

## **PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT BOARD**

100 North Park Avenue, Room 201

Helena MT 59601

AGENDA

Thursday, May 12, 2011

### **REGULAR MEETING**

President John Nielsen called the regular meeting to order at 8:35 am Thursday, May 12, 2011. Roll call was taken and all members of the Board were present. Board members and staff present were:

John Nielsen, President  
Terry Smith, Vice President  
Darcy Halpin, Member  
Patrick McKittrick, Member  
Scott Moore, Member  
Dianna Porter, Member  
Timm Twardoski, Member  
Roxanne Minnehan, Executive Director  
Melanie Symons, Chief Legal Counsel  
Flora Sebens, Executive Assistant

Other's present: Ralph Pomnichowski, MPERA; Mike O'Connor, MPERA; Beth Long, GWRs; Ed Cleary, Rick Ryan, Dax Fraser, George Richards, Kevin Bentz and Jason Baker, members of the Montana State Firemen's Association; Don Kinman, AFSCME; Jill Hindoien, MRPEC; David Senn, TRS; Jay Masci, Provaliant; Barbara Quinn, Fiscal Services Bureau Chief; Patricia Davis, Member Services Bureau Chief; Kate Talley, Legal Counsel; Jenny Weigand, Education Supervisor; June Dosier, Information Systems Manager; Dave Swenson, IT Systems Supervisor; and Renae Justice, Internal Auditor, joined the meeting.

### **OPEN MEETING**

- I. Roll Call**
- II. Public/Member Comment** - No comments were given.

*Action items*

### **III. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes**

The minutes of the open meeting of April 14, 2011, were presented.

***Motion: Vice President Terrence Smith moved to approve the minutes of the April 14, 2011, PERB Regular Open Meeting with corrections.***

***Second: Member Dianna Porter***

***No public comment.***

***Vote: 7/0***

**IV. Executive Director's Report – Roxanne Minnehan, Executive Director**

**A. Pension Administration Benchmarking (Mike Heale, CEM Benchmarking, Inc.)**

Cost Effectiveness Measurement (CEM) Benchmarking Inc. is an independent, objective provider of benchmarking information specializing in pension investment and administration operations. Mr. Mike Heale, partner at CEM, provided a presentation on CEM's services.

CEM Benchmarking, Incorporated was founded in 1991 and is located in Toronto, Canada. Mr. Heale explained that benchmarking is an important aspect of any organization's continual improvement initiatives. Without some form of benchmarking there is no quantitative way to measure the success of major initiatives, including system replacement projects. Currently MPERA doesn't have a set of benchmarks that it can use to evaluate its major initiatives. Therefore, the question is not if we need to create benchmarks, but what is the most cost effective and beneficial method to create those benchmarks.

CEM offers a Pension Administration Benchmarking Service (PABS). PABS is a unique information service that provides participants with a performance management and improvement tool. Participants complete a survey that focuses on administration costs, service levels, and key transaction volumes. The data and results are strictly confidential. The survey takes about two days to complete.

The all inclusive cost of the PABS service is \$20,000 and includes the following benefits:

- A detailed annual benchmarking report that analyzes costs, service delivery and administration workloads using standardized, directly comparable measures.
- An annual supplementary best practice study. The 2011/12 best practice study will focus on Customer Satisfaction Surveying.
- An onsite meeting scheduled at MPERA's convenience to present and discuss the results.

Participants use PABS to answer key fiduciary questions, to monitor and manage performance improvement over time, to communicate performance to stakeholders, and to gain best practice insights.

An approximate timeline for key events is:

- |   |                |
|---|----------------|
| • Send PABS survey                                  | July, 2011     |
| • Conference call to discuss survey completion      | August, 2011   |
| • PABS Survey due at CEM                            | October, 2011  |
| • Draft Benchmarking Report sent to us              | November, 2011 |
| • Customer Satisfaction Surveying Report sent to us | June, 2012     |
| • On-site presentation of the Final Report          | November, 2012 |

Ms. Minnehan stated that it is the staff's belief that CEM provides us with the most cost effective and meaningful way to establish benchmarks for MPERA. In evaluating the

cost of CEM versus trying to build internal benchmarking we estimate that it would cost us \$21,200 in internal cost, versus \$20,000 for CEM. The cost comparison assumes that:

1. MPERA resources are available, which is very unlikely because of the current workloads and MPERAtiv effort.
2. MPERA would get the same quality of responses from other agencies that CEM receives. Once again, very unlikely.

It was noted that the cost comparison does not include the cost of loss of staff time from day-to-day work and other projects.

President John Nielsen asked if this contract would require an RFP. Ms. Melanie Symons, Chief Legal Counsel, responded that it would not because of the uniqueness of the services it would be considered a Sole Source Contract. Ms. Symons explained that if it is not a Sole Source Contract then anything between \$5,000 and \$25,000 requires three (3) telephone contacts to get information from other possible vendors.

Vice President Terrence Smith voiced concern that we were already paying Provaliant a large sum of money to redesign our system. He stated that at the last meeting, Mr. Scott Grant from Provaliant mentioned that if we did not contract with CEM that Provaliant would have to perform the benchmarking service. Ms. Minnehan stated that Mr. Grant mentioned that *staff* would have to perform the benchmarking services and Provaliant would assist us to some degree, but that was not part of their contract.

Mr. Jay Masci, President of Provaliant, was introduced to the Board. Mr. Masci stated Provaliant's task is to perform oversight for the MPERAtiv program. They make sure that the line of business vendors and everyone that is building the new system is doing it correctly and according to the RFP. CEM provides a service that is completely different than Provaliant. Mr. Masci clarified there is no relationship between CEM Benchmarking, Inc. and Provaliant. The biggest thing that CEM provides is an independent evaluation of all of the performance measures. With a project of MPERAtiv size and financial commitment, there will be questions from the Legislature, citizens, and other concerned entities about the ultimate benefits to MPERA. Benchmarking will give MPERA the tools to clarify and justify the need for such investments by providing an objective, clear "before and after" picture. Mr. Masci felt the Board has an obligation as fiduciaries to ensure that the fees paid and services rendered are reasonable to some goal or standard. MPERA's contract with Provalient does not include any benchmarking provision. Both Provalient and MPERA management also feel that having Provaliant oversee benchmarking for the project would be a clear conflict of interest.

***Motion: Member Dianna Porter moved to contract with CEM Benchmarking, Incorporated to perform the benchmarking survey.***

***Second: Member Darcy Halpin***

***No public comment.***

*Vote: 7/0*

**B. *EIAC Recommendations (Patricia Davis)***

1. Investment Policy Statements

Ms. Patricia Davis, Member Services Bureau Chief, explained that the Board's Investment Policy Statements (IPS) for the Defined Contribution Retirement Plan (DCRP) and the Deferred Compensation (457) Plan are reviewed annually. EIAC has reviewed both statements and has made recommendations for Board consideration. The recommendations include evaluation criteria for the addition of Target Date Funds. Target Date Funds were approved at the March 10, 2011 Board meeting.

***Motion: Vice President Terrence Smith moved to approve the recommended changes to the Board Admin Policies 11 & 12.***

***Second: Member Scott Moore***

***No public comment.***

***Vote: 7/0***

2. Target Date Funds

Wilshire Investment Consultants recommended adding JP Morgan SmartRetirement Funds to the DCRP and 457 Plan investment option lineups. Target Date Funds can provide a solution to participants who are uncertain about how to create a balanced, diversified portfolio.

***Motion: Vice President Terrence Smith moved to accept EIAC recommendation to add JP Morgan Smart Retirement Funds to the DC and 457 Plans.***

***Second: Member Timm Twardoski***

***No public comment.***

***Vote: 7/0***

3. Discontinue Use of Asset Allocation Funds in the 457 Plan

The addition of Target Date Funds would replace the Asset Allocation Funds now available in the 457 Plan. Target date funds automatically adjust and rebalance assets over the life of the fund.

***Motion: Vice President Terrence Smith moved to accept EIAC's recommendation to remove the asset allocation funds from the 457 plan.***

***Second: Member Darcy Halpin***

*No public comment.*

*Vote: 7/0*

4. DCRP Default Investment Options

With the addition of Target Date Funds, EIAC recommends the Target Date Fund become the default investment option for new participants, effective July 1, 2011.

*Motion: Vice President Terrence Smith moved to accept the EIAC recommendation to change the default investment option in the DC plan to the appropriate target date fund.*

*Second: Member Scott Moore*

*No public comment.*

*Vote: 7/0*

5. Fund Retention – Munder Mid-Cap Fund

In March 2011, the Board approved T Rowe Price Mid-Cap Growth Strategy as a replacement fund for Munder Mid-Cap. MPERA then learned that T Rowe Price was closed to new investors. Wilshire presented additional investment options at the April EIAC meeting. In light of the other options and improved performance by Munder Mid-Cap, EIAC is now recommending retention of Munder Mid-Cap Fund.

*Motion: Vice President Terrence Smith moved to accept EIAC's recommendation to retain the Munder Mid-Cap fund, on a probation status, in the DC & 457 plans.*

*Second: President John Nielsen*

*No public comment.*

*Vote: 7/0*

**C. *Board Committee Review and Assignments (John Nielsen)***

Board elections were held last month. Following Board elections, the Board President assesses and appoints the Board committees. Some committees meet more often than others. Some Committees (i.e. Personnel/Negotiations) require face-to-face meetings, while others can be conference calls. President John Nielsen asked if any Committee Members wished to make changes at this time. There were no changes.

*Motion: President John Nielsen moved that the Board Committee assignments are as follows:*

**Audit Committee:**  
Terrence Smith, Chair

**Legislative Committee:**  
Dianna Porter, Chairwoman

Patrick McKittrick  
Timm Twardoski

John Nielsen  
Terrence Smith

**Personnel Committee:**

Darcy Halpin, Chairwoman  
Scott Moore  
Timm Twardoski

**Policy Committee:**

Scott Moore, Chair  
Darcy Halpin  
Dianna Porter

**Joint Issues Committee:**

John Nielsen  
Patrick McKittrick

*Second: Member Darcy Halpin*

*No public comment.*

*Vote: 7/0*

***D. PERS Contract – Flathead Emergency Communications Center (Kate Talley)***

Ms. Kate Talley, Legal Counsel, noted that local government entities may elect PERS coverage for their employees. Flathead Emergency Communications Center is a consolidation of 911 centers for Kalispell, Whitefish, Columbia Falls and Flathead County. Each of these entities originally contract individually for services. We requested a new contract for the new combined entity. Obtaining a new contract has been in the process for close to a year.

***Motion: Vice President Terrence Smith moved to uphold staff recommendation and approve Flathead Emergency Communications Center’s contract for PERS coverage.***

*Second: Member Darcy Halpin*

*No public comment.*

*Vote: 7/0*

***E. Travel Authorization – NAGDCA Conference, September 10-14, Albuquerque, NM***

The National Association of Government Defined Contribution Administrators, Inc. (NAGDCA) is a professional organization of deferred compensation/defined contribution plan administrators from state and local governments and private industries. NAGDCA is an excellent resource for sharing information on investments, marketing, administration and laws governing public sector plans. The 32nd Annual NAGDCA Conference is September 10-14 in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The conference theme is Retirement Security: Learning from the Past & Envisioning the Future. The Member Services Bureau Chief, MPERA Chief Legal Counsel and one or two Board members have attended in the past. Ms. Minnehan is requesting that she be able to attend this year, as well. It is approximately \$2,130 per person.

***Motion: President John Nielsen moved to approve the travel authorizations for three (3) staff members and one (1) Board member to attend the National***

***Association of Government Defined Contribution Administrators, Inc. (NADCA),  
from September 10-14, 2011, in Albuquerque, New Mexico.***

***Second: Member Darcy Halpin***

***No public comment.***

***Vote: 7/0***

***F. Set Board Retreat Date***

The Board usually has a fall retreat. Last year the retreat was in March. Staff recommends September 8-9, 2011, for this year's retreat. Ms. Minnehan explained that she felt that date was convenient from the standpoint that it fell at the time of the regularly scheduled monthly Board Meeting, plus right afterwards the chosen staff could then fly to Albuquerque, New Mexico to attend the NADCA Conference. If the meeting on September 8<sup>th</sup> gets over early then the Board Retreat can start immediately afterwards and finish up on Friday afternoon. Several Board members stated that they had prior engagements already scheduled for September 9<sup>th</sup>. It was suggested the Retreat start a day earlier and be finished after the Board meeting on September 8<sup>th</sup>.

***Motion: Vice President Terrence Smith moved that the next Board Retreat be scheduled to begin on September 7, 2011, and completed after the Board Meeting on September 8, 2011.***

***Second: Member Darcy Halpin***

***No public comment.***

***Vote: 7/0***

***G. Set Board Meetings – July, August, September (John Nielsen)***

Ms. Minnehan mentioned that it was time to schedule the next quarter monthly meetings – July, August and September. Board Meetings are usually held the 2nd Thursday of the month.

***Motion: President John Nielsen moved that the next quarter Board Meetings be scheduled as follows: Thursday, July 14, 2011, Thursday, August 11, 2011, and Thursday, September 8, 2011.***

***Second: Member Darcy Halpin***

***No public comment.***

***Vote: 7/0***

#### ***H. 2011 Legislative Session – Lessons***

Ms. Minnehan mentioned that while the Legislative Session was still fresh in everyone's minds, a brainstorming session discussing what worked well, what could be improved upon and what should be avoided needs to be discussed. She asked for input from Board members, lobbyists, staff and the public.

Member Porter felt the handouts, the press releases, newsletters, facebook postings and Ms. Minnehan's blogs were extremely helpful. Member Terrence Smith felt that we needed to boost our PR campaign by releasing articles at least every quarter on retirement issues and making sure that we present as much information to the public as we can in an effort to educate them on what the retirement issues are. He referred to the Government Finance Officers magazine articles that talked about the myths of retirement systems and was written in layman's terms so it is very easy to understand. He urged the staff to review it and use the information and stated that a lot of times these types of sources do not charge people to republish them. Ms. Minnehan felt we needed to build a rapport and relationship with our members, as well as the employers. She felt we needed to educate the employers on what a great benefit it is to offer their employees. Member Porter suggested trying to include something during the educational webinars about logging into facebook and reviewing the information that is posted. Ms. Jenny Weigand, Education Supervisor, noted that this is already currently being done. Member Timm Twardoski mentioned that he intended on putting the MPERA website in the AFSME newsletter and stated that if the MPERA Education Department wanted to write an article he would be happy to include that in the newsletter, as well. Member Twardoski also suggested contacting Mr. Eric Fever with MEA-MFT to see if he would do the same for their newsletter. President John Nielsen felt that the hiring of a lobbyist this year was very helpful and that we needed to seriously considering doing this again for the next legislative session. Ms. Minnehan mentioned that she felt it was extremely helpful to meet with the leadership at the legislature and let them know who we were and where we stood on certain bills. Member Porter asked if it was helpful when Board members testified at hearings. Ms. Minnehan felt that it was important for the committee members to be able to meet Board members.

Mr. Ed Cleary, Montana State Firefighter's Association, thanked the Board, staff and lobbyist for their professionalism and support during this Legislative Session.

Ms. Melanie Symons, Chief Legal Counsel, noted that there were a few different styles of documents that were created to track certain bills. She asked the Board if they had a preferred style. The table shows all of the status and how that bill has transferred back and forth between the houses. It has a lot of detail, but it is lacking a summary of what the bill is. The bill summary tracks all of the bills that we are tracking in-house. It hones in on ones that are specific to us or that the Board has taken a position on. It is more user friendly than the table. President John Nielsen suggested discussing this item at the Board Retreat. Ms. Minnehan noted that the reason it was on the agenda for discussion at today's meeting was because the Board Retreat was several months away and she wanted to capture everyone's ideas while they were still fresh in their mind, but she agreed this could be discussed at the Retreat in September. Board members expressed preference for the tracking table.

*Discussion Items*

**I. 2011 Legislative Session Recap (Dianna Porter, Roxanne Minnehan)**

Ms. Minnehan stated that as of May 10, 2011, there were 492 bills in front of the Governor:

- 14 (N) – became law with NO signature
- 11 (R-AC) – were returned to Governor, Governor Amendment Concurred
- 17 (R-AF) – Returned to Governor, Governor Amendment Failed
- 50 (R-BG) – Received by Governor (still pending)
- 1 (S-LV) – Signed, Line Item Veto
- 342 (SGND) – Signed
- 57 (VTD) – Vetoed
- 78 – Yet to Arrive

We tracked 90 Introduced and Unintroduced Bills:

- 68 were introduced – of those 68, 27 were specifically retirement bills.

Of the introduced bills:

- 40 died in the process
- 16 became law
- 5 were vetoed
- 5 are awaiting Governor Action
- 2 were resolutions filed with SOS
- 

Bill Statuses:

- HB 122 – PERS funding bill – awaiting for Governor action
- HB 70 – PERB General Revisions bill – passed
- HB 134 – GWPORS funding bill – passed
- HB 135 – SRS funding bill – passed
- HB 85 – Working retiree bill – died in Committee
- SB 328 – Require PERS new hires to be in DC plan – died in process
- HB 608 – Close retirement systems and provide for annuity benefit program – died in process
- HB 632 – Use spendable portion of coal severance tax to pay down UAL in PERS, TRS, SRS & GWPORS – died in process
- SB 113 – Transfer statutory excess retirement funds in trust by school districts to TRS & PERS – died in Committee
- SB 222 – Revise qualifications for firefighters – passed
- SB 223 – Revise VFCA benefits – passed
- HB86 – TRS General Revision Bill
- HB116 – TRS bill to tighten actuarial controls
- SB 54 – TRS Hybrid Plan – vetoed
- HB 2 – General Appropriations Bill – awaiting Governor action

- HB 13 – State Employee Pay Plan – died in process
- HB 585 – Require public disclosure of contract with outside counsel for state agencies – awaiting Governor action
- SB 129 – Provide limit to state employee salaries and benefits – died in process
- HJ 38 – Interim study of local fire protection, firefighters and EMTs – filed with SOS
- SR 6 – Confirm certain Governor’s appointees (Timm & Scott) – filed with SOS

#### *Lobbying Contractors*

Ms. Minnehan mentioned that President John Nielsen had requested a recap of how much we had paid Mr. Mike O’Connor to assist with the lobbying efforts. To date we have paid Mr. O’Connor \$19,975. Ms. Minnehan also noted that Mr. Ralph Pomakowski’s contract was to be no more than \$4,500. He has invoiced us \$1,800 so far. Mr. Pomakowski provided newspaper articles during the session. President John Nielsen thanked both Mr. O’Connor and Mr. Pomakowski for their assistance during the Legislative Session. Member Dianna Porter also thanked the MPERA staff and Legislative Committee for all of their efforts.

#### ***J. MPERAtiv Program Update (June Dossier, Jay Masci, Provalient)***

Ms. June Dossier, Information Systems Manager, reported that the MPERAtiv Program is moving ahead as scheduled. Some of the activities that have been completed since the last Board meeting are as follows:

- Risk Assessment was conducted by MPERAtiv Steering Committee and Provaliant.
- The project quality assurance plan and quality check point process was developed and used to approve contractual documents.
- Contractual documents, including MPERAtiv project charter, communication plan and quality assurance plan were developed.
- The IT tactical strategy is being developed to address how MPERA will support the LOB, imaging and other solutions going forward.
- Business Process Modification – research on MPERA business processes and side-by-side observations of MPERA processes is continuing.
- Data Cleansing – development of the RFP is commencing with gathering the information on MPERA data, completion of the Data Readiness Report Card, gathering requirements and establishing the timeline for completion of the Data Cleansing RFP. The RFP is tentatively scheduled for release on June 15, 2011.
- Imaging – imaging deliverable timeline was modified to allow business process modifications project to identify imaging integration points to be utilized for the imaging RFP.

Activities to be completed next month:

#### *Data Cleansing*

- Requirements will be collected and finalized. RFP will be developed and is scheduled for release June 15, 2011.

#### *Business Process Modification*

- Continue research on MPERA business processes and side-by-side conversations.

*Imaging*

- Develop recommendations for very basic workflow and back file conversion.

**K. *Quarterly Budget Report – (Barbara Quinn)***

Ms. Barbara Quinn, Fiscal Services Bureau Chief, gave a brief overview of the third quarter of the current fiscal year budget. Because this budget is in the latter part of the 2011 fiscal year it is expected that 75% of the budget has been expended. The one category that is close to being completely expended that was not anticipated was repairs and maintenance. Ms. Quinn explained that when we installed cubicles in the MPERAtiv project room we discovered that the electrical wiring was not sufficient to handle the number of people that would be sitting in there. We had to correct this and pay for it ourselves. Ms. Quinn emphasized that we are not over-budget on this item because there was \$3,500 budgeted and we still have \$700 remaining.

**L. *Conference Report – PRISM (June Dosier, Dave Swenson)***

Ms. Dosier reported that the theme of this year's PRISM conference was "Managing Risks in the Real World". Mr. Phil Sorentino and Mr. Andrew Walls were keynote speakers. Mr. Sorentino is a humor consultant whose philosophy is "assisting in the enjoyment of everything." Mr. Sorentino encouraged attendees to create results through enjoyable solutions by coming to work "ready to play." Mr. Walls is a research director in Gartner Research where he specializes in information security practices, tools and marketing in social media, enterprise governance, awareness and communications, investigation and security program management. Mr. Walls spoke on security risks and enterprise governance.

The conference depends on a very generous group of sponsors who help defray conference expenses. On Monday afternoon the sponsors of the conference introduced themselves in a round table format to allow us to put names with faces. This was followed by the Member Roundtable. During the Member Roundtable each state summarized their most significant projects. This allowed us to report on our successes and to seek out others who are working on similar projects. On Monday afternoon we had an opportunity to meet one-on-one with sponsors to discuss their services and software.

For the remainder of the conference we participated in breakout sessions. This provided opportunities for us to learn more and share information about technologies that are available and are being used by retirement systems to deal with today's challenges. These sessions were all facilitated by the retirement systems.

*Paperless Board (iPads)*

Ms. Dosier reported that she had a conversation with Mr. Bill Hallinan, TRS, regarding their research into purchasing iPads for their Boards in an attempt to have paperless meetings. Ms. Dosier noted that if we decided to pursue this there would be a few IT issues with the State that we would have to overcome. At the PRISM Conference the San Mateo County Employees Retirement Association (SamCERA) Retirement Board gave a presentation on how their Board members use iPads for paperless meetings. They adopted a portable electronic device policy. This policy paved the way to introduce electronic delivery of board materials.

It was asked what the approximate cost of purchasing a tablet like the iPad would be. Ms. Dosier responded she did not know at this time but that she would research it and report back at the next meeting. Member Twardoski noted that he owned an iPad and he felt that it was a user-friendly, convenient device that could be used for up to 10 hours at a time. It was asked what the benefits would be to using these devices. Ms. Dosier responded that it would be a big financial savings for costs like producing the packets, staff time spent producing the packets, plus mailing costs would be eliminated. Member Porter requested the Board be surveyed as to whether or not they even wanted to go paperless. She stated that she preferred to receive a hard copy of the Board packet because she liked to be able to read it while she was reclining on her couch. Member Patrick McKittrick asked if we would still be required to supply hard copy meeting notices and open meeting packet material to the public. Ms. Minnehan responded that we would continue to post all of these items on our website and the public can print off any item prior to the meeting. She noted that we currently mass produce the entire open meeting packet for the public and generally people are only interested in one or two agenda items and the rest of the packet is wasted. The mass volumes of wasted paper are then dumped into a recycling bin. It was noted that there is a cost for us to have our paper recycled, so we are not only wasting large volumes of paper, but we are also being charged to recycle it.

It was agreed that June would report more on this subject at a future meeting.

***M. Committee Reports (Committee Chairs)***

*Personnel Committee* – Chairwoman Darcy Halpin noted that House Bill 13 was vetoed by the Governor, but there are still negotiations going on in the Governor’s Office. Member Twardoski recommended not contacting the union to give them time to find out what the outcome of these negotiations might be.

*Legislative Committee* – Chairwoman Dianna Porter – report already given in Section H and I.

*Audit Committee* – Chairman Terrence Smith – nothing new to report.

*Policy Committee* – Chairman Scott Moore – nothing new to report.

***N. Board Contact Information – SB 120 (Roxanne Minnehan)***

Senate Bill 120 passed. The Board needs to post contact information on our websites and in our publications. Currently we just have the member’s name and what position they are filling on the Board. We now have to supply either an address, email or phone number for each Board member. It was decided that an email address would be set up for each Board member by an MPERA staff member and the Board members would be notified of their login and passwords.

***O. Executive Director Update (Roxanne Minnehan)***

Ms. Minnehan reported that we are reviewing applications for the Refund Clerk position. The Retiree Database Assistant position was posted externally but we did not receive any qualified candidates, so it is being re-posted internally again and we will

also post it externally, if necessary. This time we may consider a training assignment. We have gone through interviews for the Active Database Support position and we are in the process of checking references on a candidate. The Software Specialist position closes May 20, 2011.

***P. Litigation Update (Melanie Symons, Kate Talley)***

Ms. Talley stated that oral argument in the Briese case will be before Judge Seeley on Thursday, May 19, 2011.

*Information Items*

***Q. Next Board Meetings – June 9, 2011***

**CLOSED MEETING**

The following portion of the meeting relates to matters of individual privacy. The Board President determined that the demands of individual privacy clearly exceed the merits of public disclosure. As such, this portion of the meeting will be closed as of 12:10 p.m.

**RECONVENE OF OPEN MEETING**

President Nielsen called the open meeting back to order at 1:50 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Board, President Nielsen adjourned the open meeting at approximately 1:50 p.m. The next regular meeting will be Thursday, June 9, 2011, at 8:30 am.

---

John Nielsen, President

ATTEST:

---

Roxanne M. Minnehan, Executive Director

**Montana Public Employees Retirement Board**  
**Strategic Planning Retreat**  
**September 7, 2011**  
**Summary**

Board Members present:

John Nielsen, President  
Terry Smith, Vice President  
Darcy Halpin, Member  
Scott Moore, Member  
Dianna Porter, Member  
Timm Twardoski, Member

*Excused:* Patrick McKittrick, Member

Staff present:

Roxanne Minnehan, Executive Director  
Melanie Symons, Chief Legal Counsel  
Barbara Quinn, Fiscal Services Bureau Chief  
Patricia Davis, Member Services Bureau Chief  
June Dosier, Information Systems Manager  
Kate Talley, Legal Counsel  
Flora Sebens, Executive Assistant

---

**Table of Contents**

**Page Numbers**

1. Progress Report - Looking at the Last Year	2 - 4
2. The MPERB State of the State	4 - 5
3. 457 Plan Auto Enrollment	5 - 5
4. Employment Investment Advisory Council	5 - 6
5. DCRP/457 Plans	6 - 7
6. DCRP/457 Stable Value Option	7 - 8
7. DB Plans Under Attack	8 - 9
8. Our Board Meetings	9 - 11
9. Our Board Self-Evaluation	11 - 11
10. Revised Montana Public Employees' Retirement Board Mission Statement	11 - 11
11. Meeting Evaluations Summary	12 - 14

## 1. Progress report looking at the last year

What progress took place in the last year? About what are we proud of and feel a sense of accomplishment about?

### a. Legislative issues:

- We survived it!
- We had good representation (thanks to Roxanne, Melanie and Mike).
- We deflected some of the more egregious bills – we prevented bad things.
- The Volunteer Firefighters Bill was passed without major changes.
- Sheriffs/Game Wardens changes (necessary but not good).
- Out of 5 bills, 4 passed.
- We were included in meetings with key legislatures in their discussions; we gained respect on the floor with Legislators.
- We began using social media during the Legislative Session.
- We used more and improved communication on our website about how our bills were progressing.
- We hired a lobbyist and PR consultant.
- We generated good attendance at hearings.
- The DB Plan was saved.

### b. Maintain contract rights:

- Legislators understand more of what contracts rights are.
- The bill to strip them didn't go anywhere.
- A white paper was researched and developed.
- Protected GABA – a big issue.

### c. Proactive public relations:

- We researched and hired a public relations person.
- We were proactive with a positive message to counteract national negative news.
- We were able to tell our story and react more timely to negative issues using Facebook, blogs on our website, etc.
- The training of the numbers themselves, educated them.
- The ongoing training of members via the blog.
- PR beyond the Legislature were started via the webinars. A lot of people are participating and these are available 24/7.
- The new website is a lot more user-friendly.
- We looked for different answers to tell our story (news releases).

- d. Legislative audit to the Board
  - An outside view took place.
  - We had a fairly clean audit.
  
  - The Board works with the Legislature.
  - It was an in-depth audit of benefit calculations and there were no issues.
  - A MT Watch Dog requested top ten benefits.
  
- e. Evaluation of the Executive Director
  - She is still here.
  - We did it in a timely manner.
  - It's good to hear how the Board members feel Roxanne is doing.
  - We liked the part where we get to know Roxanne better, how things are going, a personal touch and time together with her.
  
- f. Change the new Board member orientation
  - We went from new Board members having to stay late to everyone being involved during the regular Board meetings, thus benefitting all Board members.
  - Good for the Board to be involved to cover what it is actually like to be a member.
  - We instituted serving on the Board and *then* orientation, so the content makes more sense to new Board members.
  - The information we added to the website about the details of serving on the Board.
  - Interested persons can apply for Board positions via the website.
  
- g. Education and training calendar provided to Board members:
  - Information provided in Board packets.
  - Provided the Board with information on what we are doing.
  - Helped the new members understand the benefits.
  - Board members are introduced at trainings, providing a public face for the system.
  - It demonstrates the local representation our Board members provide.
  
- h. Medical consultants meet the Board
  - Put faces with names.
  - We created a better understanding about their backgrounds, expertise and passion about their work. They provided their bios to us.
  - It showed them our interest in being partners regarding disabilities.

- i. Open Board meeting packet posted on the website
  - We started doing this on a regular basis.
  - It gets the packet to the Board sooner so they can review it; it's on the website when it's mailed.
  - Doing so allows the public to see what's on the agenda and help them decide if they want to attend.

## 2. The MPERB State of the State

- a. What positive influences might affect our collective work and future successes?  
What is going on that we should all be aware of in the next few years – or might be going on?
  - The CEM survey we are going to do; a comparison with other states' systems.
  - There is a lot more information about retirement in the world; it's more on people's radar.
  - The negative attacks on the public sector are in some arenas generating more support for public workers.
  - The state of the State of Montana; we're in a more positive economy than other states; we're in the black.
  - The upcoming elections may garner more potential supporters of our bills.
  - There is increased interest in learning about retirement planning by members.
  - We continue to attempt to dispel retirement envy.
- b. What negative influences might affect our collective work and future successes?  
What is going on that we should all be aware of in the next few years – or might be going on?
  - Pension envy.
  - Bad information; brain washing; lack of facts; jumping to negative conclusions.
  - Continued financial instability in the stock markets.
  - The economy as a whole will make people feel they can't save for retirement or retire; people will have to work longer.
  - GASB changes; with a legislative session before their implementation. If legislative changes occur at the next session legislators may have to make changes but complaints will take place.
  - Growing influence of the extreme right and their philosophy.
  - A retirement wave is anticipated. People will retire before changes take place.

- c. What else will or might affect our future?
- Going DC.
  - Other states decisions about the impairment contract issues.
  - Federal legislation effects on state pension plans.
  - Increased cost of service providers; lack of choice; lack of selection.
  - IRS lack of action on Cycle C filing.
  - Future MT legislation; this is just the beginning of not-so-good decisions.
  - Attacks on Social Security and Medicare.
  - Normal Retirement Age decisions by IRS.

### 3. **457 Plan Auto Enrollment**

- a. What is our vision for an ideal future for this work?
- Any new state employee is automatically enrolled in the 457 deferred compensation plan unless they opt out.
  - City and county employees are included (that are already contracted with). Are contract changes required?
  - One-time financial incentives by employers to sign on.
  - State and other government employees are prepared for their retirement.
  - The percentage people allocate to retirement grows – “auto escalator”.
  - People see the benefits of being enrolled and growing their contribution amount.
  - Poverty prevention takes place because of financially secure retirees.
- b. What options should we consider?
- Grow escalator numbers more aggressively.
  - Regular reminders to opt-outers to consider opting back in / signing up for 457 Plan.
  - Draft Legislation to make auto enrollment the norm?
  - What investment to be the default fund?
  - Wage/hours laws.
  - Administrative costs.
  - Resistance.
  - Education.
  - How much time to opt out.
  - Approach SAVA.
  - Talk to Governor.
  - Prepare materials to support case.
  - Get information from NAGDCA.

***Decision: Pursue 457 Plan Auto Enrollment***

#### 4. Employment Investment Advisory Council

- a. What is our vision for an ideal future for this work?
  - We know what to expect from this council so we can advocate it for it with SAVA.
  - Their necessity (or not) is clear.
  - (Difficulty in shifting it occurs right now).
  - They remain important for the Boards work to pre-screen recommendations.
  - They have excellent investment knowledge.
  - Timing of EIAC decisions (next 4 times per year) attached to Board meetings is a challenge. Adds extra step in process. The time lag feels reasonable.
  - Wide representation of the state exists on the committee.
  - Removal of investors takes place in a more understandable way – search options addressed.
  - Additional opportunity for member involvement.
  
- b. EIAC options and recommendations we can consider?
  - Keep it as it is.
  - This Board hears Michael's recommendations directly.
  - Help EIAC be more of a conduit with members.
  - Utilize the member training sessions to recruit EIAC members and educate members about the EIAC meetings.
  - Hold a joint meeting to increase our joint effectiveness.
  - Shorten probation period.
  - Board gives the power to EIAC to add or remove investments.
  - Continue EIAC as it works today.
  - Use Roxanne's blog to update investment changes to members.
  - SAVA: sales pitch about their value.
  
- c. What questions do we need to address?
  - Of the recommendations brought to the Board that were requested, how did they feel?
  - Is the committee the most efficient way to manage the 457 and other plans?
  - Could they be doing more?
  - How could they be more effective?
  - Why is it hard to recruit members?
  - Could we compensate the EIAC members for their preparation time?

- d. Decisions:
- Continue EIAC as it works today.
  - Utilize trainings to recruit new members.

## 5. DCRP/457 Plans

- a. What is our vision for the ideal future of this work?
- Everybody in state and local government understands their own responsibility in planning for their retirement.
  - The 457 is a known complement to DC and DB plans.
  - A brokerage window is available for participants, utilizing their own advisors.
  - 100% participation in 457 plans.
  - Participants have diversity in their plans, or at least decide consciously to use the stable value option.
  - Members are well-educated.
  - Participants want to understand the plans.
  - Participants feel confident in reporting we provide to them.
  - The 457 plan grows – existing and employers.
- b. What concerns are there about his?
- Brokerage window.
- c. Why is this important to us?
- A lot of ramifications about the 457 plans.
  - We tend to focus on DB plan in Board meetings; DC & 457 doesn't get much Board attention.
- e. Options and recommendations:
- Address internal controls and reconciliation issues.
  - Look into options for participants beyond just brokerage window; minimum withdrawal benefit; advisory.
  - Revisit addressing financial hardship requests and how to do it in a better way.
  - Clarify with EIAC the other 457 options and make recommendations.
  - Continue to prioritize and value highly the education of participants in a big way.

## 6. DCRP/457 Stable Value Option

- a. Ideal:
- It is relied on less (60% right now).

- There is passion and interest by participants.
  - Educated decision making by participants.
  - A stable wrapper to protect the value of the stable value funds.
  - The best possible stable value funds provider.
- b. What questions does this raise?
- Is the 60% of the money an appropriate choice?
  - Other states are at 40% - what are they doing differently?
  - Are participants using this choice because it's appropriate or because it looks safe?
  - How can they be interested enough to invest but not interested enough to make strategic investment decisions?
  - What other options are out there other than PIMCO?
- c. What recommendations and suggestions do we have?
- Explore options about the stable wrapper.
  - Staff bring PIMCO proposal to the Board after details are known for a Stable Value product, a one-stop shop approach.
  - Staff research one-stop shop providers and propose their findings to the Board no later than the Board's November meeting.
- d. Decisions:
- Continue investor education with Great-West Retirement Services.
  - Evaluate if the education provided is making a difference.
  - Analyze who is using Stable Value and why.
- e. Concerns:
- Aegon may only argue to wrap a portion.
  - Should we rely on PIMCO to manage wrap provider?

## **7. DB Plans Under Attack**

- a. What is our vision of an ideal future for this work?
- Plans are protected and safe for future generations.
  - Legislature knows the value of the plans.
  - No one thinks they are a Ponzi Scheme; instead people think highly of them.
  - Employers know the value of the plans.

- MACO know the value of the plans.
  - Plans are fully funded.
  - Governor openly and actively supports the DB Plan.
  - The General public sees the value, understands the plans, and is on board.
  - The media represents the plan accurately and fairly – and provide a positive spin.
- b. What questions do we have?
- How do we protect it for the future generations?
  - What funding sources might be available
  - Why does legislature think DB plans are Ponzi Schemes?
- c. What suggestions and recommendations do we want to consider?
- Show and explain to legislators that DB Plans make sense and are not Ponzi Schemes.
  - Shed light on the total costs versus the misinformation that currently exists and drives decisions.
  - Develop a strategy of who can be our legislative sponsors. Do these as early as possible; get to know and educate them.
  - Develop relationships with the Governor and his staff.
  - Continue the public relations campaign on the value of the DB Plan and costs. Use going data from each county about retirees.
  - Propose legislative to reduce GABA.
  - Look at AGABA – adjustable being the “A”.
  - Discuss this internally with members; look at Colorado model.
  - Ask ERS for their help.
  - Change the definition of compensation for the 125 Plans and overtime.
  - Meet with editorial committees.

## **8. Our Board Meetings**

- a. What is helpful about them to the staff?
- Direction in a timely manner.
  - Answers to staff’s questions and proposals.
  - Comply with the law.
- b. What is helpful to the Board about our Board meetings?
- Education and information in order to comply with the law.

- Staff prepares very well for our meetings.
  - Diversity of opinions.
  - The staff's knowledge.
  - A sense of accomplishment.
  - A sense of satisfaction for serving.
  - We learned about the subjects of the day and come away more educated.
- c. What is currently great about our Board meetings?
- Openness; anyone can share an opinion.
  - We all get along really well.
  - We can disagree but still get along.
  - Because of our different experiences we can make up a whole; we complement one another.
  - They are organized; the agenda is followed. They start on time. Process brings comfort.
  - Presentations from outsider stakeholders and vendors.
  - Know that I'm learning information at each meeting so I can relay to others.
- d. What would we lose or miss if the Board meetings did not take place?
- Knowledge and education of the Board members.
  - We'd be deficient in our roles as fiduciaries.
  - Everything would be staff-run. No check and balance would exist.
- e. What is the purpose of our Board meetings?
- To serve the memberships.
  - To provide secure and stable retirement income for public employee retirees.
  - To administer the funds.
  - Provide a balanced view and other perspectives.
  - To provide financial protection for people who are injured and people with disabilities.
  - To provide leadership, direction and oversight to MPERA staff.
- f. What do we suggest to make them even more productive and helpful?
- Have a meeting at another time and month – once in a while – or regularly.
  - Provide more creative demonstrations of how things operate, such as MPERAtiv.
  - Provide more visuals beyond power point.
  - Regarding travel in the winter, hold one or two Bard meetings by conference call;

and/or hold shorter meetings in the winter.

- Reverse the order of the agenda. Put disability decisions early on. Also, put earlier in the agenda items that need decisions and thinking. Put education items last or late in the meeting.
- Begin at 7:30 a.m.
- Utilize I-pads
- Disability process changes – address this (fix) repeated disability claims by the same person – streamline the process.
- Hold video conference committee meetings. (i.e. Skype)
- Hold bi-monthly meetings instead of monthly meetings and potentially have more video committee meetings instead.
- Have a 2-hour disability conference call via telephone and/or Skype between regular meetings (with a 1 hour format).
- Share motion-making and seconds versus always relying on the same people to do this.
- Continue the education segments.
- Brainstorm specific topics and ideas that the staff wants information about. Pose questions on the agenda for the Board to brainstorm about.
- Hold and schedule quarterly status meetings with the Executive Director. Create a mechanism for more one-on-one interaction with Roxanne.
- Conduct the Executive Director's performance appraisal the night before or the morning following the meeting.
- We don't need conversion reports or retirement benefit approvals. Instead put it in Operational Board summary.
- Allocate more time for important subjects (such as the 457-DC Plans).
- Make time sensitive discussions at the time of the meeting versus postponing them to future meetings. Come to conclusion; don't let things languish.
- Encourage staff's comfort in bringing issues to the Board (specifically the need for time sensitivity).
- Encourage participation by stakeholders who normally don't currently attend. Target specific groups and personally invite them. Send a letter of invitation to the Associations and Unions.
- Invite more Board-staff interactions at their work stations.

**Decision: John and Terry – and staff – will look at this list and make official recommendations to the Board on some of the proposed improvements.**

## 9. **Our Board Self-evaluation**

- a. What stands out to you about the results?
- 5 of 7 of us responded (one Board member didn't receive it).
  - It demonstrates our collective strengths and weaknesses; some of us have different expertise; some subjects are complex.
  - One person requested more supporting documents.
  - The Evaluation invited our comments.
  - More education is desired.
  - Meeting requirements of Code of Ethics/Governance Principles.
  - Nothing is on fire, broken or in distress.

## 10. **Revised Montana Public Employees' Retirement Board Mission Statement**

a. Current mission statement:

The Montana Public Employees' Retirement Board will fiducially administer its retirement plans and trust fund, acting in the best interest of the members and beneficiaries.

b. Proposed revised mission statement:

The Montana Public Employees' Retirement Board, as fiduciaries, administers its retirement plans and trust funds, acting in the best interest of the members and beneficiaries.

## 11. **Meeting Evaluations Summary**

a. *What were the most productive, helpful or interesting parts of our meeting?*

Board members' feedback:

- Review of what we accomplished in the last year. Hearing what staff needs in direction on some subjects. Doing Board meetings differently.
- Working with staff all day on issues.
- Open discussion with staff. How the meeting moved along.
- Really knowing our mission statement. A goal should start with a verb. Auto enrollment information. PIMCO/Aegon dilemma.
- Open and honest discussion between Board and staff. Having an organized facilitator.

Staff members' feedback:

- Open communication between Board and staff. Being able to show the Board what we needed. Great decisions made.
- Decisions on auto enrollment. EIAC, Stable Value and legislative endeavors.

- Eliciting Board input on ideals, questions, recommendations, decisions and concerns on identified topics.
- Revisiting past goals and accomplishments and setting future directions from a Board perspective outside the normal Board meetings. Listing ways meetings could be more effective.
- Decisions Board made on the issues presented.
- Brainstorming ideas and determine the most important. Open communication.
- Great to learn that the Board is open to changes. Some tough issues were raised and decisions made!

***b. What were the least productive, helpful or interesting parts of our meeting?***

Board members' feedback:

- Nothing.
- All was productive.
- No negatives.
- All was good.

Staff members' feedback:

- I really liked all of this meeting.
- Review of administrative vision and goals could have been more streamlined.
- Did not spend too much time on Code of Conduct or Governance.
- The accomplishments from last year needed to get verification, but probably too long a discussion.
- All good!
- Reviewing the Executive Team's vision statements; probably because I went through the process.

***c. What did we accomplish that was important to you? If so, what subjects or issues were they?***

Board members' feedback:

- Vision. Goals.
- Some ideas on what we need to do for the next Legislative Session as pre-preparation.
- 457 and DC issues.
- Great ideas for improvements and time lines to accomplish them. Better acquainted with staff.
- Goals for the future. Sense of good direction of MPERA.

Staff members' feedback:

- Direction was given on several issues. New look at old processes.
- Revisiting past goals and accomplishments, and setting future directions from a Board perspective outside the normal Board meetings. Listing ways meetings could be more effective.
- Ways to improve Board meetings. Goals accomplished in the last year.
- Validation of vision statements and goals developed by the Management Team.
- Board validation of our strategic planning.
- Brought out the Stable Value issue.
- Work together as a team. Recognize accomplishments.
- More direction from the Board. Help them get away from daily detail.

**d. *What changes should we make at our future meetings like this one?***

Board members' feedback:

- Fewer topics. More in-depth on certain issues.
- Ensure that all the Board participates.
- None.
- More small group discussion with different team members at each.
- None; enjoyed it.

Staff members' feedback:

- Require all Board members to participate.
- Elicit Board participation earlier in the Retreat. Item 5 and up.
- In a couple of cases, better staff notes would have been helpful to know our direction on a topic.

**e. *What should we leave exactly as it was at this meeting? Keep these characteristics:***

Board members' feedback:

- Hiring a facilitator. Mixing staff and Board.
- Notes on wall during meeting.
- Liked it all.
- An organized facilitator.

Staff members' feedback:

- Laughter. Openness.
- Beki as facilitator.
- Eliciting Board input on ideals, questions, recommendations, decisions and concerns on identified topics.

- I can't think of anything to change.
- Quickly moved through a big agenda!

*f. Any other comments, thoughts, feedback or suggestions?*

Board members' feedback:

- Very good meeting.

Staff members' feedback:

- Little frustration shown by facilitator when she probably should have stepped in and moved discussion forward.