

Campus Commentary on Preliminary Report Issued by Basic Needs and Equitable Compensation Task Force

Summary

In addition to the public comment period held during each of its meetings, the Task Force created several venues for members of the campus community to comment on our Preliminary Report (the penultimate version of this report). This document presents all of the comment that was received by Task Force, starting with that which was received by the time of the Task Force's final meeting prior to issuing its report to President Fogel.

The following opportunities to comment on the Preliminary Report, and to engage in discussion with the Task Force, were provided:

- a presentation and discussion with the Staff Council (September 5);
- a presentation, discussion, and deliberation on a resolution supporting the recommendations of the report with the Faculty Senate (September 11; resolution presented below);
- a presentation to the Student Government Association followed by deliberation among the Senators on a resolution supporting the recommendations of the report (September 19; resolution presented below);
- a Town Meeting on our report (September 21);
- a comment box on the Basic Needs website, where the preliminary report was posted on September 18; and
- public comment period at the Task Force's final meeting.

Faculty Senate Resolution on the Preliminary Report of the Basic Needs and Equitable Compensation Task Force

WHEREAS President Fogel appointed the Basic Needs and Equitable Compensation (BNEC) Task Force on April 24 2006 and charged it to "make recommendations concerning principles and policies that should guide the University's employment practices for lower-paid members of UVM's workforce in regard to wages, benefits, and other terms of employment, including access to education and training"; and

WHEREAS the UVM community describes itself as a "just community" that "unites against all forms of injustice" (from Our Common Ground statement of values); and

WHEREAS the BNEC Task Force has determined, after fact-finding and analysis, that there are employees at UVM whose wages and benefits do not allow them, working full time, to meet the basic budget expenses of a single-person household; and

WHEREAS President Fogel requested that the Task Force solicit the views of the campus community on its findings and recommendations;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate broadly supports the BNEC Task Force's recommendation that the University establish a wage floor based on the basic budget expenses of a single-person household; and

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recognizes that the implementation of such a policy will require the identification of new base-budget resources by the University's central administration.

Student Government Association Resolution
in Support of the BNEC Task Force Recommendation:

WHEREAS a livable wage is the hourly or yearly wage necessary for an employee working a full time job to meet their basic needs,

WHEREAS the Student Government Association Senate at the University of Vermont expressed its support for livable wages for all UVM employees through a unanimously supported Resolution Supporting the Adoption of a UVM Basic Needs Budget (RF06-12) in the fall semester of 2005,

WHEREAS the Basic Needs and Equitable Compensation Task Force (BNEC) was created by President Daniel Fogel to research the issue of a livable wage for the lowest-paid campus employees and to make a recommendation on such,

WHEREAS the current recommendation addresses many of the issues that are of concern to the SGA Senate, including Cost of Living Adjustments and a wage floor based upon UVM-specific information and methodology from the State of Vermont's Joint Fiscal Office,

WHEREAS the current recommendation only applies to directly-employed workers, and does not include contractors working on campus, such as Sodexo and University Dining Services,

WHEREAS a livable wage policy will further UVM in its mission of being a "socially just institution," and is in line with the UVM Our Common Ground's statement of justice,

WHEREAS a livable wage policy that applies to all workers will reflect positively on UVM, and will make the University a leader in labor issues in Burlington, the State of Vermont, and the United States,

LET IT BE KNOWN that the Student Government Association of the University of Vermont supports the BNEC Task Force Recommendation and encourages President Fogel and the UVM Administration to support the recommendation,

LET IT BE FURTHER KNOWN that the Student Government Association would like to see a livable wage policy based upon the BNEC Task Force recommendation implemented in a timely and efficient manner, that is transparent and public,

LET IT BE FURTHER KNOWN that the Student Government Association strongly encourages the University of Vermont to include contracted workers in its future livable wage policy.

Comments from Town Meeting

- Speaks as someone at the bottom of the wage scale. Pays \$590 for a one-bedroom apartment in Burlington and receives a check for \$650 every two weeks. Has lost weight because he doesn't eat. Doesn't mind because he chooses to be here – the benefits are excellent. Has a masters degree in education but doesn't want to do that and has chosen to go back to school which is why he's here. The two weeks before the 2nd check of the month are really tight.
- Is a local resident. Applauds the Task Force – great direction. The cost of living has risen, it's almost impossible to find affordable housing in Burlington. Also, the fuel costs make earning a living outside of Burlington and Chittenden County not an option. City of Burlington has a livable wage for the City – similar policies are being considered by the Burlington Schools. Lives on Bright Street and there is a tremendous amount of poverty in the Burlington community. This has large social costs. One thing not in the report is anything about the contracted workers at the University, e.g., Sodexo which is now a big corporation with a spotty history of workers' rights. Would not want to see UVM contracting out to avoid paying livable wages.
- Works in the Library. The report is phenomenal and courageous and it's a step in social justice. Just makes good sense all around. Feels there's a lot riding on this process. Feels like the expectation of this campus through this process has been raised. If the President's Office doesn't follow through, can't imagine the fallout. UE workers are being offered less than the livable wage.
- It's very difficult for people to come here to tell how close to the edge they are. A faculty member pays \$1100/month for a one-person apartment. Some Sodexo workers, after 20 years, make \$9 – 10/hr if they're lucky. It's disappointing what the gap is between what BNEC says it should be and what the workers are being offered. They receive \$10/hr after probation. That's a \$.34 increase in starting rate and there's no proposal to raise that starting rate in the next year or the year after. Concerned – the idea that the administration has to be at the bargaining table and they don't seem to be listening.
- Works in Res Life. Is a truck driver – moves furniture for the students and sometimes moves the students. Has four children. It's very difficult to raise a family when you depend on two incomes. Makes probably more than the housekeepers. They make \$10/hr after 10 -15 years. Doesn't understand unless management just doesn't want to pay anything else.
- Works in Patrick Gym. Wondered if the Task Force looked at various ways the University could offset that \$1m. Everyone could do more in just energy savings. Suggests to the Committee to look at ways to save money as unit in terms of energy savings.

Comments from website

message: Lower wage earners need to be respected and supported. Our department makes it a point to make a gift to our custodial employees around the end-of-year/new year holidays. However, I don't believe just increasing their wages is the best answer. I would support a campus fund designated to assisting lower wage earners (as defined by the task force) with meeting out-of-the-ordinary expenses. For instance, if a person might benefit from physical therapy but cannot afford the copay, this fund could be used.

message: You need to do a comparison between the cost of living in Chittenden County and the rest of Vermont.

Since not all of the UVM population lives in Chittenden County, and it is the most expensive County to live in Vermont, this could be skewing the data results.

Of the UVM population you identified, they all could be living outside of Chittenden County and their hourly wage could be livable based on the standards of Vermont.

message: I have been trying for years to get tuition remission for spouses/partners at UVM. Other universities DO have it. When my husband was laid off, UVM would not allow tuition remission for him to get credit for classes that he wanted to take to expand his job opportunities. Since he is in his 50s, getting a job is harder than for younger people. Although he did audit one class, having the credit for a class helps towards another degree and helps in obtaining jobs. I don't imagine there would be a large number of spouses /partners who would take advantage of such an expanded benefit, so UVM isn't looking at spending a lot of money on it. Since we don't have children of college age, we essentially are losing the tuition remission benefit that UVM says we should take into consideration in our salary levels.

message: Bravo!

message: I think the task force recommendations in general are good. I especially agree with the section of the report on training and education programs for lower-paid employees. I think employees should be able to access training DURING work time when the training relates to their job skills. I also really like the idea of reimbursement for training at vocational programs and CCV since these programs often offer the kinds of training that these workers might need/want in order to improve their skills, make themselves more marketable, etc. In this area, I think it would be very wise of UVM to be in touch with Vermont Adult Learning (adult literacy and work training programs) who has so much experience with ESL and job training for folks with lower literacy. This organization has done worksite courses offered on site in the past and is well respected.

These are my thoughts for the moment. This is a much needed piece of work and the task force, the students who brought this to the forefront, and president Fogel are to be commended for taking this on.

message: I was surprised to read in the preliminary report that there are UVM employees who work full time and yet make less than \$12.28 per hour. (The going rate for 16 year-old babysitters in Chittenden County is \$10.00.) There is no question that the responsible response to this situation is to offer all full-time UVM employees a liveable wage.

Many years ago, Ben & Jerry's observed that its lowest paid full-time employees needed to moonlight just to make ends meet. Believing the company's part in this was socially and economically irresponsible, the company devised what it called its "liveable wage" which was based, like the UVM calculation, on the reasonable bare-minimum expenses of a single person household. Since then, many, many Vermont companies have followed Ben & Jerry's example. Vermont Businesses for Social Responsibility (of which UVM is a member) assists Vermont companies to design liveable wage compensation plans through advocacy and its Liveable Wage Toolkit.

This being said, there were proposals in the preliminary report I found troubling. These related to the University adjusting pay and/or benefits relative to assessed "need." Is it the role of a University to be a social arbiter? Does a single father with two children have more needs than a middle-aged woman supporting elderly parents? How do you factor in the tuition benefit which is worth about \$10,000 per enrolled child per year? Don't go here. As the human resources professional responsible for closing down the Ben & Jerry's child care center in Waterbury a number of years ago, I can say from experience that when an organization attempts to determine and differentiate need among its employees, it opens up a can of worms best left to the government agencies designed to deal with it. Even the best intentions can lead to glaring and subtle inequities that have the potential to undermine morale at all levels, leak as bad press and/or lead to organized employee action.

Concentrating instead on offering and making more accessible training, development and career counseling programs that enable employees to qualify and apply for better paying jobs is a far wiser pursuit. As an educational institution, this is our business and we should be good at it. Providing someone with the means to improve his/her life through education is the ultimate, lifelong benefit.

message: Excellent, comprehensive, and thoughtful report. I would emphasize that these recommendations not only make sense because of the social justice it supports but it is also consistent with the Common Ground values that the University says forms its foundations and is committed to and I would also support the end note of livable wages for contracted employees.

message: Your estimates of 2 emergency visits, 1 hospitalization, and 12 physician visits per year are high.

A quick search for data on ED visits found approximately 35 visits per 100 population in California in 2001 (Health Affairs Web Exclusive March 24, 2004).

A quick search for hospitalization rates found that in Massachusetts, there are 11,656 hospitalizations for every 100,000 residents (http://www.mchcf.org/special_initiatives/link_health_atlas.html, see Hospitalization Data All Causes). A report in Health Affairs (cited below) also shows a rate of 118 admissions per 1,000 population. More than 90% of adults have no hospital stays in the past 12 months (www.census.gov/prod/2006pubs/p70-106.pdf).

Data on physician visits was located in Health Affairs (May/June 2003; 22(3): 89-105). The US average in 2000 was 5.8 visits per capita.

Regarding prescription medication, 45% of adults took none during a 12-month period, while 41% took prescription medication throughout the 12-month period (www.census.gov/prod/2006pubs/p70-106.pdf). Data from Canada show approximately 300 days of prescription drugs sold per capita in 2003 (bmj.bmjournals.com/cgi/content/full/331/7520/815). If drugs are dispensed in 30-day supply, that would be 10 prescriptions filled per person per year. Therefore the estimate of 1 drug per month seems reasonable to me.

Sent via email

Hi Jane,

As a part-time faculty member who has been teaching History at UVM since 2001, I would like to comment that part-time faculty members deserve better treatment from their respective departments. Of particular concern is that part-time faculty receive due consideration in hiring when full-time faculty positions become available; it also would be nice to have access to offices and telephones so we can meet with our students outside of class times.

Sent via email

Dear Jane,

After a quick skim of the report I noticed that there is only one graduate student on the committee to three undergraduates, although graduate students comprise a large body of underpaid workers. These are individuals who often have families and, in addition to their own research and classes, teach virtually all of the lab classes on campus. The hours estimated in the job descriptions are more often wishful thinking, or the minimum hours required to do a really rough job. All grad teaching assistants I know work many more hours than paid for, to improve students writing skills, to tutor them one on one, to grade papers and tests and, more importantly, to prepare stimulating and interesting material for their students. I am fortunate to be on a fellowship right now, but if I were required to teach two labs of 15 students every semester for the entire time I were here to do research and take my own classes I am not sure I could finish. I believe that something should be done to better compensate graduate students, and lighten their load a little so they have a few semesters that they don't have to teach, as at other schools. I suggest that initiation of a dialog with graduate students would lead to even better reasearch (and credit for that to UVM), and an even higher standard of undergraduate education at our fine University.

message: I don't recommend using Medical Expenses Panel Survey data, which I examined in preparing my previous message, because out-of-pocket costs vary greatly with the structure of the insurance package. It is more accurate to estimate utilization and then determine the out-of-pocket costs associated with our particular insurance package.

message: I am also forwarding the following comments to the Staff Council, as it is also an appropriate issue for that group to act upon. However, in regards to the preliminary report's comments on training opportunities, I think this comment applicable here as well.

It appears that the tuition remission program applies to current UVM employees taking classes at UVM, or their dependent children taking classes at UVM or certain other

Vermont Colleges (even though this has no direct benefit to the University). It can be extended to current UVM employees living outside a 40 mile radius of the campus taking courses at other sites. However, it does not apply to UVM employees living within the 40 mile radius of the campus who wish to further their education in a program not offered by UVM (i.e. offered by one of the other Vermont Colleges), even if that training would ultimately benefit the University.

message: The recommendations are as fair as they can be given inevitable problems of compression and market forces. ESL should be a strong recommendation. I have always believed that employees whose salaries are less than a certain minimum - or for whom their share of insurance premiums is above a certain percentage of their salary (another way of looking at the same thing) - should receive an extra subvention from their employers.

message: I am not sure which employees are on the list of not being paid enough but I wanted to add Lecturers in case they are not already there. I am a lecturer who currently teaches 7 classes per year and I do not make enough money to cover my mortgage; not even to mention any other bills. Since I am not employed 100% of FTE I am also not eligible for dental, retirement or disability benefits. In addition although I can buy medical benefits, I am forced to do so at a much higher rate than full time employees, which I therefore cannot afford.

UVM offered me this job with the idea that I would be working full time by this year (my second) and that I would get a contract. Neither have been offered to me although I have repeatedly asked. If I do not get a contract or full time workload I may need to move outside of Vermont if I want to afford a house and children.

message: September 20, 2006

To whom it concerns,

This "Preliminary Report" for which comments are solicited appears to apply to staff only.

I am a part-time unpaid faculty member at UVM who has been rendering service at the department, college and university levels.

In less than a year, my 'fixed' income (as from Social Security) will go down to about 2/3 of what I'm receiving now on disability, when I reach retirement age.

I would be nice to know then (i.e., mid 2007) that I had some options, too, to earn more than my present level of zero income from UVM to supplement what I receive from other sources, while continuing to do what I have been doing for UVM.

To this end, is there at UVM a "Basic Needs/Equitable Compensation Task Force" for the case of FACULTY, and a report put out by it that I could access?

I have been working at about the 50% full-time level.

Thank you.

message: The fact that you only find 250 employees at risk for not being able to support a single person household is a joke. I believe you have many more people than that at risk. I think that you must want them to go to the food bank and definitely not have a car and only live in Burlington. Wake up you fat cats and look at apt prices, food prices and the cost of everything else that can't be met on most UVM salaries.

All of the commentary up to this point was received by the time of the Task Force's last meeting prior to issuing the final draft of its report to President Fogel (the morning of September 27, 2006), and was considered in those deliberations. Commentary presented from this point on was received by the Chair of the Task Force after this meeting of the Task Force.

Comments on Preliminary Report of the Basic Needs and Equitable Compensation Task Force

September 27, 2006

The Basic Needs/Equitable Compensation Task Force issued a preliminary report (September 14, 2006) for public comment. After carefully reading the Report we find that it leaves much unsaid, ignores important issues, provides insufficient data to evaluate the impact of their proposal, and contains substantial errors in analysis.

The proposed basic needs budget is flawed. The premise behind a basic needs budget is that there are basic spending needs that can be identified and measured. It presumes that people earning low wages have no choices about how much or what they spend their income on. But people do make choices, and given their budget constraints, they adjust their spending to match their income.

For example, the single largest expenditure category in the proposed basic needs budget (Table 1) is housing, at \$638 per month (the average rent for a 1 bedroom apartment in Chittenden County). This represents 40% of all monthly expenses. Is there any way low-wage UVM workers can reduce their housing costs? For single individuals, one way would be to share a two bedroom apartment, thus reducing monthly housing costs by over \$200 per month.

The second single largest expenditure category is transportation, at \$301 per month. Any UVM employee can use CCTA's bus service at no cost, which means that an employee living near a bus route in Chittenden County would not need to commute to work by car and may not even need to own a car. This would substantially lower the \$301 monthly fee.

The Task Force correctly notes that a basic needs budget will vary based on family size, the number of workers in a family, and the ages of children (if any), but does not consider that a family – or individual's – spending reflects many other choices.

The data in the Task Force report are based on the assumption that low wage employees at UVM are single. The Task Force recommends a wage of \$12.28 as the minimum amount necessary for a single person. But there are no data in the report that tell us how many of the 256 employees earning less than \$12.28 are single with no children. Any employee who has a working spouse or partner has a combined income well above \$12.28 per hour. Table 2 in the Task Force report hints that as few as 89 low wage employees may be single, but we do not know the actual number of employees who are actually making ends meet with their UVM wage and no other source of income.

The Task Force fails to investigate the length of time the typical low wage employee remains at that level. Failure to do so completely ignores the fact that low wage jobs are entry level positions. They serve as an entrée into the workforce and a mechanism for individuals to acquire additional skills, demonstrate reliability, and move to higher paying occupations both within and outside the University. Failure to even consider this issue is, by itself, sufficient to challenge the Task Force's conclusions.

The Task Force makes limited use of economic theory and of economic studies about minimum wages. Standard economic theory predicts that when the wage paid is above the market rate, a variety of things will change. The Task Force fails to consider the less desirable of those changes. First, UVM, like all organizations, has limited fiscal resources. The consequence of increasing wages for entry level workers is quite likely to be that fewer such workers will be hired, and employees whose productivity is less than \$12.28 will not be able to find employment. In addition to the wage loss, those shut out of employment lose access to UVM's exceptionally generous benefits. Although a very generous health insurance policy is one benefit, one of the most important benefits is the free tuition for employee children. For many low wage employees, especially recent immigrants who most likely place a very high premium on education for their children, this benefit is substantial. (The Task Force report implicitly recognizes that many of these employees are immigrants with a poor command of English.) Losing the opportunity to work at UVM would be an enormous loss for these workers.

Second, since it will be paying a higher wage than other employers in Chittenden County pay for similar work, more people will want to work at UVM rather than somewhere else. Many of these workers will have higher skill levels (or be fluent in English, which recent immigrants are not) and will be more sought after employees. Those who are less-skilled will then have opportunities foreclosed to them that would be open in the absence of the higher wages the Task Force recommends.

These observations are based on decades of economic research which can be found in every principles of economics textbook, and the Task Force ignores it all. The only economic analysis that it cites, is the efficiency wage theory. The Task Force report states that "there is evidence that paying employees higher wages has payoffs for the employer in terms of higher productivity and less turnover." Yet the Task Force presents no evidence that there is high turnover at this pay grade at UVM. In addition, efficiency wage theory assumes that increased productivity will result from paying higher than market wages only if two conditions are met. First, those low wage workers must be currently working well below their productive capacity. Second, there must be a credible

threat of firing by the employer if the employee's productivity does not increase. It is unlikely that UVM would fire a worker because his or her productivity is not higher after the wage increase than it was before. In any event to suggest that low wage workers are currently working well below capacity implies that they are badly managed and/or are shirking.

The Task Force notes that there will be salary compression if its recommendations are adopted but does not put a price tag on the cost of reducing the compression. The Task Force estimates the cost of bringing the wage of the 256 workers up to \$12.28 per hour to be approximately \$1 million, including benefits. It notes in passing that there are 726 employees who would be "potentially compressed" affected by wage compression. Actually, all 726 workers would see a compression but the degree of compression is not stated. Very likely, UVM would have to take measures to reduce this compression. If they do not, morale and productivity are bound to suffer. Without access to specific data, it is impossible to estimate the cost to UVM, but it would more than likely raise the total cost of the Task Force's recommendations to far more than \$1 million.

There is no discussion of whether the \$1 million cost of the Task Force Proposal could be better spent elsewhere. The Task Force recommends the University spend \$1 million (and most likely more) to raise the wage of low paid workers so they can achieve a "basic needs budget." As noted earlier, these workers may live in households that have a combined income above any basic needs budget. If the University's ultimate goal is to help low income workers, then the relevant question is whether this is the best way to spend \$1 million in order to accomplish that goal. Would the goal be better served by committing the University to spend the \$1 million on 50 full scholarships of \$20,000 each – tuition, room, board, and all other expenses – for the children of low income Vermont families, for example?

There is no discussion of the revenue source for the \$1 million in expenditures. The Task Force recommendation can only be accomplished by either reallocating \$1 million that are currently spent elsewhere on campus or by raising \$1 million in additional revenues. The most probable source of revenue for this is additional tuition. If the Task Force intended that its recommendation be the basis for analysis, then it would have served that goal better to point out to students, as well as their parents and the community at large, what the tuition impact of a \$1 million expenditure is. If the \$1 million is to come from a reallocation of existing spending, what might that be? If it comes from the budgets of the departments that employ most of the 256 workers, then those departments will most likely cut expenditures in some way, including hiring fewer workers.

The Task Force's recommendations, while well intentioned, are based on a flawed concept of basic needs and are very likely to do more harm than good. The unintended, but completely foreseeable, consequences of the implementation of a higher than market wage will quite likely be reduced employment opportunities for those individuals who need entry level jobs, impaired morale for those more skilled individuals who suffer wage compression, and a diversion of University resources from other more important uses. For these reasons, we recommend that UVM not adopt the recommendations of the Basic Needs Task Force.

Signed:

Arthur Woolf
Associate Professor of Economics

James Gatti
Associate Professor of Business

Stephen Dempsey
Associate Professor of Business

David Harrison
Associate Professor of Business

Thomas Noordewier
Associate Professor of Business

Michael Tomas III
Assistant Professor of Business

Richard Jesse
Associate Professor of Business

David Novak
Assistant Professor of Business

Dear Ms. Knodell,

I am sorry to send this to you personally, however, I could not find the place you referenced on the website for me to comment on the "preliminary report" that you sent out last week. As I applaud the effort that is being made here I have to completely disagree with the dollar amount that the task force has come up with. I have reviewed the report and looked closely at Table 1. I believe that this is not very fair representation of what the average employee pays to live on a monthly basis.

First of all it is based solely on people living within Chittenden county. I understand that you needed a base, however, there are many employees, including myself, who do not live within Chittenden county. This is not a choice that I made, I was forced to move outside of the area because my husband and I cannot afford to live in this area. (we had to move to Port Henry, NY, an hour away) It was a difficult decision to make being that we both were born and raised here, however, we really didn't have any other option.

Second, I challenge you to find a place to live, within Chittenden county, where you could pay \$638.00/month. It's not feasible and I dare say not possible. Next we have transportation costs. \$331, that

would barely cover most people's car payment for the month. I just recently bought a "new" car (used), it's a 2001 and I paid \$7,000, which comes out to be \$221/month, that would leave me with \$110 for maintenance/repairs, gas and parking (if you can get a permit!). Again, not possible, even when living some places in Chittenden county.

Even the estimated telephone expense, \$37/month? I would love to know what company that is. I have never seen a phone bill of less than \$50-\$60/month, and that would be pretty basic.

Savings of \$38. I challenge you to find someone that is in the group being effected by this (myself included) that has ANY money to put into their savings. That \$38 would be spent on utilities, food or something else that has been underestimated in this table. I can tell you that I'm making a mere \$600 less than the proposed annual salary of \$24,066, and even if I had that extra money my husband and I would STILL have to continue working two jobs.

The part that is worst? I graduated from UVM, I have a BA, and all I can find for work is to be an Office/Program Support Generalist? Don't you think that someone who has graduated from this "fine" institution should have a better chance of finding good work? Or at least that UVM would take into consideration that many of us are more than qualified for the positions that we have no choice but to take. I like working at UVM, I am grateful for all of the benefits that are available to me, but benefits can't pay my rent. They can't pay my car payment, they cannot pay for the \$50-\$60/WEEK that I pay in gas to get to and from my home, and they most certainly cannot put food on my table.

I am glad that this issue is being taken seriously by the university and I think this is a good start. However, I sincerely believe that it's still a long way from meeting our basic needs. I would be more than happy to record my monthly budget for you so you could get a real idea of what a basic needs budget would look like. Maybe if you invited others to do that and averaged them out you would come closer to meeting the annual salary that we so desperately need.

Thank you for all of the time, energy and effort that you have dedicated to this issue. I truly appreciate what the task force is trying to do and genuinely hope that this succeeds. It will directly effect me and it feels good to know there are people here that care.

Sincerely,
Tiffany Hartwell