Lee Swislow Joins GLAD as Executive Director

Lee Swislow, a top non-profit executive with extensive experience advocating for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people and those with HIV and AIDS, joined GLAD as its new executive director effective May 23, 2005.

“We are thrilled and fortunate to have Lee join us during this extraordinary period of success for GLAD,” said board president Mark C. Kelley. “She has a deep and accomplished management background and a passion for social justice. Lee is just the person to lead GLAD in its ground-breaking fight for equal justice under law.”

Swislow came to GLAD from the Justice Resource Institute, where as Vice President for Health Programs and Executive Director of the Sidney Borum Jr. Health Center she oversaw a broad array of programs providing services to underserved populations, with a focus on adolescents and young adults.

“Joining a cutting-edge LGBT organization with arguably the finest legal team in the country is very exciting,” said Swislow. “It’s a great time for GLAD to build on its strengths and fortify its position advancing the legal rights of LGBT people and those with HIV and AIDS. GLAD’s accomplishments are disproportionate to its size – it’s the little engine that could.”

Swislow said a top priority will be GLAD’s New England Outreach Initiative. “To win rights and sustain those wins, we need to enlarge the circles of support for LGBT rights.

New England Outreach Initiative: Expanding Circles of Support

With the creation of several new positions, GLAD launched an unprecedented multi-state New England Outreach Initiative. Building on lessons learned before, during, and after Goodridge, GLAD will collaborate with state-level organizations to build public environments that support and sustain advances in LGBT legal rights.

“A mobilized community played a critical role in sustaining Goodridge, both in the political arena and in the court of public opinion,” said Executive Director Lee Swislow. “Legal victories alone are not enough if they can be undermined by vocal minorities.

“As the only state with marriage equality, Massachusetts is a magnet for national right-wing mobilization. We have to mobilize equally as well as our opponents, and support efforts in other
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My first month at GLAD has been both exhilarating and sobering. It’s fantastic to be working at such a historic time with what I think is the best LGBT legal team in the country.

But it’s also clear that the national anti-gay movement is focusing their enormous energy and vast wealth on stopping progress in Massachusetts. In just a few short weeks:

- The National Review published an article attacking Mary Bonauto and her undergraduate alma mater, Hamilton College, which gave her an honorary degree;
- National anti-gay groups came to Massachusetts to picket the high school graduations of communities that have supported diverse families in their schools; and
- A coalition of national right-wing groups announced a new drive to put an anti-gay, anti-marriage equality constitutional amendment on the Massachusetts ballot in 2008.

Make no mistake – it’s very important to our opponents to isolate Massachusetts, and to take marriage away from the thousands of couples who have wed since May 17, 2004. Marriage in Massachusetts lets the whole country know that marriage equality IS a possible dream, that married same-sex couples can live in complete harmony in their communities and in their neighborhoods, and that politicians can vote for marriage equality and still be re-elected! In addition, marriage in Massachusetts is an inspiration for LGBT people around the country. No wonder the attacks from our opponents are so relentless.

Our new Outreach Initiative is one tool we will use to stop the right-wing agenda from encroaching on LGBT rights in New England. We are working throughout New England to enlarge circles of support for our rights and help build strong, locally-based movements. Where we can – in Connecticut, for example, with Kerrigan-Mock v. Department of Public Health – we are working towards complete marriage equality.

GLAD has been opening the doors to LGBT civil rights since 1978. With your help, I’m looking forward to achieving more victories and meeting all challenges.
Maine Passes Non-Discrimination Law

By Mary Bonauto

“It’s the law!” declared Gov. John Baldacci of Maine on March 31, as he slowly (with many ceremonial pens) but triumphantly signed a bill ending discrimination against LGBT people in employment, housing, education, public accommodations and credit.

“A small number of people were in the room, but thousands around the state heard those words and can take them to heart,” said Betsy Smith, Executive Director of EqualityMaine, the lead grassroots lobbying organization responsible for passage of the law.

As GLAD’s representative to EqualityMaine’s special legislative committee, known as Legislative Action 2005, I helped draft what we think is the strongest non-discrimination law yet seen in Maine. With a small group of Maine attorneys and EqualityMaine’s lobbyists par excellence (Moose Ridge Associates), we found people who were willing to testify about their personal experiences of discrimination and answered every possible question legislators had about the bill.

Making discrimination visible was key. A cruel irony arose from voter repeals of two previous non-discrimination legislative efforts (in 1998 and 2000). Those repeals, which generated fear in our community and emboldened those who discriminate, were nonetheless regarded as confirmation that there is no problem with anti-LGBT discrimination in Maine.

Just eight days before the vote, a powerful hearing before the joint Judiciary Committee helped to dispel that notion. The first hour was packed with Mainers who have in fact faced discrimination at the hands of their fellow citizens. Michele Duval talked about how her once exuberant daughter started coming home from school drenched in tears because her classmates taunted her as a lesbian. Duval was able to enroll her daughter in a private school nearby, but at a cost that was greater than her annual income.

Martin Ripley, making heroic efforts to contain his pain, cried as he described reluctantly quitting a great job after repeated death threats turned into a physical attack. For over a decade, Mr. Ripley has been terminated from jobs despite positive performance as soon as his employers realized he is gay. Marty Hagglund told how the bank she'd been with her whole adult life would no longer do business with her after she transitioned to being a woman. A male couple who had visited Maine from New York testified (by letter) that an innkeeper yelled at them that they “hated women” and asked them to leave the inn when she realized they were gay.

Allies including a school superintendent, Attorney General Steven Rowe, and a Catholic priest spoke clearly and forcefully as well. But the person who brought down the house was Rachel Talbot-Ross, President of the NAACP in Portland. An African-American and 9th generation Mainer, she asked legislators to summon the courage to do what is “righteous and moral,” and invoked the example of her father who had co-sponsored the first gay-inclusive non-discrimination bill in Maine.

Opponents spoke from talking points prepared by right-wing legal groups and Concerned Women for America, hitting every hot button issue: the slippery slope to incest and pedophilia, teaching about gay people in schools, special rights for gay people, predators in women’s bathrooms, and last but certainly not least – civil unions and marriage. The Christian Civic League is pursing this last argument aggressively to persuade tentative voters not to follow through on their commitment to non-discrimination. Of course, there is no legal relationship between the two issues, and what opponents really object to is treating gay people fairly under law in any area of life.

After a strong committee vote, capturing for the first time the vote of Republican Senator David Hastings, the matter turned to the House and Senate. Both chambers strongly supported the bill. The real question was whether they would attach a referendum provision requiring voter approval before it would go into effect. Despite the drumbeat from the opposition that the people had voted before, the winning argument was that it was the legislature’s job to pass bills, and the opponents’ to gather signatures and force a vote if they thought they had a better policy. That argument carried strongly in the Senate, and 76-74 in the House.

As of this writing, the opponents are at work gathering signatures on “people’s veto” petitions and must gather 50,519 valid signatures by June 28 at 5 p.m. [See update above.] Hoping for the best but planning for the worst, Maine Won’t Discriminate, a campaign organization, is already at work making the case to voters about why they should retain the non-discrimination law. Stay tuned.
GLAD has filed a brief with the Vermont Supreme Court in the ongoing dispute between Janet Miller-Jenkins (of Vermont) and Lisa Miller-Jenkins (now of Virginia) over custody and visitation regarding their daughter. GLAD, with local counsel Theodore A. Parisi, Jr., represents Janet in her effort to maintain a relationship with her child.

While the litigation continues in both Vermont and Virginia, Janet has not seen her daughter, now three years old, since June 2004.

In the current appeal, Lisa has asked the Vermont Supreme Court to reverse three Vermont Family Court rulings:

- A September 2004 contempt ruling, issued because Lisa failed to comply with the court’s order that Janet be allowed to have visitation and telephone calls with her child.
- The court’s November 2004 declaration recognizing Janet to be the child’s legal parent, as the child was born while Janet and Lisa were legally joined in a Vermont civil union.
- The court’s December 2004 refusal to enforce a Virginia court judgment declaring Lisa to be the sole legal parent and excluding any continued relationship between Janet and her child.

In an effort to avoid the Vermont court’s June 2004 visitation order, Lisa started a new legal action in Virginia in July 2004 seeking to take advantage of Virginia’s so-called Defense of Marriage Act, which excludes any recognition of the civil union Lisa and Janet had together entered into.

“The Vermont Family Court properly heard this case as filed by Lisa and determined that Janet is a parent of this child and entitled to ongoing, regular contact with her daughter,” said Gary Buseck, GLAD’s legal director.

Lambda Legal, Equality Virginia and the ACLU of Virginia represent Janet in the Virginia action; she is represented in the Vermont appeal by GLAD.
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New England states to achieve marriage where it’s possible.”

Working closely with GLAD’s legal team, the Outreach Initiative will combine coalition building with technical assistance, media and message training, and information sharing across state lines. GLAD will put outreach workers on the ground in Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, and has already done so in Maine.

“What we know is that education is needed on issues of discrimination facing lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people in Maine,” said Betsy Smith, Executive Director of EqualityMaine. “We are fortunate to have such a valuable resource as GLAD in our back yard and we praise GLAD’s commitment to allocate the resources necessary to provide this education.”

To lead the new Initiative, GLAD has hired Alexis K. Hill, who has a sterling record as a grassroots organizer, judicial educator and legislative lawyer. A graduate of Smith College and Georgetown University Law Center, Alexis has spent the last five years in Washington, D.C. as the Associate Director for Lawyer Chapters for the American Constitution Society and program director for the National Association of Women Judges.

“There are so many people who are hungry for ways to get more involved and support GLAD’s work,” said Hill. “The Outreach Initiative will enable us to give those people the tools to make a difference.”
Preserving Marriage Equality in Massachusetts

On May 25, 2005, the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court rejected last of the legal challenges to marriage, *Doyle v. Goodridge*. Despite majority support for marriage equality in Massachusetts, marriage opponents continue their political efforts to turn back the clock and make marriage disappear.

A constitutional convention in the fall will consider for the second time a constitutional amendment to ban marriage while mandating civil unions. And on June 16, a coalition of right-wing groups announced a citizens’ petition drive to put a different amendment on the ballot in 2008, one that would simply take away marriage, leaving our families completely unprotected.

“Thousands of couples have married with no harm coming to anyone in the state,” said GLAD executive director Lee Swislow. “Clearly most people in Massachusetts are ready to move on, but there are some extremists who just won’t let go. So we all have to continue to fight.”

For more information about the battle to preserve marriage in Massachusetts, visit www.massequality.org.

GLAD Celebrates A Year of Marriage

The LGBT community and its allies enjoyed a happy day on May 17, 2005, the first anniversary of marriage equality in Massachusetts. GLAD celebrated with a party, a photo exhibit at the Boston Public Library, and with this family photo: hundreds of married couples and their supporters in front of the State House.
Civil Unions Come to Connecticut

After a year of groundwork and two months of emotional lobbying, hearings, and debate, Connecticut’s legislature voted to grant civil unions to gay and lesbian couples, stopping short of marriage. Shortly after legislators passed the bill, Governor Jodi Rell signed it into law. The bill included language that restricted marriage to unions between a man and a woman. Civil unions will go into effect on October 1, 2005.

“Connecticut’s legislature has recognized the existence of same-sex families and has stepped up to the plate to provide those families with much-needed legal protections,” said GLAD Civil Rights Project Director Mary Bonauto. “But they have also put couples in a catch-22 situation: they can only have legal protections by signing up for a separate and stigmatized legal status. We look forward to the time when Connecticut’s same-sex couples have the same simple and fair choice to marry as other couples.”

The law creates a legal status parallel to civil marriage at the state level, in which the parties to the civil union “shall have all the same benefits, protections, and responsibilities under [Connecticut] law...as are granted to spouses in a marriage...”.

Connecticut’s Love Makes a Family fought for marriage and succeeded in pushing the marriage discussion forward. A major victory was the pro-marriage stance taken by the Hartford Courant in an editorial on February 18, 2005, which asserted, “Civil unions fall short of marriage.”

GLAD will continue to make the case for marriage with its lawsuit Kerrigan & Mock v. Department of Public Health, filed in New Haven Superior Court in August 2004. Some of the lawsuit’s plaintiffs expressed disappointment with the legislature’s actions. Janet Peck of Colchester, who has been committed to her partner Carol Conklin for 29 years, said, “Marriage best reflects the deep love and level of commitment that we have shared for nearly three decades. Only marriage reflects the truth of who we are together and what we mean to each other.”

“While civil unions provide state-based legal rights, couples joined in them are even more likely to face discrimination against their relationships by other states, and cannot make any claim to the 1,138 federal rights associated with marriage,” said Bonauto. “They also impose a badge of inferiority on gay people and same-sex relationships.”

GLAD attorneys Mary Bonauto, Bennett Klein, Karen Loewy and Jennifer Levi are at work on the case, as well as Horton, Shields & Knox attorneys Kenneth Bartschi and Karen Dowd, New Haven attorney Maureen Murphy, and Annette Lamoreaux of the Connecticut Civil Liberties Union.
What’s the difference?

Civil Unions and Marriage

There is a difference. Civil unions will provide state-based legal rights that normally come with marriage, and that is a tremendous advance over where things stood previously in Connecticut.

However, marriage is more than the sum of its legal parts: it is a social, cultural, and legal institution providing protections to the married family on each of those levels. The word itself is a protection; marriages receive widespread respect, and for some couples, marriage expresses externally the nature of the commitment they feel internally.

Beyond these intangible protections, there are some concrete differences.

- The word “marriage” is the gateway to the 1,138 federal protections afforded married couples. Without it, same-sex couples in civil unions have no claim for those legal protections. Those protections are currently withheld from married couples of the same sex, but GLAD does not believe that discrimination will stand the test of time.
- It will be harder to gain respect for one’s civil union in other states than it is to gain respect for a marriage. All states have a marriage system, but only two other states have a system for same-sex couples. (Vermont has civil unions and California has domestic partnerships.)
- The civil union law gives public officials the explicit right not to officiate at a civil union while there is no such explicit exemption in the marriage laws.
- There are certain circumstances in which 16 and 17-year-olds may marry, but you must be 18 to join in a civil union (unless you are ruled an emancipated minor by a court).
- By calling the status a “civil union,” a self-insured employer (and that includes most large employers) will have to amend its plans to include civil union spouses whereas married spouses are automatically covered under self-insured plans that defer to a state-law definition of who is married.

Have you called GLAD’s Legal Information Hotline? Have you received attorney referrals, information about the law and legal processes, or other services from GLAD? We want to hear from you! Help us improve our services and gather testimonials for our website and publications!

To share your experience, or for more information about this project, please contact Ethan Levine at elevine@glad.org.

Docket Update

HIV Phobia (MA): GLAD intervened on behalf of an HIV service organization that was denied a lease because other tenant groups feared having people with HIV in the building. After GLAD sent a demand letter spelling out how such a refusal violates Massachusetts law, the landlord relented and leased the space to Health Awareness Services. “We are elated,” said HMS President Micha el Mazloff.

Respect for Marriage (RI): GLAD worked with the ACLU of Rhode Island and the National Education Association of Rhode Island on behalf of a retired Tiverton, RI teacher, a resident of Massachusetts, who sought spousal health insurance coverage for her new wife, under the governing collective bargaining agreement. The committee first denied the request, but ultimately settled and agreed to pay the benefits.

Family Leave (RI): GLAD is representing a Cranston, RI teacher who was denied family leave benefits to care for her partner. Her claim of sexual orientation discrimination was filed in May at the Rhode Island Human Rights Commission.

Privacy/HIV Status (MA): GLAD is representing a young woman from Kenya whose HIV status was disclosed illegally to her community by a hospital employee.

Massachusetts SJC to Hear 1913 Case

The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts will hear GLAD’s appeal this fall in Cote-Whitacre et al v. Department of Public Health, the case that challenges the state’s revival of an unused 1913 law to bar out-of-state same-sex couples from marrying if their marriages would be void in their own states.

GLAD’s brief, filed on March 11, 2005, argues among other things that the Commonwealth’s denial of marriage licenses to eight couples (from Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, New York, Connecticut and Vermont) violates the November 2003 SJC ruling in Goodridge that denying marriage licenses to same-sex couples is unconstitutional. “Goodridge said that Massachusetts may not discriminate against same-sex couples who want to marry,” said GLAD attorney Michele Granda. “Goodridge did not say that Massachusetts can discriminate if another state discriminates.”

GLAD’s brief and amicus briefs are available at www.glad.org.

GLAD’S 1913 ARGUMENTS

GLAD makes four arguments against the use of the 1913 law against out-of-state, same-sex couples:

1. Goodridge is the law: The Goodridge opinion recognized that the equality and liberty protections of the state constitution prevent the state from denying same-sex couples marriage licenses simply because they are same-sex couples. Goodridge thus forbids the application of “1913,” which is being used by the state to do exactly what Goodridge said the state cannot do.

2. Discriminatory intent: Before May 17, 2004, the Commonwealth never took any action to bar non-residents from marrying whose marriages would be void in their home states. Governor Mitt Romney revived the 1913 law expressly because of his opposition to the marriages of same-sex couples.

3. “Privileges and Immunities” clause of the U.S. Constitution: This clause ensures that a citizen of State A who ventures into State B enjoys the same legal privileges as the citizens of State B. This application of the 1913 law violates this clause.

4. 1913 does not apply to all states and territories: The Commonwealth ignores the technical terms of the 1913 law in order to prevent all same-sex couples from marrying throughout the country from marrying here. Even if constitutional, the 1913 law only applies to a subset of states that declare the marriages of same-sex couples to be “void.”
GLAD Looks at Federal Marriage Discrimination

GLAD has sent surveys to more than 5,000 of the same-sex couples who have married in Massachusetts in the past year, asking how the federal “Defense of Marriage Act” harms them.

DOMA excludes these couples from the 1,138 federal laws providing protections, benefits, and obligations to married people in areas including Social Security, federal tax laws, family medical leave, veterans’ benefits, pension survivorship rights, and nursing home care.

So far, over 600 couples have responded. We have heard from:
- A woman who could not be with her hospitalized spouse because she couldn’t use the federal Family Medical Leave Act to take time from work;
- Older couples who may lose their homes if widowed because they won’t inherit a jointly owned house as a spouse, but will have to pay heavy taxes;
- Married World War II veterans who can’t be buried together in a veterans cemetery;
- Federal employees who can’t get family health insurance or pensions benefits for their spouses;
- Stay-at-home moms and dads who worry about not being able to benefit from their spouses’ Social Security; and
- A widowed man who has been denied Social Security survivor benefits.

If you are a married couple who has not received the survey – or if you know such a couple – we want to hear your story! If you received a survey, and have not responded, please do! You can just log on to www.glad.org/DOMA and fill out the survey right there, or call GLAD at (617) 426-1350 for a paper survey.

AIDS Law Project: Expanded Syringe and HIV Confidentiality

As part of GLAD’s work fighting the HIV/AIDS epidemic, AIDS Law Project Director Bennett Klein recently testified at the Massachusetts State House to support decriminalizing possession of hypodermic needles and syringes, and permitting their sale without prescription in pharmacies. GLAD is part of an ongoing effort led by the AIDS Action Committee of Massachusetts to expand access to clean syringes throughout the Commonwealth.

Massachusetts is one of only three states that retains these barriers to syringe and needle access, despite a scientific consensus that clean needles slow or prevent the transmission of HIV, thereby saving many lives.

Klein said, “It’s important to recognize that injection drug use exists in all communities, gay and non-gay, and preventing the spread of HIV by any mode of transmission is of concern to us all. Massachusetts must remove these barriers to HIV prevention efforts.” In addition to testifying, Klein helped organize what has become significant support for this legislation among law enforcement officials.
NH College Employees Seek DP Benefits

GLAD is representing Patricia Bedford and Anne Breen in their effort to secure domestic partner benefits from their employer, New Hampshire Community Technical College. Ms. Breen, a sixteen-year employee of the college, is Director of Security. Ms. Bedford has worked at the college for nine years and is Director of Student Support Services.

Each is in a committed, long-term relationship with a female partner. Each is raising a child with her partner. Yet when the women sought employment benefits for their families equal to those received by married colleagues, they were denied.

The state’s Commission for Human Rights rejected Ms. Bedford’s and Ms. Breen’s claims that the College’s refusal to provide them with equal employment benefits constituted prohibited sexual orientation discrimination. In May 2005, GLAD appealed to the Merrimack County Superior Court to reverse the Commission’s findings.

“The college didn’t have to use marriage as the criterion for family employment benefits – they chose to,” said GLAD attorney Michele Granda. “As a result, they are treating their gay & lesbian employees differently than their straight employees. That’s clearly sexual orientation discrimination.”

GLAD Fights Discrimination Against Trans Employee

GLAD filed a lawsuit in federal court in New Hampshire on behalf of a transgender woman who was fired by Saint Anselm College (in Manchester, NH) after she informed them that she would be transitioning from male to female.

On March 9, 2004, Robert Blanchette, a computer programmer who had worked for seven years at Saint Anselm, informed superiors that she had been undergoing treatment for gender dysphoria and would return from a two-week vacation as Sarah Blanchette. Upon returning to work, she met with college administrators who handed her a letter stating, “As you know, you recently disclosed to senior college administration your transsexual status. Upon consideration, you are immediately relieved of your duties...”

Senior attorney Bennett Klein, who is representing Blanchette, said “Saint Anselm College found Sarah Blanchette to be an exemplary and loyal employee, then treated her shamefully and unlawfully. The firing was completely unrelated to her job performance and was motivated by prejudice, pure and simple.”

This case continues GLAD’s efforts to establish strong legal protections against discrimination based on gender identity and expression.

GLAD’s Winter Party

Guests at GLAD’s Winter Party in March enjoyed a Sunday afternoon of cocktails and conversation at the Boston Ballet, as well as an update on GLAD’s legal work by Civil Rights Project Director Mary Bonauto. GLAD’s thanks go to the event’s premier sponsor, New England Financial.
Gay & Lesbian Advocates & Defenders
Statement of Financial Position
For the Year Ended December 31, 2004

**ASSETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Assets</th>
<th>Subtotal: $862,164</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 532,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledges receivable</td>
<td>294,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract receivables</td>
<td>30,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>4,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total current assets:</strong> $1,788,615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property and equipment**

| Equipment                             | 59,506              |
| Leasehold improvements               | 2,268               |
|                                    | **Subtotal:** 61,774 |
| Less: accumulated depreciation       | 14,804              |
|                                    | **Total property and equipment:** 46,970 |

**Other assets**

| Deposits                             | 9,989               |
|                                    | **Total other assets:** 9,989 |
|                                    | **Total assets:** $1,845,574 |

**LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS**

**Current liabilities**

| Accrued expenses                     | $ 34,489            |
| Pension payable                      | 2,694               |
|                                    | **Total current liabilities:** 37,183 |

**Net Assets**

| Unrestricted net assets              | 656,607             |
| Undesignated                         | 822,184             |
| Subtotal unrestricted net assets     | 1,478,791           |
| Temporarily restricted net assets    | 329,600             |
|                                    | **Total net assets:** 1,808,391 |
|                                    | **Total Liabilities & Net Assets:** $1,845,574 |
Welcome New Staff

**Steve Farrand**, Maine Education Coordinator, most recently worked at Maine Speakout, where he coordinated a statewide speakers bureau and planned the annual Walks With the Ones You Love.

Outreach Director **Alexis Hill**, a Georgetown Law Center graduate, comes to GLAD from the American Constitution Society, where she was the Associate Director for Lawyer Outreach.

**Marie Longo**, Deputy Development Director, was Director of Annual Programs at the Museum of Fine Arts, and before that, Deputy Director of the Federal Club at HRC.

New Events Manager **Robbie Samuels** has worked for the Theater Offensive, NGLTF's Creating Change Conference, and the Red Ribbon AIDS Ride.

Litigation Assistant **Kate Strangio**, a recent graduate of Grinnell College, worked most recently at MassEquality.

**Lee Swislow**, Executive Director, comes to GLAD from the Justice Resource Institute, where she was Vice President of Health Services and Executive Director of Sidney Borum Health Center.

Litigation Assistant **Jessica Young** is a recent graduate of Vassar College, where she studied psychology and Africana studies.