

Unidentified Male: New York State rate repair mutual wagering and breeding law, section 102, provides that New York State Gaming Commission. The members are appointed by the Governor, by and with advice and consent of the Senate. Four members confirmed by the New York State Senate are necessary to report the commission an ability to establish a foreman and undertake action. This present meeting of the commission is now called to order. Ms. Secretary, please call the roll.

Ms. Secretary: John Cratti?

John Cratti: Here.

Ms. Secretary: Peter Machete?

Peter Machete: Here.

Ms. Secretary: John Baclemba?

John Baclemba: Here.

Ms. Secretary: Barry Sanbol?

Barry Sanbol: Here.

Ms. Secretary: Jerry Scernek?

Jerry Scernek: Here.

Ms. Secretary: Todd Snyder?

Todd Snyder: Here.

Unidentified Male: Ms. Secretary, please have the record reflect that a quorum of qualified members is present, thus enabling transaction of business. Chairman Sanbol?

Barry Sanbol: Minutes to the commission meeting conducted on July 16, 2018 have been provided to the members in advance. At this time, I would like to ask members. Are there any edits, corrections, or amendments? Any changes to the minutes? May I have a motion to approve?

Unidentified Male: So moved.

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: Second.

Barry Sanbol: All those in favor?

Unidentified Male: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Aye.

Barry Sanbol: Any opposed? Thank you. Next on the agenda is the executive director report. \_\_\_\_\_ [00:01:19]?

Unidentified Male: Thank you. This afternoon I would like to touch on a few thoroughbred and standardbred items and one lottery item. Saratoga Racecourse. The final all source handled for the 40 days was in excess of \$659 million – the second highest ever recorded despite the number of races taken off the turf. Overall, inclement weather forced 50 turf races to be moved to the dirt compared to an average of 20 moved each year from 2015 to 2017. This caused a reduction of field size of 8.25 per race for last season to 7.75.

Trainer Chad Brown set a Saratoga meet record with 46 victories, breaking his previous record of 40 he set in 2016 and tied by Todd Fletcher in 2017. Irad Ortiz Junior was the top winning jockey registering 52 wins. Klaravich Stables was the meet's leading owner with 21 victories. Light Racing returned to Belmont Park on September 7 for a 36-day \$10 million meet, which extends through October 28. The Belmont Full Meet will be highlighted by Super Saturday on September 29 for the Grade 1 Jockey Club Gold Cup, Grade 1 Joe Hirsch Turf Classic Invitational Stakes, Grade 1 Vosburgh Stakes, and the Grade 3 Pilgrim Stakes will be contesting.

On the standard bridge side, the 2018 New York Sire Stakes Night of Champions took place this past Saturday. The Sire Stakes is designed to promote the breeding, buying, and racing of standardbred horses in New York State. It is the nation's oldest harness racing program administered by the Agriculture and New York Horse Breeding Development Fund. This year approximately \$14 million in purses and \$1 million in breeder awards will be distributed to support and encourage the Agriculture Foundation of the New York Sire Stakes Program in this state. The Night of Champions, which provides those horses that have earned enough points to compete in the championship round, just a set of eight races with a combined purse total of \$1.8 million. It took place at Yonkers Raceway. The New York Sire Stakes was the first of its kind, and we believe still the best. We congratulate those winners from this past weekend.

On the lottery side, there is certainly good news for New York. Powerball, which is conducted in 44 states, the District of Columbia, and the US Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico; had just one winner on its August 11 drawing. It was a New Yorker. The single ticket was worth \$245.6 million and was purchased at a Stop-n-Shop on Staten Island. A press conference with Yolanda Vega will be held this coming Thursday at Resorts World New York City. The winner has decided to take a lump sum payment of \$147.8 million. Ironically, the last \$100 million plus winner in New York was also from Staten Island who won the \$169 million Mega Millions Jackpot on January 8, 2016.

- Unidentified Male: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- Unidentified Male: Okay. New York State Racing Paramutual Wagering and Breeding law authorizes the commission to promulgate rules and regulations that it deems necessary to carry out its responsibilities. In that regard, the commission will from time to time promulgate rules and rule amendments pursuant to the New York State Administrative Procedure Act. We have four items for consideration this afternoon. Ron, will you please outline the first item?
- Ron: Blazing Sevens Progressive wager. For commission consideration is the adoption of a proposed rule establishing a blackjack table side wager called Blazing Sevens Progressive. The proposed rule-making including the text of the proposed rule have been published in the August 8, 2018 state register, a copy of which is attached. A public commentary for the proposal will expire on October 8, 2018. To date, no comments have been received. In the event comments are received before the close of the commentary, staff will promptly inform each member as mentioned previous to the rule proposal. Division of Gaming staff evaluated the experience with this game and is satisfied that this wager will be appropriate to add to the table game rule as a permanent rule. Also, please note that the language correction was made to the rule proposed by the commission. The correction did not substantively alter the proposal. \_\_\_\_\_ [00:05:36] that commission adopt this proposal rule making.
- Unidentified Male: Commissioners, any questions on the adoption of a rule for Blazing Sevens Progressive side wager for blackjack subject to not receiving substantive comments before the close of the comment period? Any discussion? May I have a motion for the proposed rule?
- Unidentified Male: So moved.
- Unidentified Male: Second?
- Unidentified Male: Second.
- Unidentified Male: All in favor?
- Unidentified Male: Aye.
- Unidentified Male: Aye.
- Unidentified Male: Any opposed? Motion carries. Ron?
- Ron: Self-exclusion. For commission consideration I proposed a consolidated amended regulation for self-exclusion from gaming activities. While the commission previously authorized a version of these rules last year, staff wishes to expand the proposal to include certain lottery play and supersede the previously proposed rule. To refresh your recollection, the various forms of gaming in the state operate under different self-exclusion rules. Commission

staff has sought to centralize self-exclusion policy to make self-exclusion universal rather than limit self-exclusion individually to each form of gambling. The proposal would require that a person file a request for self-exclusion and select a length of exclusion. A self-excluded person would be prohibited from collecting gambling winnings or recovering any gambling losses that occurred during the exclusion period. They would be subject to possible arrest for trespass if found on the premises of a place from which the person is excluded.

Among other requirements, all gaming operators will be required to establish procedures and training for their employees to identify and manage any self-excluded person found to be present on a gaming floor or participating in gambling-related activity. Self-exclusion program elements are found in regulation for thoroughbred wagering, standardbred wagering, quarterhorse wagering, off track betting, video lottery gaming, and commercial casino gambling. The proposal before you would consolidate all, including lottery, into a single location following current rules allowing for voluntary self-imposed restrictions and count wagering. These existing standards would be consolidated in a new part 5403. It will eliminate duplicative provisions currently in the thoroughbred, standardbred, quarterhorse, and off-track betting rules. Staff recommends that the commission authorize the re-proposal of this rule making.

Unidentified Male: Commissioners, are there any questions on the re-proposal of a rule regarding self-exclusion? Any questions? Any discussion? May I have a motion please?

Unidentified Male: So moved.

Unidentified Male: Second?

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: All in favor?

Unidentified Male: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? Motion carries. Ron?

Ron: Claiming purse structure and thoroughbred. For commission consideration is a proposal to add flexibility to the thoroughbred claiming price rule in appropriate circumstances. The current rule provides that the minimum prize for which a horse may be entered, and a claim ratio will not be less than 50% of the value of the purse for the race. The rule was adopted in 2012 when the increase in claiming rates purses at Aqueduct Raceway seemingly caused an increase in race horse fatalities. The rule reduced the incentive of an owner or trainer to enter a potentially lame or uncompetitive horse in such a race. Various interested parties have requested the commission to consider adding flexibility

to the existing rule, identifying neighboring jurisdictions who have experience safe racing with higher purse to claiming purse ratios. The proposed rule would provide flexibility by permitting on a case-by-case basis for all or a portion of a race meeting by requiring the track to meet increased requirements to ensure the competitive soundness and safety of the horses that enter any such race. Staff recommends the commissioner authorize the proposal of this rule making.

Unidentified Male: Any questions on the proposal of a rule regarding claiming purses structure in thoroughbred racing? Any questions? I know Dr. Palmer was kind enough to come today. Maybe he can talk to us a little bit about if it that is all right.

Dr. Palmer: Sure.

Unidentified Male: Thanks.

Dr. Palmer: This is in the way of a little bit of background. I realize that the change with this can be uncomfortable. We have made important strides in this area over the last six years, and I think the last thing that any one of us wants to do is to relax some standards that are working well for us and put horses at risk. Just quickly to summarize, there are many risk factors that contribute to fatalities in horse racing. The risk for injury can be mitigated by protective factors. There are risk factors and there are protective factors that are important. One of the claiming rule price ratio too that we set up in 2012 was an emergency measure to address a specific situation at Aqueduct Racetrack where there were purse to claim ratios of up to four times the value. It really was a tough situation there. We did some things that worked out pretty well along with a number of other recommendations.

I think that I like this language. We talked about this for quite some time. I was very uncomfortable with a fixed increase to say now we are going to increase the level of purse to claim ratio of 2.7 or 2.8. It just did not strike me as a real comfortable situation. The idea that we can have a case-by-case basis evaluation and racetrack to racetrack evaluation made me more comfortable with this. Also, there is the fact that we have some new protective factors in place. I always thought that if we were going to take away one protective factor, what do we have to take the place? What are we going to put back in that is going to protect these horses?

Something that we have been very successful with in the past couple of years is a program that I am running in conjunction with the Jockey Club where we use Jockey Club information to get a list of horses that meet certain criteria that might put them at increased risk of injury. Then we get these horses on a list. We then interview the trainers. We go actually look at the horses in an out of competition format. We call it Out of Competition Scrutiny.

In addition to looking at the horses on race day, out of competition we are examining all these horses. We are getting the history on them. We are finding out why you did not race until you were four years old. Why have you not been

racing in the last six months? We get a real detailed history about these horses. Then we can make a very good informed decision about should they be racing right now or should they not. It is that level of Out of Competition Scrutiny in conjunction with the other things that we are doing, and the flexibility of this rule to evaluate on a case-by-case basis, and to make changes as we go along. It is a constant real time evaluation and adjustment capability that makes me believe that we can put this amendment in place without making a significant increase in risk for the horses.

Unidentified Male: I am not sure I am using the right language. Are you saying that someone – I do not know who – but someone will be taking clinical history of each horse for each claiming horse?

Dr. Palmer: No. What it is is we have a list of horses that meet certain criteria that are a scientific valid criterion for risk. Every one of those horses is examined. That is right. It is by a veterinarian – a regulatory veterinarian. We get a history from the trainer about his life history. How did he get here?

Unidentified Male: Is it before each claiming race?

Dr. Palmer: No, it is one time. Then that horse is on a list then. We call them horses of interest. That is a special list where we keep an eye on those horses as time goes on. We follow them along in the racing program. It is not every horse. Risk is not equally distributed across the whole population. The key here is really identifying horses that are increased risk and paying special attention to them to make sure they are okay.

Unidentified Male: If I understand it correctly, the implication of what you are saying is that the general rule proves too much. It catches too many horses and keeps them from running and claiming races that, perhaps on a clinical basis, you might conclude they could run in.

Dr. Palmer: That is right.

Unidentified Male: The flip side is experience may eventually show us that the clinical approach is not generally applicable enough. We end up having an increase in mortality rate on the track. We will not know, I assume, until we have some experience.

Dr. Palmer: This rule only applies to a certain class of race. It is open claim races. We say in the proposal here that race tracks will have to meet certain criteria to apply for this adjustment. It is a modest adjustment. Let us say we go up to 2.4 or 2.7 from 2. In order to do that, they are going to have to demonstrate that they have the procedures in place to protect the horses. That is going to be one of the criteria to allow that. If we find, for example, that in a portion of the meet the fatality rate is going up, then we can stop it.

Unidentified Male: Do you look at each fatality to see which risk factors may have been involved.

- Dr. Palmer: Oh yeah, absolutely. We investigate every fatality with that in mind.
- Unidentified Male: Is this a rule proposal?
- Unidentified Male: Yes, it is a proposal.
- Unidentified Male: What are we expecting? Is there a comment period?
- Unidentified Male: We will have a typical comment period.
- Unidentified Male: Doctor, you were kind enough to send us a memo I think a while back – two weeks I think – just kind of outlining the success that we have had in reducing fatalities. In the list, the claims to purse ratio was in there. I do not think they were in order of importance. But it was one of many, and there were many lists there. My question I guess is, is there a basis for saying that that is one of the things that has been in effect that has made the fatality rate go down? Is there any empirical evidence of that?
- Dr. Palmer: We cannot. Because it is a multi-factorial problem, we cannot isolate a single factor and say that this is the key. Some things are probably more important than others, but there is no science to establish that. It is one of the factors that has been important.
- Unidentified Male: I think, at least for myself and maybe I speak for others, but I am not sure. We would like some kind of comfort level. Okay, we are going to. If we make this change, we did really well in Saratoga this year. The fatalities were way down. I think that was a very successful thing. But if we are going to do this as Commissioner Snyder said, we do not want them to start all of a sudden ticking back up. It is just not acceptable to us.
- Dr. Palmer: Right, of course.
- Unidentified Male: Right? I know that you put a lot of emphasis on this. I guess we are looking for some assurance that we are not going to reverse the trend that we have set here. It is a very positive trend.
- Dr. Palmer: Believe me, I studied this carefully. I am on the line for this.
- Unidentified Male: Sure.
- Dr. Palmer: That is my job. It is to make sure that that does not happen.
- Unidentified Male: We are going to take your counsel. Right? We are going to take your suggestions on this.
- Unidentified Male: Can we go back in time a little bit? Why did you implement? Why did we implement this rule in the first place? It was related to an increase in fatalities, right?

Unidentified Male: Exactly.

Unidentified Male: Now we are saying it is a little more flexible, so we anticipate less, or we are deeper?

Dr. Palmer: We are saying the circumstances are different than they were in 2012. In 2012, there was an enormous influx of money into the purse structure at Aqueduct. The claiming a \$10,000 horse could be running for \$40,000 purses. That was way inappropriate.

Unidentified Male: Right.

Dr. Palmer: It completely distorted the normal level of risk aversion that one would have for entering horses. What we are talking about here is a very modest change. It is not four times. We are talking about maybe go to two. Right now, it is at two. Maybe go to 2.4 for certain races. There are really only two classes of races that NYRA has requested to make exchanges. I also would say to you that at that time, there was no scientific evidence. I chaired that commission that made that recommendation. We had no scientific evidence to really prove that the four times purse claim ratios were more dangerous than the two, but it seemed intuitive. We had to do something. We did a lot of things in a hurry because we had to stop that. It was one of 38 different recommendations that we put in place.

Again, I think that right now we have in place what I would like to think of as an ongoing quality control program. Every single fatality is investigated every single month. We look at fatalities every single meet. We measure fatalities. We do real time assessment and interventions. If things start to go up, as they did in 2017 in particular, in the first week of that meet in 2017 we started doing work on the problem. We got it fixed, but it took a week or two to get that part squared away. Then we used all that information to design the interventions for 2018, and it was spectacular.

Now, I think that the key here is that we continue that ongoing quality control process. If there is any indication that we are making a bad move here, everything here I think is very legitimate. It is well thought out. It is appropriate in its limited scope. It provides flexibility to stop it if it is a problem. I would not endorse it under any other circumstances.

Unidentified Male: So, with regard to the flexibility that you are referring to, does the proposed rule? I do not know who would have the answer to this. Does the proposed rule indicate that in the event that we see a statistically significant ticking up of mortality rates that we can re-impose the rule as is?

Unidentified Male: The text of the rule as the amendment is structured is that the track would request a relaxation of the general rule. Each of those requests is evaluated individually. If it is a request that underlines and if it goes beyond the threshold



that Dr. Palmer or others were analyzing they would deem acceptable, that particular request would be denied.

Unidentified Male: Right, so the underlying rule actually does not change.

Unidentified Male: Yeah. The underlying rule would –

Unidentified Male: It would still be 50% or two times.

Unidentified Male: Yes, then the actual rule would say unless the commission approves a request after evaluation after considering the competitiveness, soundness, and safety of the horses.

Unidentified Male: That request would come to us then.

Dr. Palmer: It would come to the commission in general, yeah.

Unidentified Male: Is that time sensitive – the request?

Unidentified Male: Yeah, are we going to be getting frequent? What is the frequency of the reporting that we are going to be getting on this?

Dr. Palmer: I imagine that you would get reporting on how it is all turning out as you direct staff to give to you. I would imagine that the day-to-day administration of this will be done at the staff level under your delegation to staff.

Unidentified Male: My question was different. Someone puts in a request. Is it for a period of time, for a meet, or for a year? Or is it in place just in response to the initial request? Will they have to get it renewed after an 18-month period or a six-month period? How does it?

Dr. Palmer: There would be no hard and fast, so they would make a proposal.

Unidentified Male: It is not time sensitive is what you are saying.

Dr. Palmer: Yeah. They might say I want to have this type of rule for this level of price in a race for the Belmont Meet, or something like this.

Unidentified Male: That was my question.

Dr. Palmer: If that is appropriate, then the Horse Racing Division and the experts would analyze that. They would say yes, that is appropriate. If they say no, it should be for a shorter time period they would make an adjustment on that particular race.

Unidentified Male: Mr. Chairman, I think the sensitivity of the commissioners is clear on this issue. We are pleased with the success that we have had. We are not in a hurry to give up that success. I just want to make sure that we take whatever steps are

necessary so that the rule does not make it impossible for us to watch this very closely and to catch it if it starts going in the wrong direction.

Unidentified Male: Great.

Unidentified Male: Put a time lapse on it. Only approve it for a year.

Dr. Palmer: It is less than that. We would not approve it for a year. I can tell you that right now.

Unidentified Male: Okay.

Dr. Palmer: It would be approved for a limited.

Unidentified Male: What is the proposal?

Unidentified Male: Yeah, the proposal. Is there a time limit in the proposed rule?

Dr. Palmer: I do not think it was specified in the rule.

Unidentified Male: I did not see one.

Unidentified Male: No, there is not.

Unidentified Male: There is no sunset clause.

Unidentified Male: There is no sunset.

Unidentified Male: That was my question.

Unidentified Male: Let them come back. They have to come back at that point.

Unidentified Male: If you are saying that you would not –

Dr. Palmer: A year is too long.

Unidentified Male: Yeah.

Unidentified Male: Okay.

Unidentified Male: Do we want to put a time period in the rule? If so, what is your guidance on what that should be?

Dr. Palmer: I certainly think it should be no longer than a meet – any given meet. It would be one meet at a time because things can change. The risk at the meets are a little different.

Unidentified Male: Aqueduct is coming up.

Dr. Palmer: Yeah.

Unidentified Male: Do it for Aqueduct.

Dr. Palmer: The intent was that it certainly would be. The next request is undoubtedly going to be for Aqueduct because that meet is coming up.

Unidentified Male: Yeah.

Dr. Palmer: Then I would not approve anything that lasted more than that meet. You know, I think we need to watch it carefully and see what happens.

Unidentified Male: Okay.

Dr. Palmer: Even so, we can make appropriate adjustments like we have done before in the past at Aqueduct. We had a bump in the road in 2014. We convened the horses. We made some changes right off the bat. No race –

Unidentified Male: Hi, this is Rick. The rule as drafted to us minimized permission for all of our portion of a race meet. I think that we have –

Unidentified Male: I was going to say that too. It says it right in there.

Unidentified Male: It says what? I am not clear.

Unidentified Male: It says unless the commission approves a request from a franchise or a licensed corporation conducting thoroughbred racing for a lower minimum price for all or a portion of a race meeting.

Unidentified Male: Okay, so it is specific to a meet. That is what they are saying at most.

Unidentified Male: Am I understanding correctly?

Unidentified Male: More or less, yes.

Unidentified Male: Okay.

Unidentified Male: The other thing is that I think if permission were granted, Dr. Palmer would still be monitoring the effects. So, every grant permission would be conditioned on his continual oversight of it. We would not be committed to \_\_\_\_\_ [00:23:37] continue to go forward if there were a serious problem.

Unidentified Male: Okay. At most, it is up to a meet, but you can set it less than that.

Dr. Palmer: Yeah.

Unidentified Male: Okay.

Unidentified Male: We are making a proposed rule for comment. Would this type of flexibility be available during the comment period?

Unidentified Male: No.

Unidentified Male: It only becomes available 60 days from now.

Dr. Palmer: It is when you adopt the rule formally after the expiration of the comment period.

Unidentified Male: Okay?

Unidentified Male: All right. We will see who we hear from.

Unidentified Male: Any other questions or comments? Thank you a great deal, Doc, for your guidance and leadership and keeping on top of the issue for us.

Unidentified Male: Thank you.

Unidentified Male: We have not revisited the level of fatalities we had in the past. We thank you a great deal.

Dr. Palmer: Thank you.

Unidentified Male: I think we need a motion to approve the proposed rule.

Unidentified Male: Yes.

Unidentified Male: Do we have a motion on the rule?

Unidentified Male: So moved.

Unidentified Male: Second?

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: All in favor?

Unidentified Male: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any against? Okay. The motion passes. Ron?

Ron: Pick 6 Jackpot pools. For commission consideration is a proposed new thoroughbred wager to be known as the Pick 6 Jackpot wager. This rule making would authorize New York thoroughbred tracks to offer wagers that are offered

in several other jurisdictions. The wager also known as Jackpot or Rainbow Wager appeals to betters by giving a larger jackpot when there is only one winning wager from a pool. If there are more than one winning tickets, then the major portion of the day's pool is paid out to those who selected six of six winners. The minor pool is added to be carry-over. The carry-over gets paid out when there is a unique winning ticket or when there is an intermediary or final distribution as approved by the commission, which would typically occur at the end of a race meeting. I would like to specifically thank staff from the New York Racing Association for assisting with language development. Staff recommends that the commission authorizes proposal of this rule making.

Unidentified Male: Any questions on the proposed rule? May I have a motion?

Unidentified Male: So moved.

Unidentified Male: Second?

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: All in favor?

Unidentified Male: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any against? Motion carries. Adjudications?

Unidentified Male: Okay.

Unidentified Male: The next item on schedule is business regards adjudications. Today we have two items for adjudication. Ron?

Ron: In the matter of Thomas E. Russell; on January 10, 2018 the Bureau of Licensing denied the application of Thomas E. Russell for a non-gaming employee registration as a housekeeping shift manager at Resorts World Catskills citing New York Racing Paramutual Wagering and Breeding Law section 13181C. It provides for disqualification on the grounds of the conviction of the applicant of any offense in any jurisdiction which is or would be a felony or other crime involving public integrity, embezzlement, theft, fraud, or perjury.

Mr. Russell requested a hearing which was conducted on June 19, 2018. The hearing officer submitted a report dated August 2, 2018. It recommended that the registrations now be upheld. The commission considered this matter at a meeting conducted pursuant to the judicial and quasi-judicial proceedings exemption of New York Public Officers' Law section 108.1.

Unidentified Male: The commission duly deliberated and considered this matter. It determined upon a six to zero vote to sustain with technical modifications in language, the hearing officer's report and recommendations. Next case?

Ron: In the matter of Terry Santiago. On January 19, 2018, the Bureau of Licensing denied the application of Terry Santiago for a non-gaming employee registration as an environmental services attendant at Resorts World Catskill citing New York Racing Paramutual Wagering and Breeding Law section 13181. It provides for disqualification on the grounds of a failure of the applicant to prove by clear and convincing evidence that the applicant is qualified in accordance with the provisions of this article. The failure of the applicant to provide information, documentation, and assurances required by this article or requested by the commission are failure of the applicant to reveal any fact material to qualification. Or there is the supplying of information, which is untrue or misleading as to a material fact pertaining to the qualification criteria. The conviction of the applicant of any offense in any jurisdiction, which is or would be a felony or other crime involving public integrity, embezzlement, theft, fraud, or perjury.

Mr. Santiago requested a hearing which was conducted on May 24, 2018. The hearing officer submitted a report dated July 5, 2018. It recommended that the registration denial be upheld. The commission considered this matter at a meeting conducted pursuant to usual quasi-judicial proceedings, exemption of New York Public Officers' Law section 108.1.

Unidentified Male: The commission duly deliberated and considered this matter. It determined upon a six to zero vote to sustain the hearing officer's report and recommendations. The next order of business is old business. Does anyone have any old business? Hearing none, the next issue is new business. Does anyone have any new business to discuss? No? Following that, the next issue is scheduling our next meeting. Kristen will be in touch with all of us to confirm a date for our next meeting. At the moment, we are thinking we have identified a tentative date of October 22. If everybody can check their calendars to see if that is doable for them and get back to Kristen, that would be greatly appreciated. Anything else? With that, that concludes today's publish --