

**Town of Brookline
Advisory Committee Minutes
Tuesday, October 10, 2023**

Present in Person or on Zoom: Michael Berger, Paul Bernard, Ben Birnbaum, Harry Bohrs, Clifford Brown, John Doggett, Dennis Doughty, Katherine Florio, Harry Friedman, David-Marc Goldstein, Neil Gordon, Susan Granoff, Perry Grossman, Kelly Hardebeck, Alisa Jonas, Carol Levin, Pamela Lodish, Joslin Murphy, Donelle O’Neal, Linda Olson Pehlke, Markus L. Penzel, David Pollak, Stephen Reeders, Lee Selwyn, Alok Somani, Carolyn R. Thall

Absent: Carlos Ridruejo, Christine Westphal, Amy Hummel

Also Attending: Director of Water and Sewer Jay Hersey, Director of Finance Lincoln Heineman, Director of Council on Aging Ruthann Dobek, Town Counsel Joe Callanan, Fran Perler, David Leschoier TMM 11, Regina Frawley TMM 16, Jenny Lewis, Ben Dubin, Petitioner for WA 13 David Gacioch, 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.

PUBLIC HEARING

7:00 pm Public Comment

Fran Perler: General comment applicable to WA 7 and WA 8 Council on Aging Member. Really support this. Seniors having trouble with real estate taxes. My taxes have gone up 20% in the last 2 years and scheduled to go up another 10%. Need to allow our seniors to age in place. Very important programs to help them do that. As a person who goes to the Senior Center it couldn’t run as well as it does and provide such services if it wasn’t for the people who volunteer through the work write off program. Support both articles.

7:15 pm Discussion, deliberation, and possible vote on Warrant Article 8 Amend the Senior Tax Work Off Program (Finance and COA Directors)

Lincoln Heineman, Director of Finance, Senior Citizen Property Tax Work-Off Program allows those 60 years and older to work for the Town at no more than minimum wage (prescribed by State law) and in exchange for that, receive up to \$1,500 in tax exemption for real estate bills. The Mass GL that allows this set the maximum tax exemption or ties it to 125 hours in a calendar year. Right now the Town is at the \$1,500 level. In the last few years the minimum wage has risen. This article will allow each senior participating in the program to work 125 hours at the new current rate of \$15/hour. The State law is very restrictive in providing significant relief but this is one area where we can expand.

Ruthanne Dobek added a few updates on the program. We currently have 35 slots and 34 are filled. Usually a waiting list of a handful of people who we can accommodate the following year. The participants are at the Senior Center doing essential tasks, serving meals, reception, etc. Positions in the Assessor’s Office, Brookline Schools, Library and Recreation. Many municipal departments taking advantage of this workforce. Hope to attract interest of more Town departments.

QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, DISCUSSION

Q: Something in the tax legislation that the Governor signed yesterday that relates to this? A: Not familiar but we can check.

Q: What is the income requirement? A: We follow HUD guidelines which are similar to Community Block Grants. \$78,300 if you are one-person household, considered as moderate income, and all applicants must share their tax returns. Updated annually.

Q: How many people in the Town over 60 would qualify? A: We only have a finite number of slots and you have to be matched to an appropriate job. 3 people on the waiting list last year.

Q: Thank Ruthann and Lincoln for bringing this article. What happens if a participant does not work the full 125 hours? A: If unfinished due to ill-health, others can donate their hours to someone who is ill as a proxy. If you only work a certain amount of hours, you will still get a certificate for that amount. As the wage went up the hours required to work to get maximum tax write off kept going down and tax burden kept going up. Something had to be done and support this.

Q: Is it a taxable benefit? 1099? A: According to State law it is not taxable for State purposes but it is for Federal and tax forms are mailed.

There was a brief discussion about the impact of recent legislation signed into law by the Governor regarding the write off cap.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for favorable action on WA 8.

By a **VOTE** of 22 in favor, none opposed and 1 abstention, the Advisory Committee recommends favorable action on the WA 8.

7:30 pm Discussion, deliberation, and possible vote on Warrant Article 7 Legislation authorizing the Select Board to offer a senior discount program for water and sewer rates. (Select Board)

Jay Hersey, Director of Water and Sewer, WA 7 Enabling legislation for a senior discount program was already passed by Town Meeting 4 years ago. It didn't make it through the state legislature (not due to the content, but it sounds like a miscommunication in process or paperwork) and so it is being resubmitted. There is no specific decision being made about the senior discount program, this is simply language that will allow the Town to have one and the SB to consider/evaluate/set that as it does the W&S rates.

There is currently a program in place, but Town Counsel has opined that it needs this legislation in order for the Town to legally allow this program. We are looking for this to be authorized by Town Meeting and the State Legislature prior to enacting any future changes on the program. Not utilized by many but hoping to make it more accessible to those with income challenges.

David Lescohier, TMM 11: See his comments linked at the end of these minutes. Part of Water and Sewer Citizens Working Group who worked with the Director to bring this Warrant Article back to life.

Regina Frawley, TMM 16: When water bills were distributed in the 1960s there were no sewer bills attached. Subsumed in Real Estate taxes and was deductible. In the 80s, the Town began to charge for Sewer charges and equivalent to water but no longer deductible. With water meters, it is now double - \$10 for water, \$20 for sewer, plus base fees – supports the cost of bringing water to the house. Sewer is now 3x the water rate. Different rate structure if you live in a condo. As we change demographic living styles become removed from paying their bills. This is a non-equitable situation, larger condos pay less, individuals pay more. Don't put the burden on low income people who have to pay individually.

QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, DISCUSSION

Q: Seven to twelve elderly discounts – what is the authority for that? And why do we need more discounts? A: Mass. General Law is the authority. Discounts given now you have to be a homeowner with your own meter.

Q: How much does this cost, these discounts? A: About \$45 off each quarterly bill. Only 6 people are utilizing the program right now. This article would allow us to get approval to begin to develop the program. We have a financial consultant to help us set rates. They have begun researching rates in other communities and will provide a report to the Working Group. Looking at a variety of options. A good exercise to figure out who we can provide this program to. Confident it will be more than the 6 or 7 people we have not.

Consultant costs ~\$40K for analysis of costs, revenue, for the coming year. It includes other things not just this one program.

Q: To Town Counsel: David Lescohier's write up referred to the Billerica case, and other towns giving these discounts. Are you in agreement that we need to go the home rule route to do what other towns are doing. A: We are doing that already in a different form. Warrant Article in previous Town Meeting that passed but had trouble getting through the State legislature and the staff started the process. So in Town Counsel's opinion, the mistake was made so we don't have to kick those 7 off but come into compliance as soon as we can and the best way is a home rule petition.

Q: Current program is just seniors and one of the new changes would be to expand it to low income groups? A: Yes.

Q: Assume this passes the State Legislature, what will be the procedure for developing this and final approval? A: Goal is to develop the program while we are waiting for legislative approval and when we have it we are ready to go. The Select Board would have the authority to adopt the program. Water and Sewer Division with Citizen's Task Force and the consultant would work on the program. The consultant already works with the department to help set rates annually and there is a rates task force that supports these efforts.

Comment: My condo has grappled with how to more equitably distribute water and sewer costs. We have one meter. We incorporated into our bylaws to do it on an occupancy basis to help determine a fair way to distribute the cost.

Q: Is there any other municipality that has done this through Home Rule petition successfully? A: That would be part of our analysis with the consultant but some suggest yes.

Q: Any conversations with Rep. Vitolo on this specific article? He is a former member of the working group. No knowledge of other discussions with him.

The proposal speaks to seniors consistent with policy. Residents age 65 and over and income eligible residents, charged to residents – directly to residents? Condos and apartment buildings are charged. Different conversation whether low income renter would be able to get a benefit from their landlord. Don't see language here that does that. Eliminates

from consideration a significant number of seniors not to mention low income residents, i.e. students. Puts all rate setting authority in the hands of the Select Board. A: The intent of the program is to look at all of it and everything. When we do the analysis we will look at all of that information but at the end of the day we have to administer the program. There will be a detailed analysis with the consultant and with the working group to figure out how to make this program work for the most people that we can.

Q: In referenced studies do you know if these communities are they providing relief to actual rate payers or actual renters who are not billed directly? A: This will be part of the research, strategies and ethics and feasible for what the Water and Sewer Commission can do given staffing, etc.

Comment: In the handout, the Towns do say owner-occupied 1-4 family dwelling. It is unclear what these other towns do.

Q: Out of compliance currently – is there any potential penalty for this? Seems like petitioners are asking for authority without having a plan – so many unknowns. Why are we bringing this to Town Meeting now and not waiting until more information is known? A: It takes time to get things through the legislature 12-18 months so we have ample time to get a program designed.

Town Counsel added, we need legislative authority and details. If we figure out details first it involves DPW staff, the Citizen's Task Force, the consultants and a proposal to the Select Board and other committees. If we do all of that before we give the Town a Warrant Article, we will do these in parallel not in sequence. Get permission from Town Meeting, work with the department and committees, then when we have authority we can act quickly.

Comment: Suggest this isn't ready for "prime time" –

Comment: Unclear who would be eligible but this would be delayed another 2 years before this can come back to the Town, plus 18-24 months discussed. People need relief now.

Comment: Do we think it worthwhile pursuing a discount program for low income residents in Brookline. For those worried about not knowing all the details, it has to go through the water rates task force and the Select Board and at a public hearing. So before it gets implemented all details and parameters will be known allowing you to weigh in at that time. Hope we can get this process going. Don't think we want to wait until the next session.

Regarding potential liability with the current low income assistance program, Town Counsel said there are no fines, not something that a DOR inspector will fine us; the liability would possibly a tax payer suit – implementation of this program is illegal. Possibility of a tax payer suit would be low. Cost is about a couple thousand dollars and they would be spending more money on a lawyer.

Comment: Who gets the discount? A tenant that is not billed by the water department – does the landlord or condo associate get the discount and they determine how to disburse it? Seems very complex to implement and impossible to enforce. Regarding the base charge in a utility is not uncommon. Surprised to learn costs associated with fire hydrants are included in this base charge is surprising. Water being supplied to Town buildings is not billed to the Town but spread across the population and that was changed. Odd that it wasn't applied here with hydrants. They should go back to the Fire Department budget and not spread across taxpayers. How much of the consultant costs are associated with this project? A: It is a percentage. All bulked together. About \$20-24K.

Comment: Question the fiscal merit of this.

Jay Hersey explained we will be able to address all of the questions but need the legislative approval first.

Comment: Not sure why some guard rails can't be put on this. What is income eligible?

Comment: You can solve your issue if you deleted a) charged to income eligible residents.

Comment: Remind people this has already passed, largely. I was Town Counsel when the best approach was to seek home rule petition. Approved by Town Meeting in November 2019 and the reason it didn't make it to the legislature COVID struck and the Town was busy with other things. This isn't a new topic for Rep. Vitolo, he would have been aware of this back then. We should vote this. It is a good thing for the community. Also we are very fortunate to have Jay as Director of Water and Sewer.

The \$40K for the consultant is for multiple projects and it is our hope to have the program designed within 12 months or less. Analysis, design, legislative approval, public process with committees and Select Board.

Comment: Concerned about the order of things. Why didn't we do this to begin with?

Comment: Support this based on what's right about it. 1800 we currently have in a relief program is not meaningful and the idea that a major cost for residents and low-income residents is deserving of attention to balance the costs. Studying and pursuing is worthy and it was already voted – if we can find a way of implementing a program through some mechanism we do need the home rule petition. If we can't target the majority of low-income payers because we can't identify them, may not be through water and sewer, then we don't need the home rule petition. The first thing when someone considers a home rule petition is to go to our delegation. It is common courtesy.

Comment: We have segments of our population that we would like to support and help and we approach it in a variety of ways. The problem is we don't know what kind of impact we are having or how much it is costing us. Would like a moratorium on these projects and create a budget line to address these needs and figure out how to disburse it. No idea how helpful we are actually being to those segments of society we want to help. Need to create some financial discipline around our desires to help people in this Town.

Q: If Town meeting votes this down, will you still go on with the study? A: Yes because again, the contract with the consultant is for a number of different initiatives including rate setting, etc. that will use the same data they are researching and analyzing.

Q: "charged to residents aged 65 and over" – will this limit us if they are not the "owner" of a meter in any solution we want to come up with or will we be able to come up with workarounds? A: Town Counsel said the idea is that we have an interpretation of rule – exemption from legislature to charge non-uniform fees. Remove the legal bar that we have to charge uniform fees and then how you do that would be developed by recommendations from Jay's consultant to the rate setting committee to the Select Board. Broadly worded to off set the use of the Water and Sewer system; rebates could be part of the program.

Comment: Suggest simple fix to "charged to" – change "charged to" to "for" – may be out of scope. This needs to be clarified.

Comment: Issue regarding too many chaotic programs, they have been initiated by the State legislature and we respond to and opt into them. Generally don't create new programs for our Town alone. So that is what may count for the irrationality of that and difficult to fix that which would mean our opting out which already benefit some of our residents.

Comment: This is still no excuse for us not being proactive.

Comment: The Advisory Committee voted favorably for this initiative when it was originally brought before this body.

Additional questions to be answered at some point:

- How many people did we hope to cover in 2019?
- Is there another way to do this instead of a home rule petition?

Town Counsel suggested if the bill is charged to ABC Condo Association and the Smith family, Addams family and Green family will not benefit – there are ways to deal with this – change the bill. It was drafted broadly and we can deal with this while the legislature does their work.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for Favorable Action on WA 7.

An **AMENDMENT** was made and seconded to change Section 1, part (a) of the warrant article to add the words “income eligible,” so that it reads, “(a) income eligible residents aged 65 and over; and”

DISCUSSION ON THE AMENDMENT

The Select Board want us to do this and their focus was on having relief for seniors but we could come up with a different rate or eligibility standard that is separate for seniors, still income eligible but distinct from standards we come up with general low-income eligible population.

In favor of this concept, should we refer to next annual Town Meeting and much of our concerns will have been addressed and consult with the delegation and see what the prospect is to get it through the legislature.

Aside from all the issues, and referral for additional study may make sense. Not sure why water users should be subsidizing high income seniors. Brookline is already expensive and we are making it more difficult to live here. Younger populations are already paying for other benefits shared across the Town.

Seniors are a special category. They don't have the same mobility as younger people. So respectfully disagree.

There will be some sort of verification process and will not be open to wealthier seniors and will not happen that way.

By a **VOTE** of 18 in favor, none opposed and 4 abstentions, the **AMENDMENT** passes.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to refer back to the Select Board or a Select Board appointed committee.

Comment: The legislature is not going to ask for all of the details about giving discounts to seniors. There is urgency in getting this before to the legislature. If you refer this back and taking it out of the hands of DPW, the rate setting committee and others who are planning this, you are delaying this effort further. This idea that you need to know all of

the details before you can ask the legislature is misguided. Do you want to offer discounted water and sewer rates vote yes, but if not, vote no.

Comment: I don't need the legislature to know all the details, I need to know all the details. I want to know what we are doing and I want to know how they are going to the rental and the condo thing. This will not come back to Town Meeting and will just go to the Select Board. This is the wrong order.

The Advisory Committee is here to provide measured judgment. If our goal is to provide economic assistance to residents in Town there are many ways to do this not just a home rule petition effecting water rates. Carol's idea would give us more flexibility and take us out of the trap for having to respond to this and go to the legislature.

Comment: Last spring there were a bunch of proposed changes that we were talking about bringing to the legislature and Rep. Vitolo talked to us about picking and choosing. We have time to talk to our delegation and I would like to know what they think about this and if it is good use of a chip.

By a **VOTE** of 15 in favor, 7 opposed and no abstentions, the Advisory Committee recommends referring this back to the Select Board for further action.

PUBLIC MEETING

8:00 pm Report by the Schools Subcommittee, discussion, deliberation, and possible vote on Warrant Article 13
Rename the Heath School (Gacioch et. al)

Perry Grossman, member of the School Subcommittee gave the report on the hearing on WA 13, the full report of which is linked below. Their discussion centered on the following topics:

- The reasons for, and consequences of, renaming a school.
- The processes and outreach that were conducted.
- The potential costs.
- Criteria used in choosing the school name.
- The AC's role in school renaming.

On a motion of favorable action, and with three members abstaining, the Schools Subcommittee recommends passage of Warrant Article 13 by a vote of 1-0-3.

Petitioner David Gacioch noted that this was a community led process and several opportunities for people to weigh in. Driven by students to get the list of finalists. Happy to answer questions.

QUESTIONS COMMENTS DISCUSSION

What was the rationale for those who abstained? A: The three who abstained came at it from different directions. Is Roland Hayes an improvement over Heath? Yes. On the other hand don't know why the Advisory Committee needed to be involved in this when so many other committees and Boards weighed in. Trust educators to make these decisions. If you are an African American kid in that school and you see Mr. Hayes' picture in that school, it is a good thing for you. If that is the gain, that is the gain. Certain things come before us that are not our business.

I abstained for no specific reason. I agree in fact with what Ben has said, but not so much that Advisory shouldn't take this up. Not a fan of this renaming thing. Not a hill to die on for me. Not offended by the process or choice. But to be

honest there are a lot of things going on in Brookline – I guess I'm just wishing there was more laser focus toward teaching and learning. This represents an energy, resource, focus and direction while it may be well meaning don't see things getting better educationally in Brookline. This initiative came directly and solely from Dr. Sevelius, not a popular groundswell. And again, monetary issues are unresolved...signage, painting, etc. Make sure there isn't mission creep in terms of the finance.

Agree with Ben, not for us to decide. People glomming onto the bandwagon in support of black people while students are doing abysmally. We are not doing something about it. Spending time on renaming this school but yet we have a horrific outcome on education. Masking a massive achievement gap.

Dave noted no one disagrees with this problem. We can walk and chew gum at the same time. Confusion about what **physical changes needed to be changed. The front façade needs repair anyway not taking advantage of the scope.** The genesis was the work done with Hidden Brookline and the Florida Ruffin Ridley change. Community conversation began as a result of that effort.

Don't want to spend a lot of political capital on this, losing proposition. Don't think the subcommittee report conveyed my thoughts. Concerns about the process – talk about the Heath Community. Narrow definition. Not alumni, not neighbors.

According to the student presentation 733 people voted during the process. They consisted of:

- 57.4% current students (421)
- 29.3% current family members (215)
- 13.2% current staff (97)

Where is the rest of the community? Where are all the Heath alumni? Where are the Heath neighbourhood residents that don't currently have children in the school?

Neither the street, nor the school, was specifically named for John Heath, the man who owned slaves. Is a name forever tainted because of the bad character or deeds of an earlier generation?

The principal said it was structured so that the chosen name would be that of a person of colour. Why aren't representatives of other groups being honoured?

For the last century, Brookline's largest minority has been its Jewish community. No school is named for someone Jewish. Since the 1960s, the largest racial minority has been the Asian community, in large part, its Chinese community. No school is named for a member of the Asian community

Q: Curious about the comparison of processes for naming other buildings, town squares, etc. and who was involved – how similar or different the process was. A: The naming process was muddled and votes were deadlocked. The decision by the adults was put in before anything else. Renaming Devotion the kids went first and offered a choice, but then adults stepped in and changed the process and direction. No guidelines or policy for this.

Comment: Where is the list of worthy people to be named and where is the list of available public places to be named? We don't have those and we need to do better.

The Naming Committee is considering coming up with guidelines.

Recommend the Naming Committee have a public process to come up with the two lists – who in the Town’s history ought to have things named after them and what available properties are there to be named.

Roland Hayes was an accomplished artist and recognized at Town Meeting some time ago. The historical record says Ada Heath Dolober reported to Brookline Historical Society her vision of the Heath family having black faces in the kitchen. Not proper proof of slave ownership. Born 75 years after slavery was abolished so evidence seems lacking. We have an obligation that the research is done correctly, appropriately and the process was not more robust.

Comment: I recall the presentation being clear on possession and names of slaves – this is not a rumor – we can check the source. No doubt that the original Heath owned slaves but we can find the evidence / source.

Comment: Roland Hayes was the first proposed name for renaming of Devotion. Neither Ridley nor Hayes had a connection to Brookline Schools. What bothers me about the process, someone decided that the outcome was going to be a person of color. This is a racist and inappropriate process.

Petitioner Gacioch suggested that folks may be misinformed about the process. There was a large demographic during the course of the decision-making process. The student committee decided to give some weight to the race of the person for the renaming given that the original name was of a street, named for a family of which one of the ancestors was a slave holder. This body can decide if they want to express a view or not, or go against prevailing views. We may have to do some work on the subcommittee report which the petitioner did not see before tonight. The school was named almost by accident. It is currently carrying a name of someone for whom some of the community would find offensive and not something we want to support. We can nitpick around the edges or we can support what the community supports. Hope AC will decide to join or step aside.

Comment: At the Naming Committee Asa said it was structured that the selection would be a person of color.

The petitioner noted he would be happy to clarify and correct that, if necessary.

Comment: Advisory Committee does have a role and we need to make sure that there is a proper process and valid evidence.

Comment: The process, the fact that children voted on it doesn’t make it a good idea, changing the name or the change itself. If you put children in a room with a school principal and he asks do you think my idea is a good idea, they will mostly say yes. Are you suggesting that this is a good idea that since this is not named after anyone but it should be named after a real person.

Most people objected to the suggestion that we should fall in line, or remain silent on this as Town Meeting will most likely vote in favor.

Comment: As far as I can see, the name chosen is an honorable one and a good one. Nice for black kids but also white kids so they can think of blacks in other ways. Firmly in support of this. Matter of conscience but mine is clear.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for Favorable Action on WA 13.

An **AMENDMENT** was made and seconded to substitute the MOTION for No Recommendation because I believe this where the Advisory Committee should sit on articles such as this.

DISCUSSION

Unless we want to take a position that this is a flawed process, we should let Town Meeting decide.

Agree with Dave that this will fly through Town Meeting, agree some will say the Advisory Committee is out of touch but I believe the process is flawed, so not in favor of the amendment.

This is something we really shouldn't be voting on. I went back and forth and back and forth but we have no specific role or expertise despite our personal opinions. So support the amendment.

I do agree we shouldn't be involved in this.

By a **VOTE** of 14 in favor, 4 opposed, and 2 abstentions, the **AMENDMENT** passes.

By a **VOTE** of 15 in favor, 4 opposed and 1 abstention, the Advisory Committee has no recommendation on WA 13.

Comment: By convention after our debate, we give the last word to the petitioner and tonight we acted poorly and showed some fragility by reacting and interrupting his comments. It was disappointing.

Comment: There was a brief discussion about who should write up this report especially if their vote in subcommittee was different than the vote of the full AC.

Comment: We should focus on the points that are made and not the tone or the emotion or "how" something is said.

8:30 pm Other Business

Upon a **MOTION** made and seconded to adjourn, and voted unanimously, the meeting was adjourned at 10:26 p.m.

Meeting recording link: https://brooklinema.zoomgov.com/rec/share/CjzPzW_Nf6V7zNTvHn8m_6ONkcZxoL-mNtow9Xd_fyFgQvOR77w56pzWUEuu535d.ypnXl1qjnEbukuHI

Documents Presented <https://www.brooklinema.gov/DocumentCenter/Index/4663>

- ARTICLE 07 - water and sewer discount
- ARTICLE 08 - Sr work off program
- ARTICLE 13 - Rename Heath
- WA7 Water and Sewer Discount Legislation AC Petitioner Questionnaire - 2023 - DPW
- Article 8 AC Petitioner Questionnaire - 2023
- Senior Tax Work-Off Program Expansion Article 8
- 09 27 23 School Subcommittee Report on WA 13
- DLescohier Comments Warrant Article 7 STM 2023

VOTES

	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6	Vote 7
# Votes Yes	22	0	18	15	0	14	15
# Votes No	0	0	0	7	0	4	4
# Votes Abstain	1	0	4	0	0	2	1
Vote Description:	MOTION: FAVORABLE ACTION ON WA8	MOTION: FAVORABLE ACTION ON WA7	REEDERS AMENDMENT: “add the words ‘income-eligible’ before ‘residents aged 65 and over’”	DMG REFERRAL: Subject matter to SB or SB- appointed committee.	MOTION: FAVORABLE ACTION ON WA13	BROWN AMENDMENT: NO RECOMMENDATIO N	MOTION AS AMENDED
Michael Berger	Y		Y	Y			
Paul Bernard	Y						
Ben Birnbaum	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y
Harry Bohrs	Y		Y	N		Y	Y
Cliff Brown	Y		A	Y		Y	Y
John Doggett	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y
Katherine Florio	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y
Harry Friedman	Y		Y	Y		N	N
David-Marc Goldstein	Y		Y	Y			
Neil Gordon	Y		A	Y		Y	Y
Susan Granoff	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y
Perry Grossman	Y		Y	N		N	N
Kelly Hardebeck	Y		Y	N		Y	Y
Amy Hummel							
Alisa Jonas	Y		Y	N		Y	Y
Janice Kahn							
Carol Levin	A		A	Y		Y	Y
Pam Lodish							
Joslin Murphy	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y
Donelle O’Neal, Sr.	Y						
Linda Olson Pehlke	Y		Y	N		Y	Y

Markus Penzel	Y		Y	N		A	N
David Pollak	Y		Y	N		N	Y
Stephen Reeders	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y
Carlos Ridruejo							
Lee Selwyn	Y		Y	Y		A	A
Alok Somani	Y		A	Y		Y	Y
Carolyn Thall			Y	Y		N	N
Christine Westphal							
Dennis Doughty							