COUNCIL INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

11700 SPRINGFIELD PIKE

SPRINGDALE, OHIO

AUGUST 2, 2018

BEGINNING AT 6:58 p.m.
MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: I would like to call to order the CIC meeting for August 2nd, 2018. We will start by saying the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Thank you. For the record, both Jeffrey Anderson and myself are here. Because of how much has been going on, we decided to move the correspondence up today in the agenda. So we are going to start with correspondence.

We did get the e-mail sent to me -- oops, I am sorry, I am already jumping ahead, minutes from July 5th meeting. Do I have a motion to either correct or accept the July 5th meeting?

JEFFREY ANDERSON: I honestly don't know that I received them.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: We received them before our last meeting was supposed to take place, the one that we cancelled.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: Okay, sorry.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: You're good. It's like ninety-six pages, not what it was at -- condensed.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: Could we defer
that to next time?

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Oh, absolutely.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: I didn't get a chance to review it at the time. I don't know that I got a copy.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Absolutely, and I will make sure that I e-mail it to you so you will have one.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: Great.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Okay, let me write it down here. Okay, we will table those to the next meeting. So we are moving on to correspondence. I received an e-mail dated Tuesday, July 31st, 2018. It was in response to other e-mails that we had received throughout the week period, seven-day period. It was from council person Holly McQuillan-Emerson.

She said Ms. Meghan Sullivan-Wisecup, chairperson for the investigation committee, I feel it would be in the best interests of everyone involved that no records are released for public review until a report is written and the case is closed. No one will benefit from harsh confirmation. Thank you, Holly McQuillan-Emerson.
At this time, would anybody else want to speak? Please come to the podium. Please be sure to state your name and address.

JULIE MATHENY: Julie Matheny, 669 Park Avenue. I simply want to speak on what Ms. Emerson wrote. I totally agree with that. I know that there is a lot of interest, a lot of curiosity on what -- how everyone has answered these questions and so forth.

But I think you don't release -- you don't put the cart before the horse. And I think that you need to have -- if there is any inkling that there was any kind of a leak and you guys determine that, then absolutely there should be nothing released. And even if you are questionable on whether you want to go forward and spend more money and everything else calling witnesses in, you know, maybe -- maybe you put that back on the city council.

They are the ones that gave you the authority to create this committee and to hire a law director. So maybe you put that back on them on the August 15th meeting, let them decide. Just a thought. Thank you.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Thank you.
Anyone else like to speak? Second call. Third and final call. We will close the correspondence from the audience, and we will move to new business. Our first piece of new business is the status of fact-finding investigation, and I will turn that over to Mr. Abes.

ALAN ABES: So at the last meeting, the committee decided that it would proceed by subpoenaing various people to answer written questions in lieu of calling them in to testify, at least for the time being, so we could get a handle on what kind of information we would get and determine what the next steps would need to be.

We have now received all of the written responses. Everybody complied with the requirement to submit them and to have their responses notarized. I have reviewed all of those responses. At this point, the committee needs to decide whether it wants to close the evidence, subject to being reopened if further examination would determine that we need anything else, or whether the committee wants to either subpoena documents or take live testimony or both.

So I think at this point, it probably
makes sense to put it back to you for some
discussion, and then I can answer any questions
that you have.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Thank you.

Mr. Anderson, do you have any?

JEFFREY ANDERSON: Yeah, I have a few
questions about that. So when we say we closed
the evidence gathering, is that necessary in order
for us to start examining from a legal perspective
the responses and what the implications of those
would be, or are we able to start or continue down
that path without doing that?

ALAN ABES: It's the latter. We can
certainly continue down that path. You have a
number of options, one of which would be to begin
drafting an investigative report based on the
evidence we have. If you determine based on that
draft or as we progress that you need further
information, you can certainly get that
information.

You could decide at that point that
you don't need further information, or you could
try to get the further information now. It's
really up to you as to how you want to proceed.
But there is nothing preventing us from going
ahead and relying on what we have and then seeing
if we get anything else.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: I know from my
perspective, I need to understand the legal
implications of some of the responses a little bit
more before I would know if I needed more from any
of the respondents. So I know at least from that
perspective, I would like to understand that side
of things before we get into things like
finalizing the report or recommendations or
opening those records up to the public.

ALAN ABES: Yes, I can prepare for
you my thoughts on the legal implications of what
we received. That would be attorney-client
privileged at this point, all in the nature of
legal advice to the committee. And you could
determine based on that whether you have further
questions, whether you need further information,
or whether we should proceed based on what we
have.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: And I want to be
clear on that. The fact that it's attorney-client
privileged while we work through the implications,
that doesn't prevent us once we have gone through
that and are satisfied that the feedback we have
gotten from counsel, we can still open those --

the raw data and the recommendation up to the

public. There is nothing that would prevent us

from doing that later because we are still doing

legal review now?

ALAN ABES: Absolutely.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: That is certainly

my intent.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: So to make

sure I am clear on this because it was my

understanding that this was already closed as a

work product until we were doing the report. Is

that what you are saying is that while we are

working on this report, while we are doing all the

fact-finding that the original questionnaires

would still be held and not released as public

record, correct?

JEFFREY ANDERSON: That's my

understanding of what the feedback I just got is

that because there are still questions about how

responses could be interpreted, both on their own

or with -- in light of other responses, it's

reasonable for us to get that legal advice while

parsing the responses --

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Yes.
JEFFREY ANDERSON: -- and building a
draft for review.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: I just want
to make sure that we were all three saying the
exact same thing. That's what my understanding
was that it would all be held in still
confidential while you were working on it and not
released as public record until we have a report
to send to counsel. So we are all in the same
understanding on that.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: Well, and to be
clear, the things that are protected are the --
that we are talking about us understanding is the
subpoena responses.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Right.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: There is nothing
else that we have done that we need to talk about.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Right.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: And so e-mail
communications about agendas or conversations with
the administration, those are all already public
records.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Correct.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: We are only
talking about the work product that we are getting
advice on, which is the subpoena responses.

    ALAN ABES: That's correct.

    JEFFREY ANDERSON: Yes, I am comfortable with that.

    MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: I am comfortable with that as well. Okay. Do we have anything else? Under fact-finding investigation, you want us to make a determination now on which way we want to go forward, if we want to -- because it's our understanding that we are going to keep these -- keep everything sealed. And then did you want to start on the report now or do you think there is further investigation that needs to come from either subpoenas or from live testimony?

    JEFFREY ANDERSON: I guess I am not sure what some of the responses mean yet, and I need that advice before I could say for certain that we have everything we need. So I don't know, which is why I don't think I am comfortable making a motion to close evidence or testimony.

    I think we could -- we can if you think it's appropriate because we can reopen it, but I don't -- I don't know what that gets us. I think we need to finish parsing the responses, get the legal advice about the implications and what
it means. And we can do that in the context of, you know, preparing for the report.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Okay, that's fine. Let's go forward in that direction. And then our next -- we have pending public records requests. We have received several public record requests. I think we just have covered those a little bit, and I know that Alan has been responding as they came in to the public records requests as well.

In that respect, they are work product as of right now, and they are still not public record as of right now. But they will be being released in the full context once that we have a report written so that it's not just the raw data out there.

I want the correct information going out instead of pieces of it. I always tell my kids the same thing I tell everybody else is that if you know one percent of the deal, it doesn't tell you the whole story. So I really don't want to send out one percent of a story and call it a fact. That's my opinion on it.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: Yeah. I mean, to what we were talking about earlier, for me it's
not even a question of withholding the data. I don't understand the implications of some of it, and I need that legal advice as to what it means.

I don't have any problem releasing the records once we understand what they are, which is the same thing we committed to when we started this, that we would do it open and transparently. It's not a paternalistic kind of protect the public from a set of truth.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: No.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: They can draw their own conclusions from the data once we conduct and complete our part of the investigation.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Yeah, I don't want to release something without having all of the information behind it is what my whole thing is. Like you said, I really don't want to release stuff that's partial. I thought we had decided before that we wanted to do it as a whole with -- so that people understand the whole entire picture. But if it is -- if it's legally okay to release, obviously, I have no problem with it. I have zero problem releasing anything if it's --

ALAN ABES: Well, let's be clear on
the law just so everybody has the right background. So the presumption under the Revised Code is that documents are public records, and there are exceptions to that presumption. And there are lots of cases that discuss the limits of those exceptions.

So there are a couple issues here. Number one is the issue of whether these documents are records as defined in the statute to begin with. And then number two is if they are records, do they fall under an exception to production right now.

So based on the way that the records have been -- or the documents have been received and used, there is certainly an argument that they are not yet public records because the committee has not actually used them for any of the purposes that are outlined in the statute.

But even if you assume for the sake of argument that they are public records at this point, they would still be protected if they are part of an investigation being conducted or directed by an attorney and if they are being used -- and/or if they are being used to provide legal advice.
So at this point, the records certainly are a part of the investigation that is ongoing, and which I am involved, and I am using those records to provide legal advice to the committee. So those are the bases on which the records could be kept from production right now.

There will be a point in time when that is no longer the case. And at that point, the records would need to -- the documents would become public records, and they would need to be produced. So while I agree from a policy standpoint that it would be best if we had all of the evidence and could issue a report and put everything in context before disclosing what would then be public records, that's not necessarily the legal basis for refusing to produce them right now.

The legal basis is that we are relying on them to provide legal advice to the committee. So I just want to make sure that distinction is clear in the record. It would be nice if everybody could just wait until the committee finishes its business.

That's not going to happen, as we know. But we still have a legal basis not to
produce right now because they are the subject of an attorney investigation and ongoing legal advice.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: I am comfortable with that.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: I am comfortable with that. Okay, so that will -- at this point in time, we are waiting on our legal implications before we make any decisions.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: So do you need us to make any motions at this point in terms of the records request in order for you to continue to respond to them? Or back to your question of closing the evidentiary portion, do you need that as a formal motion at this point, or are we okay to continue?

ALAN ABES: No, you can give me direction without having to put it in a motion. If you feel more comfortable putting it in a motion, that's fine. But the direction is clear that I should continue to evaluate the responses that were received with respect to the subpoenas. I should provide legal advice to you as to what the responses mean and how to put them in the context of the law.
And within the context of that advice, you will decide how to proceed. And in the meantime, we will preserve the privilege for the records that were received pursuant to subpoena. If we receive any other requests for what truly are public records and they are not subject to the privilege, they will be produced promptly, as required by law.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: That summary is exactly right from my perspective. Meghan, are you --

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: I am totally fine with that, yeah. Like I said, as long as it's -- as soon as it's legally able to be released, we will release it. But until we know exactly what they mean, it's kind of pointless.

ALAN ABES: Yeah, and one thing I should add is that while I believe that Supreme Court precedent supports that position, and I have sent the case law to you so you can confirm that determination, not everybody will necessarily agree with that. So the committee should be aware that we have had multiple people request the subpoena responses.

And while we are comfortable in our
position, that would not prevent someone from challenging us. Someone could file a lawsuit. Someone could contest that we are incorrect. Obviously, any time you put an issue before a Court, a Court could disagree with your position. So there is risk in moving down this path.

And I just want to make sure that the committee appreciates that, and I know you do. But you can decide notwithstanding that risk that you are comfortable with the legal position and want to move forward.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: So as maybe a suggestion or an action for this committee to consider is we made our two positions clear. We certainly have a city council meeting where we give an update on the committee process. I would recommend that as part of our update we make sure that the full council is aware that we have taken that position.

And if there is concern, that is certainly their opportunity to raise it formally. The timing -- I mean, that's what, actually next Wednesday, and our next meeting isn't far behind it. So it's really just -- we are talking about days at this point between when we think we will
be able to produce something.

But I would recommend that we include that in our formal update as a committee to the full council. One more point on that. If out of that city council meeting there is concern raised about that risk, I think that would be a situation where we should consider a special meeting in order to then formally open the records or consider that feedback.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Absolutely.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: So from that, you know, we can certainly have a special meeting if needed. I don't expect it to be -- I think we have gotten sound legal advice, but I will just put that on the table.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Of course. So I want to make sure this is right because I want your input on what I am going to say, so I am saying that we move the full council to know that we agree open to releasing public -- or subpoenaed answers.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: I would say based on legal advice received to the committee, the committee agrees that we should continue to get the legal advice inside the responses, due to the
responses, as we conduct our investigation. That
does carry some risk that we wanted to make sure
that city council as a whole was aware of.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Okay. Risk
of -- okay. All right, I will put that in my
report. Now, this kind of goes under the options
of the committee investigative report. I think we
have already covered that by our other two things.
I think we understand our options. At this point
in time, I think we have already stated our
options were to wait on getting legal implications
and going forward from there.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: Are you talking
about the report?

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Uh-huh.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: Yeah, so maybe we
can talk for just a minute about that. So we have
gotten the subpoena responses. We are working
with counsel interpreting and understanding what
those mean. What are the next steps that are
available to us? So we have got this opportunity
to talk about it, right? So let's make sure it's
clear because I don't want to lose two more
weeks --

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Absolutely.
JEFFREY ANDERSON: -- if there is something else we can agree on today. So what are our options, knowing that we are still reviewing the subpoenas in terms of starting the report so we can get a recommendation? Our original schedule had us targeting in early September a submission of our draft report to counsel. So what are our options to hit that?

ALAN ABES: So right now we have done fact-finding. And based on that fact-finding, I want to provide legal advice to the committee as to what the facts mean and whether there are any gaps in the facts based on the city charter, based on the council rules, and based on the law generally.

So the option at this point as I understand it is for me to continue to analyze the responses that we have gotten pursuant to the subpoena, to advise the committee how those responses relate to the law because ultimately, the committee is engaged in kind of a dual prong process, one of which is to find as best it can the facts of what happened. But second, to put that in the context of the law and then decide what conclusions or actions need to be taken as a
result of how the facts apply to the law.

So I would provide you with that analysis. It could take the form of a draft report. It could take the form of a memorandum. I will decide based on -- after I take a further examination of the responses what form that should take.

But the result would be legal advice to the committee as to how we should proceed based on the facts gathered. That can be done within a couple weeks, for sure. I will be away next week, as I think I told you. But the following week, I can have an analysis for you.

And then depending on when you decide the next meeting of this committee should be -- I know there is one scheduled for the 16th, but you might want to postpone that based on the time it will take to put the analysis together. Then the committee can decide whether it has enough to issue the report or whether it needs to take further testimony or other kinds of evidence.

And if at that point you decide that you have enough or there is a limited amount of evidence taking you still want to do, then we should still be on target for that early September
date to issue a report.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: So you mentioned a memorandum or, you know, a draft report. Would it be reasonable for us to assume that based on that -- we would get that draft ahead of time? Obviously, the committee needs to make recommendations based off of that feedback.

Is that something where we need to have that conversation at that 16th meeting or whenever the draft of the report, the 23rd or whenever the next meeting is and then write a cover page to the report with our recommendations or -- because at some point, that goes back to city council as a whole and they can decide to accept the report or not and then accept the recommendations or not, and maybe multiple recommendations.

So I guess I am trying to understand very tactically how that can happen, just from a task. Like what do we need to do when in order to get a report that's actionable with recommendations to counsel?

ALAN ABES: So you would need to adopt the report in an open committee meeting. So we can discuss a draft of the report in a setting
that's attorney-client privileged. But once you
decide based on my advice that there is a report
that is sufficient to consider in an open meeting,
then you would do that.

People would get to see that report
because it would be a public record, and you would
decide in the open meeting whether to issue your
report as drafted or whether to make any changes.
Once you adopt the report in that meeting, then
you would send it to the full council for
consideration.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: So can you say a
little bit more on the evaluating drafts outside
of a meeting? What kind of things would we be
able to talk about under the -- in that type of
setting as opposed to -- we are trying to -- I am
just trying to understand how to keep it moving
forward, right?

So we have got meetings set. We can
have more meetings if we need them, right? So we
have got the responses. We believe there is
enough to do some more analysis and potentially
write a set of draft reports or findings. We
would then as a committee get those, and we would
then in an open meeting add our recommendations
because that's not going to have, like, recommendations for actions or results, it's just going to be responses and what that means from a legal perspective.

ALAN ABES: Well, it depends on format. So I think if I were to prepare a memo, then it would have a summary of the facts and a summary of the law and recommended options for how you can proceed.

If I prepare a draft report, then you can look at that in a privileged setting, but you would not make decisions about what's ultimately going to be in the report. You would not deliberate about what's going to be in the report, but you could evaluate the report for completeness. You could evaluate it for presentation, format, et cetera.

And then when we are in the open meeting, you can discuss ultimately what you should adopt as the content of the report. So I think probably the best way to do it is to prepare a draft, take a look at it in a privileged setting.

Let's determine whether it's in a format where you are comfortable discussing it in
an open meeting. And then if we need to add meetings so we can have some working sessions, for example, that's fine. But really any decisions about the final content of the report will be made in a public meeting.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Okay. I probably have the same concerns that Jeff does because I was worried about if we are in a privileged -- it wouldn't be any different than you e-mailing us and us talking about it in an open discussion later on, right? Because you are allowed to -- if we are in a privileged meeting, we can't have any say-so on it. At this point in time, there is no decisions can be made about the product that we received?

ALAN ABES: Right, right. I would just be providing you with legal advice, information, and options. But you would not deliberate or make decisions other than in a public meeting.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: If there was a gap or a question that wasn't included or something that we would want advice on --

ALAN ABES: You could point that out.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: -- we could point
out that this area or this question was raised in
an open council meeting, for example, isn't
addressed in the draft report, please revise the
draft report. That's not a decision that needs to
be done in open, that's just feedback on --

ALAN ABES: That's an exchange of
information.

MEGAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: So we are
allowed to do that?

ALAN ABES: Yes.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: That's what
I was asking, what was the difference between if
you just e-mail it to us and we show up to talk
about it.

ALAN ABES: If I prepare a draft and
you tell me I missed something, that's just an
exchange of information. That's not a decision
that needs to be made in a public meeting.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: But if we
disagreed with a conclusion or wanted it to be
more forceful or less forceful, that would be
something we should reserve for an open meeting?

ALAN ABES: Yes.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: So I guess I am
back to just very tactically because I don't want
to lose time. I want this to finish. We have a set of information, we are evaluating that. What do you need from us in order to draft either that memorandum or report based on the evaluations that you are doing? Do you need us to tell you that, agree on that? What do you need to do? Because I feel like that's the next step --

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Yeah.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: -- right?

ALAN ABES: If you tell me to prepare a draft, I will prepare a draft. I will provide it to you in a privileged setting. We will talk about it for an exchange of information and an explanation of legal options only, and then you can decide whether to make it an agenda item for a public meeting.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: I am comfortable with that. What timeline? What timeline could we do that on, just that expectation, both for us and for the public?

ALAN ABES: So right now -- I am just looking at my calendar. Right now, there is a meeting scheduled for the 16th. I think just based on my personal schedule, it's ambitious to have something ready for a public meeting by then.
So I would suggest setting or rescheduling a meeting for the following week. The 23rd would be fine with me, if you want to do that. I could then have a draft to you either at the end of the week of the 13th or the very beginning of the week of the 20th, more likely the end of the week of the 13th.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Do you have the City's schedule?

JEFFREY ANDERSON: I have it right here.

ALAN ABES: We could discuss it in a privileged setting simply for an exchange of information and explanation of what's in the report. And then we would be prepared -- assuming that there is nothing significant missing from the draft report, we would then be prepared to discuss it in an open meeting on the 23rd or whatever other date works that week.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: The City calendar is open on the 23rd. That's not to say that -- I mean, I would need to confirm that.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Right.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: But I would like to do that, if it's a matter of moving the regular
meeting back by a week so that we could have a
draft report that we could review and potentially
agree on. That would then give us the opportunity
to make revisions and get a report out to the full
council for pre-read with at least a week for them
to review it before the first meeting in
September.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Oh, I
absolutely agree. I will check with the City.
And if it's available, I will get us on the
calendar and have notice put out. So at this
point in time, I do want to put out there that
we -- I need to vote on cancelling the 16th
meeting or actually moving it to the 23rd.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: I move that we
reschedule the August 16th meeting for
August 23rd, pending availability of facilities.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: All those
in favor?

JEFFREY ANDERSON: Aye.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Aye. All
right. I will get ahold of them tomorrow and make
that change, the 23rd at 7:00 o'clock in these
chambers.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: To be clear, so we
said a lot of ifs, if we ask you to do these things. I feel like we are.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: We are. I feel like we are.

ALAN ABES: I am pretty sure you are, yes.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Yes. Okay, so you will let us know when the draft is ready for the review in a privileged setting, and then we will go from there and leave the 23rd open meeting to discuss it?

ALAN ABES: Correct.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Okay, I am good. Are you good?

JEFFREY ANDERSON: I am. I really want to see the draft now.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN: It's not ready yet, Jeff.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: Is it ready yet?

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Be patient. We will e-mail you daily, is it ready yet?

JEFFREY ANDERSON: I might be able to go to law school faster than this.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Okay, moving on to old business. Do you have any old
business you would like to discuss?

JEFFREY ANDERSON: There was just one item I want to make sure gets addressed at least publicly. We committed to having the agendas and minutes posted the last time we talked about it. There was a section of the City website that was created for it. Links are still up, but the documents are not yet there.

We have a commitment from the administration that the minutes that have been approved will be posted on the public website tomorrow at the very latest, so I assume that's tomorrow by the close of business. I am going to follow up on that --

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Absolutely, that's fine.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: -- after, tomorrow.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Yeah, I saw your e-mail today. I actually saw that there was a link. I didn't click on it, so I actually assumed that they were there because the link was there. I didn't click on it, though. So yes, that would be awesome. Any other old business you have?
JEFFREY ANDERSON: No.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: Okay, then I will move on to our last agenda.

JEFFREY ANDERSON: Move to adjourn.

MEGHAN SULLIVAN-WISECUP: I agree.

Have a great night, everybody.

(Thereupon, the meeting was concluded at 7:33 o'clock p.m.)
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