

Brian Sandoval
Governor

Tara Hagan
Executive Officer



COMMITTEE
Rex Reed, Chair
NDOC
Brian Davie, Vice Chair
LCB
Karen Oliver
GCB
Dr. Carlos Romo
Retired
Scott Sisco
NDOT

Carrie L. Parker
Deputy Attorney General

**Nevada Public Employees'
Deferred Compensation Program**

**DEFERRED COMPENSATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES FOR CLOSED MEETING
Thursday, June 21, 2012**

These minutes are a draft subject to approval by the Deferred Compensation Committee at the next regularly scheduled meeting. The agenda for this meeting was posted according to the Nevada Open Meeting Law and was sent to groups and individuals as requested.

CHAIRMAN REED: It is now two minutes after two o'clock we are now in closed session. By we, I mean the Nevada Deferred Compensation Committee, is in closed session. We are working on agenda item, please tell me I left my agenda in the other room, agenda item V J. In the room are the Committee members, all five, also is Ms. Jenny Potts who is recording for us, Jake O'Shaughnessy our Arnerich Massena consultant, and Ms. Tara Hagan who is our Executive Officer. Ms. Hagan before we proceed I just want to remind the Committee members that we are going to be giving our scores to them and then after the scoring I would ask the Committee members what they would like to do before we actually proceed with scoring. I want the record to indicate that Ms. Carrie Parker is in the room as well. We will go through the scoring first and after that we can have discussion but as I understand what Ms. Parker said is we cannot have, we should not have any votes of any kind until we go back into open session. So that means that we can't really decide which of the finalists, we cannot decide our finalists. On the flip side to say it a different way we can't decide in here who is not going to be a finalist that has to be done in open meeting. Am I correct Ms. Parker?

DAG CARRIE PARKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN REED: Okay, thank you. So right now any comments, questions or discussion before we proceed with the scoring? I relayed what I thought is how we proceed here if you think I'm wrong please say so now.

BRIAN DAVIE: So just to clarify, the scoring will determine the finalists. Is that correct?

TARA HAGAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN REED: My understanding is we have to decide how many finalists we want too. But that can't be done here it has to be done in there. So we will have the scoring, after the scoring is done then we have to... We can talk about things but we can't have any motions, we can't come to a decision on how many finalists we are going to have, that's the first thing, and who those finalists are. Any other comments or questions before we get started? Ms. Parker, please.

DAG CARRIE PARKER: Also, if you'll notice Tara's chart is going to disclose the weights of the different factors. Previously we had gone in to closed session because of the weighting of the factors being confidential. Those are only confidential until the RFP is published, so they are not confidential any more. So I anticipate that maybe due to Mr. Sisco's question, there might be some discussion in the open meeting about what to do with the RFP. I would encourage that conversation to occur before the weighting of the factors is disclosed just in case if we are, if the Committee is disposed to redo the RFP

and you want to use the same weighting factors it's not going to clue-in the bidders as to the weights of the factors.

SCOTT SISCO: That was what we needed to know in there though cause . . .

DAG CARRIE PARKER: So when we go back in to the open session if that's where you would like to go, I would recommend doing that before Tara puts the chart up.

SCOTT SISCO: Oh before it goes up? I'm sorry I thought you meant before we actually did the ratings.

DAG CARRIE PARKER: No, just before it becomes public.

CHAIRMAN REED: Any other comments, questions? Okay I want to remind you that when you give a score you're supposed to also give a reason why you gave them a specific score.

SCOTT SISCO: I'm sorry. Supposed to, as in there's a statute for that?

CHAIRMAN REED: I wouldn't know if there's a statute or not but that's what I've been told is that if we give a score on a specific item we should just give a short description of why we thought they got that kind of score. Ms. Parker.

DAG CARRIE PARKER: NAC 333.162 has a requirement of providing a written explanation of scores upon request of the Division of Purchasing. So unless Purchasing has made that request, strictly speaking, a written explanation is not mandatory at this time [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: Any other questions, comments? Seeing none by Committee members Ms. Hagan please start on the scoring. I'm sorry, Mr. O'Shaughnessy would you have anything?

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: Yes, certainly. I just wanted to level-set a little bit to refresh. So, you know from the time this process was initiated it has been roughly nine months. Some of the Committee members may not have been on board when we initiated this process. So as we got in to it there were a few objectives that we wanted to look at in the program to make sure they were optimal for participants. Some of those aspects were: single versus dual provider, a proprietary fund like a General Account, how that worked as an investment option and also how it maybe gave you a discounted administrative fee and also number of on-site days and how that cost factors in to participants.

What the objective of this is is to really drill down for you, the Committee, to determine for example, what is the tax being applied to the ING participants in the smaller plan - the \$80-\$100 million plan. What is the additional charge that they are facing because there is a dual provider construct and there is less access. I look at it to some degree, they are paying significantly more today and as you saw these bids come back, each proposer provided a bid for those individuals which is on the order of three times the expense of the individuals in the larger plan. In my mind there is a lot of focus and I've heard a lot of talk about competition and things like that and I think there is some degree of legitimacy to that. But I think as the Committee sort of weighs these factors, is the benefit of potential competition outweighed by this sort of "tax" being applied on participants in the smaller plan? Is there an ability to consolidate the plan down and provide a lower fee maybe to everyone, not just the people in that smaller plan?

[REDACTED] So as a Committee member, should you consolidate the plan to provide an additional benefit to everybody or is the competition still worth the increased cost? On-site days, you'll notice that each bid we asked them no on-site days or full on-site days. Ultimately we may walk away saying "those on-site

days are very, very expensive," maybe we can do with half of those on-site days and go back and negotiate a lower fee with the recordkeeper.

So by and large there are those three broad categories we are looking at: fund requirement, multiple provider and on-site days in order to help you, the Committee, determine what the actual cost is that each bidder is proposing. So that's the first, to level-set kind of how we are coming at the RFP. Secondly, as I have gone through this exercise with a lot of committees they kind of tend to try to pick the winner; we are not trying to pick the winner today. Are there some bids here which clearly are not worth continuing to pursue? That's a little bit of a different hat then as we read these and we are thinking "what's the best." We aren't trying necessarily to pick the best today; we are trying to identify those that simply aren't qualified. It allows us to really drill down those bids which we think are worthwhile. That's really all I have.

CHAIRMAN REED: Does anybody want to add to what Mr. O'Shaughnessy has said? Mr. Sisco, please.

SCOTT SISCO: I think there are some missing parts of that equation though

CHAIRMAN REED: Anybody else before I give my thoughts. I do want to address this idea of having one or two providers. When I came in to the system we had two providers and they were actually providing the funds that were available to the participants. It seems to me

So we have a whole different environment now that we are moving toward and not only us but, correct me if I'm wrong Mr. O'Shaughnessy you have experience, the whole industry is moving more in that direction. So it doesn't surprise me that there are some people, our participants, have mistaken assumptions that if we do away with ING or do away with Hartford we are doing away with their funds. That's not the case. All we are going to do now is select a record provider and then we decide what funds. We could actually select a record provider and in almost every case we can take those funds that are currently available to our participants and tell our record provider "you're still going to have these funds available for our participants." Now, correct me if I'm wrong, but we could do that if I understand the open architecture concept, with maybe the exception of the guaranteed interest account.

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: That is correct. First of all I concur with your commentary about the industry moving to open architecture. It used to be if you wanted Hartford funds you had to have a Hartford plan but the world has moved much more to where ING will keep Hartford assets and vice versa. The one exception

[REDACTED]

Those are the aspects which I feel differentiate a recordkeeper. So I would encourage you to focus on that as we get to the finalists.

CHAIRMAN REED: Anybody else? Mr. Davie.

VICE CHAIRMAN DAVIE: Just a quick comment, I appreciate this clarification and comments as well on the recordkeeper. Again, I was the only one here who went through this process five years ago and back then there was loyalty to a company because they did provide the funds. I think it is important and this is something we need to get across to the participants as well that company loyalty doesn't mean anything in this deferred compensation marketplace anymore because of the open architecture and that we are just looking for a recordkeeper. We aren't looking to establish a long term relationship with a company that is going to do good or bad or whatever. We are looking for a competent recordkeeper that is going to do a good job for us. Last time we talked about competition and then the Legislature changed the law that allowed us to go to one provider and so we set it out again. At that time we didn't see much difference. There was some but because things were tied to the providers and people didn't want to just have a choice of Hartford, they wanted to have another choice, that's why the Committee back then went with the choice argument.

[REDACTED]

So just more added to our comments I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN REED: Anymore comments or questions? I don't think there are any more comments or questions Ms. Hagan if you will proceed I'd appreciate it. I should ask, is there anything else from Mr. O'Shaughnessy?

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: The only thing, I will play whatever role is most beneficial to the Committee. Generally I reviewed these but this is the Com process and I don't want to come across that I'm quiet or not wanting to offer advice. Please pull out of me what you need from me. I will go to whatever level the Committee wants me to go but I'm here to service you and I hope the Committee can come to a decision. So let me know what I can do to best facilitate that.

CHAIRMAN REED: Also I want to make sure Ms. Parker has a chance to offer any thoughts. Did you have anything else or should we just proceed.

DAG CARRIE PARKER: I think we are okay. I wonder if we could check and make sure it's picking up everyone's voice?

CHAIRMAN REED: It is now 2:23 pm. I think we have all finished the preliminaries for the scoring. Ms. Hagan if you will now begin leading us through the scoring process I'd appreciate it.

TARA HAGAN: Sure and it's really however it pleases the Committee. I was thinking it may make more sense to take each category and so you would all go through by each firm and each category. Rather than doing each firm in its total, but that's completely up to the Committee.

CHAIRMAN REED: Actually you are leading us quite well so I'll leave that up to you.

TARA HAGAN: Well if we want to go ahead and start then [REDACTED]

How would you like to proceed?

CHAIRMAN REED: Just like you said we will start with a category and go down through all the companies then go back to the next category.

TARA HAGAN: I just have the companies listed in alphabetic order.

SCOTT SISCO: Can I ask for clarification? You said the total will be 90 that would be if you gave everybody the full amount right?

TARA HAGAN: That's right. I just have Rex, if you would like to start with Great West.

CHAIRMAN REED: I'll be flipping back and forth.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: Do we all have the same order in our booklets? Can we start with VALIC?

CHAIRMAN REED [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: I'm sorry, you gave 73 but there are only 20 points available for that.

CHAIRMAN REED: I thought you would base it on 100 percent and then turn around and use the weighting factor.

SCOTT SISCO: I assumed that all six questions added up to 100 percent. Therefore each question was a maximum.

CHAIRMAN REED [REDACTED]

KAREN OLIVER [REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Did we want to stay with VALIC and go all the way through? Is that easier?

CHAIRMAN REED: Since we are on VALIC there is one thing I forgot to mention, [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Carlos, do you want to start with [REDACTED] under VALIC?

CARLOS ROMO: I gave them a 19 [REDACTED]

others who [REDACTED]

. They do have [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED].

VICE CHAIR DAVIE [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED [REDACTED]

had [REDACTED]

. They [REDACTED]

of caught my attention. [REDACTED]

; that kind [REDACTED]

KAREN OLIVER [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I did notice [REDACTED]
which is a positive. Some of the [REDACTED]
some were better.

were okay but I felt [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
offer a [REDACTED]. They could

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I was pretty much the same [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO: I gave them [REDACTED]. I did agree that the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

KAREN OLIVER: I [REDACTED] VALIC. I did notice the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: The only thing I would say is [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: Again, using my methodology [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: When you say qualifying can I just ask what you mean? [REDACTED]?

SCOTT SISCO [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: I'm sorry I can't hear you can you move your paper down?

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: Let me going to interrupt here and say maybe we should use the microphones especially Ms. Oliver you speak very softly. Please proceed Ms. Hagan.

TARA HAGAN: Karen do you want to go ahead and start with the [REDACTED]

KAREN OLIVER [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: What I did is the same for every plan is the way I looked at [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I think objectively I followed the same procedure as the others have mentioned. [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: This is the one question that I used a different methodology on. [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Last category, [REDACTED], Rex do you want to start?

CHAIRMAN REED: Yes, I gave a score of [REDACTED]. Like all the others it seems like the [REDACTED], they have a website for sponsors like they all do, [REDACTED], I've mentioned that already, they want [REDACTED] and I can understand that. So all in all I gave them [REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them [REDACTED] Jake: [REDACTED]

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: The fact is actually pretty interesting. So for example [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] maintained [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] These bids, I think, [REDACTED]. Proprietary can be a relative term, some may have this uniform chassis and they put their own web interface on it. So you can say proprietary because you have bolted on some unique aspects to it but the guts of it are still a leverage system.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you, I apologize for that digression but it's a question I wanted answered.

CHAIRMAN REED: Can I add to that? When I read proprietary [REDACTED]. But if you read some of the other proposals it [REDACTED]

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: No.

CHAIRMAN REED: Okay.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: That's about all I had. I gave them credit for [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: Question 5 right? [REDACTED].

CARLOS ROMO: Number 5, I gave them [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED]

KAREN OLIVER: I've got an [REDACTED] on that one. I did notice a [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: I just wanted to confirm the totals that I have for everybody at this juncture and then we can move on to the next firm. [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: What is that total as long as we are there now? Do you average them? Before we walk out of this room we are going to have total for all of them?

TARA HAGAN: I haven't averaged them yet.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: By the way I want to thank you and compliment you on putting this booklet together. It is so much easier than last time and so organized, we really appreciate it.

CARLOS ROMO: The one thing I saw was it was the same thing for everybody. It helps us to be as objective as possible so we weren't subjectively looking at things.

TARA HAGAN: Thank you. So next in your book I think is [REDACTED]. Rex do you want to start us out with [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: [REDACTED] for the state defined contribution plans. They have [REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] all the companies out there so that is an important factor for me.

KAREN OLIVER [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Let's stay in order, it keeps me organized. [REDACTED], Rex?

CHAIRMAN REED [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: 16.

CHAIRMAN REED: Ok I was right. I gave them [REDACTED].
[REDACTED] which I found was interesting
because at the same time they said [REDACTED], so I'm wondering how they are
[REDACTED] and
stuff like that. I'm sure they will get there eventually. They will provide [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]. I think they are the only ones to
say that [REDACTED] is [REDACTED], that's pretty high.
[REDACTED] but [REDACTED] so I thought that was
acceptable. The [REDACTED], that's acceptable to my way of thinking. There is a
[REDACTED], I liked that idea.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them [REDACTED]. I made a note of [REDACTED].
[REDACTED]. I don't want to repeat everything Rex said but I had the same points.

KAREN OLIVER: I [REDACTED].
[REDACTED] They [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED]. I'm not sure that [REDACTED] would suffice and at this
point [REDACTED] but they would [REDACTED] the

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Do you maybe want to discuss that a little bit [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: Actually no. If we all use a methodology and we are consistent with that methodology,
we could have somebody on the board here that gives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 but as long as they are
consistent through all of their bids, no.

TARA HAGAN: Okay. Rex, [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them an [REDACTED]. One thing I key on is said it
[REDACTED] in about
[REDACTED]. I didn't know how to really work this idea of [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] They can [REDACTED], I like that. They offer [REDACTED]. They will [REDACTED]

One thing maybe Mr. O'Shaughnessy can help me with, what is a unitized fund?

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: A unitized fund, this is involving a trend in the large plan market where instead of offering Mutual Fund Company X large-cap growth fund, a plan sponsor could go out and find three large-cap domestic funds, maybe a value, a blend, and a growth, put those together and create what we would call the "Nevada Deferred Compensation large-cap fund." So those three are put together and participants can buy in or out daily to that fund, but you need somebody at the recordkeeper level to look at the three funds and blend them together to strike the NAV that your participants could buy in or out of. Does that make sense?

CHAIRMAN REED: NAV?

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: Net asset value, a blended up option. Let's say you have one that's 50, one that's 40 and one that's 10 at the end of the day. If you want to buy a dollar in that, how does that get allocated amongst the three underlying funds? So in unitizing they would do that function for you at no cost.

CHAIRMAN REED: I did mention my interest in a quarterly change in the interest rate but I should have followed forward with that concept. I expect in the future it would be to the benefit of the provider in four or five years if they can change the interest rate cause I expect it to start going up before too long.
[REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] and I liked [REDACTED] the [REDACTED], but I can't remember what it stands for now.

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: It was probably the [REDACTED] so let me put a number on how they can't just cherry pick the best one, they have to [REDACTED] to a [REDACTED] return. So then they market the [REDACTED] and I think that's right rather than to cherry pick their best and blend them all together. [REDACTED]

KAREN OLIVER [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: Question 3 right?

TARA HAGAN: [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Rex, [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: [REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] My big concern with them [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] that's been free for us for a long time. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] so that's basically what I took off for.

KAREN OLIVER [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I thought the [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: The last one for [REDACTED] Rex?

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them an [REDACTED]. The reason I did so, they have an [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]. I like how they are going [REDACTED] and
the fact that [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] which I kind of
like that because then you know it's [REDACTED] to their needs. The fact that [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] this year, 2012, and that they do a [REDACTED], I like
that idea.

TARA HAGAN: Thanks Rex and just to confirm I have a total of [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: Yes, my final score is [REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them a [REDACTED]

KAREN OLIVER: I gave them a [REDACTED]. I noted a [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: I had a total for you of [REDACTED]

KAREN OLIVER: That's right.

CARLOS ROMO: I gave them a [REDACTED]. I thought their [REDACTED] were good and I liked the fact that
they are going to invest [REDACTED] in [REDACTED].

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: I had [REDACTED].

SCOTT SISCO: You are right, sorry.

TARA HAGAN: So [REDACTED]?

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED] yes.

TARA HAGAN: The next one is [REDACTED], correct? Rex would you like to start [REDACTED] for
[REDACTED]?

CHAIRMAN REED: I had a score of [REDACTED] I thought, compared to some of the other ones that were bidding, [REDACTED]. They [REDACTED] the [REDACTED]. I looked at the [REDACTED]. They would do the Nevada Deferred Compensation Program as a [REDACTED]. [REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave Prudential [REDACTED]. Pluses to me [REDACTED] but I deducted [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED] even with that [REDACTED]. The other thing I had concerns about is they do not have [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Rex please start with [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them [REDACTED]. I like the [REDACTED] that they talk about that [REDACTED]. They mention [REDACTED]. I can't remember what that was, I apologize. Do you want me to drag out my book? I'd be happy to. They have [REDACTED] for the [REDACTED]. Their [REDACTED] is right up there [REDACTED]. They have a [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] and I those [REDACTED] so I thought that was a [REDACTED] and I wasn't too excited about that either. I do like how [REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I also noted their [REDACTED]. They did mention [REDACTED] but [REDACTED] on [REDACTED]. I gave them a plus for [REDACTED]. I had a question on one of their responses too on [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED]. No [REDACTED] and I had a note about [REDACTED]

KAREN OLIVER: I have [REDACTED]. I noted the [REDACTED]. They do [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] they are [REDACTED]. They would [REDACTED] to the plan. I also felt they had [REDACTED] with the participants. I looked at the [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] than a couple of the others.

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Okay, Rex [REDACTED]?

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them a score of [REDACTED]. They mentioned that they have [REDACTED] including [REDACTED]. I like the fact that they have a [REDACTED] for [REDACTED]. I don't remember anybody else offering that which [REDACTED] but that's what we have [REDACTED], but it's nice and we could always compare the two and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] to change an investment option, I thought that's a [REDACTED], even compared to what some of the others said they could do it in. They have [REDACTED] as a [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] provided by [REDACTED] and that seems like that's a [REDACTED] and that does [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and I had the same [REDACTED], just [REDACTED] there again.

KAREN OLIVER: I gave them a [REDACTED]. I noticed a [REDACTED], [REDACTED] but you could [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO: I gave them a [REDACTED]. I did look at [REDACTED], I thought [REDACTED]. Also under one of the categories they talked [REDACTED]. The other concern I had was the [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED].

TARA HAGAN: Rex, [REDACTED]?

CHAIRMAN REED: [REDACTED] I gave them a [REDACTED] which works out to 18.75. Same process I used with everything else when it came [REDACTED].

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave this one [REDACTED]. They had no [REDACTED], they [REDACTED] and their [REDACTED] to me. It looks [REDACTED] but I [REDACTED]

KAREN OLIVER: Mine is [REDACTED] using that [REDACTED].

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED], using the same method I did for all of them: [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED].

TARA HAGAN: Last one, [REDACTED].

CHAIRMAN REED: Score of [REDACTED]. They do have a [REDACTED], I like that. They are another one that has an [REDACTED]. They [REDACTED] but they [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] and they have [REDACTED]. What I didn't like was they [REDACTED]. They could [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] than what some of the other providers [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: I have a total for you for [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: [REDACTED], that's correct.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them [REDACTED]. I gave them [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as well as being [REDACTED]. So my total is [REDACTED].

KAREN OLIVER: I gave them a [REDACTED] in this category. I noted a [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Not only do they [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] but also [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: I had a total of [REDACTED].

KAREN OLIVER: That's right.

CARLOS ROMO: I gave them a [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] although they certainly are [REDACTED]. I gave [REDACTED] and I particularly pointed out that this [REDACTED] program seemed [REDACTED] but it's also [REDACTED] and dealing with [REDACTED] so a [REDACTED].

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Once again a total of [REDACTED].

SCOTT SISCO: Correct.

TARA HAGAN: Next we have [REDACTED]. Rex do you want to start us off with [REDACTED].

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave [REDACTED]. I liked the fact they are [REDACTED]. What I didn't like is [REDACTED]. Did I understand that correctly? That seems strange to me. They have [REDACTED] that's something [REDACTED] and it's on a [REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them [REDACTED] but I think [REDACTED] the Plan very much. The fact [REDACTED]. Whoever gets it, there is so much [REDACTED] and it was a big [REDACTED] for me, the fact [REDACTED]. The fact that they [REDACTED] and haven't [REDACTED], their ratings [REDACTED] which is a [REDACTED]

It was mentioned that we [REDACTED] for that [REDACTED] with this program. [REDACTED] that [REDACTED]. We have had other [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], [REDACTED] that wasn't [REDACTED] in a [REDACTED] I have strong feelings about recordkeeping [REDACTED]

KAREN OLIVER: I just can't ignore [REDACTED]. I tried to stay away from things [REDACTED] with all of the companies in the ordinary course of business [REDACTED] with us with [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED], I did take into consideration [REDACTED]. They are the only ones [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. I also took into consideration the fact [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] that.

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]. I also couldn't ignore [REDACTED]. I just [REDACTED].

CHAIRMAN REED: I didn't hear that, what was the score?

TARA HAGAN: [REDACTED]. Rex, [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them [REDACTED]. They have [REDACTED] and I think they do have [REDACTED] for their staff. They [REDACTED] which I thought was [REDACTED] given the [REDACTED]. They did not [REDACTED] and I think that's the way a lot of the industry is going so it seems like they are [REDACTED]. One thing that really caught my eye is their [REDACTED], I found that [REDACTED].

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them [REDACTED]. I noted [REDACTED] serving [REDACTED]. They mentioned a [REDACTED]; I'm still not sure what that is. [REDACTED]

so [REDACTED]. I [REDACTED] about this when we look at these proposals and when we hear the finalist presentations, I will tend [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] because it's just [REDACTED] and that is not what I care about here. I care about [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], so I gave them a [REDACTED].

KAREN OLIVER: I gave them a [REDACTED]. They are one of the very [REDACTED]. They offer [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] for the [REDACTED] and then a [REDACTED], that was important to some. I did ding them just a little [REDACTED] wouldn't be [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED]. I did take into consideration the [REDACTED] with the participant's needs and the fact [REDACTED]. They do have [REDACTED] even they have one [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] currently. They don't have any [REDACTED] and the other thing I noted was their [REDACTED] was the [REDACTED] in terms of [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Rex [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them a [REDACTED] They can [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. The rest of it is kind of [REDACTED] as far as I'm concerned given everybody else's similar description of [REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them [REDACTED]. That didn't really tell me very much about what they [REDACTED]. I was more interested [REDACTED] or not, and I have no idea. I also downgraded them for [REDACTED]. Again that places a [REDACTED] That to me is a big [REDACTED] for this company.

KAREN OLIVER: I used my tick mark system [REDACTED] and I gave them a [REDACTED]. They looked like they had [REDACTED] and could also offer [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED]. I liked the fact [REDACTED] with the participants to look at the [REDACTED] in the menu. I also [REDACTED] which I found [REDACTED] of [REDACTED].

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: [REDACTED], Rex?

[REDACTED]. I used the same system I have already described for the past two other plans.

TARA HAGAN: [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: I'm sorry I was reading [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: It's all right, [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: [REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them [REDACTED]. Actually I was [REDACTED] because [REDACTED] if we [REDACTED] the [REDACTED]. That to me is [REDACTED] and I don't understand how that go to [REDACTED] and those were the notes I had so [REDACTED]

KAREN OLIVER: [REDACTED].

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED] based on the same method I used on the others. I looked at [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] and without [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED], I gave them [REDACTED] marks.

TARA HAGAN: Rex, Plan [REDACTED]?

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them [REDACTED]. They want a [REDACTED] market [REDACTED]. Just like with the others you can [REDACTED] and there is [REDACTED]. They [REDACTED] and they [REDACTED]. Their [REDACTED] at least [REDACTED] so that's why I gave them that score.

TARA HAGAN: I had a total for you for [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Brian, [REDACTED]?

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them a [REDACTED]. From the RFPs and comparing with other ones they are definitely a [REDACTED]. They have [REDACTED] but all [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] operations. [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] I could not give them a [REDACTED].

KAREN OLIVER: Based on [REDACTED] the number of mine was a [REDACTED]. It said [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] calculations.

TARA HAGAN: I had a total of [REDACTED].

KAREN OLIVER: I have [REDACTED].

TARA HAGAN: I have [REDACTED].

KAREN OLIVER: I had [REDACTED].

TARA HAGAN: Thank you, I'll make that change. Carlos, [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED]. I liked the fact that [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED]. They also have done, in my view, [REDACTED] that are [REDACTED]. They did [REDACTED] in 2012, so my number is [REDACTED].

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED] it looks like I took a point off for something with [REDACTED].

TARA HAGAN: I have [REDACTED] as your total.

SCOTT SISCO: Correct.

TARA HAGAN: Okay, [REDACTED] Rex?

CHAIRMAN REED: Which one did you say? [REDACTED] is next.

TARA HAGAN: I'm sorry I was going in alphabetical order. Go ahead with [REDACTED]

***CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them an [REDACTED]. They have [REDACTED] so they are obviously into the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] with over [REDACTED]. They have good [REDACTED] and they have endorsement relationships with the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] I gave them an [REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them [REDACTED]. They are [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. They gained [REDACTED] [plan] and [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED] that was over [REDACTED] so they [REDACTED].

KAREN OLIVER: I gave them a [REDACTED]. I did go back on this one too and gave them a [REDACTED] [REDACTED], just a point [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] were [REDACTED] so I gave them [REDACTED].

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED] I liked the fact that [REDACTED] over [REDACTED] similar to ours. I also noted [REDACTED], I don't know if the others did or not but it makes it [REDACTED] for my point of view. [REDACTED].

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Rex, [REDACTED]?

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them an [REDACTED]. They [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]; they [REDACTED] by [REDACTED]. They [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] I like that. They have [REDACTED] through [REDACTED] so do some of the others. They get a [REDACTED] and are among the [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]. Their [REDACTED] I thought was [REDACTED], compared to some of the others. They have an [REDACTED] program.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them a [REDACTED]. I didn't have a lot written here but one of my concerns was [REDACTED], I thought [REDACTED] I think everybody else was like [REDACTED]. Other than that I think their [REDACTED] Services look [REDACTED].

KAREN OLIVER: First, for the prior category my score does not change, my justification I made an error I did not consider [REDACTED]. In [REDACTED] though I did give them [REDACTED].

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED]. They answered [REDACTED] in Nevada but no details [to location] and I was [REDACTED] I think the [REDACTED] They would [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] I understand that as well. The other concern I had was [REDACTED] available for [REDACTED].

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED] and I just want to mention that was one of the areas where I took the most amount of points away from one of the vendors from the qualifying points and that's just because [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: [REDACTED] Rex?

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them an [REDACTED]. They seemed to [REDACTED] although I did notice they [REDACTED]. I don't know exactly what they meant by that so I was going to ask Mr. O'Shaughnessy if he can fill me in or if he knows what they are referring to when they said that.

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: I can't exactly speak to [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: They [REDACTED]. I didn't know what they meant by [REDACTED] a [REDACTED], that's where I tripped up in my understanding.

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] So perhaps what they were saying there is they to have a [REDACTED] than a [REDACTED].

CHAIRMAN REED: Thank you

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them a [REDACTED]. I deducted because I saw in [REDACTED] and I didn't see that in any of the other bids.

KAREN OLIVER: I gave them a [REDACTED] and I had that same line of questioning that Rex had so thanks for answering. They had [REDACTED] which was a little better and a [REDACTED] list of [REDACTED].

CARLOS ROMO: I gave them an [REDACTED]. I guess a concern I had is they [REDACTED] and tell us [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] of 2012 but [REDACTED].

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Rex, [REDACTED]?

CHAIRMAN REED: For [REDACTED] I gave them an [REDACTED] points. I used the same system I described previously.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them [REDACTED]. I thought they had the [REDACTED] but I did deduct because they had [REDACTED] that I didn't care for.

KAREN OLIVER: I have [REDACTED] based on my same scenario [REDACTED].

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Last one for [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them an [REDACTED]. They have a good [REDACTED] that are available [REDACTED] I thought. They will [REDACTED] and I liked the fact there was [REDACTED] for [REDACTED], that might be very useful for us. Unfortunately they will [REDACTED] a [REDACTED]. I gave them an [REDACTED].

TARA HAGAN: For a total for you for [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: That's correct.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them a [REDACTED]. I didn't really write any notes so [REDACTED].

KAREN OLIVER: I gave them a [REDACTED]. My notes say there is an [REDACTED] and they will [REDACTED] for an [REDACTED]. They offer a [REDACTED] and they have a [REDACTED].

TARA HAGAN: I have a total of [REDACTED].

KAREN OLIVER: Yes

CARLOS ROMO: I gave them [REDACTED]. They do offer [REDACTED] and I also saw that [REDACTED] in [REDACTED].

TARA HAGAN: I have a total of [REDACTED].

CARLOS ROMO: Correct

SCOTT SISCO: I gave them [REDACTED] and they lost for [REDACTED] mentioned which was the [REDACTED].

TARA HAGAN: I have a total of [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: Correct

TARA HAGAN: Okay, last one is [REDACTED]. Rex would you like to start with the [REDACTED]?

[REDACTED]. They have a [REDACTED] and I understand [REDACTED] is [REDACTED] in the business. They have been [REDACTED]. I do make note of the fact that they are going to an [REDACTED] so [REDACTED] which [REDACTED] of [REDACTED].

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them [REDACTED]. I am [REDACTED] that's [REDACTED], I did make note of that. I was concerned too [REDACTED]. Their [REDACTED].

KAREN OLIVER: I gave them a [REDACTED]. This is the one where I did give them credit for [REDACTED]; however I did note that I was reading they did [REDACTED] under [REDACTED].

CARLOS ROMO: I gave them a [REDACTED]. I did have some [REDACTED] as to the [REDACTED]. On a positive, they have [REDACTED]; however [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED]. They do [REDACTED]. I did have concern also that they only [REDACTED]. They operate with a [REDACTED] as [REDACTED]. I did have some questions about the [REDACTED] it seems like a [REDACTED], [REDACTED] than the other bidders.

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Rex, [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them a score of [REDACTED]. They do have [REDACTED]. They [REDACTED]. I suppose [REDACTED]. They do have [REDACTED] for their [REDACTED]. I have a lot of notes here but not much different than what [REDACTED]. They do have [REDACTED] for those who want to use their [REDACTED]. The statements do not include [REDACTED]. I thought that was [REDACTED]. I thought.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them [REDACTED]. I gave them [REDACTED]. They mentioned [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] for the [REDACTED]; I thought that was good [REDACTED]. I did deduct them [REDACTED]. But I do also give them credit for [REDACTED]. I give them a lot of credit for [REDACTED].

KAREN OLIVER: I gave them a [REDACTED]. They have [REDACTED]. They offer a [REDACTED] which would [REDACTED]. There is even a [REDACTED] that parallels the [REDACTED]. Reading through they had some [REDACTED].

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED] for [REDACTED]. I did recognize the fact that they had [REDACTED], and they indicated they would [REDACTED]. They have [REDACTED]. The only concern I had was the [REDACTED].

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Rex, [REDACTED]?

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them a [REDACTED]. They have [REDACTED]. They [REDACTED]. I thought that's an [REDACTED]; I thought that wasn't very good. But

they can provide a [REDACTED] but I [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them a [REDACTED]. They had [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and were willing to [REDACTED].

KAREN OLIVER: They were [REDACTED] but I gave them an [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO: I gave them a [REDACTED]. Not any [REDACTED] on [REDACTED]. They have the ability to [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. They will offer [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], which [REDACTED]

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: [REDACTED], Rex?

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them a [REDACTED]. Same method I have described in the past.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I gave them a [REDACTED]. They were clearly the [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] clearly the [REDACTED] out there in my view.

KAREN OLIVER: [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO: I gave them an [REDACTED]. I again did the analysis by looking with [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]. I did find them [REDACTED] rated them as an
[REDACTED].

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: Last, [REDACTED]?

CHAIRMAN REED: I gave them a [REDACTED]. I don't have a lot of notes
but saw they can [REDACTED], they recommend [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], I thought [REDACTED]. They will [REDACTED] but I
think all of the others would do the same thing. I was impressed with the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] and they do have a [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: I had a total on [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: That's correct.

[REDACTED] I can't remember what the deduction
was for but I did want to make note that [REDACTED] with [REDACTED]. They
[REDACTED]

KAREN OLIVER: I gave them a [REDACTED]. They had a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. I think the negative was [REDACTED]

CARLOS ROMO: [REDACTED], I liked the [REDACTED] they have, [REDACTED] as well. Question I had
was [REDACTED]; I wish they had been more specific there. They did indicate
[REDACTED] annually on [REDACTED] and they [REDACTED]. My total
was [REDACTED].

TARA HAGAN: I'm sorry, Karen I had [REDACTED]. I don't think I verified that.

KAREN OLIVER: Yes

SCOTT SISCO: [REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: I have a total of [REDACTED].

SCOTT SISCO: Correct

TARA HAGAN: I will read the averages. I do obviously have the averages for each company, I'll just go alphabetical. Do you want me to verify your scores again or is everybody comfortable?

[REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: Okay Ms. Hagan I have the scores lined up this way:

[REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: I have [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: I had [REDACTED] that is what I thought you said.

TARA HAGAN: I apologize, [REDACTED]

CHAIRMAN REED: [REDACTED] thank you. [REDACTED]. Okay I'm going to repeat those just so we know we all have the same scores.

[REDACTED]

TARA HAGAN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN REED: Thank you. We have now gone through the scoring process. Ms. Hagan if I understand we can have some time for discussion but other than that, and I have to ask Ms. Parker too, there is really not a whole lot we can do here. The next two steps would be involving how many we want for finalists, and who we define as the finalists. Correct?

TARA HAGAN: Correct the number of finalists.

CHAIRMAN REED: I will open it up now for discussion although I can't have any motions. Is there any discussion that people would like to go through? Ms. Parker I would like to start with you if there is anything you want to advise us of before we begin our discussions.

DAG CARRIE PARKER: The only advice I would give is if your discussion is general then I recommend it go in the open but if you want to talk details of the proposals I would keep it here.

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: One administrative matter, at times when finalists are selected, our firm will create an invitation letter to the finalists and say you have been selected and invited to the finalist presentation and as you prepare for the finalist presentation these are the areas we would like you to focus on. A lot of times it will come with a revised bid to the finalist presentation so if that's of interest I'd be more than happy to work with the group to create that communication in areas of focus and a request to modify the bid if they would like to. I don't know procedurally if that's viable or if the Committee is even interested in pursuing that.

CHAIRMAN REED: Any comments or discussion on that point? Mr. Davie.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: That sounds reasonable to me. I don't want the finalist presentations to just regurgitate their bids that would be a waste of time. I would be interested in providing some focus and hopefully they will provide new information or expand on areas we had questions in.

CARLOS ROMO: I would agree with you Brian on that same thing. I think sometimes it's so close when it comes to selecting a provider or providers we need to find out what is the difference between the numbers we select.

CHAIRMAN REED: Any other comments or questions? Mr. O'Shaughnessy.

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: Procedurally, Carrie, would that be within the guidelines, does that sound viable?

DAG CARRIE PARKER: Yes that sounds viable. I'm not sure if you were thinking that the Committee as a whole would vote on what they want the letter to say or if each Committee member would send you their comments and you could incorporate them into the letter?

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: The former we could absolutely do. So if there were points any of you want integrated that you feel valuable please feel free to send them to me, but I was envisioning drafting a letter and sending that through and having it blessed by you and the Chair or the entire group.

DAG CARRIE PARKER: Yes that sounds fine with me if the Committee agrees.

CHAIRMAN REED: Can it go to the entire group?

DAG CARRIE PARKER: Like if you were to send a draft ahead of time? So it would just be a yes or no? Or giving suggestions?

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: I would envision drafting a letter and sending it off for comment to the Committee and setting a day, please provide your feedback by such and such a date, and then integrating that feedback, sending out a final draft we would have to set a deadline in which we would have to send it back out. I would be reticent to draft a communication speaking for the Committee and sending that out. I feel it's very important that the Committee be comfortable with what's going out because it is a reflection of the Committee. The other alternative is a "you're invited, please show up" letter, but it's whatever pleases the Committee.

CARLOS ROMO: My question would be if we individually respond to you it's not the Committee that's responding but the individuals.

CHAIRMAN REED: I refer to Ms. Parker.

DAG CARRIE PARKER: I like that idea, the reason I hesitated before is if Jake were to put it together a "track changes" then we are creating a problem, but if you are just giving Jake your comments individually and he puts them in a letter I think that's okay.

SCOTT SISCO: So I just want to verify then what we are basically doing is we are entrusting him to make the final decision on the letter.

TARA HAGAN: Jake might comment as someone who has done this before. You might have some conflicting comments so I would recommend you might want to do a quick telephonic call, I think that would be the best way to do it so members have full input and you know what you're looking for in that letter. I think that's the best way to do it.

DAG CARRIE PARKER: That would be the safest way and would require meeting notice and we can have telephonic meetings but we have to have a place the public can go to show up and call in if they want to.

CHAIRMAN REED: That's a great idea but the question is who does it? We have a staff of one part-time individual.

TARA HAGAN: I would help Micah do that, I'm available. The Treasurer's Office knows I'm going to help Micah get through some of this administrative stuff.

CARLOS ROMO: Jake probably has a former letter that they would send to everyone but gives us individual member's opportunity to add something to it so we could get it out to the finalists.

CHAIRMAN REED: I see several people with fingers on their buttons.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I just wanted to comment that more than the concerns about the open meeting law; I'm really concerned about having another meeting. In a way what I would like to see, to save all of us some time and effort, is if you could just send out based on your experience and knowledge what you think would be appropriate, get comments back from each of us and if you see some conflict or some things that you wouldn't know how to resolve without having us get together and discuss it then we could have a meeting. Otherwise this is pretty much a pro forma letter; this isn't rocket science or anything. The recordkeepers get this all the time and they know how to respond, we aren't trying to set anybody up, just trying to focus presentations. But we are still going to be open to question when we have the finalist presentations so we can run astray and look at different things but it gives the recordkeepers something to focus on in their presentation. I would like to see us do that rather than automatically set up another meeting if there is no conflict then let's use the pro forma letter.

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: What we will ask for is: people that are actually going to work on your account are here, senior management is here, we want to see a display of web technology during their presentation. It's fairly straightforward so we will send it around and make sure everyone is comfortable. If there is significant change in comment I may come back and say we need to think about this but if it is fairly benign or no commentary then we will send the pro forma letter.

CHAIRMAN REED: It's getting kind of late in the day and I would like to say if anybody really objects to that let's hear from them now, if not then that's fine with me.

CARLOS ROMO: The letter will go under the Chairman's signature correct, or will it go under Jake's?

CHAIRMAN REED: My understanding is it will go under Mr. O'Shaughnessy.

CARLOS ROMO: Are you comfortable with that, Jake?

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: Yes

CHAIRMAN REED: Everybody is comfortable with that. My thought is I go out there and ask Ms. Hagan to deliver the scores and rankings. Then I will open it up to how many providers we want in the final presentations. I would obviously want a motion at the beginning and then some discussion. Does that sound like a way to proceed? Am I missing anything?

SCOTT SISCO: Can you repeat that?

CHAIRMAN REED: We would go in there, resume the open meeting I would ask Ms. Hagan to provide the scores and rankings; she can put those on the screen. Let the people in the audience see it and I would obviously ask Ms. Hagan to verbally present the findings so that those listening can hear them. Then I would open it up to the final discussion of how many people we want for the presentations as a number for me, the top four. Once that motion is done, then make a motion to clearly identify who they are whether it's Nationwide, Hartford etc. So I'm looking really for two motions. Part of the problem we have is not everybody is there watching so say it again with a motion, these are the people. Is that okay? Mr. O'Shaughnessy?

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: That sounds great but the one aspect that's coming to my mind is, let's say that we invite finalists to come back and our next meeting I assume would be the intent to award, so we would provide a winner at that point. At what point are we going to debate single provider versus dual provider? For example when the presenters come back and give finalist presentations then that day we are going to have to select a winner.

SCOTT SISCO: Are we selecting a winner that day or are we authorizing you to negotiate into agreements? I think that would also be the time to then decide if you are going to negotiate one, two, or more.

CHAIRMAN REED: Here's what you would do, you would select the winner with a runner up. The contingency would be this, someone would negotiate with the winner with the understanding if there could not be a common agreement on the contract then we have the ability to go to the runner up and that puts the number one party under a little bit of a hammer, so to speak.

SCOTT SISCO: I'm really uncomfortable this agreement should have been record. I disagree with you it's like a winner with a runner up your making the decision right here right now that we are going with one.

TARA HAGAN: That is what it states in the bid that you would have the finalist presentation and award the contract on the same day.

SCOTT SISCO: I agree with all that but the way you just worded it I took it to say you are going to select a winner and then you are going to select a runner up that says just one. What Mr. O'Shaughnessy's question was when are you all, the Committee, going to make a decision on whether you are going with one service provider, two service providers, three service providers, or six.

CHAIRMAN REED: That's for the Committee to decide and we can't do it now.

SCOTT SISCO: Yes, but that's what he was asking.

DAG CARRIE PARKER: I think Jake was asking timing and the RFP timeline that was sent out did say at that next meeting. So you could put it in the agenda before selection of finalists you could put in there, single provider or multiple or whatever you wanted to. Are you concerned that you couldn't decide how many providers the same day you are choosing a winner?

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: Here's my thinking is that as they are in the finalist presentation I would like to use the other pool as a negotiating tactic. So when they are in there and you say "you bid this for the larger pool of assets and you offered to do this for the entire plan, are you really going to do that entire bucket?" You have a deal where you have one pool of very attractive assets and one pool with not very attractive assets. So you see as the Hartford bid people are going to strongly keep... If I'm a provider in there I want you to split the plan and I want the profitable fund. The objective of the Committee is to equalize that payment to the smaller pool. Making a determination to go to single provider before you hear those finalist presentations is going to put you in a stronger negotiating point.

CHAIRMAN REED: I think we should keep that comment in mind as we go into the other room. I guess very quickly do we want to wrestle with that question today?

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I was going to say, I don't think it's on the agenda, I don't notice it as an action item so I don't know how we could make that decision.

TARA HAGAN: Even though it's a part of the RFP process?

CHAIRMAN REED: Ms. Parker has a comment.

DAG CARRIE PARKER: I agree with Mr. Davie. I think as its agendized, discussion regarding service provider RFP evaluation and scoring to determine and select finalist who will make presentations at the July 18 meeting is problematic to decide how many providers through that item.

CHAIRMAN REED: I guess that answered that. Anybody want to disagree with our deputy attorney general?

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I just wanted to add, this is a major decision that people have come and testified before us and I think we have an obligation to let them have another say on that and I think we also have an obligation to inform the public and whoever shows up what it's going to cost to be in the second plan in this process. We need to make that clear that if we stay with two plans there's going to be a significant tax and cost on those participants who choose the smaller plan. That's going to be a big consideration when you charge somebody so much more for theoretically the same kind of services that it's going to be a big decision, I think.

CARLOS ROMO: I guess the way I'm understanding this process is on the agenda item for July 18 we will decide first whether it's single or dual providers or more and then proceed from there. In other words we would have to take a vote on that basis first before awarding the final.

CHAIRMAN REED: We would have to make the decision of how many providers we will have before we make the award. But then we have to get back to the question about does it put us in a stronger bargaining position if we have runners up sitting in the background to give the first place winner a little incentive to be a little bit more flexible.

VICE CHAIR DAVIE: I guess the other point is it will give us a chance to see how fast they think on their feet. Depending on how the other presentations turn out it could be interesting.

CHAIRMAN REED: Mr. O'Shaughnessy I assume you're the one who will be doing what I'm negotiating, correct?

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: I would happy to if that were the Committee's pleasure.

CHAIRMAN REED: Would it put you in a stronger position if there was a runner up in the background that gives incentive to the first place winner to be more amenable to idea.

JAKE O'SHAUGHNESSY: Yes it would.

CHAIRMAN REED: Thank you. Do we need to discuss anything else in this room at this time with the closed meeting? I don't see any activity or any fingers on microphone buttons so I guess we are going to close it at this time. The time is now 4:15 pm and we will go into the other room and resume our meeting.