

# POLICE AND FIRE RETIREMENT PLAN

## Minutes of the Board Meeting

**THURSDAY**

**SAN JOSÉ, CALIFORNIA**

**January 4, 2007**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Administration of the Police and Fire Department Retirement Plan met at 8:44 a.m., on Thursday, January 4, 2007, in regular session in the Department of Retirement Services' Conference Room, 1737 North First Street, Suite 600, San José, California.

### **ROLL CALL**

#### **Present:**

**MARK J. SKEEN, CHAIR**

**KENNETH HEREDIA, VICE CHAIR**

**BILL BRILL**

**LARRY LISENBEE**

**BRET MUNCY**

**Fire Employee Representative**

**Retiree Representative**

**Civil Service Representative**

**City Administration Representative**

**Police Employee Representative**

### **ALSO PRESENT:**

**Edward F. Overton -SECRETARY / DIRECTOR**

Russ Richeda -Saltzman & Johnson

Roger Pickler -Staff

Tamasha Johnson -Staff

Donna Busse - "

Amanda Ramos -Staff

Carol Bermillo -Staff

Judy Powell -Staff

Maria Loera -Staff

Susan Perriera - "

Martin Hogan -SJPOA

Tony Vizzusi -SJPD

Sandra Holloway -SJPD

A. Rosingana -AORP+FA

Colleen Hy -Staff

Tom Webster -Staff

Susan Devencenzi -City Attorney

Debbi Warkentin -Staff

Udaya Rajbhandari - "

Ron Kumar - "

Paul Salerno -SJPD

Jim Jeffers -Attorney

Mike Pribula -Staff

John Martinez -SJFD

Rich Toledo -SJFD

Linda Charfauros -SJFD

Brian Hyland -SJPD

Dale Morgan -SJPD

Henry Mendoza -SJFD

Dawud Rauf -SJFD

## **REGULAR SESSION**

### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m., and stated that Item 11 should be an effective date of January 13, 2007 instead of January 13, 2006.

### **RETIREMENTS**

#### **Service**

**Hayward L. Brandon, Sr.** Sergeant, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 27, 2007; 21.09 years of service.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Heredia) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2. (Cortese/Vacant).

**Robert. DeGeorge,** Police Officer, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 13, 2007; 21.44 years of service.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Brill) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Frank D. Dominguez**, Police Officer, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 16, 2007; 25.81 years of service.

(M.S.C. Brill/Muncy) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Richard L. Fairhurst**, Police Captain, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 31, 2007; 30.22 years of service.

(M.S.C. Brill/Muncy) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Jack L. Farmer**, Police Captain, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 13, 2007; 30.03 years of service.

(M.S.C. Brill/Heredia) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Roberto Gonzalez**, Sergeant, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 14, 2007; 25.35 years of service.

(M.S.C. Brill/Heredia) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Rick J. Heckel**, Police Officer, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 7, 2007; 26.25 years of service.

(M.S.C. Brill/Heredia) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Ronald L. January**, Sergeant, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 13, 2007; 26.51 years of service.

(M.S.C. Brill/Muncy) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Daniel W. LeZotte**, Police Officer, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 27, 2007; 26.45 years of service.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Heredia) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Robert J. Lobach**, Police Officer, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 27, 2007; 25.77 years of service.

(M.S.C. Heredia/Brill) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**David L. Madsen**, Police Officer, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 26, 2007; 25.99 years of service.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Brill) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**John Martinez**, Firefighter, Fire Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 13, 2006; 29.71 years of service. **(SCD Pending)**.

(M.S.C. Brill/Heredia) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Stanley W. Mason**, Police Officer, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 27, 2007; 27.19 years of service.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Heredia) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Gilbert T. Mendez**, Fire Engineer, Fire Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 27, 2007; 32.54 years of service.

(M.S.C. Brill/Heredia) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Henry Mendoza**, Fire Engineer, Fire Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 27, 2007; 31.63 years of service. **(SCD Pending)**

(M.S.C. Heredia/Muncy) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Michael Rabourn**, Police Officer, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 13, 2007; 26.57 years of service.

(M.S.C. Brill/Heredia) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Dawud Rauf**, Fire Engineer; Fire Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 13, 2007; 30.69 years of service. **(SCD Pending)**

(M.S.C. Muncy/Brill) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2 (Cortese Absent/Chavez arrived at 9:24 am).

**James Roach**, Sergeant, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 27, 2007; 26.61 years of service.

(M.S.C. Brill/Muncy) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Richard Saito**, Lieutenant, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective December 30, 2006; 30.00 years of service.

(M.S.C. Heredia/Muncy) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Jaime Saldivar**, Police Officer, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 13, 2007; 31.10 years of service. **(SCD Pending)**

(M.S.C. Brill/Muncy) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Bruce C. Toney**, Lieutenant, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 13, 2007; 27.55 years of service. **(SCD Pending)**

(M.S.C. Muncy/Heredia) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**George M. Vega**, Battalion Chief, Fire Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 27, 2007; 25.40 years of service. **(SCD Pending)**

(M.S.C. Brill/Heredia) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Anthony C. Vizzusi**, Sergeant, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 13, 2007; 30.03 years of service.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Brill) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Jesse Chacon**, Firefighter, Fire Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 27, 2007; 30.72 years of service. **(SCD Pending)**

(M.S.C. Muncy/Brill) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Joseph S. Giorgianni**, Police Officer, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 13, 2007; 30.03 years of service. **(SCD Pending)**

(M.S.C. Muncy/Brill) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Disabilities**

**Brian T. Hyland**, Sergeant, Police Department. Request for Service-Connected Disability Retirement effective January 4, 2007; 24.88 years of service.

**Retired Police Sergeant Hyland** was present and was represented by *Jim Jeffers*.

For the record, the following medical reports have been received:

<u>Doctor's Name</u>	<u>Report Date</u>
R. K. Japra	5/13/04 (2rpts); 6/3/04; 7/15/04; 10/14/05; 8/14/06
William Breall	9/20/04; 3/7/05; 7/27/05
Jonathan Ng	2/16/05; 7/12/05; 10/12/06
Puneet Chandak	7/15/04
<u>Board Doctor</u>	<u>Report Date</u>
Dr. Rajiv Das	4/19/06; 11/8/06

*Dr. Das* stated that since his report Officer Hyland has had a stint put in place and the most current medical report would be that of his treating doctors'; however there is no significant artery problems present.

*Mr. Jeffers* described Officer Hyland's career. He said that the cardiologist put him on leave and he has ran out of sick/vacation and personal leave. The doctor has also prohibited him from any work, including administrative/clerical duties.

*Retired Sergeant Hyland* described the pain that led up to his medical findings and how it has affected him. He said that his treating doctor and another doctor seen for a second opinion both advised him against continued work in any capacity. He then summed up his career and work ethic.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Heredia) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Paul D. Salerno**, Police Officer, Police Department. Request for Service-Connected Disability Retirement effective January 4, 2007; 27.5 years of service.

**Retired Police Officer Salerno** was present and was represented by *Jim Jeffers*.

For the record, the following medical reports have been received:

<u>Doctor's Name</u>	<u>Report Date</u>
Michael Sommer	5/29/01; 1/7/02; 1/30/06
W. James DeMartini	12/20/05
Martin Trieb	9/23/04; 11/18/04; 12/19/05
Jonathan Ng	5/19/05; 5/28/05; 9/1/05; 10/25/05

Darrell Bruga	10/12/05
Donald Fujimoto	4/1/04; 10/4/05
Michael Gold	7/7/03; 9/9/05
Mark Coulton	1/25/05
Robert Lieberson	9/19/05
Jeffrey Holmes	12/9/02
Lucy Lin	5/23/03; 6/18/02
<u>Board Doctor</u>	<u>Report Date</u>
Rajiv Das	4/19/06; 11/8/06

*Dr. Das* said that the major problem is with his knees and that he is under treatment for his heart condition now.

*Mr. Jeffers* described Officer Salerno's work ethic, injuries and treatments undergone. He stated that two years ago Officer Salerno worked in a modified duty capacity, but now his main disability is his heart, which is a very serious condition.

*Officer Salerno* stated that he was grateful for his career, he described his pain and said that he just can no longer deal with the on going pain.

(M.S.C. Heredia/Muncy) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Change in Status** – None

**Deferred Vested** – None

## DEATH NOTIFICATIONS

**Notification of the death of Roland S. Mason, Retired Police Officer. Retired:** 6/22/71; died: 11/25/06. No survivorship benefits to be paid.

**Notification of the death of Joseph Azzarello, Retired Police Captain. Retired:** 5/1/75; died: 12/10/06. Survivorship benefits to Rina Azzarello, Spouse.

**NEW BUSINESS** – None

## OLD BUSINESS / CONTINUED ITEMS

**Adoption of Resolution No. 3247 adopting and fixing rates of contribution for Police members of the Police & Fire Plan effective December 17, 2006 and July 1, 2007.**

**The Secretary** stated the Board already approved these rates last month and this is an amended resolution memorializing that action.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Heredia) to approve application. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Adoption of draft ordinance implementing the contributions for Police members of the P&F Retirement Plan for prior service costs attributable to delay in implementation of new rates.**

**The Secretary** explained that he had some discussions with the attorney and they stated that the Municipal Code had to be changed to resolve the delay in implementation.

(M.S.C. Heredia/Brill) to approve ordinance. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**Approval of proposed amendment to Ordinance No. 27712, Domestic Partnership procedures, to extend deadline and expand criteria for establishing partnership.**

**The Secretary** stated that the prior criteria, although it's not codified required that they needed to sign up for the City's Domestic Partnership in order to qualify for retirement benefits. For someone who was not here when the City implemented their Domestic Partnership procedure it would be impossible for them to comply with that, so what we are asking the Board to do is look at expanding the criteria beyond the City's enrollment procedures to include other things where the person could establish that they were in a domestic partnership, they did register with the State but they were already retired from the City when they put in the requirement that they sign up with the City's health insurance and benefits program.

**Member Heredia** asked that when this was initially done, it was done for them to comply with the State Law? Was the state law retroactive?

**The Secretary** said that it was done to comply with state law, but the State passed it in 1999 (although there were different versions of it, the first one was in 1998, and we reacted in 2005). What we did was allow an expanded timeframe for individuals who were already retired but who had entered into domestic partnership relationships before we changed our code, but not before the state law came into effect. This will take it back to 1996, when the person that brought this issue forward retired. It's up to the Board whether or not they want to expand the criteria or expand the opportunity for people who are in domestic partnerships to register their domestic partners. This individual does comply with the state law and is registered, the only reason she doesn't comply with the current restrictions is when the City implemented its domestic partnership for health insurance and other kinds of benefits, this individual had already retired but she was in a domestic partnership and would like to ask the Board to expand its criteria beyond being registered in the City's program in order to get the benefits.

**Chair Skeen** asked if there will be a cost associated with this item because we are adding people to cover benefits for. Right now we are talking about one person but have other retirees been notified, and if there are others would we get a number back to do an actuarial study.

**The Secretary** explained that when the actuary did this they changed the marriage assumption and they said they were going to raise the assumption by 3-4% for the number of people who are married, so this issue was taken up in that assumption change.

**Member Heredia** said that he doesn't understand how we bring people back in the Plan who weren't eligible under the state law.

**The Secretary** stated that the retiree who brought up the issue is eligible under the state law, she has a certificate of domestic partnership, but the only reason she cannot qualify for retirement benefits is because the prior requirements require that you register with the City as well, and she had already retired from the City when the City implemented it. She is saying that is a criteria for establishing a domestic partnership, register with the state and City. What we are saying is that the Board should look at other evidence beyond registering with the City because for those people that cannot register with the City because they were gone when the City

implemented this program, what other alternatives would you look at to determine the existence of the domestic partner relationship.

*Mr. Richeda* said that this is a policy issue for the Board and not a legal mandate.

**Member Brill** said that the person whose matter we are discussing retired in 1996, so these benefits for domestic partners did not exist, so she wasn't registered with the City of San Jose regardless of being registered with the State or not. He is having difficulty with the notion that 10-11 years later someone is coming back and saying what if, now based on some ordinances have been passed and now wanting to get those benefits when in fact they retired. He couldn't go back to his Plan and say now you are giving people a new COLA and ask for it, he retired under the terms in place at that time. Do we really know how many people are in this pool? This person has stepped forward and said this is my predicament would you take a look at it.

**The Secretary** stated that is exactly the point, that is the predicament and would you take a look at it. Our first reaction was that she did not qualify, and then they looked at it and said that it is really a policy call for the Board because the program that is required for the person to enroll in didn't exist. The Board can establish other criteria if it wants to, you can also say no and stick with the existing criteria.

**Member Heredia** wanted to know if there was a time when the Board adopted the original ordinance that people were allowed to come back because they retired while this program was in transit.

*Mrs. Devencenzi* stated that they asked themselves at the time they were implementing the program, what about the people that retired prior to the effective date of the Domestic Partners State Law that the City reacted to that became effective on January 1, 2005. The Board conversation at that time was that if there was someone that did not have a domestic partner registered with the State because they didn't know there was going to be a benefit, but they would have registered had they known, so we looked at the difference and those people that already registered with the City, they would have a piece of paper at that time.

**The Secretary** said that Member Heredia is correct; the way the Board validated legitimate domestic partnerships there were two things: registered with the State and registered with the City. Now we are saying should the Board have criteria other than City registration, if they meet the State requirements, in addition we are going back further.

*Mrs. Phillips* said that she is the person that this affects and she appreciates the Board hearing this matter. She thinks this is an issue of equity and may not be required by law, she also thinks that she may have an answer to the issues. She is proposing that the Board amend the domestic partners procedures, expanding the criteria for establishing a group of domestic partnerships and to extend the deadline. She stated that she has an affidavit that shows she was with the same partner at the time that she retired. It is her understanding that some of the concern is to prevent fraud, but she thought about it in terms of equity of the fund for all members and came up that the Board could look at each case individually on a case by case basis and require instead of the domestic affidavit form, which didn't exist at the time she retired, but use an evidentiary standard approach. In her case, it is particularly compelling because at the time that she retired she requested her partner be put on her retirement benefits and her request was denied because there was no such law in place. What did occur was the documentation of the timing of the request and who that person was, and what the relationship was, so that is pretty compelling evidence.

**Chair Skeen** asked how this is different than the Board granting the police benefit a few years ago for the police retirees.

*Mrs. Devencenzi* said that this is an ordinance going to City Council and that it would go through the same process that granting any other benefit would have. It doesn't specifically amend the Code because this is a transition provision. One thing she pointed out in the draft is that there is a blank in number four, which should be filled in with the date December 1, 2000; because that is the date the City established the domestic partners affidavit program for adding a domestic partner to the health benefits. That is actually something that by State law was available in July 2000 but implemented by the City in December 2000. Also, understand that the City's Affidavit of Domestic Partnership would still be used as evidence, but what we had before is that they had to bring that information in by the end of January. There is still a cut-off and people have been notified that either you are registered a domestic partnership before you retire or if you didn't have that opportunity before you retired but you have a domestic partnership affidavit with the City, you have to bring that information in by January 31, 2007; however if we move this deadline out then we have to give people a little more time to know but if you don't bring it in by then that's it because it is just to give them a window to do this. For those people that could not qualify under the City program, perhaps there is other information that they can provide and it would have to be evidence that was satisfactory to the Board to show that there was a domestic partnership at the time they retired.

*Mr. Richeda* stated that this will have to be a new notification because you are creating a new window period for a new group of eligible people that weren't eligible before assuming you pass this.

**Member Heredia** suggested that since this ordinance would have to go to the bargaining groups, then to City Council for approval he would like the window to be expanded to 12/1/2007.

*Mrs. Devencenzi* said that she suggests that were it reads that "in any case where the member retired prior to December 1, 2000" that they delete that line from the ordinance because you will have either the affidavit of domestic partnership or other evidence that would be acceptable to the Board. Then in Item four to clean it up to make consistent.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Heredia) motion to bring back the ordinance with suggested corrections next month then send it on to the other parties involved. Motion carried 6-0-1. (Cortese arrived 9:08 am/Vacant).

**(Out of Order)**

## **STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Investment Committee (Skeen/Heredia/Muncy) – next meeting 18 January 2007.**

**Real Estate Committee (Skeen/Heredia/Muncy – Alt: Vacant)**

Summary of meeting held 13 December 2006.

- a. Approval of 2007 Business Plans & Budget and 2007 Tactical Plan (MIG)
- b. Approval of 2007 Business Plans & Budget and 2007 Tactical Plan (Kennedy)

(M.S.C. Brill/Muncy) to approve. Motion carried 5-0-2. (Vacant/Heredia stepped away).

**Investment Committee of the Whole (Full Board) – next meeting 15 February 2007.**

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Monthly board meeting held 7 December 2006.**

(M.S.C. Brill/Muncy) to approve. Motion carried 5-0-2.



**Special board meeting held 13 December 2006.**

(M.S.C. Brill/Muncy) to approve. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**PENDING ACTIONS LIST**

**Updated list as of 28 November 2006.**

*This item is note and file.*

**BENEFITS REVIEW**

Summary of meeting held October 2006

*This item is note and file.*

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

(M.S.C. Brill/Muncy) to approve. Motion carried 5-0-2.

**PROPOSED AGENDA ITEMS**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**EDUCATION & TRAINING**

**(Back on Agenda)**

**Acceptance of actuarial special studies on three benefit improvements as requested by Retirees' Association and authorization to staff to forward on to retirees and City Administration.**

*Mr. Young* stated that in a letter dated 12/20/06 they have outlined the benefits identified in the proposal by the retirees, and their understanding is that this improvement will only apply to those retired at the time these benefits are implemented. Also, this study involved the cost of the medical benefits and has continued to follow the Board's guideline in funding over the next 10 years; however those costs are not a factor in this study they are just for the GASB reporting requirements of monitoring and accounting for liabilities. For improvement number one right now in order for a spouse to be eligible for retirement benefits the spouse must be married to the retiree at the time of retirement and death, the request is to change this to be that the spouse only has to be married to the retiree at the time of death not at retirement. There are two categories of spouses that will become eligible after this change; one group of survivors will be immediately eligible for the benefit because the retiree has already passed away, then there are those retirees that have gotten married after retirement whose spouses will become eligible for these benefits. When you look at the data from the most recent evaluation the majority which is around 20 of them has been identified by the system as having someone who is eligible for a survivorship benefit. The pooling indicated by the system is only accurate as the information supplied by the retiree, so as result you will see there is a slight actuarial gain to reflect that the data could be a little bit inaccurate. That creates a cost deduction of 10 bps of payroll and that will offset some of the cost and the net cost to the Plan for the City will be 0.09% of payroll. The net cost will be the same whether we do this improvement or not. The Pension plan there is no change whatsoever, however right now the funding policy is such that the members pay for some of the cash flow for the retirees so that is why

there's an impact because the active members share a cost for the medical program. For the improvements for the membership for the medical and dental program is 0.009%, so in total it's about 0.329% of payroll for the members. For the City it would be 0.422%.

(M.S.C. Brill/Heredia) to approve. Motion carried 6-0-1. (Heredia returned/Vacant).

### **Acceptance of actuarial illustrative examples of division of assets between the Police members and Fire members.**

*Mr. Young* stated they have provided an illustrated example of how, if the asset were to be divided between the Police and the Fire Plan, how they would look. This came about from the meeting last month when the Board approved the contribution rate increase that would apply only to the police members because there was a benefit improvement that was planned only for them. Part of the improvement was a cost to provide for a prior service enhancement, so the question came to them from the firefighters and attorneys because they want to be absolutely sure that with this improvement none of those costs will flow through the fire. In order for that to happen because assets have been commingled in the past and they have been using the money in the fund to pay both firefighters and police assets we have to divide up the assets at the very minimum for the pension plan because the pension plan has been improved going forward a police member can get up to 90% of final pay, while the fire member can currently only be entitled to 85% of final pay. They have outlined the methodology that they would recommend that the Board follow to divide up the assets. In exhibit number one they provide how the assets will be divided. They have used the contribution rates that they calculated in their valuation and they have calculated the debt reconciliation that the City's total rate would be 21.75%, so before the splitting of the assets you would charge the same rate to the City to pay for police as well as the fire benefits, and these are the rates before the benefit improvement. The member's rates are the same for the police and fire. Once they divide up the assets using the provided methodology outline, you will see that as far as the contribution rate that has to do with the splitting of the assets (the unfunded actuary accrued liability), the contribution rate that the City will pay is the same 1.29% on day one. However if you look at the City's normal cost rate you will see that it is slightly different between the police and the fire, which is to reflect that the police members demographics are slightly different from the fire. Right now you don't see that difference because the members were all combined together to get one rate, but going forward from day one there is going to be a difference between the rate, so we do anticipate that if we split the assets and use that new assets as the basis for our 6/30/07 valuation even if the police improvement have not taken place we expect the rate to be slightly different. It is going to be slightly lower about 0.02% of payroll lower for the police because relative to the rate that everyone is being charged right now which is 20.46%, the firefighter rate will be slightly higher to reflect their own unique demographics and because the normal cost is shared between the City and the membership you can see that the members rate for the police will be lower. Right now everybody is being charged according to their valuation, not the rate that was adopted, everybody all the police members will be required to pay the rate of 7.73%, but if we were to split the assets and split the normal cost calculation primarily the members total rate would be slightly higher for the fire group its going to be 1.75%. With these examples we are trying to show you what could happen when they do the next valuation.

**Member Heredia** said the methodology of the assets following the liabilities he doesn't agree with. He believes that people that have retired paid into the system for 25-30 years, so they have a certain liability. You also have people that are active firefighters and police officers who only been on the job less than 5-years and he doubts that the assets computed into the plan for those people are equal to the liability. Once you pool

assets and liabilities and everything is 100% funded that means that some individuals that have more assets into the plan than liabilities are paying for the people that haven't been in the plan very long that have more liability than assets. He assumes that it is not equal funding, and that assets and liabilities are not equal among actives and retirees. Also, when you do the police officers and firefighters member contributions it appears that Segal changed the assumption of entry age. The original contribution rate is a pooling of the entry age and now you have separated it for police and fire, yet you haven't separated years of service. He feels that this is so critical that this needs to be looked at more in depth and that we should meet just to come up with various scenarios.

*Mr. Young* stated that the entry age is what is reflective in the data. As for the years of service, individually for the police members versus the fire members have been factored into the normal cost calculations. Right now because the Board has one set of retirement rate assumptions that predicts how long a police member is going to stay before he/she retires and how long a fire member is going to stay before he/she retires, unless we change that assumption the assumptions are indifferent between the police and fire members they are going to stay about the same period of time. The entry age is really not an assumption because they look at the date of hire for members and the birthday, and they actually calculate an entry age for each and everyone of the fire members and for each one of the police members and come up with an average, so this is a data driven item.

**Chair Skeen** requested that staff set up a special meeting for discussion of this matter in further detail.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Brill) to continue this item. Motion carried 6-0-1.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, at 10:15 a.m., **The Chair** stated the meeting would be adjourned.

---

**MARK J. SKEEN, CHAIR  
BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION**

**ATTEST:**

---

**EDWARD F. OVERTON, SECRETARY  
BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION**