

Notes from conversation with Bill Jacobs on June 28,2005:

Bill Jacobs said that he approved the use of the chef because there were, around that time, 2-4 events a week at the Residence, and it was more cost effective to hire a chef than caterer. If there are 2 events a month at the house, Bill said the chef should be rethought, and he might not approve a chef under those facts. He felt that Ben's personal use of the chef would be incidental. The "dining" provision was intended to cover Ben and Nancy's "reasonable" food expenses. Ben and Nancy were so busy at this time, they were eating "on the fly." Bill said he told Ben he was not going to micro-manage whether Ben had a hamburger or a steak for dinner, but Ben should use his judgment. No food would be paid for outside of the house -- not at Gibson Island, for example. Bill actually said "I certainly hope that the chef is not packing up food for Ben to take to Gibson Island." I talked to Bill about wine charges. Again, he said that getting down into the weeds and saying this bottle of wine is too expensive, this one is not, is not productive, but he agreed that he always assumed it would be Ben's responsibility to keep the expenses within reasonable limits. However, Bill explained that Ben understood that his personal use of the house is taxable to him, and the University has no choice but to tax Ben on these amounts. I asked Bill about personal parties. He wanted examples, and I noted the engagement party and garden party examples. He said the intent was University-related events were paid for, personal events were for Ben to pay for.

AUSF 007454