

T. ROWE PRICE PROXY VOTING – PROCESS AND POLICIES

T. Rowe Price Associates, Inc. and T. Rowe Price International, Inc. recognize and adhere to the principle that one of the privileges of owning stock in a company is the right to vote on issues submitted to shareholder vote—such as election of directors and important matters affecting a company’s structure and operations. As an investment adviser with a fiduciary responsibility to its clients, T. Rowe Price analyzes the proxy statements of issuers whose stock is owned by the investment companies that it sponsors and serves as investment adviser. T. Rowe Price also is involved in the proxy process on behalf of its institutional and private counsel clients who have requested such service. For those private counsel clients who have not delegated their voting responsibility but who request advice, T. Rowe Price makes recommendations regarding proxy voting.

Proxy Administration

The T. Rowe Price Proxy Committee develops our firm’s positions on all major corporate issues, creates guidelines, and oversees the voting process. The Proxy Committee, composed of portfolio managers, investment operations managers, and internal legal counsel, analyzes proxy policies based on whether they would adversely affect shareholders’ interests and make a company less attractive to own. In evaluating proxy policies each year, the Proxy Committee relies upon our own fundamental research, independent proxy research provided by third parties such as Institutional Shareholder Services and Glass Lewis, and information presented by company managements and shareholder groups.

Once the Proxy Committee establishes its recommendations, they are distributed to the firm’s portfolio managers as voting guidelines. Ultimately, the portfolio manager decides how to vote on the proxy proposals of companies in his or her portfolio. Because portfolio managers may have differences of opinion on portfolio companies and their proxies, or their portfolios may have different investment objectives, these factors, among others, may lead to different votes between portfolios on the same proxies. When portfolio managers cast votes that are counter to the Proxy Committee’s guidelines, they are required to document their reasons in writing to the Proxy Committee. Annually, the Proxy Committee reviews T. Rowe Price’s proxy voting process, policies, and voting records.

T. Rowe Price has retained Institutional Shareholder Services, an expert in the proxy voting and corporate governance area, to provide proxy advisory and voting services. These services include in-depth research, analysis, and voting recommendations as well as vote execution, reporting, auditing and consulting assistance for the handling of proxy voting responsibility and corporate governance-related efforts. While the Proxy Committee relies upon ISS research in establishing T. Rowe Price’s voting guidelines—many of which are consistent with ISS positions—T. Rowe Price may deviate from ISS recommendations on general policy issues or specific proxy proposals.

Fiduciary Considerations

T. Rowe Price’s decisions with respect to proxy issues are made in light of the anticipated impact of the issue on the desirability of investing in the portfolio company. Proxies are voted solely in the interests of the client, Price Fund shareholders or, where employee benefit plan assets are involved, in the interests of plan participants and beneficiaries. Practicalities and costs involved with international investing may make it impossible at times, and at other times disadvantageous, to vote proxies in every instance. For example, we might refrain from voting if we or our agents are required to appear in person at a shareholder meeting or if the exercise of voting rights results in the imposition of trading or other ownership restrictions.

Consideration Given Management Recommendations

When determining whether to invest in a particular company, one of the key factors T. Rowe Price considers is the quality and depth of its management. As a result, T. Rowe Price believes that recommendations of management on most issues should be given weight in determining how proxy

issues should be voted.

T. Rowe Price Voting Policies

Specific voting guidelines have been established by the Proxy Committee for recurring issues that appear on proxies, which are available to clients upon request. The following is a summary of the more significant T. Rowe Price policies:

Election of Directors

T. Rowe Price generally supports slates with a majority of independent directors. We withhold votes for outside directors that do not meet certain criteria relating to their independence or their inability to dedicate sufficient time to their board duties due to their commitment to other boards. We also withhold votes for inside directors serving on compensation, nominating and audit committees and for directors who miss more than one-fourth of the scheduled board meetings. T. Rowe Price supports shareholder proposals calling for a majority vote threshold for the election of directors.

Executive Compensation

Our goal is to assure that a company's equity-based compensation plan is aligned with shareholders' long-term interests. While we evaluate most plans on a case-by-case basis, T. Rowe Price generally opposes compensation packages that provide what we view as excessive awards to a few senior executives or that contain excessively dilutive stock option plans. We base our review on criteria such as the costs associated with the plan, plan features, burn rates which are excessive in relation to the company's peers, dilution to shareholders and comparability to plans in the company's peer group. We generally oppose plans that give a company the ability to reprice options or to grant options at below market prices.

Anti-takeover, Capital Structure and Corporate Governance Issues

T. Rowe Price generally opposes anti-takeover measures and other proposals designed to limit the ability of shareholders to act on possible transactions. Such anti-takeover mechanisms include classified boards, supermajority voting requirements, dual share classes and poison pills. We also oppose proposals which give management a "blank check" to create new classes of stock with disparate rights and privileges. We generally support proposals to permit cumulative voting and those that seek to prevent potential acquirers from receiving a takeover premium for their shares. When voting on corporate governance proposals, we will consider the dilutive impact to shareholders and the effect on shareholder rights. With respect to proposals for the approval of a company's auditor, we typically oppose auditors who have a significant non-audit relationship with the company.

Social and Corporate Responsibility Issues

T. Rowe Price generally votes with a company's management on social issues unless they have substantial economic implications for the company's business and operations that have not been adequately addressed by management.

Monitoring and Resolving Conflicts of Interest

The Proxy Committee is also responsible for monitoring and resolving possible material conflicts between the interests of T. Rowe Price and those of its clients with respect to proxy voting. We believe that due to the client-focused nature of our investment management business that the potential for conflicts of interests are relatively infrequent. Nevertheless, we have adopted safeguards to ensure that our proxy voting is not influenced by interests other than those of our clients. While membership on the Proxy Committee is diverse, it does not include individuals whose primary duties relate to client relationship management, marketing or sales. Since our voting guidelines are pre-determined by the Proxy Committee using recommendations from ISS, an independent third party, application of the T. Rowe Price guidelines to vote clients' proxies should in most instances adequately address any possible conflicts of interest. However, for proxy votes inconsistent with T. Rowe Price guidelines, the Proxy

Committee reviews all such proxy votes in order to determine whether the portfolio manager's voting rationale appears reasonable. The Proxy Committee also assesses whether any business or other relationships between T. Rowe Price and a portfolio company could have influenced an inconsistent vote on that company's proxy. Issues raising possible conflicts of interest are referred to designated members of the Proxy Committee for immediate resolution prior to the time T. Rowe Price casts its vote. With respect to personal conflicts of interest, T. Rowe Price's Code of Ethics requires all employees to avoid placing themselves in a "compromising position" where their interests may conflict with those of our clients and restricts their ability to engage in certain outside business activities. Portfolio managers or Proxy Committee members with a personal conflict of interest regarding a particular proxy vote must recuse themselves and not participate in the voting decisions with respect to that proxy.