

The Judicial Council of California is the constitutionally created policymaking body of the California courts. The council meets at least six times a year for business meetings that are open to the public and audiocast live via the California Courts website. What follows is a formatted and unedited transcript of the **special meeting of June 8, 2015**. The official record of each meeting—the meeting minutes—is usually approved by the council at the next business meeting. Much more information about this meeting, the work of the Judicial Council, and the role of the state court system is available on the California Courts website at www.courts.ca.gov.

>> All right, Chief. If you think it's okay, I'll go ahead and start.

>> I think it's good. Go ahead, Justice Miller.

>> Thank you. Good morning, Council members and members of the public. This is a special business meeting of the Judicial Council --

>> Joining the meeting [Indiscernible -- multiple speakers]

>> This meeting is being conducted by telephone and is now in session. It's an open meeting with members of the public available to listen by phone. As many of you know, we are meeting today at the direction of the Chief Justice as the Rules and Projects Committee to develop an expedited get -- on a basis a new court rule that would allow --

>> Joining the meeting --

>> Allow those with traffic infractions to appear before -- for arraignment and trial without prior deposit of bail. Please also note that we received public comments which have been provided to all council members; public comment ended on Friday. However, we continue to receive public comments. Over the weekend those were provided to council members for review and consideration for today. Before the Chief begins, I'm going to ask council staff member Nancy Carlisle if you could take the role of the voting members of the Judicial Council. Thank you, Nancy.

>> You're welcome. Chief Justice: Chief Justice Cantil-Sakauye, Judge Marla Anderson, Judge Brian Back, Assembly Member Bloom, Mr. Mark Bonino, Judge Brandlin, Justice Chin, Judge De Alba, Judge Elias, Mr. Fox, Justice Hull, Senator Hannah Beth Jackson, Ms. Melby, Justice Miller, Judge Nadler, Ms. Pole, Judge Rosenberg, Judge Rubin, Judge Stout, Judge Tangeman. And I'll ask Justice Ashmann-Gerst? We anticipated her absence. I anticipated the roll call.

>> Thank you, Nancy. We do have a quorum of Judicial Council voting members. Chief, thank you.

>> Thank you, Justice Miller. Thank you, Nancy for the roll call. I appreciate everyone making time for this emergency meeting. And for lending us this early morning. As many of you know, three weeks ago I asked the Judicial Council to take urgent action to adopt the rule of court to

increase access to court for those who want to challenge their traffic tickets. I wanted to make certain that Californians would not have to pay for a traffic infraction before appearing in their court. I directed Justice Hull as chair of the council's Rules and Projects Committee, or RUPRO, as we call it, to develop a rule of court that would promote procedural fairness and traffic infraction safety. In developing the rule I requested Justice Hull, as well as interested individuals and organizations, that input was very helpful. For that, I'm grateful. In April, the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and other organizations issued a report entitled *Not Just a Ferguson Problem*. That raised a number of significant issues related to traffic laws and procedures, including the high cost of traffic fines and penalties, the loss of driver's licenses and uncollected court-ordered debt. All of these issues are of great concern to us and will need to be addressed. The issue at the immediate forefront for our branch is the increasing barriers faced by those contesting their traffic citations. This was an issue that could be addressed immediately by the council. The issue reminded me once again of the 1926 argument that urged voters to pass a state constitutional amendment creating the Judicial Council. With the Judicial Council, the argument went, "whenever anything goes wrong any judge or lawyer or litigant or other citizen will know to whom to make complaint, and it will be the duty of the council to propose a remedy, and if this cannot be done without an amendment to the laws the council will recommend to the Legislature any change in the law which it deems necessary." So let us address what the council and judicial branch can do today. And let us quickly study and recommend any other rule that will increase access to justice. Of course, many of the concerns highlighted in the lawyer's committee reports will require solutions from all three branches of government. And we are working to that end, members of the Legislature and Governor's administration. In the meantime, I want to say that I'm proud of the rule that's been developed and I believe it will go far to address what -- [Indiscernible]. This is an important first step to address an urgent access-to-justice issue. More work lies ahead. Many of the comments we received all the way up to Friday, and as Justice Miller indicated came in through the weekend, raised substantial and important issues that concern all three branches of government. The Futures Commission that I appointed is also considering traffic infraction issues. Additionally as part of our action today we'll ask that Judicial Council's Traffic and Criminal Law Advisory Committees consider recommendations to promote access to justice in all infraction cases including nontraffic infractions and postconviction proceedings and, in particular, instances when an individual has failed to appear or pay. I'm very appreciative to all of those who have worked on this important rule in the past month and in particular to Justice Harry Hull, whom I will now ask to present this rule. [Audio begins here.] Justice Hull?

>> Thank you, Chief. Good morning. We'll get right to the rule. We have before us today proposed rule 4.105, which is a new rule implementing the Chief's directive to which she just referred. This rule was developed by the Rules and Projects Committee working closely with Judge Mark Borrell, the chair of Traffic Advisory Committee. The purpose of the rule and its key provisions can be briefly summarized. Rule 4.105 sets out the law on the rights of defendants to appear for arraignment and trial without deposit of bail in traffic infraction cases. The purpose of

the rule is to make it clear that if a defendant declines to utilize one of the statutorily authorized alternatives, courts must allow the defendant to appear as promised for arraignment and trial without prior deposit of bail. The rule is not intended to modify or contravene any statutorily authorized alternatives to appear in court or to address proceedings where the defendant has failed to appear as promised or the court has rendered a judgment. The first subdivision of the rule, subdivision A, as you can see, states that the rule specifically applies to any traffic infraction violation of the Vehicle Code for which the defendant has received a written notice to appear. An advisory committee comment to the proposed rule relating to this subdivision A explains that the rule is intended to apply only to a traffic infraction violation of the Vehicle Code for which the defendant has received a written notice to appear and has appeared by the appearance date set forth on that notice or to an approved extension of that appearance date. The second and the key provision in the rule is subdivision B, which provides that courts must allow a defendant to appear as promised for arraignment and trial without deposit of bail except as provided in subdivision C. Subdivision C, in turn, lists the specific circumstances under which courts, by law, may require defendants who appear as promised to deposit bail. Subdivision C provides:

1. Courts must require the deposit of bail when the defendant elects a statutory procedure that requires the deposit of bail;
2. Courts may require the deposit of bail when the defendant does not sign a written promise to appear as required by the court; and
3. Courts may require a deposit of bail before trial if the court finds, based on circumstances of a particular case, that the defendant is unlikely to appear as ordered without a deposit of bail and the court expressly states the reasons for that finding.

Finally, the rule in subdivision D addresses the very important issue of notice. A lack of information or confusing information regarding a defendant's options in traffic cases has been a major source of confusion for those who find themselves in traffic court. Rule 4.105 ensures that courts will be providing improved notice to defendants in traffic infraction cases. It specifies that courts must inform defendants of the option to appear in court as promised without the deposit of bail in any instructions or other materials that courts provide to the public that relate to bail for traffic infractions including any website information, written instructions, courtesy notices, and forms. The rule recognizes that courts will need time to implement this new notice requirement. Therefore subdivision D states that courts must implement the notice requirements of this subdivision as soon as reasonably possible but in any event no later than September 15, 2015. I think it is very important for members of the council and others to note that if the rule is adopted by the council today, it becomes effective today—that is immediately in all traffic courts. It is only the notice requirements of subdivision D that are subject to an implementation period. Thus it is not the case that the rule itself only takes effect after an implementation period. Turning then to comments to the rule, Chief, you referred to as you mentioned when you asked the Rules and

Projects Committee to develop the rule you said you wanted input on the rule from trial court leaders. Even though the rule has moved forward on an expedited basis, there has been substantial outreach to ensure that court leaders and others that had an opportunity to comment on proposed rule 4.105. For instance the Joint Rules Subcommittee of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and Court Executives Advisory Committee—the Joint Rules Subcommittee referred to as JRS—met twice to review and comment on the rule. On May 26, the Traffic Advisory Committee reviewed the draft rule, and on May 27 the proposed rule was shared with all trial court presiding judges and court exit officers in California. The public also has had an opportunity to comment on the draft rule after it was posted publicly on May 27. As set forth in the report to the council and the accompanying comment chart, a total of 11 formal comments were received on the rule by May 29. These included comments from the JRS, the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California, the California Commission on Access to Justice, the Western Center on Law and Poverty, and the Superior Courts of Fresno, Orange, Riverside, and Tulare Counties. The Rules and Projects Committee carefully reviewed all these comments. Based on the comments and the committee’s discussions, a number of changes were made to the proposed rule, including adding several explanatory advisory committee comments and changing the deadline for implementing the notice of requirements in subdivision D from August 15 to September 15. The comments received by May 29 also led the Rules and Projects Committee to develop several additional recommendations, which I’ll refer to momentarily, that go beyond the adoption of the proposed rule and establish a pathway for future action on important traffic and nontraffic issues. Finally, after the materials were posted for today’s Judicial Council meeting, 12 additional comments were received. Many of the new comments address issues similar to those previously raised and considered by the Rules and Projects Committee, including suggestions to expand the scope of the rule to apply to nontraffic infractions and to address ability to pay considerations and proceedings after the defendant has failed to appear or pay. Other comments raise new considerations, including concerns about burdens on law enforcement and a suggestion for a new rule of court to allow clerks to perform specific duties related to trial setting. Although these suggestions involve important substantive issues, most exceed the limited scope of this urgency proposal. To ensure due consideration of all the recent comments, however, the Rules and Projects Committee proposes that the considerations raised by the commentators be included in the recommended review by the appropriate advisory committees, which is part of the recommendations that I shall now describe to the council. As indicated in the Rules and Projects Committee’s report on traffic issues that you are considering today, at page 2, the Rules and Projects Committee recommends the following:

1. The adoption of rule 4.105, on appearance of defendants in traffic infraction cases without deposit of bail, effective immediately, with the requirement that the new notice requirements in subdivision D be implemented as soon as reasonably possible but no later than September 15, 2015.

2. In addition, the Rules and Projects Committee recommends the following:
 - a. The Judicial Council direct the Traffic Advisory Committee to expeditiously review all related Judicial Council traffic forms and to recommend any revisions that are needed to make these forms consistent with rule 4.105;
 - b. The Judicial Council direct the Criminal Law Advisory Committee to consider recommendations consistent with rule 4.105 to provide for appearances at arraignment and trial without the deposit of bail in nontraffic infraction cases; and
 - c. The Judicial Council direct the appropriate advisory committees to consider rule, form, or any other recommendations necessary to promote access to justice in all infraction cases including recommendations related to postconviction proceedings or after the defendant has previously failed to appear or pay.

These, Chief and council, are the recommendations that the Rules and Projects Committee asks you to adopt today. Chief, before we open the meeting to comments and discussion and comments from my other panel members here this morning, I want to publicly acknowledge Judge Mark Borrell's contributions in the preparation of this rule proposal advising us as we went forward in his capacity as chair of the Traffic Advisory Committee. I want to thank, as well, Judge Slough and Mary Beth Todd for their efforts as chair of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and the Court Executives Advisory Committee, respectively, for their very valuable assistance in getting as much input from the trial courts concerning this rule as the time allowed. Also, I want to publicly thank Debbie Brown and Patrick O'Donnell from the Legal Services office and Arturo Castro, Shelley Curran, and Courtney Tucker from the Criminal Justice Services office. Given the very short time frame we were working with, they worked many extra hours to get this rule proposal before the council today, and I should say that if this very important rule is indeed adopted today, a great deal of the credit must go to them. At this point, I would invite other panel members for their comments. Judge Borrell, sir?

>> Good morning. Chief Justice, members of council, ladies and gentleman, good morning. Justice Hull, thank you very much for your kind words. As chair of the Traffic Advisory Committee, it's my pleasure to address you this morning in support of the proposed rule, 4.105. With the rule that you consider today, our courts take an important step forward in advancing access to justice in traffic infraction cases. We recognize that proposed rule 4.105 has narrow application. This is both necessary and appropriate given the strong desire to bring the rule into application as quickly as possible. Yet we believe the spirit of this rule as articulated by the Chief Justice is clear and provides helpful guidance in many areas beyond its bounds. It is the foundation upon which further advances will be built. The proposed rule harmonizes with existing law. Several statutes require the collection of bail for traffic infractions before an adjudication has taken place. This rule cannot and does not attempt to contravene those statutes.

Rather, the proposed rule would operate where those statutes do not, to fill the void with a clear, uniform, and fair procedure. The discretion of the court is preserved in the proposed rule. In the broader context of criminal law, courts have historically been vested with discretion and decisions to order and fix bail. The proposed rule recognizes this discretion but because exceptional circumstances may justify the imposition of bail in rare cases. But the proposed rule would foreclose the adoption of a blanket procedure requiring bail not authorized by statute and provide that any discretionary decision to order bail be made by a judicial officer based on the unique and unusual circumstances of a particular case. I would be remiss if I did not convey the concerns of my colleagues on the Traffic Advisory Committee that the proposed rule, although necessary, will nevertheless exacerbate the demands on already overburdened traffic courts. These concerns are justified. Yet we understand that this rule is too important to forgo. The courts will, as they have so often, find a way to make it work. But this discussion highlights the difficult situation of our strained traffic courts and the tension between having the type of traffic justice system Californians deserve and that which our budget allows. On behalf of the Traffic Advisory Committee, I want to thank the Chief Justice for bringing public awareness to this serious burden facing our courts and for her tireless efforts to restore this branch's funding. Proposed rule 4.105 is a first step—an important first step. Other issues remain to be considered. And the members of the Traffic Advisory Committee look forward to the task ahead and welcome the opportunity to lend their subject-matter expertise to the process. Thank you for the opportunity to work with these dedicated colleagues under the capable leadership of Justice Hull to bring to this council today a proposed rule of which we all can be proud. I'd be glad to answer any questions that you may have.

>> Thank you, Judge Borrell. Judge Slough and then Ms. Todd. And I think the questions as they come up we can address them to the appropriate person. Judge Slough?

>> Thank you. Good morning, Chief, and members of Judicial Council. I want to very simply say that the presiding judges really appreciate the opportunity to be included in the process of fashioning a solution to a real concern that impacts access to justice for all of our citizens. And as you referenced, Chief, it is a first step to larger reform. I feel the exercise really hasn't just resulted in this proposed rule. But it also has provided all of us an opportunity in our respective home courts to take a look at our local practices and procedures to see if there's more that we can accomplish now in order to improve access to justice. I appreciate, Justice Hull, you reaching out to the presiding judges and the CEOs for early input and to our Joint Rules committee, who is comprised of presiding judges and CEOs, as you reference. I think their early involvement assured that we would end up with a rule that can be implemented on the ground in our various courts with minor adjustment. I have reviewed and understand the public comments, some of which express, as previously stated, don't solve the overarching problem. That's true. However, it is one step that could quickly be taken for the good. And others will be taken. It will require the joint work between executive and the legislative branches as well as us in our own branch here at home. I also read the concerns that expressed that maybe more people will be asking for

trials if this rule is processed and approved today. And actually I think if that is true, then really it may suggest that the purpose of this recommendation for the rule has indeed been accomplished by improving access to justice for traffic infraction defendants who appear as promised and desire their day in court. Thank you, Chief and Justice Hull.

>> Thank you, Judge Slough, for your comments. Ms. Todd?

>> Good morning, Chief and Judicial Council members. I also would like to thank Justice Hull for the opportunity to talk to you today and for having an opportunity to participate in this most recent rulemaking process. As Justice Hull, Judge Borrell, and Judge Slough have so eloquently stated, we all appreciate the opportunity to work together to bring greater consistency and fairness to the traffic infraction appearance process. I think what I'd like to touch on is the process that the presiding judges and this court executive officers were able to participate in with respect to this—I don't know if it might be historical—expedited rulemaking process, but definitely it was quite an expedited, quick process where many of us came together to put together what we could in this short period of time. While I too have reviewed the comments that have been submitted and recognize that there's much more work ahead of us, [I] want to point out the positive aspects of being able to address what may appear to be a very limited-scope matter in such a short period of time. While the scope was very limited, it was a huge a compliment and could not have been achieved without the input from the court executive officers, the presiding judges, the Traffic Advisory Committee, and staff who pulled it all together. As Justice Hull and Judge Slough described, the Court Executives Advisory Committee and the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee were involved in the review of the proposal through their Joint Rules Subcommittee, which is led by presiding Judge Caroline Kuhl from Los Angeles Superior Court and Court Executive Officers Susan Matherly from the San Luis Obispo Superior Court. After the initial drafting by RUPRO members and staff, the Joint Rules Subcommittee was able to participate in a call where they were able to provide informal comments and suggestions on the rule in order that it be clarified so it could be more successfully implemented. Those discussions are extremely valuable in that they're on the ground as the rule is being proposed and we get some early input and feedback on what works and what doesn't work and ensuring the rule is clear. Two days after that, in that very short turnaround, the Joint Rules Subcommittee reviewed the final draft, and some of their input had been incorporated into that final draft for which we are very appreciative. Then they provided formal comment, which is in your materials. Primarily the comment surrounded clarifying that the rule did -- was at this time only applying to cases where the defendant was appearing by the appearance date or an approved extension of that date. That clarification was sought based on a response to an inquiry made by the committee where staff indicated that was the limited scope. So we felt that was important that that be clarified. As you see the clarification appears in an advisory committee comment. Again, recognizing that this is a very narrowly scoped rule due to this expedited process and that any rules or statutory changes necessary to deal with the more expanded post-failure to appear or postconviction will take some more time and careful

consideration and it's just the beginning of the process, not the end. The subcommittee also requested that the firm implementation date, which in the initial draft was August 15, be stricken, preferring the more broad language of just to implement as soon as reasonably possible. In the discussions at RUPRO, we felt that a clear date needed to be included to ensure courts knew what the expedition was and that's when we went ahead and decided on a September 15 date. Given the short turnaround, we weren't able to reach out to all courts so there's no way to know whether some courts may have some issues with that date. We suspect some may if they have a long lead time with respect to printing courtesy notices, things like that. But the expectation though is that the rule would be implemented immediately, and potentially incrementally. If you can't get your courtesy notice changed, at least staff will be informed to inform any persons contacting the court of the new process and that they would be afforded an opportunity to appear in court without posting bail. This Thursday, the Court Executives Advisory Committee will be holding a meeting of its executive committee. This new rule will be discussed at that meeting. And we hope to hold a discussion to not only talk about the implementation requirements but to also talk about effective practices and to do some brainstorming with courts so that hopefully when they leave that meeting they have some clear ideas on how they can easily and immediately implement as many components of this rule as they possibly can so that we can start ensuring that persons are afforded this access to the trial courts. I do thank Justice Hull, Judge Borrell, and Judge Slough for all of their diligent effort and especially staff who were reaching out to us throughout the drafting process to get our input, to ensure that whatever we crafted during this expedited process, it would be something that was understandable, was clear, and was able to be implemented statewide. So thank you.

>> Thank you, Ms. Todd. Let me add one thing. I want to make sure that the council members are focused on this. That is that the implementation period to which there has been reference is only as to the notice provisions of subdivision D. Subdivisions A through C of the rule, if the council so approves the rule today, are effective immediately. Thus, in those circumstances, any requirement by any traffic court that a person who has been notified of a traffic infraction, any requirement that bail be posted before arraignment or trial, as the rule points out, is no longer lawful. We would be glad to answer any questions the council might have at this point. And we would turn the matter back to you for that purpose. Thank you, Chief.

>> Thank you. I'm going to ask when people have comments, simply first identify yourself by name. I know it's difficult by phone. I know we will be speaking over each other at times. But we'll persevere here. So the floor is open.

>> Chief, this is Justice Miller. Having not heard any comments, if there are, please go ahead, but if there are not, I would make a motion that we adopt rule 4.105. If you look at the report, I'm going to refer to page 2. So it would be the rule as printed there; and then sections A, B, C, and D; and on page 2 it also lists two, which I think should be part of the motion, which directs the advisory committee to do as requested under A, B, and C. So that would be my motion.

>> [Indiscernible -- multiple speakers] Justice Chin. I would second it, Chief.

>> Thank you, Justice Chin.

>> This is Rosenberg. Just a comment. This branch has a history of going through an incredibly detailed process in analyzing proposals and in adopting them. And I am a member of RUPRO. And even though this was an expedited process, I'm still frankly impressed by the amount of time and effort and analysis and the ability to get so much input in such a short amount of time. So I really tip my hat to everyone who's been involved in moving this through.

>> Thank you, Judge Rosenberg. Any other comments or discussion before I have Martin take a vote with roll call?

>> This is Justice Chin. I just have one comment. Everyone complains about bureaucracy and how long it takes. This was a remarkable process and everyone involved should be congratulated. I just have one comment, Chief, on the concern of the sheriff of Riverside County where he is talking about the most efficient use of law enforcement. It seems to me that all of us ought to be looking far into the future and decide how we want these trials to take place. I don't want to gum up the works here, but it seems to me if we are concerned about the efficient use of law enforcement, we ought to start thinking about a video appearance by law enforcement in these trials—and a video appearance by the defendants. All of these citizens, I'm sure, do not want to be taking time off work to come in and have traffic trials. Why don't we start thinking about having them make remote appearances rather than making all of these trips to the courthouse? I realize that has absolutely nothing to do with the current rule before us, but it seems to me we ought to start thinking about the future and how to handle these very emotionally drawn trials for our citizens and to try to reduce the amount of time we are requiring them to spend in our courtrooms.

>> Thank you, Justice Chin. And I appreciate your comments. There will be many eyes on the future going forward as this is the first start. And I also know the Futures Commission that is headed up by Justice Carol Corrigan and Justice Bill McGuinness are looking at some efficient use of time and availability and processing for traffic citations. Definitely we are looking forward with a close eye. Thank you. Again we are open for comments. There has been a motion by Justice Miller to move recommendations one and two in your materials. Seconded by Justice Chin. Any further comments besides Judge Rosenberg's? If not, then I'll be asking Martin Hoshino to proceed with roll call vote on this matter. Martin?

>> Ready to go. Thank you. Judge Anderson? Yes. Judge Beck? Yes. Mr. Bonino? Yes. Judge Brandlin? Yes. Justice Chin? Yes. Judge de Alba? Yes. Judge Elias? Yes. Mr. Fox? Yes. Justice Hull? Yes. Senator Jackson? Yes. Justice Miller? Yes. Judge Nadler? Yes. Ms. Pole? Ms. Pole? There's a note she may have had to leave the call.

>> I'm still here.

>> Your vote?

>> Yes.

>> Judge Rosenberg? Yes. Judge Rubin? Yes. Judge Stout? Yes. Judge Tangeman? Yes. That concludes the roll call, Chief. Recommendation passes.

>> Mr. Hoshino, this is Donna Melby. I also vote yes.

>> Thank you, Ms. Melby.

>> Thank you, Martin, thank you all for the vote. Before we conclude, I want to again express my gratitude to Justice Hull, Judge Borrell, Presiding Judge Slough, and Mary Beth Todd and the advisory committees, as well as council members, and the Judicial Council staff, who as already has been stated worked overtime to move this expeditious rule and to do the reach out and the work that's been done and identifying issues to go forward. I'd like Justice Hull's Rules and Projects Committee to coordinate and oversee the work of the Traffic Advisory Committee and the Criminal Law Advisory Committee so we're all kept in the loop as to all the work moving forward. In addition, Justice Hull, I'd like you and your committee, RUPRO, to name any advisory committee or subcommittee you deem appropriate to consider any other recommendations that may arise from these discussions that are necessary to promote access to justice in all infraction cases, as we've spoken, not only about traffic but nontraffic, and to please report back to this council on your progress, a status report, at our August 20 Judicial Council meeting.

>> [Indiscernible -- multiple speakers] please. I'm done.

>> I was just going to say as to your last point, the Rules and Projects committee obviously will be pleased to report back to the council in August concerning the progress being made by the advisory committees and to implement the direction that has been given to them to move forward on traffic and other issues. I know the Traffic Advisory Committee has already been working on revising traffic forms to ensure that they are consistent with rule 4.105—now rule 4.105. I wanted to note the revised forms will be brought back to the council very soon. I'm also confident that the Rules and Projects Committee is going to have a number of additional sound proposals ready for presentation no later than the October council meeting. I wanted to mention, too, that as chair of the Rules and Projects Committee, I report on the committee's activities at each council meeting, and I intend to include in my regular report, starting in June and July, specific information about what is being done by the advisory committees overseen by the Rules and Projects Committee to carry on the important work that we've begun today of increasing procedural fairness for parties in traffic and other cases in California. Thank you, Chief.

>> Thank you, Justice Hull. I'm going to say that Mary Beth Todd, I think you said it right: this meeting is historical, at least in all my experience in the council and up to date, as quickly as we moved. So thank you, again. This historical meeting is adjourned.

>> [event concluded]