



Peninsula Health Care District

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
REGULAR MEETING  
Thursday, March 26, 2009**

The Board of Directors of the Peninsula Health Care District was called to order for Regular Session on Thursday, March 26, 2009 at 17:45 hours, at the Millbrae City Council Chambers, 621 Magnolia Avenue, Millbrae, CA.

**ROLL CALL:** On roll call there were present, Dan Ullyot, MD, Chair, Rick Navarro, MD, Vice-Chair, Helen Galligan, RN, Secretary and Don Newman, MD, Director. Sue Smith, C.P.A, Treasurer was unable to attend for health reasons.

**Also present were:** Colin J. Coffey, General Legal Counsel, Kelly K. Molloy, District Executive Assistant, and Jan Matejcik, District Administrative Assistant. Absent was Cheryl Fama, Chief Executive Officer.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** The Consent Calendar, consisting of the minutes for the February 26, 2009 Regular Meeting and the unaudited Financial Statements for February 28, 2009, was presented.

**DIRECTOR NEWMAN MOVED AND DIRECTOR NAVARRO SECONDED THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

Nothing was offered from the public.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**Director and Officers' Insurance Renewal: D. Newman**

**Director Newman** stated that the District currently has D & O insurance through Chubb/Federal Insurance Company for \$5M Aggregate Coverage for \$20K. Ms. Fama compared information from other community Districts which showed a wide range in coverage and costs. The cost comparison ranged from \$7K - \$42K. Director Newman stated he would be uncomfortable with anything less than \$5M in coverage. The cost to renew this year has not escalated. He then recommended that the District continue with the same insurance company at the current level of coverage and cost.

**DIRECTOR NEWMAN MOVED AND DIRECTOR NAVARRO SECONDED THE MOTION TO APPROVE RENEWAL WITH THE CURRENT INSURANCE CARRIER AND AT THE CURRENT LEVEL OF COVERAGE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Burlingame Storm Drain Initiative: Syed Murtuza, Dir. of Public Works, City of Burlingame**

**Mr. Murtuza** thanked the Board for the opportunity to present at the meeting. The City of Burlingame has five major watersheds consisting of 45 miles of pipelines, catch basins and pump stations. It is 80 years old and it has served its intended design life. As Burlingame is adjacent to the SF Bay, with hills and flat areas, the storm water goes through the natural creeks, the City's pipe system and finally reaches the Bay. In heavy storms and high tides water backs up into streets, homes, businesses, the Bay and pollution occurs. The City must have new pump stations; the current ones are old and cannot do the job. Failing storm pipe drains are a dual liability, not only do they "clog" up, but they force the water to find alternate routes of exit such as homes, garages, etc. It also creates the possibility of landslides and sinkholes. California Drive and El Camino are the major routes to Peninsula Medical Center for emergency vehicles. When these streets flood, it ultimately lengthens the amount of time it takes to arrive at the Emergency Department because they are forced to use alternate routes.

To address these needs the City asked the Public Works Engineers to review the whole system and estimate how much it would cost to fix the problem. The estimate given to fix the system is \$39M, which includes levies into the Bay, pipelines and catch basins.

**Chair Ulliyot** asked Mr. Murtuza to point out where the hospital was located within the map he was referencing. Mr. Murtuza did so Mr. Murtuza noted that this system upgrade would improve the water flow underneath the Hospital as well as keep properties from flooding.

This measure, if approved by the voters of Burlingame, will provide local control over the funds – the State would not have access to the funds. The City looked at several different ways to obtain funds such as the Federal Government, the State and a number of other measures. The City tried to pass this measure two years ago – it lost by only 200 votes. Two years ago, this measure would have been based on assessed property values. This time the calculation will be based on different criteria.

The City looked at several different funding approaches including a General Obligation Bond, a community facility district tax, which is not applicable to this type of community, and a utility user's tax, where people pay taxes on their utilities which would not generate sufficient revenue. The City looked at the sales tax and assessment district. The City recognizes this is a citywide problem and needs a citywide solution.

Essentially the City concluded a sewer or sewer drain fee based on properties that impact the storm drainage would be most fair. Parcel owners will pay based on the properties run-off effect on the drainage system.

**Chair Ulliyot** interjected that the District is a public agency, exempt from property taxes. Will the District be required to pay this fee if it is passed in the ballot measure?

**Mr. Murtuza** answered yes. The fee is just like the water/sewage fee, if you use the storm drain, you are responsible to pay. The City of Burlingame has several parcels within the City as well which will be assessed a fee and the City will be responsible for paying approximately

\$70K per year. **Chair Ulyot** then asked about the economic stimulus package just passed by Congress for infrastructure. Will we receive any benefit from this federally passed package? **Mr. Murtuza** stated that the City has applied for over \$30M in projects that are deemed “shovel ready”. However, looking at the communities throughout the nation, we are all competing for the same dollar. The projects that seem to have a better chance to be funded are the “transportation” projects. Many projects that qualify for funding have to be done within 120 – 180 days including all design, engineering, and environmental clearances. Environmental clearance usually takes years to get approved. The projects that we think apply under the Federal stimulus package total approximately \$6M and the City is already applying.

**Director Newman** clarified that this is a ballot measure that goes out to the public. In this environment what makes the City think it can get a positive vote? **Mr. Murtuza** noted that was a good point and stated the City has been working on this for a very long time. The longer the wait, the more it will cost. **Director Newman** then asked what the prospect of a positive vote was. **Mr. Murtuza** answered that the City did a poll that showed 54% in favor of this measure. At that time, the fee was higher because it was a one-time bond. This measure is a series of three bonds, lessening the monthly fee incurred. The City hopes that by doing their due diligence and informing the community, the voters will make the right decision. A lot of home and business owners have formed a volunteer task force to go out to the neighborhoods to educate more of the community.

**Chair Ulyot** asked if he knew the fee for the District and if it was a one-time fee or a monthly fee? **Mr. Murtuza** said that an engineering study was done to perform the fee for each parcel. Satellite technology was used to assess how much square footage each parcel had and how much growth area they had. That is essentially how it was determined how much run-off water gets into the system. The fee is based on how much storm water each property contributes to the system and it will be fair to all property owners. The cost is \$4.2 cents for each impervious square foot or approximately \$3 cents for each gross square foot. Most residential parcels are 60% or less “impervious”. The City is estimating \$180 per year for a 6000 square foot parcel. [Mr. Murtuza did not have the exact size of the District’s parcels and could not give an estimation of fees at that time.] The City will collect the fee and issue a bond for 30 years. The City intends to cap the inflation percentage at 2%. **Chair Ulyot** asked Mr. Murtuza if the ballot measure only allowed land owners to vote. He then asked Mr. Coffey if the agreements with MPHS allow us to pass the fee onto our renters. [Mr. Coffey did not respond at this time] **Mr. Murtuza** stated that this bond money will have strict oversight, ensuring the funds are spent as they are intended. There will be an independent citizen’s oversight committee to monitor the spending on the project.

The City needs to act quickly as there is an increased flooding risk and water quality issues as well as, impacts on emergency services. The City is subject to a \$10K fine when there is a sewage overflow that gets into the creek. This fiscal year, the City cut \$2.3M to balance the budget and next year is projecting a \$3.2M shortfall. To combat this shortfall, the City is cutting positions, but this does not include any money for capital improvements. The City identified about \$3.5M in capital improvements that are needed next year, with approximately \$1M

needing to be invested in the storm drain project. If the bond does not pass, more services will have to be cut.

On April 5, 2009, the ballots will be mailed to the property owners. Only property owners or their designee can vote. If you have more than one parcel, you have more than one vote. If multiple owners own one parcel, you designate who is going to vote. Ballots are returned by mail.

**Director Galligan** asked if the ballot is mailed only to the citizens in Burlingame proper. There are properties in the Burlingame hills that are in the County, are they included in the assessment? **Mr. Murtuza** stated it is only for the City of Burlingame residents, not those in the unincorporated areas. **Director Galligan** then asked where the water goes from the Burlingame hills? Burlingame happens to be on the downstream from Hillsborough and the County properties and the City of Burlingame does not have the authority by State law to charge or enforce a fee. He said they are working with Hillsborough to build retention ponds within their new developments reducing some of the impact on Burlingame. Unless the State mandates a change, that is the best the City can do for now.

**Chair Ullyot** thanked Mr. Murtuza for his presentation. He then asked Mr. Coffey to say a few words about this issue. **Mr. Coffey** answered Dr. Ullyot's earlier question which was the fee imposed on the District's several parcels and if it could be passed on to the tenants of those parcels. Legal Counsel looked at the issue vis-à-vis the 26 acre parcel and indeed, under the various agreements with Sutter and MPHS governing the various stages of our relationship, such as the existing lease of the existing hospital, the construction arrangements and long term 50-year ground lease. MPHS has indeed assumed responsibility for any fees that are imposed on the land and will ultimately be responsible for the fees imposed on the District as the owner of the land. It is going to be our recommendation to discuss with MPHS what our vote entails vis-à-vis their budgeting and hopefully we can accomplish this before you have to cast your vote in May for the other parcels, the fee may be passed on to the tenants as defined in the lease arrangements in place with each of those tenants.

**Mr. Murtuza** made one last additional comment, that the last time the City of Burlingame asked its citizens for money was forty-two years ago. He asked the Board for their support. **Chair Ullyot** thanked him again.

**COMMUNITY EDUCATION: Sara T. Mayer, Manager, Health Policy & Planning Unit, SMCHD - "Aging 2020-Impact and Implication"**

**Ms. Mayer** began by thanking the District for the invitation. An important task at the Health Department is to prepare for the aging population, specifically the baby-boomer generation. Ms. Mayer gave a demonstration of age-pyramids beginning in 1960 and ending in 2030. She explained San Mateo County can expect to have 72% more elderly adults by 2030. The most dramatic jump in population is going to be the people over the age of 85. If put into today's context, there are approximately 10K adults in the county 85 or older and by the year 2030 that will be 30K. We can also expect the aging population who are foreign born to be dramatically

different with at least half having been born in another country. The two groups expected to grow the most are the Asian and Latino groups.

The second key finding is the need to invest in preparing for this older adult population, one that will require significantly more medical services. This is in part driven by adults over 85 as well as the fact that the baby-boomer generation seems to have more complex health problems. It is anticipated that 62% of acute hospital days will be used by this population and we would need more than a 50% increase in physicians to meet the needs of the older adult population. Also, the number with Alzheimer's will increase dramatically within the area.

The third finding is that few baby-boomers are prepared to age in place. Most have not made adjustments to prepare for retirement; however it is something they are thinking about and planning for. About 84% of baby-boomers in San Mateo County own their own home, with 25% of them owning free and clear and most being detached single family homes which tend to be the most challenging to prepare for aging. It really becomes the sole responsibility of the property owner and many of them are in the hills, which makes it hard for transportation needs. About half of them would like to stay in their own home after they retire. Only 11% of them have made modifications to their home to prepare.

The final finding shows the baby-boomer generation is worried about many things when considering their own aging such as the cost of health care, social security and running out of their own savings.

**Public Comment:**

**Member of Senior Focus** states that one of the things that they find with their patient population is not a lot of care-giver support and care-giver education. She felt that it really needed to be factored into the equation because those who will be taking care of friends or family really need a lot of help. **Ms. Mayer** answered that they are already seeing increases in their case loads of in-home supportive service providers and notes it is one of the most costly to provide because it is one person going to the house to provide care.

**Chair Ulyot** mentioned that he lost his mother last summer. His mother was 101 and she had wonderful care in a Presbyterian nursing home in St. Paul, Minnesota. Aging gives rise to so many questions and would be a good call for an entrepreneur to come to San Mateo County and build affordable housing for the elderly. Every time he visited his mother he couldn't help but reflect on a few things. One of which being they were all women, because women outlive men. There might be one or two men and 25 women and the other thing is just the tremendous amount of money needed to essentially "warehouse" people in this country. We are a compassionate nation, we don't believe in euthanasia and yet the quality of life for most of those people was abysmal, and they would be falling asleep in front of the TV in the middle of the afternoon and most of them didn't know who they were. It is a very great expense and awesome problem for this society. We have been successful in bringing people on to these ages and now we have to take care of them.

**Ms. Mayer** said that Dr. Scott Morrow uses the analogy that one's lifetime is like walking up to a cliff. You want to have a nice healthy life until you don't have one anymore. Instead there is not a sudden drop off, but a slow decline where you get worse and worse. The fear of having a very large baby-boomer population living a lot longer is that you have significantly more people living in a slow decline and the quality of life erodes.

**Chair Ullyot** also asked how much money we can afford to invest in end-of-life situations. The work of Wenberg at Dartmouth compares the regional variation of the cost of this care. It looked at a small area and the cost of medical care in Miami, where an elderly person gets into the intensive care unit and a lot of money is spent. In Minneapolis it's about half the cost of Miami. Chair Ullyot suggests a lot of public education is needed, including education of the doctors regarding the appropriateness of care issue. We have wonderful technology, but we have to be smart and compassionate in the way we use it. **Ms. Mayer** commented that we should invest in prevention. If we continue to build our cities in a way that will allow people to stay active, mobile and connected we will see a lot less need for those services.

**Public Comment:**

**Member of the Public I** states that there is child care credit offered; is there senior care credit? That would make it easier for care givers. **Ms. Mayer** answered that some businesses offer it, like a benefit if you are caring for an elderly parent, but nothing nationally is offered. It would reduce the number of people being housed. **Ms. Mayer** said it was a great point. **Member of the Public II** said that Ms. Mayer stated that she was confident that people could live a more healthful life as they got older, but there was also that statistic of increasing Alzheimer's and what do you do about that? **Ms. Mayer** noted it is very stressful for all involved. The statistics she showed regarding health are the "do nothing" scenario. If we don't change our communities, that is the kind of need we will be seeing. There are actual preventative mechanisms for Alzheimer's. People that are more engaged in their community and are more active have lower rates. People that are using their cognitive abilities more frequently have lower rates. We cannot prevent all Alzheimer's diagnosis, but there are things we can do to encourage people to mitigate some of that.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**MPHS Building Committee-Chair Ullyot:**

**Chair Ullyot** reported that the building is about 55% completed with the exterior being put on now. That allows for dry-wall installation inside, caulking and waterproofing. All the floors of the medical office building have been poured. Before the current hospital is demolished they have to perform an abatement procedure to take out all the asbestos and lead. In order to do that, they have to take approximately 1000 samples. The whole process is about as expensive as the demolition itself. The hospital will include a new electrical room to generate sufficient power to supplement what PG&E can provide.

**Mitigation Monitoring Panel – Chair Ullyot:**

This is a panel that meets every couple of months to hear the problems of the neighbors living next to a construction zone. Larry Kollerer, who is head of the project, does a wonderful job in making the situation better.

**Communication Oversight Committee–Chair Ullyot:**

Stated that the newsletter is in process.

**Scholarship Committee-Director Galligan, Chair:**

Loan applications are still open for nursing scholarships. Currently we have three MPHS employees who have applied, in addition two people are applying to CSM and two applying to other schools.

**Physician Recruitment Committee-Director Navarro, Chair:** Nothing new to report

**Ad Hoc Service Agreement/Grants Committee– Director Galligan, Chair:**

Two events occurred within the last month. We attended and received recognition at the San Mateo Community College District Board meeting this month. They recognized the District for the \$2M given toward the nursing program over the past ten years. That money is used for the nursing instruction. They handed out some interesting information on the application process and their student profile. CSM conducts their enrollment by a ‘lottery’ system, not based on merit. Applicants are required to have certain prerequisite programs, but after that, it is just a lottery. Some students wait three years to get into a two-year program. They are looking into another way of accepting applications. They also noted that most who apply to CSM have previous degrees and are adding nursing as a second career. **Chair Ullyot** asked if they tend to become nursing instructors or professors from that program. **Director Galligan** stated no. On another grant subject, the District was recognized in the media for its support to the Farewell to Falls program.

**Public Comment:**

**Luciana Kincer, San Mateo** asked how much the District gives out to students. **Director Galligan** said it depends if the student is going to a two or four year program. If the student is going for an Associate’s Degree, they can be awarded \$2K/year and if the student is going for a Bachelor’s Degree, they are eligible for \$5K per year. **Ms. Kincer** then clarified that Director Galligan was saying the allocation for the scholarships is \$50K? **Director Galligan** answered that the District budgeted \$50K for RN Loans and was well within the budget last year. **Ms. Kincer** then asked if it would be more efficient, depending upon the amount of students, to allow for more funds for each student who applies? If the budget is not fully used, it might warrant rethinking how it gets allotted. **Director Galligan** answered that the committee likes to leave some reserve funds in case a student were to come mid-cycle. **Ms. Kincer** answered that she has been coming to meetings for over ten years and the amount has not changed significantly, especially to encompass the cost of living in this area.

**CEO REPORT-Cheryl Fama:**

Nothing to report – Cheryl Fama has an excused absence.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Guardians Lawsuit Update: Colin Coffey**

Mr. Coffey gave background on the Guardian's lawsuit which was brought by a group of tax payers shortly after the MPHS / Sutter / District transactions began regarding the new hospital construction and the 50-year ground lease. The lawsuit alleged in vein that the transactions were unlawful by reason of being in excess of a 30-year term ordinarily applied to hospital districts and operators of hospitals. The lawsuit combined several different causes of action to allege illegality, all of which can basically be narrowly focused to that one allegation. The lawsuit also contained a cause of action unrelated to the overall transaction between Sutter, Mills-Peninsula and the District. It alleged that the newsletters published by the District during the course of the election in favor of the measure put before the voters to approve the transaction was an unlawful expenditure of funds for political purposes. This was the last cause of action in the lawsuit. Again, by way of background to bring this up to present, that lawsuit was defeated at every stage of its life to date. It was defeated at the trial court level and dismissed in its entirety. There was an appeal to the Court of Appeals which upheld the trial courts' dismissal of the case in its entirety as it was filed with one exception. The Court of Appeals said the plaintiffs could in fact have another chance at alleging the illegality of the newsletters if they filed a new version of the lawsuit that alleged the reason for illegality other than the other one they had alleged. Without going into great detail, he did not share the nuance between what they alleged in their initial lawsuit, versus what the Court of Appeals said they might be able to pursue. It was left by the Court of Appeals to the plaintiffs to recast that cause of action against our newsletters in a different light. The taxpayers again appealed the dismissal; the case went to the Supreme Court. Last month the Supreme Court refused to hear the case, which therefore solidified the initial dismissals and as of today that case is complete and dismissed without the possibility of being resurrected. That takes the District, Mills-Peninsula and Sutter out of the status of being in litigation concerning the transactions involving the hospital. As Mr. Merwin said last month with a great big smile on his face, relating to the fact that this lawsuit had been dismissed at every stage of its life and the Supreme Court effectively upheld those dismissals. Mills-Peninsula and Sutter are completely out of the transaction in which Mr. Merwin was very much engaged.

So, where we are today with that lawsuit is that the Guardian's did in fact, a few weeks ago, recast its lawsuit into one that it focuses solely on the newsletters published by the District during that campaign. Using a slightly different facet of the law than what they originally alleged. It has to do with common law rather than statutory law and is a rather esoteric nuance to the cause. Doug Strauss, who the District worked with during the course of this litigation, is working on responsive pleadings that will ultimately once again move to dismiss this action on the basis that these newsletters were entirely legal and did not constitute unlawful advocacy by public agents. That is where we are today. It would probably merit having a session of the Board and Doug at some point to go over exactly what the response is going to be and how it will be framed. In order to bring the Board up to speed on the new nuances of the law involved in the case. We can have a closed session focused on litigation with Doug, fairly brief; we are now very focused on that one issue.

**Investment Policy Annual Review - Deferred**

Chair Ulyot stated that the annual review usually occurs in January. The District lost about \$900K because of the Lehmann failure in the county. Therefore, until the County's pursuit of the Lehmann Brother issue the conclusion of the County's forensic audit, and their consultants' recommendations, we will defer.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**Sewer Easement Request: Colin Coffey**

**Mr. Coffey** began with a brief digression, noting to Dr. Ulyot that the District was not the only entity that lost a lot of money [the San Mateo Pooled Fund lost ~\$150M in total]. Many public agencies throughout this country lost large sums with that particular downfall.

The topic of waste water pipes seems to be large on the agenda tonight. This is a complete coincidence as they are unrelated waste water pipes that we are now talking about. This agenda item requires no action because what ultimately has to be approved by this Board and Mills-Peninsula is not ready yet. We are projecting that it will be on in a month or two; however, it would be appropriate to briefly update the Board on this issue and what will come.

This has to do with sewer access for the hospital campus development and is part of the City of Burlingame's extensive review and approval of that construction project. One of the many conditions for that project, as submitted by Mills-Peninsula, was a new sewer main to carry waste from the campus to the City's main sewer line. The need as it was addressed by the hospital in the construction documents led them to construct a new sewer pipe from the campus, underneath El Camino, through their property at 1720 El Camino, and across to California Drive where there is a sewer main. This is a large project. The District has been involved of late over various legal responsibilities involved with this new pipeline. Since the District owns the land on the West side of El Camino and ultimately will own whatever facilities are there in fifty years or conceivably will take over operations if the present operator fails or if the present operator fails to keep up his sewer lines. The District has a responsibility as the owner of the land, which is a similar situation to the storm drain fee and why it is being imposed on us.

The two agreements that will be brought to the Board are:

- 1) A maintenance agreement between the District, MPHS and the City in which Mills-Peninsula will be assuming responsibility for the ongoing maintenance for this new sewer line that is going from the hospital campus through El Camino over to California so that it never becomes the responsibility of the City storm drain and will be maintained throughout its life. The District will therein be responsible if it takes over operations of facilities and ultimately becomes the operator.
- 2) An easement agreement and will include the City, Mills-Peninsula and the District. If the District is ever to become responsible for this new sewer line it would have to have legal access rights to that portion of it that is going through the MPHS property at 1720 El Camino. So we are going to get a long term easement for that access. In the interim, Caltrans has to give us permits and permission to install the line. These are not all complete. Once they are, these

agreements will be put in final form. A memo was distributed at the meeting that summarized those two agreements. Ed Shaffer from Archer Norris is the land use specialist working on this behalf of the District.

**Public Comment:**

**Ms. Kincer** raised questions about the “flood zone” status of 1720 El Camino and impact on insurance. **Vice-Chair Navarro** answered that the District does not own 1720 El Camino. **Mr. Coffey** answered that Mills-Peninsula purchased that piece of property from the District and Ms. Kincer should address her question to their facilities person who might be able to answer it. What the District needs is an easement to have access to the line, should the District ever be responsible for it in the future.

**PHCD Standing Committees: Chair Ullvot**

**Chair Ullvot** stated that the District currently has three standing committees: Communications, Physician Recruitment and Scholarship. The District has one ad hoc committee – the Service Agreements/Grants Committee. He commented that it seemed like a good time to change the structure and proposed the following committees and his reasons for the proposal. Communications – may no longer be needed since most of that function is done in-house as part of the new office structure and staffing; management can handle communication needs without a board committee. Physician Recruitment – has essentially been dormant; its function could be incorporated into one of the new committees. Scholarship – deals exclusively with the RN Loan Forgiveness Program; this could also be incorporated into a new committee. He then proposed three new committees: ***Long-Term Planning*** that would be concerned with recruitment of future Board members, oversight of progress on the strategic plan progress, and on-going monitoring of District demographics – epidemiologic, economic, as well as, medical technologies and other influences over the health and healthcare needs of our residents; ***Community Health Investment*** would provide oversight of the District’s financial investments in health programs and services and would take on the functions currently covered by the Physician Recruitment, Scholarship, and Service Agreements/Grants committees, and ***Sutter Health Oversight*** would monitor Sutter’s financial health because it relates to the potential for a paramount default and District financial obligations, as well as, monitor compliance with the master agreements, make sure that the core services that are promised are carried out and monitor the quality of services provided for the District residents. The Board members on this committee would also serve on the MPHS Building and Mitigation Committees. **Director Navarro** said that the proposed new structure was a good division of labor and an effective incorporation of the work currently done by the Board and the work it should be doing looking into the future. **Director Galligan** agreed.

**Public Comment:**

**Ms. Kincer** stated she was speaking on behalf of herself and the MPHS nurses’ Professional Performance Committee and that they would like to be a part of the committee process. **Chair Ullvot** stated that the District can only have two members of the Board on each committee and would be very receptive to Ms. Kincer and her colleagues’ participation.

**DIRECTOR NAVARRO MOVED AND DIRECTOR GALLIGAN SECONDED ACCEPTANCE OF THE NEW COMMITTEE STRUCTURE. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Mr. Coffey** said he would work with Ms. Fama to update any bylaws for the new structure.

**CORRESPONDENCE:**

**Chair Ulyot** referenced the Board materials; nothing required discussion.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Ulyot at 19:00 hours.

**By:**

---

**Kelly K. Molloy, Executive Assistant**

**Approved:**

---

**Helen C. Galligan, Secretary**

---

**Daniel J. Ulyot, M.D., Chair**