INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT & CONSULTING GROUP

VIEWPOINTS

4TH QUARTER 2012 | *ADVISORY NEWSLETTER*

MARKET COMMENTARY FREDRIC W. WILLIAMS

Drama du Jour (encore une fois)…

> *"Never blame a legislative body for not doing something. When they do nothing, they don't hurt anybody. When they do something is when they become dangerous."*
>
> *Will Rogers - 1928*

Not that it caught any of us by surprise, given the ideological loggerheads that our duly elected officials have backed themselves into, but the politics of trench warfare in our nation's capital once more pushed us to the precipice as a compromise on the so-called "fiscal cliff" appeared untenable until the eleventh-hour. Similar to the debt ceiling fiasco of 2011, our paragons on the Potomac pushed us over the edge before getting their act together and pulling us back from the brink very early in the new year. As if 2012 didn't already have a sufficient dose of political and economic drama, what with the election and continuing (albeit abating) Euro-centric stresses, it appeared that our hallowed halls of Congress couldn't resist the opportunity to one last time be the soap-opera-esque media-center-of-attention as we transitioned into the new year.

What we "got" was not as much a compromise as it was a continuation of the stalemate: taxes were raised on the wealthiest of taxpayers (absent the distinction between *adjusted gross* income and *taxable* income), while the sequestration issues were kicked down the road via a two month delay in the spending cuts' implementation. Since this coincides with when the debt ceiling discussions will be in full boogie, it would appear that our newly minted narcissists-de-Washington want to make sure they're the focus of the planet the next couple of months, despite the historical precedent that indicates they won't be able to get anything done until the last minute…again.

Excluding the headwinds that the government spending cuts, when and if they get implemented, would present to any continued economic expansion, the reinstatement of the employee payroll tax cut poses the greatest near term challenge to GDP growth in 2013 due to its broad impact on all wage earners. Projected to pull $125 billion out of consumers' pockets this year, there will be a direct impact on funds available for expenditure (given that consumer activity represents two-thirds of our GDP), as well as an indirect impact via diminished consumer confidence as we realize a lower absolute-dollar pay check. The extent that these two issues could be impediments to growth will be a function of the robustness of our ongoing economic recovery and its ability to overcome these fiscal drags. The good news, one could argue, is that we've survived the Mayan doomsday prophecy for December 21st and we've dodged the more dire consequences of the dreaded "cliff" – at least temporarily.

Despite these challenges we see a number of macro developments that, like we mentioned in last quarter's commentary, we feel could be constructive to the capital markets over the next 3 to 5 years.

1) Business and consumer confidence has taken refuge in the basement the last several years given the "perfect storm" that combined the global financial crisis with political policy paralysis. Although the economic "apocalypse now" mindset has littered this landscape in years past, it began morphing last year in to something more like "apocalypse maybe", which we expect will eventually release significant pent up demand from consumers and businesses for everything from cars and houses to technology upgrades and new hires.

2) Fears of a European implosion and the Chinese economy slowing to stall speed had caused the dismal scientists to forecast minuscule, if not negative, rates of global economic growth. With the imminent demise of the Euro deferred, at least temporarily, and the Chinese economy beginning again to move back into expansion mode, we expect a pick-up in emerging market GDP, as well as a continuation of the gradual ongoing recovery in the developed world.

3) Although the global expansion in sovereign debt (money "printing" by central banks to battle the financial crisis) has many concerned due to its potential future inflationary implications, consumer deleveraging has been silently significant as shell-shocked families reined in spending and accelerated debt reduction, the latter a pleasantly unintended consequence of lower interest rates.

> *"Yet debt burdens have been easing closer to home. The portion of Americans' disposable income applied to mortgage and consumer loan payments has shrunk from 14.1% in 2007 to 10.6%, the lowest in 31 years. Our financial obligations – which add car leasing, rental payments, and property taxes – are the lowest since 1984…To Americans trying to make ends meet, low borrowing costs are as much a blessing as busy workdays and silent nights."* *Barron's 12/24/12*

The aforementioned low interest rates, along with the resulting low yields in the bond market (all of which are a direct result of the Fed's various quantitative easing programs) are another significant piece of the macro puzzle that investors need to include in any forward looking analysis. We discussed in this space last quarter how years of equity-aversion on the part of individual investors could likely be a contrarian indicator within the context of a regression to the mean within normal asset allocation parameters. Combine this with the impact on bond holdings when (not *if*) rates begin to rise and we see an expanding demand for dividend producing equities as investors seek yield and migrate away from what they thought was a "safe" bond market. *(This concept is discussed in more detail below in the Bond Market Overview)*

In a fortuitous turn of events, 2013 has opened with the glimmer of an apparent change in investor attitude, as a recent research report showed a $19 billion inflow into U.S. equity funds for the first full week of the year. That's the biggest surge since June of 2008 and the fourth highest since 2000.

As such, we stand by our close last quarter:

> *"Although we don't suggest that everything is going to be hunky-dory immediately, we do think that it's time for investors to expand their time horizons and reflect on some of the macro forces that are developing in the background. That exercise could then shed some light on the extent of the recent level of equity-aversion and show it for what it may be – an emotionally extreme reaction that could be a significant contrarian indicator, and opportunity, for patient longer term investors."*

EQUITY MARKET OVERVIEW **J. FLOWER & F. WILLIAMS**

A Whiff of the Cliff…

Politics, as expected, dominated the headlines and certainly played a primary role as the driver in the daily equity market movements of the fourth quarter. It was a relatively volatile three months, with a dramatic sell-off after the presidential election as investors rushed to realize capital gains at 2012 tax rates and raise cash, as concerns over the fiscal cliff quickly snowballed as the Nero's of our nation's capital continued to fiddle. The equity markets bottomed for the quarter in mid-November as investor's short attention spans were diverted by better than expected economic data that was released regarding the housing recovery, jobs growth and even manufacturing. The buying continued into mid-December until the fiscal cliff worries set in again as the year-end deadline was swiftly approaching. Investors got nervous as the likelihood of our leaders in Washington being able to come to any agreement to avoid the scheduled spending cuts and tax increases seemed increasingly remote. But then, in not-so-dramatic fashion, a last minute deal was announced and the markets rallied into the close on the last trading day of the year (the best last day of the year since 1974) and the S&P 500 ended the quarter down about 1% and up 13.4% for the year.

The chart below illustrates that all major global indices were positive for the year but there was a wide disparity between them. Interestingly, the two major US indexes, the S&P 500 and the Dow Jones Industrial Average, were separated by over 600 basis points as the Dow was up only 7.26%. This is a reversal of 2011 when the S&P 500 was flat and the Dow was up 5.5%. As we've discussed in this space before, indexes are imperfect gauges designed to represent the performance of a particular asset class or sector and there can be, at times, wide disparities between even those that are designed to represent the same space. The reasons are primarily index construction, stock selection and sector weighting. For example, Apple was up about 30% last year and because of its $500B market cap it represents the largest weighting in the S&P 500 and was, therefore, the biggest contributor to the S&P's rise in 2012. Apple stock is not a Dow component but it if were, it would have had a much more profound impact on the performance of that index last year due to the way the weightings of the Dow are constructed. The weightings of the Dow's 30 components are based solely on the price of the shares (the higher the share price the higher the weighting) whereas the S&P 500 distributes the weightings of their 500 components based on market capitalization. The sector weightings are not aligned between the Dow and the S&P 500 either. The financial sector was one of the top performing sectors in 2012 yet that sector only represents 11% in the Dow versus 15% in the S&P 500. Technology is a large weighting of the Dow (remember Apple is not a Dow 30 component) but the large technology names like Microsoft (up about 3%), Intel (down about 16%) and Hewlett-Packard (down almost 50%) were a drag on the overall Dow average. The disparity between sector performance last year was also relatively extreme. As an example, the consumer discretionary and financial sectors were both up over 30% while utilities and energy were both up only about 5%.

As we move into 2013 our Investment Committee will continue to identify asset classes, sectors and individual securities that are trading at attractive valuations and distribute above average income. One of the screens we run to help us identify these opportunities is reviewing the current trailing 12-month P/E as it relates to the historical average P/E going back as far as possible. We run this for individual securities but also for sectors to identify what areas of the market might be trading at a discount to the aforementioned historical averages. While we don't and won't make short-term market predictions, it is important to note that a recent review of these screens showed that all but two of the ten major sectors are currently trading below their average P/E multiples. Amazingly, the equity markets have recovered almost all the way back to the pre-financial crisis levels of late 2007 yet today corporations have considerably stronger balance sheets, are running more efficiently and are sitting on historic levels of cash that we believe will be strategically put to work (dividend increases, share buybacks, acquisitions, capital improvements, etc.) and increase shareholder value over the long term. While many headwinds still exist, including slow GDP growth, a divided leadership in Washington, a still simmering European debt crisis, potential inflation and continued unrest in the Middle East, we feel that with proper risk management, diversification and a disciplined security selection process, current equity valuations represent (as noted in the previous article), attractive long-term rates of return potential as well as current income opportunities.

Equity Indices			
US	*Closing Level*	*Percentage Change For Quarter*	*Percentage Change Year-to-Date*
DJIA	13104.14	-2.48%	5.70%
S&P 500	1426.19	-1.00%	11.67%
Nasdaq	3019.51	-3.10%	14.00%
Europe/Asia			
FTSE - London	5897.8	2.71%	3.47%
DAX - Frankfurt	7612.39	6.72%	23.45%
CAC - Paris	3641.07	8.53%	13.00%
Nikkei - Tokyo	10395.18	17.19%	21.70%
Emerging Markets			
Bovespa - Sao Paulo	60952	2.34%	5.40%
MICEX - Moscow	1474.72	1.13%	5.17%
SENSEX - Mumbai	19426.71	3.54%	25.19%
SSE - Shanghai	2269.13	8.77%	4.60%

QEternity?…

In the final months of 2012, the world's obsession over the European debt crisis cooled. The ECB began to follow through on Mario Draghi's "do whatever it takes" speech to save the Euro, providing relief by purchasing government debt from the weaker Eurozone countries. The bailout was welcome news for those who had the courage to purchase Greek bonds. According to Barron's, if purchased at the start of January, by mid-December investors were rewarded with an 80% return on their investment. But timing is everything: John Corzine's large bet on Greek debt just a year earlier sent his firm MF Global into bankruptcy.

As confidence gained overseas, US treasury demand weakened slightly and rates bounced back from their lows, with the 10-year finishing at 1.76%, just below where it started the year. Domestically bonds had a good showing, with higher rewards delivered to those taking on more credit risk as Treasuries provided a 2%, and munis a 6.8%, total return in 2012, while movement out the risk spectrum saw investment grade corporates providing a 9.8% return and high yield junk bonds jumping 15.8%.

Fixed Income				
US Treasury Yields		*Yield To Maturity*	*Basis Point Change For Quarter*	*Basis Point Change Year-to-Date*
	5 Year Note	0.74%	0.13	-0.14
	10 Year Note	1.77%	0.133	-0.15
	30 Year Bond	2.95%	0.12	0.003

For most of 2012, we think it's safe to say the predominant emotion among investors was fear. Based on money flows (a true gauge of investor sentiment), fixed income was once again favored over equities. According to Lipper, despite historically low rates and warnings of a bond bubble, $250 billion had been funneled to bond funds (including ETFs) during 2012, while conversely, $130 billion was pulled from equity funds. An interesting anomaly took place in December when investors reversed course favoring stock funds to bonds by a ratio of 8 to 1.

Coincidence or not, in the same month Bernanke delivered a speech further tipping his hand with regard to the Fed's position on interest rates. He declared the Fed's ultra-low interest rate policy would remain in effect as long as unemployment remains above 6.5% (currently it's just under 8%) and inflation stays at or below 2.5%. Earlier in the year his language was more general, hinting that rate hikes would move higher with, "improving economic conditions" likely sometime in the future, like mid-2015. This time he was a little more direct, almost as if he was raising a little yellow flag for the first time on the bond market:

> *"Greater clarity will help markets better predict how bond yields will behave. The more information we provide…the better information they'll have on the likely impact on bonds, and that will allow for a smoother adjustment."* Ben Bernanke

In other words, if the economy improves and we at the Fed raise rates, don't say we didn't warn you.

We're not sure whether the recent uptick in rates will become a new trend over the near term or not, although we do expect interest rates to be higher over the next 3 to 5 years. Bonds have been in an extremely long-term bull market for the better part of 30 years - some of our clients will remember collecting double digit returns on CDs and government bonds in the 70's and 80's, and more likely paying double digit interest rates on their mortgages! Things have changed: at year-end, a 5-year US treasury bond yielded .72%, while a 30 year mortgage would cost a mere 3.5%. To put this into perspective, see the mountain chart below, keeping in mind how the decline in interest rates from the early 1980's improved the price of existing bonds. With 10-year Treasuries sitting at 1.75%, there's only so much room left for rates to drop. Mathematically, the bond market returns from the long-term bull market simply can't be repeated. Further, any significant uptick in rates could mean negative returns for bonds in the future.

To quantify this interest rate risk we thought a *hypothetical* example in real dollar terms would help; we stress the word hypothetical. This is not intended to be a market prediction, rather an example of the potential risks in select credit markets, especially those labeled "conservative". So… let's say you add $10,000 to the safest investment money can buy, US treasuries. And for this example let's assume you invest this $10,000 into 10-year treasuries at par which yields 1.85%. Every year for ten years you <u>will</u> collect your $185 in interest, and at the end of those ten years be handed your $10,000 back. The chances of default are virtually nil, if the US Treasury's checkbook runs light, they can always print more money. However, it's the time between purchase and maturity where market values are subject to change and that just might get your attention when reading a statement or if you should need to sell your bond before maturity. What would happen two years later to the value of your bond with now 8 years remaining to maturity, if newly issued 8 Year treasury rates were up to 4.5%? The market value of the bond (although not the maturity value – which remains unchanged) two years later would be approximately <u>$8,236</u> or a 17.64% drop in price. When we add the two years of interest collected, the total return improves to <u>$8,606</u>, but the fact of the matter is, if you had to sell prior to maturity, it still would be a loss…on what investors perceive as a safe, conservative investment.

In fact, this dynamic is already playing out very early in the new year as bond market action has highlighted:

> *"But, due to a quirk of bond math, losses are exaggerated when yields are low. That risk has been brought into sharp relief since the start of 2013. In just three trading days, long-term Treasurys lost 3.07% in value, more than wiping out the 3% coupon payment they will deliver in 2013."* *Wall Street Journal 1/14/13*

As mentioned in previous newsletters, we remain cautious with fixed income investments and are well aware of their inherent risks. At the same time we believe fixed income still serves an important role in asset allocation. However, this low rate environment has increased the risk potential within traditional "conservative" asset classes as displayed above, leading IMCG reevaluate the risk/reward balance. For this reason it's our intention to begin lowering bond exposure in portfolios in 2013. The fixed income we continue to buy and hold will be selected with these risks in mind, lowering risk by laddering bonds, investing globally, using floating rate securities, TIPs, and managing duration.

FIDUCIARY CORNER — STEPHEN L. EDDY

Off Target…

Any investment concept that generates a legislative reaction from Congress, as target date funds did in 2009, deserves a wary and educated approach from retirement plan participants, plan sponsors and investment fiduciaries alike. Target date funds show up in most plan fund lineups these days, but many plan sponsors do not have a real good handle on why they are there. Ironically, many of the advisers who include them in the lineups are not aware of the potential shortcomings or fiduciary ramifications either. I will attempt to explain the most commonly cited (top 5) issues with target date funds which have led them to have the reputation as one of the more deviously brilliant ideas ever marketed by the fund industry. First, some background:

THE MECHANICS AND STRUCTURE OF THE TARGET DATE FUND

A target date fund (TDF) is a mutual fund that holds other mutual funds as assets, usually all coming from the available lineup of the fund family issuing the target date fund. This investment method is often referred to as a "fund-of-funds" approach. The idea is that the TDF is a one-stop shop for an investor, alleviating the need to own multiple funds separately since the TDF is so well diversified.

Each TDF has a "target", usually in the form of a year ending in five or zero (2015, 2030, 2040, etc.), at which the investors in the fund would theoretically reach retirement age. The fund is managed with the mix of stock and bond funds that are deemed appropriate for the target year. As the target year gets closer, the mix is managed more conservatively. This gradual change in allocation between stock and bond funds is commonly referred to as the TDF's "glide path".

SAMPLE TARGET DATE FUND HOLDINGS

The table below lists the recent holdings and weighting percentages for the T Rowe Price 2040 and 2015 funds. Even though they invest largely in the same T Rowe Price funds, the percent allocated under each target year are very different. It is these tweaks to the percentages as time goes on that allows the manager to create the glide path (ultimately leading to a 60/40 stock/bond split for the 2015 fund versus the 2040 fund's more aggressive 90/10 stock/bond split). One would assume that in 2037, the 2040 fund asset mix would be similar to today's 2015 fund asset mix.

MUTUAL FUNDS HELD IN THE T ROWE PRICE TARGET DATE FUND SERIES (12/31/12)	2040 ASSET ALLOCATION % WEIGHTINGS	2015 ASSET ALLOCATION % WEIGHTINGS
T. Rowe Price Growth Stock	22.78	7.68
T. Rowe Price Value	20.77	6.37
T. Rowe Price International Stock Fd	7.60	5.19
T. Rowe Price Equity Index 500	7.39	20.81
T. Rowe Price Overseas Stock	6.68	4.58
T. Rowe Price Intl Gr & Inc	6.61	4.53
T. Rowe Price Emerging Markets Stock	5.69	3.89
T. Rowe Price New Income	4.95	20.02
T. Rowe Price Real Assets	3.67	2.52
T. Rowe Price Mid-Cap Growth	3.44	2.39
T. Rowe Price Mid-Cap Value	3.39	2.33
T. Rowe Price New Horizons	1.55	1.07
T. Rowe Price Small-Cap Stock	1.50	1.03
T. Rowe Price Small-Cap Value	1.46	1.01
T. Rowe Price High-Yield	0.94	3.71
T. Rowe Price Emerging Markets Bond	0.92	3.52
T. Rowe Price International Bond	0.64	2.43
T. Rowe Price Summit Cash Reserves	0.02	
T. Rowe Price Inflation-Focused Bond		6.92

THE TOP FIVE ISSUES WITH TARGET DATE FUNDS

1. ***Lack of communication to investors regarding the risks associated with owning a TDF:*** many investors in 2010 TDF's were surprised in 2008 when their fund, which was supposedly being risk-managed for when they retired in two years, held 75% stock and lost 30% of its value. Most did not know what their fund held for investments, just that it was managed with their retirement date in mind, and did not expect an aggressive mix.

2. ***Composition of the underlying holdings:*** the fund list above includes three funds that don't come close to meeting IMCG's fund screens. The participant and plan sponsor do not control the asset selection. This allows the fund families to include funds in their target date funds that wouldn't be found in a fund menu if they had to stand alone on their own merits. We estimate the proprietary nature of TDF's (only investing in their own family's funds) costs participants in the above 2040 fund around 1% per year in performance, which could be gained just by replacing the three funds (18.7% of total fund assets) with better options.

3. ***Discrepancies in Glide Path between fund families:*** each family has a different philosophy regarding proper asset allocation – how else do you explain that in a 2012 Morningstar industry study, the stock exposure among the forty-eight fund families with an available 2015

TDF ranged from a high of 75% (Goldman Sachs) to a low of 28% (John Hancock)? This is one of the most overlooked aspects of installing TDF's in plans – with such disparate strategies in place, how do you compare fund families performance? It is apples to oranges.

4. ***Potential for extra layer of fees:*** since TDF's are a fund of funds approach, a mutual fund shell needs to be created for each target, in order to hold all of the funds in the asset allocation mix. A new fund means new fees for marketing, administration, commission, etc. Fees on top of fees that already exist in the underlying funds. Investor outrage upon discovering this has made a few of the fund families back off of this extra fee layer.

5. ***The right people for all the right reasons in the wrong fund:*** in 2013, if you have twenty 38-year-old employees in a room, would you tell them they should all invest in the 2040 fund for when they retire in 27 years? Don't most of them have different circumstances from each other? Then why would they all be in the same fund?

SO, WHY ARE TARGET DATE FUNDS SO POPULAR?

As we have discussed, the TDF purports to manage the proper asset allocation among stock and bond funds to achieve the appropriate risk and return parameters that a person retiring at that target date would typically adopt: the closer to the targeted year, the more conservative (i.e. bonds over stocks) the holdings of the fund. It is a simple solution for participants.

But, is it the right solution? Unfortunately, there are only two causes for an investment product to become immensely popular in the investment world: either the investment is performing well or it is being heavily recommended (sometimes both). Brokers/advisers recommend target date funds for plans for two primary reasons:

1. They are easy to explain to participants: *"put your money in this fund and it will be managed with a targeted year in mind (say 2040) when you plan to retire… you have nothing to do but deposit your contributions and wait!"*

2. Since TDF's use the "fund-of-funds" approach they save the broker a LOT of time because the asset allocation investment mix is already determined by the fund family. This means that the broker/adviser doesn't have to meet one-on-one with participants to provide them with a personalized investment allocation strategy from the various funds in the fund menu lineup (which brokers consider to be very time consuming).

In reality, the mutual fund industry saw these funds as a way to generate more revenue: extra layers of fees, a way to grow assets in poorly performing funds, less work for brokers. The opportunity is compelling, the motives are not. The bottom line is that target date funds represent a tremendous amount of cash flow to the fund industry and the brokers that sell them. This is not the "fiduciary" way to do business. At IMCG we prefer meeting individually with participants to discuss their allocations ***to the best funds available***, from a menu we have hand-picked, not funds that have been forced upon them as part of a target date fund allocation. We're happy to review your fund lineup any time and give you our honest, unbiased opinion.

South of the Border… *John Warme*

The accelerated decline of the Western developed economies coupled with the rise of emerging or developing economies has marked a global markets paradigm shift since the start of the financial crisis. It had been the case over the last century that when developed economies had gotten a "cough", developing economies would get the "flu". This was not the case this time around and the financial resilience of these resource-rich developing economies has been one of the great surprises of the last 5 years. It was, in fact the developing economies that were quicker to recover. The most notable of the developing economies are the BRIC nations of Brazil, Russia, India and China.

China is certainly the largest and most compelling of the growth stories, but opaque transparency and heavy-handed government intervention make foreign investment difficult. The same can be said for Russia, while India is a quagmire of political red tape. Brazil, though imperfect regarding government intervention, tells an interesting – one of untapped potential.

Some data: Brazil, a darling of post-recession recovery has seen its growth slow considerably from the voracious 7.5% pace of 2010 and its Bovespa index logged a rough year in 2012. That said, Brazil's long-term economic future looks bright. The Bovespa's average P/E is currently a value at 7.4 times earnings. Consumption is on the rise as Brazil transitions to more a consumer-based economy fueled by its burgeoning middle class, current unemployment rate of just 4.9% and considerable wage inflation. This consumption, of course can be negatively affected by price instability which has proven to be an on-going concern. Brazil's inflation-rate spiked in October of 2011 to an annualized rate of 7.31% but has since eased and is projected to moderate.

Price stability will remain an issue to monitor, however Brazil's President Dilma Rousseff appears focused on returning to the growth levels of a few years ago. This may be a tall order, but with considerable stimulus funding new infrastructure in the country and as preparations for the 2016 Olympic Games to begin to ramp-up, Brazil should see positive pressure on its GDP. Both government spending and private consumption are important variables in the GDP equation; currently both appear to be headed in a positive direction for Brazil.

The BRIC economies will continue to emerge as major players on the world stage. There is abundant data to show Brazil and other developing countries continuing to gain their footing, both economically and politically. Brazil is an intriguing market for investment. As managers of globally-diversified portfolios, we will continue to monitor for proper investment opportunities in the continuously evolving global investment landscape.

TRACY ROGERS **–** Tracy was recently appointed to the Board of Directors of MAPS-Worldwide (formerly Maine Adoption Placement Services). "At MAPS, a multi-service, non-profit organization, we believe that every child needs and deserves a stable, permanent family, and our mission has been built on this conviction for over thirty years. We create opportunities through innovative services that promote permanency for children by building and strengthening families here in the US and around the world." Additional information can be found at www.maps-worldwide.org.

CHRIS WALKER **–** Chris and his wife Elizabeth added to their family on 12/07/12 with the arrival of Rose Bresca Walker, coming in at 7 lbs. 7 oz. and 20 inches of fun. The happy parents are having a blast despite a lack of sleep, while sister, Lucy and brother, Tuck love her but think she gets too much attention.

SAVE THE DATE:

CENTER FOR GRIEVING CHILDREN'S "LOVE REALLY COUNTS" AUCTION AND DINNER GALA **–** Friday February 1st at the Holiday Inn By The Bay. Tickets and Additional information can be found at www.cgcmaine.org.

WEB SITE UPDATE **–** We recently revamped our web site (www.imcgrp.com) so do drop by and pay us a "visit". We can also be followed on Linkedin (www.bitly.com/theimcgrp) and Facebook (www.facebook.com/imcgrp).

Our team at IMCG wishes you and yours a healthy and prosperous New Year

Back Row (l to r): Jason Foster – Vice President-Portfolio Manager; Ben Daigle – Relationship Manager; Terry Davies - Vice President-Portfolio Manager; Tracy Rogers - Vice President-Portfolio Manager; John Warme – Relationship Manager; Jordan Williams – IT Staff

Front Row (l to r): Jay Flower - Vice President-Portfolio Manager; Noelle Surprise – Intern; Fred Williams – Managing Director; Jeannine Plourde – Client Service Associate; Steve Eddy – Vice President-Fiduciary Consultant; Chris Walker – Relationship Manager

(Missing from photo – Larry Bowlan – Portfolio Manager; Camille Shiffler – Operations Manager; Ben Fulmer – Intern)