

VERMONT ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD
10 V.S.A. §§ 6001-6092

RE: George and Diana Davis
d/b/a Bates Mansion at Brook Farm

Land Use Permit
2S1129 -EB

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

This proceeding concerns an appeal of Land Use Permit #2S1129 (Permit) and accompanying Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order (Decision) issued to George and Diana Davis d/b/a Bates Mansion at Brook Farm (Permittees) authorizing the previous construction of site improvements and the operation of the event facility permitted in Water Supply and Wastewater Disposal Permit #WW-2-1125 (Project). The Project is located on Twenty Mile Stream Road in Cavendish, Vermont.

I. Procedural History

On February 27, 2004, the District # 2 Environmental Commission (Commission) issued the Permit and Decision.

On March 17, 2004, Permittees filed an appeal with the Environmental Board (Board) from the Permit and Decision alleging that the Commission erred in its conclusions with respect to Conditions 17, 18, 19 and 20 concerning Criteria 1(B) and 8.

On April 22, 2004, Board Chair Pat Moulton Powden convened a Prehearing Conference and on May 5, 2004, she issued a Prehearing Conference Report and Order (PCRO). The PCRO granted party status to the following neighboring property owners; William and Nancy Buswell, Keith and Brenda Buswell, Jonathon Buswell, and George and Karen Langlais.

On August 5, 2004, a Panel of the Board convened a hearing and on August 18, 2004, the Panel deliberated.

On September 29, 2004, the Panel issued Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order (Panel Decision) and proposed Land Use Permit #2S1129-EB (EB Permit) to Permittees.

On October 14, 2004, Permittees filed a motion to alter the Panel Decision.¹

¹ Motions to alter are typically filed to request changes to a Board decision. In the instant case, the Board will treat the Permittees' motion to alter as an objection to the Panel Decision and address the concerns in the Discussion section.

On November 17, 2004, the full Board deliberated on Permittees' motion to alter the proposed Panel Decision and EB Permit.

II. Issues

1. Whether, and to what extent the Project complies with Criterion 1(B).²
2. Whether, and to what extent the Project complies with Criterion 8 (aesthetics).

III. Discussion

Permittees' motion to alter raises three issues. No party filed a response to the Permittees' motion. First, Permittees are concerned that language in the EB Permit that references the Permittees' plans and exhibits may cause confusion because there was more than one set of plans. Permittees want it to be clear that they must follow the Richard Salz Plans. Assuming Richard Salz's plans were incorporated into the Panel's Decision, Permittees were not necessarily seeking any change in the language of the EB Permit.

The Board always imposes a permit condition that requires applicants to complete, operate, and maintain projects in accordance with the plans and exhibits on file with the Board. The Board imposes this condition in order to ensure that the project is completed, operated, and maintained the same way the applicant represented it would to the Board. This requirement has been imposed in every permit and has not been a source of confusion. In this case, there is even less likelihood of any confusion because the Panel's Decision imposes specific conditions that were suggested by the testimony and exhibits of Richard Salz. Therefore, the Board sees no need to alter this part of the Panel Decision.

Second, Permittees provide a minor correction to Finding of Fact #6 that there is a "20 foot by 24 foot dance floor under the tent." Permittees correctly point out that half of the dance floor is under the barn. Therefore, the first sentence of Finding of Fact #6 will be altered to read as follows: "There is a 20 foot by 24 foot dance floor, half of which is under the tent and half in the barn."

Third, Permittees urge the Board to allow them flexibility to hold weddings on Sundays when there is a three day weekend, with Monday as a holiday. The

² At the hearing the Permittees withdrew their appeal on Criterion 1(B). No party objected.

Board only allowed later music curfews on Saturday nights because that is when the weddings took place. The Board recognizes that the same logic should apply to the occasional Sunday wedding that occurs on a three day weekend.

Therefore, Finding of Fact #7 will be altered to read as follows. "The music at the weddings on Saturday nights and on Sunday nights of a Monday holiday weekend ends at 11:00 p.m." The relevant portion of Condition #19 of the EB Permit shall read as follows: "The music shall end by 10:00 p.m. on weeknights and 11:00 p.m. on Saturday nights and Sunday nights of a Monday holiday weekend." The relevant portions of the second full paragraph of page 11 of the Conclusions of Law shall read as follows: "The music shall end by 10:00 p.m. on weeknights and 11:00 p.m. on Saturday nights and Sunday nights of a Monday holiday weekend. The band must finish packing up by 11:30 p.m. on Saturday nights and Sunday nights of a Monday holiday weekend."

IV. Findings of Fact

To the extent any proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law are included below, they are granted; otherwise, they are denied. *See, Secretary, Agency of Natural Resources v. Upper Valley Regional Landfill Corporation*, 167 Vt. 228, 241-42 (1997); *Petition of Village of Hardwick Electric Department*, 143 Vt. 437, 445 (1983).

Project Operations

1. The Project hosts weddings and other formal events from May to October. The weddings typically are multi-day events with the guests arriving on Thursday night and departing on Sunday. There are approximately 25 weddings held at the Project each year.

2. Rehearsal dinners are held outside on the lawn to the north of Bates Mansion. There are outdoor tables on the lawn. Rehearsal dinners usually are held on Friday nights and start around 6:00 p.m. and finish around 8:00 p.m. There is seldom music involved and the only noise is from the chatter of the 35 to 40 guests.

3. The wedding ceremony usually occurs in the garden to the south of Bates Mansion. Most weddings involve 125 to 150 people.

4. The wedding reception is held in a 22 foot tall tent that is attached to the horse barn located west of the Bates Mansion. A live band performs at most weddings. The stage is in the barn portion and faces south toward the tent.

5. There is soundproofing on 3 sides of the stage. The roof has exposed beams. There are sound proofing panels on the tent walls nearest the stage. The tent has plastic window walls that can be pulled down. There are 6 speakers, 2 of which face the band.

6. There is a 20 foot by 24 foot dance floor, half of which is under the tent and half in the barn. The rest of the tent has green outdoor carpeting over gravel. The outside area around the tent is mowed grass.

7. The music at the weddings on Saturday nights and on Sunday nights of a Monday holiday weekend ends at 11:00 p.m. It often takes the band an additional 30 minutes to pack up and leave the Project site. Other nights of the week, any music must end by 10:00 p.m.

8. Wedding guests often remain on the Project site after the 11:00 p.m. ending of the reception. The wedding guests often engage in conversations on the Project grounds that can be heard at neighboring properties. Some wedding guests occasionally engage in extracurricular activities late at night that can be especially annoying due to the volume and the hour of the night.

9. The extracurricular activities could be controlled if there were an event manager on site. Mr. Davis sleeps on the third floor of the Bates Mansion. However, there is not someone assigned to control late night noise.

10. The wedding party and some guests sleep at the Bates Mansion and other buildings on the Project site. There are currently 11 bedrooms available for up to 25 people. Bates Mansion is a large, historically significant building.

11. There is a porch that wraps around from the northeast side around to the south side of the Bates Mansion. Some guests engage in quiet conversation on the porch after events at the Project.

12. The Project also hosts other events during weekdays including formal parties for sororities and fraternities. These events usually occur in May. The guests are often bused in and the buses are parked in front of the Bates Mansion which deflects sound away from the nearest neighbors. Since the Permittees have followed this protocol for bus parking, there have been no complaints concerning the buses.

Project Site and Environs

13. In addition to the Bates Mansion and Horse Barn/tent area, the beautifully landscaped grounds include the Cow Barn, Pig House, Chicken Coop, Cheese House, and Field House. Some of these buildings are currently used to house guests. Others are in various states of disrepair.

14. The area surrounding the Project is a quiet rural residential neighborhood. The Project is reached via Twenty Mile Stream Road, a lightly traveled road that connects to Highway 131. The Project site is located far enough from busy Highway 131 that no traffic noises are audible. Twenty Mile Stream Road has a gravel surface near the Project site.

15. There are no other commercial or industrial facilities near the Project site. Ambient noise levels are 38 to 42 dBA as measured during the day.

16. There are several homes located in the neighborhood including the homes of William and Nancy Buswell, Keith and Brenda Buswell, Jonathon Buswell, and George and Karen Langlais (collectively referred to as the "Neighbors"). The homes are separated by a mixture of forest and pasture.

17. Of these homes, William and Nancy Buswell's home is the closest to the Project at 630 feet away. Their house is located across a small ravine and is at a slightly higher elevation than the Project. The house is clearly visible from the porch of the Bates Mansion and the rehearsal dinner area through a thin band of trees. Because William and Nancy Buswell's property boundary with the Permittee is down in a ravine, this area is not of concern to the parties.

18. The other Neighbors' homes are located further up Twenty Mile Stream Road. None of the other homes are visible from the Project tract. All of the Neighbors' homes are at a higher elevation than Bates Mansion.

Project's Noise Impacts

19. An on-site sound technician is in charge of the music volume for Saturday nights. The technician runs the amplified music through a limiter, which controls the maximum volume. The limiter has no impact on acoustic drum sets which are not plugged in to the amplifier. As measured at 3 feet away from the speakers, the music will not be turned up over 90 dBA. The sound technician is the only staff person on-site after 11:00 p.m. but he typically leaves by 11:30 p.m.

20. A sound test was performed with the music bypassing the limiter and amplifying the music at 95 dBA as measured 3 feet in front of the speakers.

At 20 feet away from the speakers, the music was 85 dBA. At the end of the tent, the music was 79 dBA. In the garden, the music was 42 dBA.

21. At William and Nancy Buswell's house there was no measurable difference between the ambient noise level without the music from the Project and the noise level with the music from the Project. If the music does not result in a measurable difference at the closest location, it will not result in a measurable difference at another Neighbors' house located farther away.

22. The music is audible at the nearby houses, even if it is not measurable. In addition, other noises associated with parties including loud conversations and occasional yelling can be heard at nearby residences. Just because a noise is not measurable, does not necessarily mean it is not annoying, especially late at night.

23. The Project can meet a 45 dBA Lmax noise level as measured at the nearest residence or outdoor area of frequent use. The Permittee must also ensure that the limiter is tamper proof and cannot be bypassed.

24. Any noise over normal conversation level is forbidden on the porch and outside grounds after 10:00 p.m. week nights and 11:00 p.m. Saturday nights and on Sunday nights of a Monday holiday weekend.

25. An on-scene manager who can be contacted in case there is a violation of any of the noise limitations would alleviate some of the Neighbors' concerns about excessive noise. The Permittees acknowledged that an on-site manager can be provided.

26. The Permittees' sound expert proposed several additional measures to further reduce the amount of noise that the Neighbors would hear. These measures include installing sound deadening panels around the inside of the stage and dance floor area and on the side of the tent that faces the Bates Mansion, constructing a wall that encloses the stage area where the amplification equipment is currently located, taping and sealing the wall with joint compound on both sides, installing interior shutters for the part of the barn that is under the tent, but does not abut the stage, and augmenting the joint between the tent and the barn with a layer of acoustic panel material to provide a better seal. These measures would significantly mitigate the noise from the live music at the events.

IV. Conclusions of Law

Criterion 8

Under Criterion 8, before issuing a permit, the Board must find the proposed Project will not have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historic sites or rare or irreplaceable natural areas. 10 V.S.A. §6086(a)(8). The parties' only concern under Criterion 8 is aesthetics, which includes noise from the Project.

1. Burden of Proof

The burden of proof under Criterion 8 is on those who oppose the Project, 10 V.S.A. §6088(b), but the applicant for the permit must provide sufficient information for the Board to make affirmative findings. *See, Re: Southwestern Vermont Health Care Corp.*, #8B0537-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 28 (Feb. 22, 2001); *Re: Black River Valley Rod & Gun Club, Inc.*, #2S1019-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 19 (Jun. 12, 1997) and cases cited therein.

2. Adverse Affect

The Board relies upon a two-part test to determine whether a project satisfies Criterion 8. First, it determines whether the project will have an adverse affect under Criterion 8. *Re: James E. Hand and John R. Hand, d/b/a Hand Motors and East Dorset Partnership*, #8B0444-6-EB (Revised), Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 24-25 (Aug. 19, 1996), *citing Re: Quechee Lakes Corp.*, #3W0411-EB and #3W0439-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 17 -19 (Nov. 4, 1985).

[T]he Board looks to whether a proposed project will be in harmony with its surroundings or, in other words, whether it will "fit" the context within which it will be located. In making this evaluation, the Board examines a number of specific factors, including the nature of the project's surroundings, the compatibility of the project's design with those surroundings, the suitability for the project's context of the colors and materials selected for the project, the locations from which the project can be viewed, and the potential impact of the project on open space.

Hand, supra, at 25, citing, *Quechee, supra*, at 18. In other words, if a project "fits" its context, it will not have an adverse affect. If the Board concludes that the Project has an adverse affect under Criterion 8, the Board moves to the second part of the test and evaluates whether the adverse affect is "undue."

a. The context of the Project

To decide whether this Project would “fit” the context of the area, the Board first has to determine what that context is. The Project is located in a quiet rural residential area. The ambient noise level during the day is between 38 and 42 dBA. There are no other commercial or industrial activities in the immediate neighborhood. The Project is accessed off of Twenty Mile Stream Road, a quiet, lightly traveled road.

b. The impact of the Project on its context

Once the Board determines the context of the Project site, the Board then must consider the scope and extent of the Project's impacts on that context. The Project will create noise including amplified music, bus noise, increased traffic, party noise, and outdoor conversations. The question, then, is whether the noise produced by the Project is out of character with the setting. *Re: Barre Granite Quarries, LLC and William and Margaret Dyott, #7C1079 (Revised)-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order at 79-80 (Dec. 8, 2000); Charles and Barbara Bickford, #5W1186-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 33 (May 22, 1995); John and Marion Gross, #5W1198-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order at 10 (April 27, 1995); R.J. Colton Company, Inc., #9A0082-1R-2-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 11 (January 14, 1982).* This is a qualitative and quantitative determination, involving both an examination of the type and volume of noise that the Project will generate and the neighboring land uses.

Board precedent has long held that different types of noises must be treated differently. Sharp, intermittent or high frequency noises must be judged differently from low frequency continuous noises. In *Re: Bull's Eye Sporting Center et al., #5W0743-2-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 17 (Feb. 27, 1997)*, the Board wrote:

The impact or quality of noise is not entirely reflected by decibel rating. The degree of noise annoyance must also consider the duration and intermittency of noise. Impulse noises, such as gunshots, are often judged to be "noisier" or more unwanted than non-impulsive noises have the same total integrated energy.

And see, Re: Black River Valley Rod & Gun Club, supra, at 19.

In the instant matter, the Project's loud music and party noise do not fit within the surrounding context. The Board, therefore, concludes that this Project will be out of character with its surroundings and will have an adverse affect on the aesthetics of this area.

3. Undue Adverse Affect

If the Board concludes that the Project has an adverse affect, the Board must evaluate whether the adverse affect is “undue.” The Board will conclude that adverse affect is “undue” if it reaches a positive finding with respect to any one of the following factors:

Does the Project violate a clear, written community standard intended to preserve the aesthetics or scenic beauty of the area?

Does the Project offend the sensibilities of the average person? Is it offensive or shocking because it is out of character with its surroundings or significantly diminishes the scenic qualities of the area?

Has the Applicant failed to take generally available mitigating steps which a reasonable person would take to improve the harmony of the Project with its surroundings?

See, Quechee Lakes, supra, at 19-20; And see, Hand, supra, at 25-29.

a. Written Community Aesthetic Standard

Under this first factor, the Board must determine whether the Project violates a clear, written community standard intended to preserve the aesthetics or scenic beauty applicable to the area in which the Project would be located. In evaluating whether a project violates a clear written community standard, the Board routinely looks to town plans, open land studies, and other municipal documents to discern whether a clear, written community standard exists and should be applied in the review of the aesthetic impacts of a project. *See Raymond and Centry Duff, #5W0952-2-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order at 9 (Jan 29, 1998).* There was no evidence produced of an applicable clear, written community standard. Therefore, the Board will turn to the remaining two factors.

b. Shocking or offensive

Under this second aesthetic factor, the Board must determine whether the Project offends the sensibilities of the average person. This includes whether the Project would be so out of character with its surroundings or so significantly diminish the scenic qualities of the area as to be offensive or shocking to the average person. *Re: Pike Industries, Inc. and William E. Dailey, Inc., #1R0807-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 18 - 19 (Jun. 25, 1998);*

Duppstadt, supra, at 35; and see, *Re: Robert B. & Deborah J. McShinsky*, #3W0530-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 9 (Apr. 21, 1988), *aff'd*, *In re Robert and Deborah McShinsky*, 153 Vt. 586 (1990).

The Board has already determined that the noise from the Project will be out of character for that area. The question is not merely whether the possible noise from the Project is out of character with the surrounding area but whether it is *so out of character* as to be aesthetically shocking or offensive to the ordinary person.

The determination turns on whether the noise from the Project is merely annoying or whether it will dramatically interrupt the setting. *Re: Talon Hill Gun Club and John Swinington*, #9A0192-2-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order (Jun. 7, 1995). The Board notes that while the noise from the Project is audible at the Neighbors' homes, it is not significant enough to register a measurable difference.

The Board will require certain sound levels to be met by the Permittees as regards noise as discussed below. Given these limitations, the Board concludes that the noise generated by the operation of the Project will not rise to the level that it could be considered offensive or shocking.

c. Mitigation

Pursuant to 10 V.S.A. §6086(c), the Board has the authority to impose conditions necessary to alleviate adverse impacts with respect to the ten Act 250 criteria. As long as a condition constitutes a proper exercise of the police power and alleviates adverse affects that would otherwise be caused by a project, the Board may impose the condition.

In judging whether there should be mitigation, the Board looks to the steps that the applicant has taken or may take to reduce the aesthetic impacts of a project on the character of the area where it is proposed; the Board asks whether there are generally available mitigating steps that have or should be taken to improve the harmony of the project with its surroundings. *See Re: Thomas W. Bryant and John P. Skinner, supra*, at 22 (height and exterior color restrictions on homes, plantings to screen the development, covenants to govern future activities on the site, and retained open space all comprised generally available mitigating steps to alleviate adverse effects of subdivision on the surrounding area).

In addressing the question of noise, the Board generally considers the maximum sound level and the hours of operation. *Hannaford Brothers Co. and Southland Enterprises, Inc.*, #4C0238-5-EB Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order (Altered) at 23 (Nov. 27, 2002). In *Hannaford*, the Board stated that it sets the maximum sound level or Lmax and leaves it up to the permittee to determine how to meet the standard.

As to the first factor - sound levels - the Board has not attempted to instruct applicants as to how they should operate their businesses; rather, the Board has set maximums on the level of noise (Lmax) that proposed projects will be allowed to create and then left applicants to their own devices to determine how those levels will be met.

Id.

The Board has historically set maximum sound levels at either the applicant's property line or at relevant receptors on neighboring properties, or both. *Barre Granite*. In *Barre Granite* the Board set a maximum allowable noise level for when noise is unduly adverse at 55 dBA Lmax at any residence or outdoor area of frequent human use and 70 dBA Lmax at the property boundary. However, in the instant case, given that the closest property line is down in a ravine which is of little concern to any party, the Board will not focus on the property boundaries.

Since *Barre Granite*, the Board has continued to utilize the dBA Lmax as a standard, although on occasion it has made minor modifications to the allowable Lmax level based on the particular facts and circumstances of a case. For example in *Dominic A. Cersosimo and Dominic A. Cersosimo Trustee and Cersosimo Industries, Inc.*, #2W0813-3 (Revised) -EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 13 (Apr. 19, 2001), the Board set a standard of 50 dBA Lmax at any residence or outdoor area of frequent human use because of specific language in the town plan that stated noise from quarries should not be an inconvenience or burden to neighbors. In *Re: Alpine Stone Corporation, ADA Chester Corporation, and Ugo Quazzo*, #2S1103-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 33 (Feb. 4, 2002), the Board set a standard of 55 dBA Lmax at any residence or area of frequent use.

The Board notes that most of its earlier precedent such as *Barre Granite*, *Cersosimo* and *Alpine Stone* set only one maximum noise level because these operations ran only during the day. However, in *Hannaford*, the Project generated noise during the day and night. The Board adopted noise maximums based on a stipulation of 55 or 60 dBA Lmax depending on location for the

project's daytime operations and 45 or 50 dBA Lmax for the project's nighttime operations.

In the instant case, the Project operates from the late afternoon till late in the evening. The Permittees projected that the Project will not measurably add to the 38 to 42 dBA daytime ambient noise level presently experienced in the area nearby where the neighbors reside. Under *Hannaford's* stricter noise standard for night time activities, the Board will impose a noise maximum level of 45 dBA Lmax at the nearest residence or outdoor area of frequent use. The demand limiter which sets the maximum volume for the amplifier must be tamper proof and operated only by the sound technician.

Assuming the accuracy of the noise projections by Permittees' sound expert, the Permittees should have little difficulty meeting these limitations. See, *Old Vermonter Wood Products and Richard Atwood, #5W1305-EB*, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 15 (Aug. 19, 1999) ("The Board will accept the [traffic] numbers presented by the Permittees and then require the Permittees to operate within their stated predictions.") The Permittees' expert specifically testified that the Project could meet the 45 dBA Lmax permit condition.

The music shall end by 10:00 p.m. on weeknights and 11:00 p.m. on Saturday nights and Sunday nights of a Monday holiday weekend. The band must finish packing up by 11:30 p.m. on Saturday nights and Sunday nights of a Monday holiday weekend. In addition, the Board will require that the Permittees not permit any noise over normal conversation level on the porch of Bates Mansion or on the outside grounds after 10:00 p.m. on week nights and 11:00 p.m. on Saturday nights. The Permittees shall also post notices to inform the guests of the noise curfew, assign a staff member to enforce these rules and to be available for neighbors to contact in case of a problem. The Permittees shall continue the existing bus protocol.

However, even if the noise from the Project is not measurable at the Neighbors' residences, it can still be annoying. The Permittees suggested the following additional mitigative measures which the Board will require in an effort to reduce the audible noise as much as feasible.

The Permittees shall install sound deadening panels around the inside of the stage and dance floor area and from the side of the tent that faces the Bates Mansion. The Permittees shall also construct a wall that encloses the stage area where the amplification equipment is currently located. The wall should be located behind the sound deadening panels and should be constructed using

typical 2 x 4 construction consisting of 5/8" fire code sheet rock on both sides, with insulation such as Certainteed CertaPro AcoutaTherm fiberglass batts. The wall shall be taped and sealed with joint compound on both sides. The Permittees shall also install interior shutters for the part of the barn that is under the tent, but does not abut the stage. These shall be closed during events with music. The joint between the tent and the barn shall be augmented with a layer of acoustic panel material to provide a better seal.

The Board also notes with approval that the Permittees have also installed a "bass-shaker" device which creates vibrations and a perception of increased volume for the guests on the dance floor with little to no acoustic output to the environment. However, given that the Permittees' explained that the purpose of the device is to add a sense of excitement and the name of the model is the "Buttkicker Concert," the Board will not specifically require it as a permit condition.

The above conditions shall supersede Condition 19 of the Commission's Permit. The Board concludes that if the Permittees take the above available mitigating steps to improve the harmony of the Project with its surroundings, the affects of this Project will not be unduly adverse, and the Project thus complies with Criterion 8.

V. Order

1. The Project complies with 10 V.S.A. §6086(a)(8).
2. Land Use Permit #2S1129-EB is issued. The required improvements must be made prior to the 2005 operating season.
3. Jurisdiction is returned to the District 2 Environmental Commission.

Dated at Montpelier, Vermont this 15th day of December, 2004.

ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD

/s/Patricia Moulton Powden
Patricia Moulton Powden, Chair
George Holland

Sam Lloyd
Willaim Martinez
Patricia Nowak
Alice Olenick
Karen Paul
Jean Richardson
A. Gregory Rainville