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

PROVIDENCE, SC.

SUPERIOR COURT

C.A. NO. PC-2017-3856

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

## HEARD BEFORE

# THE HONORABLE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE BRIAN P. STERN ON SEPTEMBER 25, 2018

# 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 13, inclusive, are a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes.

GINA GIANFRANCESCO GOMES

COURT REPORTER

## 

# 

# 

#### 

# 

#### 

# 

#### 

## 

# 

#### 

#### 

# 

## 

#### 

## 

# 

## 

# 

# 

# 

#### 

#### 

# TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2018

## MORNING SESSION

THE CLERK: The matter before the Court is Case

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

Rhode Island v. St. Joseph's Health Services Retirement

Plan. This is on for the Receiver's Sixth Interim Report

and the Fifth Request for Attorneys' Fees. Would counsel

please identify yourselves for the record.

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

THE COURT: Good morning. I have had the opportunity to review the report and fees. You may proceed, counsel.

MR. DEL SESTO: Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor as was stated at the call of the calendar, we're here on the sixth interim report and the fifth request for fees on this matter. Just to recap, I was appointed the temporary receiver of the plan on August 17, 2017, and later appointed permanent receiver on October 11, 2017. We were last before your Honor on the fifth report on July 26, 2018.

I will start with what we ended the fifth report on, which is at the conclusion of the fifth report, I advised the Court of a then recently arising issue related to the transition of information from Angell to GRS. As your

1.0

Honor knows, we had a conference immediately after, I believe it was the very next day, between myself and counsel, for Angell. I am happy to report to the Court that after a very fruitful and constructive telephone conference between GRS, Angell, as well as counsel, the issue had been resolved. It was resolved relatively quickly and without much concern and that the information transition started about early August.

As of today, I would report to the Court that we are what I would call maybe about 90 percent completed with the transition of the information that Angell has used over the past 10 to 12 years in their capacity as actuary. All that remains is there are five benefit calculation summaries that need to be produced over to GRS.

In addition to that, GRS has begun the process of preparing and completing the 2017 actuary evaluation.

And the only thing, I'm leaving this outside of the 98 percent, but Angell advised us about a week and a half to two weeks ago that they also have, in hard copy form only, all the documents that they had obtained from Payon, who is the predecessor actuary and asked GRS if they wanted that as well. After a very brief discussion, it was determined that that information is relevant and was utilized by Angell and GRS would need to go back and

determine certain information regarding a participant's benefit calculation. So that information now has to be compiled, boxed, and delivered to GRS.

Like I said, that issue just came up for the first time about two weeks ago and it's in the process of being done. There are no issues that I see in getting it done other than the fact that it will take time because it's in hard copy, not digital. So other than that, GRS is fully on board. At the very beginning of August, one of the main focuses of the conversation with Angell was to get information over to GRS that was essential to making sure that the participants, who either sought to file an application or were at an election stage, that information could be dealt with quickly so that those participants could be -- those that elected to be on receiving benefits as quickly as possible and those that had application that that process could move along as quickly as possible.

I'm happy to say GRS got on that very very quickly and was able to process all of the elections with the exception of one and two in advance of the September 1st payment date and that the rest, obviously, will start on October 1st and the application process is moving along very very quickly. All reports back to me from any participants are that the communication process between

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

them and GRS has been very, very, very fluid, flawless, that GRS has been responsive and I received no complaints from anybody about timing or anything of that nature.

Your Honor, in this process we, I'll call it, put in quotes, we established a new team for the plan. team includes GRS, who I just mentioned as the plan actuary, Caliber, who are the accountants for the plan. I've also brought on Jeffrey Cohen, from Bailey & Ehrenberg in Washington, DC. As the Court may recall Attorney Cohen was general counsel with PBGC for about 15 years so he has a welcome experience in that area. And the only member who is not new to the plan is Mercer. have gotten into a routine with each one of those parties where I have constant e-mails with them, but we have a call scheduled depending on the party every week or every two weeks as being necessary to discuss relating to the plan, issues related to the investment portfolio, so on and so forth.

I did have a face-to-face meeting with Mercer in August which we reviewed market conditions, the investment portfolio, and things of that nature, and in addition to regular e-mails, I continue to have calls with them every 10 to 14 days. While I understand that the investment is a longer term issue, I want to make sure that we aren't surprised by anything and that Mercer

is consistently reviewing and assessing where our position is to make sure if there is a downturn in the market, the result to the plan will be as minimal as possible.

As of the end of July we had just over \$81 million in the plan and that continues. The significant erosion in those assets, if your Honor recalls, in the beginning we had approximately \$5 million. As a result of the unfreezing of applications and collections, there were several payments that needed to be made all at once in March, April, May, and June. That is what has resulted in the erosion, not market conditions or things like that, just those payments going in.

As the Court knows we filed complaints in both this Court as well as the federal court against 14 defendants. We also filed a motion to intervene in the Superior Court Cy Pres matter which arose out of the 2014 hospital conversion transaction. The state court litigation, as the Court knows, has been stayed by consent of the parties. The federal court litigation is ongoing.

We had a conference with Judge Smith on July 30th where the Court set a briefing schedule to deal with dispositive motions. That briefing schedule required all defendants to file their dispositive motions on September 15th. I believe it actually rolled to the 16th, because

the 15th was a Sunday. Then we have until November 15th to provide responses, and then December 15th for the Defendants to provide their responses to our responses. I can tell your Honor that all parties with the exception of St. Joseph Health Services of Rhode Island, Roger Williams, and CharterCARE Community Board all filed some dispositive motions in the federal case, which we will be responding to in the deadline set by that court.

In addition to that, as this Court is well aware, Judge Smith had sent notice out identifying that there will be a conference tomorrow morning with all parties, Judge Smith, and your Honor, to discuss the coordination of the two courts with the various receivership Cy Pres and state litigation, federal litigation issues, as well as the motion to settle and things of that nature. That will obviously happen tomorrow morning at 9:30.

On June 18th we filed a motion to intervene. As the Court is well aware, that issue was extensively briefed. We had a hearing on September 13th and then on September 17th, last Monday, a week ago Monday, this Court issued a bench decision granting that motion. We will now move forward as is appropriate in the motion to intervene. In addition, there was a motion to lift confidentiality of certain documents that were produced to the Receiver during the investigatory phase relating to the 2014

3

2

\_\_\_\_

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Hospital Conversion Application. There were responses but no objections to that motion to lift and the Court entered an order approving that motion to lift the confidentiality for a limited purpose as to certain documents on September 17th as well.

The most significant thing that has happened, your Honor, in this case probably since the filing of the complaints, was on September 4th we filed a petition to approve settlement of the litigation claims that we had asserted against St. Joseph's Rhode Island Health Services, Inc., Roger Williams, as well as the CharterCARE Community Board. A hearing was scheduled on that matter for September 13th. However, CharterCARE Foundation filed an objection, the Attorney General's Office joined in that objection, and the Prospect entities filed a motion to continue that hearing. After a very brief hearing, the Court did agree to continue that hearing to October 10th and set a briefing schedule for the parties. Based on the briefing schedule any objections to the settlement are due on September 27th and then the Receiver will have until October 5th to reply with a hearing on the 10th.

Just in summary, your Honor, for the benefit of the record, the settlement is between the Receiver as well as the other named Plaintiffs from the class action and

St. Joseph's Health Services, Roger Williams, and CharterCARE Community Board. The result of that settlement will be an immediate payment of \$11.15 million to the estate for the benefit of the plan, and there is also the assignment of certain rights and interests that will go along as to any one of those three settling entities believe that they hold. The minimum that the plan will receive from that settlement is the \$11.5 There is the potential for more. As I stated, this Court will address the settlement on October 10th and the other couple of high point details. going to get into the issue because it's being briefed at this time.

In addition to all of that, your Honor, I continue to meet with the advisory committee. Although as a result of the transition from Angell to GRS, those meetings have been suspended for a short period of time mostly because we do require for discussion of those meetings information that the actuary produces, so we wanted to get the new actuary in place so they could not only confirm information that we previously received, but also could respond with other data that we think is relevant to those discussions.

I continue to have the monthly Town Hall meetings and they are still very well attended. I believe,

24

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

although I don't take a head count at the meetings, it's generally about 100 to 150 people that attend and then a digital recording of those meetings are posted on the website so that any person who either can't attend because of a scheduling conflict or because they don't lend a stake in the view of what is discussed in those meetings.

Your Honor, at this time I would like to formally ask the Court to renew the postponement of the benefit adjustment. As we stated I believe it was on the fourth report, I wanted to get the timing of that issue in line with the timing of the reports for the same reasons that I stated in March and each report thereafter, I am asking that this Court defer any requirement of me to present a benefit adjustment to the Court until at least the seventh interim report, which I will be asking the Court to set down for 60 days from now. Obviously, if something happens in the interim that requires a hearing on the issue before that, I will seek that hearing from the Court. But without anything occurring, I will be asking for a 60-day deferral on that.

As of the last report, your Honor, we had cash on hand of \$360,024.15. As your Honor knows, that money or funds that were provided to the estate from, I believe, it was Roger Williams from cash that they had on hand.

2.2

Since the last report, your Honor, we had no receipts, no additional money has come in. We had disbursements totaling \$243,850.58, leaving cash on hand at this time in the amount of \$116,173.57.

That concludes my report, your Honor. If you have no question or unless you have any questions, I will move on to the fee portion.

THE COURT: That's fine. Just to clarify as far as the transition to GRS, that is complete at this point and we're getting less phone calls about the issues?

MR. DEL SESTO: Much, much. Actually, I received almost no phone calls at this point in time regarding anything relating to the actuarial services. Like I said, with the exception of the six balance summaries, everything that could be digitally transitioned over to GRS has been.

THE COURT: Why don't move on to the fee portion.

MR. DEL SESTO: Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, regarding the fifth request for fees, the fees presented to the Court run the span of time of July 1, 2018, through August 31, 2018. Fees and expenses for that time period total \$64,226.64. As your Honor is well aware, the fees and expenses associated with Special Counsel now that the litigation has been filed are in what I will call the contingency phase, so other hard expenses that

are incurred by Special Counsel, there are no fees that are being sought by Special Counsel going forward. So the fees represent only the fees, costs, and expenses of me and my team relative to that two-month period. And unless there is any objection, I would be asking the Court to approve that amount in full in connection with the 6th interim report.

2.2

THE COURT: Thank you very much, counsel. The Court prior to hearing received no objection to the Receiver's sixth interim report. Does anyone wish to be heard with respect to the report? Hearing none, as I said, the Court has reviewed your report beforehand. I just want to hit on a couple of points. During your last report there were some issues raised as far as a letter received from Angell and I do want to thank Attorney Boyajian, who resolved any miscommunications. I am very happy to hear that is moving forward.

Second, as counsel mentioned Chief Judge Smith and I are both in a joint conference call on the state and federal action with respect to case management tomorrow morning with the attorneys that have entered in the case itself. At this point what is pending before the Court other than this motion is the petition to approve the settlement by the Receivership and that is currently scheduled for October 10th. The Court has reviewed the

report, the Court ratifies the acts and deeds of the Receiver, and has also reviewed, and I did receive an in-camera copy of the fees, costs, and expenses by the Receiver. Again, as you stated properly, the Special Counsel has converted over to a contingency fee at this point. I have reviewed the fees and expenses and I find those are fair and reasonable and for the benefit of the estate and that amount is approved.

Finally, this will be the last hearing we will have in Presiding Justice Gibney's courtroom in Courtroom 12. As of next week, I'm not happy about the reason, but Justice Silverstein will be retiring on Friday. I will be moving in Courtroom Five which is large enough to accommodate everyone in the case. Please submit the appropriate order to the Court.

MR. DEL SESTO: I will, your Honor. Just the order does indicate, your Honor, that we will be setting the next hearing down for 60 days. Based on my quick calculations, I have that right around Thanksgiving. So that may go into December.

THE COURT: That's fine. If you can just coordinate with Miss Miley.

MR. DEL SESTO: I will. I have an order, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good. You can hand that up.

(Document handed to the Court.) THE COURT: And incorporated in the order, I forgot to mention, that we will defer any recommendation as far as any adjustment of benefits. MR. DEL SESTO: Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you. The Court is in recess. (ADJOURNED.)