

[REDACTED]

may be subject to provisions of the Act which require the disclosure of information

Richard R. Smith Staff Attorney

Federal Trade Commission
6th St. & Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20580

Re: *Request for informal staff interpretation*

Dear Mr. Smith:

[REDACTED] intends to affiliate with [REDACTED], a [REDACTED] nonprofit membership corporation. For the reasons set forth below, the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] believe that because the [REDACTED] is a state agency, no premerger notification obligation applies to the transaction under section 7A of the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act (the "Act"). Pursuant to 16 C.F.R. § 803.30, the University and [REDACTED] request an informal interpretation from the Commission's staff to that effect.

I. Structure of the Proposed Transaction.

The [REDACTED] by and through [REDACTED]

the sole voting member of [REDACTED] will become an additional obligor on up to \$9 million of [REDACTED] long-term debt, will provide [REDACTED] up to \$4 million in capital to fund the planning,



[REDACTED]

creation and implementation of a region-wide integrated [REDACTED] system and the expansion and upgrade of [REDACTED] current facility, and will build an additional [REDACTED] facility on the [REDACTED] site at a cost of up to \$3 million.

After the affiliation, [REDACTED] Board of Directors will consist of four directors appointed by [REDACTED] the President of [REDACTED] the [REDACTED]; an independent [REDACTED] who is an active member of the [REDACTED] staff; six community representatives; and one member of the [REDACTED] staff. In addition to the [REDACTED]

substantially all of [REDACTED] assets; acquisition, consolidation, change, or expansion of locations other than as contemplated in an approved strategic plan; changes to the [REDACTED] Restated Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation; material transactions other than those contemplated in an approved strategic plan; and any action that might adversely affect [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] exempt status.

II. Parties to the Proposed Transaction.

[REDACTED] is a nonprofit membership corporation organized under [REDACTED], and is exempt from state and federal income taxes under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. [REDACTED] provides [REDACTED] care and various other business activities.

The [REDACTED] is a "constitutional corporation." [REDACTED] Governance of the [REDACTED] is vested in a twelve-member [REDACTED]. Control and management of the [REDACTED] affairs rest with the [REDACTED] subject to the [REDACTED] legislature's right to attach reasonable conditions to appropriations for the [REDACTED] in addition to the requirements of general state law.

[REDACTED] an operating division of the [REDACTED] through it is governed and managed by a separate governing board appointed by the [REDACTED] it has no separate legal existence. The [REDACTED] Board of Governors' authority is limited to that

by the [REDACTED] laws") and delegated to them by the [REDACTED] pursuant to a formal written policy last amended in February 1994. The [REDACTED] retain final authority over [REDACTED] major statement, strategic plan, operating budgets, capital expenditures, plans involving

[REDACTED]

legislative funding or increases in indebtedness, significant changes in strategic direction, changes in major public policy or business practices, significant changes in the employment status of

The [REDACTED] coordinates its provision of [REDACTED] services through [REDACTED] which operates the [REDACTED] which are staffed by [REDACTED] who work as [REDACTED] (i.e., those services outside their roles as [REDACTED] are provided through a number of separate [REDACTED] entities which enter into service contracts with the [REDACTED] through the [REDACTED] members of the [REDACTED] have established [REDACTED] as an independent corporation organized under [REDACTED] has no voting members. Its mission is to coordinate delivery of [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED]. It is not a subsidiary of [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] management and direction is vested in a Board of Directors composed of six at large directors, an unspecified number of ex-officio voting directors, and five ex-officio non-

[REDACTED] as ex-officio voting directors. The five ex-officio non-voting members are the [REDACTED] Executive Director, the [REDACTED] General Director, the [REDACTED] President, and the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] coordinates the activities of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] a nonprofit corporation and has a pending application for exemption from state and federal income taxes under IRC Section 501(c)(3). It was incorporated to [REDACTED] and annual revenues of approximately \$ 5 million in 1994

[REDACTED] acquired an [REDACTED] with annual revenues of approximately \$ 1.5 million and total assets of approximately \$.7 million. [REDACTED] holds the assets of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] affiliated with the [REDACTED] 1992. [REDACTED] nonprofit corporation organized under [REDACTED] law and has a pending application for exemption from state and federal income taxes under IRC Section 501(c)(3). It was

approximately \$ 1.1 million and annual revenues of approximately \$ 13.5 million.

The [REDACTED] is affiliated with two foundations, each of which has total assets or revenues approaching or in excess of \$100 million.

[REDACTED] operates exclusively for the benefit of the [REDACTED] in support of the [REDACTED] the second foundation, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] reports the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] is an independent, nonprofit charitable corporation exempt from taxes under IRC Section 501(c)(3). It is a publicly-supported organization under IRC Section 170(b)(1)(A). It is not a private foundation under IRC Section 501(c)(3). [REDACTED] raises, invests, and manages contributions and endowments and disburses those funds for [REDACTED] improvements, [REDACTED]

As of June 30, 1994, [REDACTED] had total assets of \$ 372.2 million and annual revenues of \$ 34.1 million.³ [REDACTED] did not have any unrelated business income during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1994. [REDACTED] is governed by a 45-member Board of Trustees, approximately one quarter of whom are appointed by the [REDACTED] and three-quarters of whom are elected.

[REDACTED] is an independent nonprofit corporation exempt from taxes under IRC Section 501(c)(3) and Minnesota Statute § 290.05. It is not a private foundation under IRC Sections 509(a)(1) and 170(b)(1). As of June 30, 1994, [REDACTED] had total assets of \$ 97.5 million and Total [REDACTED] unrelated business income for the year ended [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

²Two other foundations are affiliated with the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED]. Neither [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] total assets or annual revenues approaching \$ 100 million.

³In 1983, [REDACTED] acquired 90 percent of the common shares of [REDACTED]. The remaining shares were held by the [REDACTED] inc. engages in the operation of [REDACTED] resources. On September 6, 1994, the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] executed a letter of intent to sell their shares to [REDACTED]. That sale was consummated prior to January 1, 1995.

[REDACTED]

The [REDACTED] has a wholly-owned subsidiary [REDACTED] as incorporated in [REDACTED] is the [REDACTED] provides [REDACTED] for the [REDACTED] does not [REDACTED] anyone else. [REDACTED] Board of Directors consists of officers of the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of June 30, 1994, [REDACTED] total assets of approximately \$ 19.7 million and annual revenues of approximately \$ 2.4 million.

The [REDACTED] may control other corporations which, because of the [REDACTED] size, age, and decentralization, have not been identified. It is the [REDACTED] belief after reasonable investigation that no such corporation has assets or annual revenues even approaching \$ 100 million.

III. Potential Applicability of the Act.

But for the [REDACTED] status as an agency of the State of [REDACTED] appears that a premerger notification filing might be required. As a result of the Affiliation Agreement, the [REDACTED] hold the assets of [REDACTED], which appears to be an "entity" engaged in commerce. The total assets of the [REDACTED] exceed \$100 million and the total assets of [REDACTED] exceed \$15 million. [REDACTED]'s assets and revenues are well below \$100 million. Although [REDACTED] does not have voting securities for the [REDACTED] acquire, after the transaction the [REDACTED] control [REDACTED] as though it were [REDACTED] sole shareholder. The issue, then, is whether the [REDACTED] "person" subject to section 7A's filing requirements.

IV. Issue Upon Which Interpretation Is Sought.

Section 7A requires premerger notification when any "person" acquires the assets or voting securities of another "person." The regulations define a "person" as an ultimate parent entity and all entities which it controls directly or indirectly. 16 C.F.R. § 801.1(a)(1). "Entity" includes corporations and many other forms of organizations, but does not include "the United States, any of the States thereof, or any political subdivision or agency of either (other than a

[REDACTED]

corporation engaged in commerce. Because a state agency is not an entity, it is not a person within the meaning of the statute. Because premerger notification obligations only apply to transactions between two or more "persons," the parties to a transaction with a state agency are not obliged to make any premerger notification filing.

[REDACTED]

When the premerger notification regulations were promulgated, the FTC's "Statement of Basis and Purpose" of the regulations said that

...States, as well as their agencies and political subdivisions are not subject to the act. However, corporations controlled by such units and engaged in commerce are entities, and may be subject to the requirements of the act.

43 Fed. Reg. 33450, 33456 (July 31, 1978). We understand the Premerger Notification Office's analysis of the regulations is that the assets and revenues of each corporation engaged in commerce and controlled by a state agency should be compared to the filing threshold levels as though each such corporation were an acquiring entity, but that if a state agency controls more than one corporation engaged in commerce, the assets and revenues of those corporations need not be added together because the state agency is not an "entity" subject to the Act.

In addition to the conclusion from the Act just discussed, section 7A(2)(D) of the Act

[REDACTED]

the [REDACTED] an agency or department of the state government and is not liable in damages for injury to person or property. [REDACTED]

The [REDACTED] status as a state agency is not dependent on the character of the [REDACTED] actions. The business transacted by the [REDACTED] "public business." [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] applicability of [REDACTED] open meeting law, [REDACTED] meetings of a committee advising the [REDACTED] in executive recruitment matter). Actions taken by the [REDACTED] appear to be outside the scope of the original vision of the [REDACTED] nonetheless actions of a state agency (at least as long as they are within the scope of the [REDACTED] ver).

[REDACTED] According to the [REDACTED] Supreme Court, [any possible doubt as to the permissible range of the [REDACTED] proper authority has long since been laid to rest. . . . This court indicated the broad scope of the [REDACTED]

would grow and develop and undertake activities in the way of research and in other respects not visualized in the dreams of the founders. . . ."

Likewise, the [REDACTED] legislature "has the undoubted right within reason to condition appropriations [for the [REDACTED]]"

The legislature's ability to supervise the [REDACTED] of

The [REDACTED] status as a part of the state is likewise reflected in numerous statutes. For example, the [REDACTED] is subject to the [REDACTED] as a "public employer." [REDACTED] "public employer" means: (a) the state of [REDACTED]; (b) the board of [REDACTED] the [REDACTED]; . . . ; c) . . . the governing body of a political subdivision or its agency or instrumentality"). The [REDACTED] is included in the definition of "state" for purposes of [REDACTED] claims statute. [REDACTED] "state" includes . . . the [REDACTED]"). The same is true with respect to a variety of other statutes. See, e.g., [REDACTED] an "agency" subject to the requirements of the [REDACTED] (including [REDACTED] the definition of "state" for purposes of creating Reinsurance Association).

The [REDACTED] as an arm of the State of [REDACTED] reflected in other contexts

[REDACTED] employed immunity from tort suits under the doctrine of sovereign immunity. [REDACTED]

Before adoption of the present statutory scheme for limiting the [REDACTED] tort liability

from tort liability. [REDACTED]

ROSC CASES WERE [REDACTED] THE TIME PERIOD AFTER

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] likewise considered a part of the state when it comes to funds: all funds held by the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] considered funds of the state. [REDACTED] Finally, the [REDACTED] the power of eminent domain, [REDACTED] the state as an attribute of its sovereignty.

Section 1983, and hence is not a "person" subject to suit under that statute.

[REDACTED] therefore is immune from suit in federal court unless the state has expressly waived its constitutional immunity):

dismissed because the Eleventh Amendment deprived the federal court of jurisdiction over state law claims against the [REDACTED] as a state instrumentality);

For the above reasons, the [REDACTED] clearly is an agency or arm of the State of

The [REDACTED] also is not a "corporation engaged in commerce" under the regulation. Notwithstanding the fact that it is chartered as a corporation and the Regents are defined as a "body corporate," the [REDACTED] a "constitutional arm" of the [REDACTED]

[The] constitutional provision [perpetuating the [REDACTED] corporate franchise] did not change the character of the [REDACTED] make it a private or

The current statutory scheme with regard to state tort liability expressly recognizes the [REDACTED] a part of the state for that purpose. [REDACTED] therefore is entitled to avail itself of the waivable cap on tort liability established in the statute.

[REDACTED]

independent corporation; but perpetuated it as a public institution, and took from the Legislature the power to discontinue, or abolish it, or convert it into a private corporation. The [REDACTED] has been reorganized from time to time, and its scope and jurisdiction much extended; but it has always been recognized as a public

has ever been made to give it any other or different character. In [REDACTED] [REDACTED] held that the board of [REDACTED] were a public corporation; but it was also held that such corporation was merely an agency of the state to exercise certain limited and specified powers in the manner

[REDACTED] in no sense a private corporation. It

The [REDACTED] not chartered as a corporation for any reasons having to do with commerce. The [REDACTED] Supreme Court described the rationale for incorporating the [REDACTED] vesting control in the [REDACTED] rather than the legislature as a constitutional plan to "put management of the greatest [REDACTED] beyond the dangers of vacillating [REDACTED]"

[REDACTED] the applicability of the [REDACTED] Veterans Preference Act).

The [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] believe that the [REDACTED] status as a state agency is not altered by its affiliation with [REDACTED] nor by the affiliation it plans to have with [REDACTED]. Although [REDACTED] are corporations, and they may be "engaged in commerce," the state of [REDACTED] made clear that any commercial activities of the affiliates are incidental to the main purpose of the [REDACTED] which is to carry out the state's [REDACTED] purposes as an agency of the state of [REDACTED] under state and federal law, the [REDACTED] status as a state agency is not affected by its affiliates' activities.

⁵The [REDACTED] is not the only state [REDACTED] structured as a constitutional corporation for this reason. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] be entirely independent of all political or sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its [REDACTED]

in the administration of its affairs. . . "); [REDACTED]

In addition, the activities of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] would be attributed to the [REDACTED] only if the [REDACTED] is considered the "ultimate parent entity" of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. As we have explained above, the [REDACTED] neither a "person" nor an "entity" within the meaning of section 7A, and so cannot be considered an "ultimate parent entity" of either [REDACTED] or [REDACTED].

notification under the Act. Even if [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] were deemed to be a "corporation engaged

The [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] likewise believe that the [REDACTED] relationship with various foundations does not affect the [REDACTED]'s status as a state agency. According to a Board of [REDACTED] Statement adopted March 11, 1994, "the Board of [REDACTED] recognizes that it cannot, and should not, have direct control over foundations that enhance and support the

members of the board of directors of either [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. Neither [REDACTED] nor [REDACTED] is "engaged in commerce." Instead, the activities of both foundations are solely charitable and neither has significant business income unrelated to those charitable purposes. Any other corporation that might be controlled by the [REDACTED] that might be engaged in commerce has assets and revenues well below the \$100 million filing level.

CONCLUSION

No premerger notification is required for the proposed transaction because the [REDACTED] is a state agency and not a "person" within the meaning of section 7A(a), and because the transaction is exempt under section 7A(c)(4).

Very truly yours,

[REDACTED SIGNATURE]

ENCLOSURE NO. 1 of 12 1 0 0 0

Handwritten note: This never, [REDACTED] state agency and none of the individual corporations it controls meets the 100MM size-of-person test. Since the required person, [REDACTED] is not a 100MM person, the requisite size-of-person test requiring a 100MM person is not met. P. Schmidt