## IN RE:

JACKSONVILLE POLICE AND FIRE PENSION FUND FORENSIC AUDIT MEETING

DATE: November 2, 2015

TIME: 1:30 p.m.

LOCATION: City Hall

Conference Room A 117 West Duval Street

Jacksonville, Florida 32202

## Transcribed by:

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

1	
2	MR. GULLIFORD: All right. I call the
3	meeting to order. Let's go around the table and
4	let everybody introduce themselves.
5	Mr. Crescimbeni.
6	MR. CRESCIMBENI: John Crescimbeni, At Large
7	Group 2, the City Council.
8	MR. PARKS: Brian Parks, Council Auditor's
9	Office.
10	(Inaudible) Mayor's office.
11	MR. WEINSTEIN: Mike Weinstein, Finance.
12	(Inaudible)
13	MR. DURDEN: Stephen Durden, Office of
14	General Counsel.
15	MR. CLEMONS: Jeff Clemons, Council
16	Research.
17	MR. LOPEZ-BROSCHE: Anna Lopez-Brosche, At
18	Large Group 1.
19	MR. HAZOURI: Tommy Hazouri, At Large
20	Group 3.
21	MR. SCHMITT: Larry Schmitt, Chairman of the
22	Police and Fire Pension Fund.
23	MR. GULLIFORD: Bill Gulliford, District 13.
24	MR. KELLEY: Eileen Kelley, Florida
25	Times-Union.

```
MR. SCHINDLER: Anne Schindler, First Coast
 1
         News.
 2
             MR. JAMISON: Dan Jamison, Sheriff's Office
 3
             MR. GORDON: Chunk Gordon, JSO, sheriff's
 4
 5
         office.
             MR. ZONA: Steve Zona, Secretary of
 6
 7
         Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge 530.
             MR. CARR: Dan Carr, Concerned Taxpayers.
 8
             MR. BERGAMO: Alex Bergamo, Second Vice
 9
         President of FOP.
10
             MR. DARAGJATI: Paul Daragjati, Klausner
11
         Kaufman.
12
             MR. ANDREWS: Joe Andrews, Concerned
13
         Taxpayers of Duval County.
14
             MR. PIGGOTT: Jim Piggott, Channel 4.
15
16
              (Inaudible)
             MR. KENDALL: Brian Kendall, Action News.
17
18
             MR. AMOS: Steve Amos, President, Fraternal
         Order of Police.
19
20
             MS. BUSBY: Jenny Busby, Tommy Hazouri's
         office.
21
             MR. STARK: Kevin Stark (inaudible)
22
23
             MR. GASSETT: Bill Gassett, citizen.
24
             MR. CLINE: Alan Cline, inspector general.
25
             MR. HARRIS: Jonathan Harris (inaudible)
```

```
MS. KILBRIDE: Lindsey Kilbride, WJCT.
 1
             MR. GANCARSKI: A.G. Gancarski, Florida
 2
         Politics.
 3
 4
             MR. LEE: Curtis Lee, Concerned Taxpayer.
 5
              (Inaudible)
 6
             MR. GULLIFORD: Well, as you can tell,
 7
         Mr. Scheu, we have a packed room.
             MR. SCHEU: Well, this is really impressive.
 8
         Where are you-all meeting?
 9
             MR. GULLIFORD: In Conference Room A.
10
                                                     And
         Mr. Danny Becton, Councilman Danny Becton, is
11
         with us. He just joined us too.
12
13
             MR. SCHEU: Great.
             MR. GULLIFORD: Oh, yeah, you need to
14
         introduce yourself, Bill.
15
             MR. SCHEU: I'm Bill Scheu of Rogers Towers
16
         and a JPFPF trustee.
17
18
             MR. GULLIFORD: Can you hear us okay?
19
             MR. SCHEU: Yes.
20
             MR. GULLIFORD: All right.
21
             Well, Chairman, you asked for this meeting,
         and I don't know whether you expected the cast of
22
23
         thousands that showed up, but here we are.
24
              So the floor is yours, sir.
25
             MR. SCHMITT: All right. I appreciate that.
```

It's up to you because it's your office, but I would like to open up for public comment, if that's all right with you.

MR. GULLIFORD: Sure.

MR. SCHMITT: Is there anyone who would like to make a public comment?

MR. LEE: All right. My name is Curtis Lee. In light of the forensic auditor's report and everything that preceded it and all its implications, I think the first order of business is that the Police and Fire Pension Fund Board should immediately suspend John Keane and Robert Klausner and should hire a new attorney to replace Robert Klausner.

This would not necessarily be a permanent decision, but Mr. Klausner has conflicts of interest. That's it.

MR. GULLIFORD: Thank you, sir.

MR. GASSETT: My name is Bill Gassett and I'll just pass out a few among the folks here, if it's okay. (Inaudible) and it's not about the nature of the report or the subject. It's about how the format of the report is done. What I did was -- I know this is kind of a problem with other reports that you folks have on the panel

committees and recommendations to the city.

I did an analysis of that report -- and the first 16 findings, and most of the reports have findings one, backup together, findings two, have two exhibits and so on.

If you look at what I've passed out there, he's rambled throughout the whole thing, starting with F7 and 5 and -- things like that. So it makes it very hard for the reader, especially a citizen like myself, to understand where he's coming from and not get caught in the seaweed of (inaudible)

The other problem I had was that when you have this kind of bad report writing, it makes it hard not only for a guy like me to understand, but it kind of takes away from the credibility for it -- broadcasting in overtime. So the writer isn't really very clear and specific himself.

So I would like to ask the Chair who handles these reports, please have him follow some more academic-type structure on how they write it.

Thanks very much.

MR. GULLIFORD: Well, we will probably have public comment at the end too if it's okay with

you. This is fairly informal, so if somebody wants to chime in. I will ask that you maintain proper discipline and decorum in your comments, but other than that.

So, yes, sir, okay. Chair, it's yours.

MR. SCHMITT: All right.

I'm Larry Schmitt. I'm the Chairman of the Police and Fire Pension Fund. I joined the Board in July of 2014 and have been chairman for about four months.

This meeting this morning was initiated by me. I called it because I saw the news reports that the forensic audit was going to be released.

The normal practice in business is for an auditor to contact the board of the fund that's being audited. This individual, Mr. Siedle, never contacted the board one time. So I was a little curious about that.

So now as a new chairman -- they said they're going to release a forensic audit -- excuse me if I talk this way. I don't want to put my back to you, but I'm trying to make sure everybody hears me.

I actually looked forward to seeing the

forensic audit. As a new chairman, that would give me some additional reassurance that the fund was actually -- you know, the finances of the funds were in order.

I was also optimistic, having just completed pension reform with Mr. Gulliford and his assurance at the time that the political games were over. And you came over to the Police and Fire Pension Fund. We worked through this deal. I believed him. I trusted him. And we were able to hammer out this pension reform deal.

We said that we were going to continue to work together to solve the pension debt issues with solutions based on sound financial principles and facts.

And after a quick review of Mr. Siedle's work -- I'm not sure why he's not here today -- but it was very obvious that it was not a forensic audit. It was just personal opinions, unsupported allegations and misused reference material.

And Mr. Siedle is perfectly within his rights to say his personal opinions, and I may have actually agreed with some of those personal opinions that are in the report. But going back

and forth on personal opinions at \$85,000 per document gets pretty expensive. That would put us back to where we were before we even got pension reform, which is being completely unproductive.

So today I'm going to clarify -- I have a few clarifying questions and I wish Mr. Siedle was here for those -- discuss transparency, provide some additional information, give an overview of the management of the board, and discuss the real causes of the pension debt.

My questions I was going to ask

Mr. Siedle -- and, Mr. Gulliford, maybe you

already know these answers -- was there any

specific credible evidence uncovered that would

identify any person from the pension fund who

committed any criminal acts?

MR. GULLIFORD: I'll let Mr. Siedle answer that. My -- my personal response would be based on what is -- what's transpired today was that he didn't get enough information to be able to make that determination. He so stated in the press conference that we had.

MR. SCHMITT: I'll take that as a no.

So I'll move on to transparency. And I

stress this since I became chairman of the Police and Fire Pension Fund. It's absolutely imperative for the fund to have any and all parties inside and out of the fund that do business with the fund be completely open.

Every single trustee has heard me say that.

Every single employee of the Police and Fire

Pension Fund has said that -- has heard me say

that. The financial documents of the fund don't

belong to the fund. They belong to the public.

And as trustee here again today, any financial documents that you want, you may have. I extend the invitation once again. And I contacted Councilman Gulliford and Mr. Siedle personally and told them each, come on over to the fund, bring as many employees from the city as you can; I'll show you where all the files are, you know, every single box, filing cabinet, storage room, wherever they are, bring people over. We will make copies of them right then and there. You can have them.

Instead, the Times-Union reported that I told them, If you want them, come and get them yourself. That was not my intent. That's not the spirit of what I told them, and I extend that

offer again.

Any of those documents are open to any -there's nothing confidential in there. They're
not the files of the police officers or
firefighters of the actual pension. It doesn't
include their Social Security numbers. This is
all information from reports from outside
entities that we may or may not have copies of.
That's it. You can have copies of all of them.
Come on over and we'll make copies.

In speaking of transparency -- and, again, I wish Mr. Siedle was here -- I'm not going to get into all the specifics of his report, but one thing stood out to me in his report.

On page 32 of 144, in Mr. Siedle's document, it makes reference to a 2007 U.S. Government Accountability Office Report.

In that report it talks about if there is a pension consultant in this group that has conflicts of interest -- in general the plans that have that pension consultant, their returns are 1.3 percent lower.

So what Mr. Siedle did was take that 1.3 percent, apply it to the pension investments over a 20-year period. He came up with a figure of

300- to 500-million dollars, and said the pension consultant conflicts cost plans 1.3 percent, and over a 20-year period, with compounding, such conflicts may have cost the fund to almost 30 percent of its value, perhaps 300- to 500 million dollars. That's what he put in his report.

When you read the actual report, what it says is, it related to that 0.3 percent, 1.3 percent, because many factors can affect returns, and data as well as modeling limitations limit the ability to generalize and interpret the results.

This finding, the finding of this report that he refers to, should not be considered as proof of causality between consultants and lower rates of returns. In other words, the report said you shouldn't do exactly what Mr. Siedle did. And that's what he used in his report.

I found it interesting in his report, also going through this 2007 report, that I also refer to a case with the United Airlines Pension Fund. And it specifically says in there that plan sponsors should not be the fiduciary, which is exactly what the city is trying to do now. And it lists reasons why.

There's a built-in conflict of interest. It you're the plan sponsor, you should not control the decisions of whether to fund that plan. And if you're the fiduciary of the plan, you don't have an independent board, there's a built-in conflict of interest to where you're the city, you don't want to raise taxes, so you don't pay the pension amount that you should.

That's actually listed in this same report that he referred to, but he didn't bother mentioning that.

The next thing I want to cover is the overview of the Police and Fire Pension plan management. The Police and Fire Pension Fund is audited annually by an independent certified public accountant. They do their own report.

There's also an annual actuarial evaluation that is completed each year by an outside actuary. The audited financial statements, the actuary reports, the budget, the monthly investment returns, that's gross and net of fees, all posted on the fund's website for complete transparency. Every single month they're on there. They're on there right now.

The structure and oversight of the Police

and Fire Pension Fund is standard throughout the State of Florida. It's in the state statutes — the same structure and oversight the city utilizes to manage the General Employees Pension Plan and the Correction Officers Pension Plan. The city is — to those plans. They use the exact same management structure that the Police and Fire Pension Fund uses.

They have a board, a fund treasurer, a controller, a trust company, an independent auditor, an actuary, a professional pension consultant, professional money managers and attorneys. It's the exact same.

The only difference is the board of the Police and Fire Pension Fund is independent.

They don't have to do only what the city wants to do. They have to do what's in the best interest of the members.

In addition to the above, the Florida

Division of Retirement reviews every single

annual report. It's submitted to them every

single year for their report. This is the same

structure in governance that was approved in the

2015 pension reform.

The board of trustees is required to meet

quarterly, but usually they meet monthly, and lately it's been a lot more often. The board members of the Police and Fire Pension Fund are volunteers. They're community oriented. They're giving their time and talents for the benefits of the police officers, firefighters, and the citizens of Jacksonville.

This is an extra responsibility that they take on in a very challenging environment.

Recent board members include former JEA Chief

Executive Walt Bussells. Attorney Bill Scheu is here today. He's a City Council appointee.

Former Sheriff Nat Glover, Fire Lieutenant Rich

Tuten, and Dr. Adam Herbert, who is the former president of the University of North Florida, all upstanding citizens in this community.

The treasurer for the City of Jacksonville is also the treasurer for the General Employees Pension Plan, the Correction Officers Pension Plan, and the Police and Fire Pension Fund Pension Plan. We share the same treasurer. There's nothing secret going on here. It's the same treasurer.

The treasurer regularly utilizes a combined bargaining power of all three pension plans to

negotiate lower fees for all three plans. He uses that leverage to get lower fees, not just for our plan, but for the two city-run plans as well.

The treasurer attends most of our board meetings and gives regular updates to the board regarding negotiated investment fees.

The report indicated that we didn't know what our fees were and we never paid attention to the fees. That is absolutely false. If you had attended any of the board meetings, you can clearly see that those are discussed every single month, and periodically the treasurer will give us an update on new fees. He was able to lower the fees for all three funds.

The Police and Fire Pension Fund uses the same pension consultant, Summit Strategies, that the city uses for their two pension plans. They hired the same one -- or we hired the same one as them. They're a reputable company. They have been around for a long time.

The consultant provides monthly investment reports to the board and is reviewed monthly at the board meetings. The consultant reports include investment returns, gross and net of

fees. The consultant is in regular contact with the treasurer.

The Police and Fire Pension Fund utilizes
the same core group of professional money
managers that the city has selected to use for
the plans that they manage. The exact same ones.

The city uses the same outside attorney many times for pension-related issues. You mentioned Mr. Klausner. The city uses Mr. Klausner many times for specific pension questions.

The investment policies and the asset allocations within the plans are very similar. The General Employees Pension Plan and the Correction Officers Pension Plan have some options until recently that the Police and Fire Pension Fund did not have. But they have them available now.

And the investment returns are similar among the plans. At times the General Employees

Pension Plan has better returns. But, in general, over the long-term, they're relatively the same.

So my question is: If a majority of the unfunded liability is, in fact, due to poor management, as suggested, why are the General

Employees Pension Plan and the Correction Officers Pension Plan not fully funded?

If it's only because of the management, and they manage the fund, why are they not fully funded? They're funded at 66 percent and 48 percent as of September 30, 2014.

Both of those plans have a higher investment assumption rate than the PFPF. The PFPF uses a 7 percent assumption rate, which means when they calculate how much the city has to put in, they assume -- the Police and Fire Pension Fund assumed that the funds are going -- or the investments are going to earn 7 percent.

The two managed by the city, they make the assumption rate at 7.5 percent, which means the city has to put in less, which is another reason why the state legislation made independent boards of Police and Fire Pension Funds, so they couldn't manipulate that investment return option.

If it's controlled by the city, the city says, Well, let's raise the assumption rate so we don't have to put as much in. That's not to the benefit of the members.

The main cause of the unfunded liability

continues to be the cumulative impact of using the pension fund to supplement the artificial low millage rate, and this has taken -- this has been done over many, many years. This was a financial decision made by several administrations and with a calculated risk.

There were benefits to the decision that were enjoyed at the time, and now we're experiencing the negative side of those decisions. It's turned around. Now we're paying the price.

I've printed out a few documents here. It's a summary of basically the pension plan since 1990. It shows the millage rate. It shows the unfunded liability and the undeniable correlation of decreasing the millage rate and increasing the unfunded liability.

The pension plan has not been fully funded since one year after Councilman Hazouri was mayor. That's how long it's been. And this is the main cause.

All these documents, again -- I've got a few copies to hand out here, but we will post them on the Police and Fire Pension Fund website as well.

And I'm hopeful that the other council members

review the financial information provided and draw their on conclusions.

Mr. Gulliford seems to think that the Police and Fire Pension Fund should be under management of the city. I understand that position. You know, I understand reasons why you want that.

But paying somebody \$85,000 to create a document full of opinions, misinformation and unsubstantiated allegations is not beneficial to the community.

As far as the board, this is what we're committed to do. We will remain completely transparent by continuing to post on the fund's website the audited financial statements, actuary reports, budgets, and monthly investment return reports, gross and net of fees.

We will hire all the personnel necessary to make copies of any and all financial records requested. That's an expensive proposition, but if you want us to hire people to make copies, we'll do it.

We have already limited the amount of travel that will be allowed by future executive director -- a future executive director, and we will specifically dig into the commission

recapture process to determine what accounting 1 and reporting improvements can be made in that 2 3 area. 4 Lastly, we will also review the other 5 information in the document to see if there's any 6 merit to any of the allegations of wrongdoing. 7 And if you have any questions, I can take 8 them now. MR. SCHEU: Mr. Chairman, I would like to 9 say something too, but I'll do it at the 10 appropriate time. 11 MR. GULLIFORD: Sure. Mr. Crescimbeni. 12 MR. CRESCIMBENI: My question is, can I get 13 14 a copy of that document that you're reading from? MR. SCHMITT: 15 Sure. 16 MR. CRESCIMBENI: Okay. Do I have to come 17 and get that or can you send that to me? 18 MR. SCHMITT: I've give a copy of it right 19 now. 20 MR. CRESCIMBENI: And then is that something 21 you prepared --22 MR. SCHMITT: It is --MR. CRESCIMBENI: -- or was it prepared by 23 24 someone else? 25 MR. SCHMITT: These are my notes.

MR. CRESCIMBENI: Prepared by you? 1 MR. SCHMITT: Yes, sir. 2 3 MR. CRESCIMBENI: So there's no internal emails or anything that wasn't sent to you? 4 5 MR. SCHMITT: I may have sent it to myself. 6 MR. CRESCIMBENI: Okay. All right. I would 7 like to get a copy of that and the attachments. That would be great. 8 MR. SCHMITT: 9 Sure. MR. CRESCIMBENI: When you post your stuff 10 to the website, I've heard complaints about the 11 delay and how long it takes to get information 12 reported to the website, earnings, et cetera. 13 How long does that normally take? 14 MR. SCHMITT: After this meeting I'll send 15 it to the secretary. Whenever she gets to it --16 17 I can have her expedite it. As far as an actual 18 time frame, I'm not sure. Hopefully within a 19 day, maybe two. 20 MR. CRESCIMBENI: No, no. I'm saying when 21 you get your investment reports, like at the end of a quarter or something, how long does it take 22 23 to get that information on the website? 24 There seems to be some delay on when you 25 receive that information and when it actually

becomes transparent to the public. 1 MR. SCHMITT: Well, take the last month, for 2 3 instance --4 MR. CRESCIMBENI: Let's take -- let's take, 5 you know, a quarter -- six months ago. Last 6 month is probably an anomaly. Six months ago, 7 when did the information go up? I was going to use last month 8 MR. SCHMITT: because I think it got on there fairly quickly. 9 I mean, within a day or two of our board meeting. 10 11 MR. CRESCIMBENI: Is that customary? MR. SCHMITT: Yes. 12 MR. CRESCIMBENI: So if we went back and 13 looked at information from 6 or 12 months ago, it 14 15 would be date stamped one day and up within the next couple of days? 16 17 MR. SCHMITT: I understand you're trying to 18 get me very specific days and dates and all that, 19 but I don't post them myself. 20 MR. CRESCIMBENI: Okay. 21 MR. SCHMITT: Our policy is for them to get them on there as quickly as possible. 22 23 MR. CRESCIMBENI: Can you say 30 days? 24 Could that take 30 days in some instances? 25 MR. SCHMITT: It could. Hopefully not, but

it could. The secretary is the one responsible 1 for getting them on. And if there's a delay in 2 3 getting them posted, we'll try to make sure that 4 she gets them posted there quicker. 5 MR. CRESCIMBENI: You mentioned at the 6 beginning of your comments about Mr. Siedle never 7 reached out to you. We were under the impression that he reached out for documents and that those 8 weren't provided. 9 So, I mean, if he reaches out for documents 10 and they're not provided, there's still an 11 expectation that he reaches out to be before he 12 publishes his report? 13 MR. SCHMITT: That's the standard practice, 14 15 yes. Is it the standard 16 MR. CRESCIMBENI: 17 practice in line with a documents request? 18 MR. SCHMITT: I'm not sure what you're 19 asking. 20 MR. CRESCIMBENI: Well, he asked for information. 21 22 Right. Who did he ask? MR. SCHMITT: 23 point is, he never contacted the board. MR. CRESCIMBENI: So he never asked the 24 25 board for any information.

MR. SCHMITT: He's supposed to be auditing 1 the Police and Fire Pension Fund. The standard 2 3 practice is to contact the board that you're 4 auditing. He never made contact with us. 5 MR. CRESCIMBENI: Did he contact the executive director? 6 7 MR. SCHMITT: I do not know, but what I can 8 tell you --MR. CRESCIMBENI: So he never contacted the 9 executive director? 10 MR. SCHMITT: He most certainly could have. 11 12 MR. CRESCIMBENI: Okay. MR. SCHMITT: My point is, he had never made 13 contact with the board. 14 MR. CRESCIMBENI: I think it's a little 15 16 disingenuous to suggest that the request for documents, which went unheeded and caused us to 17 have to issue -- or authorize the issuance of a 18 19 subpoena, can be rebutted with a comment that he 20 didn't reach out to you prior to publishing this 21 report. It's not rebuttal. 22 MR. SCHMITT: It's a 23 statement of fact. The standard practice for an auditor is contact the board of which -- which is 24 25 being audited. I wanted him to come talk to us.

MR. CRESCIMBENI: How long have you served 1 on the board? 2 3 MR. SCHMITT: Well, I've been on the board since July 2013 (sic) and chairman since July 4 5 2014 (sic). MR. CRESCIMBENI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 6 7 MR. GULLIFORD: Anyone else before I make a couple of comments? And then I'll give it to 8 Mr. Scheu and Mr. Hazouri. 9 MR. HAZOURI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 10 I am the liaison as of three or four months 11 ago to the board. I've been really impressed 12 with the way that they've changed and the 13 direction that they're going. That's not to say 14 that what was done before or even today is good 15 16 or bad. 17 But one of the first questions I asked 18 was -- because it has been in the paper -- what 19 is it that you-all did not provide, Mr. Crescimbeni, to the forensic auditor -- and I 20 21 didn't know his name at the time -- that you-all didn't give him? 22 23 And the answer was -- it wasn't from you. 24 It probably was from John. Bill, you may have 25 been there then. I don't know.

But they never -- there's nothing that they
asked for that they had that they did not
provide. And -- you know, because I said, as a
councilman and as a council representative as a
liaison, I wanted to at least know that from the

beginning.

The other matters. First of all -- and you can take this criticism or not, Mr. Chairman. I would have liked, not just as a liaison, but also as the chairman, I would have liked to have advanced copies before your press conference.

But, more importantly, I was concerned -- I was concerned about the sole source of how we picked Mr. Siedle. And you can explain that maybe to the council at a later date.

How we just happened to select -- you-all did before I got on and before 11 of us got on -- how you picked someone -- and really and truly, I don't disagree with what Bill a while ago said.

A lot of it to me, and this is not in defense of the board or what they have done or what they will be doing or have done in the past, and that is, it did seem like a lot of rambling prose to me of what I read.

More accusations, more findings -- less

findings, really, than things that we already knew about, that we've been hearing about in the paper before this report even came out.

I value the Florida Retirement System, having chaired that committee for 10 of my 12 years in the legislature, rewriting the collective bargaining law, and knowing what -- how effective the FRS is and some of the statements that they've made and how he contradicted what they said.

You know, that was his opinion, and that's what I got. It seems like a lot from *The Good Wife*, the TV show, "in my opinion."

And in my opinion, quite frankly, much of what needs to be talked about is what you already addressed, the travel, some of the other things that are important to us. I think we have had a lack of oversight from the city council and from the city.

You provided these things -- things just don't happen. 2012. We let some of these issues go after the legal counsel made their statement about taking this to court. Nobody did anything. I'm not saying that I would have or wouldn't have if I had been on the council, but having had that

somewhat of a background, that would have been important to me to find -- to get to the truth.

And I can't -- I can't reply -- having read his report, everything, him not being here really is a strike against him, because who else would better know the answers than Mr. Siedle that we -- I'll let Bill cross-examine him since he's the attorney -- Scheu.

But it really does concern me. I am very interested in getting at the truth. Help save the taxpayers money. I think we all want to do that.

I just -- I find it very difficult to understand some of the statements that were made, and I know the direction that we're going in. The council has done an excellent job with the bill that we passed just as we get on the city council after July 1. And we are making the right steps, taking the right steps.

I think what they're doing now in trying to work with the General Counsel's Office,
Mr. Chairman, is going to be an asset to us in getting this part of it resolved.

We still have a tremendous amount of unfunded liability, and that's what we have to

address. That's our main issue.

And for all the other things dealing with who I think is really the target, has been John Keane, if not more so than the board, and hopefully that's going to be resolved shortly.

But I cannot, as a councilman, as a citizen, can't comprehend -- I understood more what you said and what Bill said than what -- not understood, but was more clarified, clarifying to me, than what Mr. Siedle did.

And shame on him for not being here. Maybe you didn't invite him, Mr. Chairman, but he's a logical choice to have been here.

MR. GULLIFORD: He was here for the press conference and was available to answer any questions.

MR. HAZOURI: Well, how can you -- excuse me, Mr. Chairman. How can you answer questions when you don't even have the bill --

MR. GULLIFORD: I'll be glad to give you -Mr. Hazouri, I'll be glad to give you his phone
number if you have specific questions you want to
ask him.

MR. HAZOURI: Yes. But if I had been at that press conference, which I wasn't, I would

have been able to ask some questions afterwards 1 or up there, but when you don't have something in 2 3 front of you, you can't ask somebody --MR. GULLIFORD: Again, do you want to 4 5 follow-up and ask him? And I will do that. 6 MR. HAZOURI: 7 MR. GULLIFORD: That's fine. You do that. MR. SCHEU: Mr. Chairman, could I --8 Sure. Go ahead, Mr. Scheu. 9 MR. GULLIFORD: MR. SCHEU: You know, I'm only involved in 10 this because of the retirement reform task force. 11 And my observations -- I think we're all adults. 12 We just need to take a step back and take a deep 13 breath and really see what we need to be focused 14 15 I think that's what the community is looking on. for. 16 And what the focus is on is reform. 17 You-all's -- the task force made recommendations. 18 19 You-all -- after some time, you approved with some modifications those recommendations, and we 20 21 are now moving toward that reform. We have a new council trustee. 22 Shortly 23 we'll have a staff new council trustee. We will 24 have a new police and fire -- we will have a new

fifth member trustee. We will have an investment

25

advisory committee. All of these things we are moving toward, which leads me to make some observations about this report.

Number 1: Keeping our eyes on the ball.

If you think of an audit or even a community reform, the gold standard for me is the JCCI type of report where you have findings, conclusions and recommendations.

I have read this whole report. It does -it is basically conclusions and recommendations.
There are very few findings in here that are his
own. He copies newspaper articles. He copies
sessions from the retirement reform task force
and other non -- what's the word when you're
doing research? These are secondary --

MR. SCHMITT: Independent.

MR. SCHEU: -- and even tertiary forces.

These are not the base primary sources. So most of what he did was piggyback on what others had done.

For example, again, the task force had recommended the investment advisory committee which is going forward. We recommended various changes to the general counsel. In fact, I will have a motion at the next board meeting that we

do an RFP for -- and we work with the general counsel's office.

I've discussed this previously with

Mr. Durden, and I think Mr. Gabriel, that we need
the general counsel's office's help in, you know,
preparing an RFP for legal services to the
pension board that would be pension related, and
the general counsel's office would undertake most
of the day-to-day representation, contract
representation, public records representation.

They are already moving into that. So that's something that Mr. Siedle didn't even -- he acts like these things have never happened.

He quotes Jonathan Trichter's portions of the recommendations to the task force about the fees. We have already examined the difference between active and passive management, particularly in large cap stocks; that it is cheaper fees to do a passive management to the index funds than active. That was already a recommendation.

And in my little time on the JPFPF board, they are already looking at that. That's nothing new. That's nothing that he did on his own.

His observations about the Keane retirement

fund, well, that's already something being worked on, that you-all are negotiating about that, as I understand it. I'm not part of that, but that's all something that is already in controversy, and is being resolved.

The fact that Cindy gave a memorandum. I don't think that was a binding opinion dealing with the reality of the fund. There's also a separate legal opinion -- which she didn't agree or disagree with either of them, but those need to be resolved. And he doesn't even say that there's anything moving forward.

So what I conclude from this report -- and there are some things, quite frankly, the travel was something I knew about, but that needs to be corrected. And the chairman already said it was. There were a couple of other things I don't remember.

With all due respect, if you think this is an audit, it is not an audit at all. This is a political document, not an analytical document.

And I was really disappointed in my good friends at the paper that they settle for this, because they have -- they're really good.

David Bauerlein and Ron Littlepage sat in on

our meetings this whole time, and they know the difference between an analysis and rhetoric, and that's what this is. There are a few exceptions.

But I would urge us to get back -- we're in the process of getting the reforms. That's going to take all of us working together.

This goes backwards. Not to say that there's not some things that need to be addressed that are the responsibility of the board, but we've got to pull this community together. And the way to do that is to make the changes that you-all have already approved, adopted, the task force recommended and the paper endorsed, and move forward. This is going to get us nowhere.

I really am -- frankly, I'm shocked that you-all would pay \$85,000 for this political document which doesn't analyze anything.

And that's what I wanted to say. Thank you.

MR. GULLIFORD: Okay. Everybody has had their opportunity. Now it's my turn.

First of all, I was hoping that this
meeting might end up being a positive thing, and
I said when we had our press conference that
finger-pointing gets you nowhere. But apparently
we want to continue to point fingers.

And my suggestion from this and -- correct you, Mr. Scheu, he never identified it as a forensic audit. He was specific to say it was a forensic investigation and made that differentiation.

He also over and over again referred to the fact that whether Chairman Schmitt was not consulted or not, I would say that the person that you would go to when you do any kind of investigation would be the person that's operating the fund, namely, the executive director, which he did not get the cooperation. Hence, the reason we issued subpoenas.

Now, everybody can talk about, Well, we gave them everything we wanted. Well, no, you didn't, because over and over again he came back to me and over and over again he related stories of hearing one thing from one side and investigating and finding something else.

We have a commission recapture issue that nobody can tell us where that money went. No one. And he asked about it, but nobody could tell. And I will remind everybody that a woman with FRS went to jail over a commission recapture issue.

So it is significant and it is big. To me, the only thing that I wanted to see out of it -- out of this investigation was that wrongdoing -- not limited to local, if there was any local -- but wrongdoing would be punished.

You asked a question. And, again, in a press conference he said, I can't tell you whether there's any criminal wrongdoing because I haven't got enough information to make that determination.

So the things I wanted was if there's any kind of wrongdoing, I certainly wanted that pursued. If there was a potential for financial recovery, and I still think that there is based on what he has indicated, that we might pursue that.

I don't frankly think that what the city got out of Merrill Lynch when we settled for 200-some-thousand dollars was anywhere close to being sufficient to what we should have gotten.

That was a choice by some prior board led by the executive director at the time, and we can't go back, I guess. But I sure would like to know that we could go back.

You know, as to his credentials, well, you

know what? We made the decision and every councilman at the time participated in that. And the man has investigated numerous state and local pension funds at the request, I might add in a number of instances, of unions and not just the city or the county, as well as Fortune 500 companies.

I don't know where, Mr. Hazouri, you find that guy that you're talking about can do a better job. But based on the credentials, and I urge you to look at his credentials on his web page, I didn't see anybody out there that could certainly come anywhere close or as capable --

MR. HAZOURI: I read his credentials. I just thought that his whole force was a wrong approach.

MR. GULLIFORD: Well, we -- we didn't. So, you know, you can bring that up as a matter of -- and to your point as far as this whole issue of millage, and I've heard that over and over again ad infinitum, that the city was at fault. And you know what? Maybe they were. Maybe that was the case.

But about two years ago I went to council research and I said, How about running a

comparative survey of Police and Fire Pension Funds around the state? I want to know on a percentage basis of administrative costs and return on investments. Those are the two percentages I wanted.

And guess where we ended up? Rock bottom. So you can talk about millage rate all you want, but the fact is we were not performing properly. And you're absolutely right, and I don't want to in any way pass over -- and I made that comment at the press conference about the General Employees Pension Fund. You're 100 percent right. It may be as bad or worse than the Police and Fire Pension Fund when you apply the 7 percent versus the 7.5 percent.

But two wrongs don't make a right. I mean, that is a problem we've got to address. And it's a significant big problem.

Again, what I said was at that press conference finger-pointing is not a solution. What I would hope for was that collectively we, as a community -- and you know what? Every now and then a report like this, whether you agree, disagree or whatever, sets the needle to us to move ahead and do something positive for the

community. And that's exactly how I look upon this.

Whether you think he was right, wrong, didn't do it adequately, whatever the fact, I think that the fact that we can move ahead as a community and take this thing as a positive, which I view it to be, and say, Come on, let's get together and fix this thing.

I had a meeting with him at 12:30. My suggestion was, Look, the direction for this Police and Fire Pension Fund Board has changed drastically now that you're out of the benefits issue.

You are responsible, the way I see it, for two things: You're responsible for oversight of the administrative costs and performance of the fund. Fundamentally, yeah.

Why wouldn't you, when you pick that fifth member -- and he pushed back from a suggestion that we ought to go back and talk about maybe us having the control over that fifth member again because the taxpayers, i.e. city, ends up paying for it -- that maybe we ought to try and push that through again. We tried four or five times and Mr. Crescimbeni sort of pushed back.

But my suggestion to you would be when you

pick that fifth member, how about looking at the

qualifications -- not because you-all think that

he or she is someone that would get along as a

community leader or whatever, but has the

qualifications that we set forth for the two

appointees that the city council is going to

appoint.

And I think, Mr. Schmitt, that is a critical, critical issue for us right now, is we need to see the best out of that fund that we can possibly see into the future for everyone -- everyone that's got a stake in it, which is the entire community.

So that being said, we've all gotten our shots in. We've all, you know, taken -- gotten our hits out there. Everybody has gotten to say what they wanted to say, and I think everybody hit a nerve a little bit, right?

MR. SCHMITT: Sure.

MR. GULLIFORD: But now what do we do?

MR. SCHMITT: Well, I think that --

MR. GULLIFORD: Now that we've done that, now that we've taken all of our shots, I think we've got to talk about -- seriously talk about

how we move forward. What do we do? We know that we've got to solve the funding problem. That is not going away. That is foremost in my mind. We've got to do that.

You, on the other hand, have a responsibility to the community. You have to do the best damn job on investment return and monitoring the oversight of the administrative costs that you could possibly do because, frankly, you know and I know it has not been done in the past.

MR. SCHEU: And we're doing this --

MR. GULLIFORD: I know you are, Bill, I understand that. And that's -- but I just think it needs to be reiterated that we all are in this thing together and that's what we've got to go on it.

And, you know, with that, I don't view it to have been political. I really don't. Again, that's your opinion. I'm not -- I'm not trying to -- to disparage the fund.

What I want to do is see us move forward in a positive way, and if that needle causes us to do it a little bit, then I've seen what I wanted to see accomplished. Okay?

MR. SCHMITT: Councilman, you just said some 1 of the same things that you said when you came 2 3 over and we were trying to work out pension 4 reform. And I believed you then and hopefully I 5 can believe you now. 6 MR. GULLIFORD: We had already authorized --7 if you recall, we had already authorized that forensic investigation. 8 9 MR. SCHMITT: Right. MR. GULLIFORD: We didn't go back --10 That's the investigation. 11 MR. SCHMITT: But you mentioned finger-pointing. That's all this 12 thing is. And I want something positive to come 13 out of it, but I think we can do something 14 positive without going in the gutter. 15 That's my whole point for this thing. 16 17 have been working well together. We are making 18 progress. We've made great changes to the 19 operation of the Board and we will continue to. 20 MR. GULLIFORD: Mr. Chairman, if you -- if 21 you found that we had the opportunity to go back and make financial recovery because of past sins, 22 23 would you not be an advocate of that? 24 MR. SCHMITT: Oh, absolutely. 25 MR. GULLIFORD: Okay. That's all I wanted

1 to hear. MR. SCHMITT: But I wouldn't drag anybody 2 3 through the gutter to do it. 4 MR. GULLIFORD: I'm not -- listen, I have 5 purposely tried not to do that with individuals. I have not gone after any individuals. I've been 6 7 straight up and straightforward. And so I understand where you're going, but that's not 8 been the case for me personally. 9 MR. CRESCIMBENI: For clarification, I'm not 10 sure what dragging somebody through the gutter 11 means. But if there was some sort of malfeasance 12 or criminal activity, are you saying we shouldn't 13 pursue that if that's occurred? I mean, you're 14 in the business of enforcing the laws in this 15 16 community. MR. SCHMITT: 17 That's exactly right. based on evidence -- it's based on evidence in 18 19 fact. I can't go out there say -- and accuse you 20 of doing something without any evidence. If the evidence were to 21 MR. CRESCIMBENI: 22 find some malfeasance or criminal activity, are 23 you saying -- suggesting that we don't pursue

25 MR. SCHMITT: I'm saying pursue it 100

24

that?

percent. I'll be right there with you. 1 MR. CRESCIMBENI: Okay. But that's not --2 3 that's not dragging anybody through the gutter. 4 That's just enforcing the law. 5 MR. SCHMITT: The problem is when you make 6 those allegations without any evidence or 7 support. That is my point. If there are criminals, the gentleman behind 8 you and I are 100 percent with you. Give us the 9 evidence or whatever law enforcement agency out 10 there that you're comfortable with. Give them 11 the evidence. We are 100 percent with you. 12 Anybody who committed a crime, let's go after 13 them. 14 MR. CRESCIMBENI: Thank you for that 15 clarification. I appreciate that. 16 MR. GULLIFORD: Good. Well, I think that 17 18 it's great to hear that you-all are taking 19 positive steps and moving in that direction. 20 I would go so far as to say that --21 Mr. Scheu, I don't know how long you plan to be on that -- on that board; but certainly I would 22 23 hope that when you get off, that both your 24 replacement and somebody to follow you -- I 25 guess, would be another one that would have to be appointed -- and then the fifth one will have to be selected, that there will be great prudence in the decision-making.

We have set criteria and qualifications for those individuals that are appointed by the city council, and I would hope the same prudence would be considered when you look at the -- when the board looks at that fifth member.

MR. SCHEU: I absolutely agree with you.

MR. GULLIFORD: I think that's critically important and not just because they represent one interest or another interest, but because they represent the city as a whole and have the qualifications to be able to make the decisions that are pretty doggone tough sometimes and require certain level of experience and knowledge.

So that being said, what can we do to help? We're from the government.

MR. HAZOURI: We made a good point of putting Bill on there.

I'll tell you, I have seen -- and they said the previous liaison hadn't been there much. But let me tell you, I have seen them, and certainly not siding with them, because we all are

interested in getting this thing behind us, 1 moving forward like you said, Mr. Chairman, I 2 3 have seen a big -- I don't know what it was like before, a big difference with Bill and some of 4 5 the others and Chairman Schmitt was on there -has been on there. 6 7 And what they're doing are making some tough decisions and covering up for any sins not 8 covered -- not using that literally -- for any 9 sins that may have been in the past. 10 And I hope this doesn't -- I want to say 11 this public, in the sunshine, but that lady that 12 you-all are looking at in hiring is -- I hope she 13 doesn't get discouraged from all this discussion 14 because it's moving in a positive way, because 15 she is excellent and she will make --16 17 MR. SCHEU: She's a cracker jack. 18 going to say that --She sure is. She can make a 19 MR. HAZOURI: giant step forward with you-all. 20 21 MR. SCHMITT: Well, I hate to break it --Oh, don't tell me --MR. HAZOURI: 22 23 MR. SCHMITT: Yeah. I hate to break it to

MR. SCHEU: What? Well, you can't talk to

you, Bill. That's exactly what happened.

24

25

me outside of the sunshine. So when did this 1 happen? 2 3 MR. SCHMITT: She called me this morning. 4 This was -- this was the main issue that kept her 5 from coming, is this report and the false 6 allegations in it. She has a good job where 7 she's at. She's doing well and she saw no need to put herself in the middle of all of this. 8 MR. GULLIFORD: Could you give me her name 9 and number? I would like to just talk to her. 10 Let me talk to her. Yeah, let me talk to her. 11 MR. SCHEU: Hey, Bill, would you do that and 12 then call me and tell me? Because I'll call her. 13 I think we need to do that. 14 MR. GULLIFORD: Yeah. I will call her and 15 do it this afternoon, because I think -- I feel 16 17 the same way. I thought she was extremely 18 capable, and so we will make that contact. 19 MR. SCHEU: I mean, the fact of the matter is that this means we go back to the drawing 20 21 board, we do a national search again --MR. GULLIFORD: 22 Yeah. 23 MR. SCHEU: -- and we've got -- I mean, 24 everybody is critical of Mr. Keane, but the fact 25 of the matter is that there's no institutional

knowledge and we want to do -- we want to change 1 as quickly as possible. 2 3 MR. GULLIFORD: Yes. 4 MR. SCHEU: But not focusing on the reforms, 5 it's just makes it so hard. Just so hard. 6 MR. GULLIFORD: All right. Well, I will 7 call her before the day is out. MR. HAZOURI: We need to do that, Bill. 8 need to do everything to bring her back, because 9 I figured she's going to think she's inheriting a 10 whirlwind, and she's -- the way this council and 11 the way the board is moving forward. I hope she 12 can know that we're moving in a positive 13 direction. 14 MR. GULLIFORD: Actually, she's better off 15 coming in now than if she was coming into a rough 16 17 situation where there has been no activity, no action to resolve all of this. 18 19 MR. HAZOURI: Yeah. 20 So that's what I'm going to MR. GULLIFORD: 21 attempt to tell her, that she will have our support as the council and the administration 22 23 would support her. 24 MR. HAZOURI: She needs to hear that. 25 MR. GULLIFORD: We'll do that for sure.

MR. SCHEU: Thank you very much.

MR. SCHMITT: What you can do moving forward, that's definitely one of them. She's an awesome candidate. I think she would do very well here and she would do very well for the pension fund. And, you know, work well with the city council and do what's best for the citizens.

For future. If there's something you have a question on, any one of us trustees are more than happy to talk to you. Whatever we can do to make it easier for you-all to get what you need on our side, we want the same things. We want the fund to be successful, in sunshine, no questions. We're trying to get to the same place.

MR. GULLIFORD: I think all of us are trying to get to the same place. I mean, remember, he more than myself, I've been on it for four years. He's been on it way beyond that. How many years have we seen this wrestling going on back and forth over this myriad of conflicts about the funding?

To your point, Mr. Hazouri, as far as oversight, I can tell you in the budget process we had very, very little oversight --

MR. HAZOURI: I know.

MR. GULLIFORD: -- and very little 1 cooperation as to things that we suggested as the 2 3 city council and as a finance committee. And I 4 took exception to it, frankly. And I know he did 5 and others on there -- that the attitude that was 6 projected to us was not a positive attitude. 7 So I think we all have something to learn and we all have something to contribute and we 8 all need to get positive on this moving forward 9 and forget about the past. 10 I don't know whether the millage issue was 11 the problem. I don't know what else there was 12 that was a problem. But you know what? 13 Ιt doesn't fix it now. So we've got -- we play the 14 hand we're dealt and we move ahead. 15 16 MR. SCHMITT: Before you go, sir, I would 17 like to make a compliment to Councilman Hazouri. He has been the liaison for three months now. 18 19 He's attends the meetings. He gives input and good advice, and we appreciate him being there. 20 21 MR. HAZOURI: Thank you. MR. GULLIFORD: All right. Are we done? 22 23 Mr. Scheu? 24 MR. SCHEU: Yes, sir. Thank you for the

meeting. I think it turned out -- to help the

25

community move forward, as you've suggested. 1 MR. GULLIFORD: Let's do it. 2 3 MR. GASSETT: May I make a statement before 4 you end? 5 MR. GULLIFORD: Sure. 6 MR. GASSETT: With all due respect, your 7 comments about forgetting the past and going forward, I'm speaking as an angry taxpayer now. 8 I want to know exactly why. Somebody 9 said -- tell me how in the -- pardon me -- hell 10 did we get in this situation financially? 11 I believe you owe it to the taxpayer to let 12 them know what caused this. I'm not saying who 13 is at fault, but this offers some help. 14 there's other things that need to be presented --15 because when I hear the call-in shows and things 16 17 like that, these people are coming out -- how did 18 we get here? They have a sense of deception and 19 things like that. 20 So please, please, as part of your 21 going forward, put together --MR. GULLIFORD: Why don't we just all accept 22 23 blame for it moving forward? 24 MR. GASSETT: No, no, no --25 MR. GULLIFORD: I mean, we all can accept

some level of blame. All right? MR. GASSETT: -- explain to us how it's been a problem. MR. GULLIFORD: Well, you know what? We can spend thousands of hours and dollars on trying to figure out how the hell we got there, and I would suggest to you that that effort would probably be much more positive when we put it toward, How do we solve this thing and move forward? And that's what I think is critical, is let's find out. If someone else wants to take that under task. I'm way beyond that. So anybody else? We're adjourned. (The meeting was adjourned.) 

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	STATE OF FLORIDA
4	COUNTY OF DUVAL
5	I, Denice C. Taylor, Florida Professional
6	Reporter, do hereby certify that I transcribed a DVD
7	given to me by the Jacksonville Police and Fire
8	Pension Fund staff of a meeting held at City Hall,
9	Conference Room A, on November 2, 2015, and that the
10	foregoing transcript, pages 2 through 53, is a true
11	transcript of the DVD, to the best of my ability.
12	I further certify that I am not a relative,
13	employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties,
14	nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'
15	attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am
16	I financially interested in the action.
17	DATED this 11th day of November, 2015, at
18	Jacksonville, Duval County, Florida.
19	
20	Denice C. Taylor, FPR
21	Defilied C. Taylol, Tik
22	
23	
24	
25	