## JACKSONVILLE POLICE AND FIRE PENSION FUND BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING CLOSED SESSION

DATE: March 18, 2016

TIME: 12:08 p.m. to 12:58 p.m.

PLACE: Jacksonville Police and Fire Pension Fund

One West Adams Street

Suite 100

Jacksonville, Florida 32202

## BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Larry Schmitt, Board Chairman Richard Patsy, Trustee William Scheu, Trustee Willard Payne, Trustee

## ALSO PRESENT:

Beth McCague, Interim Executive Director Jake Schickel, Special Counsel

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

Cindy Danese, Notary Public
AAA Reporters
233 East Bay Street, Suite 912
Jacksonville, Florida 32202
904.354.4789

## PROCEEDINGS

2 March 18, 2016 12:08 p.m.

- -

2.3

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It's 12:08. Call the meeting back to order, still in public session.

I will read from --

MS. MANNING: Actually, I think Paul goes first.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

MR. DARAGJATI: Generally I don't like reading things into the record, but because such a hyper technical area of the law this is, I'm simply going to read the rules.

During the regular meeting, you were advised of a request by special counsel Jake Schickel of the need for a closed meeting pursuant to Florida Statute 286.011(8), the purpose to receive advice regarding litigation strategy regarding expenses and settlement negotiations.

You may not take any votes during this closed session except to end the closed session. Any formal action taken following the closed meeting must be taken in open session.

As I am not counsel on that case, I will exit the room as soon as the closed session begins.

There will be a verbatim record of the proceedings that will become public once the litigation is concluded.

2.2.

2.3

I defer to the Chair and I will leave the room.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I have one question and then I'll read this into the record as well.

The notice of an executive session closed meeting was posted?

MS. McCAGUE: It was posted on Tuesday, Tuesday or Wednesday.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: So our intent to have a shade meeting was posted on Tuesday. And I'll read into the record: As the fund's special counsel has requested a closed session to receive advice concerning litigation costs and settlement strategy, I will take a motion to enter executive session to discuss the matter of City of Jacksonville versus Board of Trustees Police and Fire Pension Fund and John Keane, Fourth Judicial Circuit, Case Number 2015-CA-007380.

A verbatim record of the meeting will be kept as required by law.

The names of the persons in attendance are myself, Trustee Lawrence Schmitt; Trustee Willard

1 Payne; Trustee Rick Patsy; Trustee William Scheu; Attorney Jake Schickel, Special Counsel; and Beth 3 McCAGUE, Interim Executive Director; and Cindy 4 Danese, court reporter, who will take a verbatim 5 record of the meeting. The closed session will last approximately 45 6 7 minutes. And the motion is made by? MR. PATSY: Me. 9 CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Trustee Patsy. And second 10 by --11 MR. SCHEU: Me. 12 CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- Trustee Scheu. 13 Is Debbie on your list? MR. PATSY: 14 CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Debbie's not on the list. 15 MS. MANNING: I'm leaving when the attorney 16 leaves. 17 CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: So all in favor? 18 (Responses of "aye.") 19 Opposed? 20 (No responses.) 21 CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Motion carries. The closed 22 section will convene at 12:10. 2.3 MR. DARAGJATT: I would ask the record to 24 reflect that everyone except those named left the 25 room.

(Whereupon, all persons except those named 1 herein left the room at this time.) 3 (Begin closed session.) CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Good afternoon. 4 MR. SCHICKEL: Hello everybody. 5 MR. PAYNE: Nice of you to drop by. 6 7 MR. SCHEU: Certainly had a dramatic entrance. I told Beth it'd be four to 8 MR. SCHICKEL: five hours, and she said: No, make it four to five 9 10 minutes, and I said: Well, we'll compromise in the 11 middle then at 45 minutes or less. It won't take 12 that long. 13 Let me sort of back you up a little bit and 14 briefly tell you how we got here at this point in 15 time, at least as far as I was concerned. 16 We had at the -- early on, there was a series 17 of subpoenas issued by the City Council and others 18 to the Board to try to resolve things. 19 I was retained then, as well as Hank Coxe, I 20 think, by Bob Klausner to -- Hank was to represent 21 Klausner and his firm because certain items had 22 been subpoenaed from the law firm, and then I was 23

> We had a meeting. The Chief was there. We sat down. The City laid out four or five different

coming in on behalf of the Board and John Keane.

24

options in terms of having to pay John, and we said fine, and realized right then that that part was more John's decision as to what to compromise and how much he would be willing to compromise on the pension plan.

And the other part of it, though, that we were concerned about as much as anything -- I know the Chief was and I was, and Bob Klausner was there as well -- was what the whereases were going to be, what the -- the gist of what we were agreeing to, and how we were agreeing and why we were agreeing and all of that.

We left, and nothing really happened for a while. Partly, the plans were being vetted by an annuity specialist to tell what the actual numbers were, and they were crunching numbers and Joey was going and finding out some other information and all of that.

And just to let you know all the way through,
I was calling the City and talking to a couple of
attorneys there, trying to find out what was
happening, what was going on, and said: Well,
let's sit down and try to work it out, because they
had some of the items together.

Matter of fact, we met at -- the Bedell firm

was having a party that night. I said -- we 1 couldn't work a schedule -- so let's meet over 3 there. We did --4 MR. PAYNE: Before drinks or after drinks? MR. SCHICKEL: It was before drinks. That's 5 why the meeting was real quick. 6 7 (Laughter.) MR. SCHICKEL: And the meeting was real quick 8 9 as well because they said: We're filing a lawsuit 10 tomorrow. And I went: You're what? 11 12 And they said -- I said: You hadn't told me 13 this. 14 And they said: Well, we told Hank. 15 And I said: Well, Hank represents Klausner. 16 I represent the Trustees. What are you doing? 17 Somebody somehow had given them the word, 18 okay, that they had to file a lawsuit the next day, 19 which was Friday. MR. SCHEU: This was back in November. 20 21 This was back in November. MR. SCHICKEL: 22 We had a flurry of phone calls going back and 2.3 forth. I spoke with the Chief, I spoke with John, 24 spoke with some others.

We decided at that point that we really

couldn't do anything by that afternoon. And, of course, their timetable for doing something moved from noontime to 3:00 o'clock to 5:00 o'clock to midnight, each being an absolute deadline for doing anything.

2.3

And I said: I am 99.9 percent sure that everything's going to be fine and we're going to do it, and I just need to sit down and walk through -- and I can't do it in five minutes -- with the Chief or with John, anything else.

And then he said: Well, we had marching our orders.

So I said: Okay. Who's giving you the marching orders?

And they told me it was -- I would have to talk with either Mike Weinstein or Sam Mousa. So I called both of them, did not get any responses, and 5:00 o'clock came and went. I couldn't do anything, and so I went home.

Low and behold, at about 11:30 that night, they did file the lawsuit.

Monday morning I called them up and said -I've now had a chance, after we had talked and John
and I had talked -- said: We're agreeable to
everything. We had a few minor details to work

out, but everything was fine.

They agreed to eliminate them, such as the language which talked about binding agreement, a binding legal opinion, which was a big issue that they had. We contested that very vigorously, and they agreed just to put "a legal opinion" and deleted that word. They deleted "unlawful" at different times and just put "unauthorized."

We got down to where we were relatively happy with everything that was there. We had another goround, and by that time -- were you at the second meeting that we had? We had another goround with them. Larry was there and Sam Mousa.

MS. McCAGUE: Oh, yes, I was there. That was just last month.

MR. SCHICKEL: Was that it? Time flies when you get old, so it's a heck of a time.

But we had several different meetings and were able to work things out reasonably easily, reasonably quickly, and going down the road.

They came to this meeting, and I really didn't realize they were going to be here and do that, but then it went ahead and we were on a good path.

Then City Council met, okay, and if you haven't seen it, I urge you to see it because it

was quite -- I'm a lawyer, not a politician, and so I was rather shocked at some of the things that were said and the way it was handled and all of that.

I took as a good sign that they had a shade meeting, because then the lawyers could sit and talk honestly with everybody about what was happening.

My concern all along was that -- a couple of things.

Number one, I never felt that your story had been told to the public or the City Council, okay? Y'all had just been punching bags by everybody else who just wanted to say bad things, and I felt -- I kept saying: How can we get this out?

And in talking with Beth, she came up with a great idea, which was to file an answer or a pleading in the lawsuit.

My concern about going directly to the Council, which I debated doing, was that it would make the General Counsel's Office upset, okay? And I had seen enough emotion in the City Council meeting, knowing that emotions were driving a lot of what was happening as opposed to considered, thoughtful action by anyone. And I didn't want

General Counsel using some of them, but Beth's idea was great.

So I notified Rita Mairs, who was in the General Counsel's Office, that I was going to go ahead and file a responsive pleading. She went ballistic, saying: No, no, please don't do that. I haven't served you yet.

Well, as we have talked at different times, service of the lawsuit is a technical thing that starts the clock running for the defendants, okay? I am under no duty or obligation under the law right now to do anything because they haven't served the lawsuit.

Now, that doesn't mean I can't file something, because it is of record over there right now, and we would proceed. Several people had asked me that at different times. We discussed it, and I said: It's no big deal.

In fact, I told the City that if they ever wanted to serve it, just tell me, and I would accept service for the Board as well as for John. There's no sense a deputy or a process server walking in and going: Here.

We've seen that recently in the news, and I thought that was a horrible thing to -- is a

horrible thing to do. It was very inappropriate to get the news media in it.

Anyway, so then, after the shade meeting, though, I called her and I said: What's going on?

And, of course, they couldn't tell me, just like y'all can't tell the world as we leave here what happened at the shade meeting, because it is confidential until it's later disclosed in the minutes later on by the court reporter, which will be after the litigation is over.

That's the background.

Now, why things have happened and what's gone on the way they have, I, from a legal standpoint, really don't always understand everything, okay? They're doing things that just don't make sense. Why they filed the lawsuit and haven't said: Serve it, Jake, do something, let's get it on down the road, I don't know.

There are lots -- several City Councilmen asked that same question at the meeting, and nobody responded, as I recall, and told them why they haven't done it.

Even after the City Council at that meeting didn't do anything, the public meeting, they still haven't served the lawsuit.

I was encouraged at the -- Beth was all upset.

She watched it. I watched it on TV a day or so

later. But I was encouraged by what happened

because there were a couple of people saying no,

but I got the gist that most people wanted to go

forward, and once the shade session was mentioned,

it encouraged everybody to say: Yes, this is where

Now, two things happened also that were in addition to that. One was that they rejected Councilman Crescimbeni's motion to go back to the original numbers or cut the numbers in half, okay? The Council defeated that, which encouraged me to say they either want to do it or not do it.

And the second thing they did was, the auditor had -- and us in the process had made some suggestions that we change the language of some of the whereases, and this one -- I don't remember the exact language now, but the whereas in essence said the City didn't discover that this pension plan existed until --

MS. McCAGUE: 2012.

we can qo.

2.3

MR. SCHICKEL: -- 2012, and the auditor agreed that that wasn't true and they deleted that language.

So that was a technical amendment that the 1 auditor general -- inspector general -- council 3 auditor suggested. General Counsel agreed with it, and it was very important, I felt, for y'all to 4 5 have that straightened out. So we were -- I was encouraged by all of that, 6 7 okay? In spite of the rhetoric, I figured saner

heads would prevail and it'd happen.

Shade meeting came along and nothing, okay? As far as I know, it's not back on City Council agenda. I asked the General Counsel, they said nothing. They wouldn't tell me anything.

We prepared then a motion to dismiss or abate, which are legal -- have I shared -- have we shared that with everybody? I brought some with us. It's a long lawyer gobbledygook-type thing that tells you a lot about what we're saying. Some of it will be changed, I just haven't sat back down and did it --

MR. SCHEU: From what we --

MR. SCHICKEL: -- from what we've talked about.

But I wanted to -- she told me: Please don't file it, please don't file it.

And not wanting to make the lawyers mad, okay,

23 24 25

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

because clients oftentimes listen to lawyers, not 1 always, but I didn't --3 MR. PATSY: Clarify something for me. 4 MR. SCHICKEL: Yes. 5 MR. PATSY: This says the City of 6 Jacksonville. Does that mean City Hall, or does 7 that mean City Council, or does it mean collectively the two? MR. SCHICKEL: I think that means -- I would 9 10 guess that means the City Council and the 11 administration. But City Council is the -- is 12 likened to the Congress, which can pass laws and do 13 things. It's also part of the government, is the 14 executive branch, along with the judicial branch. 15 MR. SCHEU: It's the City. They're not a 16 separate entity. 17 MR. PATSY: Right. I'm just trying to -- I'm curious as to where the motivation to file this 18 19 came from. You mentioned Sam and Mike being 20 involved in the process, and that's City Hall. 21 I've heard a lot of discussion about the City 22 Council being in the argument, but it sounds like 23 Sam and City Hall filed the suit, but --MR. SCHICKEL: I have not been privy to the 24

information that will tell me all of that. I think

what's happened is the City Council finance committee -- and anybody correct me if you know more or have different feelings, because they didn't tell me. But I think the City finance committee got involved with this and said: We want to resolve this issue.

2.3

They passed the -- passed an ordinance or resolution which said: File suit against the Board, but you can settle it if you can.

MR. SCHEU: Which is why in November they told the City Council -- whoever that leadership was, probably Gulliford or Crescimbeni, said: You've got until end of business Friday to file a lawsuit, which they did.

And the General Counsel represents not only us but also the Mayor and all the others. So he felt he had a duty to file because he's been directed by his client. I think that's what happened.

MR. SCHICKEL: That's the best I understand it as well.

MR. PATSY: Because if we can't identify exactly where the impetus for this lawsuit came from, then can we really figure out how to settle this thing and resolve it without --

MR. SCHICKEL: Well, everyone -- and, Chief,

you were there, and I think everyone decided at the meeting that it needed to be resolved by ordinance, okay, that the settlement would be an ordinance as opposed to just everybody sitting down and signing a document saying we agree.

Do you recall those discussions?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes. And I think it's pretty clear that the drive to file the lawsuit came from the City Council. Not the Mayor's office, City Council.

And just to give a little bit more background to our newest Trustee, this all stems back to John Keane's -- well, there's three members in a senior volunteer requirement plan.

Initially, when John was hired at the Police and Fire Pension Fund, the Board at that time wanted to put them into the general employees pension plan, which is the City's general pension plan, general employees pension plan.

At that time, the City said: No, he can't go into our pension plan. He's not a City employee, he's an employee of the Police and Fire Pension Fund.

So several years later, I think it was in 2000, the Board at that time decided they were

going to initiate the process to create a pension plan for the Police and Fire Pension Fund employees who were not in the general employees pension plan.

So that's where this all started.

So over the years, the pension fund obviously paid John Keane a salary, paid into his pension plan.

Upon getting ready to retire, I guess, or getting close to retirement in 2011, 2012, the issue arose as to how much John Keane's actual pension payments were going to be, and that's what started this whole trail down this, ultimately ending in this lawsuit that hasn't technically been filed yet.

MR. SCHEU: It has been filed.

MR. SCHICKEL: It's been filed.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Oh, it has been filed?

MR. SCHICKEL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Hasn't been served.

As an employer, the pension fund, from the perspective of an employer, paid John Keane a certain salary each year and paid him -- or promised him a pension for those years of service.

So that's why, when this whole thing started, really, from an employer's perspective, whether

we're getting sued by the City, one of their 1 suggestions is that we just stop paying John Keane 3 his pension. Well, from a federal lawsuit standpoint and an 4 employer's standpoint, I don't see how we could 5 possibly do that and not be shown -- we would get 6 7 sued by John in that case, and I don't see how there's any way possible we would win that lawsuit. 8 9 So taking that into consideration, that's how 10 we've hired Jake to represent us and basically John 11 at the same time, because if we don't pay the 12 pension, we'll get sued by John. So really it's in our best interest to have 13 14 this settled with the support of John, he's happy 15 with the settlement and we don't get sued again by 16 not paying a pension. 17 MR. PAYNE: So John has agreed to an amount of 18 some --19 MR. SCHICKEL: Yes. 20 CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: He did. 21 MR. SCHEU: As did the General Counsel's 22 Office. 2.3 Right. CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: 24 MR. SCHEU: But the City Council did not.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT:

They rejected that and had

a shade meeting, and that's where we are now.

MR. SCHICKEL: Right.

2.3

MR. SCHEU: And there's only one little twist to that that I might have a slight disagreement, because Jake and I have discussed whether or not -- because if a circuit judge does rule that the pension plan was void ab initio -- which I don't think that's going to happen, but that's a possibility -- we would have paid out that money and not be able to get it back.

So I've raised with Jake the possibility of paying what we promised into an escrow account rather than to John. That would also, presumably, increase some leverage. But Jake and I -- he explained that to me one time, but I don't remember in my old age.

MR. SCHICKEL: We would look at each and go: Now, what was that? What was that?

(Laughter.)

MR. SCHICKEL: Let me carry you just a little bit further than that, which will bring us up to probably right now.

I think it is the City Council's the motivators behind it. I think they're the ones that are telling the General Counsel what to do,

and I think they're moving forward.

The General Counsel wouldn't tell me what happened at the shade meeting.

I'm going: Are we going ahead with the litigation or what?

And the answer was: Well, I guess so.

So it made sense for us to go ahead and file something, which is going to be to tell everybody where we were coming from and what our position was.

And she said: Please don't do that. She said -- she told me that they would share it with the City Council when they had their shade meeting. I took her at her word, and so that's where we are.

What happened after that last conversation was: I guess we're going ahead with the litigation.

I got an email requesting 25 different items from y'all, which were minutes, which were notices, which were --

MS. McCAGUE: Copies of documentation of posting of notices, copies of reports from the compensation committee of the Board and personnel committee of the Board, and requests for emails from the time that this plan was created in '99 and

2000, among other things. It's an extensive list.

MR. SCHICKEL: Here's the list. I didn't bring one for everybody, but you can look at it.

So as a result of that, I called them and I said: What are we doing? Why are you requesting that? Is it for you, or is it some third party requesting that?

Because if it's for -- if it's in part of the lawsuit, it technically ought to be part of a pleading somewhere. If it's not, then it ought to come some other way. And if wasn't part of the lawsuit, I was going to give it to Klausner or the City and say: Y'all figure it out. No sense paying me to do that.

She said: It's part of the lawsuit. She said: We need to figure this out.

Reading between the lines that I got -- now, subsequent to that, Beth and I did meet with Loree French, who's Assistant General Counsel, and talked about getting this information together and what was happening and letting them look at it.

So I think that what happened, the gist I got reading between the lines, anyway, was that the General Counsel's Office was not going to go forward with any sort of settlement talks or

discussions anymore until they were satisfied that the creation of this pension was legal from a sunshine standpoint. They had not ever addressed that or looked at that until Councilman Crescimbeni said something that night, that he had been informed that this, that and the other occurred.

2.3

Beth has done a lot of work in trying to find and put together all of that information, and from everything I understand and have seen, it was created in the sunshine and there are no sunshine problems with when it was created.

As a matter of fact, part of it which became humorous, and I asked Loree when she came over to bring it with her, so she was asking me for public information, I wanted it from her, which is what was the City's policy in 1999 --

MS. McCAGUE: '99 and 2000.

MR. SCHICKEL: -- to 2000 for doing public notices of meetings and so forth.

I found out Beth had been asking Durden for that for weeks and had no answer. And when Loree came over, she had no answer. And as we told her, I said: Well, it's our understanding that the Board would provide notice to the City and the City distributed it. So if the City didn't distribute

it, that's your problem, folks.

But I think that's -- I can understand her point, that if it was brought up, okay, that to settle the case and then have some citizens lawsuit come along and a court someplace said: Oh, it wasn't in the sunshine, then you lose. I mean, then the City Council looks bad, the General Counsel and everybody else looks bad.

So they're trying just now to vet it and see whether or not that was accurate or not.

All of this gets tied up in a whole lot of city law, state law and federal law, okay? And it's sort of like a bowl of spaghetti, you never know what you're going to get when you reach in there, which noodle is going to come out.

There is language out of the Florida Supreme

Court and others that says: Establishment of a

pension is part of someone's remuneration, their

salary, their pay. It may be called a pension, but

it's part of their pay.

And from all indications, if everything happens, this Board has the right to do and set the compensation of anybody, any of your employees, without regard to all the other formalities that they're talking about.

One of the reasons why we wanted to get this 1 out and we tried to put right in the first is that 3 we don't believe that Cindy's opinion -- Cindy 4 Laquidara's opinion that this was an -- only the 5 City Council can authorize a pension is incorrect, for a couple of reasons. 6 7 It's correct in the sense that -- subtle differences -- only the City Council can establish 8 9 a pension for a City employee, but as the Chief 10 said a minute ago, none of the employees here are 11 City employees. 12 MS. McCAGUE: Well, the director is not. 13 MR. SCHICKEL: Oh, okay. 14 MS. McCAGUE: The other employees are 15 employees of the City. 16 MR. SCHICKEL: Well --17 MR. PATSY: And that's a change, correct? 18 Isn't it a change? 19 MS. McCAGUE: No. 20 MR. SCHEU: But he's never been a City 21 employee. 22 MS. McCAGUE: He's never been a City employee. 2.3 MR. SCHICKEL: Well, Cohee and Walmsley 24 weren't either. 25 MS. McCAGUE: That's correct.

MR. PATSY: The three people on the --1 MS. McCAGUE: The three people were not a part 3 of the -- were not employees of the City, but the 4 other employees here are. 5 MR. PATSY: Okay. So you --MS. McCAGUE: I am a contractor. I have no 6 7 part of any pension. MR. PATSY: Right. But the executive 8 director --9 10 MS. McCAGUE: Is employed by the fund. 11 MR. PATSY: -- is part of the plan. And who's 12 the third person? 13 MS. McCAGUE: A woman named Donna Wollins, 14 something like that. 15 MR. SCHICKEL: Walmsley. 16 MS. McCAGUE: Thank you. 17 MR. PATSY: Is she retired? MS. McCAGUE: Oh, yes. And her pension 18 19 portion is very small. 20 MR. PATSY: So all three of the participants 21 in that plan effectively were retired. 22 MR. SCHEU: Are retired. 23 MR. PATSY: Or --24 MS. McCAGUE: Or survivors. 25 MR. PATSY: Or a survivor.

MS. McCAGUE: Correct.

MR. PATSY: All right, got it.

MR. SCHICKEL: Now, as we talk about this some more, from a legal standpoint, I don't like to -- I sue people, okay? I didn't want to bring -- or bring Walmsley or Dick Cohee's wife into all of this.

We did allege that they're indispensable parties, though, because, technically, if they're going to abolish this or think that they can, then they got to do it to Walmsley and Cohee's widow at the same time. And while I didn't want them around, you just sort of had to do that.

I was also hopeful that it would soften things a little bit, as they started seeing: Oh, my golly, we're going to have to do something to these people as well. Because it's totally inconsistent, in my mind, to say: We're going to treat John this way and we're going to treat everybody else like none of this arose, like everything with them was fine but with John we don't like it.

I think from listening to City Council and all that, the only thing that they're griping about John with is the amount of the money.

They all agreed, at least Councilman

Crescimbeni, as I heard him say about four different times: He's entitled to a pension.

2.3

They just don't like the amount. But the amount of the pension is determined by the length of service, as well as your salaries, and that's what it was. So there's not a whole lot getting around.

But we felt Cindy was wrong in that sense. We felt that an agency of the City of Jacksonville had not asked her to write that opinion. In other words, City Council didn't do it, Mayor didn't do, this Board didn't do it. And so, therefore, it was just like --

MR. SCHEU: It's just a memorandum.

MR. SCHICKEL: Yeah, sending something out.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And there are all other independent agencies in Jacksonville, of Jacksonville, who have created pension plans within their agencies, not through City Council.

MR. SCHICKEL: So --

MR. PATSY: And they didn't have to go through City Council to do that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Correct.

MR. SCHEU: Correct. So could we -- I would like to get off to Atlanta. Could we just sort of

cut to the chase?

MR. SCHICKEL: Yes.

MR. SCHEU: I feel that we really ought to put our position of record so that City Council sees it, it's in black and white, and they say: Well, you know, they really do have a pretty good case.

Now, I realize the General Counsel may have communicated that.

We really feel like we ought to file the motion to dismiss. That might put more pressure on the -- the General Counsel is not our counsel, and we might want to please them, but I just feel strongly that the public hasn't seen this, and so you get the newspaper, which doesn't like John Keane either -- we need our legal -- we've got a strong legal position, and we're just being (makes sound).

MR. PATSY: And the one point that was brought up earlier about the pension plan being created without the knowledge of City Council, the thing that was redacted from the --

MR. SCHICKEL: Right, the discovery, the discovery language, yeah.

MR. PATSY: Well, to the best of my knowledge, that's still out there in print as far as the paper

is concerned. Just because they made that declaratory statement, everybody takes it as fact, even though they backpedalled and said: Okay, well, maybe we did know about this before 2012.

MR. SCHICKEL: Well, we had --

MR. PATSY: That story doesn't get out.

MR. SCHICKEL: Well, I think the rest of it is that, as we go through it they're going to see that there was -- well, John told me that the City Council didn't audit the books here for 10 years, 12 years.

So all the financial stuff was there. It was plainly visible to all of them. But they, quote, unquote, didn't discover it because they didn't look, you know.

And so I think that a lot of this is just, you know, the perfect storm hit. If we didn't have a big deficit right now, we probably wouldn't have that. But we've got a big deficit, we've got John making a lot of money, we've got public records enthusiasts running around everywhere doing all of that and so forth.

So what I want to do is to bring y'all up to date on where it is.

I was thinking and we have started -- and sort

of what you're talking about. We can request admissions, say: City, do you agree this is true, do you agree this is true.

If they deny them and they are in fact true, then there's certain penalties assessed against the City, the other side, for wrongfully denying, okay, and also asking for the audit reports that were going on.

So we were sort of putting together a package to do that, and then stopped when she said don't, and she assured me it was going to be there.

But I'm happy to go ahead and start moving forward on this. Doing nothing doesn't cost y'all money. Doing something does cost you money. But as much as anything else you can see, it's a political decision, because Sam Mousa agreed, Mike Weinstein's agreed. The General Counsel, to the extent that they're willing to agree, they negotiated the deal, and they agreed. And we're just now to the City Council.

And is going forward with the litigation end of it, getting our story out, going to help or hurt in the long run. And so that's sort of a political decision, which I'm not an expert in.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I would prefer to make these decisions based on facts and not politics.

And from a business perspective --

MR. SCHICKEL: Sounds like a good policeman and a good lawyer.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Well, from a business perspective, this whole lawsuit doesn't make any sense. Whether you agree with the salary that John Keane was paid or not, that was his salary. That's indisputable. The number of years that he served as the executive director of the Police and Fire Pension Fund is not disputable.

So to come back after he's about to retire and say: We're going to change the amount that we agreed to pay you, to me we can't win that case.

There's no way we can win that case from an employer's perspective.

So this political lawsuit just doesn't make any sense to me, and especially when you factor in we are going to spend more money on the lawsuit than we would save the difference between what they want to pay John and what he's legally entitled to. We will pay more in attorneys' fees than that difference. It makes zero sense to me.

So I'd like to get this resolved, and I think

2.3

one of the ways to do that is to push forward with filing this response, to get it on the table, try to stop the silliness, let them come up with a settlement, we agree to it and we move on.

MR. SCHEU: In the City Council debate, you heard it, they said they were willing to spend up to over a million dollars to collect \$600,000.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Makes no sense.

MR. SCHEU: It's ridiculous.

MR. PATSY: Depending why, foolish.

MR. SCHEU: Until you get it out in the public that they can start getting political pressure coming the other way, maybe it is better to settle. You basically got Bill Gulliford and John Crescimbeni driving the debate, driving the insistence.

And their people, like that Becton guy, he turned out to be a reasonable guy. And there are others that want to just put it behind them. And for the good of the community, this just needs to get behind us. I just really think you've got to do that.

MS. McCAGUE: So, Jake or Bill, could you detail then what happens if you file this motion to dismiss? What should we expect happens in the

judicial system and what will happen with the City attorneys?

MR. SCHICKEL: Well, from a legal standpoint, once it's filed, it starts the process going.

We'll call it up before a judge and have a hearing on it where the judge will look at it and read it and decide whether it's accurate or inaccurate.

Candidly, there's a lot of argument in it that isn't technically supposed to be there. A lot of it, the judge may say: Well, they've stated a cause of action. I'm going to let it go forward, or I'll want to strike certain portions of it, and then decide what's valid and legally binding and not.

It's almost that you need evidence to show this, but we're going to try to do it through ordinances and statutes, saying: This is the General Counsel's duty, this is responsibilities, this is what a binding opinion is. This isn't that, okay?

The judge can make a decision then and strike part of it, leave part of it, or say abate it because you haven't done it the right way.

The City Council has not made a demand on this body as of this point in time. Cindy did not issue

a ruling to this body at all saying you can't do it.

MR. SCHEU: She gave a memorandum and said it was preliminary anyway, saying that the City Council was the only entity that could create a pension for a City employee, and John wasn't a City employee.

And that's a legal issue that a judge could decide on a motion to dismiss. You wouldn't have to take testimony for that.

MR. SCHICKEL: So he could say yes, no, or parse it up, or: City, it's dismissed. Go back and you can try again, phrase it differently.

During the course of that, and I think when we file this, we want to file along with it a request to produce, which is what Beth and I talked about it for a period of time, the types of documents that they've got, like: Well, show us where the auditor looked at all these records at any point in time, as well as some admissions, admit that this wasn't delivered directly -- was not an opinion directly to this Board or was not on behalf of an agency of the City and start setting it up.

Then, after that, it will start -- that's the paper discovery that we're talking about. And then

it starts people discovery, which is probably a deposition of John, a deposition of the chairman back then, what was happening, who did what, who said what.

But a lot of the paperwork is going to be out by that time, which is going to be people just saying: Well, on such and such a date, here are the minutes of the meeting.

MS. McCAGUE: So, alternatively, if we did not officially file this motion, then the City attorneys would do their work to look to see from their viewpoint were there any sunshine violations, and I don't think they will find any, and then we would still be in a position that there may be settlement?

MR. SCHICKEL: I should certainly hope so. It could have been -- it could have been -- and we don't know the answer -- it's a shade meeting -- while there are no votes taken, everybody looked up and said: Full speed ahead. We don't want to make a decision and settle it. We want a court to settle it.

And so I'm hopeful, though, that saner minds will prevail in despite of some of the things that we saw.

My suggestion, if that's where you want to go, is to give them -- I don't want to fall into what they've done to us at different times, okay? I want to take the higher position.

I think, just like I saw at different times, if we've got records to give them, let's give them to them as soon as we can get them together. Let's not have a bunker mentality or make them fight for everything. All of this is public records.

But I would say that we tell them that by
April 1, which is two weeks, a little less than two
weeks, 10 days or so, we don't have some direction
in this from them, we're going to file an answer or
file these papers --

MR. SCHEU: Well, let me just --

MR. SCHICKEL: -- which -- I'm sorry -- which may give them the opportunity to say: Wait a minute. We're taking it back, give us some more direction. If not, then, you know --

MR. SCHEU: I just think it's like rope-a-dope. I mean, I just think we're just -- and I would normally counsel that sort of thing, but then they got to go back to the City Council and you got to do it all over again.

You can still settle it. You say: Loree,

this has drug on for so long, you've given us no direction, so we're going to go ahead and file the motion and hope we can settle it. We're giving you stuff, we're going to ask you for stuff.

I wouldn't wait to get all the discovery pleadings done. I'd go ahead and file it.

MR. SCHICKEL: No, I'm --

MR. SCHEU: And just say: You know, it just frames it, and you can still settle it.

We are just getting beat up everywhere. At the Rotary Club, the questions you got, you got them about John, about this.

And I had lunch yesterday with Jerry Holland. He said he gets asked: Why did you do that stupid thing and approve that 30-year agreement back in 1990? You were the president of the Council. He said: Well, because the administration -- everybody said it was okay.

MR. PATSY: And to be honest with you, when you looked at the numbers back then, 1999, equity returns -- or four years prior to that, you know, 20 percent, 18, 20 percent, so the numbers were good. The expected rate of return was 8 1/2 percent, very high number.

So the funded status of the plan was probably

very healthy, so it seemed like a very reasonable 1 -- and then world changed. 3 MR. SCHEU: I don't think we need to take a vote, just like the City Council didn't take a 4 5 vote, so that it doesn't -- we don't have a public meeting after this, then we get the sense of the 6 7 Board that we feel the motion ought to be filed. MR. PATSY: I'm not an attorney, but I would defer to you, Bill and --9 10 MR. PAYNE: I know I would. I just think that 11 we need to get this behind us and move forward, 12 because this will have a bump for all the other 13 stuff that we're trying to do and move forward. 14 That's what I'm hearing publicly, from the public, 15 and we just need to get it behind us. 16 MR. PATSY: There are going to be a lot of 17 people that aren't going to be happy about this --18 MR. PAYNE: Exactly. 19 MR. PATSY: -- but we'll deal with it. 20 MS. McCAGUE: And one thing -- I don't have a 21 view on this, but I remember that Council -- some 22 of the Council members at the meeting were 23 concerned about litigation being filed while the Mayor's bill was being processed in Tallahassee. 24

And so we may need to think about -- I think Mike

25

Weinstein said earlier today that the governor had 1 until the 25th or 26th to --3 MR. PAYNE: 30th. I thought he said 30th. MR. SCHEU: I thought he said the 25th or 4 26th. 5 MS. McCAGUE: So is it worthwhile waiting 6 7 until that date passes before we do something that could cause another news article? MR. SCHICKEL: Who are the worst clients? 9 10 MR. PATSY: I'm not sure what the 11 ramifications are --12 MR. SCHICKEL: Who are the worst clients? 13 MR. PATSY: -- of waiting --14 MR. SCHICKEL: Lawyers. 15 MR. SCHEU: They are. 16 MR. SCHICKEL: I would --17 MR. PATSY: I'm not sure --18 The first thing I would do is MR. SCHICKEL: give them a warning, say --19 20 MR. SCHEU: I would do that, too --21 MR. SCHICKEL -- you've got --22 MR. SCHEU: -- I'd say --2.3 She can't hear what you're saying. MR. PAYNE: 24 THE REPORTER: Well, I need one person at a 25 time, please.

MR. SCHICKEL: I would suggest we give them a 1 warning. I'd say a week, 10 days. That's why I've 3 picked the first of the month. 4 That's okay. I just think we --MR. SCHEU: MR. SCHICKEL: And then we'll find out --5 6 MR. SCHEU: -- they need to know we're not 7 going to roll over much longer, that we need to get it out there. 9 MR. PAYNE: I agree. 10 MR. SCHICKEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I'm conflicted as to 11 12 whether we should wait. I will concede and we will 13 wait. I don't think any of this requires a motion. 14 You are our attorney. We will go on your 15 advice, and hopefully it's worked out by April 1st. 16 I highly doubt it, but that would be great. 17 MR. SCHEU: Well, Mr. Chair, if the 25th is 18 the date, that's a Friday. That's a week from 19 today, just like that was a Friday. I think you said: Loree, we're going to file 20 21 if we don't have -- what do we tell them? 22 MR. SCHICKEL: No. 23 MR. SCHEU: Because, see, they've still got --24 what are we asking them for? We don't --25 CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I'm asking them to settle

1 it.

MR. SCHEU: Well, they're not going to settle it by then, because you got to go to the Council, and so, you know, that's sort of backing up. I think we ought to go ahead and file --

MR. SCHICKEL: My hope is, okay, in the best of all worlds and an optimist, that they sit there and it would hurry up with their vetting whether or not it was in the sunshine or not, and be able then to come say: We vetted it, it was in the sunshine, everything is fine. Now let's push it forward.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: If that's truly what they want to do, then why can't they just communicate that to you?

MR. PATSY: It's not the politically correct thing --

MR. SCHICKEL: I had -- she was here when we sat and talked, and I looked at them and I said:
Guys, this isn't a big-time lawsuit over personal injury cases or anything like that where you're going to get banged somehow. I said: We're all in the game together. We're all citizens of Jacksonville. We're all trying to do the right thing. Quit playing games with me, you know, quit playing lawyer. Open up and talk.

Didn't I say that? 1 MS. McCAGUE: You did. 3 MR. SCHICKEL: And I said: I don't want --I'm not going to surprise you with anything and I 4 don't expect you to surprise me with anything. 5 It's only helpful to the City to move forward. 6 7 MR. SCHEU: What were you going to get if you tell them -- what are you going to say, if you 8 haven't done what by the 25th, we're going to file 10 it? You don't get anything. 11 MR. SCHICKEL: You'd be surprised. I bet you 12 we'll -- we're going to make them scramble, anyway. 13 We're going to make them scramble, anyway. 14 But I think what will happen is that they will 15 be more forthcoming about what they're trying to do 16 and move forward. Lawyers have a great 17 procrastination in us --18 MR. SCHEU: They sure do. 19 MR. SCHICKEL: -- and so unless there's 20 something, like Larry was saying, that's pushing 21 them forward, they're going to just let it sit. 22 MR. SCHEU: Well, I'd agree to go out to the 23 close of business on the 25th, but I don't know 24 what to say we get. I mean, what is the quid pro

25

quo?

MR. SCHICKEL: We just tell them: 1 This is what we're doing --3 MR. PATSY: So, Bill, are you --MR. SCHICKEL: -- pick your best hole. 4 5 MR. PATSY: -- do we go ahead and, if this is 6 ready to go, go ahead and file --7 MR. SCHEU: He's got to make some changes that we talked about --9 MR. SCHICKEL: Yes. 10 MR. SCHEU: -- but by the end of next week, it 11 needs to be filed. 12 CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: When we come --13 MR. PAYNE: I concur with that. 14 CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: When we come out of the 15 shade meeting, we'll have to do a motion, and 16 basically the wording is here -- it's somewhat 17 generic -- a motion is in order to adopt the 18 recommendation of counsel and to authorize him to 19 take such actions as may be necessary to protect the interests of the fund. 20 21 That will basically be it. 22 Sounds good. He gets to --MR. SCHEU: 23 If you want it, I'll take it. MR. SCHICKEL: 24 I mean, it doesn't matter to me.

MR. PATSY: I'd like to read it.

25

MR. SCHEU: This is what I've got already. 1 MR. SCHICKEL: Yes. 3 MS. McCAGUE: Yes. 4 MR. SCHICKEL: It shows -- it shows -- I was 5 out of town and they were working on it. It shows a certificate on it, which is a Certificate of 6 7 Service. It was not served, so that was just a 8 preliminary --9 Jake, make I ask a question? MS. McCAGUE: 10 MR. SCHICKEL: Yes. 11 MS. McCAGUE: If a reporter or citizen asks 12 for any material that was presented in this 13 meeting, is that covered under the shade and would 14 not be released until the lawsuit --15 MR. SCHICKEL: Correct. 16 MS. McCAGUE: -- or any litigation was 17 settled? 18 MR. SCHICKEL: Correct. 19 MS. McCAGUE: So this is not for public 20 knowledge. 21 MR. SCHICKEL: That is correct. 22 MS. McCAGUE: Except if it's filed, it is 23 public --24 MR. SCHICKEL: Then it -- once it becomes 25 filed --

MR. PATSY: So all the minutes --1 MR. SCHICKEL: -- it's public record. 3 MR. PATSY: -- she's taking are not releasable until this --4 5 MS. McCAGUE: The case is settled. MR. PATSY: -- lawsuit is settled. 6 7 MR. SCHEU: Or a judgment is entered. MS. McCAGUE: Right. And then the transcript 8 is fully available, but not until that point. 9 10 And, as Jake said earlier -- you guide us --11 we don't say -- everything here is confidential. 12 We don't say anything about what happened one way 13 or the other, correct? 14 MR. SCHICKEL: Right. We discussed the 15 litigation. You're the client. 16 MR. PATSY: Can't say nothing. That's 17 perfect. 18 CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Does --19 MR. PAYNE: Lips are sealed. 20 (Laughter.) 21 MR. SCHEU: I'm sorry to feel so vehement 22 about it, but I just feel we're getting led down 23 the primrose path and we just need to say: Enough 24 is enough. I just feel strongly about that. 25 MR. SCHICKEL: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It is 12:58. We'll need a motion to end the closed session and return to public meeting. Do we have a motion? MR. PATSY: Motion. MR. PAYNE: Second. CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: We have a motion and a second. It is 12:58. The closed session is -- the motion passes and the closed session is adjourned. (End of the closed session.) (Thereupon, at 12:58 p.m., the closed session was adjourned.) 2.0 

1	CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF FLORIDA )
3	COUNTY OF DUVAL )
4	I, Cindy Danese, Notary Public in and for the
5	State of Florida at Large, do hereby certify that the
6	foregoing pages are a true and accurate recordation of
7	the proceedings which took place.
8	WITNESS my hand and official seal this 22nd
9	day of March 2016.
10	
11	
12	STATEWIDE REPORTING SERVICE
13	
14	
15	GINDY DANIEGE Notes Deleter
16	CINDY DANESE, Notary Public State of Florida at Large.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	