



**EXECUTIVE BOARD  
Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, October 9, 2014  
IRMA Office  
9:30 a.m.**

**PRESENT:** Drew Irvin, Chair  
Ingrid Velkme  
Eric Palm  
Eileen Donahue  
Kathleen Gargano  
David Clark  
Bridget Wachtel  
Julia Cedillo

**ALSO PRESENT:** Margo Ely  
Susan Garvey  
Jackie Streid  
Chris Naveja  
Donna Sluis  
Dan LeTourneau  
Rita Boserup

**ABSENT:** Paula Schumacher

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Irvin called the meeting to order. Roll was taken and a quorum declared.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 28, 2014**

A motion was made by Palm and seconded by Velkme to approve the Executive Board Meeting Minutes of May 28, 2014. A voice vote was called and the motion carried, with Wachtel abstaining.

Reports for information Only, Found in the Member Section of the IRMA website

Irvin stated that these reports were for information only and asked if anyone had any questions. Hearing none, Irvin moved to the next agenda item.

**III. CHAIR'S REPORT - IRVIN**

**Announcement of Formation of Nominating Committee for 2015 Officers**

Irvin introduced Velkme as the Chair of the Nominating Committee. Velkme stated that she would be looking for some people to serve on the committee and would make that announcement at the October 29<sup>th</sup> Board of Directors meeting. Velkme noted that the slate of candidates would include the Treasurer/Finance Committee Chair and both the At-Large Representative for a Large IRMA Member and At-Large Representative for a Small IRMA Member.

**Contribution Structure Task Force**

Ely stated that there have been some discussions among some of our larger members regarding our contribution structure creating a situation where they may subsidize the rest of the pool disproportionately. Ely stated that she and Irvin have met with some members who have this concern. At this point, the agenda item asks that the Executive Board appoint a task force to look at this question. Ely noted that she believed that this

question has been discussed previously and the solution was to create a \$250,000 permanent deductible. Nobody has taken that deductible, and staff believes that the way it is structured is not very functional because we do not have an actuarial formula for how they would be individually rated on a year by year basis. Ely stated that she also believed an individually rated structure is antithetical to pooling philosophy. Further, there is confusion about how an individually rated member might transition back into the pool. Ely reported that Milliman has had discussions with staff on this issue, and have given us a proposal of between \$20,000 and \$24,000 to help with this. In addition, Peter Wright has given us a proposal for around \$7,500 to help us out. Ely noted that staff is not asking for approval to these contracts, but just approval to identify the task force.

Irvin commented that he and Ely had discussed whether to assign this to one of the standing committees or to appoint a special committee. The committee would certainly contain some member of the standing committees. However, by appointing a task force, the members would be more flexible in meeting with more frequency than a standing committee. Irvin stated that Ely would be the liaison and we could give her some tools to help her go through this. Irvin stated that since Milliman and Peter Wright have already met, they did have some ideas already. He felt that this project could be completed within a year.

Palm asked how many members had expressed concerns over this. Irvin stated that there were a handful of members that met on this, led by the City of Lake Forest.

Wachtel asked whether we are comfortable that our contribution formula for medium to small members is still working well. Boserup stated that staff met with the actuaries on that and without doing a big study, the quick overview is that the medium members are equal – they support what they pay in. The smaller members are being subsidized, but to what extent we do not know and the larger members are subsidizing the smaller members.

Ely stated that at this point it's just to study the issue and develop some recommendations, if any. Wachtel asked if this was budgeted for. Ely replied, no.

Irvin asked what the thoughts of the Executive Board were. Did they want to leave this at the Executive Board level or have the report given to the Administration & Finance Committee first? Palm stated that he felt comfortable with having the task force liaison as Ely and she could report back to the Executive Board. Irvin stated that he also felt that the task force should meet and work with Ely and she could come back to the Executive Board with a report and we could move on from there. If it requires changes that need to go to the Administration & Finance Committee then those changes can go through that committee.

Palm commented that the proposed listing of members of the task force seems to be skewed toward the north. It was suggested that Steve Tilton from Tinley Park be asked to join the committee. Ely stated that she still has to ask the people on the list to sit on the task force. Cedillo indicated that she would sit on the task force. Irvin stated that if anyone had any other suggestions for addition to the task force, they should contact Ely.

Irvin stated that he was looking for a motion to give Ely direction to move forward with the task force and approve the contracts with Milliman and Peter Wright. Ely stated that she wasn't looking for the approval on the contracts because we do not have money in the 2014 budget. These contracts would be added to the 2015 budget.

Palm stated that this could have some big changes potentially that could set the landscape of how we set our premiums. Irvin stated that the idea would be to get the project started now and budget for it in 2015. If that is the case, then the full Board would get the chance to weigh in on it.

Ely stated that there are two ways this is going to get to the Board. One is through the 2015 budget. There will be a line item in the budget. So when they approve the budget, they will be approving the contracts and ratifying the task force idea. The other way to do it is to bring this actual agenda item to the next Board meeting for action or put on the agenda for information and if they want to talk about it, they will. The development of a task force doesn't require approval of the Board. Irvin stated he would be more inclined to bring it to the next Board meeting and ask for the approval of the contracts outside the budget. Ely asked Boserup if we would need an amendment to the budget. Boserup stated she would have to look to see what surplus money was available. Cedillo stated that she felt it should go to the next Board meeting for their information. Ely noted that this whole idea is so undeveloped there is a potential that it may instill fear in some members, as Palm has suggested, and she wouldn't want for the issue to be denied because of the unfounded fear.

Gargano recommended that the top 4 or 5 large members be invited to sit on the task force. Irvin suggested that we try and get the Chair of the Administration & Finance Committee on the task force. Ely stated that if the Executive Board feels that the full Board needs to see this before we begin work with the task force, she can draft it in that way. After a brief discussion, it was decided to bring it to the next Board as information and also invite people to join the task force. The contract money will come back to the Executive Board either as part of the 2015 budget or as a budget amendment.

#### **IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

##### **A. MEMBERSHIP RELATIONS COMMITTEE – WACHTEL**

###### **1. Legislative Lobbyist Contract Approval**

Wachtel reported that the Membership Relations Committee reviewed the Agreement with the Legislative Lobbyist at their September 10, 2014 meeting and made the recommendation to approve a contract with Vaughn Consulting Services for 2015 in the amount of \$2,000 per month, which is included in the budget. Wachtel stated that they had some discussion about the value of lobbyist services and feel that there is still some value there, especially most recently with the pooling legislation. Wachtel reported that the committee talked about a mechanism by which the membership could see the efforts of our lobbyist and Garvey will follow-up on that.

Garvey made the comment that the dates on the contract were incorrect and needed to be changed to 2015 dates. Garvey also noted that the committee talked about having him come to more than one Board meeting per year. Gargano stated that she would like to see more of an ROI from Vaughn. He seems to only talk about the big issues, but she would like to learn more about whom he is making contact with in working on our behalf.

Irvin mentioned that in regards to the earlier mention of ROI, there has been some discussion at the Northwest Municipal Conference regarding the value of lobbying

versus spending dollars on public relations. One of the members dropped some serious dollars on a public relations firm very successfully, rather than going the traditional way of contracting with a lobbyist. Irvin stated that he was throwing this out there to plant the seed that in the future there might be a place or time that this method might work better for us.

Wachtel made a motion that was seconded by Gargano to approve the contract with Vaughn Consulting Services for 2015. A voice vote was called and the motion carried.

## **2. Village of Oak Park Membership Application**

LeTourneau reported that this is the second time that we have presented Oak Park for IRMA Membership. LeTourneau stated that he had talked with Paul Stephanides, Oak Park's new Director of Legal Services, yesterday and he indicated that they have a quote from Mesirow and are still waiting for a quote on their excess coverage from Arthur J. Gallagher. LeTourneau stated that he had told Stephanides that he would bring this to the Executive Board today, but would not recommend bringing this to the Board of Directors unless Oak Park had a staff recommendation for approval for IRMA. We can bring this to the Board of Directors in December, if needed.

LeTourneau reported that Oak Park is one of the few municipalities to participate in the IRMA Prospective Member Fee for Service Program at their cost during 2012. Oak Park has a five year average revenue base of over \$76 million, which would rank highest among current IRMA members. Their claims frequency is below the IRMA frequency target in all five years analyzed. Their severity is also under the IRMA target in four of five years and their five year average. They are looking at all levels of deductibles, but most likely the \$250,000 deductible will meet their needs.

LeTourneau stated that staff is looking for approval at the Executive Board level, but unless we get approval prior to the October Board of Directors meeting, we will bring it to the December Board of Directors meeting, if needed.

Palm asked Ely what kind of impact Oak Park would have on the claims staff and whether she anticipated any increase in staff. Ely stated that this is something that we would watch; however, based on the 50 workers' compensation claims a year they have, she didn't think it was at a sufficient level to justify any staff adjustment.

After a brief discussion, a motion was made by Wachtel and seconded by Velkme to approve the Membership Application of the Village of Oak Park and to hold for the December Board meeting, if we don't hear back from Oak Park prior to the October Board meeting. A voice vote was called and the motion carried.

## **B. TRAINING & EDUCATION COMMITTEE – DONAHUE**

### **1. Proposed 2015 Training Programs**

Donahue stated that this item was for information and listed out the proposed training for 2015.

## **2. Titan Safety Management Agreement**

Donahue reported that the Training & Education Committee reviewed the agreement and thought it was fair. Crimmins has lowered his pricing for 2015 and also for 2016. The committee discussed his outstanding service and the experience each of them has had with him.

A motion was made by Donahue and seconded by Wachtel to approve the Titan Safety Management Agreement for service from January 1, 2015 to January 1, 2020. A voice vote was called and the motion carried.

Wachtel asked whether it would be possible to add a standard training session on contract liability. Wachtel commented that she felt this was training that everyone could learn something from on a regular basis. Jackie stated that the training is currently being offered as onsite training, but we could set it up as a regional training for 2015.

## **C. COVERAGE, CLAIMS & LITIGATION COMMITTEE – CEDILLO**

### **1. Workers' Compensation Claims Approach**

Cedillo stated that this item includes a memo from Ely that outlines a more proactive and partnership approach to the management of workers' compensation claims. This approach includes a number of best practices to be administered at different points in the claim management process. Cedillo stated this information was included in a past E-News. Members can expect to be reminded of these best practices as they manage their workers' compensation cases. Cedillo stated that members are encouraged to use this new approach.

### **2. Litigation Successes**

Cedillo stated that this memo from Ely highlighted the recent litigation successes since the last time that the Coverage, Claims & Litigation Committee met.

### **3. Increase in Settlement Levels for Liability Cases**

Cedillo noted that this is similar to the increases that were approved in regards to Workers' Compensation Indemnity Settlement Authority. Cedillo noted that the liability settlement authority levels haven't been reviewed or revised since 2003. Specifically, staff is recommending and the Coverage, Claims & Litigation Committee concurred with increasing the settlement authority of the Executive Director for liability claims to \$500,000; increasing the settlement authority of the Coverage, Claims & Litigation Committee for liability claims from \$500,000 to \$750,000; and adding settlement authority of \$300,000 for the Director of Legal Services for liability and workers' compensation claims.

A motion was made by Gargano and seconded by Velkme to approve the recommendation of staff and the Coverage, Claims & Litigation Committee as outlined in the memo of August 19, 2014 and redlined in the Claims Policy that accompanied the memo. A voice vote was called and the motion carried.

#### **4. 2015 Excess/Reinsurance Coverage**

Cedillo asked LeTourneau to give a brief overview of the program.

LeTourneau reported that we will not be changing any of our insurance carriers. LeTourneau referenced the exposure column in the chart on page 69 of the packet and stated that overall we have a 1% increase in the overall cost for all our excess and commercial insurance. However, exposures are going up much more than that in each line of coverage. There would have been an overall cost reduction if member exposure bases weren't increasing. LeTourneau also referenced the rate column, noting that we have received either rate reductions or flat rates in all lines of coverage. LeTourneau pointed out that the actual benchmarking pricing prepared by JLT Re on the liability line of coverage was 11% higher with Genesis and 26% higher with Munich Re than the actual quotes we received from them, confirming very aggressive pricing for IRMA. LeTourneau commented that the overall renewal was very positive. In regards to the Optional Coverages, LeTourneau stated that Volunteer Accident/Disability has no rate increase because it is locked in for the final year of a 3-year policy. However, because of three large claims during this past year, we can expect this coverage to increase in 2016.

A motion was made by Gargano and seconded by Wachtel to approve the 2015 Excess/Reinsurance Coverage Program remaining at the \$10 million liability limits with the current \$6 million Annual IRMA Member Aggregate Cap for 2015. A voice vote was called and the motion carried.

#### **D. ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE COMMITTEE – CLARK**

##### **1. Outsourcing/Revenue Base Deductions**

Clark stated that this item had been previously reviewed and pulled from a previous Board of Directors agenda for further consideration related to an issue raised by Carol Stream concerning the application of certain revenue base exclusions related to enterprise funds versus contracts and whether or not they should be entitled to both or whichever is greater. The Administration & Finance Committee reviewed this at two meetings and Carol Stream was present at both meetings and seems satisfied with the outcome of the process.

A motion was made by Clark and seconded by Gargano to recommend Option B – Pick one or the other – whichever is greater.

Wachtel stated that back two Board meetings ago when the change was made with the outsourcing credit, Flossmoor backed it, but thought it was a bad policy. We are going to end up with changes that are more complicated than the IRS tax code and here we are right back with a special circumstance. Wachtel stated that she may have a hard time supporting this and she personally didn't think it was a good idea in the first place. More than half a member's services could be outsourced, and Wachtel stated that she thought we are going down a slippery, dangerous slope. Wachtel stated that this is just her opinion, but didn't want anyone to be surprised when she voted no.

With the motion on the floor, Irvin called for a vote and the motion carried with one opposed vote.

## **2. Members' Reserve Policy & Procedure Revision**

Clark reported that this item was brought to the attention of the Administration and Finance Committee by staff concerning former members who leave where there is a provision requiring IRMA to retain 25% of the member's initial contribution in a reserve account until all claims in all program years of the member's participation in IRMA are closed. Clark noted that we have several members who have left where we are holding this reserve and the 25% has been growing based upon the interest earnings of IRMA, and these members are asking to get back the excess over the 25% requirement.

Clark reported that the change to the Members' Reserve Fund Policy and Procedure is to establish on an annual basis, after the audited financial statements have been issued, a review of each former member's reserve fund to assure the appropriate 25% of the final year's initial contribution is in the account and money in excess of the required amount shall be refunded.

A motion was made by Clark and seconded by Palm to approve the revision to the Members' Reserve Fund Policy and Procedure. A voice vote was called and the motion carried.

## **3. Purchase & Sales Policy Revisions**

Clark reported that this was on the agenda for the last Board of Director's meeting, but was pulled for further consideration because of a question raised by a member regarding provisions related to unbudgeted expenditures. The discussion of the Board was to extend the increases in authority as outlined, but further that all purchases that aren't budgeted will be made in accordance with the Budget Policy. Clark noted that the Budget Policy is basically the 10% rule. As long as an item is within 10% of the category it can still be authorized by the Executive Director or various committees.

A motion was made by Palm and seconded by Velkme to approve the revisions to the Purchase & Sales Policy. A voice vote was called and the motion carried.

## **4. IT Strategic Technology Assessment**

Clark reported that there was a discussion at the Administration & Finance Committee of the RFP process and the level of services to be provided. Following that discussion, the Administration & Finance Committee approved staff's recommendation to negotiate a Managed Services Agreement with Sikich at a cost not to exceed the 2015 Preliminary Budget for IT Services.

Ely stated that staff issued an RFP for a Strategic Plan in June. Our responses to the RFP were too expensive, so we reissued the RFP and narrowed the scope to concentrate on internal issues and excluded our end users. That brought it into an affordable range and the project became more of a technology assessment rather than a strategic plan. Ely stated that we paid Sikich about \$12,000 to conduct the assessment. They met with everyone on the staff and had a turn-around time of two weeks in order to get the item to the Administration and Finance Committee for approval.

Ely reported that the Sikich assessment found that we have been pursuing IT with a band aid approach in a more reactive manner rather than a proactive manner. Sentinel, who has been our IT support for hardware since 2005, has failed to identify some security issues. As a result of this, we have found that Sikich provides a much more comprehensive service package and we should be able to get this for not any more money than our current IT budget. Our current IT budget is \$170,000 a year. Out of that, we spend about \$70,000 on our claims software. We believe that we will be able to negotiate an agreement with Sikich that will be about \$4,000 per month. Ely stated that she would anticipate that staff would negotiate the agreement with Sikich and be able to bring it to the October 29<sup>th</sup> Board of Directors meeting and notify Sentinel of the cancellation of our contract with them for a transition period in January.

Ely stated that she was asked at the Administration & Finance Committee meeting why she didn't issue an RFP for a Managed Service Agreement. In response, Ely believes that our investment of \$12,000 with Sikich for their assessment would be redundant by asking someone else to come and do the same work. We have confidence that Sikich understands our system and provides high quality service. Ely added that we did not get an overwhelming response to our initial RFP or to the revised RFP because of our small size. Ely stated that she thinks it is most expeditious and financially prudent to go forward with the Sikich Managed Services Agreement without any further competitive bidding.

The Executive Board had a brief discussion. Palm asked whether staff would be able to add some of the suggested equipment in the Sikich assessment such as monitors, wireless, etc. Ely replied, no. For the first year, we will be concentrating on the business continuity items for purposes of disaster recovery. For 2015, we will get Sikich on board, get them familiar with our system and have them get everything more secure. Then in the 2016 budget, we will be able to give the Executive Board an Information Technology replacement plan that will be more like a 5-year replacement plan.

Palm stated that he goes along with the plan, but would recommend having an additional \$20,000-\$25,000 in the budget for IT equipment, so you have some flexibility. The Executive Board discussed this option.

A motion was made by Clark and seconded by Cedillo to approve the recommendation to have staff negotiate a Managed Services Agreement with Sikich and also to increase the 2015 IT budget by an additional \$20,000-\$25,000. A voice vote was called and the motion carried.

## **5. Personnel Policy Revisions**

Clark reported that the Personnel Policy revisions were reviewed at the Administration and Finance Committee meeting. These were items presented by staff who indicated that rather than doing a review of the policy on an annual basis, they will be bringing revisions to the committee on an as needed basis. Clark noted that one of the things that the Administration and Finance Committee discussed was the level of approval and whether or not approvals to the Personnel Policy, particularly if they are of a non-financial nature or non-compensation nature, going forward need to go to the full Board of Directors. They can be approved by the

Administration and Finance Committee and then the Executive Board can determine whether they are of the nature that has to go to the full Board.

Ely stated that the only reference that mandates that the full Board of Directors approve revisions to the Personnel Handbook is found in the Personnel Handbook itself in the Disclaimer section which is on page 110 of the meeting packet. There is nothing in the Bylaws or in any other policy that says that the Board of Directors has to approve all revisions to the Personnel Handbook. Obviously, the Board of Directors will approve budgets and any changes to salary and benefits. Ely stated she is asking that revisions to the Personnel Handbook be approved with just Executive Board approval. The Administration and Finance Committee concurred with that. So the revision to the Disclaimer outlined on page 110 is all that is necessary. Any and all changes to the Personnel Handbook would then actually go to the Administration and Finance Committee and then to the Executive Board. Clark added that at that point, if the Executive Board felt there was a topic that needed to go to the full Board, the Executive Board would be able to make that recommendation.

Ely reviewed the changes that are being recommended to the Personnel Handbook. She is asking that Funeral and Bereavement Leave include part-time employees who would have a pro-rated leave. There are some housekeeping issues with the FMLA Policy. The biggest substantive issue that she would like to see changed is that currently for the birth of a child, you don't get intermittent leave, and she would like to allow for intermittent leave. The other revisions on the FMLA Policy are explained in the memo. The recommended change to the Sick Leave Policy would eliminate the current restriction allowing employees to use only 3 days a year for a family illness, but no restriction on sick leave for the employee. As a result, if an employee's child or parent is in the hospital, the employee has to use vacation time after 3 days. After discussion at the Administration and Finance Committee, they unanimously supported the revision that you can use your sick time for family illness. Ely pointed out that we have the ability to ask for proof of such illness.

After a brief discussion, a motion was made by Clark and seconded by Gargano to approve the revisions to the Personnel Handbook and revisions to the Personnel Handbook be effectively approved at this point by the Executive Board. Irvin asked whether this whole item then has to be brought to the full Board to make the decision. Ely stated that the legal answer is that technically these revisions don't need to go to the full Board; however, because of past practices and the fact that they have seen this before, she thinks that the whole thing should go to them so they are aware that the Personnel Handbook revisions are going to be approved by the Executive Board going forward. If they don't concur with that, then we will need a change to the Bylaws.

Gargano suggested an amendment to the Funeral & Bereavement Leave to include the aunt, uncle, niece, nephew or cousin in the preceding paragraph so it's just included in the members of the employee's family.

Irvin reiterated the motion that was on the table: to approve the revisions to the Personnel Handbook and that revisions to the Personnel Handbook be reviewed by the Administration and Finance Committee and approved by the Executive Board and that the recommendation outlined by Gargano be approved.

Wachtel asked whether family is defined in the Sick Days Policy. Garvey pointed out that it was defined in the Funeral and Bereavement Policy, but not in the Sick Days Policy. Ely commented that this is a discrepancy. Gargano asked that the motion be amended again to include putting the definition of family back into the Sick Days Policy. The motion carried.

## **6. 2015 Personnel Report**

Clark reported that this was reviewed by the Administration and Finance Committee. Clark stated that there was a change in the staffing levels with the elimination of the Principal Accounting Assistant position and the addition of an Accounting/Financial Analyst position. Staff is requesting a 2% increase to the salary ranges for 2015. The budget for salary increases would be 3%. Staff is asking for \$15,000 for a Compensation Study during 2015, and is requesting a monetary bonus fund of \$8,385.

Ely reported that the Principal Accounting Assistant has been gone since September 12<sup>th</sup>. We have the Accounting/Financial Analyst position advertised with IGFOA and ICMA. Ely stated that the applicant pool has not been overwhelming. At this point, we have hired one of our applicants to temporarily help out, since he has been out of work. We had very high hopes of his analytical ability and he has met those high hopes from an analytical perspective; however, he is slightly challenged with respect to completing tasks in a simple and non-complex way. Ely stated that there is another applicant interview on Monday. Ely stated that the Administration and Finance Committee recommended that the salary range for this position be decreased by one range. Staff has no problem with that, and the committee recommended that this personnel report include a recommendation for a Compensation Study next year. If this range needs to be adjusted, the Compensation Study will provide merit for the change.

Ely noted that the 2% increase in salary range is really CPI, and noted that we only have one employee who is at the top of the salary range that would really have an impact with that regard. The 3% salary increase is consistent with the last four years and also consistent with a World at Work study and a Hay Group study that is attached for your reference. We have a budget amount of \$15,000 for a Compensation Study during 2015. Ely noted that we haven't looked at our positions from a market perspective in 7 years.

Ely stated that she is asking for the approval of a bonus program in the amount of \$8,385, where our employees would be rewarded in the moment for outstanding customer service, outstanding team effort, process improvements, and outstanding effort. There are frequently times that our employees go above and beyond in the moment on certain projects. This would be a bonus program that would allow us to recognize their efforts in the moment when they complete the project. It would be a financial reward for them. In addition, the proposed bonus would also allow for the award of up to 3 "bonus" days in a given year, which would need to be used within 30 days.. Ely stated that the maximum yearly bonus for any employee would be \$1,000.

A motion was made by Clark and seconded by Palm to approve the 2015 Personnel Report as presented. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried.

**7. 2015 Preliminary Budget**

Clark reported that the Administration and Finance Committee has reviewed and approved the 2015 Preliminary Budget. Clark explained that the memo on page 123 outlines the various line items. A motion was made by Palm and seconded by Gargano to approve the Preliminary Budget with an additional \$20,000 added to the Information Technology budget. A voice vote was called and the motion carried.

**V. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR/STAFF REPORT**

➤ **Arnstein & Lehr Contract Extension**

Ely stated that she is recommending extending the agreement with Corporate Counsel Chris Naveja. Ely added that IRMA has a long history with Arnstein & Lehr and Naveja has done a great job. A motion was made by Gargano and seconded by Palm to approve the extension to the Corporate Counsel agreement for an additional 5 years, until December 31, 2020. A voice vote was called and the motion carried.

**VI. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

A motion was made by Gargano and seconded by Palm to move into Executive Session to discuss matters of: review/approval of closed session minutes and personnel pursuant to 5 ILCS 120/2(c) (21) and (1), respectively. Roll was called and the motion carried.

\*\*\*\*\*

A motion was made by Palm and seconded by Gargano to approve the Executive Session Minutes of May 28, 2014. A voice vote was called and the motion carried.

**VII. ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

There were no additions to the agenda.

**VIII. CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING**

Irvin stated that the next meeting of the Executive Board was scheduled for Wednesday, December 3, 2014 at 9:30 a.m. at the IRMA office.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Gargano and seconded by Palm to adjourn the meeting. A voice vote was called and the motion carried.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Margo Ely  
Executive Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Drew Irvin  
IRMA Chair