TOWARD SUSTAINABILITY

Helping communities engage with and protect the environment
ON THE COVER: Clean energy solutions at the community level are among the kind of practical approaches to sustainability that the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation is exploring through our environmental grantmaking. Pictured here: Wind power in Michigan’s Saginaw Bay region.

The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation’s 2013 Annual Report features photography by Adam Stoltman. Unless otherwise noted, all photos are his.
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Mott Foundation Chairman, President & CEO William S. White describes how the Foundation’s newest environment work builds on decades of exploration and learning.

Tranquil forests and other gifts of nature are protected for future generations to enjoy at Arcadia Dunes: The C.S. Mott Nature Preserve.
There are compelling reasons to focus the Mott Foundation’s 2013 annual report on our long-standing interest in — and commitment to — the environment. Not the least of these is our work on a new plan that adds an important and exciting interest area to our environmental work — advancing climate change solutions.

Before diving into the details of that plan, I think it’s both important and useful to take a brief look back at the grantmaking and learning that have brought us to this new stage.

We formally launched our environmental grantmaking program more than three decades ago, and, for roughly the past 15 years, we’ve focused primarily on two interest areas: protecting freshwater ecosystems in the United States, particularly in the Great Lakes region, and reforming public investment practices in the developing world to protect the environment and affected communities. In each case, our fundamental goal has been to help people participate in the decisions, processes and activities that impact the environments in which they live, learn, work and play — environments that shape their quality of life.

2013 witnessed several historical milestones in this work. For example, the year marked a decade since the Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy purchased nearly 6,000 acres in the northwest region of Michigan’s Lower Peninsula with the help of nearly $8 million in grants from Mott. More than half of that land became Arcadia Dunes: The C.S. Mott Nature Preserve, which today features pristine sand dunes, forests, grassland and two miles of shoreline along Lake Michigan. It attracts a multitude of nature- and recreation-lovers each year and is becoming a cornerstone of economic development in that part of Michigan. The project also reflects the growing role of land trusts in preserving and protecting the state’s most precious natural resources.

The year also marked the five-year anniversary of the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact, commonly referred to as the Great Lakes Compact. Passed in 2008, this landmark interstate compact was informed by a decade of diligent work by Mott grantees and others. It set a first-of-its-kind legal framework for making decisions about how to manage water resources in the basin, how much water from the Great Lakes can be used, and how far away it can be used. The compact remains central to framing those discussions today.
On the international front, 2013 marked a quarter century of the Foundation’s grantmaking related to improving the social and environmental accountability of those investing in large-scale infrastructure and other projects in developing countries. Mott grantees remain at the forefront of this vital work, striving to ensure that such projects incorporate responsible policies and practices that help to alleviate poverty, enhance the well-being of communities and support healthy, natural environments.

Woven throughout these examples and, in fact, all of the Foundation’s grantmaking programs is a commitment to helping people, organizations and communities engage, connect and work together in practical ways to achieve multiple benefits.

Our 2013 support to The Nature Conservancy (TNC) illustrates this approach. A longtime Mott grantee, TNC is leading a collaborative effort among partners working with the agricultural community in the Saginaw Bay Watershed. Those partners, which also include Michigan State University, are helping area farmers explore and voluntarily adopt environmentally friendly land use practices that will help strengthen their economic bottom lines while improving water quality and restoring freshwater habitat in the watershed and Lake Huron.

A focus on multiple benefits also is evident in our support during 2013 to Forward Works in China and the Brazilian Institute of Social and Economic Analysis. Both organizations are engaging the international banking and environmental sectors to ensure that energy and infrastructure projects funded by their respective countries in developing regions around the world respect and protect the environment; improve access to sustainable energy, especially among poor families; and reflect the voices of those living in the projects’ shadows.

It’s worth noting that, while we’re now working in what many call the “modern environmental era,” our roots in environmental issues stretch back to the Foundation’s earliest days. In fact, 2013 also marked the 85th anniversary of our first funding in the field. In 1928, Mott made a $500 grant — equivalent to nearly $7,000 today, adjusted for inflation — to the University of Michigan. The funds supported an expedition by researchers using balloons and kites to study air circulation patterns on the Greenland ice sheet.

While I’ve barely scratched the surface regarding Mott’s long-standing support for environmental issues, what’s important to understand is how our prior work has helped to shape our new program plan, including our added focus on advancing climate change solutions. It has taught us that this grantmaking must seek practical ways to simultaneously build strong economic, environmental and social conditions for all people — in a word, “sustainability.”

The new plan, which was formally adopted by the Foundation’s Board of Trustees in September 2014, uses this frame to strengthen, refine and expand our commitments in ways we believe have significant potential for advancing sustainability efforts here in the United States and around the world.

The core of our work in the United States remains focused on addressing what we call the freshwater challenge: securing sustainable levels of clean water to support both people and the
environment. We place special emphasis on the Great Lakes region — not only because the shores of our home state of Michigan touch four of the five Great Lakes, but also because the Great Lakes are the single largest system of surface freshwater on Earth. As such, they affect the physical, social and economic well-being of tens of millions of people in and beyond the region.

To make progress toward our goal, we’ll work to strengthen the community of nongovernmental organizations dedicated to the long-term conservation of freshwater ecosystems. We also will seek to inform and advance well-designed and effectively implemented water-quality and water-quantity policies that conserve freshwater resources. While this isn’t new work for Mott, we anticipate that we will fund more work in this area than we have in the past.

Our new program plan also points to a refreshed focus in our support related to development finance. As emerging economies such as Brazil and China are becoming donor countries, and as their national banks are becoming major lenders for developing countries, Mott’s goal of transforming development finance is more salient than ever. We will fund organizations working to shape international investment in ways that support sustainable development and economic opportunity, especially in poor communities, and reduce harm to the environment.

As I indicated earlier, our environmental grantmaking will move forward with an exciting new focus — advancing climate change solutions.

Research\(^1\) suggests that, by 2099, rising annual temperatures could make summers in our home state of Michigan more akin to those in present-day Oklahoma. If this were to occur, it would have significant implications for virtually every aspect of life in the state. The health of native ecosystems, especially those dependent on cold water rivers and streams, would be threatened. Water levels of the Great Lakes, which are so vital to the region’s quality of life and economic well-being, could change — possibly in dramatic and unpredictable ways. And key industries, such as agriculture and forestry, would face daunting new challenges as certain crops and trees no longer thrive, and new plants and animals — some welcome and some otherwise — become viable.

Every continent, country and community around the world faces its own unique challenges as our climate continues to evolve. Some might be tempted to discount the impacts as being far into the future, pointing to other pressing concerns that need immediate attention. The Mott Foundation seeks to help address many of those concerns — poverty, education and citizen participation, to name a few — through our environment and other grantmaking programs.

But the global community cannot set aside the environmental challenges that coincide with our changing climate and expect to deal with them later. Instead, we must collectively ramp up our responses to their signs, symptoms and underlying causes. Waiting to take action will simply pass along problems to our children and grandchildren — and, for them, it may be too late.

That said, the picture is not all “doom and gloom.” In fact, while the above concerns are very real, so are the opportunities for addressing

---

\(^1\)U.S. Global Change Research Program (2009). Global Climate Change Impacts in the United States.
them. To that end, our grantmaking in this area will support practical, innovative and solutions-based approaches to helping people and communities respond to the impacts of climate change.

Specifically, we have two objectives for this work: increasing access to clean energy in developing countries and stimulating clean energy use in our home state of Michigan. Although these objectives will play out in different parts of the world, both aim to support individuals and organizations that will do the hard work of delivering clean energy solutions at the community level.

In the international context, this will mean supporting organizations working to remove financial and policy barriers standing in the way of clean energy access, as well as organizations providing technical assistance at the local level to help communities take full advantage of the resulting opportunities. Similarly, in Michigan, we’ll support organizations providing technical assistance to early adopters of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies, and help link these organizations so that the sum of their efforts is much greater than the parts.

It’s important to reiterate that our decision to add this new area of work was anything but sudden. For years, we’ve studied findings from the environmental field, including research conducted by our own grantees, about the challenges and opportunities related to climate change and renewable energy sources. Our staff and Trustees gave long and careful study to the proposed strategies and intended outcomes of the new grantmaking area, and their fit with our institutional values and goals. We asked each other tough questions, probed for more information and went back to the proverbial drawing board. It was my late wife, Claire, granddaughter of our founder and a Trustee of the organization for 16 years, who posed the simplest, most compelling question: What happens if we fail to act?

In the end, we concluded that adopting a formal approach to advancing climate change solutions is a natural evolution in our environmental grantmaking. In fact, I’ve come to characterize it as the critical third “leg” of the stool that is our environmental program, with the lessons and strategies generated by the individual components helping to shape and guide work across the overall program.

Likewise, our environmental activities will continue to inform — and be informed by — work across Mott’s other grantmaking areas: Civil Society, Flint Area and Pathways Out of Poverty. And that collective body of work will help provide the tools, models and insights to others working on issues of environmental protection, poverty alleviation and citizen engagement — indeed, the spectrum of sustainability.

Of course, we aren’t suggesting Mott’s new Environment program plan has all the answers related to climate change or other issues of sustainability. If the work were that easy, it certainly would have been done already.

Instead, it offers new and exciting opportunities to explore, test and implement strategies that can help balance concerns for the world’s natural resources with impacts on people, communities and businesses.

In a nutshell: It’s an approach we believe makes good sense.

In the pages that follow, as well as on our website, you’ll find examples of Mott-funded efforts, including those described earlier in this message, that reflect our evolving work related to freshwater ecosystems and sustainable development. We look forward to future opportunities to share with you the stories, findings and lessons that emerge under our new environment grantmaking plan and that continue to help nurture a truly sustainable global community.

William S. White,
Chairman, President & CEO
Protecting the world’s natural resources, such as Michigan’s Cass River, is key to the sustainability of people, wildlife and the environment.
Profiles of Mott’s environment work in 2013 illustrate the importance of helping people, organizations, communities and countries work together to advance ecological sustainability.
An outdoorsman, farmer and conservationist, Mr. Mott was among the earliest private philanthropists in the United States to support environmental activities through formal grantmaking. Indeed, a 1928 Mott Foundation grant to the University of Michigan supported a Greenland expedition to observe meteorological patterns in the polar region.

Eighty-five years later, the Mott Foundation’s belief in the value of the natural world remained evident in our work. In 2013, our Environment Program, which was formally launched more than three decades earlier, provided ongoing support for the stewardship of land and freshwater resources, particularly in and around our home state of Michigan. We also funded efforts to ensure that international investments in large-scale development projects, especially those related to energy and infrastructure, promote sustainability for people and the environment.

In the pages that follow are five brief stories about this grantmaking. Each reflects an ongoing journey of exploring and sharing practical approaches to environmental issues, and the continuous learning that has informed and shaped our grantmaking.

As we reflect on our work in 2013, we are reminded of the importance of taking the long view in helping to build sustainability at the community level. Glen Chown, executive director of the Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy, made this point eloquently in speaking about the Coastal Campaign, a successful effort funded in part by Mott to protect land in Michigan’s Lower Peninsula.

“Our goal was to put everything we had into the effort, and to advance the stewardship ethic for generations to come,” said Chown. “There are many more chapters to this book, and it’s a story that will continue to unfold in the years to come.”

The Mott Foundation supports the protection and restoration of the Great Lakes ecosystem. Pictured here: Coastal sand dunes in Michigan’s Lower Peninsula.
A decade after Mott helped launch efforts to protect land in Michigan’s Grand Traverse region, 6,000 acres of farms and undeveloped parcels are contributing to the area’s economic future.
Arriving at the top of Old Baldy, a nearly 400-foot-high sand dune located on the northwest coast of Michigan’s Lower Peninsula, visitors are rewarded with stunning views of distant grasslands, dense forests and the white-capped waters of Lake Michigan.

Perhaps few are aware that, in early 2003, these pristine surroundings, which have long provided habitat to migratory birds, Monarch butterflies, and many rare and endangered plants, were targeted for private development.

“Plans included putting in hundreds of homes and turning the top of Baldy into the seventh-hole sand trap of a new golf course,” recalls Glen Chown, executive director of the Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy, a longtime Mott Foundation grantee.

Farmer Brian Putney (left) and Victor Lane of the Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy examine a map of area farms that are protected by the Conservancy’s Coastal Campaign from competing forms of development.
“We were in danger of losing what was arguably one of the most environmentally significant properties on the Lake Michigan coast.”

In October 2003, the Conservancy, armed with $16 million in support from private donors and the foundation community, including a commitment of nearly $8 million in grants from Mott, formally kicked off its Coastal Campaign. This three-year, $35 million initiative aimed to protect dozens of undeveloped parcels and working farms in the region, where the economy is closely tied to recreation, tourism and agriculture.

Two months later and with additional funding from the community and a $6 million interest-free loan from the Foundation, the Conservancy purchased 6,000 acres in the area. The parcel included land that, with Old Baldy as one of its crown jewels, became Arcadia Dunes: The C.S. Mott Nature Preserve.

Today, the Preserve’s 3,600 acres of natural habitat and 15 miles of carefully designed trails attract visitors from around the country and beyond. Meanwhile, farmers have invested more than $4 million in improving and planting 1,400 acres of nearby farmland that is now permanently protected from development.

Engaging allies across the region and helping them connect to the area’s natural assets have been key to building a base of support, says Chip May, executive director at nearby Camp Arcadia. Camp staff and guests often help the Conservancy construct and maintain the Preserve’s trails.

“When you’re out biking or working on the trails, with your sweat dripping into the ground, you connect with the land,” May explains. “When you’ve made that investment and understand how important the land is, you can’t help but want to protect it.”

Chip May (center) pauses while mountain biking to speak with staff of the Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy and volunteers who had just completed work on a trail at Arcadia Dunes. May operates Camp Arcadia, and he and his campers often help maintain the trails.
Visitors enjoy the view of Lake Michigan from Old Baldy, a nearly 400-foot-high sand dune that once was targeted for private development.
Farmers are adopting strategies that benefit their bottom lines and the environment with help from a Mott-funded initiative in Michigan’s Saginaw Bay region.
When it comes to connecting economic and environmental concerns, many farmers “face a difficult push-pull situation,” says Mary Fales, who directs the Saginaw Bay Watershed Project for The Nature Conservancy (TNC).

“On the one hand, they need to use agricultural practices that keep them profitable and allow them to provide for their families,” Fales explains. “On the other, they increasingly understand the negative, long-term impacts some practices can have on their farms and the environment.

“Our goal is to help them find the win-win strategies.”

TNC leads a collaborative effort to help farmers in this mid-Michigan watershed improve their bottom lines and the health of the region’s freshwater ecosystems. The project draws upon field data and computerized modeling, the latter developed in partnership with Michigan State University, to help farmers select mutually beneficial approaches.
Such analysis informed the Zimba family’s decision to create filter strips between their farm fields and neighboring drainage ditches in the community of Deford, located 22 miles southeast of the Saginaw Bay. By slowing storm water runoff, these narrow bands of perennial vegetation minimize costly field erosion and help prevent nutrients and pesticides from entering the watershed and altering the natural ecosystem.

Farmers also are working with project partners to plant cover crops that minimize field erosion outside of the usual growing season, and to create or restore wetlands on unused farm fields. Such practices have the added benefit of providing valuable habitat for area wildlife, including bees and other pollinating species that benefit agriculture.

By documenting these efforts on the project website, farmers and conservationists will help inform similar models around the Great Lakes region — and possibly around the world, notes Fales.

The project also is demonstrating the value of building trust and forging relationships between the agricultural and environmental communities, says Joe Kautz, administrator for the Sanilac Conservation District, one of the project’s partner agencies.

“We may approach the work from different starting points, but at the end of the day we’re all trying to protect the natural resources and way of life in the watershed.”

Filter strips, such as this goldenrod next to a corn crop, help to reduce erosion and keep agricultural by-products from entering nearby ditches and waterways.

“On the one hand, they need to use agricultural practices that keep them profitable and allow them to provide for their families. On the other, they increasingly understand the negative, long-term impacts some practices can have on their farms and the environment.” Mary Fales, The Nature Conservancy
Jim Kratz (left), administrator for Michigan’s Tuscola County Conservation District, and farmer Ben Zimba are working together to protect the area’s freshwater resources and ensure the Zimba family’s farmland remains viable for generations to come.
Five years after Mott grantees helped inform its landmark passage, the Great Lakes Compact is protecting the quality and quantity of water in the Great Lakes Basin.
The well-being of communities in the Great Lakes Basin, home to roughly 90 percent of the available fresh surface water in the United States, is clearly and intimately tied to the health of those waterways, according to Joel Brammeier, president and CEO of the Chicago-based Alliance for the Great Lakes.

“The problem is that, as a society, we tend to treat water like a commodity that can simply be taken and used, with little thought about how it will be returned,” he says.

Depleting water faster than it can be naturally restored can lead to drained reservoirs; rising temperatures in lakes, rivers and streams; shifting shorelines; and increased concentrations of water pollution — all of which can dramatically affect people and wildlife.

Brammeier says one reason the interstate Great Lakes Compact “is so brilliant” is because it makes a clear connection between quality and quantity.

“It views the actual amount of water in the basin as being essential to a healthy and functioning regional ecosystem,” he explains.

The Milwaukee skyline, viewed from Lake Michigan. Milwaukee residents are among the 35 million people who depend on the quality and quantity of water in the Great Lakes Basin.
The eight-state compact, known formally as the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact, is a first-of-its-kind legal framework for deciding how to manage the basin’s freshwater resources, including how much water can be diverted and how far away it can be used. A nonbinding, parallel agreement exists with the Canadian provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

The compact was signed into federal law in October 2008 after a decade of diligent work by grassroots and policy groups, including the Alliance, the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) and other Mott grantees.

Subsequent efforts by the participating states and provinces to improve water management practices have varied, sparking “some innovative results,” says Marc Smith, policy director at NWF. For example, researchers in Michigan can now use a data-driven assessment tool to better understand how groundwater withdrawals near the state’s rivers and streams are likely to affect local fish populations.

The compact’s ban on new diversions of water outside the basin was first tested in 2013, when the city of Waukesha, Wisconsin, sought exception under a limited provision for communities straddling the basin’s geographic boundaries. Today, that proposal remains under consideration, and several Mott grantees are continuing their efforts to build the compact’s long-term strength and resilience.

Success, says Smith, is key to the basin’s future.

“Water is a way of life here. It shapes who we are as a people and, in many ways, drives our economic engines. That’s why we need to look at the Great Lakes with the clear value of protecting them.”

A proposal by Waukesha, Wisconsin, located almost 17 miles inland from Milwaukee, is testing the Great Lakes Compact’s restriction on new diversions of water for use outside of the Great Lakes Basin.
“Water is a way of life here. It shapes who we are as a people and, in many ways, drives our economic engines. That’s why we need to look at the Great Lakes with the clear value of protecting them.” **Marc Smith, National Wildlife Federation**
Promoting investment practices that ensure large-scale projects in South America also advance sustainability is central to the work of several Mott-funded organizations.

A Xikrin woman and child near the Bacaja, a tributary of the Xingu River. When completed, the Belo Monte Dam will significantly decrease water flow here.
Deep in the Amazon’s Xingu Basin, construction is underway on Belo Monte, the world’s third-largest hydroelectric dam. Financed primarily by Brazil’s national development bank (Banco Nacional de Desenvolvimento Econômico e Social, or BNDES) at a price tag that could reach $26 billion, the dam is expected to be operational by 2016. When it is, it will flood 128,000 acres of rainforest, change the flow of rivers and alter the lives of local people.

This troubling situation points to the need to balance the interests of those funding massive energy and infrastructure projects with the environmental, social and economic concerns of surrounding communities.

“Amazon countries, with ample access to strategic resources, often don’t adequately consider that these resources are located in extremely environmentally and socially sensitive areas,” says Maria Elena Rodriguez, coordinator at the Brazilian Institute for Social and Economic Analysis (Instituto Brasileiro de Análises Sociais e Econômicas, or IBASE). Such projects can disrupt and even destroy important and fragile ecosystems, with local communities suffering the brunt of the consequences, explains Rodriguez.

“They are removed from their native lands and watch their means of subsistence disappear without new sources of food or income,” she says.

IBASE is one of several Mott-funded organizations that continued in 2013 to promote sustainable development finance in South America. It did so by building networks, engaging in public oversight of projects, and advocating on behalf of communities and the environment.
Those efforts included launching dialogue between civil society organizations and BNDES representatives. The resulting discussions on transparency, governance, and social and environmental safeguards related to development finance have helped to improve the bank’s public disclosures on project financing, says Alessandra Cardoso, policy advisor at the Brazilian Institute for Socioeconomic Studies (Instituto de Estudios Socioeconómicos).

Groups also worked to reverse processes and policies that, for the sake of attracting investment, actually weaken environmental and social safeguards, says Cesar Gamboa, executive director of Law, Environment and Natural Resources (Derecho, Ambiente y Recursos Naturales). Efforts included educating investors and political leaders about increased costs that can result from legal proceedings and negative press when a project fails to consider local needs.

“Environmental and social standards are not an external cost, but an additional investment for sustainable development, a key to generating profit on projects,” Gamboa points out.

Improving public disclosure by BNDES and engaging the institution, while small steps, are helping transform the future of development finance, says Rodriguez.

“We view the work with BNDES as emblematic of cooperation and joint coordination of nongovernmental organizations and affected communities,” she explains. “It also demonstrates the fundamental role of civil society organizations in providing public oversight and mitigation of the environmental and social impacts of these projects.”

“The health of the Xingu River is key to sustaining the Juruna and other indigenous communities.

“Environmental and social standards are not an external cost, but an additional investment for sustainable development, a key to generating profit on projects.”

Cesar Gamboa, Law, Environment and Natural Resources
Aerial view of a section of the Nanay Tributary in the Amazon River Basin. The basin produces roughly 20 percent of the world’s oxygen and is home to more than a third of all known animal species.
The flow of water to San Rafael Falls, Ecuador’s largest natural waterfall, will be diminished significantly by the Coca-Codo Sinclair hydroelectric dam.

Mott grantees in China are working to shape the country’s investments in overseas development projects to benefit people and the environment.
With one of the world’s fastest-growing economies, including annual foreign investments estimated in the tens of billions of dollars, China has emerged as an influential player in the field of development finance.

Its unique position presents the country with both the opportunity and responsibility to examine how its overseas investments, particularly in major energy and infrastructure projects, affect people and the environment, says Yunwen Bai, director of the Climate and Finance Policy Center at the Greenovation Hub, a project of Forward Works.

“It is very important for China to build the link between global development and ecology, and to be a leader in instituting social and environmental standards,” explains Bai. “Chinese nongovernmental organizations can help that process by promoting an inclusive and open discussion about the country’s overseas investments and their impacts.”

That’s why the Greenovation Hub and several other initiatives that received Mott funding focused their 2013 efforts on building the capacity of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) to seek improvements in China’s international development finance practices.

For example, the Greenovation Hub helped launch conversations and connections between NGOs in China and South America regarding the Coca-Codo Sinclair Hydroelectric Project, a massive hydroelectric dam under construction on Ecuador’s Coca River. Funded largely by the Export-Import Bank of China, the $2.3 billion project is expected to significantly alter the Coca’s
natural flow when the dam becomes operational in 2016. Critics believe this will devastate the river’s ecosystems, including nearby San Rafael Falls, Ecuador’s tallest waterfall and a popular tourist attraction.

The situation points to the important role of China’s NGOs in identifying the environmental and social risks of such projects; bridging the gaps in communication and understanding between Chinese financiers and local communities; and helping to identify sustainable alternatives, explains Michelle Chan, director of Economic Policy at the U.S. affiliate of the Friends of the Earth international network.

“China actually has some of the world’s most progressive environmental banking regulations,” says Chan. “When lending overseas, Chinese banks must ensure that their corporate borrowers comply not just with local laws, but with good international practice. Local NGOs can help that process.”

It’s no surprise that creating a cultural shift in one of the world’s oldest civilizations has its challenges, says Sze Ping Lo, founder of the Greenovation Hub and currently CEO of World Wildlife Fund—China. At the same time, rethinking China’s approach to overseas development finance may spark opportunities for the country to explore new frameworks for other environmental and social issues.

“We have seen in the last few years a very encouraging effort in China to look at how we can do better on issues of development finance,” says Lo. “I think that shows how companies and policymakers can shift from being part of the problem to bringing in positive solutions.”

“It is very important for China to build the link between global development and ecology, and to be a leader in instituting social and environmental standards. Chinese nongovernmental organizations can help that process by promoting an inclusive and open discussion about the country’s overseas investments and their impacts.” Yunwen Bai, Climate and Finance Policy Center
“When lending overseas, Chinese banks must ensure that their corporate borrowers comply not just with local laws, but with good international practice. Local NGOs can help that process.” **Michelle Chan, Friends of the Earth**
OUR FOUNDER

“It seems to me that every person, always, is in a kind of informal partnership with his community. His own success is dependent to a large degree on that community, and the community, after all, is the sum total of the individuals who make it up. The institutions of a community, in turn, are the means by which those individuals express their faith, their ideals and their concern for fellow men. …

“So broad and so deep are the objectives of the Mott Foundation that they touch almost every aspect of living, increasing the capacity for accomplishment, the appreciation of values and the understanding of the forces that make up the world we live in. In this sense, it may truly be called a Foundation for Living — with the ultimate aim of developing greater understanding among men.

“We recognize that our obligation to fellow men does not stop at the boundaries of the community. In an even larger sense, every man is in partnership with the rest of the human race in the eternal conquest which we call civilization.”

Charles Stewart Mott (1875–1973), who established this Foundation in 1926, was deeply concerned from his earliest years in Flint, Michigan, with the welfare of his adopted community.

Soon after he had become one of the city’s leading industrialists, this General Motors pioneer found a practical and successful way to express his interest. He served three terms as mayor (in 1912, 1913 and 1918) during a period when the swiftly growing city was beset with problems, with 40,000 people sharing facilities adequate for only 10,000.

As a private citizen, he started a medical and dental clinic for children and helped establish the Whaley Children’s Center, as well as chapters of the YMCA and Boy Scouts, in Flint.

Nine years after the Foundation was incorporated for philanthropic, charitable and educational purposes, it became a major factor in the life of Flint through organized schoolground recreational activities, which developed into the nationwide community school/education program.

From this start, the Foundation’s major concern has been the well-being of the community, including the individual, the family, the neighborhood and the systems of government. This interest has continued to find expression in Flint and also has taken the Foundation far beyond its home city, as the content of this annual report makes clear.
**OUR VALUES**

Charles Stewart Mott’s central belief in the partnership of humanity was the basis upon which the Foundation was established. While this remains the guiding principle of its grantmaking, the Foundation has refined and broadened its grantmaking over time to reflect changing national and world conditions.

Through its programs of Civil Society, Environment, Flint Area and Pathways Out of Poverty, and their more specific program areas, the Foundation seeks to fulfill its mission of supporting efforts that promote a just, equitable and sustainable society.

Inherent in all grantmaking is the desire to enhance the capacity of individuals, families or institutions at the local level and beyond. The Foundation hopes that its collective work in any program area will lead toward systemic change.

Fundamental to all Mott grantmaking are certain values:

- Nurturing strong, self-reliant individuals with expanded capacity for accomplishment;
- Learning how people can live together to create a sense of community, whether at the neighborhood level or as a global society;
- Building strong communities through collaboration to provide a basis for positive change;
- Encouraging responsible citizen participation to help foster social cohesion;
- Promoting the social, economic and political empowerment of all individuals and communities to preserve fundamental democratic principles and rights;
- Developing leadership to build upon the needs and values of people and to inspire the aspirations and potential of others; and
- Respecting the diversity of life to maintain a sustainable human and physical environment.

**OUR CODE OF ETHICS**

- Respect for the communities we work with and serve.
- Integrity in our actions.
- Responsibility for our decisions and their consequences.

We are committed to:

- Acting honestly, truthfully and with integrity in all our transactions and dealings;
- Avoiding conflicts of interest;
- Appropriately handling actual or apparent conflicts of interest in our relationships;
- Treating our grantees fairly;
- Treating every individual with dignity and respect;
- Treating our employees with respect, fairness and good faith and providing conditions of employment that safeguard their rights and welfare;
- Being a good corporate citizen and complying with both the spirit and the letter of the law;
- Acting responsibly toward the communities in which we work and for the benefit of the communities that we serve;
- Being responsible, transparent and accountable for all of our actions; and
- Improving the accountability, transparency, ethical conduct and effectiveness of the nonprofit field.
OUR WORK

Our Vision: The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation affirms its founder’s vision of a world in which each of us is in partnership with the rest of the human race — where each individual’s quality of life is connected to the well-being of the community, both locally and globally. We pursue this vision through creative grantmaking, thoughtful communication and other activities that enhance community in its many forms. The same vision of shared learning shapes our internal culture as we strive to maintain an ethic of respect, integrity and responsibility. The Foundation seeks to strengthen, in people and their organizations, what Mr. Mott called “the capacity for accomplishment.”

Our Mission: To support efforts that promote a just, equitable and sustainable society.

■ CIVIL SOCIETY

Mission: To strengthen philanthropy and the nonprofit sector as vital vehicles for increasing civic engagement and improving communities and societies.

PROGRAM AREAS:
• Central/Eastern Europe and Russia
• South Africa
• United States
• Global Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector

■ ENVIRONMENT

Mission: To support the efforts of an engaged citizenry working to create accountable and responsive institutions, sound public policies, and appropriate models of development that protect the diversity and integrity of selected ecosystems in North America and around the world.

PROGRAM AREAS:
• Conservation of Freshwater Ecosystems
• International Finance for Sustainability
• Special Initiatives

■ FLINT AREA

Mission: To foster a well-functioning, connected community that is capable of meeting the economic, social and racial challenges ahead.

PROGRAM AREAS:
• Arts, Culture and Education
• Economic Revitalization
• Strengthening Community
• Special Initiatives

■ PATHWAYS OUT OF POVERTY

Mission: To identify, test and help sustain pathways out of poverty for low-income people and communities.

PROGRAM AREAS:
• Improving Community Education
• Expanding Economic Opportunity
• Building Organized Communities
• Special Initiatives

■ EXPLORATORY AND SPECIAL PROJECTS

Mission: To support unusual or unique opportunities addressing significant national and international problems. (Proposals are by invitation only; unsolicited proposals are discouraged.)

PROGRAM AREAS:
• Historically and Predominantly Black Colleges and Universities
• Special Projects
PROGRAMS & GRANTS
2013 PROGRAM OVERVIEW: CIVIL SOCIETY

Mission: To strengthen philanthropy and the nonprofit sector as vital vehicles for increasing civic engagement and improving communities and societies.

CENTRAL/EASTERN EUROPE AND RUSSIA
Goal: To foster a civil society in which nonprofits strengthen democratic values and practices and have access to adequate and responsive resources.

OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:
• Active Civic Participation. People and nonprofits empowered to take collective action that promotes and defends democratic values.
• Philanthropy Development. A more robust culture of private giving for public good.

SOUTH AFRICA
Goal: To empower poor and marginalized communities to unlock resources and realize their development needs and aspirations.

OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:
• Community Advice Office Sector. Strong and sustainable community advice offices and related community-based organizations that assist poor and marginalized communities.
• Philanthropy Development. Increased philanthropy with improved responsiveness to the needs of poor and marginalized communities.
• Special Opportunities. Unique opportunities to strengthen civil society.

UNITED STATES
Goal: To increase the nonprofit and philanthropic sector’s responsiveness and capacity to address social and community needs.

OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:
• Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness. A robust infrastructure that protects and promotes a vibrant and responsive nonprofit sector and philanthropy.
• Community Philanthropy. Philanthropy that promotes vitality and resiliency in local communities.

GLOBAL PHILANTHROPY AND NONPROFIT SECTOR
Goal: To foster global platforms for philanthropy and the nonprofit sector that respond to the needs of local communities.

OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:
• Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector. Improved effectiveness of philanthropy and nonprofit support organizations through international collaboration and exchange of knowledge.
• Special Opportunities. Unique opportunities to strengthen civil society.

Note: The grant listings and charts within this report reflect the geographic sub-regions in which we make grants in Central/Eastern Europe and Russia.
Residents of Stara Zagora, Bulgaria, gather at a bread house event. The bread house movement unites people from all walks of life through the simple act of baking. Organizers say bread houses enhance understanding among community members by sparking dialogue and bridging ethnic, cultural, racial, economic and religious divides.
**Central/Eastern Europe and Russia**

**Southeast Europe**

- **Ana and Vlade Divac Foundation**
  Belgrade, Serbia
  $125,000 – 24 mos.
  Program and operational development support

- **Association for Community Relations**
  Cluj-Napoca, Romania
  $100,000 – 24 mos.
  Community foundation development program

- **Balkan Investigative Reporting Network**
  Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
  $100,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **Balkan Investigative Reporting Network Kosovo**
  Pristina, Kosovo
  $100,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **Bulgarian Donors’ Forum**
  Sofia, Bulgaria
  $120,000 – 36 mos.
  General purposes

- **Bulgarian Environmental Partnership Foundation**
  Sofia, Bulgaria
  $76,074
  Adjustment to previous grant

- **Center for Civic Cooperation**
  Livno, Bosnia and Herzegovina
  $60,000 – 24 mos.
  Increasing citizen participation in community life through media

- **Center for Cultural Decontamination**
  Belgrade, Serbia
  $60,000 – 24 mos.
  Institutional capacity building

- **Centers for Civic Initiatives – Tuzla**
  Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina
  $100,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **Community Foundation Slagalica**
  Osijek, Croatia
  $75,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **Community Volunteers Foundation**
  Istanbul, Turkey
  $220,000 – 24 mos.
  YouthBank development in Turkey

- **Dimitar Berbatov Foundation**
  Sofia, Bulgaria
  $100,000 – 24 mos.
  Institutional development

- **Diyarbakir Institute for Political and Social Research**
  Diyarbakir, Turkey
  $70,000 – 24 mos.
  Community-based restorative justice mechanisms in southeast Turkey

- **Documenta**
  Zagreb, Croatia
  $155,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **FOL Movement**
  Pristina, Kosovo
  $60,000 – 24 mos.
  Strengthening capacity and outreach

- **Hrant Dink Foundation**
  Istanbul, Turkey
  $100,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **Humanitarian Law Center**
  Belgrade, Serbia
  $190,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **Ideas Factory Association**
  Sofia, Bulgaria
  $160,000 – 24 mos.
  Hub for agents of social change

- **International Association ‘Interactive Open Schools’**
  Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina
  $50,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **MozaiK Community Development Foundation**
  Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
  $220,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **National Alliance for Volunteer Action**
  Plovdiv, Bulgaria
  $80,000 – 24 mos.
  Rebirth of volunteerism in Bulgaria

- **PACT – Partnership for Community Action and Transformation Foundation**
  Bucharest, Romania
  $190,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **Princess Margarita of Romania Foundation – Romania**
  Bucharest, Romania
  $140,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **Pro Vobis National Resource Center for Volunteering**
  Cluj-Napoca, Romania
  $80,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **Reconstruction Women’s Fund**
  Belgrade, Serbia
  $90,000 – 24 mos.
  Institutional and program development support

- **Resource Center for Public Participation**
  Bucharest, Romania
  $100,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **Romanian Federation of Community Foundations**
  Cluj-Napoca, Romania
  $70,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **SENSE – Central European News Service Ltd.**
  Zagreb, Croatia
  $60,000 – 24 mos.
  Local documentation centers in the Western Balkans

- **Third Sector Foundation of Turkey**
  Karakoy, Turkey
  $200,000 – 24 mos.
  Philanthropy infrastructure development in Turkey

- **Trag Foundation**
  Belgrade, Serbia
  $220,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **Women in Black**
  Belgrade, Serbia
  $50,000 – 24 mos.
  Confronting the past in Serbia

- **Workshop for Civic Initiatives**
  Sofia, Bulgaria
  $400,000 – 24 mos.
  Bulgarian community foundations development fund

- **Youth Initiative for Human Rights**
  Belgrade, Serbia
  $140,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **Youth Initiative for Human Rights – Croatia**
  Zagreb, Croatia
  $60,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

**Subtotal: $4,327,926**

**Western Former Soviet Union**

- **Agency for Social Information**
  Moscow, Russia
  $200,000 – 24 mos.
  Regional communication centers

- **Andrei Sakharov Foundation**
  Moscow, Russia
  $194,000 – 24 mos.
  Development of multifunctional social center

- **Carnegie Endowment for International Peace**
  Washington, DC
  $200,000 – 24 mos.
  Carnegie Moscow Center

- **Charities Aid Foundation**
  London, England
  $40,000 – 24 mos.
  Community foundation development in Russia

- **Civic Analysis and Independent Research Center**
  Perm, Russia
  $14,000 – 24 mos.
  Civil initiatives for public benefit support service

- **Civic Network OPORA**
  Kyiv, Ukraine
  $100,000 – 24 mos.
  General purposes

- **GURT Resource Center for NGO Development**
  Kyiv, Ukraine
  $100,000 – 36 mos.
  General purposes

- **Institute of Socio-Cultural Management**
  Kirovohrad, Ukraine
  $100,000 – 24 mos.
  School of Civic Participation

- **Kherson Regional Charity and Health Foundation**
  Kherson, Ukraine
  $100,000 – 24 mos.
  Community resource centers in Ukraine

- **Krasnoyarsk Center for Community Partnerships**
  Krasnoyarsk, Russia
  $200,000 – 36 mos.
  General purposes

- **Legal Team**
  Moscow, Russia
  $100,000 – 24 mos.
  Building legal capacity of nonprofit sector in Russia

- **LLC MEMO**
  Moscow, Russia
  $200,000 – 24 mos.
  Development of human capital through social marketing
New Eurasia Foundation
Moscow, Russia
$600,000 – 24 mos.
Mainstreaming civic and community engagement into social development

Nizhni Novgorod Voluntary Service
Nizhni Novgorod, Russia
$150,000 – 24 mos.
TimeBank

Russia Donors Forum
Moscow, Russia
$35,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

Saint-Petersburg NGO Development Centre
St. Petersburg, Russia
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Ukrainian Step by Step Foundation
Kyiv, Ukraine
$180,000 – 36 mos.
Community development in Ukraine through community school programs

Subtotal: $2,613,000

CEE/Russia Regional

Academy for the Development of Philanthropy in Poland
Warsaw, Poland
$600,000 – 36 mos.
Community foundation development fund

CEE Bankwatch Network
Prague, Czech Republic
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Center for Community Change
Washington, DC
$46,000 – 20 mos.
Organizing training in Central/Eastern Europe

ContinYou
$110,000 – 12 mos.
Adjustment to previous grant

Foundation-Administered Project
$103,863
Active civic participation
$25,000
Assessing innovative approaches to civil society support
$91,927
Community foundation development in Central/Eastern Europe and Russia
$89,193
Philanthropy development in southeast Europe

Fundacja TechSoup
Warsaw, Poland
$400,000 – 24 mos.
Strengthening institutional capacity to provide information and communication technologies support to nongovernmental organizations in Central/Eastern Europe and Russia

Funding Network
London, England
$150,000 – 36 mos.
Developing the Funding Network in Central/Eastern Europe and Russia

International Association ‘Interactive Open Schools’
Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina
$181,000 – 24 mos.
Community schools quality partnership

International Centre of Excellence for Community Schools
Coventry, England
$110,000 – 8 mos.
General purposes

Socia – Social Reform Foundation
$131,049
Adjustment to previous grant

VIAC Foundation
Prague, Czech Republic
$600,000 – 36 mos.
ViabilityNet – regional nongovernmental organization capacity-building program

Zing Foundation
Arlington, MA
$123,200 – 12 mos.
Promoting philanthropy in Central/Eastern Europe and Russia

Subtotal: $2,479,134

Program Area Total: $9,420,060

PHILANTHROPY DEVELOPMENT

Centre for Community Justice and Development
Pietermaritzburg, South Africa
$183,000 – 12 mos.
Advice office support

Centre for Rural Legal Studies
Stellenbosch, South Africa
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Community Law and Rural Development Centre
Durban, South Africa
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Advice office training and support

Democracy Development Programme
Durban, South Africa
$120,000 – 24 mos.
Training local government councillors and communities in KwaZulu-Natal

Education and Training Unit
Johannesburg, South Africa
$80,000 – 24 mos.
Materials development and website management for paralegal training

HIVOS – South Africa
Johannesburg, South Africa
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Multiagency grants initiative: advice office re-granting project

Legal Resources Trust
Johannesburg, South Africa
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Legal support services for nonprofit organizations

National Alliance for the Development of Community Advice Offices
Cape Town, South Africa
$30,000 – 6 mos.
Support to the Association of Community Advice Offices of South Africa

ProBono.Org
Johannesburg, South Africa
$75,000 – 24 mos.
Backup legal services for advice offices

Project for Conflict Resolution and Development
Port Elizabeth, South Africa
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Conflict resolution training for advice offices

SOUTH AFRICA

Community Advice Office Sector

Association of University Legal Aid Institutions Trust
Potchefstroom, South Africa
$220,000 – 24 mos.
Advice office support project

Black Sash Trust
Cape Town, South Africa
$630,080 – 48 mos.
General purposes

Centre for Community Outreach and Education
Cape Town, South Africa
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Subtotal: $2,546,080

Community Advice Office Sector

University of the Western Cape
Cape Town, South Africa
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Philanthropy Development

Charities Aid Foundation
Johannesburg, South Africa
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Community Chest of the Western Cape
Cape Town, South Africa
$80,000 – 24 mos.
Capacity building

DOCKDA Rural Development Agency
Cape Town, South Africa
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Foundation for Human Rights
Johannesburg, South Africa
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

GreaterGood South Africa
Cape Town, South Africa
$20,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Johannesburg, South Africa
$50,000 – 24 mos.
Nonprofit clinic project

South African Institute for Advancement
Cape Town, South Africa
$160,000 – 24 mos.
Nonprofit clinic project

Southern African Community Grantmakers Leadership Forum
Cape Town, South Africa
$50,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Tides Center
San Francisco, CA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Africa grantmakers’ affinity group

Uthungulu Community Foundation
Richards Bay, South Africa
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
West Coast Community Foundation
Cape Town, South Africa
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Women’s Hope, Education and Training Trust
Cape Town, South Africa
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Subtotal: $1,295,000
Philanthropy Development

Special Opportunities

Community Development Resource Association
Cape Town, South Africa
$75,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Constitutional Court Trust
Johannesburg, South Africa
$25,000 – 28 mos.
Creating an audible legacy

Desmond Tutu Peace Centre
– $50,000
Adjustment to previous grant

Foundation-Administered Project
$68,993
Learning and sharing sessions

Gordon Institute of Business Science
Johannesburg, South Africa
$75,000 – 24 mos.
Support for social entrepreneurship program

Institute for Healing of Memories
Cape Town, South Africa
$60,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Promises Films
San Francisco, CA
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Breaking the Rules – film project

SGS Consulting
Johannesburg, South Africa
$200,000 – 13 mos.
Technical support and dialogue platform

Social Surveys
Johannesburg, South Africa
$50,000 – 18 mos.
Towards a better understanding of civil society in Africa

Southern African NGO Network
Braamfontein, South Africa
$150,000 – 24 mos.
NGO Pulse and Prodder

Subtotal: $703,993
Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness

Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers
Arlington, VA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Foundation Center
New York, NY
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Foundation-Administered Project
$150,570
Office of Foundation Liaison

Grand Valley State University
Allendale, MI
$100,000 – 18 mos.
LearnPhilanthropy

Grants Managers Network
Washington, DC
$22,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

GuideStar
Williamsburg, VA
$50,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

National Center for Family Philanthropy
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

National Center on Philanthropy and the Law
New York, NY
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Philanthropy Roundtable
Washington, DC
$60,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Subtotal: $1,992,570
Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness

Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Philanthropy

Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy
San Francisco, CA
$90,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

Association of Black Foundation Executives
New York, NY
$150,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

Council of Michigan Foundations
Grand Haven, MI
$150,000 – 12 mos.
Transforming Michigan philanthropy through diversity and inclusion

Hispanics in Philanthropy
Oakland, CA
$120,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

Native Americans in Philanthropy
Minneapolis, MN
$90,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

Subtotal: $600,000
Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Philanthropy

Program Area Total: $3,367,570
United States
### Global Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector

#### Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector

**Alliance Publishing Trust**  
*London, England*  
$30,000 – 16 mos.  
Developing philanthropy in emerging markets  
$100,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

**CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation**  
*Washington, DC*  
$80,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

**Community Foundations of Canada**  
*Ottawa, Ontario*  
$36,000 – 6 mos.  
Global participation in Community Foundations of Canada conference

**European Foundation Centre**  
*Brussels, Belgium*  
$160,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes  
$150,000 – 18 mos.  
Philanthropy House

**Foundation-Administered Project**  
$49,896  
Global community philanthropy development

**Global Fund for Community Foundations**  
*Johannesburg, South Africa*  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Small grants and capacity-building program  
$175,000 – 15 mos.  
Global Alliance for Community Philanthropy secretariat

**Hudson Institute**  
*Washington, DC*  
$100,000 – 24 mos.  
Index of Philanthropic Freedom

**London Community Foundation**  
*London, England*  
$50,000 – 12 mos.  
Developing the London Community Foundation

**Network of European Foundations for Innovative Cooperation**  
*Brussels, Belgium*  
$28,000 – 12 mos.  
Membership and administrative support

**Research Foundation of the City University of New York**  
*New York, NY*  
$42,000 – 24 mos.  
International community foundation fellows program

**Southern Africa Trust**  
*Midrand, South Africa*  
$75,000 – 12 mos.  
Africa Grantmakers Network

**Stichting SBF**  
*Hague, Netherlands*  
$150,000 – 36 mos.  
Community foundation development

**Synergos Institute**  
*New York, NY*  
$200,000 – 24 mos.  
Connecting global philanthropy to community philanthropy

**Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support**  
*São Paulo, Brazil*  
$400,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

#### Subtotal:  
$2,075,896  
Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector

#### Special Opportunities

**International Academy for Innovative Pedagogy, Psychology and Economy gGmbH**  
*Berlin, Germany*  
$174,000 – 12 mos.  
Youth empowerment partnership program

**Madariaga College of Europe Foundation**  
*Brussels, Belgium*  
$35,000 – 12 mos.  
Citizens’ Europe program

**Philanthropy Ireland**  
*Dublin, Ireland*  
$100,000 – 132 mos.  
Ray Murphy memorial lecture series

#### Subtotal:  
$309,000  
Special Opportunities

#### Program Area Total:  
$2,384,896  
Global Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector

#### Program Total:  
$19,717,599  
Civil Society
Mission: To support the efforts of an engaged citizenry working to create accountable and responsive institutions, sound public policies, and appropriate models of development that protect the diversity and integrity of selected ecosystems in North America and around the world.

Conservation of Freshwater Ecosystems

Goal: To advance the conservation and restoration of freshwater ecosystems in North America, with emphasis on the Great Lakes and, to a lesser extent, portions of the southeastern United States.

Objectives/What We Seek:

- Strengthening the Environmental Community. A strong, effective and sustainable nongovernmental organization (NGO) community dedicated to the long-term conservation of freshwater ecosystems.
- Public Policies. Well-designed and effectively implemented water-quality and water-quantity policies that advance the conservation of freshwater ecosystems.

International Finance for Sustainability

Goal: To shape international investment to support sustainable development and reduce environmental degradation.

Objectives/What We Seek:

- Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future. Infrastructure and energy investments that contribute to environmental sustainability and offer local economic opportunity.
- Sustainable Regional Development and Integration. Regional trade and investment strategies that contribute to local sustainable development, with an emphasis on Latin America.

Special Initiatives

Goal: To respond to unique opportunities to advance environmental protection in the United States and internationally.

Objectives/What We Seek:

- Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan. In Michigan’s urban areas and surrounding older communities, a built environment designed to promote environmental health, economic prosperity and social equity.
- Special Opportunities. Efforts that offer a one-time opportunity to contribute to the resolution of a significant domestic or global concern.
The Great Lakes Coastal Marsh near Arcadia is one of only about 15 freshwater marshes that still exist along the western shoreline of Michigan's Lower Peninsula. Protecting freshwater ecosystems and other natural resources is key to nurturing a sustainable global community.
**CONSERVATION OF FRESHWATER ECOSYSTEMS**

**Strengthening the Environmental Community**

Citizens Campaign Fund for the Environment
Farmingdale, NY
$40,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Environmental Defence
Toronto, Ontario
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Great Lakes water program

Freshwater Future
Petoskey, MI
$455,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Cities Initiative
Chicago, IL
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Heart of the Lakes Center for Land Conservation Policy
Bay City, MI
$140,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Institute for Conservation Leadership
Takoma Park, MD
$120,000 – 12 mos.
Freshwater leadership initiative

Michigan Environmental Council
Lansing, MI
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Great Lakes program

University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI
$100,000 – 24 mos.
The Center for Socio-Environmental Integration

---

**Program Area Total:** $1,255,000

**Strengthening the Environmental Community**

---

**Public Policies**

Alabama Rivers Alliance
Birmingham, AL
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Alabama water-management project

American Rivers
Washington, DC
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Promoting integrated water management in the Great Lakes

Coastal Conservation League
Charleston, SC
$50,000 – 36 mos.
Protecting freshwater ecosystems

Ecojustice Canada
Vancouver, British Columbia
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Great Lakes water-protection program

Great Lakes Environmental Law Center
Detroit, MI
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Water quality project

Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
Odanah, WI
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Great Lakes sulfide ore-mining project

National Wildlife Federation
Reston, VA
$85,000 – 31 mos.
Sustaining the Great Lakes project

Northeast-Midwest Institute
Washington, DC
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Great Lakes Washington program

River Network
Portland, OR
$40,000 – 18 mos.
Water quality project

Southern Environmental Law Center
Charlottesville, VA
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Southern water-management project

**Subtotal:** $1,175,000

Program Area Total: $2,430,000

Conservation of Freshwater Ecosystems

---

**INTERNATIONAL FINANCE FOR SUSTAINABILITY**

**Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future**

ActionAid Brasil
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Monitoring BRICS development in Brazil

ActionAid USA
Washington, DC
$300,000 – 24 mos.
BRICS action project

BankTrack
Nijmegen, Netherlands
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Both Ends Foundation
Amsterdam, Netherlands
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Multilateral financial institutions and export credit agencies program

Center for International Environmental Law
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Ensuring development and climate finance support sustainable development

Environmental Law Alliance Worldwide
Eugene, OR
$280,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Friends of the Earth
Washington, DC
$400,000 – 24 mos.
Advancing and protecting sustainability standards in development finance

Institute for Policy Studies
Washington, DC
$305,000 – 24 mos.
Global finance for climate sustainability

International Rivers
Berkeley, CA
$350,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

NGO Forum on ADB
Quezon City, Philippines
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Pacific Environment
San Francisco, CA
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Responsible finance campaign

Sakhalin Environment Watch
Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Russia
$300,000 – 35 mos.
Public monitoring of oil and gas projects on Sakhalin

Sierra Club Foundation
San Francisco, CA
$200,000 – 24 mos.
International Financial Institution reform project

South Africa Development Fund
Boston, MA
$50,000 – 24 mos.
BASIC South Initiative

Tides Canada Initiatives
Vancouver, British Columbia
$50,000 – 36 mos.
Halifax Initiative

World Resources Institute
Washington, DC
$400,000 – 24 mos.
International financial flows and the environment

**Subtotal:** $3,835,000

Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future

---

**Sustainable Regional Development and Integration**

Center for Socio-Environmental Support
Cunha, Brazil
$500,000 – 24 mos.
South America small grants program

Friends of the Earth – Brazilian Amazonia
São Paulo, Brazil
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Improving sustainable performance of financial institutions in Brazil

iBase
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
$180,000 – 18 mos.
Monitoring Brazilian Development Bank investments in energy and infrastructure

INESC
Brasilia, Brazil
$240,000 – 24 mos.
Finance for sustainable development in South America

IPS-Inter Press Service
Montevideo, Uruguay
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Growing role of Brazil in Latin America

Sobrevivencia
Asunción, Paraguay
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Building capacity and alliances for international financial institutions monitoring

**Subtotal:** $1,570,000

Sustainable Regional Development and Integration

---

Program Area Total: $5,405,000

International Finance for Sustainability

---
## Special Initiatives

### Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecology Center</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Model transit project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Association of Planning</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>18 mos.</td>
<td>Integrating transportation, health and community placemaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Environmental Council</td>
<td>Lansing, MI</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Moving Michigan toward a world-class transportation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Fitness Foundation</td>
<td>Lansing, MI</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Enhancing transportation equity in Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Land Use Institute</td>
<td>Traverse City, MI</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Initiative to promote transportation choices in Grand Traverse region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan United Conservation Clubs</td>
<td>Lansing, MI</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Michigan state parks and outdoor recreation panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Great Lakes Governors</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Great Lakes summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EcoAdapt</td>
<td>Bainbridge Island, WA</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>16 mos.</td>
<td>Climate adaptation survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation-Administered Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>$71,954</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Finance for Sustainability convenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley State University</td>
<td>Allendale, MI</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>15 mos.</td>
<td>Growing Michigan’s blue economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Press</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Translating climate science for actionable solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third World Network Berhad</td>
<td>Penang, Malaysia</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Capacity building in south on climate change and sustainable development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** $440,000

**Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan**

### Special Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Group on Biological Diversity</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Great Lakes Governors</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Great Lakes summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EcoAdapt</td>
<td>Bainbridge Island, WA</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>16 mos.</td>
<td>Climate adaptation survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation-Administered Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>$71,954</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Finance for Sustainability convenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley State University</td>
<td>Allendale, MI</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>15 mos.</td>
<td>Growing Michigan’s blue economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Press</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Translating climate science for actionable solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third World Network Berhad</td>
<td>Penang, Malaysia</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Capacity building in south on climate change and sustainable development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** $676,954

**Special Opportunities**

**Program Area Total:** $1,116,954

**Program Total:** $8,951,954

**Environment**
Mission: To foster a well-functioning, connected community that is capable of meeting the economic, social and racial challenges ahead.

ARTS, CULTURE AND EDUCATION

Goal: To support education, arts and cultural institutions as critical forces for positive change and key determinants of the community’s quality of life and economic well-being.

OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:

- Arts and Culture. Strong, sustainable and vibrant local cultural organizations that provide diverse arts and cultural opportunities to all residents of Genesee County.
- Education. A continuum of high-quality learning opportunities that meets the needs of Flint-area children, youth and adults from pre-kindergarten through college.

ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION

Goal: To support efforts that improve local governance, regional cooperation, community participation and the Flint area’s economic vitality.

OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:

- Economic Development. A vibrant and diverse regional economy.
- Workforce Development. Quality employment opportunities for Flint-area residents who face multiple barriers to good jobs in the regional labor market.

STRENGTHENING COMMUNITY

Goal: To support programs that provide opportunities for children and families, improve neighborhoods and the community, and sustain a vibrant nonprofit sector.

OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:

- Children and Families. Healthy and productive lives for Genesee County children and families.
- Housing and Neighborhoods. Affordable housing and livable neighborhoods, with an emphasis on the city of Flint.
- Philanthropy/Nonprofit Sector. A strong, local nonprofit sector capable of meeting community needs.

SPECIAL INITIATIVES

Goal: To respond to critical opportunities and/or issues that have the potential to significantly improve the quality of life in the Flint area.

OBJECTIVE/WHAT WE SEEK:

- Special Initiatives. Flexibility to respond to critical needs, seize special opportunities, leverage other resources and incubate new program areas in the Flint community.
The Mott Foundation has funded a summer employment program for Flint-area young people since 1996. In 2013, more than 500 teens found jobs through the Summer Youth Initiative, operated by the Flint & Genesee Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber also offers TeenQuest, an afterschool job training program that serves more than 600 students annually.

**GRANT ACTIVITY:**
$41,253,692 / 81 GRANTS

**ARTS, CULTURE AND EDUCATION**
- Education: $18.892 (14 grants)
- Arts and Culture: $4.888 (16 grants)

**ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION**
- Economic Development: $9.168 (10 grants)
- Workforce Development: $0.369 (3 grants)

**STRENGTHENING COMMUNITY**
- Children and Families: $2.290 (18 grants)
- Housing and Neighborhoods: $2.285 (7 grants)
- Philanthropy/Nonprofit Sector: $0.928 (5 grants)

**SPECIAL INITIATIVES**
- Special Initiatives: $2.434 (8 grants)

**TOTALS**
- $41.254 (81 grants)
ARTS, CULTURE AND EDUCATION

Education

114th Partnership
Rockville, MD
$30,000 – 6 mos.
College and career pathway readiness: district audit for sequencing success

Children's Aid Society
New York, NY
$150,700 – 18 mos.
Community schools technical assistance

Cranbrook Educational Community
Bloomfield Hills, MI
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Flint Community Schools young scientists

Flint Community Schools
Flint, MI
$576,200 – 12 mos.
Science, technology, engineering and math support

Flint Community Schools
Flint, MI
$25,000 – 12 mos.
YouthQuest afterschool initiative

Flint Community Schools
Flint, MI
$200,000 – 24 mos.
International student recruitment

Foundation-Administered Project
$149,953 – 12 mos.
Smart Teachers as Role Models (STAR) Initiative

University of Michigan-Flint
Flint, MI
$200,000 – 24 mos.
International student recruitment

Subtotal: $18,891,353

Arts and Culture

ArtServe Michigan
Wixom, MI
$25,000 – 12 mos.
Michigan cultural data project

Back to the Bricks
Davison, MI
$15,000 – 10 mos.
Back to the Bricks marketing

City of Flint
Flint, MI
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Public safety

Community Foundation of Greater Flint
Flint, MI
$302,110 – 17 mos.
S. Jean Simi Fund for the Arts

Flint Cultural Center Corporation
Flint, MI
$86,780 – 12 mos.
Parade of Festivals

Flint Institute of Arts
Flint, MI
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Capital improvements

Flint Institute of Music
Flint, MI
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Music in the Parks

Flint Institute of Music
Flint, MI
$270,000 – 12 mos.
Property purchase

Subtotal: $4,888,201

Program Area Total: $23,779,554

ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION

Economic Development

Brookings Institution
Washington, DC
$250,000 – 12 mos.
Metropolitan policy program

Foundation for the Uptown Reinvestment Corporation
Flint, MI
$295,000 – 4 mos.
Downtown property purchase

Flint Institute of Arts
Flint, MI
$113,000 – 12 mos.
Downtown security

Flint Institute of Arts
Flint, MI
$7,700,000 – 25 mos.
Flint health and wellness district

Flint Institute of Music
Flint, MI
$48,500 – 12 mos.
Real estate development support services

Foundation-Administered Project
$115,000
Technical assistance for downtown Flint revitalization

Kettering University
Flint, MI
$25,000 – 12 mos.
Capital improvements

Subtotal: $9,167,636

Program Area Total: $9,537,104

STRENGTHENING COMMUNITY

Children and Families

American Arab Heritage Council
Flint, MI
$45,000 – 12 mos.
Immigration services

Boys & Girls Club of Greater Flint
Flint, MI
$160,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Carrige Town Ministries
Flint, MI
$65,000 – 12 mos.
Increasing food distribution

Catholic Charities of Shiawassee and Genesee Counties
Flint, MI
$285,000 – 12 mos.
North End Soup Kitchen, warming center and medical transportation
Corporation for a Skilled Workforce  
*Ann Arbor, MI* 
$98,200 – 12 mos.  
Summer Youth Initiative evaluation

Crim Fitness Foundation  
*Flint, MI* 
$40,000 – 36 mos.  
Repayable grant to promote health and fitness in elementary schools

Food Bank of Eastern Michigan  
*Flint, MI* 
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
Increasing food distribution and access  
$50,000 – 12 mos.  
Flint diaper bank

Genesee Area Focus Fund  
*Flint, MI* 
$825,000 – 12 mos.  
Summer Youth Initiative

Old Newsboys of Flint Inc.  
*Flint, MI* 
$50,000 – 12 mos.  
Seasonal care assistance

Priority Children  
*Flint, MI* 
$30,000 – 9 mos.  
Summer Youth Expo

Resource Genesee  
*Flint, MI* 
$60,000 – 12 mos.  
One Stop Housing Resource Center

Salvation Army of Genesee County  
*Flint, MI* 
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
Rent and utility assistance program

Shelter of Flint Inc.  
*Flint, MI* 
$170,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

**Specialized Employment Services Inc.**  
*Flint, MI* 
$85,000 – 12 mos.  
Flint STRIVE Academy youth empowerment program

**YWCA of Greater Flint**  
*Flint, MI* 
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Subtotal: $2,289,700

**Housing and Neighborhoods**

**Center for Community Progress**  
*Flint, MI* 
$1,180,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

**City of Flint**  
*Flint, MI* 
$265,673 – 12 mos.  
Master plan for a sustainable Flint  
$40,000 – 12 mos.  
Center Street Village Non-Profit Housing Corporation  
*Flint, MI*  
$65,000 – 24 mos. 
Property management software for land banks

Subtotal: $2,285,673

**Genesee County Land Bank Authority**  
*Flint, MI* 
$300,000 – 12 mos.  
Neighborhood and community planning  
$65,000 – 24 mos.  
Michigan State University  
*East Lansing, MI*  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
Building Excellence, Sustainability and Trust nonprofit capacity building

Subtotal: $927,961

**Local Initiatives Support Corporation**  
*New York, NY* 
$300,000 – 36 mos.  
Flint and Genesee County community development project

**Metro Community Development**  
*Flint, MI*  
$135,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Subtotal: $2,285,673

**Philanthropy/Nonprofit Sector**

**Community Foundation of Greater Flint**  
*Flint, MI*  
$164,000 – 14 mos.  
Flint National Service Accelerator Fund

**Crim Fitness Foundation**  
*Flint, MI*  
$135,000 – 12 mos.  
Capacity building

Foundation-Administered Project -$8,039  
Adjustment to previous grant

**United Way of Genesee County**  
*Flint, MI*  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes  
$150,000 – 18 mos.  
Building Excellence, Sustainability and Trust nonprofit capacity building

Subtotal: $5,503,334

**Special Initiatives**

**City of Flint**  
*Flint, MI*  
$235,700 – 24 mos.  
Flint 21st Century Community Policing

**Flint Area Congregations Together**  
*Flint, MI*  
$110,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

**Flint Downtown Development Authority**  
*Flint, MI* 
$18,000 – 36 mos.  
Downtown festivals

**Flint Jewish Federation**  
*Flint, MI*  
$150,000 – 18 mos.  
Capacity building  
$135,000 – 12 mos.  
Michigan State University  
*East Lansing, MI*  
$100,000 – 14 mos.  
Building Excellence, Sustainability and Trust nonprofit capacity building

Subtotal: $2,433,700

**Mount Hermon Missionary Baptist Church**  
*Flint, MI* 
$5,000 – 24 mos.  
African-American history calendar

Subtotal: $2,433,700

Program Area Total: $5,503,334

Strengthening Community

**Special Initiatives**

**City of Flint**  
*Flint, MI* 
$235,700 – 24 mos.  
Flint 21st Century Community Policing

**Flint Area Congregations Together**  
*Flint, MI*  
$110,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

**Flint Downtown Development Authority**  
*Flint, MI*  
$18,000 – 36 mos.  
Downtown festivals

**Flint Jewish Federation**  
*Flint, MI*  
$150,000 – 18 mos.  
Capacity building  
$135,000 – 12 mos.  
Michigan State University  
*East Lansing, MI*  
$100,000 – 14 mos.  
Building Excellence, Sustainability and Trust nonprofit capacity building

Subtotal: $2,433,700

Program Area Total: $2,433,700

Program Total: $41,253,692

Flint Area
Mission: To identify, test and help sustain pathways out of poverty for low-income people and communities.

**IMPROVING COMMUNITY EDUCATION**

**Goal:** To ensure that community education serves as a pathway out of poverty for children in low-income communities.

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**

- **Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth.** Policies and practices that ensure that vulnerable youth are prepared for college and careers.

- **Learning Beyond the Classroom.** High-quality learning beyond the classroom initiatives that increase student success by providing students with multiple ways of learning, anchored to high standards and aligned with educational resources throughout a community.

**EXPANDING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY**

**Goal:** To expand opportunity for those in, or at risk of, persistent poverty by promoting policies and programs that increase income and assets, help people connect to the labor market and enable them to advance into better-quality, higher-paying jobs.

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**

- **Income Security.** A social safety net that augments families’ efforts to escape poverty.

- **Reducing Barriers to Employment.** Innovative strategies that enable low-skill, low-income job seekers to enter the labor market.

- **Retention and Wage Progression.** Workforce development policies and practices that help low-income workers stay in the labor market and increase their earnings over time.

**BUILDING ORGANIZED COMMUNITIES**

**Goal:** To enhance the power and effectiveness of the community-organizing field in order to strengthen and sustain the involvement of low-income communities in shaping their futures.

**OBJECTIVE/WHAT WE SEEK:**

- **Building Community Organizing Infrastructure.** Strong and effective community-organizing networks at the national, regional and state levels that foster community engagement and positive change in poor communities.

**SPECIAL INITIATIVES**

**Goal:** To sustain promising practices and promote innovative and multidisciplinary approaches to reduce persistent poverty.

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**

- **Transitions.** Policies and practices that strengthen microenterprise in the United States in order to maximize its potential as a means for low-income entrepreneurs to escape from poverty.

- **Exploratory and Special Projects.** Flexibility to identify critical issues, seize special opportunities, research issues to determine future program directions and promote cross-cutting projects.
Mott’s long-term commitment to afterschool programming is anchored in the belief that providing all children, particularly those in underserved communities, with access to high-quality programs can close gaps in academic achievement and create important pathways to opportunity.

GRANT ACTIVITY:
$28,649,634 / 117 GRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPROVING COMMUNITY EDUCATION</th>
<th>GRANT DOLLARS (in millions)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth</td>
<td>$4,635</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Beyond the Classroom</td>
<td>$10,234</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPANDING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY</th>
<th>GRANT DOLLARS (in millions)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income Security</td>
<td>$2,602</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Barriers to Employment</td>
<td>$0.576</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention and Wage Progression</td>
<td>$5,289</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING ORGANIZED COMMUNITIES</th>
<th>GRANT DOLLARS (in millions)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Community Organizing Infrastructure</td>
<td>$3,142</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIAL INITIATIVES</th>
<th>GRANT DOLLARS (in millions)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>$0.520</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory and Special Projects</td>
<td>$1,652</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTALS                                  |                             | 117               |
**Improving Community Education**

**Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth**

- **American Institutes for Research**
  - *Washington, DC*
  - *$150,000 – 24 mos.*
  - Connecting and collaborating with key stakeholders to build pathways to education and the workforce for disconnected youth

- **Boston Private Industry Council**
  - *Boston, MA*
  - *$250,000 – 24 mos.*
  - Boston Youth Transitions Task Force: supporting city partnerships to address dropout crisis

- **Career Alliance Inc.**
  - *Flint, MI*
  - *$30,000 – 12 mos.*
  - Jobs for America’s graduates

- **Community Foundation for the National Capital Region**
  - *Washington, DC*
  - *$40,000 – 12 mos.*
  - Youth Transition Funders Group

- **Editorial Projects in Education**
  - *Bethesda, MD*
  - *$100,000 – 12 mos.*
  - Diplomas Count: The Graduation Project

- **Mott Community College**
  - *Flint, MI*
  - *$49,050 – 12 mos.*
  - Increasing literacy levels for at-risk youth in college-connected programs

- **National League of Cities Institute**
  - *Washington, DC*
  - *$250,000 – 12 mos.*
  - Municipal leadership for disconnected youth

- **National Youth Employment Coalition**
  - *Washington, DC*
  - *$225,000 – 24 mos.*
  - Building capacity and informing policy to better serve disconnected youth

**Philadelphia Youth Network**
- *Philadelphia, PA*
- *$248,000 – 24 mos.*
- Philadelphia youth transitions collaborative: supporting city partnerships to address dropout crisis

**Resource Genesee**
- *Flint, MI*
- *$95,000 – 12 mos.*
- Genesee County Out-of-School Youth Initiative

**School & Main Institute**
- *Boston, MA*
- *$268,000 – 12 mos.*
- Schools for the Future: developing new high school pathways and innovations for at-risk and struggling students

**University of Michigan-Flint**
- *Flint, MI*
- *$415,700 – 12 mos.*
- Precollege summer residential and academic year bridge program

**Youth Connection Charter School**
- *Chicago, IL*
- *$150,000 – 12 mos.*
- Career pathways program

**YouthBuild USA**
- *Somerville, MA*
- *$237,500 – 12 mos.*
- Developing sector strategies to position low-income youth for careers in high-demand sectors

**Youth Development Institute**
- *Washington, DC*
- *$2,000,000 – 24 mos.*
- Supporting national network of afterschool networks

**Collaborative Communications Group**
- *Washington, DC*
- *$1,546,000 – 24 mos.*
- Supporting national network of afterschool networks

**Education’s Next Horizon**
- *Baton Rouge, LA*
- *$225,000 – 12 mos.*
- Afterschool communications project

**Foundation-Administered Project**
- *$83,714*
- Afterschool technical assistance

**Learning Beyond the Classroom**

- **Afterschool Alliance**
  - *Washington, DC*
  - *$2,300,000 – 12 mos.*
  - General purposes
  - *$125,000 – 14 mos.*
  - VISTA project

- **After-School All-Stars**
  - *Los Angeles, CA*
  - *$250,000 – 24 mos.*
  - Middle school initiative

- **Afterschool Corporation**
  - *New York, NY*
  - *$250,000 – 18 mos.*
  - Expanded learning and afterschool initiative

- **Alaska Children’s Trust**
  - *Anchorage, AK*
  - *$225,000 – 36 mos.*
  - Alaska statewide afterschool network

- **Alliance for Excellent Education**
  - *Washington, DC*
  - *$100,000 – 12 mos.*
  - Digital learning in afterschool

- **American Institutes for Research**
  - *Washington, DC*
  - *$300,000 – 24 mos.*
  - Exploring statewide data systems for 21st century community learning centers

- **Boston Private Industry Council**
  - *Boston, MA*
  - *$250,000 – 24 mos.*
  - Integrating afterschool and school-community partnerships

- **Baltimore’s Safe & Sound Campaign**
  - *Baltimore, MD*
  - *$225,000 – 36 mos.*
  - Maryland statewide afterschool network

- **Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit**
  - *Milton, PA*
  - *$225,000 – 36 mos.*
  - Pennsylvania statewide afterschool network

- **Civic Canopy**
  - *Denver, CO*
  - *$15,000 – 12 mos.*
  - Colorado statewide afterschool partnership

- **LA’s BEST**
  - *Los Angeles, CA*
  - *$125,000 – 24 mos.*
  - General purposes

- **McLean Hospital**
  - *Belmont, MA*
  - *$500,000 – 12 mos.*
  - Increasing science, technology, engineering and math in afterschool

- **Michigan Association of United Ways**
  - *Lansing, MI*
  - *$225,000 – 36 mos.*
  - Michigan statewide afterschool network

- **Minnesota Department of Education**
  - *Roseville, MN*
  - *$225,000 – 36 mos.*
  - Minnesota statewide afterschool network

- **Mozilla Foundation**
  - *Mountain View, CA*
  - *$100,000 – 12 mos.*
  - Digital badges initiative

- **Nebraska Children and Families Foundation**
  - *Lincoln, NE*
  - *$225,000 – 36 mos.*
  - Nebraska statewide afterschool network

**FowlerHoffman**
- *Richmond, CA*
- *$200,000 – 12 mos.*
- Policy and messaging strategies for afterschool networks

**Harvard University**
- *Cambridge, MA*
- *$350,000 – 24 mos.*
- Supporting expanded learning and afterschool research

**Greater Gallatin United Way**
- *Bozeman, MT*
- *$15,000 – 12 mos.*
- Montana statewide afterschool partnership

**Kaho’omiki**
- *Honolulu, HI*
- *$15,000 – 12 mos.*
- Hawaii statewide afterschool partnership

**LA’s BEST**
- *Los Angeles, CA*
- *$125,000 – 24 mos.*
- General purposes

**McLean Hospital**
- *Belmont, MA*
- *$500,000 – 12 mos.*
- Increasing science, technology, engineering and math in afterschool

**Michigan Association of United Ways**
- *Lansing, MI*
- *$225,000 – 36 mos.*
- Michigan statewide afterschool network

**Minnesota Department of Education**
- *Roseville, MN*
- *$225,000 – 36 mos.*
- Minnesota statewide afterschool network

**Mozilla Foundation**
- *Mountain View, CA*
- *$100,000 – 12 mos.*
- Digital badges initiative

**Nebraska Children and Families Foundation**
- *Lincoln, NE*
- *$225,000 – 36 mos.*
- Nebraska statewide afterschool network
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laramie, WY</td>
<td>New Jersey School-Age Care Coalition</td>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Jersey statewide afterschool network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe, NM</td>
<td>New Mexico Public Education Department</td>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Mexico statewide afterschool network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelbyville, KY</td>
<td>Ohio Valley Educational Cooperative</td>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentucky statewide afterschool network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>Pacific Science Center</td>
<td>$50,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Science, technology, engineering and math fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>Partnership for Children and Youth</td>
<td>$30,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning in afterschool and summer project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>School’s Out Washington</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington statewide afterschool network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>United Way of Greater Atlanta</td>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia statewide afterschool network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin, TN</td>
<td>United Ways of Tennessee</td>
<td>$15,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee statewide afterschool partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise, ID</td>
<td>University of Idaho Foundation</td>
<td>$15,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho statewide afterschool partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>Virginia Child Care Resource and Referral Network</td>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia statewide afterschool network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laramie, WY</td>
<td>Wyoming Community Foundation</td>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming statewide afterschool network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laramie, WY</td>
<td>YWCA of Seattle-King County-Snohomish County</td>
<td>$150,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjustment to previous grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,234,132</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Beyond the Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,868,867</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improving Community Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPANDING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brookings Institution</strong></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Budgeting for national priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center on Budget and Policy Priorities</strong></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$950,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>State fiscal and low-income initiatives project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporation for Enterprise Development</strong></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal and state asset policy project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation-Administered Project</strong></td>
<td>$59,064</td>
<td>$20,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjustments to previous grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michigan Unemployment Insurance Project</strong></td>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New America Foundation</strong></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$400,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asset building program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philanthropy New York</strong></td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asset Funders Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Institute</strong></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Tax Policy Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington University</strong></td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>$463,016 – 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asset- and capacity-building meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,602,080</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reducing Barriers to Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goodwill Industries of Mid-Michigan Inc.</strong></td>
<td>Flint, MI</td>
<td>$136,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Michigan good temp alternative staffing organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICA Group</strong></td>
<td>Brookline, MA</td>
<td>$200,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Staffing Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US Ignite</strong></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$150,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flint US Ignite expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$576,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing Barriers to Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention and Wage Progression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspen Institute</strong></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$375,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sector Skills Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flint/Genesee Earn &amp; Learn Initiative</strong></td>
<td>$500,000 – 21 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low-wage work: what can we do to improve job quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Alliance Inc.</strong></td>
<td>Flint, MI</td>
<td>$200,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flint/Genesee Earn &amp; Learn Initiative</strong></td>
<td>$500,000 – 21 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus: HOPE</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$750,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insight Center for Community Economic Development</strong></td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>$400,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Network of Sector Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnering for Children</strong></td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>$225,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning southern sector initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Skills Coalition</strong></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$400,000 – 22 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership for Children</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$300,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prima Civitas Foundation</strong></td>
<td>East Lansing, MI</td>
<td>$113,552 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moving Ideas to Market Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest Housing Solutions</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$900,000 – 21 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit/Wayne Earn &amp; Learn Initiative – re-granting partnership with Open Society Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus: HOPE</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$750,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insight Center for Community</strong></td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>$225,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Replicate sectoral initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Skills Coalition</strong></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$400,000 – 22 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership for Children</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$300,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHI</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$200,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prima Civitas Foundation</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$113,552 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moving Ideas to Market Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest Housing Solutions</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$900,000 – 21 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit/Wayne Earn &amp; Learn Initiative – re-granting partnership with Open Society Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership for Children</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$300,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prima Civitas Foundation</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$113,552 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moving Ideas to Market Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest Housing Solutions</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$900,000 – 21 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit/Wayne Earn &amp; Learn Initiative – re-granting partnership with Open Society Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership for Children</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$300,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prima Civitas Foundation</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$113,552 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moving Ideas to Market Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest Housing Solutions</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$900,000 – 21 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit/Wayne Earn &amp; Learn Initiative – re-granting partnership with Open Society Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership for Children</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$300,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prima Civitas Foundation</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$113,552 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moving Ideas to Market Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest Housing Solutions</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$900,000 – 21 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit/Wayne Earn &amp; Learn Initiative – re-granting partnership with Open Society Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership for Children</strong></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$300,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUILDING ORGANIZED COMMUNITIES**

**Building Community Organizing Infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>Alliance for a Just Society</td>
<td>$80,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Alliance for Justice</td>
<td>$10,000 – 21 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resources for evaluating community organizing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Bend the Arc: A Jewish Partnership for Justice  
New York, NY  
$50,000 – 12 mos.  
Organizing apprenticeship program

Center for Community Change  
Washington, DC  
$300,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Intermediary support for organizing communities  
$58,000 – 20 mos.  
Documentation of IAF community organizing in Wisconsin

Community Catalyst  
Boston, MA  
$50,000 – 12 mos.  
Community learning partnership

Community Training and Assistance Center  
Boston, MA  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Intermediary support for organizing communities

Direct Action and Research Training Center  
Miami, FL  
$130,000 – 24 mos.  
DART Organizers Institute

Faith Action for Community Equity  
Honolulu, HI  
$65,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Foundation-Administered Project  
$47,943  
Intermediary support for organizing communities annual meeting

Gamaliel Foundation  
Chicago, IL  
$200,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Harriet Tubman Center  
Detroit, MI  
$100,000 – 15 mos.  
Michigan organizing collaborative

Interfaith Education Fund  
Austin, TX  
$96,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Isaiah Institute  
New Orleans, LA  
$30,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

National Council of La Raza  
Washington, DC  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Intermediary support for organizing communities

National Employment Law Project  
New York, NY  
$45,000 – 12 mos.  
Research and technical assistance to community organizing groups

National People’s Action  
Chicago, IL  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Intermediary support for organizing communities

PICO United Florida  
Orlando, FL  
$140,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Southern California Education Fund  
Los Angeles, CA  
$200,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Southern Echo Inc.  
Jackson, MS  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Intermediary support for organizing communities

Virginia Organizing Inc.  
Charlottesville, VA  
$10,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Washington Interfaith Network  
Washington, DC  
$180,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Western Organization of Resource Councils Education Project  
Billings, MT  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
Leadership and capacity building project

Subtotal:  
Building Community Organizing Infrastructure  
$3,141,943

Program Area Total:  
Building Organized Communities  
$3,141,943

SPECIAL INITIATIVES

Transitions

Aspen Institute  
Washington, DC  
$100,000 – 9 mos.  
MicroTest  
$100,000 – 8 mos.  
Demonstrating scale in domestic microenterprise

Association for Enterprise Opportunity  
Washington, DC  
$225,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Center for Rural Affairs  
Lyons, NE  
$95,000 – 12 mos.  
Rural microenterprise development

Subtotal:  
Transitions  
$520,000

Exploratory and Special Projects

Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan  
Detroit, MI  
$400,000 – 126 mos.  
New Economy Initiative for southeast Michigan

Harlem Children’s Zone  
New York, NY  
$200,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Michigan State University  
East Lansing, MI  
$102,192 – 13 mos.  
Fiscal solvency and service effectiveness project

Prima Civitas Foundation  
East Lansing, MI  
$850,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Sagawa/Jospin LLC  
Chevy Chase, MD  
$100,000 – 8 mos.  
Service as a strategy

Subtotal:  
Exploratory and Special Projects  
$1,652,192

Program Area Total:  
Special Initiatives  
$2,172,192

Program Total:  
Pathways Out of Poverty  
$28,649,634
EXPLORATORY AND SPECIAL PROJECTS

Mission: To support unusual or unique opportunities addressing significant national and international problems. (Proposals are by invitation only; unsolicited proposals are discouraged.)

EXPLORATORY AND SPECIAL PROJECTS

Historically and Predominantly Black Colleges and Universities

Phelps Stokes Fund
$50,000
Adjustment to previous grant

Subtotal: $50,000
Historically and Predominantly Black Colleges and Universities

Special Projects

Center for Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI
$50,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Council for Advancement of Adult Literacy
New York, NY
$35,000 – 9 mos.
Return on investment roundtable

Council of Michigan Foundations
Grand Haven, MI
$80,000 – 12 mos.
Office of Urban and Metropolitan Initiatives

Institute for Global Ethics
Rockport, ME
$200,000 – 19 mos.
Transition support

Southern Center for International Studies
~$100,000
Adjustment to previous grant

Vital Voices Global Partnership
Washington, DC
$50,000 – 9 mos.
Global leadership awards

William J. Clinton Foundation
New York, NY
$20,000 – 12 mos.
Clinton Global Initiative

Subtotal: $335,000
Special Projects

Program Total: $285,000
Exploratory and Special Projects

EMPLOYEE AND TRUSTEE GRANTS

In addition to its regular grantmaking, the Foundation also encourages charitable giving by its Trustees and staff. The Foundation’s match to these contributions is included as part of its total grant budget.

EMPLOYEE/TRUSTEE MATCHING AND TRUSTEE-INITIATED

Employee/Trustee Matching Grants

Program Area Total: $1,306,674
Employee/Trustee Matching

Trustee-Initiated Grants

Program Area Total: $840,000
Trustee-Initiated

Program Total: $2,146,674
Employee/Trustee Matching and Trustee-Initiated

TOTAL: $101,004,553
All Grants
In 2013, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation ended the year with nearly $2.6 billion in assets, an increase over the $2.3 billion in assets at the close of 2012.

### 2004–2013 Selected Financial Information (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets – Fair Value</td>
<td>$2,524.7</td>
<td>$2,477.3</td>
<td>$2,626.1</td>
<td>$2,711.5</td>
<td>$1,929.9</td>
<td>$2,079.9</td>
<td>$2,227.4</td>
<td>$2,159.9</td>
<td>$2,301.1</td>
<td>$2,584.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets – 2013 Dollars</td>
<td>3,091.9</td>
<td>2,933.6</td>
<td>3,032.8</td>
<td>3,008.6</td>
<td>2,139.4</td>
<td>2,244.6</td>
<td>2,368.3</td>
<td>2,230.5</td>
<td>2,329.6</td>
<td>2,584.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–Month Rolling Average Assets</td>
<td>2,361.9</td>
<td>2,407.0</td>
<td>2,507.0</td>
<td>2,707.4</td>
<td>2,380.2</td>
<td>1,916.0</td>
<td>2,063.4</td>
<td>2,227.7</td>
<td>2,246.8</td>
<td>2,393.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Investment Income (Loss)</td>
<td>287.8</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>290.5</td>
<td>245.0</td>
<td>(684.6)</td>
<td>289.3</td>
<td>275.5</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>252.7</td>
<td>401.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Investment Income (Loss) 2013 Dollars</td>
<td>352.5</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>335.5</td>
<td>271.9</td>
<td>(758.9)</td>
<td>312.2</td>
<td>292.9</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>255.8</td>
<td>401.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grants Awarded</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>123.2</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>110.4</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>101.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures*</td>
<td>136.3</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td>158.2</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>134.2</td>
<td>127.9</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>137.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Private foundations are required to make qualifying distributions (grant payments and reasonable administrative expenses) equal to roughly 5 percent of their average assets each year. The basis of the 5 percent calculation is a rolling, 12-month, average of the foundation’s investment assets.

*Total expenditures include grant payments, foundation-administered projects, administrative expenses, excise tax and investment expenses.
PROFILE: 2013 GRANTMAKING

Grantmaking Activities 2013

TOTAL GRANTS: 400

- Civil Society: 141 Grants (35.2%)
- Environment: 55 Grants (13.7%)
- Pathways Out of Poverty: 117 Grants (29.3%)
- Flint Area: 81 Grants (20.3%)
- Exploratory & Special Projects: 6 Grants (1.5%)

Does not include Employee/Trustee Matching & Trustee-Initiated Grants

2004–2013 Grants Awarded by Program (in millions)

- Civil Society: $19.7 / 19.5%
- Environment: $9.0 / 8.9%
- Flint Area: $41.3 / 40.8%
- Pathways Out of Poverty: $28.6 / 28.4%
- Exploratory & Special Projects: $.3 / .3%
- Employee/Trustee Matching & Trustee Initiated Grants: $2.1 / 2.1%

TOTAL: $101,004,553
REPORT OF INDEPENDENT CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Grant Thornton

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (the “Foundation”), which comprise the statements of financial position as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, and the related statements of activities and cash flows for the years then ended and the related notes to the financial statements.

Management’s responsibility for the financial statements
Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditor’s responsibility
Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits. We conducted our audits in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor’s judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the Foundation’s preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Foundation’s internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

Opinion
In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Charles Stewart Mott Foundation as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, and the results of its activities and its cash flows for the years then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Grant Thornton LLP
Southfield, Michigan
July 1, 2014
## STATESMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION

**Years Ended December 31,**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments, at fair value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 30,677,696</td>
<td>$ 58,160,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>575,097,218</td>
<td>481,980,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income securities</td>
<td>127,751,664</td>
<td>181,733,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – limited partnerships</td>
<td>1,320,751,924</td>
<td>1,092,985,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – nonpartnerships</td>
<td>502,429,137</td>
<td>468,890,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>6,711,870</td>
<td>6,028,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,563,419,509</td>
<td>$ 2,289,779,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>4,261,023</td>
<td>4,061,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued interest and dividends</td>
<td>679,938</td>
<td>1,697,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, building and improvements, net</td>
<td>3,520,727</td>
<td>3,591,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>12,110,818</td>
<td>2,010,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,583,992,015</td>
<td>$ 2,301,140,574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |            |            |
| **Liabilities and Unrestricted Net Assets** |            |            |
| Investment trades payable | $ 4,781,154 | $ 109,151  |
| Grants payable          | 9,262,720  | 21,257,356 |
| Accounts payable and other liabilities | 25,068,488  | 27,918,758 |
| Deferred excise tax     | 12,095,283 | 6,942,779  |
| **Total Liabilities**  | 51,207,645 | 56,228,044 |
| **Unrestricted Net Assets** | 2,532,784,370 | 2,244,912,530 |
| **Total Liabilities and Unrestricted Net Assets** | $ 2,583,992,015 | $ 2,301,140,574 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.
## STATEMENTS OF ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income:</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dividends and interest</td>
<td>$21,571,349</td>
<td>$24,941,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnership income (loss)</td>
<td>67,279,527</td>
<td>53,794,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net realized gain (loss) on investments</td>
<td>62,130,811</td>
<td>26,768,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net unrealized gain (loss) on investments</td>
<td>250,187,887</td>
<td>148,121,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income (expense)</td>
<td>1,247,501</td>
<td>(926,163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>402,417,075</strong></td>
<td><strong>252,699,220</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment expenses:</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct investment expenses</td>
<td>5,462,522</td>
<td>5,580,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for excise tax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>1,502,682</td>
<td>2,039,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred expense (income)</td>
<td>5,152,504</td>
<td>2,804,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investment expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,117,708</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,424,808</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net investment income**                     | 390,299,367| 242,274,412|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants and operating expenses:</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants, net of refunds</td>
<td>97,671,821</td>
<td>86,951,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation-administered projects</td>
<td>1,548,680</td>
<td>1,274,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration expenses</td>
<td>15,650,534</td>
<td>15,674,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Grants and Operating expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>114,871,035</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,900,773</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net operating income (loss)**               | 275,428,332| 138,373,639|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other changes in unrestricted net assets:</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pension-related changes other than net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periodic pension cost</td>
<td>10,267,610</td>
<td>(1,035,288)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postretirement health care-related changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other than net periodic benefit cost</td>
<td>2,175,898</td>
<td>(1,693,670)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in unrestricted net assets</td>
<td>287,871,840</td>
<td>135,644,681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unrestricted net assets:                   | 2013       | 2012       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of year</td>
<td>2,244,912,530</td>
<td>2,109,267,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of year</td>
<td>2,532,784,370</td>
<td>2,244,912,530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.
### STATEMENTS OF CASH Flows

#### Years Ended December 31,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash flows from operating activities:</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in unrestricted net assets</td>
<td>$287,871,840</td>
<td>$135,644,681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjustments to reconcile change in unrestricted net assets to cash used by operating activities:

- Net realized (gain) loss on investments: $(62,130,811)$(26,768,462)
- (Income) loss on limited partnerships: $(67,279,527)$(53,794,462)
- Net unrealized (gain) loss on investments: $(250,187,887)$(148,121,029)
- Depreciation expense: 283,503 292,930
- (Increase) decrease in accrued interest and dividends: 1,017,893 1,550,162
- (Increase) decrease in other assets: $(10,100,365)198,465
- Increase (decrease) in grants payable: $(11,994,636)2,039,364
- Increase (decrease) in accounts payable and other liabilities: $(2,850,270)791,551
- Increase (decrease) in deferred excise tax liability: 5,152,504 2,804,788

Total adjustments: $(398,089,596)$(221,006,693)

Net cash used by operating activities: $(110,217,756)$(85,362,012)

#### Cash flows from investing activities:

- Proceeds from sales or redemptions of investments: 559,640,735 447,153,709
- Purchases of investments: $(449,010,863)$(361,994,096)
- Acquisition of building improvements: $(212,643)$(8,570)

Net cash provided by investing activities: 110,417,229 85,151,043

#### Net increase (decrease) in cash

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash, beginning of year</td>
<td>4,061,550</td>
<td>4,272,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, end of year</td>
<td>$4,261,023</td>
<td>$4,061,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Supplemental disclosure of noncash investing activities:

- Investment trades receivable (payable) at year end, net: $1,930,716 $5,919,702

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

A. Mission and Grant Programs
   The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (the “Foundation”) is a private grantmaking foundation established in 1926 in Flint, Michigan. The Foundation’s mission is “to support efforts that promote a just, equitable and sustainable society.” The Foundation’s grantmaking activity is organized into four major programs: Civil Society, Environment, Flint Area and Pathways Out of Poverty. Other grantmaking opportunities, which do not match the major programs, are investigated through the Foundation’s Exploratory and Special Projects program.

B. Accounting Policies
   The following is a summary of significant accounting policies followed in the preparation of these financial statements.

METHOD OF ACCOUNTING
   The financial statements have been prepared on the accrual basis of accounting, which includes recognition of dividends, interest, and other income and expenses as earned or incurred. Trustee and Executive Committee grant actions are recognized as expense on the date of the action. Grants by the President or Executive Committee by specific authority conferred by the Trustees are recognized as expense on the date the authority is exercised. Grant expense is net of grant refunds.

INCOME TAXES
   The Foundation follows the authoritative guidance on accounting for and disclosure of uncertainty in tax positions (Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) – Accounting Standards Codification 740) which requires the Foundation to determine whether a tax position is more likely than not to be sustained upon examination, including resolution of any related appeals or litigation processes, based on the technical merits of the position.
   The Foundation has received a favorable determination letter from the Internal Revenue Service stating that it is exempt from federal income taxes under Section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code as an organization described in Sections 501(c)(3). However, unrelated business income is subject to taxation. There was no such tax liability in 2013 or 2012.

CASH EQUIVALENTS
   Cash equivalents with original maturities of three months or less are reflected at market value and include short-term notes and commercial paper, which are included with investments.

CONCENTRATION OF CREDIT RISK
   The Foundation maintains certain cash accounts, the balances of which, at times, may exceed federally insured limits. The Foundation has not experienced any losses in such accounts. Management believes the Foundation is not exposed to any significant credit risk on cash.

OTHER ASSETS
   Included in other assets are prepaid pension expense and land and buildings that were purchased by the Foundation for charitable purposes and are recorded at cost.
**LAND, BUILDING AND IMPROVEMENTS**

Land, building and improvements are recorded at cost. Upon sale or retirement of land, building and improvements, the cost and related accumulated depreciation are eliminated, and the resulting gain or loss is included in current income. Depreciation of building and improvements is provided over the estimated useful lives of the respective assets on a straight-line basis, ranging from 6 to 50 years. Depreciation expense for the year December 31, 2013, and 2012, was $283,503 and $292,930, respectively.

Costs of office furnishings and equipment are consistently charged to expense because the Foundation does not deem such amounts to be sufficiently material to warrant capitalization and depreciation.

A summary of land, building and improvement holdings at year end is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$ 397,852</td>
<td>$ 397,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and</td>
<td>9,357,158</td>
<td>9,368,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less accumulated</td>
<td>(6,234,283)</td>
<td>(6,174,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,520,727</td>
<td>$ 3,591,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESTIMATES**

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities, and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements, and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

**INVESTMENTS**

Equity investments with readily determinable fair values, and all debt securities, are recorded on the trade date and are stated at market value based primarily on December 31 published quotations. Gains and losses from sales of securities are determined on an average cost basis.

Equity investments that do not have readily determinable fair values, representing amounts in venture capital and limited partnerships, are recorded on the trade date. These investments are stated at an estimate of fair value as determined in good faith by the general partner or fund managers. The Foundation believes the amounts recorded approximate fair value.

The Foundation’s 18.4 percent investment in United States Sugar Corporation (USSC), a non-publicly traded security with no readily determinable fair value, is priced based on an independent valuation of the USSC stock on a non-marketable minority interest basis.

The Foundation is party to certain limited partnership agreements, whereby the Foundation is committed to invest future funds into these partnerships. As of December 31, 2013, the Foundation has $348.7 million in outstanding limited partnership commitments, including both domestic and international partnerships.

Temporary investments in partnerships that are publicly traded and where the Foundation has no committed capital are included with equity securities and not limited partnerships for financial statement presentation.
FUNCTIONAL ALLOCATION OF EXPENSES

The costs of operating the Foundation have been allocated among program-related, communications and administrative expenses (all of which are included with administration expenses on the Statement of Activities). Program-related expenses pertain principally to the direct programmatic grantmaking functions of the Foundation, such as reviewing proposals and awarding, monitoring and evaluating grants, whereas communications expenses include activities directly related to the Foundation’s external communications efforts. Administrative expenses include all other nonprogram and noncommunications related operating expenses of the Foundation.

INVESTMENT TRADES RECEIVABLE AND PAYABLE

Investment trades receivable represent investments that have been sold with a trade date in the current year but for which the funds have not been received until the subsequent year. The pending cash equivalent to be received from such trades is classified as an investment for balance sheet purposes. Investment trades payable represent investments that have been purchased with a trade date in the current year but for which the funds have not been sent until the subsequent year. This commitment to settle the trade is classified as a liability for balance sheet purposes.

RECLASSIFICATIONS

Certain amounts in the 2012 statements have been reclassified to conform to the 2013 presentation.

C. Investment Securities

The following is a summary of cost and approximate fair values of the investment securities held at December 31 (in thousands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair Value</td>
<td>Cost Basis</td>
<td>Fair Value</td>
<td>Cost Basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 30,678</td>
<td>$ 30,677</td>
<td>$ 58,160</td>
<td>$ 58,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>$ 575,097</td>
<td>$ 465,858</td>
<td>$ 481,980</td>
<td>$ 409,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income securities</td>
<td>$ 127,752</td>
<td>$ 117,574</td>
<td>$ 181,733</td>
<td>$ 160,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
<td>$ 1,320,752</td>
<td>$ 966,398</td>
<td>$ 1,092,986</td>
<td>$ 907,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpartnerships</td>
<td>$ 502,429</td>
<td>$ 355,857</td>
<td>$ 468,891</td>
<td>$ 377,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>$ 6,712</td>
<td>$ 6,712</td>
<td>$ 6,029</td>
<td>$ 6,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,563,420</td>
<td>$ 1,943,076</td>
<td>$ 2,289,779</td>
<td>$ 1,919,623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
Investments valued at Net Asset Value (NAV) as of December 31, 2013, consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
<th>Unfunded Commitments</th>
<th>Redemption Frequency if applicable</th>
<th>Redemption Notice Period if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities (a)</td>
<td>$ 416,774,438</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>Quarterly to Annual</td>
<td>5 days to 4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships (b)</td>
<td>1,320,751,924</td>
<td>348,700,000</td>
<td>Quarterly to Annual</td>
<td>5 days to 4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total investments at NAV</td>
<td>$ 1,737,526,362</td>
<td>$ 348,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) This category includes investments in real estate funds, hedge funds and international equity. The NAV of the real estate funds is as provided by the fund and determined using the fair value option or depreciable cost basis of the underlying assets. The NAV of the hedge and international equity funds is as provided by the fund using various observable and unobservable market valuation techniques as allowed by the FASB. The majority of the hedge funds offer quarterly to annual liquidity options that require advance notice from five business days to four months, with various “lock-up” and “gate” provisions, while the real estate funds do not offer redemption options.

(b) This category includes investments in private equity funds, public equity funds, hedge funds, real estate funds and energy funds. The NAV of these funds is as provided by the general partner or fund manager using various observable and unobservable market valuation techniques as allowed by the FASB. The majority of the hedge funds offer quarterly to annual liquidity options that require advance notice from five business days to four months, with various “lock-up” and “gate” provisions, while the private equity, real estate and energy funds do not offer redemption options. The public equity funds offer a monthly redemption frequency with 30 days’ notice.

See footnote D for additional information regarding fair value measurements.

Due to the various liquidity limitations on the above referenced funds, the Foundation maintains a significant portion of its investments in highly liquid and other Level 1 assets so as to ensure that grantmaking and administrative expense needs are covered into the foreseeable future.

The Foundation has significant amounts of investment instruments. Investment securities, in general, are exposed to various risks, such as interest rate, credit and overall market volatility. Due to the level of risk associated with certain investment securities, it is reasonably possible that changes in the values of investment securities will occur in the near term and that such changes could materially affect the amounts reported in the financial statements.
D. Fair Value Measurements

Fair Value is defined as the exchange price that would be received for an asset or paid to transfer a liability (an exit price) in the principal or most advantageous market for the asset or liability in an orderly transaction between market participants on the measurement date. In accordance with the authoritative guidance on fair value measurements and disclosures under generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP), the Foundation adopted a framework for measuring fair value under GAAP that establishes a fair value hierarchy, which requires an entity to maximize the use of observable inputs and minimize the use of unobservable inputs when measuring fair value. The standard describes three levels of inputs that may be used to measure fair value:

**Level 1** — Quoted market prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities.

**Level 2** — Observable inputs other than Level 1 prices such as quoted prices for similar assets or liabilities; quoted prices in markets that are not active; or other inputs that are observable or can be corroborated by observable market data for substantially the full term of the assets or liabilities.

**Level 3** — Unobservable inputs that are supported by little or no market activity and that are significant to the fair value of the assets or liabilities. Level 3 assets and liabilities include financial instruments for which fair value is determined using pricing models, discounted cash flow methodologies or similar techniques, as well as instruments for which the determination of fair value requires significant management judgment or estimation. This category generally includes certain private debt and equity instruments and alternative investments. Also included in Level 3 are investments measured using NAV per share, or its equivalent, that can never be redeemed at the NAV or for which redemption at NAV is uncertain due to lock-up periods or other investment restrictions.

Generally, assets held at the Foundation’s custodian, Comerica Bank, include cash equivalents, U.S. government obligations, corporate bonds and equity securities, which are publicly traded in active markets and are considered Level 1 assets. Equity securities purchased and held directly by the Foundation include private equities, hedge funds, real estate funds and energy funds.

The following discussion describes the valuation methodologies used for financial assets measured at fair value. The techniques utilized in estimating the fair values are affected by the assumptions used, including discount rates and estimates of the amount and timing of future cash flows. Care should be exercised in deriving conclusions about the Foundations’ financial position based on the fair value information of financial assets presented below.

The valuation of nonpublic or alternative investments requires significant judgment by the General Partner or Fund Manager due to the absence of quoted market values, inherent lack of liquidity and the long-term nature of such assets. Private equity investments are valued initially based upon transaction price excluding expenses. Year-end valuations are as provided by the General Partner or Fund Manager, which are tied to capital statements and/or audited financial statements when available and are carried at NAV or its equivalent. These valuations include estimates, appraisals, assumptions and methods that are reviewed by the Foundation’s independent investment advisors and management.
The following table presents the investments carried on the statement of financial position by level within the valuation hierarchy as of December 31, 2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 30,677,696</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 30,677,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>575,097,218</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>575,097,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income securities</td>
<td>127,751,664</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>127,751,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>1,320,751,924</td>
<td>1,320,751,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpartnerships</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>502,429,137</td>
<td>502,429,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>6,711,870</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>6,711,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 740,238,448</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 1,823,181,061</td>
<td>$ 2,563,419,509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of Level 3 activity for the year is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance, December 31, 2012</th>
<th>$ 1,561,876,634</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchases</td>
<td>194,416,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>(234,874,184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized gains/Partnership income</td>
<td>77,413,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized gains</td>
<td>224,348,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance, December 31, 2013</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,823,181,061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table presents the investments carried on the statement of financial position by level within the valuation hierarchy as of December 31, 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 58,160,123</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 58,160,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>481,980,259</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>481,980,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income securities</td>
<td>181,733,284</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>181,733,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>1,092,985,976</td>
<td>1,092,985,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpartnerships</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>468,890,658</td>
<td>468,890,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>6,028,853</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>6,028,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 727,902,519</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 1,561,876,634</td>
<td>$ 2,289,779,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A summary of Level 3 activity for the year is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance, December 31, 2011</th>
<th>$ 1,430,356,221</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchases</td>
<td>219,932,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>(238,328,908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized gains/Partnership income</td>
<td>61,957,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized gains</td>
<td>87,958,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance, December 31, 2012</td>
<td>$ 1,561,876,634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transfers in and out of Level 3 assets are as denoted by “Purchases” and “Sales” in the summary of Level 3 activity schedules above, whereas the funds used to make purchases of Level 3 assets are generally made from liquid (Level 1) funds and likewise, sales or maturities of Level 3 assets are generally received as cash (Level 1) and deposited into liquid fund assets. Purchases of Level 3 assets are made in accordance with the Foundation’s investment policy to maintain targeted levels of such assets, which are balanced against the liquidity needs of the Foundation for purposes of making grants and covering operating expenses, and to achieve an overall growth in investments sufficient to meet various required distribution calculations. Sales and maturities represent a combination of predesignated capital distributions from partnerships whose specific timing is generally determined by the partnership but that, overall, is an expected and integral part of the partnership agreement. Other sales of Level 3 assets, whereby such is not predesignated, are based on the Foundation’s liquidity needs, maintaining targeted levels of various assets as proscribed by the investment policy, and in certain instances where the Foundation and its investment committee decide to take funds out of a given investee due to poor performance or otherwise better opportunities deemed available with other investees.

E. Excise Tax and Distribution Requirements

The Foundation is exempt from federal income taxes under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC), but is subject to a 2 percent (1 percent if certain criteria are met) federal excise tax on net investment income, including realized gains, as defined in the IRC. The current excise tax is provided at 1 percent for 2013 and 2 percent for 2012. The deferred excise tax provision is calculated assuming a 2 percent rate and is based on the projected gains/losses that assume complete liquidation of all assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excise tax payable</td>
<td>$ 142,682</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred excise tax liability</td>
<td>12,095,283</td>
<td>6,942,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 12,237,965</td>
<td>$ 7,542,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excise tax payments of $1,960,000 and $1,200,000 were paid in 2013 and 2012, respectively.

IRC Section 4942 requires that a private foundation make annual minimum distributions based on the value of its noncharitable use assets or pay an excise tax for the failure to meet the minimum distribution requirements. For the year ended December 31, 2013, the Foundation made qualifying distributions in excess of the required minimum distribution by approximately $8.4 million. The Foundation has $78.3 million in prior year excess distributions, resulting in a net accumulated over-distribution of $86.7 million to be carried forward to 2014.
F. Grants Payable

Grants payable at December 31, 2013, are expected to be paid as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMS</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>$ 4,308,645</td>
<td>$ 822,000</td>
<td>$ 130,000</td>
<td>$ 5,260,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>1,023,535</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,283,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Area</td>
<td>425,037</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>462,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways Out of Poverty</td>
<td>1,795,811</td>
<td>467,500</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,313,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants payable</td>
<td>7,583,028</td>
<td>1,610,500</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>9,379,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Unamortized discount</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>99,792</td>
<td>17,016</td>
<td>116,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 7,583,028</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,510,708</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 168,984</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 9,262,720</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the Foundation has also approved grants that require certain conditions to be met by the grantee. Conditional grants excluded from the Foundation’s financial statements totaled $1,173,000 and $2,479,959 as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

Grant activity for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undiscounted grants payable, January 1</td>
<td>$ 21,510,305</td>
<td>$ 19,471,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants approved</td>
<td>102,311,512</td>
<td>89,680,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>123,821,817</strong></td>
<td><strong>109,151,606</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less grants paid by program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>24,954,406</td>
<td>15,843,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>11,513,419</td>
<td>7,977,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Area</td>
<td>41,598,500</td>
<td>32,767,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways Out of Poverty</td>
<td>33,464,290</td>
<td>28,360,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>2,911,674</td>
<td>2,691,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undiscounted grants payable, December 31</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 9,379,528</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 21,510,305</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Exploratory, Special Projects and Matching Gifts Program.
G. Pension and Other Postretirement Benefits

The Foundation sponsors a qualified defined benefit pension plan covering substantially all employees along with an unfunded nonqualified plan for restoration of pension benefits lost due to statutory limitations imposed upon qualified plans. In addition, the Foundation sponsors an unfunded postretirement medical plan for all eligible employees. The qualified defined benefit pension plan is funded in accordance with the minimum funding requirements of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act.

Basic information is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in ($000)</th>
<th>Pension Benefits</th>
<th>Postretirement Health-Care Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit obligation at December 31</td>
<td>$ (51,727)</td>
<td>$ (53,862)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair value of plan assets at December 31</td>
<td>55,445</td>
<td>46,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded status at December 31</td>
<td>$ 3,718</td>
<td>$ (7,653)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts recognized in the statements of financial position:

- Prepaid benefit included with other assets: $ 9,716
- Accrued benefit liability included with accounts payable and other liabilities: $(5,998)

Net amount recognized: $ 3,718

Employer contributions: $ 2,748
Benefit payments: $(1,879)

Components of net periodic benefit cost:

- Service cost: $ 1,538
- Interest cost: 2,051
- Expected return on assets: $(3,502)
- Amortization of net loss: 1,502
- Amortization of prior service cost: 55

Net periodic benefit cost: $ 1,644

BENEFIT OBLIGATIONS

The accumulated benefit obligation of the nonqualified pension plan was $5,997,639 and $4,749,453 as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively. The accumulated benefit obligation of the qualified plan was $41,570,058 and $43,672,995 as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.
The assumptions used in the measurement of the Foundation’s benefit obligations and net periodic benefit costs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pension Benefits</th>
<th>Postretirement Health-Care Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate (benefit obligation)</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate (net periodic cost)</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected return on plan assets</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation increase (benefit obligation)</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation increase (net periodic cost)</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For measurement purposes, an initial annual rate of 7 percent for Pre-65 and 5 percent for Post-65 in the per capita cost of health care was used. These rates were assumed to decrease gradually each year to an ultimate rate of 4.5 percent by year 2019.

**ASSET HOLDINGS**

The investment strategy is to manage investment risk through prudent asset allocation that will produce a rate of return commensurate with the plan’s obligations. The Foundation’s expected long-term rate of return on plan assets is based upon historical and future expected returns of multiple asset classes as analyzed to develop a risk-free real rate of return for each asset class. The overall rate of return for each asset class was developed by combining a long-term inflation component, the risk-free real rate of return and the associated risk premium.

A summary of asset holdings in the pension plan at year end is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>2013 Percent of Assets</th>
<th>2013 Target Allocation</th>
<th>2012 Percent of Assets</th>
<th>2012 Target Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic stock</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International stock</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real asset</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt securities</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table presents the pension assets by level within the valuation hierarchy as of December 31, 2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ 33,327,869</td>
<td>$ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,758,411</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real asset</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,773,725</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt securities</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>16,585,293</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ 55,445,298</td>
<td>$ –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS**

The Foundation expects to contribute $2,143,440 to its pension plans and $560,000 to its postretirement medical plan in 2014. For the unfunded plans, contributions are deemed equal to expected benefit payments.

**EXPECTED BENEFIT PAYMENTS**

The Foundation expects to pay the following amounts for pension benefits, which reflect future service as appropriate, and expected postretirement benefits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pension Plans</th>
<th>Postretirement Health Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$ 2,983,440</td>
<td>$ 560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,083,440</td>
<td>620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3,053,440</td>
<td>620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3,113,440</td>
<td>670,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3,103,440</td>
<td>660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2023</td>
<td>16,277,200</td>
<td>3,990,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEFINEd CONTRIBUTION 401(k) PLAN**

In addition to the above, the Foundation maintains a 401(k) defined contribution retirement plan for all eligible employees. The Foundation matches employee contributions up to $3,000 per year. For the years ending December 31, 2013 and 2012, the Foundation contributed $207,723 and $215,870, respectively.
H. Subsequent Events
The Foundation evaluated its December 31, 2013, financial statements for subsequent events through July 1, 2014, the date the financial statements were available to be issued. The Foundation is not aware of any subsequent events that would require recognition or disclosure in the financial statements.

Administration and Investment Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration Total</th>
<th>Investment Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$ 7,733,299</td>
<td>$ 7,494,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personnel costs</td>
<td>4,547,527</td>
<td>4,637,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>1,401,486</td>
<td>1,397,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>930,814</td>
<td>1,044,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and business expenses</td>
<td>893,818</td>
<td>901,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and contract services</td>
<td>143,590</td>
<td>197,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 15,650,534</td>
<td>$ 15,674,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is with great sadness that the C.S. Mott Foundation marked the passing of Claire Mott White on March 24, 2014. Elected to the Foundation’s Board of Trustees in 1997, she was a granddaughter of Charles Stewart Mott, the daughter of C.S. Harding Mott, and the wife of William S. White, chairman, president and CEO of the Foundation.

Though she came from a prominent family, Claire was a private person who always put the needs and interests of family and friends before her own. Family members describe her as a humble servant who generously shared her time, talent and good fortune with others. As a Trustee, she was known for her common sense and ability to ask questions that went directly to the heart of whatever issue was being discussed.

An accomplished artist and ceramics instructor, Claire served on many local and national boards and was the recipient of several awards, including the Community Foundation of Greater Flint’s 2006 Libby Award for her work on behalf of women and girls. Along with her husband, Bill, she shared in the 2007 Guvvy Award — the Michigan Governor’s Award — for lifetime achievement in supporting the arts and culture. In 2005, the Flint Institute of Arts, where she had served as a board member since 1997, named its renovated studio wing in her honor, acknowledging her lifelong commitment to the museum and its school.

She twice served as chair of the board for her church in Flint. Known for her quiet leadership, positive energy and gentle guidance, she also was a great asset to many national and local nonprofits working on behalf of young people.

She is fondly remembered and greatly missed.
TRUSTEE NEWS

On January 1, 2014, Lizabeth Ardisana joined the Foundation’s Board of Trustees. She is co-founder and principal owner of ASG Renaissance, a Dearborn, Michigan-based technical and communications services firm.

Prior to founding ASG Renaissance, Ardisana was an engineer for the Ford Motor Company. Daughter of a career military officer, she spent her early years living in the Philippines, Japan and Germany, as well as Illinois, Alabama and Texas. As a business owner and member of numerous local, state and national boards, she brings a wealth of knowledge and practical experience to the Foundation’s Board.

At the time of Ardisana’s election, Trustees A. Marshall Acuff Jr., John Morning and William H. Piper each were re-elected for three-year terms.

John K. Butler, who was a vice president, director and investment manager with Mairs and Power, Inc., in St. Paul, Minnesota, became a member of the Foundation’s Investment Committee in January 2014. John has been a trustee of the Patrick and Aimee Butler Family Foundation since 1990. Aimee Butler was a daughter of Charles Stewart Mott.

Alan Van Noord, who also joined the Investment Committee, retired as chief investment officer of the Pennsylvania Public School Retirement System in 2013, where he served since 2002. Prior to that, he was director of the Bureau of Investments and chief investment officer of the State of Michigan Retirement System.

STAFF NEWS

Kathryn Thomas was named vice president of communications in February 2014. Previously a senior communications officer for the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation in Princeton, New Jersey, Thomas brings extensive experience in strategic communications and policy advocacy to her new role with Mott. She succeeds Carol D. Rugg, who retired in December 2013 after a 28-year career with the Foundation.

Our best wishes go with Jeanette “Gay” McArthur, who retired in September 2014 as Library Administrative Assistant after almost 15 years with the Foundation.

This year, we also bid farewell to Jack A. Litzenberg, who died May 6, 2014, in Grand Blanc, Michigan. For nearly three decades until his retirement in 2012, Jack was a leading force in the Foundation’s efforts to address poverty and help low-income people succeed in education and the workforce. In 1994, the Council on Foundations honored Jack with its Robert W. Scrivner Award for innovation and creativity in grantmaking.
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