

**Town of Brookline
Advisory Committee Minutes
Thursday, April 27, 2023**

Meeting Recording

https://brooklinema.zoomgov.com/rec/share/GBV7cPblwQyEsm_PdUDZJETFXOGA49rqvzLLtrLbXuujFGIb2cjGCHAwycG1wRml.q-og1XpUx943MvaD?startTime=1682635714000

Present: Ben Birnbaum, Harry Bohrs, Clifford Brown, Patricia Correa, John Doggett, Dennis Doughty, Katherine Florio, Harry Friedman, David-Marc Goldstein, Neil Gordon, Susan Granoff, Kelly Hardebeck, Amy Hummel, Anita Johnson, Alisa Jonas, Janice Kahn, Pamela Lodish, Joslin Murphy, Donelle O’Neal, Linda Olson Pehlke, Markus L. Penzel, David Pollak, Stephen Reeders, Carlos Ridruejo, Lee Selwyn, Alok Somani, Carolyn R. Thall, Christine Westphal

Absent: Carol Levin

Also Attending: Director of HR Ann Hess Braga, Petitioners for WA 20 Rebecca Stone TMM 3, Alec Lebovitz TMM 8, Arden Reamer TMM 8; Petitioners for WA 22 C. Scott Ananian, on behalf of the Ranked Choice Voting Study Committee; Anthony Ishak, Benjamin, Gayle Rich, Rachel Silver, Alexander Neary, Bonnie Bastien, Jay Sweitzer-Shalit, Kevin MacKenzie, Greg Dennis, Elizabeth Schafer, Select Board Member Michael Sandman, and other members of the public.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM.

Announcements: Pursuant to this Board’s Authority under 940 CMR 29.10 (8), all of the committee members will be participating remotely via telephone or video conferencing due to emergency regulations regarding the Corona virus. The Chairman has reviewed the requirements of the regulations. There is a quorum physically present and all votes taken will be recorded by roll call so all above listed Advisory Committee members will be allowed to vote.

7:00 pm Public Comment

7:15 pm Report from the Human Services Subcommittee, Discussion and Possible Votes on WA 20 Amend the Menstrual Hygiene Product Access By-Law of the Town’s General By-Laws, currently Article 8.39, to change the Article’s duplicative numbering and add provisions relative to reproductive and gender health care (Stone, et. al)

Katherine Florio, a member of the Human Services Subcommittee gave the report on their deliberations on WA 20. The full report is linked below.

WA20 creates a bylaw that protects anyone seeking or providing full spectrum, safe compassionate pregnancy and gender-affirming care, including legal abortion, from abusive litigation. It outlines consequences for non-compliance. It creates the space in the general bylaws that recognizes reproductive and gender health as an area of local policy concern. It creates a home in those bylaws for related policies, such as the 2019 menstrual product access bylaw, and for future actions the town may wish to take. It is supported by the Brookline Chief of Police, the Director of Public Health and Human Services, and the Advisory Committee on Public Health.

The successful passage of WA 20 would commit Brookline to enforcing protections medical providers and patients seeking pregnancy and gender-affirming care, including legal abortion, from abusive litigation (see footnote in the full report). The subcommittee recommended Favorable Action on Warrant Article 20, as amended by the subcommittee and agreed to by the petitioners by a vote of 4 in favor, none opposed with no abstentions.

Petitioner Rebecca Stone TMM from Precinct 3, Member of the Commission for Women, spoke on behalf of the Commission for Women and the other petitioners. She thanked Katherine for the report and the Subcommittee for their enthusiastic and unanimous vote of favorable action.

She reiterated that the current environment for Women and LGBTQ individuals is terrifying. The Dobb's decision overturning Roe v Wade was a disaster, and things have only managed to get worse since it was overturned. The bans on gender affirming care, federal judges attempting to eliminate the FDA's authority to approve drugs and to eliminate the availability of Mifepristone, an incredibly safe and incredibly effective drug that's been used by millions and millions of people worldwide for more than 20 years.

26 States have passed laws effectively banning abortion. Many of them have criminalized it. Florida is now suggesting that not even menstruation can be discussed in schools. Women in this country have already started dying as a result of the Dobbs decision, and because of the new laws at the state level, they are also being forced to carry pregnancies to term, and the government is doing that.

What has happened in the last several months, all of the things just detailed, was frankly unthinkable just a short while ago. Even though we have great state laws in Massachusetts protecting us, we have proposed a bylaw. It is not just a resolution, because to borrow from co-petitioner Alec Lebowitz, we need guardrails at the local level for whatever is coming next. We can no longer assume, given what's happened, given the fact that all of this is happening unexpectedly, that the protections we enjoy in Massachusetts will not be challenged and that they won't be challenged at the local level in ways that we simply haven't anticipated yet.

The state laws in Massachusetts are terrific, but local bylaws saying, a terrible thing is happening and local bylaws show our clear intention, and demonstrate our values that we will hold our local employees accountable for it. This is the kind of guard rail that we need at this moment in time. The Select Board approved it this past Tuesday. It is so important that we get this done. She then offered to take questions.

QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, DISCUSSION

Patty Correa Q: Has Town Counsel looked at this? A: Yes vetted by Town Counsel and the Town Moderator and sections were removed based on his recommendations. Amendments made by the subcommittee and were wording for clarity and did not change the substance at all. There are no fines. Nothing is changed in current HR Policies but will utilize current HR guidelines. We did not run it by HR specifically, but allowed that Town Counsel would raise any conflicts or concerns.

Q: Has the Police Chief reviewed it? A: Yes and was enthusiastic.

Amy Hummel Q: Is there a severability clause in case there is an issue? A: Yes there is.

Harry Friedman Q: Guard rails but we come under state law, so if the state law in Mass. changes it wouldn't matter what the locality did. Are the people you are trying to protect any better off if this were to pass as a resolution or a bylaw? A:

Bylaw as statement of intent that this is not different than state law. This part of the bylaw says that Brookline makes a formal commitment to enforce state law. Repeating intention to enforce the state law about harassing litigation.

Harry added that he doesn't see the need for this as a bylaw.

Susan Granoff Comment: Concern for Town employees to have pressure put on them to do something that might violate this law due to deeply held beliefs. Having specific language in the bylaw would alleviate those pressures. Section in the bylaw that says any Town employee found to be in violation will be subject to already existing remedial actions. Same for contractors or vendors. Clarified the situation for Town employees so made sense to have it as a bylaw.

Neil Gordon Comment: This would not be unique in our bylaws effectively mirroring state law. There are many things that don't need to be there that are in state law and are adequately protected. The best case is we put it there and we never need it. But if we do, that protection will be where it should be.

Stephen Reeder's Comment: Not convinced why having state law why these hypothetical people who suffer are better off? Educating people might be a better way to accomplish your aims rather than layering on a second law which is really the same thing. If we want to make sure that Town agents and contractors don't break the law, educate them.

Janice Kahn thanked co-petitioners for their work on this article. It doesn't create a new law in the Town but incorporates a women's reproductive health law already in existence on menstruation products. Brookline has a vulnerable women's health clinic and Brookline knows first hand that is associated with providing women's health care in Brookline. For us to take this action is relevant and we know it is important to protect this right. Hope the AC does support this.

Amy Hummel Comment: For all reasons put forth by petitioners and all of the crazy stuff is happening in our country now. We need to vote favorable action to send the right message. It's the right thing to do.

Amy made a **MOTION** that was seconded for Favorable Action on WA 20.

Patty Correa Comment: Looking at the language I think HR would want to have something included about employees "knowingly"...etc.

Joslin Murphy Comment: Feel strongly about the message and appreciate the work the petitioners put in but important to consult with HR before proceeding.

Linda Olsen Pehlke Comment: Can someone describe a situation where this would be applicable? A: Not legal to facilitate the manner in which another state might attempt to reach into Massachusetts to get information as a way of finding and bringing suit against someone who delivered or received care here. How this could in fact help a Town employee who was asked to act against the law. Having a local bylaw outlining Brookline's commitment to state law would support that Town agent in saying no. Not anticipating any particular scenario but rather the extraordinary lengths people areas that are anti-reproductive rights and anti-LGBTQ rights might interfere in the business of our Town, our citizens, etc.

Susan Granoff added some of the things they had in mind were situations where someone called the Health Department and inquired where services could be provided, or someone is asked to deliver subpoenas to physicians, etc. In this time of great overreach we don't know how much at risk our residents, Town employees and health care providers are in, and this will provide legal protection under our municipal law.

Q: Any implications to a Town employee or agent if they are fooled into being complicit? A: Yes enforceable the same way HR would deal with any other violation.

Susan suggested adding “knowingly” before violated in both sections a and b in the Violations section.

Katherine Florio asked Patty if she could specifically provide what she would like HR to say? A: There are a host of questions from an HR perspective. Those departments need to have the chance to weigh in and there will specific language concerns, disciplinary concerns, are there collective bargaining issues, the issue of Article 10 in the by-laws and none of us are the position to speak for HR. This is establishing employment policy and disciplinary actions which is the purview of the HR Director. Most bylaws address the public and not the Town workforce. If HR did weigh in, there would be some language changes and discuss specific questions with Town Counsel, the labor attorney in the office. This is a question that could come up on the floor of Town Meeting and should be addressed.

Katherine wondered if there is anything we could do in terms of transparency to support petitioners to understand who all needs to vet an article before they have gotten this far?

Ben Birnbaum Comment: Let’s suppose I am a devout Catholic and I work for the Town of Brookline, what am I restrained from doing or saying that I could do and say if I was simply a Catholic living in Brookline? Not constraining any citizens in Brookline? A: Christine Westphal responded. This is a question of making it easier for people to say No Can I have all of the addresses of all the physicians in Brookline? No. Can you give me a list of pharmacies in Brookline? No. Can you give me a list of women’s health clinics in Brookline? No. On a state level it says we aren’t going to allow you to extradite our doctors and put them in prison in Tennessee for example. It also makes a statement to encourage State reps to hold in place or move forward. We think this is important.

Alisa Jonas Comment: As an example, if I work for the Town and if I am anti-abortion, I can do what I want in my own personal capacity but now when acting in my capacity as a Town employee. Also concerned about proper protection of employees and don’t want them to be punished for unknowingly doing something so support Susan’s suggestion. Would petitioners be supportive of this being tabled until HR reviews it.

A: Petitioner Stone responded that there were many meetings and several conversations with Town Counsel Callanan and hope that they would have consulted with labor expertise in their office. This was done before it was even submitted to the warrant to avoid just this. Would have assumed that if it needed to be vetted by HR that it would have been communicated via Town Counsel and the Moderator.

Mark Penzel Comment: We were informed that the Select Board to whom the HR Director reports, voted in favor of this. She is not a separate entity and if the Select Board had any issues regarding HR no doubt those would have been

Lee Selwyn Comment: Guard rail concept is important and support codifying it in the Bylaw. You can undermine a statute through action or inaction. Imagine a situation where Ron DeSantis, Lauren Bobbert, and Majorie Taylor Greene became Select Board members in the Town you could envision a situation where they could attempt to undermine State Law. The notion that we would be protecting through a bylaw the effort of any Town employee or Official is something we should do.

Alisa Jonas Comment: Agree in light of what has been said, a motion to table is a good idea.

HR Direct Ann Hess Braga joined the meeting after reviewing the article and the report, agreed that she was comfortable with the addition of “knowingly” and saw no reason for the article not to move forward.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for Favorable Action on the WA 20 with “knowingly” added as shown below

Section 8.XX.3.iii Violations

- a. Any Town employee/agent found to have **knowingly** violated this article shall be subject to the relevant discipline policies of the Town of Brookline, if applicable.
- b. Any Town contractor found to have **knowingly** violated this article shall be subject to review and potential termination of contract.

By a **VOTE** of 23 in favor, 1 opposed and 1 abstention, the Advisory Committee recommends Favorable Action on WA 20.

7:45 PM Report from the Public Safety Subcommittee, Discussion and Possible Vote on WA 22 Home Rule petition to establish ranked choice voting in Town elections (Rank Choice Voting Committee)

Mark Penzel, a member of the Public Safety Subcommittee gave the report of their deliberations on WS 22. The full report is linked below.

WA 22 asks that the Town authorize the Select Board to petition the General Court for a special act providing for the use of ranked choice voting in all Brookline municipal elections, including those for Town Meeting. Ranked choice voting requires the voter to rank, in order of preference, each candidate in a multi-candidate field when 1) in a single seat race, there are more than two candidates; and 2) in a multi-seat race, the number of candidates exceeds the number of seats available. These preferences are then used to determine the winner(s).

If the Warrant Article is approved by both Town Meeting and the Legislature, it would then be subject to a Town-wide ballot for final approval. The Town Clerk would be responsible for voter education and developing methods to resolve ties.

The Article also proposes a change to address an issue not peculiar to ranked choice voting: the randomization of the order of candidates’ names on the ballot for each position, to neutralize the bias that may occur from alphabetical listing on the ballot.

The Ranked Choice Voting Committee noted in a statement, “After evaluation of several potential RCV options, the Committee selected a Proportional RCV method. Standard forms of Proportional RCV are currently in use in Cambridge and have been selected by Amherst, Concord and Northampton. Other options reviewed were Sequential RCV and Bottom-up RCV, which were noted by the RCV Committee to less fairly represent voter base intentions. The Committee reviewed commonplace methods of transferring Proportional RCV votes from eliminated candidates to continuing candidates, including random assignment, which is simple but can skew outcomes, and fractional-transfer, which requires a spreadsheet to calculate results, but produces outcomes which are transparent and traceable. Survey evidence indicates that voters in municipalities actually using RCV understand how it works, and the committee concluded that traceability of voting results was important and recommended the fractional-transfer method.”

For an extensive explanation of Rank Choice Voting options and how they work please see the subcommittee report.

The Subcommittee recommended No Action on Warrant Article 22, as printed in the Warrant and amended by Petitioners, by a vote of 3-0-1, and with a vote of 2-2-0 makes no recommendation on the article as amended to limit its application to Town-wide elections.

Petitioner Ananian mentioned the Town of Arlington implemented changes to their Town Meeting Member elections which obviated the need for RCV. Stressed that the counting of RCV can be complicated but that is why we have computers. From the voter's perspective they just rank folks in order of preference.

There is also language in the home rule petition that we would only use RCV where it matters for Select Board and Town Meeting Member race. Would not be implemented in a wholesale fashion.

The proposed bylaw offers a suggestion to randomize the way people appear on the ballot rather than alphabetically.

QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, DISCUSSION

In an effort to get clarity on how RCV would work Lee Selwyn proposed a hypothetical voting scenario and raised some concerns. Subcommittee member Mark Penzel and Petitioner Ananian attempted to clarify the proportional voting outcome based on his scenario. Lee Selwyn noted it is hard enough to get people to vote in the first place, if you put in a system like this with a ballot that looks like a Bingo card and you start making it complicated with complex ballots, that's not going to help much,

Chairman Doughty pointed out that many, many years of research into voting systems shows that it is possible with any voting system to create a hypothetical scenario with a particularly thorny combination of votes that might lead to an outcome that on its face might seem unexpected. He hoped that the Committee would spend less time debating one or more of those hypotheticals, similar to what Mark did, and take more time talking about how such a system actually works in practice, and whether it makes sense for Brookline.

Susan Granoff Comment: Concerned that this new system will have a number of very undesirable unintended consequences.

- It may result in suppressing voting, and our key problem has always been getting people to turn out to vote at our local elections. This is going to particularly intimidate older voters, poorer voters, and less technologically savvy voters and scare them off from voting.
- It's not going to be enough for voters simply to turn out to vote in favor of a specific candidate but they will now have to sequence that from best to worse. Not only is it too complicated, but they don't know enough about all the candidates, so perhaps they shouldn't bother to vote at all.
- It will make a campaigning for Town Meeting in particular much more extensive, because it will make name recognition even more important. This will encourage and almost mandate large mailings to every voter household. This will in turn unfairly advantage well-heeled candidates for Town Meetings who can afford to mail glossy campaign postcards to voters in their precinct.
- It will also unfairly advantage candidates of highly organized groups who will simply tell their voters and supporters how to rank their candidate choices.

- It will make not only the whole procedure more complicated, more expensive but ultimately it will probably encourage bland, vanilla, candidates who want to be every voter's second choice.

The big issue in Town is turning out voters to incentivize them to vote during our regular town elections, and introducing this unnecessary and highly complicated system is simply going to make a problem that currently exists even worse. Without necessarily improving the process of voting or the fairness, it will simply again encourage the more well-heeled, wealthier people to run for Town Meeting and everyone else to avoid doing so, because they couldn't compete with the kind of name recognition that wide-scale mailings for a Town Meeting office will then require. Not in support.

Alisa Jonas Q: Seems like a complicated way to do ranked choice. Why didn't you select a simpler version – First choice gets 3, Second choice gets 2, 1 and you add them up? Thought one of the benefits of RCV was that you can avoid getting an extremist into office. A: Petitioner Ananian responded that the RCV Committee reviewed a lot of different versions of ranked choice voting. It seems that the Committee's position in almost every case has been for the thing which most accurately reflects the voter intent and avoids the possibility of gaming the vote. So the proportional system was the option recommended. There is a lot of mathematics around the whole field of ranked choice voting and how to best honor voter intent. There are a number of situations where simpler systems can yield not the desired outcome. So how do you know it's three points for the first choice versus five points or six points. The ranking is consistent, and when you honor the ranking, you are honoring people's first choice as much as possible. Until that first choice is not mathematically possible of winning it. Then you honor their second choice as much as possible. It's pretty straightforward in how it works in actual practice.

Chairman Doughty cautioned members not to debate or critique any one ranked choice voting method over another but to simply vote up or down on the one before the committee.

Amy Hummel Comment: What exactly is the problem we have in Brookline that we spent all this well-intentioned time on this question? We are frustrated as a community at problems we see in other communities and in other parts of the country and feel we have to fix them here in Brookline where they don't exist. Don't see this is a solution any problem. How will this make democracy much better in Brookline? If we are far apart on something it is still closer than on the national stage.

The Chairman noted the complexity point of voters who need to understand all 15 candidates for 5 seats. No reason to fill out a ballot with 1 or 5 people. No one is requiring them to rank candidates so it is no different than how they voted in the past.

Lee Selwyn Comment: 63 places where they are doing ranked choice voting in this country. 3000 counties, 150K municipalities, at least that many voting districts and if only 63 have pursued RCV it is not a resounding endorsement.

Kelly Hardebeck Q: About the example given in the subcommittee report was the subcommittee presented with a situation where there would be a practical difference in an election as to how we are doing it now versus how we would do it with RCV? A: We could probably come out with a practical one where that would be the case. One of the examples in the report is the following: "2. A gets 2,300 first place votes, B gets 0, and C gets 700. B gets the proportional excess of all of A's 2d choice votes. A wins in the first round, and B wins in the second round."

Harry Friedman Comment: I attended a number of the RCV Committee hearings as well as the AC subcommittee hearings on this subject. I think the RCV Committee did a good job. They did what they had to do but their charge was

not, “Is ranked choice voting a good choice?” Their charge was, “How do you implement ranked choice voting?” and they’ve come up with a reasonable method. But I really think that the people of Brookline, who generally in elections have supported ranked choice voting, and the citizens of much of America who have supported ranked choice voting, are doing so for elections where there is a single winner. But when you apply it to elections where there are multiple winners, it causes all kinds of problems.

I think our discussion tonight shows how terribly eye-glazingly complex it can be, and I think it’s important, especially in these times where people don’t trust elections that they ought to be able to understand exactly how it works, and with ranked choice voting in multi-winner elections that’s a big stretch, and for most people they simply are not going to understand it. I think there is good reason why most localities and most election places in America don’t use ranked choice voting especially for multi-winner contests. The people who vote need to be able to understand it; they need to be able to intelligently rank and I just don’t think they do. As other people have said, I think this is a solution in search of a problem, and so I will not be supporting it.

Neil Gordon Comment: We heard the petitioner say multiple times, we don’t really need to understand how it calculates the votes because we’ve got software that does it. “Software does it” is not transparent democracy to me. I’m a co-chair with Marty Rosenthal of Brookline PAX. I’ve been on the board for a long time. We are one of those endorsing organizations. When we meet as a board for endorsement, we have voting records. We have questionnaires that most people at this meeting have filled out at one time or another. We have personal knowledge of candidates. We have statements made on the record. As an endorsing organization we are as knowledgeable of candidates, if not all of us on the board, individually in our own precincts, as any in Town representative.

We are not capable of ranking candidates, not because we don’t have time because we don’t have sufficient information to rank candidates. It’s not something we can do, and I don’t believe it’s something that the voters can do. I know the candidates running for Library Trustees and I cannot rank them 1 to 4. I know all of my Precinct 1 colleagues in Town Meeting. I can’t rank them either. I think that we’re asking the voters to do something that is impossible.

Neil also spoke about specific Town Meeting races, redistricting and majority minority precincts, and potential voting patterns of those groups.

Patty Correa Comment: Appreciate the Committee’s work on this but it is very complicated. Went to Fair Vote that offered some clear instructions to election workers on this. Suggest we put it into simple language. People want to understand it.

David-Marc Goldstein Comment: Has long supported RCV but this article is a complicated mess. If we do this, we are going to have two different systems of elections in the Town. Wouldn’t be used for State offices, Federal elections, etc. Lacks a problem. It is not needed. The system we have now works.

The Petitioner Ananian fundamentally disagreed that our elections don’t need rank choice voting.

Janice Kahn acknowledged that the RCV Committee worked really hard to get their mandate right.

A **MOTION** was made for Favorable Action on WA 22 as amended by the petitioners. By a **VOTE** of 1 in favor, 23 opposed and 3 abstentions, the motion fails.

A **MOTION** was made for Favorable Action as amended to remove “and Town Meeting Members from Section 1 clause (b).” By a **VOTE** of 5 in favor, 19 opposed, and 3 abstentions, the Advisory Committee recommends No Action.

8:15 PM Possible amendments to previous votes on Warrant Articles

WA 13 Create a new Article 3.12A of the Town’s General By-Laws to establish an Office of Housing Stability

The Select Board voted in favor of a slightly different version referring instead of a Select Board Committee, refer to the Office of the Town Administrator. This and other possible amendments will be taken up at a future meeting, as necessary.

8:45 PM Other Business, including Update on Warrant Article 19

Upon a **MOTION** made and seconded to adjourn, and voted unanimously, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Documents Presented

<https://www.brooklinema.gov/DocumentCenter/Index/4074>

- 2023 03 22 and 30 Public Safety Subcommittee Report WA 22 RCVoting final
- 2023 04 27 Health and Human Services Subcommittee Report WA20
- Brookline RCV Warrant Articles as Approved 2023-04-19 Redline
- Brookline RCV Warrant Articles as Approved 2023-04-19
- RCV chair answers to AC Petitioner Questionnaire - 2023-2.docx
- RCV WA22 AC Subcommittee

VOTES

	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
# Votes Yes	1	5	23
# Votes No	23	19	1
# Votes Abstain	3	3	1
Vote Description:	MAIN MOTION: FAVORABLE ACTION on WA22 as amended by the petitioners	MAIN MOTION: RECOMMEND FAVORABLE ACTION ON WA22 as amended to remove “and Town Meeting Members from Section 1 clause (b).”	MAIN MOTION: FAVORABLE ACTION on WA20 as amended + “knowingly” in appropriate places Section 8.XX.3.iii Violations a. Any Town employee/agent found to have knowingly violated this article shall be subject to the relevant discipline policies of the Town of Brookline, if applicable. b. Any Town contractor found to have knowingly violated this article shall be subject to review and potential termination of contract.
	<i>Enter Y, N or A</i>	<i>Enter Y, N or A</i>	<i>Enter Y, N or A</i>
Ben Birnbaum	N	N	Y
Harry Bohrs	N	Y	Y
Cliff Brown	Y	Y	Y
Patty Correa	A	A	Y
John Doggett	N	N	Y
Katherine Florio	N	N	Y
Harry Friedman	N	N	A

David-Marc Goldstein	N	N	Y
Neil Gordon	N	N	Y
Susan Granoff	N	N	Y
Kelly Hardebeck	N	N	Y
Amy Hummel	N	N	Y
Anita Johnson	N	N	Y
Alisa Jonas	N	Y	Y
Janice Kahn	N	A	Y
Pam Lodish	N	N	Y
Joslin Murphy	N	N	Y
Donelle O'Neal, Sr.	N	A	Y
Linda Olson Pehlke	N	N	Y
Markus Penzel	N	Y	Y
David Pollak	A	Y	Y
Stephen Reeders	N	N	N
Carlos Ridruejo	N	N	
Lee Selwyn	N	N	Y
Alok Somani	N	N	Y
Carolyn Thall	A	N	
Christine Westphal	N	N	Y
Dennis Doughty			