

CORAL GABLES RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Minutes of April 25, 2019
 Youth Center – 2nd Floor Classroom
 405 University Drive
 8:00 a.m.

MEMBERS:	M	A	M	J	S	O	N	J	F	M	A	APPOINTED BY:
	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	19	19	19	19	
Andy Gomez	P	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	P	P	P	Mayor Raul Valdes-Fauli
James Gueits	P	P	E	P	P	E	P	P	P	A	P	Vice Mayor C. Quesada
Javier Baños	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	E	Commissioner Michael Mena
Michael Gold	P	P	E	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Commissioner Patricia Keon
Rene Alvarez	E	P	E	P	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	Commissioner Vince Lago
Joshua Nunez	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Police Representative
Randy Hoff	P	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Member at Large
Jesus Cordero	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	A	P	General Employees
Troy Easley	P	P	P	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Fire Representative
Diana Gomez	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Finance Director
Raquel Elejabarrieta	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Labor Relations and Risk Management
Need appointment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	City Manager Appointee
Pete Chircut	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	City Manager Appointee

STAFF:

Kimberly Groome, Administrative Manager
 Ornelisa Coffy, Retirement System Assistant
 Christopher Greenfield for Alan Greenfield, Board Attorney
 Dave West, AndCo Consulting
 Pete Strong, GRS

P = Present
 E = Excused
 A = Absent

GUESTS:

None

The Board meeting was called to order at 8:05 a.m.

1. Roll call.

All members were in attendance except for Mr. Baños and Mr. Gueits. Mr. Garcia-Linares is no longer on the board.

2. Consent Agenda.

All items listed within this section entitled "Consent Agenda" are considered to be self-explanatory and are not expected to require additional review or discussion, unless a member of the Retirement Board or a citizen so requests, in which case, the item will be

removed from the Consent Agenda and considered along with the regular order of business. Hearing no objections to the items listed under the "Consent Agenda", a vote on the adoption of the Consent Agenda will be taken.

- 2A. The Administrative Manager recommends approval of the Retirement Board meeting minutes for March 14, 2019.
- 2B. The Administrative Manager recommends approval of the Report of the Administrative Manager.
1. For the Board's information, there was a transfer in the amount of \$4,800,000.00 from the Northern Trust Cash Account to the City of Coral Gables Retirement Fund for the payment of monthly annuities and expenses at the end of March 2019 for the April 2019 benefit payments.
 2. For the Board's information, the following Employee Contribution checks were deposited into the Retirement Fund's SunTrust Bank account:
 - Payroll ending date March 3, 2019 in the amount of \$188,046.64 was submitted for deposit on March 12, 2019.
 - Payroll ending date March 17, 2019 in the amount of \$181,935.38 was submitted for deposit on March 26, 2019.
 3. Copy of detailed expense spreadsheet for the month of March 2019 is attached for the Board's information.
 4. For the Board's information, a Private Industry Notification from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Cyber Division dated March 7, 2019 is attached regarding cyber criminals stealing funds from retirement and spending accounts through unauthorized online access.
 5. For the Board's information, an article dated March 19, 2019 is attached regarding a Detroit man who defrauded the Social Security Administration by receiving over \$280,000.00 of his deceased mother's Social Security.
- 2C. The Administrative Manager recommends approval of the following invoice:
1. Gabriel Roeder Smith invoice #445163 dated March 11, 2019 for actuarial consulting services during the months of January and February 2019 in the amount of \$10,976.00.
 2. Crain Communications Inc. invoice #M00050072 dated March 18, 2019 in the amount of \$1,840.00 for the advertisement of the Board Attorney RFP.
 3. Verdeja DeArmas Truillo invoice #22217 dated March 19, 2019 in the amount of \$2,500.00 for additional services rendered in regards to the City of Coral Gables Retirement System State Report (Florida retirement System).

4. AndCo invoice #30145 dated March 29, 2019 for consulting services and performance evaluation for January to March 2019 in the amount of \$39,875.00.
 5. City of Coral Gables invoice for January 1, 2019 to March 31, 2019 in the amount of \$26,052.18 for expenses of the Retirement System paid out of the General Ledger account of the City.
 6. Gabriel Roeder Smith invoice #445950 dated April 3, 2019 for actuarial consulting services during the month of March 2019 in the amount of \$14,265.00.
- 2D. The Administrative Manager recommends approval of the following Purchase of Active Military Service and Purchase of Prior Service:
1. Arturo Lujan of the Police Department requesting to buy back 4 years of Active Military Service.
 2. Erik Honig of the Police Department requesting to buy back 5 years of Active Military Service.
 3. Jeidy D. Marrone of the Police Department requesting to receive her prior City service time.

A motion was made by Mr. Hoff and seconded by Mr. Easley to approve the Consent Agenda minus 2D2 and 2C3. The motion unanimously passes. (10-0)

There is discussion on 2D2. Mr. Hoff advises that he would like to table 2D2 because he does not believe that Eric Honig has the qualified time to purchase. He adds that he reviewed the DD214 and has also asked Ms. Groome to go back and review the document. Dr. Gomez asks for a brief summary to refresh his memory of the process. Mr. Hoff explains that if there is a person who has prior active military service they can purchase up to 5 years of that time. Mr. Hoff explains that Mr. Honig's documents are not clear. Ms. Groome adds that there is also the issue that he was hired and then went on active duty. Ms. Gomez asks Ms. Groome if she reviewed the documents before putting it on the Agenda. She continues asking if the Board is supposed to do the homework on it or is Ms. Groome supposed to do the homework on it. Mr. Hoff replies that Mr. Honig's DD214 is a special case. Ms. Gomez adds that if it is on the Agenda for approval it is her understanding that Administration believes it should be approved. Chairperson Nunez explains that this particular DD214 would have needed further researching and that is something that the Plan Administrator would not have been able to do.

A motion is made by Mr. Hoff and seconded by Mr. Easley to table 2D2 for further review. The motion unanimously approved (10-0).

Chairperson Nunez informs that he wanted to bring Agenda Item 2C3 to the Board's attention. There was a bit of an issue in terms of the audit and there was an additional bill

received. Verdeja DeArmas Truillo invoiced \$2,500.00 for additional services rendered in regards to the City of Coral Gables Retirement System State Report. Ms. Groome is asked to elaborate further by the Chairperson. Mr. Chircut asks if this is an above and beyond service from what is listed in the contract. It was his understanding that the State filing was part of their normal contractual activities. Ms. Groome believes that this was their first time ever that they reported to the State of Florida for a public pension system and were unaware of the process with the State. Ms. Gomez asks if the auditors are supposed to report to the State of Florida for the pension. Ms. Groome answers affirmatively. Ms. Gomez asks if this has been done before. Ms. Groome replies that it has been done by the past auditors. It was the first time this auditor performed those tasks. She believes that Verdeja underestimated the time it would take them because it was their first time completing an audit for a public pension and the Retirement Office does not have access to put in the information to be reported into the State's online site. The previous auditors would take the report she provides and put that information into the State's computer system. Mr. Chircut comments that hopefully they will not charge additional funds if this happens again. Ms. Groome thinks that since they have completed the report this year they are more aware of the process next year and it will be easier for them.

Dr. Gomez comments that he received the phone call and passed it on to Chairperson Nunez. He asked the same question and what was told to him was it was very difficult to get the information from our office. Ms. Groome replies that she does not understand that because she provided the same information that she would have provided to past auditors. Ms. Gomez replies it could be that they do it in a different format. She adds that the first year audit is always more difficult on the auditor. Mr. Hoff asks if it is customary for the client to pay the overage. Ms. Gomez replies that the first year audit is usually more expensive. Dr. Gomez asks Ms. Groome if she relayed to the auditors that the report would be due by a certain date. Ms. Groome replies the auditors knew the report was due on March 15th. Dr. Gomez does recall them saying that they were unaware that the reporting would be so complicated. He knows they spent a great deal of time even after the review getting all the work done. Mr. Easley suggests splitting the bill as there could have been some issues on their part and on the part of the Retirement Office. Ms. Gomez thinks that would be fair but they should have factored that into their bid because it was the first year they did the audit and that first year is more difficult. Ms. Groome believes they underestimated the work needed to put the information into the State report since they had never completed the tasks before. Ms. Gomez replies that is their job to know what it will be and to add it in their bid. Mr. Gold recalls Verdejja saying that the State report took longer than expected. Ms. Groome points out that it was a part of the email they sent. She believes they truly just did not realize how much time would be needed to complete the State report. Ms. Gomez states that if that is true then the Board should not pay the overage. Ms. Elejabarrieta comments that the way the invoice is worded it says for additional services. She would like clarity on whether it is additional services or are

the services provided along the scope of work listed in the contract. Mr. Chircut asks for Mr. Verdeja to attend the next meeting to further explain to the Board exactly what happened.

A motion was made by Dr. Gomez and seconded by Mr. Gold to table approval of Agenda Item 2C3 and have the auditors Verdeja DeArmas Truillo at the next meeting for explanation of the additional charge. Motion unanimously approved (10-0)

4. Comments from Retirement Board Chairperson.
There were no comments from the Board Chairperson.
5. Items from the Board Attorney.

Mr. Christopher Greenfield is present for his father Mr. Alan Greenfield. Mr. Greenfield greets the board and informs that his father is not doing well and his health tremendously declined over the weekend.

He begins his reporting with the permissible functions of the Board and if the Board has the right to review calculations done by the Administrator. Mr. Greenfield advises that he reviewed the matter with his father and it is the opinion that the Board does not have the authority to review the records. However, it is the duty of the Board members to bring to the attention of the person who made the mistake if a mistake is noticed. Mr. Gold clarifies stating that we the Board cannot go through individual records but if an error is notice they can bring it to the attention of the Administrator. Mr. Greenfield agrees.

Mr. Greenfield reports on the purchasing of liability insurance and City indemnification. The Code does have a provision that the Board is indemnified by the City. In the past the Board has gone out and received quotes for insurance but has never moved forward. The Board does have the ability to purchase insurance and it is up to the Board if they would like to purchase that insurance.

Mr. Greenfield continues. In regards to the over payment due to the death check, a demand letter was sent out to GRS and Alan Greenfield and GRS's attorney had conversations. It was an optimistic conversation and they decided that after the damages had been accessed there was an agreement, once it was known the total damages unable to be recouped; they would then be seeking those damages from GRS.

Mr. Greenfield informs that a lawsuit was filed and Barbara Schmitt was served in the State of California. He explains that Ms. Schmitt is to respond by May 3, 2019.

Mr. Greenfield states that he received a call from attorney Ron Cohen in regards to an heir of the COLA settlement. The heir basically passed the deadline to cash the checks.

The City Attorney along with the outside attorneys came to an agreement to allow those persons to receive the funds.

In regards to the agreement with Brandywine, he went back in forth with them in regards to indemnification. The indemnification clause was removed from the contract and the contract was forwarded to the Chair for his signature.

Mr. Hoff sends his regards to Alan Greenfield. Mr. Gold asks how long Alan Greenfield was the Board Attorney. Mr. Greenfield responds that his father was the Board Attorney for 30 years.

6. Status update of the automation of the Retirement System.

Ms. Menagazzo was unable to attend the meeting due to illness. Mr. Nunez advises that he did receive an update from her and he will forward it to Ms. Groome so it can be shared with all the Board members. He adds that hopefully she can make it to the next meeting. Ms. Gomez adds that the report she had IT create has been completed. That report should relieve some of the manual labor done by the Office. Ms. Groome confirms that the report does work but from 2007 forward it removes some of the loyalties that are needed. Ms. Groome informs that it works well enough but the amounts still need to be reviewed by Office personnel to be sure the pensionable amounts of the participants are accurate.

7. Presentation of the 10/1/2018 draft Actuarial Valuation report by Gabriel Roeder Smith.

Pete Strong reports that the contribution requirement is down almost a million dollars this year. The main reason is because of the extra payments that paid off the amortization basis.

Mr. Gueits arrives to the meeting at this time.

Mr. Strong continues. Additional contributions of \$2,471,544 were made in October 2018 of which \$2,413,479 was in excess of the required City contribution for fiscal year 2018. It was applied towards the unfunded actuarial accrued liability to eliminate or reduce the following bases; the plan amendment base established January 1, 1992; the plan amendment base established January 1, 1994; the assumption change base established January 1, 1996; and the retiree COLA base established January 1, 1996. The first three of these were eliminated after including the scheduled amortization payment to be made October 1, 2018 as part of the fiscal year 2019 required contribution. The assumed investment rate of return was lowered from 7.65% to 7.60% per year, compounded annually and will continue to be lowered in five bases point increments each future valuation until reaching 7.50%. This assumption change resulted in a \$226,784 increase in the City's required contribution and a \$2,660,040 increase in the actuarial accrued

liability. He does believe there is room to lower the assumption. He believes the Board is able to lower a little further and that is his recommendation.

There was a net actuarial experience gain of \$2,374,009 since the last actuarial valuation. This means that actual experience was more favorable than expected. The investment return was 9.3% based on the actuarial value of assets versus the expected investment return of 7.65%. They also had higher than expected salary increases which were offsetting sources of actuarial experience loss. New employees were given a choice between entering the 401(a) or the defined benefit plan and as of October 1, 2018; 45% of new employees hired chose to enter the 401(a) in lieu of participating in the defined benefit plan. Over time, future employees entering the 401a will result in lower liabilities in the defined benefit plan. It is almost cost neutral for someone to enter into the 401(a) plan. Ms. Gomez verifies that it does not negatively affect the defined benefit plan. Mr. Strong replies it does not negatively or positively affect it. Mr. West asks if GRS has the ability to track the turnover rate of those persons that enter into the 401(a) plan. Mr. Strong advises that the information is not tracked but it may be possible to be received. He does not have that information at this time. Ms. Groome comments that the data is provided to GRS. Mr. Cordero asks how these benefits are explained to incoming employees. Ms. Groome responds that Human Resources handles the information given to new employees.

Mr. Strong continues. This year's funded ratio is up 63.6% compared to 61.7% last year. Prior to the assumption change the funded ratio would have been 63.9%. The ratio is equal to the actuarial value of assets divided by the actuarial accrued liability. The unfunded actuarial accrued liability is being amortized as a level dollar amount over then number of years remaining in each amortization. The plan is expected to be fully paid off in 2037 assuming no extra City payments and with \$3 million extra City payments each year that changes from 2037 to 2031. The current investment return assumption is 7.60% net of investment expenses. The plan's funding policy states that economically base actuarial assumptions, including the general inflation assumption and the net investment return assumption, shall be based on forward-looking expectations over a medium to long-term rising. The funding policy also says that the Board should give consideration to the arithmetic and geometric mean of forecasted investment returns when selecting a net investment return assumption. While it is GRS's opinion that the plan's current net investment return assumption of 7.60% does not significantly conflict with what would be reasonable for the purpose of the measurement, they shortly recommend that the Board continue to lower the net investment return assumption further than the current target assumption of 7.50% based on the current arithmetic and geometric means of forecasted returns. It is important to note that although the use of the arithmetic mean of forecasted returns is acceptable the geometric mean is more appropriate for estimating the future compound average return. It is his recommendation to target 7.00%.

Ms. Gomez comments that they are doing pretty well. Mr. Gueits states that in the next five years if they have one really bad year people are going to be running for the exits and

they are going to get caught because they will be at 7.25%. Mr. Strong replies that currently there is a cushion and the Board could absorb 2% a year right now but you could not absorb a -15% year.

Mr. Strong explains that he needed signature approval because the assumption rate was too low. Mr. West asks if the head of their firm would not sign off or a sign off has to be received with investment returns under 7.5%. Would Mr. Strong still have to get a signoff if on the other side of the seesaw they were to be more aggressive with the investment program so that the assumption models were a reasonable probability of hitting that negative return assumption? The Board needs to be aware that there is another solution. Mr. Strong states that you would expose yourself to a lot more volatility by being more aggressive. It is possible but he would recommend that the Board stress test before making any decisions. He recommends lowering the current target investment return assumption to 7.50%. Based on their proprietary model with inputs from 12 investment consultants, the current median expected forward-looking compound average return is 6.67% and the probability of earning a compound average return of at least 7.60% over the next 20 years is 37%. Mr. Gold asks when the assumption rate is reduced every year. Ms. Groome replies that it is done every fiscal year. Mr. Gold asks exactly when, Ms. Groome replies that it is on October 1st.

Ms. Gomez comments that you cannot look at any one factor on its own. She would question its qualification based on just that rate because you really need to look at our story and our intentions and the resolutions of the City. She would be very upset with GRS had they unqualified the report just for the assumption rate. She suggests that prior to the finalizing of the valuation report that the City can receive some of that information so that the City would possibly be okay and it could lead to positive discussion so that everyone can be on board. There was an agreement between the City Commission and the Retirement Board on the decreasing of the previous assumption rate. They are obviously making progress and this plan is a success story for the last six years. She thinks that they should continue on their path. She asks if the City can have more time to review the report. Mr. Easley asks if there are any time sensitive issues in delaying the approval of the report. Ms. Gomez answers negatively.

Dr. Gomez reminds the Board that it is time for the joint meeting with the City which is usually held in June. That would be a perfect time to discuss this matter with the Mayor and Commissioners. Chairperson Nunez comments that they will need to bring up changing the assumption rate in September for the following year.

Mr. Strong states that next year FRS will issue a new mortality table. He adds that will force the plan to use a different mortality table. Mr. West states that when Mr. Strong was discussing normal cost paying to the unfunded actuarial assumption liability, he referenced \$7.2 million and that the employees are paying the normal costs. Mr. Strong explains that for General Non-Excluded employees they are and for everybody else the City is paying part of their normal costs. Mr. West understands but either way the

employees are paying a substantial amount. Mr. Strong agrees, they are paying about 60% of the normal costs.

A motion was made by Ms. Gomez and seconded by Mr. Hoff to table the approval of the valuation report until the City reviews it.

Discussion:

Chairperson Nunez informs the Board that he received an email from Mr. Baños advising that he was on a cruise and he found it particularly annoying that the meeting had to be moved. He explains that there were a few Board members who had an issue with the meeting date and a poll was sent out to see which members were available and all members were available for this date except for Mr. Baños. He is annoyed by Mr. Baños annoyance and his egotistical email about his role on this Board. When things are done they are done for a reason and for the greater good of all members and not just his plans. Mr. Strong informs the Board that Mr. Baños reached out to him as well through email expressing that he could not make the meeting and wanted to be able to express his desire to lower the return assumption. Mr. Gueits comments that it was discussed at length today and would like to move on.

The motion unanimously approved (11-0).

8. Review of buy back policy set by the Board.

Ms. Groome informs that back in 1989 when the Code was completely redone buy back was included as a new amendment to the Code. At the time, the Board came up with a policy on how much money it would be to buy back previous time. Currently the policy is that the amount would be the employee's first 26 pay periods multiplied by 18% for each year to buy back up to five years. Dr. Gomez asks if that applies to all groups. Ms. Groome replies that applies to all groups except general employees with military time which is now done by the actuary. Ms. Gomez adds that the issue is she does not believe that the amount that people are paying is actually enough to cover what the costs are. The plan should not be absorbing the buy back costs and she believes it would be good to have the actuary review it and to provide a formula. Mr. Strong replies that there will not be one formula. It will vary based upon each person's age and when they retire. Ms. Gomez asks what other cities do. Perhaps the City may need to amend the ordinance. She thinks the Board needs to look at it.

A motion was made by Ms. Gomez and seconded Mr. Gueits for the actuary to do the calculation for each person that is interested in buying back time.

Discussion:

Mr. Gold asks how many of these are done a year. Ms. Groome replies that depends. When the plan was changed many people do not see it beneficial to purchase that previous time any longer. Mr. Strong informs the Board that the standard cost to do a buyback calculation is \$450. Ms. Gomez recommends that the cost be included in the buy back cost. Ms. Groome points out that the Board has never required that from other participants or retirees. Mr. Gueits recommends charging for the calculation if they agree to do the buy back but if they disagree with doing the buy back then the Board would foot the cost.

Ms. Gomez states that the 18% could possibly be too high or too low for each person. Her motion does not include the costs of the calculation. Her motion is simply just to send calculations for buy back to the actuary. Ms. Groome asks if this change can be for future buy backs because she has sent out memos in May and already explained the current process to employees. Ms. Gomez replies that the change would be for the next fiscal year starting October 1st. She restates her motion.

A motion was made by Ms. Gomez and seconded by Mr. Gueits that effective 10/1/2019 any person whose buy back eligibility is on or after October 1 the actuary will do the calculation for each person that is interested in buying back time.

Ms. Elejabarrieta asks where this 18% is derived from. Ms. Groome does not know. That percentage may have come from the actuary back in 1989. The decision was made by the Retirement Board but that is not in the minutes as to where the 18% was derived. Ms. Gomez comments that waiting for 10/1/2019 allows persons who have been contemplating the buy back the ability to do so. Mr. Hoff asks if this should be in the ordinance. Ms. Groome replies that it used to be in the union contracts but it was never in the ordinance. Ms. Gomez thinks it should be placed in the ordinance. Mr. Hoff recommends having an amendment to the ordinance. Ms. Gomez interjects to say that it is a Board policy. She recommends that the City have the City Attorney at a future Board meeting.

Motion unanimously approved (11-0).

9. Investment Issues.

Dave West reviews the investments. For the month of March the fund was up 1.17%. For the fiscal year to date that put the fund down six bases points. There was a complete reversal of manager underperformance to outperformance. On a year over year basis the plan is annualizing at 5.9% versus 4.4%. The three-year number is 10.2% versus 8.8% and the 5 year number is 7.5% versus 6.7%. All the managers are at policy except for RBC fiscal year to date. They are still struggling as well as JK Milne. JK Milne's long-term numbers continue to be very index like. Titan Masters International Fund dropped back below the benchmark. The plan is in excellent shape and they have recovered. He

believes they are looking better than many other systems out there. He has no suggestions for any changes.

Mr. West points out that at the last meeting there was discussion of one of the managers which was JK Milne. JK Milne is one of two active fixed managers. They have Richmond Capital and the Aggregate index fund. Tracking JK Milne's results they have not done a bad job but they basically have been very index like and there are index options available. Any manager that has performed in-line with the index has been finishing down or around the bottom quartile. There are potential opportunity costs in keeping JK Milne in the portfolio. The second issue that he wanted to address is to continue in investing in bonds and consistent with overall strategic objectives, the Board has embarked on a very slow process of de-risking the portfolio and has been slowly moving assets into a more conservative posture. The main reason for owning bonds is to have that ace in the hole when equity markets rollover and everything finally comes to an end. They do have those safe and secure assets that will hopefully be providing double digit returns when the market gives those atrocious negative returns.

He wanted to go back and challenge the research managers and so he requested that they find a manager that does not depend on credit and get extra returns using other methods so that there is a possibility of upgrading their bond portfolio and not leave returns on table. A three manager search was put together and he knows all of these managers. His objective is to propose an adjustment to the current strategy that lessens the dependency on credit so that when that day comes they have minimized that exposure. The second objective is to hopefully get a little bit more return. His proposal is to set up for a more protected type of portfolio and moving JK Milne out and possibly going with the Garcia Hamilton investment team. He is aware that the Board usually likes to interview managers but through the screening process there are very few managers that consistently have been able to outperform using the latter to methods. There is a little bit more volatility but that is not the issue of concern. There is an issue with an increase in quality and having preservation oriented portfolio.

A motion was made by Mr. Gold and seconded by Mr. Easley to accept the recommendation of AndCo in replacing JK Milne with Garcia Hamilton. Motion unanimously approved (11-0).

Mr. West informs that he will notify both managers. The changes are being made for performance but the primary reason for the change, as discussed, is to change the strategic approach to the management of the portfolio.

10. Old Business.

Dr. Gomez advises that he would like to make the Board aware that the joint meeting between the Commission and the Retirement Board is being scheduled for June 13 and to please start communicating that to the Commission. He asks for an update on the

Attorney RFP. Ms. Groome informs that the Retirement Office has received about 20 to 25 requests for the Board Attorney RFP. She adds that it has not been just local it has been National firms requesting. The due date for the RFP is May 14th and then the Investment Committee will meet to shortlist so the Board can interview in June. She thinks the Board should make a separate date for the meeting with the Commission since the RFP states that the Board will interview at the June meeting. Chairperson Nunez suggests that they meet with the Commission on June 6th. Mr. Hoff informs that he will not be able to make the June 13th Board meeting. Ms. Gomez recommends coming up with an agenda at the next meeting and spend about half an hour as opposed to doing a repeat of what has been done in the past. Ms. Groome clarifies that there will be two meetings in June, June 6th is the joint meeting with the Commission and June 13th is the regular monthly Board meeting.

Ms. Gomez states that at the last meeting she had made a motion for Chris Greenfield to represent on behalf of Alan Greenfield the Board Attorney. She is unaware of what an interim step would be at this point. Ms. Groome replies that they only have a month or two to go before hiring a new attorney. Ms. Gomez informs that she is bringing it up for the Board to discuss what they should do. Chairperson Nunez asks what the timeline is of when a new attorney would be selected. Ms. Groome replies a new attorney would begin in July. Ms. Gomez comments that Mr. Garcia-Linares stepped in the last time but because he is putting in for the RFP she does not believe that he would be able to be the interim. Mr. Hoff replies that Mr. Garcia-Linares cannot serve on the Board but he believes it is a question worth asking the City Attorney if he can be the interim. Ms. Gomez informs that her motion was made with the understanding that Christopher would be representing his father who just was not able to attend the meetings. It was made clear to her today that Alan is just not able to be the Board Attorney any longer. She recommends that Ms. Groome contact the City Attorney and pending her approval of Mr. Garcia-Linares stepping in as the interim.

A motion was made by Ms. Gomez and seconded by Dr. Gomez that pending the approval of the City Attorney to place Mr. Garcia-Linares as the interim attorney of the Retirement Board. If there is a conflict then Mr. Christopher Greenfield is to remain the attorney.

Discussion:

Mr. Gueits asks what would be the procedure in releasing Mr. Greenfield's firm as the Board Attorney. Ms. Groome replies that a letter would suffice. Ms. Elejabarrieta recommends getting a plaque for his years of service. Mr. Gold asks what it would take to get a Proclamation from the City. The City Commission should make an "Alan Greenfield Day." Ms. Gomez advises that this is something to be done by the Mayor.

Motion unanimously approved (11-0).

11. New Business.

Ms. Groome informs that an employee came by the office informing that he has been approved by Social Security for disability. She is aware that that does not mean anything in accordance with the Retirement Ordinance however the condition listed for his non-service disability is liver cancer. There is a concern in the Office, since we do have to send employees to an independent medical evaluation, that it will be difficult for the Office to obtain oncologist for someone who has already been diagnosed with liver cancer. Mr. Gueits asks if a terminal disease qualifies as a disability. Ms. Groome explains that he is going on non-service disability because he can no longer do his job. The employee could retire and he was notified of this. Retiring would be quicker process than going through non-service connected disability. Mr. Hoff comments if more than two doctors have deemed him disabled why does the Board need to send him to another doctor. Ms. Groome replies that the ordinance says "shall" and because of the ordinance he must be sent to a doctor for an independent medical evaluation. Dr. Gomez recommends trying the University of Miami to see if they would do the independent medical evaluation. Ms. Gomez asks is there something very clear from his doctor stating that he cannot go back to work. The doctor does not have to do a full evaluation but perhaps provide a document stating that a person who has terminal cancer of the liver would not be able to perform job duties of this employee.

12. Public Comment.

There was no public comment.

13. Adjournment.

Meeting is adjourned at 10:42 a.m.

APPROVED

JOSHUA NUNEZ
CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:

KIMBERLY V. GROOME
ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGER