MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE OF THE DUPAGE WATER COMMISSION HELD ON DECEMBER 10, 2009

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 P.M. at the Commission's office located at 600 East Butterfield Road, Elmhurst, Illinois.

Committee members in attendance: E. Chaplin, T. Elliott, J. Zay (arrived at 7:25 P.M.), and W. Murphy

Committee members absent: L. Rathje (ex officio)

Also in attendance: M. Crowley and R. Martin

Commissioner Elliott moved to approve the Minutes of the November 12, 2009, Administration Committee meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Murphy and unanimously approved by a Voice Vote.

All voted aye. Motion carried.

Staff Attorney Crowley advised that the Freedom of Information Act Updated Rules, Regulations, and Forms that were discussed at the November 12, 2009, Administration Committee meeting had been revised as requested by the Committee to (1) add a rule for contemporaneous submission to the Board of all requests received and (2) eliminate website processing, in addition to other changes based upon input from outside counsel. With respect to submissions to the Board of requests received, Commissioner Elliott asked whether e-mailed or faxed distributions were contemplated and how soon the Board could expect delivery. Staff Attorney Crowley advised that the method of dissemination was left to the discretion of the Freedom of Information Officer in the new rule II.D.1 so long as a copy was distributed within a "reasonable period of time" following receipt of each complete request.

With respect to the Health Insurance Renewal, General Manager Martin noted that the Commission's health insurance renewal is January 1st; that the proposed premium increase of 12.2% was in line with the national average; and that in an effort to reduce costs, the General Manager was proposing that the Commission reduce its contribution towards employee coverage from 100% to 80% of the individual employee's health and dental premiums which would put the Commission more in line with what customer utilities charge their employees.

After confirming with the General Manager that changing the Commission's contribution towards employee coverage from 100% to 80% of the individual employee's health and dental premiums would result in an approximately \$21,000.00 cost savings, Commissioner Elliott expressed his hesitancy to make such a dramatic increase in employee contributions for a \$21,000 savings to the Commission, especially when the change would place the Commission on the high end of what customer utilities charge their employees. As a result, Commissioner Elliott suggested phasing in the change: Requiring a 10% employee contribution in 2010 and then requiring a 20% contribution in 2011.

Commissioner Chaplin acknowledged that 20% was a big increase but noted that employers all over are having to tighten their belts and, in the private sector, a 60/40 split is more common. Commissioner Chaplin also asked staff to consider a limitation

that other companies have implemented—the ineligibility of a spouse for coverage under the Commission's plan if the spouse's employer offers insurance coverage. Commissioner Chaplin offered to provide staff with a sample description of how such a limitation has worked in her experience, and the Staff Attorney questioned how the rule is applied when there were differences in coverages and/or differences in premiums between the insurance plans of the two employers. Subject to resolving those and any other questions of legalities, Commissioner Murphy and Elliott both felt the option was worth looking into for 2011 but not 2010 in light of the January 1, 2009, renewal date.

Commissioner Zay arrived at 7:25 P.M.

After Commissioner Murphy summarized the Committee's discussions prior to Commissioner Zay's arrival, Commissioner Zay confirmed that quotes had been received from other companies. Commissioner Zay also noted his agreement with the General Manager's recommendation to reduce the Commission's contribution towards employee coverage from 100% to 80% of the individual employee's health and dental premiums.

With respect to 20% employee contribution, Commissioner Murphy commented that he agreed with Commissioner Elliott's 10% phased in approach that still sends the message that the Commission is on the path to requiring a 20% employee contribution, especially because the General Manager advised that he would not be proposing any pay increases for FY 2010/2011. Commissioner Elliott added that the Commission's proposed premium increase of 12.2% seemed reasonable because at his firm, the proposed increase was 20%. Commissioner Chaplin countered that a 20% employee contribution sends a good message when all of the papers are full of reports of the various ways local government has had to cut spending.

In response to Commissioner Elliott's question, General Manager Martin advised that the Commission had been using Langan, Haeger, Vincent & Born, Inc. to assist with employee benefit issues, including insurance renewals, for approximately nine years.

Commissioner Zay requested a summary of the plan benefits, noting that he did not want to approve the renewal without knowing what was being renewed. Because of the January 1 renewal date, Commissioner Elliott suggested that it would be better to simply renew for 2010 with a direction to staff to bring up the matter of the 2011 renewal sometime in August or September. Commissioner Zay disagreed, noting that the Commission could switch to a month-to-month coverage plan.

Noting the lateness of the hour, Commissioner Murphy advised that the discussion of the Commission's Ethics Officer would be deferred to the January meeting. At which point, Commissioner Elliott moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:35 P.M. Seconded by Commissioner Chaplin and unanimously approved by a Voice Vote.

All voted aye. Motion carried.

H:\Board\Minutes\Administration\2009\Adm0912.docx