## VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING STATE OF CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION BOARD GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

WEBEX PLATFORM

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2020 10:00 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER LICENSE NUMBER 10063

### APPEARANCES

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

- Mr. Henry Jones, Chairperson
- Ms. Lisa Middleton, Vice Chairperson
- Mr. Rob Feckner
- Ms. Fiona Ma, represented by Mr. Frank Ruffino
- Ms. Stacie Olivares
- Ms. Eraina Ortega
- Mr. Jason Perez

### BOARD MEMBERS:

- Ms. Margaret Brown
- Mr. David Miller
- Mr. Ramon Rubalcava
- Ms. Shawnda Westly
- Ms. Betty Yee, represented by Ms. Lynn Paquin

### STAFF:

- Ms. Marcie Frost, Chief Executive Officer
- Mr. Matt Jacobs, General Counsel
- Mr. Kelly Fox, Chief, Stakeholder Relations
- Ms. Pam Hopper, Committee Secretary
- Ms. Anne Simpson, Managing Investment Director

# APPEARANCES CONTINUED ALSO PRESENT: Ms. Ashley Dunning, Nossaman LLP Mr. Larry Woodson, California State Retirees

	INDEX	PAGE
1.	Call to Order and Roll Call	1
2.	Approval of the November 18, 2020 Board Governance Committee Timed Agenda	1
3.	Executive Report - Matthew Jacobs	3
4.	Action Consent Items - Matthew Jacobs a. Approval of the September 15, 2020 Board Governance Committee Meeting Minutes	3
5.	<pre>Information Consent Items - Matthew Jacobs a. Board Education Program - Education     Activity Report b. Board and Committee Meeting Schedule - 2021</pre>	4
6.	<pre>Information Agenda Items a. Composition of the Pension and Health     Benefits Committee - Anne Simpson b. Proposed Change to Board Governance Policy:     Reporting Investigations to Board Anne</pre>	4 15
	Simpson c. Summary of Committee Direction - Matthew	-
	Jacobs d. Public Comment	3 6 3 6
Adjournment		
Reporter's Certificate		38

### PROCEEDINGS 1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I'll call the Board 2 3 Governance meeting to order. And the first order of business is roll call. 4 Ms. Hopper, please. 5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Henry Jones? 6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Here. 7 8 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Rob Feckner? 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Good morning. COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for 10 Fiona Ma? 11 ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO: Present. 12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Lisa Middleton? 1.3 VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Present. 14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares? 15 16 COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Here. COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega? 17 COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Here. 18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez? 19 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Here. COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. President, all 21 is in attendance. 2.2 23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you very much, 24 Ms. Hopper. 25 The next item is the approval of the Board

```
Governance Committee timed agenda. Do I have a motion?
1
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Move to approve.
2
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Second.
 3
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Moved by Mrs. Middleton,
 4
    second by Mr. Feckner.
5
             Any discussion?
 6
7
             Seeing none.
8
             Ms. Hopper, please call the roll.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Rob Feckner?
9
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Aye.
10
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for
11
   Fiona Ma?
12
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO: Aye.
1.3
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Lisa Middleton?
14
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Aye.
15
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?
16
             COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Aye.
17
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega?
18
19
             COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Aye.
20
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?
             COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Aye.
21
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. President, we
2.2
23
   have Lisa Middleton making the motion, Rob Feckner
    seconding it. All ayes for Agenda Item 2, timed agenda.
24
25
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: All right. Thank you, Ms.
```

```
Hopper -- Ms. Hopper. Next item is Executive Reporter.
Mr. Jacobs.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yes. Good morning,
President Jones and Board members. Happy to be here with
you this morning. We have two substantive items on the
agenda today. The first is whether to make the Pension
and Health Benefits Committee a committee of the whole.
And the second is a presentation of a new version of a
potential amendment to the Board Governance Policy
regarding reporting investigations of executive team
members to the Board.

Ms. Simpson will present both of those items. I would also note that Ashley Dunning, your fiduciary counsel, will be standing by on the second of those items.

And that is my executive report.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you, Mr. Jacobs.

The next item agenda is Item 4a, approval of the September 15th Board Governance Committee meeting minutes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: (Hand raised.)

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Moved by Mr. Feckner.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Move approval.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: (Hand raised.)

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Second by Mr. Perez.

Further discussion?

Seeing none.

```
Ms. Hopper, please.
1
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Rob Feckner?
2
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER:
                                       Aye.
 3
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for
 4
    Fiona Ma?
5
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO:
 6
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
                                           Lisa Middleton?
7
8
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON:
                                          Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
                                           Stacie Olivares?
9
             COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Aye.
10
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega?
11
             COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA:
                                      Aye.
12
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?
1.3
             COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ:
14
                                       Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
15
                                           Mr. President, we
16
    have Rob Feckner making the motion, Jason Perez seconding
    it for the approval of Item 4a of the Committee meeting
17
   minutes.
18
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you Ms. Hopper.
19
20
    The next item is the information consent items. I have no
    requests to discuss any of those, Items A -- 5a or 5b.
21
2.2
    we will move on to information agenda items, 6a,
23
    composition of the Pension and Health Benefits Committee.
             Mrs. Simpson.
24
             MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON:
25
                                                     Good
```

morning, Board members. And thank you, Chair Jones.

1.3

2.2

This item has been prepared in response to a request by Board Member Perez to consider whether the Pension Health[SIC] and Benefits Committee should become a Committee of the whole, wherein all members of the Board would be members.

We have -- know that the Board is very familiar with the discussion around committee structures. This was a central part of discussions in the most recent Board self-assessment. So in the item, you'll see that we set out three options for the Committee to consider. The first to retain the status quo, the current arrangements; secondly, to introduce this suggestion into the next Board self-assessment, which will be coming up in the spring of 2021; and three, of course, to move ahead with Mr. Perez's suggestion.

So with that, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Questions from the Committee members or other Board members?

I see no requests to speak. This is an information item.

Oh, Mr. Feckner.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, I guess I just need to weigh in about the making committees a committee of the whole. I think

that negates the purpose of having committees. And I don't think there's any one committee that's more important than the other, so if we would do this with Pension and Health, then I would assume we would need to do that with Board Governance, Risk and Finance. And I think that just does away with a lot of the committee work that we work so hard to get done, and that we at no time discourage or prohibit any Board member from sitting in on any committee meeting or having any input.

The only thing is they don't get to vote on Committee day, but they certainly have full access to comments, and commentary, and then they can vote during Board day. So I, for one, just have some concerns about, you know, making it a committee of the whole, because I think it does away with some of the options. And also, for some of the appointed folks, they didn't sign on for doing six committees, so maybe they can't make their schedule work for that. And I think we need to take that into consideration as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you, Mr.

Feckner.

2.2

Mr. Perez.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Thank you.

Rob, I agree with you in regards to the

committees being important. I think it -- I think the way we run it is kind of -- is not very smooth. It's not very effective. I think if we made it all committees -- each committee a committee of the whole, the Board of Administration could just meet on the items that they need to meet on. They don't need to report back. We wouldn't need to have another set of votes and substitute motions, which if it's done in the committee, it would be done.

That's my thinking behind it.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Ms. Middleton.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Thank you, Mr.

President. We've had a lot of discussion back and forth on these issues, and clearly the Investment Committee is a very different animal. And I understand the point of making the Investment Committee a committee of the whole. I think the Pension and Health Benefits Committee is an extremely important one, but it would be hard to argue that it is more important than any of the other committees. So I would prefer that we leave Pension and Health Benefits as a committee as opposed to making it a committee of the whole.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Than you, Ms.

Middleton. We have a couple of comments -- or questions and comments from other Board members.

Mr. Miller.

BOARD MEMBER MILLER: Yeah. You know, I've spoken at some length on this in the past. And I think we really need to remember that the whole purpose of creating committees, subcommittees, the whole purpose of delegating is for efficiency and effectiveness. To delegate and to have subcommittees, we have to have trust in other Board members that are assigned to those committees to do that additional work. They are additive. They add value, and efficiency, and effectiveness to our process of the Board.

1.3

2.2

And so just going to committees of the whole, we lose those benefits and we also kind of imply that, you know, without me on every committee, those committees are not going to be as effective and efficient in all cases.

And I think that -- that does us a disservice as a Board. I think we need the benefits of having real committees, real subcommittees that add value, and add efficiency and effectiveness.

That said, it's not about the importance of the work. This is about process. This is about effectiveness and efficiency. This is about allowing the Board to perform at its best and it's additive. So I would suggest, and I know this will cause some folks to take umbrage, but the decision on the Investment Committee wasn't about the importance, frankly it was about Board dynamics and other aspects. But it really was not about

effectiveness or efficiency, because basically going to a committee of the whole for any committee, then all you're doing basically is adding an additional redundancy ni your decision-making process, because you no longer have the benefits of an actual committee that is delegated to do some of the heavy lifting before the entire Board weighs in.

So, yeah, enough said from me on this subject, but I think -- I hope we will in the future focus more on process and governance, effectiveness and efficiency than on some of the more, I hate to say it, internal politics of things.

Thanks

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Miller. Ms. Paquin.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER PAQUIN: Thank you, Mr.

President. So on behalf of the Controller, she does feel very strongly that the Pension and Health Benefits

Committee should be a committee of the whole. Several important conversations going on with the long-term care insurance fund and also with our annual look at health insurance and health rates and trends.

And although, most Board members do attend the Committee, even if they're not sitting on the Committee, they lack the ability to vote, to make motions, and so

forth. And so for those reasons, we do feel that this is a committee that is going to be facing a lot of very pressing challenges this year. And we do think that all Board members should be seated on this committee.

Thank you.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

Ms. Middleton.

 $\label{thm:person} \mbox{ \begin{tabular}{ll} VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: I've spoken already and I think I may have spoken out of order and I apologize. \end{tabular}}$ 

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. That's it. We do have -- that's it from Board members. I see no further requests from Board members. We do have a request to speak on this item from the public.

Mr. Fox.

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS CHIEF FOX: Yes, Mr.

President. We have one caller, Mr. Larry Woodson of the

California State Retirees.

MR. WOODSON: Good morning. Larry Woodson,
California State Retirees. Thank you for the opportunity
to comment. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yes.

MR. WOODSON: Okay. So I'm commenting on this item, but I'm also -- I apparently didn't get in the queue early enough to comment on 5b, so I will follow that with

some comments on that as well. I hope, you know, maybe you'll give me a little extra time, since I wasn't allowed to do it on 5b, but I'll make it quick.

2.2

So first of all, CSR -- and Tim is not -- Tim

Behrens, our President, is not able to join us. I'm

speaking on behalf of him and CSR. I -- we endorse the

idea of PH -- Pension and Health Benefits being a

Committee of the whole. The discussion -- I've been

attending committee meetings and Board meetings for five

years. And this notion that it's more efficient to have

committees be not of the whole is just completely contrary

to my observation.

It's much more efficient and effective to have all members be able to vote and discuss in-depth at the time that these items are presented to staff. They're not presented and discussed at the same length in Board meetings. And as you've already acknowledged, the Investment Committee has gone back to Committee of the whole, which it operated that way and functioned that way for many, many years quite well, and that -- and more efficiently and effectively, I might add. So that's our position on that.

But of great concern -- as great a concern is the schedule and calendar that you just approved for Pension and Health Benefits. About a year ago, the Board asked

the staff to go back and review the need for revising its recent reduction to the number of meetings Pension and Health Benefits would hold, which was -- which had been downsized to quarterly. And -- and I -- two long-term Board members, and you know who you are, told me that they didn't feel four was adequate. And since CSR and other stakeholders have given input to increase them. And also, when I first started five years ago, there were eight Pension and Health Benefit Committee meetings. Now, maybe that was excessive, but four is certainly inadequate. And as late as September -- this September in the Board meetings and committee meetings there was some discussion about this and it was raised and I believe, Chairman --

2.2

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Excuse me, Mr. Woodson -- Mr. Woodson. Ms. Hopper, would you start the clock again for three minutes, because he was speaking on a separate item.

Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Woodson.

MR. WOODSON: Oh, thank you very much.

So as late as the September Board meetings this year, I think the -- one of the Board members -- or this was raised as an issue. And I think it was you, Mr. Jones, that said, well, this isn't on the agenda. We'll put it on the agenda for a later meeting, but we can't discuss it as part of the discussion about the -- you know, the makeup of the Committee, so -- but it hasn't

been put on the agenda, and all of a sudden this calendar shows up with quarterly meetings.

2.2

So I -- I -- you know, I'm perplexed and disappointed that -- because I do feel that the -- the number of issues, the complexity that this Pension and Health Committee has to address, and the work of the staff -- and, by the way, the team -- I'm really -- I'm really happy with the team, but there's a lot of work to be done as we could see from this last meeting. Our stakeholder meeting went two and a half hours, primarily because Pension and Health Benefits had so much on the table.

So I would urge you to at least take this up again soon. I hope if you do vote down this committee of the whole issue, I hope you can expand the number of meetings. Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
Woodson. And I think it's important to note, Mr. Woodson,
that as we discuss the number of meetings, those are
minimums. But whenever there's a need to add an
additional meeting, the Committee Chair will work with the
staff to agendize those additional meetings. So it's not
a hard -- it's not that you can't have additional
meetings. So thank you for your comments.

Okay. So, Ms. Brown.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. Sorry. I had lost connection there for a minute. So I don't want to know -- I don't know if I'm duplicating it, but I also agree that Pension and Health should be a committee of the whole. When I was first on -- when I first became a Board member, I was not on Pension and Health. And I have got to tell you, most of the calls and concerns I had were about Pension and Health.

2.2

Now, we're moving into even more issues and complex issues, and we've completely redesigned -- the risk adjustment, I was not on when that got canceled, but now we're going on to a new type of adjustment. And it's going to raise the rates for quite a few, I would think more than 50 percent, of the members. And I mean, I don't have the exact numbers, but these issues are so complex. And also the Pension and Health Committee voted yesterday to reduce benefit design, but we don't know what it's going to be. We're going to have to do it in the future.

And I thought it was odd, but I just think everybody should be involved in this committee, including being able to make motions and have an active vote.

Otherwise, what happens is when it comes back to the Board, I mean, it's literally an oral report go, go, go, aye, aye, no, and that's it. It's really never discussed. And so I think it makes more sense to be a committee of

the whole. Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mr. Perez.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Yeah. I feel like I have to counter to what Mr. Miller said. President Jones, you know that the last two times we have selected the committees, I've begged you not to put me on Pension and Health, because it's so -- it's so deep and there's just so much information that you have to know. So no, I'm -- I'm -- I trust the Board members to do the right thing for what they believe.

I won't disagree with the internal politic issue that he mentioned, but I absolutely disagree with the -- his point about effectiveness and efficiency. It is not. It's not effective and it's not efficient. We add extra -- excuse me -- we add extra layers of complexity that don't need to be there. And that's it.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you. Okay. So I see no additional requests to speak on this. And getting a sense from the Committee members this was just an information item. But, of course, if any of the committee members would like to have this discussed further, we could go on, but I see no additional requests. So we would now move on to the next item on the agenda then.

Okay. 6b is a information agenda item. Ms.

Simpson. The proposed changes to the Board Governance Policy, reporting investigations to the Board.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Thank you, Chair Jones. As you say, Item 6b is for the Committee to consider a potential revision to the policy which would formalize current practice. It clarifies that the Board retains authority for both oversight and monitoring of investigations and that the Board has delegated that authority to the President and to the Chair of the Risk and Audit Committee.

In the language, which is highlighted for your consideration, you'll see that it introduces wording to say that if and when an investigation determines that the allegations are more likely than not true, management would inform the full Board of the investigation.

So I'd be happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Committee members, are there any questions?

Ms. Brown.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I'm not on the Committee, but -- so no one on the committee has question. All right, so I do.

So Ms. Simpson, are you saying that we're not making any changes or are we just pointing out what the

current policy is?

1.3

2.2

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Thank you. The existing practice is the Chief Executive Officer, Marcie Frost, has explained previously is that she keeps the Board leadership informed of these types of developments. By introducing this language into the policy, it gives an opportunity to formalize that practice and ensure that all sides have had an opportunity to consider how asset matters are handled.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So under this process that's in our Board materials, when would the full Board have been told of the conflict of interest about the -- for the ex-CIO?

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: I'm not in a position to answer that specific circumstance. I don't know if Marcie or our General Counsel would like to weigh in there.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So my -- so my concern is -I think a large number of the Board members were very
concerned that we didn't know about this ahead of time,
much earlier on in the investigation, since I believe we
know the investigation was started.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Excuse me, President -CHAIRPERSON JONES: Excuse me, Ms. Brown. Excuse
me, our General Counsel wants to make a comment.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Oh, sure.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Go ahead.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yeah, I think that you're probably getting into a closed session item that is not appropriate for discussion in open session.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I don't think I said anything that was closed session, but -- so I just want to make sure that we don't find out, you know, certainly after the press. But I think it's important that we know early on in the -- with this issue. And I don't know that this policy is written here solves the problem we had with the ex-CIO. So with that, I'll leave it there.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Ms. Ortega.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am not in support of the amendment that's here. I don't feel like this quite addresses the conversation that we had in a prior discussion. I'll tell you what I would

19 support. The --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Lost her.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. We lost, Ms. Ortega.

Ms. Ortega, are you back?

Ms. Ortega, can you hear us?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Can you hear me now?

CHAIRPERSON JONES: I can hear you now. Would

you start over, please?

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Yes. So the way the amendment is drafted, as I see it, that the management will be notified -- will notify the Board once it has been determined the allegation is more likely than not to be true. So that language refers to the investigation has already been conducted and it is more likely than not that the allegation is founded.

I support something sooner than that, which is for these limited individuals that have been identified in this section, when an allegation is made, typically there is a -- there's pre-investigation work. An investigator will look into an allegation to determine whether or not the -- the issue should have a full investigation. So allegations can be made that are completely baseless and that usually there is a preliminary look into the allegation, and your EEO officer, for example, might say, I couldn't find anything to suggest this is other than somebody has a grudge and so we're not going to go forward with a full investigation.

I don't think those types of issues need to come to the Board. But for the limited number of people who are in the section that's identified, if the CEO has reason to believe that a full investigation is necessary, I believe the Board needs to be notified at that point.

Good.

So that's a step sooner than what's drafted here.

1.3

2.2

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: And if I could comment. Ms. Ortega, that's really the intent of that language and maybe it's not the correct language to use in the policy. But the idea was that at the first given point in the review, whether it's a full investigation or a pre-investigation, at the point that we believe that these allegations can be substantiated, either through, you know, testimony through some kind of documentation that we were able to discover, at that point the full Board would be notified. So I think it's the language, but the idea is you would be notified as soon as I believe that more likely than not, you know, we would have to open up that full investigation or that these allegations can be substantiated.

mean, I think we're in agreement on the policy. It's just that way it's drafted, as I read it, the language that's being used is the language that we would typically use after an investigation has been completed. So I think it needs to be clear that an investigation is going to begin.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Okay. Good.

Ms. Olivares.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you, Mr. President. First of all, my video is going to be going on

and off, just to save bandwidth, so we can get through this meeting. And I concur with Ms. Ortega's comments. In addition, as I'm looking at Agenda Item 6b, page one, the analysis paragraph, it says here that the full Board retains authority to oversee and monitor any investigation. And it goes on. It has delegated that authority to the Board President.

2.2

I'd like to bring Ms. Ashley Dunning forward to comment on that, particularly as it relates to what the risks are to Board -- the Board members, since we have oversight. And if we delegate that authority, what risk does that create to us?

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Ms. Dunning. We can't hear you.

MS. DUNNING: Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yes, now we can. Okay.

MS. DUNNING: Good morning, Board. You have the authority to delegate certain responsibilities, of course, so long as you retain your oversight. And we talked about that the last time this came to the Board. The question here is at what point you are involved in this monitoring and oversight role. And to Trustee Ortega's point about wanting to be apprised of the investigation once a full investigation is authorized, that certainly seems consistent with your oversight responsibility, so that you

would be aware of the investigation. We talked about the risks of compromising the due process rights of your members to full and fair investigations, so you have to be very careful about that and sensitive to the fact that the -- the mere fact that a full investigation is occurring does not suggest that allegations will be substantiated, so there's risk in conveying the information in a way that could result in it becoming public. But I think it's incumbent upon every Board member, as you already know, to maintain these topics confidential.

2.2

So with that being the baseline of understanding, I think that you comply with your fiduciary obligations of oversight by making the tweak to the language that Ms. Ortega suggested.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you. And, Ms. Dunning, I understand that each Board member brings their own area of expertise. And given that my area of expertise is both insurance and institutional investments, I wonder what risk that creates if I were to delegate my authority to the Board President and the Chair of the Risk and Audit Committee when they're not experts in the investment field. And a large part of the risk that we face as an organization and that our members face has to do with our investment portfolio and conflicts of interest

in that space.

1.3

2.2

MS. DUNNING: So you've raised two fiduciary and governance topics in that question. One is the way in which they Board governs itself through the selections of the Board leadership and it is appropriate for the Board to select leaders, such as your President and Vice President, who have broad authorities dealt -- assigned to them to communicate with management on all aspects of the administration and investments of the plan. So that is perfectly appropriate.

The other aspect of your question relates to competencies that you each hold, such as your own in the investment arena. And you do have a responsibility as somebody with those particular strengths to share those strengths with the Board and with the committees. So if that means that you are more active in your -- or in the way in which you share your expertise with the rest of say the Investment Committee, that would be consistent with your responsibilities.

But it is not inconsistent with your responsibilities as a trustee on the Board to have selected a President who doesn't necessarily have the same level of experience in one aspect of the business of the organization. I hope that responds to your question.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: I think it's part of

it. I guess where I'm trying to get is that if we're looking -- if there every happens to be another investigation into a potential conflict of interest that regards investment holdings, I'm not comfortable delegating my fiduciary duty, my oversight authority, particularly when it comes to looking at risks to the investment portfolio and conflicts of interest.

1.3

2.2

helps.

MS. DUNNING: Okay. Now, I see more where you're going with your question, I think. And the answer to that is that the -- the fact that you have particular expertise does not create a circumstance where you have the responsibility to advise the organization in that area. For example, you may have a number of lawyers on the Board. The fact that you have lawyers on the Board does not make them the lawyer for CalPERS.

Similarly, if you have investment professionals on the Board, they are not the investment professionals of CalPERS. They share their expertise in terms of their level of sophistication and understanding as to the topics that are discussed, but they are not the expert who's being retained or referred to in those contexts. And I hope that --

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: I understand that.

MS. DUNNING: -- that example of the lawyer

So anyway --

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: I guess what I'm -how I'm looking at this is this is part of my area of
oversight as well, right? So it's the full CalPERS in
terms of oversight, but in terms of this being my area of
expertise. And I'm trying to understand how I can provide
adequate oversight, if I delegate my authority in this
regard.

1.3

2.2

MS. DUNNING: Fair enough. And with the approach that's being discussed right now where the full Board in closed session would be apprised of an investigation -- a full investigation of one of these individuals who -- or one of these positions, based on the CEO's determination that that's the appropriate course of action, that would be the forum in which you would share your expertise. You would not, of course, be running the investigation, but you would be hearing --

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Of course, right.

MS. DUNNING: -- you would be hearing your expertise in the context of that closed session discussion with your fellow Board members and management.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Yeah. My question is prior to that. So prior to a full investigation being commenced, I'm concerned -- and this gets to the sophistication of investments and how complex it can be when there is a conflict of interest. And so this is

what's really making me pause here in terms of delegating my oversight authority.

2.2

MS. DUNNING: Another way to look at it would be do you want to be assuming the responsibility of advising on the correct answer in a conflict of interest context? Because, in fact, it's not a member -- it's not a trustee on the Board who's going to make that ultimate determination. It's going to be whomever is the adjudicatory body. And usually when you're talking about conflicts of interest, it's the FPPC or it's the attorney general.

So while your expertise will be very important to weigh in on and it may be that the Board President determines that he or she has a fellow member on the Board with whom that person should consult, because they have such a sophistication over this -- around this area. And it would be permissible for the President, so long as there's not a Bagley-Keene violation, to consult in that context.

But I think -- but to my first point, it is not inappropriate for the President and Vice President, who may not have that level of expertise, instead to consult with other experts, say your head of HR or somebody who's been hired by CalPERS to advise on the particular topic. Maybe not to run the investigation, but instead to advise

CalPERS on the conflict or whatever the topic is that's being investigated.

1.3

2.2

I'm not talking about running the investigation at all.

What I'm talking about is providing insight into

particularly the investment piece, which is critical to

fund and to our members, prior to the commencement of a

full investigation, so that we fully understand if an

investigation should be launched. How does that fit

within my fiduciary duty and in service to the members.

MS. DUNNING: Investigations often do need to be launched, even if a -- even if the one who's launching the investigation is dubious about what the results may be.

And so the fact that you may have a -- the fact that you have expertise in this area would not mean that an investigation would not need to be launched, so --

I'm saying. I think perhaps I'm not being clear. So I think there's been discussion about Board members being informed once an investigation has been launched, right, once allegation -- allegations have been founded. Prior to that though, there might be some -- something that we miss in terms of there being, for example, complex investment transactions that would actually warrant an investigation. And I do not want to be negligent in my

fiduciary duty by delegating oversight when I -- this is my area of expertise. And again, it's a complex area and there's tremendous amounts of risk here --

2.2

MS. DUNNING: So in your hypothetical Trustee Olivares, are you anticipating that an investigation might not be launched, but had you been consulted, your conclusion would have been there should have been an investigation or the opposite, the investigation launched --

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: It could go -- it could go either way, quite frankly. So it's -- and I'm not asking for -- I'm not -- my question isn't about -- my question is about my fiduciary duty, my role to our members, right, and safeguarding their interests. And to the extent that, again, there's potential risk for conflict of interest when it comes to our investments. And if a decision is being made about a potential investigation, I think it's important to have insight there.

MS. DUNNING: This is a topic that also is one that's appropriate for you and the CEO to discuss separately. So to the extent that the CEO has communication with you about matters where you have particular expertise, that's perfectly appropriate, as long as it's not becoming a bases for a serial meeting.

And I'm sure that she values and will reach out to those who have the level of expertise that you're -- you're showing in your particular arena.

1.3

2.2

So that's another way for a board to address what appears to be your concern that you're not complying with your fiduciary responsibilities. You are as you speak out on these topics, and the organization follows up on that by having communications with each of you in your areas of expertise to make sure that you are heard.

And, I mean, I welcome if the CEO would like to speak up about that. I feel like I've monopolized a little bit here, but that's -- that's my framework for analyzing your question.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Good. We have Ms. Middleton.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Thank you, Mr.

President. And I want to thank Ms. Ortega for her

comments. I think they were extremely good. I do believe

if we move to what she is proposing, then management would

notify the full Board once there was a determination that

a full investigation is warranted. That's a very bright

line that clearly defines at the moment at which the full

board would need to be notified, because we would have

authorized a full investigation. So I support that. And

I support in part because it is both an improvement over the previous process, and it is something that defines a very straightforward bright line.

1.3

2.2

If you accept that though, the previous -- the middle sentence of number 18 becomes, I think, inoperative, because as it relates now it says, "CalPERS management will inform the Board President and the Chair of the Risk and Audit Committee upon commencement of such investigation". And what we are defining is that we will be informing the full Board on commencement of an investigation. And what I would suggest is we substitute that, that the Board President and the Chair of the Risk and Audit Committee are notified whenever there is an allegation. And that's -- that would be my proposed substitute language.

And then I have a question for Mr. Jacobs and Ms. Dunning. I think one of the most important words in section 18 is the word "monitor". And I would like to have Ms. Dunning and Mr. Jacobs define what they believe the word "monitor" means in terms of Board responsibility, both what we should do and should not do in carrying out our monitoring responsibility.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Well, I'm happy to go first. I don't have much of a substantive response though. I guess what I would say, Ms. Middleton, is that

monitor means be aware of and, based on the circumstances, kind of consult with the CEO or management, as the case may be, to determine that it's being handled appropriate -- appropriately.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Ms. Dunning.

MS. DUNNING: I think that's right. And I would -- a monitor is obviously part of your fiduciary obligations with respect to many aspects of the organization's business, so it's both being apprised of or aware of invest -- of these matters, receiving sufficient reporting from those who are conducting an investigation, in this instance, relating to the investigation, and being provided an opportunity to ask questions. So whether that opportunity to ask questions is through questions you may ask of the General Counsel in a privileged context or through closed sessions that are agendized for discussion, all aspects of this being receiving reports and having an opportunity to ask questions about them is what is appropriate in the context of monitoring.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: And I appreciate that. And all of the -- that language sounds very different than directing or managing the course of an investigation, is that correct?

MS. DUNNING: Absolutely, yes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Ms. Ortega.

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to comment on the questions that Ms.

Olivares was raising. I think my sense of how the Board feels comfortable with the kind of issue that she's raising is we have to be certain that we have policies about conflict of interest and clear direction to the CEO, so that when the -- when an allegation is made, they have -- they, the staff, HR, whomever might be involved, have the right set of criteria to review, to determine whether the investigation has to go forward. And my sense of how I feel comfortable with that delegation is that we, as a Board, have set those expectations and then we expect the staff to carry them out. I think that -- making sure we're comfortable that we've set that criteria and given that direction to the staff is step one.

I think Ms. Middleton's proposal together with that provides even more protection, if that's the direction the Board wants to go in, because then there's an opportunity to have -- or for members of the Board, if it's the Chair and Vice Chair to have some interaction with the staff to be sure that that's being carried out.

I think, in my experience, there are many more allegations than there are investigations. So it makes me very nervous about going down a road of constantly being

informed of allegations, because I also think that there can be circumstances where there's then an unfair aura around an employee maybe where those allegations might have come up. So I think it is really important to keep the number of people who know about allegations to a limited number and then you -- when you have determined that something more serious has likely occurred, then you share that with a broader group.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you. And so I think we've, you know, had a number of excellent comments regarding this issue, and this is an informational item, so what I'm going to suggest unless the Board has -- Committee members have a different opinion is that the comments that Ms. Ortega and Ms. Middleton made would work with staff to rewrite that section and to incorporate those comments, and then bring this back to a future Board meeting for an action. So unless there are concerns -- I see some comments now.

Mr. Feckner.

1.3

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just think it's important to weigh in here. I do agree with some of the comments from Ms. Ortega and most of the comments from Ms. Middleton. I do, however, want to caution us that, you know, you can't unring the bell. So if something is said about an employee before

it's been investigated, we all know how this -- this rumor mill works. And once it gets out there, it's hard to pull that back. That's why we hire a CEO. The Board has direct control of the CEO. The CEO should be able to determine whether or not a full investigation is warranted, then inform the full Board if that's what the -- the point is.

2.2

But trying to do that piecemeal ahead of time I think is problematic. I think it raises personnel issues. And I caution us to -- any of us to consider that we're experts. I mean, we're all here as lay Board members and we're here to do the bidding of our organization. But at the same time, you know, I don't think any of us are any better off than any other person. We all have our own ideas, our own concepts, our own background and knowledge. But, you know, none of us are experts in these -- in all of these fields. So I just caution us to look at that.

But at the same time, that's why we have a CEO to make those determinations. I don't want to see us on the ground floor of any investigation, because we all know how that information leaks. The next thing you know we have a whole bunch of people that are -- either harmed their careers, et cetera. We want to make sure that we're very careful doing that. So thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you. Okay. We

have one more question.

1.3

2.2

Ms. Olivares.

President. And I'd like to thank Ms. Ortega for a very eloquent way of restating what I was trying to get at.

I -- as we go forward with this Governance item and then we're also going forward with conflicts of interest concerns and perhaps even looking at blind trusts, I want to be sure that we're able to establish a very robust policy that prevents conflicts of interest. And that would require early identification.

So in addition to Ms. Middleton and Ms. Ortega working with the CEO and the rest of the team, I will also be doing so.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Sure. We welcome comments from any Board, member as long as --

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: -- as we're not creating a serial meeting, as Ms. Dunning so appropriately stated. So the CEO could receive input from any Board member, as long as we're not communicating with each other regarding those issues, okay?

Okay. So this will come back in the future as an action item with the changes based on this discussion. So seeing no additional questions on this item, we now will

```
move to -- and there's no public comment -- are there any
1
   public comments on this, Mr. Fox?
2
             STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS CHIEF FOX: No, Mr.
 3
   President. There are no callers at this point.
 4
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.
                                        Thank you.
5
             Okay. So thank you. And then we move to Item
6
7
    6c. And thank you, Ms. Dunning. We will move to --
8
             MS. DUNNING: Thank you.
9
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: -- Item 6c, the summary of
    Committee direction. Mr. Jacobs.
10
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yes, Mr. Jones. I think
11
   you just stated what it is.
12
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.
1.3
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: On 6b we're going to
14
   bring that back as an item -- action item based on the
15
16
    changes that have been discussed this morning and that is
    all I have.
17
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS:
                                      Okay.
18
19
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: I think you got it, Mr.
20
    Jacobs.
             Okay. So we will move now to Item 6d, public
21
   comment.
2.2
23
             Mr. Fox, do we have any requests to speak on that
    item?
24
```

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS CHIEF FOX: Mr. President,

25

we have no callers at this time.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you very much.

And so we have a -- that's the end of the Board Governance

Committee. And our Board of Administration, let's allow a

10-minute break before we start our Board of

Administration meeting. So let's say five minutes after

11:00. Okay, 11:05. Okay. See you guys then.

Thank you.

(Thereupon California Public Employees'
Retirement System, Board Governance Committee
meeting adjourned at 10:52 a.m.)

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing California Public Employees' Retirement System,

Board of Administration, Board Governance Committee

meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters,

a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California,

and was thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by

computer-assisted transcription;

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 26th day of November, 2020.

1.3

James 4 July

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 10063