



MINUTES OF THE ETHICS BOARD

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2022, 5:00 PM

Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INSTRUCTIONS.

I. This item contains Zoom information, instructions, and a link to the Virtual Comment Form.

B. ROLL CALL.

I. William Vande Castle, Chair; Aaron Weinschenk, Vice Chair; Alder Bill Galvin; Cheryl Renier-Wigg; Said Hassan; Janet Hathaway

Present: Bill Galvin, William VandeCastle, Cheryl Renier-Wigg, Aaron Weinschenk, Janet Hathaway

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the Agenda for the February 3, 2022 Ethics Board meeting

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Aaron Weinschenk to Approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, William VandeCastle, Cheryl Renier-Wigg, Aaron Weinschenk, Janet Hathaway, No-None, Abstain- None.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the December 14, 2021 Ethics Board Meeting.

Moved by Board Member William VandeCastle, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to Hold.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, William VandeCastle, Cheryl Renier-Wigg, Aaron Weinschenk, Janet Hathaway, No-None, Abstain- None.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. Discussion with possible deliberation and action on the following topics related to the Ethics Complaint filed by Kimber Rollin against Mayor Eric Genrich under the City of Green Bay Code of Conduct for Elected Officials:

1. Recusal issues.
2. Jurisdictional issues.
3. Other matters and future scheduling.

The Board may convene in closed session pursuant to Section 19.85(1)(a), Wis. Stats., for purposes of deliberating concerning a case which was the subject of any judicial or quasi-judicial trial or hearing before that governmental body. The Board will thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to Section 19.85(2), Wis. Stats., to take action on items discussed in closed session, if appropriate, and to consider the remainder of the agenda.

Parties provide statements on recusal issues. Board Member Cheryl Renier-Wigg states that she is able to remain impartial and will not recuse herself. Alder Bill Galvin states that he is able to remain impartial and will not recuse himself.

Parties provide statements on jurisdictional issues.

Moved by Board Member William VandeCastle, seconded by Aaron Weinschenk to enter closed session.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, William VandeCastle, Cheryl Renier-Wigg, Aaron Weinschenk, Janet Hathaway, No-None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Staff Cheryl Renier-Wigg, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to return to regular session.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, William VandeCastle, Cheryl Renier-Wigg, Aaron Weinschenk, Janet Hathaway, No-None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Board Member William VandeCastle, seconded by Janet Hathaway to have Attorney May proceed as directed in closed session.

Motion Passed.

Yes- None, No- None, Abstain- None.

F. ADJOURNMENT.

VERBATIM MINUTES

[Verbatim minutes are not available for the first portion of the Board meeting.]

- [Attorney Lenz] The preamble section one of the Green Bay ethics code and our initial complaint, and then again, in her response now bringing forward allegations under sections three and four, that those, you know, for reasons I've discussed, I don't think we really need to even address those. But similarly she doesn't identify specific provisions, which is what the code requires for a complaint, merely recites what's in there. There are a lot of specific provisions in the Green Bay code of ethics. This board certainly knows that better than I ever will. None of those are addressed in Ms. Rollin's complaint. This is more of a general grievance or an elections complaint much of which has nothing to do with the mayor of Green Bay and has to do with a private individual who's not an elected official. The second reason that we believe the complaint is not in conformance with the code and therefore doesn't convey jurisdiction is that it's untimely. Ms. Rollin's response does not dispute that her complaint was filed outside the one year after all of these events allegedly took place, but more importantly, more than one year after the election, but she rather relies on the discovery rule. We made the analogy and Ms. Rollin made the analogy to discovery rule under in the civil laws and the criminal laws in the state of Wisconsin and the body of law that's developed around that that Wisconsin does recognize a discovery rule that you have a certain amount of time after you discover the wrongdoing or the violation to bring forward a complaint. But what Ms. Rollin did not do in her response and cannot do is demonstrate in any way that she was diligent in trying to uncover what had happened. And the reason she can't is that all of the events that Ms. Rollin's described, you know, the election, because many of the events she described really didn't happen, but the election took place in public. It was by law, by practice in the city of Green Bay, by practice in the media, was a very public event. There was no reason that a reasonably diligent or even partially diligent person who was interested in what was happening could not have viewed what was happening in real time. Ms. Rollin's complaints in the complaint, at least about election grant funding were subject to litigation long before the election, much of which was reported in newspapers. This were not secret events. This is not like a stray voltage case where the, you know, you don't find out about the damage to the livestock until years later and have to uncover what happened. All of this happened on YouTube in public. Ms. Rollin, like many others had every right to go to central count and observe what was going on that day. And in fact, in her response, she attaches the observer log that identifies about 38 people who did attend central count and who did observe what was happening that day. So, all of that is by way of saying that Ms. Rollin cannot demonstrate that she was reasonably diligent, rather she relies on when the city of Green Bay, more or less delivered documents to her. And then the final reason that the complaint doesn't conform with the requirements of the code is that it contains no evidentiary information, which is required by the code. Ms. Rollin's in her initial complaint did not identify a single document that she relies upon. Did not identify witnesses, did not identify the basis of her beliefs. The only document she references in the complaint is the findings of the city attorney from April of 2021, which directly contradict many of the all allegations in her complaint. She left the board and the respondent with no way of knowing what the basis of these allegations were beyond what she was saying and that's a violation of what's set forth in the code, what's required for complaints. Again, now in response, Ms. Rollin's has attempted to attach various affidavits and some other documents, frankly, none of which support the allegations, but leaving aside, those were unsworn attachments to a later document. They're not part of the complaint. They don't confer jurisdiction. They don't cure what was wrong in the first place. So I'll kind of conclude with this, you know, from the beginning, from the date of the election to today's date, these similar complaints, similar allegations that are contained here have been part of the public narrative. Unfortunately, they've been sought, you know, they've been part of litigation that the city's responded to other parties have responded to much of which again was subject to considerable press. They don't belong before this body, they've been disproven. The city ran a

successful legal election in November of 2020. That fact has been proven again and again and again, and Ms. Rollin's complaint is so lacking on its face that there's no need for the board to reconsider any of those facts. With that, I'm happy to answer any questions. Mr. Galvin you're muted, I'm sorry. I'm sorry, I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, you're muted.

- I'm sorry. Any questions from any of the board members? Nope, all right, hearing none then I'll turn the floor over to Ms. Rollin, and Ms. Rollin part of this is really limited to the jurisdictional issues that were raised by the mayor's responses. So it's not really into the substance of the complaint, but really the jurisdictional issues. So in your response, kind of confine yourself to those responses and not get into the necessarily the facts of your complaint. So the floor is yours.

- [Kimber] I don't know if I can comply with that, but, okay. So my name is Kimber Rollin. I have a prepared statement here and I'm going to read it. I'm a resident of the city of Green Bay, Wisconsin. I am not an attorney. I am just an ordinary citizen who filed the complaint as best I could. I filed a very straightforward two page complaint against Mayor Genrich on November 4th, 2021. I stated that Mayor Genrich has violated the city of Green Bay, Wisconsin code of conduct for elected officials. I'm not an attorney. In my complaint, I also reserve the right to amend and add to it. I added a number of affidavits and documents in my response that verify the facts that I stated in my complaint. Attorney Lenz in his 28th, 2020 reply stated that my complaint is based on blatant falsehoods and borderline slanderous accusations. I am insulted by that. My complaint is based on facts, supported by affidavits, emails, news articles, and other documents. This is why we need a public hearing. The facts need to be presented, and questions need to be answered in an open meeting for everyone to hear. I believe in open meetings and for the public to be informed. Attorney Lenz's statement in the mayor's January 28th, 2022 reply, in my opinion, fails to give all the facts regarding the May 4th, 2021 council meeting. I looked up the wording for the council's resolution and the resolution was that the August and November, 2020 elections administered by the city of Green Bay were properly executed in an accurate, safe, and secure manner and reject claims to the contrary. The resolution passed with six yes votes and five alders abstaining and one no vote. Attorney Lenz fails to mention that the council went into closed session for over 40 minutes and that the vote was close. Yes, the vote was six to one with five alders abstaining, hardly full confidence. It is my understanding that Attorney Lenz in law forward represent Mayor Genrich and the city of Green Bay pro bono. Now I'm going to focus on the ethics complaint. I believe it was filed on time for the following reasons. In the spring of 2020 I discovered that a man from New York ran the Green Bay central count and was significantly involved in the election in Green Bay. I discovered this after listening to testimony at the state elections meeting on March 10th, 2021. This is my testimony. How would I have ever known on November 3rd and November 4th that this man from New York had that much authority at our central count. Furthermore, the central count livestream was not recorded and therefore cannot be reviewed. It is my understanding that the observer log was not open for observation on election day and was only provided later because of a FOYA request. After listening to Sandy Juno testify before the elections committee in spring of 2021, I learned that a man from Brooklyn, New York was at central count in Green Bay telling poll workers what to do, that this New Yorker was ordering people around, that he was working with and handling ballots, that the New York man was checking people and his poll workers and observers, that this New York man designed the layout of central count and that he had keys to the storage area where the voting machines were stored at the KI Center, that this New York man was in the area where the voting machines were the Sunday and Monday prior to the election by himself and that he had a special internet connection installed at central count, that the New York man was provided a badge identifying him as representing the city of Green Bay as the election official. Finally, in the spring of 2021, I learned that numerous people stated that this New York man was in charge of central count for the Green Bay for Green Bay, and that he appeared to be running the central count. The observer log shows that the man from New York identified as Michael Spitzer-

Rubenstein was signed into central count as an observer. This observer log also shows that he did not sign in as an observant until after 11:00 PM on November 3rd, 2020. Mr. Rubenstein was not a poll worker. He was not a resident of the state of Wisconsin. I think in order to administer central count and tell poll workers what to do that he should have been at least a resident of state. I am not a lawyer, but I think that Wisconsin statute state that the clerk is to run the central count, not a man from New York. Over 31,891 absentee votes were counted at the KI Center. I questioned the fact that a man from New York managed the central count for the election on November 3rd and fourth, 2020. A man from New York should not have been allowed to be one of the head people for the central count of our city and have that much control and access to our central count. It is wrong. The code of conduct for election officials for the city of Green Bay says that a complaint under the code must be filed no later than one year from the date of discovery of the alleged violation. I discovered this in the spring of 2021, that is my testimony. In researching the news articles for this response, the first article I found was written by Hailey B Miller on November 13, 2020, 10 days after the election. After reading some more articles on this matter, I believe that the public man from New York running central count until after the FOYA requests were answered in January, February of 2021, I filed this complaint within one year from the date of discovery of the alleged violation. I was not present at central count. A livestream video of central count is discussed in the mayor's response took in my complaint. The letter from Attorney Lenz, there is no recording of the livestream, if there is one, I would like to review it. I was told that the city failed to preserve the livestream video. It would be nice to have that so we could see what really happened. The livestream video would answer a lot of question if the cameras were pointed in the right direction. I will have to present a witness as to what they saw Michael Spitzer-Rubenstein and Mayor Genrich doing at central count. I could attach a written transcript of the testimony before the elections commission, but I do not have that. So I thought I could put witnesses on to tell firsthand what they saw, Michael Spitzer-Rubenstein and Mayor Genrich doing at central count. Those people who I would ask to testify would be Sandy Juno, Attorney Hamari, Chad Winegar, Elizabeth Rankin, Andrea Johnson, Attorney Cluster and Rex Cotageli, Matt Razor, and Poly Razor. I believe all of these people would testify that they saw or had documentation that Michael Spitzer-Rubenstein from New York City was one, telling poll workers what to do, two, handling ballots, three, administering central count, four, setting up central count, five, working in central count restricted area that Sunday and Monday before the election, six, designed and setup the layout of central count, seven, set up a secure hidden internet line, eight, set up and used a computer near the ballot county machines within the central count processing area. Nine, Michael Spitzer-Rubenstein was provided a badge identifying himself as representative of the city of Green Bay as an election official, 10, most importantly is that Mayor Genrich was present at central count and was talking to an observing Michael Spitzer-Rubenstein. Mayor Genrich was aware of what was occurring at central count. Attorney Lenz letter says that Mayor Genrich absolutely denies my complaint. If the person charge appears and denies the complaint, the ethics code says that both the complainant and the person charged may produce witnesses, cross examine witnesses and be represented by counsel. I am requesting the opportunity to present witnesses. I would also like additional time to find an attorney to help me. Again, I am not an attorney. In my opinion, Mayor Genrich failed to maintain the utmost standards, a personal integrity, trustfulness, honesty and fairness in carrying out his public duties for the November 3rd election. He allowed a man from New York to administer the central count in Green Bay, Wisconsin. Mayor Genrich failed to comply with the election laws by allowing a non-resident to act as a poll worker and act as head of Green Bay central count. This is a violation of the requirements of a number of the Wisconsin state statutes. The city clerk is to be in charge of the elections. Mayor Genrich used his position authority to allow Michael Spitzer-Rubenstein to run central count work as poll worker and represent himself as a city employee. Mayor Genrich allowed a non-resident to work at and control.

- Excuse me, excuse me, excuse me Mr. May.

- [Kimber] Mayor Genrich's actions have put the legitimacy.

- Point of order.

- [Kimber] Central count and integrity of the city of Green Bay into question. The city of Green Bay and the media and books regarding the handle of the election. Mayor Greenwich has failed.

- Mr. Chairman, this is going way, way, way past what the question was as a jurisdictional issue. Obviously Ms. Rollin has a prepared statement and we're asking for her to answer about the jurisdictional issue. I mean, she's had so much information here, I can't follow what she's saying anymore.

- [Kimber] This is being recorded correctly, correct? This is being recorded?

- Yes, but Ms. Rollin We're not here to make an opening statement in your case or we're not here to present testimony or evidence. We're here to address the jurisdictional issues that were raised by the mayor's response. I think you've covered most of it, but I'll give you an opportunity to just circle back and make sure you've covered everything, but we're not here to provide testimony or opinions. Our issue here is really the jurisdictional issues that were raised in the mayor's response and that's what the purpose of tonight's meeting is. So if you wanna respond to that, that's fine, but not to make an opening statement for your case. That's not what we're here for.

- [Kimber] May I finish the last page of my letter?

- If you can attune it to the jurisdictional responses, yes. But again, like I said, you prepared a letter, but this is not an opening statement in your case, you've repeated a number of things that are factual issues that would be addressed in a legal proceeding if it got that far, but we're here to address whether or not it even gets to that point and that's the issue that needs to be focused on here tonight. So the mayor has raised several jurisdictional issues and we're looking for your responses to those, not an opening statement or not testimony. I think you've addressed the issue of timeliness. I don't know that I've heard anything about addressing the issues raised by the mayor in of the sufficiency of the complaint, if you wanna address those by all means do so. Do you have a response to the mayor's issue regarding the substance of your complaint.

- [Kimber] I'm not sure that at this time I understand the question good enough.

- Attorney May I'm at an issue here of whether I start giving legal advice as to what the requirements are. I think maybe I would turn it over to you for any guidance that we should deal with on this.

- Again, I don't think either you or I or the board ought to be advising her on how to bring her case. I think that's an issue for her. As a practical matter, if there's one page left for her to read and that's all she has, you might consider whether to just let her finish up, and then we could move on, and even though it may not be directly relevant to the issues in front of the board, she would at least have had

her day in front of the board.

- All right, right, and again, I have no problem with that, I just wanna make sure that we're focused on responding to all the jurisdictional issues that were raised. And from what I've heard and recall hearing, there's a couple of the things that I don't know have been responded to, but all right, Ms. Rollin, we note the objection from Alder Galvin and the concerns that I've raised, but go ahead and finish your last page.

- [Kimber] Okay, thank you for the time. Okay, so finally, I do not have the affidavits that I attached to my response when I filed this ethics complaint, I did not have the affidavits that I attached to the, my response when I filed the ethics complaint, the affidavits attached to my response show that Mayor Genrich was present at central count on November 3rd and November 4th. Attorney Lenz incorrectly states in the January 28th reply that the affidavit of Andrea Johnson does not mention Mayor Genrich at all. I would like to point out that the affidavit of Andrea Johnson states on page two, number 21, the following, I notice that the mayor was present during the morning and evenings, sometimes talking with Mr. Spitzer-Rubenstein, Attorney Lenz has misstated the facts regarding this affidavit. Attorney Lenz has stated a blatant falsehood. Attorney Lenz goes on to state that these sworn affidavits are not credible. I am sure that Attorney Cluster, Elizabeth Rankin and Andrea Johnson believe that their sworn affidavits are truthful and very credible, but the truthfulness and credibility issue is one for the fact finder determined during testimony. I believe that I have one year from March 12th, 2021 to file this ethics complaint. That is the date that the FOYA responses were made public. I discovered this matter in the spring of 2021, therefore the time period for filing has not yet run and I asked that I would be allowed to mend the complaint or refile it and attach all of the documents that support the facts that I have stated in my complaint. And if required restate the specific parts of the code of ethics that were violated. I am also able to provide affidavits and documentation to support each and every statement that I have made in my complaint. Mayor Genrich should appear before this committee and explain his conduct. Mayor Genrich should appear and answer all questions regarding the role that Michael Spitzer-Rubenstein played at Green Bays central count on election. I support the city of Green Bay staff, entirely, I do. I love this city, but not a man from New York. I believe that any appearance of impropriety regarding the November 3rd, 2020 election is unacceptable. I believe that everyone's vote must count. I believe in election integrity and justice for all in this situation. Thank you.

- All right, I think from a procedural standpoint, we would give Attorney Lenz an opportunity to respond to what was related if he chooses to do so. Attorney Lenz.

- [Attorney Lenz] Thank you, Mr. Chair, I'll be very brief. I appreciate the opportunity. First, I'll direct a, well, maybe I'll leave that to the end. So I wanna focus first on what we did not hear from Ms. Rollin. We did not hear responses or as to the two of the deficiencies pointed out in the complaint that it did not contain any evidentiary basis and that it did not specify a provision of the code, those appeared to be uncontested and we knew that to a certain extent from the written response as well. I think leaving aside the timeliness issue that sufficient cause for the board to find that there's no jurisdiction here. The complaint simply does not meet the requirements of the code. I respect that Ms. Rollin is not an attorney, but she was clearly able to review the code to find out that the complaint had to be sworn and had to include her address. They're not particularly difficult provisions. So I think that's enough, but just addressing a few more items, Ms. Rollin asked as part of her argument on timeliness, how would I have known, how would I have known what was happening at central count, central count was public. She, you know, it was available to her. There was a live stream. I appreciate that it wasn't recorded, but that's not really the point. The point is that it was accessible to everybody across the

country, across the world. If you were interested in what's happening in central count, it was available. And I think without, and I completely agree that we're not here to discuss facts, but what we did hear in terms of the allegations that are of interest to Ms. Rollin is that they're not allegations under the Green Bay code of ethics. They appear to be allegations at best under Wisconsin election law. Many of them appear to be directed at any elected official, but at another individual. And again, I don't think this board should find it as jurisdiction to further proceed on that type of complaint. So I do have one question similar to the question that the chair raised at the beginning in a response to a point that Ms. Rollin made. My copy of the affidavit of Andrea Johnson goes from paragraph 11 to paragraph 23 and does not appear to contain the allegations she discussed. If I had an incomplete copy, I apologize. I certainly did not mean to misrepresent any documents. The copy I have does not include the language that she discussed. I did just wanna address that because it was out there. And so I'll leave with this, you know, we've heard a number of reasons why this complaint must be dismissed, why the board should take no further proceedings in this matter. I don't want to disguise the fact that the mayor however, is proud of how the election was run, is proud of city staff, is proud of particularly the members of the clerk's office who ran this election, who ran central count, who did an amazing job under really difficult circumstances. And, you know, this election was important and it was conducted in accordance with the law is because it was so important and because it's so important to give the voters of the city of Green Bay their voice, and that's what happened here and I don't want that to be lost. So again, I'm more than happy to answer any questions the board may have, but I'll leave it there. Thank you.

- All right. Any questions from any member of the board to either Ms. Rollin or Attorney Lenz? All right, hearing none, then our next item on the agenda if I get back to the right page here is any sort of any other matters that need to be addressed, other matters in future scheduling. Having heard from both sides here, in addition to their filings and the information that they've provided tonight, obviously we were at a point where a decision, some decisions need to be made on these issues before we proceed to the, proceed to the next step in this process. Normally in these situations, we would adjourn in for discussion with legal counsel as to how we proceed next, and then don't know that any decisions would necessarily be made tonight, but we would then come back into open session to at least address where we are with those discussions from closed session. So, unless there is any other issues that need to be addressed, at this point, I would propose that we adjourn into closed session under section 19.85 sub one, sub A that's provided in the agenda and for deliberating concerning the issues that were presented this evening. Attorney May any comments on your side of this?

- Not at this time.

- Okay, so I would make the motion to adjourn into close session, is there a second and go through the process.

- I'll second, I'll second, Aaron.

- All right, Aaron has a second. So let me just read the statement that put into the record that the board may convene in closed session pursuant to section 19.85 sub one, sub A of Wisconsin statutes for the purpose of deliberating concerning the case which was the subject of any judicial or quasi judicial trial or hearing before that governmental body. The board will thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to 19.8, section 19.85 sub two of the Wisconsin statutes to take action on items discussed in closed session, if appropriate, and to consider the remainder of the agenda. Just note for the record that the only other item on the agenda would be adjournment. So we have a motion and a

second, Attorney Mather would you take a roll call vote on this as to approval of the, or action on this motion?

- You bet, Alder Galvin?

- Yes.

- Chair VandeCastle?

- Yes.

- Ms. Renier-Wigg?

- Yes.

- Mr. Weinschenk?

- Yes.

- Ms. Hathaway?

- Yes.

- All right, so we got a motion and a second, and a roll call to approve going into closed session to discuss this matter further, and it's been approved. So we will adjourn then into closed session. And Attorney Mather, will you put us into the appropriate room here to allow us to do that?

- You bet, just bear with me in just a moment, thanks.

- Certainly.

- Go ahead.

- All right, thank you. We are, I guess, technically still in closed session, but we are finished with our discussions and we are ready to reconvene an open session. So is there a motion to leave closed session?

- Make a motion to leave closed session.

- And is there a second?

- Second.

- All right, we have a motion and a second. Attorney Mather, do you want us to take this by roll call or just by voice vote?

- Just a voice vote is fine.

- Yeah, that's what I thought. All right, so all in favor of returning to open session, please signify by saying aye?

- [Multiple Board Members] Aye.

- Any opposed? Motion carries, so we are now back in open session. So let me give a recitation of where we are here. We've had a discussion concerning the issues that were raised, both the jurisdictional and some of the procedural issues that were raised by the parties in open session before we went into closed session. We've had an extensive discussion and back and forth on this and what we have done is directed Attorney May to put into writing our findings of fact conclusions of law and decision that we will review and then return with a decision based on those findings. So procedurally, what we're going to do is adjourn this meeting tonight, or wait until Attorney May submits to us the, his draft of the findings of fact conclusions law and judgment for us to review, we will meet again in the future after we receive those documents. We'll start off in that meeting, going back into closed session to review attorney May's proposed draft to make sure it's consistent with our discussions from this evening, and then we will come out of open session at that meeting and deliver our decision with the findings of fact and the conclusions. But we want, because of the legal issues that were involved here, we want Attorney May to provide us with the direction in how to respond to those. So that's the course of action that we've decided upon from our closed session discussion. Any comments from the board? Hearing none, I then think we're right for a motion to adjourn.

- I think, sorry just to interject, I think we've previously had like a motion to proceed as directed or for the attorney to proceed as directed in closed session just so we have like a decisive action item on this.

- That's correct.

- All right, So I will make the motion that Attorney May proceed as directed in the closed session and that we move forward on that basis. Is there a second?

- I'll second.

- All right, thank you, Janet. All in favor of, or any further discussion regarding the motion? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion to direct Attorney May to proceed with our discussions based on our

discussion closed session, signify by saying aye.

- [Multiple Board Members In Unison] Aye.

- Any opposed? Hearing none, motion carries. Now, is there a motion to adjourn? We have a motion, is there a second?

- I'll second.

- All right, we have motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [Multiple Board Members In Unison] Aye.

- Very good, we are adjourned. Thank you everyone. We will be back in touch once we have Attorney May's draft and then we will be back in touch with everybody to schedule the next motion or the next meeting of the ethics board. Thank you all very much, and good evening.

- And just a reminder to the ethics board members, we do have a meeting next Thursday same time, same place.

- Yes.

- Thank you all.

- All right, very good, thank you.

- Thank you for your time.