact, they said we're not even a city employee, wouldn't even give us a check.

Now, they like to sweep all that out of the way and say, Oh, well, we don't want to talk about that because we may have been right, we may have been wrong. But whatever they did, forced the Board to do what the Board did.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, from what I can gather so far as the City Council -- and I don't want to put words in your mouth -- but from what I've read is, there's not a denial here that you're entitled to a pension, correct?

MR. KEANE: No.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: You have some that think that you should have been in the city plan all along versus the plan that you just described and why it was created.

MR. KEANE: Right.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: At the end of the day, we're talking about -- I think -- what did they say? About 40 grand a year, is what they were talking about?

So are they wanting to take this to court?

MR. SCHEU: That's what they authorized the general counsel -- and the general counsel feels a great sense of urgency because it's the second time they've told him.

What I'm saying is that I think this will bring up a much quicker, simpler, easier -- and we have a conflict because we've got an opinion from our lawyers and we got an opinion from the general counsel.

So I think we pull all that together and we say, General counsel, you decide, as the charter of the consolidated city government says, and then we can respond to that. But that way we don't have to be -- the whole purpose -- the general counsel is powerful, so that you won't have people suing each other among the city.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I'm with you, Bill, on that part of it. But I think this goes past the City Council, though.

If the City Council has voted to find out in court whether or not John's pension is legal, I mean, is there -- at this point is there anything that we can do to present to them that's going to withdraw --

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Time out. Yeah.

Because, you know, I don't know how the votes would have gone. I didn't text anybody.
(Laughter)
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: So I didn't know how any of the votes would have gone. I think it would have been very difficult. It would have been a more controversial decision because I think, as you-all saw it the week or two before, that thing's been going on since I've been on the council, I mean, about how they're going to do it, even though it was a 2012 decision by Cindy.

But we did have the piece in there to keep from going to court, hopefully, that I guess determines mediation -- mitigation, mediation. MR. SCHEU: Mediation. COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: And to me, that's -and you're the lawyer, Bill, you just tell us, that opens the door for you-all to sit down and hammer out those issues, and hopefully it won't go as far as the court.

And I don't mean just settling whether or not you're entitled to it or not entitled to it, and whatever else, you-all are included.

We want it resolved. I think the biggest deal is, is the principle involved, and that's
what you heard from a couple of the councilmen is, is it legal? Not whether it's legal or not. If it is legal, then, you know, she was right. If it's wrong, it's wrong. It's behind us.

But that's not what's really happened. We've already addressed that issue, except for John and the others. We addressed it by changing the law and the pension bill.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Correct.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: And so now I think if Bill or whomever --

MR. SCHEU: That hadn't been changed yet to make the director a city employee. That's separate.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: No, no. What we changed was that you can't -- you know, that that pension -- well, we did say that the pension plan was -- I mean, this kind of pension plan would no longer exist under the next group of employees.

MR. SCHEU: Correct. That's correct.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Yeah. Well, that's what I've referring to. And, you know, I'm just doing this from memory myself.

But I just think that if you-all can hammer
out a difference where it makes sense to the council, to you-all, and it's fair -- I hate to say -- to all concerned, then that's great.

If somebody on the council -- and they indicated that, wants a clear decision from the court, that's not -- I think Jason plays the pivotal role right now in trying to resolve this.

And I agree with what you're saying, Bill. If you-all can work something out that makes sense to the City Council and that makes sense to the taxpayers, I think that's where we need to go. I don't want to go to court. I don't think any of us do.

MR. SCHEU: All I'm saying is that we ought -- we ought to proceed on this separate line because Jason feels some pressure to file a lawsuit. And I'm just saying, Well, why don't we ask Jason for an opinion first and hopefully this will be settled.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Well, he has that mediation piece in there, though. MR. SCHEU: That's right. COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: And that's why I think Bill put it in there -- I mean -- yeah, that's right. Gulliford put it in to -- you know,
because I think a lot of us felt the same way. We didn't want to pay -- use our tax dollars to take it to court. We didn't want you-all to use basically tax dollars just to defend it.

So if we could resolve it before that -- and I don't -- I can't speak for them, but that was my interpretation watching them.

MR. KAUFMAN: Just for your information, Jason has reached out to our office --

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Good.
MR. KAUFMAN: -- and we are attempting to schedule a meeting to address this without litigation.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Jason would have felt -- and I can't speak to him -- that he needed to go to court under the -- before that amendment went in. After the amendment went in, it gave him some flexibility.

MR. SCHEU: He feels pretty pressured.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: And I think he wants to pursue it that way if he can avoid it and save tax dollars on both ends.

Now, how it's going to come out, John, I mean, that's going to be you-all.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah. But there will be a
meeting coming up prior to any litigation.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Good. That's what it was all about, to avoid court, to avoid spending tax dollars.

I know people want a definitive answer about this, but more definitive would be, Are we saving the taxpayers dollars --

MR. KAUFMAN: Right.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: -- and are we avoiding a lawsuit? Because in the end the taxpayers lose, obviously, on both ends.

So if you-all can do that.
DR. HERBERT: I can follow-up, then. You currently are engaged in conversations?

MR. KAUFMAN: About scheduling a meeting to address this issue. Yes.

DR. HERBERT: Have you put forward any ideas? I'm not asking what they are.

MR. KAUFMAN: No, not yet. No. We just got a call yesterday to schedule a meeting.

MR. GLOVER: And you're amenable to scheduling that?

MR. KAUFMAN: Absolutely.
MR. SCHEU: Now, are you representing John, or are you representing the fund?

MR. KAUFMAN: I am representing the fund.
MR. SCHEU: Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN: But, you know, I'll tell you right now, though, if suit is filed, I think Mr. Klausner is probably the most important witness out there.

So it would be our recommendation for the fund to retain outside counsel. And we've had discussions with some attorneys to assume that role.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: So the lawsuit hasn't been filed yet?

MR. KAUFMAN: Has not.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: And you're going to talk to the city representative and try to find some sort of nice --

MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah. And I think they're going to hold off on any suit until we meet and confer and see if there's any --

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, if they do file for some reason, then we'll just have to go and hire somebody else.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
MR. SCHEU: Could we -- could we explore the possibility of seeking the General Counsel's
opinion as an alternative to litigation?
I mean, it just seems to me that we're going to get down this path -- I mean, this is going to be settlement, and you're either going to settle it, or if you can't settle it, then you're going to have to file suit.

All I'm saying is, let's slow the train down a little bit and say -- you know, this is what the charter provides and this gives us the opportunity to set out the facts, as Bob has laid them out in his opinion, so that we get a more efficient and cheaper resolution of it. That's all I'm saying.

So I would like to -- I'm not making a motion yet, but I would like to propose that we explore that possibility in conversation with counsel and the general counsel.

DR. HERBERT: Let me ask you this, and also counsel.

What do you think about putting forward this idea in your conversation with the general counsel?

MR. KAUFMAN: I think we could discuss it at the meeting. You know, I don't -- I'm not totally opposed to the idea, but certainly I
don't think that we can agree that any opinion that is issued by the general counsel is going to be binding upon us as a separate, independent agency of the City of Jacksonville.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: You're talking about now, or you mean Cindy's?

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm going to tell you that if Jason issues an opinion that says that it's his opinion has not changed, that is not binding upon us.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Well, then that's the intent of the council. If it doesn't work, filing a suit.

MR. SCHEU: Well, I think it is binding upon us legally, but we have a right to go to circuit court to determine whether that --

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: The Cindy one?
MR. SCHEU: No. Whether Jason, if he were to issue an opinion. If he were to issue an opinion. I think that's the way the charter works.

MR. KAUFMAN: I'll take a look at it.
MR. KEANE: There's another issue that they don't want to address over there.

It's not about the Police and Fire Senior

Management Pension Plan. Long before this Board created the Senior Management Plan, the Jacksonville Transportation Authority created a pension plan for its senior managers. Not the City Council, the JTA Board, you know. The JTA Board attorney that did that was Cindy Laquidara.

MR. SCHEU: That's in Bob Klausner's opinion.

MR. KAUFMAN: Correct.
MR. KEANE: I have a copy of it.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: And let me say this. I'm the lialson for the JTA, and I'm going to take that to them too. So I've got both ends of you-all. So that makes me feel better, that I can deal with both of them.

MR. KEANE: And there is another separate pension plan for city employees at the St. Johns River Power Plant that was not created by the City Council.

So here you have the city lawyer saying only the City Council can create a pension plan for city employees. And I agree that that says Article 16 correctly. I agree with that. However -CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Precedent.

MR. KEANE: -- they now claim those people aren't city employees. They claim these people out here aren't city employees. And they now have some idea that I may or may not be a city employee, although in 1996, Steve Rohan, the deputy general counsel, said $I$ was not a city employee.

So you've got this whole vast array of letters and opinions at different times from different members of the general counsel staff saying different things.

And the Board went down -- what their first opinion was. Cindy Laquidara issued a memo. Not a binding legal opinion. She issued a memorandum responding to Councilmember Crescimbeni, and she said only the City Council can create a pension plan for city employees.

I think she's 100 percent correct. Instead of putting a period there, she should have been put a comma, and said, except the people that you're talking about at the Police and Fire Pension Fund are not city employees because we've already taken the position we won't even issue them a paycheck.

Now, you can't claim I'm a city employee
when you refuse to pay. Abraham Lincoln outlawed that.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Well, I think we've already -- we've discussed all that John, and I think the Board is pretty firm as far as, you know, that's the position of Stu and Bob, and we went over the history of everything -MR. KEANE: Over and over.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: -- but I'm with you, Bill. Believe it or not, down here, we're not about spending money just to spend it --

MR. SCHEU: Oh, I understand.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: -- so Bob and Stu can have a bigger Hanukkah, okay?

MR. SCHEU: They're good lawyers.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: The truth of the matter --
I know. Or Christmas, you know. Either way. It's 2015.

But, anyway, the truth is at this point $I$ don't know and I'm hoping Stu can do something. But at this point, from what we've seen so far from the council, this-that, this-that, at this point I don't know what else we can do to convince the general counsel and certain councilmen that, Look, this is what happened,
whether you like it or not, it was part of the deal back then. It's happened before, as John illustrated.

And, now, if somebody could point out some sort of illegality that we didn't -- that they overlooked, that we overlooked that we don't know about, we're not against that. I'm not -- I'm not fighting just to fight.

But at this point, I don't see anything that comes from the other side, just drawing a blank, to show me that our position should be any different than it was before.

MR. SCHEU: What's come to them is they're holding up this two-page memo, as John describes it. It's not a binding opinion.

And we're either going to get that resolution by a judge or by the general counsel. All I'm saying is that it would be cheaper and more efficient to go first to the general counsel.

MR. KEANE: And that's the plan.
MR. SCHEU: And you're right. That if there's a -- if we don't agree with the opinion, we can certain then file suit.

That's the way the charter works is -- when
it was set up so that you didn't have people in the city suing each other; the general counsel is a powerful position -- so that those issues can get resolved.

That's all I'm saying. And I would like to see us proceed that way.

MR. KEANE: And -- and that's the plan. The plan is they're going to have a meeting to do just what you're saying to do.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: And I think we've given you-all the opportunity to move forward with it, and how it ends up, I hope it ends up -- you know, great for the taxpayers and great for you-all and great for the City of Jacksonville.

And I know there are a few -- and it was a big issue, you know.

And no offense, John, I mean, all the publicity, it became focused on John. And, I mean, we all know that.

But, more importantly, it's a question of getting this thing resolved. I mean, when you stand up and you say, It's either legal or not legal, and this is what she said, it's not legal, so where did you go from there?

So I think what Bill did gave at least a
safe house for you-all to go to and try to hammer out whatever differences exist without having to go to court. I hope it works out, but at least you-all have got that.

MR. SCHEU: Well, if they don't settle, I hope you-all would be amenable to requesting an opinion before they file suit, because I think that's a disaster.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Right. Yeah. I don't want -- none of us do, but I think some of them want a definite opinion. And I want it to be more because it's the right thing to do.

MR. GLOVER: But we don't -- it's headed that way. So do we need a motion here? I mean, I don't see why we need to vote on this.

MR. SCHEU: Well, I would like -- well, it seems to me that a motion to explore the possibility -- as some negotiations proceed, that we explore the possibility of asking for a General Counsel's opinion on the law and the facts involved, and that we would prepare that request and set out what we wanted to do.

And I would think Bob and I would work on that. That's what $I$ have in mind, that we don't get down the road left with nothing but a
lawsuit.
MR. KEANE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Gosh, how do I say this tactfully?

DR. HERBERT: I'm inclined -- if I could. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Go ahead.

DR. HERBERT: I'm inclined to consider that.
I think it would first be good for our attorney to talk with the General Counsel's Office to get a feel for where they're coming from.

And, frankly, I think that there are some options that we have available that we could potentially put on the table that also might cause counsel to say that they're willing to back off.

But this, I think, is an option. So as you talk with them, just to give us a sense as to what you think realistically is possible, and obviously also take a look at all the facts again to see how we might compile all of those --

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay.
DR. HERBERT: -- in a fashion that would help to move that conversation along.

MR. SCHEU: Jason and I have discussed it, so he'll be aware of your call.

MR. KAUFMAN: All right. Very good.
MR. SCHEU: I just wanted to raise that up as a possibility for everybody's benefit.

DR. HERBERT: It seems to me that's definitely an option.

Another option is that there may be some things that have not been talked about that would end up resolving this.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Sure.

DR. HERBERT: And so what we want to do is have resolution if at all possible within this going to court.

Frankly, what $I$ worry about is that this could get very nasty. All of a sudden when Klausner is able to come forward and say, Well, these are the conversations we had with the mayor and other folks, suddenly we end up deposing former mayors, City Council members and others --

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: I don't remember anything back then.
(Laughter)
DR. HERBERT: -- and it becomes a very nasty situation for everybody, and I think we need to avoid that if at all possible.

So some kind of a compromise while also
being mindful of the fact that there are rights that the members of the senior plan have, and we cannot abrogate our responsibilities to them as well.

MR. SCHEU: Absolutely. Thank you.
MR. KEANE: How about let's deviate from the agenda just a minute while we're still on this subject.

I now would like to submit to the Board my application for time service retirement, effective September 30th.

That's going to take a motion, Mr. Chairman. DR. HERBERT: Could you say what the motion is so we understand?

MR. KEANE: Motion is to approve the application for time service retirement, effective September 30th.

DR. HERBERT: I move.
MR. SCHEU: What is the impact? I'll second it, but what's the impact? Is this the vacation or is this --

MR. KAUFMAN: No. This is requirement.
MR. SCHEU: Fine. I just want to understand what we're voting on.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Yeah. Moved and second.

Discussion?
(No responses.)

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All in favor, say aye.
(Responses of "aye.")
MR. SCHEU: With thanks.
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: And no opposed. Okay.
MR. KEANE: Now we can go back to the regular agenda. I knew you have to leave, Sheriff. We have some things here.

DR. HERBERT: Is there anything that's absolutely essential that we deal with today? Because Trustee Glover has to leave, and Trustee Scheu has something, and I have a doctor's appointment.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: I got to go to work sooner or later.

MR. KEANE: Well, there's only one other item that needs a vote on, Mr. Chairman.

That's the redesignation of Jacksonville's oldest retired firefighter. There's a story in the paper this morning about Paul Galloway dying.

Succeeding him as our oldest retired firefighter is Retired Firefighter Engineer, Walter S. Farwell. And it takes action of the Board to designate this.

MR. SCHEU: So move.
DR. HERBERT: I'm very pleased to second the motion.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Any questions or discussion?
(No responses.)
CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All in favor?
(Responses of "aye.")
MR. KEANE: Everything else we can show received as information.

I do have one other thing to tell you about. At the last meeting during public comments some statements were made. Pass them out.
(Document distributed.)
MR. KEANE: We have an answer to that. That is the addendum to the agenda that is being handed out right now.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Can we talk about this John -- we'll let City Councilman Hazouri saying one last word.

MR. KEANE: Okay.
COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: I just want to say, I'm looking forward to working with you-all. I think the president of the council selected me because of my background in it. But more importantly is
that I do want to see that open communication, that transparency.

I think a lot of stuff that's happened over the years has been geared on individuals rather than what the Board is going to be doing.

And also I need to know -- I think I need to know this. This is for me, so in case anybody else asks me.

The forensic audit. Where do we stand on that? And I think Mike Weinstein is the point-person now, from what $I$ understand in the house -- in the council.

But where are you-all on that as far as giving information, and what is the target date? I think you-all until next year is it, the 30th? I thought it was a few months. But then I heard -- I think you told me, Joey, next September.

MR. GREIVE: Sure. So you mentioned my boss, you know, who is kind of overseeing me at this point.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Right.
MR. GREIVE: The forensic investigator has everything that he's requested, is my
understanding. I'm not aware of anything else
outstanding. He has told us that definitely by the end of October, maybe earlier. We'll see. COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Because they said -- I think Mike told me that they've had as much as a year, but they thought they would have it ready sooner than later.

I just want to get that -- I just want us to have a clean slate with everything that we're doing so we can move forward and -- because we're all in this together.

So October?
MR. GREIVE: Yeah. I would think within about a month, at the latest.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Thank you. Thank you, John. Thank you, Joey.

MR. KEANE: We would like -- we want to give you one thing to take with you.

COUNCILMAN HAZOURI: Thank you, John, for your service.

MR. KEANE: Yes, sir.
This is an email from Devin Carter who is responding to the statements made at the public hearing at our last meeting. And he says that:
"Public comment issues that were stated at the Board of Trustees meeting on 9/18/2015 have
been paid in full."
It was a matter of traffic infraction.
MR. SCHEU: I had asked John to give a report on this, and I appreciate you're talking care of that.

So you're all cleared up with all of those allegations that Mr. Lee had raised?

MR. CARTER: Everything is resolved.
MR. SCHEU: Thank you for doing that.
Thank you, John.
MR. KEANE: Traffic things.
(Councilman Hazouri exists the Board meeting.)

MR. KEANE: But as information for your reading between now and next meeting, here is a list of continuing and new projects that are on the table ongoing that need to be handled as we transition on October the 1st.

MR. SCHEU: It seems to me that you might recommend to the Chair that we ought to just have a special meeting to go through this, because there's -- I mean, it's all related to what we've been talking about.

If we're not going to have a special meeting next week, sooner rather than -- Joey just said,
whoever this is, is going to be standing in a fire hydrant.

DR. HERBERT: Is it possible for us to have a meeting on Tuesday, a special meeting?

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: What's today? Thursday? Friday. Yeah. We need to get with Larry, though.

MR. SCHEU: Can we do it Tuesday at 2:30 Tuesday.

DR. HERBERT: Yeah. 2:30 if at all possible.

MR. KEANE: We'll notice it.

DR. HERBERT: Thank you.
MR. KEANE: So I'm going to show those -- on the addendum to the agenda, we're going to show that Number 3, email from Devin Carter, received as information; continuing projects list, received as information; and time service application, approved.

The other items on the regular agenda, we would just mark as received as information, which is the letter we sent to Mr. Bussells thanking him.

The Board had previously approved the replacement of the skylight that's leaking.

We've got all the contracts. They were drafted, by the way, by the Office of General Counsel. MR. SCHEU: Good.

MR. KEANE: And they've all been signed and encumbered and we're ready to go. We have a copy of the Board Meeting Action List in your file.

I believe that concludes the regular and the addendum to the agenda, Mr . Chairman and Trustees.

CHAIRMAN TUTEN: Anybody got anything else? DR. HERBERT: I move we adjourn. MR. SCHEU: Second the motion. CHAIRMAN TUTEN: All right. Meeting adjourned.
(The Board meeting concluded at 11:15 a.m.)
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