

POLICE AND FIRE RETIREMENT PLAN

Minutes of the Board Meeting

THURSDAY

SAN JOSÉ, CALIFORNIA

February 1, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Administration of the Police and Fire Department Retirement Plan met at 8:41 a.m., on Thursday, February 1, 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

BRET MUNCY

DAVID CORTESE

FORREST WILLIAMS

Fire Employee Representative

Retiree Representative

Police Employee Representative

Council Representative

Council 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

Alex Gurza -OER

Sandra Holloway -SJPD

A. Rosingana -AORP+FA

Colleen Hy -Staff

Matt Stansk -Attorney

Linda Hurley -Macias Gini

Allan Dye -POA

John Tennant -POA

Toni Johnson -Staff

George Rios -CAO

Tom Webster -Staff

Susan Devencenzi -City Attorney

Debbi Warkentin -Staff

Udaya Rajbhandari - "

Ron Kumar - "

Paul Angelo -Segal

Andy Yeung -Segal

Mike Pribula -Staff

Jim Jeffers -Attorney

Rich Fong -SJPD

Linda Charfauros -SJFD

James Giambrone, Jr. -Retired SJPD

Dale Morgan -SJPD

Randy Sekany -L230

Thomas J. Boyle -Attorney

C. Taylor -POA

Jeff Ricketts -POA

Bob Lopez -POA

Bob St. Amoir -POA

Aracely Rodriguez OER

REGULAR SESSION

ORDERS OF THE DAY

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:41 a.m., and stated that Item 3a has been deferred to May at the request of the applicant's attorney. Also, the Real Estate Committee will be meeting on March 15, 2007.

RETIREMENTS

Service

George F. Cravalho, Fire Engineer, Fire Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 27, 2007; 32.96 years of service. (SCD Pending)

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

Stan Faulwetter, Lieutenant, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective January 31, 2007; 30.08 years of service.

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

David G. Fritz, Sergeant, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective February 10, 2007; 25.09 years of service.

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

James E. Moore, Police Officer, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective February 10, 2007; 25.09 years of service.

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

Robert P. Nalett, Jr., Sergeant, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective February 10, 2007; 25.01 years of service.

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

Bruce P. Stine, Sergeant, Police Department. Request for Service Retirement effective February 10, 2007; 25.00 years of service.

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

Disabilities - None

Change in Status

Gary Bertelsen, Sergeant, Police Department. Request for change to Service-Connected Disability Retirement effective August 12, 2006; 25.88 years of service.

This item was deferred.

James Giambrone, Police Officer, Police Department. Request for change to Service-Connected Disability Retirement effective October 7, 2004; 28.58 years of service.

Retired Police Officer Giambrone was present and was represented by *Matthew Stanek*.

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

<u>Doctor's Name</u>	<u>Report Date</u>
James Giambrone, Jr. (letter)	11/15/06; 7/1/06
J.P. Wensel, M.D. PHD	8/14/06
Donald Pang, M.D.	7/17/06
J. Springer, M.D.	5/3/06 (4 rpts)
Jeffrey Holmes, M.D.	10/8/05
Arthur L. Messinger, M.D.	2/19/04
Keith Fraker, M.D.	2/17/04
Charles A. Borgia, M.D.	7/17/03
Martin Trieb, M.D.	5/14/03; 4/1/02; 3/29/01; 3/26/01
Lucy Lin, M.D.	10/1/02; 2/19/02

Board Doctor
Rajiv Das

Report Date
1/9/07; 1/4/07

Dr. Das said that there are multiple injuries, but his knees seem to be the most significant disability. His restrictions are based on those submitted by the treating physician.

Mr. Stanek described the history of Mr. Giambrone's injuries. He then commented that Dr. Das' restrictions left out some vital restrictions. Also, he stated that he has a memo from Captain Morgan of the SJPD saying they can accommodate Mr. Giambrone's restrictions; however they also have a letter from Workers Compensation that says there is no modified duty available. So, he wanted to know what the modified position that is available is.

Lt. Morgan stated that the position is that of a tow liaison, which Mr. Giambrone had worked in before, plus there are 45+ additional positions available at the tier I level.

Mr. Giambrone described his work career and the injuries he received. He discussed the treatments, pain, and the unsatisfactory level performance in his daily life. He feels that the restrictions are too simplistic and that he cannot work any longer.

(M.S.C. Heredia/Muncy) to approve application. Motion carried 4-0-3. (Brill/Johnson absent; Williams left 9 am).

Deferred Vested – None

DEATH NOTIFICATIONS - None

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Skeen turned over control of the Board to Vice-Chair Heredia.

Request for action on letter sent on 12/14/06 by John Tennant, POA's counsel, concerning breach of confidentiality by the Department of Retirement Services.

Mr. Tennant stated that they sent the letter out and he received a call from Mark Skeen on 1/12/07. He said, "My bad, should have gotten back to you earlier, sorry about that and asked for an additional 2 weeks." That was granted. Our concerns were much alleviated having gotten a response, although our concerns will bleed into what Robert Lopez, President of POA, will be addressing a little later; they are primarily concerns about lack of response. With regards to this issue it seems that the appropriate steps are being taken to rectify my clients concerns, simply not having heard anything for a month gave rise to the concerns.

Vice-Chair Heredia asked why there was no response from the administration to the POA.

The Secretary stated that he spoke to the City Attorney about the department's position and what the department should do and he was informed that the City was preparing a coordinated response and he was to do nothing. He should have called Robert Lopez or their counsel to tell them that but he was following the legal advice he was given to do nothing.

Request for action on Board's inquiry into the disclosure.

The Secretary said that this is the Board's inquiry into the disclosure and to get things out onto the record, asking if the POA is satisfied with the progress being made and asking if there is anything else that the Board

needs to do to satisfy the POA. Also, letting them know that this matter is serious and that we are looking into it and to have that as part of the official record of the Board.

Vice-Chair Heredia asked what position this Board and staff should take when we get some advice that doesn't seem to suite what our goals should be.

Mr. Richeda stated that first; the Board doesn't know what happened, so the Board needs to find out what happened. Second, he assumes that the Board has a preexisting policy about that this kind of disclosure should not occur and the Board needs to reaffirm that policy to ensure that whatever happened does not happen again. He thinks that it's reasonable to cooperate if you know what it is. He thinks that you have a fiduciary duty to find out what happened.

Request for action on the authority of City, through Hanson Bridgett, to conduct an investigation of the Department of Retirement Services and the Retirement Board.

Chair Skeen stated that he is the only one being investigated at this time.

Mrs. Devencenzi said that she does not know the scope of the investigation. She knows that Hanson Bridgett has been retained, they are a law firm, and they are doing the investigation to find out what happened and how this release occurred. They may be interviewing Board members. Hanson Bridgett was requested to conduct the investigation by the City Manager's office; under the City Charter the City Manager is the person who is responsible for the administration for all of the departments of the City. If the investigation is being conducted as a personnel issue then employees that are talked to have the right to have some privacy. Again, she is not privy to the investigation, but there is some sensitivity.

Vice-Chair Heredia stated that if Hanson Bridgett has only sent a letter to Mr. Skeen and they have not notified this Board that they are doing an investigation. In the letter they sent Mr. Skeen they say they are trying to figure out what happened from the Retirement Plan, what was done and what wasn't done. That's certainly something that we need to regulate to make sure it doesn't happen again and to make sure that it is consistent with our policy. He thinks that we should send some kind of correspondence to Hanson Bridgett and tell them that we would like to be involved with their investigation when it comes to matters that are not personnel, but that are of Plan policy.

Member Cortese stated that how do you vote/decide to join an investigation or not without knowing the scope of it, what powers it has to subpoena documents, witnesses, and to take testimony.

Request for action for the Board's cooperation with City inquiry.

Vice-Chair Heredia requests that Mr. Richeda send a letter to Hanson Bridgett letting them know that we would like to understand the scope of the investigation, how they plan to share that investigation with the Board, that the Board has an interest in finding out what happened, how it happened, and now we can prevent it from happening again. Our interest is proactive rather than punitive just trying to fix what appears to what has been broken and who they plan to interview.

Mr. Richeda stated that perhaps this would be more appropriate to go to the attorneys' client. Hanson Bridgett will not be able to respond to any of this, he can only refer this to his client as these are issues outside of his scope. He could include Hanson Bridgett in the CC.

Mrs. Devencenzi said that she is willing to go to the City Manager and explain what has happened here. She would also like to add that since the original letter dealing with this was copied to Mr. White, Mr. Rios, and to

Mr. Gurza. I would be willing to certainly go back and tell all three of them what has transpired and what the Board's concerns are.

Request for action on Board's waiver of conflict of interest with City's investigator, Hanson Bridgett.

Vice-Chair Heredia stated that he don't think they should do this until they get some answers.

Mrs. Devencenzi said that she has no idea what conflict of interest they are talking about. Did they request that we do this?

The Secretary said that staff has researched the records and Hanson Bridgett have not worked for the Board.

Mr. Richeda stated that he believes that the Board is considering this on their own notion, for example, Bob Blum spoke at retreats and perhaps that is something to think about. He is the one that put it on the agenda because if they had done some work then we just want things to be smooth and clear. Bob Blum at various points did a co-presentation to the City Council, he subsequently provided presentations at the retreat of the Retirement Board and there were several meetings that Bob attended before making the presentation.

Mrs. Devencenzi said that Hanson Bridgett has never been a law firm providing services to this Board, they have provided services to the City in the past; the place where there has been a contract with the Board is when Bob Blum worked for Mercer some time back. He did not work for the actuarial firm side of it, but he worked on the consulting side so when we had Mercer come in and do some work specific to a particular issue that was not related to this and he was not acting as an attorney.

Request for action on Board Chair's request for legal representation during the Hanson Bridgett investigation.

Chair Skeen said that he received a letter from Hanson Bridgett dated 1/17/07, from an attorney in their law firm named Steven D. Miller and he is engaged me and would like to sit down and do an investigation of my disclosures, so I would like a legal representative to represent me through this process.

Mrs. Devencenzi stated that we have had this type of conversation a while back when another Board member was also considering having the Board provide legal counsel. And she thinks that what you are going to have to decide if you are going to spend Plan assets to do that is whether what you are talking about having the attorney do is actually in furtherance of the administration of the Trust or if its not directly related to the administration of the Trust, that it will benefit the Trust because you going to be using Trust assets to pay for that. That is the kind of finding you are going to need to make.

Mr. Ricketts said that he thinks that being a participant in the Plan they need to look at if Mr. Skeen was acting as chairman and benefit the Plan when he made the decision, if that was the case and he was acting course and scope as the chairman of the Retirement Plan, then he has no problem paying it, but if he was not acting as chairman of the plan but was acting on outside interest then we need to look at not paying for it.

Vice-Chair Heredia stated that he wondered should we have a special meeting to take action on items right away. He would suggest scheduling a date that these issues that require follow up to be done, in coordination with Mr. Richeda for instruction on drafting the letter.

The Secretary stated that with regard to the special meeting we need to look at everyone's calendars to see whether or not we can get everyone together, including representation from the POA/Fire and the City on short notice. He has as the agenda items 6f and d for that day to follow up on.

This item has been continued.

Request for action on approval of draft letter informing active Plan members of the release of confidential information.

Mr. Norling said that his understanding is that this leak of information happened in November, then Mr. Tennant was notified in December and sent out a letters notifying different people, and the Secretary was told by the City Attorney that it would be taken care of and not to worry about it, but it seems like a lot of the members were caught flat footed about this whole subject, it is not something that was brought up to you sooner and why wasn't it agendized for the January meeting.

Vice-Chair Heredia said he doesn't have an answer to why it wasn't agendized in January, but when he got the letter it was at the end of December.

The Secretary responded that one of the issues is the timing of the agenda, we have a break at Christmas time and we left on the 22nd of December and this issue had not really taken shape. We came back the day before the Police and Fire Board met in January, so we were just getting everything all together then and agendized it for February. The letter is going to go out to all Plan members.

Mrs. Devencenzi said that the agenda reads active Plan members, but the information she has indicates that there may have been some people who are not active members and unless you actually have the data you won't know who needs to be notified.

The Secretary stated that administration has looked into maintaining and providing actuarial data that accurately reflects demographics of the Plan without use of social security numbers and maybe even names. We are working with the Segal to put in place a plan to do this and we are working with LRS, our pension administrator, to identify plan members in a way is not using social security numbers. We are in the same process with the Federated Board, so that is the strategy we are working on.

Mrs. Devencenzi also said that in the second paragraph of the letter, where it says information released includes your name; that would probably be better if it reads consists of your name, so they know exactly what information was released.

Mr. Lopez stated that he thinks warning that their information was let out and not necessarily saying there was anything criminal in nature, but the mere fact is that people need to check their bills/statements because their confidential information was let out and that you are doing everything that you can at this time to gather the information and destroy it. In the future only the people entitled to the information will be the only ones receiving it. I think that would weigh heavily on assuring members that nothing happened and will not happen in the future.

Vice-Chair Heredia said that at this point he would direct the Board's legal counsel and the Secretary to get together and send a letter out that covers the pertinent issues and information as requested by POA and Local 230.

Request for action on direction of staff to produce written policy and training for staff concerning release of member information.

The Secretary stated that fundamentally they have already taken care of it. Unfortunately, our Plan is hardwired, which means that this data is encoded in the actuarial database; we cannot even read it ourselves. So the issue is once we can work through modifications to the database, what is housed within that database, then we can ask the Board to determine when, where, and if it gets released other than on the Board's official direction.

Vice-Chair Heredia requested that the Secretary forward the written policy to the L230, POA, SJREA, and the Board for review.

Request for action on Robert Lopez' (President – Police Officers' Association) letter concerning perception of bias felt by the Plan's police members.

The Secretary said that he has written to Mr. Lopez and indicated that in his tenure of more than 30 years as the Director of Retirement Systems, there has never been any bias to one group against the other one. That is simply not the way we do business. We adhere to requests from the POA, POA's counsel, L230, and L230's counsel. Members are provided the same kind of service as each other, he was very surprised to hear that, and he guesses that it was principally driven by: a) the disclosure of the information, which is a separate matter that is being handled, and b) the inability to get a timely meeting put on to discuss issues that were in front of the Board that had already been decided and agreed to by City Council; is that accurate?

Mr. Lopez stated that was correct. He finds this really important because perception is a difficult thing to monitor, and confidence levels. First, he wants to say that the Board has done a wonderful job with managing the Plan. Starting at the beginning, since he has only been the President for this past year, he cannot talk about history, but when he first inherited this position in January they had just gotten the contract and had attempted to get those items costed. During the course of that time, many of his members were looking forward to retiring and looking forward to the fact that in July they would be able to reap all the benefits they had as a result of that contract. It became very difficult to get those items costed, there was a lot of things involved, but we had six months to work on that and the perception was that it was not going to happen, in fact it did not happen. It wasn't until October 24th that all our benefits were truly costed, the perception was that we weren't getting the service, confidence was low at that time and in fact that when POA wanted something it didn't happen very much. Many things didn't seem definite. As things progressed, we had the issue of during the course of Christmas vacation L230 was able to get their theoretical benefits costed for their arbitration. Now I had to answer to my members, why is it that we had nine months to wait for our benefits that we had contracted to get funded, but L230 over a Christmas season was able to get theoretical benefits costed? Then we are hit over the head again with their personal information being sent out. Then there is now talk about splitting the fund. The thing that's occurring is that on a regular basis there's perception and the confidence becomes low that when the firefighters want something they get it, when the cops want something we take our time. As of right now, the POA wants to put the Board on notice that a major portion of my officers has a perception that this Board is bias. We see that the Chair is a firefighter and the Vice-President of the Union; and the Vice-Chair is a retired firefighter and former Vice-President of the Union and is currently on the Retirement Board, which represents Fire and Police, it's a hard perception to get away from. The POA feels that any split at this time is premature.

Mr. Tennant said that he is proud to represent the police officers. They are models of patience and forbearance. You will find my client can be incredibly reasonable and forgiving, but everyone's patience has

a limit. While what President Lopez has articulated today may simply be a perception, he has tried to get a meeting scheduled, and tried, and tried, and then the actuary gets fired. So that had an impact and there was tremendous concern. With regards to the split of the Plan, I don't know that it's the best thing and I don't know if you are going to have a special meeting on it although President Lopez has asked that you opt not to until the arbitration agreement comes down. Our understanding is that there is no need for a split, especially if the arbitration comes back with similar benefits for the firefighters.

Member Cortese and *Mr. Tennant* had further discussion concerning the perception of bias.

Chair Skeen said that he was sorry for the perception but that last year was a very trying time. He is not making excuses, but the Board fired the actuary, an RFP started for a new one and that was time consuming.

Vice-Chair Heredia stated that he doesn't feel that anyone should have to explain to another person what he has done; he did it, he takes responsibility, and he is proud of what he does. The fact that POA members are questioning his motivation troubles him, all he can do at this point is to offer to them to come to whatever and how many meetings they want him to come to and put him in the hot seat. He has no problem explaining himself. There are going to be disagreements, however his motivation would be to convince each and every one of the officers that he decides on things because it is best for the Plan and best for the members in his estimation. It is about what he thinks the City and this Plan owes all of us because of what we do to protect our families and everyone else's families. He does this as best he can, putting aside personal prejudices and personal preferences. I guarantee you it's not about whether you are a cop or fireman, male or female, retired or active; we are the same. As far as the asset split goes, I am trying to figure out where someone got the idea that I was in favor of that. He saw this thing going down this path where Mr. Gurza came to a meeting requesting benefits to be costed, so nothing on the fire side pays this benefit, it all has to be paid for by the City and the cops. Mercer comes up with several options of how that can be done that had to do with the City's contribution rate and keeping the employees' rate different. Now, different employee rates, which is a level percentage of payroll was against the code at that time, so we had to change that code. The three alternatives that Mercer came up with, only one was accepted by our new actuary Segal and to do that they said we need to account for the assets differently. They mention that several times and there was no discussion going on by the Board about that. So, last month or so, we get the more final view that talks about an asset split and how they are going to do it; he objected strongly about using an artificial date of 7/1/05 to begin the split. He has serious objections to how that goes, how it affects retirees, SRBR, medical, unfunded actuarial accrued liabilities, and how that all gets put back in mine and yours pocket is his concern. So, he has been opposed to that split because he sees no reason to do it and he asked for a special meeting to have the actuary explain to us why they need to do it and who else in this state have pension plans that give different benefits to employees and either do or do not split their assets. We have to do another actuarial valuation starting around July/August for the next 2 years contribution rates, so we need to be ahead of this game and have some information and some resources to help us make our decision before we get that far. His position to continue with the education of splitting assets has nothing to do with cops and firemen; it has to do with my ability to understand what I need to do to make sound decisions as a fiduciary.

Vice-Chair Heredia and *Mr. Ricketts* discussed further whether separation of assets education and exploration is necessary and voiced their individual opinions about the matter.

Request for action on Robert Lopez' letter requesting the Retirement Board cease any further action on the concept of separation of Plan assets.

Vice-Chair Heredia would like the opportunity to find out what other Plan's with segregated assets are doing.

Mr. Angelo said that he thinks that what other systems do is part of the answer. When they were asked to do an illustration of how an asset split might work, it raised a lot of interesting questions; he thinks the prior question is what is the role of split assets or not splitting assets in determining contribution rates for the Plan at the highest level. One of the things to include in that conversation would be in our experience with other funds, here is what they do, but it may be helpful if this could wait until after the arbitration or it could be an educational meeting that happens before. He is sensing in this discussion is that it would be helpful to understand what it means and does not mean to separate assets, does it separate them legally or only actuarially, are there different ways and different levels, can we separate them but then lump them together when you are on the cost. We could structure that into what we are talking about here.

Member Cortese stated his understanding would be that we are ceasing any preparation of an asset split but we are not denying members of this Board the opportunity to request information and education of the actuary.

There was collective discussions regarding the concerns about further discussion and involvement in any decision making process at this time.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Cortese) for the Board to in the future regarding any separation of Plan assets, schedule these as discussion items only and not an action item, until the conclusion of either arbitration or a consensual agreement between L230 and the City. Motion carried 4-0-3.

OLD BUSINESS / CONTINUED ITEMS

Acceptance of Segal's actuarial study on proposed benefit enhancements as request by IAFF Local 230 and City Administration forward to interested parties.

(M.S.C. Skeen/Heredia) to accept report. Motion carried 4-0-3.

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

The Secretary that this ordinance reflects the decision that the Board made last month to extend the proof of the evidence of relationship of domestic partnership beyond being enrolled in the City's domestic plan.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Heredia) to approve ordinance. Motion carried 4-0-3.

Acceptance of Towers Perrin Report on the Plan's Disability Retirement Process Review, approval to pursue study of work conditions and work environment in Police Department and Fire Department, and recommendation to City Council for additional analytical staff in Fire Department for participation in discussion about worker health and safety.

The Secretary stated there are three action items that were requested and the report is complete. We have some additional work and are in the process of modifying our agreement and will be back in front of you next month. Once you approve these then we will send it forward to the City Council. We have to have some weigh in on the City Council, this is a package deal and these can be taken separately and that will give the Board direction on how to proceed.

(M.S.C. Heredia/Muncy) approved item. Motion carried 4-0-3.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Investment Committee (Skeen/Heredia/Muncy)

Summary of meeting held 18 January 2007.

- a. Approval of Seix Investment Advisor's request to invest in high yield portion of the portfolio in the Seix High Yield Fund.

(M.S.C. Heredia/Muncy) approved item. Motion carried 4-0-3.

- b. Approval to allow Brandes Investment Partners to participate in mini-tender offers with the understanding that manager will indemnify Board against any losses to extent such losses were result of manager's negligence.

(M.S.C. Heredia/Muncy) approved item. Motion carried 4-0-3.

Real Estate Committee (Skeen/Heredia/Muncy – Alt: Vacant) – next meeting June 2007.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Monthly board meeting held 4 January 2007.

(M.S.C. Heredia/Muncy) to approve. Motion carried 4-0-3.

PENDING ACTIONS LIST

Updated list as of 23 January 2007.

This item is note and file.

BENEFITS REVIEW - None

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Skeen pulled item 17e for discussion.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Heredia) to approve. Motion carried 4-0-3.

Update on Pension Protection Act (Pretax Public Safety Benefit).

Chair Skeen asked if the Code has to be amended for that.

Mrs. Devencenzi stated that there are varying opinions, but it may not be necessary. There are a few theories on that because you don't have to allow people to have their medical premiums deducted from their check, but if you do then the theory is that you have to allow them to have the tax benefit. Distributions that were made after 12/31/06, so it only starts for this year and won't affect any one's prior years taxes, so what we would be doing is adjusting the 1099 taxable income and we have time to work on this stuff.

Chair Skeen asked if staff can work with legal counsel to prepare a report on what they should or not be doing.

Mr. Richeda stated that he thinks the bottom line after staff and legal consideration have the report approved by the Board is that we are going to have to send out a notice to the members telling them what's available and what the parameters for this that we have decided upon. Then the election form is very complex.

Mr. Ricketts requested also if staff can look at adding voluntary benefits besides the medical, he understands that you can also put on long-term care and cancer insurance too.

(M.S.C. Muncy/Heredia) to approve. Motion denied 3-0-4. (Cortese exited at 11:50 am).

PROPOSED AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Skeen requested that staff review the Conflict of Interest Form.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

EDUCATION & TRAINING

Notification of CalAPRS Principles of Pension Management for Trustees to be held at Stanford Law School, March 27 thru 30, 2007.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, at 11:59 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**