STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS SUPERIOR COURT PROVIDENCE, SC. ST. JOSEPH'S HEALTH SERVICES OF) RHODE ISLAND) C.A. NO. PC-2017-3856 VS. ST. JOSEPH'S HEALTH SERVICES OF) RHODE ISLAND RETIREMENT PLAN HEARD BEFORE THE HONORABLE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE BRIAN P. STERN ON MAY 15, 2019

APPEARANCES:

STEPHEN DEL SESTO, ESQUIRE......THE RECEIVER

GINA GIANFRANCESCO GOMES COURT REPORTER

CERTIFICATION

I, Gina Gianfrancesco Gomes, hereby certify that the succeeding pages 1 through 9, inclusive, are a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes.

GINA GIÁNFRANCESCO GOMES COURT REPORTER

WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 2019

MORNING SESSION

THE CLERK: Your Honor, the matter before the Court is PC-2017-3856, St. Joseph's Health Services of Rhode Island v. St. Joseph's Health Services of Rhode Island Retirement Plan. This is on for the Receiver's ninth interim report and eighth request for approval of fees. Would counsel please identify himself.

MR. DEL SESTO: Good morning, your Honor. Stephen
Del Sesto, the court-appointed Receiver for the St.
Joseph's Health Services of Rhode Island Retirement Plan.

THE COURT: You may proceed.

MR. DEL SESTO: Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, we were last before the Court approximately six days ago on the eighth interim report. In that time there has actually been some substantial action that has taken place with regard to the plan. As of today, your Honor, the plan assets are approximately \$73 million. I do want to note for the Court, and I did note it in my report, that when we started in August of 2017 we had approximately \$85 million. As I just stated, we're down to about \$73 million now, which is approximately a \$12 million diminished amount. However, in that same time, your Honor, we have paid out approximately \$22 million in benefits as well as other costs related to the plan. So

while the \$12 million reduction is significant, I am at least happy to report to the Court that the investments, because that is the only source of income for this plan at this time, has buoyed it somewhat. Unfortunately, I have to thank the market, not my own acting on that, but it is a fact that remains, your Honor, that those investments have been assisting.

In addition, your Honor, as your Honor is aware there was a joint conference held approximately a month ago. Your Honor and Judge Smith in the Federal Court requested that conference and all parties' counsel attended that conference. The result of that conference was not only to have a joint status of what was taking place both in this court as well as the Federal Court, but mostly geared toward a discussion as to whether or not something could happen that would put the parties in a position to either resolve the litigation issues or at least narrow those litigation issues. As your Honor is aware, although not formally ordered, there was a very strong suggestion by both this Court and the Federal Court that the parties look to mediation. have agreed to terms of mediation and that will be starting tomorrow. It's scheduled for two days and, obviously, I will provide a report to the Court as to the results of that mediation. I am hopeful that at the very

25

1

2.

3

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

least it will result in the narrowing of some issues.

Obviously, it would be ideal if it could resolve all, but

it remains to be seen what will happen over those next

two days.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In addition, your Honor, Judge Smith has approved preliminary the settlement that this Court approved as being in the best interest of the plan with CharterCare Community Board, the old St. Joe's and the old Roger Williams. Now that it has received that preliminary approval, the next step is final approval, which Judge Smith indicated that he wanted to wait until the mediation proceeded before he dealt with that issue. In addition, we had a telephone conference yesterday in advance of the mediation and one piece of that conference came out where CharterCare Foundation, CCF, who also entered into a settlement with me and this Court approved it as being in the best interest of the plan inquired as to whether or not preliminary approval would go forward Judge Smith indicated that he would probably be scheduling a hearing within the next few days for that so that settlement could also move to that next step.

Beyond that, your Honor, the most significant event that has occurred -- actually, let me speak to the last hearing before this Court in which Prospect sought motion notice of intent to sue in Delaware and in the

22

23

24

alternative motion for relief. Your Honor heard arguments. It was a lengthy argument in which Prospect and the Receiver's counsel presented to the Court, and at the end of that argument, your Honor took it under advisement and deferred any ruling. So as a result the parties are progressing to mediation. That hearing has been heard and we will await the Court's decision when the Court deems that to be an appropriate time to release that.

In addition, your Honor, the most significant event that has occurred since the last report is on April 15th I took actions to bring the plan under ERISA. That's a voluntary election. As your Honor is aware, this plan historically has been treated as a church plan and church plans are exempt from the requirements under ERISA. However, even an exempt plan can voluntarily elect to be covered under ERISA. So on April 15th I filed the requisit forms which were the 5500 with the IRS, an 8955 SSA with the Department of Labor, as well as a premium filing with the PBGC, The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, which are necessary to trigger that election.

In addition to the PBGC filing there was also a payment of the premium due to the PBGC of approximately \$1.5 million, slightly more than 1.5, and the election

it's important to note was retroactive or I seek retroactive election to July 1, 2017. The reason for that date, your Honor, is that is the beginning of the plan year. The plan year begins on July 1st of each year and under the regulations and the election allowances I am only allowed to go back two years in terms of the I would have gone back further if I could, but election. the regulations require me to limit it to two years. a result now, your Honor, as of April 15th I have sought voluntarily to be covered under ERISA in connection with that election. The plan, which was a church plan prior Ι to that time, did not comply with ERISA regulations. have amended the plan to bring it in compliance with ERISA.

In addition, there are certain investments that are non-ERISA investments that a church plan can participate in. We had to -- I'll call it ERISAify the investments as well. As of this date the plan has been amended and the investments have been amended to reflect all ERISA compliant investments. As far as investments are concerned, your Honor, the vehicles are the same. There is just an ERISA and a non-ERISA version. The impact to the plan in terms of the performance of those investments should be nothing at all. The investments should perform the same.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Now that this is done, the next step is to have a meeting with the IRS and the Department of Labor because we have amended the plan to make it compliant under ERISA as of April 15th. However, we have elected to have ERISA coverage as far back as July 1, 2017. As a result the IRS and the Department of Labor are going to require me to develop an action plan to, I guess I'll call it, correct the non-ERISA problems that existed prior to the plan's amendment. That will be done in cooperation and conjunction with the Department of Labor and the IRS, and whatever the Department of Labor and IRS identify as the appropriate action to take, we will take that action in an effort to cure the non-ERISA compliant issues for the plan as far back as July 1, 2017.

It's important to note for the Court as well as for the participants that the filing itself does not actually provide any additional protection to the plan. As I stated in the report, it's my belief, one, that the filing will have no impact on the litigation or the claims we have made in the litigation. In addition, at this time I have no insight into what position any of the federal agencies, the IRS or the Department of Labor or the PBGC, will take relative to the election and relative to most importantly the PBGC coverage. Based on the conversations that I had with the PBGC prior to the

election they had taken what I would call a non-position, which is to merely state that factually the plan had been treated like a church plan historically and that until an agency or a Court indicated that it should be treated differently, the PBGC will not look at it any differently. When asked what would happen if an election were made, the response was essentially we will deal with that when it happens if it happens.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So just because we have made the election, I want to make it very very clear that does not mean that all of a sudden there is federal protection. I know there have been some reports and some news outlets that seem to indicate that there is now protection. I think those articles went a step or two too far in terms of characterizing the effect of this election and that this is an election that I believe was necessary and appropriate based on the condition of the plan as it is today as well as the claims that were brought in the litigation with the hope that it will also result in the benefits of the plan. But it's most important to say that as of my appointment, the ERISA compliance issue for this plan was necessary and I did it in order to protect the plan and make sure that the plan was operating as it should under both federal and state law. Unless your Honor has any questions, I can move to the fee portion.

THE COURT: That would be fine.

J

MR. DEL SESTO: Thank you, your Honor. For the period of time from February 1, 2019, through March 31, 2019, I have fees, costs, and expenses totalling \$68,431.95. I have provided an itemized invoice to the Court for review. In addition to those fees, costs, and expenses, in accordance with the engagement that I entered into with Special Counsel, it allows for me to reimburse Special Counsel out-of-pocket hard costs, and to date out-of-pocket hard costs -- not for the same time period. This time period is longer than the past two months -- total \$33,071.16.

In connection with the report today, I am asking that the Court approve the fees, costs, and expenses of the Receiver as reasonable and necessary and appropriate for the protection of the plan and also authorize me, consistent with the terms of the engagement that was approved by this Court, to reimburse Special Counsel their hard out-of-pocket expenses in that amount of \$33,071.16. I will tell your Honor that I do have cash on hand totalling \$69,195.40. Since the last report I have had disbursements of \$9,324.54 and that now as of this report reduces the cash on hand to \$58,870.86. That cash is being healed by the Receiver, your Honor, in a separate account for expenses similar to reimbursement to

Special Counsel and then all other expenses that are appropriate under ERISA are born by the plan, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. No objection having been filed, the Court at this point after reviewing the report and hearing the presentation, ratifies the acts and deeds of the Receiver and approves the report. As I indicated to the Receiver prior to taking the bench, I did receive the backup materials on the fees and costs but have not had the opportunity to review them. What I am going to ask the Receiver to do is submit an order both on the report as well as the expenses and leave the fee portion blank. The Court will review it over the next day and issue the appropriate order.

MR. DEL SESTO: I will do that. Thank you, your Honor.

(ADJOURNED.)