JOINT MEETING
SOUTH DAKOTA RETIREMENT SYSTEM

September 2, 2015

The Board of Trustees of the South Dakota Retirement System held its joint meeting with the Retirement Laws Committee on September 2, 2015. The meeting began at 9:30 a.m. in the conference room of the South Dakota Investment Office, Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Elmer Brinkman, Chair
Karl Alberts
Steve Caron
Jason Dilges
Jilena Faith
Laurie Gill
Laurie Gustafson
James Hansen
James Johns
Louise Loban
Bonnie Mehlbrech
Dave Merrill
Lt. Gov. Matt Michels
K.J. Peterson
Eric Stroeder
Matt Clark, Ex Officio

Table of Contents

Board member Justice Zinter was absent.

RETIREMENT LAWS COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Senator Bruce Rampelberg, Chair
Senator Bernie Hunhoff
Senator Larry Tidemann
Representative Jim Bolin
Representative Patrick Kirschman
Representative Tim Rounds

Senators Phil Jensen and Jim Peterson and Representatives Schoenbeck and McCleerey were absent.

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:
Mary Duvall, Legislator, District 24
Dana Ferguson, Argus Leader
June Larson, Nationwide Retirement Solutions
Bob Mercer, Newspapers
Rob Monson, SASD
Carmel Nelson, Self
James Nord, Associated Press
Eric Ollila, SDSEO
Aaron Olson, LRC
Tammy Otten, SDIC
Paul Schrader, Consultant
Mike Studebaker, Nationwide Retirement Solutions
Sandra Waltman, SDEA
Rob Wylie
Travis Almond
Doug Fiddler
Susan Jahraus
Michelle Mikkelsen
Jane Roberts
Dawn Smith
Jacque Storm
Susan Thiry

For continuity, these minutes are not necessarily in chronological order.

AGENDA ITEM 1
OATH OF OFFICE FOR BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEMBERS

Summary of Presentation
The Oath of Office was administered by SDRS General Counsel Jacque Storm to Karl Alberts and Elmer Brinkman. Justice Steven Zinter was absent and did not participate in the Oath.

AGENDA ITEM 2
APPROVAL OF JUNE 4, 2015, MEETING MINUTES

Board Action
IT WAS MOVED BY MR. JOHNS, SECONDED BY MR. MERRILL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 4, 2015, BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY ON A VOICE VOTE.

AGENDA ITEMS 3 & 4
REPORT FROM NOMINATING COMMITTEE
& ELECTION OF CHAIR & VICE-CHAIR

Summary of Presentation

Ms. KJ Peterson, chair of the Nominating Committee, stated that it was the recommendation of the Nominating Committee to nominate Elmer Brinkman as Chair of the SDRS Board of Trustees. It was also the recommendation of the Nominating Committee to nominate Justice Zinter for the office of Vice-chair.

Board Action

CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. PETERSON, SECONDED BY MR. ALBERTS, THAT NOMINATIONS CEASE AND A UNANIMOUS BALLOT BE CAST FOR ELMER BRINKMAN AS CHAIR AND JUSTICE STEVEN ZINTER AS VICE CHAIR OF THE SDRS BOARD OF TRUSTEES. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY ON A VOICE VOTE.

AGENDA ITEM 5
UPDATE OF SDRS FY2015 FINANCIAL STATUS

Summary of Presentation

SDRS Membership & Experience Report/State of the System

Mr. Rob Wylie, SDRS Executive Director/Administrator, stated that the System has a fully funded status which is a significant and rare accomplishment. The System is sound, in balance, and meets the funding goals. There are no GASB balance sheet liabilities. Conservative actuarial assumptions including updated mortality tables, strong overall benefit practices, and fixed statutory employer and member contributions that meet actuarial requirements are all contributing to keeping the System sound. Mr. Wylie noted that having the precedent of corrective actions when required is very unique to SDRS.

Investment Performance

Ms. Tammy Otten, Assistant State Investment Officer, SDIC, informed the Board that SDRS's net annualized return for the one-year period ending June 30, 2015, was 4.18 percent. Ms. Otten noted that over the past 10 years the average net SDRS investment return was 8.07 percent.

Ms. Otten stated that against the Callan Public Fund Sponsor - Public, SDRS ranked 13th with one being the best and 100 being the worst. Against the Callan Corporate Funds - Large, SDRS ranked 34th.

SDRS Projected Funded Status
Mr. Douglas Fiddler, Senior Actuary, SDRS, informed the Board that the projected fair value funded ratio for June 30, 2015, was approximately 104 percent and the projected actuarial value funded ratio was 100 percent. The cushion is projected to be $436 million and the risk management contribution $29 million.

Mr. Fiddler stated that the nominal investment return assumption is 7.25 percent through 2017 and 7.5 percent in 2018 and after. Returns equal to the nominal assumption will grow the cushion and market value funded ratio. When adjusting for the risk management contribution, the assumption rate effectively decreases to 7 percent and 7.25 percent for the two periods. These returns maintain the market value funded ratio and slowly grow the cushion. If SDRS were to utilize the cushion, each rate would decrease to 6.90 percent. Returns of 6.90 percent will exhaust the cushion and decrease the fair value funded ratio to 100 percent over 10 years.

Board Action
No action was necessary.

AGENDA ITEM 6
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR/ADMINISTRATOR COMPENSATION

Summary of Presentation
Mr. Elmer Brinkman asked the Retirement Laws Committee members to affirm the proposed 2 percent salary increase to market value for the SDRS Executive Director/Administrator.

Board Action
IT WAS MOVED BY REPRESENTATIVE ROUNDS, SECONDED BY SENATOR TIDEMANN, TO APPROVE THE ADDITIONAL 2 PERCENT PAY INCREASE TOWARD THE MARKET RATE FOR THE SDRS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR/ADMINISTRATOR. THE MOTION FAILED ON A ROLL CALL VOTE WITH 5 AYES; 1 NAY; AND 4 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING.
THOSE VOTING AYE: SENATOR RAMPELBERG, SENATOR TIDEMANN, REPRESENTATIVE BOLIN, REPRESENTATIVE KIRSCHMAN, REPRESENTATIVE ROUNDS
THOSE VOTING NAY: SENATOR HUNHOFF
THOSE ABSENT AND NOT VOTING: SENATOR JENSEN, SENATOR PETERSON, REPRESENTATIVE SCHOENBECK, REPRESENTATIVE MCCLEEREY

AGENDA ITEM 7
TYING IT ALL TOGETHER: A PLAN DESIGN FOR NEW MEMBERS – REVISITED II

Summary of Presentation

Mr. Wylie stated that there was general agreement with the new member plan design objectives and details of the recommended plan design that was presented in June. The Board requested information on practices of other statewide plans for new members and also requested examples of maintaining a special early retirement (rule of) benefit with eligibility modifications and increasing the vesting requirement form three years to five years of service.

Mr. Wylie stated that the main objective of the new plan design for new members was to increase the likelihood of sustainability and avoidance of corrective actions in the future. Other objectives included eliminating or decreasing subsidies, inequities, and unanticipated costs, all while restructuring the benefits without requiring additional contributions. The new plan design also adds more variable benefits utilizing the savings, recognizes increasing life expectancy, meets income replacement goals for career employees, enhances the hybrid features of SDRS, maintains equity with current members, aligns benefits to better recognize employers' workforce issues, and considers national practices and materiality.

Mr. Paul Schrader, Consultant, explained the differences between the current plan and the new member plan design. He stated that the proposed normal retirement age was increased from 65 to 67 years old for Class A and Class B Judicial and from 55 to 57 years old for Class B Public safety. The early retirement ages also increased to 57/47 respectively, with a five percent per year reduction instead of the 3 percent for current members. There is no "Rule of" special early retirement benefit and no alternate formula. The base benefit for Class A members has increased to 1.8 percent with no change for Class B. There will also be a variable benefit account for new members that can be used to supplement base benefits at retirement. The final average compensation has increased from three years to five years. A survivor benefit is available at member cost, and the COLA is indexed to the funded status and CPI with a minimum of one percent and a maximum of 3.1 percent. If a member chooses to refund, the member would receive the member contributions plus a percentage of the employers' contributions including the variable benefit account.

Referring to a pie chart, Mr. Schrader stated that under the current plan, the normal costs with subsidies was 84 percent of the total contributions with 14 percent going to the risk management contribution and 2 percent for the expenses of the system. Under the proposed new plan, the normal cost is reduced to 71 percent which leaves 12 percent to fund the variable benefit account, and 15 percent for the risk management contribution and the same 2 percent for expenses.

Mr. Schrader reviewed the similarity of the recommended new member benefits with provisions in other states. He stated that there were nine other statewide systems with a hybrid defined benefit plan with variable member accounts. The most common period for final average compensation was 5 years. Statewide systems in 10 states provide unreduced retirement benefits only after reaching a normal retirement age of 65-67 while statewide systems in five states are defined contribution or cash balance plans and therefore provide no early or special early retirement subsidies. The most common early retirement reductions are 5 percent per year or exact actuarial reduction. As for the COLA, advised Mr. Schrader, 22 statewide systems have no automatic annual COLA and another 21 are based on CPI, with a minimum of 1.5 percent or less.

Mr. Schrader noted that most statewide systems have made benefit changes in the wake of the Great Recession or other significant budgetary pressure. A common result is new member tiers with reduced benefits or delayed benefit eligibility while still requiring the same level of contributions, and frequently subsidizing benefits for existing members. Without reserves or adequate contributions, subsequent unfavorable experience can require additional changes, leading to multiple tiers (29 statewide systems have three to seven tiers of benefits).

Mr. Fiddler stated that the new member plan design for SDRS meets all of the proposed objectives. Preserving early or special early retirement subsidies will dilute some or all of the objectives depending on how benefits are then restructured. Mr. Fiddler noted that approximately one-third of fiscal 2014 retirements were subsidized special early retirements. Staff and consultant opinions on eliminating all early and special early retirement subsidies include:

- Avoid making value judgements about the priority of retirement subsidies over other subsidies and over new plan design objectives,
- Avoid subsidizing members who have not met normal retirement age requirements,
- Avoid interfering with employer workforce issues,
- Avoid dilution of new plan design objectives, and
- Providing resources (variable benefit contribution) that members may use to finance their own early retirement, if desired.

Mr. Fiddler noted that a request from the Board asked for an example of what retaining the special early retirement benefit would do to the proposed new plan design. The first example shows retaining the special early retirement with a minimum age of 57/47 and a Rule of 90 for Class A, Rule of 80 for Class B Public Safety, and a Rule of 85 for Class B Judicial. The results of this example increases the SDRS normal cost from 8.99 percent to 9.67 percent of pay. Member who retire upon reaching the "Rule of" requirements at age 57/47 receive benefits with a value 50 percent greater than benefits at normal retirement age. These provisions would require reduced sustainability features (RMC or

VBC), or reduced benefits for all members to subsidize some members. The consequences of addressing the increased costs of this example while maintaining the balance between Class A and Class B would be to reduce the RMC only, reduce the VBC only, reduce the benefit multipliers only, or reduce some combination of the three.

The second example keeps the same "Rule of" as in the first example but changes the minimum age to 62/52. This would result in an increase in normal costs from 8.99 percent to 9.53 percent. Members who retire upon reaching "Rule of" requirements at age 62/52 receive benefits with a value 25 percent greater than benefits at normal retirement age. This example would require the same reduced sustainability features or benefits, and cost consequences as above.

Moving on to vesting, Mr. Fiddler stated that systems in three neighboring states have vesting requirements of 3 years. It is the staff and consultant opinion that three year vesting, PRO, and indexing of deferred vested benefits in combination added key hybrid features that maintained an appropriate balance between benefits for short-term members and benefits for long-term members and are a unique positive feature of SDRS that counter criticisms that most public defined benefits plans do not deliver meaningful benefits to shorter service members. Increasing the vesting period to 5 years would decrease the SDRS normal cost from 8.99 percent to 8.85 percent of pay. This would result in very slight increases in benefit multipliers, the RMC, or the VBC, which would only modestly enhance the sustainability or income replacement objectives.

In conclusion, stated Mr. Wylie, the recommended new member plan design meets all the objectives. The specific benefit provisions recommended are similar to benefit features in new member tiers in many other statewide plans. Eliminating all subsidies avoids making value judgments about the priority of a specific subsidy over other subsidies, and over new plan design objectives. Maintaining identified subsidies comes at a cost to all other members and requires corresponding reductions in benefits and /or sustainability features.

Board Action

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MICHELS, SECONDED BY DR. HANSEN, TO SUBMIT AND SUPPORT LEGISLATION FOR A NEW MEMBER PLAN DESIGN AS PRESENTED AT THE JUNE MEETING. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY ON A VOICE VOTE.

AGENDA ITEM 8
POTENTIAL 2016 LEGISLATION

Summary of Presentation

Ms. Storm stated that there were four pieces of legislation, not including the one just approved, for this year's legislative session. The first one is related to the SDIC membership. Currently the Board of Trustees is required to make an annual appointment. The amendment would make the administrator (executive director) of SDRS a permanent member.

The second piece of legislation is administrative clean-up. This legislation would require eight votes and a majority for a Board decision. It would remove statutory reference placing SDRS budget report within the budget report of the Department of Labor and Regulation, and it would revise the SDRS statutory term, administrator, to executive director.

The third piece of legislation, advised Ms. Storm, would replace the term, market value, with fair value. This legislation would also revise the date for the Internal Revenue Code and remove specific content requirements of the quadrennial report so the report is based on current, relevant measures.

The final piece of proposed legislation would repeal obsolete sections of SDRS law. They include 3-12-47.3 – proration of interest; 3-12-120.1, 3-12-120.2, and 3-12-120.3 – independent actuarial review no later than December 1, 2000; and 3-12-140 – regaining service lost from mandatory refunds.

Ms. Storm addressed the affected sections of law that the potential new tier would affect, but noted that because the Board did not take final action until this meeting, there was no draft legislation for the new tier.

Board Action

It was a consensus of the Board to direct staff to move forward with legislation for everything discussed.

AGENDA ITEM 9
REVIEW OF RETURN TO WORK PROVISIONS

Summary of Presentation

Mr. Wylie stated that in 2010, when the return to work provisions were changed, SDRS indicated to the Legislature that we would review this in 5 years to analyze if the changes did what was hoped. The object of the 2010 changes was to bring SDRS into compliance with the IRS in-service distribution requirements that prohibit benefit payments without a bona fide termination. The need to eliminate subsidies and unanticipated costs to SDRS for members who return to work after eligibility for unreduced benefits was also an objective.

The last objective, advised Mr. Wylie, was that SDRS wanted to respond to the employers' need for succession planning and retention of experienced employees by providing flexible, but more equitable, rehire alternatives.

Mr. Schrader stated that the 2010 changes to retire and return to work included a minimum three-month termination period. If members came back to work under normal or special early retirement, their benefit was reduced by 15 percent. If members had taken an early retirement (reduced) their benefit was suspended. There was no change to the benefits for Class B members retiring and returning as Class A members. The COLA was eliminated for Normal, Special Early, and Early Retirement, however, the COLA for Class B to Class A continued. Member contributions during reemployment went to the SRP while the employer contributions went to SDRS without any attribution to the member to help fund the cost of the return to work.

Mr. Schrader emphasized that the 2010 changes do not prohibit reemployment of retirees, but were intended to eliminate the subsidies to members who retired and returned to work.

Referring to a graph, Mr. Schrader noted that members who retired and returned to work prior to 2010 had total compensation of 144 percent of what the member was earning prior to retirement. After the 2010 changes, the member's total compensation was 137 percent of their pre-retirement compensation.

Mr. Fiddler stated that for the five years prior to the 2010 changes, an average of 119 employees returned to work (12 percent of retirees). In the year of the change, 99 employees returned to work (10 percent of all retirees). For the five years since the change, an average of 28 employees returned to work (2 percent of all retirees).

Based on 2009 reemployments, 123 retirees returned to work with continued retirement benefits. Of those, 90 members were rehired within 3 months of retirement. The average time between retirement and reemployment was 13 days. As of June 30, 2015, 42 members remain reemployed.

Mr. Fiddler stated that a member who returned to work prior to 2010 had a net gain in total compensation of $49,677, over a member who remained employed and retired at age 64. Since the 2010 changes, the net gain in total compensation has been decreased to $2,413.

Mr. Fiddler noted that the 2010 changes essentially eliminated the subsidy paid to the member for retiring and returning to work compared to continuing to work. The significant drop in the number of members retiring and returning to work since the 2010 changes is likely due to the new break in service requirement and the elimination of the available subsidy.

For most public sector retirement systems, advised Mr. Fiddler, actuarial losses or unexpected costs result in increased required member and /or employer contributions. However, SDRS operates with fixed member and employer contributions defined in statute, has SDCL thresholds for corrective action and the 2010 strategy when those thresholds are crossed, and a benefit improvement policy defined in the funding policy. As a result, actuarial losses or unexpected costs impact all SDRS members through accelerated or increased required corrective actions and/or delayed or decreased permitted benefit improvements.

Mr. Fiddler stated that the 2010 changes essentially eliminated the added SDRS cost for the member retiring and returning to work compared to continuing to work. The primary cost concerns were regarding members who were reemployed within 3 months. The cost for the 92 members reemployed within 3 months in 2009 is based on a comparison of costs as a continued active member with costs as a retired and reemployed member. Based on the pre-2010 provisions, the SDRS cost increase for retirements and reemployments within 3 months was $5.3 million. Had the 2010 provisions been in place for these reemployments, the SDRS cost increase would have been $0.3 million.

Mr. Wylie stated that based on an analysis of the members reemployed in 2009, the 2010 changes brought SDRS into compliance with IRS in-service distribution requirements that prohibit benefit payments without a bona fide termination. It significantly decreased the SDRS costs for immediate reemployments. Eliminated the subsidy provided to members who retire and are immediately reemployed and resulted in a significant drop in the number of members receiving retirement benefits while reemployed.

Additional cost savings will result for employees who intended to permanently retire and have been retired for more than three months but opt to return to work because of a change in personal or financial circumstances. The combination of the 2010 changes and the very small number of members returning to work since the changes were made have virtually eliminated any measurable subsidy due to return to work all while retaining significant flexibility for retired members to return to work. As a result, advised Mr. Wylie, no changes in the current return to work provisions are recommended.

Board Action

No action was necessary.

AGENDA ITEM 10
SUPPLEMENTAL RETIREMENT PLAN

Summary of Presentation

Annual Service Report

Mr. Wylie stated that the Board had received the handouts from Nationwide Retirement Solutions. He asked for any comments or questions.

Investment Portfolio Review

Mr. Clark advised the Board that the Investment Office has reviewed the SRP investment alternatives and was recommending one change to the SRP portfolio this year. The SEC has adopted new rules for money market funds based on investor behavior in these funds during the financial crisis in 2008. Funds for institutional investors will be required to have floating asset values while funds for retail investors will maintain the status quo with a stable asset value of $1. The state's SRP qualifies as a retail investor. Fees and gate requirements to prevent runs on the funds will be implemented for both institutional and retail funds. The exception is government money market funds which will maintain a stable NAV of $1 and will not impose gates and fees. For these reasons, the State Investment Officer has determined the Vanguard Prime Money Market Fund should be replaced with the Vanguard Federal Money Market Fund.

Savings Initiative

Mr. Wylie stated that the inclusion of the auto escalation into the auto enrollment in the SRP is getting a good start. There are 18 different employers who have already signed up for the plan.

Board Action

No action was necessary.

RETIREMENT LAWS COMMITTEE ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY REPRESENTATIVE ROUNDS, SECONDED BY SENATOR BOLIN, THAT THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE JOINT MEETING OF THE RETIREMENT LAWS COMMITTEE BE DECLARED ADJOURNED. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY ON A VOICE VOTE.

AGENDA ITEM 11
REVIEW OF SDRS MEMBER ISSUES FILE

Summary of Presentation
Mr. Wylie stated that pursuant normal procedure, changes to the benefit structure of SDRS should be addressed in the member issues file. Because of outdated language, advised, Mr. Wylie, the Board may choose to amend certain member issues.

Board Action
IT WAS MOVED BY MS. PETERSON, SECONDED BY MS. LOBAN, TO AMEND THE MEMBER ISSUES FILE AS PRESENTED.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. PETERSON, SECONDED BY MS. LOBAN, TO AMEND THE MOTION AND TO REMOVE MEMBER ISSUE 2000-1 (FORMULA IMPROVEMENT) FROM THE MEMBER ISSUES FILE. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY ON A VOICE VOTE.

THE ORIGINAL MOTION, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY ON A VOICE VOTE.

AGENDA ITEM 12
CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY AND GIFT POLICY

Summary of Presentation
Ms. Storm stated that during the last legislative session, a conflict of interest laws was passed. That law provides that absent a waiver of conflict, the conflict of interest law prohibits certain current and former officers and employees from contracting with state agencies or deriving benefits from another outside entity if the officer or employee has a substantial involvement in recommending, approving, awarding, or administering that contract. These prohibitions apply to persons who supervise the persons that approve, award, and administer the contracts. In addition, the prohibition applies to benefits derived from a state contract by a spouse or persons living with and commingling assets with the employee or officer.

Mr. Wylie stated that 3-16-8 referenced gifts as well. He noted that it was appropriate at this time to bring a policy relating to gifts. The policy stated that any gift valued at over $25 received due to the Board member's or employee's affiliation with the South Dakota Retirement System, regardless of how or where received, must be disclosed in writing to the Executive Director/Administrator and/or Chair of the Board of Trustees. No disclosure is required for any gift valued at $25 or less. Likewise, no disclosure is required for any gift that is provided to a Board member or employee at a meeting or conference attended by the Board member or employee due to his or affiliation with SDRS if the gift is provided as part of a meeting or conference.

Board Action

Conflict of Interest Policy

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. MEHLBRECH, SECONDED BY MR. MERRILL, TO ADOPT THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY, INCLUDING THE WAIVER FOR TRANSACTIONS OF $200 OR LESS, AND THE ACCOMPANYING DECISION MATRIX AND WAIVER FORM FOR THE SOUTH DAKOTA RETIREMENT SYSTEM BOARD MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY ON A VOICE VOTE.

Gift Policy

IT WAS MOVE DBY DR. HANSEN, SECONDED BY MS. FAITH, TO APPROVE THE GIFT POLICY AS PRESENTED BY STAFF FOR THE SOUTH DAKOTA RETIREMENT SYSTEM BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY ON A VOICE VOTE.

AGENDA ITEM 13
NCPERS CODE OF CONDUCT

Summary of Presentation

Ms. Gustafson stated that NCPERS has developed a Code of Conduct that it believes all pension systems should adopt for all public pension service providers of companies and firms that provide services or products to the public sector pension plans.

Board Action

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. GUSTAFSON, SECONDED BY MS. PETERSON, TO ADOPT THE NCPERS CODE OF CONDUCT FOR SDRS. THE MOTION FAILED ON A VOICE VOTE.

AGENDA ITEM 14
CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE REPORT

Summary of Presentation

Ms. Laurie Gill gave a report on the NASRA conference that she attended.

Board Action

No action was necessary.

AGENDA ITEM 15
OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Summary of Presentation
Definition of Spouse
Ms. Storm stated that there were no changes required to the SDRS definition of spouse as a result of the recent court cases.

Upcoming Board Meeting Dates
Mr. Wylie stated that the upcoming meeting dates were listed on the bottom of the agenda. He asked for Board input.

Board Action
No action was necessary.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. GUSTAFSON, SECONDED BY MS. LOBAN, THAT THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING BE DECLARED ADJOURNED. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY ON A VOICE VOTE.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert A. Wylie
Executive Director/Administrator