

December 21, 2018

VIA E-MAIL

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F St., NE
Washington, DC 20549

Re: *Bank of America Corporation*
Stockholder Proposal of the National Center for Public Policy Research
Securities Exchange Act of 1934—Rule 14a-8

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This letter is to inform you that our client, Bank of America Corporation (the “Company”), intends to omit from its proxy statement and form of proxy for its 2019 Annual Meeting of Stockholders (collectively, the “2019 Proxy Materials”) a stockholder proposal (the “Proposal”) and statements in support thereof (the “Supporting Statement”) received from the National Center for Public Policy Research (the “Proponent”).

Pursuant to Rule 14a-8(j), we have:

- filed this letter with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission”) no later than eighty (80) calendar days before the Company intends to file its definitive 2019 Proxy Materials with the Commission; and
- concurrently sent copies of this correspondence to the Proponent.

Rule 14a-8(k) and Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14D (Nov. 7, 2008) (“SLB 14D”) provide that stockholder proponents are required to send companies a copy of any correspondence that the proponents elect to submit to the Commission or the staff of the Division of Corporation Finance (the “Staff”). Accordingly, we are taking this opportunity to inform the Proponent that if the Proponent elects to submit additional correspondence to the Commission or the Staff with respect to this Proposal, a copy of that correspondence should be furnished concurrently to the undersigned on behalf of the Company pursuant to Rule 14a-8(k) and SLB 14D.

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
December 21, 2018
Page 2

THE PROPOSAL

The Proposal is entitled “Proposal Regarding Extraordinary Action to Maximize Shareholder Value,” and requests that the Company retain advisors to study strategic alternatives to maximize stockholder value. Specifically, the Proposal states:

RESOLVED,
Shareholders request that Bank of America begin an orderly process of retaining advisors to study strategic alternatives and empower a committee of its independent directors to evaluate those alternatives with advisors in exercise of their fiduciary responsibilities to maximize shareholder value.

The Supporting Statement provides:

In April 2018, Bank of America announced that it would no longer do business with certain firearms companies. When questioned, the Company's CEO refused to say how much money shareholders would lose because of this political decision. Compounding that financial loss, the state of Louisiana announced it would no longer do business with the Company over its anti-Second Amendment stance.

The Company has also been fined on numerous occasions and forced into costly settlements thereby diminishing shareholder value. This includes a \$137.3 million settlement with the Department of Justice because of the Company's “conspiracy to rig bids in the municipal bond derivatives market.”

In 2014, the Company also agreed to a \$16.65 billion settlement with the Justice Department to release it from liability for its involvement with the sale of mortgage-backed securities.

The Company has also distanced itself from certain fossil fuel businesses. This has created unknown losses for shareholders.

Furthermore, Bank of America had a prior relationship with the Human Rights Campaign, a group that works to diminish religious liberty in the United States. This concerning relationship may mean the Company also holds anti-religious views harming its reputation and brand.

The above examples are simply instructive as to why we are requesting such an extraordinary action. The request does not seek to micromanage the Company

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
December 21, 2018
Page 3

on the litany of day-to-day operational fiduciary failures that have led us to make our extraordinary request.

A copy of the Proposal and the Supporting Statement, as well as related correspondence from the Proponent, is attached to this letter as Exhibit A.

BASES FOR EXCLUSION

We hereby respectfully request that the Staff concur in our view that the Proposal may be excluded from the 2019 Proxy Materials pursuant to:

- Rule 14a-8(i)(7) because the Proposal deals with matters relating to the Company's ordinary business operations; and
- Rule 14a-8(i)(3) because the Proposal is impermissibly vague and indefinite so as to be inherently misleading.

BACKGROUND

The Company is committed to ensuring that its policies, practices, products and programs align to advance the Company's purpose of making its customers' financial lives better through the power of every connection. The Company achieves its purpose by pursuing Responsible Growth, which entails growing and winning in the marketplace by remaining committed to its customer-focused strategy and by managing risk well. Under the Company's Responsible Growth strategy, this growth must be sustainable, by sharing success with the communities it serves, being the best place to work for its teammates, and remaining committed to operational excellence so it can continue to invest in its employees and its capabilities. The Company's Board of Directors, in the exercise of its fiduciary responsibilities, endorses this approach. Comparing the nine-month period January 1, 2015 – September 30, 2015, to January 1, 2018–September 30, 2018, the Company has grown net income 66%, and increased earnings per common share 85%. From December 31, 2014 through September 30, 2018, the Company's common stock price has increased by 65% and market capitalization by 54%. Through Responsible Growth, the Company has been growing revenue, net income, and earnings per share, while adding new customers, and increasing adoption of the Company's products and services among existing customers. The Company has maintained positive operating leverage, with revenue growth outpacing expenses for 15 consecutive quarters. As of December 18, 2018, the Company has the third largest market capitalization of all global bank holding companies, and approximately the fifth largest net income among all global bank holding companies.

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
December 21, 2018
Page 4

The Company's Board of Directors regularly explores and challenges management on strategic alternatives to enhance performance and shareholder value. For example, the Company's Board of Directors annually reviews and approves the Company's financial plan and three-year strategic plan. Similarly, during the annual stress-testing and capital action review conducted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System's ("CCAR"), the Company's Board of Directors actively oversees and is involved in assessing the appropriate CCAR capital action requests to enhance shareholder value. Since December 31, 2014, the Company has paid nearly \$48 billion to common stockholders in dividends and share repurchases.

ANALYSIS

I. The Proposal May Be Excluded Under Rule 14a-8(i)(7) Because It Deals With Matters Related To The Company's Ordinary Business Operations.

The Proposal may be omitted pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(7) because it relates to general strategies to maximize stockholder value and thus addresses the Company's ordinary business operations. Rule 14a-8(i)(7) permits a company to omit from its proxy materials a stockholder proposal that relates to the company's "ordinary business" operations. According to the Commission release accompanying the 1998 amendments to Rule 14a-8, the term "ordinary business" "refers to matters that are not necessarily 'ordinary' in the common meaning of the word," but instead the term "is rooted in the corporate law concept providing management with flexibility in directing certain core matters involving the company's business and operations." Exchange Act Release No. 40018 (May 21, 1998) (the "1998 Release"). In the 1998 Release, the Commission stated that the underlying policy of the ordinary business exclusion is "to confine the resolution of ordinary business problems to management and the board of directors, since it is impracticable for shareholders to decide how to solve such problems at an annual shareholders meeting," and identified two central considerations that underlie this policy. As relevant here, one of these considerations was that "[c]ertain tasks are so fundamental to management's ability to run a company on a day-to-day basis that they could not, as a practical matter, be subject to direct shareholder oversight."

The 1998 Release distinguishes proposals pertaining to ordinary business matters from those involving "significant social policy issues," the latter of which are not excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(7) because they "transcend the day-to-day business matters and raise policy issues so significant that it would be appropriate for a stockholder vote." *Id.* (citing Exchange Act

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
December 21, 2018
Page 5

Release No. 12999 (Nov. 22, 1976)).¹ When assessing proposals under Rule 14a-8(i)(7), the Staff considers the terms of the resolution and its supporting statement as a whole. *See* Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14C, part D.2 (June 28, 2005) (“SLB 14C”) (“In determining whether the focus of these proposals is a significant social policy issue, we consider both the proposal and the supporting statement as a whole.”).

The Staff has consistently held that proposals calling for a company generally to seek to enhance stockholder value fall within a company’s ordinary course of business, even if the proposal suggests a variety of issues to be addressed. For example, in *Analysts International Corp.* (avail. Mar. 11, 2013), the Staff concurred with the exclusion of a proposal that requested that “the [b]oard of [d]irectors of the [c]ompany immediately engage the services of an investment banking firm to evaluate alternatives that could enhance shareholder value including, but not limited to, a merger or sale of the [c]ompany, and . . . that the [b]oard take all other steps necessary to actively seek a sale or merger of the [c]ompany on terms that will maximize share value for shareholders.” The company argued that that enhancement of stockholder value is an ordinary business matter and, as such, is the purview of the management and board of the company. The Staff agreed and concurred that the proposal could be excluded under Rule 14a-8(i)(7), stating, “In this regard, we note that the proposal appears to relate to both extraordinary transactions and non-extraordinary transactions. Proposals concerning the exploration of strategic alternatives for maximizing shareholder value which relate to both extraordinary and non-extraordinary transactions are generally excludable under rule 14a-8(i)(7).” *See also Anchor Bancorp* (avail. Jul. 11, 2013) (concurring with the exclusion of a proposal requesting the company engage an investment banking firm to evaluate alternatives to enhance stockholder value, with a similar explanation that Proposals concerning the exploration of strategic alternatives for maximizing stockholder value which relate to both extraordinary and non-extraordinary transactions are generally excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(7)).

Similarly, in *Donegal Group, Inc.* (avail. Feb. 16, 2012), the Staff concurred with the exclusion of a proposal that requested an independent committee retain an investment banking firm to “explore strategic alternatives to maximize shareholder value, including consideration of a merger of DMIC [the company’s mutual insurance business] with another mutual insurer

¹ The mere fact that a proposal touches upon a significant policy issue is not alone sufficient to avoid the application of Rule 14a-8(i)(7) when a proposal implicates ordinary business matters. The Commission has stated that “proposals relating to such [ordinary business] matters but focusing on sufficiently significant social policy issues . . . generally would not be considered to be excludable,” and accordingly the Staff has concurred that proposals relating to both ordinary business matters and significant social policy issues may be excluded in their entirety in reliance on Rule 14a-8(i)(7). 1998 Release.

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
December 21, 2018
Page 6

followed by the sale or merger of DGI.” The company argued that, under Delaware law, the general enhancement of stockholder value is a matter squarely within the exclusive authority of the company’s board of directors (citing *Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc.* 506 A.2d 173 (Del. 1986) for the proposition that the board of directors “has no more fundamental duty than seeking to maximize the value of the corporation for the benefits of its stockholders”). The company noted that even if the final clause of the resolution could arguably relate to the solicitations and evaluations for a merger and subsequent sale or merger, it did not narrow the scope of the proposal, “which remain[s] exclusively related to the ordinary business obligations of [the company’s] board of directors.” The Staff concurred, stating that the “proposal appears to relate to both extraordinary transactions and non-extraordinary transactions,” and noting further that “Proposals concerning the exploration of strategic alternatives for maximizing shareholder value which relate to both extraordinary and non-extraordinary transactions are generally excludable under rule 14a-8(i)(7).” *See also, e.g., Central Federal Corp.* (avail. Mar. 8, 2010) (permitting the exclusion of a proposal under Rule 14a-8(i)(7) that called for the board to both appoint an independent board committee and retain a leading investment banking firm to explore strategic alternatives for maximizing stockholder value, including the sale or merger of the company, and authorize the committee and investment banker to solicit offers for the sale or merger of the company because “the proposal appear[ed] to relate to both extraordinary transactions and non-extraordinary transactions”); *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.* (avail. Feb. 22, 2006) (allowing the exclusion of a proposal under Rule 14a-8(i)(7) that urged the board to “retain a nationally recognized investment bank to explore strategic alternatives to enhance the value of the [c]ompany, including, but not limited to, a possible sale, merger, or other transaction” as it related to both extraordinary and non-extraordinary transactions); *Medallion Financial Corp.* (avail. May 11, 2004) (concurring with the exclusion of a proposal that requested that an investment banking firm be engaged to evaluate alternatives to maximize stockholder value including a sale of the company as excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(7) because the proposal appeared to relate to both extraordinary and non-extraordinary transactions).

Consistent with these precedents, only a stockholder proposal that seeks to enhance stockholder value exclusively by means of an extraordinary corporate transaction such as the sale or merger of the company is not excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(7). *See Allegheny Valley Bancorp. Inc.* (avail. Jan. 3, 2001) (declining to concur with the exclusion of a proposal to retain an investment bank for the purpose of soliciting offers for the company’s stock or assets and present the highest cash offer to stockholders). For example, in *Cerus Corp.* (avail. Apr. 13, 2018), the thrust and focus of the proposal’s supporting statement related to exploring a sale of the company, and accordingly the Staff did not concur in the exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(7) of the proposal, which requested that the company begin an orderly process of retaining advisors to seriously study strategic alternatives, and empower a committee of its independent directors to

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
December 21, 2018
Page 7

evaluate those alternatives with advisors in exercise of their fiduciary responsibilities to maximize stockholder value. In *Cerus*, the supporting statement indicated that the proposal was requesting the committee to explore transactions that would result in the company becoming “part of a larger firm,” and thus related only to “strategic alternatives” in the form of a sale, acquisition, or similar change in control transaction. In rejecting *Cerus*’ request to exclude the proposal, the Staff indicated that the proposal was not excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(7) because the proposal’s supporting statement was “focuse[d] on an extraordinary transaction.”

Here, neither the Proposal nor the Supporting Statement is focused on requesting an extraordinary transaction, and accordingly the Proposal may be excluded pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(7). The Proposal’s “Resolved” clause speaks only generally of studying “strategic alternatives . . . to maximize shareholder value.” Moreover, the Supporting Statement clearly demonstrates that the Proposal is intended to address day-to-day aspects of the Company’s business, as it refers to business decisions regarding client relations and the determination of product and service offerings, and decisions regarding a purported relationship with a particular organization. Thus, both the Proposal and the Supporting Statement address maximizing stockholder value through ordinary course, non-extraordinary business operations and customer relationships, which the Staff consistently has recognized to be within the purview of a company’s board of directors and management.

The Supporting Statement unequivocally distinguishes the thrust and focus of the Proposal from the proposal in *Cerus Corp.* (avail. Apr. 13, 2018). Because the Staff “consider[s] both the proposal and the supporting statement as a whole” when determining whether the focus of these proposals is a significant social policy issue, *see* SLB 14C at part D.2, the similarities in the wording of the “Resolved” clause in *Cerus* and the Proposal are not determinative. Critically, the Supporting Statement plainly demonstrates that the Proposal implicates the Company’s ordinary business, and the day-to-day business decisions as they relate to the responsibility of management and the Board to maximize stockholder value generally. Accordingly, the Proposal is excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(7) because it addresses the Company’s ordinary business and does not focus on a significant policy issue that transcends such day-to-day business matters.

II. The Proposal May Be Excluded Under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) Because It Is Impermissibly Vague And Indefinite.

Rule 14a-8(i)(3) permits the exclusion of a stockholder proposal if the proposal or supporting statement is contrary to any of the Commission’s proxy rules or regulations, including Rule 14a-9, which prohibits materially false or misleading statements in proxy soliciting materials. The Staff consistently has taken the position that vague and indefinite

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
December 21, 2018
Page 8

stockholder proposals are inherently misleading and therefore excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) because “neither the stockholders voting on the proposal, nor the company in implementing the proposal (if adopted), would be able to determine with any reasonable certainty exactly what actions or measures the proposal requires.” Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14B (Sept. 15, 2004). *See also Dyer v. SEC*, 287 F.2d 773, 781 (8th Cir. 1961) (“[I]t appears to us that the proposal, as drafted and submitted to the company, is so vague and indefinite as to make it impossible for either the board of directors or the stockholders at large to comprehend precisely what the proposal would entail.”). As further described below, the Proposal is so vague and indefinite that neither the Company’s Board nor the Company’s stockholders can comprehend what the Proposal would entail and, therefore, is excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(3).

The Staff has on numerous occasions concurred in the exclusion of stockholder proposals under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) where key terms used in the proposal were so inherently vague and indefinite that stockholders voting on the proposal would be unable to ascertain with reasonable certainty what actions or policies the company should address if the proposal were enacted. For example, in *Puget Energy, Inc.* (avail. Mar. 7, 2002), the Staff concurred in the exclusion of a stockholder proposal under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) where the proposal requested that the company’s board of directors implement “a policy of improved corporate governance” and included a broad array of unrelated topics that could be covered by such a policy. *See also AT&T Inc.* (avail. Feb. 21, 2014) (concurring in the exclusion of a proposal requesting that the board review the company’s policies and procedures relating to the “directors’ moral, ethical and legal fiduciary duties and opportunities,” where the phrase “moral, ethical and legal fiduciary” was not defined or meaningfully described); *Bank of America Corp.* (avail. June 18, 2007) (concurring with the exclusion of a proposal calling for the board of directors to compile a report “concerning the thinking of the Directors concerning representative payees” as “vague and indefinite”); *Alaska Air Group, Inc.* (avail. Apr. 11, 2007) (concurring with the exclusion of a proposal requesting that the board amend the company’s governing instruments to “assert, affirm and define the right of the owners of the company to set standards of corporate governance”).

The Proposal is indistinguishable from the proposal considered and determined to be vague in *Puget Energy*. Just as the reference to “improved corporate governance” in that proposal was vague and indefinite, here the reference to “strategic alternatives . . . to maximize shareholder value” is so general and undefined that the Board and stockholders would not be able to determine what is being asked. Likewise, just as the supporting statements in *Puget Energy* reference a variety of unrelated topics that could be encompassed by the proposal, the Proposal’s Supporting Statement lists a range of diverse, disconnected topics that are unclear and confusing as to whether one, some or all are to be the subject of any review to maximize value for the Company’s stockholders. Under these long-standing precedents, the Proposal is excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(3). The potential actions that would result from the Proposal’s

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
December 21, 2018
Page 9

passage present an indeterminate array of alternatives, making it impossible for stockholders considering the Proposal to know what they would be asking the Board to do that is any different from what it does currently in fulfilling its fiduciary duties to stockholders. Likewise, it is unclear what action by the Company would address any of these disparate matters, since the Proposal provides no limitation or guidance with respect to what “strategic alternatives” the Board would be required to explore.

Because neither stockholders voting on the Proposal nor the Company or the Board in implementing the Proposal would know with any degree of certainty what actions are being proposed or should be taken, the Proposal is properly excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(3).

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing analysis, we respectfully request that the Staff concur that it will take no action if the Company excludes the Proposal from its 2019 Proxy Materials.

We would be happy to provide you with any additional information and answer any questions that you may have regarding this subject. Correspondence regarding this letter should be sent to shareholderproposals@gibsondunn.com. If we can be of any further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to call me at (202) 955-8671 or Ross E. Jeffries, Jr., the Company’s Corporate Secretary, at (980) 388-6878.

Sincerely,



Ronald O. Mueller

Enclosure

cc: Ross E. Jeffries, Jr., Bank of America Corporation
Justin Danhof, National Center for Public Policy Research

EXHIBIT A



Via FedEx

November 9, 2018

Ross E. Jeffries, Jr., Corporate Secretary
Bank of America Corporation
Hearst Tower, 214 North Tryon Street
NC1-027-18-05
Charlotte, North Carolina 28255

Dear Mr. Jeffries,

I hereby submit the enclosed shareholder proposal ("Proposal") for inclusion in the Bank of America Corporation (the "Company") proxy statement to be circulated to Company shareholders in conjunction with the next annual meeting of shareholders. The Proposal is submitted under Rule 14(a)-8 (Proposals of Security Holders) of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission's proxy regulations.

I submit the Proposal as General Counsel of the National Center for Public Policy Research, which has continuously owned Bank of America stock with a value exceeding \$2,000 for a year prior to and including the date of this Proposal and which intends to hold these shares through the date of the Company's 2019 annual meeting of shareholders. A Proof of Ownership letter is forthcoming and will be delivered to the Company.

Copies of correspondence or a request for a "no-action" letter should be forwarded to Justin Danhof, Esq, General Counsel, National Center for Public Policy Research, 20 F Street, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20001 and emailed to JDanhof@nationalcenter.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Justin Danhof", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Justin Danhof, Esq.

Enclosure: Shareholder Proposal

Proposal Regarding Extraordinary Action to Maximize Shareholder Value

Whereas, Bank of America (the “Company”) has engaged in activity detrimental to long-term shareholder value.

Whereas, long-term investors expect the Company to abide by its fiduciary duties. Therefore, we request the following extraordinary action.

Resolved: Shareholders request that Bank of America begin an orderly process of retaining advisors to study strategic alternatives and empower a committee of its independent directors to evaluate those alternatives with advisors in exercise of their fiduciary responsibilities to maximize shareholder value.

Supporting Statement

In April 2018, Bank of America announced that it would no longer do business with certain firearms companies. When questioned, the Company’s CEO refused to say how much money shareholders would lose because of this political decision. Compounding that financial loss, the state of Louisiana announced it would no longer do business with the Company over its anti-Second Amendment stance.

The Company has also been fined on numerous occasions and forced into costly settlements thereby diminishing shareholder value. This includes a \$137.3 million settlement with the Department of Justice because of the Company’s “conspiracy to rig bids in the municipal bond derivatives market.”

In 2014, the Company also agreed to a \$16.65 billion settlement with the Justice Department to release it from liability for its involvement with the sale of mortgage-backed securities.

The Company has also distanced itself from certain fossil fuel businesses. This has created unknown losses for shareholders.

Furthermore, Bank of America had a prior relationship with the Human Rights Campaign, a group that works to diminish religious liberty in the United States. This concerning relationship may mean the Company also holds anti-religious views harming its reputation and brand.

The above examples are simply instructive as to why we are requesting such an extraordinary action. The request does not seek to micromanage the Company on the litany of day-to-day operational fiduciary failures that have led us to make our extraordinary request.

November 16, 2018

VIA OVERNIGHT MAIL

Justin Danhof
National Center for Public Policy Research
20 F Street, NW Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Mr. Danhof:

I am writing on behalf of Bank of America Corporation (the “Company”), which received on November 9, 2018, the stockholder proposal you submitted on behalf of the National Center for Public Policy Research (the “Proponent”) entitled “Proposal Regarding Extraordinary Action to Maximize Shareholder Value” pursuant to Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) Rule 14a-8 for inclusion in the proxy statement for the Company’s 2019 Annual Meeting of Stockholders (the “Proposal”).

The Proposal contains certain procedural deficiencies, which SEC regulations require us to bring to your attention.

Rule 14a-8(b) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, provides that stockholder proponents must submit sufficient proof of their continuous ownership of at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of a company’s shares entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year as of the date the stockholder proposal was submitted. The Company’s stock records do not indicate that the Proponent is the record owner of sufficient shares to satisfy this requirement. In addition, to date we have not received proof that the Proponent has satisfied Rule 14a-8’s ownership requirements as of the date that the Proposal was submitted to the Company.

To remedy this defect, the Proponent must submit sufficient proof of the Proponent’s continuous ownership of the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including November 9, 2018, the date the Proposal was submitted to the Company. As explained in Rule 14a-8(b) and in SEC staff guidance, sufficient proof must be in the form of:

- (1) a written statement from the “record” holder of the Proponent’s shares (usually a broker or a bank) verifying that the Proponent continuously held the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including November 9, 2018; or
- (2) if the Proponent has filed with the SEC a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 or Form 5, or amendments to those documents or updated forms,

GIBSON DUNN

Mr. Justin Danhof
November 16, 2018
Page 2

reflecting the Proponent's ownership of the required number or amount of Company shares as of or before the date on which the one-year eligibility period begins, a copy of the schedule and/or form, and any subsequent amendments reporting a change in the ownership level and a written statement that the Proponent continuously held the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period.

If the Proponent intends to demonstrate ownership by submitting a written statement from the "record" holder of the Proponent's shares as set forth in (1) above, please note that most large U.S. brokers and banks deposit their customers' securities with, and hold those securities through, the Depository Trust Company ("DTC"), a registered clearing agency that acts as a securities depository (DTC is also known through the account name of Cede & Co.). Under SEC Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F, only DTC participants are viewed as record holders of securities that are deposited at DTC. You can confirm whether the Proponent's broker or bank is a DTC participant by asking the Proponent's broker or bank or by checking DTC's participant list, which is available at <http://www.dtcc.com/~media/Files/Downloads/client-center/DTC/alpha.ashx>. In these situations, stockholders need to obtain proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which the securities are held, as follows:

- (1) If the Proponent's broker or bank is a DTC participant, then the Proponent needs to submit a written statement from the Proponent's broker or bank verifying that the Proponent continuously held the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including November 9, 2018.
- (2) If the Proponent's broker or bank is not a DTC participant, then the Proponent needs to submit proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which the shares are held verifying that the Proponent continuously held the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including November 9, 2018. You should be able to find out the identity of the DTC participant by asking the Proponent's broker or bank. If the Proponent's broker is an introducing broker, you may also be able to learn the identity and telephone number of the DTC participant through the Proponent's account statements, because the clearing broker identified on the account statements will generally be a DTC participant. If the DTC participant that holds the Proponent's shares is not able to confirm the Proponent's individual holdings but is able to confirm the holdings of the Proponent's broker or bank, then the Proponent needs to satisfy the proof of ownership requirements by obtaining and submitting two proof of ownership statements verifying that, for the one-year period preceding and including November 9, 2018, the required number or amount of Company shares were continuously held: (i) one from the Proponent's broker or bank

GIBSON DUNN


Mr. Justin Danhof
November 16, 2018
Page 3

confirming the Proponent's ownership, and (ii) the other from the DTC participant confirming the broker or bank's ownership.

The SEC's rules require that any response to this letter be postmarked or transmitted electronically no later than 14 calendar days from the date you receive this letter. Please address any response to me care of Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP, 1050 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20036.

If you have any questions with respect to the foregoing, please contact me at 202-955-8500. For your reference, I enclose a copy of Rule 14a-8 and Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F.

Sincerely,



Ronald O. Mueller

Enclosures

Rule 14a-8 – Shareholder Proposals

This section addresses when a company must include a shareholder's proposal in its proxy statement and identify the proposal in its form of proxy when the company holds an annual or special meeting of shareholders. In summary, in order to have your shareholder proposal included on a company's proxy card, and included along with any supporting statement in its proxy statement, you must be eligible and follow certain procedures. Under a few specific circumstances, the company is permitted to exclude your proposal, but only after submitting its reasons to the Commission. We structured this section in a question-and-answer format so that it is easier to understand. The references to "you" are to a shareholder seeking to submit the proposal.

(a) *Question 1: What is a proposal?* A shareholder proposal is your recommendation or requirement that the company and/or its board of directors take action, which you intend to present at a meeting of the company's shareholders. Your proposal should state as clearly as possible the course of action that you believe the company should follow. If your proposal is placed on the company's proxy card, the company must also provide in the form of proxy means for shareholders to specify by boxes a choice between approval or disapproval, or abstention. Unless otherwise indicated, the word "proposal" as used in this section refers both to your proposal, and to your corresponding statement in support of your proposal (if any).

(b) *Question 2: Who is eligible to submit a proposal, and how do I demonstrate to the company that I am eligible?*

(1) In order to be eligible to submit a proposal, you must have continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the meeting for at least one year by the date you submit the proposal. You must continue to hold those securities through the date of the meeting.

(2) If you are the registered holder of your securities, which means that your name appears in the company's records as a shareholder, the company can verify your eligibility on its own, although you will still have to provide the company with a written statement that you intend to continue to hold the securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders. However, if like many shareholders you are not a registered holder, the company likely does not know that you are a shareholder, or how many shares you own. In this case, at the time you submit your proposal, you must prove your eligibility to the company in one of two ways:

(i) The first way is to submit to the company a written statement from the "record" holder of your securities (usually a broker or bank) verifying that, at the time you submitted your proposal, you continuously held the securities for at least one year. You must also include your own written statement that you intend to continue to hold the securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders; or

(ii) The second way to prove ownership applies only if you have filed a Schedule 13D (§240.13d-101), Schedule 13G (§240.13d-102), Form 3 (§249.103 of this chapter), Form 4 (§249.104 of this chapter) and/or Form 5 (§249.105 of this chapter), or amendments to those documents or updated forms, reflecting your ownership of the shares as of or before the date on which the one-year eligibility period begins. If you have filed one of these documents with the SEC, you may demonstrate your eligibility by submitting to the company:

(A) A copy of the schedule and/or form, and any subsequent amendments reporting a change in your ownership level;

(B) Your written statement that you continuously held the required number of shares for the one-year period as of the date of the statement; and

(C) Your written statement that you intend to continue ownership of the shares through the date of the company's annual or special meeting.

(c) *Question 3:* How many proposals may I submit? Each shareholder may submit no more than one proposal to a company for a particular shareholders' meeting.

(d) *Question 4:* How long can my proposal be? The proposal, including any accompanying supporting statement, may not exceed 500 words.

(e) *Question 5:* What is the deadline for submitting a proposal?

(1) If you are submitting your proposal for the company's annual meeting, you can in most cases find the deadline in last year's proxy statement. However, if the company did not hold an annual meeting last year, or has changed the date of its meeting for this year more than 30 days from last year's meeting, you can usually find the deadline in one of the company's quarterly reports on Form 10-Q (§249.308a of this chapter), or in shareholder reports of investment companies under §270.30d-1 of this chapter of the Investment Company Act of 1940. In order to avoid controversy, shareholders should submit their proposals by means, including electronic means, that permit them to prove the date of delivery.

(2) The deadline is calculated in the following manner if the proposal is submitted for a regularly scheduled annual meeting. The proposal must be received at the company's principal executive offices not less than 120 calendar days before the date of the company's proxy statement released to shareholders in connection with the previous year's annual meeting. However, if the company did not hold an annual meeting the previous year, or if the date of this year's annual meeting has been changed by more than 30 days from the date of the previous year's meeting, then the deadline is a reasonable time before the company begins to print and send its proxy materials.

(3) If you are submitting your proposal for a meeting of shareholders other than a regularly scheduled annual meeting, the deadline is a reasonable time before the company begins to print and send its proxy materials.

(f) *Question 6:* What if I fail to follow one of the eligibility or procedural requirements explained in answers to Questions 1 through 4 of this section?

(1) The company may exclude your proposal, but only after it has notified you of the problem, and you have failed adequately to correct it. Within 14 calendar days of receiving your proposal, the company must notify you in writing of any procedural or eligibility deficiencies, as well as of the time frame for your response. Your response must be postmarked, or transmitted electronically, no later than 14 days from the date you received the company's notification. A company need not provide you such notice of a deficiency if the deficiency cannot be remedied, such as if you fail to submit a proposal by the company's properly determined deadline. If the company intends to exclude the proposal, it will later have to make a submission under §240.14a-8 and provide you with a copy under Question 10 below, §240.14a-8(j).

(2) If you fail in your promise to hold the required number of securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders, then the company will be permitted to exclude all of your proposals from its proxy materials for any meeting held in the following two calendar years.

(g) *Question 7: Who has the burden of persuading the Commission or its staff that my proposal can be excluded? Except as otherwise noted, the burden is on the company to demonstrate that it is entitled to exclude a proposal.*

(h) *Question 8: Must I appear personally at the shareholders' meeting to present the proposal?*

(1) Either you, or your representative who is qualified under state law to present the proposal on your behalf, must attend the meeting to present the proposal. Whether you attend the meeting yourself or send a qualified representative to the meeting in your place, you should make sure that you, or your representative, follow the proper state law procedures for attending the meeting and/or presenting your proposal.

(2) If the company holds its shareholder meeting in whole or in part via electronic media, and the company permits you or your representative to present your proposal via such media, then you may appear through electronic media rather than traveling to the meeting to appear in person.

(3) If you or your qualified representative fail to appear and present the proposal, without good cause, the company will be permitted to exclude all of your proposals from its proxy materials for any meetings held in the following two calendar years.

(i) *Question 9: If I have complied with the procedural requirements, on what other bases may a company rely to exclude my proposal?*

(1) *Improper under state law:* If the proposal is not a proper subject for action by shareholders under the laws of the jurisdiction of the company's organization;

Note to paragraph (i)(1): Depending on the subject matter, some proposals are not considered proper under state law if they would be binding on the company if approved by shareholders. In our experience, most proposals that are cast as recommendations or requests that the board of directors take specified action are proper under state law. Accordingly, we will assume that a proposal drafted as a recommendation or suggestion is proper unless the company demonstrates otherwise.

(2) *Violation of law:* If the proposal would, if implemented, cause the company to violate any state, federal, or foreign law to which it is subject;

Note to paragraph (i)(2): We will not apply this basis for exclusion to permit exclusion of a proposal on grounds that it would violate foreign law if compliance with the foreign law would result in a violation of any state or federal law.

(3) *Violation of proxy rules:* If the proposal or supporting statement is contrary to any of the Commission's proxy rules, including §240.14a-9, which prohibits materially false or misleading statements in proxy soliciting materials;

(4) *Personal grievance; special interest:* If the proposal relates to the redress of a personal claim or grievance against the company or any other person, or if it is designed to result in a benefit to you, or to further a personal interest, which is not shared by the other shareholders at large;

(5) *Relevance:* If the proposal relates to operations which account for less than 5 percent of the company's total assets at the end of its most recent fiscal year, and for less than 5 percent of its net earnings and gross sales for its most recent fiscal year, and is not otherwise significantly related to the company's business;

(6) *Absence of power/authority:* If the company would lack the power or authority to implement the proposal;

(7) *Management functions*: If the proposal deals with a matter relating to the company's ordinary business operations;

(8) *Director elections*: If the proposal:

- (i) Would disqualify a nominee who is standing for election;
- (ii) Would remove a director from office before his or her term expired;
- (iii) Questions the competence, business judgment, or character of one or more nominees or directors;
- (iv) Seeks to include a specific individual in the company's proxy materials for election to the board of directors; or
- (v) Otherwise could affect the outcome of the upcoming election of directors.

(9) *Conflicts with company's proposal*: If the proposal directly conflicts with one of the company's own proposals to be submitted to shareholders at the same meeting;

Note to paragraph (i)(9): A company's submission to the Commission under this section should specify the points of conflict with the company's proposal.

(10) *Substantially implemented*: If the company has already substantially implemented the proposal;

Note to paragraph (i)(10): A company may exclude a shareholder proposal that would provide an advisory vote or seek future advisory votes to approve the compensation of executives as disclosed pursuant to Item 402 of Regulation S-K (§229.402 of this chapter) or any successor to Item 402 (a "say-on-pay vote") or that relates to the frequency of say-on-pay votes, provided that in the most recent shareholder vote required by §240.14a-21(b) of this chapter a single year (i.e., one, two, or three years) received approval of a majority of votes cast on the matter and the company has adopted a policy on the frequency of say-on-pay votes that is consistent with the choice of the majority of votes cast in the most recent shareholder vote required by §240.14a-21(b) of this chapter.

(11) *Duplication*: If the proposal substantially duplicates another proposal previously submitted to the company by another proponent that will be included in the company's proxy materials for the same meeting;

(12) *Resubmissions*: If the proposal deals with substantially the same subject matter as another proposal or proposals that has or have been previously included in the company's proxy materials within the preceding 5 calendar years, a company may exclude it from its proxy materials for any meeting held within 3 calendar years of the last time it was included if the proposal received:

- (i) Less than 3% of the vote if proposed once within the preceding 5 calendar years;
- (ii) Less than 6% of the vote on its last submission to shareholders if proposed twice previously within the preceding 5 calendar years; or
- (iii) Less than 10% of the vote on its last submission to shareholders if proposed three times or more previously within the preceding 5 calendar years; and

(13) *Specific amount of dividends*: If the proposal relates to specific amounts of cash or stock dividends.

(j) *Question 10*: What procedures must the company follow if it intends to exclude my proposal?

(1) If the company intends to exclude a proposal from its proxy materials, it must file its reasons with the Commission no later than 80 calendar days before it files its definitive proxy statement and form of proxy with the Commission. The company must simultaneously provide you with a copy of its submission. The Commission staff may permit the company to make its submission later than 80 days before the company files its definitive proxy statement and form of proxy, if the company demonstrates good cause for missing the deadline.

(2) The company must file six paper copies of the following:

(i) The proposal;

(ii) An explanation of why the company believes that it may exclude the proposal, which should, if possible, refer to the most recent applicable authority, such as prior Division letters issued under the rule; and

(iii) A supporting opinion of counsel when such reasons are based on matters of state or foreign law.

(k) *Question 11*: May I submit my own statement to the Commission responding to the company's arguments? Yes, you may submit a response, but it is not required. You should try to submit any response to us, with a copy to the company, as soon as possible after the company makes its submission. This way, the Commission staff will have time to consider fully your submission before it issues its response. You should submit six paper copies of your response.

(l) *Question 12*: If the company includes my shareholder proposal in its proxy materials, what information about me must it include along with the proposal itself?

(1) The company's proxy statement must include your name and address, as well as the number of the company's voting securities that you hold. However, instead of providing that information, the company may instead include a statement that it will provide the information to shareholders promptly upon receiving an oral or written request.

(2) The company is not responsible for the contents of your proposal or supporting statement.

(m) *Question 13*: What can I do if the company includes in its proxy statement reasons why it believes shareholders should not vote in favor of my proposal, and I disagree with some of its statements?

(1) The company may elect to include in its proxy statement reasons why it believes shareholders should vote against your proposal. The company is allowed to make arguments reflecting its own point of view, just as you may express your own point of view in your proposal's supporting statement.

(2) However, if you believe that the company's opposition to your proposal contains materially false or misleading statements that may violate our anti-fraud rule, §240.14a-9, you should promptly send to the Commission staff and the company a letter explaining the reasons for your view, along with a copy of the company's statements opposing your proposal. To the extent possible, your letter should include specific factual information demonstrating the inaccuracy of the company's claims. Time permitting, you may wish to try to work out your differences with the company by yourself before contacting the Commission staff.

(3) We require the company to send you a copy of its statements opposing your proposal before it sends its proxy materials, so that you may bring to our attention any materially false or misleading statements, under the following timeframes:

(i) If our no-action response requires that you make revisions to your proposal or supporting statement as a condition to requiring the company to include it in its proxy materials, then the company must provide you with a copy of its opposition statements no later than 5 calendar days after the company receives a copy of your revised proposal; or

(ii) In all other cases, the company must provide you with a copy of its opposition statements no later than 30 calendar days before its files definitive copies of its proxy statement and form of proxy under §240.14a-6.



**Division of Corporation Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission**

Shareholder Proposals

Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F (CF)

Action: Publication of CF Staff Legal Bulletin

Date: October 18, 2011

Summary: This staff legal bulletin provides information for companies and shareholders regarding Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Supplementary Information: The statements in this bulletin represent the views of the Division of Corporation Finance (the "Division"). This bulletin is not a rule, regulation or statement of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission"). Further, the Commission has neither approved nor disapproved its content.

Contacts: For further information, please contact the Division's Office of Chief Counsel by calling (202) 551-3500 or by submitting a web-based request form at https://tts.sec.gov/cgi-bin/corp_fin_interpretive.

A. The purpose of this bulletin

This bulletin is part of a continuing effort by the Division to provide guidance on important issues arising under Exchange Act Rule 14a-8. Specifically, this bulletin contains information regarding:

- Brokers and banks that constitute "record" holders under Rule 14a-8 (b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8;
- Common errors shareholders can avoid when submitting proof of ownership to companies;
- The submission of revised proposals;
- Procedures for withdrawing no-action requests regarding proposals submitted by multiple proponents; and
- The Division's new process for transmitting Rule 14a-8 no-action responses by email.

You can find additional guidance regarding Rule 14a-8 in the following bulletins that are available on the Commission's website: [SLB No. 14](#), [SLB No. 14A](#), [SLB No. 14B](#), [SLB No. 14C](#), [SLB No. 14D](#) and [SLB No. 14E](#).

B. The types of brokers and banks that constitute "record" holders under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8

1. Eligibility to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8

To be eligible to submit a shareholder proposal, a shareholder must have continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the shareholder meeting for at least one year as of the date the shareholder submits the proposal. The shareholder must also continue to hold the required amount of securities through the date of the meeting and must provide the company with a written statement of intent to do so.¹

The steps that a shareholder must take to verify his or her eligibility to submit a proposal depend on how the shareholder owns the securities. There are two types of security holders in the U.S.: registered owners and beneficial owners.² Registered owners have a direct relationship with the issuer because their ownership of shares is listed on the records maintained by the issuer or its transfer agent. If a shareholder is a registered owner, the company can independently confirm that the shareholder's holdings satisfy Rule 14a-8(b)'s eligibility requirement.

The vast majority of investors in shares issued by U.S. companies, however, are beneficial owners, which means that they hold their securities in book-entry form through a securities intermediary, such as a broker or a bank. Beneficial owners are sometimes referred to as "street name" holders. Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) provides that a beneficial owner can provide proof of ownership to support his or her eligibility to submit a proposal by submitting a written statement "from the 'record' holder of [the] securities (usually a broker or bank)," verifying that, at the time the proposal was submitted, the shareholder held the required amount of securities continuously for at least one year.³

2. The role of the Depository Trust Company

Most large U.S. brokers and banks deposit their customers' securities with, and hold those securities through, the Depository Trust Company ("DTC"), a registered clearing agency acting as a securities depository. Such brokers and banks are often referred to as "participants" in DTC.⁴ The names of these DTC participants, however, do not appear as the registered owners of the securities deposited with DTC on the list of shareholders maintained by the company or, more typically, by its transfer agent. Rather, DTC's nominee, Cede & Co., appears on the shareholder list as the sole registered owner of securities deposited with DTC by the DTC participants. A company can request from DTC a "securities position listing" as of a specified date, which identifies the DTC participants having a position in the company's securities and the number of securities held by each DTC participant on that date.⁵

3. Brokers and banks that constitute "record" holders under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8

In *The Hain Celestial Group, Inc.* (Oct. 1, 2008), we took the position that an introducing broker could be considered a "record" holder for purposes of

Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). An introducing broker is a broker that engages in sales and other activities involving customer contact, such as opening customer accounts and accepting customer orders, but is not permitted to maintain custody of customer funds and securities.⁶ Instead, an introducing broker engages another broker, known as a "clearing broker," to hold custody of client funds and securities, to clear and execute customer trades, and to handle other functions such as issuing confirmations of customer trades and customer account statements. Clearing brokers generally are DTC participants; introducing brokers generally are not. As introducing brokers generally are not DTC participants, and therefore typically do not appear on DTC's securities position listing, *Hain Celestial* has required companies to accept proof of ownership letters from brokers in cases where, unlike the positions of registered owners and brokers and banks that are DTC participants, the company is unable to verify the positions against its own or its transfer agent's records or against DTC's securities position listing.

In light of questions we have received following two recent court cases relating to proof of ownership under Rule 14a-8⁷ and in light of the Commission's discussion of registered and beneficial owners in the Proxy Mechanics Concept Release, we have reconsidered our views as to what types of brokers and banks should be considered "record" holders under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). Because of the transparency of DTC participants' positions in a company's securities, we will take the view going forward that, for Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) purposes, only DTC participants should be viewed as "record" holders of securities that are deposited at DTC. As a result, we will no longer follow *Hain Celestial*.

We believe that taking this approach as to who constitutes a "record" holder for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) will provide greater certainty to beneficial owners and companies. We also note that this approach is consistent with Exchange Act Rule 12g5-1 and a 1988 staff no-action letter addressing that rule,⁸ under which brokers and banks that are DTC participants are considered to be the record holders of securities on deposit with DTC when calculating the number of record holders for purposes of Sections 12(g) and 15(d) of the Exchange Act.

Companies have occasionally expressed the view that, because DTC's nominee, Cede & Co., appears on the shareholder list as the sole registered owner of securities deposited with DTC by the DTC participants, only DTC or Cede & Co. should be viewed as the "record" holder of the securities held on deposit at DTC for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). We have never interpreted the rule to require a shareholder to obtain a proof of ownership letter from DTC or Cede & Co., and nothing in this guidance should be construed as changing that view.

How can a shareholder determine whether his or her broker or bank is a DTC participant?

Shareholders and companies can confirm whether a particular broker or bank is a DTC participant by checking DTC's participant list, which is currently available on the Internet at <http://www.dtcc.com/~media/Files/Downloads/client-center/DTC/alpha.ashx>.

What if a shareholder's broker or bank is not on DTC's participant list?

The shareholder will need to obtain proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which the securities are held. The shareholder should be able to find out who this DTC participant is by asking the shareholder's broker or bank.⁹

If the DTC participant knows the shareholder's broker or bank's holdings, but does not know the shareholder's holdings, a shareholder could satisfy Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) by obtaining and submitting two proof of ownership statements verifying that, at the time the proposal was submitted, the required amount of securities were continuously held for at least one year – one from the shareholder's broker or bank confirming the shareholder's ownership, and the other from the DTC participant confirming the broker or bank's ownership.

How will the staff process no-action requests that argue for exclusion on the basis that the shareholder's proof of ownership is not from a DTC participant?

The staff will grant no-action relief to a company on the basis that the shareholder's proof of ownership is not from a DTC participant only if the company's notice of defect describes the required proof of ownership in a manner that is consistent with the guidance contained in this bulletin. Under Rule 14a-8(f)(1), the shareholder will have an opportunity to obtain the requisite proof of ownership after receiving the notice of defect.

C. Common errors shareholders can avoid when submitting proof of ownership to companies

In this section, we describe two common errors shareholders make when submitting proof of ownership for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2), and we provide guidance on how to avoid these errors.

First, Rule 14a-8(b) requires a shareholder to provide proof of ownership that he or she has "continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the meeting for at least one year by the date you submit the proposal" (emphasis added).¹⁰ We note that many proof of ownership letters do not satisfy this requirement because they do not verify the shareholder's beneficial ownership for the entire one-year period preceding and including the date the proposal is submitted. In some cases, the letter speaks as of a date *before* the date the proposal is submitted, thereby leaving a gap between the date of the verification and the date the proposal is submitted. In other cases, the letter speaks as of a date *after* the date the proposal was submitted but covers a period of only one year, thus failing to verify the shareholder's beneficial ownership over the required full one-year period preceding the date of the proposal's submission.

Second, many letters fail to confirm continuous ownership of the securities. This can occur when a broker or bank submits a letter that confirms the shareholder's beneficial ownership only as of a specified date but omits any reference to continuous ownership for a one-year period.

We recognize that the requirements of Rule 14a-8(b) are highly prescriptive and can cause inconvenience for shareholders when submitting proposals.

Although our administration of Rule 14a-8(b) is constrained by the terms of the rule, we believe that shareholders can avoid the two errors highlighted above by arranging to have their broker or bank provide the required verification of ownership as of the date they plan to submit the proposal using the following format:

“As of [date the proposal is submitted], [name of shareholder] held, and has held continuously for at least one year, [number of securities] shares of [company name] [class of securities].”¹¹

As discussed above, a shareholder may also need to provide a separate written statement from the DTC participant through which the shareholder’s securities are held if the shareholder’s broker or bank is not a DTC participant.

D. The submission of revised proposals

On occasion, a shareholder will revise a proposal after submitting it to a company. This section addresses questions we have received regarding revisions to a proposal or supporting statement.

1. A shareholder submits a timely proposal. The shareholder then submits a revised proposal before the company’s deadline for receiving proposals. Must the company accept the revisions?

Yes. In this situation, we believe the revised proposal serves as a replacement of the initial proposal. By submitting a revised proposal, the shareholder has effectively withdrawn the initial proposal. Therefore, the shareholder is not in violation of the one-proposal limitation in Rule 14a-8 (c).¹² If the company intends to submit a no-action request, it must do so with respect to the revised proposal.

We recognize that in Question and Answer E.2 of SLB No. 14, we indicated that if a shareholder makes revisions to a proposal before the company submits its no-action request, the company can choose whether to accept the revisions. However, this guidance has led some companies to believe that, in cases where shareholders attempt to make changes to an initial proposal, the company is free to ignore such revisions even if the revised proposal is submitted before the company’s deadline for receiving shareholder proposals. We are revising our guidance on this issue to make clear that a company may not ignore a revised proposal in this situation.¹³

2. A shareholder submits a timely proposal. After the deadline for receiving proposals, the shareholder submits a revised proposal. Must the company accept the revisions?

No. If a shareholder submits revisions to a proposal after the deadline for receiving proposals under Rule 14a-8(e), the company is not required to accept the revisions. However, if the company does not accept the revisions, it must treat the revised proposal as a second proposal and submit a notice stating its intention to exclude the revised proposal, as required by Rule 14a-8(j). The company’s notice may cite Rule 14a-8(e) as the reason for excluding the revised proposal. If the company does not accept the revisions and intends to exclude the initial proposal, it would also need to submit its reasons for excluding the initial proposal.

3. If a shareholder submits a revised proposal, as of which date must the shareholder prove his or her share ownership?

A shareholder must prove ownership as of the date the original proposal is submitted. When the Commission has discussed revisions to proposals,¹⁴ it has not suggested that a revision triggers a requirement to provide proof of ownership a second time. As outlined in Rule 14a-8(b), proving ownership includes providing a written statement that the shareholder intends to continue to hold the securities through the date of the shareholder meeting. Rule 14a-8(f)(2) provides that if the shareholder "fails in [his or her] promise to hold the required number of securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders, then the company will be permitted to exclude all of [the same shareholder's] proposals from its proxy materials for any meeting held in the following two calendar years." With these provisions in mind, we do not interpret Rule 14a-8 as requiring additional proof of ownership when a shareholder submits a revised proposal.¹⁵

E. Procedures for withdrawing no-action requests for proposals submitted by multiple proponents

We have previously addressed the requirements for withdrawing a Rule 14a-8 no-action request in SLB Nos. 14 and 14C. SLB No. 14 notes that a company should include with a withdrawal letter documentation demonstrating that a shareholder has withdrawn the proposal. In cases where a proposal submitted by multiple shareholders is withdrawn, SLB No. 14C states that, if each shareholder has designated a lead individual to act on its behalf and the company is able to demonstrate that the individual is authorized to act on behalf of all of the proponents, the company need only provide a letter from that lead individual indicating that the lead individual is withdrawing the proposal on behalf of all of the proponents.

Because there is no relief granted by the staff in cases where a no-action request is withdrawn following the withdrawal of the related proposal, we recognize that the threshold for withdrawing a no-action request need not be overly burdensome. Going forward, we will process a withdrawal request if the company provides a letter from the lead filer that includes a representation that the lead filer is authorized to withdraw the proposal on behalf of each proponent identified in the company's no-action request.¹⁶

F. Use of email to transmit our Rule 14a-8 no-action responses to companies and proponents

To date, the Division has transmitted copies of our Rule 14a-8 no-action responses, including copies of the correspondence we have received in connection with such requests, by U.S. mail to companies and proponents. We also post our response and the related correspondence to the Commission's website shortly after issuance of our response.

In order to accelerate delivery of staff responses to companies and proponents, and to reduce our copying and postage costs, going forward, we intend to transmit our Rule 14a-8 no-action responses by email to companies and proponents. We therefore encourage both companies and proponents to include email contact information in any correspondence to each other and to us. We will use U.S. mail to transmit our no-action response to any company or proponent for which we do not have email contact information.

Given the availability of our responses and the related correspondence on the Commission's website and the requirement under Rule 14a-8 for companies and proponents to copy each other on correspondence submitted to the Commission, we believe it is unnecessary to transmit copies of the related correspondence along with our no-action response. Therefore, we intend to transmit only our staff response and not the correspondence we receive from the parties. We will continue to post to the Commission's website copies of this correspondence at the same time that we post our staff no-action response.

¹ See Rule 14a-8(b).

² For an explanation of the types of share ownership in the U.S., see Concept Release on U.S. Proxy System, Release No. 34-62495 (July 14, 2010) [75 FR 42982] ("Proxy Mechanics Concept Release"), at Section II.A. The term "beneficial owner" does not have a uniform meaning under the federal securities laws. It has a different meaning in this bulletin as compared to "beneficial owner" and "beneficial ownership" in Sections 13 and 16 of the Exchange Act. Our use of the term in this bulletin is not intended to suggest that registered owners are not beneficial owners for purposes of those Exchange Act provisions. See Proposed Amendments to Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 Relating to Proposals by Security Holders, Release No. 34-12598 (July 7, 1976) [41 FR 29982], at n.2 ("The term 'beneficial owner' when used in the context of the proxy rules, and in light of the purposes of those rules, may be interpreted to have a broader meaning than it would for certain other purpose[s] under the federal securities laws, such as reporting pursuant to the Williams Act.").

³ If a shareholder has filed a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 or Form 5 reflecting ownership of the required amount of shares, the shareholder may instead prove ownership by submitting a copy of such filings and providing the additional information that is described in Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(ii).

⁴ DTC holds the deposited securities in "fungible bulk," meaning that there are no specifically identifiable shares directly owned by the DTC participants. Rather, each DTC participant holds a pro rata interest or position in the aggregate number of shares of a particular issuer held at DTC. Correspondingly, each customer of a DTC participant – such as an individual investor – owns a pro rata interest in the shares in which the DTC participant has a pro rata interest. See Proxy Mechanics Concept Release, at Section II.B.2.a.

⁵ See Exchange Act Rule 17Ad-8.

⁶ See Net Capital Rule, Release No. 34-31511 (Nov. 24, 1992) [57 FR 56973] ("Net Capital Rule Release"), at Section II.C.

⁷ See *KBR Inc. v. Chevedden*, Civil Action No. H-11-0196, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36431, 2011 WL 1463611 (S.D. Tex. Apr. 4, 2011); *Apache Corp. v. Chevedden*, 696 F. Supp. 2d 723 (S.D. Tex. 2010). In both cases, the court concluded that a securities intermediary was not a record holder for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b) because it did not appear on a list of the

company's non-objecting beneficial owners or on any DTC securities position listing, nor was the intermediary a DTC participant.

⁸ *Techne Corp.* (Sept. 20, 1988).

⁹ In addition, if the shareholder's broker is an introducing broker, the shareholder's account statements should include the clearing broker's identity and telephone number. See Net Capital Rule Release, at Section II.C.(iii). The clearing broker will generally be a DTC participant.

¹⁰ For purposes of Rule 14a-8(b), the submission date of a proposal will generally precede the company's receipt date of the proposal, absent the use of electronic or other means of same-day delivery.

¹¹ This format is acceptable for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b), but it is not mandatory or exclusive.

¹² As such, it is not appropriate for a company to send a notice of defect for multiple proposals under Rule 14a-8(c) upon receiving a revised proposal.

¹³ This position will apply to all proposals submitted after an initial proposal but before the company's deadline for receiving proposals, regardless of whether they are explicitly labeled as "revisions" to an initial proposal, unless the shareholder affirmatively indicates an intent to submit a second, *additional* proposal for inclusion in the company's proxy materials. In that case, the company must send the shareholder a notice of defect pursuant to Rule 14a-8(f)(1) if it intends to exclude either proposal from its proxy materials in reliance on Rule 14a-8(c). In light of this guidance, with respect to proposals or revisions received before a company's deadline for submission, we will no longer follow *Layne Christensen Co.* (Mar. 21, 2011) and other prior staff no-action letters in which we took the view that a proposal would violate the Rule 14a-8(c) one-proposal limitation if such proposal is submitted to a company after the company has either submitted a Rule 14a-8 no-action request to exclude an earlier proposal submitted by the same proponent or notified the proponent that the earlier proposal was excludable under the rule.

¹⁴ See, e.g., Adoption of Amendments Relating to Proposals by Security Holders, Release No. 34-12999 (Nov. 22, 1976) [41 FR 52994].

¹⁵ Because the relevant date for proving ownership under Rule 14a-8(b) is the date the proposal is submitted, a proponent who does not adequately prove ownership in connection with a proposal is not permitted to submit another proposal for the same meeting on a later date.

¹⁶ Nothing in this staff position has any effect on the status of any shareholder proposal that is not withdrawn by the proponent or its authorized representative.

<http://www.sec.gov/interps/legal/cfs1b14f.htm>

Proof of Delivery

Dear Customer,

This notice serves as proof of delivery for the shipment listed below.

Tracking Number

Weight

0.00 LBS

Service

UPS Next Day Air®

Shipped / Billed On

11/16/2018

Delivered On

11/19/2018 9:45 A.M.

Delivered To

WASHINGTON, DC, US

Received By

PATTERSON

Left At

Front Desk

Thank you for giving us this opportunity to serve you. Details are only available for shipments delivered within the last 120 days. Please print for your records if you require this information after 120 days.

Sincerely,

UPS

Tracking results provided by UPS: 11/20/2018 2:08 P.M. EST



Via FedEx

November 20, 2018

Ross E. Jeffries, Jr., Corporate Secretary
Bank of America Corporation
Hearst Tower, 214 North Tryon Street
NC1-027-18-05
Charlotte, North Carolina 28255

Dear Mr. Jeffries,

Enclosed please find a Proof of Ownership letter from UBS Financial Services Inc. in connection with the shareholder proposal submitted under Rule 14(a)-8 (Proposals of Security Holders) of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission's proxy regulations by the National Center for Public Policy Research to Bank of America on November 9, 2018.

Copies of correspondence or a request for a "no-action" letter should be forwarded to Justin Danhof, Esq, General Counsel, National Center for Public Policy Research, 20 F Street, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20001 and emailed to JDanhof@nationalcenter.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Justin Danhof", is written over a horizontal line.

Justin Danhof, Esq.

Enclosure: Ownership Letter



UBS Financial Services Inc.
1501 K Street NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel. 202-585-4000
Fax 855-594-1054
Toll Free 800-382-9989
<http://www.ubs.com/team/cfsgroup>

CFS Group

Anthony Connor
Senior Vice President - Investments
Senior Portfolio Manager
Portfolio Management Program

Bryon Fusini
First Vice President - Investments
Financial Advisor

Richard Stein
Senior Wealth Strategy Associate

www.ubs.com

Ross E. Jeffries, Jr., Corporate Secretary
Bank of America Corporation
Hearst Tower, 214 North Tryon Street
NC1-027-18-05
Charlotte, North Carolina 28255

November 20, 2018

Confirmation: Information regarding the account of The National Center for Public Policy Research

Dear Mr. Jeffries, Jr.,

The following client has requested UBS Financial Services Inc. to provide you with a letter of reference to confirm its banking relationship with our firm.

The National Center for Public Policy Research has been a valued client of ours since October 2002 and as of the close of business on 11/09/2018, the National Center for Public Research held, and has held continuously for at least one year 140 shares of the Bank of America common stock. UBS continues to hold the said stock.

Please be aware this account is a securities account not a "bank" account. Securities, mutual funds and other non-deposit investment products are not FDIC-insured or bank guaranteed and are subject to market fluctuation.

Questions

If you have any questions about this information, please contact Dianne Scott at (202) 585-5412.

UBS Financial Services is a member firm of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation (SIPC).

Sincerely,

Dianne Scott
UBS Financial Services Inc.

cc: Justin Danhof, Esq., National Center for Public Policy Research