

Brian Sandoval
Governor

Reba Coombs
Program Coordinator



**Nevada Public Employees'
Deferred Compensation Program**

COMMITTEE
Scott Sisco, Chair
NDOT
Carlos Romo, Vice Chair
Retired
Brian L. Davie
LCB
Karen Oliver
GCB
Steve C. Woodbury
GOED

Shane Chesney
Senior Deputy Attorney General

**DEFERRED COMPENSATION COMMITTEE
QUARTERLY MEETING MINUTES FOR**

Wednesday, February 20, 2013

The quarterly meeting of the Deferred Compensation Committee was held on Wednesday, February 20, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. in room 2144 of the Legislature Building, 401 S. Carson St., Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was held by videoconference from the Nevada Legislature Building to the Grant Sawyer Building, 555 E. Washington Ave., Suite 4412 E, Las Vegas, Nevada. Other attendees participated in person or by conference call.

A copy of this set of meeting minutes, including the agenda, the audio recording and other substantive exhibits, is available on the Nevada Deferred Compensation (NDC) website at: http://defcomp.state.nv.us/NDC_MinutesMeetings.htm. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (e-mail: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775.684.6835).

BOARD MEMBERS

Brian Davie
Karen Oliver
Steve Woodbury
Carlos Romo, Vice Chair
Scott Sisco, Chair

OTHERS PRESENT

Bill Abramowicz, MassMutual
Jim Barnes, Zeh Law Firm
Eric Caruso, Parole/Probation
Shane Chesney, Senior Deputy Attorney General
Reba Coombs, NDC Program Coordinator
Jack Crawford
Paul Dowd, Morningstar
Michael Hackett, MassMutual
Jacob Honea, MassMutual
Brian Merrick, ING
Frank Picarelli, Segal Rogerscasey
Steve Platt, ING
Charles Salerno, Participant
Micah Salerno, NDC Admin Assistant
Todd Theroux, MassMutual (by phone)
Robert Trenerry, MassMutual
Tom Verducci, Great West

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chairman Scott Sisco called the quarterly meeting of the Nevada Deferred Compensation Committee to order at 9:05 a.m., on Wednesday, February 20, 2013. Roll was taken and it was determined a quorum was present. Ms. Reba Coombs indicated the meeting had been properly noticed and posted.

2. Public Comment

Mr. Davie commented on the letter submitted by Dr. Ervin for public testimony.

Mr. Eric Caruso with Parole and Probation addressed the Committee about his previous request about borrowing against the Plan for people who are in financial distress. He requested to have the Committee look at the loan request again.

Chair Sisco noted the Committee discussed the loan provision at the planning meeting in January, 2013, but because of the amount of work and costs involved because of having two recordkeepers, it was something the Committee did not want to move forward with at this time.

Mr. Davie clarified there were no decisions made at the planning meeting; it was only for open discussion. Because the Request for Proposal (RFP) did not go through in 2012, the loan feature was set aside. The issue was still out there and at some point the Committee did need to make a formal decision with a vote at a public meeting.

Mr. Davie requested to have this item on the next agenda to take a formal vote.

3. For Possible Action – Election of Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman pursuant to NRS 287.330

Motion made by Vice Chair Carlos Romo to nominate Mr. Scott Sisco as Chair, seconded by Mr. Steve Woodbury.

Mr. Davie pointed out that the current chair and vice chair appointments would expire in September, 2013 with no guarantee of reappointment so they could be facing nominations again later in the year. He suggested a compromise by nominating Mr. Steve Woodbury as Chair noting that Mr. Woodbury would be able to serve the full year with the assistance of staff.

Chair Sisco accepted the nomination.

Mr. Woodbury appreciated the nomination but did not feel the timing was right and he would support the original motion.

Vote for the motion to nominate Mr. Scott Sisco as Chair carried 4 – 1 with Mr. Davie voting against it.

Motion made by Ms. Karen Oliver to nominate Dr. Carlos Romo to serve as Vice Chair, seconded by Mr. Steve Woodbury. Vote passed unanimously.

4. For Possible Action – Approval of Committee meeting minutes from meetings of November 2, 2012; December 13, 2012; and January 30, 2013.

Motion by Vice Chair Carlos Romo to approve the minutes from November 2, 2012, December 13, 2012, and January 30, 2013, seconded by Mr. Steve Woodbury.

Ms. Coombs noted two typographical errors found in the December and January minutes.

Mr. Davie requested his remarks be shared on the November minutes, page four, regarding the Hartford letter. To keep from the appearance of hiding things he asked that those few sentences from the Hartford letter be added verbatim to the minutes.

Amended motion by Vice Chair Carlos Romo to approve the minutes from November 2, 2012, December 13, 2012, and January 30, 2013 with changes from Ms. Coombs and Mr. Davie, seconded by Mr. Brian Davie. Vote carried unanimously.

5. For Possible Action – Update on Open Meeting Law complaints filed against the Committee related to various meeting minutes not posted within 30-day requirement around time of DCP staff vacancies.

Senior Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Shane Chesney noted the investigation into the Open Meeting Law (OML) complaints was ongoing and was confidential until concluded. The process time varied but he believed it should be resolved soon.

Mr. Davie had requested this item to be placed on the agenda but did not expect it to be so restricted. He requested an update and discussion of open meeting law requests and public records requests and responses to, from, and about the Committee. He questioned if public record or open meeting law requests made were confidential. The Committee should know what was requested so they were all informed.

DAG Chesney stated that public records requests were not confidential. He stated there had been requests made through separate agencies and sent to him. There were requests of emails from Committee members. Those requests were made through the agencies for which the Committee members are employed and those agencies were partially charged with producing the records. Chair Sisco and Ms. Oliver had email requests made directly through their agencies which were produced and sent to the requestor, Mr. Reed, former chairman. That was the only record request he had received.

Mr. Davie asked if the only OML requests were the ones by Dr. Ervin.

DAG Chesney confirmed that was correct.

6. For Possible Action – Receive and approve Program Coordinator's report.

Ms. Coombs presented her report to the Committee. The first item she addressed was the excess fee reimbursement to participants. After reviewing all the quarterly payments made to the providers since 2008 to verify reconciliations, she found a missing payment to The Hartford in 2008 of \$32,130. That amount was subtracted from the total reimbursement for 2012, so

\$115,820 was distributed to Hartford participant accounts as of 12/31/2012. There was no money being returned to ING participants.

Chair Sisco remarked that he would like to see the reimbursement go to zero by narrowing the budget.

Mr. Robert Trenerry with MassMutual noted with the new fee structure the amount returned to participants would go down naturally.

Mr. Davie mentioned that in the past, before staff came on, the Committee did not know that mechanism existed so the extra amounts were retained by the recordkeepers.

Chair Sisco asked the recordkeepers if Mr. Davie's comment was correct.

Mr. Bill Abramowicz with MassMutual stated it was a common process to have money returned to participants. Nevada had been on par with other organizations regarding reimbursements.

Vice Chair Romo questioned if the reimbursement could be done quarterly instead of yearly.

Mr. Abramowicz confirmed they could administer it from that perspective.

Mr. Trenerry commented they were working with Ms. Coombs to come up with that option and should be something MassMutual could do.

Mr. Steve Platt with ING noted reimbursements went back to 2005 but were smaller then. Adding staff increased overhead and the Committee wanted to make sure there were funds available to cover costs so that was why the amounts were higher. He stated that ING was always willing to look at ways to reduce funds and have lower costs which would be more efficient for participants.

Mr. Davie remarked that the Chairman's question was not answered directly in asking if the excess money in the past was retained by the recordkeepers.

Mr. Platt confirmed the money did not go back to the Plan but stayed with the recordkeepers.

Ms. Coombs continued with her report focusing on the Financial Audit, noting a contract with an accountant could be done by a Request for Information. She would start preparing an appropriate RFI in the near future and would report back to the Committee.

Ms. Coombs remarked on items that would be included in the Winter Newsletter which was expected for distribution in early March.

Staff had been experiencing severe difficulties with email and internet connections. EITS has been contacted and agreed to do an analysis of hardware and software but it had not been completed yet. Ms. Coombs was very thankful for the assistance from EITS and was hoping to get their issues resolved soon.

Vice Chair Carlos inquired if there were costs from EITS.

Ms. Coombs believed they would charge for the amount of storage staff used on their server.

Chair Sisco noted they should be careful with having EITS involved because of the Silvernet line item that was added to the budget.

Ms. Coombs confirmed she would follow up on why that line item was added and verify it was removed.

Ms. Coombs provided an update on future IT costs including the need to purchase one computer, one printer and licenses for Microsoft Windows 7 Professional software.

Finally, Ms. Coombs addressed future issues including: attendance at NAGDCA; Administrative Manual update (which was circulated to the Committee); the Loan Provision; Plan, Summary Plan, and FICA Alternative documents needing to be updated; Regulatory updates, Onsite visit to MassMutual and ING; and Communication Calendar.

Vice Chair Romo inquired if the Administrative Manual was ready to approve.

Ms. Coombs commented she wanted the Committee to look at it and provide feedback.

Chair Sisco suggested that Mr. Picarelli should give input on the Administrative Manual also.

Mr. Brian Merrick with ING explained that a "site visit" referred to Committee members and/or staff visiting their corporate headquarters. It gave an opportunity to meet with their management team, visit customer service and operations, and provided greater exposure and insight into their organization as provider and business partner for the Program.

Chair Sisco recommended surveying the Committee to see who would want to attend NAGDCA. If more than two people wanted to attend they could add money to the fund on the next agenda.

Vice Chair Romo and Mr. Woodbury expressed interest in attending with Ms. Coombs.

Chair Sisco asked Ms. Coombs, for the next agenda, to price out what it would take for 3 people to attend and see if there were sufficient funds in the category. If there were not enough funds she would need to bring a budget amendment request to the Committee at the next meeting.

Mr. Davie remarked that Ms. Coombs should attend NAGDCA every year. Other members should attend within reason as it was a worthwhile conference, but depended on what was available in the budget as to how many other members were able to attend. He also commented that the basic changes staff recommended to the Administrative Manual should be implemented as soon as possible. In addition, any substantial amendments to any of the other documents (as mentioned in Ms. Coombs' report) should wait until the compliance audit was done by Segal. Mr. Davie noted onsite visits had been done in the past but as state employees they could not accept gifts so there would have to be money available in the budget to cover costs.

11. For Possible Action – Discussion and possible approval of the Investment Consultant Contract with Segal Rogerscasey.

Chair Sisco took this item out of order so the contract was in place before the Committee heard from the investment consultant.

Ms. Coombs gave a brief explanation of the contract and noted on the last page that the compliance review date was changed from 2014 to 2013.

Motion made by Vice Chair Carlos Romo to approve the investment consultant contract as amended, seconded by Mr. Brian Davie. Vote carried unanimously.

7. For Possible Action – Receive and approve Investment Consultant’s review of fourth quarter reports from providers and performance of investment options and/or direct staff accordingly.

Mr. Picarelli highlighted some major themes of 2012 and provided comments on financial market conditions for fourth quarter (4Q) 2012 from pages 1-19 of his Performance Review report. Continuing on pages 20-25 Mr. Picarelli presented the Executive Summary for the Deferred Compensation Program for 4Q period ending December 31, 2012 noting the total Plan assets were \$588.9 million which was an increase of \$5.2 million or 0.9 percent. The majority of Plan assets were invested in the Stable Value Funds representing \$277.3 million (47 percent) in the Hartford General Account and \$29.8 million (5 percent) in the ING Stable Value Account. Individually, MassMutual assets totaled \$479 million, increasing \$3 million or 1 percent and ING assets were \$109.8 million with an increase of \$2.2 million or 2 percent. ([4Q Performance Review](#))

Vice Chair Romo questioned if the majority of people in the General Account were retirees.

Mr. Trenerry noted they had run that demographic previously and could provide that number on a quarterly basis if the Committee felt it would be helpful.

Vice Chair Romo indicated he would like to see that number.

Chair Sisco suggested accessing retirees through Retired Public Employees of Nevada (RPEN) to provide information on diversifying money so retirees could gain higher earnings.

Vice Chair Romo felt it would be good to educate retirees on the General Account and about diversifying their investment funds.

Vice Chair Romo asked Mr. Picarelli to explain the Life Cycle funds.

Mr. Picarelli called it a “lazy man’s way of investing” because it selected funds based on approximately when a person would retire. The composition of the funds chosen would change as a person got closer to retirement but still remained diversified instead of having all their money in a general account. ([4Q Perf. Review, Pg. 40](#))

Mr. Davie commented that the numbers in the General Account were not all retirees and they should do more education for participants on Target Date Funds because of the simplicity of using them and the diversity already set up in those funds.

Mr. Picarelli continued his report pointing out that Vanguard had been changing a number of their benchmarks. Segal would be watching that closely and modifying their performance reports to reflect the new benchmarks. He also commented on fund changes and fee reductions noting that MassMutual confirmed the State Street Bond fund (SSgA) would be moved from 15 basis points (bps) to 6 bps revenue sharing under the new model. (Page 21 of report)

Mr. Picarelli recommended the fee disclosure be sent to all participants for the funds and fees for both recordkeepers.

Chair Sisco inquired if that could be done in the newsletter.

Ms. Coombs said she and the recordkeepers could discuss that.

Mr. Picarelli discussed the watch list from page 23. He suggested the Committee may want to add Victory Diversified on watch because of performance.

American Funds Growth Fund of America	Remain on Watch
Hartford MidCap HLS	Recommend Removing as of 12/31/12
Lazard U.S. Mid Cap Equity Fund	Terminated Effective Q2 2013
Munder Mid Cap Core Growth Fund	Remain on Watch
Keeley Small Cap Value Fund	Remain on Watch
Mutual Global Discovery	Remain on Watch
Hartford General Account	Discuss Removal
Hartford Small Company Fund HLS	Recommend Place on Watch

There was no motion for the watch list because it was not an action item on the agenda.

Chair Sisco noted the Watch List should be a separate action item on the agenda in the future.

Mr. Picarelli moved on to pages 26 and 27 commenting on revenue sharing and the need for the Plan to be reconciled as of March 31, 2013 since fee changes went into effect on April 1, 2013.

Mr. Picarelli reviewed the Segal Scoring System handout which was a tool to evaluate the funds. He noted they were moving away from the "A, B, C" scoring method and he would be introducing the new system in the future. ([Scoring System](#))

Vice Chair Romo questioned if any of the Plan funds had investments in gun and ammunition categories. He wanted to be able to answer participants when questioned about those issues.

Mr. Picarelli stated they would have to do an analysis of the funds and contact managers and stated some funds may have a play in those arenas.

Mr. Davie thought it was good to look into what the funds were invested in and noted the Plan did have "socially responsible" funds for people who did not want to invest in tobacco or alcohol companies.

Mr. Picarelli noted the scoring was done two times per year with the June 30 and December 31 reports.

Chair Sisco asked if Mr. Picarelli would look at the Plan investment statements and recommend changes.

Mr. Picarelli confirmed he would do that as well as become familiar with what criteria the Committee wanted to use to add funds to the watch list.

Motion made by Vice Chair Carlos Romo to accept and approve the Segal Rogerscasey 4Q 2012 report, second by Ms. Karen Oliver. Vote passed unanimously.

Chair Sisco called a break for lunch until 12:15 p.m.

Chair Sisco reopened the meeting at 12:16 p.m.

8. For Possible Action – Receive and approve plan activity and administrative update from MassMutual for quarter ending December 31, 2012.

Mr. Trenerry spoke regarding the reimbursement noting there were 9,094 participants with an account balance as of December 31, 2012. Of the 9,094 participants 3,264 received a reimbursement and 5,830 did not. Anyone that had a balance under \$41,280 did not receive a reimbursement because it would have been less than \$10. He also shared that the SSgA bond fund expense ratio was going down from 15 bps to 6 bps. From a revenue share, 9 bps previously went to The Hartford and that was changing to a revenue share of 0 which was an 80 percent reduction in expenses on that fund.

Mr. Trenerry provided a presentation of material from MassMutual. ([MassMutual Quarterly Review](#))

Mr. Davie commented he liked the charts and suggested having general categories to show what the unforeseen emergency withdrawals represented.

Mr. Abramowicz announced that Jeff Morrow and he would be running the governmental side of the business going forward with Mr. Morrow in the east and Mr. Abramowicz in the west. He also encouraged the Committee to have more than one planning session per year to exchange thoughts and ideas as it was a great format to talk about what was going on in the industry. Mr. Abramowicz welcomed the Committee and staff for a site visit to meet the investment managers, visit the call center and service center and get a behind the scenes look at the business.

Mr. Davie recalled in the past there was a situation where the Committee wanted to make a fund change and they could not do it because of a redemption fee with the recordkeeper. He wanted to know if that was being addressed with MassMutual.

Mr. Abramowicz noted it was being addressed so it should not be a problem in the future.

Motion made by Vice Chair Carlos Romo to accept and approve the MassMutual report, seconded by Ms. Karen Oliver. Vote carried unanimously.

9. For Possible Action – Receive and approve plan activity and administrative update from ING for quarter ending December 31, 2012.

Mr. Platt remarked the Lazard fund change had a target date of April 19. Participants would receive a mailing thirty days prior to the change. He also noted a staffing change for their northern Nevada field representative and announced they offered the position to Eric Honea, (brother of Jake Honea with MassMutual). Mr. Honea would be taking licensing exams and they expected him to be working for the State of Nevada Plan by the end of March.

Mr. Merrick provided a presentation of material from ING. ([ING Quarterly Review](#))

Mr. Platt stated a coordinated "EZ Enrollment" email campaign would be beneficial to stimulate new enrollment.

Motion made by Vice Chair Carlos Romo to accept and approve the report from ING, seconded by Ms. Karen Oliver. Motion passed unanimously.

10. For Possible Action – Discussion and possible approval of the addition of Morningstar Managed Accounts to the ING platform and/or direct staff accordingly.

Mr. Paul Dowd, Morningstar Retirement Manager, presented a report to the Committee on the Morningstar Retirement Manager. ([Morningstar Retirement Manager](#))

Chair Sisco apologized for stopping Mr. Dowd's presentation and stated this was more than an enhancement to ING but to the whole program and to offer a program like that would have to be done through the RFP process. Additionally there were several legal issues because of the way it was structured and the agreements between Morningstar and the Plan.

Mr. Platt noted it was an enhancement to what ING already offered because ING already had an agreement with Morningstar.

The Committee, DAG Chesney, Mr. Dowd, ING Representatives, and Mr. Picarelli had a lengthy discussion about the Morningstar service being offered.

Mr. Platt remarked the important point was to educate the Committee about the option of managed accounts. He stated they could work with DAG Chesney in looking at the possibility of this enhancement without having to go out to RFP.

Chair Sisco asked Mr. Picarelli to do some research and provide a recommendation to the Committee.

DAG Chesney stated he would work with Mr. Picarelli in researching this service.

Mr. Merrick mentioned that ING would work with Mr. Picarelli, DAG Chesney and Morningstar.

Motion made by Vice Chair Carlos Romo to have the investment consultant look into the arrangement, pricing, and what responsibilities the Committee would have and what would be required for a contract. Motion seconded by Ms. Karen Oliver the vote carried unanimously.

12. For Possible Action – Clarification of administrative oversight between Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Program Coordinator including responding on behalf of the Committee between meetings.

Chair Sisco commented on his conversation with Ms. Coombs when she first started as Program Coordinator. They agreed a threshold of \$9,999 and lower for spending would be handled by Ms. Coombs, but since then there have been issues about moving money from one category to another. Chair Sisco asked the Committee to consider relying on the Chair to give direction to staff but he felt that lately his decisions were being questioned. The Committee elected the chair and vice chair and needed to trust them to bring items to the Committee when there were major policy decisions and to allow them to do what was asked of them in between meetings.

Vice Chair Romo believed the Committee should be aware of any major issues that needed to be addressed but did not want to micromanage the position Ms. Coombs was hired for. The Committee should give the Program Coordinator sufficient latitude to act in good faith of the Committee and benefit of the participants.

Mr. Davie stated the Committee hired a coordinator they felt was best qualified for the job and she should be given the freedom to do the job without micromanaging. It put the obligation on the staff member to communicate with all the Committee members and keep them informed of the administrative aspects of the Program. The staff member was there to deal with the daily things and the Committee should not be concerned with minor issues but focus on higher level items. Mr. Davie felt the Committee should give Ms. Coombs the opportunity to do her job and they would evaluate her performance at the appropriate time. He did not want arguments submitted on behalf of the Committee that the Committee had not discussed or voted on.

Mr. Davie noted for the record that he did not agree that the Committee was not subject to Open Meeting Law.

Motion made by Chair Scott Sisco to authorize the Chair or Vice Chair to respond on behalf of the Committee when necessary and provide guidance to staff and bring policy level decisions to the full Committee, seconded by Vice Chair Carlos Romo.

Ms. Oliver asked if there was a threshold for the budget.

Chair Sisco and Ms. Coombs set \$9,999 as a threshold for spending within the existing budget, but if money needed to be moved from one category to another it had to go through the regular state process and be signed off by the Committee.

Mr. Davie felt the motion was acceptable with the addition of some wording. The elected chair and vice chair should represent what the Committee really believed in. He would add to the motion "that the Committee be informed of what the Chair/Vice are speaking on."

Mr. Woodbury noted it could be challenging for staff getting direction from different Committee members and generally the chair should be the primary point of contact. He suggested they could develop some guidelines approved by the Committee to provide guidance on what things needed to come before the Committee. He stated that communication should generally go through the chair so Ms. Coombs was not getting different direction from the different members.

Ms. Oliver commented that the Committee should be informed when decisions were made so they knew how they were being represented.

Vice Chair Romo agreed with Mr. Woodbury's suggestion that the Committee develop some guidelines for Ms. Coombs.

Mr. Davie remarked there was a lot of time between meetings and issues did not come up often. He offered to do some research on other boards and see if they had guidelines and would present a balanced view to the Committee. He was concerned that the Committee be represented fairly and noted there had to be trust and confidence within the members but he did not currently feel that trust.

Vote was taken on the motion and it carried unanimously.

13. For Possible Action – Discussion and possible approval of work program to transfer funds from Category 04 to Category 03 to cover shortage of in-state travel funds.

Ms. Coombs noted some money needed to be moved from the operating account to the in-state travel account because of the shortage due to the extra meetings from last year. She requested permission to move \$700 to cover travel expenses through the end of the fiscal year leaving enough to allow her to travel to Las Vegas as part of the communication plan to hold seminars and participate in meetings with plan representatives.

Chair Sisco was concerned about travel expenses submitted by Mr. Davie and inquired as to why he did not fly in the day of the meeting so the Plan did not have to cover hotel and food costs for the extra day. He felt Mr. Davie's agency should cover some of those costs if he was doing other business when he traveled from Las Vegas to Carson City.

Mr. Davie explained he used his time to meet with staff, review the agenda and material for the meeting, and to make sure he was aware of what was happening since he could not meet with staff on a regular basis. He remarked he could take the early flight on the day of the meeting but he believed he was better prepared by coming the day before, meeting with staff, and being rested prior to the all-day meeting. He never tried to hide the fact that at times he would conduct legislative business, if possible. During the time when in-state travel was cut he paid for his own way to travel to Committee meetings because he cared about this Program and what the Committee was doing. If the Committee did not want to pay his travel costs in coming the day before he would not argue with that.

Chair Sisco proposed changing the amount to transfer from \$700 to \$500 since Mr. Davie agreed to not bill for hotel and extra food expenses.

Mr. Davie offered to not submit any travel claims for the June meeting to save the Program money.

Chair Sisco amended the amount again to \$350.

Motion made by Vice Chair Carlos Romo to approve a \$350 to move to in-state travel, second by Ms. Karen Oliver. Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Coombs commented for such a small amount of money it seemed a waste of the Committee's time to get approval and she requested the authority to do this on behalf of the Committee, with their knowledge, in the future.

Chair Sisco stated when money was moved between categories the normal procedure in state government was to have Committee approval before moving funds.

Vice Chair Romo inquired about needing travel funds for NAGDCA.

Chair Sisco commented they would amend the budget at the June meeting, if necessary.

14. For Possible Action – Discussion and setting of future meeting dates.

Ms. Coombs reviewed the future meeting dates.

Chair Sisco remarked they may need to hold a meeting for the recordkeeper RFP in December so suggested leaving the Planning Meeting for January.

Mr. Woodbury recommended putting a proposed RFP timeline together for the June meeting and selecting meeting dates at that time.

Comments/Updates

15. Committee Members

Vice Chair Romo commented on an email questionnaire on number of providers which came from NAGDCA.

Chair Sisco noted Ms. Coombs should answer the NAGDCA survey.

Mr. Davie submitted the minutes from the Board of Examiners meeting from December 5, 2012 so they were on record as what was presented.

Chair Sisco inquired if Mr. Davie wanted to rebut the minutes from the Board of Examiners meeting.

Mr. Davie informed him he did not, but wanted them to be part of the public record for the Committee.

16. Staff Updates

No comment.

17. Public Comment

No comment.

18. Adjournment

Motion made by Vice Chair Carlos Romo to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Steve Woodbury. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:36 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Micah Salerno
Administrative Assistant