

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
STATE EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT COMMISSION
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PURCHASE OF SERVICE & RELATED MATTERS
MEETING

MAY 30, 2024 MEETING
HELD VIA ZOOM
CONVENED AT 8:45 a.m.

Present:

Peter Adomeit, Chairman
Michael Carey, Trustee
Carl Chisem, Trustee
John DiSette, Trustee
David Krayeski, Trustee
Benjamin Sedrowski, Retirement Services Division
Cindy Cieslak, Rose Kallor, LLP

TRANSCRIPTIONIST: Boden Truitt

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(Proceedings commenced at 8:45 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. This is a State Employee Retirement Commission Purchase of Service and Related Matters Subcommittee meeting being held remotely using Zoom technology. Do you have the attendance, please Cindy?

MS. CIESLAK: Yes. Good morning. This is Cindy Cieslak. Present today we have Chairman Peter Adomeit, Trustee Michael Carey, Trustee Carl Chisem, Trustee David Krayeski. From the Retirement Services Division, we have Ben Sedrowski. From Robinson & Cole Tax Counsel to Retirement Commission, Virginia McGarrity. And I'm Cindy Cieslak, General Counsel from Rose Kallor.

CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. We need a motion to amend the agenda to remove John Gasparino, David Medina and Nicholas Buckland.

MR. CHISEM: Make a motion.

CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. Who seconded it?

MR. KRAYESKI: David Krayeski. I'll second Carl.

CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. All in favor say aye or raise your hand. It's unanimous. The ayes have it. Okay. A new business, Kimberly Newman.

1 MR. SEDROWSKI: Good morning, everyone. Ms.
2 Newman is a retiree who retired effective January 1st, 2022 as
3 a voluntary retirement. She's currently seeking a retroactive
4 change in her retirement type to apply for a non-service
5 connected disability in lieu of the voluntary retirement.

6 She's making this appeal on two basis. The
7 first of which is that she was unable to receive adequate
8 counseling regarding her retirement options at the time that
9 she was leaving state employment and retiring. And the second
10 is that or -- and that she retired as a result of the medical
11 con -- I'm struggling this morning, apologies.

12 The medical complications that she was suffering
13 from. Additionally, the Social Security Administration has
14 acknowledged her disability in writing and given her a notice
15 of award that has been retroactive back to the initial date of
16 retirement of January, 2022.

17 I will make two points regarding it. Should the
18 commission approve this, her application is firmly within the
19 24 month window for disability retirement applications. As
20 well as that, there is no statutory bar to a change in
21 retirement type.

22 The division has consistently applied that no
23 member may change their option nor their retirement type
24 following retirement. However in historic appeals, the
25 commission has approved retroactive changes based on the facts

1 of the case, specifically whether or not the record
2 demonstrated that the health of the individual was a crucial
3 element in their retirement.

4 MR. CAREY: So, in this particular circumstance,
5 I do see that the request is within 24 months of the original
6 retirement date, and people do go regular pending. So, under
7 other circumstances, I might be amenable to considering this.

8 What hangs me up here is that the person came
9 back into state service as a Temporary Worker Retiree and
10 worked for I know it was only two months, but I think that the
11 fact that she did come back subsequent to retirement, I don't
12 think we generally see disability retirees coming back as TWRs.
13 So, that for me would mean I would vote no on this one for that
14 reason.

15 MR. KRAYESKI: I'm sorry, Ben. I was just -- a
16 question and a little bit of clarification. My own knowledge.
17 This is David Krayeski. So, my question is that, the change in
18 retirement to disability or retirement goes retroactively to
19 day 1 of retirement; is that accurate?

20 MR. SEDROWSKI: Correct. Yes.

21 MR. KRAYESKI: Okay. So, there is an issue then
22 that at some point in time somebody deemed her, whether it was
23 her or her physician, or the Department of Children and
24 Families, to be capable of working. So, I'm not -- I find it's
25 incongruent to have her say that she was disabled all the way

1 back to there. She was allowed to come back to work at some
2 point in time, work for a short period of time, albeit.

3 If in fact -- and I understand what the Social
4 Security disability retirement -- or disability system is
5 saying, but for us that's a -- it's a struggle that somebody
6 could have both worked and be eligible for disability
7 retirement, generally speaking, whenever we're doing retirement
8 applications within an agency.

9 We can't consider a disability retirement until
10 somebody is effectively off the payroll and effective after
11 that, not retroactively back while they were actually employed.
12 So, I struggle with that as well.

13 MR. SEDROWSKI: I do know that in her appeal
14 request she does specifically state that it was a failed work
15 attempt so she attempted to go back to work. And at that point
16 she had not applied for a disability retirement. So, I'm not
17 sure if the internal kind of conversation with herself with
18 debating to go back to work and get that would've kind of come
19 into play in that regard. But I completely understand the
20 position that you just took regarding that.

21 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah, I just -- that's why I
22 asked the question when the effective date would be. If it
23 would be after her failed attempt, that's a slightly -- that I
24 could actually wrap my head around, but to have shown up and
25 worked, and then retroactively before that be granted a

1 disability retirement, it almost seems like there's an audit
2 problem there.

3 Where we would have to either perhaps change her
4 retirement date, not that we have the ability to do this, to
5 after her employment or something like that in order for her to
6 be deemed eligible for a disability or retirement. I don't
7 know how you get both.

8 So, and somebody with a better retirement
9 division handle might be able to articulate what I'm trying to
10 say in more retirement division vernacular, but I'm not a
11 hundred percent sure how she can make the argument for both.

12 MR. SEDROWSKI: So, effective -- just to relay
13 understanding then. So, effectively, it's under the
14 circumstances because of the temporary rehired retiree portion
15 in June -- in July, she would have to effectively move her date
16 of retirement from January 1, 2022 to following the close of
17 that temporary working retirement or temporary rehired retiree
18 portion of work to satisfy the permanently disabled from
19 performing the duties of the job.

20 MR. KRAYESKI: That's the cleanest way I would
21 be able to do that. Now, what that does to her benefit and how
22 that adjustment would need to be made, I have no idea. But to
23 me that would be the only really clean way to do this.

24 MR. CAREY: And David, like you said -- this is
25 Mike. I'm not even sure that's within our purview to permit

1 that kind of change, right?

2 MR. KRAYESKI: Correct. I'm not -- I don't
3 think, you know, the purchase subcommittee can, you know,
4 necessarily make that change. But that would be a -- that
5 would be the appropriate historical documentation to lay out
6 the case, I think.

7 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: So, what's the conclusion
8 here?

9 MS. CIESLAK: This is Cindy Cieslak. I will
10 just note that I believe both David and Mike's sort of opinion
11 on this is accurate. And note that, you know, to the extent
12 individuals have requested a change in their retirement date,
13 those considerations have gone before the commission before,
14 and they are regularly decided on a case by case basis, given
15 the circumstances without an actual request for that, without
16 the member knowing what that will do to her retirement benefit.
17 I don't think that is within the decision to be made today.

18 And then also just sort of noting that the
19 actual decision as to whether she gets a disability benefit
20 will be up to the MEB. So, even if the commission ultimately
21 determines to move her retirement date and allow her to apply
22 for a disability retirement, that is going to be up to the
23 Medical Examining Board. And then I just had one quick
24 question as I was reading the materials and I wanted to make
25 sure I understood them correctly. She returned to the exact

1 same position she was in immediately before her retirement,
2 correct?

3 MR. SEDROWSKI: Same position, reduced working
4 schedule, 50 percent. So, she came on as a -- to attempt it at
5 a 50 percent or at a lighter workload, was the understanding
6 that I had.

7 MS. CIESLAK: Okay.

8 MR. SEDROWSKI: But yes, same position.

9 MS. CIESLAK: And that's all within -- that's
10 all within the statutes, which allows her to collect her
11 retirement benefit while working or did her retirement benefit
12 stop while she was working?

13 MR. SEDROWSKI: It did not stop, no. She was
14 under the 120 days.

15 MS. CIESLAK: Okay. All right. Those are the
16 only two questions I had.

17 MR. CHISEM: This is Carl Chisem. I agree with
18 the 24 months, whatever it is, that she's within that. The
19 only thing I -- and I have to agree with David and Mike. If it
20 got changed, the date, I think that would be better. I'm not -
21 - and I'm not sure, like they said, I'm not sure if we could
22 change that. Is that something that goes beyond us, correct?

23 MR. CAREY: Correct. She'd have to request that
24 change, Carl, and even then we'd have to look at the specifics
25 of whether or not we would -- we would approve that. But the

1 question before us today is whether or not we would authorize
2 or recommend to the full commission to grant her request to
3 seek a retroactive change in retirement type. I think we can -
4 - we can't do that.

5 MR. CHISEM: Right. Okay. Yeah, I see the
6 dates and stuff. Yeah. Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: All right. We're on board
8 with this. We had a motion.

9 MR. CAREY: So, I'm not quite sure where Mr.
10 Krayeski is, but this is Mike Carey and I would move that the
11 subcommittee recommend to the full commission that they deny
12 Ms. Newman's request for a retroactive change in retirement
13 type based upon the specific fact pattern in this case.

14 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Is there a second?

15 MR. CHISEM: I'll second it. Carl.

16 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: All in favor say aye. Raise
17 your hand. Opposed, nay. Raise your hand. It's unanimous.
18 Okay.

19 MR. SEDROWSKI: Just before we move on, Mr.
20 Chairman, if I could -- just to specify, in the event that Ms.
21 Newman does submit a separate appeal for a change in retirement
22 date, post that temporary worker retirees point, if she does do
23 that, would she be permitted to also include a new version of
24 this alongside that with those facts? Or would this be subject
25 to reconsideration separately from the date of retirement

1 appeal?

2 MS. CIESLAK: This is Cindy. I think if she
3 wants to challenge just this decision, it would be a request
4 for reconsideration. If she wants to modify her request in any
5 way as long as it's okay with the chairman, I think we could
6 treat it as a new appeal. And then, you know, in the event
7 that's approved, she'll move on. In the event it's denied,
8 she'll be able to seek reconsideration from that appeal.

9 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay.

10 MR. SEDROWSKI: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: All right. We're all through
12 this one now, right?

13 MR. SEDROWSKI: Correct. Yes, sir.

14 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: All right. McBride.

15 MR. SEDROWSKI: All right. If everyone could
16 turn to page 12 on the PDF. Mr. Dwayne McBride is a MERS
17 retiree who initially applied for a November 12th, 2022 date of
18 retirement applying for a service connected disability under
19 the MERS statutes. His retirement application was completed
20 and submitted to the City of Bridgeport, his employing agency.

21 A timely delay in the submission of the
22 application itself to the retirement services division was
23 solely at the agency's error. The agency has supported this in
24 letter. It is Exhibit B on the document. The issue primarily
25 with this, aside from the agency error, is the delay in the

1 amount of time.

2 Originally it was submitted for November 12th,
3 2022. We did not receive it until December 22nd, 2023. As
4 such, he is now outside of his 12 month window for applying for
5 disability retirement benefits under MERS. However, should the
6 retirement commission approve the retroactive date of
7 retirement change back to his initially intended and submitted
8 date, then he would be squarely within that and would've no
9 issues.

10 MR. CHISEM: This is Carl. Clearly states --
11 clearly sees that it's not his fault, so, I would be in favor
12 of granting his retirement.

13 MR. CAREY: Carl, if you made that motion, I
14 would support that.

15 MR. KRAYESKI: Me too. Absolutely.

16 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Is there a motion?

17 MR. CHISEM: I'll make the motion.

18 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. What's the -- what's
19 the content of the motion now?

20 MR. CHISEM: Oh, because it was -- the delay was
21 not on his part, but it was on the City of Bridgeport. And
22 because it was 2023, December 22, '23, that they'd been given
23 to him was passed the window, but because it wasn't his fault
24 that he should be granted his retirement retroactive back to
25 the date that he first put it in. Is that what we're looking

1 for?

2 MR. CAREY: Carl, this is Mike. I'll second
3 that and you to clarify that we're recommending to the full
4 commission that we honor Mr. McBride's intended retirement date
5 of November 12th, 2022 as a result of agency error.

6 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. It has been moved and
7 seconded. Any further discussion? Hearing none. All in favor
8 say aye. Raise your hand. It's unanimous. The ayes have it.
9 Ralph Marone or Maroney.

10 MR. SEDROWSKI: Okay. Page 17 of the PDF is
11 where Mr. Marone's appeal begins. Mr. Marone has requested the
12 retirement commission permit him to make a -- not necessarily
13 an option change, however that is practically what would be
14 taking place. At the time that he retired in April 1, 2021, he
15 named a contingent annuitant under option B 50 percent a
16 Juliana Poulin.

17 At the time she was listed as fiance on his
18 documents. However, according to the documents that he has
19 submitted, as well as the statements of affirmation, they never
20 cohabited, they never co-mingled finances and their
21 relationship soured shortly thereafter.

22 However, pursuant to Connecticut General
23 statutes, an option is irrevocable and cannot be changed. Mr.
24 Marone has submitted mostly subjective materials in support of
25 his claim. As I had stated, it was the statement of

1 affirmation and then also the willingness of Ms. Poulin to
2 affirmatively decline survivorship benefits.

3 MR. KRAYESKI: I make a motion we deny the
4 request.

5 MR. CAREY: I would second Mr. Krayeski's
6 motion.

7 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. Any further
8 discussion? Hearing none. All in favor say aye. Raise your
9 hand. It's unanimous. The ayes have it. Okay. Gary Soules.

10 MR. SEDROWSKI: Mr. Gary Soules is also a -- or
11 is a MERS employee who has been separated from MERS service
12 since 2015. He has raised this appeal to make an untimely
13 application to purchase his military time or his prior military
14 service before he started working for the Town of Oxford in
15 March of 2007.

16 His main support for this claim is that his
17 initial agency did not inform him of his ability to purchase
18 it, nor the one-year deadline associated with the purchase. In
19 support of that he has also submitted through his attorney, Mr.
20 Zim -- or Attorney Zimberlin, two separate letters, one from a
21 officer Luke Ramirez, and then another from a retired MERS
22 employee from the Town of Oxford, who was previously a
23 bookkeeper with their police department.

24 Both of the letters as well as his statement all
25 assert that the Town of Oxford did not inform anyone in regards

1 to their purchase opportunities at the time. They cite issues
2 regarding human resources and the lack thereof. I've been
3 unable to get any confirmation regarding the amount of
4 information that was provided to him back in 2007 when he
5 initially began work in the municipality. So, as it stands to
6 now, this is before the commission.

7 MR. CAREY: Ben, this is Mike. Do we know -- I
8 don't know what the -- I guess the basic question I have is
9 regarding the Town of Oxford, do we have record of other cases
10 that would be kind of contemporaneous, where people,
11 individuals did purchase military time?

12 I don't know if their -- you know, number of a
13 new hire -- the volume would kind of allow for that, but I'd be
14 interested to know if there's anyone similarly situated and if
15 indeed they purchased their prior military service in a timely
16 way.

17 MR. SEDROWSKI: I'm not aware of that off the
18 top of my head, sir. However, I can bring that information to
19 light at the next meeting if we would like to table it or if it
20 -- we wouldn't like to now move on.

21 MR. CAREY: Well, Ben, you also mentioned that
22 you were -- you were looking for some verification and I don't
23 know if that's because you're just not going to get it or if
24 they're just delaying getting it to you. So, I think there are
25 a couple of reasons where I would like to see this tabled for

1 future consideration.

2 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. That's a motion.

3 MR. CAREY: So, I'll make that motion. So, this
4 is Mike Carey. I move that in the Soules' matter, that the
5 subcommittee table pending receipt of additional information
6 and bring the matter up at our next scheduled meeting.

7 MR. CHISEM: Carl Chisem. I'll second that.

8 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. All in favor, say aye
9 and raise your hand. Unanimous. The ayes have it. Justin, is
10 it Clachrie?

11 MR. SEDROWSKI: I believe it's Clachrie.

12 MS. CIESLAK: Mr. Chairman

13 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Clachrie? Yeah.

14 MS. CIESLAK: I apologize for the interruption.
15 This is Cindy Cieslak. I will just note that when we
16 reconsider this matter, Mr. Soules, we should also evaluate the
17 timeliness of the appeal.

18 MR. CAREY: Okay. Thank you, Cindy.

19 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay.

20 MR. SEDROWSKI: Mr. Clachrie. If you turn to
21 Page 38 of the PDF please, his appeal starts there. Mr. Justin
22 Clachrie is requesting the commission to allow him to purchase
23 all of his CMERS time and transfer that into the State
24 Employee's Retirement System. The issue is that he is vested
25 in his CMERS pension and in accordance with plan provisions is

1 unable to divest from CMERS in order to purchase that time in
2 SERS.

3 His assertions in support of his appeal are that
4 during his transition, CMERS had informed him, somebody within
5 the office had informed him that he would be able to take all
6 of his service as well as his contributions and move them
7 directly over. They did not make any caveat on vesting status
8 or anything in those regards.

9 Additionally, he states that because the tier 3
10 summary plan description says that he can receive unlimited
11 amounts of time from MERS and SERS, that the fact that he
12 vested this CMERS pension does not necessarily preclude him
13 from being able to transfer that into SERS.

14 Regarding his two assertions, I would say that I
15 was unable to have any record of the conversation found with
16 CMERS. He did not provide an individual or a point of contact
17 directly who he spoke with. I do not have an email chain that
18 I can provide where we had provided that information to him.

19 Additionally, I would say that even if he did
20 receive the bad information, it's common and consistent that
21 incorrect information provided does not supersede law.
22 Regarding the tier 3 summary plan description it does make that
23 comment specifically about the unlimited credited service.

24 However, I once again would turn to the MERS
25 plan provisions where it provides that once you have vested

1 that benefit, you are unable to remove your contributions from
2 that system and divest from that system. As such, our esteemed
3 administratively denied the application due to his vested
4 status in MERS.

5 MR. CAREY: He's vested in MERS. I think we
6 have to -- this is Mike Carey, I move that we deny Mr.
7 Clachrie's request and recommend that the commission deny the
8 request to permit him to transfer his service in CMERS to SERS.

9 MR. CHISEM: Carl, I second.

10 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Any further discussion?
11 Hearing none. All in favor say aye and raise your hand. It's
12 unanimous. The ayes have it. Okay. Speight.

13 MR. SEDROWSKI: Page 46 of the PDF is where Ms.
14 Speight's appeal begins. Ms. Speight is a longtime state
15 employee as well as municipal employee who has been a member of
16 the Teacher's Retirement System for approximately 21 years at
17 both the municipal and the state level.

18 Regarding her state employment, she first began
19 in state employment effective August, 2010, at which point she
20 did elect to participate in TRS. She works as a part-time
21 lecturer, and she has consistently worked spring and fall
22 semesters periodically from 2010 through 2023.

23 Every single one of those semesters, she did
24 continue to participate in TRS. However, in the summer of
25 2023, she decided to take a part-time job, seasonal at DEEP, at

1 which point she was then forced to participate in the SERS tier
2 4 plan because TRS is ineligible for that position. At what
3 point she then transferred plans and upon rehire in the fall
4 semester, she was informed by this division that she was unable
5 to return to TRS because of the transfer into the SERS tier 4
6 position.

7 MR. CHISEM: Wow.

8 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah. Wow. This is Dave
9 Krayeski. And I'm going to ask you to educate me here, Ben,
10 because I need a little help on this. So -- and theoretically,
11 all of her TRS time, what would happen with that? All that
12 transfers into SERS?

13 MR. SEDROWSKI: At the state level? No. So, it
14 would remain within TRS. Her primary position is the municipal
15 public school teaching. So, that's where she's been retaining
16 her, or gaining her service credit. She's been essentially
17 kind of packing FAE with the additional wages from the PTL
18 time. That would all remain in TRS. It's everything post that
19 summer position. For argument --

20 MR. KRAYESKI: So, even if she went back to work
21 for a town or municipality, which wouldn't be a normal TRS
22 contributing position, it now goes into SERS?

23 MR. SEDROWSKI: No. No. So, at the municipal
24 level, she would -- she's still required to participate in TRS.
25 There's a separation between the two. So, if it's solely at

1 the municipal level, it is distinct from SERS and the SERS
2 would not impact it, so to speak.

3 MR. KRAYESKI: So, level 2 of the question,
4 we're going to hopefully get it -- get to the -- I'm going to
5 grind through this. But if she wanted to be a part-time
6 lecturer at a (inaudible) community college or something like
7 that, that would go into SERS now because of this choice she
8 made to do a summer at a state park?

9 MR. SEDROWSKI: That's how it has resulted.
10 Correct. She was rehired as a PTL in the fall of '23,
11 following her employment with DEEP, and was informed that she
12 was now required to be in tier 4 because of that plan change.

13 So, essentially, she worked for 20 days and was
14 forced into a plan that she hadn't been advised about and now
15 does not have access to TRS. So, she is requesting that she be
16 permitted to return to TRS and divest the service contributions
17 for that portion of employment as error.

18 MR. KRAYESKI: I'm going to guess the DEEP
19 probably didn't explain any of that when she was hired as a,
20 you know, life guard for the summer or park attendant,
21 whatever.

22 MR. SEDROWSKI: Correct. I also fail to believe
23 that they - even if the question was presented in the manner,
24 like, you know, I'm in TRS, how would this impact my
25 retirement, you know, choices? I do not believe the agency

1 would be able to answer that. So, I think -- I think that even
2 in a perfect world, there's a debate about whether or not she
3 would even be able to receive the counseling that she'd require
4 because of how much of an outline situation this is.

5 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah. I mean, I've been around a
6 couple weeks. I'm not sure I would've picked up on that
7 either. So, Carl, don't make fun of my couple weeks.

8 MR. CHISEM: No comment. Yeah, that's a bad
9 deal here.

10 MR. CAREY: Yeah, it's a bad deal. So, I think
11 it sounds to me that where we're landing is, we're sympathetic.
12 We don't like that this happened to this person, but, you know,
13 legally do we have the authority to do something like this?
14 And I'm not sure about that.

15 MR. KRAYESKI: Yep. All right. Cindy, what can
16 we do?

17 MS. MCGARRITY: Yeah, Cindy -- this is Virginia
18 McGarrity. Cindy, if you want to -- well, I'll invite Cindy to
19 chime in. Just a couple of questions and maybe, Ben, you can
20 confirm this but my understanding is, with respect to the
21 initial election forms, like when you enter TRS, I believe it
22 includes in the retirement information disclaimers there, that
23 if you elect TRS and are subsequently employed in a position
24 and knowledgeable for participation in the plans, you
25 automatically begin participation in SERS; is that correct?

1 MR. SEDROWSKI: That is correct, yes. On the
2 931.

3 MS. MCGARRITY: Yeah, okay.

4 MR. SEDROWSKI: I will state though, I'm just
5 bringing it up real quick. I don't believe it's on the
6 standard 931 and it's only on the higher ed one. But let me
7 just confirm. So, on her initial CO-931 that she completed
8 back in 2010 when she first started, it's on Page 49 of the
9 PDF, it does not have that language included on her original
10 one.

11 MS. MCGARRITY: Okay. And might she -- oh,
12 sorry, go ahead.

13 MR. SEDROWSKI: I was just confirming on the one
14 that she signed for DEEP. Apologies.

15 MS. MCGARRITY: Yep.

16 MR. SEDROWSKI: Yep. And so on Page 50 of
17 Exhibit C you'll see under B, employees with prior state
18 service. Employees with prior state service must rejoin their
19 retirement plan unless the employee is hired into a position
20 ineligible for participation in their prior plan. So, yes,
21 that's consistent.

22 MS. MCGARRITY: And is she able to use her time
23 in SERS to purchase TRS service?

24 MR. SEDROWSKI: So that I'm not aware of
25 specifically for the requirements on when you can purchase non-

1 teaching time with TRS. I know the provisions do exist and
2 that people do routinely do that. I'm not sure what the actual
3 guardrails on there are. Whether or not it needs to be
4 sandwiched with TRS time, so on and so forth, I'm not sure.
5 However, to my knowledge, she is still actively employed at
6 that municipality in TRS for her day job. And is still
7 receiving full-time credit there. It's just the night PTL
8 earnings that are a question here.

9 MR. CAREY: That was a great question, Virginia.
10 I don't know if Cindy has anything to add, but I think do we --
11 find -- getting an answer to that question would be very
12 valuable to us, I think.

13 MS. CIESLAK: This is Cindy. I was just going
14 to comment that this sounds like it might be appropriate if we
15 table it for a legal opinion.

16 MR. CAREY: It's Mike Carey. So, moved.

17 MR. CHISEM: Carl, second.

18 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. All in favor say aye.
19 Raise your hand. Unanimous. The ayes have it. Okay. Great.
20 Motion to adjourn.

21 MR. KRAYESKI: Dave Krayeski. I make a motion
22 we adjourn.

23 MR. CHISEM: Carl Chisem, I second.

24 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. All in favor raise
25 your hand. The ayes have it.

1 MR. KRAYESKI: Hey, Ben, could you hang on for
2 one second?

3 MR. SEDROWSKI: Yes, sir.

4 MR. KRAYESKI: All right. I just want to ask
5 you a quick question.

6 MR. SEDROWSKI: Yep.

7 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Thanks, everybody.

8 MS. CIESLAK: Have a good weekend.

9 (Adjourned at 9:15 a.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



A Plus Reporting, LLC

55 Whiting Street, Suite 1A

Plainville, CT 06062

203-269-9976

scheduling@aplusreportingservice.com

I certify that this document is a true and accurate description
of the proceedings obtained from the recorded conversations
contained in the listed audio file.

Boden Truitt

Boden Truitt,

Transcriber