

MEMORANDUM

December 14, 1987

TO: George R. Minshew
FROM: Dennis M. Dyer
RE: Review of Grassroots Resources - Region I

As you know, it is my opinion that all forms of grassroots involvement in the legislative process are an essential component to our success here in New England. Over the years the popular definition of what is a "grassroots resource" has been altered on a number of occasions. This apparent confusion on the part of the Tobacco Institute as to what are its legitimate grassroots resources often leads to confusion both to the type and volume of the response that can be anticipated from those resources on any given federal, state or local legislative matter.

This current request for an analysis of our "grassroots resources" seems to return us to an all-encompassing view of the potential resource. Even though the memorandum asks that a distinction be drawn between coalition allies and Tobacco Action Network (TAN) activists, and for an analysis of the quality of those contacts, it is my fear that during the legislative battles of 1988 the analysis will be lost and only the potential gross quantity will be recalled. For this reason, the remainder of this memorandum will attempt, on a state-by-state basis, to clearly delineate between those resources that exist solely to support the legislative agenda of the tobacco industry and those resources whose response to our requests for assistance is, at best, secondary and in most cases irrelevant to their own perceived legislative interests. It is my suggestion that the tobacco industry can rely only on those resources that are totally committed to its defense. Those non tobacco allied association contacts are largely unreliable and primarily available to the tobacco industry as a result of the relationship that has evolved between them and the representatives of the tobacco industry.

This preface to the Region I report on grassroots resources is not necessarily a negative comment on the request for information about this vital subject. However suggest a caution for how these reports are utilized both now and in the future. This would be especially true if these reports were to be utilized to suggest anticipated levels of response to tobacco industry requests for grassroots input from these resources to either TI senior staff or our member companies.

TI24110315

CONNECTICUT

Coalition Resources

As in most states, no matter how much work is done to develop a particular relationship, it is unlikely that that relationship will solidify without the pressures of legislative battle. The recent attacks on the tobacco industry in the state of Connecticut improved development of our grassroots and coalition programs during 1986 and 1987 over that of previous years.

The identification of a "most effective/least effective" group of coalition allies is extremely difficult. As in most areas, allies, whether groups or individuals, act in their own immediate self interest. For this reason our most effective coalition ally on a restaurant issue may have no interest whatsoever in a tax issue. Similarly, those people who may take an active stand on a tobacco-related issue that immediately impacts the way they conduct their business may, in fact, want no ongoing relationship with the tobacco industry. So while a particular group's involvement on our behalf may have its intended effect, their designation as an ally is somewhat misleading.

Local Resources

At the local level the industry has faced a number of legislative challenges during 1986 and 1987. Our experience in these instances suggests that the restaurant community can have a significant impact at the local level. Similarly, local business associations can be of some value. However, this latter group, usually represented by the chamber of commerce, tends to prefer to avoid outright hostile contact with local government officials on tobacco issues. If they are pressured internally by some of their activist members who are concerned about a particular tobacco issue, or can be shown support for their position by other organizations within a community, then local business organizations will mount active opposition to particularly restrictive anti-tobacco ordinances. However, it should be noted that in most cases these organizations would prefer to develop some form of compromise ordinance that meets the minimum needs of the local legislative body in question.

State Resources

At the state level, the active support of tobacco industry positions on a particular legislative matter is reliant on a number of sometimes unrelated issues. As an example, during the course of the 1987 legislative session in Connecticut, each of the following business

organizations and their members supported the industry's opposition to various pieces of workplace, restaurant and public smoking legislation:

- Connecticut Restaurant Association
- Connecticut Food Stores Association
- Connecticut Retail Association
- Connecticut Business and Industry Association
- Southwest Area Commerce and Industry Association
- Connecticut Hotel-Motel Association
- Connecticut Vendors Association
- Connecticut Candy and Tobacco Wholesalers Association
- Connecticut School Boards Association
- Connecticut Education Association

Noticeably absent from this list, particularly given the strength of our activities in Massachusetts, is organized labor. This absence illustrates how important an on-going contact program with organized labor in any given state is. During the 1987 session, organized labor not only did not oppose workplace smoking restriction legislation, but offered some minimal support to the proponents of that legislation. This support was forthcoming because the sponsors of the legislation were key votes on other labor-related bills. Those votes were used as bargaining chips to obtain labor's support on workplace smoking restrictions. It is unlikely that this could occur in those states where we have developed an on-going labor presence.

Support offered by the above organizations varied. The Connecticut Education Association had no desire to deal directly with the Tobacco Institute on legislation prohibiting smoking by both students and staff in public schools in the state of Connecticut. Once alerted to the measure and its requirements, they did, in conjunction with Connecticut School Boards Association, support amendments providing for the establishment of smoking sections for adult staff members. The Connecticut Vendors Association and Connecticut Candy and Tobacco Wholesalers Association became involved, if only slightly and with limited impact, in the legislation prohibiting the sale of tobacco products through vending machines. These two groups would also become involved, again with questionable impact, in tobacco tax legislation. The remaining business organizations became involved to varying degrees in both the restaurant prohibition measure and the workplace restriction measure. Of these, our most active and productive ally was the Connecticut Restaurant Association. The others were involved to a lesser degree, primarily motivated by the perceived jeopardy of their members under the proposed legislation. The least

effective of these organizations were the Connecticut Business and Industry Association and the Southwest Area Commerce and Industry Association. These organizations have more pressing legislative concerns, and the vast majority of their members are simply not opposed to public smoking legislation. This is not surprising since the majority of both of these organizations' members are medium to large corporations with smoking restrictions already in place.

In summary, our coalition efforts in Connecticut have brought us into contact with most of these statewide business organizations. These will provide us with varying levels of support depending on what factors are involved in the legislation. These considerations might include:

1. their members' jeopardy
2. the likelihood of passage
3. the potential for reasonable compromise
4. other legislative pressures facing that organization
5. the intangible personal attitude of the organization's staff toward smoking and tobacco products in general

It is reasonable to assert that our relationship with each of these organizations is a strong one. It does not follow, however, that we can transfer successes at the state or local level to their active participation in opposing anti-tobacco measures at the federal level.

TAN Resources

With regard to our industry grassroots program, also known as the Tobacco Action Network (TAN), it is safe to say that we have established a hard core of some 250 committed tobacco proponents. On most issues with enough advance notice and education each of these individuals is capable of responding to a request on a broad range of anti-tobacco subjects. This core of tobacco supporters is drawn almost exclusively from the employees of the cigarette manufacturers. There are some selected wholesalers, retailers, and vendors who are part of this list but they are an insignificant percentage of the whole.

In some instances, so-called TAN activists can prove useful at the local level if authorized by their companies and if provided with the proper support from the Tobacco Institute. However, for the most part, it should be recognized that not only are they few in number but also the majority of TAN activists are no more politically adept or legislatively aware than any other member of the general population.

Other Grassroots Opportunities

One of the more significant opportunities for grassroots activity in Connecticut was provided by our two largest member companies, Philip Morris and R.J. Reynolds. These opportunities included the utilization of their smokers' lists for direct legislative action. In one instance one of the companies participated in a full-scale, statewide mailing and phone bank effort which although detected as an organized campaign, was successful in generating more than 2500 pieces of mail in opposition to tobacco related legislation. In another instance one of the companies was willing to provide us with a complete smokers list for the city of Westport for our unrestricted use. Our utilization of this particular mass contact program was not detected as an organized campaign. It is my opinion that this effort played a part in our reversal of an earlier vote and defeated a broad based smoking restriction ordinance in the city of Westport. Based on our experience in Connecticut, I would suggest that the ability to utilize our member companies considerable resources, including their mailing lists, is a potentially significant development in the expansion of the industry's overall grassroots program.

MAINE

Coalition Resources

Unlike Connecticut where our grassroots program was enhanced by the state and local legislative battles of 1987, the effectiveness of our grassroots program in Maine may have suffered somewhat of a decline during this past year. This decline, if it occurred, was a result of the lack of serious state and local problems in Maine. Each of our priority pieces of legislation was dealt with early in the legislative session primarily through either direct lobbying or legal challenge.

The one exception was the bill prohibiting the sale of cigarettes through vending machines. This measure was to have a minimal impact on the sales prerogatives of the tobacco industry. The efforts of the Pine Tree Vending Association, the Maine Restaurant Association, and the Maine Innkeepers Association were critical to the success of this effort. As in most instances, the motivation for each of these organizations participation in the opposition to the bill stemmed not from their interest in defending the sales prerogatives of the tobacco industry but in protecting a source of revenue for their members.

The organizations with whom we have contact in Maine include:

- Pine Tree Vending Association
- Maine Restaurant Association
- Maine Innkeepers Association
- Maine Commerce and Industry Association
- Maine Retail Grocers Association
- Maine Municipal Association
- selected Chambers of Commerce
- most independent wholesalers of tobacco products throughout the state

In past years each of these organizations or individual companies has provided us with varying degrees of support depending on the issue. Predictably, the larger business organizations like the Maine Commerce and Industry Association and the chambers of commerce have been less likely to become involved in tobacco issues than the smaller groups whose members may be more immediately effected by a particular piece of legislation. The Maine Restaurant Association and the Maine Innkeepers Association have consistently opposed any restrictions on smoking in the state's restaurants. However, they are much less interested in workplace and public smoking legislation and show no interest at all in sales, advertising or tax-related measures. Similarly, the individual members of the tobacco wholesaling community are, for the most part, disinterested in those

measures that do not immediately translate to an effect on their bottom line. These companies are always available to oppose tax increases or sales restrictions but are less interested in public smoking legislation or advertising prohibitions. The only consistent non-industry ally in Maine is the Maine State Grocers Association. The relationship that has been developed between the Tobacco Institute and the Maine State Grocers Association can only be described as unique. The TI regional vice president is a member of the board of directors, the only non-grocer member of that board to have been reappointed every year for the last five years. The Association has testified in opposition to the entire range of anti-tobacco measures coming before the legislature. For our part, we have consistently supported the Association's legislative, membership and financial needs. We have assisted in the development and implementation of their grassroots program, an activity that has accrued significantly to our benefit, and actively participated in their annual conventions.

Again, as previously suggested, it is difficult if not impossible to translate support at the state and local level to similar levels of support at the federal level. The reasons for this are similar to those encountered in other states in the region. However, in addition to the usual lack of time, resources, and perceived jeopardy of their members, most organizations in Maine seem to perceive the distance between Augusta and Washington as immense. They are generally not geared toward federal legislative involvement; are not comfortable with it; and have no intentions of tainting whatever contacts may be necessary on their own priority issues with previous contacts on low priority tobacco issues.

The state of our coalition effort in Maine is a good one. As indicated at the beginning of this analysis, it may have suffered from some lack of use during the 1987 legislative session. However, because it started the year at an extremely high level of contact, interaction and potential responsiveness, it is still among the best examples of coalition building in the region.

TAN Resources

With regard to our industry grassroots program, also known as the Tobacco Action Network (TAN), it is safe to say that we have established a hard core of some 50 committed tobacco proponents. On most issues with enough advance notice and education each of these individuals is capable of responding to a request on a broad range of anti-tobacco subjects. These

contacts are drawn primarily from the employees of the cigarette manufacturers. However, there are a significant number of wholesalers, vendors and retail grocers who are part of this Maine group. This more balanced development is an indication of the nature of our Maine program. It enjoyed a better start and more opportunity for nurturing in its early stages than did our programs in Connecticut, Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

Again, the ability to transfer our state and local grassroots capability to federal issues is not guaranteed. This suggested response reduction is not only a function of interest but also a result of our member companies development of internal contact programs which are largely redundant. It is natural for an individual or company to be more responsive to a request from a source with whom there is a financial relationship than from one with a purely political context. Each time our members access essentially the same people contacted by TI with a similar request, it diminishes our ability to motivate them both on that issue and in the future.

MASSACHUSETTS

Coalition Resources

In Massachusetts the Tobacco Institute has developed a large number of ongoing and ad hoc relationships with a variety of statewide and local general and specific business organizations. It is, I think, accurate to indicate that none of these business organizations are interested in being perceived by either their members, local governing boards, the state legislature, the media, or the general public as being supportive of the tobacco industry. This is true no matter how active or vociferous they may become in their opposition to specific anti-tobacco proposals at the state or local level. The list of ongoing contacts is too lengthy to list in total. It includes:

Associated Industries of Massachusetts
Massachusetts Restaurant Association
Massachusetts Hotel-Motel Association
Greater Boston Hotel-Motel Association
Massachusetts Foodstores Association
Massachusetts Automatic Merchandising Council
Massachusetts Candy and Tobacco Distributors
Association

In addition to these and other statewide organizations, we also enjoy or are developing relationships with a variety of local chambers of commerce, restaurant associations, and the growing number of "downtown business associations".

Statewide Resources

At the state level, our most involved business allies are the members of the hospitality industry. This includes the Massachusetts Restaurant Association, Massachusetts Hotel-Motel Association, and the Greater Boston Hotel-Motel Association. Each of these organizations has consistently taken an interest in preserving their individual members' perogatives in the area of state mandated smoking restrictions. However, even these organizations would prefer to distance themselves from the tobacco industry when appearing before legislative bodies. As in other states, the vast majority of the statewide

business organizations will participate with the industry in opposition to tobacco legislation only if that legislation imposes a severe burden of their individual members or in some way affects the "bottom line" of its members. In the following Local Resources section, the strength and nature of our grassroots program as it has evolved in Massachusetts in recent years will be discussed in more detail. Essentially, we have assumed the role of organizer, facilitator and information resource for our reluctant business association allies. Generally, the quality of the individual association's response for our request for support is directly related to the ability of the regional staff to eliminate expenditures of time, effort and money by the business associations' staff.

Local Resources

At the local level we have developed what I believe is a successful formula for identifying, organizing and mobilizing local business and restaurant groups to spearhead opposition to the local anti-tobacco ordinances. In many instances, our local coalition building program will expand on past activities in a particular community. However, we are also finding that in a growing number of cases we are able to build on the reputation earned in other cities. Our best local allies continue to be the members of the Massachusetts Restaurant Association. It is usually through these individuals that we are able to access both the remainder of the restaurant community and the local chamber of commerce. Even more so than at the state level the focus of our coalition building program at the local level is our ability to eliminate the organizational and information gathering burden from the shoulders of the local business and restaurant leaders. It may be possible to state that the degree to which we are successful at the local level is directly related to the amount of time the TI regional staff has to devote to a particular local legislative problem.

Other Tobacco Resources

An as yet untried resource in Massachusetts is the newly organized Candy and Tobacco Distributors Association. During this past year, TI and the MCTDA have attempted to keep in contact and review opportunities for mutual support. As yet there has been no opportunity to test the resources of this organization at either the state or local level. However, it is reasonable to assume that during 1988 that opportunity will exist.

Labor Resources

An analysis of our extensive labor program activities has been provided to the Tobacco Institute Headquarters in a separate memorandum. I would suggest that anyone interested in that program should review that memorandum. However, for our purposes here, let me suggest that organized labor may be the most dynamic and loyal ally available to the tobacco industry in the future. Developing this resource requires a great deal of time, effort and commitment. However, once developed, organized labor seems to be generally more committed to achieving a successful result from a legislative battle and less prone to the "cutting their own deal" syndrome like our business allies.

Unlike some of our other resources, it may, in fact, be possible to translate local support for the industry's perspective on tobacco issues to federal action. Our experience to date clearly indicates that the development of our local relationships is enhanced as a result of the existence of the tobacco industry Labor Management Committee in Washington. It may be that our local activities will enhance the activities of that group at the federal level by showing that there is grassroots support for their positions. One thing that is clear is that the development of a local labor program must be coordinated with the activities at the federal level if they are to be successful.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Coalition Resources

As has been stated in the past, New Hampshire is a unique political and legislative entity. It is at once poor, rural and agrarian in the north and west; rich and hospitality industry oriented in its central lakes and mountain region and an upwardly mobile adjunct to Massachusetts in the south. The conservative populations of the north and west are countered by the liberal, yuppie transplants from Massachusetts in the south. The governing body is made up of more than 400 members. It is a true citizen legislature with extremely low annual stipends and is dominated by individuals with little or no ongoing practical experience in the private sector. These realities, combined with the dominance of the state's media by the sometimes interesting, always vitreolic Manchester Union Leader, seems to result in a disintegration of the decision-making process into one largely based on newspaper headlines, emotionalism and "gut reaction".

While the state is much more complex than the above paragraph might suggest, it gives a fairly accurate indication of some of the pressures which impact not only on our legislative program but also on our coalition building activities. Over the years the Institute has enjoyed very successful relationships with the following:

- New Hampshire Hospitality Association
- New Hampshire Retail Grocers Association
- Business and Industry Association of New Hampshire
- New Hampshire Retail Merchants Association
- New Hampshire Vendors Association
- a variety of local chambers of commerce

However, these relationships are largely the result of personal contact and not based on any support for the industry's positions on any of the subjects of concern to us. One of the best examples of this might be the on-again, off-again relationship with the New Hampshire Hospitality Association. During one period of our relationship we were able to count on the New Hampshire Hospitality Association on almost every issue from taxes to advertising. That situation was reversed with a staffing change that saw the former legislative director of the New Hampshire Lung Association take over as executive director of the New Hampshire Hospitality Association. Presently, the Association is run by a much more reasonable individual and that contact is currently being restored to its former level.

With regard to the other members of the business community, our relationships are strong and personal. However, it is always difficult to translate those relationships into concrete legislative actions. Most members of the business community are extremely cautious when appearing to support tobacco industry positions. The emotional reaction usually accompanying the debate on tobacco issues creates a concern among the representatives of the business community that a strong and vocal opposition to tobacco legislation may result in a lingering negative perception by members of the legislature. It is not unreasonable that that sort of negative impression could result in closed doors and unfavorable votes on other issues of concern to the business community later in the legislative session. This condition is vastly different from what one finds in the remaining states in the region. The majority of the other states' legislators perceive the legislative process as one which not only accommodates but encourages opposing perspectives on all issues coming before the legislature. However, while that may be the stated view of the legislature by the majority of its members in New Hampshire, the reality is that many members approach the vast majority of issues with an unsophisticated almost paternalistic and, therefore, easily antagonized view of the subject. Again, this makes it very difficult for our contacts in the business community to vocally oppose most pieces of anti-tobacco legislation.

TAN Resources

As in Maine, we have been able to identify approximately 100 activists who would respond to most anti-tobacco issues. Included are cigarette manufacturers employees, some members of the wholesale community, and some members of the retail grocery community. Our ability to motivate these activists on federal issues has diminished in recent years both by the number of requests and by the redundant requests from at least two of our member companies.

Other Resources

Aside from the potential to utilize our members companies' smokers lists in the state, one of our member companies, Philip Morris, has created the Smokers Caucus in New Hampshire. The indicated purpose of this ad hoc smokers organization is to query presidential candidates on their positions on tobacco related issues. However, it is conceivable that the organization could have grassroots potential during the 1989 legislative session.

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island is the only state in the region without a viable network of business associations capable of mounting credible legislative campaigns. There are a variety of small business groups like the Rhode Island Hospitality Association, the Rhode Island Retail Grocers Association, and the chambers of commerce. But their membership is small, their budgets limited and their legislative expertise almost non-existent. This lack of development may stem from the way in which both business and individuals relate to their legislature in this very small state. Most, if not all, of the state's business leaders have a personal relationship with one or more members of the legislature's leadership. Most small business men and women have direct and personal access to one or more members of the legislature. The result is that public hearings are not overly attended by business organizations but by private citizens speaking pro and con on a particular measure.

This fragmented business community is very difficult for the tobacco industry to work with and organize. While we have been successful in our efforts to have some of the trade associations testify on our behalf, that testimony carries little weight. It is essential for us to devote more time to the development of individual relationships in Rhode Island with key business leaders throughout the state.

TAN Resources

Over the years we have successfully identified a hard core of approximately 50 individuals who can be counted on to support industry positions on a majority of the issues facing us at the state and local level. At the federal level even the most ardent tobacco supporter is so discouraged by the negative attitudes of their elected federal representatives that it is difficult if not impossible to motivate their contact on tobacco issues. No one enjoys beating their head against the wall, especially if they are not getting paid for it, and that is the nature of the relationship that exists with members of the Rhode Island delegation on tobacco issues.

VERMONT

As in Maine, the tobacco industry enjoys one of the best ongoing coalition building programs in the region in the state of Vermont. During the past ten years we have successfully developed close relationships with a variety of organizations and individuals including:

- Vermont State Chamber of Commerce
- Associated Industries of Vermont
- Vermont Retailers Association
- Vermont Retail Grocers Association
- Vermont Truck and Bus Association
- Vermont Police Association
- Vermont Wholesale Beverage Association
- Vermont Petroleum Institute
- a number of local chambers of commerce
- a number of small and medium businesses

These contacts have consistently resulted in these organizations taking the tobacco industry's side during a number of legislative battles including public smoking and tax issues.

The unique relationships that have been established are a direct result of the amount of time and effort that was possible during the very early stages of our activities in the state of Vermont. This early effort is now paying dividends which include access to the associations' lobbyists, their legislative committees, and almost unrestricted support on state and local issues.

Unlike other states in the region, we have been able to translate the support of these organizations for our positions at the state level into concrete action by them at the federal level. On a number of occasions we have been able to generate both private citizen and association contacts on pieces of federal legislation. Unfortunately, the federal delegation is generally unresponsive to these messages of support for tobacco industry positions, but our allies in the state are not discouraged and continue to support us.

TAN Resources

In this smallest of the states in the region, we have successfully identified approximately 50 individuals who have consistently supported the tobacco industry's positions on a variety of anti-tobacco subjects. Again, these are primarily members of the cigarette manufacturer's sales force augmented by members of the wholesale and retail grocery community. For the most part we have been able to continue to generate enthusiasm for the Tobacco Institute requests despite the overlapping of our activities and those of some of our members' companies.

COMMUNICATIONS

Rather than react to the communications needs of our grassroots program under the heading of each individual state, I have left that area for its own review. A state-by-state of our past and future communications would have been repetitive. The Institute's communication program in Region I has previously been documented in both memoranda to TI Headquarters and presentations at TI field staff meetings. Essentially, the communications program's focus is the establishment of a schedule of both written and telephone communications with selected groups throughout the year. These contacts are more concentrated during the legislative session and less frequent during the slower Summer and Fall months of the year. They include a weekly update for the region's 150 key contacts. This is supplemented by a quarterly legislative update for up to 1200 members of both the TAN and coalition communities. The purpose of this written communication is to prepare members of the industry's support network for legislative requests. This written communication is supplemented with a monthly conference call to each of the regional representatives of the Tobacco Institute's member companies. This conference call format allows these key member company leaders to both hear and comment on industry programs and anticipated legislative events. In recent years we have encouraged these industry leaders to invite any of their staff to sit in on the conference call in their offices. This systematic approach has allowed us to avoid the "oh, I didn't know about that" syndrome. It also diminishes the number of "we never hear from the Tobacco Institute" comments.

This programmed communications effort is supplemented by requests for action and follow up personal letters either thanking people for their efforts or reporting to them on the outcome of their efforts. In essence, it is my opinion that communication is the glue that holds the network together. As our communication effort fails, so does the viability and success of our grassroots program.

1988 GRASSROOTS UTILIZATION

It is likely that our grassroots network will be utilized in all six New England states and in most if not all of the cities and towns in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts during the upcoming legislative session. In Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont, that activity will be concentrated in the first six months of the year. At both the state and local level in Massachusetts that activity will extend throughout 1988.

If our sources are correct, the most concentrated effort is likely to be at the local level in Massachusetts where we understand the Massachusetts State Department of Public Health and its allies in the non-profit private/public health community and the anti-tobacco community will mount an all out assault on public smoking ordinances across the state. We hope that we will be able to build on our local grassroots organizing in 1987 to expand our coverage statewide as necessary.

GRASSROOTS NETWORK WEAKNESSES

In my estimation the primary weakness of our grassroots program is the lack of resources committed to the development and maintenance of that program. The TI State Activities, Headquarters and Field Staff's time is split among a variety of different objectives and responsibilities. Too often the immediate legislative problem demands the total attention of all those involved leaving the development of the grassroots network to a later time. In most instances the grassroots network is built for immediate use. Unfortunately, this results in our constantly hopping from one legislative and one grassroots network to another and never being able to devote the time necessary to bolster previously developed grassroots networks.

The addition of a regional director in Region I is likely to enhance our ability to not only develop our grassroots network, but also to attend to its continuation during even the course of the legislative session. Also, during 1988 it is our intention to fully implement the previously described Region I Alert Action Network. When implemented this should greatly enhance our ability to both identify and respond to anti-tobacco pressures in the region. A complete review of that program has been submitted to TI Headquarters in Washington on a number of occasions and can be reviewed in detail.