

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

January 23, 2003



This special meeting of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois was conducted telephonically on Thursday, January 23, 2003, beginning at 2:10 p.m.

Dr. Kenneth D. Schmidt, chair *pro tem*, called the meeting to order and asked the secretary to call the roll. The following members of the board were present: Mr. Lawrence C. Eppley, Dr. Jeffrey Gindorf, Mr. Thomas R. Lamont, Dr. Kenneth D. Schmidt, Mrs. Marjorie E. Sodemann, Mr. Robert F. Vickrey. Governor Rod Blagojevich was absent. Mr. Noah L. Wolfe, voting student trustee from the Chicago campus, was present. Mr. Art Moore, non-voting student trustee from the Springfield campus, was present. Mr. Keely J. Stewart, nonvoting student trustee from the Urbana-Champaign campus, was absent.

Also present were President James J. Stukel; Dr. Nancy Cantor, chancellor, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Dr. Sylvia Manning, chancellor, University of Illinois at Chicago; Dr. Richard D. Ringeisen, chancellor, University of Illinois at Springfield; and the officers of the board, Mr. Stephen K. Rugg, comptroller (and vice president for administration); Mr. Thomas R. Bearrows, university counsel; Mr. Lester H. McKeever, Jr., treasurer; and Dr. Michele M. Thompson, secretary. In addition, the following persons were also in attendance: Mr. Richard M. Schoell, executive director for governmental relations; Mr. Thomas P. Hardy, executive director for

university relations; Ms. Susan J. Sindelar, executive assistant to the president; Ms. Corla A. Hagenbruch, assistant secretary; and Ms. Marna K. Fuesting, assistant secretary.

MOTION FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION

Dr. Schmidt stated: "A motion is now in order to hold an executive session to consider the following subjects: University employee matters; the purchase or lease of real property for use by the University; pending, probable, or imminent litigation against, affecting, or on behalf of the University."

The motion was made by Dr. Gindorf and approved by the following vote: Aye, Mr. Eppley, Dr. Gindorf, Mr. Lamont, Dr. Schmidt, Mrs. Sodemant, Mr. Vickrey, Mr. Wolfe; no, none; absent, Governor Blagojevich.

(The student advisory vote was: Aye, Mr. Moore; absent, Mr. Stewart.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Purchase or Lease of Real Property for Use by the University

Dr. Schmidt called on Chancellor Manning to present the subject for this discussion. Dr. Manning asked to have several associates join this discussion. The board agreed and the following joined the group: Dr. Eric A. Gislason, vice chancellor for research, Chicago; Dr. Charles L. Rice, vice chancellor for health affairs, Chicago; Dr. Stanton Delaney, vice chancellor for administration, Chicago; and Dr. Arthur Savage, vice chancellor for external affairs, Chicago. Dr. Manning proceeded to explain that the one requirement for submission of a proposal to build a National Biocontainment Laboratory on the Chicago campus was board approval of the site and the land transfer necessary to enable the campus to build on this site. She then said that in order to discuss the site for the building it was also necessary to explain that a related part of the requirements given in the guidelines for the proposal is to show board approval of a guarantee the University will provide \$50.0 million in matching funds for the grant for which the campus is applying. Dr. Manning added that the Illinois Medical District Commission board had met earlier to authorize transfer of land under their control to the Chicago campus for this purpose. She asked Stephen K. Rugg, vice president for administration, to comment further on sources the University might turn to for the required \$50.0 million match in funds. Mr. Rugg indicated that five sources of possible funding had been identified. He said the first source to be considered would be a State appropriation, and he noted that the University's considerable success in economic development suggested that a special request to the State for these funds would be obvious, particularly since one of the main purposes of this facility is homeland security. He pointed out that if the grant is awarded, the University would begin to receive the funding in Fiscal Year 2004 and that 10 percent of the match would be needed in that year.

Mr. Rugg then invited Michael B. Provenzano, senior associate vice president for business and financial services, to comment on other possible

sources for the required \$50.0 million in matching funds. Mr. Provenzano indicated that one other source might be from the issue of revenue bonds by the University, with a 30-year repayment plan. He noted that the debt service on this would be \$3.25 million per year, and he presented possible ways for raising this. One of the ways he suggested was to sell timeshares to researchers for use of the laboratory. He also suggested using the indirect cost recovery (ICR) funds from research in the facility to pay the debt service, if allowed. He stated that this would require \$12.5 million in research grants.

Mr. Provenzano also suggested that it might be possible to issue revenue bonds through another authority, such as the Illinois Development Finance Authority. He stated that this would involve entering into an installment purchase agreement with a repayment plan of 30 years that would also involve providing money for the debt service. Mr. Eppley asked what purpose would be served by electing this source of funds. Mr. Provenzano stated that this would be pursued only if it was not possible to use ICR funds for debt service.

Next Mr. Provenzano suggested that the University might issue Certificates of Participation if the first two suggestions proved unworkable. He explained that the repayment plan for these would be 20 years and the debt service \$4.0 million per year, requiring \$15.0 million in research grants to provide the debt service. Mr. Eppley asked if the lab would be used entirely for government purposes. Dr. Gislason stated that a small amount of research might be performed in the laboratory by private companies, probably less than 10 percent. Mr. Eppley commented on the impact of the proposed funding plans on the University's debt capacity and future bond rating.

Mr. Provenzano then advised the board that the last possibility for raising the required \$50.0 million was from philanthropic sources. Mr. Rugg added that every reasonable opportunity would be pursued for gift money for this purpose, but that there is no assurance of such for this project.

Litigation

Dr. Schmidt asked Mr. Bearrows to summarize the facts in the recommended settlement in the case of *Brenston v. Vajaranant, et al.* Mr. Bearrows indicated that this case involved surgery during which a pad was left in the patient that later became infected requiring additional surgeries. He explained that the medical costs were over \$200,000, lost wages were significant, and pain and suffering were involved. He recommended the board accept the settlement offer of \$750,000.

A CONTINUING NEED FOR
CONFIDENTIALITY
EXISTS FOR THIS SECTION.

A CONTINUING NEED FOR
CONFIDENTIALITY
EXISTS FOR THIS SECTION.

EXECUTIVE SESSION ADJOURNED

There being no further business, the executive session adjourned at 3:05 p.m. The board convened in regular session at 3:10 p.m.

BOARD MEETING RECONVENED

When the board reconvened in regular session, those noted as being in attendance at the beginning of this meeting were still in attendance.

Dr. Schmidt asked if any board member had questions about the agenda items presented. Mr. Vickrey asked for a description of the perimeters of the site proposed for the National Biocontainment Laboratory. Dr. Manning referred to a map and indicated that the perimeter of the site would be some distance from the building itself. She explained that the National Institutes of Health (the organization to whom the proposal is being submitted for funding for this facility) requires that such buildings be set back 45 meters (approximately 148 feet) in all directions from the edge of the site. She explained that the edge of the site would be bordered with security planters with one gate for deliveries, and that there would also be a fence about 30 meters (approximately 100 feet) from the building with a single point of entry for pedestrians. She added that the plan called for six different security zones inside the building. In response to Mr. Vickrey's question about what it meant to call this a Level 4 Laboratory Dr. Manning stated that a Level 4 Laboratory provides the highest level of security internal to the building and that this involves many levels of security including screening of individuals and air locks for protection against microorganisms, and that special clothing prescribed for decontamination is required.

ELECTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Dr. Schmidt reported that since two members of the Executive Committee had resigned and the third member had concluded his term that it was necessary to elect a new Executive Committee to serve until the annual meeting of the board, February 12-13, 2003.

Dr. Schmidt then asked the secretary to read the language from the *Bylaws* of the Board of Trustees regarding the Executive Committee. Dr. Thompson read the following:

Article IV. Standing Committees of the Board

Section 1. At the annual meeting in January of each year, the board shall elect two members to an "Executive Committee," consisting of three members, the board chair to be the chair ex officio, which members shall hold office for one year, or until their successors have been elected.

Section 2. The Executive Committee shall meet whenever the chair, or two members thereof, shall find it necessary for the transaction of any business which is urgent and cannot be postponed to a regular meeting of the board. The committee may meet by conference telephone call or other communication equipment by means of which all persons participating in the meeting can communicate with each other. All trustees shall be given the same notice of the meeting that is sent to the members of the executive committee and any who wish may elect to participate in the meeting as nonvoting participants.

Section 3. The Executive Committee functions as an instrument of the board and shall possess all the powers of the board when in session, provided that it shall not overrule, revise, or change the previous acts of the board, or take from regular or special committees any business referred to them by the board.

Section 4. The Executive Committee shall make a written record of all its transactions and submit it to the board at its next regular meeting, signed by all the members of the Executive Committee agreeing thereto. Such record shall thereupon be incorporated in the minutes of the board as an integral part thereof.

Dr. Schmidt then nominated Mr. Lamont and Mr. Vickrey to serve with him as members of the Executive Committee until the annual meeting of the board, February 12-13, 2003.

Dr. Gindorf made the motion to approve the nominees.

Dr. Schmidt asked for a motion to close nominations. On motion of Mrs. Sodemann, the nominations were closed.

Dr. Gindorf's motion was approved unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA

The board considered the following reports and recommendations from the president of the University.

By consensus, the board agreed that one vote would be taken and considered the vote on each agenda item nos. 1 through 3 inclusive. The recommendations were individually discussed but acted upon at one time.

(The record of board action appears at the end of each item.)

Honorary Degree, Urbana

(1) The senate of the Urbana-Champaign campus has recommended that a honorary degree be conferred on the following person at the Commencement Exercises on May 18, 2003:

PETER GAY, historian of European culture and thought, and director, The New York Public Library's Cullman Center for Scholars and Writers—the honorary degree of Doctor of Letters.

Peter Gay is considered the most distinguished cultural historian of modern Europe. His scholarly work has encompassed five major cultural and geochronological areas: (1) the European and American Enlightenment of the eighteenth century; (2) the mind and culture of Victorian society; (3) European Modernism in the cultural areas; (4) the cultural politics of modern Germany; and (5) Sigmund Freud and the history of psychoanalysis. He is the recipient of the Amsterdam Prize in Historical Science, the National Book Award, a Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin Fellow, and the Gold Medal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He has held distinguished appointments at Columbia University and Yale University, retiring from Yale as Sterling Professor Emeritus of History. A prolific writer, his publications are known for their scholarly approach as well as readability. His books continue to be assigned widely in graduate and undergraduate courses. Born in Berlin, Professor Gay was a German-Jewish émigré to the United States in late 1938.

The chancellor at Urbana concurs in the recommendation.

The president of the University recommends approval.

On motion of Mr. Lamont, this degree was authorized as recommended.

Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Springfield

(2) The chancellor at Springfield has recommended the appointment of L. Christopher Miller, currently dean of students and associate vice chancellor for student affairs, as interim vice chancellor for student affairs, beginning January 24, 2003, on a twelve-month service basis with an administrative increment of \$13,200. Dr. Miller will continue to serve as dean of students and associate vice chancellor for student affairs on a twelve-month service basis, on 100 percent time, at an annual salary of \$80,000, for a total salary of \$93,200.

Dr. Miller will succeed Patricia Ann Swatfager-Haney, who has accepted a position as director of University-Wide Student Programs in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The vice president for academic affairs concurs.

The president of the University recommends approval.

On motion of Mr. Lamont, this appointment was approved.

Designate the Incubator Facility as Enterprise Works @ Illinois, Urbana

(3) The chancellor at Urbana, with the advice of the Board of Managers of the University of Illinois Research Park, LLC, recommends naming the incubator facility as Enterprise Works @ Illinois. This facility promotes collaborative efforts between University researchers and industry; encourages research, development and commercialization of the University's intellectual assets; and fosters economic growth in Illinois.

The incubator provides opportunities for faculty and students to benefit from the commercialization of their research—keeping the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign competitive with other world-class research institutions for the very best talent. The incubator will also attract established technology firms as a source of new technologies complementary to their primary markets.

The name “Enterprise Works @ Illinois” makes the incubator distinctive, creates a strong image for clients, and distinguishes it from other technology facilities in Champaign County. “Works” indicates both a place where the “enterprise” of generating new businesses occurs at “Illinois” as well as the activity of commercializing research. The “@” lends to the distinctive name without narrowing expectations about the type of companies that would be housed in the incubator.

The president of the University concurs.

On motion of Mr. Lamont, this recommendation was approved.

By consensus, the board agreed that one roll call vote would be taken and considered the vote on each agenda item nos. 4 through 6 inclusive. The recommendations were individually discussed but acted upon at one time.

(The record of board action appears at the end of each item.)

**Employment of Architect/Engineer and Construction Manager
for Campus Recreation Facilities Expansion
and Renovation Project, Chicago**

(4) At the September 12, 2002, meeting, the board approved the Campus Recreation Facilities Expansion and Renovation Project for the Chicago campus. This action authorized the campus to begin work toward the construction of a new recreation building on the east side of campus and renovation of the recreation facilities on the west side of campus. A student referendum on this project was held in February 2002; 81 percent of the students voting approved a \$70 per semester fee increase to pay for the improvements and new construction. The fee will become effective the semester that the new facilities are open for use. The project will be funded from proceeds of a future sale of Auxiliary Facilities System Revenue Bonds. In accordance with Illinois Statutes, this noninstructional capital improvement was approved by the Illinois Board of Higher Education at its December 10, 2002, meeting.

This project consists of the construction of a new recreation building on the east side of campus and renovation of the recreation facilities on the west side of campus at the Chicago campus. The project budget is \$45,350,200.

The project consists of the following:

- Construction of 148,350 gross square feet of new barrier-free space on the east side of the campus consisting of an indoor jogging track, a four-court gymnasium, a two-court multi-purpose gymnasium, a weight training and cardiovascular equipment area, an aquatics area with lap pool and leisure area, racquetball and squash courts, three fitness studios, a climbing wall, lounge areas, and locker rooms.
- Construction of 17,400 gross square feet of construction and 28,000 gross square feet of renovation on the west side of the campus including a new weight training and cardiovascular equipment area, new fitness/martial arts studios, multi-purpose rooms and offices, renovation of the gymnasium, a jogging track, locker rooms, racquetball courts, upgrading of equipment and laundry rooms.

In order for the project to proceed it is necessary to employ an architect/engineer for the required professional services. The selection of the architect/engineer for this project was in accordance with the requirements and provisions of Public Act 87-673 (Architectural, Engineering, and Land Surveying Qualifications-Based Selection Act).¹

Accordingly, the president of the University with the concurrence of the appropriate University officers recommends that Phillips Swager Associates, Inc., Chicago, with Moody Nolan, Inc., be employed for the professional architectural and engineering services required. The firm's fee through the warranty phase, including reimbursables, will be \$3,226,500.

¹A selection committee consisting of James Foerster, Boyd Black, Ronald Giles, and Bradley Appiér (Capital Programs—Chicago), Ray Clay (Campus Recreation), Michael DeLorenzo (Campus Auxiliary Services), Mark Donovan (Facilities Management), Darlene Ebel (Facilities Planning and Space Analysis), Michael Landek (Campus Services, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs), Arla McMahon (Campus Services, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs), Helen Ng (University Office for Capital Programs), Robert Rouzer (Campus Unions), and Student Representatives interviewed the following firms (listed in ranking order): (1) Phillips Swager Associates, Inc., Chicago, with Moody Nolan, Inc.; (2) Perkins & Will, Chicago, with Hastings & Chivetta; and (3) Cannon Design, Inc., Chicago. The committee recommends Phillips Swager Associates, Inc., Chicago, with Moody Nolan, Inc., as best meeting the criteria for the project.

Further, in order for the project to proceed it is also necessary to employ a construction manager for the required professional services. The selection of the construction manager for this project was in accordance with the requirements and provisions of Public Act 87-673 (Architectural, Engineering, and Land Surveying Qualifications-Based Selection Act).¹

Accordingly, the president of the University with the concurrence of the appropriate University officers recommends that Power Construction Company, Schaumburg, be employed for the professional construction management services required. The firm's fee, including reimbursables, will be \$1,958,300.

Funds for these contracts are available initially from the operating budget of the Campus Auxiliary Services unit with anticipated reimbursement from the proceeds of a subsequent revenue bond sale.

On motion of Dr. Gindorf, these recommendations were approved by the following vote: Aye, Mr. Eppley, Dr. Gindorf, Mr. Lamont, Dr. Schmidt, Mrs. Sodemann, Mr. Vickrey, Mr. Wolfe; no, none; absent, Governor Blagojevich.

(The student advisory vote was: Aye, Mr. Moore; absent, Mr. Stewart.)

University National Biocontainment Laboratory Project, Chicago

(5) The National Biocontainment Laboratory Project ("the Project") includes construction of a research facility on the University of Illinois at Chicago campus under terms and conditions of a Request for Applications issued by the National Institutes of Health. The construction is estimated to be 75 percent funded by the National Institutes of Health with the remaining 25 percent to be funded from non-federal sources. The project budget is estimated to be \$200.0 million.

In order for the application to proceed, certain actions are required to be taken by the board, including authorization for submission of the proposal, a funding guarantee for the non-Federal funded portion of the project, and authorization to obtain the necessary property interest in the project site.

The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, in support of the project and in furtherance thereof, takes the following actions:

1. The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois authorizes the filing of the application to the National Institutes of Health in response to the request for proposals and applications titled "BAA-NIH-NIAID-NCRR-DMID-03-36: Regional Biocontainment Laboratories (RBLs) and National Biocontainment Laboratories (NBLs)" including all understandings and assurances contained therein, as set forth in the University's application.
2. The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois directs and authorizes the vice chancellor for research at Chicago, Dr. Eric A. Gislason, to function as the official representative of the campus, to act in connection with the application and to provide any additional information as may be required by the National Institutes of Health.
3. Contingent upon award of the grant to the University, the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois guarantees securing the required matching funds as stipulated in the request for proposal and application identified above.

¹A selection committee consisting of James Foerster, Boyd Black, Ronald Giles, and Bradley Appier (Capital Programs—Chicago), Ray Clay (Campus Recreation), Michael DeLorenzo (Campus Auxiliary Services), Mark Donovan (Facilities Management), Darlene Ebel (Facilities Planning and Space Analysis), Michael Landek (Campus Services, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs), Arla McMahon (Campus Services, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs), Helen Ng (University Office for Capital Programs), Robert Rouzer (Campus Unions), and Student Representatives interviewed the following firms (listed in ranking order): (1) Power Construction Company, Schaumburg; (2) Turner Construction Company, Chicago; and (3) Ragnar Benson, Inc., Park Ridge. The committee recommends Power Construction Company, Schaumburg, as best meeting the criteria for the project.

4. The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois authorizes the vice president for administration and comptroller to negotiate and execute an appropriate Intergovernmental Agreement with the Illinois Medical District for provision of a project site for the National Biocontainment Laboratory Project.

The chancellor at Chicago with the concurrence of the appropriate university officers recommends that the board take those actions necessary to pursue the project.

The president of the University concurs.

On motion of Dr. Gindorf, this recommendation was approved by the following vote: Aye, Mr. Eppley, Dr. Gindorf, Mr. Lamont, Mrs. Sodemann, Mr. Vickrey, Mr. Wolfe; no, none; absent, Governor Blagojevich. (Dr. Schmidt asked to be recorded as not voting on this item.)

(The student advisory vote was: Aye, Mr. Moore; absent, Mr. Stewart.)

Authorization for Settlement

(6) The university counsel recommends that the board approve settlement of *Brenston v. Vajaranant, et al.*, in the amount of \$1,875,000. The plaintiff, 44-year-old Cathy Brenston, alleges that a laparotomy pad was left in after abdominal surgery, causing her numerous complications and subsequent surgeries.

The vice president for administration concurs.

The president of the University recommends approval.

On motion of Dr. Gindorf, this recommendation was approved by the following vote: Aye, Mr. Eppley, Dr. Gindorf, Mr. Lamont, Mrs. Sodemann, Mr. Vickrey, Mr. Wolfe; no, none; absent, Governor Blagojevich. (Dr. Schmidt asked to be recorded as not voting on this item.)

(The student advisory vote was: Aye, Mr. Moore; absent, Mr. Stewart.)

STATEMENT FROM DR. KENNETH D. SCHMIDT, CHAIR PRO TEM

Dr. Schmidt then presented the following statement to the board in response to an article published in the *Chicago Tribune*, January 19, 2003.

Board Statement

By now, I am sure that everyone has read and thought about the article regarding the University of Illinois published in the Sunday edition of the *Chicago Tribune*. I think I can speak for every member of the board when I express my concern about the article and the impressions it left about the University. My own view is that we have now been appropriately challenged to evaluate what had become S.O.P.'s—standard-operating practices—in the fulfillment of our duties as members of the Board of Trustees. The provincial view would seem to be that we focus on board operations. However, the broader view, I believe, is to evaluate the *modus operandi* of our entire University—it would seem that there are things to think about at every level of our shared governance, the very concept which is a definer of universities over the country, and a concept which implies shared responsibility as well.

I have spoken with the president, and he has agreed to take on—to be responsible for—the evaluation of University operations that were brought into focus by the article—those that are not integral to board operations per se. The president will then work with the chair, the Executive Committee of the board, and ultimately the full board to develop the refining and defining policies that are needed for implementation and continued governance.

The board chair, in conjunction with the secretary of the board, will begin evaluation of board operations, especially those brought into focus by the *Tribune* article. This will be done in consultation with the members of the Executive Committee of the board, and eventually brought to the full board for debate, refinement, and establishment of policy. To that end, I have requested Secretary Thompson to gather data from peer institutions regarding Board of Trustees' operations and from other state boards and agencies regarding their operations, which are coincidental to ours. We will evaluate information from both public and private institutions, knowing that we share the sensitivity to the use of public funds more with other public university boards, and we share special missions with perhaps a different cohort.

It is not my belief that a "cookie cutter" approach to operations of governing boards is appropriate. It is not. Rather we are seeking information that will help us to define what in medicine is defined as "best practices," and information that allows us to make "apples to apples" comparisons. No doubt we will find ways to improve; no doubt that in some instances we will be validated. It will be important to evaluate all data in light of the University of Illinois as a unique entity with wide areas of engagement. This University has outreach programs and operations in every county of a large state. There is active promotion of statewide diversity. And beginning some four years ago, there is the added fourth mission of economic development—this in itself has doubled the workload and travel commitments of the board. Observers may note that we have decreased the number of board meetings to conserve both time and money; however, this in turn mandated more trustee committee work—again, more travel. As both administration and faculty can attest over the past four years there has been extraordinary commitment and activism by the board.

Considered also will be funding alternatives for board operations—are there sources other than public monies to carry out the board's role in the growth and continued quality of our state's flagship public university? It should be clearly noted that legitimate expenses of board operations are indeed part and parcel, in light of the state mandated mission of the University, of appropriate expenditures of public monies.

In specific regard to air travel, I am—we are—currently reviewing all charter invoices for the past five years. This is not to assess the flights of individual trustees, but rather to look at the pattern of how we conduct business. As a matter of operation, before formal policies in regard to air travel are adopted, the following:

1. When clearly appropriate, air travel will be utilized.
2. When requested, alternatives will be sought.
3. When not necessary, air travel will not occur.

The most well intentioned practices can become a bad habit over time—we must not let inertia overcome common sense. The above will be monitored by the board chair and the secretary of the board, in conjunction with the Executive Committee of the board. The bottom line is the successful operation of the University, in all four of its missions, in a manner that is the most fiscally responsible in the context of the work and goals of any given day.

I trust that this is a good beginning to an ongoing evaluation. To those who are involved in the process, as well as to those who will be observers of the process, I would urge:

- Be sensitive to the needs of the University in light of its multiple missions.
- Be sensitive to the stewardship of tax dollars.
- Be sensitive to the needs of those who serve *pro bono*.

- Be sensitive to the needs of our students and faculty.
- Be sensitive to the voices of all who love and support this University.

It is an appropriate time to make change, following the lead of our governor and echoing his promise—"No more business as usual." We are committed that every dime of spending, including the GRF Appropriation, which represents 30 percent of our \$3.0 billion annual budget, must serve the University's mission to the fullest.

With the above in mind let us begin.

I would now invite comments from members of the board.

There being no further business, the board adjourned.

MICHELE M. THOMPSON

Secretary

KENNETH D. SCHMIDT, M.D.

Chair pro tem