

ILLINOIS MUNICIPAL RETIREMENT FUND
MINUTES OF
REGULAR MEETING NO. 24-04
APRIL 12, 2024

ILLINOIS MUNICIPAL RETIREMENT FUND

MEETING NO. 24-04

REGULAR MEETING

OF THE

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees was held at 9:00 a.m. on April 12, 2024, in the Fund Office at 2211 York Road, Suite 400, Oak Brook, Illinois.

Mr. Stefan presided as President/Chair and called the meeting to order.

Ms. Herman took a roll call:

Present: Copper, Cycholl, Henry, Kosiba, Kuehne, Miller, Stanish, Stefan
Absent: None

Ms. Bewick and Mr. Kazemi from Wilshire Associates were present at the meeting. (Mr. Kazemi attended the meeting on MS Teams.)

(24-04-01) (Watchlist Review) - Ms. Bewick from Wilshire Associates informed the Board that IMRF will be placing Brown Capitol Management on the watchlist due to turnover of key staff. She explained that it is not a performance issue but rather a personnel issue. IMRF and Wilshire have been monitoring Brown closely and will continue to monitor their results throughout the rest of 2024.

(24-04-02) (Investment Reports) - CIO Angela Miller-May reported that total fund value as of April 10, 2024, was \$53.188 billion. She further reported that as of April 10, 2024, the Domestic Equity portfolio was down -2.04%; the International Equity portfolio was down -.78%; the Fixed Income portfolio was down -1.92%; the Private Real Assets portfolio was up .24%; the Alternative Investments portfolio was up .55%; and the cash portfolio was down -62.41%. Overall, IMRF's portfolio was down in value by -1.74% on April 10, 2024, compared to what it was on March 31, 2024. Furthermore, the following benchmark returns were reported as of April 10, 2024:

S&P 500	-1.75%
Custom U.S. Equity Benchmark	-1.90%
93% Russell 3000 Index	
7% FTSE Global Core Infrastructure 50/50 Index (Net)	
MSCI ACWI Ex-U.S.	-.65%
Broad International equity market benchmark	
Bloomberg Aggregate	-1.94%
Broad U.S. bond market benchmark	

Ms. Miller-May reminded everyone of IMRF's Investment Philosophy which includes the following:

- IMRF is a long-term and patient investor that has exceeded its expected rate of returns over the long investment horizon.
- Asset allocation is the primary driver of long-term total fund returns and IMRF is disciplined to their Asset Allocation Targets.
- Strategic Decisions will prevail in determining asset allocation rather than tactical or short-term market timing decisions.
- Investment Structure and Rebalancing is vital in complying with asset allocation targets.
- Diversification is key across all asset classes and is the main defense against realizing losses.

Monthly Minority Manager Utilization and Brokerage reports were given as information as well.

In addition, the Wilshire monthly report for January was posted for review. Highlights of the summary included:

- IMRF ended *January 2024* with a market value of \$52.3 billion, up for the month by approximately \$48 million. IMRF returned $-.04\%$ during the month, outperforming the Total Fund Benchmark, which returned $-.16\%$. Capital markets were mixed to begin the new year as the Fed indicated they are not going to rush rate cuts considering strong economic growth and job numbers.
- The broad U.S. Equity market was generally positive for the month, while Small Cap stocks posted negative returns. The U.S. Equity Portfolio underperformed its benchmark during January, returning $.63\%$ versus $.86\%$. The portfolios allocations to Small Cap and Global Listed Infrastructure were the largest contributors to relative underperformance.
- International Equity markets were mixed in January, with Developed Markets outperforming Emerging. The International Equity portfolio outperformed the benchmark during the month, returning $-.60\%$ versus $-.99\%$. In aggregate, investment manager performance in Large Cap Core was the largest contributor to relative outperformance.
- Bond yields rose in January, while short end of the curve remained relatively unchanged. The Fixed Income Portfolio outperformed the benchmark during the month, returning $.02\%$ versus $-.13\%$. Investment manager performance in Core and High Yield were the largest contributors to relative outperformance.
- As of January month-end, all underlying asset class allocations in the Portfolio are within the stated four percentage point rebalancing range as outlined by the current Statement of Investment Policy.

Furthermore, the Wilshire monthly report for February was posted for review. Highlights of the summary included:

- IMRF ended *February 2024* with a market value of \$53.2 billion, up for the month by approximately \$915 million. IMRF returned 2.12% during the month, underperforming the Total Fund Benchmark, which returned 2.94% . Growth and defensive assets posted mixed results in February as stocks were up on the back of strong corporate earnings, while fixed income generally struggled as investors pushed out the time frame for future rate cuts.

- The broad U.S. Equity market was up for the month, while Small Cap stocks outperformed Large Cap. The U.S. Equity Portfolio underperformed its benchmarking during February, returning 4.94% versus 5.08%. The portfolio's allocations to Small Cap Value and Global listed Infrastructure were the largest contributors to relative underperformance.
- International Equity markets were positive in February, with Developed Markets trailing Emerging. The International Equity portfolio outperformed the benchmark during the month, returning 2.70% versus 2.53%. In aggregate, investment manager performance in Large Cap Core and Emerging Markets were the largest contributors to relative outperformance.
- Bond yields rose and credit spreads tightened in February. The Fixed Income Portfolio outperformed the benchmark during the month, returning -.92% versus -1.05%. The portfolios allocations to High Yield and Bank Loans were the largest contributors to relative outperformance.
- As of February month-end, all underlying asset class allocations in the Portfolio are within the stated four percentage point rebalancing range as outlined by the current Statement of Investment Policy.

(24-04-03) (Consent Agenda) The President/Chair presented an agenda consisting of a Consent Agenda. Mr. Miller asked that the bid for employee benefits brokerage services be removed from the consent agenda due to needing more information on the process of selecting the service provider. Cara Bannon, HR Director, explained the process of how the service provider is selected. She explained the bid review process and the ranking process. She informed that CBIZ was the provider used for the past seven years and IMRF is familiar with their high quality of service at almost the lowest cost. Another benefit CBIZ offers is their depth in health and wellness.

2024 Employee Benefits Brokerage Services Bid

Approved Bidder: CBIZ Benefits & Insurance Services, Inc.

Approved Bid: \$293,500

It was moved by Mr. Miller and seconded by Ms. Copper to approve the bid submitted by CBIZ Benefits & Insurance Services, Inc., in the amount of \$293,500.

VOTE:

ALL VOTED AYE - MOTION CARRIED

8 AYES; 0 ABSENT

(A) Schedules - For the month of February 2024

Schedule A - Benefit award listing of retirement, temporary disability, death benefits, and refund of employee contributions processed during the preceding calendar month under Article 7 of the Illinois Pension Code.

Schedule B - Adjustment of Benefit Awards showing adjustments required in benefit awards and the reasons therefore.

- Schedule C - Benefit Cancellations.
- Schedule D - Expiration of Temporary Disability Benefits terminated under the provisions of Section 7-147 of the Illinois Pension Code.
- Schedule E - Total and Permanent Disability Benefit Awards recommended by the Fund's medical consultants as provided by Section 7-150 of the Illinois Pension Code.
- Schedule F - Benefits Terminated.
- Schedule G - Administrative Benefit Denials.
- Schedule P - Administrative Denial of Application for Past Service Credit.
- Schedule R - Prior Service - New Governmental Units.
- Schedule S - Prior Service Adjustments

(B) Approval of Minutes

Regular Board Meeting from February 23, 2024

(C) Bids

2024 Cisco Smartnet Co-Term Renewal

Approved Bidder: Mindsight

Approved Bid: \$191,627.66

2024 BMC Track-It! Maintenance Renewal and License Increase

Sole Source: BMC Software, Inc.

Approved Bid: \$58,474.32

Cybersecurity Consulting Services Renewal

Sole Source: Sentinel Technologies, Inc.

Approved Bid: \$245/hr for Senior Consultant

\$195/hr for Associate Consultant

Disaster Recovery Circuit Bandwidth Increase (Element Critical - DR Location)

Sole Source : Element Critical

Approved Bid: \$4,280 increase to the Monthly Recurring Cost; with new Monthly Recurring Cost increasing to \$30,218.76

Disaster Recovery Circuit Bandwidth Increase (Vinakom - Oak Brook location)

Sole Source: Vinakom Communications

Approved Bid: \$700 increase to the Monthly Recurring Cost plus a one-time upgrade fee of \$299. The New Monthly Recurring Cost will increase to \$3,098 plus taxes for an additional 24 months.

Workspace Assessment Consulting Services

Approved Bidder: Cushman & Wakefield and T. Dallas Smith & Company

Approved Bid: 30% commission rebate

(D) Participation of New Unit of Government

Sugar Grove Public Library District
County: Kane
2024 Employer Rate: 7.76%
Effective Participation Date: July 1, 2024
Number of Employees: 10

(E) February/March 2024 Financial Reporting Packages

(F) February/March 2024 Statement of Fiduciary Net Position

(G) Impact of 2024 Year-To-Date Investment Income of Employer Reserves,
Funding Status and Average Employer Contribution Rate

(H) Schedule T - Report of Expenditures (February 2024 & March 2024)

It was moved by Ms. Copper and seconded by Mr. Miller to approve the items on the Consent Agenda.

VOTE:

ALL VOTED AYE - MOTION CARRIED

8 AYES; 0 ABSENT

(24-04-04) (Approval of Board Self-Evaluation Process) General Counsel Vladimir Shuliga explained that at the February Board meeting, the Board asked staff to confer with board governance consultant Julia Nicholson about implementing a staff feedback component to the 2024 Board self-evaluation process. The following "best practices" and recommended structure are for the Board to consider in soliciting feedback from staff during the evaluation process.

1. Be Specific - to get actionable feedback, the questions or prompts must be specific. A generic or open-ended prompt like "what can we improve on as a Board" is less likely to result in valuable feedback than feedback prompts that are targeted to a specific topic. Additionally, tailoring the feedback prompts also provides flexibility for the Board to rotate its focus to different areas in different years, rather than expect a holistic review and holistic improvement plan each year. Potential areas of focus include Board direction to staff, board meeting preparation, or vendor selection.
2. Anonymous Feedback - to encourage and expect candid feedback, staff responses must be anonymous.
3. Limit to Those Employees Who Regularly Interact with the Trustees - the overall direction of the Fund is a product of the partnership between the Board and senior leadership where the Board makes policy decisions and staff implements those decisions through the day-to-day management of the Fund. Therefore, the scope of staff feedback should be limited to the leadership group who partner most closely with the Board in implementing its policy decisions. In the first instance, staff feedback should be limited to staff at the director level.
4. Keep Staff Feedback Separate from Self-Feedback - one of the sources of value in seeking staff feedback is the opportunity to compare staff's perspective to the self-evaluation feedback from the trustees. Therefore, the trustees should not receive and review the staff feedback until after they have submitted the

self-evaluation feedback, so that the staff feedback does not influence the trustee's own self-evaluation process. Additionally, the staff feedback should be captured in the same manner as the self-evaluation feedback to allow for easy comparison. An anonymous survey administered through survey monkey, similar to what is used with the trustees is recommended.

5. Treat the First Year as a Pilot - as with any new process, the first attempt should be viewed as a work in progress. It is tempting to try to make the first iteration perfect and then consider it "set in stone". However, a more optimal approach is to consider what the Board's goal is in soliciting staff feedback. Once the staff feedback is received and reviewed, was the goal met? If not, what can be changed in the future to better achieve the Board's goal. Allowing flexibility in this approach will make it more likely that the staff feedback component will add value rather than become routine.

Recommendations

Subject

- Julia prepared a draft survey when the Board discussed feedback in 2023. The recommendation is to use these statements as a starting point and revising them in future years as necessary.

Timing

- With the Board's self-evaluation scheduled for the May 31st Board meeting, the directors should be surveyed from May 1 to May 15th. This will allow time for Julia to gather feedback for comparison to the Board's self-evaluation.

Process

- It is recommended to use the same process as the Board self-evaluation, meaning that staff will be surveyed through survey monkey. This will allow Julia to administer both surveys and maintain the confidentiality of the feedback. It would also allow Julia to easily compile the feedback and present it to the Board in a format that the Board is familiar with.

There will be an additional cost of \$7,300-\$7,500 for the consultant fee for the additional work.

It was moved by Mr. Kosiba and seconded by Mr. Kuehne to approve the Board Self-Evaluation Process that will include a staff survey, to accept the "best practices" and recommendations as presented, and to approve the additional consultant fee.

VOTE:

ALL VOTED AYE - MOTION CARRIED

8 AYES; 0 ABSENT

(24-04-05) (Report of the Investment Committee Meeting) Ms. Stanish, the Chair of the Investment Committee, gave a report of the meeting that was held on April 11, 2024.

It was moved by Ms. Stanish and seconded by Ms. Copper, to approve the following recommendations of the Investment Committee:

- For Private Equity
 - o Authorize a commitment of up to \$50 million to Charlesbank Technology Opportunities Fund II, L.P., subject to satisfactory legal due diligence; and,

- o Authorize staff to complete all documentation necessary to execute this recommendation
- For Real Estate
 - o Authorize a commitment of up to \$50 million to Grandview Partners Fund III, L.P., subject to satisfactory legal due diligence.
 - o Authorize a commitment of up to \$100 million to Starwood Distressed Opportunity Fund XIII, L.P., subject to satisfactory legal due diligence; and,
 - o Authorize staff to complete all documentation necessary to execute this recommendation.

In addition to approving the above, the following approvals are recommended:

- o Accept the 2023 Annual Minority & Emerging Investment Manager Utilization Report, the 2023 Minority Broker Utilization Report, the 2023 Securities Lending Activity Report, and the 2023 Annual Proxy Report.
- o Accept the revised Master Trust Agreement

VOTE:

ALL VOTED AYE - MOTION CARRIED

8 AYES; 0 ABSENT

(24-04-06) (Report of the Benefit Review Committee Meeting) Ms. Copper, Chair of the Benefit Review Committee, gave a report of the meeting that was held on April 11, 2024. The Committee heard one disability appeal and four non-disability appeals.

It was moved by Ms. Copper and seconded by Mr. Miller, to approve the following recommendations of the Benefit Review Committee:

- To reverse the staff recommendation and allow Mr. Hoerbert to retain all service credit in question.
- To affirm staff's recommendation to deny total and permanent disability benefits to Jill Linn.
- To affirm staff's recommendation on the appeal of Johnson County regarding the accelerated payment charge.
- To affirm staff's recommendation on the appeal of North Mac CUSD #34 regarding the accelerated payment charge.
- To affirm staff's recommendation on the appeal of Peoria County regarding the accelerated payment charge.

VOTE:

ALL VOTED AYE - MOTION CARRIED

8 AYES; 0 ABSENT

(24-04-07) (Retiree Health Insurance Endorsement) Per the Board's request at the November 2023 Board meeting, General Counsel Vladimir Shuliga gave a presentation on the retiree health insurance that IMRF currently endorses. He explained that the IMRF Board of Trustees created the retiree insurance program in the 1990's, which has been brokered by Doyle Rowe LTD. The Board wanted to give IMRF members access to insurance plans with discounted group rates. Doyle Rowe oversees several health plans that are available to IMRF retirees. They also oversee a long-term insurance program that is available for both retired and active IMRF members. Mr. Shuliga added that there are currently 25,000 enrollments in Doyle Rowe IMRF

endorsed programs. IMRF promotes these programs on various platforms, including email newsletters, print newsletters, IMRF.org, social media accounts, and member workshops. Mr. Miller stated he has a problem with IMRF paying to market Doyle Rowe. Mr. Shuliga proceeded to present the following six options for the Board to consider when deciding whether or not to keep this program, and he gave the pros and cons of each option:

1. End endorsement and stop premium deductions immediately
2. End endorsement but allow existing deductions to continue
3. Maintain Status Quo
4. RFP to select one endorsed vendor to administer menu of plan options
5. RFP to select multiple qualified vendors
6. Create IMRF Insurance Division to internally administer

Option 1 - Pros

- Removes administrative cost
- Removes reputational dependency on third party

Cons

- Eliminates valuable service to approximately 25,000 members and family members
- Loss of resource for common retiree questions
- Additional phone calls to call center
- Reputational risk due to lack of deductions causing missed premiums and lapsed coverage

Option 2 - Pros

- Eventually removes administrative cost
- Eventually removes reputational dependency on third party
- Reduces likelihood of calls and questions from existing retirees

Cons

- Eliminates valuable service to new retirees
- Loss of resource for common retiree questions

Option 3 - Pros

- Well established process
- Overall satisfaction of retirees and dependents
- Reliable resource for common retiree questions
- Independent third-party review
- Alternative options available to retirees
- Tap into external vendor expertise

Cons

- Reliance on external vendor
- Reputational risk
- No competitive bidding process
- Directing business to single vendor

Option 4 - Pros

- Competitive bid
- Reduced reputational risk
- Tap into external vendor expertise

Cons

- Reliance on external vendor
- Directing business to single vendor
- Potential transition costs

Option 5 - Pros

- Competitive bid
- Reduces reputational risk
- Tap into external vendor expertise

Cons

- Reliance on external vendor(s)
- Potential transition costs
- Administrative challenge to maintain verification of qualified vendors
- Lack of clarity or direction to member questions

Option 6 - Pros

- Full control of reputational considerations and customer service

Cons

- Requires legislative changes
- Tax-qualified plan status concerns
- Lack of internal expertise
- Additional cost

Discussion ensued and the Board agreed to eliminate Option 6. As former Executive Director, Mr. Kosiba explained the history of how IMRF started to get involved in retiree health insurance options. After further discussion, the Board agreed to proceed with Option 4 and put out an RFP to select one endorsed vendor to administer the menu of plan options rather than continually endorsing Doyle Rowe. Mr. Miller would like to select a vendor who will give discounts to IMRF retirees. The Board would like staff to create the RFP and give the Board an opportunity to review it and provide feedback. Mr. Shuliga informed that staff may need professional services to assist in evaluating and creating the best structure for effectuating Option 4. Staff will return to the Board with next steps at a future board meeting.

(24-04-08) (Legislative Update) IMRF's General Counsel gave a report on current legislative activity. He reported that the General Assembly is currently in session. He added that, with the exception of two weeks, at least one of the chambers of the General Assembly has met each week since the last Board meeting. Both chambers are scheduled to be in session each week, except the final week in April, through the scheduled May 24th adjournment.

Mr. Shuliga further informed that there has been very little pension activity in either chamber thus far in 2024. The Senate pension committee has not even been scheduled to meet as of yet in 2024, and therefore, no pension bills are active in that chamber. While the House committee has met several times so far this year, few bills have passed and only one bill that affects IMRF is currently active, pending the committee deadline in the House.

The deadline for Senate bills to pass out of Senate committees was Friday, March 15th. The corresponding House deadline is not until Friday, April 5th. The Senate deadline for Senate bills to pass out of that chamber is Friday, April 12th, while the equivalent House deadline is the following week on Friday, April 19th.

The only currently active bill that affects IMRF is **House Bill 4139**, sponsored by Rep. Bradley Fritts (R-Amboy). It adds additional types of

medical professionals to those allowed to certify disability eligibility for an IMRF disability benefit to include an advanced practice registered nurse, clinical psychologist, or physician assistant, as long as the diagnosis is in line with that person's education, training, and licensure. It is now on Second Reading in the House.

As of now, none of the three bills that contain the Board's legislative agenda are active. Although there are relatively few from which to choose, we are currently working with the sponsors and proponents of other active pension bills to potentially add the language on as an amendment to one of those bills.

Discussions continue behind the scenes between employer/taxpayer groups and unions on potential Tier 2 enhancements. No final proposal has been released. It is expected that if there is any movement on these proposals, it will not be before the fall veto session, which will occur after the November elections. Discussions have of course centered on the need for changes to the wage cap so that the non-coordinated plans (which includes all systems except IMRF and most of SERS) do not run afoul of the requirement that they provide equivalent benefits to Social Security. Discussions have also included potential changes to the retirement age and the COLA calculation.

Update as of April 5th

The House pension committee met on April 4th for the final meeting before the April 5th deadline to move House bills out of committee. Several bills moved out of committee and while several applied to IMRF in their current form, all except one were explicitly explained that they were moving only because of the deadline and there was no intention to move them out of the House.

House Bill 1574 is the only additional bill that pertains to IMRF that is moving and is not going to be held in the House. Sponsored by Rep. Jackie Haas (R-Bourbonnais) would allow SLEP annuitants to return to work as a schedule security officer for up to 999 hours without jeopardizing their pension. It makes no other changes to the return-to-work rules and these annuitants would remain subject to the separation of service requirements. The bill passed the House pension committee unanimously with no discussion.

The committee also passed several bills regarding changes to Tier 2 pensions out to the full House. All were sponsored by Rep. Stephanie Kifowit (D-Oswego), who is also the chair of the pension committee. Because negotiations with the unions and employer/taxpayer groups continue, Rep. Kifowit made it very clear that she did not intend to move any of these proposals. The bills included various proposals regarding changes to the retirement age, annual increase calculation, and the wage cap. The only consistency amongst the bills is that they all include the "fix" to align the wage cap with the Social Security wage cap so that those systems that are not coordinated with Social Security do not violate the requirement that they provide an equivalent benefit to Social Security.

(24-04-09) (Litigation Update) The following is an update of the currently pending or recently concluded litigation:

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM ET AL, v. PETROBRAS-PETROLEO BRASILEIRO S.A. (MARKET ARBITRATION CHAMBER,

ARBITRAL PROCEEDING No. 72/2016)

Summary: A group of investors is seeking recovery through arbitration proceedings against Brazilian corporation, Petrobras, related to the overstatement of the corporation's assets and earnings along with potential liabilities that the corporation was exposed to as a result of a widespread bribery and kickback scheme. Once knowledge of the bribery and kickback scheme became public, the price of Petrobras securities declined significantly, causing substantial losses for investors.

Status: A U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York declined to exercise jurisdiction over claims related to Petrobras shares traded in Brazil. Therefore, these claims are pending before the Market Arbitration Chamber of the Brazilian Stock Exchange. IMRF has participated in proceedings to establish its right to a claim, but the actual calculation of individual damages for each claimant has not yet been addressed. The parties have recently agreed to a list of qualified experts. The experts will assist the arbitration panel in resolving questions of econometric causation and calculation of alleged damages. On November 28, 2023, a hearing before the arbitration panel was held to discuss liability, standing, and a plan for prosecution.

KEITH GARDNER v. BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF IMRF et al.
(DUPAGE COUNTY 2021 MR 1377; THIRD DISTRICT APPELLATE COURT 3-22-0404)

Summary: Gardner was a sheriff's deputy for the Kane County Sheriff's Office. He then received temporary disability benefits for a number of months. Upon evaluation of his claim for total and permanent disability benefits, IMRF received new information showing that Gardner had refused to attempt to work with medical accommodations offered by Kane County. Therefore, the IMRF Board retroactively terminated Gardner's temporary disability benefits rendering the question of total and permanent disability benefits moot. Gardner appealed the decision.

Status: The retroactive denial of temporary disability benefits to Mr. Gardner was affirmed by the Circuit Court. Mr. Gardner appealed the Circuit Court's decision. The Appellate Court issued its decision on October 16, 2023, which reversed the decision of the Circuit Court. The Appellate Court determined that IMRF should not have retroactively denied Mr. Gardner temporary disability benefits. IMRF determined not to pursue an appeal to the Supreme Court. The case was remanded back to the Circuit Court, who in turn remanded it back to IMRF on December 13, 2023. IMRF is now reviewing the member's eligibility for total and permanent disability benefits. The court has left the case open in the event the total and permanent disability application is denied and the member wishes to pursue an appeal of that determination. No future status date has been set.

GLENCORE PLC (UNITED KINGDOM INVESTOR GROUP ACTION)

Summary: A group of investors is seeking recovery through the UK's Financial Services and Markets Act against multinational commodity trading and mining company, Glencore PLC. The claim is based on alleged misstatements and omissions concerning Glencore's operations in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Specifically, the entity failed to disclose that its business operations in the DRC were secured through possible corrupt means. Once knowledge of the bribery and corruption scheme became

public, the price of Glencore's securities declined significantly, causing substantial losses for investors.

Status: IMRF has opted to participate in one of the investor group actions. The action is still gathering qualified investors for the group action and pleadings have not yet been filed. The litigation of these claims will be handled by an outside English counsel. Staff is working with English counsel and IMRF's investment managers to establish standing for each group of shares that may be recoverable in this action.

VERONICA MONTOYA v. BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF IMRF et al.
(DUPAGE CTY 2022 MR 756)

Summary: Montoya was the transportation coordinator for Rockford School District 205. She applied for and was granted temporary disability benefits from IMRF for the maximum statutorily permitted amount of time. Upon evaluation for total and permanent disability benefits and after an administrative hearing, the IMRF Board denied Montoya's claim for total and permanent disability benefits. Montoya appealed the decision.

Status: The Court issued its decision on October 18, 2023, which reverses IMRF's denial of total and permanent disability benefits. IMRF has filed an appeal with the Appellate Court at the Board's direction. All briefs have been filed. IMRF awaits an oral argument hearing date from the Appellate Court.

GIVENS v. IMRF (U.S. EEOC 440-2022-09088; N.D. ILL. 1:23-CV-14101)

Summary: This is a charge of discrimination by a current employee through the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Status: Plaintiff's Counsel has filed an amended complaint. In turn, IMRF filed a responsive pleading. The parties currently await a discovery schedule from the court.

GREGORY PALMER v. VILLAGE OF SUMMIT, IMRF et al.
(COOK COUNTY 2023 CH 8087)

Summary: IMRF was named as a necessary party to litigation involving the Village of Summit and Palmer, its former employee. Palmer claims that he was eligible to participate in IMRF in 1993 but that the Township failed to enroll him. He seeks mandamus, declaratory judgement, and a civil rights claim against the Village to require the Village to execute an omitted service application for IMRF service credit. Palmer is a current IMRF retiree. Prior to this lawsuit, Palmer submitted an omitted service application to IMRF, however, the form was denied on the basis that it was incomplete due to not providing the time period for which service was being requested.

Status: IMRF's position is that IMRF is not a necessary party to the action. IMRF has filed a motion to dismiss itself as a misjoined party, which has been stayed pending settlement discussions between the member and employer. In March, a completed omitted service application was submitted, and the purchase of service is in progress. The next status date is April 24, 2024.

MARY SERDAR v. IMRF BENEFIT REVIEW COMMITTEE, et al.

(WILL COUNTY 2023 MR 382)

Summary: Serdar was the building secretary for the Village of Plainfield. She applied for and was granted temporary disability benefits from IMRF for the maximum statutorily permitted amount of time. Upon evaluation for total and permanent disability benefits and after an administrative hearing, the IMRF Board denied Serdar's claim for total and permanent disability benefits. Serdar appealed the decision.

Status: IMRF's motion to dismiss with prejudice was granted on March 28, 2024.

RUBEL CHOWDHURY v.
ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY; IMRF, et al.
(COOK COUNTY 2024 L 050019)

Summary: Chowdhury worked in maintenance for Glenbrook School District #225. He applied for and was granted temporary disability benefits from January 23, 2021 through July 31, 2022. Upon evaluation for continued temporary disability benefits and after an administrative hearing, the IMRF Board denied Chowdhury's claim for continued temporary disability benefits. Chowdhury appealed the decision.

Status: This suit was incorrectly filed as an employment security case, and incorrectly names IMRF as his employer as well as the Illinois Department of Employment Security ("IDES"), the Director of IDES, and the Board of Review. In March, the Law Division judge transferred the case to the Chancery division. IMRF must re-raise its previously filed motion to dismiss with the new Chancery judge.

(24-04-10) (Horizon Update) Executive Director Brian Collins gave a 40-day check-in update on the Horizon Project. He reported that the following Key Organizational Activities occurred since Go Live (March 4th):

- Eliminated risk associated with operating on an obsolete platform
- Targeted campaign to drive Employer Access registrations
- Completed first monthly cycle of wage report collections in Horizon
- Delivered first monthly Benefit Payment in Horizon
- Deployed first planned "hotfix"

He added that, of course, with these activities, there were challenges; but the challenges are normal and expected with a project of this magnitude. Some challenges he mentioned are:

- +700 million data records
- +70 million lines of code
- +490,000 members
- +3,000 employers
- Unanticipated system issues
- Member, employer, and staff learning curve associated with new systems and new processes
- High volume of calls and emails; complex questions; long hold times

Mr. Collins reported that staff at IMRF and Telus have stepped up to help with all the challenges faced; and although there were challenges faced, there were many key successes:

- IMRF was able to deliver the regular monthly payment on time (156,414 payments made delivering a total of \$222,404,255)
- IMRF, with the help of Telus, provided person-to-person support to payees with special circumstances
- Targeted campaign drove employer registrations (8,078 registrations with 24,712 logins on the Employer Access portal)
- Member registrations grew organically (26,887 registrations with 51,158 logins on the Member Access portal)
- Significant site usage throughout March
- Self-service accounted for most customer interactions (77,558 self-service interactions related to Online Learning Center pageviews, help-video play, customer FAQ pageviews, and Interactive Voice Response (IVR); and 26,308 person-to-person interactions related to phone calls, emails, counseling sessions, and online forums)
- Shifted staff resources to contact center; worked nights and weekends responding to customer contacts

The key takeaways from Go-live are:

- We successfully launched Horizon, but of course, we are not satisfied. We are driven to improve.
- We will continue to fine-tune system performance, address unanticipated issues, and improve person-to-person response times.
- Members and employers are continuing to learn the new system.
- Staff is working incredibly hard to master the new system.

(24-04-11) (Report of the Executive Director) Executive Director Brian Collins provided information on FOIA requests and provided a personnel report.

(24-04-12) (Trustee Forum) The Chair reported that there are three new requests to attend upcoming conferences:

- Request by Natalie Copper to attend the 2024 NASP Financial Services Conference in June 2024.
- Request by Natalie Copper to attend the 2024 IPPFA Mid-American Pension Conference in September 2024.
- Request by Gwen Henry to attend the ValueEdge Public Funds Forum in September 2024.

It was moved by Mr. Kosiba and seconded by Ms. Stanish to approve the three conference requests listed above.

VOTE:

ALL VOTED AYE - MOTION CARRIED

8 AYES; 0 ABSENT

A list of upcoming conferences for 2024 was included as information.

Finally, a chart was included that shows the number hours of training each Trustee has earned so far in 2024.

(24-04-13) (Adjournment) It was moved by Ms. Copper and seconded by Mr. Kuehne to adjourn the Board Meeting at 10:51 a.m., and to reconvene at 9:00 a.m. on May 31, 2024.

VOTE:

ALL VOTED AYE - MOTION CARRIED

8 AYES; 0 ABSENT



President

Date



Secretary

Date

