IN THE MATTER OF MEETING NO. 1077

STENOGRAPHIC REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the video conference meeting of the above-entitled matter, held at 20 South Clark Street, Suite 300, in the City of Chicago, County of Cook, State of Illinois, on Friday, August 21,2020, commencing at the hour of 8:30 a.m.

## APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS:

DANIEL FORTUNA, President and Annuitant Trustee

ANTHONY MARTIN, Secretary and Active Trustee

WILLIAM MURPHY, Active Trustee

TIMOTHY McPHILLIPS, Active Trustee
MELISSA CONYEARS-ERVIN, City Treasurer
ANNA VALENCIA, City Clerk
RESHMA SONI, City Comptroller
ANNETTE NANCE-HOLT, Active Trustee
ATTORNEYS FOR THE BOARD:
BURKE, BURNS AND PINELLI, LTD.
BY: MS. MARY PATRICIA BURNS
MR. VINCENT PINELLI

ALSO PRESENT:
LORI LUND, Deputy Director
STEVEN R. SWANSON, Executive Director
LORNA SCOTT, Chief Investment Officer
JACLYN VLAHOS, Comptroller
MARC TORRES, IT Analyst
MARK MYSLINSKI, City Treasurer's Office
DANIEL G. SAMO, M.D., Board Physician
BRADY O'CONNELL, Callan
CRAIG GOESEL, Alliant
Bruno Amici, Alliant

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: I hereby convene this Board of Trustees meeting for August 21, 2020.

Please call the roll.
MS. BURNS: Trustee Valencia.
MEMBER VALENCIA: Present.
MS. BURNS: Trustee Murphy
MEMBER MURPHY: Here.
MS. BURNS: Trustee Fortuna.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Here.
MS. BURNS: Treasurer Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Here.
MS. BURNS: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER HOLT: Present.
MS. BURNS: Trustee Martin.
Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Present.
MS. BURNS: Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Here.

MS. BURNS: You have seven of the eight trustees present, which is a quorum, and you are ready to proceed.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Public Act 101-0640 allows this meeting to be conducted by video conference. The Act requires a roll call vote on
each matter acted upon.
I am physically present here at the Fund office as is Director Steve Swanson.

We are proceeding by video conference in accordance with the Governor's orders because we continue to believe that due to the pandemic it is prudent to not be physically present in the same space. We have posted notice of this meeting in accordance with the Open Meetings Act and the meeting is being recorded and a transcript of this proceeding will be prepared and ultimately after approval will be made available to the public.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr.

President. This is Trustee McPhillips. I will be acting as the Secretary until Trustee Martin can get on the call.

Consistent with Public Act 91-0715 and reasonable constraints determined by Board of Trustees, at each Regular Meeting of the Board or its committee that is open to the public, members of the public may request a brief time to address the Board on relevant matters within its jurisdiction.

With that being said, are there any
requests for public comment today?
Hearing none, we will move on.
First we turn to Approval of
Administrative Items. Approval of the Minutes. We have the Regular Audio Meeting for July 17, 2020,

Regular Audio Meeting Transcript from July 17, 2020
and the Legal Committee Meeting Minutes and Transcript from July 17, 2020 .

I make a motion to approve the minutes and transcripts from the July 17 th Board meeting and from the July 17 th Legal Committee meeting. MEMBER VALENCIA: Second.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: There is a motion by
Trustee McPhillips. Seconded by Trustee Valencia.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee
Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy. MEMBER MURPHY: Yes. CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia. MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes. CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And $I$ am a yes. Motion carries. MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Item B, Minimum Formula Annuities. Mr. President, I'd like to approve the Minimum Formula Annuities beginning with Member 14921 and ending with Member 12251. MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Second.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: There's a motion by
Trustee McPhillips. Seconded by Trustee Holt.
Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee
Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia. MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And I am a yes.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Moving on to Item C,

Survivor's Annuities/Widow's and Children's

Annuities. I make a motion to approve the Widow

Annuities starting with Member 06749 through Member 10131. Is there a second?

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Motion by Trustee

McPhillips. Seconded by Trustee Conyears Ervin.

Trustee Soni.

MEMBER SONI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee

Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.

MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia.
MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And $I$ am a yes.

Motion carries.

MEMBER MCPHILIIPS: Moving to Item D,
Refunds. I make a motion to approve the Refunds starting with Member 18959 and continuing through to Member 16365.

On the question, I note one of the
refunds is for Firefighter Araujo who died as a result of COVID-19.

Staff has worked with Mario's mother to accomplish this refund and we will continue to assist the family any way that we can.

MEMBER SONI: Second.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: There is a motion by Trustee McPhillips. Seconded by Trustee Soni.

Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee

Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER McPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy. MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia.

MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And $I$ am a yes.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Moving on to Item E,
Death Benefits. I move to approve the Death Benefits for Members 06749 through Member 10131 .

MEMBER MURPHY: Second.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: A motion by Trustee McPhillips. Seconded by Trustee Murphy.

Trustee Soni.

MEMBER SONI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee

Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee MCPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.

MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia.
MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And I am a yes. Motion carries.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Mr. President, moving
on to Item $F$, Partial Payments. I make a motion to
approve the Partial Payments beginning with Member 06749 and continuing on through Member 10131.

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Second.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Motion by Trustee McPhillips. Second by Conyears-Ervin.

Trustee Martin.
MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee
Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia.
MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And $I$ am a yes.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Mr. President, now that Secretary Martin is back on the call, $I$ will transfer the meeting over to him.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Thank you, very much, Trustee McPhillips.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: You're welcome.
MEMBER MARTIN: Thanks, Tim.
Benefit Recalculations. Mr. President, under Benefit Recalculations, there are none.

Moving on to Item H, Requests for
Permission. There is one guardianship matter for Member 09848 John Stender by his daughter. Staff confirms that the doctor's letter and Power of Attorney are on file. I make a motion to approve Guardianship.

MEMBER McPHILLIPS: Second.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: There's a motion by
Trustee Martin. Seconded by Trustee McPhillips. Trustee Martin. MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni. MEMBER SONI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee

Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER McPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia.
MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And I am a yes.
Motion carries.
MEMBER MARTIN: Moving to Item I, I make
a motion to approve the Removals starting with
David Bassett and ending with Summer Clark.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Second.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: There is a motion by
Trustee Martin. Seconded by Trustee Holt.
Trustee Martin.
MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee
Conyears-Ervin.

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.

MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia.

MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And $I$ am a yes.
Motion carries.

MEMBER MARTIN: Mr. President, Item 3,
Request for Approval for Payment Pursuant to Administrative and Court Order pertaining to Members 010979 , 013734 and 016745 . I make a motion to approve.

MEMBER VALENCIA: Second.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: There's a motion to approve by Trustee Martin. Seconded by Trustee Valencia.

Trustee Martin.

MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.

MEMBER SONI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee
Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia.
MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And I am a yes.
Motion carries.
MEMBER MARTIN: Mr. President, under Item
4, Consideration for Approval of the Following Matters. We are moving to Hearings.

MEMBER MARTIN: Let the record reflect that this is the Duty Disability application for Robert Olmstead, Paramedic in Charge, Ambulance 39.

As you know, our attorney Vince Pinelli is going to be conducting this hearing. Without anything further, take it away, Vince.

MR. PINELLI: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Good morning, Mr. Olmstead.

As you have been told, $I$ am one of the attorneys for the Pension Fund that will be conducting this hearing for the record. I'd like to advise you of some preliminary matters before we begin. Can you hear me, sir?

MR. OLMSTEAD: Yes, sir.
MR. PINELLI: First of all, there are eight trustees present at this time to hear the evidence on your application, if $I$ heard the roll call correctly. If you don't know you should know that you need the yes vote of at least five of the eight trustees in order to receive this benefit per the Pension Code. Do you understand that?

MR. OLMSTEAD: Yes, sir.
BY MR. PINELLI:
Q In addition, you, like any member who comes before the Board, have a right to have an attorney represent you, if you think that is appropriate. I don't believe that any attorney filed an appearance on your behalf. Is it your intention to proceed without an attorney?

MR. OLMSTEAD: That is correct.
MR. PINELLI: Lastly, it is the
applicant's burden of proof to present sufficient
evidence to the Board in for the Board to grant a benefit. Do you understand it is your burden of proof?

MR. OLMSTEAD: Yes.
MR. PINELLI: By way of procedures, I am going to start by asking you some questions. The board members may or may not have questions of you. Then $I$ will call Doctor Samo, the Fund's Physician/Consultant to testify. If there is anything $I$ don't ask him that you think is important for the Board to know before they vote, please let me know and you will be given that opportunity.

MR. OLMSTEAD: Yes, sir.
MR. PINELLI: Mr. Olmstead and Doctor Samo, could you please your raise hands?
(Witnesses sworn.)
ROBERT J. OLMSTEAD
a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION
BY MR. PINELLI:
Q Mr. Olmstead, please state your name for the record and spell your last name.

A My name is Robert J. Olmstead, o-l-m-s-t-e-a-d.

Q Mr. Olmstead, what is your rank with the Fire Department?

A I am a Paramedic in Charge.
Q What was your last assignment before you went on layup most recently?

A Ambulance 39.
Q You should have been provided a copy of the Board Exhibits previously marked Board Exhibits 1 through 14. Did you receive those exhibits?

A Yes.
Q Did you have a chance to review them?
A Yes.
Q Do you have any objection to their introduction into the record for the Board to review in support of your application?

A No.

MR. PINELLI: Thank you, sir.
Mr. Chairman, I move for introduction of Board's Exhibits 1 through 14, without objection from the applicant.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Admitted without objection.
(Board Exhibits 1 through 14 were admitted into evidence.)

MR. PINELLI: Thank you.
BY MR. PINELLI:
Q Mr. Olmstead, recognizing the Board has Group Board Exhibit 1, which is your sworn statement in support of your application for this disability benefit, $I$ would just ask you to tell us what is the specific injury or injuries upon which you are seeking this benefit?

A On July of 2011, I sustained an injury trying to subdue an intoxicated patient that resulted in me having a cervical fusion of c-5/C-6.

Q Very well. We will get through to the medical treatment in a moment. Knowing that is the case, and again understanding the Board has had the opportunity to review your statement, could you please just summarize for us where you were and what happened to you on July 11 th of 2011 , that caused you any injury that is the basis of your application?

A We were dispatched to a call for person down unknown cause on Irving Park Road east of Lake Shore Drive.

We arrived on the scene. We did not find anything. We had civilians pointing the direction. When we arrived, we found a car facing eastbound on Irving Park parked with the back rear door opened and legs hanging out.

My partner, my partner Michael Allen, and I approached the vehicle and noticed there was a person laying in the back seat. We could smell alcohol in the car itself.

When we had tried to arise the patient, he was very discombobulated. He was very uncoordinated. He wouldn't speak. He kept reaching for his pockets. We tried to ask him regular questions. Who he was, did he know where he was, stuff like that, to attain his coherency. He would not respond.

As we tried to get him to the ambulance, he started to resist us. We tried to talk him to be nice to him to try to get him to cooperate with everything. Once he gave us the sign of putting his hands up like he was cooperating, I had turned away from the patient. The patient then grabbed me by my right arm and pushed me into the -- we were outside of the ambulance. Pushed me into the side
wall of the ambulance.
I had fallen to the ground and my partner grabbed onto the patient to try to subdue him because at that time the patient was trying to strike both of us.

And then $I$ was finally able to call a 10-1 to get assistance there with the police and that was basically the incident.

Q Now did you experience pain or discomfort in your cervical spine area?

A At that time $I$ had experienced numbness into my arm, my dominant arm, right arm and shoulder. I had difficulty grabbing onto the radio because it was on my right side so $I$ was trying to get it with my left arm and in an attempt while the patient was down on the ground kicking at me while my partner was holding onto him.

Q Had you ever injured that part of your body or upper neck, back and shoulder area prior to this incident?

A To the best of my knowledge, I have never physically injured myself to my head, neck. I had split my head open multiple times as a kid but nothing as significant adult-wise until that
incident. I know $I$ was being treated for something prior to that but there was no physical injury that resulted in it at that time.

Q Okay. Now the records indicate that ultimately you ended up having a fusion surgery on your cervical area in 2012; is that correct?

A It was October of 2011.

Q I'm sorry. October of 2011. And as a result of the surgery, it looks like you did return to work after that; is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q In June of 2012, after you rehabilitated from the surgery, correct?

A That is correct. I did my
rehabilitation. I passed the Functional Capacity exam and $I$ returned to duty.

Q By the way, with the fusion, did they put any metal or screws in?

A I have a plate that holds together c-5/6, with screws anchoring into the vertebrae column.

Q Then you were able to continue to work for it looks like several years and then you had a series of other duty related injuries; is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q I will go through those in a second. Let's just stay with your neck and upper back and shoulder area. During the time you returned to work up until you laid up most recently, did you experience any pain or discomfort or limitations in that area after the surgery?

A For the first couple years, no, I did not. I started noticing after probably around four to five years postsurgery -- I started noticing I was getting weakness in my right arm and my right shoulder, my hand. Once in a blue moon, $I$ would get pain that would go from my neck all the way down into my index finger. $I$ always would get neck spasms on the right side of my neck as well as severe cramping and headaches and that continued and gradually got worse as time went on. The more I lifted the more it caused me those symptoms.

Q Can you tell the Board today, as you sit here or as you are on the phone with us $I$ should say, can you describe for us what type of symptoms, if any, are you having with respect to that area?

A I have -- it's difficult for me to sleep on my right side due to the cramping in my neck. I
will get severe muscle cramps in my neck that go into my head that cause me to have headaches. When I have been lifting too much, like when $I$ be on shift and as the day progressed, my hand would feel -- I would get a radiating pain that would go down into my hands and $I$ would literally keep shaking my hand and try to do something to get rid of the pain and my arm would always start -- like as $I$ was lifting things, my arm would sometimes shake because $I$ was trying to force myself to lift.

Q Okay. Let's just talk briefly about the other injuries you have had. It looks to me, just if you could verify for me, that in March of 2016 while you were on duty you injured your right knee lifting a patient from a basement; is that correct?

A Yes. We were on a cardiac arrest.
Q As a result of that left knee or right knee injury, you had a knee replacement in May of 2016, correct?

A That is correct.
Q And then you were able to rehabilitate and return to work in August of 116 ; is that correct?

A That is correct. I passed another


#### Abstract

Functional Capacity test and $I$ was able to return to work with no restrictions or problems.


Q Okay. And then it looks like in December of '16, you had an injury to your left shoulder while you were assisting to move a patient; is that correct?

A Yes. I was moving a patient from a stretcher to a hospital bed and as $I$ was pulling -lifting up to push the patient over, I partially dislocated my left shoulder.

Q As a result of that duty injury, did you have a surgery in June of '17?

A Yes.

Q And were you able to rehabilitate and return to work after that?

A I was able to rehabilitate. The doctor was very hesitant on releasing me back to duty because he was afraid that, depending on how $I$ lifted things, my shoulder would dislocate again. I convinced him that $I$ wouldn't have any problems the way $I$ lift, the way we are taught to lift things, and $I$ would get help if need be and he reluctantly released me. I passed another Functional Capacity and I came back to work.
$\square$
Q Okay. Lastly, the records indicate that you had an another surgery but this time on your lower back in January -- or, I'm sorry, February of this year?

A That is correct.
Q That was a fusion surgery; is that correct?

A Yes. It is a second fusion $I$ have now at L-5/S-1.

Q That is because obviously you had some issues with your lower back, correct?

A I had known throughout the years that $I$ had slight bulging discs in my lower back but they were non-operative as per all the neurosurgeons that I had seen. And at the time $I$ figured it was a bulging disc, $I$ would go get an injection, try to do some physical therapy to make the pain symptoms go away and that is when $I$ found out I needed to have surgery.

Q Then you had that surgery just several months ago so you are still -- are you doing any physical therapy or anything following the surgery?

A Yes, $I$ am in physical therapy three times and week and $I$ do therapy for my neck and my back.
$\square$
Q Okay. Now, finally, sir, just a couple of questions. Since you went on layup most recently, have you engaged in any activity by which you earn income?

A No.
Q Have you engaged in any sporting activities?

A Absolutely not.
Q Are you taking any medications prescribed by a doctor for any --

A Yes, I am.
Q -- symptoms? What are you taking?
A Let me grab my bottles. I don't have them in front of me. Nucynta, which is Tapentadol, that is my pain medication. I take six pills total a day. I take Hydrochlorothiazide for my blood pressure. I take a medication called Zonisamide. I take Methocarbamol, which is a muscle relaxer, two times a day. I take Memantine one time a day. I take Fluoxetine, which is a generic for Prozac, once a day for anger management and Mexiletine once a day.

MR. PINELLI: Thank you, sir. That is all the questions $I$ have at this time.

Are there any questions of the applicant from the Board?

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: No questions.
MR. PINELLI: Thank you.
At this time $I$ would call Doctor Samo to testify.
(Witness previously sworn.) DANIEL SAMO, M.D.
a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION
BY MR. PINELLI:
Q Sir, please state you name.
A Daniel Samo.
Q You are a physician; is that correct?
A Yes.
Q And is a copy of your qualifications as a physician attached to the Board Exhibits?

A Yes.
Q Do you perform a function as a consultant to this fund?

A I'm sorry.
Q Do you perform a function as a consultant to this fund?

A Yes, I do.
Q In that capacity do you review medical records, either examine or interview applicants and report to the Board?

A Yes, I do.
Q Did you file a written report marked as Board Exhibit Number 2?

A Yes.
Q Doctor, with respect to Mr. Olmstead, because of the current conditions, did you conduct a telephone interview with him as opposed to an in-person examination?

A I did.

Q And during that interview did he describe for you his medical history, background and so forth?

A Yes, he did.
Q Was what he told you consistent with the medical records that you had the occasion to review before you interviewed him?

A Yes.
Q Doctor, $I$ know he has had a number of different injuries. Let's start with the cervical spine and that initial injury in 2011. Can you
describe for us the course of treatment and where he's at right now?

A So he had had a problem with his neck several years before that and he had an annular tear at $C-5 / 6$ the place where he eventually had the herniation. First you tear the annulus and then the disc will herniate through that tear. And he was treated for that with injection therapy and eventually was able to improve and return to work. He said that he was laid up for about a year at that time in 2009 .

And then in 2011 he had a recurrence, which eventually lead to surgery. And after the surgery he had a total resolution of his symptoms and was able to return to work about six months after his surgery. He was fine.

He told me that after surgery he still had right arm weakness but today he said that only started four or five years after the surgery. So apparently right after the surgery he was really fine.

And then he continued to have some neck symptoms beginning again in 2019 and he began seeing a pain specialist and getting injections and
also taking the medication, all the medications, that he mentioned.

Q Doctor, you reviewed the records with respect to these other duty injuries that he had?

A Yes.
Q And he was able to return to work after rehabilitating from surgery for both a knee replacement and shoulder; is that correct?

A Yes, he said that the knee was great. He was very happy and felt perfect. He did not feel that this would interfere. The shoulder he said he was able to perform all his duties. He said his doctor was reluctant to send him back for fear that he might dislocate again but he has not had any symptoms of instability since the surgery and has been at work without any problems regarding the shoulder.

So the shoulder, the knee. There was a problem with the hip which he has been told was not surgical and he said he felt this was not a major issue and would not interfere with him performing his full duties.

And a history of also Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, depression, anxiety and anger
problems and he did not feel that this would interfere with his ability to perform his duties either.

Lastly, his substance abuse disorder, which I believe was while he was laid up because of all the multitude of medications that he's taking.

Q Those are pain medications obviously following all these different injuries?

A So he is on opioids. Nucynta,
Methocarbamol a muscle relaxant and the other medications all of which are sedating and he cannot function with those medications on board.

Q Lastly, he's currently post the fusion surgery at $\mathrm{L}-5 / \mathrm{S}-1$; is that correct?

A Right. The back -- I didn't get a history of any specific injuries. He was having problems he told me for five to seven years. And following his knee surgery, when he was laid up, he had a MRI and saw Doctor Nolden who told him he needed a fusion surgery.

He said the surgery helped. He had some radiation to his thigh and that seems to be better since the surgery but the rest of the back pain really seems to be unchanged.
$Q \quad I$ would take it, he's not at MMI from that surgery yet?

A Correct.
Q Doctor, given that fact and the condition he is in currently, do you believe he would be able to perform his assigned duties with the Fire Department as a Paramedic?

A No.
MR. PINELLI: Thank you, that is all the questions $I$ have of this witness.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustees, any
questions for the doctor?
Hearing none, Tony.
MR. OLMSTEAD: Mr. President, having had the opportunity to read this file and listen to all of his testimony, $I$ would like to make a motion to grant.

MEMBER McPHILLIPS: Second.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Motion to grant by
Trustee Martin. Seconded by Trustee McPhillips.
Trustee Martin.
MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee
Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia.
MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And I am a yes.
Motion carries.
MEMBER MARTIN: Mr. President, I'd like
to make a motion to adopt the Findings of Fact as presented by Fund counsel to the staff.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Second.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Motion by Trustee
Martin. Seconded by Trustee McPhillips.
Trustee Martin.

MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee

Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia.
MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And $I$ am a yes.
The motion carries.
I need a motion for reexam.
MEMBER MARTIN: Mr. President, I make a
motion for reexam consistent with the Fund's policy.

MEMBER McPHILLIPS: Second.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Motion for reexam by
Trustee Martin. Seconded by Trustee McPhillips. Trustee Martin.

MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee

Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia.
MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And I am a yes.
Motion carries.
Mr. Olmstead, based on the Findings of Fact made by the Trustees, the Trustees have voted to grant you the benefit that you have requested.

You will notified by mail of the Findings of Fact and the Board's decision.

Good luck to you.
MR. OLMSTEAD: Thank you, very much all. I appreciate it and $I$ wish you guys well and thank you, very much.

MEMBER MARTIN: Mr. President, I'd like to move on to Item 4B, Handicapped Child's Annuity. It is Eliza Kowalczyk by Halina Krupa, Trustee for
the Benefit of the child of John Henry Kowalczyk. Counsel, do you want to speak to this?

MR. PINELLI: We have documentation to present to the Board. There is a packet, including Board Exhibits 1 through 10, that have been provided in support of this application by Ms. Krupa, who is the legally appointed guardian for Ms. Kowalczyk.

The documents are supportive of this application and includes an order from the Kane County Circuit Court, which created a Special Needs trust and appointed Ms. Krupa as a guardian for that trust.

There is also an affidavit from the doctor indicating that Ms. Kowalczyk is indeed handicapped and is limited in her abilities and life skills.

With respect to the income that she derives, it is essentially Social Security Disability benefits.

So that with respect to the documents presented I believe that under the Pension Code they would be sufficient to support the award of a Handicapped Child's Annuity Benefit to her, to Ms.

Krupa as the guardian for her, under Section 6-148 from my review of the documents.

MS. BURNS: The only thing might be a
motion to accept the exhibits into the record.
MR. PINELLI: Thank you. Yes, I would
ask that the Board make a motion to accept these documents. They are certified records. We have reviewed them and I think they are appropriate for admission into the record.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Is there a motion? MEMBER MARTIN: Mr. President, I'd like to make a motion to approve the Handicapped Child's Annuity and a motion to accept the exhibits presented to the Board. MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Second. CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: There is a motion by Trustee Martin seconded by Trustee McPhillips. Trustee Martin. MEMBER MARTIN: Yes. CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni. MEMBER SONI: Yes. CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Conyears-Ervin.

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips. MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes. CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt. MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes. CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy. MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia.

MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And $I$ am a yes.

Motion carries.

I would like to move on to Item 9, the legal update, please.

TRUSTEE MARTIN: Mr. President, moving on to Item 9. Mary Pat, any updates?

MS. BURNS: We were going to out of the regular order of business to allow Vince to address the Siwinski matter and then Vince can leave the call.

Vince, do you want to walk the board through what the court did and your recommendation with respect to the order entered?

MR. PINELLI: Yes, thank you. Thank you for taking this out of the order.

As you have before you, the remaining
issue on the Siwinski matter was the Petition for Attorney's Fees and Costs.

For the benefit of those trustees who were not on the Board, this was a matter that began in 2015 when Ms. Siwinski applied for Duty Disability benefits based upon Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

This was an extensive litigation. The Board denied her the benefit. It went to the Circuit Court. The Circuit Court remanded it for more proceedings to the Board. It then went back to the Circuit Court where the Board was affirmed by the Circuit Court. Ms. Siwinski appealed it. It went to the Appellate Court. The Appellate Court reversed the Board and granted her the benefit and then we pursued a Petition for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court, which was not taken. The Supreme Court did not take the case so that ended the litigation, with respect to the underlying issue of whether she was entitled to these benefits.

As a result of that, the Board then approved and paid her the past benefits that she was owed and she is, of course, receiving Duty

Disability Benefits since that time.
The remaining issue was her petition for attorney's fees, which under Section 6-222, any applicant who prevails in the Circuit Court in reversing the Board on either a Duty or an Occupational Disease Disability benefit can petition for attorney's fees.

That is a provision that didn't formally exit in the Pension Code. It was added a number of years ago to Article 6.

I think, and Mary Pat can certainly correct me if $I$ am wrong, that it is the only provision in the Pension Code that $I$ am aware of that does allow for a fee shifting provision for a prevailing applicant to receive attorney's fees in the event they prevail. Is that right, Mary Pat?

MS. BURNS: Yes, you are correct. It is a Local 2 gift.

MR. PINELLI: I raise that only because it effects what happened here. What happened was that Mr. Marconi, who is a very experienced practitioner as you know, he has been before this Board many times, and obviously was the attorney for Ms. Siwinski.

His Petition for Attorney's Fees was very detailed. He was able to secure the affidavits of three other practitioners to support an award of attorney fees that he sought of approximately $\$ 105,000$ over the course of this litigation.

The substantial issue for the court was not really the amount of time he put in, there were some minor issues we challenged and the court did ultimately grant us a reduction of about 10 hours that he spent on his attorney's fee petition but that was it. The rest of his time the court approved as reasonable.

The issue was that Ms. Siwinski had retained him at the beginning of the case under terms of $\$ 300$ a hour rate, that was the rate he was going to charge her.

The way the statute is written, which again was done without, if $I$ remember correctly and again Mary Pat can remind me, any input from us as to how these fee shifting statutes work and how it's important; the language of it.

Certainly, the intent that a Member not lose, or as a result of having to go to court, they would be reimbursed for whatever reasonable
expenses they got, that's fine.
The problem is they didn't insert any language that would have specifically said "fees incurred", the word "incurred", by the applicant.

What happened here is even though we argued that the fees incurred by her was a $\$ 300$ a hour rate, which is pretty consistent with the rates that we charge the Fund and that in fact we gave the court as evidence of market value for this type of work. The court in its discretion, which it has, rejected that and accepted Mr. Marconi's fee petition at $\$ 470$ a hour. So as a result that is why the amount ended up at the level that it did because of the higher hourly rate.

Now judges have a lot of discretion and it is our opinion that it would be very difficult to reverse this because you have to show an abuse of that discretion by the court and Mr. Marconi's fee petition was very detailed. It was very thorough, as the court even commented, and I don't think you would prevail on the rate issue. Especially because, as the court pointed out, our statute does not include the word "incurred". It just says "reasonable attorney's fees". That gives
the court the discretion for any attorney to come in.

You could have a Clint Krislov come in and ask for, as we have seen with other funds and other cases, $\$ 900$ a hour for litigation. He says he's been approved at that rate. I am not saying a court would grant that. I am just saying that is what we are exposed to because of the way this provision is written it is kind of open-ended.

So the takeaway I think $I$ am suggesting is that if there were an opportunity to tweak that statute and make it a little less open-ended, you could still achieve the goal that Local 2 was perhaps seeking, which was not penalizing the Member for having to go to court and let them be made whole for that, but yet not open the door to ridiculous highly fee awards, that we would be opposed to.

Having said all that, again in summary, our recommendation would be it is not worth your efforts to continue to litigate this case on this sole issue. We believe the court would likely be affirmed and it is kind of bite the bullet and finish this case and conclude it.
I recommend that a motion be made to
approve the payment pursuant to court order.
If there's any questions on that, I am
happy to entertain them.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Vince, I do have a
question. The judge that made this ruling do you
have his name?

MR. PINELLI: Yes. It is actually Judge Allison Conlon.

I would only point out that Judge Conlon didn't even hear the underlying case. It was a different judge who retired in the interim while the case was up on appeal.

So this judge, which $I$ think is a bit of a detriment for us, didn't have the benefit of the underlying litigation, which again that judge affirmed us at one time; the underlying court.

So that is what it is. A new judge came in and basically just had the fee petition and the decision, of course, of the court to review.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Thank you.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Vince, I'm sorry if I
am asking you to repeat yourself. I did hear you say that the attorney's fees are 470 a hour and we
proposed I think 300 to 350 as reasonable. What was the overall fee? Not the rate, but the fee. MR. PINELLI: That he was awarded or that he sought?

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
MR. PINELLI: He was awarded $\$ 98,467.50$ in attorney fees and then $\$ 635.30$ in costs. Those are hard charges for pursuing the case.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Wasn't the award in the amount he sought one in the same?

MR. PINELLI: No. Originally his total award sought was $\$ 104,547.50$.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Thank you. I appreciate that.

MR. PINELLI: We objected to a number of entries for different reasons, $I$ don't need to take up your time with, but at the end of the day she basically agreed that he shouldn't have recovered -- I think he asked for like 25 hours for the fee petition and we said, no, that is ridiculous and the court kind of agreed with us and shaved it down to 10 hours or so.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Thank you, very much, Vince.
$\square$
TRUSTEE MARTIN: I'd like to approve the fee petition.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: I will second it.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: There is a motion by Trustee Martin and seconded by Trustee McPhillips.

MR. PINELLI: Just so the record is clear, you would be approving the court's order granting the fee petition in the amount as contained in the court's order. You are not approving the fee petition itself. I just want to be clear on that.

TRUSTEE MARTIN: Correct. So let the record reflect that this a fee petition based on a court order. We are approving the court order for the fee petition.

MR. PINELLI: Correct.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Motion by Trustee Martin seconded by Trustee McPhillips.

Trustee Martin.
MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
Trustee Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: I don't see much of a choice here so $I$ guess yes. Yes. We don't
have a chance.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: No, we don't.

Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER McPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Unfortunately, yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia.
MEMBER VALENCIA: Same as Treasurer
Conyears-Ervin, yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And I am,
unfortunately, a yes.
Motion carries.
TRUSTEE MARTIN: Can we put that on the Legislative agenda?

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Indeed we shall.
MEMBER MARTIN: Do we move back to the regular order of business?

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Yes, that would be great. Thank you.

MEMBER MARTIN: Item 5, Approval of Board
Physician Reviews and Disability Recipients. I
move to approve the Board Physician's
recommendations for these disability reviews.
MEMBER SONI: Second.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Motion by Trustee
Martin. Seconded by Trustee Soni.
Trustee Martin.
MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee

Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia.
MEMBER VALENCIA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And $I$ am a yes.
Motion carries.
MEMBER MARTIN: Item 6, we have
Investments. We can turn it over to Lorna to walk us through the Investment Agenda.

MS. SCOTT: Item 1 is the Investment Report.

Just a quick update on where we stand with our new investments. We completed legal contracting with Brown Capital and actually funded the account the end of July as well so that account is up and running.

Highclere contracts are still pending on that one and we are shooting for the end of September.

Moving onto the next slide, this first slide shows the one month performance for July for various asset classes. Another very strong month for investors despite the increase in coronavirus cases drastically.

There are some themes we are seeing on this chart. Emerging market equities were the top performer. They were up 8.9 for the month. U.S. growth stocks had another strong month up 7.4 percent outperforming value stocks at 3.8 and large cap up 5.9 outperformed small cap at 2.8 .

The next slide looks at the year-to-date performance period. Year-to-date most asset classes are still negative for the year. U.S.
growth stocks are up 17.1 percent which are clearly the winner. We do have investments in growth but we have more tilts, more investments, in value stocks, which are still down 3.5 percent for the month and small cap which is down 10.6 for the year-to-date.

So these tilts will hurt us when comparing against the policy benchmark, which is in that first column, where you can see the U.S. equity policy benchmark is up 2 percent year-to-date.

We are already starting off in a little bit of a hole and then our style tilts are underperforming year-to-date.

The next slide shows our Fund return versus the policy target for the month -- or for the time period. For the month the Fund is up 4.2 percent so it was a good month for us but year-to-date the Fund has still not recovered all the losses.

The Fund is down 2.5 percent behind the policy target which is down 0.3 percent. So we are underperforming by 2.2 percent year-to-date.

Let's look closer at that Fund
performance versus the policy target and that is on the next slide. This is where we try to explain how and why we are underperforming.

There are two ways that we will perform differently from the policy. One way is asset allocation having slightly different weights than the policy will cause different performance and then using active management. Even with an active management having style tilts, like we have the style tilts in value in small cap, that will cause different performance in the policy.

Looking at this chart, year-to-date for July, we are underperforming by 2.2 percent. Having different weights than the benchmark has passed 0.6 percent and that is primarily holding cash versus the policy target has been a detractor and active management style tilt the cost is 1.6 percent.

The next slide breaks down that underperformance further. Again, year-to-date the Fund is down 2.5 percent. You can see that in column three. Versus the policy target which is in column 4.

Comparing those columns across the asset
classes, we see underperformance in U.S. equities and international equities, fixed income, liquid diversified.

Specifically, within U.S. equities, the biggest detractor are the tilts to value. Actually positive active management; i.e., a manager outperforming that value target, like Neuberger Berman did, can actually offset some of that detraction.

Within international equities, also our value managers Brandes and LSV who underperformed and that caused that underperformance. And within fixed income, it is underperformance by Loomis and Western, whose investments in higher yielding but riskier segments of the market have caused underperformance. Both of those portfolios have rebounded sharply in the last couple of months.

Within liquid diversifying, it is Black Rock's stock portfolio that is causing the underperformance there.

The next couple of slides are additional data that $I$ will leave for your review. We will move on to the next report which is the MWDBE report.

This is a check-in on our MWDBE
utilization year-to-date through June 30th. This first page is our equity commission. We have a goal of 22 percent. Equity managers generated \$193,000 in commissions year-to-date. 28 percent of that, $\$ 55,000$, went to MWDBE brokers so in total we are meeting that goal of 22 percent.

Looking at this list, there are some laggers. I see Mellon and I see Wells Fargo. I reached out to both firms. Wells Fargo does expect to meet the target of 22 percent by year end but Mellon does not.

Mellon trades in large blocks across all of their clients. They won't take our account out of the block to trade with a MWDBE firm.

There are other firms who will take all of the MWDBE mandates and trade with a minority broker but Mellon doesn't have that many other MWDBE mandates.

So I asked them if they can't take our account out and trade it then why not trade the whole block with a MWDBE firm. They actually are making efforts to do that. I actually see purchases in our account going to MWDBE firms and
that tells me that they are doing the purchase of the entire block with a MWDBE firm, which is a sizable win. At this point in time I don't have any way to measure that. I am not very clear on how much commission these minority brokers are making.

So I believe there is progress. I need to figure out a better way to better measure that and that is something else $I$ continue to monitor.

The next page is fixed income. So we have our goal of 12 percent of par traded. Year-to-date through June 30 th 14.6 percent has been traded with MWDBE firms so we are meeting this goal.

Onto the next item, which is the procurement policy. This is primarily a housekeeping item. This document was adopted in 2009 and actually having now completed several RFP's following this policy $I$ thought it was time for a little bit of an update.

Let's take a few minutes to scroll
through the document and $I$ will highlight some of the changes.

On Page 1, $I$ added in language that
permits follow-on funds, which allows follow-on funds without the issuance of a RFP that is consistent with the Code.

Scrolling on down to Page 2, we can see that $I$ removed the advertising requirement in a state newspaper but $I$ added in advertising in a nationally circulated investment publication like $P \& I$ and we did put our advertisement in $P \& I$.

Scrolling on down, you will see that $I$ consistently removed the SIA, that is Search for Investment Advisor, and replaced it with RFP which is more standard.

Scrolling on down, again a lot of cosmetic, SIA to RFP.

Scrolling on down, quiet period. On the advice of counsel, we updated the definition of the quiet period to define the quiet period from the issuance through successful contracting.

And scrolling on down, SIA to RFP
Scrolling on down one more page, this last page, the policy requires disclosure on the website of successfully completed RFPs and contracts so this is the form of that disclosure that $I$ just wanted the Board to see.

```
I am looking for a motion to approve the
revised Procurement Policy for selection and
appointment of consultant investment advisors.
    MEMBER MARTIN: I'd like to make a motion
to approve the changes to the Procurement Policy.
    MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Second.
    CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Motion by Trustee
Martin. Seconded by Trustee McPhillips.
    Trustee Martin.
    MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
    CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
    MEMBER SONI: Yes.
    CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee
Conyears-Ervin.
    Trustee McPhillips.
    MEMBER McPHILLIPS: Yes.
    CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
    MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
    CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
    MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
    CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And I am a yes.
    Motion carries.
    MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: I am yes.
    I did have two questions. Sorry, there
```

is so much going on. So, yes, on the previous motion.

Lorna, on the MWDBE goals, I had a question. I noticed that from 2019 to today we're at about half for both of those percentages. I think like the 22 percent goal and 12 percent goal. I think for the 22 percent we were at in 201936 -over 36 percent. At 2020 up to June 20 th, which is half the year, we were at a little over 28.

So what is the reason, and you may have explained it and I apologize, but what is the reason that we are seeing for that? Do we think we will be able to get to the 2019 levels? That is for both the 22 percent as well as the 12 percent. I don't really know what is the difference. One is 22 and one is 12 and both says asset managers. I think this is equity and the other is fixed income.

MS. SCOTT: Correct. Our goal is 22 so we are on track to easily meet the 22. As of June, we accomplished 28.3 percent. I don't know if we are going to get up to the 36.3 percent that we achieved in 2019, that really depends upon the trading environments.

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Is that a Callan
question?
MS. SCOTT: Brady is on, too. Maybe, Brady, if you have any comments on the level of trading.

But we have it at 22 percent, by checking it at year-to-date, we are at 28. We are on target to meet 22. I can't say we're going all the way to 36, though.

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Certainly, I appreciate that we are well over target. What I am concerned about is decreasing from previous years, that is why $I$ am asking, and what we are seeing for the reason for that. I don't want to just look at a goal and say that is all we want. I mean, if we can surpass the goal, I mean, obviously, we would want to do that. Even at 28 we do. I am wondering what is the difference?

MS. SCOTT: The other thing that happened in 2018 we eliminated step-outs. That is a little bit of a problem $I$ am having with Mellon. Stepouts were that concept of Mellon could trade with JP Morgan and then JP Morgan will give the commissions to a minority broker. We eliminated their ability to do that, that impacted a couple of
the managers in their ability to get commissions to minority brokers. We are probably going to see a little bit of a decrease as managers try to work through that.

As $I$ was saying with Mellon, they are trying to get more business to the minority brokers direct as opposed to just using step-outs is what they have done in the past.

We are going to see a little bit of transition there. We will probably see a little bit of decrease in commissions there until they can work that up.

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Going on to fixed income -- that is fixed income. That is certainly an area where we should have a great opportunity at being able to diversify, if we can go down to the next screen.

So which the goal is 12 percent and I don't know why the goal is 12 percent for fixed income, that certainly is a great opportunity area. But in 2019, 34 percent, 201828 percent and now in 2020 we're not even at 15 percent.

MS. SCOTT: We're still at June 30 th.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Certainly
correct. I am just doing the check, a temperature check, right.

MS. SCOTT: Western, you can see their numbers have come way down from year to year. My belief is Western will definitely pick it up. Garcia Hamilton, Ernest, those types of portfolios trade in very liquid treasury markets where it is easy -- not easy but the minority brokerage support in those areas is very strong.

Western and Loomis trade in other areas of that fixed income market where minority brokers aren't as strong. I really have to push hard for them to work harder at working with minority brokers in those areas.

I expect Western, just based on their history, will actually get higher numbers towards the end of year. They haven't given me any indication that they won't.

It is definitely something to monitor but those are the two $I$ continue to work with to try to get their numbers up.

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Okay. Thank you.
MS. SCOTT: We are on $C$, the Security

Lending Guidelines.

This one $I$ want to show you where this is coming from because this first page you're looking at is the quarterly review of the security lending that we do.

On June 30 th, we had 105 million dollars out on loan. Northern chooses the borrowers and chooses how much to lend each borrower.

This report shows they had 30 million going to Bank of America, about 28.5 percent of the amount on loan, and they had 34 million going to JP Morgan.

Right now there is no limit on how much Northern can put with any one borrower. I have actually watched this number grow over time. I watched it be 20 percent to 25 percent to 28 percent and now the 34 percent.

Again, Northern does not have any kind of cap on how much they can put with any one borrower. In order to manage that risk of that concentration with any one borrower, $I$ am proposing adding a guideline that would limit that borrower concentration to 25 percent.

This is something that $I$ have discussed with Brady. And I don't know, Brady, if you want
to comment on this as well.
MR. O'CONNELL: Just quickly, this is a very straightforward risk control mechanism. And I think the economic impact of the Covid crisis, there are a lot of reminders of the global financial crisis. And $I$ think the global financial crisis was a lot worse for banks and financial institutions and it was a period of time when it made sense to have tighter controls on who was holding onto your money.

And as Lorna pointed out, the amount that Northern has lent to some of these institutions has grown and it seems like a very prudent and reasonable step to put a cap on that so that our exposure is limited in those worse case scenarios.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Is this kind of a trend through this sector or are we kind of behind the curve on this?

MR. O'CONNELL: The question is is it a trend or are we behind the curve? I don't know that it is a trend because we haven't seen borrowers default. So it is not like we are doing this in reaction to losses either for the Fund or for the industry.
$\square$
I think it is really more of a housekeeping item and Lorna $I$ think has been monitoring this very closely and it was really her initiative to identify this as maybe an issue.

At 30,35 percent, it is not a huge
amount but at what level would each of these have 40 or 45 percent of the funds out on loan? At some point it would become a problem.

I support the recommendation to place a reasonable cap on this. Northern $I$ think is responsible for deciding if these borrowers are credit worthy and will repay, but it still makes sense for us as prudent fiduciaries to place a cap and 25 percent $I$ think seems reasonable.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: In your conversations with Northern Trust was there any pushback?

MS. SCOTT: No. They were very quick to say it is very common to put on a 25 percent cap and it is not going to bother us any, other clients do this. I just went with that flow.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Can you remind myself and maybe the other trustees how those fees are split between ourselves and Northern Trust?

MS. SCOTT: It is a 75/25 split from the
income.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Thank you, very much for keeping on top of this.

MS. SCOTT: I am looking, barring any other discussion, for a motion to approve the updated Security Lending Guidelines as recommended by the CIO and Callan.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Is there a motion?

MEMBER MARTIN: I'd like to make a motion is approve the security lending changes proposed by staff.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: I will second that motion.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: There is a motion by Trustee Martin seconded by Trustee McPhillips.

Trustee Martin.

MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.

MEMBER SONI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee

Conyears-Ervin.

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia had to drop off.

I am a yes.
Motion carries.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Can I ask a
question real quick? Is there anything else we need to vote on?

MEMBER MARTIN: The drawdown.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: I will try to hold on.

MS. SCOTT: We're not raising any cash.
MS. BURNS: The other issue for the Treasurer would be the fiduciary liability insurance.

I believe you have gotten comfort on that issue from your conversations with the Executive Director.

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Alright. Great.
MS. SCOTT: Let's turn to Item D, Cash
Needs. I will turn it over to Jackie

MS. VLAHOS: For the month of August a lot has changed since we last talked. I know in July when we had talked previously, we were proposing to collect I believe it was approximately 42 million. Before the Covid, we would collect approximately 42 million in July, based on past practices. However, from the Covid, when we had our July meeting, we had collected only 2.6 million. Obviously, since that meeting, things have kind of returned to normal business and we have collected approximately an additional 76 million dollars.

So if you go to the spreadsheet, you will see that as of August 17 th, after our salary contributions, you will see that we have approximately 76.7 million dollars.

We are going to have after our benefit payments as well as our Death Benefits, our refunds and our office payables -- coming up to an approximately 31.8 million dollars in bills, we are going to have a surplus at the end of August of 44.9 million dollars.

Next page, please. So since basically from the last time we talked, I had modified things
so I didn't know how things were going to work with the due date changed from the normal expected August lst until the due date or the extension $I$ should say of October 1st.

We had modified last month kind of making assumptions of when money would actually be coming in because at the time, like I said, if we had only 2.6 million dollars versus the originally proposed 46 million.

However, since we have collected a lot of additional monies of 76 million dollars and it has kind of returned to business as usual, I have updated the spreadsheet.

As you can see, for this month we won't need a drawdown and we are going to have the surplus of 44.8 million dollars as well as coming to the next month of September this extra money is going to carry us through November where we are going to need a drawdown of approximately 6.9 million dollars.

We have 13 percent of our tax levy that is still left to be collected at this time so we are in good shape.

MEMBER MARTIN: Very good.

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: I have a question for you and Lorna. I think I heard with the Police -- I have my meeting coming up soon with that. I think $I$ heard they are expecting this year retirement is to $I$ believe double or almost double. Obviously, Fire is different from Police but $I$ was wondering are we expecting any type of a surge and if that is the case how would that affect our numbers?

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: I can speak to that. We are normally always on about the same plateau as far as our retirements at the end in November is normally when they go. But we don't have a big influx right now of $I$ would say a candidate class that is now matured enough to retire so we are fine, that is the short answer. Everything will probably be just the same as last year.

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Okay. That is something $I$ was thinking about. Thanks.

MS. SCOTT: Marc, if you will pull up the rebalancing template. With the rebalancing template, we don't have to raise cash but I thought I would use this opportunity to check-in on the asset allocation.
$\square$
Looking at that last column, the variance, this column shows the difference between where we were actually versus our target. You can see we have too much U.S. equity which is shown in green, not enough private equity which is shown in res.

Other than that, we are pretty much on target. The idea will be we will be able to see some of that equity and fund the private equity as that is called. Again, the takeaway is we are pretty close to target on our asset allocation. With that, $I$ will turn this over to Brady to talk about the Watch List.

MR. O'CONNELL: There's a Watch List memo that is fairly brief and maybe $I$ will just summarize it and then ask the trustees if there are any questions. But Callan is recommending that that the Board consider adding three different managers to the Watch List. Keeley Teton Advisors, Globeflex Capital and Credit Suisse.

For all three of those firms, Callan is tracking personnel changes and/or performance struggles and that is detailed in the memo. We intend to closely monitor all three of those firms
and we will also reevaluate the strategy of the asset classes to reconsider the roles that all three firms play.

So Kelley Teton is a SMID cap value equity manager, Globeflex remains a U.S. mid-cap growth and then Credit Suisse is a commodity manager.

So for Keeley Teton and Credit Suisse, we have been notified of personnel changes. Globeflex it's more an issue of performance.

I will pause to see if there are any questions, but our recommendation is to add these three firms to the Fund's Watch List.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustees, any
questions? $I$ would need a motion on this.
MEMBER MARTIN: I make a motion to place Keeley Teton, Globeflex and Credit Suisse on watch.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: I will second that.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: There is a motion by Trustee Martin seconded by Trustee McPhillips.

Trustee Martin.
MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee
Conyears-Ervin.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Valencia is no longer on the call.

I am a yes.
Motion carries.
MR. O'CONNELL: I will put you on maybe a few high levels in the Callan Executive Summary.

Lorna did a very good job in providing an update in the good news that we have seen in the rebound subsequent to the end of the first quarter. She also talked about asset allocation.

So I think one of the big themes for the second quarter report, if we go to Page Number 5, the Fund has a lot in equities. So in the second quarter, we saw significant rebound as U.S. equities rebounded.

Unfortunately, what we have seen is value
continued to lag growth in U.S. equities so value is -- I wish $I$ chose better colors here -- the blue bar at 14.3 in the second quarter and growth was up 27.8 percent. And for that past year a difference of over 30 percentage points. Really an
unprecedented divergence between growth and value and we just don't think that that is sustainable. We're recommending our clients maintain exposure to both. Often times that requires rebalancing and selling out of the growth managers that have done well and buying into value managers.

If we turn to the next slide, slide

Number $6, ~ I$ just wanted to reiterate a point that Lorna made.

The pie charts here illustrate the actual allocation and the pie chart on the right is the policy targets.

So when we review the Investment Policy Statement, when we do an Asset Liability Study, you, the Board, accept these targets and tell Lorna and $I$ at Callan to implement the investment strategy with these targets in mind and these guidelines.

At the bottom of the page, you can see
that we're very close to these targets. The market moves on a daily basis so we will never be totally on top of target.

The one big difference Lorna spoke to already is private equity. So we did a search there not too long ago and our goal is to build exposure to private equity over the coming years to maintain vintage year diversification.

As we heard from your Chief Investment Officer, that will be funded from domestic equities. We are underweight in private equity but we are overweight in asset classes that are very similar to that.

Slide Number 7, this top exhibit shows the Fund return during the quarter and various longer periods of time and then the rank within a universe of similar public funds.

So the Fund earned 13.71 percent during the second quarter and that exceeded the policy target of 12.4. It also put us in the top quartile of peers. That blue dot in the quarterly column ranked in the 18 th percentile.

If you look at the last year column, one column to the right, we still have some ground to
makeup.
The first quarter is very difficult from an absolute relative return basis. We have recovered some of that but we have a ways to go.

Lorna touched on attribution at the bottom of this page. I think what $I$ will do is ask you to turn to Slide Number 8 because $I$ think this is an interesting illustration of the Fund's performance pattern.

So the middle of the page there, Callan versus the Public Fund Sponsor. We show the Fund's rank, the return and the benchmark rank during calendar periods and year-to-date.

If you look at the bar charts in the middle of the page, what you will see in 2019 there is a strong absolute return and a strong rank towards the top of peers. The same happened in 2017. The 8th percentile rank and an absolute return of 18.3.

In 2018, the overall return was negative and the Fund struggled in that environment.

The pattern is that when capital markets perform well the Fund tends to outperform. And in the first quarter of 2020 , we saw a pretty
significant drop. The Fund struggled from an absolute basis and on a relevant basis but in the second quarter we have seen a significant rebound both in absolute and relative terms.

So the $S \& P$ 500, a broad measure of the U.S. stockmarket, usually has a positive return seven out of ten years. So the vast majority of years, annual years, we would expect the Fund to achieve a positive return.

So what we have seen so far in the year-to-date period is consistent with the Fund's performance over the past several years and $I$ think we will look to see active managers continue to rebound so that is one of the things we are watching to see if we can further close the gap.

Then this issue of value managers. Lorna spoke to value being out of favor. We have value exposure within U.S. equities but we also have Brandes and LSV and international and emerging markets and those managers have struggled so we will be keeping an eye on that.

I think this chart illustrates how the
Fund has performed over time and depending on how the third and the fourth quarter of 2020 goes, it
will determine whether we see something like 2018 or more like 2019.

I think $I$ will pause and just ask if any of the Trustees have questions about that? I know that is more of a summary review but $I$ want to be respectful of your time and agenda.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Brady, I have one quick question. I imagine you do asset allocations for a variety of clients in your organization. When you do that, just like you presented to us, you have this correlation matrix.

Has that correlation matrix changed much since we did our asset allocation three plus years ago?

MR. O'CONNELL: The correlation matrix tends not to change. So for the Trustees there are three inputs into the asset liability process. The expected return from the asset class, the risk of the different asset classes and then the correlation among the various asset classes.

The correlation and the risk numbers tend to be a little more stable but because we use a ten-year projection so we're trying to model how asset classes interact over long periods of time.

It is almost impossible to model how they will react with one another over short periods of time and $I$ think we have seen that this year.

The return expectations tend to be more gradual and there's been $I$ think the change from three years ago has probably been a reduction in the expected return for both stocks and bonds, a modest reduction. And, interestingly, this year we introduced our capital market assumption at the beginning of each calendar year so in January. So we have decided so far not to make any changes to our capital market expectations based on the turbulence that we have seen so far during 2020.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Thank you, very much, Brady. I appreciate that.

MS. SCOTT: The next set of charts I am not going to go through. It shows the Fund by asset class. Just in summary the U.S. equity looks pretty good. Non-U.S. equity, like we have mentioned, the value managers are kind of at the bottom of their peer group. And fixed income actually the five year number looks good. We are allocating two top managers.

The other charts that I included are the
exposure charts from a bottom up prospective.
Again, just showing from a stock prospective, it shows the portfolio primarily that we are overweight in small and mid-cap in our equity position.

Barring no further discussion or questions, that concludes the Investment Report.

MEMBER MARTIN: Do you need a motion to spread it on the record?

MS. SCOTT: Sure.
MEMBER MARTIN: Motion to spread
Investment Report on the record.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Second.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: There is a motion by Trustee Martin seconded by Trustee McPhillips.

Trustee Martin.
MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.

MEMBER SONI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee

Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And $I$ am a yes.
Motion carries.
MEMBER MARTIN: Mr. President, moving on
to Item 7, Expenditures. Under Item A,
Administrative Expenses for Board Review and
Approval. I would like to make a motion to approve the Administrative Expenses as presented.

MEMBER McPHILLIPS: Second.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: There's a motion by Trustee Martin seconded by Trustee McPhillips.

Trustee Martin.
MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee
Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.

MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And I am a yes.
Motion carries.
MEMBER MARTIN: Mr. President, moving on to the Executive Director's Report, Item 8, Steve.

MR. SWANSON: Thank you, very much.
I just wanted to cover very quickly the first six items on the Executive Director's Report are the submission of the Funding Resolution to the City.

I just wanted to document that fully and all the attachments that were included with it and it went to the Budget Director, the City officials and City Council. Just so we have that, no action is needed.

Items 7 and 8 are Trustee education opportunities. One is the Callan College in October and another is the Principal Investment Conference in November. Both of those are virtual.

Just a reminder that the Trustees need to get education hours in. Within the year they need a total of eight.

And then $I$ believe the next item we have on the agenda would be an update of the Authorized Signature Resolution. This is something that Lorna worked on, added her comments, Fund counsel also reviewed it and signed off on the changes that were made. Largely, it was just to document how we currently operate. Some of the changes we have had recently. Now we use electronic approvals at Northern where you no longer need to send a letter. We make sure that the same people mentioned on this resolution have that electronic access and do those approvals.

It's also updating that the investment contracts are clarifying that the initial contracts will be signed by the Fund President and Fund Secretary and any addendums to the contract or additions the CIO can sign as well.

That is my summary of that, if anyone has any more questions or if Lorna wants to add anything or Fund counsel, that is it.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Any questions?
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Could you give me a quick review who you are going to send the funding letter to? I see the Chairman of the Finance

Committee.
MR. SWANSON: The Item Number 1 is the funding letter that is requested by the City. Where it goes to the Budget Director, Chief Financial Officer and the City Comptroller. I have sent that and then $I$ believe the last item is it also goes to the City Council as well under the Pension Code so I always send that to the Chairman on the Committee on Finance.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Has that been sent already?

MR. SWANSON: Yes, they have all been sent.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: I thought you would have included the date March 1st in the letter to the Finance Chairman because that is the day they have to make that deposit by, but I am sure he can read it. Thank you.

MR. SWANSON: We certainly can do that going forward.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Thank you for your efforts.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: I believe I am going to need two motions here. I am going to need a
motion to accept the Director's Report and then I am going to need another separate motion to approve the revised signature resolution.

MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Motion to accept the
Executive Director's Report.
MEMBER MARTIN: Second.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Motion to accept the Director's Report.

MEMBER MARTIN: Second.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt made the motion seconded by Trustee Martin.

Trustee Martin.
MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee
Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And $I$ am a yes. Motion carries.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: I would need a motion
on the revised signature resolution. Do I have a
motion?

MEMBER MARTIN: I will make that
motion.

MEMBER SONI: Second.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Motion by Trustee
Martin seconded by Trustee Soni.

Trustee Martin.

MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee

Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.

MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And I am a yes.

Motion carries.
MEMBER MARTIN: Moving to the next item, the fiduciary liability presentation. Mary Pat and Steve.

MR. SWANSON: I believe we have Craig on the phone, our broker. Or actually on zoom, he is there.

MR. GOESEL: Craig Goesel. Nice to see all of you, physically that is. I represent Alliant Insurance Services. We had spun off from Mesirow Financial about three years ago and joined this company.

If we could go to Slide 4 , we are talking about the Fiduciary Liability Insurance Renewal for the Board of Trustees and the Pension System.

I am joined by my colleague Bruno Amici, who recently joined me about a year ago from Brazil. He worked with public pension funds in Brazil as well so he's a very experienced individual working in this space.

On Slide 4, I show about ten items why we feel like we add value to the process. I don't want go through them ad nauseam. I do want to point out a couple.

We have a dedicated group to organized labor, including public pension systems. We are all former underwriters and/or brokers working in this space specifically and we do have a dedicated claims advocacy team that would advocate on your behalf should we have a claim, knock on wood that we do not.

Slide 5, the next slide, please. I show a quick snapshot of very large representatives of clients. Some in Illinois. Some in California. Some spread out throughout the nation. I will let you read at your leisure.

Let's talk about the general market conditions with regard to insurance. I am on Slide 6. So as we are closing out 2019, the insurance marketplace started to harden dramatically. That concept harden means it shifted from what was called the buyer's market, you are the buyer of insurance, to a seller's market, that was happening before Covid.

I show some industry examples or industry snapshots from periodicals in the industry. Whenever we are referring to directors and officers in insurance, it is a catch-all for directors, and
officers, fiduciary liability and other management liability lines.

Going into Slide 7, more updated. Once 2020 arrived and the pressing of COVID-19, obviously, the insurance marketplace changed dramatically.

There is a number of issues obviously associated with it. The financial markets in turmoil. Volatility in the financial market. But probably even more importantly, the insurance carrier's price for uncertainty and they underwrite to uncertainty and these are by definition very uncertain times.

The insurance carriers want to make sure or insure that throughout the policy term their clients aren't going to sustain major financial risk or try to hedge their underwriting exposure.

So they have started to abbreviate limit profiling available to any one single client, increasing deductibles and increasing pricing.

Again, $I$ show four or five bullets here, sort of headlines from industry periodicals going up until just this month, suggesting there is about an average of 59 percent year-over-year price
increases for all management liability purchasers in the industry. So, unfortunately, a rather bleak picture showing the insurance industry.

On Slide 8, I show our procurement request. Much like in your years past, we take some of the publicly available information for the Firemen's Annuity and Benefit Fund, including the caps in the actuarial report and some other updated information, including employee counts, et cetera, and send that information to all of the insurance carriers that do offer fiduciary liability insurance to public pension systems, that is already an abbreviated group.

The fact that we are a part of an Illinois pension system and a Chicago pension system and have significant underfunding issues, those numbers of carriers gets abbreviated even that much more.

Where there basically are four insurance carriers that are willing to offer this type of insurance to a Chicago public pension fund.

On Slide 9, I summarize all of those carriers that we have approached and their responses. I will let you review them.

It is healthy to note that as of last year ULLICO was the lead carrier and only carrier for the 10 million profile that we had.

ULLICO had sent around notice that they will be cutting limits. So, therefore, in order to build this 10 million dollar expiring program, we did need to use two insurance markets, which I will showcase in a minute.

Fortunately, we did get responses from at least two carriers that were interested in participating in the program.

Let's go to Slide 12, I am going to hit the highlights here and then talk about a possible change to coverage or a definite change to coverage.

On Slide 12, we show in that first column the coverage provisions. This includes fiduciary liability insurance, which protects all of the Trustees around the Board as well as the Executive Director and staff from claims alleging mismanagement of the pension system.

Obviously, the Illinois Pension Code does provide or establish the roles and responsibilities of the various Trustees. It also establishes what
their liabilities are and does state what their protections and/or limitations to those protections are.

The Illinois Pension Code does not guarantee protection for the Trustees. Whereby this insurance policy is intended to not only in-fill that guarantee of indemnity to the Trustees but also provide sort of a financial backstop if the pension system itself, the Fire Fund, is intended to indemnify the Trustees for a claim alleging breach of fiduciary duty.

Employment practices liability coverage is built into the program as well. We added that about five years ago. That is a million dollars of limit, that covers breach of Title VII type claims. That would be harassment, sexual harassment, discrimination, wrongful termination type claims.

And then cyber liability insurance as well, that is a product we added about four years ago. It is an off date. It is a November 30 th effective date. I did want to reference it here only to showcase that you do indeed have this insurance. I did not include the premium in the expiring nor in the forward going numbers but that
is a product that costs about $\$ 8700$ on an annualized basis. Again, that will be coming up at the end of November and we are not yet prepared to negotiate with the insurance carrier for that effective date.

The expiring 10 million dollar profile, with those coverages that $I$ had discussed, is costing about $\$ 115,000$ on an annualized basis.

Last year the Trustees had asked for a couple of different options. As you recall, we were coming down from the 15 million dollar limit going into last year's renewal, going into this time last year.

I also wanted to show what obviously your retiring program would look like but what lower limits and higher limits would be.

I do show my highlighted option, my recommended limit, which is to maintain the same limit profile.

The differences between Options 1, 2 and 3 are very clearly the limit profile, which is bolded up top. And, obviously, the pricing associated with it.

My recommendation is to move with Option
10. I do want to bring this or highlight this scenario and $I$ am looking at my notes.

When talking to ULLICO, and they were talking about their reduction limit profile, which again is not unique to Chicago Fire Fund, that is something ULLICO and all insurance carriers are looking to make it their limit profiling to any one customer.

But when looking at the Chicago Fire Fund's specifically, ULLICO stated that it is the lowest funded or has the poorest funding ratio of any of their pension systems in their entire portfolio.

Now this is an insurance carrier that does write not only Illinois risk, but also California risk. I am not suggesting they write all of them. I fully recognize there are more difficult or more challenged funds in the nation. ULLICO may not write those insurance program.

To that end, ULLICO is instituting or pushing a failure to pay benefits due, due to inadequate funding exclusions, on any of the policies that would be secured.

This is a change from years past. They
would be putting an inadequate funding exclusion on the policy, if we were to renew any one of these options.

MS. BURNS: Craig, can you provide us with a copy of that language?

MR. GOESEL: Absolutely. Again, for the record, failure to pay benefits due to inadequate funding.

MS. BURNS: What does that mean? So if somebody makes a claim and says that because Trustees made bad decisions in the past and therefore the Fund is inadequately funded, would that be covered or not?

Or, if somebody said that we didn't seek funding as Trustees, would that be covered or not?

MR. GOESEL: Counsel, those are very good questions and those are exactly what the insurance carriers are trying to drive home here.

Again, $I$ will state that it says failure to pay benefits due to inadequate funding. There is preamble to the funding issue. It is a failure to pay benefits due to the inadequate funding.

MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: If we fail to pay benefits, we would be covered. But if we failed to
pay benefits because we said we have inadequate funding, the insurance carrier would not cover us? MR. GOESEL: Allocations for failure to pay payments associated with a breech of fiduciary duty have indeed been covered, not necessarily for this plan but for some of the reciprocal plans as you can well imagine or systems $I$ should say.

So claims of breech of fiduciary duty associated with not paying benefits are indeed defendable claims and have already been covered by this policy for similar Chicago pension systems. So, yes, sir.

MS. BURNS: Craig, could I ask you has this new provision been submitted in any of the insurance policies you have placed on behalf of the other City funds or just this fund?

MR. GOESEL: Not as of yet, no, they have not. We have another pension system next week that is reviewing the coverage and I am going to be speaking to them about a similar exclusion.

MS. BURNS: Is it just really Police and Fire then?

MR. GOESEL: Correct.
MS. BURNS: I find that very offensive to
my trustees that they would have this exposure at a time when they really need the insurance directly because of that funding exposure, you know what $I$ mean?

Is there any way we can address this to another insurance company?

MR. GOESEL: I really wish, counsel, that there were. There are no other carriers willing to submit the coverage.

I have also asked the insurance carrier for pricing to keep this coverage static, if you will, or what would be the additional coverage to include, and they have not been willing to add the program.

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: So you are saying there was no concern with Municipal and Laborers but it was with Police and Fire, that is what you are saying?

MR. GOESEL: Correct.

MEMBER SONI: Could you repeat that last statement again?

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: So Municipal and Laborers there is no change but the change is to Police and Fire.

MEMBER SONI: Okay. Thank you.
MS. BURNS: If Craig has completed with his presentation, again, for the record, your recommendation as the broker for the Firemen's Fund is that we renew the coverage under Option 3, with the caveat with respect to the change in coverage that you articulated, that is your recommendation?

MR. GOESEL: Correct.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: What is counsel's recommendation?

MS. BURNS: I have a couple thoughts. One, I'd like to have the Board at least entertain this motion so that we have this coverage in place and then I'd like to talk to the Trustees about other ways we can secure the Trustees so that they don't have exposure personally on this issue. Because as $I$ have told you before, you are the only people that have personal liability in the whole system and I'd like to explore ways with you that we can limit that.

MEMBER MARTIN: I'd like to make a motion to approve our broker's recommendation for Option 3.

## MEMBER McPHILLIPS: Second.

$\square$
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Motion from Trustee
Martin seconded by Trustee McPhillips.
Trustee Martin.
MEMBER MARTIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Soni.
MEMBER SONI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee
Conyears-Ervin.
MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee McPhillips.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Holt.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Trustee Murphy.
MEMBER MURPHY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: And I am a yes.
Thank you.
MR. GOESEL: Sorry I didn't have better
news for you, Trustees.
MEMBER MARTIN: Moving on to New Business/Old Business.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Any New Business? Any Old Business?

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Mary Pat, did you
want to save it for another meeting to discuss further protection?

MS. BURNS: Yes, ma'am. Thank you. I would like a little bit of time to work on this and talk to the Police Fund to make sure that you are protected in the same manner as similarly situated Trustees over there are protected.

I am especially concerned about Trustees like you and Trustee Soni, who are gracious enough to serve on a number of funds, because $I$ don't want you getting pulled into a mess because some funds are covered and some funds aren't covered. I need to spend some time working on it and then $I$ will be back to you.

MEMBER CONYEARS-ERVIN: Thank you.
MEMBER SONI: We appreciate that. Thank you.

MS. BURNS: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Thank you, Mary Pat.
MEMBER NANCE-HOLT: Motion to adjourn.
MEMBER MCPHILLIPS: Second.
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: All in favor?
(Chorus of ayes.)
CHAIRMAN FORTUNA: Opposed?
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Hearing none, motion carries.
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