1	RETIREMENT SYSTEMS OF ALABAMA
2	RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 201 South Union Street
3	Montgomery, Alabama 36104 877.517.0020
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	* * * * * * * * * * * *
9	COPY
10	* * * * * * * * * * * *
11	
12	
13	THE ALABAMA RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
14	MEETING that was taken by Jeana S. Boggs, Certified
15	Court Reporter and Notary Public, in the conference
16	room of the Retirement Systems of Alabama, 201 South
17	Union Street, Montgomery, Alabama that was held on
18	Tuesday, September 13th, 2021, at approximately 2:00
19	p.m.
20	
21	
22	
23	
	Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com
	33 1

1	APPEARANCES
2	BOARD MEMBERS:
3	NORRIS GREEN, CHAIRMAN
4	DAVID COLSTON, VIA WEBEX
5	JIM FIBBE
6	TAMMY ROLLING, VIA WEBEX
7	LISA STATUM, VIA WEBEX
8	ALSO PRESENT:
9	DON YANCEY, RSA DEPUTY DIRECTOR
10	JO MOORE, RSA DEPUTY DIR/ADMIN
11	DIANE SCOTT, RSA CFO
12	LARRY LANGER, CAVANAUGH MACDONALD
13	ED KOEBEL, CAVANAUGH MACDONALD
14	MATTHEW STROM, SEGAL
15	NICHOLAS COLLIER, MILLIMAN
16	SCOTT PORTER, MILLIMAN
17	DEBBY DAHL - RSA EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	Boggs Reporting & Video LLC

1	AGENDA
2	I. Call to Order/Roll Call -
3	Norris Green5
4	II. Approval of 9/10/2019 Minutes -
5	Norris Green5
6	III. Five-Year Experience Study -
7	Diane Scott7
8	A. Overview of Process
9	B. Presentation of Experience Study
10	Recommendations -
11	Cavanaugh Macdonald11
12	C. Presentation on Peer Review of
13	Experience Study and Limited Scope
14	Audit of 9/30/2020 ERS & JRF
15	Valuations - Segal30
16	D. Cavanaugh Macdonald Response
17	to Segal Report47
18	E. Presentation by Milliman on Peer
19	Review of Experience Study and
20	Limited Scope Audit of
21	9/30/2020 Experience Study for
22	FY 2021-202552
23	
	Boggs Reporting & Video LLC

1	F. Cavanaugh Macdonald Response to
2	Milliman Report68
3	G. Recommendation to Adopt ERS & JRF
4	FY 2016-2020 Experience Study
5	for FY 2021-202571
6	IV. Recommendation to Amend ERS and JRF
7	Funding Policies Based Upon
8	Experience Study Recommendations
9	Diane Scott74
10	V. Recommendation to Appoint Board Actuary -
11	Diane Scott77
12	VI. Recommendation to Approve Board
13	Investment Advisor -
14	Diane Scott80
15	Adjourn - Norris Green82
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	Boggs Reporting & Video LLC

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL 1 2 MR. NORRIS GREEN: I call the 3 meeting to order. Roll call. We have got some on the web, I think. You are going 4 5 to call the roll. 6 MS. DAHL: Norris Green? 7 MR. NORRIS GREEN: Here. 8 MS. DAHL: David Colston? 9 MR. COLSTON: Here. 10 MS. DAHL: Jim Fibbe? 11 MR. FIBBE: Here. 12 MS. DAHL: Tammy Rolling? 13 MS. ROLLING: Here. 14 MS. DAHL: Lisa Statum? 15 MS. STATUM: Here. 16 MR. NORRIS GREEN: Okay. 17 that's four out of the five. A quorum is 18 present. So, we can begin the meeting. APPROVAL OF 9/10/2019 MINUTES 19 20 MR. NORRIS GREEN: The first order 21 of business was to approve the minutes of 2.2. September 10th, 2019. I think everybody 23 had the book that has the minutes

1	available to you.
2	Anybody have anything they want
3	to change or questions about the
4	minutes?
5	(No response).
6	MR. NORRIS GREEN: If not, someone
7	might want to make a motion that we
8	approve the minutes.
9	MR. FIBBE: I make a motion to
10	approve the minutes.
11	MR. NORRIS GREEN: Do I have a
12	second?
13	MS. STATUM: Second.
14	THE COURT: All in favor say
15	"aye."
16	(Board members saying "aye".)
17	MR. NORRIS GREEN: Opposed?
18	(No response).
19	MR. NORRIS GREEN: So, the minutes
20	are approved.
21	The reason we are here today is
22	to go over the the main thing we are
23	doing is to go over the results of the
	Pagga Danarting Q Video LLC

1 five-year experience study. Diane Scott 2 is going to lead us with this. 3 matter of fact, she is going to lead us and do it all. And so, we will ask 4 5 questions of her as they arise. 6 We have also got two other 7 actuarial firms here that are going to 8 comment on the results of the study, and 9 then there will be comments on their 10 comments. 11 And so, we've got a pretty full 12 afternoon, so we will get started. 13 Diane, I will just turn it over 14 to you to proceed however you see fit. 15 FIVE-YEAR EXPERIENCE STUDY 16 MS. DIANE SCOTT: Thank you so 17 much. 18 So, if everybody is using their 19 Directorpoint, if you will go to A-1, 20 which is the ERS summary, I want to give 21 us an overview and allow you to 2.2. understand what we are about to do.

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

23

Okay?

that we shall have prepared by an actuary an experience study which looks back at the previous five years and determines, based upon our experience, as well as looking forward, what our assumptions should be in our plan moving forward for the next five years.

9/30/2020 was the end of a five-year period.

2.2.

So, our actuary, Cavanaugh

Macdonald, completed an experience

study. As a result of the completion of

that experience study, on page 57, you

will see the changes that we are going

to ask the Board to approve. And if you

move to page 58, you will see for the

Judicial Retirement Fund the changes

that we are going to ask the Board to

approve.

So, to start with, if you glance through these changes, you will have a good idea of about the things that are

going to be talked about over the next -- let's just say -- hour or so.

And at the end, we will come back and ask for an approval for these changes.

2.2.

Now, we feel like it is good practice that we have another actuarial firm or two to review — to peer review the experience studies and to do a limited scope audit of the final valuation over a five-year period. We put out an RFP earlier this year, and Segal, as well as Milliman, were selected from that RFP process to peer review the experience study and to perform a limited scope of it. We have, not only here with us today Cavanaugh Macdonald, we also have representatives from Segal, as well as Milliman.

So, this is how I think we had planned to roll this afternoon.

Cavanaugh Macdonald will talk with you for about 10 minutes related to the changes that they are recommending.

1 Then Segal will present their peer 2 review and their limited scope audit. 3 Cavanaugh Macdonald will have an 4 opportunity to respond to you over their 5 findings. Then Milliman will present 6 their peer review and limited scope 7 audit findings and Cavanaugh Macdonald 8 will have an opportunity for you to --9 for them to respond to that. 10 Of course, you can ask 11 questions. They are here for us. They 12 are here for us so that you can 13 understand what we are -- what's being 14 recommended. And after all of that, 15 then I would come back and ask for a 16 recommendation that the experience study 17 results would be adopted by the Board. 18 Okay? 19 So, if we are ready for 20

So, if we are ready for

Cavanaugh Macdonald to go through their recommendations. And, of course, they will be talking about ERS as well as

JRF.

21

2.2.

23

CAVANAUGH MACDONALD

2.2.

ERS & JRF EXPERIENCE STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

MR. KOEBEL: Good afternoon. I am Ed Koebel, Chief Executive Officer of Cavanaugh McDonald. With me, you know, is Larry Langer. He is principal and consulting actuary and the lead actuary for ERS. It's a pleasure to be here.

Like Diane said, we are going to go through just kind of a brief, very quick, synopsis of our experience study. And Diane kind of touched on it. It's a review of all of the assumptions that go into the valuation.

So, it's really important because a lot of the liabilities that we develop are based on all of the assumptions. So, economic, demographic, what is happening with the money, what are we projecting to happen with the money, what are we projecting to happen with people and their behaviors, retirement, mortality. All of those we

make assumptions about to provide
you-all with a most accurate picture of
your benefit payment stream in the
future. That's really what we are
trying to do is to say how much are we
paying in retirees in benefits today and
what will that stream of benefit
payments look like for the 50 to 60
years. So, that takes a lot of
assumptions that go into it.

2.2.

On slide 61, just a little bit of our valuation. You know, we collect member data. We collect asset data. And we know the benefit provisions of the plan. So, we use those assumptions to develop our employer contributions that we provide to you-all every year. We use those assumptions to develop the accrued liability and come up with our funded ratio. And then we use those again in our projections that we provide to you-all later on in the year.

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

On slide 62, it's important just

to note that there is not really any correct assumptions. We are going to talk about actuarial standards of practice in the guidelines that we use, but it is a blend of art and science. You know, we can look back at what happened over the last five years, but we know that that might not happen over the next five years or 10 years and so forth.

2.2.

So, we want to, you know,
develop good assumptions on behaviors
that we have seen, but take into account
what we see happening in the industry
and the future and in the state.

When you use more aggressive assumptions, you can generate more actuarial losses. More conservatives are going to usually generate actuarial gains. It's important to know that. Obviously, the most important assumption that we will discuss here is the investment rate of return. And we are

recommending a decrease in that, and we will touch on that as we go.

2.2.

Skipping over to slide 64. So, there are three different economic assumptions that we review: Price inflation, the investment return, and the wage inflation, which we use for pay roll based plans. Again, the actuarial standards of practice, ASOPs, their guidelines of how we are to review the data that we have and how we are to kind of project out and make those assumptions for each of our plans in the future. And these are just some highlights of actuarial standards of practice number 27, which gives us guidance for economic.

On the demographic side, on slide 65, we are looking at, you know, what happens: The retirement behaviors, the behaviors of folks, when they leave, and that kind of stuff. So, again, different actuarial standards of

practice, number 35, helps us guideline on those assumptions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

And then the last thing we look at is all of the actuarial methods. this is on slide 66. To help with the funding of the plan and develop those employer contribution rates that we provide to you every year. So, we have an actuarial cost method, an actuarial smoothing of assets that we use and then the amortization of the unfunded accrued liability or the debt of the Retirement System and how we are going to pay for that. So, again, other ASOPs guide us in those -- in setting those methodologies.

So, just quickly on the economic assumptions, you know, I kind of look at us as a four-legged stool approach in looking at each one of these assumptions. Yeah, we want to look at the long-term historical information.

We want to even look at the last five

1 years and what happens over the last 2 five years. But we really want to look 3 at the forward looking modeling, you 4 know, and especially in the economic 5 side of things. The history is the 6 history and what the markets have done 7 and that kind of stuff. But what are 8 the experts saying they are going to see 9 in long -- in large cap equity asset 10 portfolios and that kind of stuff. 11 So, we take that individually by 12 each Retirement System and look at your 13 asset allocation and provide that 14 quidance going forward. So, that's the 15 majority of our analysis when we look at 16 economic assumptions. 17 And then we look at the peer 18 review. What are the systems around 19 you? What does the national data look 20 like for each of these assumptions as 21 well? So, we want to base that.

So, we will start with inflation. The current assumption is

2.2.

23

2.75%. Here is just the historical view on slide 68 of what price inflation, or CPIU, has done annually since 1970. And then the blue line there is the 2.75%.

2.2.

So, you can see back in the '70s obviously we had very large inflation, but then we see, you know, over the last 20 to 30 years that that inflation has been a little bit lower than the 2.75%.

when we forecast or look at experts that forecast inflation out — because we don't do it ourselves — but we have a survey of professional forecasters with Philadelphia. They look at it kind of on a short-term basis. And then the chief actuary for the Social Security Administration looks at it a little bit longer term, 75-year, they are looking at 2.4% inflation over the next 75 years.

Here's a look at your peer reviews, peer comparison. So, you are currently in the 2.75% -- and I'm on

slide 70. You are in the 2.75% bucket there with the 43 plans across the country, public sectors plans across the country that are in this study. We are recommending going down a quarter of a point to the 2.5% on slide 71.

2.2.

I'll skip over to slide 73. We are going to look at the investment return. So, again, we get the analysis from your investment folks of how each of the pension plans is — the assets are allocated and the investments, and we look at the investment experts and what they predict we will see on a real return basis going forward.

So, we then project that out for the next 50 years, and we kind of put it in percentiles sort of like stochastic modeling. And you see on the 50th percentile there, on slide 73, your returns — your asset allocation says, you know, 50% of the time we should be, you know, right at 5.83%. Okay? Or we

will be below and above that 50% of the time. That's using RSA's assumptions.

2.2.

Now, the Horizon actuarial surveys group — there is a group that they take the 39 largest investment consultants across the country, and they kind of gather their data as well. So, we want to look at that, as well, just to see a comparison. They are a little bit lower than your investment team. They are at 5.11%. But, again, our real return assumption right now is 4.95%, so both of these studies show that it is over — the real return assumption is over.

Here is a — On slide 75 is just a look at your peer comparisons. And then on slide 76, again, it's just a little bit different of a view. But looking at the last 20 or so years on where investment returns have gone, they have certainly been dropping over the last 10 years from where they were at at

8%. Now their median is at 7%.

2.2.

So, we are recommending to the Board, on slide 77, that the net investment return assumption be lowered from 7.7% to 7.45% basically leaving the real return assumption alone but dropping that inflation assumption by 50 basis points.

I am going to skip over to the demographic analysis just quickly. On slide 81, we talk about mortality. So, again, we are looking at behaviors of folks in the system, retirees.

Mortality, there is a new mortality table that has been published within the last few years. It's called the Pub-2010 Public Mortality Tables. And it's called 2010 because the data was up to 2010, but it took many years to get published. But it does use public sector data only. So, they gathered data from all public sector plans from across the country and

developed their own tables based on just public sector tables.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

The biggest thing here is not that -- really that table but implementing a generational mortality approach. So, what that means is that a 60-year-old today is projected to maybe live to 83. But a 60-year-old 40 years from now, or maybe who is 20 now, you know, in 40 years they will be 60, they're going to live possibly to 85 or That has that generational improvement scale built into the mortality table to say that the younger generation may live a little bit longer than the current generation. So, that's a new concept that we are kind of building into a lot of our systems.

Then there's some other

demographic assumption recommendations

on retirement and disability and

withdrawal. I'll kind of skip all of

those for now. And I just want to show

you to slide 88, the impact on the State Employees' and the State Police plans.

2.2.

So, again, on 88, the first column there is the valuation results at 7.7%. And we were here in June and presented these results to the Board. The unfunded was just over \$3 billion at 3.072%. The funded ratio is 62%. And then there are the Tier 1 and Tier 2 contribution rates.

Building in the demographic changes only, retirement, withdrawal and disability for right now is the next column. That actually dropped the unfunded accrued liability. So, it dropped the liability. We are keeping the same asset pool and increased the funded ratio. And it did drop the contribution requirements by about 21 to 35 basis points depending on the tier.

Then we build in a salary scale of our recommendations. And that really had a very minor impact of changing the

salary scale assumptions.

2.2.

And then the next column over there is building in the mortality assumption. So, that has an impact of just adding about a — just over \$100 million of liability to today. Again, it's changing that benefit payment stream just slightly by, you know, using the generational mortality approach and having folks live longer than they currently live. So, we're discounting that back to today increases the liability.

You will see there where the bigger increase there is also on the normal costs for both of these plans, 12 basis points on Tier 1 and almost 20 basis points on Tier 2. Again, those are — That generational mortality is really impacting those active members that are currently in the plan because we are stating that they are going to be living longer in the future. So, that

1 has an impact.

2.2.

And then the last impact on the last column is dropping that to 7.45%. That alone has — and then some other economic assumption changes, that has an increase of about \$200 million to the liabilities and drops the funded ratio to 60.39%.

Again, all of these are illustrative. They are as of September 30th of 2020. They won't really come into play until the 2021 valuations, but just to show you what we could potentially be seeing in the '21 valuations, which we ran it off of the 2020 val.

And then on slide 89 is the State Police, and you can see the impacts there on the State Police. Very similar patterns dropping liabilities due to demographic, but then mortality and the discount rate increase again those liabilities and decrease that

funded ratio. And then a slight --1 2 about 4% increase for both of the Tier 1 3 and Tier 2 contribution rates. 4 The rest of the material is kind 5 of as an appendix, so you can read it at If you're having trouble 6 your leisure. 7 sleeping at night, perfect material to 8 help you fall asleep. But I will leave 9 it at that and see if there are any 10 questions. 11 (No response). 12 MR. KOEBEL: Larry is going to 13 come up and go over Judges. Are we good? 14 (No response). 15 MR. KOEBEL: Okay. 16 Good afternoon, MR. LANGER: 17 everyone. Larry Langer from Cavanaugh 18 Macdonald. 19 Going back to page 58, I will 20 direct your -- I am going to talk a bit about Judges. A lot of what Ed has said 21 2.2. is the same here. So, I am just going 23 to touch on a couple of other places

that are a little bit different as it were. So, this will be a lot faster.

2.2.

So, the area I want to get into is a little bit more on the investment return assumption. With regard to inflation, you would anticipate that inflation would stay consistent from plan to plan to plan. We mentioned that we are dropping inflation but leaving a real return the same, and that's what drove the 25-basis-points reduction in inflation.

If you go to page 131 of the Directorpoint, it says "Economic Assumptions and Investment Returns" at the top of it. This is the projection of real returns based upon investment staff, their projections. So, you can see the real return because it's a different portfolio is 5.52%. And when you add that to inflation, you have a potential return of a little over 8%. And that's great. That's higher than

the 7.4% we're recommending. So, it gives you a little cushion.

2.2.

With that being said, you move to slide 132 of Directorpoint, you can see that it's 4.55%. 4.55% real return based upon Horizon Asset, independent group, and you can see that the overall investment return is about 7.1%. And I think a couple of differences are worth saying here is Horizon's survey. It's probably not as granular as what RSA staff puts together in specific regard to its funds.

So, it could be — You could run into differences like that. But there is a difference. One of them suggests that you could even go lower. But I think we are reasonably comfortable at this point in time with the 7.4% investment return assumption that we are recommending.

The last couple of slides to go to are the cost impact. So, if you go

to page 143 of Directorpoint, you can see here for Judges, same format that Ed talked about for ERS. We have the September 30, 2021, valuation --September 2020 valuation results just as we presented them back in June. then in the next column, we get into demographic changes only without mortality. And you can see here that there was a slight increase on the unfunded liability, a slight increase in the normal cost. Overall the contribution amounts for Tier 1 went from 42.1% to 42.51%. Tier 2, 37.34% to 37.63%. So, reasonably slight.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

Where the rubber starts meeting the road a little bit more is where you add on the mortality. And we have the same thing here where we are projecting that future generations live longer than the current, and that adds cost because people are projected that they would live longer. And you can see the

1 unfunded liability goes to 172 from 162. 2 And the contribution rates increase from 3 42.1% to 43.86%, a 1.76% increase and a 2.07% increase for Judges. 4 5 Finally, reducing the discount 6 rate, that has the biggest impact of 7 all. And you can see the funded status 8 goes from 66.13% to 64.01%. 9 Contribution rates 45.03% and 40.63%. 10 District Attorneys -- frankly, 11 the District Attorneys, it's fixed. 12 There's a lot of changes that go on in 13 the next slide. But the contribution 14 rates stay fixed. We want to keep them 15 elevated to cover any fluctuations in 16 contributions that happen underneath. 17 You can see that when you look 18 at the funded ratios, it starts off at 81.12% and goes all the way down to 19 20 78.668% in the end with all the changes 21 back then. 2.2. So, there it ends the prepared 23 comments. Two more actuarial firms are

1 coming up. It's going to continue this 2 day fun. 3 Any comments or questions? 4 (No response). 5 MR. LANGER: All right. Thank 6 you. 7 EXPERIENCE STUDY AND LIMITED SCOPE AUDIT OF 8 9/30/2020 TRS VALUATIONS 9 MR. STROM: All right. 10 I am Matt Strom from Segal, afternoon. 11 actuary. We were part of the team that 12 was hired to work on the actuarial audits of the 2020 valuations and the review of 13 14 the experience studies, as well. 15 So, our presentation really 16 starts on page 159 of the book with our 17 scope. So, on the -- For the 18 valuations, what we did was a limited 19 scope actuarial audit. We did not 20 attempt to replicate the entire 2020 21 valuations, but we did sample a 2.2. cross-section of members across all the

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

plans, across different tiers, different

23

statuses, and we reconciled their liability amounts.

2.2.

We looked at the data that went into the calculations to make sure that it was complete. We also looked at the valuation report and the calculations of contribution rates and actuarial value of assets, assess the conclusions, and then finally we looked at the report itself in the process to see if there was anything as far as improving transparency, clarity and any other information that we think a reader should be able to find in the actuarial report.

And then as far as the experience studies, we looked at the analysis that was provided in the reports from Cavanaugh Macdonald and assessed, you know, would we have — is that enough data to make recommendations and was the process reasonable. And then, in addition to that, we looked at

1 the process and came up with 2 recommendations for improvement for 3 potentially for future experience studies. 4 5 160, as far as the census data, 6 we did collect information from both the 7 system and the file that the actuary 8 used. And we looked for pockets of 9 information that may be in one place but 10 not the other or testing things like 11 total salary, average salary, average 12 ages. And what we are looking for is 13 just discrepancies there that might be 14 material. We didn't find anything like 15 The data does appear to be that. 16 reasonable. 17 So, as far as the information 18 that went into the process, we believe 19 was sound to be able to develop 20 conclusions on. 21 On 161, it talks about this 2.2. matching that we did and really the

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

sampling. And so, what we did was we

23

collected — we asked the actuary
to send us individual calculations or
individual liability amounts for various
tiers of benefits across the plans. And
then what we did is look at the
literature and the code for your
systems, you know, at the source and
programmed our system as if we were
going to be replicating the numbers.

2.2.

But we run through the sample life people, so now we have a really independent look at the benefits. We use their assumptions, but the provisions we look at independently and we try to replicate. And our threshold there is we want to be — in a present value basis, we want to be within 5% plus or minus just because different systems have different ways of applying different provisions or assumptions. So, you do get a little bit of difference there, but we want to be within 5%.

Across all the systems, we collected 59 test slides. So, for ERS and JRF it was probably, you know, slightly more than half of the 59 that we collected and the vast majority of those we matched almost what we would consider to be exactly, within 1%. It is very closely.

2.2.

So, we feel that the calculations at least for generating the liabilities are done very accurately. Another handful, within plus or minus 3%, there was one calculation that was off by 7%; but as a dollar amount, it was very small. And we were able to — thanks to the information that the actuary had provided, the background detail, we were able to identify that it was really just the system, a valuation system difference between the two. And across all your members — we were just looking at one. But across all the members, it would net out to a zero

difference. So, it would be very immaterial.

2.2.

On 162, there were a few other items that we recommended to be looked at, again, from looking at this detail. But they were really getting into the minutiae of the calculation.

So, as far as moving the needle on the numbers, they didn't have a very large impact at all. So, just very minor things that we mentioned to them but nothing very material.

And then, lastly, I mentioned that we did go through — once they have the liability calculations, we go through how those were used within the valuation. And we were able to replicate and match all those calculations. So, like, the contribution rates, things within there like the interest timing and things of that nature, we replicated all that. So, we are comfortable with that too.

And on 163, as far as looking at the reports and things with — you know, providing clarity again, another actuary should be able to pick up a valuation report and easily follow it and find all sorts of information in there.

2.2.

So, we did have some comments in there. And, namely, on the last bullet here, just some other items that would be nice to be included in that valuation report, things like a history of the returns both on a market and actuarial basis and averages, and you can kind of compare that to what the expectation was over those years.

Looking at histories of funded ratios, a history of cash flows so you can be able to see side by side the contributions both from the employers and employees coming in versus the benefit payments and expenses that are going out. And you can see that cash flow over time.

And then the last one there is a reconciliation of the change in the required contribution rates. So, just knowing, okay, the rate last year was this and the rate this year is — you know, maybe, what, went from 10% to 11%. Just knowing what caused that 1% increase, what were the sources of that. To add that in there is some good information.

2.2.

On 164, now we are kind of getting into our review of the experience study. And so, starting with the economic assumptions for inflation, the 2.5% we believe that that is reasonable. So, we are comfortable with the 2.5%.

We do notice that — noting that, you know, using — or looking at the public plans database, there is a little bit of a lag when you compare that information. So, here you are in your cycle and you're saying, well,

we're going to change to this, and you look at the database because it's close to here. You don't want to necessarily rely on that source as the only source because it's lagged. So, when you go to 2.5%, that's going to get — you know, it will get adopted. It will go into the cycle. The actuary will use it, then it will get published, and then it will be reported in this database. And you can see there is a lag there.

2.2.

So, when we — and the experience studies that we've done and we've — the assumption changes that we maybe recommended to other systems in the last couple of years, they are not going to filter their way through that database for another year or two.

On the investment return assumption, that calculation of the 50th percentile real rate of return using the same information particularly with the Horizon survey information, we were able

to closely replicate that. So, we are comfortable with how that number was calculated.

2.2.

Just a couple of items to look at for future studies and just some considerations as, again, we do agree that the systems are very long term in nature, but the liabilities for your retired members, you know, that's a pretty big portion that will be paid out actually over a shorter period of time. And if you looked at your present value of benefits, it might be, you know, anywhere from 40% to 50% of your liability. It's not necessarily long term. It is a relatively short-term number.

So, just one thing to consider is, with your capital market assumptions and particularly in that Horizon, they are published at 20-year and a 10-year. And the 10-year assumptions are going to have lower expected returns. So, if you

were to weight — calculate a 20-year expected real return and a 10-year real return and weight that between the liability that is expected to be settled in the near term versus your long term, you might get a different — you'll get a different answer. But that's consistent with how your liability is going to get paid out.

2.2.

And then the other -- just something to consider is an adjustment for negative cash flow. So, you know, that number -- the investment return assumes that you will earn that for all assets that are there. But when you have more benefits and expenses being paid out than contributions coming in, there is a little bit of a drag on your assets. So, that total value at the beginning of the year is not actually there all year to be earning that investment income.

So, maybe to consider making an

adjustment -- small adjustment for that negative cash flow for the money that's really not going to be there to be able to earn investment return.

2.2.

For payroll growth on page 165, we see where that recommendation came from, and we are comfortable with — we agree that that's appropriate. We do note that for the JRF fund that actual increases in payroll if you go back and look retrospectively that they have been lower than even 2.75%.

So, to the extent that, you know, there is something there that even in the future you think those increases in payroll will be less than 2.75%. You know, that could be something to consider if there is something systematically there.

In salary scale we agree with the recommendations there. We looked at the analysis, and we thought that that was reasonable.

And then the last one on page

166 is for the administrative expenses.

And we think that that was fine for ERS

and JRF. That recommendation to drop

the admin assumptions seemed reasonable

to us.

2.2.

On the demographic side, those assumptions now that are affecting your membership and how people behave starting with mortality, certainly with the change to the Pub tables and using generational mortality, Segal agrees with that, gives it a thumbs up.

One place where we had a comment was about the improvement scale or the mortality and projection scale. And this is the scale that is applied on top of your base rates that tell how much longer are your younger people going to live in retirement than the people that are currently in retirement.

And so, there is a skill that does that calculation. And then the

recommendation is to use two-thirds of that increase. So, that would be like saying someone who is 30 now, you know, the projection scale might say when they turn 65, they would expected to live maybe three years longer than someone who is already 65. And so, by using two-thirds of the scale, you are going to say, well, we think our improvements are going to be slower than the published scale, and that they might only live an extra two years on top of that.

2.2.

So, that's just -- We've seen that done before, but it's not the most common approach. So, it really goes down to do you think that published scale is appropriate for your system or do you think there needs to be an adjustment? And that is something that we would rely on the actuary and the Board to make that decision, but we did want to point that out that it's an

1 unusual practice.

2.2.

For retirement turnover and disability, we reviewed that analysis. We think those assumptions were reasonable.

And then one other comment that we had on the entire report was that there was a demonstration that you are going to see an increase in liability, an increase in cost from the assumption changes. And one option is to phase that in over time — phase that into the costs over time.

And there was an illustrative example to do that, like, over a five-year period, and let's say it was a 5% increase in contribution that it would take, you know, 1% the first year, 2% the second year and 3% the third year and so on. We just were pointing out that you would actually — if implemented, you would want to use a time value of money.

So, it might be 1% the first year, but because you didn't pay the full 5% increase that first year, it might jump to, like, you know, an extra 1.2% that next year, and then an extra 1.4% that third year.

2.2.

So, there is some kind of time value of money adjustment to be made there. But we had a discussion with the actuaries about that, and they were saying, yes, for purposes of the report — this was an illustrative — if this is actually implemented this way, it would be implemented with taking into consideration that time-valued money.

Another comment was with the change in the funding policy contribution and the amortization layers. We agreed with that change. It seems a lot more straightforward than the approach that is there right now but not really sacrificing what the goals are of the system to be funded over

time. So, we think it's a -- we agree with that change and that approach.

2.2.

Finally, in summary, on page 169, we certainly think that the valuations were — we had a very close match on those liabilities, thought the data was good. So, we have a — we think it validates the findings there.

And we generally agree with the experience study. And, again, there were places where we are looking at each assumption individually. You know, it's reasonable, but it might be a little bit slightly aggressive. But then there doesn't seem to be many assumptions that lean the other way to kind of offset that looking at the package.

So, when you have a few assumptions that are leaning a little bit on the aggressive side, when you take a step back and look at the entire package of assumptions, it may be just a little bit more aggressive than maybe

1 what you intend. But really nothing was 2 unreasonable as far as either the 3 valuations or the experience study. 4 There was nothing that we thought, you 5 know, needed to go back to the drawing 6 board and redo anything. Just really --7 just really things to consider for 8 future experience studies. 9 And I think that's pretty much 10 the end of our presentation from Segal. 11 MR. NORRIS GREEN: Thank you. 12 MR. STROM: All right. Thanks. 13 CAVANAUGH MACDONALD RESPONSE TO SEGAL REPORT 14 15 MR. LANGER: So, in slide 174 is 16 our response. 17 And first off, I want to talk 18 about what a joy it was to work with 19 Segal and Milliman. Maybe it's just 20 that actuaries like hanging out 21 together, but it was a good process and 2.2. I think a very helpful process. Because 23 you-all put a lot of good faith in us

and the numbers that we put together, and it takes another actuarial firm, good ones like Segal and Milliman, to make sure, like, what we are doing, you know, is done well. So, we appreciate that.

2.2.

We are pleased with their overall findings. This is our letter that we have there. And there is a lot of recommendations that were made as Matt said. We don't have to go back to the drawing board, which is, you know, the highest of all high praise. But there are some things to consider for the next valuation, and we will certainly work with staff in putting that together.

As you were listening to Matt, was there anything that you had a follow-up question for us at CavMac as you were listening to him? I just wanted to flag any of those questions.

(No response).

1 MR. LANGER: If not, that's the 2 end of my prepared comments. 3 MR. NORRIS GREEN: Explain to us -- but he mentioned that this may tend 4 5 to be a little bit more aggressive than 6 intended. Can you talk about that just a 7 little bit, what that means? 8 MR. LANGER: Certainly. 9 aggressive -- you know, I always -- I 10 get -- terminology throws me sideways 11 sometimes. When I think of "aggressive," 12 I think of bears. But really aggressive 13 is just that the liabilities that we 14 developed would be a little bit lower --15 the costs might be a little bit lower than 16 if everything was right down the middle of 17 the road. And it's sort of -- it's one of 18 19 these deals where there is a few 20 assumptions which are a little bit --21 you know, create a little bit less 2.2. liabilities like you mentioned mortality

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

specifically and investment return where

23

those might result in a little bit lower liabilities. And you add them up and then maybe you're a little bit closer — I'm not sure if it's left or right, but you would develop unfunded liabilities that are a bit lower than anticipated.

2.2.

I think that's a nice point. I think that sometimes we get hung up in reviews, and we talk about where we are, and we want to look at where we've been and where we are going to. And we have been working towards doing things like shortening up the amortization period, lowering the discount rate over time, thoughtfully implementing these new mortality tables. The mortality table, the thing with — we are not taking the full scale that the side actuary recommends.

One of the fun things about the projection of improvement and life expectancy that the SOA has been developing, they have been developing

1 that scale for several years. Over the 2 past eight years, every year they have 3 come back and ramped it back. So, they have overshot the mark, 4 5 which is nice. That means they're 6 optimistic. They think people are going 7 to live longer, but it's overshot. 8 So, we took a little bit off that table. And if it turns out it's 9 10 right, we will go back in when we're 11 back and experience three and five 12 years, maybe we implement the full 13 table. 14 But, you know, we have developed 15 slightly -- potentially slightly lower 16 liabilities than you might if everything 17 was right down the middle of the road. 18 And, you know, we are comfortable, and 19 we will keep looking at -- we'll look at 20 it between now and the next experience 21 review, and we will keep monitoring it. 2.2. Did that answer? 23 MR. NORRIS GREEN: That was an

1	answer.
2	MR. LANGER: I am working so hard
3	on my answers, too.
4	Okay. That's it for my prepared
5	comments. Any questions? All good?
6	(No response).
7	MR. NORRIS GREEN: I think not.
8	Anybody on the web have any questions? Is
9	anybody still there?
LO	MS. STATUM: I'm here.
11	MR. NORRIS GREEN: All right.
12	Thanks.
L3	MR. LANGER: Beautiful. Thank
L4	y'all.
15	MILLIMAN ON PEER REVIEW OF EXPERIENCE STUDY
16	AND LIMITED SCOPE AUDIT OF 9/30/2020
L7	EXPERIENCE STUDY FOR FY 2021-2025
18	MR. COLLIER: Good morning. I'm
L9	Nick Collier oh, wait a minute. I've
20	done too many meetings. It's good
21	afternoon. I am Nick Collier. I am here
22	with Scott Porter, and we are with
23	Milliman. And we are here to present the

results of the actuarial audit.

2.2.

If you go to 182, that should get you to the page that I'm on. You've already heard from Segal really a lot about what we are going to talk about, so I will try not to beat that too much to death but just hit on the high points. Obviously the purpose of the audit is to write an indigent peer review, and we appreciate your kind of glutinous for punishment and having two actuaries look over your actuary's shoulder. But really I think it does, as Larry said, you know, provide a really good end product.

So, our main focus here is going to be on the 2020 valuation, you know, assessing the accuracy of those calculations. And then secondly and probably more importantly is reviewing the recommendations and experience study for reasonableness and adding some commentary there.

As Matt told you, there is a limited scope on it. We did not reproduce all of CavMac's numbers, but we did do a real detailed review of the components of the valuation. And Matt really touched on those, so I won't go into too much detail there. I would just say that we did the same thing where we looked at those sample lives. Those really show you the inner workings of the actual mind of the calculations of liabilities, and we are very close on those calculations, like Segal was.

2.2.

Just a couple of things we did a little bit different, we also did a review of the benefit calculations done by the RSA staff. And we further — then we looked at the — to kind of assess reasonableness of the valuation data, we took the valuation data and took it back to what data is actually used in the calculations to make sure those were consistent.

So, I would just like to add one additional thing, which is, you know, what Larry said. It was a real good working relationship, and RSA staff was really helpful to us, and we had a bunch of requests and questions and similarly to CavMac. So, we really appreciate the cooperative nature.

2.2.

So, moving to the next slide, so, our findings are that basically all facets of valuation results were materially accurate. We found the benefit calculations were also accurate. And looking at the 2021 experience data recommendations, I think you've kind of already heard this. We really think they are going in the right direction. Yeah, maybe we would have gone a little bit further, but we still think the recommendations are reasonable. And as we said, I think the direction you are heading is going to be beneficial going forward.

So, basically a favorable audit review. We have some recommended changes, but the ones that we are actually recommending changes, there is none of them that would have a material impact. We just suggested another few other items. These are more subjective in nature for your consideration.

2.2.

I am going to let Scott talk about that. But those have more of the potential to be material if they were implemented. And I will turn it over to Scott.

MR. PORTER: Good afternoon. So,

I think we are on slide 184. So, as Nick

mentioned in our report, we had noted

several recommended changes but nothing of

any material impact that would have a

significant impact on the valuation

results.

I would like to spend the rest of our time in terms of changes that we think could be considered between now

and the next experience study, 2. specifically the investment return 3 assumption utilizing a lower assumption than the recommended 7.45%. As both 4 5 actuarial firms have talked about, this 6 mortality improvement scale using 100% of the scale instead of two-thirds of 8 the scale, considering amortization 9 periods that are going to be 20 years or 10 less. 11 So, CavMac recommended using 20 12 years for what we are going to call new 13

1

7

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

gains and losses. But the current level of amortization period is somewhere around 27 years. So, potentially moving that downward, as well.

And then the last thing is sort of monitoring the actual payroll growth in terms of how that is being used to develop the amortization amount.

On the next slide, on 185, just a couple of additional comments regarding JRF. So, again, we found a

couple of little things, nothing that would have a material impact, specifically on how compensation was being developed for one particular tier and just a consistency with how the salary was being developed for benefit purposes, as well as normal cost purposes. So, some technical items.

2.2.

And then, again, we talk about the investment return assumption. So, CavMac recommended a difference, I will say, between what's being used for TRS and ERS versus what's being used for JRF by five basis points. So, 7.45% but for JRF, 7.4%. Based on the capital market assumptions that we reviewed, we found that difference to be somewhere between 31 to 56 basis points.

So, if the assumption chosen for TRS and ERS is 7.45%, then that would put that range for JRF at 6.89% to 7.14%. And that's based on the differences in the asset allegation

between JRF and then the other two systems.

2.2.

So, slide 186, we have a couple of different charts on this slide. So, on the top left, we provide information on sort of the capital market assumptions that were utilized in the experience study. The first two columns were utilized in the experience study by CavMac, ones that were provided by RSA and then, as they noted, the Horizon survey — and this was from 2020 — and that real return of 5.83% or 5.11% was utilized in their recommendation to remain at the 4.95%. And based on that data, we concur that it's reasonable.

At the time we conducted the audit, Horizon's survey — the 2021 survey came out, and so those assumptions had come down. Milliman also creates their own capital market assumptions. And so, we include that as well. So, based on those two

assumptions sets and the inflation assumptions embedded in each of those assumption sets, we would come up with a lower investment return assumption than the 7.45%.

2.

2.2.

Also, we looked at what -- sort of the peer comparison. So, the NASRA study which takes into account all information for all statewide systems. And so, about 80% of statewide systems had selected a return that's lower than the 7.45%.

So, considering of when the new assumption is adopted and gets reflected in the actuarial valuation and then that gets reflected in the contribution rates paid by employers, which I believe is three fiscal years after it's, you know, reflected in the actuarial valuation.

So, just considering that lead time in terms of looking at the assumptions with -- before maybe the next experience study, you want to be

looking at what the investment return assumption is, where capital market assumptions are going. It's possible you might want to make a — I will say a mid-cycle change if the capital market assumptions keep moving downward, but it's something you want to keep your eye on.

2.2.

On slide 187, I will start at the bottom there in terms of the demographic assumptions.

So, again, we have all talked about the mortality improvement assumption basically, you know, effectively we would all like to see using 100% of the mortality improvement scale. And so, I think it's appropriate that in the next experience study you look at that possibility. And it will be based on the mortality improvement scale at that time. As Larry noted, the scale has changed, you know, each year that the Society has published the

improvement scale. And who knows what sort of the COVID-19 pandemic is going to have an impact on what that scale is going to look like in the next couple of years.

2.2.

The last thing we note is on the economic assumptions in terms of payroll growth and what the payroll growth assumption is. When there is an unfunded liability, that unfunded liability is getting amortized, similar to a mortgage, and it's coming up with a certain dollar amount. And then that dollar amount is being divided by a payroll figure to come up with the contribution rate that the employers are then contributing on.

To the extent that actual payroll is going to come in less than what the actuary is projecting as that payroll number, then the actual dollars, contribution dollars, coming in might be less than what was expected. So, that

1 could result in a slight increase in 2 that unfunded liability; and then if 3 those actuarial dollars are less, the 4 contribution rate might increase a little bit from what it was the year 5 6 before. 7 So, again, I think just 8 monitoring it -- we looked at the last 9 10 years. And actually ERS over the 10 last five years was higher than, I would 11 say, the recommended assumption of 12 2.75%. So, I would just say just 13 continually monitor that assumption and 14 just make sure that the payroll is 15 coming in as projected. 16 MR. COLLIER: All right. Thanks, 17 Scott. 18 So, we are moving to 188. 19 you've heard about the funding changes. 20 We think the simplification and moving 21 to amortization of 20 years on future 2.2. changes on unfunded liability makes a

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

lot of sense, and we definitely agree

23

with that change.

2.2.

There is a graph down in the corner there. We have shown TRS because we have done a one-size-fits-all presentation. This TRS is going to be very similar to your State employees, what the projection of the unfunded paying system.

So, there's two things I would like to highlight here. One is what you can see is the proposed method with the orange line there. It's projected to pay off your unfunded sooner than the blue line which is, you know, your current method.

So, that's definitely a positive sign. Just note that what you also can see is if you — the current — what you see is an increase. Basically what we have is what is called negative amortization in that the unfunded will gradually increase over the next few years if all the assumptions are met.

So, you actually end up increasing your principal.

2.2.

So, it's kind of slow to pay down. It's not optimal from our perspective, but it's — a lot of systems are doing it. And there is not anything inherently wrong with it, but we just want to point that out.

As I said, this would apply to ERS. It would not apply to -- it would apply to State employees. It wouldn't apply to State police or JRF, that negative amortization comment.

And, also, some discussion was on the phase—in. If you phase in, that would probably increase your increase in your UAL over the next few years. But on the other hand, you have a — as of right now looking like a fairly strong return, caveat obviously the year end isn't done, but that could also help mitigate that. And obviously the look on employers are going to be kind of all

over the place, so I am not going to try and fit them into one box.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

So, moving to the next slide, speaking of local employers, there's small local employers. I have got a client in a very similar situation. the local employers, we have got over 800 employers, and, you know, they range from one to 10,000 employees. And what do you do with those small employers to try to keep them out of trouble? And we have done pretty similar things to what is being done right now. There's some what we would call conservative assumptions in that they produce higher liabilities or higher contribution rates, which strengthens the funding. So, if they do run into problems down the road, they are in a stronger funding position.

We don't have any magic answer to that. We have done some things a little bit differently. But it's really

the same concept that you are creating a
somewhat higher contribution rate to get
that stronger funding upfront. My
client does have another option, which
is for the individual employers can
contribute at a higher rate, so they can
effectively prefund themselves at a
higher rate to keep themselves out of
trouble. Of course, it's generally the
plans that are in the best shape that
are doing that. So, it's not
necessarily the answer, but it's, you
know, one possible option if you wanted
to explore that.
So, that concludes our formal
presentation. And we are happy to take
any questions.
MR. NORRIS GREEN: Anybody have
any questions?
(No response).
MR. NORRIS GREEN: Thank you.
MR. COLLIER: Okay. Thank you.

CAVANAUGH MACDONALD

2.2.

RESPONSE TO MILLIMAN REPORT

MR. KOEBEL: All right. We are almost done.

I just want to thank the folks at Milliman for their professionalism in this. It was great conversations that we had to answer their questions and to, you know, answer any of this data questions that they had was great back and forth, and I appreciate that.

Again, as Larry said, it's nice to get a clean audit from a second actuarial firm. And, yes, they have some great recommendations for the Board and for the staff and for us to consider going forward.

Our letter is provided here starting on page 192.

On 193 is just the sample lives that Milliman mentioned, you know, for the most part with some of their programming. Modifications, I think it

will really benefit the liabilities going forward, and we agree with these observations. And then the other ones that we were happy to discuss with RSA staff about the going forward in the next few valuations.

2.

2.2.

On 194, we talk about — they talked about funding, about the mention of the 20 years. And we would certainly consider that in the next experience study and their unfunded accrued liability contribution rate and the payroll growth assumption that goes with it. We will happily discuss that with our RSA staff during the next valuation.

On slide 195, they talk about the investment return assumption and, you know, going lower or possibly even reducing it further to the 7.45%, and we will definitely consider that. Even, you know, pre — maybe even before the next experience study and maybe look at that more — at a more frequent time

1	given the acceptance by RSA staff of
2	that.
3	And then just lastly, on 196,
4	talking about the reports and where
5	is the other section? Oh, just the
6	reports on that. And, again, we agree
7	with the many observations that we
8	you know, just making sure our reports
9	say the correct assumptions that go into
10	our liabilities, just fine tuning that.
11	And then we will be happy to discuss any
12	other things with RSA staff and consider
13	in the next experience study.
14	So, again, any questions you-all
15	have from what Milliman went through
16	that I could help clarify?
17	(No response).
18	MR. KOEBEL: No? Great.
19	MR. NORRIS GREEN: Thank you.
20	MR. KOEBEL: Thank you so much.
21	MR. NORRIS GREEN: Are we at the
22	approval?
23	MS. DIANE SCOTT: We are at the
	Rogas Penorting & Video LLC

approval.

2.

2.2.

RECOMMENDATION TO ADOPT ERS and JRF FY 2016-2020 EXPERIENCE STUDY FOR FY 2021-2025

MS. DIANE SCOTT: So, back on page 57 and 58, you can see the -- you can see the changes that are being recommended. 57 for ERS and 58 for JRF.

I would mention — I think this is probably an appropriate place to mention it. I handed out to those present, as well as I think it was emailed to those listening in from the committee, some demographic information related to the local employers.

And we will hand this out to the full Board tomorrow and have it emailed out for those who might be listening in so that you can see the demographic makeup, how many cities, how many counties, how many actives that each has, how many retirees, what kind of total assets are related to the cities, counties, librairies, utilities, other

and how the locals stack up against the retiree -- against the State and State Police in numbers. Okay?

2.2.

So, to me that is really good information to have. So, we thought we would give you that. But I did want to remind everyone that for those local employers with less than 25 active employees, there are two assumptions that we have tightened up. And we did this at the last experience study. Those assumptions are that the employees will retire at first day eligible, all of them. And the other assumption is that the withdrawals will be 50% of what a withdrawal rate would be if they had more than 25 employees. Okay?

So, that tightens them up. One of the things that we were interested in is how did that go? Well, we are phasing that in over four years. The final year was 9/30/2020. That rate created as a result of that 2020 is

1 applicable to be paid in 2023. 2 quess you could say we phased in the 3 calculation, but we haven't fully phased in the rate. 4 5 Then on top of that, with the 6 changes that we are recommending today, 7 these changes will also affect those 8 same employers with less than 25. So, 9 it was a general consensus of us with 10 the actuary that we wouldn't do anything 11 to those as far as modify the two more 12 stringent factors. 13 Let's look at this into the next 14 five-year period, and let's see how well 15 we have achieved our goals of 16 strengthening those employers with less 17 than 25 active employees. Okay? 18 MR. NORRIS GREEN: Okay. 19 RECOMMENDATION TO ADOPT ERS and JRF FY 2016-2020 20 EXPERIENCE STUDY FOR FY 2021-2025 21 MS. DIANE SCOTT: But, yes, at 2.2. this point in time would be the time that

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

out of this committee, you would make the

23

1 recommendation that the Board approve 2 these changes. 3 MR. NORRIS GREEN: I would 4 entertain a motion from someone to approve 5 the changes on page 57 for the ERS and the 6 Judicial Retirement Fund. 7 MR. FIBBE: I will address that in 8 just a moment. But before I make the 9 motion to approve, I would just like to 10 say that was an overwhelming amount of 11 information. And I think we have all the 12 experts in the room and the staff in the 13 room from all of that information and 14 their working together, we have been 15 supplied these recommendations for changes 16 and approval. And based on those 17 recommendations from the experts and the 18 staff, I will make a motion that we 19 approve the recommendations from the 2020 20 experience study summary results on page 21 57 and 58 of our material. 2.2. MR. NORRIS GREEN: Do we have a 23 second?

1	MS. STATUM: I second.
2	MR. NORRIS GREEN: All in favor
3	say "aye."
4	(Board members saying "aye").
5	MR. NORRIS GREEN: Opposed?
6	(No response).
7	MR. NORRIS GREEN: Ayes have it.
8	MS. DIANE SCOTT: Thank you.
9	MR. NORRIS GREEN: Experience
10	study recommendations are adopted. We are
11	going to move into the funding policy
12	changes, correct?
13	MS. DIANE SCOTT: That is correct.
14	RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND ERS & JRF
15	FUNDING POLICIES BASED UPON
16	EXPERIENCE STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS
17	MS. DIANE SCOTT: So, moving to
18	page 198, as a result of the changes that
19	we just agreed to make means that the
20	funding policy of the Board needs to be
21	modified somewhat. The last time they
22	were modified was when we finished the
23	2015 experience study. So, you can see

the motion that I have on 198 for ERS and $\ensuremath{\mathsf{JRF}}\xspace$.

2.2.

Starting on 199, I have taken the funding policies as they exist today, and I have redlined them so you can easily see the changes that we are recommending. And after those, each of those, I have accepted all the changes, which starts on page 203, so you could read it through without having to look at the black and the white on there.

Primarily modifying the amortization period, taking out everything that relates to open amortization because we will no longer have any component of our unfunded liability that's open. This is an awesome feat that we have been able to get to. And it identifies and articulates that we will close future layers of gains or losses over a 20-year period.

So, with that, I would ask that

1	those modified and updated amended
2	funding policies be
3	MR. NORRIS GREEN: This is going
4	to the 27 years for the current liability,
5	right?
6	MS. DIANE SCOTT: Right. That the
7	layer, everything to 27.
8	MR. NORRIS GREEN: Not doing the
9	115 going forward.
10	MS. DIANE SCOTT: Exactly.
11	MR. NORRIS GREEN: So, we are
12	going to 27 years. Anything after this
13	would be on a 20-year, either up or down?
14	MS. DIANE SCOTT: Yes. Yes.
15	MR. NORRIS GREEN: Any questions
16	on the funding policy changes?
17	(No response).
18	MR. NORRIS GREEN: So, we need a
19	motion to approve the funding policy
20	changes as recommended on page 201 200
21	through 201 and highlighted on 203 through
22	205.
23	MS. STATUM: I will make a motion

1	that we approve the changes to the funding
2	policy.
3	MR. NORRIS GREEN: All right.
4	We've got a motion. Is there a second?
5	MR. COLSTON: I second.
6	MR. NORRIS GREEN: We have a
7	second. All in favor say "aye."
8	(Board members saying "aye").
9	MR. NORRIS GREEN: Opposed?
10	(No response).
11	MR. NORRIS GREEN: All right. The
12	funding policy recommendation has been
13	adopted.
14	The next item is the
15	recommendation to appoint the Board
16	actuary.
17	APPOINTMENT OF BOARD ACTUARY
18	MS. DIANE SCOTT: Yes, sir. Our
19	law says that the Board shall appoint an
20	actuary. We have a five-year contract
21	with CavMac. With what we have just done,
22	that completes their work for the previous
23	five-year contract. We went out to bid

1 with an RFP earlier this year. We had 2 four proposers. We had formed a committee 3 to review all of the proposers and to have finalist interviews. 4 5 Once we reviewed those four 6 proposals, we narrowed it down to two 7 finalists. And those two finalist 8 provided a best and final. 9 interviewed them, and it is the 10 unanimous consensus of the group that we 11 appoint -- or that we would hire 12 Cavanaugh Macdonald again for another 13 five-year period. 14 So, what we need for the Boards 15 to do is to formally appoint Cavanaugh 16 Macdonald for the five-year period, 17 ending with the valuations 2021, 2022, 18 2023, 2024, and 2025. 19 MR. NORRIS GREEN: Is there a 20 motion to approve the recommendation of 21 Cavanaugh Macdonald for the next five 2.2. years as the Board's actuary?

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

So moved.

MR. FIBBE:

23

1 MR. NORRIS GREEN: Do we have a 2 second? 3 MR. COLSTON: I second. 4 MR. NORRIS GREEN: All right. 5 in favor say "aye." 6 (Board members saying "aye"). 7 MR. NORRIS GREEN: Opposed? 8 (No response). 9 MR. NORRIS GREEN: All right. 10 actuary recommendation is approved. Do you have anything else? 11 12 APPOINTMENT OF BOARD INVESTMENT ADVISOR 13 MS. DIANE SCOTT: One more item is 14 the recommendation to approve the Board 15 investment adviser. The law says that the 16 Board shall appoint an investment adviser. 17 And in that law, it has three provisions: 18 One provision is that it has to be an 19 Alabama bank. The second provision is 20 that I think it has to have a 21 capitalization of \$300 million, and it has 2.2. to have an organized investment 23 department.

1	There is only one bank in the
2	state of Alabama that qualifies, and
3	that's Regions. And that's our current
4	adviser.
5	So, we would ask that the Board
6	now adopt as the law says or appoint
7	Regions as the investment adviser for a
8	period not to exceed five years.
9	MR. NORRIS GREEN: All right. So,
10	is there a motion to approve Regions Bank
11	as the investment adviser for the next
12	five years?
13	MR. FIBBE: I'll make that motion.
14	MR. NORRIS GREEN: We've got a
15	motion. Is there second?
16	MS. STATUM: I second.
17	MR. NORRIS GREEN: All right. All
18	in favor say "aye."
19	(Board members saying "aye".)
20	MR. NORRIS GREEN: Opposed?
21	(No response).
22	MR. NORRIS GREEN: All right. So,
23	Regions Bank is the investment adviser for
	Rogas Penortina & Video II C

1	the as far as the Risk Management
2	Committee is concerned.
3	All right. I think we need a
4	motion to adjourn, I believe. Is there
5	anything else we need to discuss?
6	ADJOURN
7	MR. FIBBE: I have nothing else.
8	I make a motion that we adjourn.
9	MR. NORRIS GREEN: We have got a
10	motion to adjourn. Is there a second?
11	MR. COLSTON: I second.
12	MR. NORRIS GREEN: All right. All
13	in favor say "aye."
14	(Board members saying "aye".)
15	MR. NORRIS GREEN: Opposed?
16	(No response).
17	MR. NORRIS GREEN: All right. The
18	committee is adjourned. Thank you-all.
19	Thank you-all for presenting.
20	MS. DIANE SCOTT: Thank you-all.
21	
22	(Risk Management Meeting
23	concluded at 3:17 p.m.)
	<u> </u>

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 3 STATE OF ALABAMA 4 ELMORE COUNTY 5 6 I, Jeana S. Boggs, Certified Professional 7 Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of 8 Alabama at Large, do hereby certify that I reported 9 the ALABAMA RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE meeting that 10 was held on Tuesday, September 13th, 2021; that the 11 foregoing colloquies, statements, questions and 12 answers thereto were reduced to 83 typewritten pages 13 under my direction and supervision; that the above 14 is a true and accurate transcription of said meeting 15 set out herein. 16 I further certify that I am duly licensed 17 by the Alabama Board of Court Reporting as a 18 Certified Court Reporter as evidenced by the ABCR 19 number following my name found below. 20 I further certify that I am neither of 21 relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of such

attorney or counsel, nor am I financially interested

2.2.

23

1	in the results thereof. All rates charged are usual		
2	and customary.		
3	This the 13th day of September, 2021, in		
4	the year of our Lord.		
5			
6			
7			
8	Jeana S. Boggs		
9	ABCR NO. 7, Exp 9/30/2022 Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public		
10	Commission expires: 8/9/2022		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
	Boggs Reporting & Video LLC		

2.5 [4] 18/6 37/15 37/17 38/6 2.75 [8] 17/1 17/4 17/9 17/23 18/1 41/12 41/16 63/12 20 [8] 17/8 19/20 21/9 23/17 57/9 57/11 63/21 69/9 20-year [4] 39/21 40/1 76/21 77/13 200 [1] 77/20	20/18 20/19 2015 [1] 75/23 2016-2020 [3] 4/4 71/2 73/19 2019 [3] 3/4 5/19 5/22 2020 [18] 3/14 3/21 4/4 8/9 24/11 24/16 28/5 30/8 30/13 30/20 52/16 53/17 59/12 71/2 72/22 72/23 73/19 74/19 2021 [8] 1/18 24/12 28/4 55/14 59/18 79/17 83/10 84/3 2021-2025 [3] 52/17 71/3 73/20 2021-2025	
	-, -	

4	68 [1] 17/2	9
45.03 [1] 29/9	7	9/10/2019 [2] 3/4
5	7.1 [1] 27/8	5/19
5.11 [2] 19/11 59/13 5.52 [1] 26/20 5.83 [2] 18/23 59/13	1.4 [3]	9/30/2020 [6] 3/14 3/21 8/9 30/8 52/16 72/22
50 [7] 12/8 18/17	7.45 [8] 20/5 24/3 57/4 58/14 58/20	9/30/2022 [1] 84/8 A
18/22 19/1 20/7 39/14 72/15 50th [2] 18/19	60/5 60/12 69/19 7.7 [2] 20/5 22/5	ABCR [2] 83/18 84/8
38/20 56 [1] 58/18 57 [5] 8/14 71/5	70 [1] 18/1 71 [1] 18/6 73 [2] 18/7 18/20	able [10] 31/14 32/19 34/15 34/18 35/17 36/4 36/18
71/7 74/5 74/21 58 [5] 8/17 25/19 71/5 71/7 74/21	75 [2] 17/20 19/16 75-year [1] 17/18 76 [1] 19/18	38/23 41/3 76/18 about [37] 6/3 7/22 8/23 9/1 9/22 10/22
59 [2] 34/2 34/4 6	77 [1] 20/3 78.668 [1] 29/20	12/1 13/3 20/11 22/19 23/5 24/6
6.89 [1] 58/21 60 [2] 12/8 21/10	8 8/9/2022 [1] 84/10 80 [1] 60/10	25/2 25/21 27/8 28/3 32/21 42/15 45/10 47/18 49/6
60-year-old [2] 21/7 21/8 60.39 [1] 24/8	800 [1] 66/8 81 [1] 20/11 81.12 [1] 29/19	50/9 50/20 53/5 53/5 56/10 57/5 58/9 60/10 61/13
61 [1] 12/11 62 [2] 12/23 22/8 64 [1] 14/3	83 [2] 21/8 83/12 85 [1] 21/11 86 [1] 21/12	63/19 69/5 69/7 69/8 69/8 69/16 70/4
64.01 [1] 29/8 65 [3] 14/19 43/5 43/7	877.517.0020 [1] 1/3	above [2] 19/1 83/13
66 [1] 15/5 66.13 [1] 29/8	88 [2] 22/1 22/3 89 [1] 24/17	acceptance [1] 70/1 accepted [1] 76/8

\mathbf{A}
account [2] 13/13
60/8
accrued [4] 12/19
15/11 22/15 69/11
accuracy [1] 53/18
accurate [4] 12/2
55/12 55/13 83/14
accurately [1]
34/11
achieved [1] 73/15
across [10] 18/2 18/3 19/6 20/23
30/22 30/23 33/4
34/1 34/21 34/22
active [3] 23/20
72/8 73/17
actives [1] 71/20
actual [5] 41/9
54/11 57/18 62/18
62/21
actually [9] 22/14
39/11 40/20 44/21
45/13 54/21 56/4
63/9 65/1
actuarial [25] 7/7
9/6 13/3 13/18
13/19 14/8 14/15
14/23 15/4 15/9
15/9 19/3 29/23
30/12 30/19 31/7
31/14 36/12 48/2

53/1 57/5 60/15 60/19 63/3 68/14 actuaries [3] 45/10 47/20 53/12 actuary [21] 4/10 8/3 8/11 11/7 11/7 17/16 30/11 32/7 33/1 34/17 36/3 38/8 43/21 50/18 62/20 73/10 78/16 78/17 78/20 79/22 80/10 actuary's [1] 53/12 add [5] 26/21 28/18 affect [1] 73/7 37/9 50/2 55/1 adding [2] 23/5 53/22 addition [1] 31/23 additional [2] 55/2 57/22 address [1] 74/7 adds [1] 28/21 adjourn [5] 4/15 82/4 82/6 82/8 **82/10** adjourned [1] 82/18 adjustment [5] 40/11 41/1 41/1 43/20 45/8 admin [2] 2/10 42/5 Administration [1]

17/17 administrative [1] 42/2 adopt [4] 4/3 71/2 73/19 81/6 adopted [5] 10/17 38/7 60/14 75/10 78/13 adviser [6] 80/15 80/16 81/4 81/7 81/11 81/23 **Advisor [2] 4/13** 80/12 affecting [1] 42/8 after [4] 10/14 60/18 76/7 77/12 afternoon [7] 7/12 9/20 11/3 25/16 30/10 52/21 56/14 again [25] 12/21 14/8 14/22 15/14 18/9 19/11 19/18 20/12 22/3 23/6 23/18 24/9 24/22 35/5 36/3 39/6 46/10 57/23 58/9 61/12 63/7 68/12 70/6 70/14 79/12 against [2] 72/1 72/2 **AGENDA [1] 2/18**

A ages [1] 32/12 aggressive [8] 13/16 46/14 46/20 46/23 49/5 49/9 49/11 49/12 agree [8] 39/6 41/8 41/20 46/1 46/9 63/23 69/2 70/6 agreed [2] 45/19 75/19 agrees [1] 42/12 ALABAMA [11] 1/1 1/2 1/13 1/16 1/17 80/19 81/2 83/3 83/8 83/9 83/17 all [69] 6/14 7/4 10/14 11/13 11/17 11/23 12/2 12/17 12/22 15/4 20/22 21/22 24/9 29/7 29/19 29/20 30/5 30/9 30/22 34/1 34/21 34/22 35/10 35/18 35/22 36/5 40/14 40/21 47/12 47/23 48/13 52/5 52/11 54/3 55/10 60/8 60/9 61/12 61/15 63/16 64/4 64/23 65/23 68/3

70/14 72/13 74/11 74/13 75/2 76/8 78/3 78/7 78/11 79/3 80/4 80/4 80/9 81/9 81/17 81/17 81/22 82/3 82/12 82/12 82/17 82/18 82/19 82/20 84/1 allegation [1] **58/23** allocated [1] 18/12 18/21 allow [1] 7/21 almost [3] 23/17 34/6 68/4 alone [2] 20/6 24/4 already [3] 43/7 53/4 55/16 also [13] 2/8 7/6 9/17 23/15 31/5 54/15 55/13 59/21 60/6 64/17 65/14 65/21 73/7 always [1] 49/9 am [14] 11/3 20/9 25/20 25/22 30/10 52/2 52/21 52/21 56/9 66/1 83/16 83/20 83/22 83/23 **Amend [2] 4/6** 75/14 amended [1] 77/1

amortization [11] 15/11 45/18 50/13 57/8 57/14 57/20 63/21 64/21 65/13 76/13 76/15 amortized [1] 62/11 amount [5] 34/14 57/20 62/13 62/14 74/10 allocation [2] 16/13 amounts [3] 28/13 31/2 33/3 analysis [6] 16/15 18/9 20/10 31/18 41/22 44/3 annually [1] 17/3 another [9] 9/6 34/12 36/3 38/18 45/16 48/2 56/6 67/4 79/12 answer [7] 40/7 51/22 52/1 66/21 67/12 68/8 68/9 answers [2] 52/3 83/12 anticipate [1] 26/6 anticipated [1] 50/6 any [18] 13/1 25/9 29/15 30/3 31/12 48/22 52/5 52/8 56/18 66/21 67/17 67/19 68/9 70/11

A any... [4] 70/14 76/16 77/15 83/21 anybody [4] 6/2 52/8 52/9 67/18 anything [10] 6/2 31/11 32/14 47/6 48/19 65/7 73/10 77/12 80/11 82/5 anywhere [1] 39/14 appear [1] 32/15 **APPEARANCES** [1] 2/1 appendix [1] 25/5 **applicable** [1] **73/1** applied [1] 42/17 apply [4] 65/9 65/10 65/11 65/12 applying [1] 33/19 appoint [7] 4/10 78/15 78/19 79/11 79/15 80/16 81/6 APPOINTMENT [2] 78/17 80/12 appreciate [4] 48/5 53/10 55/7 68/11 approach [6] 15/19 21/6 23/9 43/16 45/21 46/2 appropriate [4] 41/8 43/18 61/17 71/9

approval [6] 3/4 5/19 9/4 70/22 71/1 74/16 approve [15] 4/12 5/21 6/8 6/10 8/16 8/20 74/1 74/4 74/9 74/19 77/19 78/1 79/20 80/14 81/10 approved [2] 6/20 80/10 approximately [1] 1/18 are [135] area [1] 26/3 arise [1] 7/5 around [2] 16/18 57/15 art [1] 13/5 articulates [1] 76/20 as [76] 7/2 7/5 8/6 8/6 8/13 9/12 9/12 9/18 9/18 10/22 10/22 14/2 15/19 16/20 19/7 19/8 24/10 25/5 26/1 27/11 27/11 28/5 30/14 31/11 31/11 31/16 31/16 32/5 32/5 32/17 32/17 33/8 34/14 35/8 35/8 36/1 36/1 38/4

39/6 47/2 47/2 48/10 48/18 48/20 53/14 54/1 55/20 56/15 57/4 57/16 58/7 58/7 59/11 59/22 61/21 62/20 63/15 65/9 65/18 68/12 71/11 71/11 72/23 73/11 73/11 75/18 76/4 77/20 79/22 81/6 81/7 81/11 82/1 82/1 83/17 83/18 ask [8] 7/4 8/16 8/19 9/4 10/10 10/15 76/23 81/5 asked [1] 33/1 asleep [1] 25/8 **ASOPs [2] 14/9** 15/14 assess [2] 31/8 54/19 assessed [1] 31/20 assessing [1] 53/18 asset [7] 12/13 16/9 16/13 18/21 22/17 27/6 58/23 assets [6] 15/10 18/11 31/8 40/15 40/19 71/22 ASSISTANT [1] 2/17

\mathbf{A}
assumes [1] 40/14
assumption [31]
13/21 16/23 19/12
19/14 20/4 20/6
20/7 21/20 23/4
24/5 26/5 27/20
38/14 38/20 44/10
46/12 57/3 57/3
58/10 58/19 60/3
60/4 60/14 61/2
61/14 62/9 63/11
63/13 69/13 69/17
72/14
assumptions [48] 8/7 11/13 11/18
12/1 12/10 12/15
12/18 13/2 13/12
13/17 14/5 14/13
15/2 15/18 15/21
16/16 16/20 19/2
23/1 26/15 33/13
33/20 37/14 39/19
39/22 42/5 42/8
44/4 46/15 46/19
46/22 49/20 58/16
59/7 59/20 59/22
60/1 60/2 60/22
61/3 61/6 61/11
62/7 64/23 66/15
70/9 72/9 72/12
attempt [1] 30/20

attorney [2] 83/21 83/23 Attorneys [2] 29/10 based [14] 4/7 8/5 29/11 audit [13] 3/14 3/20 26/17 27/6 58/15 9/9 10/2 10/7 30/7 30/19 52/16 53/1 53/9 56/1 59/18 68/13 audits [1] 30/12 available [1] 6/1 average [2] 32/11 32/11 averages [1] 36/13 awesome [1] 76/18 aye [12] 6/15 6/16 75/3 75/4 78/7 78/8 80/5 80/6 81/18 81/19 82/13 82/14 Ayes [1] 75/7

B

back [20] 8/4 9/3 10/15 13/6 17/5 23/12 25/19 28/6 29/21 41/10 46/21 47/5 48/11 51/3 51/3 51/10 51/11 54/21 68/10 71/4 background [1] 34/17 bank [4] 80/19 81/1 81/10 81/23

base [2] 16/21 42/18 11/17 14/8 21/1 58/22 59/15 59/23 61/20 74/16 75/15 **basically** [5] 20/5 55/10 56/1 61/14 64/19 basis [11] 17/16 18/15 20/8 22/20 23/17 23/18 26/11 33/17 36/13 58/14 58/18 be [73] 7/9 8/7 9/1 10/17 10/22 11/8 18/22 19/1 20/4 21/10 23/22 24/14 26/2 27/14 31/14 32/9 32/13 32/15 32/19 33/9 33/16 33/17 33/22 34/7 35/1 35/4 36/4 36/10 36/10 36/18 38/10 39/10 39/13 40/4 40/21 41/3 41/3 41/16 41/17 43/2 43/10 43/19 45/1 45/8 45/14 45/23 46/13 46/15 46/22 49/5 49/14

В	
be [22] 49/15	
53/17 55/22 56/11	
56/23 57/9 58/17	
60/23 61/20 62/22	
64/5 65/23 70/11	
71/17 72/15 72/16	
73/1 73/22 75/20	
77/2 77/13 80/18	
bears [1] 49/12	
beat [1] 53/6	
Beautiful [1] 52/13	
because [13] 11/16	
17/12 20/18 23/21	
26/19 28/21 33/18	
38/2 38/5 45/2	
47/22 64/3 76/15	
been [11] 17/9	
19/22 20/15 41/11	
50/10 50/12 50/22	
50/23 74/14 76/18	
78/12	
before [5] 43/15	
60/22 63/6 69/21	
74/8	
begin [1] 5/18	
beginning [1] 40/20	
behave [1] 42/9	
behaviors [5] 11/22	
13/12 14/20 14/21	
20/12	
being [11] 10/13	
	1

27/3 40/16 57/19 58/4 58/6 58/12 58/13 62/14 66/13 71/6 believe [4] 32/18 37/15 60/17 82/4 below [2] 19/1 83/19 **beneficial** [1] **55/22** benefit [9] 12/3 12/7 12/14 23/7 36/21 54/16 55/13 58/6 69/1 benefits [5] 12/6 33/4 33/12 39/13 40/16 best [2] 67/10 79/8 between [7] 34/20 40/3 51/20 56/23 58/12 58/17 59/1 bid [1] 78/23 big [1] 39/10 bigger [1] 23/15 biggest [2] 21/3 29/6 billion [1] 22/7 bit [30] 12/11 17/9 17/18 19/10 19/19 21/15 25/20 26/1 26/4 28/17 33/21 37/21 40/18 46/13 46/20 46/23 49/5

49/7 49/14 49/15 49/20 49/21 50/1 50/3 50/6 51/8 54/15 55/19 63/5 66/23 black [1] 76/11 blend [1] 13/5 blue [2] 17/4 64/14 board [29] 2/2 4/10 4/12 6/16 8/16 8/19 10/17 20/3 22/6 43/22 47/6 48/12 68/15 71/16 74/1 75/4 75/20 78/8 78/15 78/17 78/19 80/6 80/12 80/14 80/16 81/5 81/19 82/14 83/17 Board's [1] 79/22 Boards [1] 79/14 Boggs [3] 1/14 83/6 84/8 book [2] 5/23 30/16 both [7] 19/13 23/16 25/2 32/6 36/12 36/19 57/4 bottom [1] 61/10 box [1] 66/2 brief [1] 11/10 bucket [1] 18/1 build [1] 22/21 building [3] 21/18

B 36/18 36/22 38/11 **Certified [4] 1/14** 49/6 64/11 64/17 83/6 83/18 84/9 building... [2] certify [3] 83/8 67/5 67/6 71/5 71/5 22/11 23/3 71/18 75/23 76/6 83/16 83/20 built [1] 21/13 cap [1] 16/9 CFO [1] 2/11 bullet [1] 36/8 capital [6] 39/19 CHAIRMAN [1] bunch [1] 55/5 58/15 59/6 59/21 2/3 **business** [1] 5/21 change [9] 6/3 37/2 61/2 61/5 \mathbf{C} capitalization [1] 38/1 42/11 45/17 **calculate** [1] **40/1** 80/21 45/19 46/2 61/5 calculated [1] 39/3 cash [4] 36/17 64/1 36/22 40/12 41/2 calculation [5] changed [1] 61/22 34/13 35/7 38/20 caused [1] 37/7 changes [31] 8/15 8/18 8/22 9/4 9/23 42/23 73/3 **CAVANAUGH** calculations [12] 22/12 24/5 28/8 [20] 2/12 2/13 3/11 31/4 31/6 33/2 3/16 4/1 8/11 9/16 29/12 29/20 38/14 34/10 35/15 35/19 9/21 10/3 10/7 44/11 56/3 56/4 53/19 54/11 54/13 10/20 11/1 11/5 56/17 56/22 63/19 54/16 54/22 55/13 25/17 31/19 47/13 63/22 71/6 73/6 call [9] 3/2 3/2 4/19 68/1 79/12 79/15 73/7 74/2 74/5 5/1 5/2 5/3 5/5 79/21 74/15 75/12 75/18 57/12 66/14 caveat [1] 65/20 76/6 76/8 77/16 called [3] 20/16 CavMac [6] 48/20 77/20 78/1 20/18 64/20 55/7 57/11 58/11 changing [2] 22/23 came [3] 32/1 41/6 59/10 78/21 23/7 59/19 charged [1] 84/1 CavMac's [1] 54/3 can [30] 5/18 10/10 census [1] 32/5 charts [1] 59/4 10/12 13/6 13/17 chief [2] 11/4 17/16 certain [1] 62/13 17/5 24/18 25/5 certainly [6] 19/22 chosen [1] 58/19 26/18 27/4 27/7 cities [2] 71/19 42/10 46/4 48/16 28/1 28/9 28/23 49/8 69/9 71/22 CERTIFICATE [1] clarify [1] 70/16 29/7 29/17 36/13 83/1

comfortable [6] completes [1] 78/22 39/6 completion [1] 8/13 considered [1]	C clarity [2] 31/12 36/3 clean [1] 68/13 client [2] 66/6 67/4 close [4] 38/2 46/5 54/12 76/20 closely [2] 34/8 39/1 closer [1] 50/3 code [1] 33/6 collect [3] 12/12 12/13 32/6 collected [3] 33/1 34/2 34/5 COLLIER [3] 2/15 52/19 52/21 colloquies [1] 83/11 COLSTON [2] 2/4 5/8 column [5] 22/4 22/14 23/2 24/3 28/7 columns [1] 59/8 come [10] 9/3 10/15 12/19 24/12 25/13 51/3 59/20 60/3 62/15 62/19	83/9 common [1] 43/16 compare [2] 36/14 37/21 comparison [3] 17/22 19/9 60/7 comparisons [1] 19/17	components [1] 54/5 concept [2] 21/17 67/1 concerned [1] 82/2 concluded [1] 82/23 concludes [1] 67/15 conclusions [2] 31/8 32/20 concur [1] 59/16 conducted [1] 59/17 conference [1] 1/15 consensus [2] 73/9 79/10 conservative [1] 66/14 conservatives [1] 13/18 consider [11] 34/7 39/18 40/11 40/23 41/18 47/7 48/14 68/16 69/10 69/20 70/12 consideration [2] 45/15 56/8 considerations [1]
39/2 41/7 51/18 component [1] 76/16 56/23 considering [3]	column [5] 22/4 22/14 23/2 24/3 28/7 columns [1] 59/8 come [10] 9/3 10/15 12/19 24/12 25/13 51/3 59/20 60/3 62/15 62/19 comfortable [6] 27/18 35/23 37/16 39/2 41/7 51/18	17/22 19/9 60/7 comparisons [1] 19/17 compensation [1] 58/3 complete [1] 31/5 completed [1] 8/12 completes [1] 78/22 completion [1] 8/13 component [1]	39/18 40/11 40/23 41/18 47/7 48/14 68/16 69/10 69/20 70/12 consideration [2] 45/15 56/8 considerations [1] 39/6 considered [1] 56/23

C
considering [3]
57/8 60/13 60/20
consistency [1]
58/5
consistent [3] 26/7
40/8 54/23
consultants [1] 19/6
consulting [1] 11/7
continually [1]
63/13
continue [1] 30/1
contract [2] 78/20
78/23
contribute [1] 67/6
contributing [1]
62/17
contribution [20]
15/7 22/10 22/19
25/3 28/13 29/2
29/9 29/13 31/7
35/20 37/3 44/17
45/18 60/16 62/16 62/22 63/4 66/16
67/2 69/12
contributions [4]
12/16 29/16 36/19
40/17
conversations [1]
68/7
cooperative [1]

55/8 COPY [1] 1/9 corner [1] 64/3 correct [4] 13/2 70/9 75/12 75/13 cost [6] 15/9 27/23 28/12 28/21 44/10 58/7 costs [3] 23/16 44/13 49/15 could [11] 24/14 27/14 27/14 27/17 41/17 56/23 63/1 65/21 70/16 73/2 76/9 counsel [2] 83/21 83/23 **counties** [2] 71/20 71/23 country [4] 18/3 18/4 19/6 20/23 **COUNTY [1] 83/4** couple [10] 25/23 27/9 27/22 38/16 39/4 54/14 57/22 58/1 59/3 62/4 course [3] 10/10 10/21 67/9 Court [4] 1/15 83/17 83/18 84/9 cover [1] 29/15 COVID [1] 62/2

COVID-19 [1] 62/2 CPIU [1] 17/3 create [1] 49/21 created [1] 72/23 creates [1] 59/21 **creating** [1] **67/1** cross [1] 30/22 cross-section [1] 30/22 current [8] 16/23 21/16 28/21 57/13 64/15 64/18 77/4 81/3 **currently [4] 17/23** 23/11 23/21 42/21 **cushion** [1] 27/2 **customary** [1] **84/2** cycle [3] 37/23 38/8 61/5 D

DAHL [1] 2/17 data [19] 12/13 12/13 14/11 16/19 19/7 20/18 20/21 20/22 31/3 31/21 32/5 32/15 46/7 54/20 54/20 54/21 55/14 59/16 68/9 database [4] 37/20 38/2 38/10 38/18 DAVID [2] 2/4 5/8 day [3] 30/2 72/13

day [1] 84/3 deals [1] 49/19 death [1] 53/7 DEBBY [1] 2/17 debt [1] 15/12 decision [1] 43/22 decrease [2] 14/1 24/23 definitely [3] 63/23 64/16 69/20 demographic [11] 11/18 14/18 20/10 21/20 22/11 24/21 28/8 42/7 61/11 71/13 71/18 demonstration [1] 44/8 department [1] 80/23 depending [1] 22/20 DEPUTY [2] 2/9 2/10 detail [3] 34/18 35/5 54/7 detailed [1] 54/4 determines [1] 8/5 develop [8] 11/17 12/16 12/18 13/12 15/6 32/19 50/5 57/20	developed [5] 21/1 49/14 51/14 58/4 58/6 developing [2] 50/23 50/23 DIANE [9] 2/11 3/7 4/9 4/11 4/14 7/1 7/13 11/9 11/12 did [20] 22/18 30/18 30/19 30/21 32/6 32/22 32/23 33/5 35/14 36/7 43/22 51/22 54/2 54/4 54/8 54/14 54/15 72/6 72/10 72/20 didn't [3] 32/14 35/9 45/2 difference [6] 27/16 33/22 34/20 35/1 58/11 58/17 differences [3] 27/9 27/15 58/23 different [14] 14/4 14/23 19/19 26/1 26/20 30/23 30/23 33/18 33/19 33/20 40/6 40/7 54/15 59/4 differently [1] 66/23 DIR [1] 2/10	2/9 Directorpoint [4] 7/19 26/14 27/4 28/1 disability [3] 21/21 22/13 44/3 discount [3] 24/22 29/5 50/14 discounting [1] 23/11 discrepancies [1] 32/13 discuss [5] 13/22 69/4 69/14 70/11 82/5
--	---	--

D	dı
do [5] 74/22	4
79/15 80/1 80/11	dı
83/8	dı
does [6] 16/19	2
20/20 32/15 42/23	dı
53/13 67/4	2
doesn't [1] 46/15	2 dı
doing [6] 6/23 48/4	dı
50/12 65/6 67/11	dı
77/8	dı
dollar [3] 34/14	dı
62/13 62/14	
dollars [3] 62/21	\mathbf{E}
62/22 63/3	ea
DON [1] 2/9	1
don't [4] 17/12 38/3 48/11 66/21	_
done [15] 16/6 17/3	6
34/11 38/13 43/15	ea
48/5 52/20 54/16	7
64/4 65/21 66/12	ea
66/13 66/22 68/4	ea
78/21	ea
down [11] 18/5	1
29/19 43/17 49/16	1
51/17 59/20 64/2	2
65/4 66/18 77/13	6
79/6	\mathbf{E}
downward [2]	2
57/16 61/6	ef
drag [1] 40/18	6

drawing [2] 47/5
48/12
drop [2] 22/18 42/4
dropped [2] 22/14
22/16
dropping [5] 19/22
20/7 24/3 24/20
26/9
drops [1] 24/7
drove [1] 26/11
due [1] 24/21
duly [1] 83/16
during [1] 69/15
E

ach [10] 14/13 5/20 16/12 16/20 8/10 46/11 60/2 1/22 71/20 76/7 arlier [2] 9/11 9/1 arn [2] 40/14 41/4 arning [1] 40/21 asily [2] 36/5 76/6 conomic [10] 1/18 14/4 14/17 5/17 16/4 16/16 4/5 26/14 37/14 2/7 D [4] 2/13 11/4 5/21 28/2 ffectively [2] 1/15 67/7

eight [1] 51/2 either [2] 47/2 77/13 elevated [1] 29/15 eligible [1] **72/13 ELMORE** [1] 83/4 else [3] 80/11 82/5 82/7 emailed [2] 71/12 71/16 **embedded** [1] **60/2** employee [2] 83/21 83/22 employees [8] 36/20 64/6 65/11 66/9 72/9 72/12 72/17 73/17 Employees' [1] 22/2 employer [2] 12/16 15/7 employers [14] 36/19 60/17 62/16 65/23 66/4 66/5 66/7 66/8 66/10 67/5 71/14 72/8 73/8 73/16 end [8] 8/9 9/3 29/20 47/10 49/2 53/15 65/1 65/20 ending [1] 79/17 ends [1] 29/22

\mathbf{E}
enough [1] 31/21
entertain [1] 74/4
entire [3] 30/20
44/7 46/21
equity [1] 16/9
ERS [20] 3/14 4/3
4/6 7/20 10/22 11/2
11/8 28/3 34/2 42/3
58/13 58/20 63/9
65/10 71/2 71/7
73/19 74/5 75/14
76/1
especially [1] 16/4
even [7] 15/23
27/17 41/12 41/14
69/18 69/20 69/21
every [4] 8/1 12/17
15/8 51/2
everybody [2] 5/22
7/18
everyone [2] 25/17
72/7
everything [4]
49/16 51/16 76/14
77/7
evidenced [1] 83/18
exactly [2] 34/7
77/10
example [1] 44/15
exceed [1] 81/8
EXECUTIVE [2]

2/17 11/4 exist [1] 76/4 Exp [1] 84/8 expectancy [1] 50/22 expectation [1] 36/14 expected [5] 39/23 40/2 40/4 43/5 62/23 expenses [3] 36/21 40/16 42/2 experience [48] 3/6 3/9 3/13 3/19 3/21 4/4 4/8 7/1 7/15 8/3 8/5 8/12 8/14 9/8 9/14 10/16 11/2 11/11 30/7 30/14 31/17 32/3 37/13 38/13 46/10 47/3 47/8 51/11 51/20 52/15 52/17 53/21 55/14 57/1 59/8 59/9 60/23 61/18 69/10 69/22 70/13 71/3 72/11 73/20 74/20 75/9 75/16 75/23 experts [5] 16/8 17/11 18/13 74/12 74/17 expires [1] 84/10

Explain [1] 49/3 explore [1] 67/14 extent [2] 41/13 62/18 extra [3] 43/12 45/4 45/5 eye [1] 61/7 F facets [1] 55/11 fact [1] 7/3 factors [1] 73/12 fairly [1] 65/19 faith [1] 47/23 fall [1] 25/8 far [9] 31/11 31/16 32/5 32/17 35/8 36/1 47/2 73/11 82/1 faster [1] 26/2 favor [6] 6/14 75/2 78/7 80/5 81/18 82/13 **favorable** [1] **56/1** feat [1] 76/18 feel [2] 9/5 34/9 few [8] 20/16 35/3 46/18 49/19 56/6 64/22 65/17 69/6 FIBBE [2] 2/5 5/10 figure [1] 62/15 file [1] 32/7 filter [1] 38/17

36/5 findings [5] 10/5 10/7 46/8 48/8 55/10 fine [2] 42/3 70/10 finished [1] 75/22 firm [3] 9/7 48/2 68/14 firms [3] 7/7 29/23 57/5 first [8] 5/20 22/3 44/18 45/1 45/3 47/17 59/8 72/13 fiscal [1] 60/18 fit [2] 7/14 66/2 fits [1] 64/4 five [25] 3/6 5/17 7/1 7/15 8/1 8/4 8/8 8/9 9/10 13/7 13/9	fixed [2] 29/11 29/14 flag [1] 48/22 flow [3] 36/23 40/12 41/2 flows [1] 36/17 fluctuations [1] 29/15 focus [1] 53/16 folks [5] 14/21 18/10 20/13 23/10 68/5 follow [2] 36/5 48/20 follow-up [1] 48/20 following [1] 83/19 forecast [2] 17/10 17/11 forecasters [1] 17/14 foregoing [1] 83/11 formal [1] 67/15 formally [1] 79/15	25/1 29/7 29/18 36/16 45/23 funding [17] 4/7 15/6 45/17 63/19 66/17 66/19 67/3 69/8 75/11 75/15 75/20 76/4 77/2 77/16 77/19 78/1
7/1 7/15 8/1 8/4 8/8	formal [1] 67/15	

F	get [18] 7/12 18/9	18
further [5] 54/17	20/20 26/3 28/7	20
55/19 69/19 83/16	33/21 38/6 38/7	25
83/20	38/9 40/6 40/6 40/9	25
future [11] 12/4	49/10 50/8 53/3	36
13/15 14/14 23/23	67/2 68/13 76/19	38
28/20 32/3 39/5	gets [2] 60/14 60/16	41
41/15 47/8 63/21	getting [3] 35/6	43
76/20	37/12 62/11	51
FY [8] 3/22 4/4 4/5	give [2] 7/20 72/6	55
52/17 71/2 71/3	given [1] 70/1	56
73/19 73/20	gives [3] 14/16 27/2	61
	42/13	62
G	glance [1] 8/21	66
gains [3] 13/20	glutinous [1] 53/11	69
57/13 76/21	go [26] 6/22 6/23	77
gather [1] 19/7	7/19 10/20 11/10	goı
gathered [1] 20/22	11/13 12/10 14/2	55
general [1] 73/9	25/13 26/13 27/17	go
generally [2] 46/9	27/22 27/23 29/12	11
67/9	35/14 35/15 38/5	25
generate [2] 13/17	38/7 41/10 47/5	46
13/19	48/11 51/10 53/2	48
generating [1]	54/6 70/9 72/20	52
34/10	goals [2] 45/22	56
generation [2]	73/15	got
21/15 21/16	goes [5] 29/1 29/8	66
generational [5]	29/19 43/16 69/13	81
21/5 21/12 23/9	going [61] 5/4 7/2	gra
23/19 42/12	7/3 7/7 8/15 8/19	gra
generations [1]	9/1 11/9 13/2 13/19	gra
28/20	15/13 16/8 16/14	gre

8/5 18/8 18/15 0/9 21/11 23/22 5/12 25/19 25/20 5/22 30/1 33/9 6/22 38/1 38/6 8/17 39/22 40/9 1/3 42/19 43/8 3/10 44/9 50/11 1/6 53/5 53/16 5/17 55/22 55/22 6/9 57/9 57/12 1/3 62/2 62/4 2/19 64/5 65/23 6/1 68/17 69/2 9/5 69/18 75/11 7/3 77/9 77/12 ne [2] 19/21 5/18 od [19] 8/23 9/5 1/3 13/12 25/13 5/16 30/9 37/9 6/7 47/21 47/23 8/3 52/5 52/18 2/20 53/15 55/3 6/14 72/4 ot [8] 5/3 7/6 7/11 6/5 66/7 78/4 1/14 82/9 adually [1] 64/22 anular [1] 27/11 aph [1] 64/2 eat [5] 26/23 68/7

Great [3] 68/10 68/15 70/18 GREEN [2] 2/3 5/6 Green	handed [1] 71/10 handful [1] 34/12 hanging [1] 47/20 happen [4] 11/20 11/21 13/8 29/16 happened [1] 13/7 happening [2] 11/19 13/14 happens [2] 14/20 16/1 happily [1] 69/14 happy [3] 67/16 69/4 70/11 hard [1] 52/2 has [20] 5/23 17/3 17/8 20/15 21/12 23/4 24/1 24/4 24/5 25/21 29/6 50/22 61/22 61/23 71/21 78/12 80/17 80/18 80/20 80/21 have [87] haven't [1] 73/3 having [4] 23/10 25/6 53/11 76/10 he [2] 11/6 49/4 heading [1] 55/22 heard [3] 53/4 55/16 63/19 held [2] 1/17 83/10 help [4] 15/5 25/8 65/21 70/16	helpful [2] 47/22 55/5 helps [1] 15/1 her [1] 7/5 here [30] 5/7 5/9 5/11 5/13 5/15 6/21 7/7 9/16 10/11 10/12 11/8 13/22 17/1 19/16 21/3 22/5 25/22 27/10 28/2 28/9 28/19 36/9 37/22 38/3 52/10 52/21 52/23 53/16 64/10 68/18 Here's [1] 17/21 hereby [1] 83/8 herein [1] 83/15 high [2] 48/13 53/7 higher [7] 26/23 63/10 66/15 66/16 67/2 67/6 67/8 highest [1] 48/13 highlight [1] 64/10 highlighted [1] 77/21 highlights [1] 14/1 him [1] 48/21 hire [1] 79/11 hired [1] 30/12 historical [2] 15/22 17/1 histories [1] 36/16
---	---	--

I	isn't [1] 65/21	41/9 42/4 57/23
information [11]	it [91]	58/13 58/15 58/21
36/6 37/10 37/22	it's [43] 11/8 11/12	59/1 65/12 71/2
38/22 38/23 59/5	11/15 12/23 13/20	71/7 73/19 75/14
60/9 71/13 72/5	19/18 20/16 20/18	76/2
74/11 74/13	23/7 26/19 27/5	Judges [4] 25/13
inherently [1] 65/7	27/10 29/11 30/1	25/21 28/2 29/4
inner [1] 54/10	38/2 38/5 39/15	Judicial [2] 8/18
instead [1] 57/7	43/15 43/23 46/1	74/6
intend [1] 47/1	46/12 47/19 49/18	jump [1] 45/4
intended [1] 49/6	49/18 50/4 51/7	June [2] 22/5 28/6
interest [1] 35/21	51/9 52/20 59/16	just [66] 7/13 9/2
interested [2] 72/19	60/18 61/3 61/7	11/10 12/11 12/23
83/23	61/17 62/12 64/12	14/14 15/17 17/1
interviewed [1]	65/3 65/4 65/5	19/8 19/16 19/18
79/9	66/23 67/9 67/11	20/10 21/1 21/23
interviews [1] 79/4	67/12 68/12	22/7 23/5 23/5 23/8
investment [32]	item [2] 78/14	24/13 25/22 28/5
4/13 13/23 14/6	80/13	32/13 33/18 34/19
18/8 18/10 18/13	items [5] 35/4 36/9	34/21 35/10 36/9
19/5 19/10 19/21	39/4 56/7 58/8	37/3 37/7 39/4 39/5
20/4 26/4 26/15	its [1] 27/13	39/18 40/10 43/14
26/17 27/8 27/20	itself [1] 31/10	44/20 46/22 47/6
38/19 40/13 40/22	IV [1] 4/6	47/7 47/19 48/21
41/4 49/23 57/2	\mathbf{J}	49/6 49/13 53/7
58/10 60/4 61/1	Jeana [3] 1/14 83/6	54/8 54/14 55/1
69/17 80/12 80/15	84/8	56/6 57/21 58/5
80/16 80/22 81/7	JIM [2] 2/5 5/10	60/20 63/7 63/12
81/11 81/23	JO [1] 2/10	63/12 63/14 64/17
investments [1]	joy [1] 47/18	65/8 68/5 68/20
18/12	JRF [19] 3/14 4/3	70/3 70/5 70/8
is [161]	4/6 10/23 11/2 34/3	70/10 74/8 74/9

J	60/18 61/14 61/22	80/15 80/17 81/6
just [2] 75/19	64/14 66/8 67/13	layer [1] 77/7
78/21	68/9 68/21 69/18	layers [2] 45/19
	69/21 70/8	76/21
K	knowing [2] 37/4	lead [4] 7/2 7/3
keep [7] 29/14	37/7	11/7 60/20
51/19 51/21 61/6	knows [1] 62/1	lean [1] 46/16
61/7 66/11 67/8	KOEBEL [2] 2/13	leaning [1] 46/19
keeping [1] 22/16	11/4	least [1] 34/10
kind [23] 11/10	$\overline{\mathbf{L}}$	leave [2] 14/21 25/8
11/12 14/11 14/22		leaving [2] 20/5
15/18 16/7 16/10	lag [2] 37/21 38/11	26/9
17/15 18/17 19/7	lagged [1] 38/5	left [2] 50/4 59/5
21/17 21/22 25/4	LANGER [3] 2/12	legged [1] 15/19
36/13 37/11 45/7	11/6 25/17	leisure [1] 25/6
46/16 53/10 54/18	large [4] 16/9 17/6	less [9] 41/16 49/21
55/15 65/3 65/23	35/10 83/8	57/10 62/19 62/23
71/21	largest [1] 19/5	63/3 72/8 73/8
know [52] 11/5	LARRY [8] 2/12	73/16
12/12 12/14 13/6	11/6 25/12 25/17	let [1] 56/9
13/8 13/11 13/20	53/14 55/3 61/21	let's [4] 9/2 44/16
14/19 15/18 16/4	68/12	73/13 73/14
17/7 18/22 18/23	last [22] 13/7 15/3	letter [2] 48/8 68/18
21/10 23/8 31/20	15/23 16/1 17/7	level [1] 57/13
33/7 34/3 36/2 37/6	19/20 19/23 20/16	liabilities [16]
37/19 38/6 39/9	24/2 24/3 27/22	11/16 24/7 24/20
39/13 40/12 41/14	36/8 37/1 37/4	24/23 34/11 39/8
41/17 43/3 44/18	38/16 42/1 57/17	46/6 49/13 49/22
45/4 46/12 47/5	62/6 63/8 63/10	50/2 50/5 51/16
48/5 48/12 49/9	72/11 75/21	54/12 66/16 69/1
49/21 51/14 51/18	lastly [2] 35/13 70/3	70/10
53/14 53/17 55/2	later [1] 12/22	liability [22] 12/19
	law [5] 8/1 78/19	

L **liability...** [21] 15/12 22/15 22/16 23/6 23/13 28/11 29/1 31/2 33/3 35/15 39/15 40/4 40/8 44/9 62/10 62/11 63/2 63/22 69/12 76/17 77/4 librairies [1] 71/23 licensed [1] 83/16 life [2] 33/11 50/21 like [27] 9/5 11/9 12/8 16/20 18/18 27/15 32/10 32/14 35/19 35/21 36/11 43/2 44/15 45/4 47/20 48/3 48/4 49/22 50/12 54/13 55/1 56/21 61/15 62/4 64/10 65/19 74/9 limited [10] 3/13 3/20 9/9 9/15 10/2 10/6 30/7 30/18 52/16 54/2 line [3] 17/4 64/12 64/14 LISA [2] 2/7 5/14 listening [4] 48/18 48/21 71/12 71/17 literature [1] **33/6**

little [31] 12/11 17/9 17/18 19/9 19/19 21/15 26/1 26/4 26/22 27/2 28/17 33/21 37/21 40/18 46/13 46/19 46/23 49/5 49/7 49/14 49/15 49/20 49/21 50/1 50/3 51/8 54/15 55/18 58/1 63/5 66/23 live [11] 21/8 21/11 21/15 23/10 23/11 28/20 28/23 42/20 43/5 43/12 51/7 lives [2] 54/9 68/20 living [1] 23/23 local [5] 66/4 66/5 66/7 71/14 72/7 locals [1] 72/1 long [5] 15/22 16/9 39/7 39/15 40/5 long-term [1] 15/22|losses [3] 13/18 longer [10] 17/18 21/15 23/10 23/23 28/20 28/23 42/19 43/6 51/7 76/15 look [35] 12/8 13/6 15/3 15/18 15/21 15/23 16/2 16/12 16/15 16/17 16/19 17/10 17/15 17/21

18/8 18/13 19/8 19/17 29/17 33/5 33/12 33/14 38/2 39/4 41/11 46/21 50/10 51/19 53/12 61/19 62/4 65/22 69/22 73/13 76/10 looked [13] 31/3 31/5 31/9 31/17 31/23 32/8 35/4 39/12 41/21 54/9 54/18 60/6 63/8 looking [20] 8/6 14/19 15/20 16/3 17/19 19/20 20/12 32/12 34/22 35/5 36/1 36/16 37/19 46/11 46/17 51/19 55/14 60/21 61/1 65/19 looks [2] 8/3 17/17 Lord [1] 84/4 57/13 76/21 lot [12] 11/16 12/9 21/18 25/21 26/2 29/12 45/20 47/23 48/9 53/4 63/23 65/5 lower [14] 17/9 19/10 27/17 39/23 41/12 49/14 49/15

L lower [7] 50/1 50/6 51/15 57/3 60/4 60/11 69/18 lowered [1] 20/4 lowering [1] 50/14 M MACDONALD [18] 2/12 2/13 3/16 4/1 8/12 9/17 9/21 10/3 10/7 10/20 11/1 25/18 31/19 47/13 68/1 79/12 79/16 79/21 Macdonald	making [2] 40/23 70/8 MANAGEMENT [5] 1/1 1/13 82/1 82/22 83/9 many [8] 20/19 46/15 52/20 70/7 71/19 71/19 71/20 71/21 mark [1] 51/4 market [7] 36/12 39/19 58/15 59/6 59/21 61/2 61/5 markets [1] 16/6 match [2] 35/18 46/6 matched [1] 34/6 matching [1] 32/22 material [9] 25/4 25/7 32/14 35/12 56/5 56/11 56/18 58/2 74/21 materially [1] 55/12	maybe [14] 21/7 21/9 37/6 38/15 40/23 43/6 46/23 47/19 50/3 51/12 55/18 60/22 69/21 69/22 McDonald [1] 11/5 me [3] 11/5 49/10 72/4 means [4] 21/6 49/7 51/5 75/19 median [1] 20/1 meeting [7] 1/14 5/3 5/18 28/16 82/22 83/9 83/14 meetings [1] 52/20 member [1] 12/13 members [12] 2/2 6/16 23/20 30/22 34/21 34/23 39/9 75/4 78/8 80/6 81/19 82/14 membership [1] 42/9
11 [1] 3/11	matched [1] 34/6	member [1] 12/13
made [2] 45/8	matching [1] 32/22	members [12] 2/2
48/10	material [9] 25/4	6/16 23/20 30/22
magic [1] 66/21	25/7 32/14 35/12	34/21 34/23 39/9
main [2] 6/22 53/16	56/5 56/11 56/18	75/4 78/8 80/6
majority [2] 16/15	58/2 74/21	81/19 82/14
34/5	materially [1]	membership [1]

M
methodologies [1]
15/16
methods [1] 15/4
mid [1] 61/5
mid-cycle [1] 61/5
middle [2] 49/16 51/17
might [17] 6/7 13/8
32/13 39/13 40/6
43/4 43/11 45/1
45/4 46/13 49/15
50/1 51/16 61/4
62/22 63/4 71/17
MILLIMAN [16]
2/15 2/16 3/18 4/2
9/12 9/18 10/5
47/19 48/3 52/15
52/23 59/20 68/2
68/6 68/21 70/15
million [3] 23/6
24/6 80/21
mind [1] 54/11
minor [2] 22/23 35/11
minus [2] 33/18
34/12
minute [1] 52/19
minutes [9] 3/4
5/19 5/21 5/23 6/4
6/8 6/10 6/19 9/22
minutiae [1] 35/7

mitigate [1] 65/22 modeling [2] 16/3 18/19 **Modifications** [1] 68/23 modified [3] 75/21 75/22 77/1 modify [1] 73/11 modifying [1] 76/12 moment [1] 74/8 money [6] 11/19 11/21 41/2 44/23 45/8 45/15 monitor [1] 63/13 monitoring [3] 51/21 57/18 63/8 Montgomery [2] 1/2 1/17 MOORE [1] 2/10 more [19] 13/16 13/17 13/18 26/4 28/17 29/23 34/4 40/16 45/20 46/23 49/5 53/20 56/7 56/10 69/23 69/23 72/17 73/11 80/13 morning [1] 52/18 mortality [23] 11/23 20/11 20/14 20/15 20/17 21/5 21/14 23/3 23/9

23/19 24/21 28/9 28/18 42/10 42/12 42/16 49/22 50/16 50/16 57/6 61/13 61/16 61/20 mortgage [1] 62/12 most [4] 12/2 13/21 43/15 68/22 motion [16] 6/7 6/9 74/4 74/9 74/18 76/1 77/19 77/23 78/4 79/20 81/10 81/13 81/15 82/4 82/8 82/10 move [3] 8/17 27/3 75/11 moved [1] 79/23 moving [9] 8/7 35/8 55/9 57/15 61/6 63/18 63/20 66/3 75/17 much [7] 7/17 12/5 42/18 47/9 53/6 54/7 70/20 my [6] 49/2 52/3 52/4 67/3 83/13 83/19 N

name [1] 83/19 namely [1] 36/8 narrowed [1] 79/6 NASRA [1] 60/7

N national [1] 16/19 nature [4] 35/22 39/8 55/8 56/8 near [1] 40/5 necessarily [3] 38/3 39/15 67/12 need [4] 77/18 79/14 82/3 82/5 needed [1] 47/5 needle [1] 35/8 needs [2] 43/19 75/20 negative [4] 40/12 41/2 64/20 65/13 neither [1] 83/20 net [2] 20/3 34/23 new [5] 20/14 21/17 50/15 57/12 60/13 next [30] 8/8 9/2 13/9 17/20 18/17 22/13 23/2 28/7 29/13 45/5 48/15 51/20 55/9 57/1 57/21 60/23 61/18 62/4 64/22 65/17 66/3 69/6 69/10 69/15 69/22 70/13 73/13 78/14 79/21 81/11 nice [4] 36/10 50/7 51/5 68/12

NICHOLAS [1] 2/15 Nick [3] 52/19 52/21 56/15 night [1] 25/7 no [18] 6/5 6/18 25/11 25/14 30/4 48/23 52/6 67/20 70/17 70/18 75/6 76/15 77/17 78/10 80/8 81/21 82/16 84/8 none [1] 56/5 normal [3] 23/16 28/12 58/7 NORRIS [5] 2/3 3/3 3/5 4/15 5/6 not [27] 6/6 9/16 13/1 13/8 21/3 27/11 30/19 32/10 38/16 39/15 40/20 41/3 43/15 45/22 49/1 50/4 50/17 52/7 53/6 54/2 65/4 65/6 65/10 66/1 67/11 77/8 81/8 Notary [3] 1/15 83/7 84/9 note [4] 13/1 41/9 62/6 64/17 noted [3] 56/16 59/11 61/21

nothing [6] 35/12 47/1 47/4 56/17 58/1 82/7 notice [1] 37/18 noting [1] 37/18 now [18] 9/5 19/3 19/12 20/1 21/9 21/9 21/23 22/13 33/11 37/11 42/8 43/3 45/21 51/20 56/23 65/19 66/13 81/6 number [7] 14/16 15/1 39/2 39/17 40/13 62/21 83/19 numbers [5] 33/9 35/9 48/1 54/3 72/3

\mathbf{O}

observations [2]
69/3 70/7
obviously [5] 13/21
17/6 53/8 65/20
65/22
off [6] 24/15 29/18
34/14 47/17 51/8
64/13
Officer [1] 11/4
offset [1] 46/16
oh [2] 52/19 70/5
okay [12] 5/16 7/23
10/18 18/23 25/15
37/4 52/4 67/22

O	0
okay [4] 72/3	0
72/17 73/17 73/18	,
old [2] 21/7 21/8	
once [2] 35/14 79/5	•
one [24] 15/20	0
27/16 32/9 34/13	0
34/22 37/1 39/18	
42/1 42/14 44/6	
44/11 49/18 50/20	
55/1 58/4 64/4	4
64/10 66/2 66/9	,
67/13 72/18 80/13	ľ.
80/18 81/1	'
one-size-fits-all [1]	0
64/4	
ones [4] 48/3 56/3	-
59/10 69/3	
only [7] 9/16 20/21	
22/12 28/8 38/4	•
43/12 81/1	•
open [2] 76/14	4
76/17	•
opportunity [2]	•
10/4 10/8	ļ ,
Opposed [6] 6/17	١,
75/5 78/9 80/7	١,
81/20 82/15	
optimal [1] 65/4	0
optimistic [1] 51/6	0
option [3] 44/11	
67/4 67/13	•

orange [1] 64/12 order [4] 3/2 5/1 5/3 5/20 **Order/Roll** [2] 3/2 5/1 organized [1] 80/22 21/19 24/4 25/23 31/12 32/10 35/3 36/9 38/15 40/10 44/6 46/16 56/7 59/1 65/18 69/3 70/5 70/12 71/23 72/14 our [40] 8/1 8/5 8/6 8/7 8/11 11/11 12/12 12/16 12/19 12/21 14/13 16/15 19/11 21/18 22/22 30/15 30/16 33/8 33/15 37/12 43/9 47/10 47/16 48/8 53/16 55/10 56/16 56/22 65/4 67/15 68/18 69/15 70/8 70/10 73/15 74/21 76/16 78/18 81/3 84/4 ourselves [1] 17/12 out [25] 5/17 9/11 14/12 17/11 18/16 34/23 36/22 39/10

40/9 40/17 43/23 44/20 47/20 51/9 59/19 65/8 66/11 67/8 71/10 71/15 71/17 73/23 76/13 78/23 83/15 other [21] 7/6 15/14 over [40] 6/22 6/23 7/13 9/1 9/10 10/4 13/7 13/8 14/3 16/1 17/7 17/19 18/7 19/14 19/15 19/22 20/9 22/7 23/2 23/5 25/13 26/22 36/15 36/23 39/11 44/12 44/13 44/15 45/23 50/14 51/1 53/12 56/12 63/9 64/22 65/17 66/1 66/7 72/21 76/21 overall [3] 27/7 28/12 48/8 overshot [2] 51/4 51/7 overview [2] 3/8 7/21 overwhelming [1] 74/10 own [2] 21/1 59/21 P

p.m [2] 1/19 82/23 package [2] 46/17 46/22

P
page [17] 8/14 8/17
25/19 26/13 28/1
30/16 41/5 42/1
46/3 53/3 68/19
71/4 74/5 74/20
75/18 76/9 77/20
pages [1] 83/12
paid [5] 39/10 40/9
40/17 60/17 73/1
pandemic [1] 62/2
part [2] 30/11
68/22
particular [1] 58/4
particularly [2]
38/22 39/20
parties [1] 83/22
past [1] 51/2
patterns [1] 24/20
pay [5] 14/7 15/13
45/2 64/13 65/3
paying [2] 12/6
64/8
payment [2] 12/3
23/7
payments [2] 12/8
36/21
payroll [11] 41/5
41/10 41/16 57/18
62/7 62/8 62/15
62/19 62/21 63/14
69/13

peer [13] 3/12 3/18
9/7 9/13 10/1 10/6
16/17 17/21 17/22
19/17 52/15 53/9
60/7
pension [1] 18/11
people [7] 11/22
28/22 33/11 42/9
42/19 42/20 51/6
percentile [2] 18/2
38/21
percentiles [1]
18/18
perfect [1] 25/7
perform [1] 9/15
period [12] 8/10
9/10 39/11 44/16
50/13 57/14 73/14
76/13 76/22 79/13
79/16 81/8
periods [1] 57/9
perspective [1]
65/5
phase [4] 44/11
44/12 65/15 65/15
phase-in [1] 65/15
phased [2] 73/2
73/3
phasing [1] 72/21
Philadelphia [1]
17/14
pick [1] 36/4
Prom [1] Out

picture [1] 12/2 place [4] 32/9 42/14 66/1 71/9 places [2] 25/23 46/11 plan [7] 8/7 12/15 15/6 23/21 26/8 26/8 26/8 planned [1] 9/20 0 plans [12] 14/8 14/13 18/2 18/3 18/11 20/23 22/2 23/16 30/23 33/4 37/20 67/10 play [1] 24/12 pleased [1] 48/7 **pleasure** [1] 11/8 plus [2] 33/18 34/12 pockets [1] 32/8 point [6] 18/6 27/19 43/23 50/7 65/8 73/22 pointing [1] 44/20 points [8] 20/8 22/20 23/17 23/18 26/11 53/8 58/14 58/18 police [5] 22/2 24/18 24/19 65/12 72/3 **policies [4] 4/7** 75/15 76/4 77/2

P Pub [2] 20/17 42/11 Pub-2010 [1] 20/17 R public [9] 1/15 18/3 20/17 20/21 20/22 21/2 37/20 83/7 84/9 published [7] 20/15 20/20 38/9 39/21 43/11 43/17 61/23 punishment [1] 53/11 purpose [1] 53/8 purposes [3] 45/11 58/7 58/8 put [5] 9/11 18/17 47/23 48/1 58/21 puts [1] 27/12 putting [1] 48/16 Q

qualifies [1] 81/2 quarter [1] 18/5 question [1] 48/20 **questions** [16] 6/3 7/5 10/11 25/10 30/3 48/22 52/5 52/8 55/6 67/17 67/19 68/8 68/10 70/14 77/15 83/11 quick [1] 11/11

quickly [2] 15/17

20/10 quorum [1] 5/17

ramped [1] 51/3 ran [1] 24/15 range [2] 58/21 66/8 rate [16] 13/23 24/22 29/6 37/4 37/5 38/21 50/14 62/16 63/4 67/2 67/6 67/8 69/12 72/16 72/22 73/4 rates [13] 15/7 22/10 25/3 29/2 29/9 29/14 31/7 35/20 37/3 42/18 60/16 66/17 84/1 ratio [5] 12/20 22/8 22/18 24/7 25/1 ratios [2] 29/18 36/17 read [2] 25/5 76/10 reader [1] 31/13 ready [1] 10/19 real [14] 18/14 19/11 19/14 20/6 26/10 26/17 26/19 27/5 38/21 40/2 40/2 54/4 55/3 59/13 really [31] 11/15

12/4 13/1 16/2 21/4 22/22 23/20 24/12 30/15 32/22 33/11 34/19 35/6 41/3 43/16 45/22 47/1 47/6 47/7 49/12 53/4 53/13 53/15 54/6 54/10 55/5 55/7 55/16 66/23 69/1 72/4 reason [1] 6/21 reasonable [9] 31/22 32/16 37/16 41/23 42/5 44/5 46/13 55/20 59/16 reasonableness [2] 53/22 54/19 reasonably [2] 27/18 28/15 recommendation [18] 4/3 4/6 4/10 4/12 10/16 41/6 42/4 43/1 59/14 71/2 73/19 74/1 75/14 78/12 78/15 79/20 80/10 80/14 recommendations [19] 3/10 4/8 10/21 11/2 21/20 22/22 31/21 32/2 41/21 48/10 53/21 55/15 55/20 68/15 74/15

R	71/14 71/22	repres
recommendations	relates [1] 76/14	9/17
[4] 74/17 74/19	relationship [1]	repro
75/10 75/16	55/4	reque
recommended [11]	relative [2] 83/21	requir
10/14 35/4 38/15	83/22	requir
56/2 56/17 57/4	relatively [1] 39/16	22/19
57/11 58/11 63/11	rely [2] 38/4 43/21	respoi
71/6 77/20	remain [1] 59/15	10/9
recommending [9]	remind [1] 72/7	respoi
9/23 14/1 18/5 20/2	replicate [4] 30/20	4/1 6/
27/1 27/21 56/4	33/15 35/18 39/1	25/14
73/6 76/7	replicated [1] 35/22	47/16
recommends [1]	replicating [1] 33/9	67/20
50/19	report [10] 31/6	75/6 7
reconciled [1] 31/1	31/9 31/15 36/5	80/8 8
reconciliation [1]	36/11 44/7 45/11	rest [2
37/2	47/14 56/16 68/2	result
redlined [1] 76/5	Report47	63/1 7
redo [1] 47/6	[1] 3/17	result
reduced [1] 83/12	Report68	7/8 10
reducing [2] 29/5	[1] 4/2	28/5 5
69/19	reported [2] 38/10	56/20
reduction [1] 26/11	83/8	retire
reflected [3] 60/14	Reporter [4] 1/15	retire
60/16 60/19	83/7 83/18 84/9	retire
regard [2] 26/5	REPORTER'S [1]	retire
27/12	83/1	20/13
regarding [1] 57/23	Reporting [1]	retire
Regions [4] 81/3	83/17	1/16 8
81/7 81/10 81/23	reports [5] 31/19	14/20
related [3] 9/22	36/2 70/4 70/6 70/8	21/21

esentatives [1] duce [1] 54/3 ests [1] 55/6 red [1] 37/3 rements [1] ond [2] 10/4 nse [20] 3/16 /5 6/18 25/11 4 30/4 47/13 6 48/23 52/6 0 68/2 70/17 77/17 78/10 81/21 82/16 2] 25/4 56/21 t [5] 8/13 50/1 72/23 75/18 ts [11] 6/23 0/17 22/4 22/6 53/1 55/11 74/20 84/1 [1] 72/13 ed [1] 39/9 e [1] 72/2 es [3] 12/6 3 71/21 ement [13] 1/1 8/18 11/23 15/12 16/12 1 22/12 42/20

R retirement... [3] 42/21 44/2 74/6 retrospectively [1] 41/11 return [30] 13/23 14/6 18/9 18/15 19/12 19/14 20/4 20/6 26/5 26/10 26/19 26/22 27/5 27/8 27/20 38/19 38/21 40/2 40/3 40/13 41/4 49/23 57/2 58/10 59/13 60/4 60/11 61/1 65/20 69/17 returns [6] 18/21 19/21 26/15 26/17 36/12 39/23 review [20] 3/12 3/19 9/7 9/7 9/14 10/2 10/6 11/13 14/5 14/10 16/18 30/13 37/12 51/21 52/15 53/10 54/4 54/16 56/2 79/3 reviewed [3] 44/3 58/16 79/5 reviewing [1] 53/20 reviews [2] 17/22 50/9 RFP [3] 9/11 9/13

79/1 right [29] 18/23 19/12 22/13 30/5 30/9 45/21 47/12 49/16 50/4 51/10 51/17 52/11 55/17 63/16 65/19 66/13 68/3 77/5 77/6 78/3 78/11 80/4 80/9 81/9 81/17 81/22 82/3 82/12 82/17 RISK [5] 1/1 1/13 82/1 82/22 83/9 road [4] 28/17 49/17 51/17 66/19 roll [6] 3/2 5/1 5/3 5/5 9/20 14/8 **ROLLING [2] 2/6** 5/12 room [3] 1/16 74/12 74/13 RSA [12] 2/9 2/10 2/11 2/17 27/11 54/17 55/4 59/10 69/4 69/15 70/1 70/12 **RSA's** [1] 19/2 rubber [1] 28/16 run [3] 27/14 33/10 66/18

sacrificing [1] 45/22 said [10] 11/9 25/21 27/3 48/11 53/14 55/3 55/21 65/9 68/12 83/14 salary [6] 22/21 23/1 32/11 32/11 41/20 58/6 same [9] 22/17 25/22 26/10 28/2 28/19 38/22 54/8 67/1 73/8 sample [4] 30/21 33/10 54/9 68/20 sampling [1] 32/23 say [20] 6/14 9/2 12/5 21/14 43/4 43/9 44/16 54/8 58/12 61/4 63/11 63/12 70/9 73/2 74/10 75/3 78/7 80/5 81/18 82/13 saying [11] 6/16 16/8 27/10 37/23 43/3 45/11 75/4 78/8 80/6 81/19 82/14 says [6] 8/1 18/21 26/14 78/19 80/15 81/6

62/1 62/3 science [1] 13/5 scope [11] 3/13 3/20 9/9 9/15 10/2 10/6 30/7 30/17 30/19 52/16 54/2 SCOTT [7] 2/11 2/16 7/1 52/22 56/9 56/13 63/17 Scott

\mathbf{S}
start [1] 61/9
started [1] 7/12
starting [4] 37/13
42/10 68/19 76/3
starts [4] 28/16
29/18 30/16 76/9
state [13] 13/15
22/1 22/2 24/18
24/19 64/6 65/11
65/12 72/2 72/2
81/2 83/3 83/7
statements [1]
83/11
statewide [2] 60/9 60/10
stating [1] 23/22
STATUM [2] 2/7
5/14
status [1] 29/7
statuses [1] 31/1
stay [2] 26/7 29/14
step [1] 46/21
still [2] 52/9 55/19
stochastic [1] 18/18
stool [1] 15/19
straightforward [1]
45/20
stream [3] 12/3
12/7 23/8
Street [2] 1/2 1/17
strengthening [1]

73/16
strengthens [1]
66/17
stringent [1] 73/12
STROM [2] 2/14
30/10
strong [1] 65/19
stronger [2] 66/19
67/3
studies [8] 9/8
19/13 30/14 31/17
32/4 38/13 39/5
47/8
study [41] 3/6 3/9
3/13 3/19 3/21 4/4
4/8 7/1 7/8 7/15 8/3
8/13 8/14 9/14
10/16 11/2 11/11
18/4 30/7 37/13
46/10 47/3 52/15
52/17 53/21 57/1
59/8 59/9 60/8
60/23 61/18 69/11
69/22 70/13 71/3
72/11 73/20 74/20
75/10 75/16 75/23
stuff [3] 14/22 16/7
16/10
subjective [1] 56/7
such [1] 83/22
suggested [1] 56/6
suggests [1] 27/16
İ

summary [3] 7/20 46/3 74/20 supervision [1] 83/13 supplied [1] 74/15 sure [6] 31/4 48/4 50/4 54/22 63/14 70/8 survey [6] 17/13 27/10 38/23 59/12 59/18 59/19 surveys [1] 19/4 synopsis [1] 11/11 system [10] 15/13 16/12 20/13 32/7 33/8 34/19 34/20 43/18 45/23 64/8 systematically [1] 41/19 systems [13] 1/1 1/16 16/18 21/18 33/7 33/19 34/1 38/15 39/7 59/2 60/9 60/10 65/6 T

table [6] 20/15 21/4 21/14 50/16 51/9 51/13 tables [5] 20/17 21/1 21/2 42/11 50/16 take [6] 13/13

	19/5 67/1 take take 60/8 takin 50/1 talk 20/1 49/6 58/9 talkin 70/4	en [2] 1/14 76/3 es [3] 12/9 48/2 8 ng [3] 45/14 17 76/13 [12] 9/21 13/3 11 25/20 47/17 5 50/9 53/5 56/9 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	57/19 60/21 61/10 62/7 test [1] 34/2 testing [1] 32/10 than [30] 17/9 19/10 21/16 23/10 26/23 28/20 34/4 40/17 41/12 41/16 42/20 43/6 43/10 45/20 46/23 49/5 49/15 50/6 51/16 57/4 60/4 60/11 62/19 62/23 63/10 64/13 72/8 72/17 73/8 73/17 thank [13] 7/16 30/5 47/11 52/13 67/21 67/22 68/5 70/19 70/20 75/8 82/18 82/19 82/20 thanks [4] 34/16 47/12 52/12 63/16 that [355] that's [24] 5/17 12/4 16/14 19/2 21/16 26/10 26/23 26/23 38/6 39/9 40/7 41/2 41/8 43/14 47/9 49/1 50/7 52/4 58/22 60/11 64/16 76/17 81/3 81/3
--	---	--	--

their [25] 7/9 7/18 10/1 10/2 10/4 10/6 10/20 11/22 14/9 19/7 20/1 21/1 26/18 31/1 33/13 38/17 48/7 59/14 59/21 68/6 68/8 68/22 69/11 74/14 78/22 them [13] 10/9 27/16 28/6 29/14 35/11 50/2 56/5 66/2 66/11 72/14 72/18 76/5 79/9 themselves [2] 67/7 67/8 then [55] 7/9 10/1 10/5 10/15 12/20 15/3 15/10 16/17 17/4 17/7 17/16 18/16 19/18 21/19 22/9 22/21 23/2 24/2 24/4 24/17 24/21 25/1 28/7 29/21 31/9 31/16 31/23 33/5 35/13 37/1 38/9 38/9 40/10 42/1 42/23 44/6 45/5 46/14 50/3 53/19 54/18 57/17 58/9 58/20 59/1 59/11 60/15

\mathbf{T}
then [8] 62/13
62/17 62/21 63/2
69/3 70/3 70/11
73/5
there [77] 7/9 13/1
14/4 17/4 18/2
18/20 19/4 20/14
22/4 22/9 23/3
23/14 23/15 24/19
25/9 27/15 28/10
29/22 31/10 32/13
33/16 33/22 34/13
35/3 35/20 36/6
36/8 37/1 37/9
37/20 38/11 38/11
40/15 40/18 40/21
41/3 41/14 41/14
41/18 41/19 41/21 42/22 43/19 44/8
44/14 45/7 45/9
45/21 46/8 46/10
46/14 47/4 48/9
48/9 48/14 48/19
49/19 52/9 53/23
54/1 54/7 56/4
61/10 62/9 64/2
64/3 64/12 65/6
72/9 76/11 78/4
79/19 81/1 81/10
81/15 82/4 82/10
there's [5] 21/19

29/12 64/9 66/4
66/13
thereof [1] 84/1
thereto [1] 83/12
these [16] 8/22 9/4
14/14 15/20 16/20
19/13 22/6 23/16
24/9 49/19 50/15
56/7 69/2 73/7 74/2
74/15
they [53] 6/2 7/5
9/23 10/11 10/11
10/21 14/21 16/8
17/14 17/19 18/14
19/5 19/6 19/9
19/11 19/21 19/23
20/21 21/10 23/10
23/22 24/10 24/11
28/22 35/6 35/9
35/14 38/16 39/20
41/11 43/4 43/5
43/11 45/10 50/23
51/2 51/4 51/6
55/17 56/11 59/11
66/8 66/15 66/18 66/19 67/6 68/10
68/14 69/7 69/16
72/16 75/21 76/4
they're [2] 21/11
51/5
thing [10] 6/22 15/3
21/3 28/19 39/18

50/17 54/8 55/2 57/17 62/6 things [19] 8/23 16/5 32/10 35/11 35/20 35/21 36/2 36/11 47/7 48/14 50/12 50/20 54/14 58/1 64/9 66/12 66/22 70/12 72/19 think [39] 5/4 5/22 9/19 27/9 27/18 31/13 41/15 42/3 43/9 43/17 43/19 44/4 46/1 46/4 46/8 47/9 47/22 49/11 49/12 50/7 50/8 51/6 52/7 53/13 55/15 55/16 55/19 55/21 56/15 56/23 61/17 63/7 63/20 68/23 71/8 71/11 74/11 80/20 82/3 think it's [1] 46/1 third [2] 44/19 45/6 thirds [3] 43/1 43/8 57/7 this [41] 7/2 9/11 9/19 9/20 15/5 18/4 26/2 26/16 27/19 30/1 32/21 35/5 37/5 37/5 38/1 38/10 42/17 45/12

\mathbf{T}
this [23] 45/12
45/13 48/8 49/4
55/16 57/5 59/4
59/12 64/5 65/9
68/7 68/9 71/8
71/15 72/11 73/13
73/22 73/23 76/17
77/3 77/12 79/1
84/3
those [49] 11/23 12/15 12/18 12/20
14/12 15/2 15/6
15/15 15/15 21/23
23/18 23/20 24/23
34/6 35/16 35/18
36/15 41/15 42/7
44/4 46/6 48/22
50/1 53/18 54/6
54/9 54/10 54/13
54/23 56/10 59/19
59/23 60/2 63/3
66/10 71/10 71/12
71/17 72/7 72/12
73/7 73/11 73/16
74/16 76/7 76/8
thought [4] 41/22
46/6 47/4 72/5
thoughtfully [1]
50/15
three [5] 14/4 43/6

51/11 60/18 80/17 threshold [1] 33/15 through [11] 8/22 10/20 11/10 33/10 35/14 35/16 38/17 70/15 76/10 77/21 77/21 throws [1] 49/10 thumbs [1] 42/13 tier [10] 22/9 22/9 22/20 23/17 23/18 25/2 25/3 28/13 28/14 58/4 tiers [2] 30/23 33/4 tightened [1] 72/10 tightens [1] 72/18 time [20] 18/22 19/2 27/19 36/23 39/11 44/12 44/13 44/23 45/7 45/15 46/1 50/14 56/22 59/17 60/21 61/21 69/23 73/22 73/22 75/21 time-valued [1] 45/15 timing [1] 35/21 today [8] 6/21 9/16 12/6 21/7 23/6 23/12 73/6 76/5 together [5] 27/12 47/21 48/1 48/17

74/14 told [1] 54/1 tomorrow [1] 71/16 too [5] 35/23 52/3 52/20 53/6 54/7 took [4] 20/19 51/8 54/20 54/21 top [5] 26/16 42/17 43/12 59/5 73/5 total [3] 32/11 40/19 71/22 touch [2] 14/2 25/23 touched [2] 11/12 54/6 towards [1] 50/12 transcription [1] 83/14 transparency [1] 31/12 trouble [3] 25/6 66/11 67/9 TRS [5] 30/8 58/12 58/20 64/3 64/5 true [1] 83/14 try [4] 33/15 53/6 66/1 66/11 trying [1] 12/5 **Tuesday [2] 1/18** 83/10 tuning [1] 70/10 turn [3] 7/13 43/5

	<u> </u>		
Ī	\mathbf{T}	unreasonable [1]	57/11 61/16
	turn [1] 56/12	47/2	usual [1] 84/1
ı	turnover [1] 44/2	until [1] 24/12	usually [1] 13
ı	turns [1] 51/9	unusual [1] 44/1	utilities [1] 7
ı	two [18] 7/6 9/7	up [19] 12/19 20/19	utilized [3] 59
	29/23 34/20 38/18	25/13 30/1 32/1	59/9 59/14
		36/4 42/13 48/20	utilizing [1] 5
	43/1 43/8 43/12	50/2 50/8 50/13	$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$
	53/11 57/7 59/1	60/3 62/12 62/15	
	59/8 59/23 64/9	65/1 72/1 72/10	val [1] 24/16
	72/9 73/11 79/6	72/18 77/13	validates [1]
	79/7	updated [1] 77/1	valuation [21]
	two-thirds [3] 43/1	upfront [1] 67/3	11/14 12/12 2
	43/8 57/7	upon [5] 4/7 8/5	28/4 28/5 31/0
	typewritten [1]	26/17 27/6 75/15	34/19 35/17 3
	83/12	us [18] 7/2 7/3 7/21	36/10 48/15 5
	\mathbf{U}	9/16 10/11 10/12	54/5 54/19 54
	UAL [1] 65/17	14/16 15/1 15/14	55/11 56/19 6
ı	unanimous [1]	15/19 33/2 42/6	60/19 69/15
	79/10		valuations [11
		47/23 48/20 49/4	3/15 24/13 24
ı	under [1] 83/13	55/5 68/16 73/9	30/8 30/13 30
	underneath [1]	use [12] 12/15	30/21 46/5 47
	29/16	12/18 12/20 13/4	69/6 79/17
	understand [2]	13/16 14/7 15/10	value [6] 31/7
	7/22 10/13	20/20 33/13 38/8	39/12 40/19 4
	unfunded [15]	43/1 44/22	45/8
	15/11 22/7 22/15	used [6] 32/8 35/16	valued [1] 45
	28/11 29/1 50/5	54/22 57/19 58/12	various [1] 33
	62/10 62/10 63/2	58/13	word [1] 24/5
	63/22 64/7 64/13	using [10] 7/18 19/2	vast [1] 34/5
	64/21 69/11 76/16	23/8 37/19 38/21	versus [3] 36/
	Union [2] 1/2 1/17	42/11 43/7 57/6	40/5 58/13
			very [17] 11/1

57/11 61/16 usual [1] 84/1 usually [1] 13/19 utilities [1] 71/23 utilized [3] 59/7 59/9 59/14 utilizing [1] 57/3 \mathbf{V} val [1] 24/16 **validates** [1] 46/8 valuation [21] 9/10 11/14 12/12 22/4 28/4 28/5 31/6 34/19 35/17 36/4 36/10 48/15 53/17 54/5 54/19 54/20 55/11 56/19 60/15 60/19 69/15 valuations [11]

3/15 24/13 24/15

30/8 30/13 30/18

value [6] 31/7 33/17

39/12 40/19 44/23

valued [1] 45/15

various [1] 33/3

versus [3] 36/20

very [17] 11/10

30/21 46/5 47/3

57/16 58/7 59/23 \mathbf{V} 37/4 39/2 41/23 42/3 42/15 44/7 71/11 72/20 73/14 very... [16] 17/6 went [6] 28/13 31/3 44/8 44/14 44/16 22/23 24/19 34/8 45/12 45/16 46/7 32/18 37/6 70/15 34/11 34/15 35/1 47/1 47/4 47/18 78/23 35/9 35/10 35/12 were [35] 9/12 47/21 48/19 49/16 39/7 46/5 47/22 51/17 51/23 54/13 19/23 22/5 26/2 54/12 64/6 66/6 55/3 55/4 58/3 58/6 30/11 33/8 34/15 VI [1] 4/12 59/12 59/13 62/23 34/18 34/21 35/3 VIA [3] 2/4 2/6 2/7 63/5 63/10 65/14 35/6 35/16 35/17 view [2] 17/1 19/19 37/8 38/23 40/1 68/7 68/10 71/11 \mathbf{W} 72/22 73/9 74/10 44/4 44/20 45/10 wage [1] 14/7 75/22 83/10 46/5 46/11 48/10 wait [1] 52/19 way [4] 29/19 38/17 48/18 48/21 54/23 want [26] 6/2 6/7 45/13 46/16 55/11 55/13 56/11 7/20 13/11 15/21 ways [1] 33/19 59/7 59/9 59/10 15/23 16/2 16/21 we [320] 69/4 72/19 75/22 19/8 21/23 26/3 we'll [1] 51/19 83/12 29/14 33/16 33/17 we're [4] 23/11 what [63] 7/22 8/6 33/22 38/3 43/23 10/13 11/19 11/19 27/1 38/1 51/10 44/22 47/17 50/10 we've [7] 7/11 11/21 12/4 12/7 60/23 61/4 61/7 38/13 38/14 43/14 13/6 13/14 14/20 65/8 68/5 72/6 50/10 78/4 81/14 16/1 16/6 16/7 wanted [2] 48/22 web [2] 5/4 52/8 16/18 16/19 17/2 67/13 WEBEX [3] 2/4 2/6 18/14 21/6 24/13 was [60] 1/14 1/17 2/7 25/21 26/10 27/11 5/21 8/9 20/19 22/7 weight [2] 40/1 30/18 32/12 32/23 28/10 30/12 30/18 33/5 34/6 36/14 40/3 31/5 31/11 31/18 well [17] 8/6 9/12 37/6 37/7 37/8 31/22 32/19 32/23 9/18 10/22 16/21 45/22 47/1 47/18 34/3 34/13 34/13 19/7 19/8 30/14 48/4 49/7 53/5 34/15 34/19 36/14 37/23 43/9 48/5 54/21 55/3 57/12

$ \mathbf{W} $
what [22] 60/6
61/1 62/1 62/3 62/8
62/20 62/23 63/5
64/7 64/10 64/17
64/18 64/19 64/20
66/9 66/12 66/14
70/15 71/21 72/15
78/21 79/14
what's [3] 10/13
58/12 58/13
when [18] 13/16
14/21 16/15 17/10
26/20 29/17 37/21
38/5 38/12 40/15
43/4 46/18 46/20
49/11 51/10 60/13
62/9 75/22
where [17] 19/21
19/23 23/14 28/16
28/17 28/19 41/6
42/14 46/11 49/19
49/23 50/9 50/10
50/11 54/9 61/2
70/4
which [15] 7/20 8/3
14/7 14/16 24/15
48/12 49/20 51/5
55/2 60/8 60/17
64/14 66/17 67/4
76/9
white [1] 76/11

who [5] 21/9 43/3 43/7 62/1 71/17 will [58] 7/4 7/9 7/12 7/13 7/19 8/15 8/17 8/22 9/3 9/21 10/1 10/3 10/5 10/8 10/22 12/7 13/22 14/2 16/22 18/14 19/1 21/10 23/14 25/8 25/19 26/2 38/7 38/7 38/8 38/9 38/10 39/10 40/14 41/16 48/15 51/10 51/19 51/21 53/6 56/12 58/11 61/4 61/9 61/19 64/21 69/1 69/14 69/20 70/11 71/15 72/13 72/15 73/7 74/7 74/18 76/15 76/20 77/23 withdrawal [3] 21/22 22/12 72/16 withdrawals [1] 72/15 within [7] 20/16 33/17 33/23 34/7 34/12 35/16 35/20 without [2] 28/8 76/10 won't [2] 24/11 54/6

work [4] 30/12 47/18 48/16 78/22 working [4] 50/12 52/2 55/4 74/14 workings [1] 54/10 worth [1] 27/9 would [49] 10/15 10/17 26/6 26/7 28/22 31/20 34/6 34/23 35/1 36/9 43/2 43/5 43/21 44/18 44/21 44/22 45/14 49/14 50/5 54/7 55/1 55/18 56/5 56/18 56/21 58/2 58/20 60/3 61/15 63/10 63/12 64/9 65/9 65/10 65/10 65/16 66/14 69/9 71/8 72/6 72/16 73/22 73/23 74/3 74/9 76/23 77/13 79/11 81/5 wouldn't [2] 65/11 73/10 write [1] 53/9 wrong [1] 65/7 Y

y'all [1] 52/14 YANCEY [1] 2/9 Yeah [2] 15/21 55/18

\mathbf{Y}
year [44] 3/6 7/1
7/15 8/9 9/10 9/11
12/17 12/22 15/8
17/18 21/7 21/8
37/4 37/5 38/18
39/21 39/21 39/22
40/1 40/2 40/20
40/21 44/16 44/18
44/19 44/19 45/2
45/3 45/5 45/6 51/2
61/22 63/5 65/20
72/22 73/14 76/21
77/13 78/20 78/23
79/1 79/13 79/16
84/4
years [42] 8/1 8/4 8/8 12/9 13/7 13/9
13/9 16/1 16/2 17/8
17/20 18/17 19/20
19/23 20/16 20/19
21/8 21/10 36/15
38/16 43/6 43/12
51/1 51/2 51/12
57/9 57/12 57/15
60/18 62/5 63/9
63/10 63/21 64/23
65/17 69/9 72/21
77/4 77/12 79/22
81/8 81/12
yes [6] 45/11 68/14
73/21 77/14 77/14
1

T7

78/18 you [178] you'll [1] 40/6 you're [3] 25/6 37/23 50/3 you've [3] 53/3 55/15 63/19 you-all [8] 12/2 12/17 12/22 47/23 70/14 82/18 82/19 82/20 younger [2] 21/14 42/19 your [34] 12/3 16/12 17/21 18/10 18/20 18/21 19/10 19/17 25/6 25/20 33/6 34/21 37/23 39/8 39/12 39/14 39/19 40/5 40/8 40/18 42/8 42/18 42/19 43/18 53/10 53/12 56/8 61/7 64/6 64/13 64/14 65/1 65/16 65/17 Z zero [1] 34/23