

**Special Meeting of the Town of Richmond Selectboard  
and the Town of Hinesburg Selectboard  
August 29, 2022**

**Members Present:** Bard Hill (Richmond), David Sander (Richmond), Dennis Place (Hinesburg), Jay Furr (Richmond), Jeff Forward (Richmond), June Heston (Richmond), Maggie Gordon (Hinesburg), Merrily Lovell (Hinesburg), Mike Loner (Hinesburg), Phil Pouech (Hinesburg)

**Members Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Josh Arneson, Richmond Town Manager; Duncan Wardwell, Assistant to the Town Manager; Kendall Chamberlin, Water Superintendent; Alyson Dengler, Police Officer; Benjamin Herrick, Richmond Interim Police Chief; Anthony Cambridge, Hinesburg Police Chief; Joseph McLean, Stitzel, Page & Fletcher Attorney

**Others Present:** Meeting was recorded by MMCTV, Ann Naumann, Connie Van Eeghen, Corey McDonald, Frank Koss, Hulshof, Jennifer Decker, Kate Littlefield, Laurie Dana, Martha Nye, MMCTV Erin, Pam, Rod West, Warren Myers

**Call to Order:** 7:30pm

**Welcome by:** Lovell

**Public Comment:**

Lovell: This is a Special Meeting of Town of Richmond and Town of Hinesburg Selectboards. We are exploring options about sharing Police Departments. This is a hybrid meeting, so some members are in person, and some are joining by Zoom. This meeting will be recorded and posted on MMCTV and it will be shared to make this a public meeting.

Littlefield: I want to thank the Hinesburg Selectboard for pursuing this. There are folks in this Town that would like to explore options. We are happy to see that this meeting is happening. Thank you for your collaboration.

Van Eeghen: I am a member Richmond Racial Equity Community Group, and we think about police governance and the connection to the community. We hope the process includes plenty of community engagement.

**Additions or Deletions to Agenda:** None

**Items for Presentation or Discussion with those present**

McLean: I am an attorney from Stitzel, Page & Fletcher who provides legal services to Richmond and sometimes Hinesburg. I am here to discuss a potential joint police force between the two communities. In Vermont, statute powers for municipalities are provided by Dillon's Rule (<https://www.vlct.org/municipal-assistance/municipal-topics/municipal-governance>). The statutory authority to form shared police services has to be based on two separate chapters of Title 24. Chapter 55 of Title 24 provides that municipalities

may establish a Police Department and point Police Officers by the legislative bodies of the communities (<https://legislature.vermont.gov/statutes/chapter/24/055>). Title 24 Section 1931.a provides for the formation of a police department and Section 1931.b provides the direction and control of the entire police force to a chief of police. In other words, the Legislative body establishes police department and staffs it. Then the authority of the department is under the chief. Title 24 Section 1938 provides agreements for intermunicipal police services and defines the scope of those services. Chapter 121 of Title 24 (<https://legislature.vermont.gov/statutes/chapter/24/121>) provides two primary means for municipalities to cooperate. The statute of interlocal contracts provides that one municipality may contract with another for authorized services. The contractual authority is not exclusive, and a municipality may develop a contract and then submit to Attorney General. One person can be authorized to hold the same office or offices in the participating municipalities. The contract can provide for method of choosing officers, choosing boards, providing for different functions, and how those functions will be paid. Chapter 55 envisions a scenario where one municipality is providing a service to another, and it is not a shared service. In Chapter 121 there is flexibility on how to establish those contracts for shared police services.

Forward: Are Chapters 55 and 121 mutually exclusive so that if you do one, then you cannot do the other?

McLean: No, the agreements of Chapter 55 are not subject to the requirements of Chapter 121. The requirements of Chapter 121 are minimal at best for an interlocal contracts.

Loner: So, we wouldn't have to get approval from the Attorney General for an interlocal contract?

McLean: The Attorney General approval for an interlocal contact is not mandatory where it is for a union municipal district. A union municipal district is different than an agreement because you create a new municipal entity. The process for doing that is set out in Chapter 24 Section 4861. It provides for the approval of a joint municipal survey committee. It would consist of members from each community who have been tasked with studying a problem, coming up with a plan, and then recommend the formation of the municipal district. Think of it as a framework that will be taken to the Legislature for approval. The statute sets forth the duration, organization, purpose, electing process, establishing a budget, taxing authority, methods for terminating, amending or withdrawal.

Pouech: I am on the Green Mountain Transit board. Is this similar to a regional district?

McLean: It is very similar. I am not sure if Green Mountain Transit is a union municipal district. The Chittenden County Public Safety Authority of a union municipal district with about a half-dozen members.

Hill: The Chittenden Solid Waste district is similar.

McLean: A union municipal district is a governed by a Legislative body with powers of imminent domain, taxation.

Furr: The power to own property. The power to sue or be sued.

McLean: If you pursued a union municipal district to consider the scope of power you want to give to the district. There is a process for doing this. It starts with the joint survey committee and a formation of an agreement. Ultimately, both entities would need approval of agreement by an Australian vote. If approved by the voters, then the Legislature would approve the agreement charter for the union municipal district. Depending on the agreement, the union municipal district may have the ability to collect taxes to establish a budget, but it is not required. It depends on the language of the agreement. The agreement should also consider employee conditions as it might apply to collective bargaining with a Union.

Heston: Do you know what process Essex Junction and Essex Town utilized for their proposed combined police service?

McLean: I am not sure. I can ask what direction they were going.

Forward: Although they failed to merge, they did talk about sharing police services.

Heston: We should look at what they did and not reinvent the wheel. We could use it as a template.

Cambridge: I was told that Essex has a ten-year contract.

Furr: One is contracting with the other to provide services. Essex Junction is paying Essex Town for services until something else can be developed.

McLean: That would be the first of the two options. It is not an example of a union municipal district.

Loner: Are there any Vermont Towns that have a shared union municipal district?

McLean: I am not aware of any doing it this way. When I spoke with Trevor Whipple of Vermont League of Cities and Towns, he said Richmond and Hinesburg would be the first example in the State. A fire district like Jericho and Underhill is an example of a union municipal district but they are formed very differently than police. Fire districts are typically chartered with authority or formed by action of the municipal legislative body to address specific issues.

Furr: We could still establish a governing board over the municipal district to work in an equitable way.

McLean: The initial agreement would define the joint governing board that would ultimately have management authority over the chief.

Hill: I think it is important to mention that currently the Town Manager oversees the Police Chief who oversees the Officers. Sometimes, people think the Selectboard is the supervisor of the Chief.

McLean: The new entity could still be structured as a single governing board.

Furr: It would make sense to have a board where at least one member of each Town would have to vote in favor. For instance, 3 from each Town would provide a majority of 4.

McLean: Sometimes there is weighted voting such as a case where Burlington is providing a majority of the funding. These are some of the many issues that would be debated by the joint municipal survey committee.

Heston: The State is also looking at Police oversight committees. Is there something we could do as a governing body to coordinate with the State.

Pouech: Are you saying that there is one body doing the nuts and bolts of organizing the district. Then there would be a community oversight of the district.

Heston: I was suggesting they would be one in the same.

Pouech: Some community members could be involved to provide some oversight. The State is looking for more of that.

Forward: I am interested in the interlocal contact and not the union municipal district.

McLean: The interlocal contract would be an agreement to share services, personnel and equipment. The interlocal agreement there will still be two communities figuring how to share the services that are equitable. If there is a Manager and Chief in each Town, then the agreement would define how the governance would work.

Forward: We need a committee to figure it out either way. Maybe it is a progression where we do the interlocal contract while we take the time to develop the municipal district.

McLean: Given the number factors you have to look at you probably want to put something in place and try it for at least a year.

Forward: A charter change approved by the Legislature is not a quick process.

Loner: I am looking for where it requires us to have Legislature approval.

McLean: I failed to include that in the packet. There is a statutory provision to approve the union municipal district. It will go to the House government offices and reviewed there and then at the Senate equivalent.

Pouech: I reached out to a number of Legislatures and there is an awareness that some Towns might start considering this. I think there is an open mind that this might be a solution to a problem.

McLean: I do not think this will be a charter proposal that will be controversial. If you did the work at the local level and you had a solid plan it might take a little bit of time, but it would ultimately be approved by the Legislature.

Place: Is Champlain Valley High School that serves Williston, Charlotte, Hinesburg, Charlotte, Shelburne with a Superintendent similar to a union municipal district?

McLean: There are many examples like union school districts that are setup with some of the same building blocks, but it is a different statutory section. You can still have representatives on the governing body from each Town based on contribution or population. The board makes all the decisions but also might look to hire an executive director who would oversee the various employees. It all depends on how you structure it. These details would be worked out through this on-going process with a joint survey committee which be subject to open meeting laws.

Furr: As previously noted, we can do an interlocal contract while developing the details with the joint survey committee. The Essex agreement is an example where Essex Town is ultimately in charge which is simple and quick.

Loner: There is no reason we cannot put together the committee and start doing the work to see where we want to go.

Heston: I have talked to a lot of people in the police world (retired, current, State, or local) and I have yet to find someone that doesn't think that regionalization is going to have to happen. We will have a lot of resources to draw from as we go through this process because many people want to see this happen. It will be a lot of work but that shouldn't deter us.

Forward: If we cannot figure this out then I am not sure of two Towns that would be better suited to do so.

Gordon: I like the idea of starting out with the interlocal contract for a limited amount of time. We are not sure of the issues that will pop up as we develop the union municipal district.

Pouech: I would like to hear from the two Chiefs. Hinesburg has done some contracting with St. George. I would also like to hear from each of the Board members about moving in a certain direction.

Heston: Are we allowed to do that at this meeting?

Lovell: That was my understanding that this would be a presentation for information.

Heston: We should not say how this might affect Richmond or Hinesburg at this meeting.

Forward: Can we talk about how we feel?

Arneson: I think if we are asking our attorney for advice on what Richmond should do then that should be executive session. I think it is appropriate for this open meeting if we are asking Board members and Town employees about how they feel about it. I defer to the Chairs and attorney on this.

McLean: We should look at the scope of how this meeting was warned.

Hill: It states a “discussion”, so it is more than just a presentation.

Heston: It states a “discussion of shared Police Department governance” so I just want to make sure we do not do anything wrong.

Forward: We are nowhere near any contract negotiations. It seems to me that getting a general sense of both boards will help us move it along.

Hill: We go to executive session to protect our interests from premature disclosure of information. I do not think that is the case here.

Furr: If we don’t talk about our opinions now, then we will have to do the same thing at our respective Town Selectboard meetings.

McLean: I think the warning is drafted so that you can take public feedback on the options. I do not see a legal issue.

Lovell: We are not making any decisions tonight. We are taking input at this point. I would be interested in hearing from Selectboard members and the Police Chiefs.

Herrick: Like June said, I think regionalization is going to happen. At some point, municipal districts are where things are going to end up. It is getting very expensive and time-consuming to have a Police Department. We do not just hire a person to point a radar gun. There are so many more trainings and things that make it difficult to have a 2–3-person department. You can get a lot more for your costs with a shared department. With an interlocal contract, one department may no longer exist. If there is a contract with Hinesburg while we figure out a municipal district, then Richmond no longer has a Police Department. To some extent, Richmond will not have as much control. With a municipal district you will maintain shared control. Police applicant pools are not going up so hiring will still be an issue. My concern is if there is a contract then what does it look like if the former Richmond officers end up working for Hinesburg.

Lovell: I am not sure that is a given. An interlocal contract might not mean you lose the Richmond Department.

Cambridge: The best thing would be not to dissolve either Richmond or Hinesburg Police Department until we formed a union municipal district. A possible move would be to create a contract for management or 1 Chief for both Towns. That would give us the ability to schedule both Departments together and start hiring consistently. It is a model provided to Essex. There is a lot of benefit to get this started with breaking anything or making big changes. If we were to contract Chief services and have 3 officers on at the same time, then we would get a glimpse of what this might look like as we are in the process of the municipal district.

Gordon: Nobody has done it before, but we know it needs to happen. It is going to take a lot of work and time. I think it will benefit both communities. We can do this. We are very similar.

Loner: I think it is time to do this work. In Hinesburg, we have been discussing what we want the police force to look like. This gives us an opportunity to open up that discussion.

Lovell: I am excited about this as we have been talking about regionalization for years. We have some legal patterns that will make it work. This is the way of the future whether we actively participate or not.

Place: I agree we need to look at this. I cannot believe that other States haven't dealt with it. I think it will be a lot of work but well worth it if we can keep the community and officers safe.

Pouech: I think the timing is right. In the end, the State would appreciate it if we can pull this off. There are advantages which are not necessarily cost savings. We will have tighter control like a school district dealing with mandates, as it is no longer possible to have a 4-room schoolhouse. For all the services we have to do, it is hard to have a 2-person police department. I think we take some baby steps to benefit from after-hours and on-call being shared. Maybe there are 2-3 things we can do with a contract.

Hill: I see this as a yellow light but keep moving hoping it turns to green and not red. The history of consolidating school districts is similar. We need to think about the intended and unintended consequences. I do not think a contract should include the dissolution of the Richmond Police Department. Six or so years ago at Town Meeting a motion from the floor to dissolve the Richmond Police Department failed by a substantial amount. A majority of the people said that even though it is expensive, it is worth it. We previously contracted with Bolton for some police services, and it is an example of giving up governance. We should evaluate the quality of the taxpayer and professional experience. Is it satisfying to both?

Forward: I am excited about this. Our Selectboards work in a similar culture. We do not want to be the junior partner but a partner. There are ways to keep our department. I like the idea of doing the contract first as it is quicker. I am uncertain about the municipal district as it much more complicated. We can get our feet wet by doing the contract. I think we can get the same coverage for the same amount of money. The Committee we formed already is impressive.

Furr: Pennsylvania has dozens of regional police departments, and many states are looking at this. Vermonter's love their local control but we are talking about a two-town district. I am eager to have discussions and listen to community feedback. People want to know if they call at 2 AM then they don't want a State police dispatcher saying they will be there in an hour. A merged district will give us the opportunity to take a fresh look at the opportunity. I am eager for the discussion even though I am not ready to say let's do it, where do I sign.

Heston: Richmond had this conversation more than a decade ago. It fell apart at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour. We are not doing this to save money although there might be some cost savings in shared services. We want to achieve an understanding of what our community wants in police services and how do we provide those services. Often, only one police officer is on duty at a time and that is not safe. There is less risk there with a larger department.

This process gives the entire community a say on what policing looks like. I am all for the union municipal district because we can do the hard work.

Sander: I am cautiously optimistic about continuing the conversation. Why are there 251 towns in Vermont and no two towns have gone down this road. The Richmond Police Department is a significant asset to our Town. We need to be careful to preserve what we have. The conversations need to continue with the existing departments and communities. I worry about making a hasty decision or unforeseen consequences. We need to be careful and thoughtful about getting feedback from personnel and the community. I am worried too much of the conversation is on the Board level.

Littlefield: I am becoming concerned about this conversation as the budget in Hinesburg keeps getting bigger. I am concerned that merging might actually increase the budget or not be a benefit to taxpayers. I feel like the Hinesburg Police Department brings in a small amount of revenue compared to the Richmond Police Department. This brings up questions around a culture of not making money off of ticketing as there are many disparities in traffic stops. I feel HPD does this really well. Please consider the cultural styles of both police departments.

Lovell: I know that Chief Cambridge and Chief Herrick have already begun to talk, and the culture of Hinesburg Police Department will not change or that will be a deal breaker. So far, the Chiefs report that it is very harmonious.

Cambridge: We reduced our traffic stops during COVID. Our ultimate goal is changing behavior, so we are constantly evaluating verbal warnings versus ticket revenue.

Hill: I have had conversations with everyone about community policing. There was a time when we did not have the same perspectives on this. Ironically, over the last 2-3 years there has not been a single Selectboard meeting where we have not heard a complaint about speeding or parking around our recreational areas. If you are from Hinesburg, you might not be aware of Cochran Rd on a sunny Saturday or Sunday. You will appreciate the phone calls I get about parkers, bikers, people carrying canoes. The last several years, citizens have been asking me why the Police Department doesn't give out more tickets and tow more cars. That is a dynamic associated with being on a recreational crossroads.

Forward: I share your concern about ticketing too much. There was a time when Richmond was in the top 5 in the State on ticketing. That culture has changed. We have had 3 different police chiefs in the last 3 years. We have been moving toward a community policing model. Hinesburg has been held up as a model for a community our size. This is another reason why this is the right time to think about alternatives.

Arneson: In FY21 our ticketing revenue was \$4,420 for local fines and \$4,071 for uniform traffic tickets. Pre-COVID, the uniform traffic tickets were around \$15,000.

Forward: My recollection is that revenue dropped significantly around 3 years ago with a new Police Chief.

Cambridge: I think we are getting into the specifics too much. Richmond and Hinesburg working together would provide at least two officers responding to an incident. How can

we do this in a small way that can bring us together. The culture will come. Both Richmond and Hinesburg have a lot to offer and create something even better.

West: I own Blackfork Towing in Richmond and have worked with the Police Department for over two decades. I am sure I have spent more time in the police office talking to officers than any individual. The Chief of a Department is the mentor for what makes it work. Most of the work is on-the-job training. I am happy for Richmond and Hinesburg to consider a union municipal district. I think you need to find a grant to study this. Regionalization is a big deal, and it is not a couple of towns shaking hands. Regionalization is about dealing with situations like Uvalde not just doing it the same way in a larger geography. Richmond and Hinesburg are similar towns in size and culture, but we are not geographically related. The Police Stations are 12 miles apart. The distance from one end of Hinesburg to another end of Richmond is over 20 miles of back roads. Two Fridays ago, a four-car accident was a big deal in middle of Richmond. There were at least 5 ambulances. Chief Herrick was backed up by 2 State Troopers and 3 Williston Police Officers who came without question. I think we need to be careful. If you want to study this, then get some grant money. I do not think it is fair to blow a bunch of legal money, time and bandwidth and cheat other functions in Town.

Lovell: Hinesburg has recently contracted with Richmond Rescue for ambulance services and many people brought up similar concerns about the roads between us. It has worked out really well. People in Hinesburg have been happy with the situation. The response time has been quick, the service has been professional. We are moving slowly and not jumping into anything quickly.

Forward: This group could morph into a joint survey committee.

Pouech: We should look out for other organizations that might be willing to support it.

Lovell: The idea is that small group will meet again and see what steps we can take.

Forward: We only appointed 2 Selectboard members, otherwise it becomes another Selectboard meeting. I am comfortable with the representation on that Committee and come back to us with further updates or discussions.

Lovell: The current members on the smaller committee are June, Bard, Chief Herrick, Town Manager Josh Arneson from Richmond, and myself, Phil, Town Manager Todd Odit, Chief Cambridge from Hinesburg.

Heston: We also have Trevor Whipple who has been hired by VLCT to help with police service questions.

Lovell: There are questions about how the merge would impact CVU and MMU High Schools. We do not know the answer at this time. Richmond also brought up the amount of recreational activity they receive during the weekend that is not evident in Hinesburg. These are things to be explored and worked out, but we do not have answers at this point.

Heston: We do have lots of questions.

Hill: It is also not clear to me the difference between a School Resource Officer (SRO) and coverage in an emergency situation. Are we posting warnings and minutes for that smaller committee? It is important to be transparent about that.

Lovell: Those are not public meetings, but we will keep minutes.

Forward: We want to be as transparent as possible.

## **Adjournment**

*Forward moved to adjourn. Heston seconded*

*Roll Call Vote: Forward, Furr, Gordon, Heston, Hill, Loner, Lovell, Place, Pouech, Sander in favor. Motion approved.*

## **Meeting adjourned at 10:57 pm**

### **Chat file from Zoom:**

00:09:03 Kate & Saben Littlefield: can we put a mic near this person - hard to hear

00:13:18 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Is everyone frozen?

00:14:18 June Heston: Those on Zoom lost you.

00:14:33 Jay Furr: the Zoom/Internet hiccuped on our end

00:51:26 Jay Furr: From the Essex Town/Essex Junction agreement: "The Chief of the Essex PD ("Police Chief") shall be an employee of the Town and shall be supervised by the Town Manager. However, the Town Manager shall seek input from the City Manager in the evaluation of the Police Chief and in the hiring of any new Chief. The Town Manager shall also accept input from and cooperate with the City Manager. The Police Chief, Town Manager, and City Manager shall meet at least once every six months to discuss the status, quality and execution of Police Services by the Essex PD. The Police Chief and City Manager shall cooperate in the creation, modification and execution of any City emergency response plans. The Chief shall have control over the execution of the emergency response plan."

01:02:12 Kate & Saben Littlefield: If this is opened up to the police chiefs it needs to open to the community

01:02:17 Kate & Saben Littlefield: thank you june

01:03:19 Ann Naumann: Given that the process of setting up a system of governance and approval by the state may take up to a couple of years. It will be important to think about what happens for each town's police dept in the interim so that we have vital and effective depts

01:03:46 Jennifer Decker: There's an ethical problem with centering town employees over the voices of those represented by the respective Select Boards.

01:04:04 Kate & Saben Littlefield: exactly jennifer

01:06:19 Kate & Saben Littlefield: 7:35 PM 3. Items for Presentation or Discussion with those present

a) Discussion of shared Police Department governance options with Town of Richmond and Town of Hinesburg (120 min)

01:06:25 Kate & Saben Littlefield: so residents also?

01:07:05 Kate & Saben Littlefield: can you come closer to mic? hard to hear

01:07:41 David Sander: I can hear Ben fine.

01:07:55 June Heston: Me too

01:11:03 Kate & Saben Littlefield: why would it be that Hinesburg takes over and not the other way around? How would that decision be made?

01:13:22 Ann Naumann: Part of the discussion that we should plan for is what exactly do we want our police depts to be doing? There are movements nationally to think about ways to use social services for some things that currently fall on the shoulders of police (domestic disputes, addiction, etc

01:14:22 Ann Naumann: This is an opportunity to consider what policing should look like in our towns

01:18:33 Jennifer Decker: I saw in the news that this would save taxpayers money. Can anyone clarify how those savings will be realized?

01:19:33 Kate Littlefield: It would be very helpful to see some numbers about how this would save taxpayers money. Currently, HPD has a budget of apx 800k and it looks like Richmond PD has apx 600k. How would a merger save taxpayers money and/or honor the voices of community members who want police reform?

01:24:05 Jennifer Decker: I can't think of any roads between Hinesburg and Richmond that feel safe to share with a speeding police vehicle. There is nowhere to pull over, and there are so many blind curves in the roads.

01:28:19 Jennifer Decker: This is also a safe area with current levels of staffing. It's a good time to work on disarming officers and acknowledging that we don't need an armed force among us. Ethical issues with officers and departments fill the news. The real opportunity is to shift our culture with a recognition that a system focused on crime and punishment is not in any of our best interests. What I want in services would be a department I could call for an unarmed response for community safety.

01:29:07 Warren Myers: We already share those roads with police vehicles, Jennifer.

01:29:33 Jennifer Decker: Thank you, Warren, This will certainly increase police traffic.

01:29:48 Ann Naumann: Thank you David, good points

01:37:11 Jennifer Decker: Can anyone provide data to back up the claim that costs will remain even?

01:40:11 Kate Littlefield: Oh - How will this merger impact coverage of CVU and MMU?

01:40:11 David Sander: I am very proud of the direction the Richmond Police Department has taken over the past three plus years

01:40:25 Laurie Dana: cannot hear josg

01:40:31 Laurie Dana: josh

01:40:43 Kate Littlefield: Great - thank you! That is good to hear.

01:41:47 David Sander: I think Richmond the 11th highest in ticket revenue in the state five years ago

01:48:09 Jennifer Decker: What would be the justification for going to the expense of detective bureaus and SWAT teams? I don't see any rationale for that in the Hinesburg police blotter.

01:49:14 Jennifer Decker: Who is on that committee?

01:49:52 Kate Littlefield: How will this merger impact coverage of CVU and MMU?

01:51:01 Jennifer Decker: What government body has appointed this committee?

01:51:19 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: How often will the committee report back to its respective communities and how?

01:51:32 Jay Furr: On our end, the Selectboard appointed two of its members,  
June and Bard  
01:51:43 Jay Furr: and then the town manager and the police chief  
01:51:43 Kate Littlefield: I'm not talking about SRO  
01:51:45 David Sander: MMU used to contract with the Sheriff. I don't know if  
they still contract with them or not.  
01:51:51 Kate Littlefield: Emergency Coverage  
01:52:24 Kate Littlefield: Even large PDs and schools like Essex don't have  
SROs - they are proven harmful and ineffective in emergencies FYI  
01:53:19 MMCTV Erin: Josh please pull mic back towards you  
01:53:51 MMCTV Erin: Thanks  
01:54:02 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Thanks everyone  
01:54:33 Jennifer Decker: Not all questions from the public in the chat  
received a response.