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C.S. Mott has a chat with Flint student Jack Grenier circa 1940s.
Mott’s 2016 annual report, “90 Years Young,” is a bit different from past books. First and foremost, it is a historical document, giving us the opportunity to share some of the accomplishments the Foundation and its grantees have achieved through the years. We believe they help illustrate why philanthropy continues to play a critical role in maintaining a healthy and vigorous society.
You may be curious as to why we chose “90 Years Young” as our theme. Nine decades of grantmaking certainly put us in the senior category of current foundations. However, in thinking about which entries we would include on the timeline in the next section of this report — and let me state right now that space limited the inclusion of many excellent initiatives — we began to realize that, through the years, we have adapted, retooled and at times reconsidered our approach to problems. And that, I believe, has helped keep our perspective and grantmaking practices fresh, curious and young. We continue to learn with each passing day, month and year.

As the world changes, we strive to change, all the while doing our best to maintain the core values that were important to our founder, Charles Stewart Mott. I think he would approve of our efforts. If you were to analyze his record as a businessman and philanthropist, you would soon realize Mr. Mott was an informed risk-taker. The automobile business at the turn of the 20th century was like the digital sector today, and he was a key player in it. He took calculated risks and achieved great returns. As a foundation, this is what we try to do today.

It bears mentioning that, when Mr. Mott revised the Foundation’s trust instrument in 1971, he knew both that change was going to occur and that he had the ability to limit it. He chose not to do so. Instead, he wanted the Foundation’s trustees to have the flexibility to adapt to new challenges. Anticipating and addressing change has been an ongoing focus at the Mott Foundation. I hope you will see that in the pages that follow.
Harvesting our history

Over the years, I’ve given some thought to how I might frame the Foundation’s history. The exercise was prompted by a question raised at a Foundation-wide retreat. Following a presentation about Mott’s major grantmaking interests, one of our newer employees raised her hand and innocently asked, “Who was Frank Manley?” At least half the room burst into laughter, but a good many people were just as puzzled about my casual reference to the man who, along with Mr. Mott, created a model of community education that eventually was adopted by thousands of school districts across the country and around the world.

You see, Mr. Manley was a remarkable local educator who was instrumental in giving shape and focus to Mr. Mott’s young foundation. Back in the 1930s, they together developed and implemented a comprehensive urban education program that changed the way citizens viewed — and used — their school buildings. Their work remains one of the Mott Foundation’s greatest accomplishments.

How had our young program officer missed that important legacy? And how had we managed to let our history recede to the point where new staff were unaware of the creativity, hard work and accomplishments that served as a basis for so much of what they were trying to accomplish in the present?

The idea of preserving our heritage as a grantmaking and learning institution became all the more important to me that day.

Historians and the Foundation’s own trustees have long warned of the dangers of forgetting the past — with good reason. Not only does it encourage the repetition of mistakes, it inspires a certain kind of arrogance that exaggerates the accomplishments of the present. At the Mott Foundation, we owe a great debt of gratitude to those who came before us — the trustees, staff and grantees who breathed life into ideas.

If you will indulge someone who has been with the Foundation in one role or another for more than half of its 90 years, I’d like to paint some of our work in the context of the Foundation’s evolution and share some lessons we have learned that may be helpful to others. I also want to pay tribute to some of the individuals and organizations that have gotten us this far. Their work is both instructive and worth remembering.

Frank Manley (right) and C.S. Mott partnered to change the way communities used their schools. Photo circa 1940s.

At the Mott Foundation, we owe a great debt of gratitude to those who came before us — the trustees, staff and grantees who breathed life into ideas.

The Mott Foundation:
A work in progress

I believe the Mott Foundation’s nine decades of work — focusing initially on the children living in our home community of Flint and in 2016 surpassing a cumulative $3 billion in grants benefiting organizations here and around the globe — have helped people in important and sometimes surprising ways. When people tell us that their lives — or the lives of others they know and love — have been transformed by a program we supported, well, that is what I call a great return on investment.

Mistakes — we’ve made a few — and they are worth remembering as well. Martha Graham, the great choreographer and dancer, said, “It is so important to know what came before you. It is also important to understand that things will follow you, and they may come along and make your work look pedestrian and silly. This is fine; this is progress.”

Our founder, Charles Stewart Mott, understood the creativity, hard work, attention to detail and persistence required to make progress. In 1907, he moved his axle...
business to Flint at the invitation of Billy Durant, founder of General Motors. Mr. Mott also served as mayor of Flint and was actively involved in what today we would call the social service sector. He was witness to times of incredible, chaotic change — and progress — as his adopted hometown of Flint became a center of automobile manufacturing.

In June of 1926, Mr. Mott entered into a declaration of trust in the state of Michigan that marked the creation of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. His initial gift to the Foundation was 2,000 shares of General Motors stock, then valued at $160 a share. Early grantmaking reflected the various interests of his family, with an emphasis on education, children’s health and the arts.

Mr. Mott’s concern for the welfare of local children — particularly those living in impoverished situations — emerged between 1926 and 1934, the years we refer to as the first stage of the Foundation’s development. While many grants were made to provide direct services, many more were made to encourage partnership among organizations, agencies and concerned citizens. Early on, Mr. Mott observed, “It seems to me that every person, always, is in a kind of informal partnership with his community.” This has been a guiding principle for our grantmaking ever since.

The second stage of the Foundation’s development corresponded with a chance meeting between Mr. Mott and Mr. Manley, who, in the spring of 1935, made a presentation to the local Rotary. Mr. Manley, then supervisor of physical education for the Flint Board of Education, also directed the Federal Emergency Relief Administration’s operations in the city. Having seen firsthand the toll the Great Depression was taking on local families, and goaded by the recent drowning of a young boy in the Flint River, he gave an impassioned speech that day. He first berated and then challenged Rotarians to take action to enlarge the “Flint Plan of Recreation,” which had been started the previous summer to reduce the high number of injuries and fatalities among children and teenagers.

The success of the recreation program, which was credited with helping to reduce child fatalities by 25 percent its first year, coupled with a vision of a planned and comprehensive program of year-round recreation based in Flint’s underused school buildings, convinced Mr. Mott to advance some funds. The Flint Board of Education used an initial grant of $6,000 to open several schools for programming during the winter. The Foundation also agreed to finance summer activities.

And so a model for community education was born, utilizing neighborhood schools as hubs for citizen engagement. The program relied on three operating principles that would become central values of the Foundation’s grantmaking: the importance of people, partnership with others and the role of institutions in helping to express concern for fellow citizens.
Suffice it to say, the idea caught fire — first in Flint, then in Michigan, then across the United States and ultimately around the world. Through the mid-1960s, the Mott Foundation dedicated a significant portion of our grantmaking to refining the Flint model of community education, funding the Flint Board of Education to serve as a demonstration site for a growing number of visitors eager to learn more about the city’s “lighted schoolhouses.”

The third stage of the Foundation’s development began in 1963, when C.S. “Harding” Mott convinced his father to transfer stocks and securities, then valued at $195 million, to the Mott Foundation’s endowment. That gift catapulted the Foundation into the ranks of the country’s largest philanthropies and presented an opportunity to expand the scope of our grantmaking, both programmatically and geographically.

During this stage, the Foundation worked on its own infrastructure, reinventing its operating policies and procedures and expanding the board of trustees. Joseph Anderson, a former vice president of General Motors who was elected to the board in 1962 and served for 23 years, wrote the first formal philosophy statement of the Foundation in 1964.

A year later, Harding succeeded his father as president, while Mr. Mott retained the title of treasurer and became honorary chairman of the board of trustees. A quiet, self-effacing man, Harding shouldered the responsibilities of modernizing the Foundation’s operations and, through the mid-1970s, helped position the institution for long-term growth.

A charter trustee who successively held every key Foundation post, Harding’s foresight and leadership helped guide the institution through a remarkable 63 years of social change.

For the record, I arrived on the scene in 1968. Harding was my father-in-law, and he brought me in from Bruce Payne & Associates as a management consultant to assist with these issues. A consensus builder and enabler, Harding was a great mentor to me. His interests in the national expansion of community education and the redevelopment of downtown Flint remain central in our grantmaking today.

Ramping up the Foundation’s grantmaking demanded the development of a larger professional staff. In compliance with the 1969 Tax Act, Mr. Mott revised and refreshed the Articles of Incorporation, clarifying the future governance of the institution.

If there was a theme to the Foundation’s work between 1963 and 1975, it was change. Change in leadership — Mr. Mott passed away in 1973 and Mr. Manley a year earlier. Change at the board level — Roy Brownell, an original board member, Mr. Mott’s lawyer and his close friend, died in 1971. Ruth Rawlings Mott, who became a board member in 1943, transitioned to trustee emeritus in 1975, serving in that capacity until her death in 1999. Change at the staff level — Financial Vice President Robert McCullough, who for 19 years handled the Foundation’s investments, retired in 1974. Finally, changes in program...
and management structures and business procedures prompted a focus on planning for the future.

By 1970, the Foundation had broadened its interests beyond funding community education to include what we then termed "urban" projects. We recognized that the best educational system in the world could not be the solution to all community problems. Through our work with community schools, we understood that the root causes of poverty, inequality, crime and a host of social issues were connected, complicated and not easily cured.

Throughout 1975, trustees and staff together identified the elements or principles they believed contributed to an effective community. That effort resulted in a more comprehensive and detailed program philosophy, which was written as a plan of action for the Foundation. It contained elements dealing with governance, grantmaking, evaluation, management and finance.

With this document as a guide, the Foundation entered our fourth stage of development in 1976, which is also when I became president of the organization, and Harding became chairman of the board. He was the first person to hold the official title and position.

During the decade or so that followed, the Foundation took many of the lessons we learned in Flint and began developing programs on a national basis. In 1979, we made our first grants to strengthen community foundations. We have long been impressed by the simplicity and power that underlies the community foundation concept, which empowers people to support causes close to their homes and their hearts. Those grants marked the beginning of a multi-year effort to strengthen the community foundation movement nationwide.

By 1982, we joined forces with the Council on Foundations to launch a technical assistance program to assist 75 community foundations with developing staff, boards, donors, endowments, grantmaking programs and marketing strategies. I'm getting ahead of myself here, but eventually we would take the lessons we learned in the U.S. to the United Kingdom, South Africa and Eastern Europe.

It was during this period that we also partnered with other Michigan philanthropies to establish the Council of Michigan Foundations (CMF), a vanguard of the effort to create regional associations of grantmakers that could represent our sector. Forty years on, CMF — now one of 36 such associations across the country — continues to be at the forefront of helping organized philanthropy achieve impact while serving effectively, transparently and responsibly.

In Flint, we ended our traditional grant relationship with the Flint Community Schools, announcing a 10-year phaseout of funding for long-standing programs and encouraging the district to reexamine the practice of community education and bring new initiatives forward. Collaborating with Michigan State University, we funded a model of community policing in Flint and helped the university establish a National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center.

We also began working on economic development projects in earnest, focusing on the revitalization of downtown Flint. As in other former industrial cities struggling to reinvent themselves in this era, we supported several ambitious projects in the 1980s. Though some of them did not succeed because of macroeconomic issues, they set the table for subsequent efforts we would embark on two decades later.

In December 1985, our board of trustees spurred new international work when they voted to adopt the Sullivan Principles. The decision meant the Foundation’s investment office would divest from companies that tolerated apartheid and invest in companies doing business in South Africa only if they treated black workers fairly and supported efforts to end apartheid. Trustee Maryanne Mott also urged the Foundation to express its concern for blacks in South Africa — not only through our investment policies — but through our grantmaking. That work would begin to take shape after Trustee Marjorie Allen and Will Hertz, who was our vice president for program planning and dissemination, traveled to South Africa and proposed a new grantmaking initiative.

From my perspective, the Foundation’s fourth stage was one in which we took calculated risks and learned a great deal, especially about managing the balance between legacy and innovation.

Our fifth stage began in 1988. I became chairman of our board of trustees, and — more important — the board engaged Rushworth Kidder, a journalist, author and founder of the Institute for Global Ethics, to lead us through a discussion of the big issues facing the world as we neared the beginning of the 21st century. We called upon every member of our board and staff to participate in the exercise, which we dubbed Agenda for the 21st Century. As serious and sobering as the conversations were, the process was exhilarating and fun. Ultimately, we came up with core issues that still drive our grantmaking today: persistent poverty; education; environment; leadership; ethics and values; pursuit of peace; and,
yes, Flint. I also should note that we thought Rush, as he liked to be called, did such a good job that we elected him to our board of trustees.

We also went international on a formal basis. Initially, this was a logical extension of our national work, particularly in community education and community schools. With the emergence of our work in South Africa, the idea that we might be able to do more to promote peace and social progress internationally began to take hold.

We formally established the Foundation’s Environment program in 1987 with a focus on two overarching issues: protecting the Great Lakes and other freshwater resources, and promoting global sustainability by supporting efforts to reform international development finance.

In 1989, Harding Mott passed away, and profound political changes began to transform the world. Between 1989 and 1991, the Berlin Wall, apartheid and the Soviet Union all crumbled, creating new opportunities to promote democracy. I must confess I never anticipated these events would occur in my lifetime. For our board and management, the chance to pursue peace on a global scale — through relatively modest grants — became an imperative.

We became early funders of the European Foundation Centre, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation and Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support (WINGS), as well as the Environmental Partnership, the Trust for Central and Eastern Europe, and — later — the Balkan Trust for Democracy and the Black Sea Trust. These projects were aimed at building the legal and social framework for civil society in the Central and Eastern European region and allowed us the opportunity to work with many wonderful philanthropic partners, including the Ford Foundation, Open Societies Foundation, Atlantic Philanthropies, Rockefeller Brothers Fund and The German Marshall Fund.

Indeed, the fifth stage of the Foundation’s development laid the groundwork for much of what we do today under all four of our current program teams: Civil Society, Education, Environment and Flint Area.

New strategies also can arise through serendipity, and so it was that my chance meeting in 1998 with U.S. Secretary of Education Richard Riley and Terry Peterson, who was then Riley’s chief education adviser, led to the Mott Foundation’s involvement with afterschool programming at the national level. A few years earlier, Riley and Peterson helped launch the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) initiative, which mirrored the earliest community education work done by the Foundation. They were looking for help to expand the program.

Working closely with the Department of Education, the Foundation provided support for training, leadership development, technical assistance and program
evaluation — activities that would ensure the quality of the program and free up federal dollars to provide direct services in schools and communities across the country. Today, 21st CCLC provides afterschool programming for 1.6 million children across the country.

For our part, Mott supports afterschool networks in all 50 states, as well as national organizations working to increase access to and enhance the quality of afterschool programs for all children. For many years, we also have supported afterschool programs in our hometown of Flint. In all, we have committed nearly $250 million to advancing afterschool in the U.S. We have done so because research and data from hundreds of studies support the positive impact of afterschool programs on children’s success. Children and youth who regularly participate in quality afterschool programs perform better in school, have better attendance and are less likely to get in trouble. Afterschool programs also help to close the achievement gap between children from lower-income families and their more affluent peers.

The Foundation’s sixth stage of development was ushered in with the new millennium, and it was marked by disruption of many types. On the positive side were disruptive innovations of the Information Age, including the growth and maturation of the World Wide Web and the introduction of the iPhone.

But we also saw disruption in other forms — the rise of terrorism, geopolitical upheaval, the global financial crisis, and natural disasters in the U.S. and abroad. Like many philanthropies, we stepped beyond the boundaries of our formal grantmaking programs to assist with recovery efforts related to 9/11 and Hurricane Katrina.

We also began focusing again on revitalization efforts in Flint. Lon Crim, a former superintendent of Atlanta schools who joined our board of trustees in 1988, was fond of the saying, “Yard by yard, life is hard. Inch by inch, it’s a cinch.” This time around, we found that inch by inch was, indeed, the way to go. We learned that more “organic” revitalization efforts built around smaller, locally driven, strategically placed projects could add up to greater impact for the area as a whole. We supported master planning efforts for the University of Michigan-Flint, the Flint Cultural Center and the downtown district. We also provided support for a team of local representatives from the public and private sectors to work with several national organizations to research and design a landbanking model that was first tested by Genesee County and ultimately utilized by municipalities across the U.S.

In 2012, the city of Flint embarked on its own master planning process, which sought input from residents in shaping the future of their community. One of the

Research and data from hundreds of studies support the positive impact of afterschool programs on children’s success.

Elementary students take part in the Safe Harbor afterschool program in Michigan City, Indiana, in 2012. Safe Harbor is a 21st CCLC site.
The top priorities residents called for was a new model of community education, reimagined for the 21st century.

And so it was with a great deal of enthusiasm that the Foundation helped to launch a new take on our longest-standing priority: helping full-service schools build healthier families, stronger neighborhoods and high-achieving students. We provided support in 2014 for the Crim Fitness Foundation to serve as the lead partner in coordinating a pilot program for the initiative at Flint’s Brownell-Holmes STEM Academy. The following year, the program expanded to five schools, with an eye toward reaching all schools in the district in the coming years. That would wind up happening even faster than we thought.

A change in Foundation leadership and a local tragedy marked the start of our seventh and current stage of development, altering our work in our hometown and elsewhere. My son, Ridgway White, became president of the Foundation in 2015, just as the Flint water crisis was beginning to unfold. When Dr. Mona Hanna-Attisha, a local pediatrician and researcher, released data showing that levels of lead in children’s blood had increased sharply after changes in the source and treatment of Flint’s drinking water, Ridgway and our board of trustees acted swiftly to prevent further harm. The board immediately approved a $4 million grant to help reconnect Flint to the Great Lakes Water Authority — a critical first step toward bringing safe drinking water back to the city.

In May 2016, the Foundation committed up to $100 million over five years to help our hometown recover and rise from the water crisis. Our related grantmaking focuses on six goals: ensuring that all Flint residents have safe drinking water; meeting the health needs of Flint families; supporting educational opportunity; building a more robust nonprofit sector; promoting community engagement; and revitalizing Flint’s economy.

The crisis underscored for us the importance of building the capacity of nonprofit organizations and continually reinventing our work. The local nonprofits we had been supporting for a long time were poised to step in as first responders, helping the community meet its diverse needs in the wake of the crisis. These included the United Way of Genesee County, Greater Flint Health Coalition, Community Foundation of Greater Flint, Food Bank of Eastern Michigan, Crim Fitness Foundation and many more.

Because work already had been well underway to reimagine the community education model for the 21st century, Flint Community Schools quickly became hubs for providing services and resources for students, their families and other residents. The Mott Foundation provided support to expand the model to all 11 schools in the district in time for the start of the 2016-17 school year.

At the same time, we began to expand access to early childhood education. Working with community partners and other funders, we helped to renovate a shuttered elementary school and open a new early childhood education center with the capacity to serve 175 students from 2 months to 5 years in age. We also approved funds to begin construction of a brand new early childhood education center. The following year, the program expanded to five schools, with an eye toward reaching all schools in the district in the coming years.
education center that should open in the fall of 2017. With more capacity to serve Flint's youngest children, we aim to ensure that all Flint kids will have high-quality educational experiences from cradle through college and career.

The water crisis changed more than just our hometown grantmaking. It also led us to realize that, although we had long supported many non-governmental organizations working to restore, preserve and protect the Great Lakes as the world's largest source of surface freshwater, few in that constellation of grantees had expertise in drinking water infrastructure. The Flint experience demonstrated that this is a looming threat for aging industrial cities across the country. And so the Flint water crisis gave birth to a new area of grantmaking for our Environment team that is aimed at promoting the coordinated management of drinking water, storm water and wastewater systems.

Even as the Flint water crisis hit us at home, events around the world forced us to grapple with the closing space for civil society. In the most dramatic example, the upper house of the Russian parliament recommended Mott for inclusion on its list of “foreign agents,” which led us to halt grantmaking in that country for the sake and safety of our grantees. However, we continue to look for ways to help citizens in Central and Eastern Europe engage in the decision-making processes that have a profound effect on their lives.

These are but a few of the many events that have changed our culture, our connectedness and our communities. They have changed us, as well.

Yet even as the Mott Foundation adapts to changing times and new ways of doing work, our nine decades of grantmaking have reinforced some lessons about approaches we believe work well for the people and communities we seek to serve. While we would not presume to tell other philanthropies how to do their work, we believe it’s the duty of those working in the social sector to share their insights and experiences with others in the hopes of strengthening the field. It is in this spirit that we share the following lessons, which have become guideposts for our grantmaking.

**Lessons learned**

/Stay in it for the long haul. Change can happen quickly, but progress takes a lot longer. As I see it, progress is the work of foundations. We have the motivation and resources to identify, test and evaluate new ways of doing things for the greater good. We also have staying power. We can stick with the issues we care about, and so we should.

/Exercise patience. Develop a tolerance for the delays, difficulties and disagreements that can bedevil even the most promising of undertakings. Much of the work foundations do is by trial and error. What looks to be a good idea can have disappointing results, and, yet, because we strive to take the long view, some of our “failures” end up being incredibly instructive to eventual success.

/Connect individuals with their communities.**

Mr. Mott’s directive — and the premise upon which much of our work is based — is to help individuals partner with their communities in meaningful ways. We have seen this happen in neighborhoods, in countries and in communities that are not geographic in nature. But it can be a complicated task. Communities are not cookie-cutter in nature, and there is no universal prescription for this work. This is where we tap every best practice we have learned as a foundation, including “shoe leather” philanthropy, which demands that we walk down Main Street to speak — and, more important, listen — to people in the communities where we work. Mott Trustee Harold “Dusty” Rodes believed so strongly in the importance of getting out of the boardroom to talk with grantees that he felt compelled to retire when he no longer had the physical strength to make site visits.

Helping individuals partner with their communities requires patience. It also requires building the capacity of organizations large and small, strengthening them to do their work. All of this pays off because change occurs only when it comes from the people who are most invested in its success.

/Never underestimate the importance of a good back office.**

While listening to a recording of the Metropolitan Opera, I was struck by a thought. As the music played, all I heard was the orchestra and singers, but I knew the recording represented so much more. Behind the musicians and singers, a great company of people worked in the back of the house to make the performance a success.

And so it is with the Mott Foundation. Behind the visible program staff is a team of grants compliance experts, accountants, investment managers, IT professionals and support staff who are essential to getting the work done. Maintaining our capacity to make sure that our grants meet legal and financial requirements, that they are implemented with integrity and transparency, and
that our response to every grantseeker is timely and respectful, is of utmost importance to Mott. We could not do this without staff and trustees who are dedicated to facilitating the grantmaking process.

We also are very much aware that grantees need a strong back office to be able to do what we fund them to do. This doesn’t mean we turn away organizations that are lacking this capacity. In many cases, we work with them to develop it. In this way, we can help to ensure that an organization can go on doing good work even after our grant relationship may have come to an end.

Look for leaders and opportunities to partner with them. Always be on the lookout for transformative leaders — people like Dr. Arthur Tuuri, a Flint pediatrician who provided essential care to thousands of children through the Mott Children’s Health Center; Dorothy Stoneman, founder and president of YouthBuild USA and chairman of the YouthBuild Coalition, which has more than 1,000 member organizations in the U.S. and the Virgin Islands; Michael Brophy, chief executive of Charities Aid Foundation, who worked with Mott and communities across the United Kingdom to expand the concept of community trusts; Raymond Georis, former secretary general of the European Cultural Foundation and founding chair of the European Foundation Centre (EFC); John Richardson, founding chief executive of EFC; and his successor, Gerry Salole.

Partnering with such leaders and supporting their vision over time can spur progress and lead to significant change. While there may occasionally be some difference of opinion about practice, approach or objectives, it is essential that both funder and grant recipient listen and respond truthfully and respectfully when that occurs. In the end, a bit of controversy can often lead to trust and better outcomes.

And never forget that you might find some of your strongest partners among the leaders of other foundations.

Evaluate your work. John Porter, a former president of Eastern Michigan University who was elected to our board of trustees in 1981 and served for nearly 32 years, was a hard-liner when it came to defining the purpose of a grant, and he constantly advocated for benchmarking the progress of our major grantmaking initiatives. This is a core grantmaking issue. Without evaluation, how can we know if we are making a difference or understand how to make a good project even better?
Evaluation takes time — another reason for staying with projects over the long haul — and it can be expensive. But if we are looking to sustain or replicate good work, then we know we must test projects and programs over the long term. So we assess our work — not to produce reports that gather dust on a shelf, but to help ourselves and our grantees know how to make positive change.

**Measure impact, but make grants with the head and the heart.** As important as it is to measure impact, it is not the only consideration in determining the value of work. Sometimes you make a grant just because it is the right thing to do.

Flint’s water crisis provides a good example. Was it philanthropy’s role to provide $4 million to switch Flint back to Detroit water once it was discovered that the levels of lead in the city’s drinking water were harming our children? Probably not. Yet our president and board of trustees did not hesitate to step out of their comfort zone to make the grant because it was the right thing to do to prevent further harm.

And we have made multiple grants to the C.S. Mott Children’s Hospital in Ann Arbor, Michigan — including the Foundation’s largest single grant of $25 million — without requiring a formal evaluation of the work done there. But through the years, we’ve received unsolicited feedback from parents who have told us that, without the hospital, their children would not be alive today.

**Tell your stories.** There will be many audiences you will want to reach, educate and move. Chief among them should always be public officials at the local, state and national levels. Make sure they understand what you fund and why. Let me share one experience to illustrate why this is so important.

At the first meeting of the Council of Michigan Foundations — I believe it was in 1973 — former Congresswoman Martha Griffiths was asked if it had been the intent of Congress to put private foundations out of business with the Tax Reform Act of 1969. She answered, “Yes, it was, but it’s no longer the case.” That is due, at least in part, to the fact that the entire philanthropic field came together to create various infrastructure organizations. By banding together and telling our stories, we regained the trust of our elected officials and the good will of the American public. And that leads nicely to the next lesson.

**Support the sector.** Our ability to do the work we do is not a given. I believe it is up to all of us — foundations and nonprofits — to advocate for a policy environment that supports and encourages charitable giving. It is equally important that we support and participate in the national and regional organizations that do this work.

**Preserve the seed corn.** I’m going to spend a little more time on this lesson because it has been one of the most important for the Mott Foundation.

Harding Mott had a mantra: Always preserve the seed corn. Long before it came to pass, Harding foresaw there might be a time when Flint’s tax base would erode and the Foundation would be called up to provide more support to the community. Just as farmers must preserve their seed corn so they can plant and harvest again the following year, Harding wanted to be sure the Foundation always protected enough of our asset
base to be able to serve our mission year after year, and decade after decade. This is not as easy as it sounds.

If you look at the Mott Foundation’s assets since our founding in 1926, you’ll see that there have been six times when they have dropped by 25 percent or more from one year to the next. I also have looked at the stocks held by the Foundation in our earliest days to compare their value in 1929 and 1930. Such exercises are sobering. They make it abundantly clear that foundations that wish to exist in perpetuity must continuously manage their investments and grantmaking in service of that goal.

What does “manage their investments” mean? At Mott, it means having trustees and an investment committee that understand their fiduciary responsibilities, establish sound policies and provide appropriate guidance. Preserving the seed corn requires a team effort.

Other key members of the Mott team include our talented and dedicated staff in investments, programs and grants administration. Thanks to them, we have always been able to meet the Foundation’s commitments while protecting our asset base. For instance, in the wake of the Great Recession that began in December 2007, we honored all grants already awarded and didn’t lay off a single employee. However, we had to reduce our grantmaking budget and enact a temporary hiring freeze as we waited for the financial markets and our assets to recover.

It is precisely because we strive to preserve the seed corn that we are still here nine decades after our founding. And that is why we recently were able to commit up to $100 million to help our hometown of Flint recover and rise from its water crisis. Just as Harding predicted, our community needed us at a time when it had few resources to fall back on. Thankfully, we have never forgotten his advice.

That is the strength and value of philanthropic dollars reserved in perpetuity — a civic nest egg held in reserve to pay for something in the future, something we couldn’t possibly predict, but for which we are prepared. Those funds — coupled with smart ideas, good leadership and community partners — are a buttress in bad times and a boon in good times.

Remember that it is all about the people. I have written this message based on a perspective formed over 49 years at Mott. During that time, the Foundation has been blessed to work with wonderful trustees, staff, grantees and advisers. Without their vigor, intellect, integrity and passion, the Foundation could not have accomplished what is highlighted in this report. As Harding once said, “All the philosophy about our Mott Foundation can be boiled down to just one word — people.” To all of those people, past and present, I extend profound gratitude on behalf of the Foundation.

Looking ahead

I realize I am writing this message in a pugilistic time. Partisan divides threaten to rend the fabric of the United States, and the entire world faces both environmental and political peril.

At a recent unveiling of a statue of C.S. Mott in downtown Flint, Ridgway shared something his great-grandfather said about the city in 1972 that reflects our hope for our hometown, our nation and the world today:

Let our community never lose its farsighted vision, its bright hopes for the future, its faith in our growth as a fine place in which to live — a place where everyone has a chance to improve his own life.

The Mott Foundation remains committed to helping people partner with their communities to realize this hope, and that is why I am as excited and energized by our work as I have ever been. History has shown that the social sector can bring down walls, build bridges, and broker solutions. We can do this again if we rise to the challenges of our time and face them head on.

No matter what the tools and trends might be in philanthropy over the coming decades, we must never forget that its essential function is to satisfy the charitable impulse — to help good people make good things happen in their communities. Philanthropy in its many forms — from giving while living to grantmaking in perpetuity — is valuable. It is something our society should nurture.

The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation will continue to do that over our next 90 years, and I can hardly wait to see the work now under development as it unfolds.

William S. White, Chairman and CEO
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation is established

On June 19, 1926, Charles Stewart Mott signed the Articles of Incorporation that created the Foundation bearing his name. Endowed with 2,000 shares of General Motors stock, then valued at $320,000, the Foundation has since experienced significant growth, marking $3 billion in giving over our first 90 years. Throughout our history, we have endeavored to remain true to the vision and values of our founder, even as we have adapted to changes that have occurred in Flint, across the United States and around the globe. The timeline that follows provides a snapshot of some of our grants and places them in the context of our evolution as a grantmaking organization.

First grant

The Mott Foundation’s first grant, for $1,000, was given to Christ Episcopal Church, or Christ’s Mission, as it was then known. Founded in Flint in 1902, the church now houses the Christ Enrichment Center, a nonprofit, nonsectarian community center serving children and adults.

First international grant

Mott’s first grant for international work helped establish a weather station on the Greenland ice sheet, where scientists studied how ice influenced regional weather patterns. The $500 grant confirmed Mott’s willingness to consider groundbreaking research with international and environmental implications.

Mott Camp for Boys

One of the Foundation’s first signature projects, Mott Camp for Boys was established in 1933 to serve 10- to 14-year-old boys from Flint’s most underserved neighborhoods. Located about 15 miles east of the city at Pero Lake, the camp was an early indicator of C.S. Mott’s lifelong concern with the health and welfare of children. The camp operated for 40 years, imparting lessons about the importance of physical fitness, service to others, teamwork and cooperation.
1935

Birth of community schools

Intrigued by Flint educator Frank J. Manley’s remarks at a local Rotary meeting, C.S. Mott invited him to share his ideas about using school buildings after hours and on weekends as “community centers” offering educational and recreational programs for children, families and neighborhood residents. The “Mott Program of Recreation,” initiated in six Flint schools, was quickly adopted by all public schools in the city. Together with the Mott Health Achievement Program, Visiting Teachers Program and Mott Camp for Boys, the Mott Program would shape the development of a school-based model for community education that eventually spread across the U.S. and around the world.

1939

The Health Guarded Child

The Mott Health Achievement Program for the Health Guarded Child was instituted in all Flint-area public and parochial schools. Each fall, children were immunized and examined for treatable problems. Each spring, children were re-examined. If health issues had been addressed, the child received a ribbon or medal. The program operated through the end of the 1977-78 school year.

1937

Tot Lot

Possibly the longest-running of all Mott-funded summer initiatives for children, the Flint Community Schools’ Tot Lot program was created in 1937 to provide local youngsters with quality recreation and learning opportunities. Eight decades later, Tot Lot continues to help the community’s youngest residents prepare for success in the classroom and beyond.

A child has her vision tested circa 1940.
1939

Mott Children's Health Center
In 1939, a small health clinic that the Mott Foundation funded through the Flint Board of Education moved to Hurley Hospital and officially became known as the Mott Children's Health Center. Dr. James Olson, who served as director of Flint's school health program, became its first director. Dr. Arthur L. Tuuri, a pediatrician who treated thousands of Flint children, took over as director in 1948 until his retirement in 1985. In 2016, the center provided dental, medical and mental health services to more than 26,000 children and adolescents.

Mott Foundation Building
C.S. Mott purchased the Union Industrial Building on the corner of First and Saginaw streets in downtown Flint. The 16-story, art deco “sky-scraper” was renamed the Mott Foundation Building on January 1, 1945.

1944

Flint’s first full-service school
During the Depression, Principal Elizabeth Welch opened Flint’s Fairview Elementary School to parents and other residents, linking them with services and involving them in school and community issues. In 1940, Josephine McDougall took over as principal and, together with home economics teacher Odell Broadway, continued to operate the school as a community center. In 1947, McDougall and Broadway sought help from Frank Manley and the Mott Program to bring a variety of health, social service and educational programs to Fairview. This helped to establish a model for Flint’s full-service community schools.

1947

Stepping Stones
Generations of Flint women took part in Stepping Stones, a school-based club for girls ages 10 to 18. While its primary purpose was to introduce members to the art of homemaking, the club also used mentoring, sports, arts and recreational activities to help girls “feel good about themselves.” Elizabeth “Ma” Pollock created the program in 1938 and acquired funding from Mott to expand the club in 1943. She also convinced the Hamady Brothers Corporation, a local grocery store chain, to donate a 22-room mansion on the Flint River to house club members for a one-week residency — considered a treat by all who participated. Stepping Stones continued to operate until 1980.
Local school children, residents, businesses and foundations pitched in to raise about $30 million to support the creation of a College and Cultural Center in Flint. Construction started in the mid-1950s, and in rapid succession the Flint Institute of Arts, Flint Institute of Music, Sloan Museum, Whiting Auditorium, Bower Theater (home to the Flint Youth Theatre), Longway Planetarium and the main branch of the Flint Public Library opened to the public. One of the first cultural districts in the nation, the Flint College and Cultural Center originally included the campus of Mott Community College, which became an independent, tax-supported institution in 1969. Through 2016, the Mott Foundation granted more than $155 million in endowment, operating, long-range planning and program support for the benefit of Flint Cultural Center institutions. In 2016, the Cultural Center welcomed 630,000 visitors.

Frank Manley’s loss of his own mother at a young age contributed to his lifelong concern for troubled kids. A star athlete, he went to Eastern Michigan University so he could play sports. There he studied under Wilbur P. Bowen, a physical education professor who believed school buildings should be made available for community activities of all kinds, an idea that led to the development of Flint’s community school model. After working with C.S. Mott to develop the concept, Manley joined the Mott Foundation staff in 1948.

On the eve of his 75th birthday, C.S. Mott offered up to $1 million in land and funds to create a four-year college in Flint. Construction of a new campus for the Flint Junior College, which would also serve as the first home for what is now the University of Michigan-Flint, began in 1952. In 1973, the junior college was renamed the Charles Stewart Mott Community College, in recognition of its longtime champion and benefactor.
Community schools spark interest

By 1957, Flint became a destination for others seeking to replicate its community education model. Over the next decade, the number of annual visitors grew to more than 12,000.

Film helps to spread community school model

“To Touch a Child” is a Mott-funded training film that was instrumental in spreading community schools and community education across the United States and around the world. For more than 20 years, Flint Community Schools used the 30-minute movie to introduce visitors to the community school concept.

CANUSA Games

Young athletes from Flint, Michigan, and Hamilton, Ontario, gathered in the summer of 1958 for the first CANUSA games, a friendly competition that continues today. Originally funded by the Mott Foundation, the CANUSA games are among the longest-running international sports competitions in the world.
The Mott Intern Program, known formally as the Mott Inter-University Clinical Preparation Program for Educational Leadership, began as a pilot program in 1963 and was offered at seven Michigan colleges and universities between 1964 and 1974. Through a year-long residential program, 694 Mott Interns earned master’s or doctoral degrees in community education. Mott interns were critical to spreading the community school concept across the U.S.

C.S. Mott transferred General Motors stock, other stocks and securities totaling $195 million to the Foundation, providing the impetus to expand grantmaking on a national scale.

Charles Stewart Harding Mott, known as "Harding," was the second president of the Mott Foundation. The son of C.S. Mott, Harding Mott served for more than 60 years as a trustee, vice president, president and chairman before being named chairman emeritus in 1988. Harding Mott's leadership bridged the Foundation's transition from a locally focused institution to a major funder of critical national issues.
In 1965, the newly formed Genesee County Parks and Recreation Commission was able to begin acquiring property with a $2 million grant awarded by the Mott Foundation. The Genesee County Parks began to take shape in 1970, when the Foundation granted an additional $2.5 million for construction of Mott Lake. Between 1965 and 2016, the Foundation granted nearly $25 million in support of the parks. The county park system — the largest in Michigan — now includes: 24 parks; 15 fishing sites; 11,000 acres of woods, water and beaches; a nature preserve; a historic village; and parts of the Flint River Trail. In 2016, the parks welcomed more than a half million visitors.

Because the Tax Reform Act of 1969 contained major provisions that would affect the way private foundations do business, C.S. Mott and Frank Manley traveled to Washington, D.C., and voluntarily testified before Congress while the legislation was being debated. Upon passage of the Act, we revised the Foundation’s Articles of Incorporation, clarifying future governance of the organization. We took steps to promote greater transparency, such as publishing Facts on Grants and an annual report. We also supported efforts to build a national infrastructure for the philanthropic field, which bolstered its capacity, efficiency and ability to advocate on behalf of the sector. This experience also informed our efforts to create a global infrastructure for civil society organizations in the 1990s.

The Mott Children’s Health Center became an independent organization in 1968 and moved to its present, freestanding site near Hurley Medical Center in 1969. Dr. Fleming Barbour was named chair and Dr. Arthur L. Tuuri president of the newly independent entity. Since 1968, the Mott Foundation has granted almost $30 million in support of the health center, with a majority of the funds going toward its permanent endowment, which had grown to more than $350 million by 2016.

Because the Tax Reform Act of 1969 contained major provisions that would affect the way private foundations do business, C.S. Mott and Frank Manley traveled to Washington, D.C., and voluntarily testified before Congress while the legislation was being debated. Upon passage of the Act, we revised the Foundation’s Articles of Incorporation, clarifying future governance of the organization. We took steps to promote greater transparency, such as publishing Facts on Grants and an annual report. We also supported efforts to build a national infrastructure for the philanthropic field, which bolstered its capacity, efficiency and ability to advocate on behalf of the sector. This experience also informed our efforts to create a global infrastructure for civil society organizations in the 1990s.

The Mott Foundation's efforts to support civil society organizations intensified in the 1990s, as the world became more interconnected and the need for global solutions became more urgent. The Foundation recognized the power of partnerships and collaborated with other foundations, governments, and NGOs to address pressing issues such as poverty, education, health, and environmental sustainability. These partnerships allowed the Foundation to leverage its resources and contribute to larger, more effective initiatives.
Expanded support for higher education in Flint

The Foundation intensified our focus on higher education as a key part of our hometown grantmaking with the announcement in 1972 of $5 million to help relocate the University of Michigan-Flint from the campus of Mott Community College to downtown Flint. The 73-acre, riverfront campus now is home to more than 8,000 students. Through 2016, the Foundation granted more than $144 million in support of the University of Michigan-Flint, Mott Community College, Baker College, Kettering University and Michigan State University.

Revitalizing downtown Flint

The launch of the University of Michigan-Flint campus coincided with the Mott Foundation’s decision to implement a formal grantmaking program to support the revitalization of downtown Flint. These efforts continued through the 1980s, when we pursued several large economic development projects, including a hotel and entertainment and shopping venues. While not all of these projects were successful, they laid the groundwork for future revitalization efforts that would begin in the new millennium.

C.S. Mott passes away at age 97

Charles Stewart Mott passed away just after midnight on February 18, 1973.

He once described the Mott Foundation as the realization of the purpose of his life. Because he had the vision to create a Foundation that could adapt to a changing world and new challenges, that purpose lives on.
William S. White becomes Foundation president

William S. White was working as a management consultant with Bruce Payne & Associates of New York City when Harding Mott asked him to come to the Mott Foundation in 1968 to help position the organization for growth. White became a consultant to the Foundation in 1969. In 1971, he became vice president and secretary of the Foundation and was elected to the board of trustees. Under White’s leadership, the Foundation significantly expanded our national and international grantmaking. He was named chairman of Mott’s board of trustees in 1988, and he continues to serve as chairman and CEO today.

1976

Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program

From 1976 through 1985, Mott made grants totaling almost $6.5 million to strengthen and expand community policing. It is a strategy that builds upon an old approach: police officers walking the beat and getting to know people in the communities they serve. In our home community, we granted approximately $3 million to the Flint Police Department over a six-year period beginning in 1977 to establish an experimental neighborhood foot patrol program. To assess the effectiveness of the foot patrol, we funded two evaluations conducted by Michigan State University, which led the university to seek funding to establish a National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center (now the National Center for Community Policing) in 1982.

1978

Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Mott’s program aimed at strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) was launched in 1978 with a $1 million grant to the United Negro College Fund. The Foundation recognized HBCUs as vital to the education of historically underserved people, as well as to the preparation of black leaders nationally and globally. Through 2010, Mott contributed more than $416 million in support of HBCUs.
Engaging the grassroots in change

Beginning in 1979 and lasting for more than three decades, Mott’s Intermediary Support Organization program provided seed grants and technical assistance to local community groups serving low-income neighborhoods across the country. In all, 239 grants totaling more than $42.5 million were made to grassroots organizations that worked with residents to identify common values, concerns and goals, and to increase civic participation.

Commitment to community foundations

A longtime supporter of community foundations, Mott began making grants in 1979 to develop and strengthen the field in the United States. Our efforts soon expanded internationally through challenge grants in the United Kingdom, resources for community foundation support organizations in Central and Eastern Europe, and leadership training for practitioners from 63 countries. Mott’s support, which totaled approximately $185 million through 2016, has played a role in expanding the field from fewer than 300 community foundations in 1979 to more than 1,800 around the world today.

First environmental grantmaking plan

In response to groundwater contamination crises in Woburn, Massachusetts, and Love Canal, New York, Mott trustees approved the Foundation’s first five-year plan for environmental grantmaking. The plan focused largely on toxic substances, but it also strengthened efforts to protect the Great Lakes and improve community resource management. Under the plan, Mott funded one of the nation’s first community-wide studies of how hazardous wastes could threaten human health. We also bolstered national efforts to reduce toxic pollution through improved waste management practices.
Kettering University

The only fully cooperative engineering and management university in the United States, Kettering University has been an integral component of Flint’s higher education system since 1919, when it was known as the School of Automobile Trades, and when it was later known as General Motors Institute. Since 1983, Mott has made 45 grants totaling more than $45 million to support the institution’s efforts to increase the size of its undergraduate and graduate programs and contribute to the economic revitalization of Flint and the region.

Neighborhood Small Grants Program

Mott’s focus on building and maintaining strong neighborhoods led to the creation of a national Neighborhoods Small Grants Program that ran in the United States from 1984 to 1994. The goal was to increase community foundations’ interactions with, and support for, resident-led organizations in low-income neighborhoods. Mott provided more than $5.8 million in support to 25 community foundations across the country. Some of those foundations continue that work today.

Environment Program

Informed by our earlier work on toxics, Mott formally established our Environment Program in 1987. Protecting freshwater ecosystems, primarily in the Great Lakes basin, and promoting global sustainability have been key components of the Environment Program from the outset. Our grantmaking also has strengthened the environmental community in the United States and abroad, supported hydropower reform that improved thousands of miles of U.S. rivers, and informed policy changes that reduced the volume of persistent toxic chemicals entering the Great Lakes.

Microenterprise

Between 1985 and 2016, Mott invested more than $56 million in microenterprise as a pathway out of poverty. The strategy relied on cooperative groups and lending approaches to encourage self-employment among low-income people. Goals of the grantmaking went beyond economic development to include self-esteem, social development and empowerment of the individuals served. Our grantmaking also supported development, evaluation and replication of effective models to strengthen the microenterprise field.
Mott Middle College

The nation’s first middle college high school serving multiple school districts, Mott Middle College was created in Flint with the support of a planning grant from the Mott Foundation. Over the years, the dual-enrollment institution, which allows students to accrue college credits while earning their high school diplomas, has used Mott funding to expand the middle college high school model to school districts in Michigan and across the country.

First grant in South Africa

As early as 1985, Mott began taking steps to help the people of South Africa by adopting the Sullivan Principles. In 1988, the Foundation made its first grants in South Africa in response to the country’s apartheid crisis. Mott’s work in South Africa led the Foundation to consider more direct grantmaking to promote social and political progress internationally.

£1 million challenge grant in U.K.

In 1988, the Charities Aid Foundation (CAF) and Mott Foundation supported an expert assistance program aimed at fostering the growth and development of community foundations in the U.K. Within two years, Mott launched a £1 million challenge grant program to help U.K. community foundations build endowments that would help to ensure their long-term sustainability. CAF raised an additional £1 million that was used for a matching grant program. The partnership between Mott and CAF proved so successful that Doug Jansson, who served as a consultant on the program, referred to it as “one of the great stories in philanthropy, with a multiplier effect that few grant programs anywhere can match.”
Mott opens first regional office

A year after establishing the Foundation’s Civil Society grantmaking program, we opened our first overseas regional office in Johannesburg. Shortly thereafter, our expanded work in Central and Eastern Europe led us to open a second regional office in Prague. That office was relocated to London in 2004. Today, Mott continues to operate offices in Flint and Troy, Michigan, as well as London and Johannesburg.

Global Civil Society infrastructure

Through our early Civil Society work, Mott recognized the need to develop global infrastructure for the field. In 1993, we joined with other funders to create CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, which promotes international cooperation among foundations and others in the global nonprofit sector. CIVICUS was followed by the Worldwide Initiative for Grantmaker Support (WINGS) in 1999 and the Global Fund for Community Foundations (GFCF) in 2006. CIVICUS has since grown to include more than 3,500 members from 176 countries; WINGS’ global network includes 90 organizations representing more than 15,000 foundations in 39 countries; and GFCF offers grants, technical support and networking to community foundations around the world.

New environment plan bolsters international work

Trustees approved a new grantmaking plan for our Environment Program that would strengthen Mott’s efforts to promote global sustainability through reform of international trade and lending practices. Our grantmaking has since helped grantees develop and monitor environmental and social safeguards that provide greater protection for indigenous communities threatened by hydropower dams and other large infrastructure projects. In some cases, those safeguards have empowered indigenous communities to halt construction of high-risk dams.

Protecting indigenous people, such as this young girl in a Peruvian rainforest, has been a cornerstone of Mott’s efforts to reform international development finance – 2012.
1994
South Africa’s first free election

One of the first focus areas of the Foundation’s newly established Civil Society plan was widespread voter education efforts in advance of South Africa’s 1994 general elections. Our funding, including a $1 million grant to the South Africa Free Election Fund, supported groups that registered voters, taught people how to vote and carried out election monitoring. Eighty-seven percent of registered voters cast ballots in the historic election.

First community foundation in continental Europe

When Mott began working in post-communist Central and Eastern Europe and Russia in the early 1990s, there were no community foundations in the region. That’s why we decided to focus on initiatives to introduce and develop community philanthropy there. With Mott support, the Healthy City Community Foundation in Banska Bystrica, Slovakia, was established in 1994 as the first community foundation in continental Europe. We have consistently funded in the area for nearly 25 years, and there are now 154 community foundations in 13 countries in the region. Mott’s related support totaled approximately $31.6 million through 2016.

Renewed focus on revitalization

We renewed our focus on revitalizing downtown Flint in 1998 with grantmaking that sought to engage local leaders and business owners in bringing new energy and investment to the city center. Efforts gained momentum in 2004 as the transformation of a vacant building into modern loft apartments kicked off a growing list of Mott-supported projects. Those eventually would include construction of commercial, residential and mixed-use properties; expansion of the University of Michigan-Flint and Kettering University campuses; and creation of the city’s Health and Wellness District. In all, the Mott Foundation granted $305 million between 1972 and 2016 to help revitalize the city’s core. This grantmaking reflects our hope that such development will continue to attract employers, residents, students and visitors to Flint.

$55 million for afterschool

In the late 1990s, Terry K. Peterson, who served as chief education adviser to Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley, approached the Mott Foundation for help. He asked William S. White, who was then chairman, CEO and president of the Foundation, to grant “a couple million dollars” to support technical assistance and training to help communities launch and operate high-quality afterschool programs through the nation’s 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) initiative. In addition to an initial $2 million grant, the Foundation committed $55 million to a multiyear expansion effort during the Clinton administration. The 21st CCLC initiative now serves more than 16 million students at more than 11,000 sites across the U.S. Mott’s support for afterschool in the U.S. through 2016 totaled nearly $250 million.
In response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the U.S., Mott joined with other foundations to help communities, schools and businesses recover from the catastrophic event. The Foundation provided 22 grants totaling almost $4 million to help with recovery efforts.

**Land preservation around the Great Lakes**
Mott made the first in a series of grants totaling $7.75 million to help the Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy acquire 6,000 acres of ecologically significant property in northwest Lower Michigan. Part of that land became Arcadia Dunes: The C.S. Mott Nature Preserve. The Foundation also granted $10 million to support The Nature Conservancy’s “Big U.P. Deal,” which preserved 271,000 acres of forest, lakes and streams in Michigan’s Upper Peninsula.

From 2001-2007, the Foundation provided more than $7.7 million to launch and support the Great Lakes Revolving Fund, which helps nonprofits and government agencies purchase and preserve critical natural resources. Overall, Mott funding has helped protect more than 360,000 acres of land in the Great Lakes basin, 14 miles of shoreline and the Humbug Marsh, a cornerstone of the Detroit River International Wildlife Refuge.

**Genesee County Land Bank**
The Mott-funded launch in 2002 of the Genesee County Land Bank Authority — initially called the Genesee County Land Reutilization Council — marked an innovative new approach to the management of tax-foreclosed and abandoned properties in the U.S. Whereas other land banks around the country served primarily as custodians of problem properties, the Genesee County program, born out of research supported by Mott, adopted a leadership role in transforming such properties into community assets. The success of that approach earned the Land Bank the Innovations in American Government Award in 2007 by Harvard University, and today the program serves as a national model for land use reform.
Community Advice Offices

Mott’s support for South Africa’s paralegals and community advice offices (CAOs) began in the late 1980s. After apartheid ended, advice offices proved to be crucial to democracy, social justice reform and the realization of people’s rights. However, the sector was fractured, with no unified voice to advocate on issues of common interest, and CAOs were closing due to lack of funding. In 2004, after more than a decade of helping to stabilize the sector, Mott joined with other funders to ensure the sector’s long-term sustainability by establishing what later became known as the National Alliance for the Development of Community Advice Offices, followed in 2013 by the launch of the Association of Community Advice Offices of South Africa. Today, more donors are contributing, and the number of advice offices is growing, making social justice real for thousands of poor people.

$25 million for Mott Children’s Hospital

The Mott Foundation awarded our largest single grant to date, $25 million, to the University of Michigan Health System for construction of a new C.S. Mott Children’s Hospital in Ann Arbor. We previously granted $6.5 million to build the original hospital in 1964-1965 and $2 million for a major renovation of the facility in 1984. Today, C.S. Mott Children’s Hospital is one of the premier health care institutions for children and women in the country.

Hurricane Katrina

When Hurricane Katrina ravaged New Orleans and other communities along the Gulf of Mexico, Mott awarded $5.8 million in grants. The funds supported immediate disaster relief, as well as long-term efforts to restore Louisiana’s coastal ecosystems and revitalize its nonprofit community.
Great Lakes Compact

In the late 1990s, a Canadian firm’s audacious plan to fill tankers with water from Lake Superior and ship it to Asia for use in high-end hotels exposed an alarming truth: there were no laws to prevent diversions from or excessive use of Great Lakes water. After a decade of work by many organizations, including several Mott grantees, the Great Lakes – St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact became federal law. The historic agreement severely restricted diversions of water and required the eight Great Lakes states to improve management of water resources. The Canadian provinces of Ontario and Quebec approved a nearly identical companion agreement.

Satellite image of the Great Lakes, courtesy of NASA.

Center for Community Progress

Launched in 2010 with the support of the Mott and Ford foundations, the Center for Community Progress soon emerged as an energizing and guiding force in the movement to rethink and revitalize the country’s vacant properties. Building on the work of leading advocates, including the Genesee Institute, an affiliate of the Genesee County Land Bank, the Center helps communities explore policy and system changes that can bring neglected land back to productive use. It also connects municipalities and provides them with opportunities to learn from one another’s challenges and successes. Mott granted more than $77 million to support the Center’s work through 2016.

Residents from Flint and Albany visit Pittsburgh for a learning exchange – 2017.
2014

Community foundation centennial

As part of the celebration marking the 100th anniversary of the first community foundation in the United States, Mott made a series of grants to help elevate the field, including $1.5 million to Indiana University to establish the C.S. Mott Foundation Chair on Community Foundations. Dr. Emmett Carson, president of the Silicon Valley Community Foundation, was the first holder of the chair.

Flint Health and Wellness District

Flint’s Health and Wellness District has transformed the way the community uses and experiences the city center. At the heart of the district is the Flint Farmers’ Market, which was named one of the country’s top six great public spaces in 2015 by the American Planning Association. Located on the top floor of the market, the Hurley Children’s Center — Sumathi Mukkamala Children’s Center provides state-of-the-art pediatric care to 11,000 patients annually. Just steps away is the Michigan State University (MSU) College of Human Medicine’s medical school and public health program in Flint. The district also features facilities serving the health care needs of families and seniors, as well as a small public plaza and green space. Through 2016, Mott provided a total of nearly $24 million — almost $12 million each for the development of the district and for the expansion and endowment of MSU’s medical school and public health program in Flint.

Community schools for the 21st century

As part of a master planning process that began in 2012, Flint residents called for a new model of community schools, reimagined for the 21st century, as a top priority. When Flint Community Schools (FCS) approached the Mott Foundation for help with the endeavor, we seized the opportunity to return to working on one of the Foundation’s first and longest-standing priorities. We provided support to the Crim Fitness Foundation in 2014 to serve as the lead partner in launching a pilot program at the Brownell-Holmes STEM Academy. With leadership from Crim and help from more than 30 other community partners, the model was expanded to five schools in the 2015-2016 school year and all 11 schools in the FCS district by the 2016-2017 school year. Between 2014 and 2016, Mott provided more than $4.5 million in funding for the new model, which is helping FCS support healthier families, stronger neighborhoods and high-achieving students.
Detroit’s Grand Bargain

Philanthropy played a catalytic role in the chain of agreements known as the Grand Bargain, which helped Detroit emerge from bankruptcy in just 16 months. With a grant of $10 million, Mott joined other philanthropies, the state of Michigan, the city of Detroit, its pensioners and the Detroit Institute of Arts (DIA) in a unique collaboration conceivably by U.S. District Judge Gerald Rosen to help avoid years of prolonged litigation. The Grand Bargain supported Detroit and its citizens in efforts to revitalize the city, prevented the DIA’s priceless art collection from being sold, and helped Detroit honor its commitments to retirees.

New ventures in environmental grantmaking

As part of a new grantmaking plan, Mott began funding climate change solutions — primarily solar power systems — in Michigan, Tanzania and isolated villages in Brazil’s Amazon rainforest. The Foundation also provided a $4 million grant to launch Blue Accounting, a program to help Great Lakes leaders set goals, work collaboratively and track progress in restoring, protecting and maintaining the world’s largest freshwater system.

2014

Installing solar panels in Pyulaga Village, Brazil – 2016.

2015

Ridgway H. White becomes Foundation president

Ridgway H. White became president of the Mott Foundation on January 1, 2015, and was elected trustee the following year. The great-grandson of C.S. Mott, he first began working at the Foundation as an intern in 2002. He was hired as a program assistant for the Flint Area team in 2004 and worked his way up through the program ranks. He was named vice president for special projects and chair of the Foundation’s management working group in 2011.

As part of his earlier program work for the Foundation, White also served as a loaned executive for the Uptown Reinvestment Corporation, a nonprofit organization focused on revitalizing Flint. Over the course of a decade, he oversaw the development of more than 1 million square feet of mixed use space, paving the way for new businesses and restaurants to open. Notable projects included the creation of the Flint Health and Wellness District, a four-block area that’s home to the Flint Farmers’ Market and the Flint campus of the Michigan State University College of Human Medicine. Within the first year of his presidency, White would be called upon to lead the Foundation’s response to the Flint water crisis.
Ten philanthropies pledge $125 million for Flint

Mott and nine other foundations together committed $125 million to help Flint recover and rise from its water crisis. Of that total, Mott committed up to $100 million over five years. The funding will help to ensure clean drinking water for all Flint residents. It also will help to expand early education for local children, meet the health needs of Flint families, support local nonprofit organizations that are responding to the water crisis, promote community engagement and strengthen Flint's economy. Other local and national philanthropies joining the effort include: Carnegie Corporation of New York, FlintNOW Foundation, Ford Foundation, The Hagerman Foundation, The Kresge Foundation, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Ruth Mott Foundation, Skillman Foundation, and W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Early childhood education

Recognizing the importance of an educational continuum that extends from the cradle to college and career, the Mott Foundation made two grants totaling $10 million in 2016 to help expand access to high-quality educational opportunities for Flint’s youngest residents. The Cummings Great Expectations Early Childhood Learning Center, located in a former elementary school on the city’s southwest side, opened in November 2016. A second early childhood education center is being constructed on the campus of Flint’s Durant-Tuuri-Mott Elementary School and is expected to open in late 2017. Together, the two programs will provide high-quality care to roughly 400 children ages 2 months to 5 years, and will help to link the youngsters, their parents and other residents with a range of services and resources. In addition, both will work with other child care providers to help improve the quality of early childhood education across the city.

Flint water crisis

Mott’s hometown became the focus of international attention in 2015 with the discovery of high levels of lead in Flint’s drinking water and, as a result, in the blood of many local children. The failure of government officials to properly test, treat and protect the city’s water supply prompted national debates about the safety of the country’s aging infrastructure. It also sparked swift action by Foundation President Ridgway White and our board of trustees to help bring clean drinking water back to our home community. Immediate support included $4 million to help reconnect Flint to the Detroit water system and $100,000 for the distribution of free water filters to local families. Our focus on the water crisis remains at the forefront of Mott’s Flint Area grantmaking.
Integrated water management

It wasn’t just Mott’s hometown grantmaking that changed because of the Flint water crisis. We also committed more than $4 million to promote a more holistic approach to managing drinking water, storm water and wastewater in Great Lakes cities. Known as integrated water management, the approach could help cities reduce water use, improve water quality at the tap and in nearby surface waters, cut operating costs and prevent floods.

Capitol Theatre

One of Flint’s most iconic and enduring structures, the historic Capitol Theatre, an “atmospheric” movie palace designed by John Eberson and built in 1928, is beloved by generations of local audiences. In 2016, we announced a $15 million grant to support the renovation of the 1,600 seat performance and concert hall. When it reopens in late 2017, the restored venue will add to the city’s downtown revitalization and provide local students with opportunities to train and work in theater.

To be continued ...
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, Education, Environment and Flint Area, 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 of Mott’s 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.

Our Programs: We pursue our vision and mission by making grants through four program teams, as well as by supporting exploratory and special projects. You’ll find more information about the specific objectives of each program area in the Programs & Grants section of this report.

CIVIL SOCIETY
Purpose: To help strengthen the nonprofit sector and expand local philanthropy to be vital vehicles for addressing tough challenges, unlocking local resources and building community leadership.

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

EDUCATION
Purpose: To expand opportunities for children and youth to succeed in school, work and, ultimately, life.

PROGRAM AREAS:
- Advancing Afterschool
- Graduating High School College & Career Ready
- Youth Engagement
- Special Initiatives

ENVIRONMENT
Purpose: To support programs around the world that protect communities and the ecosystems upon which they depend.

PROGRAM AREAS:
- Addressing the Freshwater Challenge
- Transforming Development Finance
- Advancing Climate Change Solutions
- Special Initiatives

FLINT AREA
Purpose: To help our hometown of Flint solve problems, create opportunities and build a vibrant future for the community and its residents.

PROGRAM AREAS:
- Revitalizing the Education Continuum
- Enriching Lives Through Arts and Culture
- Restoring Community Vitality
- Meeting Evolving Community Needs

EXPLORATORY AND SPECIAL PROJECTS
Purpose: To support unusual or unique opportunities addressing significant national and international problems. Proposals are by invitation only. Unsolicited proposals are discouraged.
PROGRAMS & GRANTS
CIVIL SOCIETY OVERVIEW

To help strengthen the nonprofit sector and expand local philanthropy to be vital vehicles for addressing tough challenges, unlocking local resources and building community leadership, we make grants in the following areas:

CENTRAL/EASTERN EUROPE*
GOAL: Foster an environment in which the nonprofit sector strengthens democratic values and practices.

OBJECTIVES:
Active Civic Participation: We strive for a society in which people and nonprofit organizations are empowered to promote and defend their democratic values.
Philanthropy Development: We envision a robust culture of private giving that serves the public good.

SOUTH AFRICA
GOAL: Empower underserved communities by developing local philanthropy and increasing access to justice.

OBJECTIVES:
Community Advice Office Sector: We seek to foster strong and sustainable community advice offices and related community-based organizations that assist poor and marginalized communities.
Philanthropy Development: We aim to increase philanthropy with improved responsiveness to the needs of poor and marginalized communities.
Special Opportunities: We strive to remain alert to unique approaches to strengthening civil society.

UNITED STATES
GOAL: Help the nonprofit and philanthropic sector meet the needs of individuals and communities.

OBJECTIVES:
Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness: We work to foster a robust infrastructure that helps organizations and individuals engage in charitable giving.
Community Philanthropy: We seek to expand local philanthropy in ways that support and promote community vitality and resiliency.
Special Opportunities: We strive to remain alert to unique approaches to strengthening civil society.

GLOBAL PHILANTHROPY AND NONPROFIT SECTOR
GOAL: Strengthen global support systems for philanthropies and nonprofit organizations.

OBJECTIVES:
Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector: We aim to help strengthen philanthropic and nonprofit support organizations through collaboration and information exchange.
Special Opportunities: We strive to remain responsive to unique opportunities to strengthen civil society.

*Note: Until 2015, this area of grantmaking included support for organizations in Russia. In that year, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation was included on a list of organizations the upper house of the Russian parliament recommended designating as “undesirable.” The Mott Foundation concluded that the best course of action was to discontinue our support in Russia.
CIVIL SOCIETY 2016 GRANT ACTIVITY

Global Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector $2.668 / 22 Grants
Central/Eastern Europe $10.049 / 66 Grants

$19,253,018 136 GRANTS

CENTRAL/EASTERN EUROPE

Southwest Europe
$4.394 37
Western Former Soviet Union
$2.325 16
CEE Regional
$3.330 13

SOUTHEAST EUROPE

Community Advice Office Sector
$2.055 12
Philanthropy Development
$1.156 9
Special Opportunities
$.638 5

UNITED STATES

Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness
$2.535 20
Community Philanthropy
$.102 2
Special Opportunities
$.050 0

GLOBAL PHILANTHROPY AND NONPROFIT SECTOR

Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector
$2.318 20
Special Opportunities
$.350 2

TOTALS $19,253 136

Central/Eastern Europe

AGORA Platform: Active Communities for Development Alternatives
Sofia, Bulgaria
$150,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

Anadolu Kultur
Istanbul, Turkey
$150,000 – 18 mos.
Art for Social Change

Association for Community Relations
Cluj-Napoca, Romania
$180,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Balkan Investigative Reporting Network Kosovo
Pristina, Kosovo
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Bulgarian Donors’ Forum
Sofia, Bulgaria
$180,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

Catalyst Foundation
Belgrade, Serbia
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Center for Civic Cooperation
Livno, Bosnia and Herzegovina
$60,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

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

Centre for Research, Documentation and Publication
Pristina, Kosovo
$70,000 – 24 mos.
Planning and administrative support

Citizen Participation Forum
Sofia, Bulgaria
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Civic Alliance
Podgorica, Montenegro
$70,000 – 24 mos.
Towards enhanced civic activism and sustainable civic participation in Montenegro

Civic Initiatives
Belgrade, Serbia
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Community Building Mitrovica
Mitrovica, Kosovo
$70,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

East West Centre Sarajevo
Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Civic engagement through civic theater

Forum for Civic Initiatives
Pristina, Kosovo
$150,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

Fund for Active Citizenship
Podgorica, Montenegro
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Group 484
Belgrade, Serbia
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Heartefact Fund
Belgrade, Serbia
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Institute for Public Environment Development
Sofia, Bulgaria
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Integra
Pristina, Kosovo
$60,000 – 24 mos.
Dealing with the past – transitional justice in Kosovo
International Council for Cultural Centers
Sofia, Bulgaria
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Strengthening Bread Houses Network in Bulgaria

National Network for Children
Sofia, Bulgaria
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Developing community schools in Bulgaria

Network for the Affirmation of NGO Sector - MANS
Podgorica, Montenegro
$75,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

New Horizons Foundation
Lupeni, Romania
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Developing community schools in Romania

Populari
Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
$60,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Regional Foundation for Local Development Zamah
Zagreb, Croatia
$75,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Resource Center for Public Participation
Bucharest, Romania
$150,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

Romanian-American Foundation
New York, NY
$64,200 – 12 mos.
Consultative process for national endowment for community foundations in Romania

SENSE – Central European News Service Ltd.
Zagreb, Croatia
$60,000 – 17 mos.
Local documentation centers in Western Balkans

Support Foundation for Civil Society
Istanbul, Turkey
$110,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Time Heroes Foundation
Sofia, Bulgaria
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Truth, Justice and Memory Studies Association
Istanbul, Turkey
$140,000 – 18 mos.
Documentation, verification and dissemination of gross human rights violations in Turkey

Tuzla Community Foundation
Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

United Way Romania
Bucharest, Romania
$130,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Yayla (Gola) Culture, Arts and Ecology Association
Istanbul, Turkey
$60,000 – 24 mos.
Cultural, ecological and economic rejuvenation of Eastern Black Sea region

Youth Initiative for Human Rights - Bosnia
Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Zajecar Initiative
Zajecar, Serbia
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Subtotal: $4,394,200

WESTERN FORMER SOVIET UNION

Association for International Education and Exchange
Dortmund, Germany
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Encouraging development of non-governmental organizations in Belarus

Association of Small Towns of Ukraine
Kyiv, Ukraine
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Strengthening role of communities in managing local development in Ukraine

Association of Ukrainian Human Rights Monitors on Law Enforcement
Kyiv, Ukraine
$120,000 – 24 mos.
Strengthening youth capacity to protect and restore their rights

Center for Civic & Cultural Initiatives “Tamarisk”
Dnipropetrovsk, Ukraine
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

East Europe Foundation
Kyiv, Ukraine
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Culture of giving: powering strategic philanthropy

Goreniye
Pavlovrad, Ukraine
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Municipal Center for Humanistic Technologies “AHALAR”
Chernihiv, Ukraine
$120,000 – 24 mos.
Strengthening youth capacity to protect and restore their rights

open Democracy Limited
London, England
$150,000 – 24 mos.
E-DemLab

Podolian Agency for Regional Development
Vinnytsia, Ukraine
$150,000 – 24 mos.
E-DemLab

School of Civic Education
Loughton, England
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Civic engagement fundamentals

Local community leaders participate in the VIA Foundation’s ViabilityNet 2.0 program, which ran from 2014-2016.
Step by Step Moldova  
Chisinau, Moldova  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
Community school development in Moldova

Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights Union  
Kyiv, Ukraine  
$100,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Ukrainian Step by Step Foundation  
Kyiv, Ukraine  
$200,000 – 36 mos.  
Community development in Ukraine through community school programs

West-Ukrainian Resource Center  
Lviv, Ukraine  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Wild Salmon Center  
Portland, OR  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
Russian Far East Public Watershed Council Network

Subtotal: $2,325,000

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

Association for Community Relations  
Cluj-Napoca, Romania  
$300,000 – 24 mos.  
INSPIRE – Initiative for Strategic Philanthropy and Intelligent Resources

CEE Bankwatch Network  
Prague, Czech Republic  
$400,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Community Foundation for Northern Ireland  
Belfast, Ireland  
$200,000 – 24 mos.  
International YouthBank support model

European Foundation Centre  
Brussels, Belgium  
$30,000 – 24 mos.  
Grantmakers East Forum

European Venture Philanthropy Association  
Brussels, Belgium  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
Introducing venture philanthropy in Central and Eastern Europe

Foundation for Social Entrepreneurs – UnLtd  
London, England  
$100,000 – 24 mos.  
Strengthening Global Social Entrepreneurship Network in CEE region

German-Russian Exchange  
Berlin, Germany  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
EU-Russia Civil Society Forum

International Centre of Excellence for Community Schools  
Coventry, England  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Network of European Foundations for Innovative Cooperation  
Brussels, Belgium  
$300,000 – 36 mos.  
European program for integration and migration

Roots and Wings Foundation  
Budapest, Hungary  
$200,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Spanish Association of Foundations  
Madrid, Spain  
$200,000 – 36 mos.  
Donors and Foundations Networks in Europe

VIA Foundation  
Prague, Czech Republic  
$600,000 – 36 mos.  
ViabilityNet – regional non-governmental organizations capacity-building program

Subtotal: $3,330,000

Program Area Total: $10,049,200

South Africa  
COMMUNITY ADVICE OFFICE SECTOR

Black Sash Trust  
Cape Town, South Africa  
$220,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Casual Workers Advice Office  
Johannesburg, South Africa  
$200,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Community Law and Rural Development Centre  
Durban, South Africa  
$150,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Eastern Cape NGO Coalition  
East London, South Africa  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Isandla Institute  
Cape Town, South Africa  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
Good Governance Learning Network

National Alliance for the Development of Community Advice Offices  
Johannesburg, South Africa  
$200,000 – 24 mos.  
Community advice office sustainability project  
$150,000 – 12 mos.  
Feasibility study for community advice office center of excellence

Subtotal: $1,156,000

PHILANTHROPY DEVELOPMENT

Community Development Foundation  
Western Cape  
Cape Town, South Africa  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Community Organisation Resource Centre  
Cape Town, South Africa  
$120,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Ikhalo Trust  
Port Elizabeth, South Africa  
$120,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Lusa Community Chest  
Sasolburg, South Africa  
$60,000 – 24 mos.  
Generation @ Junior Community Chest

Social Change Assistance Trust  
Cape Town, South Africa  
$250,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Southern Africa Trust  
Midrand, South Africa  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
Change4ever campaign  
$206,000 – 24 mos.  
Chair in African philanthropy

Southern African Community Grantmakers Leadership Forum  
Cape Town, South Africa  
$100,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Subtotal: $2,055,000

Community Advice Office Sector

ProBono.Org  
Johannesburg, South Africa  
$145,000 – 24 mos.  
Backup legal services for advice offices

Project for Conflict Resolution and Development  
Port Elizabeth, South Africa  
$140,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Rhodes University  
Grahamstown, South Africa  
$300,000 – 30 mos.  
Rhodes University Law Clinic: advice office project

Southern Cape Land Committee  
George, South Africa  
$100,000 – 24 mos.  
Community advice offices and farm/forestry committees project

University of KwaZulu-Natal  
Durban, South Africa  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
Centre for Civil Society

Subtotal: $2,325,000

Community Advice Office Sector
SPECIAL OPPORTUNITIES

Foundation-Administered Project
$43,122

Learning and sharing sessions
Institute for Healing of Memories
Cape Town, South Africa
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University
Port Elizabeth, South Africa
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Centre for Community Schools

SGS Consulting
Johannesburg, South Africa
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Technical support and dialogue platform

South African History Online
Cape Town, South Africa
$120,000 – 24 mos.
Centre for Community Schools

Southern African NGO Network
Johannesburg, South Africa
$75,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Subtotal:
Special Opportunities $638,122
Program Area Total $3,849,122
South Africa

United States

NONPROFIT SECTOR RESPONSIVENESS

Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action
Indianapolis, IN
$88,000 – 42 mos.
General purposes

BoardSource
Washington, DC
$50,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Communications Network
Washington, DC
$30,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Council of Michigan Foundations
Grand Haven, MI
$61,600 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Council on Foundations
Arlington, VA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Foundation-Administered Project
$120,096
Office of Foundation Liaison

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

$50,000 – 48 mos.
Building the future of philanthropy

Grantmakers for Effective Organizations
Washington, DC
$40,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Grants Managers Network
Washington, DC
$65,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

GuideStar
Williamsburg, VA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD
$55,000 – 24 mos.
Nonprofit employment data project

Michigan Nonprofit Association
Lansing, MI
$270,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Multistate Registration and Filing Portal Inc.
Washington, DC
$30,000 – 12 mos.
Single online filing portal

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

Nonprofit Quarterly
Boston, MA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Third Sector New England
Boston, MA
$125,000 – 24 mos.
Nonprofits Integrating Community Engagement

Urban Institute
Washington, DC
$100,000 – 15 mos.
Regulation of nonprofits and philanthropy

$150,000 – 24 mos.
Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy

Subtotal:
Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness $2,534,696

Seth Mnguni (pictured at right) is a community-based paralegal in Mabopane, Pretoria, and chairman of the Association of Community Advice Offices of South Africa – 2015.
COMMUNITY PHILANTHROPY
Grand Valley State University
Allendale, MI
$77,000 – 24 mos.
Giving circles and community foundations
Puerto Rico Community Foundation
San Juan, Puerto Rico
$25,000 – 17 mos.
Connecting U.S. and Ibero-American community foundations with Puerto Rico
Subtotal: $102,000
Community Philanthropy

SPECIAL OPPORTUNITIES
Foundation-Administered Project
Fluxx app development
Subtotal: $50,000

Program Area Total: $2,686,696
United States

Global Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector
PHILANTHROPY AND NONPROFIT SECTOR
CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation
Washington, DC
$50,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
$150,000 – 36 mos.
Affinity group of national associations

European Foundation Centre
Brussels, Belgium
$100,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Global Dialogue
London, England
$100,000 – 36 mos.
Funders’ initiative for civil society

Global Fund for Community Foundations
Johannesburg, South Africa
$250,000 – 12 mos.
Small grants and capacity-building program
$25,000 – 16 mos.
Global community philanthropy summit

Indiana University
Indianapolis, IN
$140,000 – 12 mos.
Index of philanthropic freedom

Inter-American Foundation
Washington, DC
$300,000 – 36 mos.
Mexican community foundation development
$150,000 – 18 mos.
Building broader communities in the Americas

Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD
$85,000 – 36 mos.
International Society for Third-Sector Research
$100,000 – 18 mos.
Global civil society information system

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
$200,000 – 24 mos.
International community foundation fellows program

Southern Africa Trust
Midrand, South Africa
$150,000 – 21 mos.
Africa Philanthropy Network

TechSoup
San Francisco, CA
$100,000 – 18 mos.
NGOsSource

U.S.-Mexico Border Philanthropy Partnership
San Diego, CA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

UK Community Foundations
London, England
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

World Affairs Council of Northern California
San Francisco, CA
$50,000 – 24 mos.
Global Philanthropy Forum

Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support
São Paulo, Brazil
$30,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Hudson Institute
Washington, DC
($40,000)
Adjustment to previous grant
Subtotal: $2,318,000
Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector

SPECIAL OPPORTUNITIES
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Advancing next generation of civil society assistance

International Academy for Innovative Pedagogy, Psychology and Economy gGmbH
Berlin, Germany
$150,000 – 12 mos.
Youth empowerment partnership program
Subtotal: $350,000
Special Opportunities

Program Area Total: $2,668,000
Global Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector

Program Total: $19,253,018
Civil Society

School girls participating in a mentorship program at the Thope Foundation in Khayelitsha, Cape Town, South Africa, circa 2016.
EDUCATION OVERVIEW

To expand opportunities for children and youth to succeed in school, work and, ultimately, life, we make grants in the following areas:

ADVANCING AFTERSCHOOL
GOAL: Promote access to quality afterschool educational opportunities.

OBJECTIVES:
Building an Afterschool Infrastructure: Our grants support a national infrastructure of organizations dedicated to increasing the quality of afterschool programs for children, youth and families.
Fostering Afterschool Policy: Our funding supports the development of effective policies and partnerships to increase quality afterschool programs for children, youth and families.
Improving Afterschool Quality & Innovation: Our grantmaking advances research and exemplary models that increase student engagement in learning and prepare students for college and career.

GRADUATING HIGH SCHOOL COLLEGE & CAREER READY
GOAL: Increase high school graduation and college and career readiness outcomes for youth.

OBJECTIVES:
Expanding Quality Programs: Our funding supports efforts to expand quality college and career readiness programming through the afterschool infrastructure.
Advancing Innovations: Our funding seeks to broaden the implementation of and investment in innovative college and career readiness strategies.

YOUTH ENGAGEMENT
GOAL: Advance strategies that lead to greater and more meaningful youth participation in schools, communities and the economy.

OBJECTIVES:
Youth Entrepreneurship: We seek to expand entrepreneurial education and experiences for youth in low- and moderate-income communities.
Engaging Youth Through Service: We seek to increase youth engagement in the K-12 system through service.

SPECIAL INITIATIVES
GOAL: Maintain the Foundation’s flexibility to respond to new strategies, unique opportunities, and changing social, economic, and political contexts.

After-School All-Stars serves more than 14,000 students annually — and an average of 6,000 students a day — at 48 school sites in Los Angeles — 2017.

Note: The preceding overview of Mott’s Education Program reflects program areas, goals and objectives that were approved by the Foundation’s board of trustees in June 2017. Because 2016 grants were awarded under an earlier framework shown on the next page, the grants listed on pages 51-53 are categorized according to that framework.
Advancing Afterschool

POLICY AND PARTNERSHIPS

After-School All-Stars
Los Angeles, CA
$300,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Afterschool Alliance
Washington, DC
$2,300,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes
$275,000 – 12 mos.
VISTA project

Afterschool Works! New York
Albany, NY
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Afterschool policy- and system-building initiative

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

Alliance for Justice
Washington, DC
$225,000 – 30 mos.
Advocacy training

Alternatives Inc.
Fort Monroe, VA
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Virginia statewide afterschool network

Arkansas State University
Jonesboro, AR
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Afterschool policy- and system-building initiative

BoardSource
Washington, DC
$651,875 – 24 mos.
Statewide afterschool network support

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

Collaborative Communications Group
Washington, DC
$400,000 – 12 mos.
Afterschool education and outreach project

Explorela
Albuquerque, NM
$225,000 – 36 mos.
New Mexico statewide afterschool network

Foundation-Administered Project
$145,000
Afterschool technical assistance collaborative and statewide afterschool networks

Fund for Educational Excellence
Baltimore, MD
$265,000 – 36 mos.
Maryland statewide afterschool network

George W. Bush Foundation
Dallas, TX
$350,000 – 24 mos.
Mayors’ Report Card on Education

Indiana Afterschool Network Inc.
Indianapolis, IN
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Indiana statewide afterschool network

Louisiana Tech University
Ruston, LA
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Louisiana statewide afterschool network
Massachusetts Afterschool Partnership
Boston, MA
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Afterschool policy- and system-building initiative

Michigan Association of United Ways
Lansing, MI
$325,000 – 36 mos.
Michigan statewide afterschool network

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

National Conference of State Legislatures
Denver, CO
$510,000 – 24 mos.
Informing state legislatures: statewide afterschool policy

National League of Cities Institute
Washington, DC
$350,000 – 18 mos.
City leaders engaged in afterschool reform and New Day for Learning

National Summer Learning Association
Baltimore, MD
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Building support for summer learning

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

New Jersey School-Age Care Coalition
Westfield, NJ
$225,000 – 36 mos.
New Jersey statewide afterschool network

Operation Shoestring
Jackson, MS
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Mississippi statewide afterschool network

Save the Children
Fairfield, CT
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Kentucky statewide afterschool network

South Carolina Afterschool Alliance
Columbia, SC
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Afterschool policy- and system-building initiative

South East Education Cooperative
Fargo, ND
$225,000 – 36 mos.
North Dakota statewide afterschool network

United Way of Delaware
Wilmington, DE
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Delaware statewide afterschool network

United Ways of Texas
Austin, TX
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Afterschool policy- and system-building initiative

University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA
$110,000 – 12 mos.
Summit on afterschool

Voices for Georgia's Children
Atlanta, GA
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Georgia statewide afterschool network

Voices for Illinois Children
Chicago, IL
$112,500 – 18 mos.
Illinois statewide afterschool network

Wyoming Community Foundation
Laramie, WY
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Wyoming statewide afterschool network

YMCA of Rapid City
Rapid City, SD
$225,000 – 36 mos.
South Dakota statewide afterschool network

Subtotal: $12,089,362
Policy and Partnerships

QUALITY AND INNOVATION

American Institutes for Research
Washington, DC
$350,000 – 24 mos.
Identifying promising practices

Asia Society
New York, NY
$300,000 – 24 mos.
International approaches and 21st century competencies

ExpandED Schools
New York, NY
$400,000 – 22 mos.
Every Hour Counts

Foundations Inc.
Mt. Laurel, NJ
$100,000 – 12 mos.
21st Century Community Learning Centers Institute

Institute for Educational Leadership
Washington, DC
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Coalition for community schools

Massachusetts Afterschool Partnership
Boston, MA
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Increasing literacy proficiency for Hispanic dual-language learner

Pacific Science Center
Seattle, WA
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Science, technology, engineering and math fellowship

Synergy Enterprises Inc.
Silver Spring, MD
$250,000 – 6 mos.
21st Century Community Learning Centers summer institute

University of San Diego
San Diego, CA
$730,000 – 12 mos.
Increasing science, technology, engineering and math in afterschool

Subtotal: $3,330,000
Quality and Innovation

Program Area Total: $15,419,362
Advancing Afterschool

Graduating High School College & Career Ready

ADVANCING INNOVATIONS

CFLeads
Braintree, MA
$250,000 – 25 mos.
Children's savings account strategies for community foundations

Community Economic Development Association of Michigan
Lansing, MI
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Michigan Communities for Financial Empowerment Network

Corporation for Enterprise Development
Washington, DC
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Advancing children's savings account field initiative

Heartland Alliance for Human Needs and Human Rights
Chicago, IL
$527,945 – 30 mos.
Midwest Children’s Savings Account Initiative

National League of Cities Institute
Washington, DC
$275,000 – 24 mos.
Cities building bridges to postsecondary success

New America Foundation
Washington, DC
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Asset-building program

Subtotal: $1,802,945
Advancing Innovations

Program Area Total: $1,802,945
Graduating High School College & Career Ready

Youth Engagement

YOUTH ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Aspen Institute
Washington, DC
$300,000 – 12 mos.
Role of microenterprise and sector strategies in connecting young people to prosperous livelihoods

Subtotal: $300,000
Youth Entrepreneurship
ENGAGING YOUTH THROUGH SERVICE

Points of Light Foundation
Atlanta, GA
$250,000 – 18 mos.
Service as a strategy
$50,000 – 7 mos.
National conference on volunteering and service

Service Year Exchange Inc.
Washington, DC
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Service in support of afterschool

YouthBuild USA
Somerville, MA
$200,000 – 12 mos.
Service continuum improving career and postsecondary pathways

Subtotal: $750,000
Engaging Youth Through Service

Program Area Total: $1,050,000

Success Beyond High School
EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR VULNERABLE YOUTH

Cleveland Botanical Garden
Cleveland, OH
$45,000 – 24 mos.
Green Corps urban youth program

Lansing Community College
Lansing, MI
$200,000 – 24 mos.
High School Diploma Completion Initiative

Subtotal: $245,000
Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth

Program Area Total: $245,000
Success Beyond High School

Expanding Economic Opportunity
INCOME SECURITY

Arise Citizens’ Policy Project
Montgomery, AL
$35,000 – 36 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative

California Budget Project
Sacramento, CA
$35,000 – 36 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
Washington, DC
$35,000 – 36 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative – DC Fiscal Policy Institute

Colorado Fiscal Institute
Denver, CO
$35,000 – 36 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative

Fiscal Policy Institute
Latham, NY
$35,000 – 36 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative

Subtotal: $350,000
Income Security

Program Area Total: $350,000
Expanding Economic Opportunity

Special Initiatives

SPECIAL OPPORTUNITIES

Center for Community Change
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
Washington, DC
$500,000 – 24 mos.
State fiscal and low-income initiatives project

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

Focus: HOPE
Detroit, MI
$750,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

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

Jazz at Lincoln Center
New York, NY
$350,400 – 18 mos.
Jazz for young people – Flint and national afterschool taskforce

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
Baltimore, MD
$300,000 – 36 mos.
ACT-SO program

Prima Civitas Foundation
East Lansing, MI
$150,000 – 9 mos.
General purposes

Schaffer&Combs
San Francisco, CA
$600,000 – 32 mos.
Education program data collection and assessment

Urban Entrepreneurship Initiative
Detroit, MI
$10,000 – 12 mos.
Urban entrepreneurship symposium

YouthBuild USA
Somerville, MA
$200,000 – 22 mos.
Capacity building and program support

Subtotal: $3,660,400
Special Opportunities

Microenterprise

Association for Enterprise Opportunity
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Subtotal: $200,000
Microenterprise

Program Area Total: $3,860,400
Special Initiatives

Program Total: $22,727,707
Education
ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW

To support programs around the world that protect communities and the ecosystems upon which they depend, we make grants in the following areas:

ADDRESSING THE FRESHWATER CHALLENGE

**GOAL:** Secure sustainable levels of clean water for people and the environment, particularly in the Great Lakes basin.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Strengthening the Environmental Community:** We seek a strong, effective and sustainable community of nongovernmental organizations dedicated to the long-term conservation of freshwater ecosystems.
- **Informing Sound Public Policies:** We seek well-designed and effectively implemented policies that advance the conservation of freshwater ecosystems.

TRANSFORMING DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

**GOAL:** Shape international investment to support sustainable development and reduce environmental degradation.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Securing Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future:** We envision infrastructure and energy investments that contribute to environmental sustainability and offer local economic opportunity.
- **Promoting Sustainable Regional Development and Integration:** We seek international and regional investments that contribute to local sustainable development, with a focus on South America.

ADVANCING CLIMATE CHANGE SOLUTIONS

**GOAL:** Advance the adoption of clean energy technologies in developing countries in South America, Africa and Asia.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Providing Access to Clean Energy in Developing Countries:** We seek to increase the use of renewable energy systems in rural areas of South America, Asia and Africa.

SPECIAL INITIATIVES

**GOAL:** Respond to unique opportunities to advance environmental protection in the U.S. and internationally.

---

**Note:** The preceding overview of Mott’s Environment Program reflects program areas, goals and objectives that were approved by the Foundation’s board of trustees in September 2017. Because 2016 grants were awarded under an earlier framework shown on the next page, the grants listed on pages 55-57 are categorized according to that framework.
**ENVIRONMENT 2016 GRANT ACTIVITY**

**ADDRESSING THE FRESHWATER CHALLENGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Dollars (in millions)</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the Environmental Community</td>
<td>$2.410</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing Sound Public Policies</td>
<td>$2.645</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSFORMING DEVELOPMENT FINANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Dollars (in millions)</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Securing Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future</td>
<td>$3.234</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Sustainable Regional Development and Integration</td>
<td>$2.635</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADVANCING CLIMATE CHANGE SOLUTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Dollars (in millions)</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing Access to Clean Energy in Developing Countries</td>
<td>$2.798</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating Clean Energy Use in Michigan</td>
<td>$.966</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPECIAL INITIATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Dollars (in millions)</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$.794</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

$15,483 87 Grants

---

**Addressing the Freshwater Challenge**

**STRENGTHENING THE ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNITY**

- **Clean Wisconsin**
  - Madison, WI
  - $300,000 – 24 mos.
  - Great Lakes water program

- **Conservation Fund**
  - Arlington, VA
  - $150,000 – 24 mos.
  - Saginaw Bay Watershed Initiative Network

- **Flint River Watershed Coalition**
  - Flint, MI
  - $105,000 – 12 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Freshwater Future**
  - Petoskey, MI
  - $150,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy**
  - Traverse City, MI
  - $250,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Institute for Conservation Leadership**
  - Takoma Park, MD
  - $200,000 – 24 mos.
  - Freshwater leadership initiative

**Land Trust Alliance**

- Washington, DC
  - $340,000 – 24 mos.
  - Strengthening land trusts and promoting collaboration to conserve freshwater ecosystems in Great Lakes basin

**Michigan Environmental Council**

- Lansing, MI
  - $35,000 – 24 mos.
  - Great Lakes program

**Minnesota Environmental Partnership**

- St. Paul, MN
  - $230,000 – 24 mos.
  - Northeast Minnesota program

**Ohio Environmental Council**

- Columbus, OH
  - $300,000 – 24 mos.
  - Great Lakes ecosystem project

**River Alliance of Wisconsin**

- Madison, WI
  - $150,000 – 24 mos.
  - Great Lakes program

**University of Illinois-Chicago**

- Chicago, IL
  - $200,000 – 12 mos.
  - Connecting freshwater leaders beyond the Great Lakes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal:</th>
<th>$2,410,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the Environmental Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Informing Sound Public Policies**

- **Bipartisan Policy Center**
  - Washington, DC
  - $100,000 – 9 mos.
  - Drinking water infrastructure program

- **Bonneville Environmental Foundation**
  - Portland, OR
  - $120,000 – 24 mos.
  - Change the Course

- **Canadian Environmental Law Association**
  - Toronto, Ontario
  - $200,000 – 24 mos.
  - Great Lakes program

- **Center for Neighborhood Technology**
  - Chicago, IL
  - $400,000 – 24 mos.
  - Great Lakes water infrastructure project

- **Chattahoochee Riverkeeper**
  - Atlanta, GA
  - $315,000 – 24 mos.
  - New approach to water management in Georgia

- **Flint Riverkeeper**
  - Albany, GA
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Great Lakes Environmental Law Center**
  - Detroit, MI
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - Water quality project
Institute for Georgia Environmental Leadership
Atlanta, GA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Georgia sustainable water-management outreach program

Michigan United Conservation Clubs
Lansing, MI
$125,000 – 12 mos.
Michigan land and water policy project

Midwest Environmental Advocates
Madison, WI
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Water quantity protection and conservation project

Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy
St. Paul, MN
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Lake Superior water quality project

National Wildlife Federation
Reston, VA
$50,000 – 24 mos.
Sustaining Great Lakes project

Natural Resources Defense Council
New York, NY
$40,000 – 12 mos.
Implementation of Great Lakes Compact

Nature Conservancy
Arlington, VA
$29,000 – 24 mos.
Saginaw Bay initiative
$100,000 – 18 mos.
Lower Flint River project

Northeast-Midwest Institute
Washington, DC
$175,000 – 12 mos.
Safe Drinking Water Policy Center

Southern Environmental Law Center
Charlottesville, VA
$23,000 – 24 mos.
Southern water-management project

U.S. Water Alliance
Washington, D.C.
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Great Lakes urban water-management project

University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI
$43,000 – 9 mos.
Right-sizing water infrastructure

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI
$75,000 – 9 mos.
Improving Great Lakes water resources management

Subtotal: $2,645,000
Informing Sound Public Policies

Program Area Total: $5,055,000
Addressing the Freshwater Challenge

Transforming Development Finance
SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENERGY FOR A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE

ActionAid
London, England
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Bretton Woods project

Beijing Greenovation Forwards Culture Communication Co. Ltd.
Beijing, China
$200,000 – 18 mos.
Monitoring Chinese development finance and global climate policy

Boston University
Boston, MA
$400,000 – 24 mos.
Development banks and sustainable development

Eurodad
Brussels, Belgium
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Addressing changes in international development finance

Forest Peoples Programme
Moreton-in-Marsh, England
$125,000 – 12 mos.
Protecting the environment and securing rights of forest peoples in international development finance

Foundation-Administered Project
$19,380
Transforming Development Finance convenings

Global Environmental Institute
Beijing, China
$200,000 – 18 mos.
Pivoting shift in overseas lending of China’s policy banks towards greener and more sustainable path

Green Watershed
Kunming, China
$115,000 – 18 mos.
Mainstreaming green credit policy in Chinese policy banks

Institute for Climate and Sustainable Cities
Quezon City, Philippines
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Supporting southern civil society engagement in finance

International Rivers
Berkeley, CA
$375,000 – 24 mos.
Strengthening dam standards and protecting rivers

NGO Forum on ADB
Quezon City, Philippines
$250,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Oil Change International
Washington, DC
$150,000 – 24 mos.
International program

PLATFORM
London, England
$50,000 – 32 mos.
Reforming energy investment

Pontifical Catholic University
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Strengthening new development bank safeguards

Re:Common
Rome, Italy
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Mainstreaming environmental sustainability into a changing development finance

Urgewald
Sassenberg, Germany
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Promoting environmental and social standards in financial sector

Subtotal: $3,234,380
Securing Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future

PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTEGRATION

Bank Information Center
Washington, DC
$220,000 – 24 mos.
China-Latin America sustainable investments initiative

Conectas
Sao Paulo, Brazil
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Strengthening Brazilian National Social and Economic Development Bank accountability
Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
Lima, Peru
$350,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Ecoa – Ecology and Action
Campo Grande, Brazil
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Monitoring environmental impacts of financial flows for infrastructure and energy in South America

Fundacion Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
Buenos Aires, Argentina
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Monitoring infrastructure investments in Argentina

Indian Law Resource Center
Helena, MT
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Integration investments and indigenous peoples in South America

Instituto de Energia e Meio Ambiente
Sao Paulo, Brazil
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Monitoring Brazilian National Social and Economic Development Bank sustainability

Instituto Socioambiental
Sao Paulo, Brazil
$225,000 – 24 mos.
Impacts of investments of Brazilian National Social and Economic Development Bank on regional sustainability

Interamerican Association for Environmental Defense
San Francisco, CA
$220,000 – 24 mos.
Promoting sustainability in energy and infrastructure investments in Latin America

SITAWI Finance for Good
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Unlocking Brazilian National Social and Economic Development Bank operation lifecycle

Socio-Environmental Fund CASA
Juquitiba, Brazil
$150,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Uruguayan Study Center of Appropriate Technologies
Montevideo, Uruguay
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Impacts and alternatives to current investment and development patterns on environmental and sustainability options in Latin America

Subtotal: $2,635,000
Promoting Sustainable Regional Development and Integration

Program Area Total: $5,869,380
Transforming Development Finance

Advancing Climate Change Solutions

Providing Access to Clean Energy in Developing Countries

Centro de Estudos Avancados de Promocaos Social e Ambiental
Santarém, Brazil
$400,000 – 24 mos.
Solar energy for Amazon River dwellers

Energy 4 Impact
London, England
$198,400 – 12 mos.
Productive use of energy applications in Devery smart solar microgrids pilot

Hivos
Den Haag, Netherlands
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Energy Change Lab Tanzania

Instituto de Energia e Meio Ambiente
Sao Paulo, Brazil
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Technical support to maximize renewable energy access success

Instituto Socioambiental
Sao Paulo, Brazil
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Energy distributed to isolated communities

Katalytx
San Francisco, CA
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Platform for energy access knowledge

United Nations Foundation
Washington, DC
$500,000 – 28 mos.
Sustainable Energy for All

$300,000 – 24 mos.
Towards universal energy access

World Resources Institute
Washington, DC
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Building national dialogues on integrated electricity planning in East Africa

World Wildlife Fund
Washington, DC
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Renewable energy for extractive reserves in Amazon

Subtotal: $2,798,400
Providing Access to Clean Energy in Developing Countries

Stimulating Clean Energy Use in Michigan

Clean Energy Coalition
Ann Arbor, MI
$15,936 – 9 mos.
Flint anchor institutions clean energy initiative

EcoWorks
Detroit, MI
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Community energy management in southeast Michigan

Elevate Energy
Chicago, IL
$120,000 – 12 mos.
Energy efficiency in Michigan

Groundwork Center for Resilient Communities
Traverse City, MI
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Sustainable energy use in northern Michigan

Michigan Energy Options
East Lansing, MI
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Minneapolis Foundation
Minneapolis, MN
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Re-AMP local solutions working group

SEEDS
Traverse City, MI
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Advancing climate solutions in Traverse City

Superior Watershed Partnership
Marquette, MI
$80,000 – 18 mos.
Upper Peninsula energy-planning project

University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI
$100,000 – 18 mos.
General purposes

Subtotal: $965,936
Stimulating Clean Energy Use in Michigan

Program Area Total: $3,764,336
Advancing Climate Change Solutions

Special Initiatives

SPECIAL OPPORTUNITIES

Consultative Group on Biological Diversity
San Francisco, CA
$40,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Environmental Grantmakers Association
New York, NY
$50,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Foundation-Administered Project
$64,160
Blue Accounting Communications

Funders’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities
Coral Gables, FL
$240,000 – 42 mos.
General purposes

Land Trust Alliance
Washington, DC
$300,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

New America Foundation
Washington, DC
$100,000 – 6 mos.
Climate Leadership Council

Subtotal: $794,160
Special Opportunities

Program Area Total: $794,160
Special Initiatives

Program Total: $15,482,876
Environment

2016 ANNUAL REPORT
FLINT AREA OVERVIEW

TO HELP our hometown of Flint solve problems, create opportunities and build a vibrant future for the community and its residents, we make grants in the following areas:

REVITALIZING THE EDUCATION CONTINUUM

GOAL: Increase educational opportunities that will help Flint area children, youth and adults achieve success in the classroom and the workplace.

OBJECTIVES:
- **Flint K–12 Education**: We strive for a strong, sustainable K–12 system that provides local families with high-quality educational choices.
- **Community Schools**: We support the district-wide adoption of a re-envisioned approach to community schools.
- **College, Careers and Connections**: We aim for broad access among residents to multiple educational and career pathways.

ENRICHING LIVES THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE

GOAL: Support local arts and cultural organizations as critical forces for positive change in Flint.

OBJECTIVES:
- **Flint Cultural Center Campus**: We strive to ensure that the Flint Cultural Center is strong, sustainable and has the capacity it needs to provide area residents, especially youth, with diverse, quality programming.
- **Smaller Arts Organizations**: We seek to strengthen the overall arts community in Flint in ways that cultivate and connect local artists, patrons and residents.

RESTORING COMMUNITY VITALITY

GOAL: Stimulate local job growth, revitalize the city center and spark new economic energy in the greater Flint area.

OBJECTIVES:
- **Regional Economy**: We envision a vibrant and diverse economy that builds on the area’s strengths and assets.
- **Downtown Revitalization**: We strive for a city center that attracts both public and private investment.
- **Community Development**: We seek affordable housing opportunities and strong neighborhoods in and around the city.
- **Entrepreneurship**: We aim for a vibrant and connected community of local entrepreneurs and small businesses.

MEETING EVOLVING COMMUNITY NEEDS

GOAL: Strengthen the capacity of Flint area programs and organizations to help children and families meet their needs and improve their lives.

OBJECTIVES:
- **Nonprofit/Philanthropic Sector**: We envision a strong nonprofit and philanthropic sector that contributes to quality of life in Flint.
- **Special Opportunities**: We strive to maintain the flexibility to help leverage opportunities and resources for the Flint community, test new ideas, incubate local projects and meet specific, unforeseen needs as they arise.
Debe el texto natural de esta imagen como lees el documento.
Mott Community College
Flint, MI
$49,050 – 12 mos.
Increasing literacy levels for at-risk youth in college-connected programs

$400,000 – 12 mos.
Adult career pathway program

Specialized Employment Services Inc.
Flint, MI
$150,000 – 12 mos.
Flint STRIVE replication program

$85,000 – 12 mos.
Flint STRIVE Academy youth empowerment program

St. Luke N.E.W. Life Center
Flint, MI
$140,000 – 12 mos.
Employment preparation program

University of Michigan-Flint
Flint, MI
$415,700 – 12 mos.
Committed to Excellence and Opportunity program

$11,000,000 – 48 mos.
Flint science, technology, engineering and math expansion and recruitment

Subtotal: $13,442,458
College, Careers and Connections

Program Area Total: $33,651,809
Revitalizing the Education Continuum

Enriching Lives Through Arts and Culture

FLINT CULTURAL CENTER CAMPUS

Community Foundation of Greater Flint
Flint, MI
$2,205,402 – 12 mos.
Endowment funds

Flint Cultural Center Corporation
Flint, MI
$1,705,000 – 12 mos.
Operating support

$100,000 – 12 mos.
School and community programming

$300,000 – 19 mos.
Sloan Museum expansion/renovation

Flint Cultural Center Foundation
Flint, MI
$5,500,000 – 29 mos.
Flint Institute of Arts glass studio and gallery

Flint Institute of Arts
Flint, MI
$1,915,000 – 12 mos.
Operating support

Flint Institute of Music
Flint, MI
$1,300,000 – 12 mos.
Operating support

$50,000 – 6 mos.
Tapology Tap Dance Festival for Youth

$50,000 – 6 mos.
Music in the Parks

Flint Public Library
Flint, MI
$48,000 – 10 mos.
Design a library for the future

Sphinx Organization
Detroit, MI
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Overture program and partnership with Flint Institute of Music

Subtotal: $13,273,402
Flint Cultural Center Campus

SMALLER ARTS ORGANIZATIONS

Buckham Fine Arts Project
Flint, MI
$30,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

City of Flint
Flint, MI
$125,523 – 4 mos.
Event policing and public safety

Community Foundation of Greater Flint
Flint, MI
$50,000 – 12 mos.
S. Jean Simi Fund for the Arts

Flint Downtown Development Authority
Flint, MI
$25,000 – 1 mo.
Downtown festivals

Greater Flint Arts Council
Flint, MI
$150,000 – 12 mos.
Parade of Festivals

Subtotal: $515,523
Smaller Arts Organizations

Program Area Total: $13,788,925
Enriching Lives Through Arts and Culture

Restoring Community Vitality

REGIONAL ECONOMY

Brookings Institution
Washington, DC
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Older industrial cities analysis

Genesee Area Focus Fund
Flint, MI
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Education and economic development initiatives

Genesys Health Foundation
Grand Blanc, MI
$140,000 – 22 mos.
Life sciences market-needs study

United Way of Genesee County
Flint, MI
$100,000 – 3 mos.
Flint Area Reinvestment Office

Subtotal: $340,000
Regional Economy

DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION

Foundation-Administered Project
$116,763
Technical assistance for downtown Flint revitalization

Foundation for the Uptown Revitalization Corporation
Flint, MI
$200,000 – 12 mos.
Operating support

$222,073 – 12 mos.
Downtown security

$30,000 – 12 mos.
Real estate development support services

$300,000 – 19 mos.
Flint Farmers’ Market operating support

Subtotal: $868,836
Downtown Revitalization

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Center for Community Progress
Flint, MI
$1,100,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Communities First Inc.
Flint, MI
$75,000 – 12 mos.
Capacity building

Court Street Village Non-Profit Housing Corporation
Flint, MI
$40,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Genesee Chamber Foundation
Flint, MI
$159,000 – 11 mos.
Online Flint publication

Genesee County Habitat for Humanity
Flint, MI
$140,000 – 12 mos.
Neighborhood impact program

Genesee County Land Bank Authority
Flint, MI
$240,000 – 12 mos.
Neighborhood and community planning

Historic Elmwood Foundation
Detroit, MI
$25,000 – 12 mos.
Glenwood Cemetery maintenance and planning

Kettering University
Flint, MI
$105,822 – 12 mos.
Blight remediation

Local Initiatives Support Corporation
New York, NY
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Flint and Genesee County community development project

Metro Community Development
Flint, MI
$135,000 – 12 mos.
Capacity building
Urban Renaissance Center  
Flint, MI  
$40,000 – 5 mos.  
Civic Park construction program

Subtotal: $2,309,822  
Community Development

ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Foundation for the Uptown Reinvestment Corporation  
Flint, MI  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
Flint Food Works commercial kitchen

Mott Community College  
Flint, MI  
$68,000 – 7 mos.  
Teen CEO initiative  
$78,196 – 12 mos.  
FABLAB for the community

Greater Flint Health Coalition  
Flint, MI  
$245,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

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

Shelter of Flint Inc.  
Flint, MI  
$50,000 – 12 mos.  
One Stop Housing Resource Center

United Way of Genesee County  
Flint, MI  
$220,000 – 12 mos.  
Building Excellence, Sustainability and Trust (BEST) nonprofit capacity building  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes  
$75,000 – 12 mos.  
Flint National Service Accelerator initiative  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
National service and volunteer center capacity building  
$190,500 – 12 mos.  
Flint National Service Accelerator initiative evaluation  
$65,120 – 12 mos.  
Berston Field House capacity building

Valley Area Agency on Aging  
Flint, MI  
$43,000 – 12 mos.  
Senior outreach program

Whaley Children's Center  
Flint, MI  
$42,000 – 12 mos.  
Facility upgrades

YWCA of Greater Flint  
Flint, MI  
$62,500 – 12 mos.  
Real estate consulting

Subtotal: $4,092,120  
Nonprofit/Philanthropic Sector

SPECIAL OPPORTUNITIES

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

City of Flint  
Flint, MI  
$120,000 – 12 mos.  
Residential service line technical assistance  
$417,199 – 19 mos.  
Financial recovery technical assistance

Community Foundation of Greater Flint  
Flint, MI  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
Water quality transparency

Foundation-Administered Project  
$70,000  
Technical assistance to prepare request for qualifications to redesign new water infrastructure system for city of Flint

Foundation for Flint  
Flint, MI  
$5,000,000 – 234 mos.  
Flint Child Health and Development Fund

Genesee County Parks and Recreation Commission  
Flint, MI  
$25,000 – 27 mos.  
General purposes

Mott Community College  
Flint, MI  
$5,000,000 – 234 mos.  
Flint Child Health and Development Fund

Genesee Health System  
Flint, MI  
$473,000 – 12 mos.  
Mobile mental health unit project

Civic Park construction program

Family Service Agency of Mid Michigan  
Flint, MI  
$30,000 – 12 mos.  
Technology upgrades

Food Bank of Eastern Michigan  
Flint, MI  
$85,000 – 12 mos.  
Increasing food distribution and access  
$20,000 – 12 mos.  
Flint diaper bank  
$160,000 – 12 mos.  
Frozen produce program  
$284,000 – 12 mos.  
Help centers

Greater Flint Health Coalition  
Flint, MI  
$245,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

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

Shelter of Flint Inc.  
Flint, MI  
$50,000 – 12 mos.  
One Stop Housing Resource Center

United Way of Genesee County  
Flint, MI  
$220,000 – 12 mos.  
Building Excellence, Sustainability and Trust (BEST) nonprofit capacity building  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes  
$75,000 – 12 mos.  
Flint National Service Accelerator initiative  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
National service and volunteer center capacity building  
$190,500 – 12 mos.  
Flint National Service Accelerator initiative evaluation  
$65,120 – 12 mos.  
Berston Field House capacity building

Valley Area Agency on Aging  
Flint, MI  
$43,000 – 12 mos.  
Senior outreach program

Whaley Children's Center  
Flint, MI  
$42,000 – 12 mos.  
Facility upgrades

YWCA of Greater Flint  
Flint, MI  
$62,500 – 12 mos.  
Real estate consulting

Subtotal: $4,092,120  
Nonprofit/Philanthropic Sector

Meeting Evolving Community Needs

NONPROFIT/PHILANTHROPIC SECTOR

Catholic Charities of Shiawassee and Genesee Counties  
Flint, MI  
$500,000 – 12 mos.  
Center for Hope  
$300,000 – 12 mos.  
North End Soup Kitchen, warming center and medical transportation

Community Foundation of Greater Flint  
Flint, MI  
$500,000 – 12 mos.  
Flint National Service Accelerator Fund  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Capacity building

Crim Fitness Foundation  
Flint, MI  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Fair Food Network  
Ann Arbor, MI  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
Double Up Food Bucks project

Subtotal: $589,196  
Entrepreneurship

Program Area Total: $4,107,854  
Restoring Community Vitality
PROGRAM OVERVIEW 2016

EXPLORATORY AND SPECIAL PROJECTS

PURPOSE: To support unusual or unique opportunities addressing significant national and international problems. Proposals are by invitation only. Unsolicited proposals are discouraged.

Special Projects

Bill, Hillary and Chelsea Clinton Foundation
New York, NY
$20,000 – 12 mos.
Clinton Global Initiative
Center for Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI
$75,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Institute for Behavior and Health Inc.
Rockville, MD
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Youth substance abuse reduction program

Program Area Total: $295,000
Special Projects
Program Total: $295,000
Exploratory and Special Projects

EMPLYEE AND TRUSTEE GRANTS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYEE/TRUSTEE MATCHING GRANTS</th>
<th>TRUSTEE-INITIATED GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Area Total: $2,150,549</td>
<td>Program Area Total: $1,605,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee/Trustee</td>
<td>Trustee-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Grants</td>
<td>Program Total: $3,755,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee/Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matching and Trustee-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustee-Initiated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IN MILLIONS

$3,755,549

TOTAL MOTT GRANTMAKING IN 2016: $124,382,111
PROFILE: 2016 ASSETS

Total Foundation Assets
Market Value vs. Inflation Adjusted (in billions)

2007–2016 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>$2,711.5</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>
<td>$2,794.6</td>
<td>$2,720.8</td>
<td>$2,788.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets – 2016 Dollars</td>
<td>3,116.8</td>
<td>2,216.4</td>
<td>2,329.3</td>
<td>2,463.5</td>
<td>2,310.7</td>
<td>2,419.7</td>
<td>2,676.9</td>
<td>2,873.4</td>
<td>2,777.3</td>
<td>2,788.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Month Rolling Average Assets</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>
<td>2,657.5</td>
<td>2,786.7</td>
<td>2,709.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Investment Income (Loss)</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>
<td>313.9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>209.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Investment Income (Loss) 2016 Dollars</td>
<td>281.6</td>
<td>(786.2)</td>
<td>323.4</td>
<td>303.4</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>265.7</td>
<td>415.8</td>
<td>322.8</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>209.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grants Awarded</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>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>119.1</td>
<td>124.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures*</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>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>154.7</td>
<td>143.6</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, or 12-month, average of the foundation’s investment assets.

*Total expenditures include grant payments, foundation-administered projects, administrative expenses, excise and income taxes, and investment expenses.
PROFILE: 2016 GRANTMAKING

Grantmaking Activities 2016

- **Civil Society** 136 Grants (32.4%)
- **Education** 87 Grants (20.7%)
- **Exploratory & Special Projects** 4 Grants (1.0%)
- **Flint Area** 106 Grants (25.2%)
- **Environment** 87 Grants (20.7%)

**TOTAL** 420 GRANTS

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

2007-2016 Grants Awarded by Program (in millions)

- **Civil Society**: $19.3 / 15.5%
- **Education**: $22.7 / 18.3%
- **Environment**: $15.5 / 12.5%
- **Flint Area**: $62.9 / 50.5%

**TOTAL** $124,382,111

**IN MILLIONS**

2016 GRANTMAKING

**Employee/Trustee Matching & Trustee-Initiated Grants**: $3.8 / 3.0%

**Exploratory & Special Projects**: $0.3 / 0.2%

FINANCE
Board of Trustees
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (the "Foundation"), which comprise the statement of financial position as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, 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 entity’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 entity’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, 2016 and 2015, 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.

Southfield, Michigan
July 11, 2017
## STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL POSITION

### ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investments, at fair value:</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 109,525,718</td>
<td>$ 94,809,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>414,665,494</td>
<td>444,062,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income securities</td>
<td>151,948,970</td>
<td>135,219,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – limited partnerships</td>
<td>1,386,640,285</td>
<td>1,356,120,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – nonpartnerships</td>
<td>671,812,635</td>
<td>604,562,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment deposits in transit</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>33,689,822</td>
<td>33,127,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,778,282,924</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,697,902,575</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Accrued interest and dividends**: $590,217 (2016), $562,676 (2015)

### LIABILITIES AND UNRESTRICTED NET ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities and Other Liabilities</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades payable</td>
<td>$ 2,008,268</td>
<td>$ 924,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants payable</td>
<td>26,450,320</td>
<td>18,662,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and other liabilities</td>
<td>38,584,333</td>
<td>34,814,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred excise tax</td>
<td>13,570,585</td>
<td>12,011,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities</td>
<td>80,613,506</td>
<td>66,412,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted net assets</td>
<td>$ 2,707,577,553</td>
<td>2,654,405,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities and unrestricted net assets</td>
<td>$ 2,788,191,059</td>
<td>$ 2,720,818,310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Years Ended December 31,**
## STATEMENTS OF ACTIVITIES

**Years Ended December 31,**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income:</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dividends and interest</td>
<td>$15,688,692</td>
<td>$21,574,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnership income (loss)</td>
<td>67,328,644</td>
<td>134,576,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net realized gain (loss) on investments</td>
<td>13,925,723</td>
<td>67,190,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net unrealized gain (loss) on investments</td>
<td>113,780,664</td>
<td>(143,723,582)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income (expense)</td>
<td>(1,372,465)</td>
<td>2,667,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>209,351,258</td>
<td>82,285,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Investment expenses:         |                 |                 |
| Direct investment expenses   | 7,110,659       | 6,312,344       |
| Provision for taxes:         |                 |                 |
| Current excise tax           | 1,302,442       | 2,297,863       |
| Deferred excise tax expense (income) | 1,559,027   | (2,198,803)     |
| Unrelated business income tax| 95,526          | 245,251         |
| State income tax             | 94,930          | --              |
|                              | 10,162,584      | 6,656,655       |

Net investment income          | 199,188,674     | 75,628,775      |

| Grants and operating expenses:|                 |                 |
| Grants, net of refunds        | 123,919,223     | 119,194,271     |
| Foundation-administered projects | 930,784         | 757,559         |
| Administration expenses       | 17,878,902      | 16,765,514      |
|                              | 142,728,909     | 136,717,344     |

Net operating income (loss)    | 56,459,765      | (61,088,569)    |

| Other changes in unrestricted net assets:|                 |                 |
| Pension changes other than net periodic benefit cost | (3,199,338)    | (7,289,617)     |
| Post-retirement healthcare changes other than net periodic benefit cost | (88,402)       | 1,860,040       |
| Increase (decrease) in unrestricted net assets | 53,172,025      | (66,518,146)    |

| Unrestricted net assets:      |                 |                 |
| Beginning of year             | $2,654,405,528  | $2,720,923,674  |
| End of year                   | $2,707,577,553  | $2,654,405,528  |
# STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash flows from operating activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in unrestricted net assets</td>
<td>$53,172,025</td>
<td>$(66,518,146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to reconcile change in unrestricted net assets to cash used by operating activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net realized (gain) loss on investments</td>
<td>$(13,925,723)</td>
<td>$(67,190,540)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Income) loss on limited partnerships</td>
<td>$(67,328,644)</td>
<td>$(134,576,486)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net unrealized (gain) loss on investments</td>
<td>$(113,780,664)</td>
<td>$143,723,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess value of donated securities included with grants</td>
<td>$2,184,341</td>
<td>$1,656,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation expense</td>
<td>$263,515</td>
<td>$291,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in accrued interest and dividends</td>
<td>$(27,541)</td>
<td>$95,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in other assets</td>
<td>$1,439,877</td>
<td>$3,896,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in grants payable</td>
<td>$7,787,620</td>
<td>$(8,913,490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in accounts payable and other liabilities</td>
<td>$3,770,257</td>
<td>$3,600,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in deferred excise tax liability</td>
<td>$1,559,027</td>
<td>$(2,198,803)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total adjustments</td>
<td>$(178,057,937)</td>
<td>$(59,615,570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash used by operating activities</td>
<td>$(124,885,912)</td>
<td>$(126,133,716)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash flows from investing activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sales or redemptions of investments</td>
<td>$622,911,230</td>
<td>$759,344,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases of investments</td>
<td>$(509,357,069)</td>
<td>$(662,064,839)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of building improvements</td>
<td>$(33,584)</td>
<td>$(101,729)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash provided by investing activities</td>
<td>$113,520,577</td>
<td>$133,177,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net increase (decrease) in cash</td>
<td>$(11,365,335)</td>
<td>$7,044,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, beginning of year</td>
<td>$15,241,498</td>
<td>$8,197,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, end of year</td>
<td>$3,876,163</td>
<td>$15,241,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental disclosure of noncash investing activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable (payable) at year end, net</td>
<td>$31,681,554</td>
<td>$32,203,417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
December 31, 2016 and 2015

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 Education. 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. The Foundation’s liability for unrelated business income taxes was $42,777 for 2015 and is expected to be similar to this amount for 2016.

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 6-50 years. Depreciation expense for the year December 31, 2016 and 2015 was $263,515 and $291,332, 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>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$397,852</td>
<td>$397,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and improvements</td>
<td>9,791,790</td>
<td>9,782,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>(6,937,418)</td>
<td>(6,698,404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,252,224</td>
<td>$3,482,155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimates**

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America require 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 17.2% 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, 2016, the Foundation has $389.6 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 operations (all of which are included with administration expenses on the Statements of Activities). Program-related expenses pertain principally to the direct programmatic grant-making 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 non-program and non-communications related operating expenses of the Foundation.

**Investment Trades Receivable, Payable, and Deposits in Transit**

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. Deposits in transit represent monies sent in the current year for purposes of purchasing an investment whose trade date is in the subsequent year. Such in-transit amounts are classified as investments for balance sheet purposes.

Reclassifications
Certain amounts in the 2015 statements have been reclassified to conform to the 2016 presentation.

New Accounting Updates
During 2016, the Foundation adopted Accounting Standards Update (“ASU”) No. 2015-07, Disclosures for Investments in Certain Entities that Calculate Net Asset Value (“NAV”) per Share (or its Equivalent). ASU No. 2015-07 amended ASC 820, Fair Value Measurements, and removed the requirement to categorize within the fair value hierarchy all investments for which fair value is measured using the net asset value per share as a practical expedient. The standard was adopted retroactively which impacted the footnote disclosure but had no impact on the Foundation’s net assets or changes in net assets.

C. Investment Securities
The following is a summary of fair values and cost basis of the investment securities held at December 31, 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
<th>Cost Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>$109,525,718</td>
<td>$109,530,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>414,665,494</td>
<td>395,731,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income securities</td>
<td>151,948,970</td>
<td>150,121,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – limited partnerships</td>
<td>1,386,640,285</td>
<td>936,080,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – nonpartnerships</td>
<td>671,812,635</td>
<td>449,535,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment deposits in transit</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>33,689,822</td>
<td>33,689,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,778,282,924</td>
<td>$2,084,689,299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a summary of fair values and cost basis of the investment securities held at December 31, 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
<th>Cost Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>$94,809,743</td>
<td>$94,810,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>444,062,832</td>
<td>456,515,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income securities</td>
<td>135,219,317</td>
<td>139,686,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – limited partnerships</td>
<td>1,356,120,801</td>
<td>936,055,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – nonpartnerships</td>
<td>604,562,017</td>
<td>427,894,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment deposits in transit</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>33,127,865</td>
<td>33,127,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,697,902,575</td>
<td>$2,118,089,614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investments valued at NAV as of December 31, 2016, consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
<th>Unfunded Commitments</th>
<th>Redemption Frequency</th>
<th>Redemption Notice Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities (a)</td>
<td>$ 553,480,062</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>Quarterly to Annual if applicable</td>
<td>5 days to 4 months if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships (b)</td>
<td>1,386,640,285</td>
<td>389,643,435</td>
<td>Quarterly to Annual if applicable</td>
<td>5 days to 4 months if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total investments at NAV</td>
<td>$ 1,940,120,347</td>
<td>$ 389,643,435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investments valued at NAV as of December 31, 2015, consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
<th>Unfunded Commitments</th>
<th>Redemption Frequency</th>
<th>Redemption Notice Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities (a)</td>
<td>$505,280,362</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly to Annual if applicable</td>
<td>5 days to 4 months if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships (b)</td>
<td>1,356,120,801</td>
<td>377,800,000</td>
<td>Quarterly to Annual if applicable</td>
<td>5 days to 4 months if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total investments at NAV</td>
<td>$1,861,401,163</td>
<td>$377,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) This category includes investments in real estate funds, hedge funds and public equities. The NAV of the real estate funds are 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 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 5 business days to 4 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 and debt 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 5 business days to 4 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 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 seldom 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.
A summary of investments classified by NAV and Fair Value Hierarchy are as follows:
Investments at Fair Value as of December 31, 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Investments Measured at NAV</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>$ –</td>
<td>$ 109,525,718</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$ 109,525,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>414,665,494</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>414,665,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income securities</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>151,948,970</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>151,948,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
<td>1,386,640,285</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,386,640,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpartnerships</td>
<td>553,480,062</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>553,480,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,940,120,347</td>
<td>676,140,182</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$2,734,593,102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance, December 31, 2015</th>
<th>$ 99,281,655</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Grants</td>
<td>(2,205,402)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized gains</td>
<td>2,184,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized gains</td>
<td>$ 19,071,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance, December 31, 2016</strong></td>
<td>$ 118,332,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investments at Fair Value as of December 31, 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Investments Measured at NAV</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>$ –</td>
<td>$ 94,809,743</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$ 94,809,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>444,062,832</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>444,062,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
<td>1,356,120,801</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,356,120,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpartnerships</td>
<td>505,280,362</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>505,280,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,861,401,163</td>
<td>817,026,193</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$2,634,774,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance, December 31, 2014</th>
<th>$ 87,485,859</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Grants</td>
<td>(1,674,227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized gains</td>
<td>1,656,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized gains</td>
<td>$ 11,813,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance, December 31, 2015</strong></td>
<td>$ 99,281,655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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% (1% 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% for 2016 and 2015. The deferred excise tax provision is calculated assuming a 2% rate and is based on the projected gains/losses that assume complete liquidation of all assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excise tax payable (receivable)</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ 59,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred excise tax liability</td>
<td>13,570,585</td>
<td>12,011,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 13,570,585</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 12,070,934</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excise tax payments of $1,361,818 and $2,685,321 were paid in 2016 and 2015, respectively.

IRC Section 4942 requires that a private foundation make annual minimum distributions based on the value of its non-charitable use assets or pay an excise tax for the failure to meet the minimum distribution requirements. For the year ended December 31, 2016, the Foundation made qualifying distributions greater than the required minimum distribution of approximately $1.9 million. The Foundation had $54.7 million in prior year excess distributions, resulting in a net accumulated over-distribution of $56.6 million available for 2016, but $37.6 million of these over-distributions will expire, leaving $19.0 million available to be carried forward to 2017.

F. Grants Payable

Grants payable at December 31, 2016, are expected to be paid as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Payable in Year Ending December 31,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>$ 8,335,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>6,176,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Area</td>
<td>1,895,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5,504,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants payable</td>
<td>21,987,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Unamortized discount</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 21,987,473</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 $9,510,649 and $10,174,724 as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively.
Grant activity for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undiscounted grants payable, January 1</td>
<td>$18,863,655</td>
<td>$27,934,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants approved</td>
<td>125,046,186</td>
<td>119,963,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143,909,841</td>
<td>147,898,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less grants paid by program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>14,878,526</td>
<td>25,667,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>12,276,216</td>
<td>20,940,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Area</td>
<td>63,874,267</td>
<td>55,228,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21,544,365</td>
<td>23,995,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>4,525,549</td>
<td>3,242,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117,098,923</td>
<td>129,034,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiscounted grants payable, December 31</td>
<td>$26,810,918</td>
<td>$18,863,655</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></th>
<th>Pension Benefits</th>
<th>Postretirement Health-Care Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit obligation at December 31</td>
<td>$(70,065)</td>
<td>$(63,685)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair value of plan assets at December 31</td>
<td>57,387</td>
<td>55,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded status at December 31</td>
<td>$(12,678)</td>
<td>$(8,074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts recognized in the statements of financial position:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid benefit included with other assets</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$2,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued benefit liability included with accounts payable and other liabilities</td>
<td>$(12,678)</td>
<td>$(10,317)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net amount recognized</td>
<td>$(12,678)</td>
<td>$(8,074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer contributions</td>
<td>$639</td>
<td>$634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit payments</td>
<td>$(2,259)</td>
<td>$(2,009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components of net periodic benefit cost:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service cost</td>
<td>$1,773</td>
<td>$1,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest cost</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>2,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected return on assets</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>4,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of net loss</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of prior service cost</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net periodic benefit cost (income)</td>
<td>$2,042</td>
<td>$695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefit Obligations
The accumulated benefit obligation of the nonqualified pension plan was $10,595,361 and $9,045,867 as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively. The accumulated benefit obligation of the qualified plan was $52,211,372 and $47,963,044 as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, 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>Pension Benefits</th>
<th>Postretirement Health-Care Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate (benefit obligation)</td>
<td>4.10% 4.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate (net periodic cost)</td>
<td>4.45% 3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected return on plan assets</td>
<td>7.50% 7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation increase (benefit obligation)</td>
<td>4.00% 4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation increase (net periodic cost)</td>
<td>4.00% 4.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For measurement purposes, an initial annual rate of 7% for Pre-65 and 6% for Post-65 in the per capita cost of healthcare was used. These rates were assumed to decrease gradually each year to an ultimate rate of 4.5% by year 2024.

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>2016 Percent of</th>
<th>Target Allocation</th>
<th>2015 Percent of</th>
<th>Target Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic stock</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt securities</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International stock</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real asset</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-alternative</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table presents the pension assets reported at NAV at year end:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NAV 12/31/2016</th>
<th>NAV 12/31/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities</td>
<td>$ 35,436,441</td>
<td>$ 34,537,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt securities</td>
<td>14,752,601</td>
<td>12,829,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>3,452,925</td>
<td>3,369,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real asset</td>
<td>1,161,575</td>
<td>2,458,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi alternative</td>
<td>2,583,804</td>
<td>2,601,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 57,387,346</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 55,797,338</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Contributions
The Foundation expects to contribute $1,603,440 to its pension plans and $590,000 to its postretirement medical plan in 2017. 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>2017</td>
<td>$ 3,553,440</td>
<td>$ 590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3,633,440</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3,693,440</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>3,763,440</td>
<td>710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>3,783,440</td>
<td>740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-2026</td>
<td>19,377,200</td>
<td>4,490,000</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, 2016 and 2015, the Foundation contributed $223,820 and $224,696, respectively.

H. Subsequent Events
The Foundation evaluated its December 31, 2016 financial statements for subsequent events through July 6, 2017, 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.
TRUSTEES
We welcomed George E. Ross, a Flint native and president of Central Michigan University (CMU), to Mott’s board of trustees in January 2017. One of 12 children, George was a first-generation college graduate who went on to earn a doctorate in Higher Education Administration from the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa. Early in his professional career, he worked as a certified public accountant before becoming director of finance for the Center for Creative Studies in Detroit. During the next two decades, he assumed positions of increasing responsibility with the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Clark-Atlanta University and CMU before becoming president of Mississippi’s Alcorn State University in 2008. He returned to Michigan to become president of CMU in 2010.

We are pleased that George agreed to join our board of trustees, where his background and professional expertise will greatly inform and enrich our work.

STAFF
With sadness, we bid farewell to Jean Simi, who passed away on January 14, 2017. Rising to the position of executive assistant and corporate assistant secretary for the Foundation, Jean joined Mott in 1983, serving an impressive 28 years before retiring in 2010.

To say Jean was considered an institution at Mott would be an understatement. Her sure presence and tireless efforts to keep the Foundation’s Executive Office calm and organized were legendary. She expected a high degree of professionalism from every member of the Foundation’s staff, but also held her colleagues close to her heart.

INTERNS
Once again, Mott’s class of summer interns brought enthusiasm, energy and insight to our Flint and Troy offices. Over a 10-week period in 2017, eight interns worked with staff in our Programs, Communications, Investments and Information Services departments. They gained practical experience, took part in learning sessions with leaders from foundations and nonprofit organizations, and received professional coaching—all while being mentored by our staff. It is our hope that this internship program will help undergraduate and graduate students with diverse interests and backgrounds gain an understanding of the field of philanthropy and consider a career in the social sector. With their input, we continue to fine-tune the paid internship experience, with the hope that it will be as rewarding for them as it always is for us.

Mott’s 2017 intern class (left to right): Anna Vicari, Ryan Madar, Sydnie Switzer, Anna Eby, Matthew St. German, Andrea Pugh, MoNeka Young and Katlyn Koegel.
TRUSTEES TRIBUTE

SINCE 1926, 41 individuals have served as trustees for the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, volunteering their time, talents and expertise for the benefit of communities across the country and throughout the world. These men and women have preserved the legacy of our founder while guiding the development of the institution, providing the Foundation’s staff with the flexibility, authority and confidence to explore and pursue creative ideas in response to prevailing challenges. We owe them a debt of thanks for their extraordinary commitment and service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRUSTEE</th>
<th>DATES OF ACTIVE SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Acuff</td>
<td>01/01/2002 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/1985 - 09/24/1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph A. Anderson</td>
<td>01/01/2014 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizabeth Ardisana</td>
<td>10/01/1971 - 12/31/1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William S. Ballenger, Jr.</td>
<td>06/19/1926 - 03/05/1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy E. Brownell</td>
<td>06/19/1926 - 12/31/1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee Mott Butler</td>
<td>01/01/1988 - 05/03/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonzo D. Crim</td>
<td>10/01/1971 - 12/31/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles B. Cumings</td>
<td>07/08/1955 - 09/17/1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth M. Dill</td>
<td>01/01/1991 - 10/19/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine W. Fanning</td>
<td>05/15/1943 - 12/31/1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph E. Gault</td>
<td>01/05/1937 - 12/31/1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John G. Getz</td>
<td>06/19/1926 - 12/31/1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa B. Mott Ives</td>
<td>01/01/1990 - 03/05/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushworth M. Kidder</td>
<td>01/01/2010 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick S. Kirkpatrick</td>
<td>01/01/2000 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany W. Lovett</td>
<td>06/19/1926 - 12/31/1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward E. MacCrone</td>
<td>10/08/1992 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb. F. Martin</td>
<td>11/27/2000 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia P. Maynard</td>
<td>01/05/1937 - 12/31/1942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRUSTEE</th>
<th>DATES OF ACTIVE SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Morning</td>
<td>01/01/2000 - 12/31/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. S. Mott</td>
<td>06/19/1926 - 02/18/1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. S. Harding Mott</td>
<td>11/06/1926 - 05/10/1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. S. Harding Mott, II</td>
<td>01/01/1975 - 12/15/1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryanne Mott</td>
<td>02/24/1973 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth R. Mott</td>
<td>05/15/1943 - 01/31/1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Nelms</td>
<td>01/01/2008 - 12/31/2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2010 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas X. Patiño</td>
<td>01/01/1995 - 12/31/2010**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy R.M. Piper</td>
<td>01/01/2013 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Piper</td>
<td>01/01/2016 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willa B. Player</td>
<td>12/02/1985 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Porter</td>
<td>01/01/1981 - 12/31/1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold P. Rodes</td>
<td>01/01/1981 - 06/27/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George E. Ross</td>
<td>10/21/1964 - 12/31/1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marise M.M. Stewart</td>
<td>01/01/2017 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen J. Taylor</td>
<td>01/01/2000 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire M. White</td>
<td>01/01/2016 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgway H. White</td>
<td>01/01/1998 - 03/24/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William S. White</td>
<td>01/01/2016 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George L. Whyel</td>
<td>01/01/1971 - 12/31/1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* C. Nelms served one year (2008) on the board, then was re-elected on 1/1/10.

** D. Patiño served as a trustee from 1/1/95 through 12/31/10, was elected a trustee emeritus on 1/1/11, and was re-elected to the board of trustees beginning 1/1/13.
TRUSTEES & STAFF

Board and Committees

BOARD OF TRUSTEES*
William S. White
Chairman
Frederick S. Kirkpatrick +
Vice Chairman
A. Marshall Acuff, Jr.
Lizbeth Ardisana
Tiffany W. Lovett
Webb F. Martin
Olivia P. Maynard
John Morning *
Maryanne Mott
Charlie Nelms
Douglas X. Patiño
Jeremy R. M. Piper
William H. Piper
George E. Ross
Marise M.M. Stewart
Helen J. Taylor
Ridgway H. White

AUDIT COMMITTEE
Webb F. Martin
Chairman
Frederick S. Kirkpatrick
Olivia P. Maynard
Charlie Nelms

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
William S. White
Chairman
Frederick S. Kirkpatrick
Webb F. Martin
Maryanne Mott
William H. Piper
Ridgway H. White

INVESTMENT COMMITTEE
William S. White
Chairman
A. Marshall Acuff, Jr.
John K. Butler
Elizabeth T. Frank
Frederick S. Kirkpatrick
Webb F. Martin
William H. Piper
Alan H. Van Noord

* The Members of the corporation are Frederick S. Kirkpatrick, Tiffany W. Lovett, Maryanne Mott, William H. Piper, Marise M.M. Stewart, Ridgway H. White and William S. White.
+ Serves as presiding/lead outside director.
# Trustee Emeritus

Board and committees lists are current as of July 31, 2017.

Officers and Staff

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
William S. White
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Ridgway H. White
President
Jennifer L. Liversedge
Assistant to the Chairman/Chief Executive Officer and Program Officer
Lisa R. Maxwell
Administrative Assistant to the Chairman/Chief Executive Officer and President

ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP
Mary A. Gaibraith
Vice President – Administration, Chief Financial Officer and Secretary/Treasurer

Administrative Services
Gregory S. Hpton
Accounting and Tax Manager
Rebecca Burns
Administrative Accountant
Collette R. Pries
Senior Accountant
Debra L. Cormier
Payroll Administrator
Annette M. Chamberlain
Ona Kay Goza
Lynne M. Mortellaro
Administrative Assistants
Kim R. McDonald
Jill A. Powell
Office Assistants
Debra E. Bullen
Building Manager
Billy M. Powell
Building Operations Supervisor
Gilbert Medrano
Patrick J. Turowicz
Building Operations Assistants

Grants Administration
Frederick L. Kump
Interim Director – Grants Administration
Michael S. Birchmeier
Grants Manager
Cindy S. Compeau
S. Renee Jackson
Grants Accountants
Jean M. Bamberg
Deborah K. Reed
Mary Beth Smith
Administrative Assistants

Human Resources
Julie M. Flynn
Human Resources Manager
Aria Staffne
Human Resources Administrator

Information Services
Gavin T. Clabaugh
Vice President – Information Services
Michael L. Wright
Information Services Manager
Glen A. Birdssall
Librarian
Ellen Chien
IT Support Analyst
Joumana M. Klaseen
Database Administrator
Asia B. Mchney
Administrative Assistant

COMMUNICATIONS
Kathryn A. Thomas
Vice President – Communications
Ann F. Richards
Senior Communications Officer
Jeff Alexander
Duane M. Elling
Jessica Martin Jones
Communications Officers
Macle D. Shriner
Communications Officer – Online Strategies
Cristina G. Wright
Web Administrator
Craig Kelley Jr.
Communications Assistant
Jon Tise S. Lewis
Administrative Assistant

INVESTMENTS
Jay C. Flaherty
Vice President – Investments and Chief Investment Officer
Kenneth C. Austin
Cheryl Garneau
Stephen W. Vessels
Investment Managers
Laura R. Bechard
Investment Operations Manager
Alicia T. Aguilar
Assistant Investment Administrator
Laure D. Franco
Kelly A. Swoszowski
Administrative Assistants
PROGRAMS
Neal R. Hegarty
Vice President – Programs
Ruth M. Woodruff
Administrative Assistant

Civil Society
Shannon L. Lawder
Program Director
Natalie LaCour-Young
Michele H. Neumann
Administrative Assistants
Central/Eastern Europe
J. Walter Veirs
Regional Director
Vera B. Dakova
Ross Maclaren
Program Officers
South Africa
Vuyiswa V. Sidzumo
Director
Mamotshidisi P. Mohapi
Program Officer
Lydia Molapo
Administrative Assistant
United States and
Global Philanthropy
and Nonprofit Sector
Nicholas S. Deychakiwsky
Program Officer

Environment
Sam Passmore
Program Director
Traci R. Romine
Sandra N. Smihey
Program Officers
Sarah Murray
Dondre D. Young
Program Assistants
Sandra J. Smith
Judy L. Wallace
Administrative Assistants

Flint Area
Kimberly S. Roberson
Program Director
Joseph M. Martin
Program Officer
Jennifer M. Acree
Brian R. Larkin
Christopher J. Stallworth
Associate Program Officers
Amy Hovey
Special Projects Coordinator
Kaitlyn C. Adler
Program Assistant
Christine L. Anderson
Delia Cappel
Administrative Assistants

Education
Benita D. Melton
Program Director
Gwynn Hughes
Senior Program Officer
Kari M. Pardoe
Associate Program Officer
Crystal L. Bright
Bethany Thayer
Administrative Assistants

LOANED STAFF
Karen B. Aldridge-Eason
Foundation Liaison
Office of the Governor, State of Michigan

CONTRACT EMPLOYEES/
CONSULTANTS
Shaun Samuels
Civil Society program (South Africa)
Linda W. Helstowski
Environment program

Staff list is current as of July 31, 2017
For a current staff list, please visit our
website at www.mott.org.
PHOTO CREDITS

Many of the photos used in the historical timeline of this year’s annual report were taken from the Mott Foundation’s archival collection. Whenever possible, we have credited the photographer or the organization providing a photo, but in some cases, the source of a photo is unknown.

Page 9: Danen Williams
Page 10: Rick Smith
Page 11: Jessica Martin Jones
Page 13: Courtesy of Bread Houses Network
Page 14: Trevor Maizland 2006/Rick Smith, Trevor Maizland 2017/Danen Williams
Page 15: Andreas Franke
Page 18: Christ Episcopal Church/Sydney Switzer; Michigan Alumnus/courtesy of the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
Page 21: Flint College and Cultural Center/Tony Spina Photographs, courtesy of the Walter P. Reuther Library-Wayne State University
Page 23: General Motors Building/Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division
Page 25: Higher education/Mott Foundation archive photo; Downtown Flint/courtesy of Buick Automotive Gallery and Research Center, C.S. Mott/Yousuf Karsh-Estate of Yousuf Karsh
Page 27: Engaging grassroots/Patricia A. Beck; First environmental plan/Michael Hayman
Page 28: Kettering/Rick Smith; Neighborhood Small Grants/Craig Wells; Microenterprise/Jane Hale; Environment/Danen Williams
Page 29: First grant in South Africa/Paul Weinberg
Page 30: Johannesburg/Evan Bench; People Power/courtesy of CIVICUS; New environment plan/courtesy of Amazon Watch
Page 31: Mandela voting/Paul Weinberg; Flint revitalization/Cristina Wright
Page 32: World Trade Center memorial/Derek Jensen; Land preservation/Adam Stoltman; Land Bank/courtesy of Genesee County Land Bank Authority
Page 33: Advice offices/Jenn Warren; Hurricane Katrina/courtesy of NOAA; Children’s Hospital/courtesy of the University of Michigan C.S. Mott Children’s Hospital, Ann Arbor
Page 34: Great Lakes/courtesy of NASA; Center for Community Progress/Janell O’Keefe
Page 35: Community foundation/courtesy of the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy; Community schools/Adam Stoltman; Health and Wellness/Rick Smith
Page 36: Neal R. Hegarty; Ridgway H. White/Rick Smith
Page 37: Water crisis/Cristina Wright; Ten philanthropies/Duane Elling; Early childhood/Danen Williams
Page 38: Integrated water management/Dmitri Ma/Shutterstock.com; Capitol Theatre circa 1928/courtesy of the Buick Automotive Gallery and Research Center; Capitol Theatre 2017/Mark Nader
Page 44: Courtesy of the Women’s Hope, Education and Training Trust (WHEAT)
Page 46: Courtesy of the VIA Foundation
Page 48: Jenn Warren
Page 49: Courtesy of WHEAT
Page 50: Courtesy of the After-School All-Stars
Page 53: Courtesy of Promise Indiana/Wabash County YMCA
Page 54: Mayberry Media
Page 56: Traci Romine
Page 58: Rick Smith
Page 70: George E. Ross/courtesy of Central Michigan University; Interns/Cristina Wright
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