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

ZOOM PLATFORM

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 2021 11:30 A.M.

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

# APPEARANCES

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Henry Jones, Chairperson

Lisa Middleton, Vice Chairperson

Rob Feckner

Fiona Ma, represented by Frank Ruffino

Stacie Olivares

Eraina Ortega

Jason Perez

### BOARD MEMBERS:

Margaret Brown

David Miller

Ramon Rubalcava

Theresa Taylor, Vice President

Shawnda Westly

Betty Yee, represented by Lynn Paquin

## STAFF:

Marcie Frost, Chief Executive Officer

Matt Jacobs, General Counsel

Kelly Fox, Chief, Stakeholder Relations

Pam Hopper, Committee Secretary

Anne Simpson, Managing Investment Director

	ADDEADANGED COMMINIED
	APPEARANCES CONTINUED
ALGO DDEGENE.	
ALSO PRESENT:	
J.J. Jelincic	

### INDEX PAGE 1. Call to Order and Roll Call 1 2. Election of Board Governance Committee Chair and Vice Chair 1 Approval of the March 16, 2021 Board Governance 3. Committee Timed Agenda 6 7 Executive Report - Matthew Jacobs 5. Action Consent Items - Matthew Jacobs 8 Approval of the November 18, 2020 Board Governance Committee Meeting Minutes Review of Board Governance Committee Delegation 6. Information Consent Items - Matthew Jacobs Board Education Program - Education Activity Report 7. Action Agenda Items Proposed Change to Board Governance Policy: Reporting Investigations to Board - Anne 9 Simpson 8. Information Agenda Items Discussion of Board's Shared Responsibility for CIO Personnel Decisions - Anne Simpson 35 Discussion of Future Board Governance 54 Committee Agendas Summary of Committee Direction - Matthew 57 Jacobs

Reporter's Certificate 60

Public Comment

d.

Adjournment

59

59

# PROCEEDINGS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

CHAIRPERSON JONES: It's 11:30 and I would like to call the Board Governance Committee meeting to order. And the first order of business is roll call.

Ms. Hopper, please.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Henry Jones?

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Here

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Rob Feckner?

Frank Ruffino for Fiona Ma?

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO: Present.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Lisa Middleton?

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Present.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Here.

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Rob Feckner?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Present.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. President, I

have all in attendance for Board Governance Committee.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you, Ms. Hopper.

The next item on the agenda is the election of

25 | the Board Governance Committee Chair and Vice Chair. And

```
for the Chair, I will turn the gavel over to the Vice
1
    Chair, Ms. Middleton.
2
             Ms. Middleton, please.
 3
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: All right.
 4
   you, Mr. President. Appreciate that.
5
             I see Mr. Feckner has his hand raised.
6
7
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Thank you, Madam Vice
8
            I would like to place a nomination in the name of
9
    Henry Jones for the Office of Chair of the Board
    Governance Committee.
10
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
11
   Feckner. We've received a nomination for Henry Jones for
12
    Chair of Governance.
1.3
             Are there any other nominations for Chair?
14
             Again, are there any other nominations for Chair?
15
16
             And third and last time, are there any other
   nominations for Chair?
17
```

Hearing none.

The nominations for Chair is closed and I would ask Ms. Hopper to call the vote.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Rob Feckner?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Aye.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for

24 | Fiona Ma?

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

25 ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO: Aye.

```
COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Lisa Middleton?
1
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON:
2
                                          Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?
 3
             COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
 5
                                          Eraina Ortega?
             COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Aye.
 6
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?
7
8
             COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. President, I
9
   have the motion being made by Rob Feckner for the election
10
    of the Board Governance Committee Chair, Henry Jones.
11
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON:
                                          Mr. Jones,
12
    congratulations, unanimous vote. And it's a pleasure to
13
    turn the gavel back over to you.
14
15
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you, Ms. Middleton.
16
   And thank you, Committee members, for your continued
17
    support as electing me as Chair. So now we will go to the
   nominations for Vice Chair. Do we have a nomination for
18
   Vice Chair?
19
20
             Mr. Feckner.
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21
    I'd like to place the nomination Lisa Middleton for the
2.2
23
    Office of Vice Chair of the Board Governance Committee.
    And after the vote, I would like to speak to it, please.
24
```

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Nomination for Ms.

25

```
Middleton as Vice Chair of the Governance Committee.
1
             Are there any additional nominations?
2
             Are there any additional nominations?
 3
             Are there any additional nominations?
             Hearing no additional Nominations, we have a
5
    nomination for Ms. Middleton to be Vice Chair. Do we have
 6
    a second for that motion?
7
8
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO: (Hand raise.)
9
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Second by Mr. Ruffino.
             And so it's moved by Mr. Feckner, second by Mr.
10
   Ruffino.
11
             Comments now, Mr. Feckner, or after the vote?
12
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: After the vote,
13
   please.
14
15
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So, Ms. Hopper,
16
   please.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
                                           Rob Feckner?
17
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Aye.
18
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino For
19
20
    Fiona Ma?
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO:
21
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Lisa Middleton?
2.2
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Aye.
23
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?
24
25
             COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Aye.
```

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Aye.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Aye.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. President, I have the motion being made by Rob Feckner, seconded by Frank Ruffino for Fiona Ma for the election of the Board Governance Committee Vice Chair, Lisa Middleton.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you. And congratulation, Ms. Middleton, on your election as Vice Chair of the Governance Committee.

Mr. Feckner.

1.3

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just want to ask, Mr. Chair, for a future agenda item to have a robust discussion -- and this again has nothing to do with the people in play. It has to do with optics. I want to have a overarching discussion on the optics of having the Board President be the same as the Board Governance Chair and is also the Committee -- the Chair of the Risk and Audit Committee being the Chair of Board Governance. To me, it seems like there could be an optics of conflict and I would just like to have a discussion about it.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Well, Mr. Feckner, we have item on the agenda today for future items. And so if

```
you could hold that till that and then we'll take that as
1
    one of the items for future discussion.
2
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Thank you.
 3
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Okay. So that moves
 4
   us then to item number three, approval of the March 16
5
   Board Governance Committee time agenda. Do I have a
6
   motion?
7
8
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: So move.
9
             COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: (Hand raised.)
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Moved by Ms. Middleton second
10
   by --
11
             COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Second.
12
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: -- Mr. Perez.
1.3
             COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Oh, sorry.
14
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So all those in favor,
15
16
   Ms. Hopper, please.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
                                          Rob Feckner?
17
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Aye.
18
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for
19
20
   Fiona Ma?
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO: Aye.
21
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Lisa Middleton?
2.2
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Aye.
23
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?
24
25
             COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Aye.
```

```
COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega?
1
2
             COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?
 3
             COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ:
                                      Aye.
 4
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
                                         Mr. President, I
 5
    have a motion being made by Lisa Middleton, seconded by
6
7
    Jason Perez on agenda item 3.
8
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you very much.
             We now will move to Executive Report, Mr. Jacobs.
9
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yes. Good morning, all.
10
    Good morning Committee members. We have three substantive
11
   matters on the agenda today. The first is an action item.
12
    We're bringing back a mechanism for reporting
1.3
    investigations of certain CalPERS executives to the Board.
14
    And then we move into the information items. We've got An
15
16
    item regarding the -- how we are going to effectuate the
    Board's shared responsibility for CIO personnel decisions.
17
   And then as Mr. Jones just mentioned, we've got what could
18
   be called a virtual white board with respect to future
19
20
    Board Governance Committee agenda items.
             And that concludes my executive report.
21
2.2
    you.
23
             CHAIRPERSON JONES:
                                 Okay. Thank you, Mr. Jacobs.
             Okay. Now, we will move to action consent items.
24
25
   We have two items under the action consent. The approval
```

```
of the November 18 Board Committee -- Governance Committee
1
   meeting mines and review of Board Governance Committee
2
    delegation.
 3
             Do we have a motion?
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Move approval.
 5
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Moved by Mr. Feckner.
 6
             We need a second.
7
8
             COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: (Hand raised.)
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Second by Mr. Perez.
9
             Mrs. Hopper, please.
10
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Rob Feckner?
11
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Aye.
12
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for
13
   Fiona Ma?
14
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO:
15
16
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Lisa Middleton?
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Aye.
17
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?
18
             COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Aye.
19
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega?
20
             COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Aye.
21
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?
2.2
23
             COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Aye.
             COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. President, I
24
25
   have a motion being made by Rob Feckner, seconded by Jason
```

Perez for Agenda Items 5a and 5b, and all has indicated ayes.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you, Ms. Hopper.

Information consent items, Item 6a, I have not received a request to move anything from that agenda item.

So we will move on to Agenda Item 7, which is an action item, and the proposed changes to Board Governance Policy, reporting investigations to the Board. Ms.

9 | Simpson or Mr. Jacobs?

1.3

2.2

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I think Ms. Simpson is going to handle the heavy lifting on this one.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Is she on?

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Good morning, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Good morning.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: And good morning, Committee members. Congratulations to Chair and Vice Chair for being confirmed again.

I'm not sure if you can see me, but I can see all of you. Maybe that's -- maybe that's good enough. This item 7a, as Matt Jacobs has just said, proposes a change for the Committee to consider on the Board Governance policy. And this is on the question of reporting investigations. And this follows the Board President's direction to come back with some proposed language

regarding the Board's oversight of allegations of misconduct by senior executives.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So you'll see that you have the language there in front of you, and as follows, "Through the Board President, monitor investigations into allegations of misconduct by the CEO, Chief Actuary, Chief Compliance Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Health Director, Chief Investment Officer, Chief Operating Officer, or the General Counsel. Upon receipt of plausible non-frivolous allegation of misconduct, by any of the aforementioned personnel and a preliminary determination that the allegations are substantiated, and if substantiated, would constitute misconduct, management...", and in parentheses, "...(CEO, unless the allegation concerns the CEO), will notify the Board President and the Chair of the Risk and Audit Committee. Management will inform the full Board upon the commencement of a formal investigation into the alleged misconduct".

And with that, this item is for the Committee's discussion. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Simpson And, Committee members, do you have any comments or questions?

I see Ms. Brown.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Are there any Committee

members who want to go in front?

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON JONES: I don't see -- I don't see any Committee members yet.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Okay. All right. I'm happy to go first.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So in looking at attachment 1, page nine of 26, the revisions, line 18, it talks about only certain positions where the Board President would inform -- or the Board President would know, the Chair of Risk and Audit would be advised. But, you know, there are many other positions that where if there's some sort of misconduct or other issue that arises, that we should know. I'm not going to mention the one that specifically we've been told about, but under this policy, we wouldn't know about the current issue that's going on. And so I have concerns that this is way too limiting and it needs to be much broader.

More importantly and generally, I'd like to know going back over the last, I don't know, three to five years, what other investigations have occurred that the Board -- the full Board was not made aware of, and not just of these positions, but for things that -- where fraud, mismanagement, very serious concerns have been brought to bear, and there have been some sort of, you

know, penalty, or some sort of, you know, performance
review, or something happened to that employee of CalPERS.
I think this is way too limiting for the Board.

And those are my comments.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Well, we'll come back to that, after we hear from other members.

Ms. Middleton.

1.3

2.2

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Thank you, Mr.

President. And I'm going to direct these as questions to

Matt and to Anne. And what I'm trying to make sure is

that I have the correct understanding of what it is that

we're doing here.

So the first notification involving these named positions is that the Board President and the Risk and Audit Committee Chair would be notified. And what I understand that to require is that we have received a plausible non-frivolous allegation of misconduct. And the next question is, if it's true, it would constitute misconduct. So, at that point, we don't have any information as to whether or not it's true, not true, or anything else, other than we've received an allegation. And that creates an affirmative obligation to notify two members of the Board. That's correct?

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: That's correct.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Okay. And the implication here is that that would be immediate notification or as timely as is possible. Is that something that we need to spell out or is the implication adequate?

1

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

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: That's an interesting comment, Ms. Middleton. I note that the language that's drafted here says, "upon receipt", which I think is probably about as prompt as is practical. But Matt, would you like to add anything to that?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yes. Yes. I mean you have to give a reasonable time for this preliminary determination that the allegation, if substantiated, would constitute misconduct. So I think the idea is you're going to get a notification upon -- well, you've gotten receipt, but the -- but the phrase goes on to say that it's a preliminary -- after the preliminary determination. In other words, we get a receipt that -- we receive an allegation that the General Counsel has done something that the complainer thinks was improper. It may be plausible. It may be non-frivolous, but it doesn't constitute misconduct, so there's a preliminary determination that, you know, somebody is complaining that -- anyway, there's -- that would not be -- that would not go to the two individuals on the Board. But there has

to be at least a moment in time, a reasonable time for that determination to be made. And I would think that, you know, that would be a very short time, you know, a couple days maybe.

2.2

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: All right. And that would be the CEO/General Counsel or just the General Counsel? Who's responsible for making that determination that this allegation rises, if true, to the level of misconduct?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: The CEO with the assistance of the General Counsel, but that's a CEO call ultimately. Yeah.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: All right. Good.

And then we have a -- last sentence that says,

"Management will inform the full Board upon the

commencement of an investigation. So in the notification

to the Board President and to the Chair of the Audit

Committee, are they being invited to give their counsel as

to whether or not an investigation is necessary, or

appropriate, or just simply they are the first individuals

to be notified on the Board?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: The latter, Ms. Middleton.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: The latter. Okay. I think maybe we need to spell that out, that they play no

role in making that determination. And I would agree with you, they should not.

1.3

2.2

But it's certain -- that last notification to the full Board, do we need to spell out what process will be used to notify the full Board? Is that something that's depending on circumstances? And it might be a telephone tree, it might be a series of conversations, or is it a special meeting. But how do we go about the logistics of making sure that we promptly notify the full Board?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yeah. Ms. Middleton, I think that you raise the scenario -- a number of scenarios, any of which could apply in a particular case. And so that's the reluctance to be more specific about what the process would be for a general policy like this. It could be done, but that is the kind of countervailing consideration there.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: And I'm getting this on the record, but the implication here is that this will happen very quickly and very promptly?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Okay. I want to go to the good question that Ms. Brown raised regarding the naming of these individual positions. And as I understand the meaning of what we're doing here is these are positions that mandate almost immediate notification to

the full Board of the possibility of a misconduct.

There's -- is there -- there is nothing in here, as I understand it, but please correct me, that says the Board should not be made aware of other investigations involving misconduct of any other employee during the course of that, as we have commonly been made aware in closed sessions previously, is that correct?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Exactly right, Ms. Middleton.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Okay. So my last -it's not a question. It's a comment. I applaud what
we're doing here. I do think one thing is missing. In
our conversations, we were very clear that no Board member
can or should interfere with the conduct of the
investigation and that Board members have a absolute
responsibility of complete confidentiality as the
investigation moves forward. And I think that needs to be
spelled out that Board members cannot interfere, and
cannot disclose -- and personally, I would argue that a
disclosure is an act of interference in the conduct of the
investigation.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: You're muted, Henry.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Ms. Taylor. Thank you.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Thank you. I will --

there's a couple of things that I want to ask about, but I will comment on Ms. Middleton's last statement. So I agree and I'm -- I would like to see that language added to this, because, yes, that would -- that could very well turn a case, depending on what the disclosure was on the individual, if there was disclosure from a Board member and it -- and it made it out into the public. So I would second basically Ms. Middleton's thoughts there.

I want to go on. Upon receipt, Mr. Jacobs, I -you explained it and I got a little confused. So, "Upon
receipt of a plausible non-frivolous allegation of
misconduct by any of the aforementioned personnel and a
preliminary determination that the allegation is
substantiated would constitute misconduct".

So who's doing that? Who does that part of the investigation? Because the accusation can be out there and it may -- you know, Matt Jacobs stole my lunch, you know, but it might not be true. So who makes the determination?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: The CEO with my help, if the allegation is not directed at me.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Well, you stole my lunch, Matt. No, I'm just kidding.

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.2

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I thought I gave it back

to you.

1.3

2.2

(Laughter.)

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: And she'd either do it alone or with the help of somebody else, if the allegation were with respect to me. Similarly, if it happened to be as to -- as to Ms. Frost, I would make that determination with -- either by myself or with the help of somebody who's not Ms. Frost, not to generalize it.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. Do we need to -- and I don't know that this to be the case, but do we need to delineate that in this or no?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I don't think so.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yeah.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. I'm not an attorney, so I just wanted to ask.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yeah, well, that's CalPERS management. And, you know, the thing about these -- this is kind of a general policy that we have here, Ms. Taylor. And so it tries to capture the crux of the issue. It provides guidance for how to do it in the future. And Ms. Middleton has explicated that through here questioning, which you aptly point out -- aptly pointed out was on the record, so that somebody could go back and figure -- and replay that and hold us to it.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay.

2.2

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: But if you get into kind of the more detail, this becomes -- this can become -- expand to a, you know, six or eight page code that I think we -- I think the goal here is to try to avoid.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. That makes sense.

And I -- and then once that initial investigation to

determine it's not frivolous, then it goes to the Board

President and the Chair of the Risk and Audit Committee to

let them know that you're investigating it? Is that what

I'm understanding?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: To let them know that this allegation has been received and that it is -- it is -- I'm sorry, I'm looked at the -- I was looking at November's. That it's plausible, non-frivolous, and that if substantiated, it would constitute misconduct.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Right. And then we'll notify the Board President and Chair of the Risk and Audit Committee. Because it seems to me, at that point, it's after that, that management will inform the full Board upon commencement of a formal investigation.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Right.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: So you're basically saying, okay, first, we're going to notify the Board President and the Chair of Risk and Audit. And then we're

going to commence a forma investigation and let the Board know, because I mean it sounds to me that this goes hand in hand.

1.3

2.2

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Well, it doesn't go hand-in-hand, because there's some leeway, there's some time in between a determination that, hey, we received this allegation. It's not frivolous, but we need to do kind of a preliminary investigation.

So, for example, we've received this allegation. It's non-frivolous. If it were true, it could be -- it could constitute misconduct. Now, let's go out and talk to the three people who are purported to be the witnesses to this event of misconduct. They all said it never happened. It never happened. They swear up and down it never happened.

So now we have a preliminary investigation that's concluded that the allegation is frivolous or is non-substantiated and it never goes to -- never gets reported to the full Board. It's only if that kind of preliminary investigation leads to a conclusion that, hey, we need to open up a full investigation here that it would get reported to the full Board.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I don't know. It kind of sounds like what you're saying there would be before you would give it to Risk and Audit and the President though,

because that's what your trying to -- how do you -- how do you know it's not frivolous? I mean, if it's a serious allegation like sexual misconduct, right, but it never happened, you've got to kind of -- before it even goes to the Board President or Risk and Audit -- here's my concern. If you don't make sure that it's not frivolous, that somebody is just going after somebody, right, it goes to the Board President and Chair of Risk and Audit, it could still leak, so -- and then you institute this investigation that you're talking about, the pre-investigation and you find out it was frivolous ultimately, that it was, you know, based on spite or whatever, then you're not going to inform the Board.

2.2

But it would seem to me that it shouldn't go to the Risk and Audit and President first. So I think that we're kind of getting -- I don't know. It seems to me like if it goes to a full investigation, that's when you advise everybody. I don't know that you would advise the president first, unless you're saying that you just want to let them know this has been brought up and we're going to do a preliminary investigation. And then if a full investigation is warranted, then you tell the Board.

I'm -- I guess that's where I'm confused.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Well, that is the idea. Now, what you said a moment ago is a legitimate position

to hold. But what we're trying to do in this document is reflect what we believe to be a consensus position or close to a consensus position of the Committee the last time it was discussed.

So I'm not saying -- I'm not disagreeing with you. I'm just saying that the sense of the Committee seemed to be, hey, if you open up, if you get one of these allegations, it's non-frivolous, at least two Board members should know about it, you know, you move on from there. And then if it's a real thing essentially, then you tell everybody.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. I guess it's going to really be tenuous on how you determine non-frivolous to advise the President. To me, it would be more like the CEO says Matt stole Theresa's lunch, and I'm just letting you guys know, because I'm going to go question everybody that was in the kitchen.

(Laughter.)

2.2

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: And then, oh, yeah, she didn't -- or he didn't steel Theresa's lunch, so I'm going to tell the rest of the Board. So I guess that's -- I guess I see where that --

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: That's not a bad way of thinking about it.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I mean, that essentially captures it, I think.

1.3

2.2

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. That makes sense. That kind of makes sense.

And then finally, I kind of want to address the issue, I think on terms of other notification of all employees that Ms. Brown was talking about, I think our CEO let's us know when those occasions arise, when they're rare -- excuse me, very serious. But something like that fraud incident that we, I think, we're referring to, that makes sense to come forward to the Board. But I will -- as a union steward for SEIU, I think it's understanding that there are a lot of actions that take place against employees. I'm not sure that we need to know every single thing. So I think it would be too expansive to include everybody else. And I think we should leave it to the CEO to determine what's serious enough to bring to the Board's attention.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. We heard from Ms. Taylor. We will now hear from Ms. Olivares.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you, Mr. Jones.

These are excellent points. And I think before I get into some of my questions, I want to acknowledge that we have very strongly leadership with our CEO and I have no reservations about her leadership. I do understand

that there have been some historical issues with a previous CEO of CalPERS and there have also been issues with prior Board members. And so I have that in the back of my mind as I think through some of the potential complications here.

So my first question is have we received an opinion on this from fiduciary counsel?

1.3

2.2

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: We have not. I don't know that it really -- that she would have insight in it. But we do have a consultant. Marcie, help me with this.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yes, Rick Funston.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Funston.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Sorry, Rick. But Mr. Funston who is an expert in governance of public employee -- public pension systems throughout the land, has consulted on this and is available to comment on this or anything else on this agenda.

would love to hear from Mr. Funston. And I have another question that maybe he could help answer too. So I'm wanting to understand what the best practice is for checks and balances on the Board. Director Feckner made a comment earlier about the concentration of leadership within the Board and the Board committees. Over time, we

have seen with -- whether it's corporate or public pension leadership, that sometimes there are bad actors, whether it's leaders on the board, whether it's executives. And I don't know what checks and balances we would have in place in the very, very rare circumstance. And I don't think anybody on this Board would do this or in our executive team. But if there were ever any type of actions between, for example, the Board President and the Chair of Risk and Audit, and a member of the executive team.

2.2

And so if they, for example, colluded in some ways, so the rest of the Board was not aware of risks that the pension was facing.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Those are questions to Mr. Funston. So Mr. Funston, I see you are on, so if you could respond to Ms. Olivares's question.

MR. FUNSTON: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Committee. A very thoughtful discussion on the -- on this point. And obviously, I -- just to reflect back, when I first became involved with CalPERS, oh, almost ten years ago, it was as a follow-up to an initiative by Mr. Feckner and the members of the Board to look at governance reforms to prevent a reoccurrence of the kinds of issues that led to the scandal at the time.

I would have to say also that the organization is probably still experiencing the ramifications from that

scandal. So I think you're wise to be concerned about a repetition of those events.

2.2

As I listened to the conversation and the points made by Ms. Middleton and others, I would say that the -first of all, the policy seems well construed. The issues of -- how do I put it -- of conspiracy or collusion are ones that are extraordinarily difficult to identify and to -- and to prevent, which is why you would have things, as you already do in terms of whistleblowers, and hotlines, and so on, and other mechanisms in place.

And I understand that this particular policy was to address a specific concern to make sure that the Board was made timely aware of any allegations involving the senior executives. I understand that you have a similar policy in place for allegations of concern about misconduct by the Board, and that, to a large extent, this policy kind of mirrors that one.

So I think -- and again, for formal investigation and so on. I think the concerns about the timeliness seem to be addressed, in that it should happen quickly. The matter of discretion is primarily that of the CEO, unless, of course, it involves the CEO. I think there are -- there probably are some points to Ms. Taylor's comments about clarification of a preliminary investigation, when does it become a formal investigation, and at which time

should the Board Chair and the Chair of the Audit Committee be involved?

But I think again, the intention is that this be -- to occur as quickly as possible. I'm not a lawyer, so I would defer to Mr. Jacobs' comments that probably less is more to allow for more latitude, given difference circumstances, but I don't know if that answers your question, Ms. Olivares.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: I think that's helpful context. I don't think it answers my question though.

(Laughter.)

2.2

MR. FUNSTON: Could you repeat your question then, please?

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: No, it's just more on the mechanics of how this would work, and appropriate checks and balances, and if we have those in place. And I don't know if I'm hearing that we would have checks and balances in place in a hypothetical situation, that there was collusion between an executive and the Board President and the Chair of Risk and Audit.

MR. FUNSTON: No. And I doubt there would be any policy that would sufficiently anticipate collusion, other than the no blind eye responsibility of other board members, who may become aware of situations. But again,

you have a whistleblower policy in place already, administered, I believe, by a third party that would again brings those things to the attention of General Counsel. I think that's the appropriate mechanism right now, Mr. Jacobs.

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: So that whistleblower policy assumes that others would have knowledge of whatever incident. Would we -- if the full Board, for example, were to have knowledge, rather than just the Board President and the Chair of Risk and Audit, would that then reduce the risk of potential collusion?

MR. FUNSTON: Well, the Board has a responsibility to not turn a blind eye to any -- to anything that it's aware of, in terms of misconduct by another Board member. So to that extent, yes. But I think the concern here is that it's verification of the incident. In other words, is it substantiated and it is -- is it non-frivolous misconduct, which is, I think, what this is designed to address. And so the question then would be at what point in time is it determined not to be frivolous and to be potentially substantial misconduct, at which point in time, the investigation would trigger.

The concern is, is that you don't inadvertently destroy someone's reputation by letting an allegation get

out before it has been reasonably investigated. So there -- again, there has to be some kind of a framework for that to happen. And it seems that this recommendation tries to anticipate it and accommodate that.

1.3

2.2

I'm comfortable with.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Well, Mr. Funston, what is your opinion on this resolution? Do you feel like it is robust and it will protect CalPERS and its members?

MR. FUNSTON: I think it's reasonable. It's not absolute to your point. There is always a way potentially to find your way around it. But I think under the circumstances, it seems to be a reasonable policy.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you.

MR. FUNSTON: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mrs. Ortega.

I just had a -- kind of a question and a comment combined perhaps back to Ms. Brown's remarks earlier. I certainly had understood this provision to narrowly apply related to the use of the term "monitor". So to me monitor suggests a level of involvement in the investigation, having more regular updated information, knowing what's happening.

And I had seen it as a heightened level of attention of the Board for this -- for the specified individuals, which

I did not see it as, in any way, diminishing the

expectation that the Board be hearing reports about any sort of important employee conduct, or anything that might occur as part of the day-to-day management of the Fund and the staff, that we would still continue to hear about, but would not have that same level of monitoring.

2.2

So in the examples I've seen, where the CEO brings reports of anything that's happened that's significant, and we would hear a regular update about any sort of progressive discipline, or how that may be proceeding, but we're not in the same level of detail as what this is proposing.

I'm comfortable with that division of responsibility. I don't think that the Board should be managing more -- I don't want to say routine, because they're not routine. They're still anomalies, right? They're still unusual actions with the employees.

But I don't think it makes sense to have the full Board involved, in what I would see as more of a day-to-day management of the staff. So I am comfortable with that division. And I think I'll leave it at that.

And perhaps, if Mr. Jacobs or Mr. Frost see the reporting changing in any way, as a result of this, as it relates to other employees, I think it would be important to tell us that.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I do not see it as

changing at all with respect to that, Ms. Ortega.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Ms. Frost.

1.3

2.2

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah, I agree. I concur with that. The same process that's used on my briefing, the personnel matters would not change.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you. Okay. Mr. Miller.

BOARD MEMBER MILLER: No, I had nothing to add.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So I see no additional questions from Board members. And I think that just listening to the comments, I think that there was some -- I think I saw some shall heads nod, but we need to resolve it, is that Ms. Middleton's comments and -- about the confidentiality and the notification that I think something may -- needs to be added to hold the Board members accountable for becoming aware of this information and then it becomes leaked. So I think that's something that maybe -- you know, maybe Committee members would

Ms. Brown, of course, you could make a motion for, you know, changing this, but I think Matt, based on what you've heard, it seems like you maybe need some time to come back to us with clearer definitions on a couple of items. One, particularly as Ms. Middleton mentioned about adding something regarding the Board member's, you know,

support adding something in it to address that issue.

being accountable for any leaks or anything around that area.

1.3

2.2

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Mr. Jones, if Ms. Middleton, she could make a motion with that modification to the current language as well.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Okay. So I did reach out to Ms. Brown to see if she wanted to change it, because this is an action item and so, Ms. Brown, if not -- Ms. Brown?

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: No, I appreciate that Mr.

Jones. I don't -- I don't have an alternative motion. I was thinking that this might actually come back, based on the discussion, but if we're going to vote on it now, then my vote is no. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Ms. Middleton.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Yes. I would move to approve this recommendation of staff as is with the provision that staff will come back to us at our next meeting with a clause that will cover the responsibility of the Board to not interfere -- to monitor, but to not interfere with the conduct of an investigation and the explicit responsibility of confidentiality and non-disclosure of the Board.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So that's a motion by Ms. Middleton. Do we have a second?

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO: (Hands raised.)

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Second by Mr. Ruffino.

So we will have a roll call on that item.

Well, before we vote on this, I see we do have some requests from the public to speak. So let's hear that before we vote.

Mr. Fox.

1.3

2.2

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS CHIEF FOX: Yes, Mr.

President. You have one caller for public comment. Mr.

J.J. Jelincic.

MR. JELINCIC: Hi. This is J.J. Jelincic, speaking as a beneficiary to my trustees. I think your focus is the wrong focus. You should focus on what gets reported to the Board not who gets reported. I once represented an employee who took a suspension for theft and what they had taken was a surge protector. But, you know, what's important is what's going on. If we have the Chief Investment Officer, the Chief Information Officer, a Deputy Executive Director, a Managing ID, a Chief of OSSD, Chief of Benefit Services, or even an office assistant who has been involved in a serious violation, theft, taking a bribe, taking kickbacks from a vendor, embezzlement, those are the things that should get reported to the trustees, so they can watch it.

If Matt Jacobs steals a surge protector, I don't

```
think that ought to go to the Board. Although, it is
misconduct and it is theft, but it's not the level that
should come to the Board. So I really think the focus
ought to be on what gets reported to the Board and not on
who gets reported to the Board.
         Thank you.
         CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you. Okay.
         Okay. So we do have a motion on the floor by Ms.
Middleton, second by Mr. Ruffino.
         So, Ms. Hopper, you want to call the roll,
please, on that motion.
         COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Rob Feckner?
         COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Aye.
         COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for
Fiona Ma?
         ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER RUFFINO:
         COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER:
                                      Lisa Middleton?
```

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Aye.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: Aye.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA: Aye.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: No.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. President, I

have a motion being made by Lisa Middleton, seconded by Frank Ruffino for Fiona Ma, five ayes, one no made by Jason Perez.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Hopper. So the item passed with that modification. So that concludes the discussion on that item.

We now will go to information agenda item, item 8a, which is a discussion of the Board's shared responsibility of the CIO personnel -- CIO personnel decisions.

Ms. Simpson.

2.2

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Thank you very much, Chair.

So as you rightly say, this item is an information item. And the purpose is to provide an opportunity for the Board -- for the Committee - I apologize - to discuss how the Board's shared responsibilities for the Chief Investment Officer personnel revision should be implemented.

You'll recall, and the item sets out, that in September of 2020, there were discussions to amend the Governance Policy to reflect that the responsibility and practice for hiring, evaluating, and terminating the Chief Investment Officer is shared between the Chief Executive and the Board members.

As a matter of expediency, the Board President has appointed two subcommittees to help the Chief Executive Officer with interviewing candidates. The recruitment is in process and the final candidate will come before the full Board.

2.2

At the February 2021 meeting of the Performance, Compensation and Talent Management Committee, in reviewing its annual delegation as part of its annual responsibility to do that, put forward the notion that that particular committee should be the place where the shared responsibility would reside.

Since that time, a number of Board members have raised a question as to whether this is actually the best place for that particular delegation from the Board to live. So the discussion today is to allow the Committee to discuss options ahead of the April Board meeting, which will, as a matter of routine, approve all the Committee delegations, which happens annually, apart from the Investment Committee, which is a Committee of the whole.

So the options before you, of course, are to agree to assign this responsibility to Performance,

Compensation and Talent Management, as is contemplated by that committee. Another option, as set out in the item, is that the full Board would assume this responsibility formally in the policy, or there may be a third option.

But the item is for discussion and we look forward to your thoughts on all the above.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you, Ms.

5 | Simpson. So, Ms. Taylor.

1.3

2.2

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: You don't have any Committee members?

CHAIRPERSON JONES: No, not yet.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. So I agree, and I think I voiced this during the Performance, Compensation and Talent Management Committee meeting, I think if we're going to have shared responsibility as a Board with the hiring of the CIO with the CEO, that it's a shared responsibility, but it's the whole Board. I think if we -- we'll just create -- we're creating a middleman that we don't need to have. So I want -- I just think it's important that the whole Board has a say on that, rather than a committee and then getting acquisition -- or acquisition -- acquiescence by the Board at a later date. I think having the middleman isn't necessary is my particular comment on that.

And then I guess I would ask Ms. Simpson if -- in terms of governance, doesn't -- is there any preclusion to having it outside of the PCTManagement Committee and just straight to the Board?

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Taylor. Mr. Funston may have a comment on this, but I'm not aware that there's a view in the governance world as to a preference for how this is organized. I think some of it is practical. In other words, if you have a board of 13, to involve 13 people in -- and into an interview process can be quite complicated. And I'm sure that's why the President saw fit to establish two subcommittees, in other words, so that the people with the time, the interest, the attention can play that role.

2.2

If it's formalized to be a responsibility of a particular committee, and obviously this is the Committee with the job of talent management, and obviously recruiting the Chief Investment Officer is probably one of the most important talent management decisions to be made.

I can see Rick is back on camera.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you. Mr. Funston, comment.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Sorry, Chair. That's -- my apologies.

MR. FUNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Anne.

I think the question is what is being delegated by the -- by the Board. It's entirely consistent for the Board to create committees to assign it some

responsibilities, some work to be done. But I would say in the vast majority of cases that they are being asked to make a recommendation -- to be involved in a process and to make a recommendation, not to actually make the decision. They would come back to the Board, make a recommendation, and the full Board then would have an opportunity to discuss and consider the recommendation that's being made.

1.3

2.2

So again, they typically would delegate responsibility for doing the work to develop a recommendation, but the Board, as the whole, would then have to weigh in on the -- on the final decision and make the decision, based on the recommendation of the CEO and committee. Does that -- does that answer your question, Ms. Taylor?

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I'm not sure. So if we delegated it to PCTM, then when, for example, the hiring of a CIO were to come up, then it would be those members that would be the subcommittee. And I don't know -- I would think it would be important to pull, especially if there's two, because the subcommittee -- the PCTM

Committee is not real big, I think it would be important to have the ability to pull more people to help with the interview process, rather than just from the PCTM

Committee. So I just think it's important that we involve

4 0

```
the whole Board and then let the Board President determine the subcommittees of the hiring, rather than delegate it to PCTM, and then thereby to the Board, at some point. I don't know. I'm just -- I --
```

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah, well, you know, another -- you know, similar to what you're saying, Ms. Taylor, would be if we delegate to the Performance and Comp Committee, their job could be to screen the applicants, just as we're doing, you know, with a subcommittee. And then this screening could identify the top three or the top two, whatever the determination may be. And then the full Board could interview the candidate. I mean, that's an approach that could be used.

And so you're delegating to the Committee to go through the process of identifying the likely candidates before it comes to the full Board.

So that's one though, you know.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: That's not a -- you mean, like we do for when we're hiring an auditor or something like that?

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah. Yeah, the same thing. Yeah.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Fiduciary counsel is another

25 one. Okay.

2.2

MR. FUNSTON: The only -- if I may, Mr. Chair, sorry. Just with one caveat though, I would express, is that in the case of the -- of the external auditor and in the case of fiduciary counsel, those are direct reports to the Board. And I believe that the relationship today is that the CEO has the primary responsibility for making a recommendation with respect to the CIO as the CIO reports to the CEO.

2.2

So I think the point, if I understand it correctly, that Ms. Taylor was making, it really depends on what charge you give to the committee and how broadly that committee then is represented. I think obviously it's a good idea to have the Board more fully involved, but then in that case why have committees, because, again, what you're trying to do through committee is delegate getting some of the work done to bring back a recommendation, as Mr. Jones said, with a short list that has been vetted, and approved, and agreed upon by all parties.

So the question then is the Board would still have the final approval. It's just that it would not be -- that's just a way that boards get the job done, right? It's just how committees work. We understand that many of you also attend most of the committee members -- committee meetings. So essentially, every committee is

close to a committee of the whole, if not the whole, which is something we see more of these days.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Right. Yeah. Okay.

Mr. Feckner.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

You're muted.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Thank you, Mr -- yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the conversation. Thank you, Mr. Funston, for weighing in. You and I have certainly been down this road a number of times. So it's refreshing to go through the topic again. You know, this process is -- if we're going to continue on the way we are, it was a number of years ago that the Board decided the C -- we're going to have one direct report to the Board and that's the CEO. If we're not going to change that, then we need to recognize the fact that the CEO is going to make the determination of who the next CIO is. agree with shared responsibility, as far as the PCTM maybe being the -- you know, the fist blush, shall we say, as Mr. Jones mentioned to do the paperwork, to screen, et cetera, but the shared responsibility (inaudible) recommendation to the full Board, in my opinion. important. And I think it needs to be a recommendation of the full Board to the CEO, and then the CEO allowed to make that final decision.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: You're muted, Henry.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mr. Feckner, you kind of broke up towards the end of your comments. Could you repeat, because I didn't hear it. I don't know if other members heard you.

My comments were that as far as the screening process goes and the first blush of interviews, I certainly understand the PCTM may be the right vehicle for that. But beyond that, since we only have one direct report to the Board that's the CEO, then that person needs to responsible for hiring the CIO. And I think the decision of a recommendation should come from the full Board to the CEO, not from any committee. This is a very important position. It needs to be a committee of the whole that makes that decision recommending to the CEO for their ultimate decision.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Middleton. And I'll come back to the other members of the Board. I want to catch the Committee members first.

Ms. Middleton.

1.3

2.2

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: All right. Thank you, Mr. President. And I'll go ahead and give my comments, but I believe Ms. Brown asked to make a comment and was missed in the rotation

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah. No, I said I was going to go into the Committee members. I'll come back to her. I've got a couple other and then committee members who wish to speak.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Thank you for correcting me --

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.

1.3

2.2

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: -- on that.

Yeah, I want to thank Mr. Funston for his comments, because I thought they were spot on. And the issue really does become to what is it that we are delegating? And no committee should be a final determiner of anything. That needs to come back to the full body. The work of a committee is most effective when it can narrow the choices for the full body and can take and do much of the screening work, particularly in a process like this.

As to whether or not it's the Performance,

Compensation and Talent Management Committee or a special

committee that's been formed, either one of them could

carry out the role. We have a special committee that was

appointed this time to go through and do the review.

One advantage of it being the Performance,

Compensation and Talent Management Committee is we know in

advance who the Committee members are going to be. And

4.5

it's -- so there's no special work that needs to go on.

If we're going to do an evaluation, PCTM will have an obligation to step in.

Another advantage of PCTM is there are three responsibilities here, hiring, evaluating, and terminating. Those are three very different responsibilities and actions. I think it would be difficult to have a special committee that would be responsible for the evaluation portion of this. And PCTM is already in a position, because of the responsibilities that committee has in making salary recommendations to be involved in the evaluation.

So I tend to come down in favor of the recommendation of vesting the recommendations to PCTM.

But I could -- I could be easily persuaded that there is another effective vehicle. What I think is important is that we move forward with some consensus and some promptness on our actions here.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you, Ms. -- okay. Ms. Paquin.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER PAQUIN: Thank you, Mr.

Chair. And appreciate the discussion here this morning as well too. We really strongly support keeping the responsibilities with the full Board as Ms. Taylor and Mr.

Feckner outlined. I think it's an important decision and it aligns with what we have done with past practices. As far as if we had to conduct a CIO search, I think that allowing the Chair the authority to create that subcommittee has worked well in the past. It's working well in this process. And I would be a little bit concerned that sometimes these search processes take quite a bit of time, and it might be difficult for everybody who currently serves on the Compensation Committee to be able to commit that kind of time. So allowing the President to name the Search Committee gives people the opportunity to think about the commitments involved and whether or not they would like to participate.

Thank you.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

Mr. Miller.

BOARD MEMBER MILLER: Yeah. Thank you for recognizing me, although I'm not on the Committee. I would tend to agree with Ms. Paquin, and -- in that there's no certainty of the guarantee of Performance, Compensation and Talent Committee, and who's on it. And I think, for example, for the CIO position, I think it's important for the Chair or Vice Chair of the Investment Committee to be involved in that process of screening and making a recommendation. And certainly, I feel that the

CEO is the one who's ultimately going to be kind of on the hook for that decision. And so I think that's an important consideration.

It may just coincidentally be that the makeup of that committee includes the Chair or Vice Chair of the Investment Committee, but that's not necessarily given. I feel it's important that, you know, if the President, with the Board's concurrence, has the opportunity to create a special committee to make those recommendations to the full Board ultimately to advise the CEO that that would be helpful.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

Ms. Brown.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Thank you, Chair Jones. I know you're just saving the best for last.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So when I raised this issue last month about the delegation to PCTM, I had concerns that in order to keep what the PCTM Committee doing under -- away from Bagley-Keene, was you would have to appoint only three members. Otherwise, you would have to have it being a public meeting.

And currently, in our CIO search, we have six members. And so you would be taking the work of six down to three in order to keep it out of the public purview

But the other concern was that we were really relegating this to PCTM as opposed to the full Board. And I think it's such a critical pick and position, that it should not be delegated to Performance Comp. I think it should with the -- rest with the full Board and that way the Board President can do what he's doing now, which is pick a subcommittee to do the interviews or however he wants to -- he or she, excuse me, wants to do that.

1.3

2.2

But I'm concerned that if it goes to PCTM, and then it would have to be a sub -- it would have to be a small group of less than four, right, because then you have a quorum, and then that has to be public. So it's -- I just think it should rest and there should be no delegation. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Ms. Olivares.

COMMITTEE MEMBER OLIVARES: I'm sorry. I didn't have anything.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Oh, okay. Five minutes -- oh, be back in five minutes. Okay. Sorry about that.

Okay. So we've heard from both Committee members and Board members and it seems like it's -- you know, I'm just taking notes here. It seems like half wants the full Board and then there's two or three that says go through the Committee. So the item that's before us now, we need

to make a decision, because it has to be -- we need to include it in our delegated authority going forward.

And so if, you know --

1.3

2.2

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is -- isn't this an information item?

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah. Yeah. Right. Yeah, but we need to, you know, plan for the future to bring it to a -- to a decision through delegated authority. So what I would suggest, since it seems like I didn't get -- you know, I want to make sure that since we do talk about the full Board being involved is maybe those are the two options that we consider with the full Board, Ms. Simpson and Mr. Jacobs, since that one -- the way it is now or go through the PCM and let the full Board have an opportunity to make that decision. So do you have any comments on that approach?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: We could do it that way. I mean, the PCTM delegation, as it now stands, as it was voted on by PCTM last month, has it delegated to the PCTM. That's coming before the Board in April. And if it is voted down, I think the default then would be that the shared responsibility, which is now in the -- well, I guess that's the question. I think the shared responsibility is in the Governance Policy now. And so we would just -- assuming that's true, and I'd want to check

it, it would just revert to the Board. So that would be a mechanism for an up/down on -- up/down vote or decision by the full Board on those two alternatives --

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.

1.3

2.2

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: -- PCTM or full Board.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I will check that, Mr. Jones. But in the event that it's not the case, we could also bring that to the full Board in April, so that the -- that choice would be provided to the Board at that time.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Yeah, and Matt, it is in the Board Governance Policy to chair it.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah, I remember that.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Okay. Well, then that -- then that would effectuate -- I mean in April, it will come forward as an up/down on PCTM delegation, and we can effectuate whatever the Board's will is at -- through that mechanism.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. That sounds like -- okay. So Committee members, is that okay with you to use that as the process? We see one -- Ms. Brown, and then Mr. Perez.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. I still do have a question. And I guess this is for Matt Jacobs. And

that is do the -- can the CIO interviews be done in closed session? Is there not a legal carve-out that we can use so that way this delegation -- this can stay with the full Board?

2.2

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yes. I didn't quite track your discussion about the three members versus six members thing. There is a delegation. In fact, the numbers are not really relevant to this question. There can be -- this can be in closed session. And that's why this CIO Subcommittee sessions have been in closed session. It doesn't pertain to whether it's three, or six, or any particular number.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So you're saying that all 13 Board members could go to these subcommittee meetings and be in closed session, and have --

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Well, it wouldn't be a subcommittee, but yeah, I mean, you could have -- you could have a closed session of the Board with all 13 members there and do these interviews. I think the idea here was that that's going to scare all potential candidates off and they really need to have a much smaller group of Board members participating.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Oh.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: But to your pure Bagley-Keene question, yes, that is correct.

```
BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Thank you. I thought
1
    the reason why we only had six members of the Board was so
2
    we could keep it in closed session, and that way --
3
    because once you get to seven and over of the full Board.
    Okay. So we just do it, because we're scary.
5
             PRESIDENT JONES: Process.
6
7
             BOARD MEMBER BROWN: We're scary or something.
8
    Okay.
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: It's (inaudible) the process.
9
             BOARD MEMBER BROWN: You know -- okay. Well, you
10
    know --
11
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Well, I'm sure there's
12
   many more reasons than that, but...
13
             BOARD MEMBER BROWN: All right. Thank you.
14
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS:
15
                                     Yeah.
16
             CHAIRPERSON JONES:
                                 Okay. Mr. Perez.
17
             COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: What I was going to
   brought up -- bring up Matt just touched on. I think it's
18
    counterproductive if all 13 of us are in an interview
19
20
    panel. I wouldn't want to interview with you guys and
    girls. So I think we need to leave it the way it is.
21
    don't know what vehicle, or what committee, or
2.2
23
    subcommittee, or whatever you guys want to call it, but I
    don't think it should be all 13 of us.
24
25
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Well, so when we come
```

back, as Matt suggested, you'll get an opportunity to voice that desire, Mr. Perez, so -- okay. Mr. Feckner.

2.2

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I just want to comment on Matt's last comment and certainly do not disagree with Jason on what he just said. However, I do want to point out that whoever this individual is is going to work for the 13-member Board. They don't get to pick and choose a subcommittee of who to work for. So they need to know they're coming in. They need to put on their adult clothes. And whether we interview them with two people, five people, or 13, they've got to be responsible to all 13.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Feckner.

Mr. Perez is that a question or a comment?

COMMITTEE MEMBER PEREZ: Yeah. I mean, they work for us in the sense that as a police officer, I guess I work for the City Council. But no, I report to a chain of command that stops at a chief. And the CIO will actually report to Marcie -- or sorry, to the CEO.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Well -- okay. Well, that's the last request I think that we -- what we're trying to achieve here is a process to comply with the Board's decision that there shall be shared responsibility in hiring, evaluating, and firing the CEO. So that's

54

the ultimate outcome what we're trying to achieve here. 1 So we will get another shot at this when we come back. 2 Ms. Taylor. 3 VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I think I -- I think I 4 forgot to say, we all need to remember -- I think Mr. 5 Perez just said it. I don't think Mr. Feckner meant it 6 7 that way, but the CIO reports to the CEO. This hiring 8 process that we're trying to set up and stating that we want a shared responsibility in, ultimately, the CEO has 9 to manage that person. So their buy-off is just as 10 important as our recommendation. So I just think it's 11 important that what -- when we're making the 12 recommendation, the CEO also gets a say in that. I 1.3 don't -- I don't want to lose sight of that, because the 14 15 CIO does report to the CEO and they do have to work 16 together, so... 17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So I see no additional requests to speak on this. I think Matt, are you okay 18 19 on -- Anne, you okay on the direction on that one. MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: (Nods 20 head.) 21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: 2.2 Okay. GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Very good, yeah. 23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Good. Okay. So now 24

we go to the next item, 8b, is future Board Governance

25

Committee agendas. And I had asked that this be placed on the agenda for the very reason as Rob has already requested something that we need to talk about and consider going forward as a Governance Committee.

2.2

And Rob had mentioned one. And I wanted -- and this is for all Board members, whether or not there are some issues that you want us to put on a white board to consider bringing back to the Governance Committee going forward.

So with that background, Mr. Feckner, you could re -- go ahead and complete your comments as you were making earlier in the agenda.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And again, I want to preface that this is -- casts no aspersions on the current leadership. I just think as far as positions are concerned, that the President of the Board and the Chair of Board Governance, as well as the Chair of Risk and Audit, and the Chair of Board Governance should not be one in the same person. I think that it has the appearance, the optics of being a conflict, whether there is or there is not. I just think that we should have a discussion about that and see what everybody's feelings are about that, that -- again, nothing to do with the current situation, just as we evolve over time -- because we never used to have this. You know, we started

this about 2009, 2010, as Mr. Funston discussed earlier, so we're always evolving. And I just want to put it on the agenda and have people talk about this and see what people's comfort zones are, whether or not these should be one in the same or if they should be separate positions for optic purposes.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Okay. That's one item. We'll add that one, Mr. Jacobs and Ms. Simpson, to go forward.

Any other Board members or Committee members?

Anything else you would like to -- Ms. Middleton.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: And I want to pick up on Rob's theme and be very clear this is not meant as an aspersion on anyone whatsoever, but I think it would be appropriate for us to have a conversation around whether there should be term limits for our most important roles, the President, Vice President, and the Committee chairs.

And I'm not sure which way I even end up falling on that question. But to the best of my knowledge, we've not had that discussion. And certainly, the diversity of leadership and talent on our 13-member Board is something that is really important and important that we have leaders from throughout the Board.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. And, Ms. Middleton, if

you don't mind, I'd just like to -- instead of using the word "term limits", "rotation", because that means members can come back. Okay.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: Absolutely.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I don't want all of a sudden the headlines of term limits. So if you don't mind. Okay.

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.2

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Because had the same -VICE CHAIRPERSON MIDDLETON: I not only don't
mind, I thank you for making that distinction.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you. So Matt, that's the second one. Any others -- items that you'd like to have the Governance Committee deal with coming forward?

Okay. So seeing no others, at least there's two items that we will agendize going forward, Mr. Jacobs, Ms. Simpson, and -- okay.

So the next item on the agenda is summary of direction. And I think -- Matt, I think you've been kind of taking them as we went.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yes, I have. Okay. So on 7a, we're going to bring the language that we discussed a sort while ago, and that is in attachment 1 to agenda item 7a. That's going to go to the Board tomorrow for

approval.

1.3

2.2

But we are also going to bring back at the next Board Governance Committee heating additional language that makes clear the points that Ms. Middleton raised and that are in the record. I don't want to repeat them, because I'll just probably get them a little (inaudible) --

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Right. Okay.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: And then on attachment -- excuse me, agenda item 8a with respect to the shared responsibility, that is going to come back to the Board in April in the form of an up/down vote on the PCTM delegation as it is currently stated.

And then on 8b, the future agenda items, we have the item that was raised by Mr. Feckner with respect to the leadership of the Governance Committee and the item raised by Ms. Middleton with respect to leadership rotation. Those will be -- I will work with the current Chair and Vice Chair to agendize those for upcoming Board Governance Committee meetings.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

Okay. Ms. Taylor, did you have an additional question or that's old?

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: No.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. I just want to be sure

I'm not skipping anyone. Okay. Okay. So that takes care 1 of that. So we go onto the last item, public comment. 2 Ms. Fox, do we have any members of the public that wish to 3 address the Committee? 4 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS CHIEF FOX: Mr. President, 5 there are no callers for public comment. 6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Fox. 7 8 And so this meeting of the Governance Committee 9 is adjourned. And we will see you all at nine o'clock tomorrow morning. Thank you and have a good evening. 10 11 (Thereupon California Public Employees' Retirement System, Board Governance Committee 12 meeting adjourned at 12:54 p.m.) 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 2.2 23 24 25

## 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 21st day of March, 2021.

1.3

James 4 Patter

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 10063