

1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2 STATE EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT COMMISSION
3 PURCHASE OF SERVICE AND RELATED MATTERS SUBCOMMITTEE
4

5 DATE: February 3, 2026

6 LOCATION: VIA ZOOM
7

8 Present:

9 Peter Adomeit, Chairman

10 John Disette, Trustee

11 Michael Carey, Trustee

12 David Krayeski, Trustee
13

14 Others Present:

15 Benjamin Sedrowski, Retirement Services Division

16 Robin Kallor, General Counsel to the Commission
17

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 (Proceedings began at 9:03 a.m.)

2 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: This is the State Employees'
3 Retirement Commission Purchase of Service and
4 Related Matters Subcommittee being held remotely
5 using Zoom technology. Can we have the attendance?

6 (Attendance not recorded)

7 Motion, please, to approve the agenda.

8 MR. DISETTE: I'll make that motion. John
9 Disette, I make the motion to approve the agenda as
10 amended. Is that how we're going to phrase this?

11 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Yeah.

12 MR. CAREY: This is Mike Carey. I'll second
13 that, with the note that, in conjunction with the
14 approval, we will move to table Chance, Wilson, and
15 Tapia from this month's agenda.

16 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. Do we have a second?

17 MR. KRAYESKI: David Kraveski, second.

18 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. All in favor, say aye
19 or raise your hand. Opposed nay or raise your hand.
20 It's always unanimous. The ayes have it.

21 Okay, New Business. We will start on Part One
22 then, Johnny Giustino. Ben?

23 MR. SEDROWSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is Ben
24 Sedrowski from the Retirement Services Division.

25 Mr. Johnny Giustino is at page 14 of your Part

1 One packet. Mr. Giustino has requested the
2 Commission permit an application to purchase his
3 prior military service past the one-year deadline
4 that's associated.

5 This is similar to a lot of the claims we've
6 seen. He's asserted that he was not informed of his
7 purchase rights when he had his initial date of hire
8 in 2024, and then that was complicated by a serious
9 injury that he incurred during his initial training
10 at academy, which then caused him to essentially go
11 out on leave for an extended period for medical
12 treatment and then return and reclass following that
13 later in 2024.

14 He makes the assertion that he did not learn
15 about the purchase rights until around February of
16 2025, in which case he then submitted the final
17 application.

18 He was initially hired in 2024, as I stated,
19 and we had that initial entry. However, contrary to
20 what he asserts in his appeal, he actually did apply
21 upon his initial date of hire. He did at both
22 points where he initially classed up and then upon
23 that second class up as well later on in 2024.

24 Upon both of those times, RSD did invoice him
25 for both of those periods and did issue the invoice

1 alongside a letter that informed him that, in the
2 event he did not elect it, he would be permanently
3 forfeiting the purchase.

4 Following the 2024 applications and invoices,
5 as I stated, after 2025 he then did submit one more,
6 and that is the one that was then denied again and
7 where the appeal arises from that final denial.

8 MR. KRAYESKI: Ben, I'm sorry, I'm flipping
9 through the documents real quick. When did he
10 return to work?

11 MR. SEDROWSKI: So, September 2024 is the date
12 that I have listed, but I will just double check to
13 make sure he was on payroll at the same time.

14 MR. DISETTE: Yeah.

15 MR. SEDROWSKI: During the period he was out on
16 workers' comp, if I'm not mistaken, during the
17 injury, and then when he came back.

18 MR. KRAYESKI: Okay, so he never was off the
19 payroll. It's not like he resigned. He was on
20 workers' comp?

21 MR. SEDROWSKI: That is what I am double
22 checking, just to be sure. But that is my
23 understanding, correct. I do not believe that he
24 terminated at any point in the middle.

25 MR. KRAYESKI: Okay.

1 MR. CAREY: I thought I saw a line in the core
2 record, Ben, that said separation--

3 MR. SEDROWSKI: Okay.

4 MR. KRAYESKI: That's what I thought you had
5 said earlier.

6 MR. SEDROWSKI: All right, yeah, and that's why
7 I'm bringing it up, just to be sure so I'm not
8 tripping on my words.

9 MR. KRAYESKI: That's okay.

10 MR. DISETTE: Ben, help me out a little bit.

11 MR. SEDROWSKI: Yes, sir.

12 MR. DISETTE: Looking at his history here, it
13 looks like he requested to pay the military service
14 several times. Is there a reason he would do that?

15 MR. SEDROWSKI: Based on what he had stated in
16 his appeal, my understanding would be upon each time
17 that he classed up for academy that they would have
18 initiated those documents and that would push
19 forward. However, that is just me speculating. I
20 don't know for a fact. I do know that if they...
21 I'm sorry, go ahead.

22 MR. DISETTE: Is each time that he levels up,
23 is that considered a new hire? Like is that an
24 opportunity for him to reapply?

25 MR. SEDROWSKI: No, not for the military

1 purchase. It's very specific, and "commencement of
2 state service" is what it uses. So it's one year
3 from commencement.

4 MR. DISETTE: So there's no break in service
5 between finishing academy and then getting a job?

6 MR. SEDROWSKI: Nope.

7 MR. DISETTE: No?

8 MR. SEDROWSKI: I will confirm, though, he did
9 resign. There was a resignation in good standing in
10 between the -- so March of 2024 and then rehired
11 September of 2024. So upon that rehire, that's
12 where we see that second application come in.

13 MR. CAREY: This is Mike Carey. So, he was
14 hired in January, something happened. There was a -
15 - he was injured, and for some reason the core
16 record shows a resignation in March. He comes back
17 into service in September and then reapplies for the
18 purchase at that time. Is that a fair assessment?

19 MR. SEDROWSKI: That's correct.

20 MR. CAREY: I'm interested to see what the
21 other Trustees would think. I think I would say,
22 given the particulars of this matter, particularly
23 the fact that he was injured very shortly after
24 becoming employed and there seems to be a consistent
25 interest and stated interest on the part of the

1 individual to apply for the purchase, and he did so
2 immediately upon being employed in the first place
3 and then upon being either re-employed or
4 reinstated. Given the facts, I might look -- I
5 think I would probably look favorably on permission
6 to proceed with purchase. What do the other
7 Trustees think?

8 MR. KRAYESKI: So, two things that struck me
9 about this situation is that he did get invoiced.

10 MR. DISETTE: He did get...

11 MR. KRAYESKI: He got invoiced. He got -- they
12 gave him the ability to purchase it, and he did not.
13 Is that accurate, Ben?

14 MR. SEDROWSKI: He did not elect the purchase.
15 That's correct.

16 MR. KRAYESKI: Correct. So he actually did
17 apply. They sent him a letter saying, here's what
18 you owe, and he never did it. So -- go ahead.

19 MR. CAREY: So, that would have been the time
20 while he was out after having been injured, though,
21 right? I think.

22 MR. KRAYESKI: No, I think he was back to work
23 when he got invoiced. Let me get back here. Hang
24 on a second.

25 MR. SEDROWSKI: So, there's two separate points

1 that he was invoiced. So, there is an initial
2 invoice that was mailed out in February of 2024, so
3 that would coincide with that initial, you know,
4 injury date that he states. Later on, when we
5 received that second application in September of
6 2024, we issued a letter and an invoice in October
7 of 2024. So, generally speaking, if anyone is still
8 within that one-year deadline when they come back
9 forward, if there is an expired invoice, we would
10 then reprocess that for them. So that is what
11 happened here.

12 MR. KRAYESKI: So I guess the area where we
13 might have some flexibility here, for lack of a
14 better term, because there generally is not a lot of
15 flexibility in these situations, is that injury.
16 I'm not sure if it was on the job or off the job and
17 just a very, very short duration for which he worked
18 before he went back out. And would we consider in
19 this particular situation, because of the odd nature
20 of it, that we would give him the one year from
21 September, which would have given him the window to
22 do that, versus sticking with the initial hire date
23 where he got injured a couple months later. And
24 that, to me, seems like the only path out of this.
25 But that also does bump up against our folks that,

1 you know, work a very short period of time and put
2 in for a purchase and then never follow through,
3 even though they don't work anymore. So we have to
4 be a little cautious about that precedent here,
5 because that would really bump up against our
6 history of not allowing people who have a break in
7 service to purchase this time if they don't follow
8 through.

9 MR. DISETTE: I'm okay with that, Dave. Just
10 for clarity, Ben, did he timely respond from his
11 second hire within one year from the September hire?
12 Did he timely respond?

13 MR. SEDROWSKI: So, he didn't -- he did not
14 respond in affirmative election to authorize the
15 purchase in any of the instances. So, the February
16 date would still be within the one-year date if we
17 use the September date from the date of hire, and
18 then so would the September application itself.
19 However, he never did authorize the purchase after
20 the invoice. So this is another one where the
21 application itself was actually valid originally,
22 however, because they did not elect that purchase,
23 it expired, and then they lapsed on their deadline,
24 and they're left without an election at this point.

25 MR. CAREY: So, Ben, this is Mike. So, again,

1 when he came back into state service in September,
2 he was invoiced again at that point in time?

3 MR. SEDROWSKI: Yes.

4 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah, in October.

5 MR. CAREY: And then he failed to respond then
6 -- again?

7 MR. KRAYESKI: Mm hmm. Yep.

8 MR. DISETTE: But at that point he only had
9 four months left to respond, right? Four or five
10 months to respond?

11 MR. SEDROWSKI: Because his one year --

12 MR. KRAYESKI: October to January.

13 MR. SEDROWSKI: Within the one year -- correct.
14 Yes. Because the clock would have been running from
15 that initial date of hire, so we wouldn't have, you
16 know, taken into account that separation and, you
17 know, reclassified it for that date of hire. The
18 Purchasing Unit would have went strictly off the
19 initial commencement.

20 MR. CAREY: I missed that before. He was
21 invoiced twice and had time. I think perhaps he's
22 out of luck.

23 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah, that's the difficulty, is
24 that we have these folks that we hire for four or
25 five months, we invoice them, they separate, and

1 then they come back a year later; they never
2 purchase it. And we would be changing our -- that's
3 the point that I was trying to make -- we would be
4 changing our precedent on those situations, which
5 we've been pretty consistent on with this particular
6 situation. That's my concern with it.

7 MR. DISETTE: And I'm just looking to see if we
8 can even grant him some confusion. In other words,
9 he maybe knew the one year rule and since he was
10 rehired in September, he acted upon that September
11 date rather than the proper February date. And Ben,
12 what I'm hearing is he still didn't meet that?

13 MR. SEDROWSKI: So, it's the tripping up on the
14 difference between the application deadline versus
15 the authorization for the purchase once you've
16 applied, I think, right? So, he very clearly did
17 apply within the one year deadline, twice, and was
18 invoiced twice. It's just he did not elect within
19 that one year deadline nor the expiration dates that
20 extend a little bit past that. So, if you apply,
21 you know, right at the end of your 12 month
22 deadline, you have, you know, the expiration
23 purchase of the window of the invoice when you
24 receive it because your application was still valid.
25 So, that would be an instance where, you know, had

1 he acted on the invoice that had happened in
2 September, he would have been able to elect that,
3 say, you know, immediately thereafter, but he did
4 not.

5 MR. KRAYESKI: So, Ben, really quick, the
6 letter that you sent him in October, does that
7 clearly state when he has to purchase by? And is it
8 the accurate date? Not -- I'm not looking for
9 anything here, John.

10 MR. SEDROWSKI: Mm hmm.

11 MR. KRAYESKI: It just -- does it have a --
12 does it toggle off that September date -- it goes
13 back to the January date of hire? Yes?

14 MR. SEDROWSKI: So the invoice itself actually
15 has a separate distinct expiration date on it of 12,
16 8, 2024. So that's actually just two months or 60
17 days after whenever the invoice was issued. And
18 that's more of an administrative procedure just to
19 make sure that we're still following through on the
20 purchases.

21 MR. KRAYESKI: Okay.

22 MR. SEDROWSKI: In regards to the letter
23 itself, it does, and this is the paragraph I cite in
24 the second page of my write up as well, where it
25 says, "Failure to respond by the expiration date

1 indicated on the invoice will result in your
2 permanent forfeiture", so that was included in both
3 the February letter invoice as well as the October
4 one.

5 MR. KRAYESKI: Not sure I can get around this
6 one.

7 MR. DISETTE: Nope. Tried.

8 MR. KRAYESKI: I did. I tried. I tried.

9 MR. CAREY: This is Mike. Do we want to do
10 motions as we go along or wait till the very end?

11 MR. KRAYESKI: Let's do them as we go along.

12 MR. CAREY: That was my thought.

13 MR. DISETTE: Yep.

14 MR. KRAYESKI: I'm getting old. I can't
15 remember.

16 MR. DISETTE: Long list too.

17 MR. KRAYESKI: I know.

18 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Is there a motion on...

19 MR. CAREY: Mr. Chairman, this is Mike Carey.
20 I'll make the motion in the Guistino matter. I move
21 that the Subcommittee recommend that the Commission
22 deny the request and not grant permission for his
23 application for prior military purchase past the one
24 year deadline.

25 MR. KRAYESKI: This is David Krayeski. I'll

1 second that motion.

2 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Any further discussion?

3 Okay, hearing none, all in favor say aye or raise
4 your hand. Opposed nay or raise your hand. I think
5 it's unanimous. The ayes have it. Thank you.

6 Okay, the next one is Jessica Gossett.

7 MR. SEDROWSKI: Ms. Gossett is on page three of
8 Part One. And she is actually a very similarly
9 situated individual that you were referring to a
10 moment ago in regards that she was employed during
11 her first year, and during her first year the
12 position was dissolved and the funding was taken
13 from it, and therefore she was not active when the
14 purchase invoice did get issued further out.

15 So, she was originally hired in December of
16 2022. Following that, she does submit a timely
17 application similar to our previous case. RSD then
18 invoices her a month later in 2023, in January, and
19 then, you know, advises her in that letter as well
20 of that permanent forfeiture as well as the one year
21 deadline. She does not elect this purchase
22 throughout that year. She does terminate at the end
23 of 2023, so she does have that full year of service
24 coming up, right to that end. She is then separated
25 from service until 2025, where she's rehired into

1 it, and she submits an additional military purchase
2 application. RSD then denied that as being
3 untimely, as being more than one year out, and this
4 appeal arose from that.

5 MR. KRAYESKI: So, Ben, she had a full year on
6 the job, correct? 12-28-22 to 12-30-23, correct?

7 MR. SEDROWSKI: Mm hmm. That's correct.

8 MR. KRAYESKI: Okay.

9 MR. DISETTE: A solid 11 months.

10 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah. Yep.

11 MR. DISETTE: And didn't act on it.

12 MR. KRAYESKI: And didn't act on it.

13 MR. DISETTE: Yep.

14 MR. SEDROWSKI: She does make -- I will say
15 that she does make a point in her appeal to state
16 that she was under the impression that it was a
17 five-year funded position, so the termination of the
18 position early was unexpected. However, that would
19 not supersede the one-year deadline as it is.

20 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah, unfortunately. I think we
21 end up in the same position we were just in.

22 MR. DISETTE: Agreed.

23 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Is there a motion?

24 MR. KRAYESKI: Mr. Chairman, this is David
25 Krayeski, I make a motion that we deny the request

1 from Jessica Gossett.

2 MR. CAREY: Carey, second.

3 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Any further discussion?
4 Hearing none, all in favor say aye or raise your
5 hand. Opposed nay or raise your hand. It's
6 unanimous, the ayes have it.

7 Next is Susan Langley.

8 MR. SEDROWSKI: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9 Ms. Langley is at page 27 of the Part One packet.
10 Ms. Langley has requested that the Retirement
11 Commission permit her a new retirement plan election
12 to move from the 5% employee contribution tier of
13 ARP to the 6.5% employee rate following a change in
14 service or a change in employment that she had.

15 She was originally hired by the University of
16 Connecticut as a post-doc research associate back in
17 May of 2020. At that time, they did not have a
18 retirement plan election available to them.
19 However, later on, that UAW contract did go into
20 place and it was retroactive for her. When that
21 retroactive retirement plan placement came into
22 play, she did elect that in December of 2021 and
23 then has been participating in the post-doc ARP plan
24 ever since.

25 Following this, in October of 2025, she was

1 promoted to a different position that's a nonpost-
2 doc position, so it is eligible for standard ARP.
3 However, that does not in and of itself grant a new
4 retirement plan election because the prior plan is
5 still binding on her new position because it is
6 eligible for that plan.

7 MR. DISETTE: Do we have any latitude to do
8 this?

9 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah, I don't know of any.

10 MR. CAREY: I don't think so.

11 MR. KRAYESKI: I don't have any. There's not
12 even an angle for us to address this that I'm aware
13 of.

14 MR. DISETTE: She's in a pension plan. The
15 pension plan still exists for her.

16 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah.

17 MR. DISETTE: It's gotta stay, right?

18 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah.

19 MR. SEDROWSKI: And because of the different
20 contract -- apologies, go ahead.

21 ATTORNEY KALLOR: Sorry, just a reminder to say
22 your name before you speak.

23 MR. KRAYESKI: Thank you, Robin.

24 MR. DISETTE: It's not Robin, her name is Dave.
25 Come on. He's lying to you now. And that was Mike

1 saying that.

2 MR. KRAYESKI: Thank you, John. This is Dave.
3 I don't necessarily see, other than a desire, any
4 way to make the change that's requested. I would
5 make a motion, Mr. Chairman, unless we hear
6 differently, to deny the request from Ms. Langley.

7 MR. DISETTE: I mean, there is no latitude,
8 right?

9 MR. SEDROWSKI: Correct.

10 MR. DISETTE: Because Tier I was around when I
11 started. If we could do this, I'd like to
12 retroactively change mine as well.

13 MR. KRAYESKI: This is Dave Krayeski. I also
14 was a summer worker in 1982, but I'm not Tier I
15 either, so.

16 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay, we have a motion. Do
17 we have a second?

18 MR. CAREY: David, this is Mike. David made
19 the motion, and I'll second it, to deny.

20 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: All right. All in favor,
21 say aye or raise your hand. Opposed nay or rise
22 your hand. It's unanimous, the ayes have it.

23 Okay. Marisol Salaman. How do I say that?

24 MR. SEDROWSKI: I believe it's Salaman.

25 This is Ben Sedrowski. Marisol Salaman is at

1 page 31 of the Part One packet.

2 Ms. Salaman has requested that the Retirement
3 Commission permit her to be placed back into Tier
4 III instead of her placement into Tier IV that she
5 has been corrected into.

6 Ms. Salaman was originally hired back in 2015,
7 in February on the 20th, at which time she did elect
8 to participate -- or did elect to become a member of
9 the Tier III Retirement Plan. She then worked for a
10 few months and then terminated in August of 2015.

11 Following her termination, she did take a
12 refund of her contributions and interest in October
13 of 2015, so she did clear her Tier III out -- her
14 Tier III account out at the time that she did
15 separate from service, and then she did have a break
16 in service through 2020.

17 She was rehired in August of 2020, and at that
18 time, she did have a permanent break in service, as
19 she had been out of state service for over five
20 years and had not vested prior to that. And her
21 vesting service prior to leaving was also less than
22 5.

23 Upon rehire, however, she was mistakenly placed
24 back into Tier III. She then continued to
25 participate in Tier III until there was a change in

1 employment, at which case it prompted a new
2 enrollment case on our end in 2024. We identified
3 it, contacted the agency in February, and initiated
4 the process to change tiers and correct her to Tier
5 IV.

6 In September and October of 2025, RSD did
7 contact her via letter, one for the defined benefits
8 contribution and one for the defined contribution
9 missed portion to correct both of those deficiencies
10 in those accounts for the difference between the
11 Tier III contributions she had been making and the
12 Tier IV contributions that were mandatory for her.

13 Ms. Salaman then contacted us for further
14 clarification. We responded via email, and that's
15 that detailed attachment from Ryan Morrissey. And
16 she then filed this appeal following that.

17 To that point, she had a permanent break in
18 service, and as such, she's properly placed, as the
19 Division sees it, in accordance with SERS plan
20 provisions, as she was over that five years. And
21 then in addition to that, she had fully refunded all
22 of her contributions and interest, so there was no
23 residual in the fund at the time that she did return
24 as well. So both of those facts, the Division did
25 administratively deny her request to return to Tier

1 III.

2 MR. KRAYESKI: This is David Krayeski. We have
3 a couple of pending CBAC grievances that concern the
4 issue of the permanent break in service and the
5 first hired language in CBAC 2017 that are making
6 their way through the system. This may or may not
7 be covered under those CBAC grievances. And the
8 reason that I say that is because she took actual
9 refund. I do not believe that the grievances that
10 we have pending would consider Ms. Salaman similarly
11 situated, but one option that we could consider is
12 tabling this pending an outcome to those grievances
13 as an option.

14 MR. SEDROWSKI: In the event -- this is Ben
15 Sedrowski, in the event that the subcommittee did
16 make that recommendation, would it also make the
17 recommendation that she maintain Tier IV membership
18 during this period while everything is pending?

19 MR. KRAYESKI: Yes. David Krayeski.

20 MR. DISETTE: How would you phrase that again,
21 though, Dave?

22 MR. KRAYESKI: Well, I think what we would do
23 is hold this case kind of in abeyance pending the
24 outcome of some CBAC grievances regarding the
25 designation of Tier IV and the 2017 language about

1 first hired. There's a disagreement between the
2 parties about what that actually means and whether
3 or not the permanent break language applies or does
4 not apply. So, we have to resolve those grievances,
5 probably as part of the CBAC negotiations that we're
6 working on right now.

7 MR. CAREY: So -- so this is Mike. In this
8 case, then, we would say that -- where would she
9 stay in the interim?

10 MR. KRAYESKI: Tier IV.

11 MR. CAREY: So, you know, understanding that
12 she may be able to access remedy through that
13 grievance process where, you know, the question
14 before us is whether or not she's properly placed in
15 Tier IV.

16 MR. KRAYESKI: Got it. Got it.

17 MR. CAREY: Right? And I think the answer to
18 that question is yes.

19 MR. KRAYESKI: Yes.

20 MR. CAREY: You know, unfortunately, an error
21 was made, but she is properly placed. We could just
22 note that she might be eligible for remedy should
23 that grievance resolve.

24 MR. KRAYESKI: Based on the resolution.
25 There's no guarantee. If we resolve it --

1 MR. CAREY: Correct.

2 MR. KRAYESKI: The way the resolution is
3 written may or may not solve this issue.

4 MR. CAREY: It's kind of a footnote. Again,
5 the question is, well, is she properly placed? And
6 maybe we just leave it at that.

7 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah, this is David Krayeski. I
8 think our consistent application has been laid out,
9 is to apply the permanent break language, and then I
10 do also believe that the refund of her contributions
11 also is a contributing factor for the proper
12 placement at this point in time as well.

13 MR. CAREY: Great. So this is Mike Carey. In
14 the matter of Marisol Salaman, I move that the
15 Subcommittee recommend that the Commission rule that
16 Ms. Salaman is properly placed in Tier IV and that
17 her request to return to Tier III be denied.

18 MR. DISETTE: John Disette, I'll second that.

19 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Any further discussion?
20 Hearing none, all in favor say aye or raise your
21 hand. Opposed nay or raise your hand. It's
22 unanimous. The ayes have it.

23 Okay, Part Two. Amy Butler.

24 MR. KRAYESKI: Hang on. Let me get to my other
25 PDF here, Mr. Chairman.

1 MR. DISETTE: We're on PDF Two?

2 MR. KRAYESKI: I think so. That's what Part Two
3 is, PDF Two, right Mr. Chairman?

4 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: I have a different -- I'm
5 using --

6 MR. KRAYESKI: Oh, you're using something else?

7 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Yeah.

8 MR. DISETTE: Okay.

9 MR. SEDROWSKI: Yeah. Part Two is the second
10 one, though. Yes.

11 MR. KRAYESKI: Thank you.

12 MR. SEDROWSKI: Amy Butler should be page one.

13 MR. DISETTE: Got it. Yeah.

14 MR. KRAYESKI: All right. Here's Part Two,
15 thank you.

16 MR. SEDROWSKI: Okay. This is Ben Sedrowski,
17 and as I stated, Ms. Butler's appeal begins at page
18 one of the Part Two packet. Ms. Butler has
19 requested that the Retirement Commission allow her
20 to waive retirement plan membership in lieu of the
21 default placement into ARP that she has been entered
22 into from her employing agency, as she did not
23 submit an affirmative waiver prior to or on her
24 first initial date of employment.

25 She has requested this on the basis that she

1 was unable to print the necessary forms timely, and
2 as such, she wasn't able to actually convey her
3 forms to the employing agency. And she also did
4 believe that she had properly conveyed that intent
5 to waive retirement plan membership through her
6 discussion with Joanna, as well as the email string
7 that is cited in Exhibit B.

8 To the case history itself, Ms. Butler was
9 first hired January 20th, 2026. It's a very fresh
10 case. She was hired as an adjunct faculty member,
11 part time at UConn, and as such, she was entitled to
12 either waive retirement plan membership or elect to
13 participate in ARP. At that time, she did not make
14 an affirmative election to waive, and therefore she
15 was defaulted into ARP. UConn advised her of that
16 on the 21st, the day after. Following that, Ms.
17 Butler submitted this appeal to SERC.

18 MR. KRAYESKI: Ben, what would be the -- what
19 would be the harm to allowing her to not elect a
20 retirement --

21 MR. SEDROWSKI: Or to waive retirement?

22 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah, yeah.

23 MR. SEDROWSKI: I mean, so, the default
24 placement is the ARP plan as it is, right?

25 MR. KRAYESKI: Right.

1 MR. SEDROWSKI: So it's more employee-centered
2 on the risk as it is, with liabilities, so on and so
3 forth. So, to that end, I would, you know, I would
4 say I can't really make a distinguishing claim as to
5 what would be the best course of action, whether or
6 not, however, allowing her to waive in this instance
7 because of it -- I will note there were multiple
8 emails where she does say even prior to her date of
9 hire -- so if you go back down that email string,
10 January 15th -- she informs UConn that she doesn't
11 believe that she would want to open a retirement
12 account for such a short period of employment, and
13 then above, she then reaffirms that following the
14 discussion.

15 However, because she sent that to Joanna and
16 UConn the day following her initial date of hire,
17 that's why it was considered untimely and was
18 therefore administratively denied.

19 MR. DISETTE: And this is all about a couple of
20 weeks ago, right?

21 MR. SEDROWSKI: Yes, that's correct. Yes.
22 There are three, I believe, in this batch that are
23 very similar in that regard.

24 I will say -- this is Ben Sedrowski, I will say
25 that Ms. Butler does distinguish herself in the

1 quickness, or in the speed that she did submit the
2 request to correct it. It was the next morning that
3 she did initiate the appeal. So, immediately
4 thereafter, she was having an issue, like, constant
5 contact with the agency in that regard. So I would
6 say there is that weight and that tension between
7 the fact that the agency did advise her both before
8 her date of hire, as well as giving her a reminder
9 on the afternoon of that date of hire that she did
10 need to submit that form, however, that then weighed
11 against the fact that she did very clearly at least
12 communicate some intent that she wished to waive, so
13 on and so forth.

14 MR. KRAYESKI: This is David Krayeski. I'd be
15 in favor of allowing her the opportunity to waive.

16 MR. DISETTE: I'd agree with that.

17 MR. CAREY: This is my, you know, based upon
18 the clear communication early on and prior -- and
19 you had said that she made an initial statement
20 prior to her employment, correct? That she would
21 want to opt out because it's such short period?

22 MR. SEDROWSKI: So, if you -- it isn't exact in
23 those words, and that's why I wanted to be cautious
24 about the paraphrasing, but if we scroll down to,
25 it's on page six of the packet.

1 MR. CAREY: Six?

2 MR. SEDROWSKI: Yep, it is. On Thursday,
3 January 15th, from Amy Butler to Joanna Smith. She
4 says, "I'm filling in for the spring semester and
5 don't really want to open this retirement account.
6 I hope that's all right." So pretty clear that she
7 doesn't want to participate in ARP in that instance.
8 And then that's later supported by the, you know,
9 actual statement that she made where she does want
10 to opt out of it. And that happens on the 21st in
11 the morning after her first date of hire.

12 MR. CAREY: Yeah, that would, that would be
13 close enough to me. This is Mike Carey. I would
14 agree with Dave and John.

15 MR. KRAYESKI: Yep. Mr. Chairman, I make a --
16 this is David Krayeski. I make a motion that we
17 grant the request by Ms. Butler to not elect a
18 retirement option for her Short Term Employment at
19 the University of Connecticut.

20 MR. CAREY: Mike Carey, second.

21 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Any further discussion?
22 Hearing none, all in favor say aye or raise your
23 hand. Opposed nay or raise your hand. It's
24 unanimous. The ayes have it.

25 Jose Crego.

1 MR. SEDROWSKI: This is Ben Sedrowski. Mr.
2 Jose Crego is at page eight of Part Two of the
3 packet. Mr. Jose Crego is an additional prior
4 military purchase past the one year deadline appeal.

5 Mr. Crego was initially hired by WestConn
6 effective January 6th, 2017. At that time he did
7 become a member of Tier III. He then did separate
8 from service in May of 2017. He had a break in
9 service until 2019 when he was rehired into full-
10 time service at DMHAS, at which point he did submit
11 a Retirement Service Purchase application for his
12 prior military service. However, upon receipt of
13 that from RSD, it was denied as being untimely
14 because it was outside that one year.

15 Following that, Mr. Crego did again submit
16 another application in 2022. He did this alongside
17 the support of his employing agency at the time, so
18 DMHAS as well, stating that there was nothing in the
19 record that demonstrated he was given the
20 opportunity to purchase that at WestConn.

21 As this subcommittee is well aware, this is a
22 routine issue we keep running into with part-time
23 lecturers where they aren't advised, so on and so
24 forth. I will note that this record doesn't
25 distinctly have WestConn supporting that. However,

1 there are two separate instances of DMHAS confirming
2 that there's nothing in the administrative record on
3 their end.

4 However, in 2022, despite including that
5 memorandum from DMHAS, it was administratively
6 denied as untimely again by RSD. There were no
7 notes specifically as to why it was addressed or
8 wasn't addressed. I didn't find anything in regards
9 to that. The letter itself didn't appear to state
10 it either. However, like I said, it was denied as
11 untimely.

12 Following this, in 2025, DMHAS came forward
13 again and submitted the 2019 application once more
14 to RSD. And this is the application that was most
15 recently denied. This is the one that then caused
16 this appeal to arise.

17 MR. KRAYESKI: Ben, this is Dave Kraveski. You
18 made a statement that WestConn did not necessarily
19 support the fact that he was not previously offered
20 the ability to purchase. I'm just flipping through
21 this, I'm trying to see, do we actually have that
22 somewhere?

23 MR. SEDROWSKI: In his record?

24 MR. KRAYESKI: Yes.

25 MR. SEDROWSKI: So, he does not have support

1 from WestConn directly. I have not gotten in
2 contact with them directly either. So if we would
3 like to table and get more information from them
4 specifically, I can. That being said, I do know
5 with the PTL population how that goes, but either
6 way I'm more than happy to do that to get direct
7 confirmation from WestConn.

8 MR. KRAYESKI: This is Dave Krayeski. What
9 does PTL population mean?

10 MR. SEDROWSKI: The part time lecturing
11 population. So, it's very similar -- we've seen
12 very similar issues that we see with the seasonal
13 employment.

14 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah. I'd be happy to table
15 this to get confirmation. Truth be told, I worked
16 with Mr. Crego, so I'm not sure if I need to recuse
17 myself or not, but I have done a lot of work with
18 him through DMHAS over the years. So, that being
19 said, I would recommend that we actually ensure that
20 that didn't happen. I would be very supportive of
21 anyone who was not given the opportunity initially
22 upon hire.

23 MR. DISETTE: Ben, to be clear, he was -- he
24 never actually submitted in that first stint, that
25 four-month period, he never actually submitted the

1 form and he was never invoiced?

2 MR. SEDROWSKI: That is correct.

3 MR. KRAYESKI: That's correct. Yep.

4 MR. SEDROWSKI: Yes. He's made the assertion
5 that he was never advised by WestConn at all, so he
6 had no idea that he could purchase it to begin with
7 would be the argument.

8 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah.

9 MR. CAREY: This is Mike. I agree with David
10 in that I think while I appreciate the efforts of
11 DMHAS to try to research the record, I think a
12 statement by WestConn would hold more weight here
13 and I would want to see something from them before
14 rendering a final decision. So, I would be in favor
15 of tabling this pending that, you know, Ben if
16 you're willing to reach out to them.

17 MR. SEDROWSKI: Yes, sir.

18 MR. CAREY: So, then I'll make that motion.
19 This is Mike Carey. In the Crego matter, I move
20 that the issue be tabled until our next meeting for
21 the Division to reach out to Western Connecticut
22 State University to see if they can get more
23 information as to whether or not Mr. Crego was
24 indeed advised at the time of employment about the
25 ability to purchase military service.

1 MR. KRAYESKI: Mr. Chairman, David Krayeski. I
2 second that motion.

3 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: All in favor, say aye or
4 raise your hand. Opposed nay or raise your hand.
5 It's unanimous. The ayes have it.

6 Tara Hood.

7 MR. SEDROWSKI: This is Ben Sedrowski. Ms.
8 Hood starts on page 26 of Part Two of your packet.

9 Ms. Hood is another appeal specifically
10 requesting the Commission honor her application for
11 prior military service past the one-year deadline.

12 She has brought this appeal forward asserting
13 that she was misidentified as a Tier IV member in
14 the denial letter that was sent to her, and that was
15 the basis for the denial. That in and of itself is
16 a clerical error. She was denied on the one year
17 from commencement date, so that would apply
18 regardless if she was Tier II, IIA or IV. So, to
19 that point, we'll get that a little bit further down
20 in discussion.

21 She was first hired by UCHC back in February of
22 2009, and she became a member of Tier IIA HD.
23 Following that, in 2010, she submitted a prior
24 military service purchase to RSD. At that point,
25 the UConn Health Center did support that she had not

1 -- or that she had completed the application on time
2 when she had been hired, however, it had not been
3 forwarded to RSD properly at that period. RSD
4 accepted that and then invoiced Ms. Hood for that
5 time in 2010.

6 There was no response, so there was no
7 election, similar to what we've seen prior, or
8 authorization, and as such, RSD closed it as a
9 permanent forfeiture.

10 In October 2025 Ms. Hood then came forward and
11 submitted an additional purchase application. She
12 sought to purchase prior military service as well as
13 some periods of military leave. Those periods of
14 military leave were invoiced, however, the period of
15 prior military service was administratively denied
16 by RSD, and that is the letter we sent in November
17 of 2025. She then submitted this appeal to the
18 Commission.

19 MR. CAREY: Ben, this is Mike. So, we've got a
20 couple of different issues here. The first is the
21 prior military service, and the second is the period
22 of military leave, and she's purchased neither, and
23 she's making the assertion that she did not go
24 forward with that because it incorrectly identified
25 her as a Tier IV member?

1 MR. SEDROWSKI: No, I do believe that she did
2 go forward with the military leave purchase.

3 MR. CAREY: Okay.

4 MR. SEDROWSKI: Yeah. Correct. Yes. I'll
5 double check to make sure that she did authorize it.
6 I know she was invoiced for it, but I want to make
7 sure that she authorized it, so I'll bring that up
8 right now. However, the military leave was
9 considered valid and acceptable as a purchase type.
10 However, because she had started back in 2009, she
11 was outside the one year, they denied the prior
12 military service for that purpose.

13 MR. CAREY: So, Ben, this is Mike again. How
14 does the Tier IV identification factor into the
15 confusion that she's asserting?

16 MR. SEDROWSKI: I believe that she thinks that
17 it's solely based in Tier IV is the reasoning behind
18 it. So, if we look at her appeal, she cites down to
19 it that says that she was denied as a Tier IV
20 employee because it was not made within one year.
21 However, she's not a Tier IV employee, so therefore
22 Tier IIA should apply. However, Tier IIA has the
23 same --

24 MR. KRAYESKI: Same provisions.

25 MR. SEDROWSKI: Correct.

1 MR. KRAYESKI: Yep.

2 MR. CAREY: Yep.

3 MR. SEDROWSKI: So once again, it was -- yeah -
4 - and there was no allegation of agency error or
5 anything in regards to that in her appeal.

6 MR. KRAYESKI: Ben, this is David Krayeski
7 again. She was given a little dispensation on the
8 initial delay simply because of UConn's error, was
9 given that additional time frame, and then did not
10 follow through. Is that accurate?

11 MR. SEDROWSKI: That is accurate, yes. So she
12 was invoiced November 10th, 2010, which was
13 technically outside of that one year, if I'm not
14 mistaken.

15 MR. KRAYESKI: Yep.

16 MR. SEDROWSKI: Correct?

17 MR. KRAYESKI: Yep.

18 MR. SEDROWSKI: So -- and that was because of
19 that memorandum that you'll see in Exhibit B on page
20 one, from Jessica Van Alstyne to Don
21 Kivke (phonetic).

22 MR. KRAYESKI: I don't see a way around the
23 initial purchase given her, you know, initial
24 granting of additional time and then not following
25 through. So, I would make a recommendation, David

1 Krayeski, that we deny the request for her initial
2 period of military leave purchase.

3 MR. CAREY: This is Mike Carey. I would second
4 that motion.

5 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Any discussion? Hearing
6 none, all in favor say aye or raise your hand.
7 Opposed nay or raise your hand. It's unanimous.
8 The ayes have it.

9 Amanda Kehoe.

10 MR. SEDROWSKI: This is Ben Sedrowski. Ms.
11 Amanda Kehoe, her appeal begins at page 39 of Part
12 Two of your packets. Ms. Kehoe has requested that
13 the commission permit her a new retirement plan
14 election to standard SERS Tier IV opposed to her
15 mistaken election to SERS Tier IV Hybrid. She has
16 raised this claiming that it was a bona fide
17 clerical error that she made during her pre-
18 onboarding process in which she was confused between
19 Tier IV and Tier IV Hybrid, thinking that Tier IV
20 Hybrid was the standard Tier IV for all higher
21 education individuals, as she has alleged.

22 Ms. Kehoe was first hired January 9, 2026, so
23 this is another very recent hire. By email dated
24 January 19, 2026, so, following that date of hire,
25 Ms. Kehoe realized that the Hybrid election had a

1 higher contribution rate and that she elected Hybrid
2 as opposed to SERS standard. She then reached out
3 to her agency and requested that to be changed. The
4 agency then forwarded her to us after denying it on
5 their end, saying that that wouldn't be likely.

6 After discussions with RSD on the phone, she
7 then received an email from us informing her of why
8 she had been denied and why she could not move, and
9 then she submitted this appeal immediately
10 thereafter on the 21st.

11 So, she has raised that she did not intend to
12 elect SERS Tier IV Hybrid at all and that the intent
13 the entire time was to go with standard SERS Tier
14 IV. However, there is not a distinct allegation of
15 the agency improperly advising her, which is
16 something that we've seen in the past in cases that
17 have been approved. So, I will at least point that
18 out, that there is some distinction to be made there
19 on that.

20 Ms. Kehoe has also, this is Ben Sedrowski, and
21 Ms. Kehoe has also submitted a few different
22 supplemental documents as well, and those are
23 included alongside her appeal request in Exhibit A.
24 She provides a timeline and then also makes an
25 argument essentially of timeliness because she came

1 forward so quick before payroll had closed and so on
2 and so forth, that there hadn't been anything
3 entered, that therefore she should be permitted to
4 have this change.

5 MR. DISETTE: I sympathize with her. Do we
6 have latitude?

7 MR. KRAYESKI: Not that I'm aware of. Not
8 without some significant statement from the employer
9 stating they didn't do a very good job of --

10 MR. DISETTE: I mean, it is confusing, right?
11 Because Tier IV is a hybrid plan. That's the way we
12 kind of refer to it, but it's not the Hybrid.

13 MR. CAREY: Ben, this is Mike. I'm wondering
14 if there's any history in the Division of having,
15 you know, if someone comes forward this quickly to
16 say, oops, I checked off the wrong box, can I fix
17 that?

18 MR. KRAYESKI: Right.

19 MR. CAREY: It's still within the first
20 payroll. Does the Division consistently take the
21 position, well, you checked what you checked and
22 that's it?

23 MR. SEDROWSKI: That is very much -- this is
24 Ben Sedrowki, that has very much been the consistent
25 position since 2019, at a minimum, following the

1 resolution of everything up at the IRS coming
2 towards (sic) back to us.

3 MR. DISETTE: Mm hmm.

4 MR. SEDROWSKI: Prior to that, I will say
5 historically there was much more leeway in the
6 opening of deductions. We know if we go back far
7 enough, we even have genuine changes of plans in
8 between semesters and so on and so forth. So the
9 further you go back, the more that you're going to
10 see that and the more it's going to be available.

11 I will say, prior to the complete lockdown and
12 the true consistency in application of this, you
13 would see corrections within the first payroll. So
14 if payroll had not closed, right, HR would be much
15 more amenable to changing contributions at that time
16 or fixing errors. But that would be much more of
17 incorrect plan placement based on their actual
18 election opposed to an election that I made
19 incidentally or mistakenly. So I would say that
20 this is unique in that aspect where there's no
21 actual agency error that she is asserting, it's more
22 of a, I straight up didn't understand the difference
23 between the two and checked the wrong box. So, to
24 that end, I'd say there's less history on our end
25 for being amenable to those changes as well.

1 MR. CAREY: Yeah, this is Mike. I am
2 sympathetic, however, I am also concerned about, you
3 know, people coming forward to say, Well, gee, I
4 made a mistake. Maybe they did. Maybe, but there's
5 also, if we allow this, then we're possibly opening
6 the door for people to actually change their mind,
7 and then it will become a matter of, do we let them
8 change their mind? If so, how long of a grace
9 period do we give them? So I'm feeling like we
10 don't have much, if any, latitude here, and I think
11 we're best served by denying the request. I'm
12 interested to know what the other Trustees think
13 about that.

14 MR. KRAYESKI: This is David Krayeski. I would
15 have to agree with that statement given the -- I
16 mean, we've got, what, seven years of consistent
17 application of the principle that that election
18 happens, barring an error or a, you know, predated
19 email like we had in the other case. I'm not sure
20 how we get around that.

21 MR. SEDROWSKI: This is Ben Sedrowski, I
22 actually do have a question in regards to that. So,
23 you know, thinking back to that waiver where there
24 was that intent that was represented in the email
25 string, so on and so forth, she does reference

1 during the onboarding process that she always
2 intended to elect the standard SERS.

3 MR. KRAYESKI: Right.

4 MR. SEDROWSKI: So, not that I'm trying to put
5 facts in here, but in the event that this fact was
6 different in that we had the agency very clearly
7 stating that, yes, she communicated that intent to
8 me, or it was documented in an email, would that be
9 the distinguishing fact that would be the thing that
10 would pivot this in that instance?

11 MR. KRAYESKI: I would consider giving her --
12 this a second look if, in fact, that documentation
13 is submitted by the agency. Yes.

14 MR. SEDROWSKI: And the only -- this is Ben
15 Sedrowski, and the only reason I wanted to raise
16 that is just because of that similarity in the
17 argument of, I intended to waive and I communicated
18 that.

19 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah, I mean, if there's some
20 communication in that regard with this particular
21 case, I think we could table it pending any
22 additional information to support that. Anybody
23 else have an opinion on that position?

24 MR. CAREY: This is Mike. I mean, if there is
25 additional communication that's documented, we

1 certainly could look at it, but I would think that
2 she would have provided that by now. But if we want
3 to table to ask that question, I'm fine with that.

4 MR. KRAYESKI: Okay. Any thoughts, John?

5 MR. DISETTE: Yeah, I'm okay with that, Dave.
6 What I don't want to do is box myself in to, if she
7 doesn't produce it, then I'm a no because I'm still
8 trying to figure out how to make it a yes. I'm just
9 trying to look at the date she got hired on the
10 19th, and by the 26th, she's telling them, Oh, wait,
11 wait, wait. I checked the wrong box. Right?

12 MR. KRAYESKI: That's what the facts are
13 saying. Correct.

14 MR. DISETTE: And I guess I struggle with
15 nothing had been entered in. I think I'd feel
16 differently if she was already locked into a plan,
17 but she wasn't at that point. Right? I mean, I
18 know we call it the first day election, but nothing
19 had been plugged in. She hadn't gotten a paycheck.
20 She did fill out the form, but she wanted to correct
21 the form. I don't know, Mike, you were saying
22 before, where do we -- where do we draw the line?
23 And I think, to me, once you start that plan, you
24 make that payment and you're locked in, I think
25 you're done. I, look at her as, she's not locked in

1 yet. And that's -- and I know it's still a little
2 loose with the rules, but it's kind of what I look
3 at is, you're not accepting it, though.

4 MR. CAREY: So, John, this is Mike. I hear
5 you, but I think we have to hold true to the first
6 day election, and that's why I'm concerned about
7 allowing some leeway here. If there were some
8 documentation about prior communication, I think we
9 could consider that. But absent that, I think that
10 this is a clear no.

11 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah, I would have to agree with
12 that position.

13 MR. DISETTE: Okay.

14 MR. KRAYESKI: You know, but, if there is that
15 documentation out there, John, I'm happy to take a
16 look at it because I want to be sure that we have
17 the full record here if we're going to make this
18 decision on this individual's --

19 MR. DISETTE: Yeah, I would too, because I
20 struggle with this one a little bit. You know, it's
21 not an egregious, awful case. It's not like she's
22 in some horrible plan, but, you know, so -- yeah, if
23 we -- if there is anything, I'd like to give it the
24 opportunity to see if we can find a way to, you
25 know, correct the error for her.

1 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah.

2 MR. DISETTE: But barring that, we'll see where
3 we go.

4 MR. KRAYESKI: Okay. So, Mr. Chairman, this is
5 David Krayeski. I make a recommendation that we
6 table the matter involving Ms. Kehoe pending any
7 supplemental information from the employer.

8 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: We table it to the next
9 meeting then?

10 MR. KRAYESKI: Yes, sir.

11 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Yeah. Any discussion?
12 Hearing none, all in favor say aye.

13 MR. KRAYESKI: Mr. Chairman?

14 ATTORNEY KALLOR: Nobody seconded. Somebody
15 needs to second it.

16 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Oh, no one seconded it.

17 MR. CAREY: This is Mike. I'll second.

18 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. All right. All in
19 favor say aye or raise your hand. Opposed nay or
20 raise your hand. It's unanimous, the ayes have it.

21 Kadali? Is it Kadali? I can't pronounce it.

22 MR. SEDROWSKI: I believe so. I will go with
23 that as well, sir. This is Ben Sedrowski.

24 Mr. Kodali is at page 50 of Part Two of your
25 packet. He has requested the Retirement Commission

1 permit him to waive retirement plan membership in
2 lieu of default placement into ARP.

3 He's similar in that he did not make that
4 affirmative election to waive on or prior to his
5 first day of employment with UConn as a part-time
6 adjunct faculty member. He has asserted that the
7 Commission should honor -- or should allow him this
8 due to the fact that he filled out the respective
9 form prior, scanned it, sent it by email. However,
10 it did not go through and that he did not realize
11 that until a week later, or over a week later.

12 Additionally, after that initial week where he
13 had submitted that, he had to undergo emergency disc
14 replacement surgery and was unable to follow up with
15 his agency during that period due to the medical
16 complications at the time.

17 I will say Mr. Kodali was first hired back in
18 2024, at that time, he did not submit the election
19 as I stated, this is then -- there is a
20 communication between the agency and him where he
21 then does seek to submit this appeal. The appeal
22 did not actually make it forward until 2025, and
23 that's where I received it and where we have it now.

24 Mr. Kodali did separate from state service a
25 few different times in between this period. He is

1 currently separated as of December 18, 2025, but he
2 has been coming back as an adjunct faculty for the
3 semester contractual periods.

4 During this period, he has contributed to ARP
5 during the entire time, though.

6 MR. KRAYESKI: Ben, this is Dave Krayeski. He
7 is appealing to be placed in what?

8 MR. SEDROWSKI: In, so, I believe it would be a
9 total waiver. How that would actually work now with
10 him having those contributions and gains in ARP, I
11 don't believe would really be tenable. I mean, at
12 this point, though, he would be entitled to a full
13 refund of those contributions because he is under
14 ten years of vesting service in ARP as well. So
15 unless there's a different reason why he wouldn't be
16 able to roll those over pursuant to ARP plan
17 provisions, which I will happily caveat here for the
18 record that, you know, likely that would be the
19 recourse for him to get his contributions out of
20 that. However, he would not be able to make a new
21 retirement plan election to waive because prior ARP
22 election would still be binding on any subsequent
23 employment.

24 MR. KRAYESKI: So he's another individual --
25 this is David Krayeski again -- who comes back and

1 works a semester as an adjunct faculty or something
2 of that nature?

3 MR. SEDROWSKI: Correct. Yes. So, he's come
4 back -- so he initially was hired in May of 2024.
5 He then continued until June of 2024. He then had a
6 period from August until October of 2024. And then
7 in 2025, he went from May until December. And then
8 he did have concurrent job records, so there were
9 some overlapping job records in there, but those
10 were the periods.

11 MR. KRAYESKI: Okay.

12 MR. DISETTE: It took him six months to -- it
13 took -- what was the time frame for him to step
14 forward and say, I didn't want --

15 MR. SEDROWSKI: It was within the first month.

16 MR. DISETTE: It was within the first month.
17 Oh, that's right, it failed to go through.

18 MR. KRAYESKI: That's right. Do we have any
19 evidence of that?

20 MR. SEDROWSKI: Aside from his statement that
21 he believes it was an error on his email client
22 side? But he did acknowledge that if there was an
23 error, it was on his, you know, email client side,
24 more likely than not. So, you know, he did not have
25 that election that was submitted.

1 MR. KRAYESKI: Okay.

2 MR. SEDROWSKI: So,] I will say at least that
3 factual distinguish is very clear.

4 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah, got it.

5 MR. CAREY: This is Mike Carey. Without
6 evidence that he actually did attempt to send an
7 email.

8 MR. KRAYESKI: Yep.

9 MR. CAREY: I think we are where we are. We
10 need to deny his request.

11 MR. KRAYESKI: I would have to second that
12 motion.

13 MR. DISETTE: Not taking thirds, but I would
14 third it.

15 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Any further discussion?
16 It's been moved and seconded. All in favor, say aye
17 or raise your hand. Opposed nay or raise your hand.
18 It's unanimous. The ayes have it. Thank you.

19 Carmen Medina.

20 MR. SEDROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This
21 is Ben Sedrowski. Ms. Medina starts at page 58 of
22 Part Two of your packet.

23 Ms. Medina is seeking a retroactive change in
24 her type of retirement from a voluntary application
25 to a disability application to be presented to the

1 MEB. She is requesting that the Commission allow
2 this based on the fact that she was not advised that
3 she was eligible to apply for disability retirement
4 at the time that she took her retirement. She did
5 retire effective January 1st, 2022, and she retired
6 with approximately 19 years and 11 months of
7 service.

8 In September of 2025, she attended one of the
9 disability retirement info sessions that we've been
10 hosting with our counseling team. She then raised
11 the question of disability retirement with Assistant
12 Director Helfand and had a communicate -- or had a
13 conversation with him, which was then followed up by
14 an email in which we administratively denied her in
15 that change of retirement type and cited for the
16 basis on you cannot change. Ms. Medina then
17 followed that up by submitting this appeal,
18 effective October 6th.

19 MR. CAREY: Well, Ben, this is Mike Carey. As
20 in prior situations, if Ms. Medina had come forward
21 within 24 months from January 1st of 2022, I would
22 think about it, because a person has 24 months from
23 the date they leave state service, I think that that
24 potentially leaves that door open a little bit for
25 us to make considerations when that fact pattern

1 exists. That's not the case here, and so I would
2 feel that we would need to deny this request.

3 MR. DISETTE: And this is John Disette. To be
4 clear, we're talking about three years and about
5 eight, nine months before she stepped forward?

6 MR. KRAYESKI: Correct.

7 MR. CAREY: Yeah.

8 MR. DISETTE: Yeah, a hard one.

9 MR. CAREY: So then, Mr. Chairman, this is Mike
10 Carey. In the Medina matter, I would move that we
11 recommend that the full Commission deny her request
12 for a retroactive change in retirement type from
13 voluntary to disability.

14 MR. DISETTE: John Disette, I'll second.

15 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Any further discussion?
16 Hearing none, all in favor say aye or raise your
17 hand. Opposed nay or raise your hand. It's
18 unanimous. The ayes have it.

19 Is it Joel? Is it Pate? Pate. How do I say
20 that?

21 MR. SEDROWSKI: I have been saying Pate, but I
22 am not 100% sure, Mr. Chairman, so I will go with
23 Pate though. This is Benjamin Sedrowski, and Mr.
24 Pate's appeal starts at page 67 of your packet.

25 Mr. Pate has requested that the Retirement

1 Commission allow him to discontinue his active
2 payroll deductions that he is currently paying
3 towards a restoration of his prior refund of Tier IV
4 Hazardous Duty service credit due to a financial
5 hardship that it's incurred to him, as it is \$1250 a
6 paycheck that he is paying for the restoration.

7 For background and case history, he initially
8 commenced state service back in 2017 where he did
9 become a member of Tier IV HD. He then resigned in
10 good standing effective September of 2024.

11 Following separation, he did receive that
12 refund. He requested it and received it. Full
13 contributions and interest were given to him. He
14 was then rehired in 2025, in June. Following that,
15 he submitted an application to restore that service
16 purchase credit or, sorry, apologies, restore his
17 prior refunded credit under SERS Tier IV, and he was
18 invoiced by RSD when the approximate payroll
19 deduction amount was \$1250.31 a paycheck. Mr. Pate
20 then took the invoice itself, which is the election
21 form to submit to the agency, and mistakenly
22 submitted it back to RSD. RSD then sent it back to
23 him with an additional letter informing him to take
24 that to his agency, at which point he had, you know,
25 that one more opportunity to review that

1 authorization before giving it to his payroll
2 officer. Following that, he did turn it in to his
3 payroll officer. Those commenced November of 2025
4 and they have continued since. He did submit this
5 appeal shortly following that in December of 2025.
6 I will say that the recent cases where we have --
7 the Commission has approved a cessation of payroll
8 deductions have both been prior military service
9 purchases and have both also come with the explicit
10 direction that there was a permanent forfeiture of
11 the service credit opportunity. This differs in
12 both the service purchase as well as the member's
13 intent to hopefully restore this later on down the
14 line under Section 5-181C, opposed to the 5-167 that
15 he's currently under that has the two year time
16 limitation on that application.

17 So, to that point I will say that it does
18 differ in both of those regards where the military
19 purchase has that kind of baked in automatic
20 permanent forfeiture once you hit that one year
21 deadline. It's very punishing in that regard. So
22 both of those cases where they did come forward,
23 they were already past that deadline. So, that may
24 be a fact that is, you know, worth considering or
25 not. But to this point, the Division did

1 administratively, you know, deny his request to
2 cease these payroll deductions, seeking Commission
3 approval to do so.

4 MR. KRAYESKI: Ben, this is David Krayeski. So
5 he could later purchase this time?

6 MR. SEDROWSKI: That is -- this is Ben
7 Sedrowski, that is what we've opined. So the
8 section that he is currently purchasing it under,
9 the 5-167, that has a two year limitation, so you
10 have to apply to purchase or to restore your refund
11 within two years of returning to service. The 5-
12 181C provision doesn't have that same limitation on
13 it and therefore he would likely still be able to
14 purchase it unless there was some, you know, or
15 there was some forfeiture that was directed by the
16 Commission. But, once again, we are not sure if
17 that would fall within discretion or not in that
18 regard.

19 MR. DISETTE: If that's the case, if he can
20 pick it up a year or two from now, is there interest
21 still accruing on that, what he owes? So in other
22 words, he owes, I forget, 64,000 or something like
23 that, would he owe like 68,000?

24 MR. SEDROWSKI: I don't know the exact amounts,
25 but yes, the interest would continue to accrue. I

1 also do believe that the 5-181C, it uses a different
2 interest calculation based -- compared to the 167.
3 However, the details of that I would have to go back
4 to Purchasing to confirm.

5 MR. DISETTE: And what about the monies that
6 he's already dropped in there? It only looks like
7 it's been a couple of paychecks.

8 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah.

9 MR. DISETTE: What happens to that? Does that
10 get credited, or does that get returned?

11 MR. SEDROWSKI: So, as our current
12 understanding is, and as it was applied to Rosario
13 and Frazier, the two prior cases that were denied --
14 or were approved for cessation, the contributions
15 were taken legitimately when they were elected, so,
16 therefore, they aren't erroneous contributions that
17 can be refunded as in-service distributions. So, it
18 is our position that it would be an impermissible
19 in-service distribution to refund that money because
20 it was taken legitimately. However, because it
21 isn't prorated in accordance with plan provisions
22 and it isn't going to be used towards his retirement
23 credit at the point that he separates, whether he's
24 vested or not, or if he retires and stays the entire
25 time, he would then be entitled to a refund of those

1 contributions that he did towards that purchase. So
2 at any time that he separates from State service
3 that would then become available to him as a refund
4 because he's no longer in State service at that
5 point. However, you know, and then if he went all
6 the way to retirement and made it all the way to
7 retirement, you can think of it kind of analogous to
8 an HD individual that retires but doesn't have their
9 20 years or their 25 years, so they are then
10 entitled to a refund of that difference in those
11 contributions. Or maybe a better example would be
12 the grandfathering contribution if you make it to
13 the new retirement age. But either one of those are
14 essentially supplemental contributions, that they
15 were legitimate when we took them. However, that --
16 and therefore we cannot just issue you, issue them
17 to you as refunds while you're still working for us
18 because they are technically legitimate
19 contributions that we collected. That is our
20 position on that.

21 MR. KRAYESKI: Ben, this is David Krayeski. I,
22 you know, this particular case has got so many
23 twists and turns to it. I want to be sure that Mr.
24 Pate, I'll go with the slang version of his last
25 name, is given the full impact of this action.

1 Meaning, what -- you know, what the difference in
2 the 167 versus 181 calculation might be, because I
3 could foresee him later coming back saying, Well, I
4 didn't know it was going to be that much, you know,
5 without, without fully understanding the impact of
6 what he's requesting here.

7 MR. SEDROWSKI: To that point, this is Ben
8 Sedrowski. I will state that I know he has a
9 concern about this. In the interim during that
10 period, if he is tabled for further information and
11 clarification, would you want to leave that \$1250
12 biweekly in place, or would you -- would the
13 subcommittee be willing to recommend that that be
14 paused? That was a question that he raised to us.

15 MR. KRAYESKI: Hmm.

16 MR. SEDROWSKI: And in this case, because of
17 the significant amount of it compared to, you know,
18 other deductions that we've seen in the past.

19 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah. What's our history on
20 that? Have we paused them before for folks in the -

21 -

22 MR. SEDROWSKI: Sorry, go ahead.

23 MR. KRAYESKI: Pending a decision?

24 MR. SEDROWSKI: So under Frazier, that was the
25 most recent approval. That one was not -- we did

1 not authorize it to be paused, however, the agency
2 themselves paused it without our authorization. So
3 when it went -- when he went to the Commission for
4 that appeal, he had been paused. However, we did
5 not direct it. So it has been the Division
6 perspective that, similar to, say, a Tier correction
7 where somebody's fighting that, we put you at what
8 we believe is the appropriate placement and you pay
9 that until your appeal is then settled and the
10 remedy is issued. So for this one, we would just
11 leave the deductions on as standard practice.

12 MR. DISETTE: When you said paused, what do you
13 mean by that? Pause them and have him pick them up
14 at \$1200 a month, \$1200 a paycheck some other time?

15 MR. SEDROWSKI: So, this is Ben Sedrowski.
16 Just solely for the purposes of if the appeal was
17 tabled and if we were going back to him to give him
18 a different calculation to let him know, okay, in
19 the event you do do that permanent forfeiture, this
20 is likely what's going to happen because of that.

21 MR. KRAYESKI: Take your pick.

22 MR. SEDROWSKI: Yeah. So in that instance,
23 that's where I would say, like, a pause, you know,
24 is where I'm thinking, where it's essentially just
25 on hold while that's going through and we're talking

1 to him. But that would also just be, you know,
2 because of the quarterly nature of this
3 subcommittee, where it's a significant amount of
4 money coming out of his checks, and he's working a
5 significant amount of overtime to compensate for it,
6 to our understanding. So I wanted to at least raise
7 it while we were here.

8 MR. DISETTE: So, Dave, your thought is that
9 perhaps we give him the latitude, but he should know
10 up front what the new calculation would be.

11 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah.

12 MR. DISETTE: Because if he's not going to be
13 able to withstand that new payment either, then make
14 the choice of either taking the new potential
15 payment method or the current one. But it sounds
16 like you're also willing to allow him to stop
17 contributions altogether.

18 MR. KRAYESKI: So, this is David Krayeski. We
19 have an individual here with seven years of
20 hazardous duty service, right? And he is, you know,
21 comes back to the State and is facing either 18 or
22 25 years of service.

23 MR. DISETTE: Mm hmm.

24 MR. KRAYESKI: Right? I mean --

25 MR. DISETTE: Big difference.

1 MR. KRAYESKI: It's a big difference, as is
2 1250 bucks out of your paycheck. And if he is
3 contemplating working 18 years and then making a
4 pitch for his prior seven as a way to ease the 1250
5 a paycheck, he probably should have an idea what
6 that costs before he makes a decision whether -- a
7 few things. Whether or not he even wants to
8 continue with this program. I don't know, but it's
9 a, it's a pretty hefty -- you know, that's 25% of
10 his entire career.

11 Mr. Carey, you're awfully quiet.

12 MR. CAREY: I am. I was just -- I was
13 wondering whether or not there's any precedent. I
14 know when we're dealing with -- in the Overpayment
15 Subcommittee, that we have some latitude to make
16 some adjustments in the amount of the, in the month
17 -- in the payment structure. I don't know if
18 there's any precedent for us to have that kind of,
19 of latitude here. In other words, is there a way
20 that we can keep some deductions going but still
21 afford him some relief? I don't know if we are
22 empowered to do that.

23 MR. SEDROWSKI: This is Ben Sedrowski. I will
24 say that the 5-167 statute that he is purchasing
25 under, it does have a cap at 36 months, so it has to

1 be paid over 36 months. So there may be some baked
2 in leeway depending on where our Purchasing Unit
3 initially did that calculation for the payroll. So
4 let's bring that up. How many payroll deductions
5 was that?

6 MR. KRAYESKI: That's why the value is so high.
7 He's got to do it over three years.

8 MR. SEDROWSKI: Mm hmm.

9 MR. DISETTE: Yeah, he's trying to pay seven
10 years worth of payments in three years.

11 MR. SEDROWSKI: And he's actually only
12 calculated at two. So, there is at least one year
13 of wiggle room right now.

14 MR. KRAYESKI: Okay.

15 MR. SEDROWSKI: Because right now it's
16 spreading over 52 pay periods.

17 MR. KRAYESKI: Can we offer that to him? I
18 know that's probably not necessarily a decision that
19 we could -- maybe we could do in this group? But
20 would that provide him enough room in his finances
21 to be able to afford this?

22 MR. CAREY: This is Mike. I think that's worth
23 a look.

24 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah.

25 MR. CAREY: I mean, if, you know, David, as you

1 were saying before, we want to make sure that this
2 gentleman is fully informed, right? Fully informed
3 as to what the cost would be if he waits, and also,
4 you know, fully informed that if this is an option,
5 maybe that's something that he could continue, and
6 we would still be within that 36-month period if we
7 get verification that we could do that. I think
8 that makes sense. Now, then the question would be
9 whether or not we put a pause on the \$1250. I think
10 that -- I'm not quite sure how I feel about that.
11 If we're looking for options, and Ben, you had
12 mentioned that we have our meetings quarterly, but
13 if we're able to get information on this quickly,
14 and we're just discussing this one case, I don't
15 speak for David or for John, but I certainly would
16 be willing to participate in a, you know, a
17 scheduled meeting just to take this matter up.

18 MR. DISETTE: No, but Mike, I go back to what I
19 asked Dave. If you're thinking about the pause, the
20 only reason you'd put the pause in there is if
21 you're willing to consider withdrawing, letting him
22 withdraw from the payments entirely, right? Because
23 you're gonna offer him some new math, perhaps that
24 may help. But if he denies the new math, he's stuck
25 with the \$1200 for the next two years, a little less

1 than two years at this point. Right? So unless
2 we're gonna also keep in the back of our heads that
3 there's the potential that we would allow him to
4 withdraw, what is the point of pausing it?

5 MR. CAREY: Well, I think, John, that Ben had
6 indicated that there is some cheaper methods there,
7 that we could allow him to withdraw. The money
8 that's there would stay there until he concludes
9 service, right? The pause really is to, in my take,
10 would be a pause would simply afford him some relief
11 while we explore other options and can provide him
12 with a full amount of information, a full array of
13 options.

14 MR. DISETTE: Okay.

15 MR. CAREY: But we could keep the, I mean, we
16 could keep the 1250 in place if we could do, you
17 know, if we could have something within the, you
18 know, the next two weeks. It's one more pay period,
19 and, you know, maybe we could get information prior
20 to our next Commission meeting, which would be a
21 couple of weeks.

22 MR. DISETTE: Okay. I'd be, I'd be willing to
23 do that and see if we can get him some new math,
24 some new choices, you know?

25 MR. CAREY: But leave the 1250 in place and

1 with an expectation that we get that very shortly.
2 So, in other words, we'd be tabling this pending
3 assessment of other options and reconvening.

4 MR. DISETTE: Right, and I'd be willing to
5 accept the pause as well, if that's what you guys
6 want to do. I'm fine with that.

7 MR. CAREY: I think as long as we're working
8 towards something, I don't have -- this is Mike -- I
9 don't feel that I have really strong feelings one
10 way or the other about pausing right now as long as
11 we act fairly quickly.

12 MR. DISETTE: Right. The only problem with the
13 pause, though, is it doesn't help his payments,
14 which means when he does his new math and we say,
15 okay, now you can do it over three years, but we
16 paused it for two months, right and he's missed two
17 payments.

18 MR. CAREY: Exactly.

19 MR. DISETTE: It's going to make his math a
20 little bit worse.

21 MR. KRAYESKI: Yes.

22 MR. CAREY: That's why I say we think we --
23 That's why I -- this is Mike. I think we table it.
24 We table it with the understanding that we're going
25 to reconvene in two weeks. Ben, do you think that's

1 reasonable?

2 MR. SEDROWSKI: I could do two weeks.

3 MR. KRAYESKI: Do we have -- Mr. Chairman, this
4 is David Krayeski. Do we have the authority to
5 reconvene a -- for lack of a better term, a special
6 session to rehear this issue under the --

7 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Well, I'm going to -- I have
8 to look at my schedule here, too, because as you
9 probably know, I'm a labor arbitrator, and so I have
10 a lot of stuff on my calendar dealing with hearings
11 and so on. So you tell me what date you're talking
12 about. Hello?

13 MR. KRAYESKI: Yeah, we're working on it.

14 MR. CAREY: In your calendar.

15 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Yeah.

16 MR. DISETTE: I mean would March 3rd be too
17 late or are you looking at February 17th or 24th?

18 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: February, I can't do the
19 17th. I have a hearing. Uh, 24.

20 ATTORNEY KALLOR: I think there's a Hazardous
21 Duty Subcommittee meeting on that morning.

22 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Yeah, yeah, I can't do that
23 date either.

24 MR. DISETTE: Any day, right?

25 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: I have, holding a Purchasing

1 Subcommittee meeting on February 24th that's open
2 for me.

3 ATTORNEY KALLOR: I have Hazardous Duty
4 Subcommittee on my calendar.

5 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Ah.

6 MR. SEDROWSKI: That was the -- this is Ben
7 Sedrowski -- that was the meeting date that we had
8 the confusion about a little bit. We were going
9 back and forth a few emails. So, I believe that's
10 where the confusion is coming from there on that
11 one. But yes, there is one that is scheduled for
12 that day.

13 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: One of what?

14 MR. SEDROWSKI: It's HD, I believe.

15 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Not Purchasing?

16 MR. SEDROWSKI: It is not Purchasing, no. So,
17 the next regularly scheduled Purchasing meeting is
18 April 14th.

19 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay, so what's the meeting
20 then on the 24th?

21 MR. SEDROWSKI: HD Subcommittee.

22 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay.

23 MR. SEDROWSKI: I will also say at this point
24 we do not have any items for the HD Subcommittee, so
25 it will more likely than not be canceled as per

1 usual, but, that, you know, remains to be seen for
2 the rest of the month.

3 MR. CAREY: So then -- this is Mike. And, Mr.
4 Chairman, if the 24th, if you've got a hold on your
5 calendar.

6 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: I do.

7 MR. CAREY: Okay. If we'd be able to, you
8 know, take this matter up as a special session, you
9 know, for 20 minutes.

10 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Yeah.

11 MR. CAREY: Maybe we could do that and,
12 hopefully the Hazardous Duty agenda would be either
13 light or non-existent. But that would -- the 24th
14 would work for me.

15 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Well, I have Hazardous Duty
16 on the 24th.

17 MR. KRAYESKI: Correct.

18 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: But we could move it forward
19 in time.

20 MR. KRAYESKI: I think, based on what Ben said,
21 there being no agenda items so far for Hazardous
22 Duty, we would probably have a little bit of wiggle
23 room either just before that or the first 15 minutes
24 of that meeting, Mr. Chairman.

25 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Yeah.

1 MR. KRAYESKI: Where we could convene this
2 particular group.

3 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Yeah.

4 MR. KRAYESKI: That being said, the real
5 question is, Ben, is that enough time for you to
6 convene -- to come to some conclusions and
7 communicate with the employee?

8 MR. SEDROWSKI: So, regarding the 36-month math
9 and all that portion of it, I would say that that
10 should be plenty. My bigger concern is the question
11 of what the later calculation could look like
12 because that's -- that would be much more of us
13 essentially just giving the formula and saying,
14 just, you know, comparing the two and saying, this
15 is how interest works here. This is how interest
16 works here without having some set date to forecast
17 that interest for in the future. That's my concern
18 on that side of the equation side of it. But that
19 being said, I still don't see why two weeks wouldn't
20 be sufficient for that.

21 MR. KRAYESKI: Okay, so, Mr. Chairman, this is
22 David Krayeske, and I make a motion that we table
23 this issue until February 24th for a special session
24 for an update on the issue from the Retirement
25 Services Division, at which point in time we will

1 make a decision on this particular issue.

2 MR. CAREY: Carey, second.

3 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. All in favor say aye
4 or raise your hand.

5 MR. DISETTE: I say -- I have a question within
6 there.

7 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Sure, go ahead.

8 MR. DISETTE: Okay. What did we do about the -
9 - what did we do about the pausing of the payments
10 in the meantime?

11 MR. CAREY: This is Mike. I think that the
12 motion was to table, which would mean that for this
13 time being, for this brief period, it stays in
14 effect.

15 MR. KRAYESKI: Correct.

16 MR. DISETTE: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay.

18 MR. KRAYESKI: Do we have a second?

19 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: All right.

20 MR. CAREY: Yep. I'm sorry, that was not
21 audible. Yes, this is Mike. I raised my hand
22 because I did second the motion. I should have
23 narrated that as I went along.

24 MR. KRAYESKI: That's okay. It's hard for
25 Robin to record that on the audio recording.

1 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Yeah. All right. So, all
2 in favor of the motion, raise your right hand or say
3 aye. Any opposed, nay? It's unanimous. The ayes
4 have it. Okay. We did it.

5 MR. DISETTE: I thought, Dave, you were going
6 to propose June 2nd. It would have been perfect.

7 MR. KRAYESKI: Gladly. Gladly. All right,
8 Robin, do you want to end the recording really
9 quick?

10 MR. CAREY: We have to conclude our meeting.

11 MR. KRAYESKI: Oh, we have to conclude our
12 meeting.

13 MR. CAREY: This is Mike Carey. I move that we
14 adjourn.

15 MR. DISETTE: John Disette, I'll second.

16 CHAIRMAN ADOMEIT: Okay. All in favor say aye
17 or raise your hand. Is always going to be
18 unanimous.

19
20 (Meeting adjourned at 10:31 a.m.)

21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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

I, Wendy Malitsky, do hereby certify that the foregoing is, to the best of my skill and ability, a true and accurate transcript of the State Employees' Retirement Commission, Purchase of Service and Related

Wendy Malitsky

Wendy Malitsky, Notary Public

My Commission Expires March 31, 2030