STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

PROVIDENCE, SC.

SUPERIOR COURT

ST. JOSEPH'S HEALTH SERVICES OF )

RHODE ISLAND

VS.

C.A. NO. PC-2017-3856

)

ST. JOSEPH'S HEALTH SERVICES OF )

RHODE ISLAND RETIREMENT PLAN

#### HEARD BEFORE

# THE HONORABLE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE BRIAN P. STERN ON MAY 31, 2018

#### APPEARANCES:

STEPHEN DEL SESTO, ESQUIRE......THE RECEIVER MAX WISTOW, ESQUIRE......SPECIAL COUNSEL

GINA GIANFRANCESCO GOMES
COURT REPORTER

## CERTIFICATION

I, Gina Gianfrancesco Gomes, hereby certify that the succeeding pages 1 through 12, inclusive, are a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes.

GINA GIANFRANCESCO GOMES
COURT REPORTER

#### 

## 

## 

### 

#### 

#### 

### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

## 

## 

#### 

#### THURSDAY, MAY 31, 2018

#### MORNING SESSION

THE CLERK: The matter before the Court is

PC-2017-3856, St. Joseph's Health Services of Rhode

Island vs. St. Joseph's Health Services of Rhode Island

Retirement Plan as amended, Bank of America Trustee.

Would counsel please identify yourselves and the party

you represent.

MR. DEL SESTO: Good morning, your Honor. Stephen Del Sesto, Court Appointed Receiver.

MR. WISTOW: Max Wistow, counsel to Mr. Del Sesto.

THE COURT: Thank you. The Court has received and reviewed the interim report of the Receiver. The Receiver may be heard.

MR. DEL SESTO: Thank you, your Honor. As your Honor noted, we are here on the third interim report in this case, your Honor. Rather than go through the history, which is well known to the Court, I'm going to cut to the most recent since our last hearing on March 29th.

As your Honor is aware, on March 29th we had a hearing on the second interim report. In addition to that second interim report, we had a hearing on a recommendation regarding adjustment to benefits. At the conclusion of that hearing, this Court approved the

second interim report and request for fees and also approved the Receiver's recommendation with regard to benefits, specifically that no cuts will be made to benefits at this time, and that decision on cuts will be deferred at least 90 days, and the application and election forms that were in cue and had been filed since the commencement of the case that had not been acted upon could then be processed through the planned benefit administrator. I am happy to report that process has happened, your Honor. Due to the volume, what was normally a four-week process has become an eight to ten-week process, but Angell has informed me as recently as last week that they actually believe they will be done with what I will call a backlog probably some time in mid June and that way we will be caught up and we will just be addressing applications that are filed on a going basis.

In addition, your Honor, subsequent to that March 29th hearing, the Special Counsel had issued additional subpoenas on CharterCare Foundation, on the Rhode Island Department of Health, and on Prospect Medical Holdings. As a result of the various subpoenas the Special Counsel had served upon various parties, Special Counsel and his team has reviewed in excess of 800,000 pages. It is my understanding, your Honor, that CharterCare Foundation as

24

23

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

well as Prospect Medical Holdings have been complying with the subpoena or at least with agreements with Special Counsel as to how those documents can be produced.

With regard to the Department of Health, the Court held a hearing last week on a motion to compel and I believe it is scheduled for a continued hearing this afternoon at 2:00. Your Honor, we have seen some volatility in the market as of January 1st. customary with the pension plan with the discretionary investment advisor on an annual basis the allocation and investments of the plan are reviewed and a recommendation is made by the investment advisor, which in this case is Mercer Investments. Starting in January I began discussions with Mercer Investments regarding the current investment pool and the allocation of those assets. Because of the issues regarding this plan as to whether or not it's a church plan, whether or not it's an ERISA plan those discussions took on a little more of a depth than had been previously because it had been purely treated as a church plan.

As of April Mercer provided to me a recommendation that the allocation of the assets be changed to reflect the fact that there are no contributions coming into the plan, that benefits are being are paid out at

2425

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

approximately \$11 million per year, and that although we are hopeful that the plan will receive additional funds, as we sit here today there is no guarantee or amount or debt line for those funds to come into play. Based on that, there are 10 and 20-year projections and adjusted the allocation of the investments from what was a 67 percent, 33 percent based on growth assets at 67 and reduced risk assets at 33 percent, so a fifty-fifty allocation. It's a more conservative allocation, and there is a range which allows that allocation to shift from fifty-fifty to maybe a sixty-forty,.

But it's in Mercer's opinion, and this was confirmed by the actuary, that it's the more prudent way to go based on the circumstances for this plan. In connection with that change in the allocation, there is, obviously, also a change in the projected rate of return. So the projected rate of return is reduced as a result of the change in the allocation, which means the plan assets quite simply are projected to earn less investment income over that period of time, 10 years or 20 years. I am still working with both Mercer as well as Angell regarding what the target allocation should be, what is the most appropriate one. Mercer has recommended on a 20-year projection a 5.7 percent rate of return and on a ten year, 5.1 rate of return.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

פ

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm currently in discussions because I have various concerns with regard to those numbers as it relates to a plan that isn't receiving regular contributions and those discussions remain ongoing. I'm happy to say I've had several discussions in meetings with the treasurer's office who, as I have reported to this Court in the past, have offered to volunteer their staff services and knowledge to assist in any way that they can and they have, in fact, done that. I have advised them of the information that I've been getting from Mercer as well as from Angell and they have sat down with me and made suggestions, not recommendations, but suggestions as to both questions that I could go back to those parties with based on their knowledge of pension plan management as well as suggestions as to what to do with the rate of return and what they think is appropriate for the rate of return at this point.

As I said, those discussions continue and that discussion is necessary for the actuary to conduct the plan valuation for the last closed year, and so that's why we need that. We need to identify what the rate is so that the valuation can be calculated.

In addition, your Honor, I have engaged on a consulting basis WhaleRock Point Partners, which is an investment firm based out of Providence, Rhode Island.

They are not managing the assets, but they, similar to the treasurer, are providing me with guidance and information. Of course, I have engaged them so they are, in fact, making certain recommendations and giving the analysis on what I am being provided from Mercer Investments, but I have been utilizing their services to make sure we're making the right decision when it comes to these assets, the investment, and on projections regarding the rate of return and things of that nature.

As the report indicated, we've engaged in discussions with the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation. All I can say, your Honor, is that we met with them in person. We had phone conversations with Those conversations remain ongoing. really, unfortunately, have anything of substance to report from those conversations as the P.B.G.C. is reviewing, as they typically do, and they have not gotten back to us with any definitive position on anything at Those discussions continue and I will this point. continue to keep the Court updated especially in the event there is something of substance that comes up with those.

Other than that, your Honor, as I reported, I have met with special counsel on a number of occasions to discuss the status of the investigation of potential

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

claims that can be brought in this case. Those discussions have been more frequent recently and we are moving towards special counsel making a definitive recommendation, which I will discuss with them and make a determination as to what we will be doing in terms of claims and actions regarding those claims.

Beyond that, your Honor, I continue to meet with the pension holders on a monthly basis in a town-hall-style meeting to address questions and concerns. I am happy to report, as I think I have reported in the past, that those meetings are getting shorter, which I hope is an indication that the pension holders that do partake in those meetings are feeling more comfortable with the information that they're getting, that they are comfortable with the fact they are getting information, that this is as transparent of a process as we can possibly make it and that the information is being provided on a moment-to-moment basis.

As I receive a piece of information that is relevant to the website, for example, it gets posted within a few hours so that information is a constant flow and that website is being updated consistently. I still receive several calls and e-mails on a daily basis, which are responded to with pension holder questions that are specific to them, not necessarily general questions, but

we're attending to as quickly as we possibly can. I met with the advisory committee that this Court had established. I was meeting with them on a weekly basis. It has now moved to every two to three weeks, and that is mostly based on scheduling, not by design necessarily. But those meetings have been productive. There are a lot of different ideas and as ideas come up, we go back and we gather data that may be relevant to those ideas in the event that at some point I do have to come before this Court and make a recommendation on reduction of benefits.

Beyond that, your Honor, all of those efforts I just spoke of continue. We will continue to engage in discussions with the P.B.G.C. Special counsel continues to review the documents that they have been getting relative to the subpoenas and I continue to speak with special counsel regarding the investigation and we will continue to monitor. If anything, obviously, comes up, I will be bringing it to the Court's attention on an emergency basis with regard to the assets allocation or investments.

Beyond that, I'm not sure if I asked for it in the report, but at the last hearing your Honor had asked to have this hearing scheduled sixty days from the last one. In the order I presented to the Court, I make that same assumption that we will have another interim report

scheduled for 60 days from today unless your Honor wants it sooner or later.

Barring that, if you have no questions, I will move over to the fee portion.

THE COURT: You may proceed.

MR. DEL SESTO: Thank you, your Honor. In connection with this third interim report, your Honor, I have current cash on hand in the amount of \$264,962.60. I can tell the Court that all of the funds that the Receiver is holding in the estate account are the result of disbursements made by Roger Williams, the former or the shell company of Roger Williams that is winding down its efforts.

I have submitted to the Court invoices for my fees, costs, and expenses from March 1st through April 30, 2018, as well as Special Counsel's fees, costs, and expenses for that same period of time and I'm asking the the Court approve those amounts which are -- if you give me a moment. The fees associated with my fees, costs, and expenses are \$57,015.50, with costs of \$44.02. And Special Counsel's fees, your Honor, are, I believe, it's a total of \$155,473.16, which is inclusive of disbursements of \$20,098.16. So in connection with this third interim report, I am asking that the Court approve those fees, costs, and expenses both of the Receiver as

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

well as Special Counsel. And as I stated, set a hearing down for 60 days from today on a fourth interim report unless an emergency issue arises sooner.

THE COURT: Does counsel wish the Special Counsel to be heard or not?

MR. DEL SESTO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Counsel, you may proceed.

Thank you, your Honor. I think I need MR. WISTOW: to thank the participants in the plan for their patience and understanding of a drawn out process, and I can imagine what it feels like to hear the fees that are being expended and nothing has happened so far. Receiver has indicated in the report that suit will be brought within 30 days from the date he filed the report. I want to say that we intend to do that. Our investigation is coming to a close. We have definite plans of suits against definite defendants for reasons that I needn't explain to your Honor. I want to keep those confidential at this point, but I want the planned participants to know that something is going to be happening within that timetable. There has been agreement between me, my office, and the Receiver that we are going to get going.

MR. DEL SESTO: I don't have anything more, your Honor. I'm just here to answer questions if the Court

has any.

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

THE COURT: No. I'm fine with the sixty days as far as the report. Based on your representations made in your report about suit being filed, I will leave it to you to see once that happens whether an interim report should happen earlier or whether you may want to convene another public-type meeting so you can go through that with the planned participants. No objection being filed, the Court approves the third interim report of the Receiver.

The Court has had the opportunity to review the individual line items of the fees that you had gone through on the record of both the Receiver and the Special Counsel has sixty days plus some significant I also note even with costs, fees, and expenses. respect to the expenses, I do note an effort in terms of trying to keep costs down. One thing that, quite frankly, jumped out at me because I'm well aware that many firms are charging as much as 40 or 50 cents a page for copying and that the Special Counsel is charging five cents a page, which may just make up for the maintenance fees of the machine, if that. But, I really appreciate, although the numbers are large, this is a significant The Court finds that the fees and expenses are fair and reasonable and for the benefit of the estate and 1 they are approved.

Please continue, especially as we are getting to the suit stage, to keep the participants in the loop in terms of what is going on through their counsel and individually. I know that this has been a long slob in terms of the investigation. I notice that some of these hearings we're getting less people in the courtroom. I just want to state, as I said from the beginning, that I rather you take the time and get it right as opposed to doing it too quickly and it looks like we're getting to that point.

With that, the Court is going to adjourn this hearing. The Court will take up at 2:00 p.m. the continued motion by the special counsel as far as the failure to comply with the Rhode Island Department of Health to the subpoena that was issued and we'll take that up at 2:00 p.m. Thank you very much. The Court is in recess.

(ADJOURNED.)

JUNE 11, 2018

GINA GOMES, COURT REPORTER PROVIDENCE SUPERIOR COURT OFFICE OF COURT REPORTERS 250 BENEFIT STREET PROVIDENCE, RI 02903

TO: STEPHEN DEL SESTO, ESQUIRE

A transcript request in the matter of St. Joseph's Health Services of R.I. vs. St. Joseph's Health Services of RI Retirement Plan, Pc-2017-3856, heard before the Honorable Justice Brian Stern on May 31, 2018.

5/31/18 27 pages \$3.00 each

\$81.00

AMOUNT DUE

\$81.00