

The Regents of the University of California

**PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

November 16, 2016

The Public Engagement and Development Committee met on the above date at UCSF–Mission Bay Conference Center, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Gould, Island, Lansing, Ortiz Oakley, Pattiz, Ramirez, Reiss, and Schroeder; Ex officio member Napolitano; Advisory members Lemus, Mancina, and White; Interim Chancellor Hexter; Staff Advisor Richmond

In attendance: Regents Elliott and Torlakson, Assistant Secretary Lyall, Provost Dorr, Senior Vice Presidents Henderson and Peacock, Vice Presidents Brown, Budil, and Holmes-Sullivan, Deputy General Counsel Friedlander, Chancellors Dirks, Hawgood, and Wilcox, and Recording Secretary McCarthy

The meeting convened at 1:30 p.m. with Committee Vice Chair Lansing presiding. She observed that, as the University articulates its goals and priorities, a major role of this Committee would be to help frame and deliver the message of those priorities. These initial meetings of this new Committee were designed to provide an informational basis to help the Committee understand the issues facing the University and its campuses to enable the Committee to provide meaningful support.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of September 14, 2016 were approved.

**2. ANNUAL REPORT ON UNIVERSITY PRIVATE SUPPORT 2015-16**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Senior Vice President Henderson reviewed private fundraising of the past year across UC's ten campuses. The *Annual Report on University Private Support 2015-16* reflected the confidence of the philanthropic community in the University and its far-reaching educational, research, economic, and public service contributions.

Assistant Vice President Geoff O'Neill observed that UC had continued its trend of increasing private support, with total 2015-16 philanthropic support exceeding \$2 billion for the second consecutive year, and increasing over the prior year by more than \$100 million. Fundraising totals have increased in 16 of the past 20 years. While large gifts were important, smaller gifts were also, with more than 300,000 donors contributing in 2015-16. This fundraising success was attributable to work at the campus level. In

2015-16, many UC campuses reported both record fundraising and record numbers of donors. Including pledges, 2015-16 fundraising totaled \$2.6 billion.

UC's more mature campuses were some of the most successful public higher education institutions in the nation in fundraising. UCLA, UCSF, and UC Berkeley were three of the nation's top five public institutions in fundraising, and five UC campuses were in the top 25; UC campuses were seven of the top 11 public or private higher education fundraising institutions in California. As a system, UC's fundraising is unequaled.

Mr. O'Neill reviewed areas within the University supported by private philanthropy. Endowed chairs recognize the distinction of UC's superior faculty and align with donors' interests. In the past year, UC set a record, with 146 new endowed chairs, bringing UC's systemwide total to more than 2,000. President Napolitano's Matching Chair Program helped to create interest in the philanthropic community.

Development opportunities include building planned giving and bequest societies. In 2015-16 UC received more than 1,000 bequests, a significant increase over prior years. All the UC campuses were involved in building legacy societies to encourage these significant gifts. Campuses were also working to provide donors more detailed stewardship information to show the tangible effects of their gifts. Establishing multi-campus consortiums and institutes that maximize UC's systemwide reach can inspire donors.

UCSF Vice Chancellor for University Development and Alumni Relations John Ford provided information about philanthropy in the health sciences, which he said was different from development programs focusing primarily on alumni. UCSF had experienced a distinct increase in philanthropic support in the past three years. Mr. Ford discussed UCSF's donor constituencies. UCSF had only 36,000 alumni with degrees from its four professional schools and its graduate division. These alumni were loyal, demonstrated by a more than 25 percent donor participation rate per year, but their potential was limited and modest compared with UCSF's total philanthropy. In the past three years, excluding two very large gifts, alumni giving was just two percent of total UCSF philanthropy.

Private grants, primarily from foundations, corporations, and associations, yielded highly restricted funds used for support and training. Private grant support was driven by UCSF faculty and had increased. UCSF's high-quality faculty competed exceptionally well for private grants, as they did for National Institutes of Health (NIH) grants. A small number of development staff worked with UCSF faculty to generate \$176 million in private grants in 2015-16.

A significant portion of UCSF's major gifts came from grateful patients and their families. In most cases, faculty physicians were the primary point of contact and donors were loyal to the doctor more than to the University. In essence, the UCSF doctor was the philanthropy volunteer. Development staff spent considerable time working with faculty to identify, engage, solicit, and steward donors, building trust with faculty physicians and

becoming partners with them in soliciting philanthropic support on behalf of the University. Many of these donations were highly restricted.

UCSF was fortunate that a relatively small group of primarily San Francisco-based citizens have supported the University financially and as volunteers over many years, and often had also chosen to receive care at UCSF. This important segment of the San Francisco philanthropic community had historically demonstrated great support for UCSF. Under the leadership of UCSF Board of Overseers Chair William Oberndorf, UCSF was reaching out to a younger generation of Northern California philanthropists to expand its donor community and refresh its boards. With the relatively recent convergence of medicine and technology, UCSF was particularly focused on engaging the technology community, with initial promising results.

UCSF's ability to secure a series of very large commitments was at the core of its recent success. Since July 2013, these have included 44 gifts of at least \$5 million, including four commitments of \$100 million or more. UCSF was fortunate to be located in an area where it could engage with donors capable of that level of giving. Mr. Ford stated that UCSF realized that big ideas were necessary to generate big gifts. Developing such big ideas involved bringing multiple faculty together, often across departmental lines, to forge ideas for the greater good of the University and to help faculty achieve their goals, while working closely with the senior leadership of the University. A great deal of time and cooperation were necessary to align University and faculty interests. Finally, UCSF's excellent leadership conveyed these big ideas to potential donors. A new generation of donors was emerging, looking for new ways to partner with UCSF. Mr. Ford reiterated that this was different from traditional alumni fundraising. The University must be open and flexible to work with these potential donors who had their own objectives. He summarized UCSF's development strategies of focusing on large gift opportunities, working with UCSF clinicians, strengthening its volunteer programs, building long-term relationships, and raising UCSF's visibility.

Committee Vice Chair Lansing reminded the Committee that, while medical center philanthropy was unique, it was important to consider, as it accounted for 50 percent of all UC philanthropy. The Committee would like to determine ways the Regents could help advance this philanthropy.

### **3. OVERVIEW OF UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRIVATELY FUNDED SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Senior Vice President Henderson affirmed the University's long-standing commitment to ensuring that financial aid was available for its students and their families. While UC's own institutional support, primarily return-to-aid, and State and federal funding were the primary sources of student support, private giving also played a critical role. While more than half of UC's students paid no tuition and more than three-quarters paid less than full

tuition, tuition was only one part of students' total cost of attendance. Scholarships and fellowships helped students pay for not only tuition, but also housing, transportation, books, and other expenses. This presentation would provide an overview of scholarship fundraising at UC's oldest and youngest campuses, UC Berkeley and UC Merced.

Assistant Vice President Geoff O'Neill first reviewed overall sources of support for UC students in 2014-15. The largest was UC institutional support through return-to-aid, which provided more than \$1.2 billion. Aid from the State through programs such as Cal Grants provided \$837 million, and federal aid such as Pell Grants and other programs provided \$484 million. Awards from outside agencies, such as professional associations or companies, provided \$70 million each year. The focus of this discussion would be gifts and endowments received by the University and used to support UC students, totaling \$153 million in 2014-15. Students could receive support from more than one source.

Mr. O'Neill discussed fundraising efforts that replenished the funds from gifts and endowments that supported students. In 2015-16, the University raised more than \$167 million in gifts designated for student support. Many donors had an academic and geographic focus; very few donors gave to a general scholarship fund. UC development staff encouraged broader donor perspectives so that funds could be as useful as possible. Systemwide, UC had more than 7,500 individual endowed funds that supported scholarships and fellowships.

Mr. O'Neill highlighted major themes of development of funds for student support. UC alumni who received support as students may want to "give back" to the University when they have the means to do so. Some programs supported specific student groups, such as former foster youth and homeless youth. A new program with support from the Office of the President was Oakland Promise, working with the City of Oakland, the East Bay College Fund, and UC campuses to provide scholarship support for low-income Oakland high school students. UC students were increasingly interested in helping their fellow students, often by giving to emergency support programs.

Mr. O'Neill cited challenges to addressing the need for scholarship support. UC's strong financial aid programs that provide support for students' tuition and fees were well-publicized, but the need existed to make the philanthropic community aware of the unmet need of students' total cost of attendance. Campuses were also developing new ways to recognize scholarship donors, for instance by arranging meetings of donors with aid recipients.

UC Berkeley Vice Chancellor for University Development and Alumni Relations Julie Hooper reported that UC Berkeley's third annual 24-hour online giving campaign, the "Big Give," would launch that evening. The prior year, the Big Give raised \$5.5 million, with 20 percent of gifts coming from first-time donors. She asked the Committee members for feedback on the Big Give website. Donors could specify the UC Berkeley organization or area to which their contribution would be allocated.

Ms. Hooper reviewed the history of scholarships at UC Berkeley. Its oldest scholarship was established in 1891, the Phoebe Apperson Hearst Scholarship, at that time an annual scholarship of \$300 each for five female students. Upon her death in 1919, Ms. Hearst bequeathed \$60,000 to UC Berkeley to permanently endow the scholarship. Currently that scholarship had a market value of more than \$1.5 million and provided ten students with scholarships of approximately \$5,000 each. UC Berkeley currently had 1,636 endowed scholarships and 1,295 endowed fellowships, with a combined payout to students of \$46 million the prior fiscal year, including scholarship funds held by the UC Berkeley California Alumni Association with a payout of about \$1.7 million.

The 2006-2013 Campaign for Berkeley, the campus' most recent campaign, raised \$428 million for student support from endowed giving and outright giving. UC Berkeley was in the planning or quiet phase of a new campaign that had raised \$1.2 billion including \$114 million for student support. The priorities of the new campaign were being planned. Ms. Hooper expressed her belief that student support would be a key focus of the campaign.

Ms. Hooper highlighted some philanthropic opportunities as possible areas in which the Committee could be of assistance. Matching gifts, which match donor gifts dollar for dollar, were very productive in encouraging donors. For example, the successful Ruth Johnson Undergraduate Scholarship Match Program (Johnson Match), made possible by a generous bequest of Ruth Johnson, provided a one-to-one match. Donors who contributed a minimum of \$100,000 had their donations matched by \$100,000 from the bequest. The Johnson Match resulted in 50 new scholarship funds. For graduate students, the Berkeley Endowments to Attract and Retain Graduate Students (BEAR GradS) program, launched in 2016 with matching funds from two generous bequests, from alumna Helene Cantor, class of 1935, and William V. Power, class of 1930, provided a \$500,000 match for gifts of \$500,000 to create fully funded doctoral fellowship endowments of \$1 million. Thus far, the BEAR GradS program had generated 17 matches, seven of which had been completed to establish seven new graduate fellowships administered as part of UC Berkeley's most prestigious annual fellowship competition on campus, held early in the admission cycle to ensure enrollment of the best graduate students with generous funding packages. The campus was very appreciative of President Napolitano's Match for Endowed Chairs. At UC Berkeley, a \$2 million donation was required to create an endowed chair. The \$500,000 match was used as a graduate fellowship or a program support endowment for the endowed chair. During the Campaign for Berkeley, the William and Grace Ford Undergraduate Scholarship Match was designed to encourage donors who had not previously established endowments to do so. The minimum gift was \$100,000, which was matched by \$100,000. This program raised \$8 million in scholarships.

Ms. Hooper observed that opportunities existed to acquaint annual alumni donors with the possibility of establishing a student scholarship endowment. Experience had shown that donors appreciated nothing more than personal letters from student recipients of scholarships and fellowships.

UC Berkeley had convened a task force, comprised of donors, campus leadership, and development staff, to review, for the first time in ten years, its minimum levels for scholarships and fellowships. The campus was considering increasing its minimum scholarship endowment from the current \$50,000 to a range from \$100,000 for unrestricted scholarships to \$250,000 for those with a geographic or discipline restriction. The campus would also consider increasing graduate fellowship minima from \$500,000 to \$1 million. It was anticipated that the task force would complete its work in January 2017 and bring its recommendations to the Chancellor.

In addition, UC Berkeley deans had convened a task force to examine possible incentives for deans to raise scholarship and fellowship support. Under one proposal being considered, deans or department chairs who raised money toward undergraduate financial aid would receive a budget allocation from the campus in some form equal to one-third of the amount raised, paid roughly at the time the gift was received. The funds would be restricted to supporting the dean's undergraduate program and use of the funds for education of low-income students would be encouraged.

UC Merced Vice Chancellor for Development and Alumni Relations Kyle Hoffman shared progress in private support for UC's youngest campus. UC Merced, currently in its 12th academic year, had a young alumni population of about 6,100 graduates with an average age of 26, not yet in their peak earning years. Furthermore, UC Merced is located in the Central Valley, an economically depressed area of the state that lacked a significant corporate and foundation presence. It was not difficult to make a case for student support, since almost three-quarters of UC Merced students were first-generation college students and more than half came from families with household annual incomes of less than \$40,000. Twelve percent of UC Merced students benefited directly from privately funded scholarships and fellowships, the third-highest level in the UC system.

UC Merced was building a strong foundation of private support. Since inception, it had raised \$122 million; the market value of its total endowment exceeded \$41 million. In 2015-16, UC Merced raised almost \$21 million, setting a new campus record for private support and including its largest ever student support gift of more than \$3.4 million. The sources of UC Merced's support differed from the norm for UC campuses. Since the campus' inception, less than one percent of its support came from its graduates. The campus was making progress in this area, and alumni giving in 2015-16 had increased to 11 percent of all giving, ranking third in the UC system.

Student support through scholarships and fellowships had always been a high priority for UC Merced. Of its private gifts, 14 percent were directed toward student support. From its inception, support from community members, private foundations, and corporate partners ensured student access to UC Merced. When the campus opened in September 2005, 35 scholarship and fellowship funds had already been established with almost \$4 million in contributions. Endowed gifts played a key role, with 63 percent of UC Merced's endowed funds supporting student scholarships and fellowships; 87 percent of monies raised for student support were directed to named funds.

Mr. Hoffman said that student support remained a high priority of UC Merced's fundraising and cited three key programs. The UC Merced Foundation Board of Trustees "Big Idea" Fellowship Program raised more than \$800,000 over a two-year period to support graduate student fellowships, including a significant gift from Regent Emeritus Ruiz. The University Friends Circle, an organization linking UC Merced with community volunteers and currently in its eighth year, had made scholarship support a priority and had increased its endowment to \$240,000. UC Merced's third annual Giving Tuesday on November 29 would be a 24-hour day of giving focused on raising scholarships and fellowships, and broadening the campus' base of support. In the past few years, UC Merced added hundreds of new donors, inspired by a unique 3:1 match provided by corporate sponsors, quadrupling the value of every gift.

Regent Island expressed pride in the number of UC students who were first-generation college students and the number of UC's Pell Grant recipients. He asked how students' total cost of attendance was being addressed. Ms. Hooper responded that UC Berkeley raised \$200,000 in private support the prior year for the student food pantry which also had support from campus staff. Regent Island asked if it would ever be feasible to offer full support for needy students, covering tuition and living expenses. Ms. Hooper affirmed her belief that student support in its fullest sense should be a top development priority of UC fundraising; if support for students' total cost of attendance were set as a goal, it should be promoted. Mr. Hoffman added that a cohort of the UC Merced Foundation had established an emergency fund for students.

President Napolitano agreed that considering students' total cost of attendance was important, including housing, food, and tuition, since tuition was less than half of the cost of attendance. A discussion at the following day's Board meeting would include ways in which students' financial aid packages take total cost into account. The University was tracking demand for food pantry and similar services. UC revenue, which in the past was a combination of State funding and tuition, was now comprised of four elements: tuition, State funding, philanthropy, and return on intellectual capital.

Regent Ortiz Oakley encouraged the Committee to focus its discussions on areas which could affect the goals of the Regents. For instance, philanthropy could be used to increase the diversity of the University. He acknowledged that there may be a disparity between the goals of the University and areas to which donors wish to contribute. It would be helpful to consider ways in which the Regents could drive synergy between the challenges UC faced and the goals of fundraising efforts. He asked if there were different techniques or financial vehicles that would intentionally support the University's goals, such as convincing potential students that UC would be affordable for them, targeting specific high schools to create incentives through scholarships, or establishing scholarship incentives for students from specific demographic groups or geographical areas of the state.

Regent Ramirez stressed the importance of encouraging small donations, noting that even small scholarships could be very encouraging to students. Students often were willing to contribute within their capacity to funding campaigns.

Interim Chancellor Hexter encouraged the Regents to review policy restrictions on the funding of development campaigns.

Regent Pattiz encouraged the use of social media to solicit small donations. Committee Vice Chair Lansing recalled an earlier systemwide social media campaign that highlighted the effect UC had on the lives of Californians. She suggested considering another systemwide campaign and devoting a portion of an upcoming Committee meeting to soliciting ideas.

Regent Schroeder advocated investing in alumni engagement and cited Cal Alumni Association fundraising for student support. UC campuses' alumni associations can be used to encourage alumni engagement and philanthropy, and to inform alumni of current student needs. She encouraged using the existing infrastructure of campus alumni associations. Interested Regents could seek suggestions for personal involvement from their local UC campus' alumni association. Regent Schroeder said establishing connections between alumni and individual students through campus alumni associations was powerful.

Ms. Henderson added that her office was exploring ways to improve UC alumni relations, including involving current students.

4. **REVIEW OF FEDERAL AND STATE ELECTION RESULTS INCLUDING STATE BALLOT INITIATIVES**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Senior Vice President Peacock reported that Democrats gained seats in both the California State Senate and Assembly, with 26 Democrats in the Senate, including 11 UC alumni. Democrats would have a super-majority in the California Assembly, which had 22 new members. Mr. Peacock's office would begin to engage with the new members after they would be sworn in on December 5. There would be several new legislative committee chairs. Proposition 55, the extension of Proposition 30 tax increases, passed with 62.1 percent.

The U.S. presidential election would result in the appointment of new cabinet members and new policies. Results were difficult to anticipate at the current time. The Democrats picked up two U.S. Senate seats. With 48 seats, the Democrats would have some ability to affect debate, even though the Republicans would control all three branches of the federal government. Democrats gained five seats in the House of Representatives.

5. **UPCOMING STATE LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Interim Director of State Government Relations (SGR) Kieran Flaherty reviewed priorities for the upcoming State legislative session. His office's highest priority would be gaining support for the University's 2017-18 budget. It was anticipated that the budget would be reflective of the budget framework UC established with Governor Brown that would remain in effect through 2018-19. The framework included a four percent base budget adjustment, a \$130.4 million increase, and the \$170 million third installment of Proposition 2 funds to help UC address its pension obligations. The Governor would likely introduce a budget reflecting these adjustments and his office would request the Legislature's support. Mr. Flaherty hoped the Governor's budget would include at least \$35 million in one-time funds for deferred maintenance. Legislative priorities that had been tied to funding in the past included increasing enrollment of California resident students. Senate President pro Tempore Kevin de León shared the Regents' vision of increasing access for economically disadvantaged students and ensuring that they succeed. The prior year, \$20 million was budgeted to achieve this common goal.

Regarding UC-sponsored legislation, SGR was currently in the annual process of identifying legislative priorities from across the UC system. Proposals would be vetted and analyzed, after which the President of the University would decide which to sponsor. SGR would identify authors for those bills and then work to ensure passage. Mr. Flaherty cited the past example of UC-sponsored legislation, Senate Bill 1210, the DREAM Loan Program, authored by State Senator Ricardo Lara, to remedy gaps in financial aid packages offered to undocumented students, who were ineligible for federal student loans. The bill was passed and signed by the Governor.

UC also would support other legislation. Of the 5,000 bills introduced in the 2015-16 biennial legislative session, UC identified 538 as having a significant effect on UC, and actively supported nearly 30 measures. Assembly Bill 1823 by Assembly Member Susan Bonilla, the Cancer Clinical Trials Program, to finance clinical trials for low-income cancer patients, was supported by UC and was signed into law by the Governor. The 2017-18 legislative session would convene on December 5. SGR would attend to welcome new legislators and to thank returning legislators who have supported UC.

The State's fiscal outlook was reflected in year-to-date revenues, which the Department of Finance said most recently were running about one percent below projections, with more negative future projections. SGR would also review projections of the Legislative Analyst's Office. Implementation of Proposition 55, which would extend by 12 years Proposition 30's personal income tax increase for high earners, might generate an estimated \$4 billion to \$9 billion in revenue for the State's General Fund. The wide range of projections was indicative of the volatility of income taxes. Other cost pressures on the State budget included uncertainty as a result of the federal election, State collective bargaining agreements, and new ongoing obligations, such as increases in the minimum wage. The State's Cap-and-Trade Program had a precipitous decline in revenue that could affect several significant State programs.

UC had a number of collective bargaining contracts that would be up for negotiation, always of interest to Sacramento. SGR would be helpful in providing information and

participating in hearings. The State would release two audits of UC in 2017 and SGR would participate with the Joint Committee on Legislative Audit that would hear the audits. UC would continue to focus on funding for enrollment and would like to partner with the State to support graduate enrollment, and funding for facilities, classrooms, and laboratories. The University was moving forward aggressively with its own housing initiatives, which were not eligible for State General Obligation Bond funding.

6. **FEDERAL ELECTION IMPACT ON HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY AND HIGHER EDUCATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Associate Vice President Gary Falle observed that the effect of the federal election on higher education policy was as yet uncertain. He reviewed key aspects of the effect of the federal government on UC. The change in presidential administrations would result in changes across the executive branch. For the first time since 2007, the same political party would control the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the executive branch.

In the upcoming few weeks, Congress must finalize fiscal year 2017 funding legislation. Mr. Falle's office of Federal Government Relations (FGR) would lead the drafting of a letter from UC, California State University (CSU), and the California Community Colleges (CCC) to the California Congressional delegation requesting adequate funding of Pell Grants and approval of year-round Pell Grants. UC was strongly advocating for passage during the Lame Duck Session of the 21st Century Cures Act that would promote medical innovation. President Napolitano and UC's ten chancellors had sent a letter to the California Congressional delegation this week in support of that legislation.

President-elect Donald Trump's statements about education policy during the campaign were limited, so the direction of policy under his administration was unknown. His campaign statements had indicated a preference for returning the student loan program to private banks and for instituting an income-based loan repayment program. While he expressed support for research, his policy toward funding research universities was unclear. He had called for repeal of the Affordable Care Act, but with little detail about a replacement plan.

Mr. Falle anticipated that the University could face severe federal budget restraints, as federal non-defense spending was anticipated to fall to historic lows, as a result of sequestration budget cuts required under the Budget Control Act of 2011.

Regent Reiss asked if UC campuses would invite new California legislators to their local campuses. She also asked about approaching U.S. House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy, a Californian with whom some Regents have a relationship, about priorities of the University. Mr. Falle stated that his office would welcome such help. Regent Reiss asked about using Regents' connections with national legislators to build ongoing relationships that could benefit the University. Committee Vice Chair Lansing agreed that

Regents would be willing to assist. Senior Vice President Peacock responded that a plan for ways in which Regents could be of assistance was being developed for State Government Relations and it would be helpful to develop a similar plan for FGR.

Regent Island asked about the \$20 million budgeted by the State to increase access for economically disadvantaged students and ensuring that they succeed. Interim Director of State Government Relations Kieran Flaherty commented that the \$20 million would be programmatic one-time funding. UC was to develop a plan to identify specific schools, in specified local control funding formula categories as defined by the State, in which a particular focus could be developed. Students graduating from those schools who were admitted to UC would be targeted for support. Within the restraints of one-time funding, the plan was to establish a support infrastructure for an ongoing relationship between those schools and UC.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked whether UC would collaborate with CSU and CCC on anticipated issues around Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff