

**Town of Brookline
Advisory Committee Minutes
Thursday, November 9, 2023**

Present: 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, Joslin Murphy, Donelle O’Neal, Linda Olson Pehlke, Markus L. Penzel, David Pollak, Stephen Reeders, Lee Selwyn, Alok Somani, Carolyn R. Thall, Christine Westphal

Absent: Pam Lodish, Carlos Ridruejo, Amy Hummel

Also Attending: Assistant Town Administrator for Finance Charles Young, Fire Chief & Emergency Management Director John Sullivan, Emergency Management Coordinator Cheryl Anne Snyder, Town Counsel Joe Callanan, Associate Town Counsel Jonathan Simpson, Town Moderator Kate Poverman, Select Board Member Paul Warren, Petitioners for Referral Motion on STM4 Article 1 Jonathan Margolis PCT 7, Marty Rosenthal PCT 9, Jonathan Davis PCT 9; Director of Planning & Community Development Kara Brewton; John Bowman, Alec Lebovitz, Roger Blood, Max Newell, Carol Gladstone, Kimberley Richardson, Eleanor Clarkson, Cora Weissbourd, Mike Toffel, Richard Nangle, Kevin MacKenzie, Kristine Knauf, Marissa Vogt, Kimberly Loscalzo, Chris Dempsey, Kim Smith, Rebecca Stone, Al Raine, Emily Dolbear, Jennifer Goldsmith, Select Board Member John VanScoyoc , Bonnie Bastien, Karin Weaver, Dave Gacioch, Livia Imada, Ben Dubin, Diana McClure, Karen Stensrude, Steven Coletti, Anne Sudduth, Sarah Sonnenfeld, Ann West, Karen Kraut, Stephanie Ebbert, Katha Seidman, Jonathan Golden, Yolanda Rodriguez, Roberta Falke, Maggie Farrell, Michael Jacobs, Natalia Linos, Donna Treece, Thomas Child, Christine Anderson, Lynn Shyevitch, Cathleen Cavell, Shira Fischer, Awet Teame, Sheryl Weitz, Blair Hines, E. Catherine Loula, Bitsy Perlman, Michael Rubenstein, Sarah Sonnenfeld, Jan Wachter, Lisa Shatz, Patricia Hickey, Brian Ladd, Susan Harr, Bob Van Meter, Felina Silver, Patricia Maher, Susan Michaels, Jessica Milhem, Azalech Sanka, Charles Fowler, Bryan Kuhlman, Madeline Shiley, Roslyn Feldberg, Marion Freedman-Gurspan, Marilyn Newman, Fran Perler, Paul Saner, Sarah Kitterman, Justin Brown, Carla Benka, Laura Knott, John Sullivan, Arlene Hill, and other members of the public.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Mr. Friedman, who chaired the meeting in the absence of Mr. Doughty, who participated while traveling.

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

Michael Rubenstein Town Meeting Member in Precinct 13 and I am speaking on behalf of the Yes In Brookline Strategy Team urging you to recommend no action on the motion to refer portions of Article 1 of Special Town Meeting 4 to a Moderator’s committee.

It would be an appropriate and useful exercise to offer a referral motion in light of new information worthy of consideration. However, Town Meeting Members who have offered this motion have failed to provide any information that had not been previously available. I urge you to maintain your recommendation for favorable action of Article 1 of Special Town Meeting 4 and recommend no action on the referral motion before you.

Shira Fischer, TMM Precinct 11, just echoing what Michael said, speaking to support no action.

Brian Ladd, New TMM Precinct 13, I agree with the previous speakers. This referral motion lists every possible reason to have doubts about the Harvard Street proposal. It is essentially saying, once we resolve all of those we can proceed. So it seems to me it's not really requesting a study. It's proposing to kill the entire effort, and since the Advisory Committee already weighed in on that, I think that's a matter for Town Meeting.

Sheryl Weitz, I live on Brown Street. I'm asking that the Advisory Committee recommend no action on this motion to refer. I'm speaking as a decades-long occupational therapist and mom of two kids. I'm the sole adult that they have. I have been ordered to vacate my Brown Street home in January. We currently have no family or place to shelter and Brookline has no housing, no resources, and no guidance for us whatsoever. Move steadfastly towards something better for this community. I attest that this motion to refer is unnecessarily redundant, not negatively impacting businesses who have expressed as a community their support for the warrant article, and it is actually an impediment. Yet our human needs are accelerating in the world, and without human patience and responsiveness, communities break down, people suffer, and we all lose.

Lisa Shatz: I agree with all the speakers previously. I think it would undermine the efforts of so many people that put in so much time and effort (on the compromise plan). The Planning Board did such an amazing effort to get the Harvard Street plan across, and everybody's looked at every aspect of this from every which way.

Jennifer Goldsmith, I'm echoing the comments that others have made. There's been a Herculean effort made to find compromise and create a proposal that is viable for many people. I imagine many of us read the Globe article yesterday. I feel like there is an extra burden on us to be responsible to consider the history of the past one hundred years and more of efforts to obstruct affordable housing, development and growth.

Natalia Linos, Precinct 6, also a member of Mothers Out Front. For the sake of this warrant article, for the sake of our housing crisis and our climate crisis, and also the trust in the process, I really urge you to allow us to move forward in Town Meeting and not refer.

Dave Gacioch, TMM Precinct 14. I know that nobody got exactly what they wanted out of that, but all worked so hard to find common ground. My hat is off to you, thank you for that hard, good work, and I hope we honor it by rejecting this motion to refer. Second, given that the Advisory Committee's focus is on town finance, and one of the reasons stated in the motion to refer is to assess town finances or the impact on town finances, I would just encourage the committee to remember that the biggest impacts that we're talking about on town finances are extra people and those people have to live somewhere.

Paul Warren, member of the Select Board. I echo all of the comments that were made earlier; but as the individual who was privileged to be able to spend many hours in person and offline with two organizations that typically have never sat across from each other, and have never had conversations about their future vision, I applaud their accomplishment, being able to find a path to compromise, to be able to listen to one another and to share ideas, and to compromise. I think it's an example for the future.

7:15 pm Reserve Fund Transfer Request of \$20,000 for Oasis Planning (Fire Department)

Chief Sullivan gave an overview of the RFT request. Funds will allow the Department to begin the process of preparing in case Brookline is asked to be part of the migrant sheltering requirements. Details are outlined in the documents linked

below – See Oasis Plan Reserve Fund Transfer Memo. The authorization will allow the department to begin to set up accounts and enter into contracts.

In an August 8, 2023 letter to Department of Homeland Security Secretary Mayorkas, Governor Healey declared **a state of emergency** due to a dramatic increase in the number of people needing temporary shelter due to the ongoing housing shortage, and an increase of migrants to the region.

As a result of this significant increase, the state’s emergency shelter system is struggling to keep up with demand and the state has begun placing families in motels and hotels. As of late September, the state has placed families in more than 90 communities across the Commonwealth. Approximately 50% of families currently housed via the state’s emergency shelter program are migrants seeking asylum in the USA. Under current federal immigration laws, asylum seekers are **prohibited from working** until their case has been heard and their status has been determined – a process which can take up to a year or more. This restriction can severely delay a family’s search for financial stability and independence.

We are currently requesting \$20,000 from the Reserve Fund to cover expenses related to planning and immediate response goods and services related to new arrival families. These funds will be used to cover immediate needs of new arrival families, including personal care items, interpretation & translation costs, feeding, case management and staff expenses. Additionally, we have begun outreach to the Brookline Community Foundation to explore starting a New Arrivals fund similar to their existing Safety Net program. This will provide Brookline residents that wish to donate to support new arrival families an avenue to do so.

Comments Questions Discussion

Q: We don’t usually cover if someone loses their home and needs shelter, they go to private sources. RFT is for extraordinary or unforeseen expenditures. Is this premature, legal, has this been run past Town Counsel? A: Town Counsel Callanan assured everyone that this is indeed legal. This is responsible emergency planning.

Q: Where does the figure \$20K come from? What do we do if more money is needed? A: Establishing the accounts and we have discussed costs with vendors for short term sheltering.

Q: Does this include food? A: We have made contingencies for food and believe it can come through Brookline Food Pantry and donations. Lots of reliance on donations and working through Brookline Community Foundation, the Schools, and some other assistance possibly from the state, but majority through donations.

Q & Comment: Laudable enterprise. Reserved Fund Transfers are not typically used for seed money or anticipated needs. If RFT takes place, what happens if we don’t receive any folks? A: The money would get absorbed back into the budget.

Q: How many people have shown up so far? A: 7500 people, but none in Brookline so far.

Q: What defines this category? A: The sudden influx of families and pregnant women seeking migrant status shelter. There is a process of evaluation.

Q: How will the Town identify those eligible and not eligible? A: There is a distinction in the State declaration.

There was continued discussion about funding this, other resources (asking families to host migrants), what the liability would be, reimbursement to the Town from the State, etc.

AirBnB.com provides \$3M of liability insurance. This same insurance would cover homes that are used for this purpose through AirBnB.org.

Q: Can we anticipate this funding will be rolled into the budget for the next cycle? A: Expansion request for the Fire Department to have a line item for Emergency Management. This is a work in progress. Still learning what our obligation would be.

Q: Have we spoken to other towns to see what they are doing to prepare and discussions with the State for funding the initial expenditure? A: Yes to both of those questions. We are part of a consortium of emergency management teams in other Towns and we are learning from each other and sharing best practices.

Q: Does this open us up for being a target for migrants? A: Risk but unavoidable.

Q: The State can send us migrants without sending us a check to cover the costs for them? A: The State would have made arrangements with the hotels, and we would just be supporting with other services, like public schooling, for example.

Q: Would this apply to women who are fleeing their states to come here for abortions? A: No. Cheryl Ann Snyder responded. We have a right to shelter law in Massachusetts and it only applies to families with children under 21 and/or families with pregnant women. There is a housing crisis in the state and that means fewer people can come out of the emergency shelter system into permanent housing. Currently 24,000 people in shelters, half are children. Bringing in 50 new families a day and can only find permanent housing for 200 families a month. One person in the family needs to be a resident of Massachusetts or a citizen, has a green card or is here with permission and knowledge of Homeland Security. There are other enrollment requirements to the State system. We in Brookline would not get involved in that.

Some communities have already received migrant families and have been sheltering them and are having to react instead of being proactive. We have tried to be proactive – making plans, making contacts with various services, and all other provisions. The last component is to get this funding.

Q: If \$250M is assured is this transfer necessary? In case of natural disasters that may affect Brookline, is there an account already set up for this and why isn't this part of it? A: Funding is not assured and it doesn't trickle down to municipalities. The funding is to cover all the State's expenses. Normally when we have an emergency, the Town fronts whatever expenses there are under an emergency declaration and then goes through the process of reimbursement from FEMA or others. We have plans and have MOAs in place with vendors for certain equipment purchasing needs to be expedient and would seek reimbursement on the back end.

We don't anticipate there will be reimbursement in this case but we do anticipate the burden.

Q: Can anyone else recall any RFT that didn't go to a bill that was already waiting payment? A: Yes for anticipated overtime costs, the feasibility study for the ice rink, etc.

Q: What are the alternatives if there was no money in the Reserve Fund? A: There really aren't any. The State can put people anywhere and we have an obligation to do something. If there wasn't money in the Reserve Fund we would rely heavily on donations, which we will be using to some degree anyway. But we cannot do case management long term.

We could set up a Gifts Account to accept donations to provide folks whatever they need – more direct care, i.e. cell phones. Maybe we could set this up with a nonprofit to supply personal, intimate items. We would be providing larger scale services like shower trailers or translation services. This is a multifaceted approach. We want to be prepared in as many ways as possible to react as needed and be flexible.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to approve a reserve fund transfer of \$20,000 for Oasis Planning. By a **VOTE** of 16 in favor, 4 opposed and 1 abstention the RFT passes.

7:30 pm **Consideration of the Select Board motion under the STM4-1, which includes a few clarifying amendments to the motion the AC passed (and which can be found starting on page 1-102 of the combined reports for STM4: <https://www.brooklinema.gov/DocumentCenter/View/46293/Combined-Reports-November-14-2023-Special-Town-Meeting-4>**

Starting on Page 1-102:

Section B: Doggett/Pehlke amendment

Section C: HAB amendment

Section D: 1 Rubenstein amendment (corrects inconsistency in a map and table of parcels)

Section D: 2-9 Benka amendments (technical amendments – clarifications/corrections)

Linda Olsen Pehlke explained the slight amendments that the Select Board approved. The Planning Board submitted a proposed amendment to allow them a lot of flexibility on specifications and materials giving them more power and purview. That was ruled out of scope by the Moderator. The compromise team reviewed it and noticed some issues on page 5 with the form-based code that involved rear set-backs. She shared a table of allowable adjustments on the screen. They retaining consistency with the agreement and the Select Board adopted the amendment and now Advisory Committee is being asked to adopt the Select Board motion.

She also noted there are three scrivener errors that the Moderator will amend from the podium and everyone agreed to this.

There were a few other technical amendments that Dick Benka noted – clarifications and corrections nothing substantial.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded that Advisory Committee accept the Select Board version of STM 4-Article 1 voted by the Select Board on October 30, 2023. By a **VOTE** of 21 in favor, none opposed and no abstentions the motion carries.

8:00 pm **Possible consideration of a Referral Motion under STM4-1 (Margolis, et al.)**

Petitioner Jonathan Margolis gave an overview of the Referral Motion. He noted it's fairly lengthy and goes through a number of what we perceive as significant shortcomings in the so-called consensus plan. He feels there's been a certain amount of hysteria about the referral motion. It is not a disguised attempt to kill the consensus plan. If you agree that there are significant shortcomings in the plan you should vote to refer, because that will guarantee that the plan will come back to Town Meeting, presumably in improved fashion, and should gain more votes. If referral is not allowed, and more than a third of Town Meeting does not vote for the plan that will kill it.

Now to me, personally, the most serious shortcoming with the plan is that there has been no analysis at all. The financial and fiscal impacts of the consensus plan, particularly Harvard Street, the Town's financial position, and I specify Harvard Street for a couple of reasons. First of all, the Harvard Street plan was begun four years ago in 2019. There's been ample

time to examine the likely financial effects of it. The M. District plan was only done in the last few months. Also, the Harvard Street plan deals with our most important commercial area. It's particularly important to the Town. It is profoundly irresponsible not to get an analysis done preferably by somebody outside the on what the likely impact of the plan would be.

If several people whom I respect have suggested, it would have a positive effect on the Town's finances. If so, let's find out about it. But given how tight our budget is every year, and the difficulties we have in allocating funds, we ought to have an idea of what's going to happen before we take a vote. It just seems to me simple logic to say that I would also point out It's been a lot of talk, and I was here for part of the discussion of what to do with it for emergency shelter. And I agree we do need to provide for people who cannot find housing. But will the article as drafted really ensure that there will be significant amounts of new housing at various levels? One way to help ensure that that would happen would be if there were limits on unit size along the Harvard Street corridor. If you look at Harvard Street today, apart from the required minimum of affordable houses, what are you seeing, you're seeing luxury housing.

John Davis sent around a list of projects. One of them was the building on Green Street. As it happens, my wife likes to go on Zillow and see what's around, and she happened to note that the units in that building are priced at \$2.3-\$4 million dollars. That's not close to affordable. I suggest that if we say that Brookline's values are to have housing at multiple price points. There's a better way to do it in this plan. So, I suggest to you that Referral is the prudent way forward. I realize there's a lot of emotional pressure, and I don't mean emotional in a bad way. But people have been working on this for a long time that they really believe that this is a good thing. But I think a calm view will show there are serious issues with the plan as it now is that can be improved. And that's why I suggest that even if you're in favor of the plan you should vote for referral. Thanks.

Co-petitioner Susan Granoff added that the amendments suggest we need to look at it carefully again no matter how much time people have spent working on it. It will have a huge impact for decades to come on Brookline's main commercial street. Make sure there are no unintended consequences if we get this wrong.

Co-petitioner Joslin Murphy thanked all the members of the public who spoke up tonight, to Paul Warren who brought two sides together and especially Linda Olsen Pehlke and Dick Benka who arrived at a plan that resolves what the Town is required to do to comply with the MBTACA. I still support this motion because there are still so many unanswered questions and areas that have not yet been focused on. This is to refine the Harvard Street plan and get the best possible product it can.

Perry Grossman thinks there has been impressive work done by the Town, Kara Brewton and Maria Morelli in particular, seeing a great deal of support from various groups and constituents and agreement by leading advocacy groups. We are creating opportunities for housing and business enterprises. Against referral.

Neil Gordon reviewed the Harvard Street history.

Markus Penzel agreed that the motion is really nothing new. We have come this far and there has been such impressive work and bringing people together to not support it would be a shame.

Alisa Jonas shares Susan's concerns. This referral motion addresses many of the issues she is concerned about regarding quality of public spaces. Don't understand urgency.

Dennis Doughty asked the petitioners if their motion refers a portion of STM 4-Article 1 what do they believe is left if this referral motion were to pass? Not well defined in this article what would be voted on. Ambiguous. A: The portion of the article that applies to Harvard Street would be referred.

Linda Olsen Pehlke noted there are differences in changes to Section 4.08 of our zoning by law which has to do with the affordable housing, inclusionary zoning. That section is different in the Harvard Street plan, so it's not a clean, easy thing to say, let's separate the two things that are combined because you've got two different sections on 4.08. So, I think you could say, let's refer this whole article, but we only want the committee to focus on Harvard Street. I think that's legitimate. You shouldn't think of it as there's this piece hanging that's still the M District that we're going to vote on. We're going to have to vote on four or five to get the whole package of what we need for the M District. I think it was a good question that Dennis asked and I don't think there is something that is left there that we should vote on. The reason for this is that there's amendments to the housing section that has to do with a commercial incentive, and that's only relevant to Harvard Street.

Carolyn Thall asked how many people were involved in the process. She clarified that she wanted to know how many people participated and she was not suggesting it was a backroom deal, somehow.

Paul Warren offered closing comments against referral. I think the big question here, what more are you going to get out of this referral that you don't already have?

There has been extensive community engagement. We heard about parking. We heard about commercial core, about commercial properties we were worried about. We heard about everybody's concerns. We heard about historic properties. We heard about the concern about growth, and how quickly it would happen, and where it would happen. This was feedback from the process, from the surveys and the meetings and the workshops. But also from the work that we did over about three weeks of multiple negotiations and meetings with these advocacy groups, and what happened as a result from that feedback – there was a series of amendments, not reactive amendments, not a referral at the last minute. These were thoughtful amendments, discussed, negotiated, and not by people that didn't know what they were doing, but people that are deep into zoning and advocacy around planning, growth and housing. These were folks that sat at the table, and they know what they're doing and what they did was remarkable, and the work that they did was then reviewed, refined, and confirmed by Staff and the Moderator. This was not done quickly. But what more you're going to get out of a referral.

So why not Referral? Because we need to be more than just, legally compliant. Legal compliance is easy. We have an opportunity to create many more affordable housing units than the one hundred and twenty-five at the BHA property that will take at least six years to develop. This is not going to happen overnight. We will get up to 1200 unit of housing, up to 300 of those will be affordable, and about 130 of those will be on Harvard Street We'll get to expand and protect our commercial tax base, which is critical. In order to bend the curve on our residential tax growth. We'll get to fight climate change because housing density near transportation, of course, helps us with climate change. And importantly, we can increase the social, economic, and racial diversity of our town by having more mixed income and different price point housing. This is not just about market rate housing. And importantly, all of this work will help inform the upcoming comprehensive plan that we're going to kick off in January. It's the right time to do this. It's the right reason to do it, and it really is the right thing to do. Please vote no action. Thank you.

Kelly Hardebeck spoke for no action on referral. This plan has been thoughtfully executed and reviewed by numerous boards. Don't let the illusion of a perfect plan be the enemy of a very good plan. We can come back and change the zoning and can continue to tweak it as we see fit. It gives us an opportunity to create more affordable housing and stand up for our values.

David Pollak spoke against the referral. Heard that we Brookline keep making things bigger and zoning for more, I disagree and not an accurate portrayal. Trying to have a comprehensive plan and try to do it all at once doesn't make sense.

Cliff Brown spoke against referral. Cost of units around Harvard Street area, important to understand the only way we are going to get significant affordable housing is by increasing density and using the mechanisms that are required here to mix affordable with market. Unless we do things through inclusionary zoning the only way is through subsidized developments. It won't happen otherwise. Regarding small businesses there was support for the plan from Coolidge Corner Merchants Association and the Chamber. Haven't heard any small businesses opposing this proposal. Where does that perspective come from that this will not be good for small businesses give the protections for commercial development. It is incorrect to assume that because new properties get developed that there will not be opportunities for small businesses including current ones. Feel this is just a delaying tactic and continue to do what we have been doing for the last 18 years which is nothing. Town Meeting will have an opportunity to make changes in the future if necessary.

Joslin Murphy responded about business owners – John Davis spoke to small businesses who were fearful about the future. She is speaking for abutters, small business owners and folks in South Brookline. There is no parking plan and no fiscal impact plan. What is the downside to waiting? We can perfect this, arrange for parking, determine fiscal impact in 2 or 3 months. What leverage will we have with developers to provide public parking? A lot of work has gone into this but it hasn't met the mark. Would like to see a plan that we can all support as a community and that is why I support referral.

Jonathan Margolis added a few last words. He noted the failure of anyone respond to the questions about fiscal impact. Other serious defects and shortcomings in the plan as it currently exists. Easy to say we can come back and fix them, not so much fiscal issues, but it takes tremendous effort and time. This is a good time to say let's get it right. Referral is the best opportunity to get it write.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for referral of STM 4 Article 1 to a Moderator's Committee (amended version). By a **VOTE** of 4 in favor, 16 opposed, and 2 abstentions the motion fails.

8:30 pm Review any other amendments submitted and approved by the Moderator for any warrant articles and possible reconsideration of previous votes on warrant articles.

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

Meeting recording link:

https://brooklinema.zoomgov.com/rec/share/YKX2g0grWlQhJ_IRlpsMU773CL0k3NuyqNoV0MbB487cKL4uOm5uDDEA7go42ifE.BairwrZ0DxgjlXDe

Documents Presented:

- FY24 Oasis Plan Reserve Fund Transfer Request Form
- FY24 Reserve Fund Balance Projection
- Oasis Plan Reserve Fund Transfer Request Memo
- Public Comment - Support Consensus No Action on Referral
- STM4 ARTICLE1 Supp 1 - Margolis et. al. Referral
- Additional Public Comment - Support Consensus No on Referral

VOTES

| | Vote 1 | Vote 2 | Vote 3 |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|
| # Votes Yes | 16 | 21 | 6 |
| # Votes No | 4 | 0 | 15 |
| # Votes Abstain | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Vote Description: | Reserve Fund Transfer of \$20K for Oasis Planning | AC accept SB version of STM4 WA1 voted by SB on Oct 30, 2023 | Motion to refer STM4 WA1 to a Moderator's Committee |
| Michael Berger | Y | Y | N |
| Paul Bernard | N | Y | Y |
| Ben Birnbaum | N | Y | N |
| Harry Bohrs | Y | Y | N |
| Cliff Brown | Y | Y | N |
| John Doggett | N | Y | N |
| Katherine Florio | A | Y | N |
| Harry Friedman | | | |
| David-Marc Goldstein | Y | Y | A |
| Neil Gordon | Y | Y | N |
| Susan Granoff | Y | Y | Y |
| Perry Grossman | Y | Y | N |
| Kelly Hardebeck | | Y | N |
| Alisa Jonas | Y | | Y |
| Carol Levin | | | |
| Pam Lodish | | | |
| Joslin Murphy | Y | Y | Y |
| Donelle O'Neal, Sr. | Y | | A |
| Linda Olson Pehlke | Y | Y | N |
| Markus Penzel | Y | Y | N |
| David Pollak | Y | Y | N |
| Stephen Reeders | N | Y | |
| Carlos Ridruejo | | | |
| Lee Selwyn | | | Y |
| Alok Somani | Y | Y | N |
| Carolyn Thall | Y | Y | Y |
| Christine Westphal | Y | Y | N |
| Dennis Doughty | | Y | N |